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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this mixed method study was to investigate how graduates originating from mainland China adapt to the U.S. academic integrity requirements. In the first, quantitative phase of the study, the research questions focused on understanding the state of academic integrity in China. This guiding question was divided into two sub-questions, academic misbehavior commonly practiced by students in China and factors leading to these types of misbehaviors. The data were collected via a web-based survey (N=300) through convenience sampling. The results from the quantitative analysis displayed the commonly practiced academic misbehaviors converge on four categories: a) cheating for benefits, b) plagiarism, c) exploiting academic resources, and d) falsifying one’s work. Most factors appeared significant in leading to the misbehaviors in the colleges in China. The quantitative analysis aimed to provide the contextual knowledge for the qualitative phase.

The second, qualitative portion used grounded theory to code the data. Three big themes emerged out of the data: a) the Chinese academic worldview, b) the Chinese academic context, and c) how Chinese graduate students learn U.S. academic ethics. In further analysis, subthemes emerged out of every theme. The Chinese academic worldview was divided into: a) the lack of a contractual binding, b) ethical issues not part of value system, c) the lack of reporting culture. The Chinese academic context was divided into: a) not taught about scholar ethics, b) poor supervision, and c) lack of a sanctioning mechanism. The theme of learning academic ethics in the U.S. was divided into: a) requirements of academic integrity in U.S., b) motives of Chinese graduate
students to adapt to U.S. academic ethics, and c) learning U.S. academic ethics. Two assumptions were then partly supported by the research findings that China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic ethics and institutions in China are homogeneous regarding academic integrity requirements. A model was formulated based on research findings in the qualitative phase through one acculturation theory.

Finally, the implications for future research and practice were discussed. Several suggestions were presented to help relevant U.S. institutions of higher learning enhance the effectiveness of current programs in fostering Chinese graduate students’ awareness of academic integrity.
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CHAPTER ONE

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Between the founding of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) in 1949 and the late period of the Great Cultural Revolution in 1975, few Chinese students originating from Mainland China came to the U.S. to pursue postsecondary education (Hsia & Hirano-Nakanishi, 1999; Qian, 2002). According to these scholars (Aron, 1984; Bull, 1984; Gaddis, 1982; Kennedy, 1991; Leffler, 1992; Shi, 2005), this was due to the fact that the PRC was standing steadfast on the side of the Warsaw Treaty Organization during the Cold War, and shared the same ideology with other communist nations. The Chinese Central Government, led by the founder of the PRC, Chairman Mao Tse-tung, implemented a closed-door policy with western nations. This policy stated that the western world, represented by the U.S.A and western European nations, was excluded from regular ideological relationship with China. The scenario began to change with the resumption of diplomatic relationship between the U.S.A and the PRC after the formal visit of President Richard Nixon to China in 1972 (Fan, 2009; Leffler, 1992; Ranke, 1973; Shi, 2005; U.S. Department of State, 1972). According to these scholars, the transformation was accomplished when the Chinese Central Government under the leadership of Comrade Teng Hsiao-ping changed the orientation of foreign policy in Mao’s era into an open-door policy. Since then China has been officially open to the Western world.

Accordingly, a number of government-funded Chinese scholars and students have
been sent to the U.S. to learn about advanced technology, business, and entrepreneurial management in the developed Western nations in order to speed up the process of Chinese modernization (Hsia, 1998; Huang, 1997; Orleans, 1988; Qian, 2002). Before 1975 most Chinese students in the U.S. were from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Macao, and Singapore (Zhang, 2005). According to Zhang (2005), the dramatic enrollment growth of Chinese mainland students began in the 1990s when state-supported, and self-funded Chinese students, began flowing into the U.S. This trend was evident specifically when the U.S. became a haven for victims of the 1989 Tiananmen Square Incident (Zhang, 2005).

Despite an undulating trajectory of international student enrollment since September 11th 2001, according to Institute of International Education (IIE, 2001, 2003, 2005), the U.S. remains the most desirable destination for international students to pursue postgraduate degrees, particularly for the students from the Chinese Mainland. According to Council of Graduate Schools (2007), in 2007 alone, 20% of international students in the world selected U.S. institutions for their postgraduate study. This percentage was much higher than for any other nation in the world.

During the 2000-01 academic year, according to the Institute of International Education (2001), Chinese Mainland student enrollment constituted nearly 20% of the total international students in the U.S., and comprised the largest group among international students in the U.S. From 1999 through 2001, China remained one of the two leading countries of origin for international students in the U.S. In the 2001-02 academic year, international students with the origin of Asian India outnumbered those
with the origin of mainland China. Then, in 2009-10, the enrollment of Chinese students (undergraduate and graduate) increased to 18.5%, and the PRC became the nation with the largest number of foreign students studying in the U.S. (IIE, 2010).

Initially, the majority of mainland Chinese students in the U.S. focused on such majors as natural science, business, and the English language. Since the late 1980s, some self-funded students from mainland China joined this group. The majors on which Chinese students are working expanded to education, sociology, and other liberal arts (Orleans, 1988; IIE, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2008, 2009). The annual average increase of undergraduates grew faster than graduates after 2000, but its absolute number in 2010 was still less than that of graduates (IIE, 2010). According to the Institute of International Education, in the 2009-10 academic year alone, undergraduate students from Mainland China comprised 31.3% of the total of Chinese students in the U.S.

Given the substantial flow of students and visiting scholars from the Chinese mainland into the U.S., it is important for U.S. higher education professionals to understand how these students adapt to the U.S. academic environment, specifically as it pertains to academic ethics. A number of studies have investigated how students or visiting scholars from Mainland China adapted to English-speaking cultures (Chang, 1973; Frank, 2000; Gao, 1997; Huang, 2005; Huang, 2010; Ling, 1997; Liu, 1996; Mah, 1995; Marien, 1997; Orleans, 1988; Owen, 2002; Sue & Kirk, 1972; Sue & Sue, 1972; Sue & Zane, 1985; Vuong, 2010; Wan, 2001; Wang, 1992; Wang, 2006; Wang, 2010; Warren, 2009; Yan, 2008; Zhang, 1998; Zhang, 2005; Zhang & Rentz, 1996). However, little empirical evidence has been presented describing how Chinese students adapt to the
academic ethics norms in foreign academic environments. Our knowledge of this phenomenon is based largely on anecdotal stories.

The researcher had served as a senator in the Graduate Government in the targeted U.S. university and served on the Academic Integrity Hearing Committee. As a member of the AI Hearing Committee, he participated in five hearings about cases related to graduate students’ violations of the Academic Integrity Policy, and some of the hearings were associated with Chinese graduate students. One hearing in particular was impressive. It involved a Chinese graduate student who was charged with violating the Academic Integrity Policy by copying some sentences from the Internet without citations in her term paper. To her professor’s surprise, the Chinese student was ignorant of this infringement even after the professor pointed it out to her.

This anecdote made me aware of difficulties and conflicts that Chinese graduate students are likely to face in U.S. institutions when they encounter quite a different academic environment from what they were formerly accustomed to. On the whole, the majority of Chinese graduate students successfully navigate this transition. Nevertheless, it is important for academia to explore the process about how they adapt to the U.S. academic ethics.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to investigate how Chinese graduate students adapt to the U.S. environment in term of academic integrity. Toward this end, a mixed methods study was conducted. A quantitative analysis was conducted first, followed by a qualitative analysis. The purpose of the quantitative analysis is to provide contextual
knowledge about how Chinese students perceive academic integrity, namely the necessity of Chinese graduate students for adapting to the U.S. academic ethics. The qualitative analysis, as the primary body of this dissertation research, aims to investigate how Chinese graduate students’ transition to U.S. academic integrity requirements in this U.S. targeted university.

Assumptions

The choice of the mixed methods is to a large extent determined by two assumptions such as: 1) China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic integrity requirements, and 2) Chinese institutions of higher learning have a high level of homogeneity in term of students’ perspective toward academic integrity. The former assumption demonstrates a necessity for conducting this study. The latter assumption allows that the quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis can occur in different settings. To further state, the high level of homogeneity of institutions in China makes it feasible to use the quantitative findings from a setting to provide contextual knowledge for a qualitative analysis in another setting. Meanwhile, the confirmation of these two assumptions will be discussed in the final chapter.

Research Questions

The overarching research question for the quantitative phase of this study is: What is the environment of academic integrity of higher education in China?

The sub-questions to be addressed in this phase include:

1. What is the cultural expectation of academic integrity in higher education in China?
2. What are the expectations of Chinese institutions of academic integrity?

3. What are the expectations of the faculty in Mainland China regarding students’ academic integrity?

   The guiding question for the qualitative portion is: How do Chinese graduate students adapt to the academic integrity environment of a South-eastern research university in the United States?

   The sub-questions for the qualitative analysis include:

   1. How do Chinese graduate students perceive their experiences in the U.S. academic integrity environment?

   2. How do Chinese graduate students manage their transitions from the Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment?

   3. How do Chinese graduate students come to understand the requirements of academic integrity in the United States?

Methods

   This study employed a mixed-methods approach (Creswell, 2003, 2007) in that it embedded a quantitative method into a qualitative method. The quantitative phase aimed to explore the environment of academic integrity of higher education in China; this analysis aims to provide contextual information for the qualitative phase. As the main part of the dissertation research, the qualitative portion aims to explore how graduate students originating from the Chinese Mainland acculturate with U.S. academic ethics. Mixed methodology is the optimum choice when neither quantitative nor qualitative method is sufficient by itself to capture the intricacies of the circumstances (Green,

In the quantitative phase, a descriptive analysis and a Principal Factor Analysis were conducted through SPSS 20 toward the data collected from the South-eastern large public provincial university in Mainland China. In the qualitative phase, the method of grounded theory was employed to analyze the data through Nvivo 9.

Theoretical Framework

This research investigated how Chinese graduate students adapted to the U.S. academic integrity environment. The theory that will be employed as the theoretical framework of the research is primarily related to the intercultural adaptation theories (Anderson, 1994; Bennett, 1986, 1993; Berry, 1994, 1997, 2005; Byram, 1989, 2008; Kim, 1988, 2001).

According to the above researchers, acculturation (or intercultural adjustment) is the exchange of cultural features that occurs when groups of individuals from different cultures come into continuous first hand contact. Either or both of the “clashing” groups may change their original cultural patterns, although they tend to remain distinct from each other (Kottak, 2005). In view of Berry (1997), acculturation was originally understood to be a group experience, but is now recognized as an individual-level phenomenon. Acculturation is a continuum of adaptation along which individuals have different experiences in melding into the host environment (Berry, 1997, 2005).

According to Berry (1990, 1994, 1997, 2005), factors impacting acculturation include individual and environmental variables, with the latter involving the participant’s initial environment and the current host environment. Many researchers (Anderson, 1994;
Bennett, 1993; Berry, 2005; Burnett & Gardner, 2006; Kim, 2001; Yoshikawa, 1998) view acculturation as a process of inter-acculturation in that the interaction between the two different cultures is reciprocal rather than unidirectional. This viewpoint influenced a number of non-U.S. scholars who have explored the adaptation of international students to U.S. culture (Donovan, 1981; Frank, 2000; Yan, 2008; Zhang & Rentz, 1994; Zhao, 1997). In reflecting these acculturation theories, the precondition of the acculturation is there exists difference between two cultures/environment. Along this dimension, the transition of Chinese graduate students to the U.S. academic ethics is a process of acculturation because the educational environment in China differs from that in the U.S. regarding academic integrity requirements. Accordingly, the acculturation theory is the optimal theoretical framework for this dissertation research.

Definitions and Terms

Academic integrity, according to the Center for Academic Integrity (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2011), is defined as a commitment, even in the face of great difficulties, to five basic core values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Based on these values, principles of behaviors come into being that help academic communities convert these ideals into practice.

Academic misconduct is referred to as any activity that is likely to harm the academic integrity of an institution, or subvert the educational process (University of Connecticut, 2011). In general, academic misconduct involves, but is not limited to: plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery, sabotage, and professional misconduct.
Academic dishonesty is referred to as “forms of cheating and plagiarism that result in students giving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work which is not their own” (Kibler, et al., 1988, p.1). According to academic regulations of U.S. universities, academic misbehavior or violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, fabricating/falsifying information, facilitating violations of academic integrity, failing to cite contributions, plagiarism, and thwarting others’ progress (Pirhalla, Orman, & Wangaard, 2011). In this research, unless otherwise indicated, the terms academic dishonesty, academic misbehavior, and academic misconducts are used interchangeably, and all refer to violations of academic ethics. For consistency, the term academic misbehavior is used more to represent typologies of academic unethical behaviors in this paper.

Chinese graduate students are defined as graduate students in U.S. institutions who are natives of Mainland China and came to the USA from an undergraduate or graduate degree program in China. They differ considerably from U.S.-born Chinese students because of their different educational and cultural backgrounds. They also differ from graduate students from Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, and Singapore. Although students from these countries or regions share a cultural Confucian heritage, they differ in their cultural understanding of morality, daily behaviors, and worldview (Chen, 1990; Chen, 1997; Cui & Zhao, 2004; Huang, 2011; Li, 1994; Li, 2010; Li & Geng, 2001; Liu, 2004; Ren, 1996; Yu, 2005; Zhang, 2005). According to these scholars, the differences are partly generated from their different educational institutions. Taiwan was the final foothold of the Republic of China after armies of the Nationalist Party led by Chiang Kai-
shek withdrew from China’s mainland. Taiwan inherited much of its higher education system from the Nanjing Government, the operative governing entity for the Republic of China before 1949. Furthermore, due to decades of a state of hostility between the Beijing government and the Taipei government, Chiang Kai-shek sought the aid of the U.S., and formed an alliance with U.S. Accordingly, the Taiwanese higher education system is influenced by U.S. educational institutions. Hong Kong, a former colony of Britain, retains much of its former colonial higher education system, even after the 1997 take-back by China. Singapore, an important colony of Britain before World War I, was heavily influenced by U.S. education after World War II, and is now typical of a combination of British and U.S. education system. The China mainland, the main entity of the People’s Republic of China, replicated higher education from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R) in the cold war era due to its one-sided diplomatic relationship with the headquarter of the communism group (Aron, 1984; Bull, 1984; Gaddis, 1982; Kennedy, 1991; Shi, 2005; Leffler, 1992; Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Walder, 1995). According to these scholars, this relationship was embodied as the antagonism between the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) led by the superpower U.S.A. and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) led by the former superpower U.S.S.R. In conclusion, to differentiate students from mainland China from students from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao, and Singapore, in this dissertation study, Chinese graduate students are defined as students who come from the Chinese Mainland and have received their previous education at least until their attainment of a bachelor’s degree in Mainland China.
Confucianism is typified as the maintenance of the existing order and advocating the pursuit of secular affairs (Li, 1997; Li, 2006; Li & Lai, 2006; Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Wu, 1997; Yao, 2003; Zhang, 2004; Zhao, 2004; Zhou, 2002; Zhou, 2007). There is consensus in academic circles that this heritage has exerted a substantial influence over people in modern times by orienting their thinking style and behaviors toward two fundamental principles: power-centeredness (Li, 1997; Li, 2006; Li & Lai, 2006; Wu, 1997; Zhang, 2004; Zhao, 2004; Zhou, 2007) and secularity-centeredness (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002).

Power-centeredness, according to these scholars (Li, 1997; Li, 2006; Li & Lai, 2006; Wu, 1997; Zhang, 2004), is defined as an absolute authority with which government officials are endowed in every aspect of daily life. Government officials are not merely the symbol of power but also role models of morality that the public should emulate. Secularity-centeredness means that secular happiness in terms of power and wealth is more valued than anything else (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003). According to these scholars, atheism is its primary characteristic. The essentials of this philosophy assume that people lack an ultimate moral standard from a supreme being to whom they comply; without the guidance of an ultimate moral standard, people tend to view their personal needs as the ultimate goal in life (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002). In view of the above scholars, the daily behavior guided by these principles is characterized by flexibility (in neutral terms) and utilitarianism (in derogatory terms). In this dissertation, these two principles are used to dissect the perspective of Chinese graduates toward academic ethics.
Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations

Delimitations of the study include the following:

1. The study was confined to only two universities, a U.S. research university and a large provincial university on the Chinese Mainland. The uniqueness of the study in specific contexts may make it difficult to replicate in other contexts (Creswell, 2003, 2007a, 2007b; Creswell & Clark, 2007).

2. Participants’ responses were confined to their reflections of personal experience and observations of the surrounding persons and events.

3. The study provided only Chinese graduate students’ perspectives on academic misbehaviors and their adaptation, excluding other variables such as faculty perspectives, administrators’ opinions, and comments from local and other international students.

Limitations

Limitations of the study include the following:

1. Given the rapid development of Chinese students in terms of worldviews, attitudes, and behaviors in U.S. institutions, the research in a specific temporal and spatial context is unable to mirror the big picture of Chinese graduates in adapting to a new academic ethics environment.

2. Due to the nature of qualitative research, that data might be subject to different interpretations by different data coders.

3. Given the difficulty in translating Chinese into English, some data coding may
have deviated from their original interpretation. Consequently, the deviation might have brought about bias in the analysis of the qualitative data.

4. Because of the interpretative nature of qualitative research, the researcher might have input his bias into the analysis and interpretation of the findings.

Significance of the Study

This study has the potential to make a significant contribution to the underdeveloped area of research associated with the adaptation of Chinese graduate students to academic integrity in U.S. The research also has the potential to pose numerous relevant questions to guide future research in similar fields.

In a practical sense, the primary significance of the research is embedded in the fact that no existing research has been found to have explored the adaptation of Chinese graduate students to the U.S. academic ethical environment. Knowledge and understanding about the transition of Chinese graduate students to the U.S academic integrity environment may provide these students with an insight into the factors that facilitate or impede their adaptation, thus assisting them in transitioning from their former academic environment to the present U.S. one.

Furthermore, the research may help administrators in U.S. institutions in their efforts who are responsible for familiarizing Chinese graduate students with the norms of academic integrity. In interviewing several administrators and faculty members, especially graduate coordinators in particular departments, the researcher learned that most faculty members and administrators take it for granted that international students are familiar with the specifications of the academic integrity policy of the university.
Knowing and understanding the characteristics embedded in the process of adaptation of Chinese graduate students may assist them in developing appropriate programs to help these students better undergo the transition. Finally, the research may assist administrators at the institutional level in making policies that are appropriate for helping these students adequately and accurately understand the regulations of the academic integrity policy and thus meld successfully into the environment.

Foremost, this research can assist faculty members who directly deliver instruction to Chinese graduate students in better providing to-the-point mentoring. Meanwhile, the research can help graduate coordinators at the department level integrate the resources on campus to acquaint these students with academic ethical norms and help them apply these norms to their daily course work, exams, and paper-writing.

Summary

This chapter introduced the background of the research, discussed the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, theoretical framework, and listed several significant definitions and terms. The chapter also discussed the delimitations and limitations of this dissertation research. Finally, the chapter also delineated the significance of the study. In the next chapter, the researcher will conduct a literature review about relevant research findings.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The need for Chinese graduate students to effectively transition to the U.S. educational environment in terms of academic ethics is related to the differences of academic integrity requirements in the educational environment in these two countries. To put this into perspective, the researcher conducted a literature review of academic integrity requirements across the Chinese and U.S educational environments.

Chinese Educational Environment for Academic Integrity

Now and then, there are some scandals regarding academic misbehavior popped up in the Chinese academia. In this section, the researcher investigated their characteristics and generation.

In recent years, scandals involving academic misbehaviors were occasionally disclosed to the public by the media in China. According to Xinhua News Agency (2006), the 2003 forgery of a software product Hanxing by Jing Chen, Dean of Micro Electronics College in Shanghai Jiao Tong University—a top tier university in China—was unquestionably a small-scale earthquake in Chinese academic field. According to Xinhua News Agency, the direct outcome of this scandal was that Dean Jin Chen was removed from his position and then laid off by Shanghai Jiao Tong University. The funding devoted to the so-called research and development of the software was withdrawn by the National Development and Reform Commission of Chinese Central Government.

According to Epochtimes (2010), Educational Testing Services (ETS) has been
striving recently to fight cheating in China on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE),
Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT), and the Test of English as a Foreign
Language (TOEFL). This article reported evidence that compliance with academic
integrity standards is not satisfactory to this well-known worldwide testing organization.
In the report, ETS identified the practice of cheating by using ghostwriters who are
employed by student test takers to take their places in completing tests.

Within schools, plagiarism, one of the main types of academic misbehaviors
committed by students, is to copy and paste web-based resources in graduation papers
(China Youth Daily, 2009; Guo, 2010, p. 78). Guo, a professor from China University of
Political Science and Law, claimed in his website that one master-level student copied
almost 9,000 words intact from his works without citations, and the plagiarized words
took up one third of the whole paper (200).

It was reported in *Chinese Business Newspaper* (2006) that one master student
and one PhD student in Northwest Agriculture & Forestry University were expelled from
school because of their collaborated plagiarism from one published paper. Meanwhile,
according to Guo (2010, p. 78), one of the graduate students from Ji’nan University was
expelled because his resubmitted test paper was duplicated from a published paper of a
scholar. This happened when the student was given a second chance to redo his paper
because his professor had discovered that he downloaded one paper from the Internet
word-for-word in the original submission. Another graduate student committed suicide
after his paper was questioned and he was accused of having committed plagiarism by the
responsible officer of the university and the original author (Guo, 2010, p. 79).
According to Guo (2010, p. 79), a graduated master’s degree student from Dongbei University of Finance and Economics was found to have plagiarized another student’s master’s thesis in his graduation paper. After the scandal was exposed to the public, the university decided to revoke the student’s master’s degree and withdraw his thesis from the library (Guo, p. 79). A published paper with two authors in *the Journal of Philosophical Research*, one of the key journals at the national level in China, was found to have developed based on the combination of the works of one scholar (Guo, p. 80). The first author of the paper was one Vice President of Liaoning University, and the second author, the actual author was a PhD-level student in Beijing Normal University.

According to Gelan Ma (2009), academic misbehavior in Chinese colleges and universities mainly includes the following types: a) piracy, duplication, and plagiarizing others’ published papers; b) fabrication and falsification of laboratory data or cited data; and c) employment of a ghostwriter for paper writing. According to Ma, piracy, duplication, and plagiarism involve simply copy-and-pasting, reproduction, and changing the author (generally from foreign countries) to the name of the plagiarizer by taking advantage of readers’ lack of familiarity with foreign scholarship. The employment of ghostwriters for paper writing consists of two forms: the employing and the employed. In the first form, the author is not the real writer; instead the author hires a writer. For the second format, the writer rents him or herself to others to write their papers. Free ride is another form of ghostwriting. This type of plagiarism belongs to the second category: to rent oneself to others for paper writing, because the free rider to some extent serves as the employer (Ma, 2009, p. 77).
Hu (2008) conducted a survey to understand to what extent graduate students in China come to know types of academic misbehavior. The results revealed that 66.1% of respondents reported copying an entire paper word-for-word, and 16.7% reported that they had duplicated some paragraphs. Another study conducted by Lin Wang (2005) indicated that 74.7% of respondents supported the idea that one can develop a paper by patching or editing a number of papers together. According to most respondents, whether one can succeed in producing a paper without being identified as plagiarism depends primarily on one’s ability to make a paper by montaging a number of published papers rather than creating one’s own paper (Wang, 2005).

As to the extent graduate students understand how to use quotations, Wang (2005) found that 18.9% of respondents chose know it very much, 45.7% chose know it to some extent, and 35.4% of respondents chose don’t know it, or don’t know it at all. As to whether laboratory data can be fabricated or falsified, according to Ye (2006), 58% of the respondents answered “definitely not”, 30.7% responded appropriate modifications can be made, and 11.3% responded know nothing about it. As to how to complete graduation papers (Wang, 2005), 31.5% responded with web-based copy and paste, 19.4 % depended on cutting from library articles, and 9.0% agreed with employing ghostwriters to complete the paper. When asked about what led them to duplicate or copy others’ papers as written assignments, 11.3% of students responded “because other students do this, and I follow them”, 32.0% responded “I cannot complete a paper on my own”, 30.0% responded “I am lazy and I don’t want to spend any time in paper writing”, and 26.7% responded “I have never copied from any other resources”. When asked whether they
knew of students who had ever copied from the Internet or library sources in paper writing, 64.2% of respondents answered “Yes”. In this survey, undergraduate students, master-level students, and PhD-level students took up 14.1%, 29.7%, and 36.7% of the sample respectively. These conclusions were also reported by Shi, Wang, and Jin (2009).

Among researchers in China who have explored the factors that result in academic misbehaviors (Chen, 2007; Dai, 2009; Gu, 2005; Guo, 2010; Jia, 2007; Jiang & Chen, 2004; Jiang, Wu, & Li, 2005; Lan, 2000; Li, 2007; Ma, 2009; Pan & Sun, 2005; Qiu, 2005; Science Times, 2010; Wu, 2007; Xiong et al, 2007; Zhang, 2007; Zhang, 2007; Zhang, 2008; Zhang & Niu, 2009; Zhou, 2006), there is certain consensus that the motives of plagiarizers can be divided into individual factors and the external environment.

Individual internal factors relate to one’s cognitive ability about codes and specifications of academic misbehaviors. To date, a number of researchers have found the ignorance of students about relevant codes and specifics of academic integrity explained much of the prevalence of academic misbehaviors among students in China (Cao, 2004, p. 7; Wu, 2007; Xiao & Hu, 2007). According to the above scholars, it is the ignorance of students that leads to their unintentional academic misbehaviors and this ignorance generates from little training at the departmental and institutional level. Meanwhile, it cannot be denied some students in China still choose to plagiarize in paper writing even they are acquainted with the academic integrity requirements, because deep in their hearts they employ utilitarianism to weigh their academic misbehaviors ((Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002). Although the researcher partly attributes the generation of
academic misbehaviors to the students’ cognitive ability, this cognitive ability is closely related to the external environment.

In this dissertation, external factors are referred to as the external environment. At a macro level, a public college or university in China differs little from the government because in a top-to-down pyramid of power the centralized administrational structure in the government is embodied in every institution of higher learning in China (Pan, 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Webber, 1947). As mentioned before, this governance pattern was adopted from the USSR (Pan, 2006, 2008a, 2008b). According to Pan, this governance is characterized by the centralization of power, and in college this centralization is embodied as two facets. Within the college, the centralization of power is embodied as the dominance of the administrative power over the academic power; outside the college, the centralization of power means that the institution has to bow to the equivalent regional authority with the core of Chinese Party Committee (CPC). Under this power structure, the institution does not have real autonomy to self-govern its internal and external affairs. Within the institution, the faculty is always marginalized and does not have autonomy to deal with the school and the departmental affairs. In this vein, it is understandable that knowledge production and disseminating in colleges has never become the focus of the decision-making body. Given this political ecology, Pan (2006, 2008a, 2008b) holds few institutions in China care about on-campus academic misbehavior, let alone relevant training.

Another external factor is associated with the off-campus academic environment in Mainland China (Science Times, 2010), which primarily pertains to the process
through which researchers apply for and acquire research grants and funds. As Shi and Rao (Lei, 2011; Science Times, 2010) pointed out, applying for grants has degenerated into a profit-seeking market in China Mainland. Oftentimes, success in successfully applying for a fund is largely determined by personal networks one has developed in academia rather than on the applicant’s competence. Li (2007) pointed out that applicants and review panels have evolved into interest-shared alliances. A direct result is that researchers have to devote much of their schedule and energy to growing and maintaining a personal network in their specialty circle if they want to successfully acquire a grant. According to Shi and Rao (2010), this leaves substantial leeway for their relevant collaborators to fabricate experimental data and to plagiarize due to insufficient supervision from advisors and review panel. Because of much energy and schedule need to be invested into maintaining personal network, project hosts usually find they are unable to distribute time to oversee the project progress. Meanwhile, sharing certain interests with the applicant, the review panel tends to not assume their responsibility for supervising researchers throughout the project, which was evidenced in the 2003 academic scandal of the forged Hanxing software (Xinhua News Agency, 2006).

The emergence of academic misbehavior is also partly associated with a fickle and impatient mentality in the academic circle in China. This mentality is produced largely by the external environment in that the thumb of rule of the business, quick success and riches, is becoming the yardstick to assess the effectiveness of the faculty’s work (Cao, 2004; Hu, 2008; Luo, 2006; Meng, Zhu, Zhao, & Chen, 2009; Mo, 2007; Pan & Sun, 2005; Wei, 2009; Xiong, 2008; Zhang, 2008). According to the above scholars,
this prevalent worldview among a number of scholars has made inroads on natural academic explorations. Nowadays, many faculty members in colleges and universities are no longer watchdogs of thought and generators of knowledge as before, but dealers feasting on these quick success and riches truth-seeking. In their hearts, the purpose of academic exploration is to acquire fast success and riches, and to seek the truth is their second task. So it is not uncommon that a number of academic infringements even occurred among some famous scholars.

Another academic ethical issue in China is related to prevalent piracy in China. According to several researchers (Fu & Li, 2010; He, 2009; Li, 1993; Li, 2006; Li & Xiao, 2005; Qian, 2005; Qin & Wang, 2004; Wang, 1999; Wu, 2008; Wu, 2009; Xu & Jiang, 2009), this has a deep root in Chinese history. As a long centralized empire, Chinese did not develop an awareness to respect others’ intellectual property but bow to the collective authority, which has been strengthened by more than 2,000 years of dictatorship of the monarchy (He, 2009; Li, 1993; Li, 2006; Li & Xiao, 2005; Qian, 2005; Qin & Wang, 2004; Wang, 1999). Thus, the conception of copyright has not yet taken root in people’s mind in China. Without the awareness of respecting others’ intellectual property, students as well as faculty members might violate the academic integrity policy unconsciously when citing others’ papers. These unintentional infringements are facilitated by the large-scale implementation of information technologies in higher education (Wang, 1999; Wu, 2008; Wu, 2009; Xu & Jiang, 2009). Actually, information technologies including hardware and software are a field that is haunted rampantly by piracy in China.
From a historical perspective, all these ethical mentalities can be traced to the educational system in ancient China. Compared with other countries, China has implemented the oldest civil servant system, in that an appointment of an official was based on the performance of candidates in the imperial examinations (Chen, 1988; Fen & Liu, 2004; Gan, 2010; Huang, 2005; Jia, 2006; Liu, 2010; Lu, 2001; Song & Xiong, 1986; Wang, 1998; Wang, 2008; Wang & Liu, 2010; Xu, 2002; Zhang, Yang, & Ma, 2010; Zhao & Shi, 2001). According to these researchers, the system of imperial examination had existed for almost 1,400 years from 518 A.D. to 1905 A.D., and it substantially assisted the governments in recruiting eligible officials in the name of the royal court. Parallel to this imperial examination, all types of cheating in the examination are passed down from generation to generation. Utilitarianism, one derivative of Confucianism which values the aspirations of happiness and wealth in the secular world was enabled by the imperial examination system (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002). Guided by the Confucian philosophy, a number of intellectuals in ancient China tended to do whatever they could to pass the imperial examination, in order to obtain their dreams of wealth and power. This mentality is demonstrated by a number of students in dealing with their concerns.

