Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

9-26-2018

Plagiarism education, perceptions, and responsibilities in post-secondary education.

Julia Colella
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

PLAGIARISM EDUCATION, PERCEPTIONS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN POST-

SECONDARY EDUCATION

by
Julia Colella

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Faculty of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

PLAGIARISM EDUCATION, PERCEPTIONS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

by

Julia Colella

APPROVED BY:

———————————————————————
C. Kier, External Examiner
Athabasca University

———————————————————————
J. Singleton-Jackson
Department of Psychology

———————————————————————
C. Cobb
Faculty of Education

———————————————————————
L. Volante
Faculty of Education

———————————————————————
T. Sefton, Advisor
Faculty of Education

September 18, 2018

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

Research on plagiarism in post-secondary education is currently receiving a lot of attention. Most of this research focuses on student plagiarism rates, which is typically done through self-reporting, as well as student plagiarism perceptions. A limited number of studies on plagiarism education, particularly in the Canadian context, are available. There are two groups of participants in this study: undergraduate students and instructors at a comprehensive southwestern university in Ontario, Canada. This mixed-method online study investigates plagiarism education, student academic entitlement, and student personal values, and it explores plagiarism perceptions, including responsibility for plagiarism education and reasons for student engagement in plagiarism. Findings from this study suggest that students would like plagiarism education and that providing students with plagiarism education may reduce the plagiarism engagement rate. The results of this study reveal that instructor participants agree on how plagiarism is defined, but they differ in how they handle plagiarism.

Keywords: plagiarism; plagiarism education; post-secondary education; academic entitlement; personal values; andragogy

DEDICATION

To my pug, Gia, for always keeping me company as I worked on this dissertation. To my husband, Scott, for everything you've done for me throughout this process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first would like to acknowledge my supervisor, Dr. Terry Sefton. Thank you for providing continuous support and guidance throughout this process. The enthusiasm you consistently demonstrated towards my work does not go unnoticed. Thank you for sharing your valuable expertise with me on my journey.

Next, I would like to acknowledge my doctoral committee, Dr. Cam Cobb, Dr. Jill Singleton-Jackson, and Dr. Louis Volante. Thank you all for agreeing to being one of my committee members and for providing ongoing, constructive feedback throughout this process. The suggestions each of you have provided have strengthened my work. I know you are all extremely busy individuals, and I am very grateful for the time each of you shared with me in this program.

Additionally, I acknowledge the university's Academic Data Centre staff for patiently working with me on my data analysis as well as Danielle Istl (University's Academic Integrity Officer) for providing ongoing feedback on my plagiarism tutorial. Finally, I would like to acknowledge many faculty members in the Faculty of Education, especially Dr. Karen Roland, Dr. Susan Holloway, and Dr. Beth Daly for encouraging me to pursue the PhD program and for their support and encouragement throughout the years as well as Dr. Jonathan Bayley for allowing me to complete part of my pilot study with his graduate research design course.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on *plagiarism education* in post-secondary education, student

and faculty perceptions of plagiarism, and individual and institution responsibilities for teaching

and learning about academic writing integrity in post-secondary education. Plagiarism, a form of

academic misconduct, is a concern in post-secondary education (Elander, Pittam, Lusher, Fox, &

Payne, 2010; Ford & Hughes, 2012). Plagiarism is considered to be the most common form of

academic dishonesty (Breen & Maassen, 2005). Most of the research available on plagiarism

focuses on students self-reporting of their engagement in this type of behaviour or on student

plagiarism perceptions (Dawkins, 2004; Gourlay & Deane, 2012; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010;

Selwyn, 2008). The plagiarism rates across campuses seem to be increasing. There are a number

of reasons why plagiarism may be becoming more common. It is suggested that the easy access

to technology is one reason why the plagiarism rate is increasing (Bailey, 2011; Selwyn, 2008).

Increased student pressure and competiveness is another reason for the increase in plagiarism

(Selwyn, 2008). With increases in class sizes, student feelings of alienation increase. Alienation

from inaccessibility to academic support resources and instructors can contribute to students

resorting to plagiarism (Breen & Maassen, 2005; Underwood & Szabo, 2004). One recurring

theme in the plagiarism literature is that students are unaware of what plagiarism entails or how to

avoid it (Ellery, 2008; Owunwanne, Rustagi, & Dada, 2010). Providing students with plagiarism

education may reduce their engagement in plagiarism (Holt, 2012).

The study investigates plagiarism education among undergraduate students enrolled at a

comprehensive Canadian university. An online survey is used to explore participants'

experiences of working through the tutorial; their attitudes towards plagiarism education; their

sense of academic entitlement; as well as personal values. Results were analyzed to determine if

there is a relationship between these factors and student plagiarism knowledge. Instructors'

perceptions of plagiarism were explored; attitudes towards responsibility for suspected

plagiarism; and approaches to how suspected student plagiarism should be handled.

For the purposes of this study, I developed an online plagiarism education tutorial

(Appendix A) that explored different aspects of plagiarism, including different types of

plagiarism. Participants were assigned to an experimental group or a control group depending on

their month of birth. The experimental group completed the post-test after the tutorial, whereas

the control group completed the post-test prior to completing the tutorial. The pre-test and post-

test scores were compared to determine if there is statistically significant change in the post-test

scores between the two groups (experimental and control). Students completed an exit survey.

This survey included questions about student experiences of the tutorial, and about their

attitudes, prior experience, and behaviour of plagiarism; and their opinions on plagiarism

education, and on personal or institutional responsibility for teaching and learning about

academic integrity. An online open-ended survey was used to learn about instructors'

perceptions of plagiarism. Perceptions of instructors' responsibility for plagiarism education and

what instructors do when they find suspected plagiarism were explored.

Ontario universities receive the "lowest level of per-student funding in all of Canada"

(Ontario Federation of University Faculty Associations, 2017). This pattern began in 2008.

During the 2013-2014 and the 2014-2015 school years, Ontario's per-student university funding

was 35% lower than the average for the rest of Canada (Ontario Federation of University Faculty

Associations, 2017). During the 2014-2015 year, Ontario received $8, 037 per student, whereas

the average for the rest of Canada that year was $12, 346 per student. To try and help make-up

for the low funding, Ontario postsecondary tuition fees have been increasing. As a result, Ontario

has the highest tuition fees, which are currently 70% higher than the average for the rest of Canada (Ontario Federation of University Faculty Associations, 2017). Universities employ a number of different strategies to help attract student tuition money to their campus. For example, developing new programs of studies is one tactic universities may resort to as a means to attempt to increase their enrollment numbers. Post-secondary institutions compete with each other for student enrollment. As a result of this competition, universities may decide not to publicize any of the academic misconduct that occurs on campus, including the number of cases they experience each year, as it may lead to their school receiving negative attention.

How individual institutions handle plagiarism differs, and how instructors within an institution interpret plagiarism also differs (Bennett, Behrendt, & Boothby, 2011). Although most institutions have plagiarism policies in place, some policies provide "little to no educative approach to plagiarism" (Devlin, 2006, p. 46). Instead, the focus of these policies outlines what students should not do and what will happen if they commit any of the sanctioned activities. Even when universities adapt policies to handle student plagiarism, it is not guaranteed that educators or administrators will implement them. Educators perceive aspects of plagiarism, such as severity and intentionality, differently. Some may choose to meet with the student one on one and forgo reporting the suspected plagiarism; others may choose to look the other way; and others will follow the university's policy and procedures. Administrators, who may work alongside educators in suspected plagiarism cases, are also a factor in how student plagiarism is handled. For example, educators may perceive the suspected plagiarism differently than administrators. Educators may be influenced by administrators when determining which course of action to take with the suspected plagiarism, such as the appropriate consequence for the

plagiarism. The interpretation of an academic institution's policy can be perceived differently by educators and administrators. This may impact sanctions that students receive for plagiarism.

Educational Relevance

This study could contribute to a discussion on providing plagiarism education to students. Through completing an online survey and a tutorial on plagiarism, student participants may be encouraged to reconsider their prior assumptions about plagiarism. Through completing a survey on plagiarism, faculty may reflect on their prior perceptions of plagiarism and how they respond to plagiarism when they encounter it in their teaching.

The results of this study may encourage post-secondary educators to change their teaching practices. Utilizing a proactive approach to plagiarism by providing plagiarism education to students may allow educators to "focus on teaching and not on policing their students" (Holt, 2012, p. 590). This research may also provide a benefit to universities, including Academic Integrity Offices, that are comprehensive and comparable in size. Academic Integrity Offices are often responsible for investigating cases of suspected plagiarism; and may be responsible for programs that address academic misconduct or integrity. Academic Integrity Offices may find it helpful to use the plagiarism education tutorial, either as an education tool for all students or as a remediation strategy with students who have committed plagiarism.

Despite universities having academic integrity offices and policies in place, these policies do little other than "detection, deterrence and provision of information about plagiarism" (Sutherland-Smith, 2010, p. 12). Academic integrity policies differ between institutions, and these policies are usually generalized instead of specific, which leads to "instructor subjectivity" of student plagiarism (Halupa, 2014, p. 124). Subjectivity when determining if the suspected plagiarism should be addressed, how to handle suspected student plagiarism-including

appropriate penalties to assign-can lead to severe consequences for students. A phenomenon that has received a lot of attention with respect to student plagiarism focuses on documentation for suspected plagiarism. If a student submits an assignment that contains plagiarism and the instructor chooses not to report it, then there is no "paper trail" of the plagiarism (Devlin, 2006). Thus, students who plagiarize and are not reported will appear as if they have never plagiarized. In a case of a serial plagiarist, a student was able to get away with plagiarism several times (Baggaley & Spencer, 2005). Sometimes, plagiarism may be unnoticed. When repeated plagiarism occurs, some instructors choose not to report it as it may lead to student expulsion, which can "damage the international reputation of the faculty or university" (Devlin, 2006, p. 53). If some instructors choose to file reports and others choose not to, then students may receive different consequences for engaging in the same behaviour. When plagiarism is reported, how it is handled may be influenced by administrators' perceptions of the plagiarism, which can be different from instructors' perceptions of the plagiarism. Should students be treated equally for similar types of plagiarism? Should the concept of equity be used when handling student plagiarism? What are the implications for using either equality or equity with student plagiarism? For example, if two students both engage in the same type of plagiarism, and they do so unintentionally, should this plagiarism be handled the same way? If two students intentionally engage in the same type of plagiarism, should other factors, such as number of occurrence that is on file, if it is on file, be included in the decision of how to handle the student plagiarism? If two students engage in the same type of plagiarism, one student who does so intentionally and the other student who does so unintentionally, should this plagiarism be handled in the same manner? What if the student who did so intentionally is a repeat offender? What are the implications for instructors who may be sanctioned by their administrators for "allowing"

plagiarism to occur; or who may be penalized by negative Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) scores if they do sanction students for plagiarism?

Plagiarism consists of different levels of severity. As mentioned earlier, there is no single adopted definition of plagiarism. Different institutions define plagiarism differently, and within institutions, instructors perceive plagiarism differently, even if they are using the same definition. Suspected plagiarism can be perceived to differ in severity; for example, purchasing a paper online from a paper-mill and passing it off as one's own will likely be perceived as severe, whereas failing to include the year of publication for an in-text citation for an essay that requires APA format will likely be considered minor. These two examples may be considered black and white. Some types of plagiarism, however, may be harder to differentiate in terms of severity. Is intentionally failing to provide an author's name and the year of publication in a paraphrase the same degree of plagiarism as intentionally failing to provide this information in addition to the page number and quotations marks in an in-text citation? How does one know which is more severe? How does one's interpretation of each type of plagiarism affect the consequence the student receives, all else being equal (number of occurrence, semester of study, etc.).

The culture of post-secondary education is competitive. Students are competing with each other for grades and possible spots in graduate programs, which directly influences social status. Therefore, some students will choose to plagiarize to maximize personal benefits (Kohlberg, 1973). Students may plagiarize due to pressures of attaining high grades, especially for students who wish to further their studies after completion of an undergraduate degree (Craig, Federici, & Buehler, 2010). Universities compete with each other for the students they perceive to be the best, and grades are oftentimes a criteria for ranking students and deciding on admissions to programs (Hoare, 1991). Many students are aware of this, and some will go to great extents,

including plagiarizing, in hopes of receiving high marks. Competition for scholarships given by universities for high marks are also a potential cause for student plagiarism (Maramark & Maline, 1993). The competiveness of post-secondary education and the way students are assessed may directly affect a student's decision to plagiarize.

Numerous international students choose to pursue their post-secondary education in Canada. According to the most recent statistics available by Statistics Canada (2016), international students comprised 11% of the student population at Canadian universities during the 2013-2014 school year, compared to 7% during the 2004-2005 school year. International students, especially Chinese students, are choosing Canada over the USA as the USA requires a visa (Chen, 2006). International students who study in Canada are charged "approximately twice as much the domestic rates, thus providing additional revenues to the institutions" (Madget & Belanger, 2008, p. 191-192). International students may have learned a writing practice that differs from the practice of the school in which they are studying in. If international students chose to study in a Western society, then they may have to adopt to a new writing practice. Doing so may be overwhelming for them, especially if their native country does not follow intellectual ownership, which predominates in Western societies. As a result, the question of whether international students should receive the same consequences for plagiarism as domestic students surfaces.

A common writing technique that students engage in is imitation. This technique may help students deal with the different writing attribution styles (Howard, 1999). Although some instructors believe that students should receive the same consequences for plagiarism regardless of their status (international or domestic), others "adapt, ignore, subvert or partially implement policy" (Sutherland-Smith, 2014, p. 33). Instructors have different beliefs about learning and

student-instructor relationships. When instructors decide to handle student plagiarism based on personal beliefs, inconsistencies become evident and the risk of the school's quality assurance as well as legalities come into play (Sutherland-Smith, 2014).

The internet is another factor that may influence plagiarism. When students are assigned tasks, many often use the internet to search for information online. Much of the material found online is questionable in terms of its credibility, and students are asked to use their discretion to decide which sources to use (Howard & Davies, 2009). There is little scrutiny of internet content, and information on the internet does not undergo a blind peer review process. Produsage, the combination of production and usage, is a term coined by Alex Burns (2008). Produsage refers to the "collaborative and continuous building and extending of existing content in pursuit of further development" (Burns, 2008, p. 21). Produsage is common in Wikipedia pages and blogs. In these types of sources, users can add and edit content. Use of these types of resources has implications for students. For instance, how will the student know what is and what is not accurate information, or what is a primary or secondary source? If anyone can post almost anything on the internet, should students be instructed to refrain from using such sites? If not, should students be instructed how to evaluate open-access pages? With the notion of produsage, addition complexities of plagiarism are formed.

Plagiarism is not a new phenomenon. The *Socratic Problem,* which encompasses plagiarism, dates back to 1741 (Dubs, 1927). Although the internet allows for easy access of material, it does not necessarily mean that more plagiarism occurs from online sources than from offline sources. Selwyn (2008) investigated offline and online plagiarism among undergraduate students. In his study, 61.9% of students self-reported to engaging in plagiarism from online material, which is identical to the percentage of students who self-reported to engaging in

material from offline plagiarism (61.9%). This study also found that 15% of students reported they would be less likely to engage in plagiarism through the use of online material since they felt they would be more likely to get caught with online sources, especially for students whose instructors use plagiarism detection software (Selwyn, 2008). One participant noted that "copying work from books is easier than copying work from the internet since there are online methods to screen essays for plagiarism" (Selwyn, 2008, p. 473). Plagiarism is a challenge for universities, but the "prevalence of internet plagiarism may not be as common as some literature suggests" (Scanlon, 2003, p. 161).

Post-secondary education refers to "those whose highest level of educational attainment is an apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma (including 'centres de formation professionnelle'); college, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma; university certificate or diploma below bachelor level; or a university degree (bachelor's degree; university certificate or diploma above bachelor level; degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry; master's degree; earned doctorate) (Statistics Canada, 2010). An agreed upon definition of plagiarism is not available: researchers define plagiarism differently, and there is variability in which behaviours are considered plagiarism amongst academic institutions (Walker, 2010). For the purposes of this dissertation, plagiarism will be defined as using material from an original author and passing it off as one's own; credit is not provided to the original author. Plagiarism education is defined as the instruction provided to students on the definition of plagiarism as well as the different types of behaviours that constitute plagiarism. This study is a mixed-methods study that seeks to investigate the effectiveness of plagiarism education to increase knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism; as well as explore both student and instructor perceptions toward plagiarism and how these perceptions may influence behaviours. In this

study, I collected quantitative and qualitative data from undergraduate students and qualitative data from instructors. I analyzed the data to determine the complexities of plagiarism in an academic environment. In Chapter 1, I provide this study's purpose, educational relevance, research questions, and the definition of terms used throughout this dissertation. In Chapter 2, I review the literature on plagiarism engagement rates, plagiarism perceptions, plagiarism education, andragogy, academic entitlement, and personal values. In Chapter 3, I provide information for this study's participants, the study's procedures, the instruments used to collect the data, and the methodology. In Chapter 4, I outline the results for the study's research questions. In Chapter 5, I discuss this study's results in relation to the literature, provide this study's limitations, and outline recommendations for future studies.

Numerous researchers have measured students' self-reported engagement rates in plagiarism as well as students' perceptions of plagiarism; however, the number of studies available that investigate student plagiarism education is less. Plagiarism education takes different forms, including on-line tutorials, in-class instruction from professors, academic integrity workshops, and plagiarism policies on course outlines. Another gap in the research which this study attempts to fill is the lack of research available on plagiarism with Canadian undergraduate students as participants (Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006). This study investigates plagiarism independent of cheating. Several studies group plagiarism and cheating behaviours into one overall category of academic misconduct, which does not allow for an examination of only plagiarism (Power, 2009). When overall rates of academic misconduct are provided, the severity of specific behaviours that constitute plagiarism are unknown. Plagiarism and cheating, although both considered academic misconduct, do not entail the same behaviours

nor do they necessarily yield the same punishments. Few studies focus on plagiarism independent of cheating (Roig, 1997).

I have decided to study plagiarism education for a number of reasons. As a student, I experienced uncertainty when submitting assignments that required APA format. I was often warned that papers would be checked for plagiarism and that penalties for plagiarism would be given, but rarely did instructors provide information about how to correctly cite and reference material. The majority of the plagiarism information I received was the information on course outlines. In a second-year social science research methods course, APA format was practiced and emphasized, but explanations regarding how to avoid plagiarism were not provided.

My teaching colleagues often expressed frustration regarding student plagiarism, particularly handling plagiarism cases and assigning student penalties for plagiarism. In my teaching experiences thus far, the majority of the students who submitted assignments containing plagiarism were perceived to have plagiarized unintentionally. Although there were some students who intentionally plagiarize, more often than not, the students were unaware that what they were doing was plagiarism. It was common for students to summarize parts of someone else's work and not cite that summary. Students also expressed confusion regarding what is needed in a citation (quotation marks, year of publication, etc.) as well as how to determine what is common knowledge and what is not. This course was primarily first-year students, and it became obvious that many who had plagiarized did not adequately understand what plagiarism was or how to refrain from engaging in it.

This work is an extension of my master's thesis. For my master's thesis research, I conducted a survey of students and instructors within a Faculty of Education. I conducted an online survey to investigate students' understandings of plagiarism and their engagement in

plagiarism as well as faculty perceptions of plagiarism. I found that the deeper the student's understanding of plagiarism, the less likely the student was to have reported engaging in plagiarism. Additionally, a number of instructors who participated in my master's thesis reported that they would have their students participate in an online plagiarism tutorial if one was available. This finding led to the idea of creating such a tutorial for my dissertation. The literature, my personal experiences as a student and as a sessional instructor, as well as experience of conducting my master's research, are primary reasons why I chose to study plagiarism education as my dissertation topic.

Research Questions:

1) What impact will completion of a plagiarism education tutorial have on students' plagiarism knowledge?

2) Whose responsibility is it to instruct students on plagiarism?

3) What are instructors' experiences of student plagiarism?

4) How do instructors define plagiarism? Are instructors confident in how their institution defines plagiarism?

5) What are students' perceptions of plagiarism education?

6) What are students' perceptions of plagiarism, including reasons for student engagement in plagiarism and consequences for plagiarism?

7) Is there a relationship between student academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge?

8) Is there a relationship between students' personal values and plagiarism knowledge?

Definition of Terms:

Plagiarism: An agreed upon definition of plagiarism does not exist in the literature, and the definition varies across post-secondary education institutions (Saltmarsh, 2004). The International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI) uses the following definition, taken from

dictionary.com, in defining plagiarism: the practice of taking someone's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own. The Academic Integrity Officer at the institution that my study was conducted at shared that the university adopted the ICAI's definition. The ICAI discusses five elements of plagiarism:

1. uses words, ideas, or work products

2. attributable to another identifiable person or source

3. without attributing the work to the source from which it was obtained

4. in a situation in which there is a legitimate expectation of original authorship,

5. to obtain some benefit, credit, or gain which need not be monetary.

It is unknown if plagiarism is intentional or unintentional. There is also no mention of the degree of the severity. For instance, is the plagiarism considered minor plagiarism, moderate plagiarism, or severe plagiarism? Again, one's perception of the plagiarism will impact one's perception of the severity one feels the plagiarism entails. Although the definition might imbed aspects of ethics, ethics, that which is considered good or bad/right or wrong, is not a part of this definition. The academic integrity policy for the institution that will be used in this study can be found in Appendix B.

Plagiarism education: The instruction, in terms of institutional policy, that is provided to students on the definition of plagiarism as well as the different types of behaviours that constitute plagiarism

Instructor: In this study, instructors include individuals who teach one or more courses at the participating university. The instructors may include those who hold any of the following titles: tenured or tenure track faculty, sessional instructors, or teaching appointments.

Academic integrity: A commitment to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage (The International Centre for Academic Integrity, 2017). Academic integrity encompasses cheating and plagiarism behaviours. For the purpose of this study, plagiarism will be examined. Integrity, in an academic setting such as a university, can facilitate student success in the classroom. In this study, student participants are asked to provide ways that academic integrity can be supported on campus through an open-ended question.

Academic Entitlement (AE): "An attitude marked by students' beliefs that they are owed something in the educational experience apart from what they might earn from their effort" (Singleton-Jackson, Jackson, & Reinhardt, 2010, p. 343). Discussions of high levels of student entitlement have been present in the media over the last decade (Andrey et al., 2012, p. 4). This study uses an academic entitlement scale created by Kopp, Zinn, Finney, and Jurish (2011). This 8-item scale asks participants to self-report on academic entitlement behaviours, such as "If I am struggling in a class, the professor should approach me and offer to help." Greenberger, Lessard, Chen and Farruggia (2008) found that 40% of university students feel that they deserve marks in the B range if they complete their course readings. Academic entitlement is measured in relation to plagiarism knowledge to determine if there is a relationship between students' levels of academic entitlement and their score on a plagiarism pre-test.

Values: "Relatively stable motivational characteristics of persons that change little during adulthood" (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Values are thought to "convey what is important to us in our lives" (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 3). Individuals hold many values, and the importance of each value differs amongst individuals (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). For example, one person may perceive social justice to be a value of high importance to him or her, whereas another individual may not value social justice, or may value it but to a much lesser degree. This study uses the Shwartzs' Personal Values Questionnaire. This 56-item questionnaire asks

14

participants to use the scale of -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to rate each of the 56 values, with -1 being used to rate values that oppose an individual's guiding principles and a 7 being extremely important to an individual's guiding principles. Personal values are examined in relation to plagiarism knowledge to determine if there are relationships between students' personal values and their score on a plagiarism pre-test.

*Andragogy: "*The art and science of teaching adults" (Southerland Evans, 2012, p. 25). Malcolm Knowles was "exposed to the term andragogy from a Yugoslavian adult educator in the 1960s, and he used it in 1968 when teaching adult education at Boston University" (Samroo, Cooper, & Green, 2013, p. 79). Andragogy was to parallel pedagogy, as andra refers to adult, unlike peda, which refers to child. Knowles (1980) suggest that andragogy encompasses four assumptions, and these assumptions are included in his book *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*:

- Adults both desire and enact a tendency toward self-directedness as they mature.

- Adults' experiences are a rich resource for learning. Adults learn more effectively through experiential techniques of education such as discussion or problem solving.

- Adults are aware of specific learning needs generated by real life tasks or problems.

- Adults are competency-based learners in that they wish to apply newly acquired skills or knowledge to their immediate circumstances. (pp. 43-44).

Andragogy is appropriate for this study as all of the participants are adult learners, and the adult learning principles that comprise andragogy are appropriate for examining the complexities of plagiarism.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review discusses studies conducted on plagiarism in post-secondary education that are applicable to the dissertation's primary research questions. This literature review is organized into six primary sections: plagiarism rates in higher education, plagiarism perceptions, plagiarism education, andragogy, academic entitlement, and personal values.

Plagiarism, a type of academic misconduct, is persistent and problematic in higher education (Ballantine & McCourt Larres, 2010; Marcus & Beck, 2011; Mozgovoy, Kakkonen, & Cosma, 2010). Student plagiarism is becoming more common and more challenging for universities to handle (Elander et al., 2010; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; Park, 2003). Plagiarism is concerning for colleges and universities, globally (Curtis & Vardanega, 2016). Considered a fraudulent behaviour, universities are spending an increasing amount of time and resources trying to eliminate it (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). Academics feel that plagiarism is concerning in their role as instructors, especially with the responsibility of assessing students (Aasheim, Rutner, Li, & Williams, 2012; Ford & Hughes, 2012).

The concept of intellectual property dates back to ancient times. Ideas were considered the property of "the educated privileged elite, who generally knew and trusted each other" (Starovoytova, 2017, p. 110). Different mediums, such as paintings, theatre, and film, used different authorship practices. For instance, with respect to the medium of film, the authorship of film "has been a current debate" (Tredge, 2013, p. 5). Deciding who receives authorship of a film, for instance, auteur, writer, or collaborator, has led both critics and scholars to debate this issue (Tredge, 2013). Some believe that respect for the work of an individual became more common in some areas during the Renaissance. For instance, painters started to sign their work

during the Renaissance period (Starvoyotova, 2017). The Latin word 'plagiarium,' which means kidnapper, symbolized the stealing of work in the first century (Starovoytova, 2017). In 1601, Ben Jonson, a dramatist, "introduced 'plagiary' a derivative of 'plagiarus' into English (Katavic, 2006). The word 'plagiary' was used to refer to someone who engaged in literary theft (Katavic, 2006). According to the Office of Research Integrity (2010), the word *plagiarism* became a part of the English vocabulary around 1620.

Research on plagiarism in higher education started in the 1960s (Cummings, Maddux, Harlow, & Dyas, 2002). Bowers (1964) was one of the first researchers to investigate academic dishonesty in higher education (Ballantine & McCourt Larres, 2010). Although the phenomenon of plagiarism has been studied for the past fifty years, the engagement rate is steadily increasing. Despite educational institutions spending time and money creating and revising academic integrity policies and resources for students, reports of plagiarism are on the rise (Owunwanne et al., 2010).

Studies conducted on plagiarism have used student participants from numerous disciplines (Aasheim et al., 2012). It has been reported that plagiarism is "indisputably a cross-discipline issue" occurring in every year of study within higher education (Holt, 2012, p. 585; Wang, 2008). For instance, business, criminal justice, teacher education, engineering, biomedical sciences, nursing, social work, humanities, information technology, law, mathematics, and architecture are majors that have demonstrated plagiarism is an issue (Chapman & Lupton, 2004; Coston & Jenks, 1998; Cummings et al., 2003; Klein, Levenburg, McKendall, & Mothersell, 2007; Molnar, Kletke, & Chungwatpol, 2008; Selwyn, 2008).

Plagiarism research has primarily focussed on the following areas: its prevalence rate, reasons why students plagiarize, and how it can be detected in student work or possible strategies

that can be employed to prevent it (Evans, 2006). Two common categories of plagiarism in the literature include "describing of frequency and reasons for plagiarism" (Barry, 2006). These three major areas, plagiarism prevalence, reasons for student plagiarism, and plagiarism detection/prevention are discussed.

