CLAIMING SPACE FOR HONEST WORK:
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AS THIRD SPACE LABOR

KELLY H. AHUNA
LORETTA FRANKOVITCH
GREER MURPHY

ABSTRACT

Academic integrity (AI) work is widely recognized as fundamental to all college and university endeavors. Outside of its own scholarly and professional niche, however, less is known about people who carry out this work. Our chapter, which reports on interviews conducted with nine AI professionals across nine different institutions, seeks to fill this gap by providing embedded, on-the-ground perspectives on how these professionals go about building intellectual capital and credibility. Our study also addresses how AI professionals fit with their respective campuses and colleagues, with participants throughout illustrating affordances and limitations of Third Space as a conceptual frame to describe AI work. By bringing Third Space and AI into more deliberate conversation, we invite professionals across both areas to critically reflect on discrepancies between work members of their communities think they do versus work they actually do. We foreground how AI professionals make sense of their own labor, drawing implications for how such calculations have affected (and may continue to affect) institutional belonging as well as the personal, emotional, and professional sustainability of AI and other Third Space work.

Keywords: academic integrity, academic honesty, institutional ethnography, labor, academic labor, administrative labor, third space

CLAIMING SPACE FOR HONEST WORK: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AS THIRD SPACE LABOR

> *We are protecting the community.... At the end of the day, we're all educators, right?*
> — *Tomas*

Academic integrity work is fundamental to all college and university endeavors.[1] Without adherence to this value, student learning, institutional reputation, and the societal worth of higher education are cast into doubt. Despite

---

[1] The modern academic integrity movement has its North American roots in research conducted by Donald McCabe and colleagues starting in the 1990s. This movement considers encouraging honest, independent completion of coursework, preventing misconduct, and holding those who commit misconduct accountable to be teaching and learning imperatives and institutional issues rather than solely or even primarily a moral failing on the part of individual students. In a United States context, administrative personnel who were considered to work in academic integrity had traditionally come from Student Affairs backgrounds (due to the professional overlaps between integrity systems and honor codes). However, this pathway has changed—and is still changing. For fuller accounts of academic integrity's professional history than we have space to provide in this chapter, see: Bertram Gallant (2008) or McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield (2012).

the importance of integrity being espoused in university mission statements, academic handbooks, and other prominent documents, the ways in which it is upheld, reaffirmed, or resourced tend to be much less clearly defined (Bertram Gallant, 2008). Organizational issues associated with upholding integrity, including where labor is housed, who does that work, or what preparation and specific expertise these professionals are considered to need, lack standardization (Bertram Gallant, 2008). As integrity scholar-practitioners, we see integrity work operating in a liminal academic *Third Space* (Bhabha, 1990, 2004; Whitchurch, 2013), similar to offices such as honors colleges, advising offices, or tutoring centers (Stoller, 2021).

In fact, viewing academic integrity through a third space lens contextualizes this imperative, but distinct, labor. Those of us who do the work can find ourselves: struggling for recognition and feeling overlooked, misunderstood, or undervalued (Whitchurch, 2008; Janke, 2019; Keller, 2021; Smith, 2020), and navigating within various, sometimes competing worlds (Gray, 2015; Routledge, 1996; Bertram Gallant & Drinan, 2006). Like other third space higher education occupations, academic integrity resists false binaries (Stoller, 2021; Whitchurch, 2010) that do not adequately capture its complexity.

By integrating integrity labor into a third space conceptual framework, this study explores how professionals who work in this space make sense of their own labor. Influenced by institutional ethnography (LaFrance, 2019; Smith, 2006), the problems we examine include how and if integrity administrators' labor fits within the fabric of their respective institutions, as well as whether and how their individual efforts have succeeded in affording credibility or sustainability to the profession overall. Though perhaps not a seamless fit, we believe the challenges and opportunities integrity professionals face can be illuminated by examining the profession through the third space lens.

BACKGROUND

Academic integrity work is increasingly prominent at many universities. Anecdotally, dishonesty concerns within U.S. higher education typically have been handled either via student conduct offices or as one of many duties of an academic Dean. As more specific integrity policies and student education initiatives have emerged, however, so have new responsibilities and new roles, either in conjunction with previous positions, or in some cases, in stand-alone careers and offices. Creating a space that did not exist has allowed individuals in these positions (i.e., integrity administrators) to forge new paths for themselves and for the field. This new space can be seen as third space, a professional place outside known structures that "allows … freedom to make and remake principles" (English, 2003, p. 70). It is a space that is open to possibilities but also fraught with uncertainty (Bhabha, 2004; Routledge, 1996).

Rather than following previously established student conduct pathways, these integrity positions evolved distinctively based on the labor of each administrator and the unique constraints of each institution (Bertram Gallant, 2022). The idea of variable institutional responses with multiple voices "articulate[s] the ambiguous and contested character of [the] reality" (Routledge, 1996, p. 414) that third space workers face. Integrity practitioners, like other third space professionals, have come to establish unique spaces that reflect their own idiosyncratic skills, needs, and limitations (English, 2004).

As with other third space work, the complex, shifting ways integrity professionals view their labor impacts and is impacted by how each individual approaches the job. Whitchurch (2022) suggests that some third space laborers (third space "professionals") enjoy the ambiguity that surrounds their work, which affords a freedom to explore and develop in ways they might not otherwise experience, while others (professionals who work "in" the third space) find such ambiguity unfulfilling and too unstructured for their needs. Similar tensions can be seen in the experiences of other teacher-scholars throughout higher education (e.g., Murphy & Mikanovich, 2023) and of practitioners in other industries (e.g., Balcom et al., 2021). Perceptions of academic integrity professionals become a stumbling block or a carousel of potentialities — or sometimes both — as the administrators who lend their voices to this study make clear.