Inside a school, the emergence of academic misbehaviors first generates from students’ disregard toward academic integrity requirements, and this disregard is closely related to instructors’ ignorance about these academic ethics stipulations if they exist in real life (Hu & Mai, 2004; Liang, 2003; Xu, 2008; Yang, 2008; Zhang, 2007). In general, according to these researchers, a number of instructors and professors in China are not
clear about the academic integrity principle and its specifics because most colleges in China do not have the Honor Code and relevant stipulations. Given the lack of role models from faculty, it is not beyond our understanding that college students in China are not clear about appropriate academic behavior in daily life particularly specific contexts. In many U.S. universities, the researcher observed that the academic integrity policy statement is highlighted at the head of the syllabus of every course. For example, in this targeted university, a statement about the significance academic integrity markedly appears at the beginning of the syllabus: “……Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value our degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.” (Academic Integrity Policy, 2008). This is very impressive to a researcher from China. This statement has a far-reaching effect by planting this worldview deep into every student’s mind. A moral orientation can be inculcated into students’ minds if it can dissolve into the human environment so that it can be seen, felt, and even “smelled” by the students living in it (Fan & Si, 2006; Gao, 2009; Ren, 2003, Zhou, 2006). However, according to the same researchers, in many Chinese institutions, the founders inscribed ancient maxims onto the monuments of the college, that emphasizes the significance of academic integrity, but the spirit has not taken root in the student’s mind because most institutions in China lack a mechanism that can convert this educational aspiration into students’ daily behaviors.

Second, most colleges and universities in China devote little resource to planting
the academic integrity principle and its specific requirements into students’ minds (Luo, 2006; Wu, 2007; Xiong, 2008). Generally, in view of these researchers, the focus of the highest-level officials in the institution is on their individual goal---how to climb the higher rung along the power hierarchy. Consequently, how to foster students’ awareness about academic ethics has never fallen on the agenda of the decision-making body at the institutional level. While the majority of universities provide students with several required courses on ethics, these courses are irrelevant to fostering their awareness of academic integrity.

Third, regulations or codes to define academic misbehaviors in universities in China are not standardized if they exist there (Pan & Sun, 2005; Qiu, 2005; Xiong, 2008; Zhou, 2006). Students who are even familiar with these regulations and codes are still uncertain about what specific stipulations indicate in specific contexts. This is because these regulations and codes were derived from the U.S. and other developed western European nations, and those drafting the codes did not take the special situation of China into consideration. What’s worse, there is no office on many college campuses in China that exclusively manages academic activities of faculty and students in order to set up a firewall against academic misbehavior within institutions.

Fourth, soft punishments cannot deter violators to stay away from academic misbehaviors (Fan & Si, 2006; Gao, 2009; Pan & Sun, 2005; Qiu, 2005). Currently, academic dishonesties not only arise among students but also among faculty members. It is unusual that violators would receive punishments from colleges or universities if the violators are faculty members. Even for student violators, whether one is punished and
the severity of punishments is dependent upon the influence the violator may have with the authorities. Due to such favoritism, violators can usually escape sanctions by the institution. This situation is worsened by the lack of a special mechanism to deal with these infringements on campus.

Also, the increasing enrollment of higher education in China since the late 20th century makes it impractical for instructors or mentors to supervise the expanding student body (Development Center for Education Science and Technology of Shanghai, 2002; Ding, 2004; Hua, 2011; Lin, 2007; Wang, 2006; Wei, 2009; Xu, 2004; Zhang, 2007; Zhang, 2008). Since the late 1990’s, a wave of campus expansion has swept Mainland China. Within a number of institutions, the student count increased steeply, and a class that formerly had 40 students now may have 60 or more. The teaching load for every instructor increased to such an extent that he or she could not spare time to mentor or supervise students’ academic activities. This contributed in part to the college students’ plagiarism in paper writing. To make things worse, regulations that endow the faculty with absolute authority to supervise students’ academic activities and report violators to the administrators have not been established.

Next, a nationwide assessment and evaluation towards research universities by the Ministry of Education failed to standardize students’ academic activities and is therefore unable to foster the development of a healthy academic climate (Mu, 2007; Shi, Wang, & Jin, 2009; Shu, 2000; Yao, 2008). In order to guarantee a high ranking in the nationwide assessment, few colleges or universities would self-disclose academic scandals of their faculty and students. On the contrary, a number of “to-be-evaluated” schools learned how
to create documentation to make them appear “perfect” before the evaluation panel.

A review of the cultural background of academic misbehavior in China assists the reader in understanding the attitude of Chinese graduates regarding academic integrity when these graduates arrive in the U.S. In order to elaborate on the necessity of the transition of Chinese students to the U.S. academic integrity environment, the researcher will review the academic integrity climate in the U.S. in the next section.

Academic Integrity in U.S. Institutions

A number of researchers in the U.S. have investigated students’ academic misbehaviors (Besvinick, 1983; Caruana, Ramaseshan, & Ewing, 2000; Cole & McCabe, 1996; Ercegovac & Richardson Jr, 2004; Harms, 2006; Hughes & McCabe, 2006; Knight & Auster, 1999; Levy & Rakovski, 2006; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003, 2006; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe, Trevion, & Butterfield, 1999; McCabe, Trevino, Butterfield, 2001a; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001b; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002; Nonis & Swift, 2001; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007; Wajada-Johnston, et al., 2001; Whitley, Nelson, & Jones, 1999). These scholars, particularly McCabe and his colleagues, have conducted a number of studies to investigate academic dishonesty in U.S. higher education. They explored two levels of academic misbehavior involving undergraduates and graduates and the factors that have resulted in the misbehaviors: individual and situational factors. Research findings in the U.S. revealed that the generation of academic misbehavior was complicated, and the incidence of academic misbehavior was related to several factors, including discipline differences, peer attitude,
faculty’s attitude toward the academic misbehavior reporting system, enforcement of the honor code, checking software, and others (Chapman, Davis, Toy, & Wright, 2004; Dumford, Murph, Connelly et al., 2007; Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; McCabe & Treviño, 1993, 1997; McCabe, Treviño, & Butterfield, 2001a, 2001b, 2002; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999; Treviño, Butterfield, & McCabe, 1998). In view of most writers in the U.S., effective prevention of academic misbehavior is determined by the education environment and the supervising mechanism.

Chinese researchers who study U.S. academic misbehaviors (Ding, 2004; Fan & Si, 2006; Huang, 2005; Li, 2007; Liang, 2005; Pan, 2005; Qiu, 2005; Ren, 2010; Xinhua News Website, 2009a; Xinhua News Website, 2009b; Xiong, et al., 2007; Xu, 2008; Yao, 2008) are not interested in investigating the generation and frequency of such misbehaviors in the U.S., their focus is on learning from U.S. schools about how they effectively arrest academic misbehaviors. This is because the academic circle and government in China hope to keep abreast of U.S. higher education and make higher education in China a worldwide frontrunner. In view of many researchers in China (Huang, 2005; Li, 2007; Liang, 2005; Pan, 2005; Qiu, 2005; Ren, 2010; Xinhua News Website, 2009a; Xinhua News Website, 2009b; Xiong, et al., 2007; Xu, 2008; Yao, 2008), higher education in the U.S. is the best in the world and to learn from the U.S. is a short-cut to bridge the gap between their current educational standing and their ideal standing.

Yufu Huang (2005) provides one of the best examples of this mentality in Chinese academia. Huang conducted an in-depth investigation of U.S. institutionalized measures
to fight academic misbehaviors from a historical perspective. Based on the research, Huang (2005) demonstrated that the establishment of a healthy academic integrity environment in the U.S. is dependent upon intramural and extramural institutional mechanisms. Huang observed that most schools in the U.S. place a priority on developing an on-campus educational climate to arrest academic misconducts, which is evidenced by the establishment of the International Center of Academic Integrity. According to Huang (2005), zero tolerance of academic misbehavior is always a basic requirement for most schools, especially research universities in the U.S. McCabe and his colleagues (1993, 1996, 1997, 2001, 2006) hold that the on-campus academic ethical state is directly associated with the attitude of students. Consequently, they believe to foster students’ awareness of academic integrity is crucial to effective arrest academic misbehaviors (McCabe, 1992; McCabe & Dukerich, & Dutton, 1993; McCabe & Treviño, 1993, 1997; McCabe, Treviño, & Butterfield, 2001a, 2001b, 2006). This is also demonstrated by the purpose of McCabe in launching the establishment of the Center of Academic Integrity (currently as the International Center of Academic Integrity).

Furthermore, Huang (2005) found colleges and universities in U.S. pretty appreciate the development of mechanism to convert academic ethical stipulations into daily actions. The researcher himself also observed that virtually each research university in U.S. has a special office that exclusively reviews and oversees students’ and faculty’s applications for studies. Part of its responsibility is to identify whether relevant researchers violate the Academic Integrity Policy beforehand. The researcher also finds the supervision goes through the study, which is also supported by McCabe and his
colleagues (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe, Trevion, & Butterfield, 1999; McCabe, Trevino, Butterfield, 2001; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002).

Huang (2005) found faculty members in U.S. play a pivotal role in supervising the study because relevant faculty members are endowed with the responsibility for overseeing students and timely identifying student violators until reporting them to relevant administrators. Huang (2005) found virtually all relevant faculty members take it serious in assuming their responsibility because they partly share the outcome if their students are identified to have crossed the line. McCabe and his colleagues (1993, 1997, 2001, 2006) believe this nexus between the policy and its enforcement is crucial: without it, academic ethics only live as written words on paper. According to McCabe and his colleagues, the faculty’s supervision works because instructors as well as advisors are in the front line in daily contact with students when delivering instruction or collaborating with their students in projects. Although relevant faculty members are reluctant to report their students’ violations to administrators, their worry of partly sharing the outcomes leads to their timely interference once they find their students crossed the line (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2002; Nonis & Swift, 2001; Pincus & Schmelkin, 2003; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999; Vandehey, Diekhoff, & LaBeff, 2007).

Besides, a number of researchers in China (Ding, 2004; Fan & Si, 2006; Huang, 2005; Li, 2007; Liang, 2005; Pan, 2005) noted that off-campus laws and mechanisms at the state and federal level in U.S. have erected a bulwark from the outside to extend the
enforcement of the zero-tolerance policy across disciplines and professions. According to these researchers, first, the federal government administration and Congress have paid considerable attention to arresting this problem.

Specifically, Huang (2005) did a chronological review toward the development of the academic integrity policy at the federal level. In 1976, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) was established under the Executive Office of the President based on *The National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976*. One of its primary objectives was to enhance the awareness of the president toward the perniciousness of academic misbehaviors of researchers. In 1985, the Health Research Extension Act passed in the Congress states that the National Health Institute is the official agency to establish procedures for handling reports of violations of the academic integrity policy from all institutes in the U.S. In 1992, under the Department of Health and Human Services of the U.S., the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) was established based on the combination of the Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) and the Office of Scientific Integrity Review (OSIR). In 1993, the Office of Research Integrity became an independent entity within the Department of Health and Human Services after former President Clinton signed it into law. According to Huang (2005), the policy of academic integrity at the federal level includes: a) definitions of academic misbehaviors in science; b) the ruling of academic misconduct; c) accountability of the federal office and relevant institutes; d) providing timely and unbiased rulings to the reported academic infringements and meanwhile providing protection to the reporters; and e) administering measures at the federal level to rectify already academic misbehaviors.
Huang (2005) also found that if necessary, the name and information of violators will be posted on the federal list of unfavorable researchers to whom relevant federal agencies and foundations refuse to provide fund or grant because of their past academic misconducts. Sometimes, the violators would be transferred to the judicial system once they are identified to have violated relevant laws. Furthermore, researchers noted that the federal government places obligations on associations and institutes to develop relevant honor code and regulations to guarantee the enforcement of zero-tolerance (Fan & Si, 2006; Huang, 2005; Li, 2007; Liang, 2005; Pan, 2005). In addition, the federal government enforces the pertinent regulations among national journals and presses to maintain a healthy academic climate in the publishing field. According to these writers (Huang, 2005; Ren, 2010; Yao, 2008), it is the seamless intramural and extramural supervising network in the U.S. that effectively encourages students and faculty members to stay away from academic misbehaviors, even though this mechanism is unable to eliminate these misbehaviors.

In summary, it is evident that China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic integrity requirements, which definitely result in a Chinese view toward U.S. academic integrity principle by many Chinese students. In order to successfully acculturate with the U.S. host educational environment, Chinese students need to understand the U.S. academic integrity principle and its stipulations, and furthermore to convert these stipulations into their daily actions.

Theoretical Perspective

In this section, the researcher compared Anderson’s (1994) model and Burnett and
Gardner’s model. Eventually, Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) five-staged adaptation model was chosen as the theoretical framework for this dissertation research.

Anderson’s (1994) model is typified as exploring sojourners’ acculturation from the perspective of a minority student. According to Anderson, cross-cultural adaptation is nothing but a common process of learning to live with change and adjustment, like other ‘transition experiences’ (Bennett, 1993, p. 45). This perspective does not belittle the significance or the difficulty experienced by the sojourner in the inter-acculturation but deals with the problem from a socio-psychological lens. Anderson doubts that sojourners can fully adapt to the new culture because he/she believes that acculturation not merely requires the sojourners to learn the host culture’s way but ‘It demands that their validity be accepted’ as well (Anderson, 1994, p. 304). Thus, Anderson’s model places more emphasis on the long-term adaptation of sojourners. Viewing the acculturation as an instrument for the sojourners to adapt to the host new culture, Anderson points out that it is the sojourner’s autonomy to observe and assess events and “determine both what must be adjusted to and how adjustment should proceed” (p. 303). Therefore, the sojourner’s acculturation in terms of degree and modes varies across specific phases in the intercultural adaptation. Anderson’s (1994) model comprises four components: cultural encounter, obstacles, response generation, and overcoming. Obstacle, in this model, is a critical element and defined as a ‘dissatisfier’ or ‘stressor’, which positions a sojourner in a status of disequilibrium, where one outgrows one’s accessible resources. Obstacles and response generation compose a repetitive cycle before arriving at overcoming, “a phase of relatively steady progression toward harmony with the new environment” (p. 308).
This model is used to describe first-year students’ learning and academic adjustment to foreign college studies (Ramsay, et al. 1999). However, no one has employed this method to investigate Chinese students’ acculturation (Wang, 2010). Even so, this model sheds considerable light for the researcher to identify an appropriate theoretical referent.

Fortunately, Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) five-staged adaptation model was derived from the investigation of Chinese students’ acculturation in a UK university. Burnett and Gardner summarized this model by administering Yoshikawa’s (1998) double-swing model to their study. In total, this model is comprised of five stages: a) encounter, b) disorientation, c) reaction, d) independence, and e) internalization.

According to Burnett and Gardner, encounter is defined as the sojourner’s high expectation of the host culture and high motivation to adapt to it, even though the new circumstances are not agreeable. In Burnett and Gardner’s words, encounter “better describe the notion of meeting or confronting the new experiences than suggested passivity of meeting contact” (Burnett & Gardner, 2006, p. 86). Disorientation, like Yoshikawa’s (1988) disintegration, describes a disoriented or disequilibrium state, in which sojourners find it difficult to meld into the host culture because of their long identification with their home heritage. In their view, after having experienced encounter and disorientation, the sojourner comes to a reaction stage. At this stage, the sojourner begins to adjust to the host culture through appreciating the differences inherently embedded in the new culture and attempting to act in culturally appropriate means. Independence is referred to as not merely the sojourners’ independence in constructing their own practical lives but also their independence of constructing opinions and
viewpoints.

Internalization, according to Burnett and Gardner, is defined as “the ability of the individual to internalize the experience of cultural differences within their sense of identity” (Burnett & Gardner, 2006, p. 89). To interpret, internalization refers to the process that individuals undergo in conciliating and integrating the host culture and their heritages. This occurs when the adjusters act appropriately in a new cultural context without having to change their identity.

Given that Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) model was generated from its application to an investigation of how a group of Chinese students acculturated with a heterogeneous environment, the researcher determined to employ this model as the theoretical framework of this dissertation research.

Acculturation of Chinese Students with Western Educational Environment

This section examines and analyzes research that documents factors that impact the acculturation of Chinese students with western education environment and examines the extent to which they meld into the mainstream environment of English-speaking countries.

Factors Impeding Adaptation to Western Environment

As to factors that impede Chinese students’ adaptation to the U.S. academic environment, the research of Zhang and Rentz (1994) indicated that students originating from the Chinese Mainland are likely to face specific challenges different from those undergone by other Asian students. In the view of Zhang and Rentz, impediments for Chinese students converge on the following aspects: a) financial concerns; b) a shortage
of knowledge about of modern U.S., c) the Chinese educational system’s impact, d) their living environment in home where the United States is described as a negative image, e) a worldview that prioritizes the collective value. In surveying Chinese students in a university, Perkins and colleagues (1977) found that Chinese students viewed their inadequacy for educational preparation as a more important concern than did students from India.

In elaborating on the “educational shock” experienced by Chinese students, Donovan (1981) stated:

P.R.C students tend to assume that American education is basically like their own. Students from China regularly interpret what they see and hear in the United States in terms familiar to them. This leads the Chinese to expect people and institutions to act in ways that would never occur to many Americans. For example, the central government of China plays a major and direct role in the placement and supervision of all foreign students in the P.R.C. and in the administration of all colleges and universities. It is difficult for Chinese nationals to understand the highly decentralized and autonomous nature of American education. Similarly, schools in China provide a number of services and enforce a number of provisions that have no counterpart in this country. It is natural for Chinese students to assume that the school will provide housing and will specify precisely what courses to be taken—because this is what happens in China. Academic institutions play a very different role in China than they do in the United States, and much of what is done by Chinese institutions is left to the
Donovan’s arguments have been corroborated by empirical findings (Lin, 1998; Timm & Wang, 1995). Lin’s (1998) study at the University of Pittsburg revealed that Chinese students in the university found that the “rules” managing their academic experiences were considerably distinctive from those in their former academic environment in China. Timm and Wang’s (1995) research examined how Chinese students attended classroom discussions and interacted with U.S. instructors as well as classmates. The study showed that about half of Chinese students viewed their experiences as negative, although 75% claimed they had social contact with U.S. students outside the classroom. The survey also found that Chinese students had quite limited interaction with their instructors and classmates inside classrooms.

The reasons that Chinese students attributed their lack of interaction with Americans lie in that they felt uncomfortable when interacting with Americans because of tight schedule, the lack of interests, language barriers, and the convenience of having many other Chinese students around.

Cortazzi and Jin (1997) examined expectations of Chinese international students and visiting scholars, and their UK supervisors. They also examined their academic language use. The study indicated that Chinese students’ academic success in a western learning environment needed to accommodate some new perspectives in the host environment. According to Cortazzi and Jin (1997), Chinese students and visiting scholars and their UK supervisors are situated at two poles in terms of knowledge function, classroom relationship, and pedagogical sensibility.
With respect to knowledge function, the study indicated Chinese students and visiting scholars emphasized collective needs. For classroom relationship, Chinese students and scholars highlighted hierarchy and harmony between learners and instructors. As to pedagogical sense, Chinese students and scholars tended to emphasize passive participation, contextualized communication, and audience responsibility. With regard to epistemology, Chinese students and visiting scholars preferred to rely on authority for knowledge mastery and transmission. They tended to view knowledge as the single solution and to accept its importance unquestioningly. On the contrary, their UK supervisors stressed knowledge function for individual needs, preferred an equal reciprocity for classroom relationship, espoused active involvement, and agreed to explicit verbal communication for classroom activities. Epistemologically, UK supervisors emphasized independent thought, seeking to explore and produce knowledge through discussing, arguing, or challenging other scholars. For existent knowledge, UK supervisors preferred to critically evaluate it and seek alternatives to current knowledge.

Kun Yan’s (2008) research revealed that what differentiated Chinese students from their U.S. counterparts was extreme cultural distance. According to Ward (1996), cultural distance is defined as the similarities and differences between the culture of origin and the culture of contact. The greater the difference between the two cultures, the greater the cultural distance. Thus, cultural distance is viewed as a barrier that impedes Chinese students from effectively engaging in curricular and extracurricular activities in a culturally heterogeneous environment. This was evidenced empirically by Samovar and Porter’s research (1991), which revealed that there are maximum sociocultural
differences between Western and Asian countries.

To summarize, the literature review reveals that the impediments to Chinese students’ adaptation to U.S. culture come from their misconceptions when they project their view formulated formerly in China to the new environment. The ill-adaptation of Chinese students emanates from their disequilibrium between these two states and the process of substituting the new appropriate view for the former one.

*How Chinese Students Acculturate*

A number of researchers have investigated how Chinese students acculturated with the U.S. educational environment (Berry, 1997; Burnett, 2004; Chuong, 2010; Frank, 2000; Gao, 1997; Vuong, 2010; Wang, 1992; Want, 2006; Wang, 2010; Warren, 2009; Yan, 2008; Zhang, 2005; Zhao, 1997).

Yanmei Zhang (2005) explored academic and social integration of Chinese students and the extent to which academic and social integration impacts their persistence on U.S. campuses by employing phenomenological methodology. This research compared Chinese students in China with Chinese students in the U.S. Overall, this study indicated that academic integration was more influential than social integration regarding development and persistence across Chinese and U.S. colleges. Differences were found between these two groups: Chinese students in the U.S. were more academically integrated in college, while Chinese students in their home country were more socially integrated. Meanwhile, Chinese graduate students in China and the U.S. were found to be more engaged in academic activities, while Chinese undergraduate students in their home country were more engaged in social activities. Differences were also found within
Chinese students in the U.S.: Chinese undergraduate students were found to be more involved in social activities than Chinese graduate students.

Nancy Frank’s (2000) research interviewed six Chinese female students and explored their acculturation with the U.S. environment also through phenomenological methodology. This research focused on describing and interpreting students’ life histories, challenges they were confronted with during their sojourn, the impact of the challenges on their lives, and their future aspirations. Four themes were identified in the research: enduring the loss of family and friends; enduring financial difficulties; striving to understand the culture, language, and the academic circumstance; and trying to make themselves understandable in their roles as graduate research assistant and students. Meanwhile, challenges they faced produced many changes in their: self-confidence, independence, beliefs, and values. Additionally, it was paradoxical that participants’ culture of origin (Chinese) resulted in a multiplicity of challenges, but it also provided the participants with inner resources which they needed to be successful in academic activities.

Kun Yan’s (2008) mixed method study of 60 Chinese students at Arizona State University by using Berry’s model (1994, 1997, 2005) examined the sources of stressors available to Chinese students, their strategies in coping with the stressors, and resources they used to manage their stressors in the process of acculturation. The study revealed that the life of Chinese students in America was not relaxed and they had to deal with multifaceted life-stressors. Job opportunities, immigration issues and academic pressure ranked as their highest stressors. The study also revealed that individual
variables like gender, college, major, age, marital status, length of stay, and acculturation strategies bore significant impact on stress levels among students. It was found that Chinese students employed a wide range of coping strategies to mitigate their stress. The most sought resources by Chinese students were family members in China. The findings in this research are partly shared by Christie Burnett (2004), whose research explored the acculturation of Chinese students in Queen’s University. The primary objective of the research was to identify key factors that affected the acculturation of this group. The results revealed that the best way to appreciate the experiences of students from other cultures and to avoid an ethnocentric prejudice is to understand the individual’s view of self. The results also revealed that Chinese students viewed themselves as interdependent and to some extent were dependent upon others such as parents and teachers, for emergent help.

In an ethnographic study, Lihong Wang (2010) investigated how Chinese postgraduates’ adjustment to teaching and learning in the new learning environment in the first academic year. The research compared Chinese students’ initial perceptions of British teaching and learning practices to their inherited culture of learning. The research also investigated how Chinese postgraduates adjusted emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally to make their learning successful, and to experience relevant changes in their conceptions about knowing and learning. The results indicated that Chinese students were characterized by an emphasis on knowledge accumulation and transmission, the learner’s effort, and a respectful manner to teachers and knowledge. As to their perspective toward British teaching and learning culture, the study revealed the participants would like to
observe new teaching and learning norms and to respond in a timely manner to the expectations of the new learning environment. Nonetheless, the participants’ initial perceptions were poorly focused, and their learning activities were ambiguous and unpredictable. The research also showed that Chinese postgraduates tended to adopt both emotion-focused and problem-focused strategies. The results indicated that adjustments to the new learning environment was an intercultural learning process for students from Mainland China, and these adjustments brought about changes and development to Chinese postgraduates’ conceptions and beliefs about learning and knowledge in this host country. This was mainly embodied as changes in three dimensions: what, why, and how. Based on the findings, the author concluded that sojourning Chinese postgraduate students did adapt well to the Western teaching and learning environment through taking advantage of the adjustable resources of their inherited learning on the one hand, while uninterruptedly assimilating and accommodating to the new values and practices on the other.

The above studies investigated how Chinese students adapted to the host culture. Quite different from the above, Tianshu Zhao’s (2007) research explored how Chinese students and British lecturers/students met each other’s academic expectations and develop into an intercultural academic identity, which was embodied as a mixture of Chinese and British cultures of learning. The research also investigated how these two groups approached the dilemma of preserving their original academic identities while developing new academic identities. It was an ethnographical study with an interpretive-qualitative paradigm. The focus was placed on the participants’ inter-acculturation in the
specific context. Triangulation was chosen as the primary data collection method, grounded theory was employed as the data analysis strategy. The research revealed that Chinese students as well as British lecturers/students underwent three stages in adapting to classroom and group communication contexts. Initially, Chinese students tend to experience frustration because of unfamiliarity to the new environment. As they become familiar to the host environment, they can establish good relationship with local students. However, along with Chinese students having in-depth communication with British students and faculty, they tend to experience frustration because they find the host culture value is conflict with their firmly believed world value. At this stage, these Chinese students would find it difficult to advance their relationship with locals forward. Conquering these barriers, these Chinese students come to the final stage by melding into the host culture with relaxation. There were differences among the participants in the final stage due to different strategies they employed to cope with challenges. The communication and relationship between those adopting integration strategies were much better than before. The results also revealed that Chinese students and British lecturers/students tended to undergo different patterns of sociocultural and psychological adaptation, and their psychological dimensions, including emotion and motivation, tended to fluctuate over time.

Overall, based on articles included in the review, the researcher found that impediments generated from the difference between home and host culture might lead to difficulties or challenges to Chinese students during the acculturation. However, these sojourners from China could eventually acculturate to the host culture after the initial
shock, conflict, and adjustment. This sheds a broad positive light on the current research.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher primarily examined and analyzed research findings with regard to four categories: a) Chinese educational environment for academic integrity; b) academic Integrity in U.S. institutions; c) theoretical perspective; and d) acculturation of Chinese students with western educational environment. The first section of this chapter revealed the U.S. differs from China in terms of academic integrity requirements, indicating graduate students with the origin of mainland China will inevitably experience a transition when they contact a heterogeneous host environment. Although there lacks relevant research findings that document how this transition executed, the articles reviewed in this chapter shed a broad positive light on this dissertation research.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research design, site selection, population and sample, data collection, interviews, reliability and validity, data analysis, and ethical considerations along two dimensions: the quantitative and qualitative portion. In the quantitative portion, the overarching research question is: What is the environment of academic integrity of higher education in China?

These sub-questions will be addressed in this phase:

1. What is the situation of academic integrity in higher education of China?
2. What are the expectations of Chinese institutions regarding academic integrity?
3. What do the faculty members in higher education of China expect of students’ academic integrity?

In the qualitative portion, the guiding question is: How do Chinese graduate students adapt to the academic integrity environment of a large research university in the United States?

Sub-questions for the qualitative analysis include:

1. How do Chinese graduate students perceive their experiences in the U.S. academic integrity environment?
2. How do Chinese graduate students manage their transitions from the Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment?
3. How do Chinese graduate students come to understand the requirements of academic integrity in the United States?
Design and Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods approach (Creswell, 2003, 2007a, 2007b; Creswell & Clark, 2007; Patton, 1990) in that it embedded a quantitative method into the qualitative method. The quantitative phase aimed to explore how Chinese college students perceive academic integrity and its stipulations; this analysis aims to provide contextual information for the qualitative phase. As the main part of the dissertation research, the qualitative portion aimed to explore how graduate students originating from the Chinese Mainland in a U.S. research university acculturate with U.S. academic integrity requirements. Mixed methodology is the optimum choice when neither quantitative nor qualitative method is sufficient by itself to capture the intricacies of the circumstances (Green et al., 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003).

The quantitative and qualitative phases were conducted respectively in two universities. The choice of the strategy resulted from the situation of higher education of China being a high level of homogeneity. This has been testified by a number of studies in China (Cao, 2010; Dong & Zhang, 2004; Gao, 2003; Han, 2008; Li, 2007; Liu, 2010; Liu & Zou, 2011; Lu, 2008; Meng, 2009; Pan, 2005, 2006; Pan & Xiao, 2008a, 2008b; Sun, 2008; Wang, 2008; Wang, 2010; Wu, 2007; Wu, 2011; Xie, 2006; Xu, 2004; Yang & Zuo, 2009; Yang, 2008; Ye, 2005; Zhang, 2010; Zhang & Ding, 2007; Zhang & Li, 2006; Zhou & Chu, 2004). According to these scholars, due to a particular evolution of Chinese higher education that copied the higher education system of the USSR typified as a highly centralized higher education system, institutions of higher learning throughout China are characterized by high homogeneity in that the mission, management style,
curriculum, and instruction have converged in the past years. According to these scholars, a public university in China is an extension of political authorities and does not have the necessary autonomy to manage its affairs as its counterparts in U.S. do. The convergence of higher education of China is evident when analyzed from an ideological perspective and operative mechanism, with communism as the core. College students who are educated in schools of China appear homogeneous with respect to worldview including their perspective toward academic integrity. This hypothesis and conclusion will be testified in Chapter Five based on the data analysis across the quantitative and qualitative portion in Chapter Four.

