Advanced economies, but they also have profound implications for emerging markets. For example, many Chinese firms fell into the trap of overly relying on acquisitions when seeking to expand overseas, ignoring the difficulties associated with postmerger integration across cultures. As a consequence, many of these acquisitions failed. Perhaps a more viable strategy is what some Indian firms did—they first granted autonomy to the acquired overseas firms, gaining a better understanding of the local cultures and consumer preferences, and then engaged with more complete integration. Build, Borrow, or Buy: Solving the Growth Dilemma also sheds light on the interrelationship between growth choices and institutional dynamics. In the past, due to the weak intellectual property regime, markets for technologies were highly imperfect in China, so it was difficult to utilize contract or alliance strategy. However, as the institutional environment improves, the alliance strategy will likely gain more importance. Given such valuable implications, the book has extended its reach to a number of emerging economy countries, with translations into local languages (e.g., Chinese and Portuguese) available.

In sum, this book develops a holistic framework for firms’ various growth choices, which is highly valuable not only to scholars interested in this central first-order theoretical question in corporate strategy, but also to practitioners who are constantly faced with the strategic challenge of how best to grow their firm. As a result, I would strongly recommend Build, Borrow, or Buy: Solving the Growth Dilemma to academics and practitioners alike.
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Reviewed by Aditya Simha, University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.

Academic cheating appears to be very much the flavor of the season or perhaps, has remained the flavor of the season for numerous years now. From cheating scandals at Harvard University to cheating scandals in Chinese “Gaokao” exams to cheating scandals at the University of Sydney, it appears that issues related to cheating and academic dishonesty can be found in all corners of the globe. In this comprehensive book, Donald L. McCabe, Kenneth D. Butterfield, and Linda K. Trevino offer us a look at the importance of academic integrity and the antecedents of academic dishonesty in colleges. They also offer suggestions to educators and administrators that can help them deal with academic dishonesty.

The authors do an exceptional job of initially and immediately impressing upon the reader the importance of academic integrity. They emphatically state their case that academic integrity is an important problem for all members of the academic community. I personally found the following point, “today’s college students represent tomorrow’s leaders” (3) to be the one that most appealed to me. There’s a strong possibility that today’s disingenuous students may well end up being tomorrow’s leaders who cause ethical and legal scandals for their organizations or nations. That fact coupled with the widespread rise of academic dishonesty makes it imperative that educators and administrators take steps to tackle this issue.

While the main focus of the book is on college students, it does bring to attention to the fact that cheating habits themselves tend to develop prior to college. According to the book’s authors, many students appear to view high school as a stopgap place before they get into the college of their
choice. Some of these students are more than ready to cheat in high school to get into college, and once they do get in, they find themselves cheating again due to various influences. These influences include parental and family expectations to perform well in school, and attribution of blame to others, especially teachers. As the authors suggest throughout, cheating in college is a widespread phenomenon. That chapter entitled “Prevalence, Types, and Methods of Cheating” provides a fascinating and longitudinal overview of the various kinds of cheating. It appears that while the prevalence of cheating itself has remained consistently high throughout the past few decades, specific types of cheating have either declined or increased. For example, cut-and-paste plagiarism from the Internet has increased; whereas cheating on exams by copying from others on exams or tests has decreased. The prevalence of the Internet and plagiarism detection software may be guiding these shifts in trends. The authors believe that given the rapid technological changes and shifting student demographics, it is possible that in a decade or so, these trends will shift again.

McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino provide some interesting food for thought, in that they assert that the majority of research suggesting individual characteristics influence cheating is rather specious. Their first concern is that a majority of the “individual characteristics as influencer” research is atheoretical and does not utilize the extensive extant literature in theoretical domains such as attribution theory or social cognition theory. Second, they note that a significant amount of the extant research focuses on demographic variables like gender and age, and not stable psychological predispositions (e.g., cognitive moral development, Machiavellianism, and locus of control), which are less easily captured but would be better used as predictors. One more interesting trend noted by the authors is that female students (in some majors such as engineering) appear to have narrowed the gap with their male counterparts in cheating. The authors believe that this pattern can be attributed to the female students trying to play by “men’s rules” to be successful in that major, with engineering as a historically male-dominated field.