Applying a "Thirdspace" paradigm (Soja, 2009) to the lived experiences of integrity administrators helps us better understand their labor both particularly and more broadly. Under this conception, Soja (2009) encourages "set[ting] aside the demands of an either/or choice and contemplat[ing] instead the possibility of a both/and also logic" (p. 50). The voices captured here cry out for a similar "both/and also logic" in describing academic integrity labor.

METHODOLOGY

As members of the integrity community ourselves, we conduct this study out of a desire not only to capture some of the complexities inherent in our work, but to share that complexity with a wider audience. Noting discrepancies in roles and expectations, we set out to accurately assess and account for the current state of academic integrity labor. As integrity forms an increasingly prominent part of the research literature and occupies both national and international conversations on the state of higher education (Lederman, 2021; Williams, 2022), we feel a study that seeks to explicitly examine academic integrity labor on its own terms is overdue.

Aiming to capture nuance in labor practices and perceptions of practitioners in the field, we chose applied qualitative, institutional-ethnographic research (LaFrance, 2019; Smith 2006) as the preferred approach. Rather than relying on "predetermined, standardized categories" (Patton, 1982, p. 5), our study builds from open-ended conversations with each individual to paint a larger, complex picture of integrity professionals' working lives. We suffer no illusion that this picture is complete or that it speaks for anyone other than the professionals in our study. Nevertheless, we see value in generalizing from the particular (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Greenwood & Levin, 2005) and giving voice to integrity under a third space paradigm.

To identify participants, we reached out to a convenience sample of members from the International Center for Academic Integrity's (ICAI) Northeast and Southeast regional consortia. After sending introductory emails to individuals active in these groups, explaining the aims of our research study and requesting voluntary participation, we interviewed 12 participants at a total of 11 different schools. Ultimately, we report on data collected from nine participants at nine schools (with some interviewees excluded due to limited knowledge of integrity processes at their institution or to limited time spent on integrity work). We did not award compensation, nor do we operate in any sort of power relationship with these individuals. As shown in the Table 1, administrators in our study represent six private and three public, mostly mid-size institutions.

Table 1

Integrity Administrators, Institutional Demographics, and Reporting Lines

Integrity administrator	Institutional demographics	Main area of responsibility (reporting line)	*Role* dedicated to integrity work?	*Office* dedicated to integrity work?
Jane	Private, R1; Large	Learning support (Senior Director)	Yes (full-time)	No
Matt	Public, R1; mid-size	Faculty (department leadership/Chair)	No (part-time service, course release)	No
Caroline	Private, R1; mid-size	Academic affairs (Asst./Assoc. Dean)	No (75%)	No
Sophie	Private, R1; mid-size	Student affairs (Assoc. Dean)	Yes (full-time)	Yes ("office" is staffed by a single person)
Tomas	Private, R1; mid-size	Faculty (department leadership/Chair)	No (part-time service, stipend)	No* (there are staff dedicated to AI but not a centralized or "named" office)
Darryl	Private, R2; mid-size	Academic advising (Asst. VP)	No (50-60%)	No
Lois	Public, R1; large	Academic affairs (Assoc. Provost)	Yes (full-time)	Yes ("office" is staffed by a single person)
Phil	Private, R1; large	Academic advising (Senior Dean)	No (5-10%)	No

Integrity administrator	Institutional demographics	Main area of responsibility (reporting line)	*Role* dedicated to integrity work?	*Office* dedicated to integrity work?
Esther	Public, CC; large	Faculty (department leadership/Chair)	No (part-time service, ~20%)	No

Note. R1 = Doctoral degree-granting institution with very high research activity, according to Carnegie classifications:
https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/classification-methodology/basic-classification/
CC = Community college, a two-year school focused on teaching not research, which grants associates' degrees.

We conducted semi-structured interviews via Zoom using pre-determined IRB-approved protocols. We transcribed conversations using Zoom automatic transcription, then cleaned and clarified each transcript. Employing traditional qualitative techniques (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007), codes were developed from iterative readings of each interview and discussed during researcher meetings, where codes were revised for further exploration. The results of our analysis exhibit how this diverse group of respondents makes sense of labor both personally and professionally, in the context of their own institutions and in the broader context of U.S. higher education.

OCCUPYING THE THIRD SPACE

We kind of reach across the aisle (in) both directions. So, while I'm under a faculty-facing hub, I do a lot of interfacing with colleagues on the student-facing side of it.

— Caroline

To be honest, the work has been pretty isolated. You'll probably hear this across different schools "... it's been a little isolating."

— Sophie

Most of the integrity administrators in this study came to their roles haphazardly. Not surprisingly, they lacked a clear path that led them to this work, since this developing field offers none. Caroline explained how she needed a job after completing her master's degree and "fell into working in academic integrity," whereas others said they felt compelled to take on integrity work when colleagues who handled it previously moved on to other duties. Overall, the path to integrity administration remains unclear and frequently unplanned. As Darryl quipped, "I never thought that I'd be here, but I'm glad that I am."

