

A Study on the Implementation Status of the Academic-Integrity Control Mechanism in Chinese Universities Based on Policy Texts*

Wang Ying Zhang Mengjia

2026-07-24

ChinaRxiv

View the original and related papers at
<https://chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202607.00254>

Source: ChinaXiv. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

This study examines the implementation of ministerial academic integrity policies in Chinese universities, with the aim of improving the completeness and effectiveness of academic integrity policies in China's higher education institutions. Using literature research and online survey methods, the study first investigates academic integrity policies issued by Chinese ministries and commissions to identify academic integrity control mechanisms, including four key elements: prevention of academic misconduct, punishment of academic misconduct, academic integrity management, and academic integrity assurance. It then samples universities according to educational level, disciplinary type, and regional differences, investigates the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities, and further analyzes the reasons behind the findings. Overall, Chinese universities have implemented academic integrity control mechanisms effectively, but problems remain, such as monotonous forms of publicity and education and insufficiently reasonable evaluation systems. Accordingly, this study proposes recommendations for strengthening the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities in light of differences in educational level, disciplinary type, and region.

Full Text

[Professional Affairs · Management]

A Study on the Implementation Status of the Academic-Integrity Control Mechanism in Chinese Universities Based on Policy Texts*

Wang Ying Zhang Mengjia

School of History and Culture, Hubei University, Wuhan, 430062

Abstract This paper examines how Chinese universities implement ministerial academic-integrity policies, with a view to improving the completeness of the content of China's academic-integrity policies and the effectiveness of their implementation. Using literature research and online investigation, the study first investigates policies related to academic integrity issued by Chinese ministries and commissions in order to distill an academic-integrity control mechanism, comprising four key elements: prevention of academic misconduct, punishment of academic misconduct, academic-integrity management, and academic-integrity support. It then samples universities according to level of institution, disciplinary type, and regional differences, investigates the implementation status of academic-integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities, and further analyzes the causes. Overall, Chinese universities have implemented academic-integrity control mechanisms relatively well, but shortcomings remain, such as monotonous forms of publicity and education and insufficiently rational evalu-

ation systems. Accordingly, the paper proposes recommendations for strengthening universities' implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms in light of differences in institutional level, disciplinary type, and region.

[Keywords] academic-integrity control mechanism; academic-integrity policy; academic misconduct; implementation status

[Chinese Library Classification No.] G258.6 **[Document Code]**
A **[Article No.]** 1003-7845(2026)01-0045-11

[Citation Format] Wang Ying, Zhang Mengjia. A Study on the Implementation Status of the Academic-Integrity Control Mechanism in Chinese Universities Based on Policy Texts[J]. *Academic Library Work*, 2026(1):45-55.

Introduction

As the principal arena for scientific research activities, universities' level of academic integrity concerns not only the quality of academic research but also the public's trust in science. Therefore, a policy-driven academic-integrity control mechanism has become an important yardstick for regulating scientific research activities in universities. Strengthening the academic-integrity control mechanism in universities helps regulate research conduct and cultivate a responsible research culture. With the rapid development of technologies such as intelligent question-answering systems, academic misconduct such as plagiarism and misappropriation has become increasingly frequent. If academic misconduct in universities is not effectively curbed, it will directly affect the quality of talent cultivation. For a long time, China's ministries and commissions and its universities have attached great importance to the development of academic integrity. Although certain achievements have been made, academic misconduct still exists to varying degrees. As important actors in the field of scientific research[1], universities should strengthen the implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms and curb academic misconduct. In September 2020, the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council and the Ministry of Education issued the *Several Opinions on Further Strictly Regulating the Quality Management of Degree and Graduate Education*, further emphasizing universities' primary responsibility for rectifying unhealthy academic styles and curbing academic misconduct[2].

Focusing on academic integrity, research by domestic and international scholars has mainly concentrated on the following four areas. First is the analysis of related concepts and manifestations of academic integrity. Muthanna A et al.[3] explored the relationship between research ethics and research integrity; Zhou Jie[4] and Jiang Lai et al.[5] summarized the main manifestations of academic misconduct, including multiple submissions of the same manuscript, duplicate publication, honorary or undeserved authorship, ghostwriting, appropriation, plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, and improper use of research funds. Second are the causes of academic misconduct. Liu Ning et al.[6] argue that the organizational environment is a key factor influencing academic misconduct; Song

Lili[7] believes that it is caused by comprehensive social inducements and the absence of education or education reduced to a mere formality; Alan S et al.[8] found that lack of training and weak awareness of authorial responsibility are important inducements for researchers' academic misconduct. Third is the governance of academic integrity. Liu Xiaojuan et al.[9] proposed measures such as expanding the target groups of education, standardizing educational content, enriching educational methods, and clarifying completion requirements; Crean D et al.[10] argued that a rigorous, standardized evaluation system is needed to demonstrate the long-term effectiveness of academic-integrity education; Pizzolato D et al.[11] emphasized that although existing academic-integrity educational resources are considerable in quantity, there is an urgent need to develop educational tools that are more discipline-specific and pedagogically interactive. Fourth is the experience of developed countries in building academic integrity. Duan Chengyao[12] and Lu Yao[13] conducted in-depth studies of academic-integrity development in universities in the United States and the United Kingdom, respectively, providing multidimensional paradigms and useful reference for the development of academic integrity in Chinese universities. In sum, existing studies have provided theoretical support and practical guidance for the development of academic integrity in universities, but research on the academic-integrity control mechanism driven by policies of China's ministries and commissions, and on the implementation status of academic-integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities, still remains

* This article is one of the research outcomes of the 2023 Hubei University Graduate Education and Teaching Reform Research Project, "Research on Graduate Academic-Integrity Policies in China and Their Implementation."

Author Biographies: Wang Ying, Ph.D., associate professor, graduate supervisor; research interests: intellectual property in information resources, information policy and law. Zhang Mengjia, master's student; research interests: information policy and law; corresponding author, E-mail: zhang-mengjia965@163.com.

Date Received: 2025-09-25 **Responsible Editor:** Liu Yi

is lacking. This is not conducive to understanding how universities implement ministerial policies on academic integrity, identifying problems in policy implementation, and thereby may weaken the effectiveness of academic integrity development. Therefore, by investigating China's ministerial policies related to academic integrity, this paper extracts an academic integrity control mechanism and uses it as a measurement standard. It then conducts stratified sampling of universities nationwide by disciplinary category, institutional level, and regional differences to investigate the implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities. Finally, it proposes recommendations for strengthening the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities, with a view to effectively improving the level of academic

integrity in universities and promoting the sound development of the academic environment in higher education institutions.

1 China's Ministerial Academic Integrity Control Mechanism

Policies formulated by government departments can provide direction for the implementation of academic integrity in universities. On authoritative websites such as the Ministry of Education government portal, China Court, the National People's Congress of China, the National Database of Laws and Regulations, and the Chinese Government Website, this paper searched separately using subject terms such as "academic integrity," "research integrity," "academic ethics," "academic norms," and "academic misconduct," then read the results one by one, ultimately screening out 64 relevant policies and regulations.

In 2018, the General Office of the CPC Central Committee and the General Office of the State Council issued the *Several Opinions on Further Strengthening the Construction of Research Integrity*, which clarified the requirements for academic integrity development in the new era [14] and summarized an academic integrity control mechanism integrating prevention, punishment, management, and safeguards. The series of collected policies and regulations also basically cover these four aspects. Therefore, this paper takes the prevention of academic misconduct, punishment of academic misconduct, academic integrity management, and academic integrity safeguards as the four key elements of the academic integrity control mechanism. Through content analysis of 64 policy samples, these four key elements are further refined into nine core contents, which serve as survey indicators for the implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities.