According to Creswell and his colleagues (2003), when designing a mixed method study, such issues as priority, implementation, and integration need to be considered. Priority is defined as which method, quantitative or qualitative, is given more weight. Implementation is referred to as the order of data collecting whether they occur in a sequence or chronological stage or concurrently. Integration is the stage during the course of research when data is combined or mingled. Given the nature of the research questions for this study, more emphasis is placed on the qualitative phase.

In the quantitative portion, an instrument was developed to measure the perspective of Chinese college students toward academic integrity. Survey items were developed by the author cooperating with his mentor and committee based on several self-reported surveys (McCabe, 1992; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1996, 1999, 2001a).

The targeted population at this phase involved graduate students and fourth-year
undergraduates in one large public provincial university in the southern part of China. A convenience sample was picked for the survey. A questionnaire developed formerly in a pilot study by the researcher in cooperation with his mentor, was then refined and finalized by the academic committee based on the feedback from the pilot survey in China, and administered to each participant in the sample. The findings of the quantitative phase were used to compare against college students’ perspective of academic integrity reported in the literature review to provide a contextual understanding for the qualitative analysis.

In the qualitative phase, sample criteria were emailed to the population of participants: a) who are natives of mainland China; b) who came to America at least with a bachelor’s degree from an institution in China; c) who are currently working on a master’s degree or a doctoral degree in U.S. The data collection method was a one-hour, semi-structured interview with open-ended questions. Most of the interviewees were picked from technology or engineering majors due to the nature of the U.S. targeted institution.

Grounded theory, an established qualitative research method that was developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and further refined by Corbin and Strauss (2008), was employed as the methodology in the qualitative portion. The reason that grounded theory was chosen as the method lies in the purpose of the dissertation research: to explore “how”, namely the process of how Chinese graduate students adapt to U.S. educational environment with respect to academic integrity. By focusing on Chinese graduate students’ adaptation to the academic integrity environment of the U.S. institution, the
researcher will develop a theoretical model to capture the characteristics of this dynamic acculturation.

As Creswell emphasized, “Qualitative inquiries use different terms such as theories, patterns, and naturalistic generalization to describe the understanding developed in their studies” (2007a, p. 119). Relying upon grounded theory as the guiding methodology, the research used the acculturation model of Burnett and Gardner to analyze and describe the acculturation of Chinese graduate students in the U.S. One of the primary objectives of grounded theory, according to Strauss and Corbin (1998), is to move beyond description and to generate or discover a theory. This methodology requires all the participants in the study to have experienced the process (Creswell, 2003; Strauss & Corbin, 1988). In this approach, the development and formulation of theory does not come “off the shelf,” but rather is produced or “grounded” in data from participants who have experienced the process (Strauss & Corbin, 1988).

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative Setting

The survey in the quantitative phase was administered to graduate students and senior undergraduates in a large public provincial university in China. This Chinese university is one of science and technology, situated in the southern part of the Chinese Mainland.

The university in China, according to its website introduction, is a comprehensive university that primarily focuses on technology and engineering majors. In recent years, several colleges and universities have been affiliated with it, specifically one medical
university, under the guidance of the provincial educational department. This expansion has made this university a giant among institutions of higher education in Southeastern China. This university ranks as a middle level institution in academics. Currently, it has 7,000 full-time graduate students on campus and 10,000 full-time undergraduates, making it convenient for the researcher to pick a sample of 300 from the above two populations.

Instrumentation

The instruments in this study include the survey questionnaire and the interview protocol. Given the lack of empirical evidence on how Chinese graduates adapt to U.S. academic ethics, the researcher, in cooperation with his mentor, developed a questionnaire scrutinized by the academic committee. The interview protocol was designed by the mentor based upon his years of experience in qualitative research.

Instrument Review

Test (DIT), a paper-and-pencil, recognition test based upon Kohlberg’s model of moral reasoning (Lind, 1978), was established by Rest (1979) to assess participators’ moral reasoning scheme through administering a series of dilemma questions to participators (King & Mayhew, 2004; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thomas, 1999). The Religious Status Inventory or ‘Being Ethical’ subscale, a paper-and-pencil inventory designed by a research team (Hadlock, 1988; Malony, 1985; Massey, 1988; Jackson, 1992), assesses Christian religion maturity.

Whereas, these scales make some general sense by investigating dynamic moral development, they are not appropriate for measuring students’ attitude regard academic integrity at one certain spatial and temporal point. Nevertheless, upon further review, McCabe and colleagues’ studies were found to shed much light on developing scales for this study of Chinese students (McCabe, Dukerich, & Dutton, 1993; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1996; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003, 2006). These were a series of test measurements developed by McCabe and his colleagues to ask college students to self-report their academic misbehaviors and factors contributing to these types of misbehaviors: some aim to investigate individual and some contextual factors.

However, even the McCabe instruments were inappropriate for measuring Chinese students’ perspective because they did not take Chinese specific context into consideration, although they can effectively measure academic moral attitudes and behaviors of college students in U.S. This determined that an instrument appropriate for the specific Chinese context needed to be developed for this research dissertation.
Development of Quantitative Instrument

An instrument with the aim of measuring Chinese students’ attitude toward academic integrity was developed by the researcher in cooperation with the mentor. In the beginning, the researcher identified 60 questions about academic misbehaviors on college campuses in China based on the literature and his personal experience. In reviewing the researcher’s initial draft, his mentor collapsed the questionnaire to 28 questions by combining questions or deleting redundant ones. After the researcher refined the questionnaire, it was emailed to the committee for further scrutiny. Upon the feedback from the committee, the questionnaire was finalized with 24 questions. It included three sections: a) demographic information of subjects; b) the frequency of academic misbehavior that the respondents find to occur on Chinese college campuses; and c) factors that contribute to these types of misbehavior.

The demographic section was composed of three questions investigating age, gender, and the degree toward which respondents were currently working. The second section, as the main body of the questionnaire, was comprised of 14 questions that primarily investigated how often common academic misbehaviors are practiced on campus related to paper writing, daily assignments, and test taking. The third section investigated factors that contribute to the generation of academic misbehavior on college campuses in China. The items in the second and third sections consisted of four-point rating type scales.

When designing the questions in Section Two, the researcher and the mentor were concerned about self-reporting bias. Generally, Chinese students hesitate to self-disclose
their dark sides to the public. Therefore, in order to avoid such bias and to glean quality information, the survey participants were asked how often they observe common academic misbehaviors are practiced on college campuses in China.

In addition, the development of the questionnaire was built on the understanding and interpretation of the Policy of Academic Integrity in a U.S. university, this policy specifies common academic ethical requirements in this targeted university.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are significant for both quantitative and qualitative research. In quantitative research, reliability is defined as the accuracy and precision of a measurement procedure (Thorndike, 1999). Indices of reliability display the degree by which the numerical data collected through a specific measurement are consistent. The reliability analysis of the scale items is involved in item descriptive statistics and frequency distributions, and internal consistency reliability. In light of the employment of the exploratory factor analysis in this research, Cronbach’s alpha is the primary reliability calculated in the quantitative analysis.

According to Thorndike (1999), validity is referred to as the extent to which a research question can accurately reflect or assess the specific concept or construct the researcher is intending to measure. In order to guarantee a high validity of the scale, several strategies were employed in this research. First, the establishment of the instrument was under close scrutiny of the academic committee particularly the chair. The academic committee consists of experienced long-term researchers in various fields. Based on their research experience, the committee reviewed the instrument and provided
advice on how to refine the instrument. Meanwhile, as a seasoned faculty member and administrator in China, the researcher is very familiar with the situation of academic integrity on college campuses around China. These two strategies guaranteed the instrument can measure what the researcher want to measure at this quantitative phase.

Second, rigorous measures were used to guarantee consistency between the English questionnaire and the Chinese questionnaire. As discussed in the data analysis, the Chinese questionnaire and the English questionnaire were checked by the researcher, the researcher’s friend Weijun Wang, and a Chinese U.S. professor Dr. Luo. A pilot survey was conducted to obtain feedback from the students in China about the level of consistency between the two editions of the questionnaires. Modifications were conducted upon the feedback from Weijun Wang, and particularly students in China. This strategy ensured the Chinese questionnaire would not deviate from the original English version.

Sample

In the quantitative phase, a sample was chosen through convenience sampling from 7,000 current graduate master students and 10,000 undergraduate seniors in a southern public provincial university in China. The liaison between the researcher and the targeted population was a current master-level student in the Chinese university, Mary (name changed to protect the surveyor), who has a good network there. The sample was picked through snowballing by Mary, and focused on undergraduate seniors and master-level graduate students. This is due to the fact that most of international graduates in the U.S. from Mainland China come from senior undergraduates and master-level graduates.
in China.

A convenience sample (Boxill, Chambers, & Win, 1997) of 300 students was picked as the targeted population from the above two populations. The website to complete the survey was delivered to each of the participants. Snowballing was employed to reach the targeted sample. First, Mary’s friends were picked as participants; next friends of Mary’s friends were recommended to be survey participants. These circles were expanded outward gradually until 300 students agreed to participate in this survey.

Data Collection

First, a pilot survey was conducted to 30 undergraduates and graduates in China. The reliabilities for the instrument were calculated demonstrating they could sufficiently satisfy the requirement. Then, the formal survey was administered to the targeted sample. The survey was conducted through a survey website in China, www.zhijizhibi.com. This is a public website through which the survey can be conducted for free. Before the survey, a consent letter that stated the purpose of the research, rights of the participants, and potential risks which respondents might face was delivered to each of the respondents, along with the website of the survey. The former master mentor of the researcher in China was contacted and he recommended several of his current graduate students to assist in completing the survey. Mary, one of the graduate students of the former master mentor of the researcher, self-recommended to conduct the survey in China.

After the questions were finalized, they were emailed to Mary and were posted on the survey website in China. The website link was provided by Mary to targeted sample
in China at the beginning of September through an email, when college students in China came back to campus. Along with the email, an invitation letter was attached. Three hundred students in China including 173 graduate students and 117 undergraduate seniors responded to the survey. At the conclusion of the survey, a letter of appreciation for participating in the study was emailed to each participant.

Data Analysis

At the quantitative phase, statistical analysis on the questionnaire was conducted by the researcher guided by the mentor using SPSS 20. Descriptive data analysis and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) were employed to analyze the quantitative data.

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative Setting

The qualitative portion of the research was conducted in one university in the southeastern United States. This is a medium-sized public institution that has gradually evolved into an international institution with steadily increasing enrollment of international students in recent years. At present, it is seeking to become a top-tier public research university in the U.S. Along with the trend of increasing enrollment of international students, students from the Chinese Mainland have, since the 1990s, developed into the second largest foreign group at this university, second only to international students from Asian India. In the 2010-11 academic year, it had 336 full-time Chinese graduate students with females making up over 40%, and less than 10 students majoring in liberal arts or education. In light of the academic orientation of this U.S. targeted university, the majority of Chinese graduate students major in disciplines
including technology and engineering. Naturally, the interviewees were primarily chosen from the largest group on campus.

Qualitative Instrument

In synergy with the purpose of the interview, the qualitative questions were primarily designed to investigate the process by which Chinese graduate students adapt to a U.S. institution’s academic integrity requirements. This was a semi-structured and open-ended interview. The interview protocol provided a guideline by which the researcher knows the path to move interviews forward and it consists of five questions. The first question was to investigate the general difficulties Chinese graduate students may be faced with when transitioning from the Chinese educational environment to a U.S. environment. The second question narrows to the focus of the research: the difference between ethical expectations in universities in China and the U.S. Questions Three and Four investigated how interviewees navigate their journey of transitioning to academic integrity ethos in the US. The final question was to investigate how effective this U.S. university acquaints Chinese graduates with the specifics of the academic integrity policy.

Sampling

The number of participants in qualitative sampling varies from single digits to thirty (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Creswell, 2007b; Strauss & Corbin, 1988). In order to avert overwhelming challenges in data interpretation and data processing, researchers are wary of determining the minimum number for grounded theory research (Rudestam & Newton, 2007). The purpose of the interview is data saturation rather than satisfying a
specific number of participants; so the researcher can stop data collection and coding when redundancy is evident.

To gain comprehensive knowledge about the acculturation of Chinese graduates with U.S. academic ethics, the researcher determined the interviewees should include a sample of Chinese graduate ranging from first-year through fifth-year. Invitation letters for interviews were emailed to every full-time Chinese graduate student on campus clearly stating the following requirements for the interviewees: a) they should come from Mainland China; b) they obtained at least bachelor’s degrees in China; c) they have rich experience in transitioning to U.S. academic ethics. Additionally, the students were informed that they would be paid $10.00 upon the conclusion of the interview.

Within one week, the researcher received thirty-eight email responses. All of them expressed that they were very interested in this research and willing to be an interviewee. They made a short introduction about their transition to U.S. academic ethics and informed the researcher they were able to provide rich description about themselves and their friends about this transition. Upon comparison of their description, the researcher selected fifteen students as targeted interviewees by emailing back to them about the researcher’s choice (Creswell, 2007, p.127). For the students who were not chosen for the interviews, a letter of appreciation was sent to them.

**Qualitative Sampling and Participants**

Fifteen Chinese graduate students in a U.S. university were interviewed. They ranged from first-year through fifth-year. Face-to-face interviews were digitally recorded upon the consent of the interviewees and conducted within a location agreed upon by the
researcher and the interviewee. Questions aimed to investigate students’ observations of differences embedded in the expectations of their home university and the U.S. university. In-depth questions about how they navigated their journey to the U.S. academic integrity environment were concentrated on at this phase.

Data Collection

Interviews

The qualitative data were collected at the U.S. university. According to Creswell (2007) and Corbin and Strauss (2008), all forms of qualitative data can be grouped into four basic types: observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials. Observations range from nonparticipants to participants, interviews range from close-ended to open-ended, documents range from private to public, and audiovisual materials involve photographs, compact disks, audiotapes and videotapes. Triangulation was employed in the data collection of the qualitative phase by using three formats of data including interview, artifacts, and field notes.

First, a pilot study was conducted with three Chinese graduate students, performed under the same conditions and atmosphere expected in the formal interviews. This pilot study served as an exploratory instrument to provide the researcher necessary experience in interviewing, transcribing data, and data coding.

Once the survey in China was completed and initial data analysis was made, the researcher embarked on the interview journey. In the course of the interview, each participant was encouraged to expand on how he or she navigated the journey to acculturate with the U.S. academic ethical environment. Considerable attention was paid
to developing and maintaining rapport between the researcher and the interviewee, and to
avoiding statements that might offend the respondent. Interviews were important to this
research because this study aimed to explore how Chinese graduates understand and
interpret their adaptation to U.S. academic integrity requirements. Interviews are a
necessary form of data collection when a researcher cannot observe behaviors, feelings,
or how people interpret the influence of the world around them (Merriam, 1988, 1998).

At the end of each interview, the researcher followed up with a letter of
appreciation to each subject for participating in the study. Seidman (1998) declares that
follow-up letters of gratitude build mutual respect between interviewers and participants,
and motivate participants to be present at the next interview.

During the interview, the researcher conducted an in-depth investigation with
each interviewee until no new topic came up. Throughout the interview, the researcher
noted almost all the interviewees had similar experiences except that several students
graduated from the Chinese Academy of Science and Technology. Even for these
students, the researcher checked their responses and found they were unable to provide
additional new information. Because the one-hour interviews achieved data saturation,
the researcher determined to halt the interviews.

Field Notes

Field notes play a secondary role to interviewing in grounded theory analysis
(Creswell, 2007, p. 131). Field notes were written after every interview. Generally, field
notes consisted of something that happened in the course of the interview. They usually
refer to the air of the interviewee, the up and down of the interviewee’s emotion, the
researcher’s interpretation of interviewees’ words, and the like. In this study, field notes produced credibility for the interviewees’ words. Given the purpose of the dissertation, the researcher was more likely to explore personal moral dilemmas encountered by the interviewees. Under such a condition, the field notes were able to assist the researcher in catching something with the interviewees that might escape the researcher’s observation.

*Artifacts*

According to Creswell (2007, pp.129-135), data forms in the qualitative analysis include observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials. Artifacts are classified into the third category, documents. In this study, artifacts refer to syllabi from faculty members, the specification of the academic integrity policies on the website of the targeted U.S. research university. These artifacts highlight the role of the U.S. research university in maintaining an academically ethical environment.

*Data Collection*

The interviews were conducted in Chinese and digitally recorded. A Chinese graduate student hired by the researcher first transcribed the taped data in Chinese. In checking the consistency and precision between taped interview and transcribed Chinese words, the researcher confirmed there was no difference between them. Then, the researcher translated the Chinese transcripts into English. After translation was completed, Weijun Wang the researcher’s friend was invited to translate several pages of English transcripts into Chinese. The former Chinese American professor in the U.S. university contrasted these two editions of transcripts and found they rarely varied from each other. Consequently, the precision and consistency between Chinese and English
transcripts were confirmed.

Once the collection of qualitative data was completed and the English transcripts were finalized, they were input into NVivo 9 for coding. The strategies to code these data are discussed in detail in the next section.

Data Analysis

Ground theory method was employed to interpret the data. Triangulation was used in data analysis by employing auditing, member check, and inter-coder agreement to guarantee its trustworthiness.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) stressed that grounded theory demands the construction of theory. Toward this goal, the researcher primarily used Straus and Corbin’s strategies in data analyzing and interpreting (Strauss & Corbin, 1988; Corbin & Strauss, 2008) in the qualitative data analysis. A format of triangulation of data analysis was employed at this phase including open, axial, and selective data coding (Straus & Corbin, 2008). At the open phase, the researcher broke data into meaning units through identifying, naming, and describing concepts found within the interview transcripts. In this stage, the researcher read each line and determined “What exactly does it mean?” At the axial coding phase, the researcher classified nodes that discuss the same topic into one category. In this phase, higher-level abstract concepts primarily Chinese academic ethics worldviews, academic context, and learning U.S. academic ethics---came into being. The Chinese academic ethics worldview is defined as the moral perspective of Chinese students that is projected by them to the purpose, process, function, and application of academic activities. Academic context is referred to as the environment in which students
engage learning and research when they are working on academic degrees in China. To restate, academic context in this dissertation is defined as the factors embedded in the environment that shape Chinese students’ perspectives and behaviors toward academic activities before in China. Learning U.S. academic ethics refers to motives, process, and channels through which Chinese graduates in the US complete their transformation from their former perspective into the current perspective, appropriate for learning and research in the US.

Causal relationships are emphasized by grounded theorists through categorizing events into a basic frame of generic relationships. According to Straus and Corbin (1990), “These (categories and subcategories) are causal conditions that influence the central phenomenon, the strategies for addressing the phenomenon, the context and intervening conditions” (Creswell, 2007, p. 161). The selective coding phase builds on the axial coding: The researcher chooses one category to be the core category, and links all other categories to this one category. The essential idea at this phase is to develop a storyline through which everything in the research is linked.

Based on Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Merriam (1998), evolution into a core of emerging theory is performed through a constant comparative method. According to Byrne (2001), the core has several characteristics. It: 1) recurs frequently; 2) links various data; 3) has an explanatory function; 4) has an implication for formal theory; and 5) becomes more detailed.

Throughout the data coding, considerable attention was paid to emerging themes, their properties and dimensions, and categorical relationships. As the theoretic model
developed, details were repeatedly examined and analyzed to elaborate on the emerging theory or the model.

**Trustworthiness**

The criteria for determining a qualitative research are different from a quantitative study. In designing a qualitative research, the researcher seeks verification through coherence, insight, instrumental utility (Eisner, 1991; Kaiser, 1974), credibility (Merriam, 1988), and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Cuba, 1985) of the scale rather than through traditional validity and reliability measures. The uniqueness of a qualitative research under a specific context makes it difficult to be exactly replicated in another context. However, if we follow some measures drawn up by researchers (Creswell, 2003; 2007; Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995), the trustfulness of a qualitative research can be increased by a large degree.

In this study, triangulation in terms of three basic strategies was used to guarantee the validity in the qualitative analysis. First, member checking (Creswell, 1998; Hatch, 2002; Stake, 1995) was applied to guarantee the accuracy of the identified categories and themes in the analysis through collecting feedback from participants (Byrant, 2000; Creswell, 2003; Lincoln & Cuba, 1985). The researcher cooperated with the interviewees in reviewing and discussing the accuracy of the findings. Then, participants were provided the opportunity to read the researcher transcripts to validate the results.

Second, inter-coder agreement was used to guarantee the validity in the process of data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Inter-coder agreement included two stages. At the first stage, the researcher and the mentor worked independently by coding and
analyzing all the interview transcripts. In the second stage, the researcher compared themes obtained from the data coding and analyzing across all the transcripts. At both stages, the consensus was that the level of trustworthiness in the data coding was maintained at a little more than 80%. This is the percentage recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994).

Third and finally, auditing was employed in the research to warrant the validity and reliability of the data coding and its interpretation. The researcher’s academic mentor performed constant and careful auditing throughout the study.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout the research, ethical consideration was the foremost concern of the research. The purpose of the research is to develop a trustful relationship between the researcher, survey respondents, and interview participants in order to generate precise, rich information without negatively impacting the participants. First, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the targeted U.S. university reviewed the proposal, the quantitative instrument, and all other research documentation in order for the participants’ rights not to be violated. Second, a letter of consent along with the website of the survey was presented and read to each participator. They were each informed of the right to take or not to take the survey, and withdraw the survey at any time. The consent letter also stated that their responses were kept anonymous and no response would be linked to any of current real students in the targeted Chinese university. They were also told that all the documents generated in this process that may disclose the true identity of any student would be destroyed once the research was over.
For the qualitative research, prior to the interviews, a statement of ethical concerns was presented and read to each of the interviewees, requiring their signatures to verify their consent. The protocol of ethics assured that participation was entirely voluntary and participants’ names would not be revealed to any other person except for the researcher and his mentor. Participants were also informed in advance that they could refuse to answer any question, and were free to withdraw from the interview at any time. All data collected became the property of the researcher and were concealed in a locked box belonging to the researcher. No transcripts produced would connect the participants to their real identity. Participants were also ensured that they were able to preview the transcripts of their interviews for accuracy. Additionally, all the documents were destroyed upon the completion of the research and the defense of the dissertation.

Summary

This chapter discussed data collection, data analysis, site, population, and sample selection along two dimensions of quantitative and qualitative methodology. Instrument development and finalization for the quantitative and qualitative analysis, and strategies that guarantee eligible reliability and validity across the quantitative and qualitative portion were discussed in detail. At the end of the chapter, ethical considerations were expounded.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS OF THE MIXED METHODS RESEARCH

This study employed a mixed-methods approach (Creswell, 2003, 2007) in that a quantitative method was embedded into the qualitative method. The quantitative phase aimed to explore how Chinese college students perceive academic ethics; this analysis provided contextual information for the qualitative portion. As the main part of the dissertation research, the qualitative portion aimed to explore how graduate students originating from the Chinese Mainland dynamically acculturate with U.S. academic ethics. Mixed methodology is the optimum choice when neither quantitative nor qualitative method is sufficient by itself to capture the intricacies of the circumstances (Green et al., 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003).

In the quantitative phase, a descriptive analysis and a Principal Factor Analysis were conducted through SPSS 20 toward the data collected from a south-eastern large public provincial university in China. In the qualitative phase, the method of grounded theory was employed to analyze the data through Nvivo 9.

Quantitative Analysis

In this section, the researcher presented participants’ demographic information and the statistical findings. Based on the results, a summary about what colleges as well as faculty members in China expected of students in term of academic integrity was discussed at the end.

Participants’ Demographic Characteristics

Demographic information of the participants included gender, age, and the degree
toward which participants are currently working. These demographic characteristics of participants were summarized in Tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, and discussed as follows.

*Gender*

All the survey participants (N=300) reported their gender. There were more female participants than male participants (56% versus 44%). This corresponds with the recent trend that more women than men choose to work on postsecondary academic degrees in China. This may be a positive outcome of three decades of implementation of the one-child policy.

*Age*

The survey participants (N=300) comprised five age categories: a) 20-25, b) 26-30, c) 31-35, d) 36-40, and e) above 40. The most typical age group fell into the category 20-25 (88%), followed by 26-30 (10%). The least represented age included three categories: 31-35 (2%), 36-40 (0), and above 40 (0) of the survey participants.

*Academic degrees they were currently working on*

All the participants (N=300) reported their academic degrees on what they were currently working. The majority (58%) were master level; next were the college students (39%) who were currently working on their bachelor degrees; six (2%) reported working on doctorate degrees; and four (1%) did not report the degrees they were currently working on. Actually, data for 302 students were collected, and the data of two students were deleted because of missing data.
Descriptive Analysis

Tests for reliability

Reliability tests were conducted on the two instruments respectively. According to the SPSS outcome, the Cronbach’s Alpha for the 14 items of the first instrument was .86; and the Cronbach’s Alpha for the seven items in the second instrument was .77, which satisfied the requirements of the quantitative analysis.

Common academic misbehavior practiced in the targeted Chinese university

The first scale measured how often academic misbehaviors are practiced on the selected university campus in China. Descriptive results are presented in Table 4.5, a mean of 2.5 represented the demarcation between low and high frequency (very uncommon, uncommon, common, and very common). As the table illustrated, the most commonly practiced forms of academic misbehavior included: a) attaining a copy of an upcoming test from classmates who had already taken the same test (2.93), b) copying from the internet or other sources without citation (2.87), and c) summary citing from other papers without crediting sources (2.72). In comparison academic misbehavior that occurs on a lesser scale, are d) cheating to successfully graduate (2.57), e) lying on a resume to obtain a good job (2.55), and f) overlooking professors’ academic misbehavior and refusing to report it to the relevant administrators (2.54). The academic misbehaviors that were practiced infrequently included: g) purchasing a paper from the Internet as a graduation requirement (1.97), h) hiring others to write a paper (2.13), and i) cheating to obtain recommendation eligibility of graduates (2.22). The following types of misbehaviors lie in between: j) cheating to attain scholarship (2.49), k) using or
distributing software or documents without asking for the owner’s permission (2.49; l)
falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of an instructor (2.44; m) asking the

Table 4.1
Demographic characteristics of participants’ gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>129 (43%)</td>
<td>171 (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum might not be 100% because of round-up

Table 4.2
Demographic characteristics of participants’ age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>Above 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>264 (88%)</td>
<td>30 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum might not be 100% because of round-up

Table 4.3
Demographic characteristics of participants’ current pursuing academic degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>B.A. or B.S.</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>117 (39%)</td>
<td>174 (58%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sum might not be 100% because of round-up

Table 4.4
Results of reliability tests for these two instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The first scale</th>
<th>The second scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
author to add your name into original authors without any contribution to the paper (2.37); and n) submitting a former assignment as a current assignment (2.31).

Factors contributing to the emergence of academic misbehavior in China

The second scale measured factors contributing to the generation of academic misbehaviors in China, and in-detailed descriptive information was also provided in

Table 4.5
Basic descriptive data of how common types of academic misbehaviors are practiced on college campus in China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying from the Internet or other sources without citation</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary citing from other papers without crediting resources</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of instructor</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking the author to add your name into original authors without any contribution to the paper</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting your former assignment as your current assignment</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking professors’ academic dishonesties and refusing to report it to relevant administrators</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining a copy of an upcoming test from classmates who attend the same test formerly</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using or distributing software and documents with the ownership permission</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring others to write a paper</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing a paper from the Internet as graduation paper</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to obtain scholarship</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to obtain recommendation eligibility of graduates</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to successfully graduate</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying on a resume to obtain a good job</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6
Descriptive statistics of factors leading to academic misbehaviors on Chinese college campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students accept the copying of material from the Internet, books, or research papers without citation because so many of his/her peers around are doing it</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers or advisors rarely or never report students’ cheating or plagiarism to pertinent on-campus administrator</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors and advisors do not present regulations of academic integrity to students in class or after class</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors or advisors rarely make efforts to investigate whether one plagiarizes in completing a paper or not</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few offices at the departmental or the institutional level have ever trained students on the regulations of academic integrity</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few students have ever been punished because of copying material from the Internet, books, or research papers without citation</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate students plagiarize because of the pressure for having a paper published in a key journal at the provincial level or the national level in some schools of higher learning in China</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. In order to make the next discussion concise and brief, the researcher simplified the items in Table 4.6 as these factors including: a) peer influence, b) lack of teacher reporting, c) insufficiency of teacher mentoring, d) shortage of teacher reviewing, e) lack of school/department training, f) scantiness of relevant sanctions, and g) publishing pressure. A mean of 2.5 represented the demarcation between low and high likelihood (very unlikely, unlikely, likely, very likely).
As the table showed, overall almost every factor appeared a high likelihood, except for the shortage of teacher reviewing. The most possible factors that might lead to academic misbehaviors involved: a) publishing pressure (2.93), b) scantiness of relevant sanctions (2.75); followed by c) lack of peer influence (2.66), d) lack of school or department training (2.64), d) lack of teacher reporting system (2.61), e) scantiness of teacher’s mentoring (2.52), and e) the shortage of teacher reviewing (2.48). Evidently, in most Chinese college campuses, low awareness of academic integrity among students derives from a lack of understanding of the academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulations, lack of a means to infuse the academic integrity policy and its context-based specifics into students’ mind on the one hand, and an absence of an enforcement mechanism to transfer these written words into meaningful actions on the other.

Results of the Principal Component Analysis on Two Scales

A principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted with the first instrument. Its purpose was to explore the categories of common academic misbehaviors practiced on college campus in China. The default for deciding how many categories to accept is eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The oblique rotation (direct oblimin) was employed to allow factors to be naturally correlated with one another. A principal component analysis (PCA) was also conducted with the second instrument and only one factor was identified for the second scale.