Plagiarism Rates in Higher Education

Research conducted on plagiarism has been growing over the last 15 years (Hu & Lei, 2012; Sutherland-Smith, 2010). The exact prevalence rate of plagiarism is unknown (Ehrich, Howard, Mu, & Bokosmaty, 2016). According to the Centre for Academic Integrity, 70% of North American higher education students admit to some type of cheating (East, 2010). The first large-scale study conducted on academic misconduct in universities was done by Bill Bowers (1964). This study used participants from 99 post-secondary institutions across the United States of America, which included more than 600 deans and approximately 5500 students enrolled in all years of study (Stout, 2013). Although it was found that half of the students self-reported to cheating thus far in their academic career, a low fraction of these students were reported to authorities (Stout, 2013). Approximately thirty years later, McCabe and Trevino's (1996) academic misconduct study, which is the largest academic misconduct study to date with 6000 student participants, found similar rates as Bowers (1966). Although Bowers' (1966) study was done prior to the internet era, McCabe and Trevino's (1996) research was conducted during the internet era. In McCabe and Trevino's study, plagiarism was not defined. Instead, 12 academic misconduct items were presented to participants, including "copying material and turning it in as your own as well as turning in work done by someone else" (McCabe & Trevino, 1993, p. 529).

Chuda, Navrat, Kovacova, and Humay (2012) investigated plagiarism engagement among 313 undergraduate students enrolled in a computer science or a computer engineering

course in a Solvakian university. Through an anonymous online questionnaire, it was found that 33% of participants self-reported to having plagiarized and that 63% of participants reported that they had given their work to other students. Although these authors do not explicitly define plagiarism, they do acknowledge that "…plagiarism covers the (improper) use of not just expressions (words, texts, pictures, etc.), but also ideas. When plagiarizing software, copying or paraphrasing (parts of) the program text is just the simplest way of committing plagiarism" (Chuda et al., 2012, p. 23).

Cochran, Chamlin, Wood and Sellers (1999) also used undergraduate students as participants. The participants in this study were enrolled at an American university, and they were registered in upper-year sociology courses. Questionnaires were given to students in these courses, and participants responded on academic misconduct items, including their engagement in plagiarism over the past 12 months. This study found that 19% of undergraduate students reported to plagiarizing within the previous 12 months. Plagiarism was not defined in this study.

In Ellery's (2008) study, first-year students enrolled in a geography module at a South African university completed tutorials that focussed on plagiarism. Tutorial groups ranged from 12-15 students, and the tutorials were conducted by a senior postgraduate tutor. This course required students to complete a final assignment, and these assignments were checked for plagiarism. Students attached a signed declaration to their assignments, with "plagiarism being defined as 'using someone else's ideas, words or data without proper acknowledgement, and presenting it as your own work" (Ellery, 2008, p. 509). It was found that 26% of undergraduate students submitted an assignment that contained plagiarism despite having completed the tutorial. Dawkins (2004) examined engagement in plagiarism through the use of online material. Questionnaires were administered to second, third, and fourth-year business students at a United

Kingdom university. Participants completed the questionnaire in class, and 249 usable questionnaires were obtained. Dawkins (2004) found that 19% of participants admitted to plagiarism through copying material found online. Plagiarism, in this study, was not defined.

Selwyn (2008), interested in student plagiarism engagement, examined online and offline plagiarism. This study was conducted in the United Kingdom. Through self-reporting, participants reported on how often they plagiarized from online and offline material within the previous 12 months. The behaviours the students reported on included the following five categories, which Selwyn (2008) adapted from Dordoy (2002) and Hart and Friesner (2004):

- copied a few sentences from a website into an essay/assignment without citing them;

- copied a few paragraphs from a website into an essay/assignment without citing them;

- copied a few pages of an essay/assignment from a website;

- copied a whole essay/assignment from a website/online source;

- paid for an essay/assignment from the internet. (p. 468)

The questionnaires were sent to full-time undergraduate students. It was found that there was not a difference between the engagement rates of the five categories in using online or offline sources, with 61.9% reporting they plagiarized from online materials and 61.9% reporting they plagiarized from offline materials. The rates of overall plagiarism engagement vary across studies. The rates may vary due to using different plagiarism definitions. The generalizations of findings is therefore limited as behaviours that constitute plagiarism may be perceived differently in post-secondary institutions. Although some studies report an overall plagiarism rate, such as

the studies outline above, other studies investigate certain behaviours that constitute plagiarism. These studies will be discussed.

Knowing an overall engagement rate for plagiarism may be helpful as numbers can be provided regarding the amount of plagiarism that occurs on a particular campus. Knowing the overall rate, however, has limitations. For instance, little information regarding how students are plagiarizing is provided when students are asked to report how often they plagiarized in a specific timeframe, such as within the last twelve months, which is common in the literature (Cochran et al., 1999). Studying specific behaviours that students engage in that violate academic integrity might provide deeper insight into exactly how students are plagiarizing. Bennett (2005), who also used self-reporting of student engagement in plagiarism behaviours, found "46% per cent admitted to copying a paragraph into their own work without acknowledgement; 31% to having lifted several paragraphs from an unacknowledged source; and 25% to having handed in a complete piece of work that had been copied" (p. 150).

Christensen Hughes and McCabe (2006) used students and staff from eleven Canadian universities as the participants. An email was sent to the entire student body at the participating institutions inviting participants to complete a questionnaire that used self-reporting to learn of academic misconduct behaviours. These researchers found that "37% of undergraduate participants copied some sentences from written material without providing a footnote, and 35% of undergraduate students did so but from material found online" (p. 10).

Scanlon and Neumann (2002) examined plagiarism behaviours at nine American colleges and universities. The participants were from all four years of undergraduate studies and were from a variety of majors. The 60-item questionnaire was given to students by faculty during scheduled classes. Six hundred and ninety-eight students completed this survey, and it was found

that 6.3% of students sometimes purchase a paper and submit it whereas 2.8% reported that they often or very frequently do so.

Trushell, Byrne, and Simpson's (2012) United Kingdom study used final-year undergraduate students, who were enrolled in *Early Childhood Studies, Education Studies*, or *Youth and Community Work*, as participants. Anonymous in-class surveys were distributed. Forty-seven participants completed this 17-item survey, and it was discovered that 17% of participants created fake studies to use in an essay, 13% submitted a made-up bibliography, and 11% modified dates of older research studies to make them look more recent.

As demonstrated above, students engage in different types of behaviours that constitute plagiarism, and some go to great lengths, such as creating fake studies to use in an essay. It is common for academic misconduct research to utilize self-reporting for engagement in plagiarism: many studies conducted on academic dishonesty adopt a self-reporting tactic through the use of surveys or interviews (Park, 2003; Risquez, O'Dwyer, & Ledwith, 2013; Walker, 2010; Whitley, 1998). The self-reporting rates in the literature may be inaccurate. The actual incidence rate of plagiarism may be under-reported (Culwin, 2006; Thurmond, 2010). Studies that use self-reporting to collect data are problematic, and when self-reporting is the chosen method of dishonest behaviour, it "is even more challenging" (Kier, 2014; Scanlon & Neumann, 2002, p. 378; Youmans, 2011). MacDonald and Nail (2005) suggest that even though participants cannot be identified in anonymous studies, they will still choose to underreport behaviours that they believe to be viewed as undesirable. This is further supported by Curtis and Vardanega (2016) who believe that "the nature of self-reporting on a survey may underestimate the true extent of student engagement in plagiarism" (p. 1177). Students who forgot that they

have plagiarized as well as students who plagiarized but were unaware that they did so can impact the results of self-reporting data (Youmans, 2011).

Few studies provide students with an operational definition of plagiarism when investigating plagiarism engagement (Fish & Hura, 2013). Students do not necessarily understand what plagiarism entails, and they may therefore be inaccurately reporting on items that request plagiarism engagement information (Fish & Hura, 2013). Thus, if students are self-reporting on engagement in a behaviour that they do not fully understand, the results from such studies may be unreliable (Power, 2009). This leads to ambiguity with respect to interpretation of results (Liddell, 2003; Park, 2003). A limited number of studies provide a definition of plagiarism for their participants, but the definition can vary considerably across studies since institutions' definitions of plagiarism are not identical, which limits the ability of comparisons across plagiarism studies (Bennett, 2005). It is difficult to draw conclusions or make inferences from studies that use self-reporting, and comparing the plagiarism engagement rates across studies is problematic (Risquez et al., 2013).

Plagiarism Perceptions

Student plagiarism perceptions have received a lot of attention in the literature. Understanding why students engage in academic dishonesty is important for potentially reducing such behaviour (Miller, Shottaugh, & Wooldridge, 2011). Understanding the reasons why students engage in plagiarism may be more important than knowing that plagiarism occurs (Curtis & Popal, 2011). Plagiarism is a complex phenomenon, and as a result, there is no single reason why students choose to plagiarize (Ehrich et al., 2016). Many studies have demonstrated that students do not have the necessary knowledge needed to avoid plagiarism (Voelker et al., 2012). Ballantine and McCourt Larres (2010) support this when they state, "students might be

confused as to when they are engaging in plagiarism" (p. 290). Probett (2011) suggests that in some instances, "students are naïve with respect to understanding what plagiarism is and how to avoid it" (p. 170). If students do not understand citation rules, they may inadvertently plagiarize (Howard, 1995). It may be a false assumption to believe that students are aware of the behaviours that constitute plagiarism (Voelker et al., 2012). Although some students deliberately plagiarize, it was found that most students are unaware when they are engaging in plagiarism (Marcus & Beck, 2011; Power, 2009; Rolfe, 2011). Plagiarism can occur in a number of ways, in a number of degrees, and from a number of sources (Batane, 2010; Bennett, 2005; Roig, 1997).

Knowing reasons why students plagiarize will assist in deciding on the action that needs to be taken to stop it from occurring (Barry, 2006). Having an understanding of student perceptions needs "further consideration … particularly their perceptions of what constitutes dishonesty in an academic setting" (Jurdi, Hage, & Chow, 2012, p. 2). Anyanwu's (2004) Australian study consists of three case studies of university students who were suspected of plagiarism. Through individual interviews with the students, it was found that students are ignorant regarding how to properly cite sources in their work.

Gullifer and Tyson (2010) investigated student plagiarism perceptions through focus group sessions. Seven focus groups with first and third-year students studying at an Australian university were used to collect data. Forty-one students participated in a focus group session, and the focus group sessions were homogenous in major (psychology, policing, public relations, and advertising) as well as year of study (first-year or third-year). It was revealed that many participants were confused regarding which behaviours violate academic misconduct. Students were also confused regarding what the definition of plagiarism entailed.

Kier (2014) used Canadian students enrolled in a *Psychology of Adolescence* course to determine their ability to recognize plagiarized material and paraphrase material. Most of the participants lived in Alberta (44%), 2.2% were international students, and the remainder lived in a different province or territory. In total, 420 students participated in this study. Students completed five quizzes in the course, and the first question in four of the five quizzes focused on plagiarism in passages. Slightly more than half of the participants could accurately determine plagiarism in passages, and a minority of participants could paraphrase. These findings support the idea that students may have a difficult time determining what is and what is not plagiarism, and that they may experience even more difficulty in paraphrasing.

Power (2009) was interested in learning how first-year and second-year students understand plagiarism. The participants were enrolled in one of two writing courses at an American university. In addition, flyers were posted around campus to recruit participants for interviews. A total of 31 participants completed this study (11 interview participants, and 20 focus group participants). The overall theme in Power's (2009) study is that students can provide acceptable definitions of plagiarism but that they have a hard time applying the definition. For instance, although students may be able to describe what plagiarism is, they have limited ability in avoiding plagiarism.

Yeo (2007) presented 190 first-year students studying science and engineering at an Australian university with in-class surveys that assessed their ability to determine if plagiarism was present in passages. Although plagiarism was present in all six of the passages, the students did not report this to be the case, indicating limited plagiarism understandings. A theme that emerged in one of Gullifer and Tyson's (2010) focus group sessions suggested that since students do not learn about plagiarism, "they'll do it inadvertently, just because they don't

understand what plagiarism is" (p. 470). This is further demonstrated by a participant in Power's

(2009) study through the following: "I'm not sure which one you have to make reference to the

name of the person of the publication that you are citing or you are quoting. It's kind of hard. I'm

not sure" (p. 650).

Paraphrasing and summarising material, as well as the correct way to do so, are difficult

to differentiate for students, which may lead to plagiarism (Roig, 1997). It is not uncommon for

course evaluations to include research essays and final papers that can be worth a significant

portion of one's course grade. Written essays and papers may ask students to demonstrate a body

of knowledge, engage in critical thinking, analyse and synthesize content, and identify themes. If

written assignments are required from students, is the evaluation process undermined as

plagiarism is considered to be an issue in post-secondary education?

Insley (2011) writes that "some students unknowingly plagiarize because they are unclear

as to what constitutes a paraphrase" (pp. 184-185). It is suggested that "a proportion of

plagiarism is committed via confusion over how to integrate and reference source materials into

academic writing" (Gourlay & Deane, 2012, p. 19). On the same note, students might not be

aware of when they can claim something as their own, such as a concept or an opinion, and when

they need to use a citation (Ballantine & McCourt Larres, 2010). Hu and Lei (2012) asked

participants to complete rating tasks to learn of their ability to recognize unattributed copying

and paraphrasing in passages. Two hundred and seventy undergraduate students studying

computer engineering, mechanical engineering, English, or business in one of two Chinese

universities participated. Hu and Lei (2012) found that approximately 35% of participants

correctly identified deliberate copying to be plagiarism, and that only approximately 12%

identified paraphrasing without proper citation to be plagiarism. Understanding student

plagiarism perspectives has merit as it enables the development of strategies to encourage academic integrity (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010).

Writing is a practice that requires guidance (Ahmad, Mansourizadeh, & Koh Ming Ai, 2012). Students may understand basic levels of plagiarism, but plagiarism is complex, and students tend not to understand the more sophisticated levels of it (Ahmad et al., 2012). Through practice, which may come in the form of plagiarism education, students may develop a more thorough understanding of plagiarism, including its different layers.

As stated earlier, no single reason can be attributed to student plagiarism. One reason, which is suggested by Bannister and Ashworth (1998) is that of time pressures. Students reported that not having enough time to meet all of their demands as a reason for plagiarism. This is further supported by Insley (2011) who acknowledges that "students wait until the last minute to research and write their papers" (pp. 184-185). Waiting until the last minute to complete an assignment, which encompasses procrastination, leaves students with a limited amount of time to complete the assignment, and as a result, some may choose to plagiarize. In addition to time, Sterngold (2004) explains that uncertainty regarding assignment expectations may lead students to resort to plagiarism. According to Insley (2011), plagiarizing provides a fast and rather easy means to complete an assignment, which is a reason students may opt to engage in it. Students may have a number of reasons for their decision to engage in plagiarism. There is no single profile, however, of a student plagiarist. A recurring theme in the literature is that students may unknowingly engage in plagiarism. Students differ in their abilities to avoid plagiarism and in their beliefs of which behaviours constitute plagiarism.

Instructors' plagiarism perceptions can also differ. Flint, Clegg, and MacDonald (2006), interested in plagiarism perceptions of staff, interviewed 26 staff members across different

departments at a United Kingdom university. They found that staff do not agree on how plagiarism is defined. Some staff felt that certain behaviours were acceptable whereas other staff members found that the same behaviours should be reported.

Wilkinson (2009) asked staff members at an Australian university to participate in a study, through an email invitation, that examined perceptions of cheating. Forty-eight staff members from the Faculty of Health Studies completed the questionnaire. Staff reported on reasons why students engage in academic misconduct. The most common reason given by staff was that students do not have enough understanding of how to correctly reference their work.

Bennett et al. (2011) explored instructor perceptions of behaviours that constitute plagiarism. Participants were recruited through three teaching electronic listservs: PsychTeacher, Teaching in the Psychological Sciences, and ZippyNews. The behaviour of recycling components of or an entire assignment was viewed differently. An online questionnaire was completed by 158 participants. Twenty-two percent of instructors did not consider recycling of assignments to be plagiarism in this study. Thus, students may receive penalties in one course if they recycle assignments, whereas in another course, they will get away with it. Across an institution, standards need to be followed to avoid student confusion (Marcus & Beck, 2011). Having consensus among staff regarding the action to take for plagiarism can help with consistency in handling student plagiarism (Zobel & Hamilton, 2002).

Plagiarism Education

The literature indicates that plagiarism is present in higher education and its prevalence rate may be increasing. Several researchers have discovered that students might be unaware of when they are engaging in plagiarism and that students may have limited understanding of how to avoid it. Although plagiarism may not be completely preventable, students may benefit from

receiving plagiarism education that provides them with the opportunity to learn about behaviours that constitute plagiarism and to practice citation and referencing skills (Chuda et al., 2012).

A common way universities respond to plagiarism is through the use of plagiarism detection software (Bruton & Childers, 2016). Detection software requires students to submit their work to a program that will detect plagiarism, such as Turnitin, which is becoming more and more popular (Batane, 2010; Sutherland-Smith, 2010). It is estimated that a million educators use Turnitin, and Turnitin processes approximately 190, 000 papers daily (Hoge, 2013; Turnitin, 2014). SafeAssign, another plagiarism detection software, is provided to instructors and students through Blackboard 9.1, which is the leading learning platform in the United States (Kowitt, 2009). The use of softwares such as Turnitin and SafeAssign can detect plagiarism, but they cannot prevent it (Marshall, Taylor, Hothersall, & Perez-Martin, 2011). These types of software, however, have limitations. One limitation is that the program cannot match text with everything online: it is difficult to match images (Batane, 2010). Also, older hard copies, such as books, may not be available online. Therefore, students who choose to use books from a library may get away with plagiarism.

A second limitation is that these types of software cannot speak to the reasons for plagiarism (Devlin, 2003; Evering & Moorman, 2012). For instance, although the software will determine if there is a match between an uploaded assignment and either content on the internet or in the software's database, it will not determine if the information is correctly cited. Rolfe (2011) found that using Turnitin did "not improve the quality of referencing and citation" (p. 707). Instead, he found that students' citation skills worsened and that there was confusion regarding how to interpret the results. Using these types of detection software has been related to "putting a Band-Aid on a bruise" (Evering & Moorman, 2012, p. 38). Instead of detecting

plagiarism, which is an intent of these types of software, a proactive approach that focuses on plagiarism instruction should be taken (Dahl, 2007; Evering & Moorman, 2012; Owens & White, 2013).

Handling student plagiarism can be difficult and unpleasant for instructors (Elander et al., 2010). It is one of the top negative behaviours that instructors manage (Youmans, 2011). Student plagiarism, which is problematic for all educators, can have different penalties across institutions (Mozgovoy et al., 2010; Power, 2009). According to Parameswaran (2007), instructors may allow plagiarism to occur as a result of pressure. For instance, as student numbers in higher education are increasing, faculty-student ratios are remaining the same, which can lead to decreased effectiveness when student plagiarism occurs. When plagiarism is suspected, instructors handle it differently despite their institution having a policy in place that outlines the suggested course of action that should be taken. Instructors must decide if they should punish the plagiarism or if they should ignore it (Henslee, Goldsmith, Stone, & Krueger, 2015, p. 27-28).

As instructors have different beliefs regarding academic misconduct, the penalties for student plagiarism will differ as perceptions of severity of different plagiarism behaviours differs (Bennett et al., 2011; Whitley, 1998). For instance, Blum (2009) suggests that plagiarism behaviours are viewed along a continuum, and some instances are perceived to be more serious than others. The perception of the severity of the plagiarism instance can impact the penalty assigned. University instructors have "conflicting views over plagiarism and aspects of student plagiarism, including disputes over penalties" for plagiarism (Bruton & Childers, 2016, p. 316). Robinson-Zanartu et al. (2005) believe instructors use three factors when deciding penalties for student plagiarism: amount plagiarized, source of material, and how severe they felt the plagiarism was. A large amount of plagiarism from electronic sources and hard copies was

perceived to be more severe than a small amount of plagiarism from previous work (self-plagiarism). When unintentional plagiarism occurs, should students be penalized is a viewpoint shared by instructors when deciding on the penalty (Fish & Hura, 2013).

In Pickard's (2006) study on plagiarism attitudes from staff and students, it was found that 72% of staff participants had experienced at least one case of student plagiarism within the previous twelve months. When asked how the plagiarism case was handled, approximately 15% of participants did not provide an answer, which may indicate that "these staff members did not act on the suspected plagiarism" (Pickard, 2006, p. 225). Some instructors may opt to overlook the academic misconduct instead of dealing with it (Stowers & Hummel, 2011). One reason instructors may look the other way is that they do not feel it is their responsibility to handle student plagiarism, particularly if they do not teach in the English department as they perceive English instructors should be the ones to instruct students on plagiarism as well as deal with the problems (Stout, 2013).

Chuda et al. (2012) found that 12% of instructors give students a warning for plagiarism. Instructors who encounter instances of plagiarism may have to devote a lot of time filing a case when this time can be better spent elsewhere. Staff may forgo reporting suspected plagiarism, especially minor plagiarism, as developing the case will take a lot of time and increase one's workload (Devlin, 2003). It can take hours of work to retrieve the original source and compare it with the student's assignment (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). Reduced funding may lead to increases in class sizes, and as the number of students in a class increases, it may be more difficult for instructors to devote time to suspected plagiarism. For example, the Ontario provincial government recently "reduced public funding for Colleges and Universities, and Ontario now ranks last in public-per-student funding in Canada" (The Toronto Star, 2017). Canadian college

and university administrators are "arguing that they need to cut costs and increase workload. This can lead to a ballooning in class sizes" (The Toronto Star, 2017). Further, instructors may feel that their role switches from educator to investigator when engaged in the process of suspected student plagiarism (Davis, 2011).

Plagiarism can prevent learning as the focus is now on detecting plagiarism (Howard, 2003). According to Whicker and Kronenfeld, (1994), reporting plagiarism requires a lot of effort, and this effort takes away from other teaching and learning tasks, which may encourage instructors to forgo reporting the plagiarism. The time spent investigating plagiarism is taken away from the time that instructors can spend creating and strengthening the learning environment (Thurmond, 2010). Some instructors are fearful of potentially harming a student's academic career, so they forgo reporting suspected plagiarism, whereas other instructors do not report it as they do not want to be a part of a time-consuming litigation process (Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992). McKeachie (2002) suggests that if an instructor chooses to address the plagiarism, it may lead to a possible legal defense, in addition to upsetting the student or having the student deny the plagiarism. With respect to reporting plagiarism and student consequences, the university may be hesitant to do anything about suspected plagiarism, so the student goes unpunished despite the instructor devoting his or her time to develop the case (Devlin, 2003). Instructors' dissatisfaction with the university's plagiarism policies and procedures may be another reason for not reporting the plagiarism (Bruton & Childers, 2016). Some instructors may opt not to report the suspected plagiarism for fear of not being supported by those in upper management; therefore, responding to academic dishonesty varies between instructors (Ryan, Bonanno Krass, Scouller, & Smith, 2009). Leonard and LeBrasseur (2008) surveyed business and economic professors from 19 Ontario universities. Professors reported on

their plagiarism experiences as well as the outcomes for students suspected of plagiarism. Many of these professor participants were unsatisfied with the punishment that was given to the student. One participant reported that "I have been consistently disappointed by the 'weak' penalties imposed on those students who have been charged with plagiarism/misconduct" (Leonard & LeBrasseur, 2008, p. 49). Another participant noted that "The procedures for dealing with cheating were so cumbersome that it was simply not worth dealing with it. The system greatly favours the dishonest student" (Leonard & LeBrasseur, 2008, p. 49).

Many higher education instructors add a statement about academic dishonesty to their course outline, but they rarely discuss that statement with their students until an incident occurs (Evering & Moorman, 2012). Faculty members may not fully understand the policy themselves (Wang, 2008). In Power's (2009) study, it was revealed that students are frustrated with receiving consequences about plagiarism and no reasoning why plagiarism is wrong, a theme that emerged through undergraduate focus group sessions. As explained by one focus group participant, "professors do not share "this was why you shouldn't do it" but more "this is what will happen if you do it" like "these are the consequences"" (Power, 2009, p. 651). Anney and Mosha (2015) found that student participants reported their instructors talked about plagiarism, but that they do not teach the concept or explain it in depth. Miller et al. (2011) suggests that the most frequent method used to reduce academic misconduct is presenting students with "the threat of punishment or consequences" (p. 173).

Ryan et al. (2009) found that undergraduate and postgraduate students reported that they knew the University had a plagiarism policy; however, many students are unaware of the policy's content. Universities may also include the plagiarism policy in student agendas/handbooks, but it does not ensure that students will read it (Wang, 2008). Power (2009)

found that out of 31 participants in her study, not one read the plagiarism information in the student handbook, even though the students all reported they were aware that the information was in it. Despite informing students where they can find the rules about plagiarism or resources to help with their writing, it does not ensure that students will read these rules and resources (Baird & Dooey, 2014).

Few instructors provide plagiarism examples to their students (Evering & Moorman, 2012). Many students may be unsure of their school's academic integrity guidelines and consequences for engagement in academic integrity (Estow, Lawrence, & Adams, 2011). Plagiarism information, along with consequences for plagiarizing, should be on course outlines that students receive in the very first class; a discussion about plagiarism should also take place (Davis, 2011). Instead of instructors having to police their students with respect to plagiarism, the relationship should be focused on student-teacher (Howard, 2001). Unlike punitive approaches, preventative approaches inform the students that the instructor cares about the students' learning and success (Insley, 2011). Holt (2012) feels that education can help students better understand plagiarism, and the amount of unintentional plagiarism committed may decrease. In other words, instructors need to educate students about skills needed to avoid plagiarism, and prevention, rather than punishment, may be the best way to handle student plagiarism (Evering & Moorman, 2012; Kier, 2014).

Students who have the skills necessary to avoid plagiarism are less likely to submit work containing plagiarism compared to students who have not yet developed this skills (Anderman & Murdock, 2007). It was also revealed that generally, "students don't cheat for the fun of it" (Anderman & Murdock, 2007, p. 87). Morris (1999) suggests that a low quality of plagiarism advice may be directly related to student plagiarism (as cited in Vardi, 2012). Paraphrasing

lessons in classrooms can teach students how to paraphrase correctly (Bennett et al., 2011). From a student perspective of plagiarism education, Dahl (2007) found that 66.6% wanted additional information regarding which behaviours constitute plagiarism. Similarly, students believe their instructors do not do a good job explaining why they should refrain from plagiarizing and how to do so (Power, 2009). Gullifer and Tyson (2010) found that students believe the education they receive about plagiarism is usually presented as rules and warnings. Rules and warnings do not allow students to practice the skills needed to avoid plagiarism. When student plagiarism is suspected, however, students would prefer to receive a warning for the first occurrence (Ryan et al., 2009).

Providing students with some type of plagiarism education may change student plagiarism perceptions (Aasheim et al., 2012). In this study, students viewed copying parts of or all of an assignment to be more unacceptable after an academic dishonesty talk. This lends support that plagiarism perceptions may be modified as a result of education. These authors discuss that "education efforts focused on clarifying the boundaries of acceptable behaviour may help students to avoid inadvertent cheating" (Aasheim et al., 2012, p. 298). Estow et al. (2011) found that "immersing students in the topic of plagiarism has clear benefits and can improve their skills significantly" (p. 257). Curtis, Gouldthorp, Thomas, O'Brien, and Correia (2013) found that an online-mastery module of academic integrity increased students' understandings of plagiarism and student perceptions for the severity of plagiarism. Instruction is also considered to be the most effective means to handle student plagiarism (Evering & Moorman, 2012).

A common misconception regarding plagiarism is that students enter higher education with sufficient plagiarism knowledge, which is not necessarily the case (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). Bruton and Childers (2013) found that some instructors perceive the limited plagiarism

education provided in secondary school to be attributed to student plagiarism in post-secondary education. Owens and White (2013) found that correct citation skills are a problem for first-year students, thereby demonstrating that students need some type of instruction when entering post-secondary education.

Elander et al. (2010) found that the changes for year one students with respect to plagiarism knowledge was the greatest compared to other years of study, which supports "the common sense case for providing instruction in the avoidance of plagiarism as early as possible in students' university careers" (p. 167). Having students complete plagiarism education in their first-year of study may reduce the plagiarism engagement rate found on campus, reduce student confusion regarding what is and what is not acceptable, and save instructors time as suspected plagiarism cases require a lot of effort.

