

## **Plagiarism Due to Generational Misunderstanding**

**Thomas Dyer**

Grand Canyon University

**John P. Steele**

Grand Canyon University

**Rick Holbeck**

Grand Canyon University

**Scott Greenberger**

Grand Canyon University

### **Abstract**

This study explores how faculty members approach plagiarism due to misunderstanding with regard to intentional plagiarism and coaching for students through a generational lens. Plagiarism continues to mystify higher education faculty and administrators. Prior research alludes to three types of plagiarism: theft, deception, and misunderstanding. Stakeholders in higher education approach the issue of plagiarism in various ways leaving room for different interpretations of plagiarism of misunderstanding. Previous research produced three categories of misunderstanding in plagiarism: cultural, generational, and academic enculturation. This manuscript focuses on plagiarism as misunderstanding from a generational perspective. The sample includes ( $n=333$ ) online faculty members. The study results note significant differences in how full-time and part-time online faculty approach plagiarism due to generational circumstances. The other significant finding displays differences between college associations in how faculty approach plagiarism issues to generational aspects.

### **Keywords**

plagiarism; misunderstanding; generational misunderstanding; online education

## **Introduction**

Plagiarism may be the one issue that continues to perplex instructors and administrators in all facets and levels of education. Research suggests the presence of plagiarism on university campuses is substantial (Owunwanne et al., 2010; Smedley et al., 2015; Trushell et al., 2012). Plagiarism occurs when one uses the thoughts, ideas, and words of an attributable source or person without attributing credit and to gain some sort of benefit (Awasthi, 2019). While stakeholders are aware of this common problem, there continue to be many misconceptions regarding why and how students plagiarize. Louw (2017) studied students and staff perceptions of plagiarism and determined that the leading motive for student plagiarism was lack of cognition. Often, when faculty think of teaching, course content comes to mind; rarely is plagiarism instruction at the top of that list (Lovett, 2016). When plagiarism is mentioned, the focus is on the consequences rather than what it is, how to avoid it, and how plagiarism handcuffs students from contributing to and gaining new knowledge.

There are several types of plagiarism outlined in the literature. Weber-Wulff (2014) described plagiarism activities such as copy and paste, disguised plagiarism, and self-plagiarism. Eassom (2016) discussed common yet serious issues leading to plagiarism such as replication, misleading attribution, verbatim copying, and improper paraphrasing. Paraphrased plagiarism is a challenging issue for faculty, as typical plagiarism detection software may not detect these complicated cases of plagiarism (Álvarez-Carmona et al., 2018). Thus, the importance of faculty focusing on the pedagogy of paraphrasing and citing. Paraphrasing is a complex and critical undertaking, requiring students to understand and utilize reading comprehension skills, and then to synthesize and restate meaning in original words (Prentice & Kinden, 2018).

Research on the topic of plagiarism has unearthed a plethora of factors that contribute to student plagiarism. Yu et al. (2018) determined a significant connection between plagiarism and a student's lack of self-control. Salleh (2011) reported student attitude and availability of Internet resources as a major culprit. Jereb et al. (2018) determined that men have a much more positive approach towards plagiarism than women. Starovoytova (2017) revealed that 60% of students had not been taught or did not understand the concept of plagiarism. The three most common factors among plagiarism continue to be cultural, generational, and academic enculturation (Evering & Moorman, 2012; Greenberger et al., 2016; Holbeck et al., 2015). The purpose of present study was to explore faculty perceptions of student generational factors of plagiarism due to misunderstanding. This included obtaining faculty perspectives of generational factors as a cause of plagiarism misunderstanding. The concept of plagiarism due to misunderstanding will be presented, then an overview of generational factors will be explored, followed by modality differences, including online faculty approaches to plagiarism due to generational factors and misunderstanding.

## **Plagiarism as Misunderstanding**

Most universities design institutional plagiarism policies leading faculty to follow a procedural protocol (Greenberger et al., 2016; Holbeck et al., 2015; Levy & Rakovski, 2006). This requires faculty to become investigators, leaving administrators to be the judge and jury. While plagiarism policies are important and necessary, they often only address two of the three definitions of

plagiarism— theft and deception. Misunderstanding, the third of the three broad definitions of plagiarism outlined by Sutherland-Smith (2010), presents its own unique challenges.

Inspired by Brown and Murphy (1989), over 40 studies have indicated that plagiarism may be an inadvertent act and in many cases students do not realize they have taken material from another source without giving proper credit. Approaching plagiarism through a lens of misunderstanding is not a simplistic notion. The three categories of plagiarism as misunderstanding—cultural, generational, and enculturation—present their own unique challenges for online higher education faculty.