In both scales, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was used to assess sampling adequacy. For the first scale, the overall KMO was 0.86; for the second scale, it was 0.79. Kaiser (1974) recommends 0.5 as a minimum acceptable value, that values are between
Table 4.7
Results of KMO and Bartlett’s Test for the two scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measure of sampling adequacy</th>
<th>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of Kasier-Mey-Llkin</td>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first scale</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1922.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second scale</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>438.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.5 and 0.7 are mediocre; that values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good; values between 0.8 and 0.9 are great; values above 0.9 are superb. KMO’s for individual survey items were likewise calculated and were all above 0.7, which fell into the good and great range respectively (Field, 2009). The P-values for Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity for both scales were less than .0001 indicating that correlations between items were sufficiently large to satisfy the demand of PCA.

An initial analysis of the first scale was conducted to retrieve categories with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. Four factors were identified with the first factor accounting for 36.50% variance, the second factor for 9.88% variance, the third factor for 7.99% variance, and the fourth factor for 7.73% variance.

In the first factor, the most strongly loaded item was a) cheating to obtain scholarship, followed by b) cheating to successfully graduate, c) cheating to obtain recommendation eligibility of graduates, and d) lying on resume to obtain a good job. Within the second factor, the items with the strongest loading included: e) copying from the Internet or other sources without citation; and f) summary citing from other papers without crediting sources. For the third factor, the strongest loading variable was g)
Table 4.8
Factor analysis of common academic misbehaviors on college campus in China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to attain scholarship</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to successfully graduate</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating to attain recommendation eligibility of graduates</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying on a resume to attain a good job</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying from the internet or other sources without citation</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary citing from other papers without crediting sources</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attaining a copy of an upcoming test from classmates who formerly took the same test</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking professors’ academic dishonesties and refusing to report it to relevant administrators</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using or distributing software and documents without asking for the owner’s permission</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting your former assignment as your current assignment</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing a paper from the internet as graduation requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring others to write a paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking the author to add your name into original authors without any contribution to the paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of an instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

obtaining information for an upcoming test from classmates, followed by h) overlooking professors’ academic dishonesties and refusing to report it to relevant administrators, and i) using or distributing software and document without asking for the owner’s permission.

In sharp contrast, the items loading on the fourth factor were negative. In
checking the wording of these items, nothing was found that they were opposite to other items, indicating these types of academic misbehaviors do not occur often. For the second scale, only one factor was identified.

Based on the common characteristics of the items, the four categories in the first scale were summarized as: a) cheating for benefits, b) plagiarisms, c) exploiting academic resources, and d) falsifying one’s data. The only category retrieved from the factor analysis in the second scale was named as factors contributing to academic misbehavior.

Summary of Quantitative Findings

Overall, quantitative findings verified the literature review about the perspective of Chinese students toward academic integrity (Hu, 2008; Wang, 2005; Ye, 2006). The findings from the first scale indicate that academic misbehaviors such as plagiarism, cheating for benefits, and exploiting academic resources are commonly practiced by college students. The findings from the second scale that most of the means of the items are more than the demarcation of 2.5 indicated Chinese college students engage in plagiarism behaviors because they are not clear about the academic integrity stipulations. The results found that the school, department, and faculty have taken little effort to foster students’ awareness of academic integrity, in contrast to U.S. schools. To date, few institutions of higher learning in China have developed channels to foster students’ awareness toward the academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulations (Hu, 2008; Wang, 2005). Few have developed a database or other mechanism to identify students’ academic misbehavior, let alone imposed sanctions on the violators (Wang, 2005; Xiao & Hu, 2007).
Qualitative Analysis

The purpose of the qualitative research was to investigate the dynamic process of how Chinese graduates adapt to U.S. academic ethical environment. Sub-questions were investigated in this phase as follows:

1. How do Chinese graduate students perceive their experiences in the U.S. academic integrity environment?
2. How do Chinese graduate students manage their transition from the Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment in terms of academic integrity?
3. How do Chinese graduate students come to understand the requirements of academic integrity in the United States?

According to the quantitative findings, college students in China have not developed an awareness of Academic Integrity because of the lack of formal and informal education in Chinese higher education environment. This information provided contextual background to the qualitative portion. Along this direction, the researcher focused on investigating how Chinese graduate students transition to the U.S. academic integrity environment.

Three themes emerged based on the analysis of qualitative data: a) the Chinese academic worldview, b) the academic context of China, and c) learning U.S. ethics. The first theme dealt with Chinese graduates’ perspective of academic integrity. The second theme, academic context in China, described factors that have led to this perspective that are embedded in the Chinese education environment. The third theme addressed how
these students navigated their transition in the U.S. university environment with a Chinese perspective.

The Chinese Academic Ethics Worldview

An academic ethical worldview refers to the perspective through which people ethically judge everything they witness, experience, and learn. It is an essential part of one’s comprehensive world view. In this dissertation research, the world view of Chinese graduates is defined as their perspective regarding the ethical nature of academic activities. In digging deep into the qualitative data, three subthemes were identified: a) the lack of a contractual worldview; b) ethical issues not being part of their value system; and c) the absence of reporting culture.

Lack of Contractual Worldview

Within the business world, when two parties strike a deal, each party has the obligation to abide by the relevant terms. In this dissertation research, a “contractual worldview” is referred to as the responsibilities that students bear when they engage in pertinent academic activities. These responsibilities are agreed upon by two relevant parties under different contexts. For example, under a contractual principle, students have the responsibility to be present at daily class, accomplish their assignments rather than copy answers from other students; and credit sources when citing others’ documents. Likewise, the institution has the responsibility to provide commensurate curricular, mentoring, and service to students.

First, large-scale cheating on assignments by college students suggests a lack of a contractual worldview among students. Most interviewees reported that many students
around cheated on assignments and plagiarized on term paper. Interviewee A had served as a teacher assistant in China and in the U.S. In responding to the question about the academic integrity climate in his former university in China, Interviewee A mentioned that when he was correcting students’ assignments in China he usually found only two versions of answers to targeted questions in his class. His class had at least seventy students, indicating many students copied their classmates’ answers in the assignments. Interviewee G told the researcher a strange story: When he found the answers of one student were wrong, and then the answers of all the class or half the class might be wrong, indicating students copied others’ answers blindly without critically reviewing the answers to determine right from wrong. The concept of contractual principle was not meaningful to these students.

Interviewee E, a computer science student, reported to the researcher that about one third of his class were likely to copy their peers’ written application programs with a few modifications. According to Interviewee E, the lab class was significant for computer science major because to write application programs is one of the essential technological skills they need to equip for future careers. He claimed that few of his peers had ever respected the intellectual property of others when they were copying those programs directly from websites. Actually, Interviewee E was a diligent student in his class because he claimed that he had never missed a single computer lab class in his former university in China. More importantly, he tended to complete the assignments and write an application program on his own. However, even Interviewee E had directly copied an application program from the Internet in his undergraduate study in China. He described
a story that had happened in his former university in China as follows:

Nowadays, along with Internet resources multiplying in China, it is very convenient for everyone to have access to multitudes of online documents with ease. This has tremendously facilitated computer majors’ direct downloading application programs. ……formerly I didn’t have to use my head in writing one application program, and I could take advantage of the available online resources at my will to patch up my targeted programs.

When copying others’ application programs, Interviewee E claimed that they presumably viewed themselves as the owner of these intellectual properties. Generally, they seldom thought that the intellectual property of the author should be respected.

Second, the lack of a contractual worldview among Chinese students was displayed by students’ large-scale plagiarism in graduation paper manufacturing. Nowadays, the majority of Chinese graduate students in the U.S. came from a pool of undergraduates who obtained bachelor’s degrees in China. Their former mindset of academic integrity directly influenced their transition to U.S. academic ethics. Most of the interviewees responded that undergraduates in China tended to manufacture graduation papers by copy-and-paste. In reflecting his college education in China, Interviewee A mentioned that the majority of his classmates, including himself, manufactured graduation papers through copy-and-paste by transplanting one whole passage into his graduation paper. Interviewee A emphasized that he began to note the issue of plagiarism when he was writing his master’s degree thesis in China. At that time, he was not fully aware of complying with the academic integrity principle because he
misconceived the definition of plagiarism due to little relevant mentoring from the mentor or his department. His former misconception was that only copying a whole paper should be ruled to be plagiarism. Different from his method in completing a bachelor paper, Interviewee A would copy several key ideas from other papers without crediting their citations in his master’s degree thesis. This terminated until he came to this U.S targeted university.

Similarly, Interviewee I, who transferred to this U.S. university after she completed one year of postgraduate study in China, described what had happened in her master-level class in her former university:

Then if we needed to write a paper, we would write it in Chinese. Usually we would patch up a paper with copied words from a multitude of documents collected from the Internet. The teacher who was responsible for grading students’ assignments should be broadly aware of our plagiarism because the words and syntaxes were not like words and syntaxes created by ourselves.

Interviewee D repeatedly stated that his classmates tended to take advantage of the rich pool of Internet documents to manufacture a “high-quality” graduation paper. Interviewee G, to some extent, was a prolific undergraduate in China and he was keen on exploring the frontline research in his field. Nowadays he majored in logistics and simulation in U.S. When working on his bachelor’s degree in China, he published several papers in journals. However, he usually adopted a montage method to produce papers, which was evidenced by his reflection about paper writing in China:

In China one sentence is impressive: We copy from each other. You copy mine,
and I copy yours, manufacturing one paper after another. You consult mine, and I consult yours. In China, consulting means copying from others, and I can say consulting is completely equivalent to copying.

According to Interviewee G, plagiarism in paper writing among undergraduate students was quite common, and few of them felt it was abnormal. Evidently, a number of undergraduate students have not formed a conception of copyright, the essential premise of observing a contractual worldview, let alone protect it.

In comparison with the mainstream standpoint, the researcher found there were some differences among students across institutions. Interviewee C, who graduated from Beijing University one of the best universities in China, informed the researcher that few of his classmates would copy answers of assignments from peers for required courses. His classmates, including Interviewee C, were quite likely to copy answers from other classmates in optional courses. The researcher found that neither instructors nor students cared about the optional courses. For example, optional courses such as ideology courses including Marxism, Deng Xiaoping Theories, and Theories for Three Representatives were least favorite among students. Instructors were broadly aware of that these courses made little contributions to students’ academic growth but only strengthened the ruling standing of the Chinese Central Government with the core of the Communist Party of China (CPC). However for the required courses, students in Beijing University tended to complete the assignments on their own. Nevertheless, Interviewee C did not deny some of his classmates had patched up graduation papers but not as large a scale as that in other institutions.
Thirdly, the lack of contractual worldview was displayed by students’ absence from significant class sections. If students agree to be enrolled in one institution, guided by contractual principles, they have the obligation to be present punctually at every class in their major except for special conditions when they are sick or there is an emergency. Several respondents mentioned the prevalent absenteeism from significant classes in their former universities in China. Interviewee I described the usual situation in one of her important master-level courses in China, Molecular Biology and Cryobiology, which was very important for her major.

The instructor spoke at the rostrum, a large percentage of students might not be present, and the teacher did not care about it.

Apparently, when students determined not to attend one class, they cared little whether the class matters in their major. Interviewee E also described absenteeism in the computer lab in his major:

In China I found a great many students in my school were not present at lab class. On the contrary, they asked their peers to respond for them when the instructor was calling the roll.

Actually, this usually happens in a big class: the instructor tends to check the students present by calling the roll. As a matter of fact, students in higher grades are willing to skip class when they think their personal affairs are more important than the upcoming class. In order to avoid the instructor’s identifying their absence, the absenters would ask their classmates to respond when the instructor called their names. Interviewee G described how his instructor checked the number of students present at his class:
He (the lecturer) spent a large amount of time in calling the roll. Every week we had one class for this subject. This class contained two 45-minute sections with 10 minutes recess in between. Usually it took 20 minutes to call the roll because my class had 200 students, a big size class. During the recess, some students might withdraw from the class. In order to prevent students from dropping out of the class halfway, the teacher tended to check the roll at the beginning of the second section. As a result, the lecturer invested only about 50 minutes to the class, a little more than one section.

According to Interviewee G, this course was very important for his major. Nevertheless, a number of his classmates opted to skip it. Even students present in the class were not attentive to what the instructor was delivering in class. Interviewee G also described the usual scenario in this class:

The first row of students were listening to the instructor, the second row were playing games, and the third and other rows of students were sleeping or engaging other irrelevant activities. Only your presence was able to satisfy the instructor’s requirements. If one student was present for two times when the instructor was checking students present, he/she could obtain an A for the course. In addition, the instructor was unwilling to deliver an in-depth quality lecture to students present because few students were listening to his class.

Evidently, the lecturer violated the contractual principle by preparing a mediocre class for the students in attendance. If students have the obligation to be present at the class, the instructor has the obligation of preparing a good class and delivered it to
students. Obviously, the lack of a contractual worldview exists not only among students but also among faculty members, since the instructor never thought he might have violated the contractual principle when he halfheartedly prepared a class and delivered it to students. The instructor even gave up his or her duty to require the attention of the students to the lecture.

Fourth, the lack of a contractual principle was displayed by the institution’s intentionally lowered teaching goal for some courses. In this specific context, if the institution abides by contractual principles, it has the obligation to request the instructors to provide corresponding high quality classes to students who have paid a huge tuition. As Interviewee G discussed above, instructors for optional courses might turn a blind eye to students’ academic misbehaviors in assignments, tests, and term papers. Given increasing enrollment in recent years and insufficient resources to develop quality curricula and instruction, a number of institutions find it difficult to provide high-quality class commensurate with the high tuition they charged from students. In this way, the institution has violated the contractual principle. Interviewee G described some strange phenomenon happened in his former university in China.

Back in China there is a strange phenomenon that a number of major courses are divided into two categories: tested courses and checked courses. Tested courses are normal courses. For tested courses, the assessment of students’ learning is primarily dependent upon weekly quizzes, mid-term tests, and final exams (or in the form of term paper). The abnormal comes to checked courses, which according to instructors, contributes little to students’ future careers. On the
contrary, most checked courses are important because they have much to do with students’ career after graduation. Actually students are usually provided a good many chances to apply what they learned from checked courses in their future positions. Even though, even every student could shine in these checked courses on their transcript; they actually learned little from the instructor in class, because the high score A for this course was only a symbol of high attendance in classes, and it has nothing to do with to what extent the students understand the discipline. Due to the intentional neglect by the department, students learned little in this class.

According to Interviewee G, in so doing the institution not only deceived students but also deceived companies or other organizations where the students are going to work. When students show their transcripts to the human resource manager, the manager forms an image that the student excels in the class because the transcript shows the student has mastery for this course. Conversely, Interviewee G held what the student learned from class is not consistent with the “high” score in his transcript because it signals nothing but only a high presence in the class. When the relevant production manager of the company assigns the employee (a former student in the checked course) a task related to what he learned from his checked course, he could not deal well with the task because he learned little about the subject from class.

To summarize, the lack of students’ contractual worldview was characterized by large-scale cheating in assignments, plagiarism in term papers and graduation papers, absence from significant classes among undergraduate and graduate students; it was also
displayed by the institution’s intentionally lowered delivery goals for some courses. Most students demonstrated a lack of the contractual worldview when they intentionally or unintentionally committed these misbehaviors.

_Ethical issues not part of value system_

Academic integrity, of course, is a morality issue. Morality consists of the core of one’s value system through which one person perceives right or wrong about whatever one does and whatever one witnesses to be the action of other people or organizations. A value system is founded on certain standards and norms. By examining and analyzing the qualitative data at the second phase of the study, the researcher found a number of Chinese students view academic ethical issues as an irrelevant part of their value system. In their opinion, academic misbehavior is an ethical issue, but they rarely integrate this viewpoint regarding academic ethics into their value system. To look deep into the issue, this is generated from the utilitarian worldview of Confucian philosophy (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002), an attitude that the ends justify the means and academic misbehaviors only serve as a means to reach their goals.

According to these researchers (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002), this utilitarian worldview was prevalent among a number of students in China. Generally, Chinese students tend to separate their academic behaviors from their value systems. According to these researchers, under the guidance of this Confucian worldview, everything only makes relative sense and there is not absolute boundary between right and wrong, thus right can be converted into wrong and vice versa. The standard is dependent upon the needs of one’s specific situation. This is evidenced in Interviewee A’s
response. Interviewee A recounted his expectation of the academic ethical standard he is likely to advocate if he determines to go back to China:

Given the macroscopic environment being a food chain in China, we are all only part of this food chain. It (whether one will abide by academic integrity stipulations or not) is dependent upon what living he/she wants to make and what kind of person he/she wants to be. Jungle law is predominant into every corner of China. If you can’t become accustomed to this law, you will find it very difficult to meld into the mainstream. Most often, you have to become accustomed to the status quo. Unless you are the best, and no one except for you can deal well with the task, then you can handle your job at your will.

Interviewee A has been in the U.S. for three years, and as a result, he became accustomed to academic ethical norms in the U.S. In the course of the interview, the researcher was very interested to know what he thought his attitude toward academic integrity would be when he returns to China. To the researcher’s surprise, he expressly responded that he was not sure. The reason he provided is summarized as the huge difference between the U.S. and Chinese culture. To adapt well with the “food chain” (another name for academic ecology in China), he may restore his former scheme toward academic integrity. For example, he may voluntarily add the name of “an academic big tree” (another name of academic authority in academia) to the original authors when he has a paper published in a key national journal even though this “academic big tree” does nothing for the research. Actually, Interviewee A is an obedient graduate student in the U.S. He told the researcher he was very earnest about course assignments, lab reports,
and paper writing. Throughout his study in this U.S. university, he would repeatedly check whether he abided by the academic integrity policy in his assignments. He is broadly aware of the fact that universities in the U.S. are enforcing a stringent academic integrity policy and he is very wary of not crossing the line.

In reading Interviewee A’s comments, we may find it strange that he has two faces and they differ considerably from each other. The reason for his two faces is that he has never sincerely integrated his academic integrity perspective into his value system. Rather, he was applying the Confucian philosophy to justify what is necessary for one’s benefits. If his compliance with the academic integrity stipulations can maximize his benefits, he will abide by these stipulations. On the contrary, if his violation of the same academic integrity stipulations can guarantee his maximum benefits, he will not hesitate to violate these regulations in another setting. Thus, his value judgment does not make any ethical sense but is a flexible attitude to adapt to different requirements in real life. The standard based on which he may conduct either ethical or unethical academic behavior is dependent upon his reality goal: whether this conduct can facilitate the maximization of his personal interest. This also mirrors the Confucian perspective that views the aspiration of worldly affairs as the ultimate goal regardless of their ethical standard behind it (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003).

Interviewee A’s standpoint was supported by Interviewee H. In comparing college faculty’s and students’ attitude toward tests between the U.S. and China, Interviewee H said:

First of all, when one student takes a test in the U.S. he should keep it in mind:
zero tolerance for cheating on tests. Cheating will only incur severe punishment in the U.S. Consequently, the supervisors in the U.S. don’t worry about whether students cheat on the test. In sharp contrast, out of their worry that they can’t supervise many students simultaneously in a test, test supervisors in China will ask additional teachers to proctor test takers. Generally, in the U.S., before a student takes the test, the protector will present a form (the Honor Code) to the student on which to sign his/her name: “I promise I will not cheat in the test, and I will not ask any help from my classmates in the course of the test.” Then sign his/her name in the end. In so doing, the proctor in the U.S. believes students will not cheat on the test.

Actually, a number of college student in China are broadly aware of the fact that cheating on tests is unethical. However, many college students become addicted to cheating and this is evidenced by now and then cheatings on the final exam in many universities in recent years especially after students spent their first year in college. For test-takers, their foremost concern is to obtain a high score. They choose cheating to guarantee a high score because they seldom integrate academic ethics into their personal moral worldview. Thus, Interviewee H thought it highly suspect that only signing their names on the statement can guarantee that students in China will not cheat on tests in China, although he has a deep belief that American students tend to keep their promises if they sign their names on the statement. As he said:

I feel it works to U.S students if they believe in Christianity. I think one won’t betray his/her oath when he swears facing the Bible. But for local (Chinese)
students, it is only a piece of paper and it won’t impose any pressure on them even if they signed their names on the Honor Code.

Evidently, signing names on the Honor Code does not work for Chinese students because they think everything is only a means to an end. So even if Chinese students sign their names on the Honor Code, it does not guarantee they will not cheat in the test.

According to Interviewee H’s further interpretation, the differences between U.S students and Chinese students toward their signatures on the Honor Code come from the implications underlying their rationale. For U.S. students, the signature on the Honor Code means they need to stick to the contractual items in the name of Honor Code; and this mirrors their need to stick to their covenant between themselves and a faith (such as Christianity) in which sin is a “line in the sand”. Even for atheists in the U.S., due to a long heritage to respect the contractual consensus, westerners (including Americans) tend to abide by the items stated in the contract. However, the signature on the Honor Code is irrelevant for Chinese students when they do not have an ultimate moral judgment because they believe in that the signature on the piece of paper is only a piece of paper and if they do not want to keep the promise, the signature will not bind them.

Having experienced the transition to U.S. academic ethical atmosphere, Interviewee H concluded that the real pressure over Chinese graduates is their concern about immediate sanction resulting from academic misbehaviors from the relevant office at the institutional level. For most Chinese graduates, this will directly bear upon whether they can have a scholarship or assistantship, a concern of “life or death” in the U.S. In view of their guiding philosophy, pragmatic Confucianism, the morality constraint is by
far more trivial and limited compared with the possibility of being deprived of eligibility for an assistantship and/or a scholarship in the U.S. The most threatening constraint to Chinese students is the external sanction mechanism rather than the constraint from inner morality cognition and reflection. As Interviewee K’s discussed in the interview:

From my personal standpoint, I didn’t do as well in China as I am doing in the U.S. However, it is not related to the academic environment. First of all, it is the extent to which I value the paper. Formerly I didn’t pay the same attention to the thesis as I do to my current dissertation in this U.S. university. Maybe the inner morality cognition and reflection works to consolidate students’ conceptions about the academic integrity principle, but the external environmental factor should play a major and more important role.

At a glance, Interviewee K held the academic environment did not play a significant in streamlining students’ academic actions. According to Interviewee K, his substantial regard toward his research and papers is related to his changed mindset, he thinks more highly of his doctoral dissertation in America than he did in China. In digging deep in his words, Interview K held the external environment plays a significant role in arresting his academic misbehaviors.

From a positive angle, this willingness to adapt to the requirements of reality can be called flexibility. This flexibility is generated from the pressure of an external environment and lacks an inborn constraint out of moral cognition and introspection. According to Interviewee K, whether one Chinese graduate student complies with the academic integrity policy or not depends upon their determination to tailor their actions to
the demands of reality. Under this conception, it is not moral cognition and introspection, but rather immediate sanctions which shape students’ perspectives toward academic integrity. This is a general scenario for most Chinese students: moral cognition and introspection is separated from moral action, and they are not entirely integrated.

Unquestioningly, this mindset has been impacted by Chinese philosophy of instrumentalism. As Interviewee C compared the Chinese with the U.S. academic environment:

Here in U.S. a number of faculty members focus on some fields for years, everyone respects them, and no one will disregard them because of their small number of published papers. In sharp contrast, faculty members in China are eager for quick success and instant benefits, and if they can realize speedy success they don’t care about whether they commit such academic misbehaviors.

Interviewee C mentioned the external pressure for researchers to plagiarize in China. However, he disregarded their mindset for plagiarism. The utilitarian principle rather than the academic integrity principle directs Chinese graduates’ academic behaviors.

Interviewee E told the researcher a story that occurred in the U.S. when he transferred there after he participated in a joint training for computer science master-level students in the targeted U.S. university:

One time I completed a paper regarding the identification of living organisms, and I provided an instance to verify my point of view by citing a Boston system. Through this system, people were able to identify features of a person’s irises.
When I was developing the paper, I neglected crediting the Boston system from the website of Wikipedia in my references. Carelessly, I directly wrote the methodology in my paper.

In fact, Interviewee E understood he needed to credit the resource in the references because he participated in several workshops about how to abide by the academic integrity policy. His neglect originated from the convenience principle, another name for utilitarianism. Interviewee H also had the similar experience:

I vaguely remembered I saw some arguments somewhere. Then I use my personal words to summarize the ideas I read from these papers. I planned to write them down into my paper. Then I need to credit the citations, but I wasn’t sure exactly who wrote those words. In addition, I didn’t have the willingness and resolution to trace it back to the original documents and then credit the source in my references.

Eventually, Interviewee H opted to plagiarize by conveniently not crediting the sources, even though he was aware that he might commit academic misbehaviors when he did not make efforts to trace the cited words to the original document. According to Interviewee H, whether or not to credit the source did not matter. What mattered most was related to whether he could save a large amount of effort.

*No reporting culture*

Chinese students as well as faculty members are reluctant to report students’ academic misbehavior to relevant administrators. According to the Chinese Confucian heritage, “insiders” should not report the misconducts of their peers to “outsiders”. This was clearly stated by Confucius more than 2,000 years ago. When responding to one of
his disciples’ questions: “If one’s father stole a pig from a neighbor, should the son report it to the officials or keep it a secret?” Confucius provided an answer that had impacted the ethos of Chinese people and the personality of each individual for more than 2000 years: “The son should keep it a secret for his father, and his father should keep it a secret for his son.” To interpret these words, the people who belong to the same group (insiders) do not have the obligation to effect justice; to effect justice naturally falls on the shoulders of people who do not belong to the group (outsiders). When this principle passed from generation to generation, the boundary of “insiders” expanded from family to all kinds of associates in daily life (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003; Zhou, 2002).

Interviewee B told the researcher that his wife, a biology master student, found one of her undergraduates had plagiarized in his term paper. When his wife consulted him on how to deal with this infringement, Interviewee B suggested his wife not to report it to her department coordinator but talked it out with the student first:

I suggested her to talk with the violator first, and to offer the student an opportunity to correct his mistake. My purpose is not to destroy his study all at once.

This is the common thought of most Chinese students and faculty members when they have to deal with infringements of the student. On the surface, the motive to talk to the violator originates from the instructor’s concern to “destroy the student’s study all at once”. The subconscious mindset of the instructor is not to hurt “insiders”, otherwise she might take the risk of being accused by her students (insiders). Students copying assignment answers from their peers verify this principle. As Interviewee H recalled:
However, when you are doing the question, maybe you don’t know the standard answer. The usual scenario is this when one student completes his/her homework, another student only copied his/her answer, then submitted the assignment to the instructor. Most of my classmates don’t care about the assignment.

Why do the students copy assignments answers from their peers so outrageously? It is because they are not afraid of being reported by their insiders including classmates. The insiders may break the tacit game rule if the classmate reports it to the instructor or the instructor reports it to the administrators at the departmental or institutional level. This is further verified by several interviewees such as Interviewees E, H, and J, who all claimed that none of their peers present in the class would report the absentees to the instructor. To some extent, they worried they would be excluded from the peer groups if they chose to report the absentees to the instructor.

However, the boundary of what constitutes an “insider” varies in specific contexts. For students from the same class participating in one lecture, they are classified into insiders and the lecturer is viewed as an outsider. This is the general situation occurs in China. When students attend the same test, the proctor is an outsider; whereas for relevant on-campus administrators, the students and the proctor (generally the instructor) belong to the same group and they are all viewed as “insiders”. Thus, when an instructor found one of his students had cheated on a test, he would blame the student for his/her misbehavior, but he would be unwilling to report this incident to the relevant administrator on campus. Under this situation, the proctor abides by some tacit rule for insiders: if he or she insisted on reporting the cheater to on-campus administration, he or
she would risk breaking a tacit cultural rule.

College seniors also support this when they engage in developing and defending graduation papers. Based on the qualitative data, the researcher noted that most undergraduates in China were likely to plagiarize in their graduation papers. When they did so, they were never worried that their classmates (insiders) would disclose their infringements to academic advisors, let alone reporting to administrators.

Several interviewees including Interviewees A, C, I, and K mentioned that a number of colleges and universities in China have enacted Academic Integrity regulations in recent years to correspond to the requirements of higher-level authority agencies such as the Ministry of Education of the PRC and Provincial Educational Department. However, these codes have developed into soft regulations partly because there lacks a reporting mechanism to identify the real violators. Interviewee H responded that large-scale cheating in assignments existed in his former classes:

Students tend to pay attention to the tests, and the instructor will assign some homework for you to do after class. But in many situations, the whole class including 100 students may have only two kinds of answers to the questions. Evidently, many students choose to copy answers from their classmates.

Interviewee J described her instructor’s attitude toward students’ large-scale in term papers:

The teacher who was responsible for grading students’ assignments should be broadly aware of the students’ plagiarism because the words and syntaxes were not like words and syntaxes created by students themselves. Usually, the instructor
keeps a blind eye to your plagiarized assignment in term papers and graded an A (90 points) to their assignments. In sharp contrast to criticizing your academic misconducts, the instructor tended to praise you for your “well-done” assignments. Actually, it is not students’ ability worthy an A but their ability to patch up a “high-quality” term paper.

Furthermore, Interviewee H pointed out that because of the lack of a reporting system, some faculty members took advantage of this loophole of the system by collecting bribes from students when they failed final exams. In this situation, the instructor would hint that the failed students might offer money or other gifts in exchange for higher scores so that they were able to maintain their full-time student status.

It is known that insiders are more familiar than outsiders with the progress of a program/project and that they are ideal supervisors of students’ academic activities. However, for students who work on graduate programs in China, their academic advisors serve more as collaborators rather than supervisors. This is verified by the fact in that in recent years almost every scandal in Chinese academic circles has been disclosed by outsiders than insiders. As Interviewee I said:

John (an anonymous scientist in China), a seasoned and prolific senior academician of the Academy of Science and Technology in China (the highest level institute in China) had a paper published in JACS, the highest level of academic journal in chemistry in the world. However, to people’s surprise, the experiment in the paper was unable to be replicated. John, the advisor called back his former student who was the operator of the experiment (at that time he was
working on his PhD degree in the U.S.), and told him to redo that experiment in his laboratory. The final outcome turned out to be this: His student failed repeating the experiment. Finally John had to withdraw his published paper from the journal with an apology letter public to the chemistry circle around the world, finding himself in a tight corner.

