Exploring the Intersection Between Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Academic Integrity Among EAL Students in Canadian Higher Education

SARAH ELAINE EATON
AMY BURNS
University of Calgary

ABSTRACT: In this article, we examine selected literature on the implementation of culturally responsive pedagogy in higher education with regard to academic integrity among international students who speak English as an Additional Language (EAL). The question that guided this work was: How can Canadian post-secondary educators demonstrate culturally sensitive responses to plagiarism for international EAL students? Within this examination we used Sleeter's (2011) critique of culturally responsive pedagogy as a framework to deepen our reflection of how to address plagiarism issues among the EAL population. We related each of Sleeter's four observances of oversimplification to the notion of plagiarism and its prevention, to contextualize and connect the notion of culturally responsive pedagogy to academic integrity. Using the research literature to ground our recommendations, we conclude with strategies for instructors to support culturally responsive ways of addressing plagiarism with international EAL higher education students.

Keywords: culturally responsive pedagogy, higher education, English as an Additional Language, academic integrity, Canada, plagiarism

RESUMÉ: Dans cet article, nous examinons la littérature sur la mise en œuvre d'une pédagogie sensible à la culture dans l'enseignement supérieur en lien avec l'intégrité académique des étudiants internationaux qui parlent l'anglais comme langue additionnelle (ALA). La question qui a guidé ce travail était la suivante: comment les éducateurs postsecondaires canadiens peuvent-ils répondre de façon adéquate au plagiat des étudiants internationaux? Dans cet examen, nous avons utilisé comme cadre la critique de Sleeter (2011) sur la

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 51, No. 3, 2018, 339-359

pédagogie sensible à la culture afin d'approfondir notre réflexion sur la façon de traiter les questions de plagiat pour ce groupe. Nous avons relié chacune des quatre observances de Sleeter soit : de la simplification à la notion de plagiat et de sa prévention et de contextualiser et de relier la notion de pédagogie adaptée à la culture à l'intégrité académique. En utilisant la littérature en tant que guide, nous proposons des stratégies pour soutenir les instructeurs qui font face au plagiat chez les étudiants qui parle l'anglais comme une langue additionnelle.

Mots-clés: pédagogie adaptée à la culture, enseignement supérieur, anglais comme langue additionnelle, intégrité académique, Canada, plagiat

The purpose of this article is to help readers better understand how culturally responsive pedagogy can inform faculty responses to plagiarism in higher education. The question that guided this work was: How can Canadian post-secondary educators demonstrate culturally sensitive responses to plagiarism for international English as an Additional Language (EAL) students? We framed our work as a conceptual study drawing from, and then synthesizing, current literature to develop recommendations to support both students and faculty.

We begin with a discussion of international EAL students in Canada. We then move on to illustrate notions of what constitutes plagiarism. From there, we explore culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) as it relates to academic integrity. We use Sleeter's (2011) critique of CRP as a framework to deepen our reflections about how academic integrity can be better addressed among the EAL population. Sleeter contends that CRP can be oversimplified through (a) cultural celebration; (b) trivialization; (c) essentializing or generalizing culture; and (d) substituting cultural for political analysis. We relate each element to the notion of plagiarism and its prevention, so as to create direct links between CRP and academic integrity. Finally, we offer recommendations for educators on how to develop culturally responsive ways to help prevent plagiarism and also to address it after it has occurred.

Prepared as an information synthesis, we draw from literature to explore and discuss culturally responsive ways faculty members can respond to cases of suspected or proven

plagiarism among international EAL students. There is a paucity of research regarding academic integrity in the Canadian context (Eaton & Edino, 2018) and as such, we have drawn from an international corpus of literature, contextualizing it for Canadian higher education. Though the main audience for this work is post-secondary faculty members and researchers in Canada, the content may be transferrable to other contexts (e.g. other countries), given the scope of literature we have consulted.

Understanding EAL International Students in Canadian Higher Education

There is no such thing as a typical EAL learner in Canada; they are a heterogeneous group from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds with differing levels of English proficiency. EAL students in Canadian higher education contexts may be loosely classified into three main groups: (a) international or visiting students; (b) immigrants, permanent residents and refugees; and (c) those born in Canada whose first exposure to English may have been at school. The latter group includes native Francophones (Coelho, 2001; Li, Myles, & Robinson, 2012) and some Indigenous students, of whom approximately 20% speak their ancestral language as a first language (Babaee, 2011).