As roles develop, organizational structures shift to accommodate institutional need (Bess & Dee, 2012). Nowhere is this more evident than in the titles and organizational chart positions held by administrators in this study. Several hold faculty appointments and serve on honor boards as part-time, temporary service. Even in staff positions, administrators often carry out duties in other offices (e.g., advising, learning centers, libraries). Phil observed, "My primary job responsibility is advising students … then I have these other responsibilities, and one of them is academic integrity." An overview of integrity administrators' reporting lines and institutional demographics appears in Table 1.

For over half the administrators in this study, academic integrity is a side gig, merely part of their complete duties, making responsibilities sometimes unclear. Only two institutions feature centralized integrity offices where labor is titled as exclusively dedicated to academic honesty concerns. While further research is certainly needed, our early sample indicates that full-time dedicated integrity positions are relatively few in number. Many institutions commonly wrap integrity into other roles on campus, often with the effect of dissipating the work's legitimacy. Administrators' time spent on academic integrity labor is less visible because it is distributed, which in turn can make it even more vulnerable to reallocation when other, seemingly more pressing institutional needs inevitably arise.

Additionally, no two integrity jobs appear the same, with skills and qualifications necessary to succeed often not delineated in job descriptions. Some positions focus more on adjudication, others more on outreach. Still others proscribe the primary duty of post-violation training or counseling for students found responsible for breaching their institution's integrity policies. These counselor-administrators regularly must go above and beyond, as Sophie put it, "to get to know who [students] are." Jane articulated connecting with reported students as both a hidden need and a hidden specialty: "There's such a mental health aspect to the work I do. … [I feel] driven to find more solutions or remedies or support systems for the students on campus." Still other integrity professionals have a focus on policy

development, faculty training, or more student outreach. Ultimately, each administrator brings strengths and preferences to their labor that informs the culture of integrity at their respective institutions.

In part because of varying responsibilities and titles, administrators in this study found it difficult to identify who their institutional lateral colleagues were. When asked, Darryl states, "I don't have anyone else that works in academic integrity." This absence of obvious peers suggests the isolation and instability of integrity as a career, while highlighting the challenges administrators face when they need to seek collegial advice. Those who serve on honor boards have the benefit of being able to talk with fellow board members. Others might seek assistance from a Conduct office, a Registrar's office, or predecessors who at one time did some approximation of their jobs. Administrators we talked to expressed loneliness, lamenting how lateral colleagues felt all but nonexistent. Sophie says, "I don't really think I have any, to be honest, … not in this work."

While identifying lateral colleagues presents a challenge for integrity administrators, physically locating labor on campus introduces another. Figuring out where the work happens becomes problematic for administrators working in roles that require them to balance competing concerns over confidentiality and centrality. Fugazzotto (2009) examined differences between stated mission and embodied practice in higher education, noting how many institutions claim, for example, that teaching and learning centers are central to their missions, even when the physical location of such centers does not support this claim. Central locations, prominent buildings, and easy access all grant legitimacy and importance to a cause or to a profession. If the professionals in this study are any indication, academic integrity has yet to establish itself in this way.

Space constraints have important implications for academic integrity work on a number of levels. First, centrality (and by extension, recognition) is rarely afforded to integrity space. Labor is carried out in transitory spaces, places occupied by other functions, or in borrowed buildings strewn across campus. For instance, Esther shared that committee work rotated around three different campuses, and that "each campus would find a place for us to meet." Several other administrators reported meeting in their faculty offices, or in shared staff offices not solely dedicated to academic integrity work. Although her learning center was in the basement of a central building, Jane and her colleagues remained "very much tenants of the library," suggesting an out-of-the-way location and a place they did not fit. Darryl's office was likewise in a central location, relatively, but also "sort of at the end of the building and students don't happen down this way."

Second, any academic integrity office that boasts a central location in a student union or main building on campus must negotiate challenges with maintaining student confidentiality. Administrators in this study discuss an inability to always accommodate walk-in appointments when there is nowhere private to meet these students. Jane's office is in a main building on campus, for example, but the ceiling-less cubicles she shares with colleagues make private meetings and adjudication hearings impossible. Jane commented how these very open, public spaces could actually "inhibit the work we do."

Reflecting these variances in physical space, academic integrity labor also does not fit cleanly into traditionally recognized categories of academic and student affairs. However, this false binary (Stoller, 2021; Whitchurch, 2010) leaves integrity administrators without a space to claim. They fit into neither category perfectly and need to be adept in both academic and student affairs. Having a foot in each realm requires real dexterity, not to mention impressive diplomacy; the constant need to bridge across divisions and units can create challenges even for those used to successfully accomplishing this work.

Because integrity administrators straddle different responsibilities, the third space they occupy becomes distinct—a place that develops or grows into itself. This distinction is echoed in how several administrators admit their positions evolved differently from what they had initially envisioned. Despite campus leaders expecting her role to be more actively involved in case management, Sophie states that she coordinates "with the Conduct office, but like overseeing the adjudication of cases ... initially, they thought that I'd be doing that, and I'm not doing that ... it's just evolved." Similarly, Lois observed: "I do not believe they thought it was going to be such a full-time job." Each institution envisioned these roles differently, with campus needs ultimately dictating how the positions eventually developed. In Sophie's case, the academic affairs side became more prevalent; in Lois', the role centered on full-time adjudication, housed in academic affairs but focused on case management and post-violation training. The fact that institutional needs inform how integrity labor develops complicates administrators' perceptions of their own role within their institutions as well as their place within the larger field of academic integrity.