1.1 Academic Misconduct Prevention Mechanism

1.1.1 Academic Integrity Education Mechanism Academic integrity education should integrate academic ethics education and training in academic norms throughout the entire process of graduate cultivation [15]. In 2011, the Ministry of Education's *Implementation Opinions on Earnestly Strengthening and Improving the Construction of Academic Atmosphere in Higher Education Institutions* stated that education should be upheld as the foundation for strengthening the construction of academic atmosphere and academic integrity [16]. In 2016, the Ministry of Education's *Measures for the Prevention and Handling of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education Institutions* further emphasized that universities should make academic integrity education a necessary component of teacher and student training and education, and should carry out education and training in multiple forms [17].

1.1.2 Publicity Mechanism for Academic Integrity Awareness and Behavior Publicizing academic integrity awareness and behavior—through creat-

ing an atmosphere, mobilizing emotions, and constructing cognition—provides value guidance for potential perpetrators of academic misconduct and is of paramount importance in preventing academic misconduct [18]. Universities need to publicize academic integrity extensively and deeply through multiple forms, so that it is internalized as conscious action by teachers and students [19], stimulates their intrinsic motivation to learn, and encourages them to abide by academic integrity.

1.2 Academic Misconduct Punishment Mechanism

1.2.1 Investigation Procedures for Academic Misconduct Effectively fulfilling investigative responsibilities is the basic guarantee for scientifically and reasonably punishing academic misconduct. Universities should improve systems for investigating and handling academic misconduct, accurately define academic misconduct, clarify investigation procedures and handling measures, correctly grasp policy boundaries, and at the same time respect the lawful rights and interests of the personnel concerned.

1.2.2 A “Zero-Tolerance” Punishment Mechanism Universities bear direct responsibility for investigating and handling academic misconduct within their own institutions. They should follow the principles of objectivity, fairness, and legality, formulate practical and feasible handling measures, and ensure that there are laws to rely on and rules to follow. In 2020, the *Several Opinions on Further Strictly Regulating the Quality Management of Degree and Graduate Education* emphasized that provisions such as the *Measures for Handling Dissertation Fraud* and the *Measures for the Prevention and Handling of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education Institutions* should be strictly implemented; that “zero tolerance” should be maintained toward academic misconduct; and that, once discovered, cases should be thoroughly investigated resolutely, in accordance with laws and regulations, swiftly and strictly, with measures such as withdrawing papers and revoking academic awards or honorary titles.

1.3 Academic Integrity Management Mechanism

1.3.1 Responsibility Allocation System Establishing a responsibility allocation system with clearly defined duties and efficient coordination is conducive to further subdividing and consolidating the principal responsibilities of the targets of academic integrity management, enabling them to form synergy in the process of academic integrity management. Through analysis of policy texts, responsibility for academic integrity in universities is mainly borne by students, teachers, academic committees, and other bodies (see Figure 1). Among them, students must abide by academic norms; teachers must lead by example and conduct preliminary reviews of the independent completion of degree theses; and relevant bodies such as academic committees must conscientiously fulfill their responsibilities for academic integrity development and strengthen whole-process management of degree theses. In the academic integrity management

mechanism, universities bear overall responsibility: they must clarify the responsibilities and rights of students and teachers, and also clearly stipulate the academic integrity work tasks, responsibilities, and authority of academic committees.

1.3.2 Classified Academic Evaluation Mechanism China's ministerial policies clearly propose upholding classified evaluation, emphasizing an orientation toward morality, capability, and performance, and focusing on the quality, contribution, and influence of landmark achievements. An unreasonable evaluation system may induce relevant personnel to take risks, resulting in behavior that seeks quick success and instant benefits or even falsification. For example, a simply quantified evaluation system may lead researchers to avoid highly challenging topics and instead choose research content that is more likely to yield results [20].

1.3.3 Academic Achievement Management System Academic achievement management mainly involves ensuring the authenticity of academic achievements and the completeness of research archives. On the one hand, universities should establish academic achievement management systems concerning the inspection and reporting of academic achievements, the public disclosure of academic achievements, and the retention of author signatures for paper submissions. On the other hand, they should standardize the management of talent cultivation archives; improve systems for collecting, organizing, and archiving original records such as admissions, cultivation, and degree conferral; and ensure the retention of archival materials.

should be comprehensive, timely, truthful, and complete, thereby promoting openness and transparency in scholarship.

- Abide by academic norms
- Resist academic misconduct

Text in Figure 1

- **Students**
- **Universities**
- **Teachers**
- **Institutions**

Relationships and responsibilities shown in the figure:

- Universities → Students: formulate academic norms; clarify students' primary responsibility.
- Universities → Teachers: formulate academic norms for teachers; establish a responsibility mechanism featuring supervisor-team guidance and collective review.

- Universities → Institutions: formulate the charter of the academic committee; clarify its tasks, responsibilities, and authority.
- Teachers Institutions: cooperate in investigations; ensure teachers' academic integrity and mobilize supervisors' enthusiasm for educating students.
- Teachers Students: conscientiously cultivate students; [[unclear: diagonal label between teachers and students]].
- Students Institutions: promptly control and handle misconduct; cooperate in investigations and actively participate in activities.
- Teachers:
 - As the first person responsible for graduate-student training, teachers themselves should take the lead in setting an example.
 - Conduct preliminary review of degree theses.
- Institutions:
 - Academic committees and other relevant bodies should conscientiously perform their duties in building academic integrity.
 - Strengthen whole-process management of degree theses.

Figure 1. Responsibility allocation system for academic integrity in universities

1.4 Academic Integrity Safeguard Mechanisms

1.4.1 Policy Safeguard Mechanism Universities and other relevant departments must implement the guidance of national policies for the development of academic integrity. All personnel should study the essentials of these policies in depth and understand their underlying rationale, so as to ensure the smooth operation of the academic integrity control mechanism. At the same time, they should actively respond to national policies, establish corresponding working bodies and mechanisms within their own institutions, align with policy requirements, and create a credible and reliable academic environment.

1.4.2 Supervision Safeguard Mechanism Internal supervision within universities is of great significance for achieving self-regulation and management, but external supervision is also indispensable. Universities should ensure unimpeded reporting channels, establish special columns on academic conduct on their official websites, and publish information related to academic integrity, such as annual reports on the development of academic conduct and the results of investigations and handling of academic misconduct. The Ministry of Education will also, on the basis of the “Information Filing Platform for Handling Degree-Thesis Fraud” and relevant dynamic monitoring data, conduct special supervision of degree-granting institutions [21].

2 Research Design

2.1 Research Approach

To investigate how Chinese universities implement the academic integrity control mechanisms issued by ministries and commissions, this study proceeds as follows. First, it adopts a method combining disproportionate stratified sampling and multistage random sampling, so as to effectively control sampling error while ensuring that samples from different types of universities are representative in terms of school-running level, disciplinary type, and region. Second, it takes the academic integrity control mechanisms issued by Chinese ministries and commissions as the first-level and second-level indicators of the research framework. In combination with the specific policy requirements and the implementation performance of academic integrity policies in Chinese universities, these are further refined into third-level indicators. The implementation status of each university is then investigated, and the implementation rate of each indicator is calculated, so as to facilitate subsequent analysis of overall implementation. Third, differences in the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms are compared among sample universities of different school-running levels, disciplinary types, and regions. Finally, based on the analysis results, recommendations are proposed for strengthening the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities.