Apparently, as an experienced academician and a graduate mentor, John assumed two roles for his graduate student: collaborator and supervisor. The problem lies in that he only assumed the role of collaborator, and overlooked his role for overlooking the progress of his student’s project. As a result, John was ignorant of his student’s falsification of the experimental data. He only came to know this after his student did not successfully obtain the same outcome from the experiment. By then, it was too late. If John had performed the role of supervisor, this academic misconduct could have been identified immediately and then corrected under the timely and tight supervision of the advisor. If the reporting system had been implemented stringently in daily research activities, this academic scandal could have been avoided and would not have led to the tragic aftermath of his academic reputation.

To some extent, the lack of a reporting culture directly impacted the establishment of the reporting mechanism. Due to the lack of insider supervision, a number of academic infringements can go unchecked and unpunished.

*Academic Context*

In this research, academic context is defined as the environment in which students engage in learning and research when they are working on academic degrees. In
exploring the role of the academic environment in shaping students’ view regarding academic integrity, the researcher investigated the factors embedded in the environment that lead to students’ academic misbehavior in day-to-day life. Based on the analysis of the qualitative data, three subthemes arose from this topic: a) not taught about scholarly ethics; b) poor supervision; and c) lack of a sanctioning mechanism.

Not taught about scholarly ethics

In investigating the factors that contribute to the generation of academic misconducts in Chinese institutions of higher learning, the researcher found most of them were ignorant of the academic integrity principle and its specifications when they were working on their academic degrees. Based on an in-depth discussion with the interviewees, the researcher noted that most college students including undergraduates and graduates were rarely taught in specific terms about academic integrity in class.

During the interviews, virtually each interviewee expressly admired the statement of Academic Integrity of this targeted U.S. university. Actually, this statement was established and announced by the founder of this institution. According to the relevant stipulation, this statement appears at the beginning of every instructor’s syllabus. Interviewee C expressed his admiration to the highlighting of the academic integrity principle by this U.S. university. He stated:

At the beginning of every semester, every lecturer will highlight the significance of abiding by this academic integrity policy at the beginning of the syllabus. From this angle, this U.S. targeted university did better than my former university in China. Furthermore, the academic circle pretty appreciates fostering students’
awareness about the academic integrity principle and its specifications.

On one hand, they admire what this targeted U.S. university did to foster students’ awareness of the academic integrity principle, but on the other hand, they feel a pity that their former home university in China has not developed similar programs to infuse this principle into students’ minds.

In comparing the U.S. academic environment with that of his former university in China, Interviewee A concluded:

The biggest difference is that academic environment of the U.S. is more normative. The syllabus of every instructor firstly states the significance of the academic integrity policy, then the requirements of the course, how to complete the assignments, when to submit the assignments, how to score; there are in-detailed specifications for each of these. For tests, the requirements are more meticulous.

Generally, pertinent orientation training is lacking on most college campus in China. As a result, most students have no idea about the context-based specifics of the academic integrity policy. Interviewee A reflected:

In China, my professor did mention something to me, but I didn’t see such an in-detailed manual. I didn’t read any official document explicating every requirement in China.

In contrast to the above participants, Interviewee F reported his academic advisor had mentored him somewhat regarding some specifics of the academic integrity policy during his graduate learning in China. Unfortunately, during his undergraduate period no
one had shared with him information about academic ethics in higher education.

Interviewee H had several papers published in journals during his undergraduate period in China. Sadly, none of the editors of the journals had identified his infringements and mentored him about the specifics of academic integrity principle: “No one had ever mentored me about these requirements when I was an undergraduate student even I published several papers.”

Generally, a journal editor is much stricter with the author about the enforcement of the academic integrity policy to maintain the journal’s high reputation in the academic field. Once one of its published papers is filled with plagiarized words and sentences, its academic reputation will be harmed immediately and it will lose subscribers. Interviewee H made plagiarism in his published paper because he repeatedly told the researcher he had copied and pasted Internet materials into his published paper without providing citations. In this situation, the external supervisor (the editor) also neglected his responsibility to supervise and mentor the author (Fu & Li, 2010; Lü, 2004; Meng, Zhu, Zhao, & Chen, 2009).

To summarize, although there is a difference between undergraduate education and graduate education in China, most students were rarely educated about academic integrity and its stipulations from on- or off-campus office as either undergraduates or graduate students.

*Poor supervision*

This category is divided into several subcategories: a) lack of external supervision, b) lack of computer check, and c) lack of instructor and advisor check. Poor
supervision is first displayed by the lack of external supervision.

Interviewee K, serving on a journal revise panel in assisting his academic advisor in this U.S. targeted university, discussed his revising experience and compared the revising system in U.S. with that in China:

In China, the assurance of academic integrity is determined by the individual. There is no good monitoring office that can check, assess, and supervise relevant researchers throughout academic activities. In comparison, the problem should be boiled down to the extent to which submitted papers are scrutinized by all kinds of channels. As you know here in the U.S., when you submit a paper to a journal, you are under the close scrutiny of a number of experts in a big field. The reviewers usually come from the same field and they tend to provide with their professional advice during the review. Under this close scrutiny, an author has few chances to violate the academic integrity policy.

Without the external supervision, academic misbehavior on college campuses cannot be arrested effectively and efficiently, if the assurance of academic integrity is determined only by the individual, which was verified by Interviewee H’s recall about how he had papers published in a journal:

Back in China, paper writing was haphazard and I didn’t have to worry about whose intellectual property I was violating. No one had ever mentored me about these requirements when I was an undergraduate student even I published several papers.

In comparing Interviewee H’s and Interviewee K’s comments, it is interesting to
find the U.S. differs considerably from China in terms of a journal’s review process. Actually, there exists a review system in a number of Chinese journals. Then what has led to the difference between the U.S. and China? According to Interviewee H, it should be the different levels of enforcing the revising system by periodicals or presses across U.S. and China. In America, as Interviewee K states, the review system is implemented very strictly and every submitted paper is under the close scrutiny of a number of experts in the same field before publication. If the author plagiarizes, it is very easy for these experts to identify the defect. In sharp contrast, the Chinese review system is not enforced very stringently. Interviewee H admitted he plagiarized in his published paper, but he had never worried about “whose intellectual property I am violating” in China before. In China, his paper would easily be published because none of the editors or “review panel” would take much effort to review and identify his plagiarized ideas. This is elaborated on by several researchers in the above (Fu & Li, 2010; Lü, 2004; Meng, Zhu, Zhao, & Chen, 2009).

Second, poor supervision is demonstrated by the lack of a computer check. In recent years, along with the rapid progress and application of advanced information technology (IT), a number of schools in the U.S. have cooperated with IT companies to develop software (databases) in order to assist the instructor in identifying plagiarisms in submitted assignments or papers. These databases have worked as a powerful weapon to combat on-campus academic misbehaviors. Interviewee A responded in the interview:

Some universities in China maybe have imported this software. This is a database of documents, which has collected a myriad of documents including papers from
the journals, forum, conference, and students’ graduation paper and written assignments. Once you input a document into the database, it will automatically compare the targeted paper with any document in the database. Based on the level of similarity between the targeted paper and any other document in the database, it will rule whether the student plagiarizes or not.

Interviewee I noted that some universities in China like Wuhan University have developed similar databases. He said:

I wonder whether you heard of software invented by Wuhan University that is able to find similarity percentage of one’s paper with other documents. For liberal arts majors, if your paper is identified to be similar to other documents by a high percentage, you have the suspect for plagiarism. Scenario may change for natural science majors.

Unquestionably, this database has helped U.S. universities effectively arrest the increasing academic misbehaviors. Unfortunately, this database has not spread widely across schools in China. As Interviewee H reflected upon an incident that happened in the U.S. university:

Actually, this database does not exist in the majority of universities in China. Back in China, this is the usual scenario: If two years ago you pick the same course as I pick for the time being, then I used your two-year-ago assignment as my current completed assignment. The instructor is unable to identify that my submitted assignment is the duplicate of your two-year-ago assignment. Even the instructor had a vague memory that he seemed to have read the similar document
somewhere else. Two years later he couldn’t locate the real owner even he tried. Without such as powerful database, the instructor couldn’t retrieve the assignment submitted by a student two years ago.

Interviewee B also evidenced this when he witnessed the power of this database in the U.S. university. Having never seen such a powerful database in China, Interviewee B felt dumbfounded at its great power: “When I looked deep into the software, I felt dumbfounded.”

Not many universities in China have developed a similar database. However, it is not powerful enough to identify the cheaters or plagiarizers in real life because the schools tend not to devote resources necessary to update the database. As a result, the usual scenario is that this database is conquered by a counter database, which allows more students to engage in academic misbehavior more publicly and outrageously, and to walk away unchecked. As Interviewee H pointed out:

In China I found some tool is able to identify the level of similarity between two documents. However, it is not powerful enough to retrieve all the submitted daily assignment of every student. It amazed me that this database here (in the U.S. targeted university) is so powerful that it is able to save students’ day-to-day assignments even submitted two years ago. What’s ridiculous, a number of soft companies have developed some countermeasure software to assist the plagiarizers in escaping the detection and following punishment. As a result, more students are tempted to involve academic misbehaviors without worrying about being detected and punished.
Thirdly, poor supervision is also demonstrated by the lack of the instructor’s and advisor’s check. Based on McCabe and colleagues’ (McCabe, Dukerich, & Dutton, 1993; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1996; McCabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2003, 2006) studies, the supervision from instructor and advisor plays a significant role in containing students’ academic misbehaviors. It is because they are in contact with students every day and are pretty well informed of the students’ learning situation, including their weaknesses and strengths. Thus, if the instructor and advisor pay attention to supervising students’ learning progress, students’ academic misbehaviors can be effectively held under control. Unfortunately, this is not the usual scenario in China, as Interviewee F noted:

When a student cites words or phrases from other documents, s/he may overlook crediting the resources in the section of references. Of course, as a daily assignment, it is not a big event in China.

Similarly, Interviewee J had the same experience. This happened during her first-year postgraduate study in her former university in China:

Then the instructor announced that for the final exam we were only required to complete a paper instead of a test. Of course, it depends up the discipline……

Then if needed to write a paper, the students would write a paper in Chinese, and they would patch up a paper with copied words from a multitude of Internet documents. The instructor who took the responsibility for grading students’ assignments should be broadly aware of their plagiarism because the plagiarized words and syntaxes looked unlike words and syntaxes created by students
themselves. However, the instructor usually keeps a blind eye to students’ plagiarized assignments and graded 90 points to their written papers. What’s worse, the instructor praised the students for their “well-done” assignments. Interviewee J’s standpoint was verified by most other participants. Given the lack of the teacher’s supervision, there existed prevalent plagiarism among college students degree papers. Interviewee D commented:

Undergraduate students usually make little effort to complete the graduation paper, most often times they have to engage in several affairs at the same time: to complete the graduation paper, to land a job, and to court a desired girlfriend/boyfriend. Generally, undergraduates tend to patch up a paper through copying and pasting words directly from the Internet or other resources. They care little about the citations. Usually, instructors don’t care about undergraduates’ papers, and they won’t invest time to checking whether students committed academic misbehaviors.

Currently, there lacks empirical evidence documenting factors that cause instructors to abandon their responsibility for supervising students’ academic activities. Interviewee I tried to explore the factors, and described his mentor’s schedule based on his personal research experience:

My advisor had 12 or 13 master-level students including several postdocs. In total, he had 30 students in his laboratory. As a result, my advisor was unable to extend his timely and essential mentoring to each of us. Actually, there were three teachers in our laboratory: two in-service PhDs along with my advisor. They could
help our advisor to mentor us.

Interviewee I’s comments made the point. According to Interview I, in China the advisor usually assumes several roles: graduate mentor, administrator, and part-time positions in other off-campus institutes. Due to their tight schedule, these academic personnel are even unable to distribute time to mentor their students, let alone supervising their research or project. When an academic scandal occurs, the mentor is the last person to know. As happened in Interviewee I’s story reported earlier:

John (an anonymous scientist), a seasoned and prolific senior academician of the Academy of Science of China (the highest level of technology and science research in China) had a paper published in JACS, the highest level of academic journal in chemistry. However, to people’s surprise, the experiment in the paper was unable to be replicated. John, the advisor called back his student who was working on his PhD degree in the U.S., and told him to redo that experiment in his laboratory. The final outcome turned out to be this: His student failed replicating the experiment and John had to withdraw his published paper with an apology letter public to the chemistry circle around the world, finding himself in a tight corner.

As to general faculty members, Interviewee K believe, due to their disadvantageous status in claiming teaching and research resources in the department, most common instructors usually take a passive attitude toward anything they have to deal with. Thus, it is not strange that Interviewee J’s instructor turns a blind eye to students’ plagiarism in the term papers. What’s worse, the academic integrity policy has
not been established in most Chinese schools and common instructors feel they do not have the obligations to supervise students’ academic activities and report their academic misbehaviors to relevant administrators, as Interviewees K, I, reported in the above.

*Lack of a Sanctioning Mechanism*

The monitoring mechanism for academic misbehavior should include training, identification, and sanction. If violators can go unpunished, that means potential violators will multiply because they set bad models for the followers---they do not have to pay the cost for their bad academic behaviors.

This is closely related to the previous discussion. Without being identified as academic ethics violators by the insiders, these moral offenders can get off scot-free. In reflecting academic environment in his former Chinese university, Interviewee K noted:

Generally a university in China has a number of offices, but I’ve never found a special office that is responsible for managing academic affairs of students as well as faculty members. The reason is maybe no one is aware of its significance.

As the researcher observed before in China, generally the administrative hierarchy is the core of the university. As an extension of the government, the university is managed by a top-down power system. Having grown up in such an environment, the researcher understands that no one cares about how to effectively contain students’ academic misbehavior. The prevalent academic atmosphere is displayed as a climate of indifference to academic misbehavior. Some instructors want to take the responsibility, but they are not endowed with the discretion to do so. Some academic personnel have the discretion, but their schedule does not allow them to do so. Interviewee A verifies this:
The lack of sanction first generates from the lack of autonomy of faculty members in running the university. In China it is the administration machine that is in charge of teaching and research. This is the foremost concern. The second concern is academic resources are usually monopolized by academic tycoons who assume key administrators within the department at the same time. These tycoons tend to suppress the academic growth of young scholars unconsciously because of kinship-centered game rule. If you don’t bow before this authority in your department, you are not eligible for obtaining the academic resources like applying for fund, grant, and promotion or tenure. Usually, the authorities are consisted of only several people in your department or school who take turns to host the resource distribution. This is the academic ecology of the higher education in China.

In order to survive in this academic environment, faculty members are barely concerned with monitoring students’ academic misbehaviors, let alone punishing them.

As Interviewee J’s responded:

The instructor who was responsible for grading students’ assignments should be broadly aware of students’ plagiarisms because the plagiarized words and syntaxes were not like words and syntaxes created by students themselves. However, the instructor would turn a blind eye to your plagiarized assignment and graded 90 points to students’ written papers.

When responsible instructors face this dilemma, how do they handle this situation? This was illustrated in Interviewee H’s response:
Most of the instructors tend not to (punish assignment cheaters). Some professors at the age of 55 to 60 who are very responsible may be infuriated and may tell you that the whole class answers are the same. Only these words. The education in China may make you from the bottom of your heart think copying others’ assignment is normal.

The implication behind Interviewee H was that few violators of the academic integrity policy had to pay the cost for their misbehaviors. Without a good model, and without having to pay the cost, few students can resist the temptation of the benefits brought about by academic misbehaviors. Thus, it is understandable that plagiarism among students’ graduation papers is so blatant.

Additionally, the external environment plays a negative role by instigating students to engage in academic misbehaviors. Interviewee A noted:

Actually, the Chinese government only halfheartedly supervises the issue of piracy. If it really handled these pirated products and technologies, a large amount of money would flow into U.S. companies. As a result, Chinese government only perfunctorily cracks down on these piracies once it feels pressured from U.S. federal government.

This is a public secret that the Chinese government encourages national enterprises to make their own technology-intensive products to beat the counterparts from other developed countries. Guided by the Confucian heritage of utilitarianism, the companies tend to adopt any means available to steal the technology from their counterparts. This has reinforced a misconception into students’ minds: end justifies
means regardless of ethical standard (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003).

To summarize, the academic ecology on- and off-campus in China does not effectively impose sanctions on the violators, and as a result it motivates students to think that academic misbehaviors are only trivialities that bear no impact in shaping their worldviews.

Learning U.S. Academic Ethics

Based on the analysis of qualitative data, this theme is divided into four subthemes: U.S. requirements for academic ethics; motives of Chinese graduate students to adapt to U.S. academic ethics; channels to learn academic ethics in America; and impressive incidents—overcoming misconception of academic integrity.

U.S. requirements for academic ethics

In order to adapt to a new environment, students should understand the difference between the new environment and the former environment. In the last two sections, the researcher investigated Chinese graduates’ perspectives toward academic ethics that were developed in their home country. In this subsection, the researcher investigated what these Chinese graduate students perceived Academic Integrity in this U.S. targeted university to be.

That China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic ethics was concluded through the observations of every interviewee. Interviewee A states:

I came to understand the difference between the U.S. and China after I came to the U.S. On the whole, the biggest difference is that academic environment of the U.S. is more normative. Generally, the syllabus of every instructor states the
requirements of the course, the assignments, and grading. There are in-detailed specifications for each of them. For tests, the requirements are more stringent. In summary, these specifications aim to help students to stay far from academic misbehaviors because in the U.S., the environment at the macro level is very appropriate for fostering a good academic environment.

Interviewee A’s viewpoint was reaffirmed by Interviewee C, although C did mention something different. Interviewee C emphasized that this U.S. targeted university was very determined to inculcate these requirements into students’ minds, which was quite different from what his home university had done. As Interviewee C recalled:

One of the differences is embodied as a diversity of training means. In Beijing University and Chinese Academy of Science and Technology (CAST), lecturers are primary educators who most often disseminate this relevant knowledge to students in class. Whereas, this U.S. university tends to employ multiple channels to seed these requirements into students’ minds, including news media, seminars, and workshops. Administrators in the U.S. have a strong willingness to spread these standards among students. At the beginning of every semester, every lecturer tends to highlight the significance of abiding by the academic integrity policy at the head of his syllabus. From this perspective, the U.S. did better in fostering students’ awareness of academic ethics.

Interviewee D noted the difference primarily generates from the specifications in the academic integrity policy. He repeatedly stressed that in China no one had taught him about academic ethics, in or after class. He only got some anecdotal information about
academic ethics from TV news. He came to know the specifications of academic integrity only when he came to this U.S. university. He said:

However, the U.S. is very strict with students. In general, the students are not allowed to directly cite the initial words or phrases without citation, even when someone is citing a picture. If you want to cite a map, you need to draw the map. If you want to cite some documents from a film, you need to get the author’s permission. Whenever you use others’ source, you have to ask for their permission. To respect one’s intellectual property is very important when engaging academic research. In comparison, (this U.S. university) does better than my former university with respect to establishing an appropriate academic environment and guaranteeing the enforcement of the academic integrity policy.

In comparison, several interviewees still had some misconceptions about Academic Integrity even after they had worked on their program for a period of time. This misconception was corrected only after they drew upon the lessons from their mistakes, as evidenced by Interviewee J:

Then my assignments also related to plagiarism when I attended class in the beginning. However, I was not intentional but knew little about the policy of academic integrity of (this U.S. targeted university). My instructor told me if I cite two sentences from others’ documents, I need to credit the source in the section of references. Actually, I didn’t understand the requirements of the policy to the full. Then, the first time when I submitted my assignment, my instructor got me to his office and pointed a sentence out to me. Actually, I provided the citation in the
references and I directly copied those words from Wikipedia into my paper. Out of my expectation, my teacher told me I didn’t make a right citation because I cited the original words. My teacher told me if I cite from a document, I need to rephrase the original words with my own words.

Interviewee J recognized that academic integrity requirements vary considerably across the U.S. and China. She repeatedly emphasized that she became scrupulous with citations in paper writing in the U.S. Nevertheless, despite her rigorous compliance, she made a blunder in her first assignment. When providing a citation, she cited the original words, but left out quotation marks around the cited words because she did not fully understand how to cite original words that she needed to add quotation marks.

Like Interviewees D and J, most Chinese graduate students began to really construct their conceptions of plagiarism, data falsification, and other forms of academic misbehavior after they came to the U.S. An incident that happened to Interviewee E lent evidence to this. In his first term paper, Interviewee E did not credit the resource when he cited a computer model in his paper. His instructor highlighted his mistake and told him what he should do to comply with the specifications of the policy:

Then my instructor pointed it out to me with earnest that whenever I cite others’ documents, I am required to credit the source regardless of citing models, or texts. Sometimes, even a small modification, but the main idea is cited from others, I still need to credit the resource.

Before the incident happened, Interviewee E had only a vague memory that he needed to provide the citation about whatever documents he cited. Unfortunately, he did
not inscribe these words into his mind. Consequently, he habitually overlooked the citation when he cited a model from a website in his course term paper.

To summarize, Chinese students change their perspective toward the significance of academic integrity after they come to U.S. because of the changed requirements in the new environment. As Interviewee H commented: “The educational environment in China makes students think academic misbehaviors are normal.” Meanwhile, the U.S. education environment helps these students place their focus on this Academic Integrity policy and its stipulations at any time.”

Motives of Chinese Graduate Students to Adapt to U.S. Academic Ethics

Motive is defined as inner driving force that compels an individual to conquer difficulties and challenges in order to reach the short-term and long-term goals. Accordingly, the motive of Chinese graduates to adapt to U.S. academic ethics is defined as the inner driving force that compels them to conquer difficulties or challenges in their acculturation with U.S. academic integrity requirements in learning and research.

On the surface, their motive comes from external pressures. During the interview, the researcher found all the participants were scared of the aftermath of violating the academic integrity policy. Interviewee A stated:

If you are identified by the instructor and administrator to have plagiarized, the aftermath is very terrible, your program is over and you will be expelled from this university. You have to pay the cost. You managed to fly to the U.S. to pursue your academic degree, and eventually you have to go back to China. How can you face your parents and teachers in China?
Interviewee A’s words represent many Chinese graduate students. Unlike undergraduate student, most Chinese graduate students decided to come to the U.S. to pursue their academic degree after they obtained offers from the U.S. Generally, most of the Chinese undergraduate students in the U.S. come from wealthy families, while many of Chinese graduate students come from middle-class or poor families (IIE, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007). If they are identified to have violated the academic integrity policy, their programs would come to an end and the financial offer would be withdrawn accordingly. As Interviewee H commented:

To my surprise, I found all of this emerged after the severe punishment was imposed on the violator. Educational atmosphere makes us behave ourselves; otherwise, the punishments are waiting for us in advance.

Interviewee H’s viewpoint was strongly supported by above Interviewee A’s words.

Secondly, Chinese graduates gradually come to the conclusion that it is necessary to uphold others’ intellectual property. By then, they transferred from the external pressure to the inner self-requirement. This was evidenced by Interviewees A, D, E, and H. As Interviewee A noted:

I think my motive to abide by the academic integrity policy is to respect others’ intellectual property. As you know to respect others’ intellectual property is very important when engaging academic research.

Likewise, Interviewee H also stated the same point of view:

If you cite others’ ideas in your paper without crediting the source in your reference section, once your paper is published, this involves the trespass or
infringement of others’ intellectual property.

Interviewee K stated that one should not be provided any opportunities to commit academic misconducts if he/she wants to have a paper published in a journal. Interviewee K came to know this after he served on a journal review panel for several years. He said:

The problem should boil down to the extent to what to-be-published papers are supervised by all kinds of channels. As you know, in America when you submit a paper to a journal, your paper is under close scrutiny of a number of experts in the big field. The reviewers usually come from the same field and they tend to provide their professional advice. Under this close scrutiny, an author has few chances to commit academic misconduct.

According to Interviewee K, the motive students have to adapt to academic ethics in the U.S. coming from the external pressure, for instance close scrutiny of a submitted paper by a review panel.

In addition, as Interviewee A stated in the following, after graduate students have engaged in research for a long time, it makes no sense if they still engage in academic misbehaviors:

When we come to this stage, we don’t need to cheat or plagiarize. If you can’t figure it out, you can ask the instructor for a delay for your assignment. Even you cheat in this assignment, a test is still waiting for you ahead. What’s more, you have to understand how to apply what you learned in class to your research. You learned something and it became part of your knowledge system. If you only want to save time by cheating in your assignments, which means that the answers you
copied from others doesn’t become part of your knowledge pool automatically.

In the opinion of Interviewee A, the purpose of working on a postgraduate degree is to explore the truth and to construct one’s knowledge system rather than to please one’s instructor or advisor. Consequently, to engage academic misbehaviors makes no sense because it is does not contribute to building up one’s knowledge system.

To summarize, initially it is external pressure that motivates Chinese graduates to adapt to academic ethics in the U.S. As time advances, this kind of external pressure may develop into an internal requirement for most of Chinese graduates.

*Channels to Learn Academic Ethics in U.S.*

Channel is defined as a way, means, or media that facilitates the attainment of one’s goal. In this dissertation research, channels to learn academic ethics are defined as media that get students to understand specifications of the U.S. Academic Integrity policy.

During the interviews, most respondents stated that their instructors particularly advisors play a significant role in familiarizing them with context-centered academic ethics. As Interviewee A said: “Generally, your advisor is the gatekeeper.”

As his advisor’s first graduate student, Interviewee B received considerate and comprehensive mentoring about how to comply with academic ethics in daily research and writing:

Every advisor is different. Whenever I wrote something, my mentor would modify it immediately, including indirect citation and direct citation and adding quotation marks to direct citation. Sometimes when we were unable to understand the
author’s original words completely, and we couldn’t paraphrase his/her words, we tended to use quotation marks to these words, and provide endnotes stating these words were cited word for word from other resources. I understand this through my advisor’s personal mentoring. As a result, I transitioned very smoothly to the new academic environment. On the other hand, my advisor’s in-person mentoring plays a role of supervision to my research. If I plagiarized in my paper, then my advisor would find my plagiarized words in my paper draft, and he would point it out to me and asked me to correct it immediately.

In the opinion of Interviewee B, his mentor served as a baby-sitter in his academic growth in the U.S. Although he graduated from one of the best universities in China, Interviewee B was not clear about the academic ethics under particular contexts in his former university in China.

In a large measure, the case of Interviewee B makes general sense because most respondents stated the advisors are very considerate and concerned about their academic growth. As Interviewee D stated:

My advisor should be the most significant impact in shaping my perspective toward academic integrity. When I complete a paper, I need to submit it to my advisor for a review. My advisor will tell me how to cite others’ papers and how to stick to these regulations. For instance, if I cite one’s figure and data, my advisor would explain the regulations to me about how to make endnotes, and how to cite others’ papers. My advisor would explain everything pertinent to me.

In addition to the role of the advisor, several interviewees mentioned that peers
might work to some extent to facilitate their understanding of context-based requirements. Interviewee F responded:

In my view, even if one has not committed academic misbehaviors it is very important to understand how to abide by academic ethics through communicating with your counterparts around. When I worked on my master’s degree, I always talked with doctors in our lab. They understand more than I. I vividly remembered that one of my passionate doctoral colleagues told me how to cite others’ papers. He pointed it out to me that I could not cite others’ original words. If I wanted to cite others’ papers, I was required to paraphrase the original words. In other words, I had to convert these words into my personal expressions. Another doctoral colleague told me that if I cited three sentences in succession, which was not permitted because it was almost close to plagiarism. Furthermore, I feel that although no one told me about academic integrity regulations, to initatively launch conversations with others is also important.

In summation, Interviewee F was proactive in exploring academic integrity specifications. Even without his advisor’s reminding, Interview F learned much from his peers in his lab when working at his master’s degree. As a master-level student, Interviewee H received mentoring from both his advisor and postdoctoral students:

Generally in the U.S., you need to submit your paper to your mentor or postdoc for review, one time after one time. When you are available, your mentor or the postdoc tend to get you and tell you the words or syntaxes you used are not accurate, or in another sentence you need to provide the data. In so doing, your
paper will look more compact and logic. Then more is relevant to plagiarism. If you cite an idea from other resource, you need to credit the citation in the references behind.

Except for the advisor and peers like doctoral or postdoctoral students, some courses or seminars are also deemed to be a significant channel to facilitate students’ understanding academic integrity specifications. As Interviewee D said:

What impressed me most is one seminar hosted by an expert in the library in the beginning of my first semester. He gave us some basic knowledge. For instance, if one cites others’ papers, s/he is required to rephrase it, and in the meanwhile to credit the source in the section of references. That means you need to paraphrase others’ words. Your paraphrasing does not mean that idea is your personal intellectual property. In addition, translation needs some strategies. Additionally, a seminar provided by our department (a course given exclusively to graduate students) helped me understand these specifications in contexts a lot. This course was a required course for graduate students (now it is cancelled from the curricular). On the whole, this course consisted of five to six topics. One of the topics was related to cheating, and plagiarism. At the end of the presentation, the host speaker listed students’ academic behaviors. There were four choices such as A, B, C, and D. Following the question the audience would be asked to pick the choice: which case was categorized into cheating, which case into plagiarism? It looked like a game. Then a cited paragraph was showed. One of its small paragraphs was repeated. Actually, these two seminars were impressive to me
because they provided me with a number of context-based cases.

Similarly, Interviewee J also highlighted the role of seminars in shaping students’ perspective about academic ethics. She stated:

We also had another course, special topic issue. In this course, the instructor would teach U.S. context-based academic integrity specifications, how to write a paper, a grant proposal, how to write a CV, and it also involved how to complete assignments. We also reviewed our papers each other. Consequently, I felt I learned much more than I did in China only in one course. Back in China, my instructor had never taught me how to write a paper, a proposal, or how to abide by academic ethics.

In hindsight, both Interviewee D and Interviewee J felt this kind of seminar worked effectively to construct their perspectives regarding context-based academic ethics. These seminars served as a good channel to clarify confusees of Chinese graduates regarding academic integrity requirements in full sail.