Well, the problem with quantifying the number of hours I put into [academic] honesty is that … there's certain periods of [the] semester where it's overwhelming … the hours are very unevenly distributed across the semester. The other thing is the sort of emotional energy it takes doesn't really count for hours, [but] that takes time, too. Just kind of dealing with this … personally.

— Matt

That's what the job really is, you know —"other duties as assigned."

— Lois

Even among this small sample, we see high variability in terms of how the academic integrity administrators qualify and quantify their labor. The mere idea of counting hours seemed borderline distasteful to some (Esther, Phil), whereas others seemed satisfied with a rough idea without digging deeper (Darryl, Lois). Still others (Caroline) talked at length about how they varied their methods of reporting time according to their audience. After about a year chairing his institution's honor board, Tomas (a full-time faculty member), stated that depending on the semester, he noticed spending double the time that he was told to expect when he took on the role. He also revealed that he has chosen to hide this time commitment from three successive departmental leaders, suggesting that personal commitment is what keeps him investing, rather than any incentives, rewards, or recognition his immediate peers or the institution provide.

Matt (also a full-time faculty member) likewise mentioned personal connection as an integral motivation for why he continues doing the work even though he lacks centralized structure or other supports at his institution. Despite referring to emotional exhaustion, he opined that for someone in his position, the "energy" involved in working with students to understand the moral and ethical impact of their choices "doesn't really count" in enumerating hours. Nevertheless, he finds it meaningful enough to devote a significant amount of time to academic integrity work in addition to his normal faculty responsibilities. Other administrators, like Darryl, seemed inspired by having freedom to flex time commitments and by finding opportunities to connect one-on-one with students.

In more specifically quantifying labor, delineating job responsibilities provides an additional challenge. Some administrators in this study lacked a formal list of duties outright, and nearly every administrator who had one said it captured what could be counted rather than what they ended up doing each day. Lois, in her role since 2006, realized her formal job description had not changed in 17 years and still included duties she never performed. Lois suspected that the fluid and dynamic nature of integrity work made her labor significantly harder to count than that of many peers across campus. Jane expressed a similar sentiment: "A lot of my job … lies beyond my scope of responsibilities." Overall, these professionals seem to feel such discrepancies render their labor less visible to colleagues and even to themselves.

Those administrators who were recently promoted, like Caroline, believed their job descriptions more or less adequately captured what they did, but even these professionals spoke to not consistently feeling in charge of their own time. Darryl and Phil found this to be curious, an oddity of the work, while Sophie and others found it to be a frustrating constraint. Sophie, who inaugurated the integrity role at her institution five years prior to our interview, initially thought she would help adjudicate cases; she never did. Instead, she now spends over 60% of a typical week doing post-violation counseling, which makes her less able to invest in developing policy or supporting campus advocacy and outreach—responsibilities she would very much like to undertake.

In addition to time, most of these administrators also spoke to never being in charge of their own projects. A partial divide emerged here along professional lines; most faculty reported feeling more entitled than administrators in staff roles to selectively allocate time to certain initiatives over others. Although for Matt (faculty), exercising this discretion did not totally assuage lingering guilt at the prospect of things left undone. Another partial divide took place in administrators for whom academic integrity was a primary responsibility (more than 50% of on-paper job duties) versus those whose job descriptions allocated half time or less to honesty work. Administrators with more time dedicated felt they had more flexibility to pick and choose truly meaningful tasks. Due to the weight of non-academic integrity (Title IX)[2] duties, for example, administrators like Caroline reported having less control, as did Jane and Sophie. To a surprising degree, overall lack of perceived autonomy affected nearly every integrity professional in this

---

[2] Title IX refers to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and "protects people from discrimination based on sex in education programs or activities that receive federal financial assistance": https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html

study, with most recognizing these dependencies as simply part of honesty work. None of them seemed to believe this was something that happened only, or even primarily, to them.

Such reported lack of autonomy translated into a related lack of agency. Describing how she had tried and failed to gain access to an email listserv that would have allowed her to send mass outreach messages to faculty at her college, and that she spent most of her budget on orientation materials, Sophie stated that she lacked "leverage to make change." Jane referenced starting to pick up only to put down longer-term projects; for her, the worst part was seeing what other schools had been able to accomplish, wishing she and her colleagues had capacity to do more. Caroline described these dropped initiatives as the kind of "programming [that] gets neglected because it's the thing that can get neglected." Acknowledging that barriers she faced (lack of time, personnel, and budget; campus politics) were not of her own making afforded Jane a patience and resignation that few other administrators expressed.

For her part, Caroline's ambitions involved getting her team members' professional plates closer to 75% than 100% full. She aimed to preserve their collective bandwidth, she said, so they could respond to unanticipated emergencies; COVID-19 was an obvious example, but Caroline said she could think of many more. She also discussed the distance from her current condition to that ideal state, observing how their daily reality often felt like a scramble: "There are times where I feel like both [academic integrity and Title IX] need all of my attention, and we just have to figure out how to make that work."

Most administrators in this study had given up outwardly expressing their desire to curtail the time they spent on certain duties over others. Those with leeway (whose roles were not co-dedicated to teaching, advising, or librarianship) reported embracing their niche of academic honesty and taking pride in hyper-specialization. Despite coming to the work largely by accident, most administrators said they enjoyed cultivating expertise in domains they knew their colleagues could not describe if they tried. Jane referred to the "never-have-you-evers" of integrity work, near-constant rewards and challenges of having to create, recreate, and adapt groundbreaking precedent on the fly. After four years, she spent so much time creating new rules in response to unforeseen situations that she had all but ceased to realize when she was doing it.