It would appear, from this literature review, that using self-reporting of student engagement in plagiarism, which many plagiarism research studies do, is problematic and needs to be interpreted with caution. The plagiarism rate found in such studies may be lower than the true rate, as it was demonstrated that under-reporting is more likely to occur in self-reporting of perceived negative behaviours. Also, student perceptions of plagiarism were discussed, and a common theme is that students are unaware of specific behaviours that constitute plagiarism and that they lack the appropriate knowledge necessary to avoid plagiarizing.

Instructor perceptions of plagiarism also differ. Some instructors may report all instances of suspected plagiarism, some instructors may report suspected plagiarism based on the amount of plagiarism, and some instructors may look the other way. The inconsistencies in handling student plagiarism may be related to student plagiarism confusion. With respect to plagiarism education, many colleges and universities are turning to plagiarism detection software, however

this software is used to catch plagiarists, with little to no education occurring regarding how to avoid it. Instead of focusing on catching plagiarists and assigning them consequences, examining why these students are plagiarizing should be the primary concern (Howard, 2001). Student plagiarism can occupy a lot of an instructor's time, particularly instructors who file plagiarism cases. Providing students with plagiarism education is encouraged, and doing so may be the best way to combat student plagiarism.

Andragogy

Social scientists have been studying how adults learn for decades (Dachner & Polin, 2016). No single theory or model regarding how adults learn or what the learning process that adults engage in exists (Merriam, 2001). There is one adult learning theory, however, that has gained popularity: andragogy, which is an adult learning theory considered to have been developed by Malcolm Knowles (1968) (Dachner & Polin, 2016). Andragogy, a concept for helping adults to learn, "evolved in Europe for quite some time before it was introduced in North America" (Storey & Wang, 2017, p. 108). Andragogy, which has gained popularity over the last thirty years, initially began as a theory, but as a result of some of its criticisms, it is now considered a learner-centered set of assumptions (Robles, 1998; Southerland Evans, 2012, p. 26; Taylor & Kroth, 2009).

Andragogy, according to the Oxford Dictionary, is defined as "the method and practice of teaching adult learners" (Oxford Dicitionaries, 2018). The term andragogy "grew in popularity from 1960 to 2000 when Malcolm Knowles began to synthesize the concept" (Taylor & Kroth, 2009, pp. 1-2). Andragogy gives the decision-making process regarding learning to the adult and assumes that the adult is able to make his or her own decisions regarding the what, how, and when of learning (Chan, 2010). According to Muneja (2015), "Andragogy can make adults learn

effectively in their own terms, and not as children" (p. 55). Andragogy purports that "someone cannot make someone else learn, but someone can help someone else to learn" (Southerland Evans, 2012, p. 35).

Researchers suggest that an increasing number of adults continue education after completion of Grade 12 (Southland Evans, 2012). Andragogy is concerned with adult learning. As such, it is important to consider the different facets of the term *adult.* With respect to biology, Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (2011) suggested that "people become adults when they reach the age at which they can reproduce" (Beard, 2013, p. 17). Legally, people are defined as adults when they can engage in certain legal procedures, such as vote and marry. Socially, adults are defined by their ability to carry out adult roles, such as full-time employment and taking care of children. Lastly, "people are adults psychologically when they are able to take responsibility for their own lives" (Beard, 2013, p. 17).

Andragogy includes six key principles of adult learners (Beard, 2013). These six principles "move power, responsibility, and motivation toward the learner, away from the instructor. Decision-making about and ownership of learning outcomes are shared among students and instructor" (Fornaciari & Lund Dean, 2014, p. 703). The six principles of andragogy, as shared by Knowles, include the following:

1. The need to know
2. The learner's self-concept
3. The role of experience
4. Readiness to learn
5. Orientation to learning
6. Motivation

The first principle, *The need to know,* suggests that adult learners need to know "why they should learn something before they engage in learning it" (Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 23). The second principle, *The learner's self-concept,* focuses on how humans become more independent as they mature, and their desire to direct their learning increases (Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 23). According to Pratt (1993), "… the needs and experience of the learner take precedence over the expertise of the instructor" (p. 19). *The role of experience,* the third principle, proposes that adults have many more experiences than children, and as a result, adults can use their past experiences during learning. *Readiness to learn* assumes that "adults are driven to learn new skills or understand new concepts based on the ever-changing demands of work and life, so timing the learning to correspond with the tasks at hand is at the heart of this principle of adult learning" (Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 25). *Orientation to learning* suggests that adult learners need to apply the learning to immediate situations, and that this learning may help them to solve a problem. According to Knowles, "adults are motivated to devote energy to learn something to the extent that they perceive that it will help them perform tasks or deal with problems that they confront in their life situations" (Knowles, 1990, p. 61). Dachner and Polic (2016) further suggest that "adults have a problem-focused orientation to learning such that they want to be able to use new knowledge and skills immediately" (p. 123). The timing of the learning "to correspond with the tasks at hand is at the heart of this principle of adult learning" (Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 25). *Motivation,* the last principle, assumes that adults, although receptive to external motivators, such as a promotion at work, most of their motivators are internal, such as self-esteem (Knowles, 1990).

Today's classrooms of adult learners require a "shift … from simply filling vacant, passive minds with knowledge provided by the instructor" (Southerland Evans, 2012, p. 26).

Many adult learning environments use lecture format, but lectures "may be considered by many to be a method more aligned with pedagogy" (Beard, 2013, p. 26). Adults need a supportive learning environment which may allow them to feel valued (Southerland Evans, 2012). Instructors who use andragogical principles "focus more on being a facilitator of learning instead of being a transmitter of knowledge and evaluator" (Taylor & Kroth, 2009, p. 3). These instructors are "encouraged to establish a climate conducive to learning … that is characterized by trust, mutual respect, collaboration and informality, rather than by the authoritarian, competitive atmosphere which students are likely to have experienced in many of their past classes" (Wolfson, 1998, p. 28).

Andragogy has different approaches as the concept, including its principles, can be perceived differently (Loeng, 2017). There are different teaching activities that adopt andragogical principles, and some will be outlined. Case studies are one technique that can be used with adult learners. Through a teaching method that utilizes case studies, adult learners are provided with opportunities to draw on previous experiences (Galbraith, 2004). The use of case studies not only encourages adult learners to learn from their own perceptions, but they also allow the learners to "build on the experiences of others" (Beard, 2013, p. 26). Discussions are another technique that allows for the teacher and the learner to both make contributions. Through engagement in discussions, it is believed that the learner is actively engaged in the educational experience, which "is well suited for the problem solving, concept exploration, and attitude change" (Galbraith, 2004, p. 210). Discussions promote collaboration, support, and mutual respect. Knowles suggest that a "psychologically positive environment is paramount to effective learning, and that a psychological climate that promotes learning includes mutual respect,

collaboration, mutual trust, support, openness …" (Knowles, 1995 as cited in Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 28).

Knowles' concept of andragogy has been "widely adopted by educators from various disciplines around the world" (Chan, 2010, p. 25). Some of these disciplines include education (Bolton, 2006), criminal justice (Birzer, 2004), and medicine (Bedi, 2004). Birzer (2004), who examined andragogical principles in criminal justice programs, acknowledges that the application of these principles can guide educators in designing learning-centered instruction (Birzer, 2004). For example, Birzer (2004) suggests that educators involve learners in the planning, such as by adjusting a course outline based on student interests. This corresponds to Knowles' principle of *The learner's self-concept.* In reality, though, "the majority of syllabi are designed by educational institutions or other accreditation bodies… which may [sic] result in both lecturer and student having very little input in what should be included in the syllabi for the course" (McGrath, 2009, p. 104). Bedi (2004) implemented the andragogical principles in instruction for medical registrars. Through applying these principles, Bedi (2004) reports that the learners were engaged in active learning in developing and acquiring the skills needed. Bedi (2004) states that:

> An understanding of andragogy has fundamentally changed me as a teacher because it has informed my teaching methods and expanded and harnessed my teaching skills. I would argue that there is a natural bridge between my expanding knowledge of learning styles and the way in which I have matured as an andragogical educator. This link, for me, is learning that we as trainers are not responsible for a student's learning, and that appreciating the learning style of an individual in a given situation helps us to better understand the learner. (p. 93)

Davis-McCauley, Hammer, and Hinojosa (2017) use an andragogical approach in teaching leadership by implementing the principles of andragogy in their course. These authors provide examples of how they incorporate the andragogy learning principles into leadership courses. For example, the principle *Readiness to learn*, centers on the fact that adults prefer information that they perceive to be applicable and that is of immediate relevance. Teamwork is one topic in the leadership course (Davis-McCauley et al., 2017). The students complete an activity on teamwork in order to experience its importance. By engaging with the course content through an exercise, the students learn of "the benefits of teamwork, thus helping students develop an appreciation and readiness for learning about this topic" (Davis-McCauley et al., 2017, p. 317).

This dissertation focuses on plagiarism perceptions and education within a higher education students. As such, the principles of andragogy, particularly *Principle 1: The need to know, Principle 3: The role of experience, Principle 4: Readiness to learn,* and *Principle 6: Motivation,* can be discussed in relation to plagiarism in a post-secondary environment. *The need to know* acknowledges that students should be informed why they should refrain from engaging in plagiarism. Providing learners with the *why* may help them to develop an understanding of the relevance of learning about the topic, in this case plagiarism. If the learners have an understanding of plagiarism as well as why plagiarism should be avoided, andragogy is promoted, which can help foster adult learning. *The role of experience* acknowledges that adult learners have many experiences, and these experiences can be used in learning. Students enter higher education with previous assumptions about different topics, such as plagiarism. For students who enter with plagiarism perceptions that differ from the institution' academic integrity practices, "unlearning" needs to take place so change can result (Knowles et al., 2011).

For example, if students were not encouraged to avoid plagiarism in secondary education, or if engagement in plagiarism was not perceived to be severe, then students may have developed a more acceptable behaviour towards plagiarism, which can differ from the policies in their higher education environment. Although adult learners can draw on past experiences, new learning may need to be created based on those past experiences (Cox, 2015).

Readiness to learn suggests that prior to completing an educational experience, the adult learner needs to be ready to learn (Tabor, 2013). If an instructor chooses to report the suspected plagiarism and has not previously explained plagiarism to his or her students, students are being punished for something they may not have yet learned (Tabor, 2013). Thoroughly informing students what plagiarism entails and why plagiarism will not be tolerated might help students learn about this concept. Also, students need to be able to see the immediate relevance of the learning. If instructors explain plagiarism and citation practices at the beginning of the semester and do not revisit this content when an assignment is due, typically a month into the semester, the adult learners may fail to see the relevance of the content. As suggested by Cox (2015), "… learners will want to work on immediate problems, rather than explore seemingly unrelated issues or tasks" (p. 30). Compared to children, adult learners have more life experiences as well as time demands; thus, the instructional approach in post-secondary education should be more andragogical (Galbraith & Fouch, 2007).

Motivation, that which focuses on adults' preferences for internal motivators, is considered to be a key factor to a student's success in post-secondary education; the higher one's motivation is, the more he or she will learn (Sogunro, 2015, p. 22). Motivation is a quality that is present in all aspects of teaching and learning (Schunk, Pintrich, & Meece, 2008). With respect to student motivation in higher education, facilitating a teacher-centered learning environment

"can remind adults of the notorious teaching practices reminiscent of the K-12 education they went through, and hence, becomes demotivating" (Sogunro, 2015, p. 30).

As suggested by Toohey (1999), activities and assignments that provide adult learners with information of requirements and different types of feedback can encourage student motivation. Effective and timely feedback was viewed to be most motivating among 90% of adult learners in (Sogunro, 2015). Since adult learners have a plethora of experiences, they may be likely to want to take control of their learning and have a higher preference for internal motivators (Knowles, 1980; Knowles et al., 2005). Providing adult learners with feedback on their work, particularly any aspects that violate academic integrity, may help these learners to develop an understanding of plagiarism with respect to where they went wrong, while simultaneously increasing their internal motivation.

Academic Entitlement

There is a growing interest in academic entitlement (AE) among researchers (Chowning & Campbell 2009; Ciani, Summers, & Easter, 2008; Lippmann et al., 2009; Morrow, 1994; Singleton-Jackson et al. 2011). Although the notion of academic entitlement was introduced 20 years ago, and researchers have attempted to define it and create measures to assess it, particularly through the development of questionnaires, the literature in this area is limited and little AE empirical data is available (Andrey, et al., 2012; Wasieleski, Whatley, Briihl, & Branscome, 2014). Researchers define AE differently (Singleton-Jackson et al., 2010). Ciani et al. (2008) describe AE as students who are "deserving of higher grades without putting much effort into the work or perceive themselves as deserving special treatment" (p. 333). Morrow (1994), an early academic entitlement researcher, suggests that a student's sense of entitlement

may lead to student beliefs that "if a student fails, the fault cannot lie in the student-it must lie in the teachers, the curriculum, the institution, or more vaguely the 'system'" (p. 35).

Twenge (2006) noted that academic entitlement may be increasing on higher education campuses. Lemke, Marx, and Dundes (2017), however, reported that academic entitlement has decreased between 2009 and 2017 from 41% to 27% (Morin, 2018). Academic entitlement positions students in the role of customers. Academic entitlement can be expressed through attitudes or behaviours; for example, "a student may ask a teacher to raise a final grade (behaviour) or a student may feel entitled to certain services because of the tuition that the student pays (attitude)" (McLellan & Jackson, 2017, p. 160). Students who have feelings of entitlement may perceive that they deserve specific outcomes as a result of paying tuition (Kopp et al., 2011). Lippman et al. (2009) discuss that "the behaviors and attitudes which stem from this disposition often reflect a sense of being owed an assessment of performance inconsistent with students' actual effort or work" (p. 198). An example of an academically entitled student's belief is that "3 hours of work on a paper should result in an "A" (Kopp et al., 2011, pp. 106-107). In this belief, the student is equating the grade that he or she should receive with the amount of time spent on the assignment. It is evident in this example that the student is not considering multiple aspects of the assignment to be relevant in the grading (Kopp et al., 2011).

Academically entitled students "believe that they should receive good outcomes, regardless of whether their performance actually merits these desirable outcomes" (Semmoms, Finney, & Kopp, 2015, p.243). Greenberger et al. (2008) found that "66% of participants believe trying hard should be considered in a course grade and about 33% thought that merely attending most classes should earn them a B in the course (Lemke, Marx, & Dundes, 2017, p. 1).

Academic entitlement "has been associated with maladapted behaviours and attitudes with implications for counselors, educators, and administrators" (Semmons et al., 2015, p. 243). Students who exhibit high levels of entitlement beliefs often demand a significant amount of an instructor's time and energy (Lippman et al., 2009, p. 220). Student AE can prevent educators from teaching effectively (Barrett & Scott, 2014). Educators may opt to modify classroom practices to accommodate these students (Cain, Romanelli, & Smith, 2012). If educators choose to do this, do they reinforce the notion of student as consumer?

Some research has examined student academic entitlement in respect to academic dishonesty. Greenberger et al. (2008) found that students who had higher academically entitled attitudes engaged in academic dishonesty more often. Wasieleski et al. (2014) suggests that "academic entitlement is associated with negative consequences, including increased engagement in academically dishonest behaviour" (p. 449). Stiles, Wong, and LaBeff (2018) investigated "the role that AE plays in predicting college cheating" (p. 825). They found that AE is a "significant predictor of cheating in college such that as AE increases so does academic cheating in college" (Stiles, Wong, & LaBeff, 2018, p. 825).

Plagiarism, a type of academic misconduct, has been investigated in relation to academic entitlement; however, the research available on this is scarce. Given that there is a steady rise in academic entitlement, we might consider how this phenomenon potentially influences students' engagement in plagiarism (Kopp et al., 2011).

Values

Before values are discussed, an outline of ethics and morality, which helps to situate one's value system, will be provided. The word ethics can mean different terms to different people (Davis, 2014, p. 471). There is no single agreed upon definition of ethics in the literature.

Ethics, in a sense, is another word for morality – "the standards of conduct that apply to all moral agents" (Davis, 2014, p. 472). Ethics can be defined as "moral principles that govern a person's behavior or the conducting of an activity" (Oxford Dictionary, 2018). Morality, according to the Oxford Dictionary, is defined as "principles concerning the distinction between right and wrong or good and bad behaviour" (Oxford Dictionary, 2018). One's "system of values and principles of conduct" is considered to encompass morality (Oxford Dictionary, 2018). According to Davis (2011), moral learning is typically completed by the time one starts post-secondary education, and as a result, technical instruction is limited in its contribution.

Values are considered to be "relatively stable motivational characteristics of persons that change little during adulthood" (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Individuals have several values, and these values differ in their level of importance; a particular value, such as a world of peace, may be extremely important to one person yet unimportant to someone else (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). According to Rokeach (1973), values serve as guiding principles in an individual's life: they are not subject to frequent change (Lan, Gowing, Riger, McMahon, & King, 2010, p. 185).

Balbuena and Lamela (2015) investigated student motives for engaging in academic dishonesty. These authors acknowledge that "… plagiarism is an ethical concern in most educational institutions" (p. 70). Student participants in this study reported numerous reasons why they engage in academic misconduct, including not wanting to fail, being too busy, not understanding the content, and wanting to make parents proud. Balbuena and Lamela (2015) discuss that "a certain dilemma occurs in students' minds with respect to dealing with academic integrity" (Balbuena & Lamela, 2015, p. 73). Although one may be aware that engaging in academic dishonesty is frowned upon in their education institution, this does not mean one will

automatically refrain from engaging in it. Individuals face different dilemmas on a daily basis, and how one chooses to respond can be a reflection of which values one perceives to be of high importance.

It is suggested that values affect behaviour (Schwartz, 2006). Values have "psychological, practical, and social consequences that may conflict or may be congruent with the pursuit of other values" (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Correlations indicate that there is a "substantial degree of agreement in nations from around the world regarding which value types are relatively important and which are relatively unimportant" (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001, p. 10).

If it is suggested that values may guide one's behaviour, then learning of values that undergraduate students perceive to be important as guiding principles in their life may provide insight on student engagement in plagiarism behaviours. Students who have weak understandings of plagiarism are more likely to engage in plagiarism behaviours (Colella, 2012). Some of the current plagiarism research investigates student characteristics, such as age, year of study, and gender, to learn which student is likely to plagiarize (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2003; Lester & Diekhoff, 2003). There is "little agreement in the research about the student types who are likely to plagiarize…" (East, 2010, p. 72). Using correlations for personal value scores and plagiarism knowledge scores may lead to learning about students who are susceptible to plagiarizing. Research on values and plagiarism understandings is extremely limited.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study investigated the effectiveness of a plagiarism education tutorial, student experiences and perceptions of plagiarism, academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge, personal values and plagiarism knowledge, students' experiences of completing the plagiarism education tutorial, and instructor perceptions and responsibilities of plagiarism. I collected both quantitative and qualitative data in my study. Combined, qualitative and quantitative research approaches can provide information that is difficult to gather independently (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1999).

One of the overall goals of my research is to provide students with plagiarism instruction to determine if students who receive plagiarism instruction score statistically significantly higher on a post-test than students who did not receive this instruction. I collected quantitative data to answer this research question for its relevance in pre-test/post-test designs. Since plagiarism can be a sensitive issue, especially for students who may have been suspected of plagiarism in the past, I opted to use an online survey, which may have provided the student participants a layer of comfort when responding to plagiarism questions.

My study asked participants to work through an online learning module, and as a follow-up, I felt it was appropriate to ask these students for feedback, which was included in *Undergraduate Students Academic Practices: Part 2* (the second part of my study for student participants). Allowing students to provide feedback on their experiences of participating in the first part of my study provided me with ideas and insights on how to improve the tutorial should it be used in the future. These follow-up questions allowed students to express their opinions, which may have provided them with a sense of value as a participant in my research study.

The qualitative information I collected from the student participants, such as their opinions on reasons why students may engage in plagiarism, was collected to gain a better understanding of plagiarism perceptions from students' perspectives. For instance, one of the survey items asks students to include plagiarism stories they heard or shared. By providing open-ended questions, participants were able to express as many details about the stories they'd like. Presenting this survey item in a quantitative manner may have limited the holisticness of the participants' story, which in turn, may have negatively impacted their autonomy when completing this study.

I decided to include instructors as participants in this study as plagiarism is a complex issue, and when plagiarism is suspected, it is typically the instructor who decides what approach to take with the suspected plagiarism. A part of my rationale for collecting data on instructors' perceptions of plagiarism responsibilities as well as their experiences regarding plagiarism was to allow for a more thorough picture of plagiarism at this institution. The instructors were presented with open-ended questions through an online survey, and they were given the opportunity to respond with as little or as much detail as they chose.

The student participants in this study were registered in a Psychology Participant Pool. The Psychology Participant Pool, hosted by the Faculty of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (FAHSS) at the participating institution, was used to collect data from the student participants. The Department of Psychology instructors, graduate students, and undergraduate honors thesis students may collect data using this pool (approval by the Research Ethics Board is required for instructors and graduate students who post studies). Instructors who teach undergraduate psychology courses can decide if they want the students in their class to earn any bonus marks towards their final course grade. If an instructor offers his or her students the opportunity to earn

bonus marks, students register as a participant on the Psychology Participant Pool. The students are then able to complete studies to earn bonus marks that they can assign towards participating classes. Students receive 0.5 bonus marks per every 30 minutes of participation. For example, if a student registers for a study that is 1.5 hours then the student will receive 1.5 bonus marks upon completion of the study that the student can then assign towards courses that he or she is enrolled in that are applicable. Student are only able to earn up to a maximum of 3 bonus marks per class (3 additional percentages), and the number of bonus marks for a certain class (up to 3) is at the discretion of the instructor.

The instructor participants were teaching (or have taught within the previous 12 months) at the same southwestern Ontario university as the student participants. Student participant data analyses include a within-subjects repeated measures ANOVA, Pearson product correlation coefficients, Spearman correlations, frequencies, and thematic analysis. Instructor participant data analyses includes thematic analysis and frequencies.

Participants

This study has two groups of participants: undergraduate students and instructors.

Students: The student participants in this study were registered in the Psychology Participant Pool during the fall 2016 and/or winter 2017 semester. During the fall 2016 semester, participants completed the plagiarism education tutorial. A total of 219 students completed this part of the study. During the winter 2017 semester, participants completed an online exit survey, and a total of 122 students completed this part of the study (43 participants who completed Part 1, and 79 participants who completed Part 2).

Instructors: The instructor participants in this study were currently teaching at the institution in which this study took place or they have taught at this institution within the previous 12 months. Eighty instructors completed the online surveys.

Procedures

After receiving permission from the University's Research Ethics Board (REB), I completed researcher training with a Psychology Participant Pool Coordinator. This training included learning of the rules and regulations of the Psychology Participant Pool as well as how to create an account and set-up my online study. After I completed this training and received permission from the Psychology Participant Pool to post the study, data collection began. In September 2016, the first part of the study, *Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices*, was posted on the Psychology Participant Pool website. There were no pre-requisites to complete this part of the study. A study description (Appendix C) was posted on the website, and it contained the study's URL. The participants who completed this part of the study were assigned 1.5 bonus marks as it took the pilot group an average of 82 minutes (time is rounded up to the next half hour increment). When participants clicked on the study's URL, they were directed to the Letter of Information (Appendix D), which was hosted in Fluid Surveys. The Letter of Information included an option for participants to check to give their consent to participate in the study.

In January 2017, *Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2* was posted on the Psychology Participant Pool website. There were no pre-requisites to complete this part of the study. A study description (Appendix E) was posted on the website, and it included the study's URL. Participants received 1 bonus mark for completing this part of the study as the pilot group took on average of 49 minutes. When participants clicked on the study's URL, they were directed to the Letter of Information (Appendix F), which was hosted in Fluid Surveys. The

Letter of Information included an option for participants to check to give their consent to participate in the study.

The instructor participants in this study completed an online survey. To send the instructors an email to participate in the study, permission from Human Resources was needed. Human Resources agreed that an email can be sent to instructors after receipt of the REB approval number. The email that was sent to the instructors included a brief description of the survey (Appendix G) and a link to assess the Letter of Information (Appendix H). The Letter of Information included a link that the participants clicked on to provide their consent and to access the online survey. The first email was sent to instructors on November 17, 2016 at 7:33 PM. On December 13, 2016 at 8:32 PM, a reminder email was sent. A final reminder was sent on January 17, 2017 at 8:41 PM. The email addresses were provided by the Human Resources Department, and all email addresses were placed in the Blind Carbon Copy (BCC) field. The emails were sent outside of university business hours as this is requirement to send the mass email. The 17-item online survey (Appendix I), which explored instructors' plagiarism perceptions and responsibilities for handling student plagiarism, were formed based on the study's research questions as well as discussions with the dissertation supervisor. All the participants who completed this survey were currently teaching at the university or have taught at the university within the previous 12 months. Completed surveys include surveys that had a response to each item. A total of 80 complete surveys are used in the data analysis.

Research Method

This study investigated the effectiveness of a plagiarism education tutorial, student experiences and perceptions of plagiarism, academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge, values and plagiarism knowledge, students' experiences of completing the plagiarism education

tutorial, and instructor perceptions and responsibilities of plagiarism. This study collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Combined, qualitative and quantitative research approaches can provide information that is difficult to gather independently (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1999).

This study used a survey design, including both open-ended and close-ended questions to collect data (Mackety, 2007). Collecting data through Web-based surveys began in 1994, and today this data collection method is extremely common (Lazar & Preece, 1999; Pitkow & Kehoe, 1996). Surveys, which can measure individuals' attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, practices, and experiences about topics, is the most common tool used to collect data in educational research, and they have the ability to inform teaching and research (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002; Lauer, McLeod, & Blythe, 2013). Survey research is an inexpensive way to collect data from a large number of participants, especially when it is conducted online (Babbie, 2007; Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Online surveys are gaining popularity because of the high number of internet users and the potential they have for a higher response rate (Gaddis, 1998).

Open-ended survey questions were used to collect data on plagiarism perceptions, plagiarism experiences, and plagiarism responsibilities. Allowing participants to report on items that are considered sensitive through open-ended questions may help to reduce surveyor bias (Reja, Manfreda, Hlebec, & Vehovar, 2003). Further, open-ended questions provide more diverse responses than close-ended-questions, which is beneficial when asking participants to self-report on their perceptions. Open-ended questions do not limit participants to responses that are provided in close-ended questions (Reja et al., 2003). Open-ended questions, which are ideal when exploring perceptions, do have challenges. First, open ended questions require extensive coding: the coding is much more labour-intensive than for close-ended questions (Bradburn &

Sudman, 1991; Reja et al.). Further, open-ended questions yield greater non-item response than do close-ended questions. Close-ended questions, which provide participants with options to choose from as their response to a question, can be analyzed more quickly than open-ended questions. Although close-ended questions limit the respondent to alternatives offered, when collecting data on variables such as yes/no responses, multiple choice test questions, and opinions through Likert scales, they are appropriate (Foddy, 1993).

The survey that the instructors completed was anonymous. Since this survey asked participants to report on academic integrity perceptions, ensuring anonymity may have increased the amount of information participants reported. Also, allowing participants to complete the survey online may have increased honesty in responses (Ritter & Sue, 2007). All participant surveys were confidential. Students provided their name and their email address prior to beginning the survey so that the bonus marks could be assigned to their account upon completing the study. All participants were able to withdraw their participation from the study at any time, and they were informed of this in the Letter of Information. A *Discard* button was present on each survey page, and if a participant clicked it, a pop-up box asking them to confirm that they want to end participation in the study was presented.

A pilot project for all parts of this study was carried out. Students enrolled in an education graduate research methods and survey design course comprised the pilot group for *Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 1.* This pilot group included five graduate students who provided the primary researcher with suggestions to improve the survey format, revise a branching error (if a participant selected no, the participant was not directed to the correct question, and instead, was directed to the same question as participants who selected yes to the item), and determine the duration of time it took to compete the study. The students were

requested to work through this part of the study as one of their homework assignments, and they reported notes about their experience working through the study with the researcher the following class through an in-class visit and class discussion. Two students enrolled in a Ph.D. program were used as a pilot group for *Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2* as well as the instructor surveys (*Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities*). These students informed the primary researcher of the amount of time it took to complete both surveys as well as any errors they came across or suggestions they had.

Instrumentation

This section describes the instrumentation that was used with each group of participants.