2.2 Research Indicators

The research indicators constructed in this paper follow the logic of “policy text—implementation mechanism—specific implementation performance.” First, the academic integrity control mechanisms issued by Chinese ministries and commissions are taken as the first-level and second-level indicators of the research framework, in order to systematically understand implementation in universities. Next, through university official websites, information-disclosure websites, university research-administration offices, and other websites, the study searches for information such as curriculum settings, rules and systems, management documents, academic integrity activities, and publicized cases. Finally, according to the actual circumstances of each university, the second-level indicators are refined into third-level indicators, thereby forming the final research indicators for the implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities (see Table 1).

Table 1. Research indicators for the implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities

First-level indicator	Second-level indicator	Third-level indicator
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Academic integrity education mechanism	Whether academic integrity education is incorporated into compulsory-course content and training content for teaching and research personnel (A1)
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	Whether academic integrity-related lectures are held (A2)
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	Whether education and publicity are carried out in multiple forms (≥ 3 forms) (A3)

Table 1 (continued)

First-level indicator	Second-level indicator	Third-level indicator
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedures for investigating academic misconduct	Whether academic misconduct is clearly defined in relevant documents (B1)
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedures for investigating academic misconduct	Whether procedures for investigating academic misconduct are clearly specified (B2)
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedures for investigating academic misconduct	Whether academic misconduct checks are conducted (B3)
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	“Zero-tolerance” punishment mechanism	Whether measures for handling academic misconduct have been formulated (B4)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility-allocation system	Whether student academic norms have been formulated (C1)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility-allocation system	Whether academic integrity regulations have been formulated specifically for teachers (C2)

First-level indicator	Second-level indicator	Third-level indicator
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility-allocation system	Whether specialized management bodies such as academic committees have been established (C3)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic classified-evaluation mechanism	Whether an evaluation system has been established (C4)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic classified-evaluation mechanism	Whether classified evaluation is implemented (C5)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic-achievement management system	Whether the management of talent-training archives is standardized (C6)
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic-achievement management system	Whether relevant academic achievements are inspected regularly (C7)
Academic integrity support mechanism	Policy support mechanism	Whether ministry-level policies are used to guide the development of academic integrity (D1)
Academic integrity support mechanism	Supervision support mechanism	Whether reporting channels are unobstructed (D2)
Academic integrity support mechanism	Supervision support mechanism	Whether information related to academic integrity is disclosed (D3)

2.3 Research Sample

This paper takes the 982 universities included in the Ranking of Chinese Universities by ShanghaiRanking as the overall sample. University sampling was conducted from the perspectives of level of schooling, disciplinary type, and regional factors. First, the overall sample was divided by disciplinary type into 11 domains: comprehensive, science and engineering, teacher education, political science and law, medicine, finance and economics, agriculture, ethnic studies, physical education, language, and forestry. Disproportionate stratified sampling was conducted independently for each of the 11 domains; in this step, categories with relatively small numbers of universities, such as political science and law and finance and economics, were excluded. Second, sampling in each

domain was carried out in two stages. In the first stage, taking regional factors as the perspective, the eastern, central, western, and northeastern regions were used as sampling units, and disproportionate stratified sampling was applied. In the second stage, taking level of schooling as the perspective, key universities (985, 211, and “Double First-Class”), regular undergraduate universities, and private universities were sampled within each selected sample unit using disproportionate stratified sampling, yielding 195 sample institutions. Third, an interval random sampling method was used to obtain the final 99 sample universities. Among them, there were 17 key universities, 69 regular undergraduate universities, and 13 private universities; 36 comprehensive institutions, 46 science-and-engineering institutions, 11 teacher-education institutions, and 6 medical institutions; and 40 institutions in the eastern region, 23 in the central region, 23 in the western region, and 13 in the northeastern region.

After determining the sample universities, the author investigated the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities from October to December 2023. Some of the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in selected sample universities

First-level category	Second-level category	Third-level category	Wuhan University of Science and Technology (undergraduate)					Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (private comprehensive / western region)	
			Tsinghua University (key / comprehensive / eastern region)	Chongqing Normal University (undergraduate / science and engineering / central region)	Liaoning Normal University (undergraduate / graduate / comprehensive / north-eastern region)	Chongqing Normal University (undergraduate / graduate / comprehensive / north-eastern region)	Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (private comprehensive / western region)		
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Academic integrity education mechanism	A1	√	√	√	√	-		

First-level category	Second-level category	Third-level category	Tsinghua University (key / comprehensive / eastern region)					Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (graduate / comprehensive / western region)	
			Wuhan University of Science and Technology (undergraduate / science and engineering / central region)					Liaoning Normal University (undergraduate / education / north-eastern region)	
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	A2	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	A3	√	×	√	×	×	×	×

First-level category	Second-level category	Third-level category	Wuhan University of Science and Technology (undergraduate)					Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (graduate / comprehensive / west-ern region)	
			Tsinghua University (key / comprehensive / eastern region)	/ science and engineering / central region)	Chongqing Normal University (undergraduate / medicine / west-ern region)	Liaoning Normal University (undergraduate / education / north-eastern region)			
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedure B1 for investigating academic misconduct	B1	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedure B2 for investigating academic misconduct	B2	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Procedure B3 for investigating academic misconduct	B3	√	√	√	√	√	√	

First-level category	Second-level category	Third-level category	Tsinghua University(key / comprehensive / eastern region)	Wuhan University of Science and Technology(undergraduate / science and engineering / central region)	Chongqing Normal University(undergraduate / medicine / west-ern region)	Liaoning Normal University(undergraduate / education / north-eastern region)	Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology(graduate / comprehensive / west-ern region)
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	“Zero-tolerance” punishment mechanism	B4	√	√	√	√	√

Table 2 (continued)

Primary category	Secondary category	Tertiary category	Tsinghua University (key/compulsive region)	Wuhan University of Science and Technology (undergraduate/graduate/engineering and architecture)	Chongqing Medical University (undergraduate/graduate/medicine)	Liaoning Normal University (undergraduate/graduate)	Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (private/for-profit)	Comprehensive/western
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	111	√	√	√	√	×	
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	112	√	√	√	√	√	
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	113	√	√	√	√	√	

Primary category	Secondary category	Tertiary category	Tsinghua University (key/competitive region)	Wuhan University of Science and Technology (undergraduate/science and engineering)	Chongqing Medical University (undergraduate/medicine)	Liaoning Normal University (undergraduate)	Xi' an Mingde Institute of Technology (private)	Comprehensive/western
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic classification evaluation mechanism	C4	√	√	√	√	√	
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic achievement management system	C5	√	—	—	—	—	
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic achievement management system	C6	√	—	—	—	—	

Primary cate- gory	Secondary cate- gory	Tertiary cate- gory	Tsinghua Univer- sity (key/comp region)	Wuhan Univer- sity of Science and Tech- nology (under- gradu- ate/science and en- gineer- ing/under- graduate region)	Chongqing Medi- cal Univer- sity (under- gradu- ate/under- graduate region)	Liaoning Normal Univer- sity (under- gradu- ate/under- graduate region)	Xi' an Mingde Insti- tute of Tech- nology (pri- vate/under- graduate region)	Comprehensive/ western
Academic in- tegrity man- age- ment mecha- nism	Academic achievement man- age- ment system	C7	√	—	√	—	—	
Academic in- tegrity safe- guard mecha- nism	Policy safe- guard mecha- nism	D1	√	×	√	√	√	
Academic in- tegrity safe- guard mecha- nism	Supervision safe- guard mecha- nism	D2	√	√	√	√	√	
Academic in- tegrity safe- guard mecha- nism	Supervision safe- guard mecha- nism	D3	√	√	√	√	√	

Note: “√” indicates that the indicator was implemented; “—” indicates that no relevant content was found; “×” indicates that the indicator was not implemented.