Likewise, Caroline struggled to adequately compare the scope of her work to that of her colleagues in student conduct or student affairs. Caroline felt sure the breadth and depth of their work differed, but doubted if others at her institution would see it that way. One of her most unique responsibilities is an honor council course Caroline teaches to student council members, where she invents and refines best practices as well as disseminates them. Additionally, Caroline notes that both her raw count of hours and the number of individual connections with students is higher than her colleagues in student affairs. She reports about one dishonesty case, for example, that "getting this case off the ground required 80 hours of work from me. That's two whole weeks before we could even begin [to] notify students." Furthermore, she has "at least five touch-points with a student who goes through the process" while colleagues in advising "might have five touch-points with a student over the course of their career."

This hyper-specialization Caroline and others developed rarely led to greater recognition from immediate colleagues or their institutions at large, nor provided them with optimism about professional growth. With palpable frustration, Sophie shared how she defended keeping the integrity portion of new student orientation on the schedule: "That's the tradition, like the only one tradition that we do that touches on [academic integrity]. Don't take it out. It literally takes two minutes." Caroline worried about the professional ceiling this hyper-specialization placed her under: "That kind of scares me to think about ... how long do people stay in this area? And then what happens? Where do people go from there? Where is there an opportunity for growth?" Although seemingly less concerned, administrators like Darryl still corroborated this lack of mobility when he said, "I don't know what [the] next step would be. I think a lot of my colleagues have been in their roles for some time."

All in all, the various ways these administrators make sense of labor reveal they are talented, passionate people who go above and beyond any formalized description of their roles. Most made clear that they have the desire and skills to do even more, but they also expressed hesitancy. They question if the goal of gaining greater recognition for their efforts is realistic and what personal or professional costs to pursuing recognition would entail. When, where, and how colleagues might further acknowledge their expertise and contributions to campus culture seemed uncertain, but any such recognition would help develop a growing field and add to its legitimacy.

BUILDING CREDIBILITY AND LONGEVITY

Not to be flippant, but my best qualification is: I volunteered for it.

— Phil

There is just such a sense that academic integrity has to be more prominent and more featured and more supported at our institution … I'm totally replaceable.

— Esther

As evidenced within this study, integrity administrators come to their work from diverse paths (education, law, library science, etc.), and undertake labor with wide-ranging job responsibilities. This variance can be an advantage in attracting talented individuals from many backgrounds and thereby enhancing the conception and fulfillment of academic integrity labor. It is a clear disadvantage, however, when it comes to integrity administrators establishing credibility on their campuses. Without universal expectations within or across institutions for what labor entails or how it should be done, integrity administrators step into their work with no predetermined authority. In the ongoing quest for recognition, success or failure seems to stem from the individual personality and efforts of each administrator.

In discussing how to generate buy-in for integrity work, Lois stated, "I was literally running around campus doing orientation meetings with departments…you know, 'selling' academic integrity...really hitting the pavement with me going door to door." Similarly, Jane mentioned how her supervisor would not anticipate how much time she spent "networking, picking up the phone and calling people and talking through a situation." She rationalizes what she acknowledges as an invisible time commitment:

> I go home at the end of the day and I'm like, "What did I accomplish today?" Because none of my boxes are checked. But I had a really good conversation with so-and-so, and down the road that's going to lead to something, or I know they're going to answer my email a little bit quicker next time.

The payoff for this level of effort is limited, however, if credibility becomes attached to the person rather than the work itself. If Lois or Jane leave their roles, replacements will have to begin the process of establishing recognition, respect, and credibility almost entirely anew.

The drawbacks of seeking credibility through individual efforts rather than the work itself appear in how volunteerism plays into integrity work, especially for professionals who carry out integrity labor peripherally to other roles. While a visiting assistant professor, Matt became an integrity administrator after he filed a case of suspected dishonesty in his own course. The Dean who read his sanctioning letter was so impressed, she asked him to apply for an Assistant Dean position to lead the Honesty Committee. When his faculty job became full time, Matt decided to keep that duty. Similarly, Tomas, a tenured professor and volunteer board member for seven years, was informed he was the "right person" for the work by the Dean and the outgoing board chair. Since he "believed in them," he accepted, despite vocal protests from colleagues in his home department who admonished, "Are you out of your mind? … Don't spend your time hearing silly undergraduate cases; you have bigger fish to fry." Additionally, Esther, library faculty who saw a "natural connection" between that work and integrity, finds herself in a niche position where she now spends upwards of 20% of her time on honesty work. This part of the job is something that no one asks, or seemingly expects, her to do.

A main tenet of credibility on college campuses is buy-in from senior administrators. Some integrity professionals in this study discuss a lack of support from vertical colleagues—the senior administrators above them. Often, their comments include the kind of laughter that belies resignation. In explaining how she learned to work with her Dean of Academic Affairs, Sophie says:

> I don't strongly believe that she'll do anything. This is years of us, not necessarily having a bad relationship. I just feel like she doesn't prioritize [integrity] and is ... managing other things, so [she] doesn't think to connect the dots at all. Multiple times during the pandemic, I reached out ... "Can we plug this? Can you share this?" ... different things I was doing. I got ... zilch.

Sophie, who also has not been invited to university-level discussions about proctoring software and lacks authority to even email faculty, reports feeling "locked down" by those above her. Tomas describes a similar impression: "One day I tried to talk to the President about academic integrity; she just brush[ed] me off. So, maybe it would be a good thing to have a little bit more buy-in from the administration."