With regards to immigrant students, we note that the term "Generation 1.5," coined more than two decades ago (Rumbaut, 2004), is worthy of consideration in our discussion. The term was originally used to describe children who immigrated to the United States while still in school, having started their formal education elsewhere (di Gennaro, 2013). It was later adopted in the field of second language education to refer to learners who enter higher education in an English-speaking country after having completed their secondary education in that same country (di Gennaro, 2013). It has morphed into a term used almost exclusively to refer to Chinese immigrant students (Marshall & Lee, 2017), indicating changes in its definition over time. Although the term has gained popularity since it was coined, Canadian researchers Marshall and Lee (2017) found that these students are not "stuck in an in-between space with respect to languages, identities and cultures" (p. 151), and that the term "Generation 1.5" is problematic because it propagates a "negative deficit view of learners" (p. 152) that leads to

"forming inaccurate essentialist reifications of our students" (p. 153).

Those born outside of Canada constitute the majority of EAL students in Canadian higher education (Li, et.al, 2012), and it is these students on whom we have focused. For the purposes of our study, when we refer to "international EAL students," we are speaking of learners who were born outside of Canada and whose first language is not English, regardless of their immigration status. In keeping with the argument presented by others (Alfred, 2009; Marshall & Lee, 2017), we found that labels attached to immigration such as *landed immigrant, international student* and so on, may cause confusion when it comes to helping faculty develop culturally responsive ways of working with EAL students born abroad and for that reason, we chose to exclude those labels from our discussion. Below we outline further complexities associated with such labels.

A brief examination of statistical data contextualizes the overall situation of international students studying in Canada. In the 2015-2016 academic year, the number of international students rose by 3.0%. This increase was slower than in the previous four years, but on the whole, the enrollment of international students has been increasing for almost two decades (Statistics Canada, 2017a). In 2017, there were just over 220,000 international students enrolled in Canadian post-secondary institutions, constituting about 11% of the total student population (Statistics Canada, 2017b). A number of caveats apply to these statistics. First, not all international students are EAL, as students from English-speaking countries (e.g., United States, United Kingdom, etc.) also comprise part of the international student body. Second, not all EAL students are considered international, as those who hold permanent resident or citizen status are not considered to have international student status. There are no readily and publicly available reliable statistics that indicate what percentage of internationally-born students speak English as an additional language. One reason for this may be the rich heterogeneity of this particular group of learners, who compel us to reconsider generalized interpretations of what it means to be an internationally-born non-native speaker of English in a Canadian post-secondary institution.

Faculty Perceptions and Stereotypes

It has been established in the research literature that EAL students may not understand plagiarism in the same way

as students whose first language is English (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Chen & Van Ullen, 2011). This situation is further complicated when faculty members from institutions in various locations around the world, including Canada (Anderson, 2015) make false assumptions about the reasons why international EAL students might plagiarize more than students whose first language is English (Leask, 2006; Phan, 2006; Sowden, 2005. We discuss this further in the next section on plagiarism.

Although K-12 teachers in Canada are required to develop a basic understanding of language competency and proficiency among their learners (Li, et. al, 2012), no such explicit requirement exists for post-secondary educators. This lack of training may be the reason for biased views among some academics. For example, international students have been generalized as a "detriment… to Canadian students and institutions" (Friesen & Keeney, 2013, n.p). This quotation shows that some academics might conflate "Canadian" with "native English speaker" when this is not always the case. We contend that the view expressed by Friesen and Keeney (2013) represents a small minority of faculty members, and we mention it only to illustrate how generalizations can lead to unsubstantiated presumptions. Furthermore, even in a country that continues to value multiculturalism (Hiebert, 2016), it may be naïve to believe that higher education faculty uniformly appreciate the richness international students or EAL students bring to our learning contexts. This is another reason that we believe that labels and classifications of students may not be helpful, when what is needed is a pedagogical approach that is inclusive, dynamic and supportive, while still maintaining academic rigour.