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 1

After participants provided consent to participate in the study, they were asked to provide their month of birth. Odd birth months (01, 03, 05, 07, 09, and 11) composed the experimental group, and even birth months (02, 04, 06, 08, 10, and 12) composed the control group. The experimental group and the control group were presented with identical items, but the order of the presentation differed. After discussions with the REB Coordinator and a Consultant from the Academic Data Centre, I was encouraged to present the participants with identical measures to ensure that one group would not receive an advantage through participation in the study compared to the other group (experimental group and control group). It was decided that the participants would complete the same measures, however the control group would work through the plagiarism education tutorial as the final component of the study. The order of the measures presented to each of the groups are as follows:

Experimental group: plagiarism pre-test, academic entitlement questionnaire, personal values questionnaire, demographic questions, plagiarism opinions survey, plagiarism education tutorial, and plagiarism post-test.

Control group: plagiarism pre-test, academic entitlement questionnaire, personal values questionnaire, demographic questions, plagiarism opinions survey, plagiarism post-test, and plagiarism education tutorial.

The plagiarism pre-test/post-test (Appendix J) included 16 items that investigated students' understandings of plagiarism. After feedback was provided from the primary researcher's supervisor and changes were made to the pre-test/post-test, a meeting with the University's Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) took place. The AIO provided feedback on the items in accordance with the university's plagiarism policy. Further, the Officer suggested alternate wording to some of the items. The 16-item pre-test/post-test includes scenarios in which participants decide if plagiarism is present, who is responsible for plagiarism when it is present, what is common knowledge and does common knowledge need to be cited. Close-ended responses, which allowed for coding numerical data, was used.

The academic entitlement questionnaire that I used in this study was developed by Kopp et al. (2011) (Appendix K). It includes 8 items, and participants rate each item using a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree).

The Schwartz personal values questionnaire includes 56 items (Appendix L). Participants report how important or unimportant each value is to them as a guiding principle in their life. A scale of -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 is used. A score of -1 is used to score an item that is opposed to one's values whereas a 7 is used to score an item that is of supreme important. Some examples

57

of the items in this questionnaire include Social Order (stability of society), Self-Respect (belief in one's own worth), and Honesty (genuine, sincere).

Participants reported on eight demographic questions (Appendix M). The demographic questions were created by the primary researcher with feedback from the supervisor. Following the demographic questions, seven plagiarism opinion items, that used a 7-point Likert scale (1= Very Much Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Neutral, 5=Somewhat Disagree, 6=Disagree, and 7=Very Much Disagree) were presented. Examples of these items include "I am knowledgeable on plagiarism," and "Plagiarism should be taught to all students." (Appendix N).

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2 included both open-ended and closed-ended questions. The first item asked participants if they completed the *Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 1* study in fall 2016. If participants selected No, they were branched to a different set of questions that excluded questions on the plagiarism education tutorial. The only difference in Part 2 for those who have completed Part 1 and those who have not were two items: one item asking participants to share their experiences of completing the plagiarism education tutorial, and the other item asking participants to report on how helpful they felt the categories that comprised the tutorial were. All participants reported on their perceptions of plagiarism, including beliefs about consequences for plagiarism, plagiarism stories they have heard, and perceptions on plagiarism education (Appendix O).

Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities

Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities included both open-ended and closed-ended questions. Participants who completed this survey were currently teaching at the university or have taught at the university within the previous 12 months. This survey included 11 open-ended

questions which explored participants' experiences with plagiarism, perceptions of plagiarism education, and responsibilities of plagiarism education.

Data Analysis

For this study, I collected quantitative data and qualitative data. Quantitative data was exported from Fluid Surveys in SPSS, and the qualitative data was exported from Fluid Surveys into Excel files. The quantitative data was analyzed using correlations (academic entitlement and plagiarism pre-test scores as well as personal values and plagiarism pre-test scores), a within-subjects repeated measures ANOVA to determine if there was a difference between the experimental group and the control group on the plagiarism post-test, and frequencies. A pre-test/post-test design is popular in behavioural research, primarily for the purpose of comparing groups and/or measuring change resulting from experimental treatments (Dimitrov & Rumrill, 2003). Pre-test/post-test research design "enables instructors to measure participants' change, and it also permits improved documentation of impact of the instruction" (Davis, 2011, p. 4). In a pre-test/post-test design, participants are randomly assigned to one of two groups: control and experimental (treatment), and the response is recorded at baseline, prior to intervention (pretest response), and again after a pre-specified follow-up period" (Davidian, Tsiatis, & Leon, 2005, p. 261). The plagiarism education tutorial utilizes a pre-test/post-test design. A repeated measures ANOVA is a "statistical method that is traditionally used in comparing groups with pretest and post-test data" (Dimitrov & Rumrill, 2003, p. 159). This analysis will be used to determine change in pre-test/post-test scores within groups as well as change in post-test scores between groups. Frequencies were used for questions that asked participants to report on their plagiarism opinions, consequences for plagiarism, and demographic questions.

I chose to use qualitative research methods to help to explore plagiarism perceptions (Savin-Baden & Howell Major, 2013). For instance, some of the variables in this study, including reasons why students engage in plagiarism, how academic integrity can be supported on campus, and how instructors handle suspected student plagiarism, cannot be easily identified. Through the use of an emic perspective, qualitative research was used to explore what participants perceive to be meaningful (Savin-Baden & Howell Major, 2013). The qualitative data in this study included open-ended questions, and these open-ended questions were analyzed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis, a flexible data analysis method, involves "identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 6). It can be used to report on experiences, such as how instructors handle student plagiarism and what kind of experiences participants had when working through the plagiarism education tutorial. Inductive analysis was used to analyze data; data was coded without predetermined coding frames, and instead, through "careful reading and re-reading of the data," "patterns were recognized which became the categories for analysis" (Freeday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p. 82; Rice & Ezzy, 1999, p. 258). To elaborate, open-ended questions were read five times, as it is suggested that this data be reviewed a minimum of three times (Savenye & Robinson, 2005). There was not a second-coder for this data.

All data was exported from Fluid Surveys to an Excel file. From the Excel file, the rows that contained responses to open end-ended questions were copied and pasted in Word documents (one document for each question). Responses that were identical or similar were copied and pasted into one row of a chart in Microsoft Word. This process continued until all responses were placed into a row with similar responses. Once this process was complete,

themes were identified. No set number of responses was needed in order for it to qualify as a

theme. This process continued for each open-ended question.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study had three different groups of participants. Two of the groups consisted of undergraduate students, and one group consisted of university instructors. This chapter will provide information for each of the three groups of participants. After this, survey questions will be presented (these are in bold font) along with information on how the question was presented as well as the data analysis method used and the corresponding results for the question. For the quantitative findings, information regarding whether the results were statistically significant, when applicable, is also provided. When necessary, charts are presented to display the results, particularly frequencies, in an organized way.

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 1

Thirty participants (15 participants in the control group and 15 participants in the experimental group) is an appropriate sample size for a repeated measures ANOVA with a power of 0.8 and a medium effect size (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2013). This study had 219 participants, with 124 participants in the control group and 95 participants in the experimental group. A purposive sample was used to collect this data.

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2

Forty-three participants who completed Part 1 during the fall 2016 semester and seventy-nine participants who did not complete Part 1 during the fall 2016 semester completed Part 2. There were approximately 1400 students registered for the Psychology Participant Pool in the winter 2017 semester, and according to Christen Hughes and McGabe ( ),a sample size of 5.0%-10.0% is typical for plagiarism studies. Since 121 students completed this part of the study, a response rate of 8.7% was found. A purposive sample was used to collect this data.

Instructors

The most recent annual report that includes the number of instructors at the participating university that was available from Human Resources at the time of this REB submission was the 2013/2014 Annual Report. This report indicates that there were 1, 036 instructors employed by the university during the 2013/2014 academic year (530 permanent/full-time instructors, 71 limited term instructors, and 435 sessional instructors). A response rate of 5.0%-10.0% (52-104 participants), which is typical for plagiarism studies, was needed for this part of the study. Since 80 instructors completed this study, a response rate of 7.7% was present. A convenience sample was used to collect this data. The results for each research question will be provided based on group of participants (which are outlined above).

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 1

Plagiarism Education Tutorial

To determine the effectiveness of the plagiarism education tutorial, a repeated measures ANOVA was the analysis used. Each participant received a score on the pre-test and the post-test. The groups pre-test scores were comparable. The dependent variable, the plagiarism post-test scores, is continuous, and the independent variable, group (experimental or control) is nominal; thus, meeting the criteria for a repeated measures ANOVA. There were 16 questions in the pre-test and the post-test, but since one of the questions was a bit ambiguous, it was removed; therefore, each participant received a mark out of 15 on the pre-test and on the post-test. The final question, which asks students to select common knowledge from four possible responses, can be common knowledge to domestic students but not international students, so it was removed. If the participant answered the question correctly, he or she received 1 for that question, and if the participant answered the question incorrectly, a zero was assigned. Averages

for the pre-test and the post-test for the experimental group and the control group showed that the experimental group had a higher average on the post-test than did the control group.

Table 1

Averages for the Pre-Test and Post-Test Score for the Experimental Group and the Control Group (N=219)

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Test Average		
Pre-Test Average	72.8	69.2
Post-Test Average	93.7	71.5

There was a statistically significant effect of group on post-test scores, $F(1, 217), = 131.9$, $p<0.001$. A Bonferroni post hoc test was conducted to determine where the differences in the means occurred. Since a Bonferroni post hoc test requires three or more groups in SPSS to run the analysis, the significance level was manually calculated. To calculate this, a significance level of 0.05 was divided by the number of questions in the pre-test/post-test (15); therefore, a significance level of 0.003 is needed. Results demonstrated that the differences were in questions 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11. The post-test scores of these questions significantly differed between the experimental group and the control group.

Academic Entitlement and Plagiarism Knowledge

A Bivariate Pearson Coefficient Correlation was done to answer this research question as academic entitlement scores and plagiarism knowledge (pre-test) scores are interval/ratio data. An academic entitlement score was calculated for each participant through averaging their

responses on the eight-item academic entitlement measure. Results found a relationship between academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge. A weak, negative relationship between academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge, which was statistically significant ($r = -.281$, $n = 219$, $p = .001$), was found. As academic entitlement increased, plagiarism knowledge decreased.

Personal Values and Plagiarism Knowledge

      Spearman's rho was used to determine if there were any relationships between personal values and plagiarism knowledge as the personal values and plagiarism knowledge include ordinal and interval data. Results found that there are twelve weak, positive correlations that are statistically significant between plagiarism knowledge and the following personal values.

Table 2

Personal Values and Plagiarism Knowledge (N=219)

	Correlation Coefficient	Significance Value
National security	.144	.033
A varied life	.145	.032
Independent	.189	.005
Ambitious	.172	.011
Influential	.144	.033
Honouring of parents and elders	.223	.001
Choosing own goals	.227	.001
Capable	.154	.023
Accepting my portion in life	.163	.016
Curious	.165	.015

Forgiving			.170			.012	

What are students' plagiarism perceptions?

A seven-item opinion scale that asked participants to report on perceptions related to plagiarism was presented. Participants responded to the seven items using a 7-point Likert Scale (Very Much Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neutral, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, Very Much Disagree) for the seven items. This scale investigated participants' opinions on items such as "I would report a friend who told me that he or she has plagiarized" and "plagiarism should be taught to all students.

Table 3

Plagiarism Perceptions in Percentages (reported in percentages of student participants who selected each response) (N=219)

	Very Much Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Very Much Disagree
Plagiarism Perception							
I am knowledgeable on plagiarism	21.4	53.4	20.1	3.0	0.9	0.4	0.9
I experience anxiety when I submit assignments, as I am fearful that they may contain plagiarism	6.8	22.0	26.1	14.5	8.5	16.7	5.1

Plagiarism should be taught to all students	40.2	24.4	30.8	3.8	0.4	0.4	-
Students should be allowed to plagiarize coursework	1.7	1.7	2.6	6.4	8.1	36.3	43.2
Students who plagiarize should only receive a warning the first time they are caught	11.5	17.1	21.8	22.6	10.3	11.5	5.1
I think students whose first language is not English may be more susceptible to plagiarism	6.8	15.4	27.8	17.5	7.3	18.8	6.4
If my friend told me that he/she plagiarized, I would report them	1.3	4.7	6.8	32.5	11.5	24.4	18.8

Although almost 75.0% of participants strongly agree or agree that they are knowledgeable about plagiarism, more than 60.0% of participants strongly agree or agree that plagiarism education should be provided to students. These results also reveal that the option of Neutral was the most favourable choice (22.6%) on students receiving a warning on their first

offence of student plagiarism. When students were asked to report on reporting a friend who reported that he or she has plagiarized, 32.5% selected Neutral and 54.7% selected one of the Disagree options (Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree), with Disagree being the highest of the three (24.4%).

Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2

Please comment on the type of plagiarism education you have received in the past. For example, were you instructed on what plagiarism is, how to avoid plagiarism, what the consequences are for plagiarism, etc. Include when you received this education. For example, in primary school, in secondary school, in any of your university courses, etc.

This question was open-ended, and participants typed their responses in a text box. The plagiarism education that the participants reported they received with corresponding levels of education is outlined below.

Primary school: Nearly one-fourth of participants reported that they received plagiarism education in primary school. Participants who elaborated on the kind of plagiarism education they received reported that it included what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, and the consequences for engaging in plagiarism.

High school/secondary school: More than two-thirds of participants reported that they received plagiarism education during high school. The type of plagiarism education differed. Three-fifths of participants reported that the plagiarism education included what plagiarism is, how to avoid plagiarism, and/or what the consequences for plagiarism are, and a little more than one-tenth of participants included that the education involved citation and reference practices, such as how to cite and reference your sources.

University: The number of participants who reported they received plagiarism education in university is similar to the number of participants who reported they received plagiarism

68

education in high school. The types of plagiarism education that participants reported they received in university varied. More than one-tenth of participants reported that the education came through the course syllabus or a welcome message at the beginning of the semester, two-fifths of participants reported that they were informed what plagiarism is and/or how to avoid it during one or more university courses, more than one-third reported that consequences for plagiarism were part of the plagiarism education they received, more than one-tenth stated that the plagiarism education included citations and references, and a few participants reported the plagiarism education took place through discussions.

Have you talked to other students about plagiarism?

This close-ended question asked participants to select the option of Yes or No. It was found that fewer than three-fourths of participants have talked about plagiarism with other students, whereas less than a third of participants have not.

What kind of plagiarism stories did you hear or did you share?

Participants who selected Yes to the previous question (Have you talked to other students about plagiarism?) were directed to this question to explain the plagiarism stories they heard from other students or the plagiarism stories they reported. This was an open-ended question, and participants typed their responses in a text box. The types of discussions that the students reported varied, and the themes of these discussions will be outlined. The most prevalent theme included stories of students who have plagiarized, which was reported by one-third of participants, with several of these anecdotes referring to students who have copied and pasted someone else's information into their work as well as students who have given their work to friends to submit and vice versa. It was also found that one-fifth of participants reported that the stories focused on penalties and consequences for plagiarism, including hearing of stories where students received a zero on the plagiarized work to being expelled from the university for

plagiarizing. Stories that included types of plagiarism were also present, as almost one-fifth of participants included this in their responses. Common responses included reusing someone's older work, plagiarism in group work, as well as purchasing work online. Other stories focused on students who were accused of plagiarism due to ignorance (reported by less than one-tenth of participants), and a handful of participants reported they are afraid to plagiarize because of potential punishments, or that they have a limited understanding of what plagiarism entails and how to avoid plagiarism.

If someone told you they cheated by plagiarizing on a paper, what would you do? What would you think?

This open-ended question allowed participants to type their responses in a text box. Two-fifths of participants reported that they wouldn't do anything/would do nothing if someone told them that they plagiarized on a paper. Students reported they would think differently of the person, with many reporting that they would think less of that person and think that person is lazy. Thinking differently of the plagiarist was reported by approximately one-third of participants. Explaining the possible consequences that may occur for plagiarism was reported by approximately one-fourth of participants. Informing the student not to plagiarize and giving the student recommendations was an action that almost one-fifth of participants reported they would take. More than one-tenth of participants reported that they would report the student who informed them that he or she has plagiarized. The reporting would be made to the course instructor or a Teaching Assistant (TA), with one participant sharing that he or she would report it to the Academic Integrity Office. Few participants reported they would help the student so that the student would not submit the plagiarized assignment, that they would not know what to do if found in this situation, and that it depends on who the student was/their relationship with the

student, with one participant sharing that if they did not like the person they would report the plagiarism, and another sharing that although it depends on who the person is, if it is their friend, they would not do anything.

Where do you (primarily) do your research when writing a paper? [For example, class notes, course readings, library resources on-site, writing centers, online resources through Google or other public search engines, other?]

This open-ended question allowed participants to type their responses in a text box. Results from this question demonstrate that students report they primarily resort to online sources when conducting research for papers, with several students referring to their course notes and textbooks. Half of the participants search for research on Google/look for online resources, almost half of the participants use their university's library website to search for articles in databases, including ProQuest, PsychInfo, JSTOR, and Scholar's Portal, approximately one-fourth of participants reported that they use their course notes/lecture slides, approximately one-fourth of participants reported they use their course textbooks/textbooks for research, approximately one-fourth of participants use Google Scholar/Scholarly articles, more than one-tenth of participants use the university's library, and a handful of participants use their course readings and library resources (did not specify that it was their university's library).

Does the type of source used affect student plagiarism, in your view (for example, books, journal articles, Wikipedia)? Please describe.

Participants' perceptions of sources used and whether or not the sources affect student plagiarism was explored through an open-ended question that allowed participants to type their responses in a text box. One-third of participants reported that the type of source does not affect student plagiarism. When participants elaborated, the common reasons were that students who

are going to plagiarize will do so no matter what source is used, and that any type of source can be plagiarized. On the other hand, almost half of participants believe that the type of source used does affect student plagiarism. For instance, almost half of participants in the group who reported that type of source used affects student plagiarism included that not using reliable sources, such as Wikipedia, can affect student plagiarism. Participants felt that information on Wikipedia may be unreliable as anyone can edit it/add information; therefore, it is unsure exactly where the information came from. Further, almost one-third of the Yes group reported that it is easier to plagiarize from online material through copy and paste. With respect to journal articles, almost one-tenth of participants reported that students may plagiarize when using journal articles as their sources since they are complex and students may not understand the information.

Is there ever a time when it would be 'okay' to plagiarize? If so, when would this be?

An open-ended question, in which participants typed their responses in a text box, was used to explore participant perceptions on whether plagiarism is okay, and in what instances plagiarism would be acceptable. More than fourth-fifths of the participants reported that there is never a time when it is okay to plagiarize, a few participants reported that they do not think so, and more than one-tenth reported yes. A few participants reported plagiarism is okay if you use quotation marks, if it is unintentional, if you are elaborating on your own work or some part of your previous work, if it is a last-minute assignment, if the student is close to dropping out of school, if you are using statistics, if you are casually talking, and if the instructor gives permission.

If other students are plagiarizing and not getting caught, would that influence your decision to plagiarize? Explain.

Through an open-ended question, it was found that the majority of participants, nine-tenths, reported that they would not be influenced to plagiarize if other students are doing it and

are not getting caught, with less than one-tenth of participants reporting that it would influence their decision. Reasons for not being influenced include that it is not worth the risk, participants do not want to take that chance, and that the consequences outweigh the benefits. Participants who reported that it would influence their decision responded with one of the following reasons: why not give themselves the same advantage, if they were in a desperate situation then they would be influenced, and it would allow them to know if they had the right idea/use it as a guideline.

How should instructors handle student plagiarism the first, second, and third time a student plagiarizes?

Although this is not one of primary research questions, consequences for student plagiarism were also examined in Part 2. Through the use of a check-box, participants reported on nine different possible outcomes for each number of offences (first, second, and third). Participants were able to pick more than one consequence for each offence. The last option for each number of offence allowed participants to provide other consequences they felt were appropriate but were not included in the available options.

Table 4

Opinions on how Instructors should Handle Student Plagiarism Based on Number of Offences in Percentages (percentages of students who selected each response) (N=122)

	First Offence	Second Offence	Third Offence
Opinion			
The instructor should ignore the student plagiarism	0.8	0.0	0.8
The student should	73.0	3.3	0.8

receive a warning

The student should be required to attend a plagiarism education workshop	68.9	31.1	12.3
The student should be allowed the opportunity to redo the assignment	29.5	0.8	0.8
The student should receive a mark reduction on the plagiarized assignment	39.3	18.9	1.6
The student should receive a zero on the plagiarized assignment, and the student should not be allowed to resubmit it	34.4	59.9	28.7
The student should be reported to the Academic Integrity Office	8.2	63.1	55.7
The student should receive a zero in the course	2.5	18.0	44.3
The student should be expelled from University	0	2.5	41.8

As demonstrated above, the severity of the consequence tends to increase as the number of offences increases. For instance, 73.0% of participants felt that a student should receive a warning for plagiarism the first time it occurs compared to 0.8% who believe a warning is appropriate on the third offence. One interesting finding is that more participants reported that students should be reported to the Academic Integrity Office on the second offence compared to the third offence (63.1% and 55.7% respectively). None of the participants felt that the student should be expelled from the University for their first plagiarism offence and 41.8% felt students should be expelled on the third offence. When plagiarism education was examined, 68.9% of participants reported that students should complete it on their first offence, with 31.3% reporting so for the second offence, and 12.3% reporting so for the third offence.

Participants were provided with the opportunity to enter additional consequences for plagiarism depending on the number of offences. Seven participants provided an *other* option for the first offence, one participant did so for the second offence, and no participants provided other options for the third offence. Responses relate to providing student plagiarism education as well as discussing the plagiarism with the instructor. For instance, having a discussion with the professor, teaching the student how to avoid plagiarism, and requiring the student to attend a workshop all relate to plagiarism education. Further, it was mentioned that the type of punishment should fit the crime, and the type of plagiarism committed should be considered (unintentional versus intentional).

Should university students be required to complete a plagiarism education tutorial?

This close-ended question asked participants to report on requiring university students to complete a plagiarism education tutorial. Participants answered this question using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

Table 5

Plagiarism Education Tutorial as a Requirement for University Students in Percentages(N=122)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Plagiarism Education Tutorial: Requirement					
	41.3	29.8	17.4	6.6	5.0

Overall, 71% of participants Strongly Agree or Agree that students should be required to complete a plagiarism education tutorial, 17.4% were Neutral, and 11.6% Disagree or Strongly Disagree that students should be required to complete a plagiarism education tutorial.

Should a plagiarism education tutorial be available as an optional resource for university students?

This close-ended question asked participants to report on whether a plagiarism education tutorial should be available as an optional resource for university students. Participants answered this question using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree).

Table 6

Plagiarism Education Tutorial as an Optional Resource for University Students in Percentages (N=122)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Plagiarism Education Tutorial: Optional					
	42.1	43.0	5.8	5.0	4.1

Overall, 85.1% of participants Strongly Agree or Agree that a plagiarism education tutorial should be available as an optional resource for university students, 5.8% were Neutral, and 9.1% Disagree or Strongly Disagree that a plagiarism education tutorial should be available as an optional resource for university students.

What are reasons why students engage in plagiarism?

This open-ended question asked participants to report on reasons why students may choose to engage in plagiarism. As discussed in the methodology chapter, open-ended questions were analyzed through thematic analysis. The themes that emerged from this question include the following: time, effort, laziness, getting caught, pressure, workload, limited understanding of the components of the assignment, lack of confidence in their work, limited understandings, and

everyone else is doing it. Each theme, and its categories, is outlined below, and student responses that support each theme are provided.

Time: The issue of time was a recurring theme as more than half of the participants mentioned one of the following categories in this theme: time/lack of time (reported by one-fourth of participants), procrastination (reported by almost one-fifth of participants), and poor time management skills (reported by less than one-tenth of participants). Although time management has similarities with procrastination, they were separated into two categories as none of the participants reported that these two were related. Participants reported that students face time constraints, and as a result of their limited time, students may choose to plagiarize. Participants also reported that waiting to the last minute to complete an assignment may lead to students choosing to plagiarize. Further, participants suggested that poor time management skills, or lack thereof, can result in student plagiarism.

Laziness: The second most common reason participants provided is laziness. Approximately one-third of participants included the theme of laziness in their responses.

Effort: Effort was also a major reason provided for student plagiarism, particularly that less effort is required when students resort to plagiarism. The theme of effort was present in more than one-tenth of participant responses. Participants felt that it is much easier to copy and paste someone else's work than it is to complete the work themselves. Plagiarizing requires less effort from students, and therefore, it is an easy way out.

Getting caught: The theme of getting caught is another reason reported by participants. This theme is divided into two categories: students' belief that they will not get caught for plagiarizing (reported by less than one-tenth of participants) and the belief that instructors do not check for plagiarism (reported by a handful of participants).

Pressure: Pressure was a repeated theme in participants' responses. Pressure was further divided into two categories: pressure from marks and stress. Pressure from marks, which was provided as a reason by one-tenth of participants, revealed that students may plagiarize as a means to obtain high marks and/or avoid receiving low marks. Further, a few participants included stress in their response.

Workload: The theme of workload reoccurred as a reason for engagement in plagiarism. Almost one-tenth reported that one's workload can lead to engagement in plagiarism. A perspective that some students reported is that they may have too much on their plate. This connects with the previous theme of time management skills.

Limited understanding of the components of the assignment: Not understanding a component/components of an assignment was reported by participants as a reason for student plagiarism. This theme is divided into two categories: not understanding the assignment and not understanding the material. With respect to not understanding the assignment, almost one-tenth of the participants reported that being unsure of the assignment requirements is a reason for plagiarism, and some reported that not understanding the material/concepts/subject as a reason for plagiarism.

Lack of confidence in their work: Another reason for student plagiarism is that students may not be confident in their abilities to successfully complete the assignment, and approximately one-tenth of participants reported this. The perception that a student's work may not be good enough was also a theme that emerged from participant responses.

Limited understandings: Having a limited understanding of plagiarism as well as a limited understanding of citing practices are two categories that emerged in this theme. Some participants reported that students may plagiarize because they are unsure of what constitutes

plagiarism and that students may plagiarize due to not understanding how to properly cite sources. A third category in this theme is accidental plagiarism. Some participants included ideas of accidental plagiarism in their responses, such as students plagiarizing because they are unsure that what they are doing is plagiarism and that it is an honest mistake.

Everyone else is doing it: The theme of everyone else is doing it was evident in participant responses as a handful of participants reported this as a reason.

Please share any thoughts and/or ideas you have regarding plagiarism education.

Through an open-ended question, participants reported their thoughts and ideas regarding plagiarism education. Three-fifths included positive thoughts/ideas of plagiarism education, including that it is important, that it is needed, and that it should be mandatory/required for students. Almost one-tenth of participants feel that the current plagiarism education on campus is fine as is and nothing needs to be done. Further, almost one-tenth reported negative perceptions of plagiarism education, including that it is usually boring, repetitive, and can be annoying for students. A handful of participants mentioned the timing of when plagiarism education should take place, with the majority sharing it should start in high school so that it is not a new concept to students once they begin university. Lastly, a few participants acknowledged that plagiarism education should be introduced to students as needed, and that plagiarism education should be optional for students.

In which ways can academic integrity be supported on campus?

An open-ended question was used to learn of participant perceptions of ways to support academic integrity on campus. A proactive approach was included in more than half of the participant responses. Participants suggested that having workshops to plagiarism lessons to student support groups to orientations for students can support academic integrity. Similarly, more than one-tenth of participants reported that promotion of academic integrity and

encouraging students is needed. Another suggestion was that more explanations and discussion regarding plagiarism need to take place. This was suggested by a handful of participants. Almost one-tenth included plagiarism consequences and punishments in their responses such as more severe consequence are needed. Professors and teaching also emerged in participants responses, with a handful sharing that academic integrity can be supported in different ways through teaching and by teachers having resources available for students. Lastly, some participants reported that academic integrity already is supported well on campus.

Undergraduate Students Academic Practices: Completed Part 1 & Part 2

Difficulty level of the plagiarism education tutorial

This close-ended question asked participants to report on the difficulty level of the plagiarism education tutorial using a Five-Point Liker scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree).