Interviewee H believed in the most effective channel should be the Honor Code and policy, as he stated here:

At the time when I was matriculated I was presented a handbook about our college. In general, one section covers tests. When you are registered, the coordinator will tell you that the first thing you need to care about is the requirements for your major; the second thing you need to care about is the requirements for tests. Maybe when you came here, the teacher will give you a thick book like this. The teacher will ask you to read two sections. In general, one
Meanwhile, several interviewees responded that they came to understand these academic ethics through mistakes. This was reported by Interviewee H:

Then my instructor pointed it out to me with earnest that whenever I cite others’ documents, I am required to credit the source regardless of citing models, or texts. Sometimes, even a small modification, but the main idea is cited from others, I still need to credit the source.

Interviewee H’s words were verified by Interviewee J in her first assignment:

Then my assignments also related to plagiarism when I went to the class in the beginning. However, I was not intentional but knew little about the academic integrity stipulations here. My instructor told me if I cited two sentences from other’s document, I needed to credit the source or provide the citation. Actually, I provided the citation in the references and I directly copied those words from Wikipedia into my paper. However, my teacher told me I didn’t make a right citation because I cited the original words. My instructor told me that if I cite from a document, I need to rephrase the original words with my own words.

To summarize, the effective channels that can acquaint Chinese graduates with U.S. academic integrity requirements include instructors, advisors, peers, cases-based seminars or courses, manuals, and one’s own mistake.

Impressive Incidents—Overcoming Misconception of Academic Integrity

An impressive incident is defined as a case through which Chinese graduate students conquer the last barrier on the way to acculturating with the academic ethical
environment in the U.S. In in-depth talks with interview participants, the researcher found Chinese graduates tended to unconsciously project their former mindset in China to academic integrity requirements in the new education environment. Thus, these impressive incidents served as a final strike that smashed their misconceptions about academic integrity and helped them construct an appropriate mindset toward academic ethics eventually.

Several respondents evidenced this. As Interviewee B described an incident that happened to his wife:

There are some details. As you know my wife, she had served as a TA in her department by delivering one course to undergraduates. At the end of every semester, my wife tended to request her students to complete a project in the format of term paper as the final exam. One time, she reported a case of infringement of an undergraduate to her coordinator. The coordinator issued an official warning to the student. When I looked into the case, I found it was the monitoring software that identified the plagiarism. As a matter of fact, this software is a database and it was developed by this U.S. university through cooperation with several computer companies. It is so powerful that it can collect all the documents even anonymous posted papers, amateur passages, or students’ term papers. Usually, it will compare students’ written paper with the database, and it can immediately identify who plagiarized, through the level of similarity between students’ submitted paper and the documents from the database. When I witnessed this incident, I felt dumbfounded. What terrible software! It has
imposed great monitoring pressure on me. This software not only warns you not to violate relevant academic integrity regulations but also indicates your study is over in the U.S. if you trespass the bottom line. As you know, this software is embedded in the Blackboard and each instructor can use the database to check students’ submitted assignments.

Based on Interviewee B, he still maintained his a psychological mindset to take chances in what he unconsciously deemed infringement of academic ethics, it is evident he might violate the academic integrity requirements if he thought he would not be caught, being unable to resist the temptation and the benefit brought about by academic misbehavior. It is because he repeatedly wowed the powerful database and repeatedly emphasized he would never plagiarize in his paper writing ever since. Evidently, his subconscious mindset of taking chances disappeared when he learned of the great power of the plagiarism database: “Wow! What terrible software!”

Likewise, Interviewee E experienced a similar case in person, as he stated in the interview:

One time I completed a paper regarding the identification of living organisms, in which I used a model, the Boston system, to confirm my argument. Through this system, people were able to identify features of a person’s irises. Based on the identification, a person can be identified eventually. When I was developing the term paper with carelessness I overlooked crediting the resource of the model in my references. I only directly wrote this model in my paper. Out of my expectation, I got a low score and my instructor told me that I committed
plagiarism based on his inspection of the database. My instructor pointed it out me with earnest that whenever I cite others’ documents, I am required to credit the source regardless of citing figures, models, or texted words. Sometimes, even I did a small modification, if the main idea is cited from others; I need to credit the source. Then I learned it in heart: credibility in the academic circle is very significant. This is a memorable incident I experienced by myself.

Actually, Interviewee E received relevant training at a graduate student orientation about academic ethics at the institutional level. He also participated in a seminar hosted by the School of Computer Science. In the opening orientation seminar, the host repeatedly emphasized that Computer Science majors need to credit the citation when they download software from a website. Nevertheless, he neglected to provide a source in his term paper. Although he did it unintentionally, his sub-consciousness hinted he could get by with it. Before Interviewee E released the incident to the researcher, he said it is a habit for computer science majors not to provide the citation when they use others’ software and databases in China. He truly thought he had projected his former perspective into the new environment. This misconception went away only he experienced this memorable incident.

In comparison, the most impressive incident comes from Interviewee H. Actually, this incident happened to one friend of his friend’s. For convenience, the researcher named his friend as A, and the friend of his friend as B. As Interviewee H stated the following:

It occurred when B submitted his assignment, a term paper. The assignment was a
summary report of a computer project in that B was required to use an application program to resolve a practical problem. For this course, each student needed to write an application program. Actually, B’s project was very similar to A’s project completed two years ago. Due to great convenience, B directly used the same codes in A’s project in his term paper rather than write one by himself. B did only a few modification about A’s codes in his assignment and then submitted it to the instructor. Out of B’s expectation, his instructor asked him to the office a short while later. The instructor told B that his paper is similar to one former student’s submitted assignment by more than 70 percent. The instructor ruled that B violated the academic integrity policy by plagiarizing others’ paper. I felt very surprised at this case. As you know in China if you use a former student’s submitted assignment as your current completed assignment, even the instructor wants to check the owner, he is unable to, because no database can save a student’s two-year-ago assignment. This scenario changed in the U.S. With the great help of a powerful database available at any time, the instructor can identify who submitted a similar document before when he only inputs the document into the database. I think it is magic. It is a big surprise to me. B was almost expelled and I dare not use anyone’s document without citations ever since.

Interviewee H had several papers published in journals before he came to this U.S. targeted university. He told the researcher he was excelling in patching up a paper with copied documents from the Internet. Although he experienced an incident personally, he felt dumbfounded at B’s case. Having grown up in an environment that
favors the philosophy of utilitarianism, deep inside Interviewee H had a mindset of taking chances even though he claimed he gradually melded into U.S. academic ethics. This incident that happened to B served as the final strike to break up his former misconception and helped him complete his transformation, “Ever since I dare not use anyone’s document without citations”, as Interviewee H commented in the end.

To analyze the qualitative data, it is evident that these Chinese graduates subconsciously embraced the former mindset in China before they experienced the incidents even though they claimed they had transitioned to the U.S. academic integrity environment. Embedded deep in a Confucian culture typified as utilitarianism, the students were unable to complete the transformation without the final strike.

Qualitative Findings

In this section, the researcher investigated the process by which Chinese graduates’ adapt to the U.S. academic integrity environment. Several categories of themes emerged: Chinese academic ethics worldview, academic context, and learning academic ethics in the U.S. Under further examination, each of the themes was divided into several subthemes. Chinese academic worldview was divided into: a) lack of contractual worldview, b) ethical issues not part of the value system, and c) the lack of reporting culture. Academic context was divided into: a) not taught about scholar ethics, b) poor supervision, and c) lack of a sanctioning mechanism. The subtheme of poor supervision was further divided into: a) lack of external supervision, b) lack of computer software supervision, and c) lack of instructor and peer supervision. Finally, learning academic ethics in the U.S. was divided into: a) requirements of academic integrity policy of the
U.S., b) motives of Chinese graduate students to adapt to U.S. academic ethics, and c) learning U.S. academic ethics. The subtheme of learning U.S. academic ethics was further divided into: a) channels to learn the academic ethics of the U.S. university, and b) impressive incidents---the final strike to smash their former misconception.

These themes, subthemes, and sub-subthemes helped the researcher to complete a comprehensive picture of the dynamic evolution of Chinese graduates from their former perspective to the current one, which is appropriate for learning and research in the U.S.

Summary of the Mixed Methods Research Analysis

This chapter describes the results of the quantitative analyses and the qualitative analyses performed in this study. The quantitative analysis investigated academic integrity attitudes of Chinese college students in China. The qualitative analysis investigated the process by which Chinese graduates in the U.S. targeted university adapted to the U.S. academic integrity environment. The quantitative portion used factor analysis to identify four common types of academic misbehavior in China: a) cheating for benefits, b) plagiarisms, c) exploiting academic resources, and d) falsifying one’s work. The most practiced types of academic misbehavior include: a) attaining a copy of an upcoming test from classmates who attended the same test formerly, b) copying from the Internet or other sources without citation, c) and summary citing from other papers without crediting sources. The least practiced types involved: a) purchasing a paper from the Internet as a graduation requirement, b) hiring others to write a paper, and c) cheating to obtain recommendation eligibility for graduates. The following types of misbehavior were found lie in between such as: a) cheating to attain scholarship, b) using or
distributing software, documents without asking for the owner’s permission, c) falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of an instructor, d) asking the author to add your name into the original authors without any contribution to the paper, and e) submitting a former assignment as a current assignment.

Factors that led to academic misbehavior were found to closely relate to the extent to which schools, departments, and faculty members expect college students to exercise academic integrity. Overall, the researcher found that the school, department, and faculty in Chinese higher education care little about fostering students’ awareness of the academic integrity principle. They have not devoted necessary resources to establishing a relevant system of mechanism for converting these regulations (where they can exist) into real life actions.

At the qualitative phase, the researcher summarized three themes: a) the Chinese academic worldview, b) the academic context of China, and c) learning U.S. academic ethics. Chinese students’ world view about academic integrity is shaped by the academic context in China and coming to a U.S. institution provides challenges for overcoming their former worldviews in China. A detailed investigation of the transition of Chinese graduates to the U.S. academic ethics was conducted. Several subthemes arose including: a) U.S. requirements for academic ethics; b) motives of Chinese graduate students to adapt to U.S. academic ethics; c) channels to learn academic ethics in America; and d) impressive incidents---overcoming misconception of academic integrity. A model that summarizes and captures the essential characteristics of the dynamic process was created in the fifth chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Overview

In this section, the researcher will discuss findings from the quantitative and qualitative portion based on the data analysis in the previous chapter. An acculturation model of how Chinese graduates transition to the U.S. academic ethics will be provided upon the summarization of research findings. The researcher will also discuss two hypotheses brought forward in Chapter 1: China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic ethics requirements, and Chinese institutions of higher learning have a high level of homogeneity regarding students’ perspective toward academic integrity. Finally, the researcher will discuss the implications for future studies and practice.

Guiding Questions

For the quantitative phase of this study, the overarching research question is:

What is the environment of academic integrity of higher education in China?

The sub-questions will be addressed in this phase:

1. What is the situation of academic integrity in Chinese higher education?
2. What are the expectations of Chinese institutions regarding academic integrity?
3. What are the expectations of the faculty in Mainland China regarding students’ academic integrity?

For the qualitative phase, the guiding question is: How do Chinese graduate students adapt to the academic integrity environment of a southeastern research university in the United States?
Sub-questions for the qualitative analysis include:

1. How do Chinese graduate students perceive their experiences in the U.S. academic integrity environment?
2. How do Chinese graduate students manage their transitions from the Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment?
3. How do Chinese graduate students come to understand the requirements of academic integrity in the United States?

Quantitative Findings

In the quantitative phase, the dissertation research aims to address the question: What is the environment of academic integrity of higher education in China? As noted above, this overarching question is divided into three sub-questions.

Question 1: What is the situation of academic integrity of higher education in China?

The researcher conducted a descriptive analysis and a principal component analysis on the first scale that measured how common academic misbehaviors are practiced in schools of China.

According to the principal component analysis for the first scale, commonly practiced academic misbehaviors in China were grouped into four categories: cheating for benefits, plagiarism, exploiting academic resources, and falsifying one’s work. The first category of cheating for benefits included the items: a) cheating to obtain scholarship, b) cheating to successfully graduate, c) cheating to obtain recommendation eligibility of graduates, and d) lying on a resume to obtain a good job. Within the first factor, the
The strongest loaded item was a) cheating to obtain scholarship (.76), followed by b) cheating to successfully graduate (.76), c) cheating to attain recommendation eligibility of graduates (.74), and d) lying on a resume to attain a good job (.64).

The second category of plagiarism included: a) copying from the Internet or other sources without citation (.85), and b) summary citing from other papers without crediting sources (.85). These two items are both strongly loaded indicating these two misbehaviors are very common in China. The third category of exploiting academic resources included: a) attaining information for an upcoming test from classmates (.74), b) overlooking professors’ academic dishonesty and refusing reporting it to the relevant administrators (.71), c) using and distributing software and documents without asking for the owner’s permission (.70), and d) submitting former assignment as current assignments (.52). The fourth category of falsifying one’s work involved: a) purchasing a paper from the internet as a graduation paper (-.74), b) hiring others to write a paper (-.72), c) asking the author to add your name into the original authors without any contribution towards the paper (-.603), and d) falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of the instructor (-.50). The items of the fourth factor were found to be negatively loaded, indicating interpretation of this factor should be reversed.

The descriptive data from the first scale found that the most practiced academic misbehavior in the schools of China involved: a) attaining a copy of an upcoming test from classmates who already attended the same test (2.93), b) copying from the internet or other sources without citation (2.87), and c) summary citing from other papers without crediting sources (2.77). This suggests plagiarisms such as copying and summary copying
without citation, are common in China. These findings are consistent with the conclusions of several studies in the literature review (Shi, Wang, & Jin, 2009; Wang, 2005; Ye, 2006). As these studies revealed in the literature review, college students are not clear about what exactly consists of plagiarism. The findings here indicate college students in China have a high probability of plagiarizing in term papers, and graduation papers. The finding from the literature review and the qualitative analysis explained factors leading to college students’ plagiarism in China.

The descriptive data also revealed that the least practiced academic misbehaviors converge on: a) purchasing a paper from the internet as a graduation paper (1.97), b) hiring others to write a paper (2.13), and c) cheating to obtain recommendation of eligibility for graduates (2.22). These findings indicate most students are developing their graduation papers by themselves, although some might choose to get others to complete the graduation papers. This is because of the convenient access to the Internet that considerably facilitates students’ manufacturing papers through copy-and-paste from downloaded documents from the websites. Consequently, they do not have to spend more money in paying for ghostwriters to write a graduation paper for them. Students demonstrating effort to prepare for the graduate recommendation eligibility test indicate Chinese students prefer the traditional value, no pain, no gain. Also, it indicates that students in China tend to supervise each other in these tests because the fierce competition forces them to snatch any opportunity to accumulate more stakes in landing a position in the future. It is known that participating in a postgraduate program can enhance one’s opportunity to find a position in the future especially bachelor’s degrees
are devalued after Chinese higher education embarked on increasing enrollment in late 1990’s.

In addition, the prescriptive data indicated that the following misconducts are more likely to occur: a) lying on a resume to attain a good job (2.54), b) cheating to successfully graduate (2.57), and c) overlooking professors’ academic misbehavior and refusing to report it to relevant administrators (2.53), indicate that students employ the Confucian principle of utilitarianism by weighing the cost against the benefit to justify their behavior. Whether students engage in unethical behaviors or not is dependent upon their real needs rather than moral standards. In China, most college students have padded their resumes to highlight their strengths in order to land a good position. The act of overlooking professors’ academic misbehaviors and refusing to report them to relevant administrators partly originates from the principle of utilitarianism, worrying they will be avenged by the professors, along with a cultural expectation that one should respect superiors (including professors), which means disclosing the dark side of superiors in public is not encouraged in China.

Second, the descriptive data revealed the following academic misbehaviors are not often practiced: a) falsifying laboratory data to satisfy the demand of instructor (2.44), b) asking the author to add your name into original authors without any contribution to the paper (2.37), c) submitting former assignments as current assignments, d) using or distributing software and documents without the owner’s permission (2.31), and e) cheating to obtain a scholarship (2.49). The findings suggest students prefer to work out their tasks by themselves. Students in China seldom ask others to add their names into the
original authors because they have little opportunity to have a paper published. When one has more published papers, he/she will have more opportunities to exchange his/her goods (namely papers) with others.

Out of the researcher’s expectation, the mean of using or distributing software and documents without the owner’s permission is 2.31. Actually it should be much higher because this misbehavior or piracy can be found in China every day. There are so many stores that provide pirated software in China. At the same time, it is very convenient for students to download their desired documents without worrying about violating the copyright of the owner. Generally, if one buys a new computer, he or she will find very convenient to get pirated window software to start his/her computer. The researcher’s personal experience is that a disk of anti-virus software was shared among nearly 30 administrators including the researcher himself in his former school in China.

Throughout Chinese history, according to these researchers (Lin, 2000; Liu, 2004; Yao, 2003), individual intellectual property has not been valued by many people under the guidance of a worldview of valuing the collective authority. This worldview had been strengthened by the 2000 years of dictatorship of monarchy. Thus, the law of copyright has not been respected in reality. The usual scenario nowadays in China is that when the author of some intellectual property sues the violator for piracy, the violator may receive due punishment. Otherwise, he or she can escape the detection and sanction at large. If a reader is careful in reading some professional papers published in the periodicals or presses, he or she can find plagiarized ideas in the reading with ease. The usual mindset of most Chinese college students is that plagiarism does not matter toward one’s
morality. As Interviewee H commented, the educational environment in the Chinese Mainland helps students develop into such a misconception: Plagiarism is trivial and manufacturing papers through copy and paste does not matter. Given the reality that plagiarism is marginalized in Mainland China, students cannot receive sufficient instruction, mentoring about academic integrity requirements in daily life. Surviving in this academic integrity climate, it is not unusual that most Chinese students are not clear about general academic integrity requirements, let alone those context-based requirements.

Question 2: What are the expectations of Chinese institutions regarding academic integrity?

The second half of the survey measured factors that lead to academic misbehaviors in Chinese schools. Of seven items, four items are related to institutions of higher learning. They include: a) Students accept that copying of materials from the internet, books, or research papers without citation because so many of their peers are doing it (2.6); b) Few offices at the departmental or the institutional level have ever trained students on the regulations of academic integrity (2.64); c) Few students have been punished because of copying from the internet, books, or research papers without citation (2.75); and d) Some graduates students plagiarized because of the pressure to have a paper published in a key journal at the provincial or national level in some Chinese schools (2.93). A mean of 2.5 represented the demarcation between high and low possibility and indicated all these factors make sense in contributing to the generation of academic misbehaviors.
The quantitative findings from the above four items indicate that the institution as well as the department does not take sufficient responsibility for infusing the concept of academic integrity into students’ minds. This was supported by the literature review that few exclusive offices at the departmental or the institutional level in China have been established to train students about the regulations of academic integrity and manage and supervise students’ and faculty’s academic activities in order to effectively arrest academic misbehaviors from inside the school (Luo, 2006; Wu, 2007; Xiong, 2008).

These findings also reveal that the institutional pressure to require graduates to have one or two papers published in a key journal at the provincial or national level forces relevant graduates to commit plagiarism to manufacture “high-quality” papers. This happens to a number of research universities around China especially those universities that hope to increase their academic reputation at fast stride.

The institutional negative influence is also evidenced by the lack of relevant sanctions toward violators of academic integrity. Without having to pay for the cost of academic misbehaviors, the violators have an evil power to instigate more potential violators. This is because the benefits brought about by the violation will unquestionably surpass its cost. In addition, the research findings indicate the institution has not taken responsibility for developing an academic integrity environment so that violators cannot thrive. The usual scenario indicates that a bad example is infectious (by their peers) and this plague can spread among the other students at a fast pace. The finding is consistent with the literature review that college students’ academic misbehaviors is directly associated with the soft punishments following behind (Fan & Si, 2006; Gao, 2009; Pan
& Sun, 2005; Qiu, 2005).

Overall, the institutions of higher learning do not take sufficient responsibility for cultivating students about the academic integrity requirements. This is made worse by the lack of sanctions toward the violators from the inside of the institution and the pressure from the institution to require graduate students to publish papers in key journals at the provincial and national levels. Students have a bad model to imitate means they do not have opportunities to learn from a good model.

Question 3: What are the expectations of the faculty in Mainland China toward students’ academic integrity?

Three items of the second instrument measured the expectations of the faculty of students’ academic integrity. They include: a) Instructors and advisors do not present regulations of academic integrity to students in class or after class (2.52); b) Instructors or advisors rarely make efforts to investigate whether one plagiarizes in completing a paper or not (2.48); c) Teachers or advisors rarely or never report students’ cheating or plagiarism to pertinent on-campus administrator (2.61). The mean of item a is a little more than 2.5, indicating faculty members have not taken their responsibility for infusing the academic integrity policy into students’ minds. The mean of item c is more than 2.5 indicating the reporting system has not been established so that teacher or advisors rarely or never report students’ cheating or plagiarism to pertinent on-campus administrator. Unfortunately, the mean of item b is less than 2.5 indicating instructors or advisors may take efforts to investigate whether one student plagiarizes in paper writing, which is a little different from what the researcher found in the literature review (Hu & Mai, 2004;
Xu, 2008; Yang, 2008; Zhang, 2007) and the qualitative portion.

Nevertheless, to summarize items a and c, the researcher can conclude: a) the faculty members in schools in China do not value fostering students’ awareness of academic integrity; and b) they do not take their responsibility for supervising students’ academic activities. These items reveal that the faculty members in institutions of higher learning in China do not have much expectation of students’ academic integrity. In other words, the faculty members in China do not care about whether students violate academic integrity regulations or not. This finding is consistent with the literature review that in China students’ ignorance of academic the integrity requirements is closely related to instructors’ disregard to the academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulations (Hu & Mai, 2004; Xu, 2008; Yang, 2008; Zhang, 2007).

**Qualitative Findings**

This section begins by looking at how the qualitative findings support the conclusions in the quantitative analysis related to the factors that lead to academic misbehaviors. Following that, research questions in the qualitative portion will be discussed.

Overall, in the qualitative phase three themes emerged from the data analysis: the Chinese academic worldview, the Chinese academic context, and learning U.S. academic ethics. Furthermore, the theme of Chinese academic worldview was divided into several subthemes: a) lack of contractual worldview, b) ethical issues not part of value system, c) no reporting culture. The second theme was divided into: a) not taught about scholar ethics, b) poor supervision, and c) lack of sanctioning mechanism.
The subtheme of the lack of contractual worldview was composed of the following issues: a) large-scale cheating in assignments, b) students’ large-scale plagiarism in graduation paper, c) students’ absence from significant class sections, and d) institutions’ lowering the teaching goal for some courses. The lack of a contractual worldview partly comes from students and, partly from the institutions. Of the four categories, three related to students. The final issue (lowering teaching goals) relates to the institution in that the university does not keep its promise to provide students pertinent quality classes even though it charged students a high tuition. Based on the implied contractual principle, students have the obligation to be present at classes, not to cheat on assignments, and not to plagiarize on graduation papers. On the part of the institution, it has the obligations to provide corresponding quality instruction to the students. These subthemes from the qualitative analysis supported that the conclusion from the quantitative analysis, which found most common academic misbehaviors involve copying from the internet or other sources without citations and summary citing from other papers without crediting resources (i.e., large-scale cheating and plagiarism). Meanwhile, they also verified an item from the quantitative portion that students’ academic misbehavior is largely led to by the educational environment, the academic integrity requirements.

The absence of reporting culture, which was discussed by the qualitative respondents, indicates a collective deference to the interest of the insiders, which also verifies the item in the quantitative portion that teachers or advisors rarely or never report students’ cheating or plagiarism to pertinent on-campus administrators. This confirmed
that the mechanism of training, supervision, identification, and sanction has not been established in many Chinese institutions.

The second theme in the qualitative analysis is the academic context in China is divided into: a) students not taught about scholar ethics, b) poor supervision, and c) lack of a sanctioning mechanism. These subthemes verified research findings from the second instrument survey in the quantitative analysis regarding the expectations of Chinese institutions and faculty regarding students’ academic integrity. On the part of the institution, patterns of findings across the qualitative and the qualitative analyses indicate that schools in China do not develop programs to educate students about academic integrity requirements. Due to their ignorance with these requirements, students in China have no idea about their violation of the academic ethics when they plagiarize in their graduation papers. This ignorance along with the lack of poor supervision and a sanctioning mechanism considerably facilitates students’ academic misbehaviors on Chinese college campuses.

To state in detail, the research findings from the theme of academic context at the qualitative phase verified several items at the quantitative phase: a) few offices at the departmental or the institutional level train students on the regulations of academic integrity; b) instructors and advisors do not teach regulations of academic integrity to students in or after class; c) instructors and advisors rarely make efforts to investigate whether one plagiarizes in completing a paper; and d) few students are punished because of copying material from the internet, or books, or because of failure to cite sources in research papers. These subthemes suggest that the institution as well as faculty members
care little about infusing students with the academic integrity principle and its stipulations, supervising students’ academic activities, identifying violators, and imposing sanctions on the violators. The cause lies in the administration system of higher education—-to establish a healthy academic integrity environment has never become a priority of the agenda of the highest level of decision-making body of most institutions around China, a fact which was repeatedly emphasized in Chapters One and Two.

To summarize, the verification of most research findings across the quantitative and qualitative analysis testifies that higher education in China is characterized by a high level of homogeneity in term of its academic integrity environment. This assumption/conclusion was first found in the literature review by a number of researchers in China (Cao, 2010; Dong & Zhang, 2004; Gao, 2003; Han, 2008; Li, 2007; Liu, 2010; Liu & Zou, 2011; Lu, 2008; Meng, 2009; Pan, 2005, 2006; Pan & Xiao, 2008a, 2008b; Sun, 2008; Wang, 2008; Wang, 2010; Wu, 2007; Wu, 2011; Xie, 2006; Xu, 2004; Yang & Zuo, 2009; Yang, 2008; Ye, 2005; Zhang, 2010; Zhang & Ding, 2007; Zhang & Li, 2006; Zhou & Chu, 2004). This assumption/conclusion was then confirmed across the quantitative and the qualitative analysis. As stated in Chapter Three, the quantitative survey was conducted in a public provincial university in China, and the qualitative interviews were conducted in the targeted U.S. university. In addition, the sample in the qualitative phase was more diverse because Chinese graduates in this U.S. targeted university came from different universities around China. The high consistency of research findings between the quantitative analysis and the qualitative analysis strongly confirm the assumption that Chinese higher education has a high level of homogeneity.
regarding the educational ethic environment. These two analyses together suggest that China differs from the U.S. regarding the academic integrity requirements. Given the difference between Chinese and the U.S. educational ethic environment, Chinese graduate students need to experience a transition to adapt to the U.S. educational environment.

Question 1: How do Chinese graduate students perceive their experiences in the U.S. academic integrity environment?

Based on the qualitative phase, Chinese graduate students in this U.S. targeted university perceived their experience in the new academic environment to be a transition that at least includes three phases: the initial contact, adjustment according to the feedback from the faculty, and impressive incidents.

At the first phase of initial contact, Chinese graduate students’ expectation is out of sync with their actions. According to the findings from the qualitative analysis, before Chinese graduate students worked on their first assignment such as course projects, term papers, or mid-term presentations that need to refer to others’ ideas, they received training or mentoring toward academic integrity from offices at the institutional, school, or departmental level. Some Chinese graduate students completed the transition to the U.S. academic integrity environment after their initial encounter such as institutional orientation workshop, school workshops, departmental seminars, and reading manuals.

Nevertheless, some may come to the second phase when they committed academic misbehaviors in the first writing assignment. They violated the Academic Integrity out of the reason that they projected their former understanding about academic
integrity stipulations formulated in China toward the new environment. Generally, the instructor tended to impose punishment to these minor violators from Mainland China by grading a low score to their plagiarized assignments. Through their instructors’ detailed explanation, these Chinese graduates understood their problem and would convert their new understanding into action in their next writing assignment. Immediately, they would transition to the phase of internalization.

Immediately, these Chinese graduates came to the second phase, to adjust their academic behaviors according to the instructor’s feedback. Instructor’s feedback played a critical role in correcting Chinese graduates’ misperception toward the academic integrity policy and its relevant stipulations.

Other students still had their former mindset of taking chances when they told the researcher they forgot to credit the source or they opted to skip the citations out of the reason that they were unwilling to take efforts to trace the citation to its source and they could get by detection and punishment. This mindset disappeared when they experienced impressive incidents before they reached their final phase. Initially, deep in their heart, their mindset of taking chances led them to take it for granted there were some exceptional occasions when they do not have to abide by these regulations. Their misconceptions were smashed after they experienced these unforgettable impressive incidents. For the second group, their out-of-sync of expectations toward academic integrity with actions was completely destroyed when they corrected their mindset. Immediately, these Chinese graduate students transitioned to the phase of internalization by converting these external requirements into their self-motivation.
In summarization, the acculturation of Chinese graduate students with the U.S. academic integrity principle and its stipulations is characterized by a spiraling trend. There are at least three acculturation trajectories. For the first acculturation trajectory, Chinese graduates completed their transition after their initial encounter with the academic integrity requirements through orientation workshop, school group mentoring, departmental seminars. For the second acculturation trajectory, these Chinese graduate students did not complete their transformation after their initial encounter because they misperceived the U.S. academic integrity stipulations by projecting their former understanding of the academic integrity requirements in China to the new educational environment. These students might reach the phase of internalization after their misunderstanding was eliminated by instructors’ feedback. For the third acculturation trajectory, these Chinese graduate students understand the academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulations. Meanwhile, deep in their hearts they embraced a mindset of taking chances by assuming there were some occasions when they did not have to abide by these academic integrity requirements. This mindset was destroyed when they experienced unforgettable impressive incidents. Immediately, they would transition to the phase of internalization.

Question 2: How do Chinese graduate students navigate their transitions from the Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment in term of academic integrity?

In the qualitative analysis, under the theme, learning American academic ethics, the researcher conducted an in-depth investigation into the motive of Chinese graduates
adapting to U.S. academic ethics. The data analysis indicated that initially external pressures motivated Chinese graduates to transition to the U.S. academic ethical environment. Their first concern was whether they would be allowed to stay in the U.S. Unlike local U.S. students, Chinese graduates worried they may be expelled from the U.S. university once they are identified to have violated the academic integrity policy. This will be leading their dream of studying in the U.S. to end. Actually, every Chinese graduates views being expelled from the U.S. university as a great shame and a stigma in life.