Understanding Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a complex and contested issue without a single definition (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; Luke & Kearns, 2012; Price, 2002), even in Canada (Eaton, 2017; Neufeld & Dianda, 2007). Notions of plagiarism are culturally and socially constructed (Leask, 2006; Haitch, 2016) and so, it is short-sighted to assume the reasons international EAL students may plagiarize can simply be chalked up to culture (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2016; Amsberry, 2010; Liu, 2005).

Although some institutions release public data about the kinds of academic misconduct that have been reported, it is generally high-level data, with very few details about the

individuals involved (Sweeney-Marsh & Palombi, 2016). According to Abasi and Graves (2008), there have been no published research studies that report a higher incidence of plagiarism among international students studying at English-language universities. Noting that Abasi and Graves' (2008) work was conducted about a decade ago, in our search of the literature to date, we found their assertion still holds today. We found that the empirical data available about who actually commits plagiarism in higher education is scant. Without actual evidence, it is important for faculty members to avoid generalizing and stereotyping what beliefs their students may subscribe to and what their cultural conditioning may be.

North American academic communication tends to emphasize a topic-centric approach in which educators value the presentation of information in a logical, concise way that is objective and dispassionate (Gay, 2002). This may invalidate other (non-Western) ways of communicating that involve the use of extensive background information, stories, indirect metaphors, or passionate expression of ideas. Gay (2002) discusses the need for cultural communication competency (p. 112), but the term "communication" remains rather ill-defined and vague. Perhaps equally ill-defined are the academic writing conventions and expectations of the Western classroom, making it important to explicitly communicate expectations to students, so they can learn how to meet these expectations (Phan, 2006).

Agency, Authorship, and Misunderstandings

Faculty members often expect students to write with agency and assume authorship of their work (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Amsberry, 2010; Sutherland-Smith, 2016). However, this assumption may be at odds with the previous learning experiences of international EAL students, who may understand that it is more appropriate to show one has memorized, and can repeat by rote, what others have said (Leask, 2006; Pecorari, & Petrić, 2014). Similarly, students may be unaware of the attribution required in Western contexts when translating text from their first language into English (Kwong, Ng, Mark, & Wong, 2010). The result may be that students produce a piece of writing that they believe to be "perfectly legitimate in their own minds" (Bombaro, 2007, p. 299), but may result in them being accused of plagiarism without them even knowing why.

According to Chen and Ullen (2011), international students from collectivist Asian countries may struggle to

understand notions of intellectual property and critical thinking. However, a student's country of origin should not be conflated with an utter lack of familiarity with notions of citing or referencing (Phan, 2006; Liu, 2005). Citing from a number of texts originally published in Chinese, Liu (2005) asserted that the concept of plagiarism has existed in China for over a thousand years, and kind-hearted Western educators lack accurate information, leading to the conflation of memorizing text with plagiarizing it. Agency and authorship in student writing are not universal concepts, but this does not equate to plagiarism being an accepted practice outside Western countries (Phan, 2006; Liu, 2005).

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

In this section, we begin with a discussion of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) and then move on to explore Sleeter's (2011) critique of CRP, in which she explains four ways in which CRP has been oversimplified. We relate each oversimplification to plagiarism and its prevention, serving to contextualize and connect the notion of CRP to academic integrity.

For too long, Eurocentric, middle-class views and values have dominated educational practices, because for decades, those in charge of developing policy and curricula have been predominately from European backgrounds (Vavrus, 2008). This becomes particularly problematic when international students are viewed as being culprits of the commodification of education (Saltmarsh, 2005). When "discourses of educational consumption are mapped onto the racialized commodification of tertiary education" (Saltmarsh, 2005, p. 1), the discourse around values strays away from student learning. In other words, international EAL students are subject to racism precisely because Eurocentric values have dominated educational contexts and discourses for centuries. In contrast, CRP calls for students' cultures to be valued and incorporated into instructional practices (Vavrus, 2008).

A call for educational systems and educators themselves to be more inclusive began in the 1960s as part of a larger social justice movement (Walter, 2018). This resulted in the development of multicultural approaches to education that prevailed for several decades (Walter, 2018). Culturally responsive pedagogy grew from these roots but goes beyond multiculturalism in its insistence on using the experiences and

values of the learners as a foundation (Gay, 2010; Larke, 2013; Walter, 2018).