Table 7

Perceived Difficulty of the Plagiarism Education Tutorial in Percentages (N=43)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Students perceived difficulty level of tutorial					
	-	2.4	40.5	54.8	2.4

The majority of the participants reported that the plagiarism education tutorial was not difficult as 54.8% selected Disagree and 2.4% selected Strongly Disagree. Only one participant

(2.4%) felt that the plagiarism education tutorial was difficult, and 40.5% were Neutral on the difficulty level.

Which parts of the tutorial did participants perceive to be helpful?

This close-ended question asked participants to report on the helpfulness of the different components of the plagiarism education tutorial using a drop-down menu that consists of 7 options (Very Helpful, Helpful, Somewhat Helpful, Neutral, Somewhat Unhelpful, Unhelpful, and Very Unhelpful).

Table 8

Helpfulness of the Different Components of the Plagiarism Education Tutorial in Percentages (N=43)

Component	Very Helpful	Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Neutral	Somewhat Unhelpful	Unhelpful	Very Unhelpful
What is plagiarism?	19.0	54.8	9.5	11.9	9.5	4.8	-
Why should plagiarism be avoided?	40.5	35.7	7.1	14.3	-	-	2.4
What is common knowledge?	23.8	38.1	19.0	14.3	4.8	-	-
Impersonation/ purchasing assignments	21.4	42.9	14.3	14.3	4.8	4.8	-
Group work	23.8	33.3	21.4	19.0	-	2.4	-

Modifying/ creating false materials	19.0	38.1	21.4	14.3	2.4	4.8	-
Recycling work /self- plagiarism	31.0	35.7	19.0	9.5	2.4	2.4	-

As revealed above, participants perceived all of the components of the plagiarism education tutorial to be Very Helpful, Helpful, or Somewhat Helpful compared to Somewhat Unhelpful, Unhelpful, and Very Unhelpful. The component Why Should Plagiarism be Avoided received the highest percentage of being Very Helpful (40.5) compared to the other six components. The summation of the percentages for Very Helpful, Helpful, and Somewhat Helpful reveal that participants reported all seven components of the plagiarism education tutorial to be a minimum of 78.5% for these ratings. Thus, more than two-thirds of the participants felt that each topic covered in the tutorial was at a minimum Somewhat Helpful.

What were participants' overall experience of completing the plagiarism education tutorial?

Participants were presented with an open-ended question in which they typed their responses in a text box to learn of their experience completing the tutorial. More than two-fifths of participants reported positive experiences of completing the plagiarism education tutorial, more than one-fourth reported negative experiences of completing the plagiarism education tutorial, more than one-tenth incorporated both positive and negative experiences in their responses, and more than one-tenth were other (did not complete it, do not remember it). Positive feedback included that completing the tutorial was educational and that it acted as a reminder to students for what plagiarism entails. Negative feedback included students reporting that they

already knew everything in the tutorial, so as a result, it was not a good use of their time. Some participants in this group also reported that the tutorial was boring. The third group, mixed feedback, included both positive and negative comments in their responses. Students in this group felt that although they did not find the tutorial interesting, it was a good use of time as some learning took place, it reinforced what they already knew/it was a good review.

Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities: Instructors

How would you define plagiarism?

An open-ended question asked this group of participants to define plagiarism is a provided text box. Four-fifths of participants believe that plagiarism involves using someone else's work without providing appropriate attribution. Participants acknowledged that this is not limited to text. Thoughts, ideas, images, videos, solutions, answers, and creative and artistic pieces all need to be cited. It was further reported by a handful of participants that one's intent is included in defining plagiarism, with intentional copying being considered plagiarism. The idea of theft/stealing/kidnapping is present in defining plagiarism, as a handful of participants included this theme in their response.

Are you confident you know how your university defines plagiarism?

An open-ended question that allowed participants to type their responses in a text box found that almost half of the participants responded that they are confident that they know how the university defines plagiarism, a few participants reported they are pretty sure, a few participants reported they are mostly confident, a few participants reported they are fairly confident, and a few participants reported they think so. Approximately one-third of participants, however, reported that they are "not confident" or "not really."

Do you feel student plagiarism is an issue on campus? Please explain.

Participants reported on their perception of student plagiarism on the participating campus through an open-ended question. More than two-thirds of participants reported that plagiarism is an issue on campus. Interestingly, less than one-tenth of participants agreed that yes it is an issue on campus, but that the issue is not campus-specific. Plagiarism occurs everywhere. The type of plagiarism also emerged from this question, with some sharing that the plagiarism is unintentional and that it is usually a result of students making honest mistakes. Another theme is international students, and some participants shared that plagiarism may be especially true for international students, as they may be coming from a culture that has a different academic perspective.

How is suspected plagiarism handled at your university? Please also comment on whether you feel you are knowledgeable about the process and if you have any concerns about the process?

Through an open-ended question, participants responded that suspected plagiarism begins with a teachable moment (reported by less than one-fifth of participants) or that the instructor takes the suspected plagiarism to the department head/Associate Dean/Dean (reported by less than one-fifth of participants). Some of the participants indicated that they are knowledgeable about the process. On the other hand, more than one-tenth of the participants indicated that they have no idea/are unsure how suspected plagiarism is handled. Some participants reported that it depends on the instructor.

Should instructors be able to handle student plagiarism at their own discretion?

Results of this open-ended question reveal three themes of instructors' opinions of handling plagiarism themselves, including instructors should be able to handle it at their own discretion (reported by more than one-third of participants), instructors should not be able to handle it at their own discretion (reported by approximately one-fourth of participants), and it

depends on the situation (reported by approximately one-fifth of participants). Some of the participants who do not feel that instructors should be able to handle student plagiarism at their own discretion supported their responses with doing so may lead to inconsistencies. Participants who indicated that it depends felt that the type of plagiarism needs to be taken into consideration. Participants felt that instructors should be able to handle minor plagiarism at their own discretion, but not major plagiarism; "minor infractions should be handled as teachable moments, major infractions should be forwarded to a more formal sanction process."

What might some advantages of instructors handling student plagiarism at their own discretion be?

This open-ended question found that almost half of the participants included that an advantage would be that it can be used as a learning opportunity for students. Time also emerged as a theme in the responses. It was reported by more than one-tenth of participants that less time would be required if they handled their own student plagiarism. Moreover, some reported that handling suspected plagiarism can provide compassion to the student, especially since the instructor knows who the student is.

What might some disadvantages of instructors handling student plagiarism at their own discretion be?

Inconsistency was a recurring theme among participants, and it was included in approximately one-third of the open-ended responses. The inconsistency in how instructors handle plagiarism presents the issue of documentation, or lack thereof. The theme repeat plagiarism offenders was present in approximately one-tenth of participant responses. If instructors handle plagiarism at their own discretion and they choose not to document it, then there would not be a paper trail for that student. Plagiarists may be able to get away with it class after class. Instructor qualities was also present in this data. For instance, more than one-tenth of

participants perceived the instructor's skill level, interest in plagiarism, confidence and

favoritism of students to be disadvantages that can result if instructors handle student plagiarism.

What are situations where instructor discretion is okay, and what are situations where

instructors should have mandatory procedures to follow?

An open-ended question found that the type of plagiarism, the type of assessment, the

year of the student, and the number of the offence are all considerable factors that instructors

report need to be considered when deciding if instructors should have discretion to handle

plagiarism. About one-third of participants included that instructors should have discretion with

students who engage in unintentional plagiarism in their responses, but intentional plagiarism

should follow mandatory procedures. It was also suggested by some participants that the type of

assessment needs to be considered, with mention of class assignments being okay for instructors

to use discretion but more substantial work, such as take-home exams, having mandatory

procedures for instructors to follow. With respect to the year of student, some participants

included that the student's year of study should be considered when deciding if instructor

discretion is okay. Several responses in this theme suggest that in first-year courses, instructors

can use the suspected plagiarism as a learning opportunity. It was also suggested that the number

of offences needs to be considered by some of the participants, with some participants suggesting

that a repeated offence should have mandatory procedures to follow. Less than one-tenth

reported that instructors should have discretion, and less than one-tenth reported that procedures

are needed.

Should instructors be responsible for providing students with plagiarism education?
What might that look like?

It was revealed, through an open-ended question, that one-tenth of participants reported

no, instructors should not need to provide plagiarism education, and one-third of participants

reported that instructors should provide some type of plagiarism education should be provided to students. The type of plagiarism education, however, greatly varied. The suggestions from participants include the following: referring students to the plagiarism policy on the course outline, informing them of the rules, telling students what plagiarism is, having a class plagiarism Q&A, showing students examples, having TAs give a workshop, referring students to a university video or tutorial, sharing plagiarism resources, and having a class presentation, such as the AIO come in. Some participants reported that plagiarism education should take place in first-year/introductory courses, and a few reported that the university should be responsible for providing plagiarism education.

Do you think students should take responsibility for learning about plagiarism? At all levels? If not, at what level (for example, first year, second-year, senior-year, masters, doctoral)?

Themes from this open-ended question reveal that instructors believe students should take responsibility for learning about plagiarism at all levels, which was reported by approximately two-fifths of participants. More than one-tenth of participants reported that this responsibility should start in first-year. Also, one-tenth of participants feel that students should take responsibility but that plagiarism should be explained to them/they need education on it. It was also apparent in some of participant responses that plagiarism education begins in high school, and that instructors should reinforce it in first and second year.

What are some of the factors that instructors encounter when handling student plagiarism and deciding on what action to take?

Student intent (reported by more than one-fourth of participants), the degree of the plagiarism (reported by more than one-fifth of participants), time (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), lack of support from administration (reported by some participants), the

87

number of the offence (reported by some participants), international students (reported by some participants), and student reactions (upset students/crying students) (reported by some participants) are themes that emerged in participant responses to this open-ended question as factors that instructors encounter when handling student plagiarism and deciding which action to take.

Have you experienced plagiarism in your courses?

This question found that more than fourth-fifths of the participants reported that they have experienced plagiarism, and more than one-tenth reported that they have not experienced plagiarism in their course/courses.

How did you handle it?

How instructors reported they handled plagiarism was explored through an open-ended question. Instructors reported that they have documented and reported it (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), used it as a teachable moment (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), discuss it with the student to determine why he or she plagiarized (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), it depended on the situation (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), allowed the student the opportunity to revise and resubmit it (reported by some participants), assigned a mark of zero (reported by some participants), and assigned a mark reduction and informed the student (reported by some participants).

Did you feel you were supported by the university's administration?

It was found that approximately one-third of participants felt supported by their university's administration, more than one-tenth left administration out of it, more than one-tenth reported no, some reported somewhat, some reported sometimes they feel supported, and some reported they felt supported by their Dean.

What are some factors you think discourage instructors from reporting plagiarism?

Through an open-ended question, factors instructors perceive to be discouraging in reporting plagiarism were explored. More than half of participants reported that the workload associated with reporting plagiarism may discourage instructors from reporting it. Further, although almost one-fifth reported that little punishment for the student occurs as a reason not to report it, more than one-tenth said the punishment for the student may be too severe as a reason not to report plagiarism. Lack of trust and support from the administration (reported by more than one-tenth of participants), discomfort from confrontation from students (reported by some participants), and lack of knowledge on the process (reported by some participants) are other factors that may discourage an instructor from reporting plagiarism.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate scores, between the control group and the experimental group, on a plagiarism knowledge post-test upon completion of a plagiarism education tutorial among undergraduate students enrolled at a comprehensive university in southwestern, Ontario, Canada as well as plagiarism perceptions of students and instructors. Student perceptions of plagiarism, including consequences for plagiarism and reasons for engaging in plagiarism, were explored. Academic entitlement as well as personal values were examined to determine the degree of the relationship between these variables and plagiarism knowledge. Faculty members' perceptions of plagiarism, including perceptions of responsibility for handling suspected student plagiarism, was also explored in this dissertation.

Summary of Results

This study's research questions, a summary of each research question's results, and a comparison of the results to previous research, when available, will be discussed. A section that discusses the findings in relation to andragogy is also provided.

Question 1: What impact will completion of a plagiarism education tutorial have on students' plagiarism knowledge?

Students who completed the plagiarism education tutorial and then the post-test, the experimental group, scored statistically significantly higher on the post-test compared to the control group $F(1, 217)$, $= 131.9$, $p<0.001$. This finding demonstrates that students who work through some type of plagiarism education may improve their understanding of plagiarism, which is demonstrated in the post-test scores. According to Chuda et al. (2012) and Evering and Moorman (2012), students can benefit from receiving plagiarism education, and plagiarism instruction may be the most effective method to handle student plagiarism. This finding supports

90

Aasheim et al. (2012) who found that students view plagiarism as more unacceptable after a plagiarism discussion and that providing students with plagiarism education may change their perceptions of plagiarism, such as what plagiarism entails.

Question 2: What are instructors' perceptions of plagiarism, including plagiarism instruction and behaviours that constitute plagiarism?

As revealed through an open-ended discussion question, one-tenth of participants reported that instructors should not be responsible for providing plagiarism education, and one-third of participants reported that some type of plagiarism education should be provided to students. This finding acknowledges that instructors have different perceptions regarding responsibility of providing plagiarism education. Instructors who perceive plagiarism education to be their responsibility and provide it to their students may then provide their student with an academic advantage with respect to plagiarism knowledge compared to instructors who do not provide this education as they do not believe it is their responsibility. Instructors also have different perceptions on what the plagiarism education should look like. It was suggested that plagiarism education can be provided in different forms, including referring students to the plagiarism policy on the course outline, having a class plagiarism Q&A, and showing students examples of plagiarized work. Some participants reported that the university should be responsible for providing plagiarism education.

Many of the student participants reported that plagiarism should be taught to all students, with approximately 65.0% of participants falling in the Agree or Strongly Agree category. This finding is similar to what Dahl (2007) reported in that 66.6% of student participants want information on plagiarism. It is important to note, however, that students were not asked to report on who should provide this plagiarism instruction. Thus, although students want this type of

91

education, it does not necessarily mean that they want it from their course instructor. Based on the results of my study, I believe that students should be provided with plagiarism education at the beginning of their academic career. Providing plagiarism education in first-year can demonstrate to students the importance of academic integrity as well as provide students with relevant information on plagiarism. I also believe that students should be encouraged to revisit the plagiarism education when they are working on assignments.

In this study, more than one-third of instructor participants articulated a belief that students should take responsibility for learning about plagiarism at all levels, and that this responsibility should start in first-year (reported by more than one-tenth of participants). One-tenth of instructor participants reported that although students should take responsibility, plagiarism should be explained to students, and students need education on plagiarism. This finding is similar to those noted by Marcus and Beck (2011), Power (2009) and Rolfe (2011). Interestingly, some participants included that plagiarism education begins in high school, and that instructors should reinforce it in first and second year classes. The instructor participants' suggestion of reinforcing plagiarism education in first and second-year classes is reflective of Owens and White (2013), as these researchers found that citation skills are problematic for first-year students; therefore, plagiarism education should be provided to students as they enter post-secondary education.

As revealed through an open-ended question, four-fifths of participants believe that plagiarism involves using someone else' work without providing appropriate attribution. Participants acknowledged that this is not limited to text. Thoughts, ideas, images, videos, solutions, answers, and creative and artistic pieces all need to be cited. It was further reported by some participants that one's intent is included in defining plagiarism, with intentional copying

being considered plagiarism. The idea of theft and stealing is present in defining plagiarism, as some participants included this theme in their response. Most participants included the idea of using someone else's material without proper acknowledgement. Previous studies that ask instructors to define plagiarism are limited. Studies that do investigate instructor perceptions of behaviours that constitute plagiarism, however, are available. For example, Flint et al. (2006), interviewed 26 staff members across different departments at a university within the United Kingdom. These researchers found that staff do not agree on behaviours that constitute plagiarism. Bennett et al. (2011), who also explored instructor perceptions of behaviours that constitute plagiarism, found that the behaviour of recycling components of or an entire assignment was viewed differently, as 22.5% percent of instructors in Bennett et al.'s (2011) study did not consider recycling of assignments to be plagiarism.

Although the instructor participants shared similar ideas in their definition of plagiarism, not all of the instructors reported they are confident in how their institution defines plagiarism, as less than half responded that they are confident that they know how the university defines plagiarism, a few reported they are pretty sure, a few reported they are mostly confident, some reported they are fairly confident, and a few sharing they think so.

Question 3: What are instructors' experiences of student plagiarism?

This open-ended question found that more than fourth-fifths of the participants reported that they have experienced student plagiarism. Pickard's (2006) study found that 72.0% of participants had experienced at least one case of student plagiarism within the previous twelve months. On the other hand, more than one-tenth reported that they have not experienced plagiarism in their course/courses. How instructors reported they handle student plagiarism differs, and Bennet et al. (2011) also reported differences among instructors in handling student plagiarism. In the current study, more than one-tenth of instructors reported that they have

documented and reported it, more than one-tenth used it as a teachable moment, more than one-tenth discussed it with the student to determine why he or she plagiarized, more than one-tenth reported that it depended on the situation, less than one-tenth allowed the student the opportunity to revise and resubmit, some assigned a mark of zero and some assigned a mark reduction and informed the student. Instructors may perceive plagiarism differently, therefore, how they handle suspected student plagiarism may vary. This can lead to inconsistencies in penalties for students who are suspected of plagiarism. For instance, if a student receives a mark reduction in one class for failing to use quotation marks for cited material and a student in a different class also fails to use quotation marks for cited material but receives a zero, these two students are being treated differently for the same type of plagiarism. The notion of ethics becomes apparent as students are being treated differently based on their instructors' decisions. This confirms Mozgovoy et al. (2010) as well as Power (2009) who suggests that students may receive different penalties for plagiarism.

Approximately one-third of the instructor participants reported that they felt supported by their university's administration, more than one-tenth left administration out of it, more than one-tenth reported no, some reported somewhat, some reported sometimes they feel supported, and some said reported they felt supported by their Dean. As suggested by Ryan et al. (2009), some instructors may choose not to report the suspected plagiarism for fear of not being supported by those in upper management. Leonard and LeBrasseur (2008), who used Canadian professors as the participants in their study, found that professor participants were unsatisfied with the punishment that was given to the student, with one participant stating that "I have been consistently disappointed by the weak penalties imposed on students who have been charged with plagiarism/misconduct" (p. 49).

Instructors reported numerous factors they feel discourage instructors from reporting student plagiarism. More than half of participants reported that the workload associated with reporting plagiarism may discourage instructors from reporting it. This is similar to what Devlin (2003) suggests in that suspected plagiarism may not be reported as developing the case will increase one's workload (Devlin, 2003). Further, almost one-fifth reported that little punishment for the student occurs as a reason not to report it. Berlink (2011) suggests that instructors assign "soft" penalties to plagiarism compared to more severe penalties that would be assigned by the institution. It was found in the current study that more than one-tenth said the punishment for the student may be too severe, so the plagiarism may not be reported.

The researcher found that more than one-tenth of the instructor participants indicated that they have no idea/are unsure how suspected plagiarism is handled. As suggested by Wang (2008), faculty members may not fully understand plagiarism, including plagiarism policies, themselves (Wang, 2008). Some participants felt that instructors should be able to handle minor plagiarism at their own discretion, but not major plagiarism, which is demonstrated through the following participant response: "minor infractions…should be handled as teachable moments, major infractions…should be forwarded to a more formal sanction process." Across an institution, standards need to be followed to avoid student confusion and so students learn identical information (Marcus & Beck, 2011). Having consensus among staff regarding the action to take for plagiarism can help with consistency in handling student plagiarism (Zobel & Hamilton, 2002).

Question 4: Is there a relationship between student academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge?

In this study, a weak, negative relationship between academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge was found ($r = -.281$, $n = 219$, $p = .001$): as academic entitlement increased,

plagiarism knowledge decreased. Although the relationship between plagiarism knowledge and academic entitlement has not been studied, studies that measure the relationship between engagement in academic dishonesty and academic entitlement have been done. Greenberger et al. (2008) found that students who had higher academically entitled attitudes engaged in academic dishonesty more often. Wasieleski et al. (2014) suggests that "academic entitlement is associated with negative consequences, including increased engagement in academically dishonest behaviour" (p. 449).

Question 5: Is there a relationship between students' personal values and plagiarism knowledge?

This study found weak, positive correlations that are statistically significant between plagiarism knowledge and the following personal values: national security ($r = .144$, $n = 219$, $p =.033$) , a varied life ($r = .145$, $n = 219$, $p = .032$), independent ($r = .189$, $n = 219$, $p = 0.005$), ambitious ($r = .172$, $n = 219$, $p = .011$), influential ($r = .144$, $n = 219$, $p = .033$), honouring of parents and elders ($r = .223$, $n = 219$, $p = .001$), choosing own goals ($r = .227$, $n = 219$, $p = .001$), capable ($r = .154$, $n = 219$, $p = .023$), accepting my portion in life ($r = .163$, $n = 219$, $p = .016$), curious ($r = .165$, $n = 219$, $p = .015$), and forgiving ($r = .170$, $n = 219$, $p = .012$). As plagiarism knowledge increased, the importance that participants give to the above personal values also increased (these are weak, positive correlations). For example, as plagiarism knowledge increased (the score on the plagiarism pre-test) so did the importance of some of the personal values that participant perceive to be guiding principles for their life, such as national security.

Although there does not appear to be another study available that examines the relationship between plagiarism knowledge and personal values, some of these correlations can be discussed in relation to plagiarism knowledge, particularly the personal values of *independent, choosing own goals*, and *capable.* Students who reported the personal value of *independent* as an important guiding principle may have also had a higher score on the plagiarism pre-test as these

students may be more likely to seek out information on plagiarism on their own. For example, if a student is unsure if something is common knowledge, this student may be search for the answer as they believe they can find it on their own. Students who reported the personal value of *choosing own goals* as important may be less likely to be influenced by others. As such, they may not engage in plagiarism even if other students are doing so. Also, if they perceive choosing own goals as important to them, they may engage more in the goal-setting process. Some of the results may be to complete different parts of a paper by different dates, which can avoid waiting to the last minute to complete work, which may be linked to a reason why a student may choose to plagiarize. The importance for the personal value, *capable,* might be positively correlated with plagiarism knowledge as students who perceive themselves to be capable might be more likely to accomplish a task on their own, such as submitting work free of plagiarism, compared to students who do not place an importance on the personal value capable. The research on personal values and plagiarism knowledge is limited, and it is important to note that these are my interpretations of the findings.

Question 6: What are students' perceptions of plagiarism, including plagiarism education, reasons for engagement in plagiarism, and consequences for plagiarism?

More than 60.0% of participants strongly agree or agree that plagiarism education should be provided to students; Dahl (2007) found that 66.6% of student participants reported they want information on plagiarism, particularly which behaviours constitute plagiarism. Further, 71.0% of participants strongly agree or agree that students should be required to complete a plagiarism education workshop, and 85.1% of participants strongly agree or agree that a plagiarism education tutorial should be available as an optional resource for university students.

97

When students reported on plagiarism education during their university studies, more than three-fifths confirmed they have received such education; however, this education takes different forms. More than one-tenth of student participants reported that the education came through the course syllabus or a welcome message at the beginning of the semester. Davis (2011) supports this, but he also acknowledges that a discussion about the content on the course outline should take place. Further, approximately two-fifths reported that they were informed what plagiarism is and/or how to avoid it during one or more university courses, and almost two-fifths reported that consequences for plagiarism were part of the plagiarism education they received. Some reported the plagiarism education took place through discussions, and more than one-tenth stated that it included citations and references. The type of plagiarism education students receive differs, from students being informed of the institution's policy on the course outline to having in-class discussions.

Student perceptions of reasons for plagiarism engagement found that time (reported by more than half of the participants), effort (reported by more than one-tenth of the participants), laziness (reported by more than one-third of the participants), getting caught (reported by more than one-tenth of the participants), pressure for marks or stress (reported by more than one-tenth of the participants), workload (reported by less than one-tenth of the participants), limited understanding of the components of the assignment or of the material (reported by more than one-tenth of the participants), lack of confidence in their work (reported by less than one-tenth of the participants), limited understandings of plagiarism/accidental or citing (reported by approximately one-fifth of the participants), and everyone else is doing it as themes for why students engagement in plagiarism (reported by some). Some of the themes that emerged from this question are also reported in the literature. Time, or lack thereof, which was a theme present

by students in the current study is similar to Devlin and Gray's (2007) suggestion of a reason why students may plagiarize. Insley (2011) also acknowledges that students may wait until the last minute, and as a result, they engage in plagiarism. More than one-tenth of student participants in this study also reported that limited understandings of the components of the assignment or of the material as a reason for plagiarism, which is acknowledged by Sterngold (2004) who explains that uncertainty regarding assignment criteria can lead to plagiarism. This study found that more than one-tenth of participants included pressure for marks or stress as a reason for plagiarism; however, Curtis and Popal (2011) suggested that students who have pressure for marks may choose to avoid plagiarism, rather than engage in it. Limited plagiarism understandings was a major theme as a reason why students engage in plagiarism (Ballantine & McCourt Larres, 2010; East, 2009; Marcus & Beck, 2011; Power, 2009; Probett, 2011; Rolfe, 2011; Voelker et al., 2012). Pressure for marks as a reason for student plagiarism is supported by Dawson (2004) who suggests that the pressure to succeed is a reason for students to plagiarize. It is important to mention that "time" was reported more often as a reason for student plagiarism than limited understandings.

Student perceptions of consequences for student plagiarism was examined. The severity of the consequences increased as the number of the offence increased. For instance, almost three-fourths of participants felt that a student should receive a warning for plagiarism the first time it occurs. This finding is similar to what Ryan et al. (2009) found in that students prefer to receive a warning for plagiarism on the first occurrence. None of the participants reported that a student should be expelled from the University for their first plagiarism offence compared to approximately two-fifths of participants who reported that a student should be expelled on the third offence. Interestingly, participants reported that plagiarism education should be used when

plagiarism is suspected, especially on the first offence, with more than two-thirds of participants reporting that students should complete plagiarism education for their first offence, almost one-third reporting so for the second offence, and more than one-tenth reporting so for the third offence. The finding that plagiarism education should be used when plagiarism is suspected relates to Kier (2014) who reports that educating students on plagiarism, instead of focusing on consequences, may be the best method to use to help students learn about plagiarism.

Andragogy's relation to findings

Some of the findings from this study reflect principles of andragogy learning. I will outline the learning principles that I feel are relevant to plagiarism education in this discussion. The learning principle, the need to know, focuses on informing the learners "why they should learn something before the engage in it" (Maybury-Lubin, 2013, p. 23). With respect to plagiarism, students may benefit from discussions that include what benefits learning about plagiarism may provide them with. More than one-third of students in this study reported that the consequences for plagiarism were present in the education they received. Further, more than one-tenth shared that the information they received on plagiarism is what is provided on the course outline or what was provided in a welcome message. These types of "education" may not suitable for adult learners. Informing students that plagiarism should be avoided but not addressing why or the importance of it may be more similar to a teacher-centered environment which is typical of Pedagogy (Chan, 2010). Some student participants also suggested that explanations and discussions of plagiarism can be used to support academic integrity.

The role of experience, another principle of andragogy learning, suggests that unlike children, adults have a lot of experience, and as a result, they can draw upon their past experiences in new learning situations. This study found that more than two-thirds of participants reported that they had received some type of plagiarism education in high school; therefore, most

participants entered university with what they perceived to be plagiarism education. Instructors can use these experiences to discover what adult learners in their classes believe about plagiarism, and instruction can be guided based on these beliefs. Doing so will allow the adult learners to learn if their previous experience with plagiarism education differs from what will be expected in their new learning environment, and new perceptions may result. Although some students reported they did not receive plagiarism education in high school, they may still have experienced the topic, whether it was through discussions or stories. For example, more than two-thirds of participants reported they have discussed plagiarism with other students. Through these experiences, adult learners may have received plagiarism information that differs from the policies of their university. Learning of the learners' background knowledge with respect to plagiarism encompasses the third learning principle of andragogy, and doing so may promote academic integrity.