3 Analysis of the Implementation Status of Academic Integrity Control Mechanisms in Chinese Universities

3.1 Analysis of Overall Implementation Status

3.1.1 Overall Status of Academic Integrity Control Mechanisms To gain a more intuitive understanding of the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities, this paper quantifies them. If the value assigned to each tertiary indicator at full score is set to 1, the following formula is obtained:

$$S = 1 \times \sum_{i=1}^n (k_i/N) \quad (1)$$

where S is the implementation score of the primary indicator, n is the number of tertiary indicators corresponding to that primary indicator, k_i is the number of universities implementing the i -th corresponding tertiary indicator, and N is the total number of universities included in the statistics.

$$R = \left(S / \sum_{i=1}^n F_i \right) \times 100\% \quad (2)$$

where R is the implementation rate of the primary indicator, and F_i is the full score of the i -th corresponding tertiary indicator.

Taking the implementation rate of the academic misconduct prevention mechanism as an example, the calculation method is as follows: the proportions of universities implementing A1, A2, and A3 to the total number of universities are 75.76%, 100%, and 15.15%, respectively. Substituting these into Equation (1), the total score of the academic misconduct prevention mechanism is $1 \times (75.76\% + 100\% + 15.15\%) = 1.9091$. Substituting this into Equation (2), the implementation rate of the academic misconduct prevention mechanism is $[1.9091/(1+1+1)] \times 100\% = 63.64\%$. By the same method, the implementation status shown in Table 3 is obtained.

According to Table 3, the overall implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities is relatively good. Specifically: first, universities have the highest implementation rate for the academic misconduct punishment mechanism (74.50%), reflecting their firm attitude of “zero tolerance” toward academic misconduct. Second, universities’ academic integrity safeguard mechanisms also perform well (71.72%), though policy safeguards still need improvement. Third, regarding the academic misconduct prevention mechanism,

universities have achieved good results in education and publicity, but still need to explore more diversified forms of publicity. Fourth, in terms of the academic integrity management mechanism, university implementation is unsatisfactory (44.44%), mainly because implementation in areas such as academic classification evaluation systems and academic achievement management systems is not ideal.

Table 3 Implementation of Academic Integrity Control Mechanisms in Chinese Universities

Primary indicator	Secondary indicator	Tertiary indicator	Universities implementing the corresponding tertiary indicator / institution	Tertiary-indicator implementation rate / %	Primary-indicator implementation rate / %
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Academic integrity education mechanism	A1	75	75.76	63.64
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	A2	99	100.00	63.64
Academic misconduct prevention mechanism	Publicity mechanism for academic integrity awareness and behavior	A3	15	15.15	63.64

Primary indicator	Secondary indicator	Tertiary indicator	Universities implementing the corresponding tertiary indicator / institution	Tertiary-indicator implementation rate / %	Primary-indicator implementation rate / %
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Investigation procedure for academic misconduct	B1	75	75.76	74.50
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	Investigation procedure for academic misconduct	B2	72	72.73	74.50
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	“Zero-tolerance” punishment mechanism	B3	82	82.83	74.50
Academic misconduct punishment mechanism	“Zero-tolerance” punishment mechanism	B4	66	66.67	74.50

Table 3 (continued)

Primary indicator	Secondary indicator	Tertiary indicator	Universities implementing the corresponding tertiary indicator / institutions	Tertiary-indicator implementation rate / %	Primary-indicator implementation rate / %
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	C1	69	69.70	44.44
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	C2	21	21.21	44.44
Academic integrity management mechanism	Responsibility allocation system	C3	89	89.90	44.44
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic classification and evaluation mechanism	C4	84	84.85	44.44
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic classification and evaluation mechanism	C5	12	12.12	44.44
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic-achievement management system	C6	12	12.12	44.44

Primary indicator	Secondary indicator	Tertiary indicator	Universities implementing the corresponding tertiary indicator / institutions	Tertiary-indicator implementation rate / %	Primary-indicator implementation rate / %
Academic integrity management mechanism	Academic-achievement management system	C7	21	21.21	44.44
Academic integrity assurance mechanism	Policy assurance mechanism	D1	39	39.39	71.72
Academic integrity assurance mechanism	Supervisory assurance mechanism	D2	88	88.89	71.72
Academic integrity assurance mechanism	Supervisory assurance mechanism	D3	86	86.87	71.72

3.1.2 Implementation status of the academic misconduct prevention mechanism

The implementation of academic misconduct prevention mechanisms in universities is generally good. Every university holds lectures related to academic integrity (A2), with an implementation rate as high as 100%; meanwhile, 75.76% of universities incorporate academic integrity into required-course content and into training for teaching and research personnel (A1). However, the forms of academic integrity publicity and education in universities are not sufficiently diverse: most are lectures, and only 15.15% of universities carry out educational publicity in three or more forms (A3). This shows that the implementing bodies of education have not formed a joint force^[22]. In addition, university official websites lack publicity on academic integrity. Only 19.19% of universities have

set up a column on the construction of academic ethos, and the displayed content is monotonous, leaving teachers and students without a sustained channel for receiving academic integrity education.

3.1.3 Implementation status of the academic misconduct punishment mechanism

To minimize the occurrence of academic misconduct, 82.83% of universities explicitly require academic misconduct screening (B3), and 75.76% clearly define academic misconduct in relevant documents (B1). However, although policy documents serve as an important basis for regulating academic misconduct and implementing punishment for academic misconduct, only 66.67% of universities have specially formulated measures for handling academic misconduct (B4). Some universities directly cite or copy academic integrity policies issued by national ministries and commissions, or mention measures for punishing academic misconduct in regulations on student disciplinary sanctions. In the face of increasingly diverse academic misconduct problems, if universities do not take into account the characteristics of the disciplines within their own institutions and localize the academic misconduct punishment mechanisms of national ministries and commissions, this will not only make investigation procedures for academic misconduct insufficiently standardized (B2), but also reduce the effectiveness of the academic misconduct punishment mechanism.

3.1.4 Implementation status of the academic integrity management mechanism

Improving management systems is the top priority for universities in implementing academic integrity management mechanisms. A total of 89.90% of universities have established specialized management bodies such as academic committees (C3), responsible for the formulation and implementation of academic integrity management systems. However, shortcomings remain in the following respects. First, in terms of academic norms, only 69.70% of universities have formulated student academic norms (C1), and there is a lack of management systems for teachers and researchers. A reading of student academic norms shows that most universities mention applying the same academic integrity management requirements to teachers as to students, while 21.21% of universities have specially formulated academic integrity regulations for teachers (C2), such as the *Code of Academic Ethics for Teachers of Hohai University (Trial)*. Second, in terms of evaluation systems, 84.85% of universities have established evaluation systems (C4), but lack scientific classified evaluation systems (C5). Third, with respect to standardizing the management of talent-training archives (C6) and regularly inspecting relevant academic achievements (C7), universities have failed to systematically safeguard the security of research data and academic achievements.

3.1.5 Implementation status of the academic integrity assurance mechanism

In terms of opening reporting channels (D2) and publishing information related to academic integrity (D3), most universities actively accept public supervision, and the implementation of the supervisory assurance mechanism is good. However, only 39.39% of universities use policies of national ministries and commissions to guide the construction of academic integrity (D1). Most universities have failed to integrate and release policy resources and lack systematic guidance for academic integrity construction. Insufficient policy assurance will lead to inadequate timeliness and accuracy in universities' implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms; the lack of a macro-level policy basis will also affect the authority of university regulatory systems.