Although CRP was originally designed to meet the needs of elementary and high school students, it has been gaining attention in higher and adult education, as the goals of providing more equitable learning outcomes extends beyond high school (Alfred, 2009; Larke, 2013). CRP involves using "cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively" (Gay, 2002, p. 106). This involves a commitment not only to understanding students' values, traditions, and learning preferences, but to also act on that understanding to develop and deliver rich and meaningful learning experiences (Alfred, 2009; Gay, 2002; Larke, 2013). This includes challenging Western orientations to individualist orientations (Alfred, 2009, Hofstede, 1984).

From a pedagogical perspective, adopting a collectivist approach to learning involves making learning the responsibility of the entire group (Alfred, 2009), thus disrupting the more traditional Eurocentric teacher-centred content delivery. This has interesting implications for helping students to learn about academic integrity. For decades, the responsibility to prevent plagiarism has been placed on individuals, meaning either the student or the professor (Bretag, 2017). More recently, advocates have called for a multi-stakeholder approach that positions the institution as a community charged with providing wrap-around support to students (Bretag, 2017). What is of particular interest is that as CRP becomes more widely adopted in classrooms, responses to academic integrity violations are shifting towards more collectivist approaches that see the institution as a community. There is a case to be made for culturally responsive approaches to academic integrity, including plagiarism prevention, that consider learners as active partners in the development of their own integrity, be it academic or professional.

In the section that follows, we examine the intersectionality of the literature relating to academic integrity through the lens of Sleeter's critique of CRP. In turn, these reflections inform our recommendations for preventing and addressing plagiarism.

Examining the Intersectionality of Academic Integrity and CRP

Post-secondary educators have taken up CRP in a myriad ways, some of which have exacerbated the very issues being addressed. Sleeter (2011) argues that this has resulted in an oversimplification of CRP in four troubling ways. We will explore each of these, and then reflect on how they may apply to plagiarism and its prevention. The rationale for focusing on the oversimplification of CRP, rather than CRP itself relates back to a key idea we presented about plagiarism earlier, that it is not a concept with a singular definition and educators have been known to make assumptions about how and why certain groups of students may plagiarize. Both plagiarism and CRP are complex multi-layered notions that are experienced by educators and learners in different ways. We will examine how over-simplifications of these complex concepts can impede student learning.

Oversimplification #1: Cultural Celebration

Sleeter's (2011) first oversimplification is *cultural celebration*, that is to say, celebrations that include food and festivals emphasizing culture, but downplaying academic instruction. Sleeter (2011) emphasizes that "cultural celebrations are not antithetical to student learning" (p. 13), but that educators too often ignore the deep pedagogical responsibilities and social complexities of CRP in favour of easy ways to address cultural appreciation in the classroom. Cultural celebrations become particularly problematic when instructional time is traded in order to emphasize and elevate the celebration.

In terms of plagiarism prevention, it has been shown that direct instruction can be beneficial for students both in terms of building their academic writing skills, and in terms of understanding academic expectations around plagiarism prevention (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Amsberry, 2010; Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2015; East, 2016; Pecorari, 2016). Therefore, it is important for educators not to sacrifice instructional time in favour of cultural celebrations that do not help students to develop their academic knowledge or skills.

Oversimplification #2: Trivialization

The second oversimplification Sleeter (20111) discusses is *trivialization* of CRP from a thoughtful and complex

paradigm for connecting teachers and students to a rote set of steps to follow. Sleeter (2011) offers the example of how community networks and associations can provide a resource to help faculty become more responsive, but that educational institutions tend to dismiss the relevance of working with such community groups. Another example involves giving teachers checklists to ask them how often they engage in including a variety of teaching approaches and accommodating immigrant students.

While checklists can serve as a means to engage in deeper reflection about one's teaching, but there is a risk that the checklist becomes the end, rather than the means. If we extend this idea to plagiarism prevention, it is important to understand that giving students checklists to help them determine if they have followed APA formatting, for example, can provide limited help. A checklist does not teach students how to cite or reference in their academic writing. A checklist will never be a "quick fix" for plagiarism.