Even if integrity professionals receive support from upper administrators, however, their credibility tends to rely on who holds power and how much that individual commits to academic integrity. Esther, who works at a community college and has involved herself with academic integrity issues for a number of years, discussed the recent appointment of a new Dean. Since he is "very committed to high academic standards for the students, [academic integrity] is important to him." As a result, Esther feels newly empowered to consider how her campus might become a "leader" in how integrity work "could be done." However, she also expressed insecurity; if the Dean ever left his role, that support might well vanish. Lois has "buy-in with the administration" and feels well-funded and appreciated, likely stemming from the fact she has the most longevity in her role (17 years) with duties that evolved to focus solely on academic integrity. Considering who might fill her position if she leaves, she worries about finding someone to "keep this pace going and keep the dedication and commitment."

Administrators in our study discussed the value of direct, often intense, work with students. In no case did this work help them establish credibility or recognition on their own campuses, let alone beyond. Caroline described how 80 hours of behind-the-scenes work to process one large case of honesty violations would have remained invisible to colleagues—until she took it upon herself to advocate for making it visible. Phil pointed out the confounding factor of confidentiality in integrity work, which prevented the institution from seeing or understanding the value of his direct work with students. He quipped, "I don't want to play James Bond here, but so much of it is secret." Likewise, Sophie reflected, "External partners and other people don't see the impact of [my] work. It's kind of invisible labor." As exhibited in past research on third space labor, invisibility perpetuates lack of understanding for the work itself and subsequent lack of value being allocated to it (Szekeres, 2004).

Establishing credibility in campus communities is further complicated for administrators by the fragmentation with which academic integrity gets handled. Often, professionals who oversee integrity do so for only part of their institution. Sophie is in charge of academic integrity for two of the 17 divisions at her university; Phil works out of his institution's College of Arts and Sciences, not the other six undergraduate schools; Tomas handles cases in the undergraduate and graduate college as well as in Engineering, but not professional schools or other graduate programs. Caroline describes integrity work at her university as "very siloed" and explains how distribution of work across undergraduate units comes to form "a very fragile ecosystem." Matt discusses how at his university, "there's different philosophies in different departments about what academic integrity is." Even at Jane's institution, which boasts a centralized policy, "each school has its own kind of culture around academic integrity," and each school also has its own integrity coordinator, leaving Jane to wonder, "Why are [faculty] going to listen to me?" She realizes: "They're going to look to people within their own school/college, [people] they report to, to be saying what I'm saying." This "silo" effect of not being "listened to" exemplifies the personal struggles of the administrators in this study to establish or extend the credibility of their roles and their labor. With time and effort they can achieve some credibility with certain individuals across isolated pockets of their institution; that hard-won credibility, however, often lacks breadth.

DISCUSSION & IMPLICATIONS

I could be putting in three times the amount of effort into academic honesty if I had more time to do it, but ... I have tenure and things to think about, so academic honesty becomes service and a course release, and it needs more than that. Yeah, it needs more than that.

— Matt

Like other types of third space work, academic integrity complicates the typical division of higher education labor into academic and non-academic domains (Whitchurch, 2008; Stoller, 2021). While integrity labor is not necessarily "devoted to the production and dissemination of 'legitimate' (i.e., disciplinary) knowledge" (Stoller, 2021, p. 44), it is certainly fundamental to that mission. Without integrity, it is hard to have confidence in how such knowledge gets produced and disseminated. Academic integrity labor finds itself in a peculiar "third space," requiring a "both/and also logic" (Soja, 2009, p. 50). Despite the contributions of individuals like Caroline in developing new knowledge, academic integrity is not yet an academic discipline unto itself. Nevertheless, as the professionals in this study make clear, academic integrity sits at the intersection of how higher education can and should function and remains a requirement of all academic disciplines. It is so central and fundamental to the work of higher education, that it is sometimes invisible and may be taken for granted (Bertram Gallant, 2022).

Whitchurch (2022) makes a distinction between professionals "working in the thirdspace" and "third space professionals," where the former group views their positionality with frustration and the latter views it with possibility. The administrators in this study clearly exhibit both mindsets. They express frustration stemming from less-than-clear definitions of their own labor, lack of institutional fit, and a continual struggle for recognition and respect. They also

show impressive individualized effort and flexibility in committing to this work regardless of these challenges. As an emerging professional community, the idiosyncratic nature and structure of integrity work makes for an uncertain future. Overall, participants expressed concern as to how the results of their labor would persist if they left their roles. In many cases, the outcomes and reputation of their work seem irrevocably tied to the person doing academic integrity labor, as opposed to the labor itself. This insecurity about replicability and sustainability shows the very real limitations of operating from the third space (Routledge, 1996).

Despite these limitations, the participants in this study exhibit a universal commitment to both the value of their labor and the critical role of academic integrity in higher education. Tomas voices this when he observes that he and his integrity colleagues have the job of "protecting the community." Even with varying titles and job descriptions, these professionals all strive to overcome barriers of operating from a third space positionality in order to accomplish this important work. In many ways, they see themselves as carrying the torch of academic integrity for their institutions, sometimes buoyed by little more than the optimism that others (faculty, students, and staff) will eventually follow its light.