A concern about removal of assistantship or scholarship was also big worry among Chinese graduates. Although recent years have witnessed increasing numbers of wealthy undergraduate students from Mainland China coming to America to pursue their post-secondary education, a number of graduate students from China were born into middle-class or poor families and their family members are unable to help them to pay the high tuition in the U.S. (IIE, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007).

However, according to the qualitative analysis, Chinese graduates would not remain at this stage the whole time. Gradually, they would evolve, to recognize the need to transition to U.S. academic ethics out of something greater than external pressure. Eventually, some students tended to view abiding by academic integrity regulations out of internal motivation. Nevertheless, the qualitative analysis informed that not all the Chinese graduates in the sample were transitioning in unison; some of them took more time to correct their mindset of taking chances. Eventually, the researcher found the entire interview participants reached their final phase by internalizing the external
academic integrity principle and its specific stipulations into their self-motivation.

Pressed by the foremost concern of sink or swim initially, Chinese graduates prefer to an active rather than a passive attitude to acculturate with the new environment. The purpose of the active attitude is to prevent the worst outcome if they trespass the bottom line, violating the Academic Integrity Policy. This external pressure gradually evolved into Chinese graduate students’ inner motivation, and these academic integrity requirements became part of their morality system.

Question 3: How do Chinese graduate students come to understand the requirements of academic integrity in the United States?

Chinese graduate students, in learning about U.S. ethics requirements, found expectations of this targeted U.S. university differed considerably from their universities in China in terms of citations, experiments, and collaboration with others. The qualitative analysis found they came to understand these differences through a multitude of channels including instructors’ syllabi, orientation workshops, library seminars, school workshops, department seminars, manuals, courses, websites, and instructors’ and advisor’ mentoring.

These channels work together to foster students’ awareness of academic integrity. Some Chinese students believed that library seminars work best at teaching ethics, some believed department workshops are an effective channel, and others think manuals are preferable. However, they agreed that instructors’ syllabi, courses with case-based examples, and instructors’ or advisors’ in-person mentoring work most effectively to help them increase their awareness of the academic integrity policy and conquer their
inappropriate mindset of taking chances.

All of the interviewees mentioned that instructors’ syllabi were very effective because the significance of abiding by Academic Integrity is highlighted at the beginning of each syllabus. They repeatedly stated that they recognized the significance of Academic Integrity in the U.S. university the moment they read their instructors’ syllabi. Seminars with case-studies were their favorite means to understand the academic integrity stipulations, which rarely occurred in their home country.

According to the qualitative analysis, to understand the academic integrity requirements includes two parts: to formulate the awareness of academic integrity, and know how to abide by the academic integrity stipulations in daily academic activities. The case-based seminars reached this purpose, because they vividly showed students what they were allowed to do and not allowed to do in the U.S. educational environment.

The role of instructor and advisor were emphasized by the interviewees in assisting them in converting the academic integrity stipulations into their daily learning, research, assignments, and writing. Having frequent contacts with their students every single day, instructors and advisors serve as the most effective supervisors for Chinese graduates. Given their comprehensive knowledge and skills, instructors and advisors were highly respected by Chinese graduates as the genuine guide for learning, research, and writing. All the interviewees claimed that feedback from the instructors and advisors helped them transfer the academic ethics from their short-term memory to their long-term memory, so that these requirements could eventually take root in their hearts.

However, all the interviewees agreed that the orientation workshop for
international students and the website of academic integrity were least effective in helping them to understand the specifics of academic ethics in the U.S. In the orientation workshop, due to their language immaturity especially related to their listening competence, Chinese graduates were unable to understand all the hosting speakers’ words. As a result, the goal of the institution to foster Chinese graduates’ awareness of academic integrity and to inculcate those requirements into their hearts was, to a large extent, unrealized.

Chinese graduate students also believed that the website of the International Center of Academic Integrity shared by this U.S. targeted university was ineffective. In the interviews and daily conversations with a number of Chinese graduates, the researcher found few Chinese graduates cared about the website. What’s worse, a number of Chinese graduates even claimed they had never heard of the website.

In in-depth interviews, the researcher came to know that administrators at the Graduate School of this U.S. university take it for granted that Chinese graduates are no different from U.S. local graduates and assume that they are familiar with the requirements. Actually, some instructors understood that Chinese graduate students differ from local American students from their contact with Chinese graduate students. Unfortunately, their feedback has not been collected by the Graduate School.

Apart from the traditional channels, impressive incidents played a crucial role in facilitating Chinese graduates’ understand the academic integrity policy and its stipulations. Impressive incidents worked to some Chines graduate students through correcting their former mindset of taking chances.
Overall, Chinese graduate students came to know the academic integrity principle and its detailed stipulations through instructors’ syllabi, orientation workshops, school workshops, department seminars, manuals, courses, websites, and instructors’ and advisor’ mentoring, and the nontraditional channel, impressive incidents.

Conclusions of the Study

First of all, the consistency of findings between the quantitative and qualitative strongly supports the hypothesis that Chinese institutions of higher learning have a high level of homogeneity. As the researcher mentioned before, the quantitative portion of the research is to provide the qualitative portion with contextual knowledge. The consistency between the quantitative and qualitative findings testified there is a high level of homogeneity among Chinese institutions. The conclusion was consolidated because the samples from these two analyses came from different populations. In addition, this high level of homogeneity is also demonstrated by the consistency between the literature review and the quantitative and qualitative findings. These consistencies guaranteed the contextual background retrieved from the quantitative portion can be employed as a reference for the qualitative analysis.

Second, research findings from the quantitative and qualitative portion unquestioningly support the assumption that China differs from the U.S. in terms of academic educational environment, which determines that Chinese graduate students need to undertake a transition from their accustomed educational environment in China to this heterogeneous environment in U.S. In the following, the researcher will have an in-detailed summary about the generation of difference regarding academic integrity
requirements, the transition of Chinese graduate students to the U.S. academic integrity requirements.

According to the interview participants, these differences are demonstrated by the U.S. detailed academic integrity stipulations and their enforcement mechanisms in on-campus and off-campus environments. In sharp contrast, the academic integrity stipulations in China (if they exist in schools) only stay on paper and they have not been converted into actions through relevant enforcement mechanisms, which is also the generation of different requirements across Chinese and U.S. academic integrity environment. To state further, the difference is generated from the following aspects.

First, the institutions, faculty members, and administrators in China have little requirement for Chinese college students to abide by the academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulations. Although several Chinese graduates from Chinese Academy of Sciences in the interviews claimed they had received some training and mentoring regarding academic ethics, most of other students responded that their institutions and instructors rarely infuse the academic integrity principle and its specifics to them, and require them to convert these stipulations into their daily academic actions. Accordingly, it is not beyond our imagination that some Chinese graduates did not develop the conception of academic integrity before the came to U.S.

Second, the poor supervision from the institution and instructors, and soft punishment make college students in China disregard the significance of Academic Integrity in daily learning and research. Based on the two analyses, in China, few schools have special offices to manage students’ and faculty’s academic activities and to
supervise their projects throughout their study in order for them not to have opportunities to commit academic misconducts. What’s worse, a number of students are instigated to engage these misbehaviors because their peers and instructors did not set a good model for them to imitate.

Additionally, the research findings testify different requirements of academic integrity requirements play a critical role in shaping Chinese graduate students’ perspective toward academic integrity. In comparing Chinese graduate students’ perspective toward Academic Integrity across China and U.S., the researcher found their different perspective is generated from different requirements of Academic Integrity from their educational environments.

The dissertation research also demonstrates the transition of Chinese graduate students to the U.S. academic integrity requirements is asynchronous, which is evidenced by their spiraling acculturation. According to the qualitative findings, there are three acculturation trajectories for Chinese graduate students: those completed the internalization of academic integrity requirements after the initial encounter, those completed internalization after the instructor’s feedback, and those completed the internalization after impressive incidents.

The Acculturation Model of Chinese Graduates’ Transition to U.S. Academic Ethics

According to the literature review, the transition of Chinese graduates to U.S. academic integrity principle and its relevant stipulation is a process of acculturation. In this subsection, the researcher employed Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) five-staged adaptation model to delineate this process of transition.
Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) five-staged adaptation model includes five stages: a) Encounter, b) Disorientation, c) Reaction, d) Independence, and e) Internalization. According to Burnett and Gardner, encounter is defined as the sojourner’s high expectation of the host culture and high motivation to adapt to it, even though the new circumstances are not agreeable. In Burnett and Gardner’s words, encounter “better describes the notion of meeting or confronting the new experiences that suggested passivity of meeting Contact” (Burnett & Gardner, 2006, p. 86). Disorientation, like Yoshikawa’s (1988) Disintegration, describes a disoriented or disequilibrium state in that sojourners find it very difficult to meld into the host culture because of their long identification with their home heritage. In view of Burnett and Gardner, after having experienced Encounter and Disorientation, the sojourner comes to Reaction. At this stage, the sojourner begins to adjust to the host culture through appreciating the differences inherently embedded in the new culture and attempting to act in a culturally appropriate manner. Independence is referred to as not merely the sojourners’ independence in constructing their practical life but also their independence of building up opinions and viewpoints. Internalization, according to Burnett and Gardner, is defined as “the ability of the individual to internalize the experience of cultural differences within their sense of identity” (2006, p. 89). To interpret, Internalization refers to the process in which the individual undergoes the conciliation and integration of the host culture and their home heritages in order to appropriately act in a new cultural context without having to change their identity.
Figure 5.1
The acculturation model of Chinese graduates' transition to the U.S. academic integrity environment

- **Academic Context of China**: Not taught about scholar ethics, poor supervision, poor external supervision, lack of faculty supervision, lack of database supervision, lack of sanctioning mechanism.

- **Chinese Academic Worldview**: Lack of contractual worldview, cheating in exams, plagiarism in papers, absence from class, lowered teaching goals, ethical issues not part of value system, no reporting culture.

- **Initially Encounter American Academic Environment**: Academic integrity principle, academic integrity stipulations.

- **Disequilibrium**: Inconsistency between former academic worldview and the U.S. worldview.

- **Reaction: Five Possible Responses to U.S. Expectations**:
  - The student changes attitudes and adapts to U.S. ethics.
  - Minor major incident causes realignment of attitude.
  - Fails to fully understand U.S. requirements.
  - Does what is required to succeed but does not inculcate Western standards (Confucian Instrumentality).
  - Knows change is needed but believes he or she can escape detection and punishment.

- **Students internalizing**:
  - Internally motivating.
  - Automatic behavior.
  - Convergent behavior.

- **Students failing to internalize**:
  - Impressive incidents.
  - Knowing appropriate academic stipulations.
  - Convenience to take chances.

- **Feedback from instructors**
Based on Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) model, an acculturation model was formulated to delineate the adaptation of Chinese graduates with U.S. academic ethics. As Figure 5.1 demonstrates, the academic context in China is characterized by the facts that students are not taught about academic ethics; receive little supervision from the administrators or faculty members at the institution, school, or department level. It also revealed that students’ academic misbehaviors in China are not oftentimes detected and identified by plagiarism database, and schools in China usually lack a sanctioning system to punish violators. This academic context in China directly leads to students’ academic worldview there. Its properties are embodied as: a) the lack of contractual worldview, b) ethical issues that are not part of a larger value system, and c) the absence of reporting culture. Furthermore, this lack of a contractual worldview is divided into large-scale cheating on assignments and exams, plagiarism in papers, absence from classes, and institutional intentional lowered teaching goals.

Chinese graduate students’ acculturation begins when they initially encounter the U.S. academic environment and realize that their former perceptions regarding academic integrity and its stipulations are inconsistent with what they observed in their new environment of this U.S. targeted university. They immediately feel a disorientation and disequilibrium between their former perception and the expectation of the U.S. targeted university toward the academic integrity principle and its stipulations. At a fast stride, they move to a phase of reaction by tailoring their perspective toward Academic Integrity to the requirements in the U.S. educational environment. Independence refers to the sojourner’s independence to construct their practical life, opinions, and viewpoints
toward the new environment. In this acculturation model, the researcher found it very difficult to differentiate Reaction from Independence in this model because they occur almost simultaneously. In this model, there are three acculturation trajectories between Chinese graduates’ reaction and their internalization of the academic integrity stipulations. The first acculturation trajectory is that Chinese graduate students completely understand the new academic integrity and substitute their old perspective toward Academic Integrity with the new one appropriate for learning and study in the new environment in their initial encounter with these new academic integrity stipulations. Thus, they completed the acculturation in the shortest period. Chinese graduate students who experienced the second acculturation trajectory did not complete the internalization of the new academic integrity requirements after the initial encounter. Whereas, they committed minor academic misbehaviors because they did not fully understand the context-based academic integrity stipulations. They completed their acculturation after they received feedback from their instructors. The longest period fell on the third acculturation trajectory. Those Chinese graduate students who experienced the longest acculturation trajectory did not complete the acculturation even after they received feedback from their instructors when they committed minor misbehaviors. Due to their mindset of taking chances, they completed their acculturation with the new environment after they experienced unforgettable impressive incidents.

In comparison with the Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) acculturation model, the disorientation and disequilibrium experienced by Chinese graduates in transitioning to the U.S. environment, is not intense, and is so transitional that some graduates cannot even
feel its existence. The underlying reason is that most Chinese graduates recognize they should adopt the U.S. academic ethical standards because it has much to do with death or survival in this U.S. targeted university. In fact, they will not struggle between their former academic worldview in China and the requirements in the host country. The difference from Burnett and Gardner’s (2006) acculturation model arose when there are three acculturation trajectories between Reaction and Internalization. Also, the difference of this model from Burnett and Gardner’s model is that the researcher integrated Reaction and Independence into Reaction.

Implications for Future Research

Although this study yielded interesting research findings, the researcher feels a number of questions need to be further confirmed and investigated. Below is a list of areas on which future studies can focus.

First, more research is needed to verify the conclusions in this study. This dissertation research is the first to have investigated how graduates from Mainland China transition to U.S. academic integrity environment because the limitations of the samples in these two specific settings. However, due to the homogeneity of higher education in China and the confirmation of this homogeneity across the quantitative and qualitative analysis in this dissertation research, the conclusions of this dissertation research can to certain extent be generalized to other Chinese graduate students who experienced a transition toward Academic Integrity from Chinese educational environment to the U.S. educational environment.

Second, Confirmatory Factor Analysis is needed to testify the validity of the
questionnaire. As a measurement of construct validity, Confirmatory Factor Analysis can effectively assist researchers in verifying the construct validity of the instrument. Modification can be made according to the conclusion of the research to improve on these scales.

Third, more research is needed to compare the type of academic misbehaviors of Chinese graduate students and how they adapt to the U.S. academic ethical environment across different disciplines. This study was conducted in a Southeastern research university in the U.S., which focuses on science, technology, and engineer majors. Its limitation is demonstrated by its insufficiency that it did not investigate how Chinese graduate students from liberal arts colleges or universities acculturate with the new environment in term of academic integrity requirements. Future studies can make comparisons across different disciplines.

Fourth, future research is needed to compare the effects of various channels that assist Chinese graduates in understanding context-based academic integrity requirements. In this dissertation, the researcher did not focus on investigating the effects of different training methods. An effective teaching method needs to be identified based on empirical evidence by administering pre- and post-questionnaires to students who received training or mentoring in different formats in between.

Fifth, future studies need to take the U.S. faculty members’ points of view into consideration. To understand how Chinese graduates transition to U.S. academic integrity requirements, the viewpoints of the faculty who deliver instruction to this group and advisors who mentor and direct them in a study can help capture the essentials of their
transition. By taking their view into account, a more precise picture can be obtained.

Sixth, longitudinal research is needed to trace Chinese graduates’ transition to U.S. academic ethics. In this dissertation, the researcher interviewed five categories of Chinese graduates ranging from first to fifth-year. The researcher noted different years of students’ exposure to the heterogeneous environment showed different characteristics in this transition. Although this strategy can trace the outline of the evolution of their academic worldview in U.S., it cannot confirm that individuals do indeed experience the transitions described. By tracing the experiences of a cohort of students through their study in U.S. institutions, the research can more accurately depict the longitudinal journey of Chinese graduates transitioning to U.S. academic worldviews.

Finally, studies are needed to testify whether students from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macau, and Singapore, differ from students from Mainland China in transitioning to the U.S. academic integrity environment because of their different educational contexts. As mentioned in the first chapter, although the above countries and regions share the same heritage, Confucianism, their current educational contexts may lead to different academic worldviews, unquestioningly which lead to their different trajectories of acculturation with the host U.S. academic ethical environment.

Suggestions for Future Practice

To some extent, this research is a policy analysis about the effects of the current training programs for inculcating academic ethics into Chinese graduates in this U.S. targeted university. Even though this study occurred in a specific setting, the researcher hopes it can shed some light to some other universities that have a large enrollment of
Chinese students. Based on this dissertation research, the author came up with the following suggestions:

First, a dedicated office should be established in the Graduate School to take special responsibility for integrating institutional and departmental resources for training international students, particularly Chinese graduates about the Academic Integrity Policy. This office should be endowed with the discretion to coordinate institutional and departmental relevant personnel, encourage them to develop training programs, and finally to supervise the training programs.

Secondly, at the institutional level, the Graduate School needs to better take advantage of orientation workshops to foster Chinese graduates’ awareness of Academic Integrity. A manual that describes all the specifications in the policy should be provided to Chinese graduates. In China, few college students have ever had detailed manuals. Although most Chinese graduates know before they come to the U.S. that institutions in the U.S. are very stringent to students’ academic behaviors, they tend to repeat former misbehaviors because they are still ignorant about the specific stipulations. Detailed manuals can help Chinese graduates to understand types of academic misbehaviors. If time permits, the host for the orientation program should present a brief introduction of the manual to Chinese graduates.

Third, ongoing special training programs should be conducted for Chinese graduates at the department level. In the course of the interview, the researcher found some students were not certain about context-based academic specifics two or three years later after arriving at their U.S. institutions. For instance, some interviewees could not tell
legal citations from plagiarism. Such misconceptions may lead these Chinese graduates to unintentionally committing academic misbehaviors. In order to clarify students’ misconceptions, a training program in the format of a workshop or seminar needs to be designed and conducted to Chinese graduates. This training program can integrate the Academic Integrity Policy with the requirements of their majors. A manual of anonymous case studies should be provided to Chinese graduates as part of these workshops. The manual should categorize students’ typical academic misbehaviors and lists reason for the sanctions in recent years. The purpose of the manual is to help students clarify their misconceptions and eliminate their taking-chance mindset.

Fourth, the training should continue in instructors’ and advisor’s teaching and mentoring. Context-based specifics need to be clarified in practical writing and research, and the feedback from the instructor and advisor can tremendously help students correct their misconceptions. The effect of a training program depends upon to what extent effective information can reach trainees. Thus, the effect of the training information should be a trainers’ foremost concern.

Fifth, the training should primarily focus on the first semester. Intensive training should not cover a long time because the institution and department cannot allocate a large amount of resources to international graduates. Also an effective training program can pave a broad path for Chinese graduates’ later education in the U.S. school. As noted above, the purpose of the training programs is to provide trainees with immediate and effective information. Then through feedback from the institutional coordinator, department coordinator, peers, instructors, and advisors, effective information can be
strengthened in students’ minds.

Overall, based on the research findings of the study, the current training program in the U.S. targeted university needs to be changed in order to enhance its overall effectiveness towards international graduates especially towards Chinese graduate students with the origin of Mainland China.
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Survey Letter of Consent

Information Concerning Participation in a Research Study
Clemson University

Adaptation of Chinese Graduate Students to the Academic Integrity Requirements of a U.S. university: A Mixed Methods Research

Description of the Study and Your Part in It

Dr Russ Marion and Hu Jian invite you to take part in a research study. Dr. Marion is a faculty member at Clemson University. Hu Jian is a student at Clemson University and is running this study in consultation with Dr. Marion. The purpose of this research is to explore how Chinese graduate students adapt to an American academic ethics environment.

Your part in the study will be to respond to a short survey. It should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. This survey will help U.S. understand something of the academic and ethics culture in China. We will use this information to better understand the adjustments that Chinese students face when they come to an American university. The results will help U.S. better serve Chinese students in the United States.

Risks and Discomforts

We do not know of any risks or discomforts to you in this research study. The questions ask your opinion of common student practices at your school and do not ask you about your personal behaviors of beliefs. You will not sign your name on the survey so no one will be able to identify your responses; further, your responses will be available only to Dr. Marion and Mr. Jian. The data will be summarized and reports will contain no information that could identify you, your class, or your university. All surveys will be destroyed once the research and resulting publications are completed.

Possible Benefits

The research will help the participants and subsequent Chinese graduate students to understand factors that impact the adaptation of Chinese graduate students’ to America’s academic ethics environment. It can assist relevant administrators and faculty members to better mentor Chinese students in American Universities as they adapt to American cultural standards.
Protection of Privacy and Confidentiality

You are asked not to sign the surveys; we do not want to have any information that would identify you personally. Surveys will be completed in class and will be collected by a graduate student or another classmate, placed in an envelope and sealed, and mailed to Mr. Hu Jian at Clemson University in the United States. Dr. Marion and Mr. Jian will carefully protect your privacy and confidentiality. No one outside of the two researchers will see the data. Paper copies will be destroyed after the data is entered into a password protected computer and backed up on a secure server. Until that time, paper copies of the survey will be maintained in a locked file cabinet within a locked office. At the completion of the research and publication, the computer files will be deleted from the computers.

We might be required to share the information we collect from you with the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance and the U.S. Office for Human Research Protections. If this happens, the information would only be used to find out if we ran this study properly and protected your rights in the study.

Choosing to Be in the Study

You do not have to participate in this study. You may choose not to take part and you may choose to stop taking part at any time. You will not be punished in any way if you decide not to be in the study or to stop taking part in the study. If you decide not to participate or to stop participating in this study, it will not affect your grade in any way. If you desire, you may submit a blank survey to the person collecting the surveys so no one can determine that you chose not to participate.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. R.U.S.s Marion at Clemson University at 1-(864) 654-5461, or at marion2@clemson.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights in this research study, please contact the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance (ORC) at 864-656-6460 or irb@clemson.edu. If you are outside of the Upstate South Carolina area, please use the ORC’s toll-free number, 1-866-297-3071.

Please keep this letter for future reference.
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Online Survey Instrument

Attitudes toward Academic Integrity Questionnaire

My Dear Friends,

First of all, I pretty appreciate your participating in my survey. Without your involvement, I couldn’t imagine that I can complete this survey. The purpose of the questionnaire is to identify the status quo of academic integrity and to seek factors that have led to academic misbehaviors in China. This instrument comprises of three sections. The first section (Questions 1-3) aims to investigate demographic information like gender, age, and the current degree. The second section (Questions 4-17) is the main body of the instrument, which purports to investigate the status quo of academic integrity on college campus in China. The third section (Questions 18-24) purports to investigate factors that lead to academic misbehaviors at college in China. The respondents focus on senior undergraduates and first-year graduates. The reason that senior undergraduates were picked as the survey participators is their attitude directly impact their attitude toward academic integrity when they work on their postgraduate academic degree. This survey is anonymous and you don’t have to provide your real name and your college. Your most concerned is our most concerned. To some extent, my survey can acquaint you with academic integrity policy and its specifications in America. Please complete the questionnaire according to your true experience on college campus. Once again, thanks so much for your warmhearted participation in my survey.

Section I: Demographic Characteristics

1. Gender?
   A. Female
   B. Male

2. Your age?
   A. 20-25
   B. 6-30
   C. 31-35
   D. 36-40
   E. Above 40

3. Current degree?
   A. Bachelor
   B. Master
   C. PhD
D. Other. Please specify:

Section II
How common do you think the following behaviors are practiced in China?

4. Copying material from the internet into a term paper or written assignment without citations.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

5. Paraphrasing original words from a book or other such source without the citation.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

6. Modifying experimental data so that project findings will satisfy lab teacher’s requirements.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

7. Asking the author of a paper to add his or her name as one of the primary authors.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

8. Submitting written assignments in one class that you had also used for another class.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

9. Overlooking academic dishonesty of a professor and not reporting it to the relevant administrator.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common
10. Obtaining a copy of an upcoming test from a student who took the same test earlier.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

11. Using or distributing software, text, electronic materials or images without the permission of the original owner.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

12. Asking someone else to write a course paper for you.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

    A. Very Uncommon
    B. Uncommon
    C. Common
    D. Very Common

14. Undergraduate students’ cheating in order to attain top scholarship for the next academic year.
    A. Very Uncommon
    B. Uncommon
    C. Common
    D. Very Common

15. Seniors’ cheating to attain postgraduate recommendation within the department.
    A. Very Uncommon
    B. Uncommon
    C. Common
    D. Very Common

16. Cheating in order to successfully graduate.
    A. Very Uncommon
    B. Uncommon
    C. Common
    D. Very Common
17. Lying on your resume to obtain a good job.
   A. Very Uncommon
   B. Uncommon
   C. Common
   D. Very Common

Section III
Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement about what factors influence student attitudes regarding the generation of academic dishonesties in schools of higher learning in China?

18. Students accept the copying of material from the internet, books, or research papers without citation because so many of his/her peers around are doing it.
   A. Strongly Disagree
   B. Disagree
   C. Agree
   D. Strongly Agree

19. Teachers or advisors rarely or never report students’ cheating or plagiarism to pertinent on-campus administrator.
   A. Strongly Disagree
   B. Disagree
   C. Agree
   D. Strongly Agree

20. Instructors and advisors do not present regulations of academic integrity to students in class or after class.
   A. Strongly Disagree
   B. Disagree
   C. Agree
   D. Strongly Agree

21. Instructors or advisors rarely make efforts to investigate whether one plagiarizes in completing a paper or not.
   A. Strongly Disagree
   B. Disagree
   C. Agree
   D. Strongly Agree

22. Few offices at the departmental or the institutional level have ever trained students on the regulations of academic integrity.
   A. Strongly Disagree
   B. Disagree
   C. Agree
D. Strongly Agree

23. Few students have ever been punished because of copying material from the internet, books, or research papers without citation.
A. Strongly Disagree
B. Disagree
C. Agree
D. Strongly Agree

24. Some graduate students plagiarize because of the pressure for having a paper published in a key journal at the provincial level or the national level in some schools of higher learning in China.
A. Strongly Disagree
B. Disagree
C. Agree
D. Strongly Agree
Appendix D
Survey Letter of Consent (Chinese Edition)

有关参与这项研究的信息
克莱姆森大学
中国学生对美国大学校园诚信环境的适应

研究简介及参与者的角色

简虎热情邀请你参与这项有关中国学生如何适应美国学术环境尤其是学术诚信这方面的研究。简虎目前是美国克莱姆森大学的一位学生，他正在他导师的指导下从事这项研究。中国南方一所大学的一位教授和几位研究生将协助简虎进行这项研究。这项研究旨在调查中国学生是如何适应美国大学诚信环境要求。

你在这项研究的任务是回答这份问卷调查。这份问卷调查主要涉及到从文化视角你观察到的本校大学生对学术诚信的态度。你的回答将会帮助我们理解哪些选择到美国继续追求他们硕士或博士研究生教育的中国同学对诚信的态度。我们预估这次调查会花费你15分钟的时间。

风险和不适

我们不确定这项研究会对你产生任何风险和不适。问卷中向你提及的问题只是要求你从文化差异这个视角提供你观察到的本校学生对学术诚信的态度，其中不会涉及到你的私人问题。而且，我们向你保证你的回答不会让任何人包括我们研究人员与你本人联系起来。

可能的收益

通过这项研究，我们将更好地理解哪些因素会影响到中国在读研究生对西方大学学术诚信环境的适应过程，因此这项研究的成果将会促进中国同学更好地适应西方大学学术诚信文化。

对个人隐私及机密的保护

所有参与调查同学的隐私及机密性的文件都会得到有效的保护。你不会在这次调查要求提供任何能识别你本人的信息，而且研究者也不能通过任何方式来识别你。这次调查产生的文件其中包括发表的论文及大会论文陈述，你大学的真实身份都不会在其中被暴露。所有数据将会由简虎和他导师在电脑里设置密码加密保护。另外，一旦研究结束，所有文件将会由研究者自行破坏以免对被调查者产生任何消极影响。
选择是否参与该项研究

你并非要求必须参与这次研究。你可以选择不参与这次研究，你也可以选择随时停止参与这项研究。你不会因为你决定不参与这项研究或选择中途退出而受到任何影响。

如何联系我们

如果对这项研究你有任何问题或挂虑，或在调查过程中出现任何问题，请不要犹豫联系简虎，他的 E-mail 是 hijan@clemson.edu，电话号码是（864）650-7437。你可 以把这样一份文件作为你的个人存档打印出来。

签名：
Appendix E

Online Survey Instrument (Chinese Edition)

对大学生学术诚信态度的调查

亲爱的同学，

首先非常感谢你参与我的问卷调查，没有你的热情参与，我的研究不可能完成。本问卷调查旨在调查学术规范的现状及学术违规行为产生的原因。本问卷调查共有24个问题，包含三个部分。第一部分（问题1-3）主要调查基本信息，如性别，年龄，目前正在取得的学位；第二部分（问题4-17）是本问卷调查的主体部分，主要涉及一些违规行为发生的状况；第三部分（问题18-23）调查导致学术违规行为产生的原因。本问卷调查对象主要涉及在读研究生和大四本科生，大四本科生列为调查对象是因为他们对学术规范的态度直接影响他（她）们就读研究生时对学术规范的态度。本调查是匿名调查，你无须提供你的真实姓名，就读的学校。其次，在本论文的数据分析及最终论文的形成，都不会有任何信息联想到你真实的本人。你的关切就是我们的关切。在某种程度上，本问卷调查能帮助你熟识有关学术道德规范。请根据你在大学的真实体验完成本问卷调查。再一次，非常谢谢你的热情参与。

第一部分

调查对象身份

1. 性别？
   A. 男性
   B. 女性

2. 年龄？
   A. 20-25
   B. 26-30
   C. 31-35
   D. 35-40
   E. 40以上

3. 你目前正在攻读的学位？
   A. 学术
   B. 硕士
   C. 博士
   D. 其他

第二部分

请问下列行为在中国大学校园发生的普遍性？
4. 从网络上直接复制句子或段落到或相关书面作业或论文而不注明引文来源。
   A. 罕见
   B. 不常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

5. 在书面作业或论文中对已发表的文章进行归纳引用而不注明引文来源。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

6. 对实验数据进行修改以便实验结果能有利于得到上级部门的认可而方便项目资金的取得。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

7. 在研究实施阶段和论文写作阶段都没有付出实质性的劳动，但却在要求论文作者在发表的论文中挂上自己的名字。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

8. 把在其他课程完成的作业当作本课程完成的作业交给老师。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

9. 忽视老师的学术违规行为且不向学校相关人员汇报。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

10. 从比你更早参加同一门考试的同学处打探考试内容。
    A. 罕见
B. 常见
C. 普遍
D. 非常普遍

11. 使用或发布没有经过原版主同意的软件，文本，及影像材料。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

12. 请别的同学或朋友写课程论文或毕业论文或请他或她完成你论文中的主体部分。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

13. 从网上购得学期论文或毕业论文。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

14. 就本科生而言，有些同学为了争取下一学年头等奖学金而在学期末考试中舞弊。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

15. 大四本科生为了取得本校的保送研究生的资格而在保研考试中舞弊。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

16. 为了顺利毕业而在毕业考试中舞弊。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
D.非常普遍

17. 为了谋取一份好工作而伪造自己的个人简历。
   A. 罕见
   B. 常见
   C. 普遍
   D. 非常普遍

第三部分
什么原因导致学术违规行为的发生？

18. 违规行为产生原因之一：默认如下行为的合理性，如写论文或完成书面作业时直接从网络或其他报刊书籍复制材料到论文中而无注明引文来源，这种默认是因为周围许多同学都这样做。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对

19. 违规行为产生原因之二：老师或导师很少或从不向学校相关部门报告同学的学术违规行为。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对

20. 违规行为产生原因之三：授课老师或硕导或博导很少或从来没有在课堂上或课后向同学解释相关的学术行为规范。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对

21. 违规行为产生原因之四：授课老师或导师很少或从没有花时间或精力来审核你的论文是否有跟别人的文章雷同而又没有注明引文来源的文字或句子。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对
22. 违规行为产生原因之五：学校没有相关机构来培训学生让他们熟识学术行为规范，其直接后果之一是有些学生没有认识到某些学术行为是不道德的并且是不允许的。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对

23. 违规行为产生原因之六：学术违规的发生是因为很少有同学因学术违规行为而受到惩罚。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对

24. 违规行为产生原因之七：迫于某些学校规定的压力，如这些学校规定硕士或博士攻读者如要顺利完成学位毕业必须在省级或国家级核心期刊上发表一篇论文。
   A. 非常不同意
   B. 不同意
   C. 赞同
   D. 强烈反对
Appendix F

Interview Letter of Consent

Information Concerning Participation in a Research Study
Clemson University

Adaptation of Chinese Graduate Students to the Academic Integrity Requirements of a U.S. university: A Mixed Methods Research

Description of the Study and Your Part in It

Dr. Russ Marion and Hu Jian are inviting you to take part in a research study. Dr. Russ Marion is a faculty member at Clemson University. Hu Jian, a student at Clemson University, is running this study in consultation with Dr. Marion. The purpose of this research is to explore how Chinese graduate students adapt to the ethics environment in an American University.