3.2 Analysis of implementation status by different levels of institution

Table 4 presents the implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities across different institutional levels, disciplinary types, and regions. The degree of implementation of university academic integrity control mechanisms is often positively correlated with institutional level, and the influencing factors involve multiple aspects, including resource allocation, academic atmosphere, and historical factors.

Table 4. Implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms in universities by institutional level, discipline type, and region

Prevention mechanism for academic misconduct	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Key universities	Regular undergraduate	Private universities	Science and Teacher Education		Medicine and pharmacy	Eastern region	Central region	Western region	Northeastern region
					Engineering		Education						
88.24	78.26	38.46	75.00	67.39	90.91	100.00	87.50	82.61	47.83	69.23			

Primary in- di- ca- tor	Secondary in- di- ca- tor	Tertiary in- di- ca- tor	Key uni- ver- si- ties	Regular un- der- grad- u- ate in- sti- tu- tions	Private uni- ver- si- ties	Science and en- gi- neer- ing	Teacher ed- u- ca- tion	Medicine and phar- macy	Eastern re- gion	Central re- gion	Western re- gion	Northeastern re- gion	
Prevention mech- a- nism for aca- demic demo- cracy mis- con- duct and be- hav- ior	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00	Public 100.00
Prevention mech- a- nism for aca- demic demo- cracy mis- con- duct and be- hav- ior	Public 47.06	Public 10.10	Public 0.00	Public 30.56	Public 4.35	Public 0.00	Public 33.33	Public 20.00	Public 13.04	Public 17.39	Public 0.00	Public 0.00	Public 0.00

chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202607.00254 Machine Translation

Primary in- di- ca- tor	Secondary in- di- ca- tor	Tertiary in- di- ca- tor	Key uni- ver- si- ties	Regular	Private	Science and Teacher en- gi- neer- ing	Medicine and phar- macy	Eastern re- gion	Central re- gion	Western re- gion	Northeastern re- gion		
				un- der- grad- u- ate in- sti- tu- tions									
Punishment mech- a- nism for aca- demic mis- con- duct	B4 “Zero- tolerance” pun- ish- ment mech- a- nism		76.47	68.12	46.15	69.44	58.70	72.73	100.00	72.50	78.26	52.17	53.85
Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	76.47	72.46	46.15	80.56	52.17	90.91	100.00	80.00	69.57	60.87	53.85
Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	41.18	18.84	7.69	19.44	23.91	18.18	16.67	22.50	30.43	21.74	0.00
Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	Academic integrity man-sys- age- ment mech- a- nism	94.12	94.20	61.54	91.67	84.78	100.00	100.00	95.00	91.30	82.61	84.62

chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202607.00254 Machine Translation

			Regular un-der-grad-u-										Science and Teacher			
Primary in-di-ca-tor	Secondary in-di-ca-tor	Tertiary in-di-ca-tor	Key uni-ver-si-ties	ate in-sti-tu-tions	Private uni-ver-si-ties	Compre-hen-sive	en-gi-neer-ing	ed-u-ca-tion	Medicine and phar-macy	Eastern re-gion	Central re-gion	Western re-gion	Northeastern re-gion			
Academic integrity sup-port mech-a-nism	Policy D1		58.82	43.48	15.38	50.00	30.43	63.64	50.00	45.00	39.13	52.17	23.08			
Academic integrity sup-port mech-a-nism	Superior D2		88.24	91.30	76.92	91.67	82.61	100.00	100.00	95.00	95.65	73.91	84.62			
Academic integrity sup-port mech-a-nism	Superior D3		94.12	88.41	69.23	94.44	78.26	90.91	100.00	90.00	95.65	78.26	76.92			

3.2.1 Implementation in key universities is standardized and comprehensive

The overall implementation in key universities is relatively satisfactory. In particular, they show clear advantages in forms of educational publicity (A3), regulations on teachers' academic integrity (C2), and classified academic-evaluation systems (C5). In addition, some key universities have added substantive provisions to their measures for handling academic misconduct. For example, the *Measures of Peking University for the Prevention and Handling of Academic Misconduct (Trial)* (2020) define the objects of academic-misconduct management as teaching and research personnel, administrative personnel, and students, and state that the abuse of academic resources and the use of academic influence to interfere with academic activities should also be regarded as academic

misconduct. Detailed institutional arrangements provide a solid guarantee for efficient implementation. The advantages of key universities lie in their richer resources, such as funding and facilities, as well as their concentration of first-rate faculty and outstanding student groups, which create a stronger academic atmosphere. At the same time, their relatively high social reputation and influence also prompt them to adopt stricter academic-integrity control mechanisms.

3.2.2 Implementation in regular universities remains to be improved

In regular universities, implementation in such areas as establishing academic committees (C3), setting up evaluation systems (C4), and ensuring smooth reporting channels (D2) is comparable to that of key universities. Overall, however, the four mechanisms—prevention, punishment, management, and support—all show shortcomings in the implementation process, such as monotonous forms of educational publicity (A3), inadequate measures for handling academic misconduct (B4), insufficiently reasonable classified evaluation systems (C5), and policy support that needs strengthening (D1).

3.2.3 Implementation in private universities is highly polarized

The implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms in private universities shows a highly polarized pattern. A small number of private universities perform well, but implementation in most private universities is not optimistic. In particular, the implementation of prevention mechanisms and management mechanisms is clearly insufficient—for example, publicity and education are monotonous (A3), classified evaluation systems are absent (C5), and the management of talent-training archives is not standardized (C6). This may be related to the history of the institutions and their internal systems and mechanisms^[23], thereby seriously affecting the progress of their academic-integrity development.

3.3 Analysis of implementation by discipline type

The implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms in universities is associated to some extent with discipline type. Judging from the implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms across different discipline types (Table 4), the research paradigms and knowledge

systems and other aspects, resulting in differences among universities of different disciplinary types in student training objectives, curriculum design, and related areas; this may affect the implementation practice of academic integrity control mechanisms.

3.3.1 Medical and pharmaceutical universities show clear advantages in implementation

The academic integrity control mechanisms of medical and pharmaceutical universities outperform the other three types of universities across multiple dimensions. In particular, the implementation rate for every indicator of the mechanism for punishing academic misconduct reached 100%; however, the management of talent-training archives is not sufficiently standardized (C6), indicating an obvious shortcoming. The medical field itself is subject to strict ethical and regulatory requirements, such as clinical trial standards and physicians' professional ethics. These norms all put forward explicit requirements for academic integrity, prompting medical and pharmaceutical universities to emphasize rigor in education and research and thereby form a sound atmosphere of academic integrity.

3.3.2 Implementation in normal universities is uneven

Normal universities are markedly superior to other types of universities in terms of policy safeguards (D1). However, possibly because their disciplines are concentrated in teacher education, such universities pay relatively insufficient attention to the classified evaluation mechanism for academic work (C5). Their approaches to educational publicity are also relatively unitary (A3), and schools' education and publicity efforts regarding academic integrity are insufficient[24]. Normal universities train future teachers and therefore ought to place greater emphasis on education and publicity concerning academic integrity.