Another segment of the research on academic dishonesty and cheating is tied to contextual factors. The authors devote two whole chapters to this subject. One contextual factor they explore is the honor code. It appears that the number of schools with traditional honor code traditions has lessened over the decades. Some schools have introduced modified honor codes, but those are a bit different from traditional honor codes. A modified honor code eliminates the unproctored exams and student reporting systems that are integral in an honor code. In schools with traditional honor codes, an interesting phenomenon was reported by the authors wherein students resist having an obligation to report cases of observed cheating. It would appear that students are willing to be bound by an honor code, but are just not willing to follow through with reporting others for cases of observed cheating. The authors suggest that honor codes are effective only if students are well oriented into the tradition, and if the college campus administrators and faculty members actively exert effort to institutionalize the associated honor code programs and practices.

Other contextual influences include a campus culture of integrity, peer influence, and rewards-and-deterrence-based factors. The authors suggest that in the absence of a campuswide effort, individual faculty members can still impact academic integrity, albeit only by subtly maneuvering aspirational and control approaches. Aspirational approaches include messages of honor tied in with integrity; whereas control approaches involve the faculty emphasizing that they take academic integrity seriously. The authors reveal some startling figures—for instance, approximately 40% of U.S. faculty members have ignored a case of cheating in their courses. That figure is high, and indicates that many faculty members simply do not have the desire to escalate a cheating issue. I have personally not encountered any cheating that I am aware of in my courses, but this example did make me consider as to how I would respond were one to occur with one of my students. Other issues affecting faculty responses to cheating include the pressure that angry parents can exert on administrators, who then persuade the respective faculty member(s) to drop the issue. Another factor is that some faculty seem to feel that the sanctions for cheating on their campuses are either too harsh or too trivial—and neither situation seems to help in terms of obtaining appropriate faculty responses.

Although the main focus of the book is on undergraduate college students, the authors have included a section on graduate business and other professional major students (e.g., medicine, law). With the exception of law, all other professional major students report high levels of cheating. The authors speculate that even for law, perhaps it is
just a case of fear to self-report, as the stakes are so high for law students since the bar admission process is stringent and has harsh penalties for misdemeanors.

In laying out their practical advice for educators and administrators, the authors’ key suggestion appears to favor the creation of a culture of academic integrity. That culture consists of two components: formal systems and informal systems. Formal systems include values, policies, and codes; reward systems; and authority structures; whereas informal systems include informal norms, rituals, and role models or heroes. The authors provide some easy to follow tips on how faculty and administrators can go about trying to establish such a culture. The authors reiterate their support of honor codes, which are properly administered to help establish a culture of academic integrity. They do caution, however, that honor codes are not a panacea for all ills befalling college campuses.

I found this book to be a well written and comprehensive overview of issues related to academic dishonesty and cheating. McCabe, Butterfield, Trevino have shaped the book in such a way that I finished it feeling as if I had gained valuable insight and perspective into the scholarship of academic dishonesty. It was interesting to see how the research on this topic first originated, and what current evidence tells us. One thought that particularly intrigues me was that the authors mention their belief that the advent of Internet-based surveys may actually be reducing the level of self-reported instances of cheating. If that is indeed the case, then that is a serious cause for alarm. Further research should examine this issue. Another aspect of this book’s narrative that I found compelling was the expertise that the three authors brought with them to the book—there are numerous intertwined stories about the authors’ personal research interests and experiences, and it is interesting to read how those stories link to the research summarized within the contents of the book.

With respect to how Cheating in College will impact my behaviors, I will be using several suggestions offered by the authors in my classes to make sure that my students are aware of how serious academic integrity is. In terms of applicability to practitioners, I think the academic integrity culture that the authors mention toward the end of their book is one that could easily be modified and harnessed by a practitioner or a consultant to solve an issue in any organization—academic or otherwise. For those who are interested in exploring this domain and applying concepts beyond those recommended in the book, I have included a list of additional resources relevant to this topic area at the end of this review.

In summary, I think Cheating in College is a valuable read that allows educators of all disciplines to gain much-needed insight into the numerous complex issues related to student cheating. It also offers readers concrete and easy to follow tips on how to work to reduce the prevalence of cheating in their classrooms and campuses. I also believe that if we as educators devote time and energy into reducing cheating by our students, then we are creating a positive impact on society by attempting, to the best of our abilities, to impart students with the skills and motivations to go on to become ethical and positive leaders in their organizational careers.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND REFERENCES
https://ctaar.rutgers.edu/groups/workshops/wiki/84092/.


Reviewed by Jamie Lee Gloor, University of Zurich.

“Research is me-search.” One hears this often in academic contexts, a phrase implying that one chooses to study topics based on previous experience or personal relevance. One notable exception is bullying. Academics have been highly criticized as of late for studying issues related to bullying in
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