Readiness to learn and Orientation to learning, two principles of andragogy learning, suggest that adults want to learn new skills and that they want to be able to apply the new skills immediately (Knowles, 1990; Maybury-Lubin, 2013). These principles relate to student plagiarism as they suggest that students should be able to practice the skill of avoiding plagiarism, and that they should be educated on plagiarism at a time when they can apply the content; when they begin to work on their assignment. As discussed earlier, some participants shared that the plagiarism education they received was through a welcome message. Welcome messages are typically posted at the beginning of the semester, and assignment may not be due until a month or more after receiving the welcome message. Therefore, the information presented in the welcome message did not allow the adult learners to immediately apply the information or to practice the skill. Some of the student participants included the timing of the plagiarism

education in response to their ideas regarding plagiarism education. Similar to orientation to learning, student participants acknowledged that plagiarism education should be provided at a time that is relevant, typically as they are working on their assignment.

Limitations

The first limitation in this study uses self-report data to answer some of the research question (Jobe, 2003; Lam & Bengo, 2002; Williams, Consalvo, Caplan, & Yee, 2009). Students and instructors were asked to self-report on numerous items. Students, for example, were asked to report on "If someone told you they cheated by plagiarizing on a paper, what would you do?" This question asked the student to self-report on a hypothetical situation. Participants may have reported what they think they would do in that situation or what they hope they would do in that situation, which may have led to inaccurate responses (Rosen, Porter, & Rogers, 2017; Zimmerman, Caldwell, and Bernat, 2002).

A second limitation is that participants were asked to self-report. Student participants were asked to self-report on questions regarding academic misconduct. For example, "If other students are plagiarizing and not getting caught, would that influence your decision to plagiarize?" was one question student participants answered. Levels of social desirability may be increased and may have affected participant responses (Jones, 2013; Kreuter, Presser, & Tourangeau, 2008). For example, even though student participants were informed that their responses would remain confidential, they might have provided answers that they perceived would be viewed favourably. One of the survey questions asked the participants to report on their experience of completing the plagiarism education tutorial. Participants may have rated aspects of the tutorial higher than what they genuinely felt as the researcher created the tutorial and was assigning the participants their bonus marks. Instructor participants were asked to self-report on how they have handled plagiarism in the past. It is possible that these participants may have

inaccurately responded to questions as a result of relying on memory and being asked to report on specific experiences that may have occurred many years ago. Asking participants to rely on their memory to respond to questions can affect the results. For example, if an instructor recently encountered suspected student plagiarism, then this instructor may be more likely to provide a more accurate report in their response to the question asking how plagiarism was handled compared to an instructor who may have encountered suspected plagiarism a few or more years ago. This could be because these instructors are relying on long-term memory, which is a "… record of prior events…it would be difficult to deny that each normal person has at his or her command, a rich, although not flawless or complete, set of long-term memories" (Cowan, 2009, p. 2). Providing information on previous events does not guarantee that all of the details will be present in the response, which again, might have impacted the results. It is important to note, however, that this study did not ask for timelines from participants when responding to items.

The timing of *Undergraduate Student Academic Practices: Part 2* is a third limitation. Participants were asked in winter 2017 if they completed *Part 1* in fall 2016. If they selected Yes, they were presented with items regarding topics in the plagiarism education tutorial. Doing so asked the participants to recall on an experience that they took part in months earlier. It would have been best to ask participants for immediate feedback directly following their completion of *Part 1* instead of asking recall questions a few month later. Initially, *Undergraduate Student Academic Practices: Part 2* was going to be offered as focus group sessions. After consideration and discussion with the Research Ethics Board, it was decided it would be best to collect the data through an online survey to reduce the risk level.

Participants also reported on the type of plagiarism education they have received and when. Participants reported learning about plagiarism education in primary school and in high

school. The accuracy of these responses may be questionable, though, due to the passage of time. On the other hand, however, it is possible that the timing may have encouraged participants to reflect on parts of the tutorial.

The fourth limitation is that a pre-test/post-research design was used for the plagiarism education tutorial, which may have threatened the internal validity of the study. The pre-test effects might have contributed to the increase in the post-test scores. A pre-test effect may have contributed to the post-test scores for both groups (Dimitrov & Rumrill, 2003).

The low response rate for the instructor participants is a fifth limitation of this study. The response rate was 7.7%, and although it falls within the 5.0% - 10.0% that Christensen Hughes and McCabe (2006) suggest is acceptable for academic misconduct studies, the instructor participants may not have wanted to participate in this study as it explored plagiarism, especially if they had a negative pervious experience(s) with plagiarism. Anonymity was ensured; however, their previous experience with the topic of plagiarism may have persuaded them not to participant (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003). The instructors' workload may have also contributed to their decision not to participate. Although an invitation to participate in this study was sent out on three different occasions, instructors are very busy, and some may have felt that completing this survey was not a priority. Further, instructors may have deleted the email without opening it due to having a busy semester.

The sixth limitation is the participants who volunteered to participate in my study. The student participants were registered in a psychology participant pool. These participants received bonus marks for participating in the study; this incentive may have been their motivator. If all students on this campus had an equal opportunity to participate in the study, the results may be different. Instructor participants received an email with a description of the study that included

the title of the study: *Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities*. Having the word "plagiarism"

present and informing the participants that this survey asks them to report on plagiarism

perceptions and responsibilities may have encouraged those who had negative or positive

plagiarism experiences at this institution to respond. If, for example, an instructor perceived a

plagiarism experience to have been very negative, he or she may have used this survey as an

opportunity to "vent," compared to other instructors who may have received the email, read it,

and chose not to respond as the topic did not interest them.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Continue to investigate plagiarism education

Future studies should continue to investigate the effect of providing students with

plagiarism education. Research on plagiarism independent of cheating is limited (Power, 2009).

Knowing academic misconduct rates that embed plagiarism and cheating can mask the

plagiarism rate; plagiarism engagement rates can be much higher or much lower than what the

rate truly is when an overall rate is reported that also includes cheating behaviours. Research on

plagiarism education is scarce in comparison to the research available on student engagement in

plagiarism and student plagiarism perceptions. More research needs to be done on providing

students with plagiarism education. Mixed-methods studies are needed in this area to determine

best plagiarism education practices. The literature on plagiarism does not include many mixed-

methods studies. Utilizing mixed-method studies can provide more depth to a study than

quantitative research and qualitative research can do alone. Mixed-methods studies allow for

triangulation. Triangulation can allow a phenomenon, in this study plagiarism, to be studied from

different perspectives, offering breadth to the study.

Recommendation 2: Complete follow-up plagiarism knowledge tests.

A limitation of this study is that students were provided with the plagiarism educational tutorial and the plagiarism knowledge test (post-test) all in one sitting. It would be beneficial for the plagiarism knowledge test to have been administered after a specified period of time to see how much of the content in the plagiarism education tutorial was retained. Student participants completed the pre-test, plagiarism education tutorial, and the post-test in 90 minutes. A longitudinal study that tracked student participants and reported incidents of plagiarism in a control group and an experimental group, over the course of their undergraduate education, would provide actual proof of the effects of plagiarism education.

Recommendation 3: Academic entitlement, personal values and plagiarism knowledge

More research is needed on post-secondary students' academic entitlement and plagiarism knowledge as well as student personal values and plagiarism knowledge. The research in these areas is limited. With regards to academic entitlement, it is suggested that engagement in academic dishonest behaviours may be associated with academic entitlement (Wasieleski et al., 2014). There does not appear to be multiple research available, however, that support this suggestion. With regards to personal values and plagiarism knowledge, again, the research is limited. Although it is believed that values can affect behaviour, associations between values and one's plagiarism knowledge has not been examined (Schwartz, 2006). Research into academic entitlement and student personal values may provide insight into ways plagiarism can be addressed depending on student levels of academic entitlement and which personal values are most important to students.

Recommendation 4: Assignment instructions

Students reported that a reason for plagiarism includes not understanding what the assignment is requiring of them. This is also suggested as a reason for student engagement in

plagiarism by Sterngold (2004). If students are unclear of the assignment instructions, it is possible they may post-pone beginning the assignment as they are unsure what is expected of them. Therefore, students who wait until the last minute to complete their work may choose to plagiarize (Insley, 2011). Future studies which examine assignment guidelines and criteria in relation to the number of plagiarism instances for that certain assignment can provide insight on the relationship between plagiarism and assignment criteria. For example, student participants can rate their understanding of the assignment instructions, including rating the different components when applicable, and these scores can be examined in relation to the presence of plagiarism in the assignment. A correlation design would allow for the relationship between these two variables to be determined. This may provide insight into how to provide clear and accessible assignment guidelines that may help students feel more confident when completing the assignment.

Recommendation 5: Types of assessments and evaluations

Time was provided as a reason for student plagiarism from the participants in this study, and previous research supports this. For example, Bannister and Ashworth (1998) acknowledge time pressure as a reason for student plagiarism. Providing students with shorter assignments, in-class time to work on the assignments, and assignments that include more active, reflective, and constructive approaches instead of large final projects may help to reduce to plagiarism. This recommendation may be most appropriate for first-year and second-year students as they practice and develop their writing skills. When students are given research papers, they may choose to wait until the last minute to begin finding their research and writing the paper (Insley, 2011). Future research can compare plagiarism rates for different instructional approaches, such as the more traditional lecture class and classes that use engaged andragogical strategies.

Recommendation 6: Providing plagiarism education

Based on the findings from this study, I would suggest that post-secondary education institutions consider providing students with plagiarism education, or at least provide students with the option of completing plagiarism education and allow the students to be able to refer back to it when needed, at the beginning of their post-secondary education. Plagiarism education can change students' plagiarism perceptions (Aasheim et al., 2012). When students are a part of plagiarism education, they benefit and their skills, such as paraphrasing and summarizing, can improve (Estow et al., 2011). Instruction can be effective in helping students to develop understandings of plagiarism, and completion of plagiarism education can increase students' plagiarism knowledge (Curtis et al., 2013; Evering & Moorman, 2012). If instructors and the Academic Integrity Office worked together on providing plagiarism education, a greater consistency would be provided to the students regarding what plagiarism entails.

Recommendation 7: Consensus among staff with handling student plagiarism

I recommend that post-secondary institutions consider having policies in place and enforce these policies with respect to consensus in handling student plagiarism. If policies clearly indicate how suspected plagiarism should be handled, students may be treated similarly for engagement in plagiarism instead of receiving penalties at their instructor's discretion. Having standards in place can also help instructors too when they are deciding what to do with the suspected plagiarism. This study found that some instructor participants are not confident in their understanding of plagiarism policies. Offering more training, especially for new instructors, may help to develop an understanding of the protocol that should be used when handling student plagiarism.

Recommendation 8: Learning of learners' background knowledge

Learning of students' prior experiences with plagiarism education can help to determine which skills students have practiced and which skills students need to learn. Students enter post-secondary education with different experiences. Tailoring plagiarism education to meet the needs of the learners may be the best approach in deciding which skills students need to practice to be successful in post-secondary academic writing. The education a student receives can be specific to their background knowledge so that it does not become redundant and time-wasting for a student who is competent in plagiarism understandings.

Implications of the Study

This study demonstrates that providing students with plagiarism education can increase students' plagiarism knowledge, which is depicted in the plagiarism pre-test/post-test scores. The assessment of plagiarism knowledge through a post-test, which was completed by the experimental group, however, was measured directly after the education took place. A longitudinal study, in which the participants are assessed on a plagiarism knowledge test a month or two months after completion of the plagiarism education may provide a richer understanding regarding the retention rate of the plagiarism education. This tutorial was completed online, and it likely appealed to visual learners. If the plagiarism education tutorial included more appropriate aspects for auditory and bodily/kinesthetic learners, the post-test scores may be different. An assessment at the beginning of the study regarding the type of learner the participant is and then allowing the participant to complete the plagiarism education that incorporates his or her learning style may have their increased engagement in the learning process.

The findings from this study are an initial step in the discussion of providing students with plagiarism education. Most student participants reported that plagiarism education should

be provided to them, but numerous factors need to be considered in determining the best approach to do so. For instance, should students be required to complete plagiarism education before registering for their first semester of study? Should students be encouraged to revisit plagiarism education when they feel they need to, or should they revisit it when their work contains suspected plagiarism? If instructors are encouraged to provide plagiarism education, will it become too redundant for the students? How difficult might it be for instructors to have to add content to their course that they may feel is already under time constraints? Will the content differ between instructors? What implications might this have for students?

Some of the instructor participants reported that students receive plagiarism education in high school. Determining the type of plagiarism education that high schools are providing may help in learning what students are already provided with when they begin post-secondary education. Of course, the nature and the extend of this education will differ based on high schools and educators, but a starting point can be to look at the plagiarism education provided by the local high school teachers. Reviewing course outlines of local high schools may provide instructors and administrators with insight on the level of plagiarism education students may have prior to beginning their post-secondary studies. If instructors and administrators communicate with high school teachers, possible gaps in academic writing practices between secondary school and post-secondary school may be narrowed, especially if the parties collaborate with one another.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that providing students with plagiarism education may be beneficial for students. Students may learn what plagiarism entails, and understanding plagiarism may help students to refrain from engaging in it. Similar to what prior research

suggests, providing students with plagiarism education during their first-semester of study may help them to develop an understanding of what plagiarism is and what constitutes plagiarism. The findings also reveal that students view plagiarism education as important and feel that it should be provided to them, at least as an optional resource.

Some of the student and instructor participants acknowledged that sometimes students plagiarize unintentionally. Student participants suggested that plagiarism workshops, student-instructor academic integrity groups, and academic integrity days, can promote plagiarism awareness on campus and that these resources can be used to clarify plagiarism and communicate proper practices amongst all parties. My study found that providing students with plagiarism education may increase plagiarism knowledge. As previous research suggests, students who understand plagiarism are less likely to engage in it. Students perceive the plagiarism education tutorial to be helpful, and they felt that plagiarism education should be provided to university students. Although student plagiarism engagement rates were not explored in this study, more than two-thirds of students reported that they have heard of a plagiarism story/stories. Student perceptions of consequences that should be assigned to students for engaging in plagiarism were explored, and it was found that sanctions should be more severe for repeat offenders.

Although many instructor participants had similar definitions in how plagiarism is defined, how instructors handle student plagiarism differs. More communication regarding plagiarism on campus as well as more consistency in how plagiarism is handled may strengthen how academic misconduct is handled. Instructors defined plagiarism with a lot of overlap, but approximately one-third reported they are not confident in how the university defines plagiarism. If instructors do not feel confident in how their university defines plagiarism, will this impact

how they handle suspected plagiarism cases? For example, will these instructors look the other way when they come across plagiarism as a result of not being confident in the process of handling plagiarism? If instructors are not confident in how university defines plagiarism, will they be able to accurately determine if plagiarism is present in a student's work?

How instructors handle student plagiarism differs. One-third of instructor participants in this study reported that instructors should provide plagiarism education to students. Providing students with plagiarism education, which was a primary focus of this study, may help students develop understandings of behaviours of that constitute plagiarism, may potentially reduce the number of plagiarism cases on this campus, and may save instructors resources as less time is spent on meeting with students for suspected plagiarism, finding the plagiarized sources, and filling out paperwork. One-tenth of the instructor participants reported that instructors should not be required to provide students with plagiarism education. These participants may have demanding workloads, and having to provide plagiarism education to students may become redundant for the student and may take time away from other teaching-related responsibilities. If the instructors are not confident in their ability to define plagiarism, the quality of the plagiarism education they provide to students may suffer.

More than one-third of participants reported that plagiarism is an issue on the campus, yet a third of participants indicated that instructors should provide plagiarism education to their students. These findings highlight diffusing the responsibility of providing students with plagiarism education. If participants believe students should receive plagiarism education, but that it should not be their responsibility to provide it, might this suggest that more discussions on plagiarism education, particularly who should provide this education and what will it look like, need to occur between instructors and the Academic Integrity Department.

Plagiarism education, the main focus of this dissertation, was viewed favourably by the student participants. Student participants want to learn about plagiarism, as approximately two-thirds reported that plagiarism should be taught to students, and 30.8% somewhat agree that plagiarism should be taught to students. When asking students if plagiarism education should be provided as an optional resource, 85.1% agree or strongly agree. Requiring students to complete plagiarism education may become boring and disengaging if repeatedly done. Having an optional plagiarism education resource available, however, that students are encouraged to access online, especially when they are completing their assignment, may act as a support for students as they complete their work.

Plagiarism is a complex phenomenon. The proliferation of online resources will continue to present challenges in plagiarism research. As students continue to have access to a plethora of online information, the task of managing student plagiarism can become more prevalent. Students can be more internet-savvy than their instructors, and with technology continuously changing, what implications will this have for instructors with regards to detecting student plagiarism? It is unlikely that faculty and staff will agree on how to handle plagiarism, whether plagiarism education should be provided, and who should provide it. Conversations and collaboration are needed across campus as the starting point for considering the logistics, reasoning, benefits, and responsibilities of providing plagiarism education.

REFERENCES

Aasheim, C., Rutner, P., Li, L., & Williams, S. (2012). Plagiarism and programming: A survey of student attitudes. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 23*(3), 297-313.

Ahmad, U. K., Mansourizadeh, K., & Koh Ming Ai, G. (2012). Non-native university students' perception of plagiarism. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 3*(1), 39-48.

Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (Eds). (2007). *Psychology of academic cheating.* Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Andragogy. (2018). In *English Oxford* online dictionary.

Andrews, D., Nonnecke, B., & Preece, J. (2003). Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard to involve Internet users. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 16*(2), 185-210.

Andrey, J., Joakim, E., Schoner, V., Hambly, D., Silver, A., Jayasundera, R., & Nelson, A. (2012). Academic entitlement in the context of learning styles. *Canadian Journal of Education, 35*(4), 3 – 30.

Anney, V., & Mosha, M. (2015). Student's plagiarism in higher learning institutions in the era of improved internet access: Case study of developing countries. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(13), 203-216.

Anyanwu, R. (2004). Lessons on plagiarism: Issues for teachers and learners. *International Education Journal, 4*(4), 178-187.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Babbie, E. (2007). *The practice of social research* (11th ed.). Belmond, CA: Wadsworth.

Baggaley, J., & Spencer, B. (2005). The mind of a plagiarist. *Learning, Media, and Technology, 30*(1), 55-62.

Bailey, J. (2011). Why plagiarism is on the rise. *Plagiarism Today.*

Baird, C., & Dooey, P. (2014). Ensuring effective student support in higher education alleged plagiarism cases. *Innovative Higher Education, 39,* 387-400.

Balbuena, S., & Lamela, R. (2015). Prevalence, motives, and views of academic dishonesty in higher education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education,* 3(2), 69-75.

Ballantine, J., & McCourt Larres, P. (2010). Perceptions of authorial identity in academic writing among undergraduate accounting students: Implications for unintentional plagiarism. *Account Education: An International Journal, 21*(3), 289-306.

Bannister, P., & Ashworth, P. (1998). Four good reasons for cheating and plagiarism. In C. Rust (Ed.), Improving student learning symposium, pp. 233–41). Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. (2003). Values and behaviour: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1207-1220.

Barrett, J., & Scott, K. (2014). Pedagogical and professional compromises by medical teachers in hospitals. *The Clinical Teacher, 11,* 340–344.

Barry, E. (2006). Can paraphrasing practice help students define plagiarism? *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 377-378.

Batane, T. (2010). Turning to Turnitin to fight plagiarism among university students. *Educational Technology & Society, 13*(2), 1-12.

Beard, R. (2013). *Exploring the lived experiences of participants in stimulation-based learning activities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC.

Bedi, A. (2004). An andragogical approach to teaching styles. *Education for Primary Care, 15*, 93-108.

Bennett, R. (2005). Factors associated with student plagiarism in a post-1992 university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(2), 137-162.

Bennett, K., Behrendt, L., & Boothby, J. (2011). Instructors' perceptions of plagiarism: Are we finding common ground? *Teaching of Psychology, 38*(1), 29-35.

Berlinck, R. (2011). The academic plagiarism and its punishments – A review. *Brazilian Journal of Pharmacognosy, 21*(3), 365-372.

Birzer, M. L. (2004). Andragogy: Student centered classrooms in criminal justice programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*(2), 393-411.

Blum, S. D. (2009). *My word! Plagiarism and college culture.* Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Bolton, F. C. (2006). Rubrics and adult learners: Andragogy and assessment. *Assessment Update,* 18(3), 5-6.

Bradburn, N. M., & Sudman, S. (1991). The current status of questionnaire research. Measurement errors in surveys, 27-40.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Breen, L., & Maassen, M. (2005). Reducing the incident of plagiarism in an undergraduate course: The role of education. *Issues in Educational Research, 15*, 1-16.

Bruton, S., & Childers, D. (2016). The ethics and politics of policing plagiarism: A qualitative study of faculty views on student plagiarism and Turnitin. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41*(2), 316-330.

Burns, A. (2008). *Blogs, wikipedia, second life, and beyond: From production to produsage.* New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Cain, J., Romanelli, F., & Smith, K. M. (2012). Academic entitlement in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 76*(10), 1–8.

Chan, S. (2010). Applications of andragogy in multi-discipline teaching and learning. *Journal of Adult Education, 39*(2), 25-35.

Chapman, K., & Lupton, R. (2004). Academic dishonesty in a global education market: A comparison of Hong Kong and American university business students. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 18*(7), 425-435.

Chen, L. H. (2006). Attracting East Asian students to Canadian graduate schools. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(2), 77–105.

Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. J. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 982-997.

Christensen Hughes, J., & McCabe, D. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(2), 1-21.

Chuda, D., Navrat, P., Kovacova, B., & Humay, P. (2012). The issue of (software) plagiarism: A student view. *IEEE Transactions of Education, 55*(1), 22-28.

Ciani, K. D., Summers, J. J., & Easter, M. A. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 169(*4), 332-344.

Cochran, J. K., Chamlin, M. B., Wood, P. B., & Sellers, C. S. (1999). Shame, embarrassment, and formal sanction threats: Extending the deterrence/rational choice model to academic integrity. *Sociology Inquiry, 69,* 91-105.

Colella,J. (2012). *Plagiarism self-reported rates, understandings, and education among teacher candidates in a faculty of education.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Windsor, Windsor, ON, Canada.

Coston, C. T. M., & Jenks, D. A. (1998). Exploring academic dishonesty among undergraduate criminal justice majors: A research note. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 22,* 235-248.

Cowan, N. (2008). What are the differences between long-term, short-term, and working memory? *Prog Brain Res, 169,* 323-338.

Cox, E. (2015). Coaching and adult learning: Theory and practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 148,* 27-38.

Craig, P., Federici, E., & Buehler, M. (2010). Instructing students in academic integrity. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 40*(2), 50-55.

Culwin, F. (2006). An active introduction to academic misconduct and the measured demographics of misconduct. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 167-182.

Cummings, R., Maddux, C., Harlow, S., & Dyas, L. (2002). Academic misconduct in undergraduate teacher education students and its relationship to their principled moral reasoning. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 29*(4), 286-296.

Curtis, G., Gouldthorp, B., Thomas, E., O'Brien, G., & Correia, H. (2013). Online academic-integrity mastery training may improve students' awareness of, and attitudes toward, plagiarism. *Psychology Learning and Teaching, 12*(3), 282-289.

Curtis, G., & Popal, R. (2011). An examination of factors related to plagiarism and a five-year follow-up of plagiarism at an Australian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 7*(1), 30-42.

Curtis, G., & Vardanega, L. (2016). Is plagiarism changing over time? A 10-year time-lag study with three points of measurement. *Higher Education Research & Development, 35*(6), 1167-1179.

Dachner, A., M., & Polin, B. (2016). A systematic approach to educating the emerging adult learner in undergraduate management courses. *Journal of Management Education, 40*(2), 121-151.

Dahl, S. (2007). Turnitin. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2), 173-191.

Davidian, M., Tsiatis, A., & Leon, S. (2005). Semiparametric estimation of treatment effect in a pretest-posttest study with missing data. *Statistical Science, 20*(3), 261-301.

Davis, M. (2014). What to consider when preparing a model core curriculum for GIS ethics: Objectives, methods, and a sketch of content. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 38*(4), 471-480.

Davis, L. (2011). Arresting student plagiarism: Are we investigators or educators? *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 160-163.

Davis, M. (2011, Fall). The usefulness of moral theory in teaching practical ethics: A reply to Gert and Harris. Teaching Ethics, 12, 51–60. Davis, M. (2012). A plea for judgment. Science and Engineering Ethics, 18, 789–808. Ethics Education Library. Retrieved from http://ethics.iit.edu/eelibrary/ (2014). Gert, B. (2011). The usefulness of a comprehensive systematic moral theory. *Teaching Ethics, 12,* 25–38.

Davis, S., Grover, C., Becker, A., & McGregor, L. (1992). Academic dishonesty: Prevalence, determinants, techniques, and punishments. *Teaching of Psychology, 19*(1), 16-20.

Davis-McCauley, K., Hammer, E., & Hinojosa, A. (2017). An andragogical approach to teaching leadership. *Management Teaching Review, 2*(4), 312-324.

Dawkins, R. (2004). Attributes and statuses of college students associated with classroom cheating on a small-sized campus. *College Student Journal, 38*(1), 116-129.

Dawson, J. (2004). Plagiarism: What's really going on? *Teaching and Learning Forum: Seeking Educational Excellence.*

Devlin, M. (2003). Policy, preparation, prevention and punishment: One faculty's holistic approach to minimising plagiarism. In Marsden, H. and Hicks, M. (Eds). Educational Integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities. Refereed proceedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia 21-22 November, 2003, pp. 39-47.

Devlin, M. (2006). Policy, preparation, and prevention: Proactive minimization of student plagiarism. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28*(1), 45-58.

Dimitrov, D., & Rumrill, P. (2003). Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. *Work, 20,* 159-165.

Dubs, H. H. (1927). The Socratic problem. *The Philosophical Review, 36*(4), 287-306.

East, J. (2009). Proper acknowledgment? *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 2*(3), 1-11.

East, J. (2010). Judging plagiarism: A problem of morality and convention. *Higher Education, 59,* 69-83.

Ehrich, J., Howard, S., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(2), 231-246.

Elander, J., Pittam, G., Lusher, J., Fox, P., & Payne, N. (2010). Evaluation of an intervention to help students avoid unintentional plagiarism by improving their authorial identity. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(2), 157-171.

Ellery, K. (2008). Undergraduate plagiarism: A pedagogical perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 507-516.

Estow, S., Lawrence, E., & Adams, K. (2011). Practice makes perfect: Improving students' skills in understanding and avoiding plagiarism with a themed methods course. *Teaching of Psychology, 38*(4), 255-258.

Ethics. (2018). In *English Oxford* online dictionary.

Evans, R. (2006). Evaluating an electronic plagiarism detection service. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 7*(1), 87-99.

Evering, L., & Moorman, G. (2012). Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 56*(1), 35-44.

Fish, R., & Hura, G. (2013). Students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(5), 33-45

Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30*(2), 145-156.

Foddy, W. (1993). *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires: Theories and practice in social research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, J. P., & Hughes, C. (2012). Academic integrity and plagiarism: Perceptions and experience of staff and students in a school of dentistry. A situational analysis of staff and student perspectives. *European Journal of Dental Education, 16,* 180-186.

Fornaciari, C., & Lund Dean, K. (2014). The 21st-century syllabus: From pedagogy to andragogy. *Journal of Management Education, 38*(5), 701-723.

Freeday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1), 80-92.

Gaddis, S. (1998). How to design online surveys. *Training & Development, 52*(6), 67-71.

Galbraith, M. (2004). Adult Learning Methods: A Guide for Effective Instruction (3rd ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Gailbraith, D., & Fouch, S. (2007). Principles of adult learning: Application to safety training. *Professional Safety, 52*(9), 35-40.

Gourlay, L., & Deane, J. (2012). Loss, responsibility, blame? Staff discourses on student plagiarism. *Innovations on Education and Teaching International, 49*(1), 19-29.

Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 37,* 1193-1204.

Gullifer, J., & Tyson, G. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: *A focus group study. Studies in Higher Education, 35*(4), 463-481.

Halupa, C. (2014). Exploring student plagiarism. *International Journal of Higher Education, 3*(1), 121-126.

Heppner, P. P., Kivlighan, D. M., & Wampold, B. E. (1999). Qualitative research. In Research design in counseling (4th ed., pp. 235-266). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Henslee, A., Goldsmith, J., Stone, N., & Krueger, M. (2015). An online tutorial vs. pre-recorded lecture for reducing incidents of plagiarism. *American Journal of Engineering Education, 6*(1), 27-32.