3.3.3 Implementation in comprehensive universities is relatively average

The implementation status of comprehensive universities is generally at an average level. Among them, classified evaluation (C5) and standardized management of talent-training archives (C6) perform relatively well. Because the disciplines of comprehensive universities are relatively balanced, such institutions tend to attach importance to classified evaluation in order to promote academic fairness. However, their supervisory safeguards are relatively inadequate; some universities have not been able to effectively open up reporting channels (D2). Objectively, this increases the difficulty of reporting and supervising research misconduct and also encourages academic misconduct in universities[25].

3.3.4 Implementation in science and engineering universities is generally weak

The implementation status of science and engineering universities is not satisfactory overall. Apart from a relatively high implementation rate for formulating academic integrity-related regulations for teachers (C2), further improvements are needed in the punishment of academic misconduct, academic integrity management, and academic integrity safeguard mechanisms, such as the preserva-

tion and inspection of experimental data and systems for managing academic achievements.

3.4 Analysis of implementation status in different regions

The implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms is influenced by various factors, including economic development, allocation of educational resources, and talent outflow. The implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities in different regions is shown in Table 4.

3.4.1 Universities in eastern and central China have significant implementation advantages

Universities in eastern and central China have clear advantages in the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms, each with its own emphasis. Universities in eastern China pay more attention to implementing students' academic norms (C1), whereas universities in central China are more inclined toward implementing mechanisms for punishing academic misconduct (B2, B4). Uneven allocation of educational resources may lead to differences among universities in their investment in, and capacity for, academic integrity construction. For example, universities in eastern and central China have relatively strong faculty resources and economic conditions, and academic exchange and cooperation are comparatively active, which is conducive to promoting responsible academic innovation.

3.4.2 Implementation in universities in western and northeastern China needs optimization

Although the overall implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities in western China is not as strong as in eastern and central China, their policy safeguard mechanisms are relatively better (D1). The mechanisms for punishing academic misconduct in universities in northeastern China are slightly better than those in western China. In addition, universities in both regions have not clearly standardized the management of talent-training archives (C6). The implementation status of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities in western and northeastern China is generally poor; the reason may be that economic conditions in these regions are relatively weak, making it impossible to invest heavily in academic integrity construction, while talent outflow also weakens their academic strength and academic atmosphere.

4 Recommendations for strengthening the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in Chinese universities

At present, academic integrity control mechanisms in universities are being gradually improved. However, some universities have not strictly fulfilled their

responsibilities and mission as the primary entities in academic integrity construction, and there remains a considerable gap between their practice and the deployment requirements of ministerial policies in China. Therefore, taking into account differences in school-running level, disciplinary type, and region, the following recommendations are proposed (see Figure 2) to strengthen universities' implementation of the academic integrity control mechanisms issued by ministries and commissions.

4.1 Diversifying publicity and education on academic integrity

Publicity and education are prerequisites for understanding academic integrity[26]. The focus of academic integrity policy is also gradually shifting from “post-event handling” to “pre-event prevention” [27]. Universities must clarify the assessment requirements for academic integrity education.

4.1.1 Enriching the content of publicity and education

Universities should not only vigorously publicize exemplary models of academic integrity, but also promptly expose typical cases that violate academic integrity requirements. Through warning education, they should encourage relevant personnel to uphold academic integrity and strive to create a sound academic atmosphere in which compliance with academic integrity is honored and violations of academic ethics are regarded as shameful. In addition, universities should increase publicity regarding national academic integrity policies to help relevant personnel grasp the overall trend[28]. For example, in the “Academic Climate Construction” section of the official website of the Research Office of Dezhou University, policies at the national, provincial, and university levels, positive and negative typical cases, publicity and education, and expert viewpoints are clearly categorized. This integrates otherwise scattered publicity and education resources on academic integrity and helps faculty and students become familiar with and understand the specific requirements of academic integrity.

4.1.2 Innovating channels and methods for publicity and education

Creating an atmosphere of academic integrity requires universities to carry out publicity and education comprehensively and through multiple channels[29]; this is a common challenge faced by major universities. Universities should make full use of formal curriculum systems as well as scientific and technological, cultural and sports, and social practice activities to comprehensively cultivate students' academic interests[30]. They can use channels such as the “Academic Climate Construction” section of official websites, public accounts, and campus email to ensure that faculty and students promptly obtain information related to academic integrity. They can also use essay competitions, debates, case sharing, speeches, scenario-based performances, and other methods to transform the passive reception of educational content by target audiences into active participation, thereby enhancing faculty and students' understanding of academic norms. In addition, university libraries can promptly

They should update and publish information related to academic integrity—for example, by setting up a special homepage section for publicity and education on academic integrity[31]—and attach importance to cultivating the AI literacy of teachers and students, so as to address the challenges of academic misconduct brought by AI technologies[32].

Implementation status of academic-integrity control mechanisms → Countermeasure recommendations → Key distribution of academic-integrity development among different types of universities

- **Prevention**

- Status: publicity and education content is monotonous; publicity and education forms are singular.
- Recommendations: enrich publicity and education content; innovate publicity and education channels and methods.
- Key distribution:
 - * Private universities; science-and-engineering universities; universities in western regions, etc.
 - * Key universities, regular undergraduate institutions, private universities; normal universities, science-and-engineering universities, comprehensive universities; universities in northeastern, central, and western regions, etc.

- **Punishment**

- Status: no measures have been formulated for handling academic misconduct; investigation procedures have not been clarified.
- Recommendations: formulate dedicated measures for handling academic misconduct; standardize procedures for investigating academic misconduct.
- Key distribution:
 - * Private universities, science-and-engineering universities, universities in eastern regions, etc.
 - * Private universities, regular undergraduate institutions; science-and-engineering universities, comprehensive universities; universities in western and northeastern regions, etc.

- **Management**

- Status: management targets are one-sided; academic norms have not been formulated; the evaluation system is not sufficiently reasonable; the management system for academic achievements is not sufficiently 完善.
- Recommendations:
 - * Ensure full coverage of management targets.
 - * Systematically improve the academic-integrity management system:
 - Improve the system of academic norms.
 - Deepen the classified evaluation mechanism for academia.
 - Improve the management system for academic achievements.
- Key distribution:

- * Key universities, regular undergraduate institutions, private universities; comprehensive universities, medical and pharmaceutical universities; universities in northeastern and western regions, etc.
 - * Private universities, universities in central regions, etc.
 - * Key universities, private universities, regular undergraduate institutions; normal universities, medical and pharmaceutical universities, science-and-engineering universities; universities in western and northeastern regions, etc.
 - * Key universities, regular undergraduate institutions, private universities; medical and pharmaceutical universities, science-and-engineering universities, normal universities; universities in western and northeastern regions, etc.
- **Safeguards**
 - Status: insufficient policy safeguards; insufficient disclosure of information related to academic integrity.
 - Recommendations: strengthen policy safeguards for academic integrity; give full play to internal and external supervision.
 - Key distribution:
 - * Private universities; science-and-engineering universities, medical and pharmaceutical universities; universities in northeastern regions, etc.
 - * Private universities, science-and-engineering universities, universities in western regions, etc.

Figure 2. Countermeasure recommendations for implementing academic-integrity control mechanisms in universities of different institutional levels, disciplinary types, and regions

4.2 Improve the punishment mechanism for academic misconduct

4.2.1 Reasonably formulate measures for handling academic misconduct

A punishment mechanism for academic misconduct can increase the cost of engaging in such behavior[33]. Therefore, universities should further strengthen credit supervision over academic misconduct and disciplinary action against dishonesty[34], formulate dedicated measures for handling academic misconduct, and provide an institutional basis for the fairness and scientific nature of punishing academic misconduct. For example, universities in eastern regions should improve their measures for handling academic misconduct so as to respond to diversified forms of academic misconduct and ensure that action is taken on a well-founded basis.