Plagiarism as misunderstanding occurs because students may lack proficient knowledge of how to cite, are unsure whether their ideas are original or supported by a source, or are not certain if the information they are using is “common knowledge” (Dee & Jacob, 2012; Elander et al., 2010). Understanding that plagiarism as misunderstanding exists may explain many aspects of student dishonesty. Evering and Moorman (2012) dissect plagiarism as misunderstanding into three categories: cultural, academic enculturation and generational.

### **Cultural Factors**

In the Fall of 2015, international students reached just under a million students in the United States, a 10% increase from the previous year (Institute of International Education, 2015). This group of students is not only the largest and fastest-growing group of students, but they also come from cultures who have varying views on many topics, including plagiarism (Soni Adhikari, 2018). Chen and Ullen (2011) state that cultural differences for international students lead to a “cultural shock” in regard to teaching style, assignment expectations, and writing. Several cultural factors, such as limited English proficiency, a preference for directly quoting authors, and a limited skill set in essay writing, may lead to plagiarism due to misunderstanding (Hayes & Introna, 2005).

While these cultural factors may lead faculty to believe that international students plagiarize at a higher rate, most have an understanding of the concept of plagiarism (Soni Adhikari, 2018). This is a good indicator to faculty that even though there may be an understanding of what plagiarism is and its consequences, students still lack the practices skills needed to paraphrase, cite, and reference. Many international students plagiarize because they were not taught to value originality and how to avoid plagiarism (Soni Adhikari, 2018).

The union between plagiarism and culture is not easily understood. Faculty sometimes assume those from other cultures are more likely to plagiarize. However, Wheeler (2009) indicated that Japanese students receive an extensive amount of training in plagiarism and look at the act in an unfavorable way. Moss et al. (2017) argue that students from other countries plagiarize due to acculturation discrepancies. Another aspect of cultural plagiarism that is often overlooked is socioeconomic status (SES). Moss et al. (2017) share that medical students who attended a private rather than public college more often view plagiarism as wrong. In contrast, students who reside in areas with a low or average SES are more likely to have plagiarized papers.

### **Generational Factors**

Students who identify with a particular generation may have a fundamentally different definition and understanding of plagiarism. This discrepancy may be attributed to the contrast of values

regarding intellectual property between students who were raised with easy access to the Internet, computer technology, and social media and those who were not. Young students (Generation Y and Z), who have had great access to information from the day they were born struggle with the concept of plagiarism due to its vague definition. The difficulty students experience defining plagiarism leads to an inability to apply that knowledge (Louw, 2017). Online education has opened up opportunities for many students. These students fall into various age groups as well. In the past, students who opted for an online class were of an older generation returning to school after a long absence or to start a second career. Today, students have the ability to take online classes full time starting from kindergarten all the way through high school. This is leading to a trend of those students continuing their higher education on an online platform.

Students today are known as digital natives as they had access to modern technology at the start of their lives (Cowan, 2011). While digital natives have an ability to use current technology, they struggle with the notion of being digital learners. Digital immigrants are those who were born prior to the widespread use of technology. Today, these terms “digital natives” and “digital immigrants” are not as often used and even avoided. Generation Z are often described as “connected” and implement active “use of communication and media technologies” (Desai & Lele, 2017, p. 802). This generation, defined as those born from 1990 to the present day, were born into an advanced technological world with access to quickly shared information and social media (Bernadowski, 2019). The academic world for these students looks much different. According to Reeves and Oh (2008), technology is their first language.

### **Academic Enculturation Factors**

Knowing the ins and outs of a college or university may be a daunting task for those new to academia. Often it is assumed that students have a working knowledge regarding how institutions function. This skill is known as academic enculturation. There are several ways to define academic enculturation. Academic enculturation encompasses the values and beliefs of an academic organization, group, and stakeholders such as those in a university (Gilmore et al., 2010). The values and beliefs of a college or university encompass institutional rules and classroom policies. While the assumption is often that students plagiarize because they have an undeveloped sense of moral responsibility, it is clear that is not the only factor. Issues of social and academic understanding of shared values and beliefs in an academic system may be the cause of plagiarism (Gardner, 2009).

Academic stakeholders must strive to help students effectively enculturate into an academic community, helping students master academic skills. An important skill that students need to master to avoid plagiarism is paraphrasing (Walker, 2008). Some deficiencies in paraphrasing are due to poor vocabulary development and lack of experience paraphrasing within the student’s discipline. Reading and writing requirements vary by discipline, grade, and across institutions, which can have an effect on a student’s academic growth. All of these factors need to be considered when assessing whether a student has the skills to avoid plagiarism.