Oversimplification #3: Essentializing Culture

Sleeter's third consideration is *essentializing culture*, resulting in fixed and overly generalized conceptions of a particular group. When culture is considered the reason that a particular group of students behave in a certain way, educators are essentializing the students' culture. Educators' perceptions of a culture may be superficial or come from misrepresentation in the media (Gay, 2002). When students feel their culture is being essentialized, they can feel rejected and disenfranchised (Sleeter, 2011). With regards to plagiarism and academic integrity, educators might erroneously conclude that students from a particular region are predisposed to plagiarize (Leask, 2006; Phan, 2006; Sowden, 2005).

Oversimplification #4: Substituting Cultural for Political Analysis

The fourth and final way that educators oversimplify CRP is *substituting cultural for political analysis* (Sleeter, 2011). In and of itself, CRP will not solve systemic inequities relating to social justice and oppression. Educators may struggle to address the messy and complicated notions of structural issues that emerge, particularly when they may be working in institutionalized structures that do not support politicized dialogue as an element of teaching. CRP requires a willingness to have deep and meaningful dialogue with

students about complex and sensitive issues, such as racism, poverty, and powerlessness, among others (Vavrus, 2008), not necessarily with a view to solving these issues, but with a view to engaging students in informed conversations. CRP goes beyond the presentation of encyclopedic facts to discuss deeply complex and even controversial issues. When this oversimplification is viewed through the lens of plagiarism prevention, conversations with students that emphasize developing values around giving others attribution for their work is not only morally and academically correct but can also be a way of empowering others by showing appreciation for the work they have contributed to the field.

Recommendations for Practice

Although we have shown an emerging trend towards addressing academic integrity issues from the perspective of the entire institution acting collectively to support student learning (Bretag, 2017), it is likely that such approaches will take time to develop. The current situation necessitates pedagogical responses to plagiarism and its prevention, particularly for international EAL students (Haitch, 2016). Students can improve their writing and research skills to prevent plagiarism, but faculty members need to provide direct support to help them learn these skills (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Amsberry, 2010; Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2015; East, 2016; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008; Pecorari, 2016). Faculty members are aware of this, but struggle to figure out how to teach these skills effectively in their courses, particularly when course syllabi are already laden with course content specific to the discipline (East, 2016). As East (2016) points out, "the challenge is not only to inform students about academic integrity, but also to engage students in this education and to provide them with opportunities to develop their scholarship capabilities" (p. 482). The result is that faculty members' responses to plagiarism prevention have been shown to be inconsistent, with some taking an active stance on how to build citing and referencing skills, for example, while others never mention it in their classes at all (Bombaro, 2007).

We contend that faculty members can be active partners in helping students to build the skills they need to succeed in North American post-secondary environments, using culturally responsive approaches. In this section, we offer

concrete strategies for educators to use in their own classrooms.

Culturally Responsive Instructional Strategies to Reduce Plagiarism

Recommendation 1: Cultivate interest in students' previous learning experiences.

Culturally responsive pedagogy "involves teachers proactively using cultural knowledge and experiences of diverse students to establish a caring school climate" (Vavrus, 2008, p. 50). As such, a student's previous learning experiences (e.g., in their home countries) become an important element of their current learning experiences. As writing is both a critical learning experience and is closely connected to culture (Phan, 2006), talking with students about the act of writing itself can be a logical place to start. Engaging students in reflective dialogue about what they have previously learned with regards to academic writing, citing, and referencing can create an opportunity for educators to learn about the knowledge, values, and experiences students already have.

Because one of the critiques of CRP is that it can be oversimplified (Sleeter, 2011), educators will want to resist the temptation to essentialize their students' experiences (Sleeter, 2011). Building "multicultural knowledge, skills and dispositions" (Vavrus, 2008, p. 50) requires time and patience. Culturally responsive pedagogy challenges instructors to "become students of these differences" (Vavrus, 2008, p. 53), and then to have the courage to dialogue with learners about dominant Western expectations for writing and attribution. It is also important to acknowledge that, while cultivating an interest in students' previous learning experiences may help educators develop their own skills, it may not have a direct impact on student learning and is therefore only a first step towards developing a culturally responsive approach to plagiarism and its prevention.

Recommendation 2: Create generative relationships.

It is not enough for instructors to cultivate a genuine interest in students' learning experiences. The next step is to create a safe space in which learning can happen. It is incumbent upon the educator to create "democratic classroom management approaches that are welcoming, participatory, and inclusive of cultural diversity" (Vavrus, 2008, p. 54).