4.2.2 Standardize procedures for investigating academic misconduct

Universities should further strengthen the development of their academic committees[35], standardize investigation procedures, take a “zero-tolerance” attitude toward strictly controlling key links in graduate training, establish a lifelong ac-

countability system, severely crack down on academic misconduct, and build a long-term mechanism for academic-integrity development. In particular, private universities and science-and-engineering universities should focus on standardizing procedures for investigating academic misconduct, so as to make up for deficiencies in the punishment mechanism for academic misconduct. In addition, universities can make full use of libraries' academic-integrity monitoring or supervisory models to conduct quality assessment and review of submitted academic achievements[36], and to provide timely feedback as well as investigate and handle academic misconduct.

4.3 Improve the academic-integrity management mechanism

4.3.1 Fully cover the targets of academic-integrity management The primary task in improving the academic-integrity management mechanism is to expand the scope of academic-integrity management targets and build a popularized and standardized academic-integrity control mechanism. In particular, universities should strengthen academic-integrity management for teachers and research-management personnel, forming a new situation in which all members are subject to academic-integrity management. Specifically, key universities and universities in northeastern regions should place emphasis on covering teachers and other personnel in academic-integrity management, so as to raise the overall level of academic integrity. In addition, universities should fully value the intermediary role of supervisors in cultivating graduate students' academic integrity[37], strengthen training in graduate students' research abilities, cultivate graduate students' concepts of academic integrity, fully implement academic-integrity control mechanisms in universities, and reduce the occurrence of academic misconduct.

4.3.2 Systematically improve the academic-integrity management system

- (1) Improve the system of academic norms. On the basis of national norms, universities should compile comprehensive and detailed academic norms for their own institutions with a serious and responsible attitude[38]. For example, the *Shanghai Jiao Tong University Code of Academic Ethics Conduct (Trial)* has established a relatively comprehensive system of academic norms, dividing codes of conduct into "basic norms," "scientific research norms," "academic-achievement norms," "academic-evaluation norms," and so forth. Universities in central regions may draw on this code to further improve their own systems of academic norms.
- (2) Deepen the classified academic-evaluation mechanism. The emergence of crises in university academic integrity is related to unreasonable evaluation systems[39]. Only by making academic-integrity development an important reference in excellence selection, qualification-grade assessment, and the like; emphasizing an evaluation orientation toward academic integrity, genuine talent and learning, and quality contributions; and establishing a

scientific and fair classified academic-evaluation mechanism, can the evaluation mechanism truly reflect researchers' abilities and levels in innovating knowledge and theories and comprehensively solving practical problems. For example, normal universities need to deepen academic

a classification-based evaluation mechanism.

- (3) Improve the management system for academic achievements. Universities should establish management systems for the inspection and reporting of academic achievements, standardized management of talent-training archives, and public disclosure of scientific research achievements, so as to ensure that important records—such as graduate admissions, academic research, dissertation proposal approval, dissertation review and defense, and degree conferral—are retained comprehensively and in a timely manner, truthfully and completely; promote openness and transparency in academic work; and ensure the security and reliability of research data and other materials. In particular, science-and-engineering and medical universities, whose research emphasizes the objectivity, authenticity, and reproducibility of experimental data and results[40], have an even greater need to proactively improve their management systems for academic achievements, establish strict standards for experimental operations and data processing, and strengthen intellectual-property protection.

4.4 Strengthening Policy and Supervisory Safeguards for Academic Integrity

4.4.1 Strengthening Policy Safeguards for Academic Integrity

A correct understanding of policy by universities is the prerequisite for effective implementation; it directly affects the ultimate effect of policy[41] and also influences the concrete implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms. Universities should track in real time and update the release of ministry-level policies, examine from multiple perspectives the roles and mechanisms of actors such as government, society, universities, and individuals in setting the policy agenda[42], and deeply understand and grasp the rationale of policymaking[43]. At the same time, they should make strong efforts to ensure implementation, thereby providing sound policy support for teachers and students to devote themselves to research. This is also where the emphasis lies in the academic-integrity development of most universities.

4.4.2 Giving Full Play to Internal and External Supervision

Universities should strengthen internal supervision, regularly investigate problems in the implementation of academic-integrity control mechanisms, and safeguard internal academic norms. At the same time, they should fully leverage the external supervisory role of the public and the news media over academic-integrity control mechanisms, and gradually establish an independent, scientific,

and fair social supervision mechanism for educational quality—for example, by setting up telephone hotlines or email addresses on official websites for reporting academic misconduct, and by regularly publishing reports on the development of academic conduct. Comprehensive universities, private universities, and science-and-engineering universities all need to ensure the smooth operation of supervisory channels and jointly promote the comprehensive improvement of academic integrity in higher education institutions.

5 Conclusion

The development of academic integrity in universities is a systematic project. Although self-discipline among personnel is certainly important, it cannot be separated from the institutional construction of academic-integrity control mechanisms. Through two phases of investigation, this paper concludes that academic-integrity control mechanisms include mechanisms for preventing academic misconduct, mechanisms for punishing academic misconduct, mechanisms for managing academic integrity, and mechanisms for safeguarding academic integrity. It also confirms the implementation status of these academic-integrity control mechanisms among universities of different levels, disciplinary types, and regions. Finally, the paper proposes recommendations such as innovating the content and methods of academic-integrity publicity and education, improving mechanisms for punishing academic misconduct, strengthening academic-integrity management mechanisms, and reinforcing policy and supervisory safeguards for academic integrity, with the aim of effectively improving the level of academic integrity in universities.

References

- [1] Li Tianjiao, Pan Qiliang. Analysis of factors influencing university research-integrity behavior from the perspective of academic ecology [J]. *Science and Technology Management Research*, 2023(2): 120-126.
- [2] Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council; Ministry of Education. Several opinions of the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council and the Ministry of Education on further strictly standardizing quality management for degree and postgraduate education [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/moe_826/202009/t20200928_492182.html.
- [3] Muthanna A, Chaaban Y, Qadhi S. A model of the interrelationship between research ethics and research integrity [J]. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 2024(1): 2295151.
- [4] Zhou Jie. Analysis of the current status, causes, and countermeasures regarding postgraduate academic ethics [J]. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 2014(6): 112-114.
- [5] Jiang Lai, Zhan Ailan. Research on misconduct in university scientific research activities and countermeasures [J]. *Bulletin of National Natural Science*

Foundation of China, 2015(1): 30-36.

[6] Liu Yu, Liu Xiaoyan. Moral self-discipline or organizational constraint? A study on the influencing factors of academic dishonesty [J]. *Library Journal*, 2022(5): 4-13.

[7] Song Lili. Research on research-integrity education in universities since the new century [J]. *Journal of Nanyang Normal University*, 2023(5): 57-62.

[8] Alam S, Babbitt V, Hu J, et al. Perceptions and recommendations about research integrity and publishing ethics: a survey among Chinese researchers on training, challenges and responsibilities [J]. *Journal of Data and Information Science*, 2025(2): 1-30.

[9] Liu Xiaojuan, Liu Huiping, Pan Yinrong, et al. Research-integrity education and its implications in world-class universities: taking 22 universities in the 2019 QS University Rankings as examples [J]. *China University Science & Technology*, 2021(9): 4-9.

[10] Crean D, Gordijn B, Kearns A J. Impact and assessment of research integrity teaching: a systematic literature review [J]. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 2024(4): 30.

[11] Pizzolato D, Abdi S, Dierickx K. Collecting and characterizing existing and freely accessible research integrity educational resources [J]. *Accountability in Research*, 2020(4): 195-211.