### **Methods**

There were four research questions outlined in this inquiry into faculty perceptions and responses to plagiarism misunderstanding. The hypotheses used were non-directional.

RQ1: Is there a mean difference in faculty perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding by faculty level of education (Master's, PhD, or Practitioner Doctorate)?

RQ2: Is there a mean difference in faculty perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding by faculty teaching level (Undergraduate, Master's, or Doctoral)?

RQ3: Is there a mean difference in faculty perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding by faculty college affiliation (College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Education, etc.)?

RQ4: Is there a mean difference in teaching status and their perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding (Part-Time or Full-Time)?

### Vignette Creation

Access to online higher education opportunities continues to increase, leading to younger and more culturally diverse populations. Hence, this establishes an appeal for understanding online faculty's thought process regarding misunderstanding of plagiarism through the lens of generational factors. Faculty perspectives are an important aspect to understanding how to make sense of plagiarism due to misunderstanding and why faculty may assume theft and deception initially. Greenberger et al. (2016) created vignettes to further address the many issues of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. The purpose of these fictional vignettes is to use storytelling to simulate a real online classroom scenario that is reflective and educational. The vignettes allow for a variety of methods to be used by the researchers (survey, focus group, interviews).

**Table 1**

#### *Vignette Creation*

Vignette Criteria	Description	Steps Taken to Create Generational Misunderstanding Vignette
Framed as a Story	Story has limited dialogue; it is primarily narrated	Created a narrated story with some dialogue for clarification about an undergraduate student's interaction with a faculty member.
Short Story	Typically, less than 200 words	After several rewrites, the final vignette was 268 words.
Relevant Story	Involves a simplified real-life scenario focused on a topic of interest	Researched and modeled after nonfictional individuals and content.

---

Encourage critical thinking	The story allows for multiple answers or unique responses	The story leads to various solutions for online faculty including coaching for plagiarism, modeling, and filing a code of conduct report.
Incomplete	Purposely incomplete story; allows for multiple interpretations	The story ends with Madison feeling successful that she found all the information she needed and even included an in-text citation and reference.

---

Note: Adapted from Simon and Tierney (2011).

Simon and Tierney (2011) utilized vignettes in a comparison of research studies to reveal teachers' beliefs and reasoning. The current researchers utilized this previous research to create a vignette regarding plagiarism as generational misunderstanding. The creation process of vignettes was used by the researchers in their earlier study, "Plagiarism due to misunderstanding: Online instructor perceptions" (Greenberger et al., 2016). The vignettes in this study were used to research the perceptions of a smaller group of faculty to generate focused questions for the survey. All three vignettes—cultural, generational, and academic enculturation—were used in the original study. The current study utilized the vignette telling a fictional story of generational misunderstanding with a much larger sample and more focused questions (Appendix A).

Simon and Tierney (2011) created strict standards when developing vignettes as a research tool. The use of vignettes is a relatively new research instrument that may be useful in analyzing teachers' beliefs (Greenberger et al., 2016; Schoenberg & Ravdal, 2000; Simon & Tierney, 2011). The researchers for this study utilized a vignette created in a previous study (Greenberger et al., 2016). All recommendations by Simon and Tierney (2011) were adhered to throughout the vignette creation process. It is important to portray relevant characters and content that are believable. The research for this vignette creation was conducted using personal experience teaching Generation Y and Generation Z students. The researchers modeled the student after not just one student, but various students who have shared experiences similar to those of Madison, the main character in the vignette. The researchers wanted to choose a scenario that was believable, viable, and common.

The vignette in this study was field tested using an expert panel consisting of online full-time faculty. The expert panel reviewed the vignette and corresponding questions and provided feedback. The researchers made minimal changes to condense the vignette and clarify the survey questions within the study. A small group of five full-time online faculty were recruited to review the revised survey, providing additional insight to improve the readability of the survey questions. The feedback revolved around the length of the vignette. The researchers attempted to be sure the vignette was short, leaving it incomplete, allowing the participants the opportunity to create different solutions and critical thinking opportunities. The vignette is shown in Appendix A.

The survey included seven statements that participants answered on a seven-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree, Strongly Agree). The statements are included below:

1. Madison understands the purpose of intellectual property rights in researching and citing sources for academic essays.
2. Madison plagiarized.
3. Madison intentionally plagiarized.
4. The instructor should coach Madison on her writing, but there is no need to file a code of conduct violation report.
5. The instructor should coach Madison on her writing, as well as file a code of conduct report.
6. The instructor should not coach Madison on her writing, but instead the instructor should file a code of conduct report.
7. With the right feedback, Madison will be well prepared to effectively write her next essay.