Hoare, T. (1991). University competition, student migration and regional economic differentials in the United Kingdom. *Higher Education, 22*(4), 351-370.

Hoge, P. (2013). *Turnitin® beat cheating and now gives grades.* San Francisco Business Times.

Holt, E. (2012). Education improves plagiarism detection by biology undergraduates. *BioScience, 62*(6), 585-592.

Howard, R. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*(7), 788-806.

Howard, R. (1999). *Standing in the shadows of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators.* Stamford, CA: Ablex.

Howard, R. (2001). Forget about policing plagiarism. Just teach. *The Chronical of Higher Education,* 1-4.

Howard, R. (2003). The search for a cure: Understanding the "plagiarism epidemic."

Howard, R., & Davies, L. (2009). Plagiarism in the Internet Age. *Educational Leadership.*

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2012). Investigating Chinese university students' knowledge and attitudes toward plagiarism from an integrated perspective. *Language Learning, 62*(3), 813-850.

Insley, R. (2011). Managing plagiarism: A preventative approach. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 183-187.

Jobe, J. B. (2003). Cognitive psychology and self-reports: Models and methods. *Quality of Life Research, 12*(3), 219-227.

Jones, S. (2013). *Academic entitlement and the association of attitude toward learning perseverance for goals and identity processes.* Undergraduate Honors Theses. Paper 67.

Jurdi, R., Hage, H. S., & Chow, H. (2012). What behaviours do students consider academically dishonest? Findings from a survey of Canadian students. *Social Psychology Education, 15,* 1-23.

Katavić, V. (2006). Five year report of Croatian Medical Journal's research integrity editor – policy, policing, or policing policy. *Croatian Medical Journal, 47,* 220-227.

Kier, C. (2014). How well do Canadian distance education students understand plagiarism? *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 15*(1), 227-248.

Klein, H., Levenburg, N., McKendall, M., & Mothersell, W. (2007). Cheating during the college years: How do business school students compare? *Journal of Business Ethics, 72*(2), 197-206.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Association Press.

Knowles, M.S. (1995). *Designs for adult learning: Practical resources, exercises, and course outlines from the father of adult learning.* Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development.* (6th ed.). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2011). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (7th ed.). Burlington, MA: Elseviee.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). The claim to moral adequacy of a highest stage of moral judgment. *Journal of Philosophy, 70*(18), 630–646.

Kopp, J., Zinn, T., Finney, S., & Jurich, D. (2011). The development and evaluation of the academic entitlement questionnaire. *Measurement and Evaluation Counseling and Development, 44*(2), 105-129.

Kowitt, B. (2009). Blackboard rules the schools. *Fortune, 160*(9), 28.

Kreuter, F., Presser, S., & Tourangeau, R. (2008). Social desirability bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question Sensitivity. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72*(5), 847-865.

Lam, T., & Bengo, P. (2003). A comparison of three retrospective self—reporting methods of measuring change in instructional practice. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(1), 65-80.

Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Barton, S. (2003). Collegiate academic dishonesty revisited: What have they done? How often have they done it, who does it, and why did they do it? *Electronic Journal of Sociology, 7*(4), 1-27.

Lan, G., Gowing, M., Rieger, F., McMahon, S., & King, N. (2010). Values, value types and moral reasoning of MBA students. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 19*(2), 183 – 198).

Lauer, C., McLeod, M., & Blythe, S. (2013). Online survey design and development: A Janus-faced approach. *Written Communication, 30*(3), 330-357.

Lazar, J., & Preece, J. (1999). Designing and implementing web-based surveys. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems, 39*(4), 63-67.

Lemke, D., Marx, J., & Dundes, L. (2017). Challenging notions of academic entitlement and its rise among liberal arts college students. *Journal of Behaviour Science, 7*(81), 1-18.

Loeng, S. (2017). Alexander Kapp – the first known user of the andragogy concept. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 36*(6), 629-643.

Leonard, V., & LeBrasseur, R. (2008). Individual assignments and academic dishonesty – Exploring the learning conundrum. *The Australian Educational Research, 35*(1), 37-56.

Lester, M., & Diekhoff, G. (2003). A comparison of traditional and internet cheaters. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*(6), 906-911.

Liddell, J. (2003). A comprehensive definition of plagiarism. *Community & Junior College Libraries, 11*(3), 43–52.

Lindeman, E. C. (1926). *The meaning of adult education.* New York, NY: New Republic.

MacDonald, G., & Nail, P.R. (2005). Attitude change and the public–private attitude distinction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*(1), 15–28.

Mackety, D. (2007). *Mail and web surveys: A comparison of demographic characteristics and response quality when respondents self-select the survey administration mode* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, MI.

Madget, P., & Belanger, C. (2008). International students: The Canadian experience. *Tertiary Education and Management, 14(*3), 191-207.

Malinowski, C. I., & Smith, C. P. (1985). Moral reasoning and moral conduct: An investigation prompted by Kohlberg's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 49*(4), 1016-1027.

Maramark, S., & Maline, M. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college students. *Issues in Education. Retrieved* from http://ezproxy.uwindsor.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/62806190?accountid=14789

Marcus, S., & Beck, S. (2011). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism at Queensborough Community College. *Community and Junior College Libraries, 17,* 63-73.

Marshall, T., Taylor, B., Hothersall, E., & Peerez-Martiin, L. (2011). Plagiarism: A case study of quality improvement in a taught postgraduate programme. *Medical Teacher, 33(*7), 375-381.

Maybury-Lubin, M. (2013). *Coaching the adult learner: A framework for engaging the principles and processes of andragogy for best practices in coaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC.

McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(5), 522-538.

McCabe, D., & Trevino, L. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change, 28*(1), 28-33.

McLellan,C., & Jackson, D. (2017). Personality, self-regulated learning, and academic entitlement. *Social Psychology Education, 20,* 159-178.

McGarth, V. (2009). Reviewing the evidence on how adult students learn: An examination of Knowles' model of Andragogy. *Adult Learner: The Irish Journal of Adult and Community Education,* 99-110.

McKeachie, W.J., (2002). McKeachie's *teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers.* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company

Merriam, S.B. (2001). Andragogy and self-directed learning: Pillars of adult learning theory. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 89*, 3-13.

Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Woldridge, J. (2011). Reasons not to cheat, academic-integrity responsibility, and frequency of cheating. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 79,* 169-184.

Molnar, K., Kletke, M., & Chungwatpol, J. (2008). Ethics vs IT ethics: Do undergraduate students perceive a difference? *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(4), 657-671.

Morality. (2018). In *English Oxford* online dictionary.

Morin, K. (2018). Dealing with entitled students. *Journal of Nursing Education, 57*(6), 323-333.

Mozgovoy, M., Kakkonen, T., Cosma, G. (2010). Automatic student plagiarism detections: Future perspectives. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 43*(4), 511-531.

Muneja, M. (2015). A theoretical basis for adult learning facilitation: Review of selected articles. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(31), 54-61.

Office of Research Integrity (2010). A European code of conduct for research integrity. (December Newsletter), *19*, 1.

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Association (OCUFA). (2017). OCUFA's pre-budget submission.

Owens, C., & White, F. (2013). A 5-year systematic strategy to reduce plagiarism among first-year psychology students. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 65,* 14-21.

Owunwanne, D., Rustagi, N., & Dada, R. (2010). Students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in higher institutions. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning, 7*(11), 59-68.

Parameswaran, A. (2007). Student dishonesty and faculty responsibility. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(2), 263-274.

Park, C. (2003). In other (People's) Words: Plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(5), 471-488.

Peters, J. (2017). Either invest or face more turmoil at Ontario's colleges and universities. *Toronto Star.*

Pickard, J. (2006). Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(2), 215-232.

Pitkow, J., & Kehoe, C. (1996). Results from the third WWW user survey. *The World Wide Web Journal, 1*(1), 1-10.

Pratt, D. D. (1993). Andragogy after twenty-five years. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 57, 5-14. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Probett, C. (2011). Plagiarism prevention. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 170-172.

Power, L. (2009). University students' perceptions of plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80(*6), 643-662.

Reja, U., Manfreda, K., Hlebec, V., & Vehovar, V, (2003). Open-ended vs. Close-ended
  questions in Web questionnaires. *Developments in Applied Statistics,* 19.

Rice, P. L., & Ezzy, D. (1999). *Qualitative research methods: A health focus.* South Melbourne:
  Oxford University Press.

Risquez, A., O'Dwyer, M., & Ledwith, A. (2013). 'Thou shalt not plagiarise': From self-reported
  views to recognition and avoidance of plagiarism. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher
  Education, 38*(1), 34-43.

Ritter, L., & Sue, V. (2007). Questions for online surveys. *New Directions for Evaluation, 115,*
  29-36.

Robles, H. J. (1998). Andragogy, the adult learner and faculty as learners (Report No. JC-990-
  071). Washington, DC: US Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction
  Services No. ED426740).

Robinson-Zanartu, C., Pena, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Pena, A. M., Afshani, R., & Nguyen, L.
  (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses
  to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20,* 318-337.

Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized? *The
  Psychological Record, 47,* 113-122.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: The Free Press.

Rolfe, V. (2011). Can Turnitin be used to provide instant formative feedback? *British Journal of
  Educational Technology, 42*(4), 701-710.

Rosen, J., Porter, S., & Rogers, J. (2017). Understanding student self-reports on academic
  performance and course-taking behaviour. *AERA Open, 3*(2), 1-14.

Ryan, G., Bonanno, H., Krass, I., & Scouller, K. (2009). Undergraduate and postgraduate
  pharmacy students' perceptions of plagiarism and academic honesty. *American Journal
  of Pharmaceutical Education, 73*(6), 1-8.

Saltmarsh, S. (2004). Graduating tactics: Theorizing plagiarism as consumptive practice. *Journal
  of Further and Higher Education, 28*(4), 445-454.

Samroo, S., Cooper, E., Green, T. (2013). Pedandragogy: A way forward to self-engaged

    learning. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 25*(3), 76-

    90.

Savenye, W., & Robinson, R. (2005). Using qualitative research methods in higher education.

    Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 16(2), 65-95.

Savin-Baden, M., & Howell Major, C. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to*

    theory and practice. New York, NY: Routledge.

Scanlon, P. (2003). Student online plagiarism: How do we respond? *College Teaching, 51*(4),

    161-165.

Scanlon, P., & Neumann, D. (2002). Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of*

    College Student Development, 43(3), 374-385.

Schaefer, D. R., & Dillman, D. A. (1998). Development of a standard e-mail methodology:

    Results from an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62,* 378-397.

Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P. R., & Meece, J. L. (2008). *Motivation in education: Theory, research,*

    and applications. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Selwyn, N. (2008). 'Not necessarily a bad thing. . .'' : A study of online plagiarism amongst

    undergraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 465-479.

Sessoms, J., Finney, S., & Kopp, J. (2016). Does the measurement or magnitude of academic

    entitlement change over time? *Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and*

    Development, 49(3), 243-257.

Singleton-Jackson, J., Jackson, D., & Reinhardt, J. (2010). Students as consumers of knowledge:

    Are they buying what we're selling? *Innovative Higher Education, 35*(5), 343-358.

Sogunro, O. A. (2015). Motivating factors for adult learners in higher education. International

    Journal of Higher Education, 4(1), 22-61.

Southerland Evans, N. (2012). *Interactive whiteboard professional development: A look through*

    the eyes of early childhood educators (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest

    LLC.

Starovoytova, D. (2017). Plagiarism under a magnifying-class. *Journal of Education an Practice, 8(*15), 109-129.

Statistics Canada. (2016). *International students in Canadian universities, 2004 – 2005 to 2013 – 2014.* Retrieved December 17 from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-599-x/81-599 x2016011-eng.htm

Sterngold, A. (2004). Confronting plagiarism. *Change, 36*(3), 16–21.

Stiles, B., Wong. N., & LaBeff, E. (2018). College cheating thirty years later: The role of academic entitlement. *Deviant Behaviour, 39*(7), 823-834.

Storey, V. A., & Wang, V. C. X. (2017). Critical friends' protocol. *Adult Learning, 28*(3), 107-114.

Stout, D. (2013). *Teaching students about plagiarism: What it looks like and how it is measured* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, Michigan.

Stowers, R., & Hummel, J. (2011). The use of technology to combat plagiarism in business communication classes. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 164-169.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2014). Legality, quality assurance and learning: Competing discourses of plagiarism management in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36*(1), 29-42.

Tabor, E. (2013). *Is cheating always intentional? The perceptions of college students towards the issue of plagiarism* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, MN.

Taylor, B., & Kroth, M. (2009). Andragogy's transition into the future: Meta-analysis of andragogy and its search for a measureable instrument. *Journal of Adult Education, 38*(1), 1-11.

The International Centre for Academic Integrity. (2017). Retrieved from www.academicintegrity.org.

Thurmond, B. (2010). *Student plagiarism and the use of a plagiarism detection tool by community college faculty* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana State University, Indiana.

Toohey, S. (1999). *Designing courses for higher education.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Tredge, D. (2013). A case study of film authorship: Exploring the theoretical and practical sides in film production. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Education, 4*(2), 5-15.

Trushell, J., Byrne, K., Simpson, R. (2012). Cheating behaviours, the Internet, and education undergraduate students. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 28*(2), 136-145.

Turnitin®. (2014). *Turnitin® launches free online 'teaching tools.'* Retrived from http://Turn itin®.com/en_us/about-us/press/Turnitin®-launches-free-online-teaching-tools-resource.

Twenge, J. M. (2006). Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled-and more miserable than ever before. New York: Free Press.

Vardi, I. (2012). Developing students' referencing skills: A matter of plagiarism, punishment and morality of learning to write critically? *Higher Education Research and Development, 31*(6), 921-930.

Voelker, T., Love, L., & Pentina, I. (2012). Plagiarism: What they don't know. *Journal of Education for Business, 87*(1), 36-41.

Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(1), 41-59.

Wang, Y. M. (2008). University student online plagiarism. *International Journal of ELearning, 7*(4), 743-757.

Wasieleski, D., Whatley, M., Briihl, D., Branscome, J. (2014). Academic entitlement scale: Development and Preliminary Validation. *Psychology Research, 4*(6), 441-450.

Whicker, M., & Kronenfeld, J. (1994). *Dealing with ethical dilemmas on campus.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Whitley, B. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(3), 235-274.

Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 98-105.

Williams, D., Consalvo, M., Caplan, S. E. (2008). Who plays, how much, and why? Debunking the stereotypical gamer profile. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 13*(4), 993-1018.

Wolfson, J. (1998). The application of Knowles' adult education principles to a *Principles of Account Course. The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 46*(2), 27-38.

Yeo, S. (2007). First-year university science and engineering students' understandings of plagiarism. *Higher Education Research & Development, 26*(2), 199-216.

Youmans, R. (2011). Does the adaption of plagiarism-detection software in higher education reduce plagiarism? *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(7), 749-761.

Zimmerman, M. A., Caldwell, C. H., & Bernat, D. H. (2002). Discrepancy between self-report and school-record grade point average: Correlates with psychosocial outcomes among African American adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(1), 86–109.

Zobel, J., & Hamilton, M. (2002). Managing student plagiarism in large academic departments. *Australian Universities Review, 45*(2), 23-30.

Appendix A

Welcome to the Plagiarism Education Tutorial!
Instructions: This plagiarism education tutorial will take you approximately 35 minutes to complete. It must be completed in one sitting. You cannot begin it and then return to it at a later time.
You will work through two modules. Each module contains a presentation on that module's topic as well as practice questions or a case study to work through.
MODULE 1:
What is plagiarism?
Why should plagiarism be avoided?
Is it every okay to plagiarize?
What is common knowledge?
Does common knowledge need to be cited?
MODULE 2:
Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?
1) Impersonation/Purchasing Assignments
2) Plagiarism in Group Work
3) Modifying/Creating False Materials
4) Recycling Work/Self-Plagiarism

If you have any questions about this study, feel free to contact the primary researcher, Julia Colella (colell2@uwindsor.ca). You must use your UWIN email address. Emails from other accounts, such as Hotmail and yahoo, will not be opened.
Module 1:
What is plagiarism?
Why should plagiarism be avoided?
Is it ever okay to plagiarize?
What is common knowledge?
Does common knowledge need to be cited?
Module 1 will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete.
Module 1: What is plagiarism?
Plagiarism is using someone's work/ideas/thoughts and passing them off as your own. Proper citation is not provided. Plagiarism is not limited to text. Using a logo, a chart, image, etc., and not citing the source is considered plagiarism. All material, regardless if the material is found from an online source or from a hard copy source (for example, a physical book), needs to be cited.
Module 1: Why should plagiarism be avoided?
Plagiarism should be avoided because it is an academic offense: it is also a form of academic theft. An author is "stealing" work/ideas/thoughts from someone without acknowledging the original author. The author is passing off another's work as if it was his or her own. To avoid plagiarism, be sure to cite the source(s) you are using.
Plagiarism can result in serious consequences. Some consequences for plagiarism include receiving a 0 on the assignment that contains plagiarism and failing the course.
Module 1: Is it ever okay to plagiarize?
Plagiarism is never acceptable. If you feel you cannot finish an assignment by its due date, discuss this matter with your instructor. There are legitimate reasons for extensions on assignments, such as a death in the family, an illness that prevents you from completing work, etc. When in doubt, contact your instructor.

Module 1: Practice Question

1. Which of the following is true regarding plagiarism?

a) It is okay to use an author's diagram without citing it.

b) Plagiarism is acceptable if one has an illness or if there is a death in one's family.

c) Plagiarism can result in serious consequences, such as receiving a zero on the assignment containing plagiarism.

Module 1: Practice Question 1 Feedback

1. Which of the following is true regarding plagiarism?

a) It is okay to use an author's diagram without citing it.

Feedback: Similar to text, using someone else's diagram requires providing credit to the author. Try again using the question below!

b) Plagiarism is acceptable if one has an illness or if there is a death in one's family.

Feedback: Plagiarism is never acceptable! If you feel you cannot finish an assignment on time, regardless of the reason, consult with your instructor. Try again using the question below!

c) Plagiarism can result in serious consequences, such as receiving a zero on the assignment containing plagiarism.

Feedback: You are correct! There are several consequences for engaging in plagiarism. Receiving a zero on an assignment is one example of a consequence.

Module 1: What is common knowledge? Does common knowledge need to be cited?

Common knowledge is information that is known by everyone within a particular domain. Common knowledge does not need to be cited. Your audience needs to be considered in order to determine if something is common knowledge.

Module 1: Common Knowledge Example

When determining if something is common knowledge and does not need to be cited, consider your audience. If you are giving a presentation in your psychology course on a topic everyone is familiar with as it was a course reading, then you do not need to cite it as the audience will be familiar with it.

Example: Jane plan's to include an overview of the different areas that compose psychology (behavioural, social, and cognitive). She would not need to cite that psychology is composed of these three areas for her presentation since her audience is well-aware of this.

Module 1: Practice Questions

1. Which of the following is **not** an example of common knowledge for *students enrolled in the psychology participant pool at the University of Windsor*?

a) Some students taking a psychology course can enroll in the Psychology Participant Pool.

b) Students in the Psychology Participant Pool can receive bonus marks towards a course for participating in research studies.

c) The University of Michigan's Psychology Participant Pool allows every student enrolled to earn a maximum of two bonus marks.

Module 1: Practice Questions

1. Which of the following is **not** an example of common knowledge for *students enrolled in the psychology participant pool at the University of Windsor*?

a) Some students taking a psychology course can enroll in the Psychology Participant Pool.

Feedback: Since students are enrolled in the psychology participant pool, they are aware of this. Try again!

b) Students in the Psychology Participant Pool can receive bonus marks towards a course for participating in research studies.

Feedback: Students who enroll in the Psychology Participant Pool are aware they can receive bonus marks. Try again!

c) The University of Michigan's Psychology Participant Pool allows every student enrolled to earn a

maximum of two bonus marks.

Feedback: You are correct! The audience is University of Windsor students enrolled in the psychology participant pool, and they would be unfamiliar with the protocols at a different University. This information would not be common knowledge, so it needs to be cited.

You have finished Module 1!

Click the *Next* button to begin Module 2.

Module 2:

Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?

1) Impersonation/Purchasing Assignments
2) Plagiarism in Group Work
3) Modifying/Creating False Materials
4) Recycling Work/Self-Plagiarism

Module 2 will take you approximately 25 minutes to complete.

Module 2: Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?

A number of behaviours constitute plagiarism. The behaviours that will be discussed in this module are behaviours that violate the University of Windsor's Student Code of Conduct. In this module, you will work through different categories of plagiarism, and each category has one or two corresponding case studies.

Module 2: Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?

A number of behaviours constitute plagiarism, and for this tutorial, plagiarism behaviours have been assigned to one of four categories.

PLAGIARISM

Impersonation/Purchasing Assignments

Plagiarism in Group Work

Modifying/Creating False Materials

Recycling Work/Self-Plagiarism

Module 2: Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?

Impersonation/Purchasing and Selling Assignments Case Study

Case Study 1: Tina's Statistics professor assigned the class a lab in which each student has to create five statistic questions based on the class material and provide the answers. The professor teaches four different sections of the statistics course. There is a Facebook group in which some students have posted their assignments for students in other sections to see. The professor is unaware of this Facebook group. Tina is on her school's volleyball team and is vice president of the student council. She is a full-time student, and statistics is her least favourite course. Tina completes her assignment. Before submitting it, she looks at the questions from peers on the Facebook group. She feels the questions posted are much stronger than most of hers. She decides to borrow two questions posted by students on the Facebook page and use three of her own.

Module 2: Which behaviours constitute plagiarism?

Impersonation/Purchasing and Selling Assignments Case Study 1

Case Study 1: Is Tina engaging in plagiarism?

a) Yes

Feedback: You are correct! Tina is passing off someone else's work as her own. This is a form of impersonation.

b) No

Feedback: Although Tina completed three questions on her own, she is borrowing two from other students. The instructor asked her to create five statistics questions. Try again!

Impersonation/Purchasing and Selling Assignments Case Study 2

Case Study 2: Jimmy is in the same statistics course as Tina. He, like Tina, does not like statistics. Jimmy asks his friend Paul, who goes to a different school and who is majoring in statistics, to help him create one of the five questions. Paul sends Jimmy a statistics question, and Jimmy slightly modified is as he does not like how Paul has worded it.

Impersonation/Purchasing and Selling Assignments Case Study 2

Case Study 2: Is Jimmy engaging in plagiarism?

a) Yes

Feedback: You are correct! Jimmy is passing off someone else's work (Paul's) as his own, even though he slightly modified some of the wording.

b) No

Feedback: Paul only helped Jimmy with one question, but the instructor asked the class to create five of their own questions. Jimmy did not do so. Try again!

Plagiarism in Group Work

It is likely that you will be asked to participate in group work at some point during your higher education career. It is important to be knowledgeable of how group work can result in plagiarism.

The following are examples of plagiarism that can occur group work:

- A group member submits his or her part of a group assignment/project, and he or she has plagiarized parts or all of it
- Collaborating with others without instructor permission given

Plagiarism in Group Work Case Study 1

Case Study 1: Max and Jackson are in the same Psychology of Adulthood and Aging course. In the course, they are asked to submit an essay on how memory, intelligence, or personality may change throughout adulthood. Each student needs to find a minimum of three journal articles to use as their research to support their essay's thesis. Max and Jackson both pick how intelligence changes throughout adulthood for their topic. During a class break, they learn that they picked the same topic. Max tells Jackson that he will give him the journal articles he finds. Jackson thanks him and uses the articles in his assignment too. They will complete the assignment independently.

Plagiarism in Group Work Case Study 1

Case Study 1: Which of the following is true in this case study?

    a) Plagiarism is not present in this case study

Feedback: Sharing of resources without instructor permission occurred. Try again!

b) Max plagiarized as he gave Jackson his articles.

Feedback: This is true, but Jackson accepted the articles. Try again!

c) Jackson plagiarized as he chose to use the articles that Max gave him.

Feedback: This is true, but Max provided Jackson with the articles. Try again!

d) Both Max and Jackson plagiarized

Feedback: Correct! Jackson and Max used the same articles. Although Max shared the articles, Jackson accepted. Both Max and Jackson plagiarized.

Plagiarism in Group Work Case Study 2

Case Study 2: In the same Psychology of Adulthood and Aging course, the instructor requires the students to work in groups and develop a learning program that can be used in retirement homes. The programs will be shared with local retirement homes. Students are free to pick their own group. Each group must have four group members, and equal contribution amongst group members is required for this task. Clay, Grayden, Jasmin, and Xuan form a group. Xuan's task is to create a brochure for her group's learning program. Xuan is an international student. She decides to take images from a Google search to use in the brochure. She does not cite the images. She tells Jasmin what she has done, and Jasmin does not mind. The instructor notices that Xuan did not provide information regarding where the images were taken from. He does a Google search, and the images come up from a number of sites.

Plagiarism in Group Work Case Study 2

Case Study 2: Who is responsible for plagiarism in this case study?

    a)   No one. Xuan is an international student, so the instructor should excuse her plagiarism since she is new to Canada.

Feedback: Although Xuan is an international student, she still needs to follow the proper rules regarding citing. All students, regardless if they are international students or domestic students, need to cite when necessary. Try again!

b) All four group members, Clay, Grayden, Jasmin, and Xuan, since all of their names are on the assignment.

Feedback: Correct! Regardless who plagiarized, all of the group members' names are on an assignment that contains plagiarism, so all of the group members are responsible.

c) Xuan, since she is the one who did not cite the images.

Feedback: Although Xuan plagiarized, she is not the only person whose name is on the assignment. Try again!

d) Xuan and Jasmin, since Xuan did not cite the images and Jasmin was aware but did not do anything.

Feedback: Although Xuan plagiarized and Jasmin was aware of this, their names are not the only names on the assignment. Try again!

Recycling Work and Self-Plagiarism

Recycling work occurs when one submits work that was completed in one course to a different course. Self-plagiarism occurs when one does not cite oneself when a citation is needed.

If you want to submit any work that was submitted in a different course, discuss this with your instructor.

Some examples of recycling work and self-plagiarism include:

- Submitting work, whether it is a sentence, a paragraph, or an entire assignment, to one course that was completed in a different course. Even if you cite yourself when referencing work, there are guidelines to follow on the amount of material that can be resubmitted. Check with your instructor before recycling any work.
- Using your own material from one assignment in a different assignment without acknowledging yourself. For example, if you created a bar graph demonstrating the cost of oil over a ten year period for your economics class and now want to use the same bar graph in your marketing class for a presentation, you need to cite yourself and acknowledge that the bar graph was created for a different course. Your instructor may want all original material. Check with your instructor before submitting anything that you created for a purpose other than the current assignment.

Recycling Work and Self-Plagiarism Case Study 1

Case Study 1: In Nyla's social justice course, each student develops a program that he or she feels will help a specific cohort on campus. Nyla chooses to focus on how to help incoming international students adjust to their new surroundings. She begins to develop a program that includes resources for international students, such as connecting them with other students on campus and orienting them to the city by planning field trips. She wants to create a brochure that says *Welcome!* in different languages that will be given to these students. In her grade 12 cultures and engagement course, she created a magazine that had the word *Welcome!* in it in different languages. She has it saved, and chooses to scan this part of the pamphlet and include it in her brochure for incoming international students.

Recycling Work and Self-Plagiarism Case Study 1

Case Study 1: Which of the following is true of this case study?

a) Nyla needs to cite herself (using the magazine as the source).

Feedback: Correct! Since she is using previous work, she needs to cite herself. Even if she retypes it, she is using content from a previous assignment, so she needs to cite the previous assignment.

b) Since it is her material, she does not need to cite the magazine as she is the author.
Feedback: Although it is her material, she needs to demonstrate that she did not create it for this assignment. Try again!
c) Nyla can retype the information she needs from the magazine into the pamphlet and then she will not need to cite it.
Feedback: Even if she retypes it, the original information was developed for a previous assignment. It is not something she created for this assignment. Try again!