To move academic integrity labor out of the shadows, academic integrity administrator must find ways to make their work more visible. One opportunity for this is currently unfolding. In November 2022, the launch of ChatGPT (a generative artificial intelligence tool that uses algorithms to predictively develop fluent responses to prompts) heightened concerns among educators about the ease with which students could commit academic dishonesty. Thus far, institutions have responded in a number of ways, from blocking chatbot access on university networks to deliberately seeking methods for incorporating generative AI into instruction. Higher education writ large recognizes the threat this kind of tool could pose to accurate assessment of students' abilities -- assessment that forms the bedrock of our university system. Protecting this accuracy is at the heart of the mission for those who do integrity work. Turning to integrity professionals for guidance, faculty and administrators alike have begun to acknowledge their expertise on an as-yet unprecedented level in U.S. higher education, thereby elevating integrity work into the national conversation. If we as integrity administrators can successfully meet this moment, our labor might become both more visible and more valued.

Another means of visibility for the field of academic integrity emphasizes intra- rather than inter-collegiate connections. Whereas lateral colleagues at an individual institution may be scarce, colleagues from other institutions abound. The International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) has established a national presence in this field with regional affiliates, to varying degrees, re-enforcing these connections. Darryl exemplifies this when he states, "I don't really sort of connect with anyone outside of [ICAI]. That stream has really been how I've learned to do my job." Since awareness of peers enhances legitimacy of integrity work to both honesty professionals and their senior administrators, strengthening ties to ICAI is warranted. Additionally, ICAI supports administrators' professional development and can stabilize their roles at their own institutions through engagement with other integrity professionals.

Because academic integrity and its underlying infrastructure is typically singular within an institution and correspondingly distinct across institutions, there is no clear path to promotion for administrators who seek to do this work long term. A number of professionals in this study (Jane and Sophie) have terminal degrees in education; others (Matt, Tomas, Darryl, Esther) have terminal degrees in other disciplines. Regardless, none could identify an upward path in integrity work. One recommendation that emerged from this study was a desire for more formal credentialing in academic honesty, yet another tool to enhance legitimacy. Caroline, who achieved certification in her overlapping role of Title IX Coordinator, wishes that academic integrity work would "establish itself in a way where you're, 'insert acronym' certified." Likewise, Esther imagines a nationally recognized six or 10-week "online academic integrity webinar," similar to another training she did where "you ended up with a certificate from it, and you had to produce work for it." Such credentialing can make on-the-job training available to more third space integrity professionals who, like many of the administrators in this study, find themselves establishing work priorities, patterns, and goals without much guidance. Credentialing would also enhance the visibility of academic integrity labor within and beyond any one institution.

Although this study provides a richly detailed portrait of academic integrity work, more research is needed to study integrity administrators' working lives in greater depth. One avenue for further exploration could be to expand the rough schema of administrators given in Table 1 into a typology that identifies and delineates: the people who do integrity work; the kinds of work they do (case management, adjudication, counseling, outreach, policy development); their positionality (role or reporting line, training, qualifications expected vs. accepted); their institutional supports (stand-alone or embedded office, number of dedicated positions, budgets); etc. This typology would not only benefit

academic integrity practitioners with more disciplinary knowledge, it would also grant legitimacy and value to the profession itself as worthy of research.

Writing centers, another third space domain, has begun such labor-mapping research through the National Census of Writing (NCW). Academic integrity could follow in the methodological footsteps of ethnographers like LaFrance and Nicolas (2012), who investigated writing center labor through a comparative lens of faculty versus staff roles. In academic integrity, as in writing center studies, juxtaposing these diverse perspectives creates further opportunities to clarify the standpoints, ruling relations, and problematics (Rankin, 2017; Smith, 2006) that underlie such complex, contested work. Eventually, further opportunities for advocacy and outreach may also emerge in both fields.

CONCLUSION

In the end, then, we are reaffirmed in our assertion that academic honesty work falls into the third space domain. We know academic integrity labor is complex and instantiates itself in many ways. Integrity professionals adjudicate cases of suspected dishonesty; they promote integrity through outreach and programming; they work one-on-one with students to remediate and move forward with honesty; they cajole faculty to uphold the value and follow the policies. The work is ever evolving. Unlike academic disciplines or more established specialties (e.g., advising, admissions, career counseling), academic integrity has no universal bullets in its job description. It depends on the priorities of the institution and those in charge, on the buy-in of others across the school, and most importantly on the individual talents and interests of those who land in these roles. In all these ways, it emphasizes the third space paradigm of possibility through uncertainty (Bhabha; 1990, Whitchurch; 2013, Routledge; 1996). While this study reinforces the tremendous variety of titles, structures, and job descriptions evident in academic integrity work, it also highlights the dedication of the special people who commit to this third space labor. Academic integrity administrators may come from diverse backgrounds and work in unique ways, but they share common allegiance to the values of academic integrity and a conviction that what they do is central to the mission of their schools and the future of higher education.

REFERENCES

Balcom, S., Doucet, S., & Dube, A. (2021). Observation and institutional ethnography: Helping us to see better. *Qualitative Health Research, 31*(8), 1534-1541. 10.1177/10497323211015966

Bertram Gallant, T. (2022). "It takes a village": The origins of the International Center for Academic Integrity. International Center for Academic Integrity. https://academicintegrity.org/images/conference/It_Takes_a_Village.pdf

Bertram Gallant, T. (Ed.). (2008). Academic integrity in the twenty-first century: A teaching and learning imperative. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *33*(5).

Bertram Gallant, T., & Drinan, P. (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *NASPA Journal*, *43*(4), 61–81. https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1723

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2012). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice* (Vol. I – The state of the system). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bhabha, H. (2004). *The location of culture.* Routledge.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

English, L. (2003). Identity, hybridity, and third space: Complicating the lives of international adult educators. *Convergence*, *36*(2), 67-80.