You are asked to participate in an interview about your experiences in adapting to the ethics expectations at Clemson University. This interview will last about an hour. It will, with your permission, be recorded for later transcribing and review.

Risks and Discomforts

There are no known risks or discomforts to participants. The questions that you will respond to ask about your adjustment to the American ethics culture. They do not ask anything that you would not feel comfortable telling your professors or advisors. If, however, you feel uncomfortable with any given question, you have the right not to respond.

Possible Benefits

The research will help participants and subsequent Chinese graduate students understand factors that impact the adaptation of Chinese graduate students to America’s academic ethics environment. It can also assist relevant administrators and faculty members to better mentor Chinese students.

Protection of Privacy and Confidentiality

Your identity will not be revealed to anyone outside the PI and co-PI, and nothing will be included in any of the write-ups that would make it possible for anyone to identify you. We will use select quotes from your discussion, but the quotes will be anonymous. All transcripts will be maintained on a password protected computer. Recordings will also be copied to the protected computer, backed up at a secure site, then erased from the
recorder. All recordings and transcripts will be destroyed at the completion of the research.

Choosing to Be in the Study

You do not have to be in this study. You may choose not to take part, you may choose to stop taking part at any time, or you may choose at a later time (until the analysis is begun; it would be difficult to separate your ideas at that point) to have your responses removed from the study. You will not experience any negative effects if you decide not to participate in the study or if you decide to stop taking part in the study. If you decide not to take part or to stop taking part in this study, it will not affect your grade in any way.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or if any problems arise, please contact Dr. Russ Marion at Clemson University at (864) 654-5461, or at marion2@Clemson.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights in this research study, please contact the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance (ORC) at 864-656-6460 or irb@clemson.edu. If you are outside of the Upstate South Carolina area, please use the ORC’s toll-free number, 866-297-3071.

A copy of this form will be given to you.
Signature:
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Interview Guiding Questions

1. Tell me about the challenges you faced in transitioning from the Chinese culture to the American culture.

2. What were some of the differences in the ethical expectations of Chinese and American schools that you struggled with?

3. Tell me about the “journey” you underwent as you adjusted to the ethics of American society and of American higher education in particular. What changes did you have to make and how did you make those changes.

4. Can you give specific examples of challenges you faced in adjusting to the ethical expectations of American Higher Education? Please choose a couple of the most challenging expectations in American schools and tell me how you adjusted to them.

5. Are you familiar with the academic integrity statement of Clemson University? [Give them a copy]. How does this differ from the ethic of the Chinese school you attended?
研究简介及参与者的角色

简虎热情邀请你参与这项有关中国学生如何适应美国学术环境尤其是学术诚信这方面研究。简虎目前是美国克莱姆森大学的一位学生，他正在他导师的指导下从事这项研究。南昌大学的一位教授和几位研究生将协助简虎进行这项研究。这项研究旨在调查中国学生是如何适应美国大学诚信环境要求。
你在这项研究的任务是回答采访者的简虎的相关问题。采访主要涉及到你是如何适应学术环境规范的。本次采访时间在45分钟左右。

风险和不适

我们不确定这项研究会对你产生任何风险和不适。问卷中向你提及的问题只是要求你从文化差异这个视角提供你观察到的本校学生对学术诚信的态度，其中不会涉及到你的私人问题。而且，我们向你保证你的回答不会让任何人包括我们研究人员与你本人联系起来。

可能的收益

通过这项研究，我们将更好地理解哪些因素会影响到中国在读研究生对西方大学学术诚信环境的适应过程，因此这项研究的成果将会促进中国同学更好地适应西方大学学术诚信文化。

对个人隐私及机密的保护

所有参与调查同学的隐私及机密性的文件都会得到有效保护。你不会在这次调查要求提供任何能识别你本人的信息，而且研究者也不能通过任何方式来识别你。这次调查产生的文件其中包括发表的论文及大会论文陈述，你大学的真实身份都不会在其中被暴露。所有数据将会由简虎和他导师在电脑里设置密码加密保护。另外，一旦研究结束，所有文件将会有研究者自行破坏以免对被调查者产生任何消极影响。

选择是否参与该项研究
你并非要求必须参与这次研究。你可以选择不参与这次研究，你也可以选择随时停止参与这项研究。你不会因为你决定不参与这项研究或选择中途退出而受到任何影响。

如何联系我们

如果对这项研究你有任何问题或挂虑，或在调查过程中出现任何问题，请不要犹豫联系简虎，他的 E-mail 是 hjian@clemson.edu, 电话号码是 (864) 650-7437。你可以把这样一份文件作为你的个人存档打印出来。

签名:
Appendix I

Interview Guiding Questions (Chinese Edition)

访谈问题纲要

1. 请告诉我在你从以前所熟悉的中国教育文化环境过渡到你比较陌生的美国文化教育文化环境，你遇到过什么挑战吗？

2. 你认为中美大学在学术诚信方面对学生的期待有什么差异（这些差异你曾为之头痛不已）？

3. 请告诉我你在适应美国社会的诚信要求尤其是学校的学术诚信环境的旅程。你为了适应这些变化做出了什么样的调整。

4. 能举出一些你在适应美国的诚信要求尤其是学校道德诚信方面时所战胜困难和挑战的一些具体例子吗？请挑选其中一两个例子具体描述你是怎样战胜这些挑战的。

5. 你对大学的学术诚信的要求熟悉吗？（给采访者一本相关手册），你认为它与中国大学对学生的学术诚信要求的差异表现在那里？
Appendix J

Field Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Participant</th>
<th>Time and Date</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee A</td>
<td>1:00-2:00 pm</td>
<td>Interviewee A had served as a teacher assistant in China before he came to U.S. He observed the difference of academic misbehaviors across America and China. Meanwhile, he found the external environment plays a significant role in shaping students’ attitudes toward academic integrity on campus. Meanwhile, Interviewee A is a typical opportunist mirroring the two dimensions of Confucianism, official-centeredness and secularity-centeredness. When responding the question whether he will abide by the academic integrity regulations if he goes back to China, he answered, “it depends.” Interviewee A told the researcher if he does not observe game rules in China he will inevitably take a risk being kicked out of the playground. According to Interviewee A, which action ethical or unethical to choose is dependent upon the demand of the reality and is irrelevant to the judgment of morality. Interviewee A also worked part-time in several computer companies in China, and he understands the prevalent piracy in China. Interviewee A’s words indicated the prevalence of academic misbehavior is also tied to the external environment. Nevertheless, Interviewee A does not plan to advance the establishment of the system of academic integrity in China. On the contrary, he only maximizes his personal interest in China.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewee B was among the first generation of students who caught the first wave of higher education expanding. He witnessed the increasing count of students on campus and could feel an imperceptible pressure on him from high density of competitors. He appeared contradictory when he insisted that he had never plagiarized while his classmates around quite probably had done it. Whereas, he found the difference of academic misbehaviors across liberal arts and natural sciences. Interviewee B is a Christian and he determined to go back to China to spread the gospel after graduation from this targeted university in America. He insisted that he would observe the academic integrity regulations when he goes back to China. Evidently, faith plays a significant role in shaping his perspective of morality.

Interviewee C was among the few Chinese graduates who claimed to have received training of academic integrity from instructors and academic advisors in China. His words were evidenced by several of other interview participants who had attended the same academy (China Academy of Science and Technology). All of them obtained master’s degrees before they came to this U.S. targeted university. Nevertheless, Interviewee C didn’t deny a number of peers around had involved academic misbehaviors. Interviewee C divided his peers into violators and non-violators: students who chose to work after graduation tended to commit infringements; while students who viewed scholarship as life aspiration tend to observe game rules. As a result, Interviewee C oftentimes employed this standard to justify his peers’ infringements. In his subconscious, students who would not engage scholarship after graduation were permitted to violate the academic integrity policy. To some extent, Interviewee C did not integrate one’s academic view into one’s worldview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>June Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5:00-6:00 pm</td>
<td>June 7, 2011</td>
<td>Interviewee D graduated from a university in South China. His major is Civil Engineering. Evidently, Interviewee D’s academic life can be divided into two periods: the period in Mainland China and the period in the U.S. According to Interviewee D, the infringements of academic integrity can be seen in every single day in his former university in China. He had never viewed them as unethical cases before he participated in the seminar regarding academic integrity in this U.S. university. From Interviewee D, it is evident that the educational environment works effectively in shaping one’s perspective regarding academic integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2:00-3:00 pm</td>
<td>June 10, 2011</td>
<td>Interviewee E is working on a joint program between China and the U.S. He came to the U.S. after one year study in China according to his program requirement. He majors in computer science. His response testified Interviewee A’s description about the prevalent piracy in computer software on- and off-campus. His response also testified utilitarianism a derivative of secular-centeredness, one of the two Confucian dimensions. Not only did he recognize the institutions of higher education value protecting one’s intellectual property but also he found its essential the contractual spirit is much appreciated in daily business in America. He witnessed this when he signed a lease with his landlord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3:00-4:00 pm</td>
<td>June 8, 2011</td>
<td>Interviewee F came to the U.S. university to pursue his doctoral degree after he obtained his master’s degree in China. He majors in civil engineering. His response indicated his master mentor took advantage of him as a cheap labor. When he was working on his master degree in China, he was always sent by his mentor to supervise a construction project in China. As a result, he missed so many required classes. Nevertheless, he could be graded A for all his courses by his mentor. He appeared a little conservative by hesitating to disclose the dark side of Chinese scholarship to the researcher. He</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
witnessed he only received some fragmentary knowledge about the academic integrity. He came
to understand the big picture of the academic integrity only after he came to this U.S. university.
Interviewee F’s mindset is very typical for a number of Chinese students who was educated in
China.

Interviewee H 1:00-2:00 pm
June 5, 2011
To some extent, Interviewee H is an expert in exercising the potential implicit rules of academic integrity in China among Chinese graduates. He was very good at patching up papers by clipping paragraphs with different writing styles. He helped the researcher look deep into the factors behind that lead to academic misbehavior, the extreme utilitarianism---to reach the goal at the cost of one’s moral judgments. He completed his transformation when he witnessed how the powerful database of the U.S. university detected his friend’s academic misbehavior of copying a student’s two-year-ago assignment. Interviewee H was very frank about the gap between Chinese and the U.S. academia regarding the requirements of academic integrity. His response also demonstrated the educational environment plays a significant role in shaping one’s perspective of academic integrity.

Interviewee I 8:00-9:00 am
July 4, 2011
Interviewee I was a visiting scholar in this targeted U.S. university. He attained his master’s degree and PhD degree in a North-western university in China. Actually, he planned to go back to his former university when his program in the U.S. university was over. His response revealed that the lack of a mentor’s supervision of his student’s research in China. This lack of supervision is demonstrated in the experiment, data collection, and paper completion. Interviewee I’s response testified that there are a number of opportunities for the student to commit academic misbehavior in his former Chinese university in comparison with the academic environment in U.S. Interviewee I repeatedly verified the educational environment plays a significant role in
shaping students’ academic perspective.

Interviewee J  6:00-7:30 pm  July 4, 2011
Interviewee J is a female Chinese graduate student. First she appeared very careful of disclosing her case of infringement to the researcher. When she described her academic misbehavior she emphasized that her Chinese predecessors in her department of the targeted U.S. university also made the mistake. To some extent, she wants to reduce the pressure of moral criticism for her misbehavior. This demonstrated the common mindset of Chinese students: they justify their infringements because peers around are doing the same. However, she is not clear about some basic requirements of citations because she still views the document in the Wikipedia as legal sources.

Interviewee K  1:00-2:00 pm  July 5, 2011
Interviewee K had a different experience from the above interviewees because he served on the panel of reviewers for an academic journal in his field. He came to understand the strict requirements of academic integrity in the academia through his reviewing experience. He emphasized the role of the external supervision in shaping one’s appropriate role towards academic integrity. To some extent, Interviewee K belittles the role of self-requirement from the inner motivation in formulating one’s academic ethical view. According to Interviewee K, the academia in China is immature in comparison with American academia in his field.
Appendix K

Artifacts 1: Academic integrity, graduate policy and procedures

(Implementation Date: Fall 2010)

Policy:

Violations of the principles outlined in the graduate philosophy on academic integrity will be pursued to the fullest extent according to the procedures outlined below. Violations of academic integrity include violations in coursework, research[1], independent projects, practica, internships, comprehensive and qualifying exams, theses and dissertations and other publications[2] or works submitted as requirements for receipt of a degree. Non-degree seeking students may also be charged with violations of academic integrity.

This policy broadly defines and provides examples of violations of academic integrity, categorizes the seriousness of violations into four levels[3] and establishes guidelines for discerning appropriate sanctions for each. As there is no way to identify within the policy all of the possible violations of academic integrity, the policy and ensuing procedures are intended as a general guide for faculty in all colleges to enable consistent, reasonable and fair judgments of graduate student actions incongruous with the fundamental values and general philosophy described above. It further describes the steps to be followed by faculty bringing charges against graduate students for violations of academic integrity.

The authority to resolve cases of violations of academic integrity by enrolled graduate students is vested in the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee.

A. Definitions, explanations and examples of violations of academic integrity

Violations of academic integrity may include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Cheating.** Cheating involves giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid on any academic work submitted for grading including but not limited to coursework, laboratory assignments, research projects, comprehensive and qualifying examinations, theses and dissertations or using computer center account numbers that belong to another person without the permission of the account owner. Unauthorized aid includes collaborating with classmates or others when explicitly prohibited, using on-line paper mills or paying individuals to prepare research papers, reports or projects, submitting identical work to satisfy the requirements of more than one class without the approval of the faculty, or using textbooks, notes, the web and other sources when instructed to work alone.
**Fabricating/falsifying information.** Fabricating or falsifying information involves actions such as making up data that were not collected, stating that studies were conducted that were not, indicating that original source material was read when information was obtained from secondary or tertiary sources, making up references not used or identifying sources that were not consulted (for example, telephone interviews).

**Facilitating violations of academic integrity.** Facilitating violations of academic integrity involves students intentionally assisting others to violate the principles of academic integrity (for example, allowing friends access to their work, or instructing students on ways to solicit aid on papers, projects, take home exams, tests for state and national licenses, etc).

**Failing to cite contributors.** Failing to cite an author or multiple authors involves not giving credit to individuals who have contributed significantly to a work (paper, research project, poster, etc.) and claiming the final product as one’s own.

**Plagiarizing.** Plagiarizing is theft of the work accomplished by someone else. It includes copying and pasting words, phrases, sentence structure, computer code or files, images, or ideas from any source, including the Internet, and attributing the work to one’s own efforts. Blatant examples of plagiarism include failure to use quotation marks, to indent text of more than three lines and failure to cite consulted sources either in footnotes, endnotes or within the body of the text of a document. More subtle examples of plagiarism include paraphrasing or using others’ conceptual frameworks for developing creative works without acknowledgement or permission or citing a source within the text but then directly quoting the materials without the use of quotations marks or text indentation.

**Thwarting others' progress.** Thwarting others’ progress involves editing, deleting or otherwise destroying computer files that belong to another person or intentionally stealing or destroying property which prevents others from using it to gain needed information to complete assignments, for example, library materials on reserve, materials on loan by a faculty member or reports and documents made available for student use by external companies, state and federal agencies, etc.

**B. Levels of seriousness of violations of academic integrity and sample recommended sanctions**

At the graduate level, it is expected that students exhibit sophistication in understanding the tenets of academic integrity. Even so, it is clear that some types of violations are more serious in nature than others and that some types of violations require deliberate, calculated actions on the part of the student. This policy categorizes academic integrity violations into four levels. To provide guidance on the administration of sanctions, examples of violations of academic integrity are delineated below by the level of seriousness. This list is by no means exhaustive but is reflective of the types of violations
that have been observed at Clemson. Guidance may be sought from the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee to determine the appropriate level of seriousness in unusual or highly complex instances.

**Level One Seriousness and Sample Recommended Sanctions**

Includes instances where it is determined that a first-year graduate student is essentially unaware of the principles of academic integrity at Clemson, where a student has misunderstood instructions from a professor and has committed an infraction impacting a minor portion of assigned work or has committed an infraction on an assignment of minor significance to the final grade. Level One violations are addressed by the professor. Examples of Level One violations include the following:

1. failure to follow instructions to work independently;
2. plagiarizing affecting very minor portions of an assignment or project; or
3. first-time offenses by students unfamiliar with the academic integrity expectations at Clemson.

Sample recommended sanctions for Level One violations include one or more of the following:

1. failure on the assignment;
2. requirement to make all corrections and resubmit the assignment for grading;
3. verbal or written reprimand; or
4. assignment to attend a seminar on academic integrity and to write a paper on knowledge gained to be submitted for credit or no credit, at the professor’s discretion.

**Level Two Seriousness and Sample Recommended Sanctions**

Includes instances that impact a moderate portion of an assignment, course, project, laboratory or research activity. Level Two violations are addressed by the faculty member, the graduate program coordinator and the department chair. Examples of Level Two violations include the following:

1. failing to acknowledge sources by use of quotation marks, footnotes, endnotes or indentations of lengthy, direct quotes;
2. using unauthorized aid (notes, books and other references, other students’ work, web sites, etc.) in violation of explicit instructions to complete in-class or take-home exams;
3. failing to acknowledge sources of materials paraphrased;
4. failing to acknowledge sources of assistance, or other contributors, in preparation of assignments, papers, posters or projects, etc.; and/or
5. using the conceptual frameworks of others in developing creative works without acknowledgement or permission.
Sample recommended sanctions for Level Two violations include one or more of the following:

1. failure on the assignment with no opportunity to amend;
2. assignment of a similar task with a higher level of difficulty and more stringent grading; or
3. receipt of zero on the assignment.

**Level Three Violations of Academic Integrity and Sample Recommended Sanctions**

Includes instances where it is determined that a student flagrantly and intentionally violates the principles of academic integrity in a significant portion of an assignment, course or research activity. Level Three violations are heard by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. Examples of Level Three violations include the following:

1. knowingly plagiarizing major sections of papers submitted for grading;
2. knowingly plagiarizing major sections of the thesis or dissertation prior to final submission;
3. purchasing papers or reports and submitting them for grading;
4. thwarting others’ progress by destroying computer files, laboratory or library materials; and/or
5. devising means with classmates to cheat on exams of any sort (qualifying, preliminary, state exams for licensing, etc.)

Sample recommended sanctions for Level Three violations include one or more of the following:

1. receipt of an “F” in the course;
2. suspension from the University for one or more semesters;
3. termination of the student’s graduate assistantship and/or University fellowship;
4. notation in the Graduate School of the violation of academic integrity and the sanction; and/or
5. notation on the student’s permanent academic record (transcript) of the violation of academic integrity at Level Three and the suspension from the University, if applied.

**Level Four Violations of Academic Integrity and Sample Recommended Sanctions**

Includes instances where it is determined that a student has intentionally committed violations of the principles of academic integrity serious enough to constitute “academic fraud,” actions which have the impact of bringing the reputation of the institution itself into question. Level Four violations are heard by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee and may involve interaction with the Faculty Senate and the vice president for research if sponsored research is involved.
1. fabricating data in research projects, papers and reports;
2. creating false sources for references, which in fact, do not exist;
3. plagiarizing in materials to be submitted for publication, including final submission of theses and dissertations and journal articles;
4. falsifying transcript records, altering any supporting documents submitted to the University with the application for admission;
5. paying an individual or company to produce a thesis or dissertation; and/or
6. forging a faculty or staff member’s signature on any document.

Sample recommended sanctions for Level Four violations include one or more of the following:

1. mandated permanent dismissal from the University with no possibility of academic renewal;
2. notation in the Graduate School of the violation of academic integrity and the sanction; permanent dismissal from the University; and/or
3. notation on the student’s permanent academic record (transcript) of the violation of academic integrity at Level Four and the permanent dismissal from the University, if applied.

**NOTE:** Repeated violations of the policy of academic integrity, irrespective of the level, may result in suspension from the University or permanent dismissal.
Appendix L

Artifacts 2: EdL 895 Advanced Field Designs for Educational Personnel

Credit Hours: 3.0
Meeting time: Tuesday 5-7:45
Semester: Fall, 2011
Professor: XXXXXX
Office location: 412D Tillman
Phone: 656-5105
Email: XXXXXX
Office hours: M 1-4; Tu 1-4

Academic Integrity Policy

"As members of the XXXXXXXX community, we have inherited Thomas Green XXXXXX’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form." Please refer to the “Academic Integrity Policy” on the ETM School of Education Website:
http://gradspace.editme.com/AcademicGrievancePolicyandProcedures#integrityphilosophy and http://gradspace.editme.com/AcademicGrievancePolicyandProcedures#integrity

The Mission of the Eugene T. Moore School of Education is to prepare caring and capable professionals through intellectually engaging experiences in theory, method, and research that connect them to the communities in which they live and serve. Our Conceptual Framework summarizes what we expect our students to value, to know, and to be able to do. Our conceptual framework six learner outcomes are caring beliefs and actions, capable knowledge and practice, and connected communication and integration.

http://www.clemson.edu/hehd/departments/education/about/framework.html

Commitment to Diversity:

The Eugene T. Moore School of Education is committed to providing all candidates with purposeful, challenging, and diverse experiences. It is through a range of diverse, carefully constructed, and challenging classroom-based instruction and field-based experiences that candidates will recognize the inherent dignity and value of all
individuals, promote equity in education, and advocate on behalf of children, families, and communities.

**Course prerequisite:** EdF 878, or ExSt 801, or equivalent

**Course description:** This course presents state-of-the-art field designs and multivariate statistics for education personnel. It provides hands-on experience with advanced statistical procedures using PASW and AMOS. It addresses demands by publicists and policy makers, and is particularly valuable for PhD students in education pursuing research in curriculum, policy, diversity, and leadership.

**Objectives:**
- To prepare students who are able to design field studies in educational leadership and other education related disciplines.
- To prepare students to be capable of the most current multivariate procedures used in educational leadership and other education related disciplines.
- To prepares student who can design and perform multivariate procedures using PASW and AMOS

**Required text/materials:**
- AMOS software; best price: http://www.onthehub.com/spss/

**Technology, equipment, or skills required:** Computers

**Instructional strategies employed:** Lecture and hands-on application

**Attendance policy:** Each class will cover a significant amount of material and absences will be difficult to make up. Consequently students are expected, barring emergency, to attend every class.

**Topics/units:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hr</th>
<th>Unit 1: Introduction to field design with multivariate procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs</td>
<td><strong>Focal question:</strong> What assumption violations typically occur in education and leadership research (e.g., multicollinearity and measures of SES) and how do researchers deal with such problems? How do education and leadership scholars use moderator variables in regression procedures to refine their...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Knowledge? | Unit 2: Review of regression techniques; Chapter 7, Fields  
  
|---|---|
| 3 hrs | **Focal question**: How does one do research in an educational environment, where random selection is generally unpractical (researchers are typically limited to use of intact groups such as classes, schools, and districts), and where variables are typically proxies, often self-reported, and perceptual rather than concrete.  

**Unit 3: Field Designs with Multivariate Procedures**  
Pedhazur, pp. 195-197 (include section, Theory as Guide); specification 35-36, 288-292; proxies 287-288; Design: 156-159  
Topics: Prediction, effect, causation; controlling extraneous variation; proxy variables; self-reported variables, sample size, power, probability level, Type I and II error, model specificity.  
  
| 3 hrs | **Focal Question**: Realistically, many designs in educational research have several correlated outcome variables. With traditional univariate procedures, separate analyses of such variables leads to threat of Type 1 error and confounded information because of overlapping variances. How, for example, can one realistically separate language and math achievement outcomes when the two skills are known to be interrelated? How does one deal with such dilemmas? How does one design such studies to deal with extraneous variation?  

**Unit 4: Field designs with MANOVA and MANCOVA**: Chapters 16 & 11 Fields  
  
### 6 hrs

**Focal question:** Passing and failure rates are of central importance in the accountability environment of education, and knowledge of such predictors or effects can be crucial to school improvement. How does one identify predictors or effectors of pass/fail? Given limited resources in education, it is important to identify “best” or the most parsimonious, models. How does one use log linear changes to identify best predictor models?

**Unit 5: Field designs with Logistic Regression:** Chapter 8 Fields  

### 3 hrs

**Focal Question:** In education, it is often necessary to explore the underlying structure of a dataset. Such exploration has been used, for example, to explore the structure and meaning of IQ. It is currently useful for such things as data mining, exploring the meaning of school improvement, and defining the structure of leadership. How, then, can we explore such underlying structures in educational dataset.

**Unit 6: Field designs with Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA):** Chapter 17 Fields  

### 9 hrs

**Focal Question:** It is important to confirm the structure of relationships that are predicted in the literature or that are assumed by educational practitioners with sophisticated techniques. For example, previous research literature has predicted that student achievement is influenced by the quality of school structures. The recent dissertation of Clemson student Scott Smith, however, applied CFA and SEM designs to demonstrate that there is less to this presumption than previously thought. This unit explores these techniques in the context of education.

**Unit 7: Field designs with Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM):** Chapters 1-6, Byrne  
6 hrs **Focal Question** A particularly thorny problem in the field research that is characteristic of education is: How does one establish causality under non-laboratory conditions? In this unit we discuss the assumptions underlying causality in scientific research and describe how Path Analysis procedures, in combination with SEM, can establish causality in field research.

**Unit 9: Causality and Path Analysis Designs:** Pedhazur (BB reserve) pp. 766-781.


9 hrs **Focal Question** A perennial, and previously confounding question, in education has been and is: How does one design studies that separate school-level (e.g., schools, principal), district-level (e.g., superintendent) etc. variation from individual-level variation in studies of leadership or other education-related fields. The solution was developed by educational scholars for education: It’s called HLM. This unit presents these techniques.

**Unit 8: Field designs with Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM):** Chapter 19 Fields


3 hrs **Focal Question:** The intent of this section is to make students aware of the capabilities of newly emerging technologies. Because of time constraints, the material will be presented in less depth than in other units. In the spirit of keeping the course dynamic and current, these topics will be updated periodically and considered for more in-depth presentation if demand for any of them increases.

**Unit 10: Overviews of Multi-Dimensional Scaling, Box-Behnken response surfaces, Set Theoretic Analysis, etc.**

**Evaluation:** There will be a take-home quiz for each of Units 2-9. These exams are weighted equally (12.5% of final grade each).

**Assessment strategies employed:**

A≥90
B = 80-89
C=70-79
D=60-69
F≤59

**Bibliography**

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:

Student Disability Services coordinates the provision of reasonable accommodations for students with physical, emotional, or learning disabilities. Accommodations are individualized, flexible, and confidential based on the nature of the disability and the academic environment in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Students are encouraged to consult with the Disability Services staff early in the semester, preferably prior to the first day of class.

Current documentation of a specific disability from a licensed professional is needed. Additional information or appointments are available from Student Disability Services, G-23 Redfern Health Center, 656-6848. Details on policies and procedures are available at www.clemson.edu/ads.

If you have a documented disability that requires accommodation, you must notify the professor in writing during the first week of classes. "It is University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations to students who have disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact Student Disability Services to discuss their individual needs for accommodation."
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