Modifying or Creating False Material

Modifying or creating false materials is a form of plagiarism as you are changing original information or inventing information that does not exist. Some examples of modifying or creating false materials include:

- Altering information from an original source, such as changing a report's data
- Creating false information and submitting it

Modifying or Creating False Material Case Study 1

Case Study 1: Clarke, who is enrolled in an introduction to criminology class, has a take-home midterm. Part of the midterm requires Clarke to pick a city of his choice and provide statistics regarding the different types of crime and the numbers of each crime for that particular city over the previous two years. Clarke chooses Windsor, ON. Clarke is having a difficult time locating all of this information. He is able to see all data online for London, ON (a city a approximately an hour and a half from his chosen city of Windsor, ON). Since he committed to Windsor, ON, he cannot switch to London, ON as his instructor told the class that switching cities is prohibited. Since Windsor has approximately half of the population as London, Clarke decides to use London's numbers and divide them by two. He is going to use the website he found this information on as his source.

Modifying or Creating False Material Case Study

Case Study 1: Is this a form of plagiarism?

    a)   Yes

Feedback: Correct! Clarke is inventing data. The data he is providing is not accurate, and this is a form of plagiarism.

b) No

Feedback: Clarke created data. Creating false materials is a form of plagiarism. Try again!

Modifying or Creating False Material Case Study 2

Case Study 2: In the same Introduction to Criminology course as in Case Study 1, the students visit a computer lab and are required to research a local crime that took place within the last 25 years. They need to summarize the crime and they will share their summaries in small groups once they return back to the classroom. This is the first part of the assignment. The second part, which will not take place for three weeks, is much more extensive and it is based upon the local crime they used for part one. Shawna uses most of her lab time writing to friends on Facebook and replying to personal emails. The instructor warns the class that they have seven minutes left and then they will be heading back to class. Shawna begins her research, but she does not find a crime case before time is up. She decides to make up a crime. Since this will not be submitted, she plans on finding a real crime to use in the second part of the assignment.

Modifying or Creating False Material Case Study 2

Case Study 2: Is Shawna engaging in plagiarism?

    a)   Yes. Shawna is creating a fake crime case, which is considered plagiarism as she is inventing material.

Feedback: Correct! Shawna is sharing fake material with her classmates for an-in class assignment.

b) No. Since it will not be graded, it is okay for Shawna to make it up.

Feedback: Even though it will not bee graded, it is still part of a class assignment. Try again!

You have finished Module 2!

You have finished this study. Thank you for participating! You will receive 1.5 bonus marks for completing this study.

Appendix B

Senate Bylaw Policy:
https://www.uwindsor.ca/secretariat/sites/uwindsor.ca.secretariat/files/bylaw_31_-_academic_integrity_amended_150313.pdf

Appendix C

Psychology Participant Pool Advertisement: Plagiarism Education Tutorial

Study Name: Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices

Duration: 90 minutes

Points: 1.5

Website: Students will click on this URL to view the Informed Consent form.

Description: If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to work through six different components that address undergraduate students' academic practices, such as academic entitlement, plagiarism knowledge, and student values. Also, this study must be completed in one sitting. You cannot start it and then finish it at a later time.

Appendix D

STUDENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Julia Colella who is a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Julia Colella 8900 or Dr. Terry Sefton.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate academic entitlement and values amongst students who are registered for the Psychology Participant Pool in the fall 2016 semester. This study will also investigate the effect of an online learning activity.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this online and confidential study, you will be asked to complete a pre-test, a learning activity and a post-test. You will also be asked to complete two surveys, including an academic entitlement survey and a values survey, as well as a demographic questionnaire. This study will take you 90 minutes (1.5 hours) to complete. Each section of this study and the time that it will take you to complete each section is listed below. All of these sections will be completed online. Also, once you begin this study you must finish it in that sitting. For instance, you cannot begin the study and then return to it at a later time. You will not be able to save your answers and return to them at a later date to complete the study.

1.   Pre-Test – 12 minutes

2.   Academic Entitlement Scale – 6 minutes

3.   Values Questionnaire – 15 minutes

4.   Demographic Questionnaire – 10 minutes

5.   Learning Activity – 35 minutes

6.   Post-Test – 12 minutes

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts, or inconveniences involved by participating in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will benefit from participating in this study as you will participate in a learning activity. The learning activity may help you with your studies. Your participation in this study will also add to the current literature, specifically in the Canadian context, as research in this area is limited.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

Participants will receive 1.5 bonus points for 90 minutes of participation towards the psychology participant pool, if registered in the pool and enrolled in one or more eligible courses. Bonus points will correspond with the amount of time participants spend completing the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Any personal information will only be used to assign Psychology Participant Pool bonus marks. The data will be secured as it will be saved on a password protected USB. It will not be released to any other parties. The data will be stored for two years.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. To withdraw from participating in this study, close the browser window. Once you close the browser window, a pop-up box will ask you to confirm that you want to close the browser window. Clicking this will end your participation, and any responses you have provided prior to withdrawing will not be included in the data analysis. The researcher has the right to withdraw your participation from the study.

You will not be able to withdraw your data from this study. Since you are earning bonus marks for participating in the study, responses are unable to be removed.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

The findings of this study will be made available to the participants on April 30, 2017. The findings will be posted on the Faculty of Education and Academic Development's website.

Web address: http://www.uwindsor.ca/education/

Date when results are available: April 30, 2017

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Julia Colella   May 23, 2016

Signature of Investigator   Date

 *Please print a copy of this letter of information for consent to participate in this study for your own records.

**Please click "Yes. I would like to begin this confidential online study."

Appendix E

Psychology Participant Pool Advertisement: Part 2 Exit Survey

Study Name: Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices: Part 2

Duration: 60 minutes

Points: 1

Description: If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a confidential online survey. You will be asked to share plagiarism opinions as well as your experience completing the plagiarism education tutorial if you completed this part of the study in the fall 2016 semester. This study will contribute to a dissertation for Julia Colella.

Appendix F

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH: Part 2 (Online Survey)

Title of Study: Undergraduate Students' Academic Practices

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Julia Colella who is a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Julia Colella or Dr. Terry Sefton.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to investigate academic entitlement and values amongst students who are registered for the Psychology Participant Pool in the winter 2017 semester. Particularly, the student online exit survey will explore students' experience in completing the online learning activity and their plagiarism perceptions.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a confidential online survey. The survey will take you approximately sixty minutes to complete. You will only need to complete this survey once, and it must be completed in one sitting. You will not be able to save your answers and return to them at a later date to complete the survey.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts, or inconveniences involved by participating in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will benefit from participating in this study as you will be able to express your opinion of requiring students to complete a plagiarism tutorial, which might improve students' plagiarism

knowledge and understandings. Your participation in this study will also add to the current literature, specifically in the Canadian context, as research in this area is limited.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

Participants will receive 1 bonus point for 60 minutes of participation towards the psychology participant poo, if registered in the pool and enrolled in one or more eligible courses. Bonus points will correspond with the amount of time participants spend completing the study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Any personal information will only be used to assign Psychology Participant Pool bonus marks. All IP addresses will be removed from the database once participants complete the study. The data will be secured as it will be saved on a password protected USB. It will not be released to any other parties. The data will be stored for two years.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. To withdraw from participating in this study, close the browser window. Once you close the browser window, a pop-up box will ask you to confirm that you want to close the browser window. Clicking this will end your participation, and any responses you have provided prior to withdrawing will not be included in the data analysis. The researcher has the right to withdraw your participation from the study.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

The findings of this study will be made available to the participants on April 30, 2017. The findings will be posted on the Faculty of Education's website.

Web address: http://www.uwindsor.ca/education/

Date when results are available: April 30, 2017

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA
These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR
These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Julia Colella   January 24, 2017

Signature of Investigator   Date

*Please print a copy of this letter of information for consent to participate in this study for your own records.

**Please click "Yes. I would like to begin this confidential online study."

Appendix G

Dear Faculty Instructors,

You are invited to participate in my online plagiarism perceptions and responsibilities study. This research will contribute to my dissertation. The online survey will ask you questions about plagiarism understandings, perceptions, and responsibilities during your experiences teaching in higher education.

Your responses to this survey will remain anonymous. You can withdraw from participating in this survey any time by clicking the Discard responses and exit button. You will then be asked to confirm that you want to end your participation in the pop-up box.

Please click here for the letter of information.

Print a copy of the letter of information for your own records. The letter of information will provide you with the survey link. This research has been approved by the University of Windsor's Research Ethics Board. The Office of the Research Ethics Board is located at 2146 Chrysler Hall North. They can be contacted by telephone at 519-253-3000 ext. 3948 or by email at ethics@uwindsor.ca.

Should you have any questions about this research project, please email Julia Colella.

Thank you!

Appendix H

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH: University of Windsor Instructors

Title of Study: Plagiarism Perceptions and Responsibilities

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Julia Colella who is a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Windsor.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Julia Colella or Dr. Terry Sefton.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to explore instructors' perceptions of plagiarism, including perceptions of responsibility for suspected plagiarism and how student plagiarism should be handled. Faculty attitudes, teaching practices, and compliance as well as resistance to enforcing institutional regulations, are all factors in how students perceive, and the value they ascribe to, academic integrity.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an anonymous and confidential online survey. The survey will take you approximately twenty minutes to complete. You will only need to complete this survey once, and it must be completed in one sitting. You will not be able to save your answers and return to them at a later date to complete the survey.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts, or inconveniences involved by participating in this study.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Instructors will benefit from participating in this study as they will be able to express their opinions/perceptions of plagiarism responsibility, and these results may positively impact how plagiarism is handled. This study will also add to the current literature regarding plagiarism in

higher education, specifically in the Canadian context, as research in this context is currently limited.

COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION

Participants will not receive compensation for participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.

This study will be confidential and anonymous. Participants will not need to provide any personal information, such as email addresses or names, when participating in this study. All IP addresses will be removed from the database once participants complete the study. The data will be secured as it will be saved on a password protected USB. It will not be released to any other parties. The data will be stored for two years.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether or not to be in this study. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. To withdraw from participating in this study, click the Discard button. Once you click this button, you will be asked to confirm that you want to exit the survey. Any information you have provided will be discarded.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE PARTICIPANTS

The findings of this study will be made available to the participants on April 30, 2017. The findings will be posted on the Faculty of Education's website.

Web address: http://www.uwindsor.ca/education/

Date when results are available: April 30, 2017

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA
These data may be used in subsequent studies, in publications and in presentations.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR
These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

Julia Colella   May 23, 2016

Signature of Investigator   Date

** *Please print a copy of this letter of information for consent to participate in this study for your own records.**

**Please click here to begin the anonymous and confidential online survey. <u>I agree to participate in this study</u>.

Appendix I

Instructor Survey

1. How would you define plagiarism? Are you confident you know how your university defines it?

☐

2. Do you feel student plagiarism is an issue on campus (here at the University of Windsor)?

☐

3. How is suspected plagiarism handled at your university? Please also comment on whether you feel you are knowledgeable about the process and if you have any concerns about the process?

☐

4. a) Should instructors be able to handle student plagiarism at their own discretion?

☐

4. b) What might some advantages of instructors handling student plagiarism at their own discretion be?

☐

4. c) What might some disadvantages of instructors handling student plagiarism at their own discretion be?

☐

4. d) What are situations where instructor discretion is okay and what are situations where instructors should have mandatory procedures to follow?

[ ]

5. Should instructors be responsible for providing students with plagiarism education? What would that look like?

[ ]

6. Do you think students should take responsibility for learning about plagiarism? At all levels? If not, at what level (first-year, senior year, masters, doctoral)?

[ ]

7. What are some of the factors that instructors encounter when handling student plagiarism and deciding on what action to take?

[ ]

8. a) Have you experienced plagiarism in your courses?

○ **Yes**
○ **No**

8. b) How did you handle it?

[ ]

8. c) Did you feel you were supported by the university's administration?

[ ]

9. What are some factors you think discourage instructors from reporting plagiarism?

[ ]

10. Do you have any other feedback you would like to offer at this time?

[ ]

11. Please select the number of courses you are teaching at the university this semester (includes undergraduate courses, graduate courses, pre-service courses, etc).

○ **0 courses**
○ **1 course**
○ **2 courses**
○ **3 courses**
○ **4 courses**
○ **5 or more courses** _____

12. Please indicate which faculty/faculties you are teaching in this semester.

┌─────────────────┐
│   │
└─────────────────┘

13. Please select your teaching status for the current semester.

○ **Sessional**
○ **Lecturer**
○ **Assistant Professor**
○ **Associate Professor**
○ **Full Professor**
○ **Other (please specify)** _____

14. Please indicate your highest level of education.

○ **Bachelor's Degree**
○ **Master's Degree**
○ **PhD**

15. Please indicate how many years you have been teaching at the University of Windsor in the box below.

┌─────────────────┐
│   │
└─────────────────┘

16. a) Have you taught at higher education institutions other than the University of Windsor?

○ **Yes**
○ **No**

16. b) Please indicate the total number of years have you taught in other institutions in the box below.

┌─────────────────┐
│   │
└─────────────────┘

17. a) Have you served in an administrative capacity (for example, Department Head, Chair, etc).

○ **Yes**
○ **No**

17. b) Please indicate the administrative position/positions in the box below.

If you are ready to submit your responses, click the Submit button. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Appendix J

Component 1:

Directions: This pre-test (post-test) consists of 16 questions. You do not need to prepare for this pre-test (post-test)! Do not look up any answers. Instead, choose the answer you feel is best for each question. This pre-test will take approximately 12 minutes to complete. Questions 1 - 11 include scenarios and ask you to decide if plagiarism is present in each scenario and/or who is responsible for the plagiarism. Questions 12 - 16 focus on specific aspects of plagiarism, such as common knowledge. All questions in this pre-test (post-test) are presented in multiple choice format.

1. Gia, a first-year psychology major, submitted an assignment critiquing Erikson's stages of development for her developmental psychology course last semester. This semester, she has to complete a similar assignment in her educational psychology course. Instead of critiquing one developmental psychologist, she has to pick two. Gia decides to use her critique of Erikson's stages of development as part of this assignment. She uses her developmental psychology professor's feedback to make changes in her assignment. They are primarily spelling and APA format errors. Gia did not ask her educational psychology professor if she is allowed to reuse part of a previous assignment that was submitted for grading. Is Gia engaging in plagiarism?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I am unsure

2. Molly, a business major, received an A+ on her macroeconomics report last semester. Her boyfriend, Connor, is taking the course this semester and has a similar assignment to complete. The assignments are not identical, but there are some similarities between them. Molly gives her assignment to Connor to use. Molly had a different instructor than Connor. Connor incorporates pieces of Molly's work into his own assignment. When the assignments are returned, Connor's assignment has a note on it requesting that he sees the instructor during the instructor's office hours as his assignment contains suspected plagiarism. Who is responsible for the plagiarism in this assignment?

- ○ Molly
- ○ Connor
- ○ Both Molly and Connor
- ○ I am unsure

3. While writing a report on the theory of intelligence, James uses a citation that explains Alfred Binet's concept of mental age. Prior to submitting his report, he proofreads it and notices that the reference for the citation that defines mental age is missing. He searches for the reference, but he is unable to locate it. He decides to submit the report anyway without referencing the definition. Is James engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

4. For bonus marks, Mr. Clegg allows his students to create up to four practice questions to be used as part of a review for the final exam in his atmosphere course. Each bonus mark is worth 0.25, and the marks are added onto the final exam score. Luan creates three questions, but she is struggling with the fourth question. After spending time rewriting a fourth question, Luan decides to Google possible atmosphere questions. She picks one from a free practice quiz she found online. Is Luan engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

5. The final project in Denzin's International Relations course is an individual presentation that requires students to pick a topic related to International Relations, give a brief presentation on their topic, and then engage the class in a debate. To make his presentation appealing, Denzin chooses to use a video clip to introduce his topic. He found the video clip online, and he does not cite it in his reference list. Is Denzin engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

6. Kayle's anthrozoology instructor assigns his class an argument essay that requires students to argue if zoos are or are not harmful to the animals who live there. Kayle is unsure which way he wants to argue for his assignment. He decides to do some research online, and he comes across a Facebook group named Free the Animals. He joins the group so he can view all of the content. He finds many opinions from members of this group all supporting the argument that zoos are harmful to animals that live there. He uses some of these opinions for his assignment. He does not give credit to these authors, and he does not mention this Facebook group in his assignment. Is Kayle engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

7. Janelle and Corey are working together on their marketing lab. Part of the lab requires the students to pick a company and research how much that company spent each year for the past ten years on advertising. The information needs to be displayed in a chart. Janelle finds a chart online that includes information their chosen company spent since its inception. Corey and Janelle agree to take the last ten years from the chart and use the information in a bar graph they create themselves. They do not mention where their information was obtained from in their lab. Are Janelle and Corey engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I an unsure

8. Dr. Zain's fourth year digital media course is working together to create a promotional video that will be shown to high school students who are interested in pursuing a communications degree. Each student is responsible for a different component of the video. Loey and Samir are acting as the video's marketing specialist. They find a University of Windsor logo that they want to include at the beginning of the video when the school is introduced. They add the logo in. They do not include information regarding where the logo was taken from anywhere in the video. Are Loey and Samir engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

9. Landon and Zora are allowed to work together on a lab assignment. The lab assignment asks them to pick a behaviour that can be observed in a natural setting. Landon and Zora decide to observe the number of people who go to Subway in the mall food court and the number of people who go to Cinnabun in the mall food court. Subway and Cinnabun are next door to each other. They are required to spend a minimum of 9 hours observing. They choose to break it up into three three-hour durations, from 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Landon observes on Friday, Zora observes on Saturday, and they argue about who is going to observe on Sunday. They both agree to take the averages from Friday and Saturday to use that data for Sunday. Are Landon and Zora engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

10. Jonathan, a fourth-year second semester liberal arts major, is learning about the circulatory system in a second-year biology course. He took this course to fulfill his last elective requirement. He finds the course material difficult, and although he attends every class and spends a lot of time studying, he is barely passing. Jonathan is worried that if he fails this course he will not graduate and will be held back another semester. He has to find two journal articles on the circulatory system and compare and contrast them with each other. With the help of a librarian at Leddy library, he finds two journal articles to use. In his assignment, he uses the main ideas from the articles to compare and contrast. He puts the main ideas into his own words, and he does not cite where the ideas came from. Is Jonathan engaging in plagiarism?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

11. Casey's introductory psychology professor assigns a group project. Each group is required to pick a developmental psychologist, research the psychologist, and submit a report outlining the psychologist's contribution to the field of psychology, including any publications authored by that psychologist. Casey's group picks Jean Piaget. They divide the work among the group members, and one group member, Lee, is in charge of editing the report and submitting it. Lee submits it with every group member's name on it. The report is graded a 0 and the group members are asked to see the professor during his office hours. It appears one of the group members, Katy, plagiarized her part. She took information from an online resource and submitted it as her own. Who is responsible for this plagiarism?

○ Katy
○ Lee
○ Both Katy and Lee
○ All of the group members (all of their names are on the assignment)
○ I am unsure

12. Which of the following do you agree with? Select every answer you feel is correct.

☐ Plagiarism is an academic offence
☐ Plagiarism is a non-academic offence
☐ Everyone who plagiarizes receives a warning the first time they are caught
☐ Plagiarism is acceptable if a student plagiarizes using material found online.

13. Which of the following do you agree with? Select every answer you feel is correct.

☐ If a student has too much work to complete and cannot finish everything by the due dates, he/she should be allowed to plagiarize
☐ It is okay to plagiarize if there is an emergency, such as a death in the family or an illness
☐ It is okay to plagiarize if a student does not know how to complete the assignment/unsure of what the professor wants
☐ Plagiarism is never okay, regardless of the circumstances

14. Plagiarism only applies when someone uses someone else's words without appropriate citation.

○ True
○ False
○ I am unsure

15. Does common knowledge need to be cited?

○ Yes
○ No
○ I am unsure

16. Which of the following is/are an example(s) of common knowledge? Select every answer you feel is correct.

☐ There are twelve months in a year
☐ Milk is a good source of calcium
☐ The legal drinking age in Canada is 19 years
☐ Since the audience was not defined, I cannot answer this question

Appendix K

Component 2: Below are eight statements. Please read each statement and check the box that is true for yourself for each statement. Please rate these statements as honestly and as accurately as you can.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
If I don't do well on a test, the professor should make tests easier or curve grades.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professors should only lecture on material covered in the textbook and assigned readings.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If I am struggling in a class, the professor should approach me and offer to help.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
It is the professor's responsibility to make it easy for me to succeed.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If I cannot learn the material from a class from lecture alone, then it is the professor's fault when I fail a test.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I am a product of my environment. Therefore, if I do poorly in a class, it is not my fault.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I should be given the opportunity to make up a test, regardless for the reason of the absence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Because I pay tuition, I deserve passing grades.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix L

Component 3

In this questionnaire, you are to ask yourself: "What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?" There are 56 values listed below. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses, following each value, there is an explanation that may help you understand its meaning. Your task is to rate how important each value is for you <u>as a guiding principle in your life</u>. Use the rating scale below: 0 – means the value is not at all important; it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you; 3 – means the value is important; 6 – means the value is very important. The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life; ordinarily there are no more than two such values. In the space after each value, type the number (-1, 0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that indicates the importance of that value for YOU, personally. <u>Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers</u>. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.
   Before you begin, read the values, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in the list.

1. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)

2. INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)

3. SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)

4. PLEASURE (gratification of desires)

5. FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)

6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual, not material matters)

7. SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)

8. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)

9. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)

10. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)

11. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)

12. WEALTH (material possessions, money)

13. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)

14. SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)

162

15. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness) [ ]

16. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination) [ ]

17. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict) [ ]

18. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs) [ ]

19. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional and spiritual intimacy) [ ]

20. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation) [ ]

21. DETACHMENT (from worldly concerns) [ ]

22. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones) [ ]

23. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others) [ ]

24. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature) [ ]

25. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change) [ ]

26. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life) [ ]

27. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command) [ ]

28. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends) [ ]

29. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts) [ ]

30. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak) [ ]

31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliance, self-sufficient) [ ]

32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling and action) [ ]

33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group) [ ]

34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring) [ ]

35. BROAD-MINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs) [ ]

36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing) [ ]

37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk) [ ]

38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature) [ ]

39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)

40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)

41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)

42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)

43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)

44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)

45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)

46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")

47. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)

48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)

49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)

50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc)

51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith and belief)

52. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)

53. CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)

54. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)

55. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)

56. CLEAN (neat, tidy)

Appendix M

Component 4

Please answer the following demographic questions.

Please select your age.

○ 19 years or younger
○ 20-24 years
○ 25-29 years
○ 30-34 years
○ 35 years or older

Please type your gender in the box below. If you prefer not to answer this question, please type prefer not to answer.

[　　　　　　]

How many years of university/college have you completed?

○ Less than 1 year
○ 1-2 years
○ 3-4 years
○ 5-6 years
○ 7 years or more

Is English your first language?

○ Yes
○ No

Have you completed any schooling outside of Canada?

○ Yes
○ No

Please list the schooling you completed outside of Canada in the box below.

[　　　　　　]

Please type your major in the box below (for example, psychology major, business major, human kinetics major, etc).

[　　　　　　]

Are you working towards a minor?

   ○ Yes
   ○ No

Please type your minor in the box below.

                [   ]

Please select your enrollment status:

   ○ Part-time student (enrolled in 3 or fewer courses this semester)
       Full-time student (enrolled in 4 or more courses this semester)

Appendix N

Please state your opinions using the scale below.

	Very much agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Very much disagree
I am knowledgeable on plagiarism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I experience anxiety when I submit assignments as I am fearful they may contain plagiarism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Plagiarism should be taught to all students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students should be allowed to plagiarize course work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students who plagiarize should only receive a warning the first time they are caught	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
I think students whose first language is not English may be more susceptible to plagiarism	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
If my friend told me that he/she plagiarized, I would report him/her	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Undergraduate Academic Practices: Part 2b

Student Information

Please provide the following information. This information is confidential. It will be used to assign your bonus points.

The name you used when you registered for the Psychology Participant Pool

```

```

Your UWIN email address

```

```

Reminder: This survey will take you approximately 60 minutes to complete. As such, you will receive 1 bonus mark for completing it. The researcher is able to determine the amount of time it takes you to complete the survey.

1. Please comment on the type of plagiarism education you have received in the past. For example, were you instructed on what plagiarism is, how to avoid plagiarism, what the consequences are for plagiarism, etc. Include when you received this education. For example, in primary school, in secondary school, in any of your university courses, etc.

```

```

2. a) University students should be required to complete a plagiarism education tutorial.
- ○ Strongly Agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Neutral
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly Disagree

2. b) A plagiarism education tutorial should be available as an optional resource for university students.
- ○ Strongly Agree
- ○ Agree
- ○ Neutral
- ○ Disagree
- ○ Strongly Disagree

2. c) If a plagiarism education tutorial is required and a student fails it or does not complete it, what should happen? Please explain.

```

```

3. Below is a list of elements that were included in the plagiarism education tutorial. Pick your response to each item using the drop-down menu.

What is plagiarism?
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

Why should plagiarism be avoided?
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

What is common knowledge?
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

Plagiarism Behaviours - Impersonation/Purchasing Assignments
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

Plagiarism Behaviours - Group Work
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

Plagiarism Behaviours - Modifying/Creating False Materials
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful
○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

Plagiarism Behaviours - Recycling Work/Self-Plagiarism
○ Very helpful
○ Somewhat helpful

○ Helpful
○ Neutral
○ Unhelpful
○ Somewhat unhelpful
○ Very unhelpful

4. a) Have you ever talked to other students about plagiarism?
○ Yes
○ No

4. b) What kind of plagiarism stories did you hear about or did you share?

4. c) If someone told you they cheated by plagiarizing on a paper, what would you do? What would you think?

5. a) Where do you (primarily) do your research when writing a paper? [For example, class notes, course readings, library resources on-site, writing centers, online resources through Google or other public search engines, other?]

5. b) Does the type of sources used affect student plagiarism, in your view (for example, books, journal articles, Wikipedia)? Please describe.

6. a) Is there ever a time when it would be 'okay' to plagiarize? If so, when would this be?

6. b) If other students are plagiarizing and not getting caught, would that influence your decision to plagiarize? Explain.

7. a) How should instructors handle student plagiarism the first time a student plagiarizes? Please check all that apply.
☐ The instructor should ignore the student plagiarism
☐ The student should receive a warning
☐ The student should be required to attend a plagiarism education workshop
☐ The student should be allowed the opportunity to redo the assignment
☐ The student should receive a mark reduction on the plagiarized assignment
☐ The student should receive a zero on the plagiarized assignment, and the student should not a be allowed to resubmit it
☐ The student should be reported to the Academic Integrity Office
☐ The student should receive a zero in the course
☐ The student should be expelled from the university
☐ Other _____

7. b) How should instructors handle student plagiarism the second time a student plagiarizes? Please check all that apply.
☐ The instructor should ignore the student plagiarism
☐ The student should receive a warning

- ☐ The student should be required to attend a plagiarism education workshop
- ☐ The student should be allowed the opportunity to redo the assignment
- ☐ The student should receive a mark reduction on the plagiarized assignment
- ☐ The student should receive a zero on the plagiarized assignment, and the student should not a be allowed to resubmit it
- ☐ The student should be reported to the Academic Integrity Office
- ☐ The student should receive a zero in the course
- ☐ The student should be expelled from the university
- ☐ Other _____

7. c) How should instructors handle student plagiarism the third time a student plagiarizes? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ The instructor should ignore the student plagiarism
- ☐ The student should receive a warning
- ☐ The student should be required to attend a plagiarism education workshop
- ☐ The student should be allowed the opportunity to redo the assignment
- ☐ The student should receive a mark reduction on the plagiarized assignment
- ☐ The student should receive a zero on the plagiarized assignment, and the student should not a be allowed to resubmit it
- ☐ The student should be reported to the Academic Integrity Office
- ☐ The student should receive a zero in the course
- ☐ The student should be expelled from the university
- ☐ Other _____

8. What reasons may lead to students choosing to plagiarize?

[ ]

9.   a) Please share and thoughts and/or ideas you have regarding plagiarism education.

[ ]

9. b) In which ways can academic integrity be supported on campus?

[ ]

Thank you for completing this survey!

VITA AUCTORIS

Julia Colella was born in Windsor, Ontario. She obtained her B.A., B.Ed., and M.Ed. from the University of Windsor. She is currently a candidate for the doctoral degree in Education at the University of Windsor and hopes to graduate in Fall 2018.