Too often, educators assume intentionality when reacting to student plagiarism or poor writing (Abasi & Graves, 2008). A more productive and culturally responsive approach involves developing trust with students to create a safe environment in which conversations about textual and referencing practices can happen in an open and non-judgemental way. Professors must acknowledge their expectations of students as assuming agency and authorship over their work. Then, the professor can actively choose to suspend their assumptions regarding authorial agency. After suspending their own beliefs, the professor is then in a position to create a dialogic space with their students where generative learning can happen, there can be "a dialogic process of knowledge production" (Abasi & Graves, 2008, p. 224).

Recommendation 3: Demystify plagiarism through direct instruction.

Institutional policies and poorly articulated instructor expectations can leave students feeling confused about plagiarism (Abasi & Graves, 2008.) Direct instruction can be an effective way to help students build their academic writing skills and learn how and why to prevent plagiarism in their own work. Once instructors have demonstrated their commitment to learn about their students' previous learning experiences and have created a safe space in which culturally responsive teaching can happen, the next step is to operationalize direct instruction for students to help them understand what is expected of them and how to write, cite, and reference.

Providing in-class activities about how to cite and reference (Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2016) is one way of demystifying expectations and building students' knowledge and skills. Offering an assignment on plagiarism itself, that requires students to research, cite, and reference material on the topic can be another way to help students practice their skills, while learning about academic integrity in the process (Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2016; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). Similarly, providing formative feedback on drafts helps students to develop their overall writing competency and confidence (Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2016; Eaton, Guglielmin & Otoo, 2017). Finally, engaging students in a process of reflection about what they have learned can help to solidify their newly

acquired skills and knowledge (Eaton, et. al, 2017; Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2016).

There are numerous ways to provide direct instruction to students about plagiarism and its prevention. These should be intentional and explicit because it is not enough to merely embed information about institutional plagiarism policies into a course syllabus (Colella-Sandercock & Alahmadi, 2016; McGowan & Lightbody, 2008). Writing institutional policy about academic misconduct into course outlines does not absolve educators of their responsibility to ensure their students have the skills and knowledge they need to succeed. Students need direct and consistent support from faculty to cultivate their academic integrity.

Recommendation 4: Employ culturally responsive pedagogy in the large lecture environment.

While the personal nature of culturally responsive pedagogy could imply application only in small, face to face, seminar-style courses, the power of CRP has a place within the large lecture and online environments also. This can be achieved in various ways depending on the format of the course being taught. For example, instructors of large lectures could use digital learning technologies such as Top Hat™ to provide snapshots of understanding regarding plagiarism within the class. This information could then inform direct instruction, making the large lecture a rich and informative environment where students can address this topic. Online instructors could engage synchronous and asynchronous discussion formats to allow students to learn from one another and, as a result, form powerful communities of understanding and collaboration. Regardless of the format, the goal is the same: to create a safe space for students to examine their own practice while allowing instructors access to the prior experiences and understanding of students on the topic of plagiarism.

Conclusions

We have explored the notions of what it means to be an international EAL student in Canada, what it means to plagiarize, and what it means to engage in culturally responsive pedagogy. In each case, we have illustrated that these concepts are complex and multi-faceted, with each defying a simplistic definition, while simultaneously being vulnerable to oversimplification and generalization. While

culturally responsive pedagogy has been defined in the literature (Gay, 2002), clear definitions of international EAL students and plagiarism remain elusive.

We contend that it is the responsibility of educators and educational leaders to develop a certain comfort level with inexact definitions and complex ideas, while actively striving to resist the temptation to oversimplify and generalize. Being willing to engage students in dialogue and explicit learning about plagiarism using culturally responsive pedagogical approaches may not guarantee a decrease in the incidences of academic misconduct, and it would be foolhardy to suggest so. However, using CRP as an approach to teach academic integrity may help students to cultivate their awareness, knowledge, and skills so they can actively make choices to avoid plagiarism and build their citing and referencing skills. Furthermore, as educators we are challenged to disentangle ourselves from traditional Western individualist approaches to learning (Hofstede, 1984). By challenging ourselves to expand our approaches to our classroom practice, we can foster a deeper sense of community where our students are partners in learning. This includes learning subject matter content, but also learning how to cultivate one's own ethic of integrity that can be fostered not only in academic contexts, but beyond. In conclusion, we call for a more purposeful integration of culturally responsive approaches to the development of integrity, be it academic or professional.