[12] Duan Chengyao. Characteristics of academic-integrity systems in American universities and lessons for reference [J]. *China University Science & Technology*, 2017(10): 42-44.

[13] Lu Yao. Experience and enlightenment from the United Kingdom in preventing and controlling academic plagiarism among university students [J]. *Education Exploration*, 2017(6): 121-125.

[14] General Office of the CPC Central Committee; General Office of the State Council. Issuance of the *Several Opinions on Further Strengthening the Construction of Scientific Research Integrity* [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2018-05/30/content_5294886.htm?eqid=a1501f650004c8f5000000046475ec3e.

[15] Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council; Ministry of Education. Opinions of the Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council and the Ministry of Education on strengthening the construction of a quality assurance and supervision system for degree and postgraduate education [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/s7065/201402/t20140212_165554.html.

[16] Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. Implementation opinions of the Ministry of Education on effectively strengthening and improving the construction of academic conduct in higher education institutions [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. https://www.gov.cn/govweb/gongbao/content/2012/content_2144288.htm.

- [17] Ministry of Education of the People' s Republic of China. Measures for the prevention and handling of academic misconduct in higher education institutions [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_xxgk/xxgk/zhengce/guizhang/202112/t20211206_58509
- [18] Luo Zhimin. Research on the publicity and education mechanism for research integrity in universities [J]. *Inner Mongolia Social Sciences*, 2020(4): 156-162, 213.
- [19] Ministry of Education of the People' s Republic of China. Notice of the Ministry of Education on seriously handling academic [[unclear: term continues beyond the visible page after “不”]]
- [[unclear: beginning of reference not visible]] misconduct [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A13/moe_2557/s3103/200903/t20090319_80681.html.
- [20] Ding Haibo. An analysis of the causes of academic-morality misconduct among university teachers [J]. *Education and Vocation*, 2010(36): 78-79.
- [21] General Office of the Ministry of Education. Notice of the General Office of the Ministry of Education on severely investigating and punishing the buying, selling, and ghostwriting of degree theses in institutions of higher education [EB/OL]. [2025-08-15]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A11/s8388/201807/t20180718_343403.html.
- [22] Wang Benxian. Problems in academic integrity education for graduate students and strategies for solving them [J]. *Higher Education Forum*, 2023(3): 102-105.
- [23] Liu Guangmin. Reflections on the institutional construction of academic committees in private undergraduate universities [J]. *Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education*, 2013(11): 42-43.
- [24] Huang Jiaqi, Ling Bo. Investigation and analysis of the current status of academic integrity among academic master' s students in physical education at higher normal universities [J]. *Anhui Sports Science and Technology*, 2014(5): 56-59.
- [25] Liu Lüxiang, Hu Ying, Shen Huige. A comparative study of measures for handling academic misconduct in 42 “Double First-Class” universities [J]. *Chinese Journal of Scientific and Technical Periodicals*, 2021(2): 145-152.
- [26] Liu Liquan, Chen Fangfang. Constructing a long-term mechanism for graduate-student academic integrity education through “five transformations” [J]. *Journal of Graduate Education*, 2016(2): 24-28.
- [27] Zhang Ling, Ni Chengtao, Yin Sili, et al. A comparative analysis of the thematic evolution of China' s research-integrity policies and literature [J]. *Journal of Modern Information*, 2023(6): 108-120.
- [28] Yuan Zihan, Jin Tong, Zhang Hongwei, et al. An empirical analysis of the status of research-integrity education in 42 Chinese universities [J]. *Science and Society*, 2019(1): 50-62.

- [29] Wu Xiaochun. On the role of moral education in the construction of academic ethics among university students and countermeasures [J]. *Leading Journal of Ideological & Theoretical Education*, 2010(11): 104-107.
- [30] Wu Xiaofeng, Wang Lei, Zhang Ying. Investigation and analysis of the current status of learning ethos and academic ethics among graduate students in China [J]. *Academic Degrees & Graduate Education*, 2012(3): 18-23.
- [31] Feng Fei, Yuan Zizhao. Practices and implications of research-integrity education in world-class university libraries [J]. *Library Development*, 2023(2): 150-159, 181.
- [32] Du Jin. Research on the practice and governance strategies of academic-norm services in university libraries in the context of AIGC [J]. *Library Work and Study*, 2025(9): 5-17, 27.
- [33] Zhao Yuhua, Yu Zhiyong. Research on pathways for constructing academic integrity systems in universities [J]. *Journal of Jilin Radio and Television University*, 2022(4): 11-13.
- [34] Wan Huiying, Hua Lingyan. Credit supervision and punishment for dishonesty in university research misconduct [J]. *China University Science & Technology*, 2017(7): 29-30.
- [35] Yang Ping. Research on the rule-of-law pathway for constructing academic integrity systems in universities [J]. *The Party Building and Ideological Education in Schools*, 2015(16): 90-91.
- [36] Zhang Qun, Liu Yumin. Research on the safeguard system for research integrity in university libraries [J]. *Library and Information Service*, 2014(22): 19-22, 37.
- [37] Fang Dongshu. Research on the influence of supervisors on the cultivation of research integrity among graduate students [D]. Zhengzhou: Zhongyuan University of Technology, 2013.
- [38] Rao Jiahui, Wang Hongjuan, Zhang Naisheng. The responsibilities of graduate students in the construction of academic integrity [J]. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 2013(1): 112-115.
- [39] Wu Xinde, Zhang Renzhi. An analysis of the research-integrity crisis in universities and the establishment of its prevention mechanism [J]. *Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education*, 2012(11): 69-72.
- [40] Liu Chaoyang, Liu Peinian. Exploration of the establishment of academic integrity among graduate students majoring in chemistry [J]. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Education*, 2020(6): 90-93.
- [41] Wang Cong, He Hongpeng. Research on the concept of research integrity in China's policy environment [J]. *Bulletin of National Natural Science Foundation of China*, 2017(4): 390-395.

[42] Zhang Yanglei, Su Yongjian. How innovation and entrepreneurship education became a national action: A study of the policy agenda based on multiple-streams theory [J]. *Research in Educational Development*, 2016(5): 41-47.

[43] Mo Jiafeng, Yang Wen. How academic anti-fraud became a national action: An analysis based on multiple-streams theory [J]. *Modern University Education*, 2022(5): 15-26, 112.

Research on the Implementation Status of Academic Integrity Control Mechanisms in Chinese Universities Based on Policy Texts

Wang Ying Zhang Mengjia

School of History and Culture of Hubei University, Wuhan, 430062

Abstract It penetrates into the implementing status of the academic integrity policy in Chinese universities and promotes the content completeness and implementation effect of the policy. This article adopts the methods of literature research and online investigation. Firstly, it conducts research on the relevant policies of academic integrity of Chinese ministries and commissions to distill the control mechanism of academic integrity, which includes four key elements: prevention of academic misconduct, punishment of academic misconduct, management of academic integrity, and guarantee of academic integrity. Subsequently, a sample of universities is selected based on educational level, discipline type, and regional distribution to investigate the implementation status of these mechanisms, followed by an in-depth analysis of the findings. Overall, the implementation of these control mechanisms in Chinese universities is generally good, yet shortcomings remain, such as monotonous approaches to publicity and education, and an unreasonable evaluation system. Accordingly, recommendations are proposed to strengthen the implementation of academic integrity control mechanisms in universities, taking into account the variations in educational levels, discipline types, and geographical locations.

Keywords Academic integrity control mechanism; Academic integrity policy; Academic misconduct; Implementation status

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv. Machine translation. Verify with the original.