English, L. (2004). Third-space/identity montage and international adult educators. In P. Ninnes & S. Mehta (Eds.), *Re-imagining comparative education: Postfoundational ideas and applications for critical times* (pp. 225-240). Routledge.

Fugazzotto, S.J. (2009). Mission Statements, physical space, and strategy in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*, 285-298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-009-9118-z

Gray, S. (2015). Culture clash or ties that bind? What Australian academics think of professional staff. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *37*(5), 545– 557. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1079397

Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (2005). Reform of the social sciences and of universities through action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 43-64). Sage.

International Center for Academic Integrity. (2021). The fundamental values of academic integrity (3rd ed.). https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAI-Fundamental-Values_R12.pdf

Janke, E. M. (2019). Scholar-administrators as change agents. *Metropolitan Universities*, *30*(2), 109–122. https://doi.org/10.18060/23202

Keller, C. (2021). Mad and educated, primitive and loyal: Comments on the occupations of honors. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, *22*(1), 3-12. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A673180785/AONE?u=sunybuff_main&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=bc88b323

LaFrance, M. (2019). *Institutional ethnography: A theory of practice for writing studies researchers*. Utah State University Press.

LaFrance, M., & Nicolas, M. (2012). Institutional ethnography as materialist framework for writing program research and the faculty-staff work Standpoints Project. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(1), 130-150.

Lederman, D. (Host). (2022, April 7). Reprise: Combatting student cheating (No. 76). [Audio podcast episode]. In *The Key with Inside Higher Ed*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/audio/2022/04/07/ep76-reprise-combatting-student-cheating

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Murphy, G., & Mikanovich, T. (2023). Institutional ethnography and the loneliness of the multilingual WPA. In L. Graziano, K. Halasek, S. Miller-Cochran, F. Napolitano, & N. Szymanski (Eds.) (pp. 203-216). *Making administrative work visible: Data-driven advocacy for understanding the labor of writing program administration*. Utah State University Press.

National Census of Writing. *National Census of Writing.* https://writingcensus.ucsd.edu/.

Patton, M.Q. (1982). Qualitative methods and approaches: What are they? In E. Kuhns & S.V. Martorana (Eds.), *Qualitative methods for institutional research* (pp. 3-15). Jossey-Bass.

Rankin, J. (2017). Conducting analysis in institutional ethnography: Analytical work prior to commencing data collection. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917734484

Routledge, P. (1996). The third space as critical engagement. *Antipode*, *28*(4), 399-419. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.1996.tb00533.x

Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (pp. 207-21). Lawrence and Wishart.

Smith, D. E. (2006). *Institutional ethnography as practice.* Rowman & Littlefield.

Smith, P.J. (2020). The professionalization of honors education. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, *21*(1), 3-18.

Soja, E. W. (2009). Thirdspace: Toward a new consciousness of space and spatiality. In K. Ikas & G. Wagner (Eds.). (pp. 49-61). *Communicating in the third space*. Taylor & Francis.

Stoller, A. (2021). Honors as a third space occupation. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, *22*(1), 43-52. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A673180791/AONE?u=sunybuff_main&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=ae87490b

Szekeres, J. (2007). The invisible workers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(1), 7-22. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080042000182500

Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of *third space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly 62*(4), 377–396. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00387.x

Whitchurch, C. (2010). Some implications of "public/private" space for professional identities in higher education. *Higher Education*, *60*, 627-640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9320- z

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of 'third space' professionals.* Routledge.

Whitchurch, C. (2022, September 22). From 'working in third space' to 'third space professionals.' *Third Space Perspectives – Exploring Integrated Practice.* https://www.thirdspaceperspectives.com/blog/tothirdspaceprofessionals

Williams, T. (2022, April 26). Levels of cheating in online exams soaring, say invigilators. *Times Higher Education*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/levels-cheating-online-exams-soaring-say-invigilators

AUTHORS

Kelly H. Ahuna is the inaugural Director of the Office of Academic Integrity at the University at Buffalo. Prior to this role, she was faculty for 20 years, first running an undergraduate critical thinking program and later working with graduate teacher candidates on curriculum and instruction. Her overarching interest in student success and academic integrity has prompted her many national and international presentations on topics including remediation programs, Student Integrity Ambassador initiatives, investigating dishonesty cases with online vendors, and defining academic integrity labor. Her publications consist of numerous articles and a textbook titled *Methods of Inquiry: Applied Critical Thinking*.

Loretta Frankovitch serves as the Assistant Director of Academic Integrity at the University at Buffalo and leads the Northeast Regional Affiliate of the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI). Having taught English language and literature at various institutions, Loretta has moved into administration where she adjudicates academic integrity hearings. Her research interests include mission statements, academic integrity, and character. Her most recent publication is a case study in *Building Honor in Academics: Case Studies in Academic Integrity*.

Greer Murphy is Director of Academic Honesty, Policy and Education in the College of Arts, Sciences, and Engineering at the University of Rochester, where she also teaches courses in the first-year writing program. Her research interests include academic integrity and faculty development; multilingual writers, writing, and program administration; and policy process as it supports organizational development and change. Her work has appeared in the *Journal of College & Character* and in several edited collections. Outside the university setting, she practices Judo and teaches and holds second degree black belt rank in Kyokushin karate, a full contact fighting style of martial arts.