REFERENCES

Abasi, A. R., & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7(4), 221-233. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.010

Alfred, M. V. (2009). Nonwestern immigrants in continuing higher education: A sociocultural approach to culturally responsive pedagogy. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 57*(3), 137-148. doi:10.1080/07377360903262168

Amiri, F., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2016). On Iranian EFL undergraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *14*(2), 115-131. doi:10.1007/s10805-015-9245-3

Amsberry, D. (2010). Deconstructing plagiarism: International students and textual borrowing practices. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(1), 31-44. doi:10.1080/02763870903362183

Anderson, T. (2015). Seeking internationalization: The state of Canadian higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *45*(4), 166-187. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/viewFile/184690/pdf_38

Bombaro, C. (2007). Using audience response technology to teach academic integrity: "The seven deadly sins of plagiarism" at Dickinson College. *Reference Services Review, 35*(2), 296-309. doi:10.1108/00907321111108169

Bretag, T. (2017). Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), good practice note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from https://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating-safeguard-academic

Chen, Y.-H., & Van Ullen, M. K. (2011). Helping international students succeed academically through research process and plagiarism workshops. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(3), 209-235. doi:10.5860/crl-117rl

Coelho, E. (2001). What are ESL/ELD? What happened to ESD? *TESL Ontario Contact*, *27*(3), 1, 3-4. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from http://contact.teslontario.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/ContactFall2001.pdf

Colella-Sandercock, J. A., & Alahmadi, H. W. (2015). Plagiarism education: Strategies for instructors. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 13*(1), 76-84. Retrieved January 1, 2018 from from http://ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/395/190

Colella-Sandercock, J. A., & Alahmadi, H. W. (2016). *Rethinking Pedagogy: How the Implementation of Transformative Teaching and Learning Can Help Reduce Plagiarism*. Paper presented at the 10th Annual International Conference on Teaching and Learning. Retrieved January 1, 2018 from

https://www.oakland.edu/Assets/Oakland/cetl/files-anddocuments/Conferences/ConferencePPTs/491RethinkPlagiarismCollella-Sandercock.pdf

di Gennaro, K. (2013). How different are they? A comparison of Generation 1.5 and international L2 learners' writing ability. *Assessing Writing, 18*(2), 154-172. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.01.003

Eaton, S. E. (2017). Comparative analysis of institutional policy definitions of plagiarism: A pan-Canadian university study. *Interchange: A Quarterly Review of Education, 48*(3), 271-281. doi:10.1007/s10780-017-9300-7

Eaton, S. E., & Edino, R. I. (2018). Academic integrity in the Canadian context: A comprehensive literature review 1992-2017 (Data set). DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/98WFM

Eaton, S. E., Guglielmin, M., & Otoo, B. (2017). Plagiarism: Moving from punitive to pro-active approaches. In A. P. Preciado Babb, L. Yeworiew, & S. Sabbaghan (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the IDEAS conference 2017: Leading educational change conference* (pp. 28-36). Calgary, Canada: Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary.

East, J. (2016). Educational responses to academic integrity. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 481-496). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Friesen, N., & Keeney, P. (2013). Internationalizing the Canadian campus: ESL students and the erosion of higher education. *University Affairs* (August 7). Retrieved May 10, 2018 from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/internationalizing-the-canadian-campus/

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(2), 106-116.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice* (2nd. ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Haitch, R. (2016). Stealing or sharing? Cross-cultural issues of plagiarism in an open-source era. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, *19*(3), 264-275. doi:10.1111/teth.12337

Harklau, L., Losey, K., & Siegal, M. (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of*

writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hiebert, D. (2016). What's so special about Canada?: Understanding the resilience of immigration and multiculturalism. Retrieved May 10, 2018 from http://www.migration4development.org/sites/default/files/tcm-trust-canada-final_1.pdf

Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 1*(2), 81-99.

Kwong, T., Ng, H. M., Mark, K. P., & Wong, E. (2010). Students' and faculty's perception of academic integrity in Hong Kong. *Campus-Wide Information Systems, 27*(5), 341-355. doi:10.1108/10650741011087766

Larke, P. (2013). Culturally responsive teaching in higher education: What professors need to know. *Counterpoints, 391*, 38-50.

Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor–implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 183-199. doi:10.1080/02602930500262486

Li, X., Myles, J., & Robinson, P. (2012). *Teaching ESL in Canada*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford.

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: Is cultural conditioning truly the major culprit? *ELT Journal, 59*(3), 234-241. doi:10.1093/elt/cci043

Luke, B., & Kearins, K. (2012). Attribution of words versus attribution of responsibilities: Academic plagiarism and university practice. *Organization*, *19*(6), 881-889. doi:10.1177/1350508412448857

Marshall, S., & Lee, E. (2017). Chinese students in Canadian higher education: A case for reining in our use of the term 'Generation 1.5.' *Canadian Modern Language Review, 73*(2), 133-157. doi:10.3138/cmlr.2911

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522-538. Retrieved January 10, 2018 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2959991

McGowan, S., & Lightbody, M. (2008). 'Another chance to practice': Repeating plagiarism education for EAL students within a discipline context. *International*

Journal for Educational Integrity, *4*(1). doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v4i1.193

Neufeld, J., & Dianda, J. (2007). Academic dishonesty: A survey of policies and procedures at Ontario Universities. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from http://cou.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Academic-Colleagues-Academic-Dishonesty-A-Survey-of-Policies-and-Procedures-at-Ontario-Universities.pdf

Pecorari, D. (2016). Plagiarism, international students, and the second-language writer. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 537-567). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, *47*(3), 269-302. doi:10.1017/S0261444814000056

Phan, L. H. (2006). Plagiarism and overseas students: Stereotypes again? *ELT Journal, 60*(1).

Price, M. (2002). Beyond "Gotcha!": Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, *54*(1), 88-115. Retrieved December 31, 2017 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1512103 doi:10.2307/1512103

Rumbaut, R. G. (2004). Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: Decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States. *International Migration Review, 38*(3), 1160-1205. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00232.x

Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, *14*(1), 44-49. doi:10.1080/15210960.2012.646853

Saltmarsh, S. (2005). 'White pages' in the academy: Plagiarism, consumption and racist rationalities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 1*(1), 1-11. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v1i1.17

Sleeter, C. E. (2011). An agenda to strengthen culturally responsive pedagogy. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *10*(2), 7-23. Retrieved May 10, 2018 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ944889.pdf

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, *47*(3), 562-584. doi:10.1177/0042085911431472

Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal, 59*(3), 226-233. doi:10.1093/elt/cci042

Statistics Canada. (2017a). Canadian postsecondary enrolments and graduates, 2015/2016. Retrieved May 10, 2018 from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/171207/dq171207c-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2017b). Postsecondary enrolments, by student status, country of citizenship and sex. Retrieved May 10, 2018 from http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26?lang=eng&retrLang=eng&id=4770031&&pattern=&stByVal=1&p1=1&p2=31&tabMode=dataTable&csid=

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2016). Authorship, ownership, and plagiarism in the digital age. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 575-589). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

Sweeney-Marsh, J., & Palombi, D. (2016). Academic integrity report: Sheridan College Retrieved December 31, 2017 from https://www.sheridancollege.ca/-/media/files/www/life-at-sheridan/student-services/library-services/academic-integrity/academic-integrity-report-2016.ashx?la=en&hash=1D58DEE0E33A58B37B41780FB99460328F4AE810

Vavrus, M. (2008). Culturally responsive teaching. In T. L. Good (Ed.), *21st Century education: A reference handbook* (Vol. 2, pp. 49-57). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Velliaris, D. M., & Breen, P. (2016). An institutional three-stage framework: Elevating academic writing and integrity standards of international pathway students. *Journal of International Students*, *6*(2), 565-587.

Walter, J. S. (2018). Global perspectives: Making the shift from multiculturalism to culturally responsive teaching. *General Music Today, 31*(2), 24-28. doi:10.1177/1048371317720262

Zivcakova, L., Wood, E., Baetz, M., & De Pasquale, D. (2012). How do faculty members respond to their students' discussions of academic misconduct and academic integrity? *International Journal for Educational Integrity 8*(1), 25-40. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v8i1.782

Address for Correspondence
Sarah Elaine Eaton
Werklund School of Education
University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. NW
Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4
Email: seaton@ucalgary.ca