### **Population and Sample Size**

To gather data related to faculty perceptions of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding, full-time and part-time faculty were recruited to participate. The researchers set an inclusion criterion defining the parameters of the study. Garg (2016) states that a homogeneous group of individuals that are chosen in a systemic way can be determined by inclusion criteria. There were no faculty excluded in this study. Thus, we argue that the results of this study will be applicable to all faculty, full-time and part-time, as well as faculty training and development, curriculum designers, and university administrators.

A survey including the vignette was sent using SurveyMonkey to a convenience sample of adjunct and full-time faculty teaching at a private Christian university in the U.S. Southwest after IRB approval. Three hundred fifty-four instructors responded to the survey. After data cleaning, 333 instructors were included in the final sample, following the removal of the outliers and incomplete responses. The participants for this study included 110 males (33%) and 223 females (67%). For this study, participants were classified into three degree categories: Master's ( $n=139$ ), PhD ( $n=115$ ), and professional doctorates ( $n=79$ ). The category professional doctorates included all doctoral degrees that were not PhDs. Participants self-reported race/ethnicity, which included 88% Caucasian, 7% African American, 1.5% Hispanic or Latino, 1% Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 2% Other. Faculty ages ranged between 26 years to 77 years old. One hundred faculty reported being between 55 and 59 years old. The smallest group of faculty was under 30, which included four instructors. The mean was ( $M=52.67$ ) and the standard deviation was ( $SD=11.43$ ).

### **Data Analysis**

The researchers performed data cleaning and error checking. The data were evaluated for the statistical assumptions of a one-way ANOVA. Due to the data not being normally distributed, a non-parametric test was conducted using the Kruskal-Wallis H test (Rovai et al., 2014). The survey used a seven-point Likert scale that can cause the scale items to be exaggerated concerning outliers and normality (Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Additionally, it has been reasoned that the median can be used for the central tendency with Likert scale data (Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Two advantages noted with using non-parametric tests: There is less possibility of reaching faulty conclusions, and the data is not impacted by outliers (Nahm, 2016). The Kruskal-Wallis H test is appropriate in this study because the data failed the Levenes homogeneity of variance test and the assumptions test

for a one-way ANOVA. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for a between-group analysis of the first three research questions about levels of education, college affiliation, and teaching level. The last research question utilized the non-parametric test of Mann-Whitney U since the full-time faculty sample size was too small, not meeting assumptions (Chen & Zhu, 2001).

## Results

To answer Research Question 1, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in faculty members' level of education and their perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. Participants were classified into three different groups: Master's ( $n = 139$ ), PhD ( $n = 115$ ), and Professional ( $n = 79$ ). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine if there were differences in faculty members' Likert scores for generational plagiarism between three groups of participants with different levels of education: "master's," "PhD," and "Professional" groups. Median Likert scores were not statistically significantly different between groups,  $p < .096-.975$ .

To answer Research Question 2, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine if there were differences in faculty members' teaching level and their perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. Participants were classified into three different groups: undergraduate ( $n = 162$ ), graduate ( $n = 111$ ), and doctoral ( $n = 60$ ). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine if there were differences in faculty members' Likert scores for generational plagiarism between three groups of participants with different levels of education: the "undergraduate," "master's," and "doctoral" teaching level groups. Median Likert scores were not statistically significantly different between groups,  $p < .053-.885$ .

To answer the third research question, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to determine if there were differences in a faculty member's college affiliation and their perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. Participants are classified into six different groups: College of Doctoral Studies ( $n = 162$ ), College of Business ( $n = 111$ ), College of Education, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions and College of Theology ( $n = 60$ ). A Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to determine if there were differences in faculty member's Likert scores for generational plagiarism between the six groups of participants with different college affiliations. Median Likert scores were not statistically significantly different between groups for the survey questions two, three, four, and five,  $p < .324-.589$ . There was statistical significance for the survey questions one and six (1)  $\chi^2(5) = 11.702$ ,  $p = .039$ , and (6).  $\chi^2(5) = 11.702$ ,  $p = .039$ ,  $\chi^2(5) = 13.137$ ,  $p = .022$ .

Pairwise comparisons were performed using Dunn's (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted  $p$ -values are presented. The statistical significance was accepted at  $p < .05$  level. This post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences in Likert scores with the adjusted  $p$ -value between the College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions (mean rank = 144.22) and College of Business (mean rank = 181.65) ( $p = .019$ ), but not between any other group combination. A Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine if a faculty member's teaching status impacted their perception of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. The Mann-Whitney U test was used because of the unbalanced sample of groups (full-time,  $n = 36$ , and part-time,  $n = 297$ ).



When reporting the Mann-Whitney U results, the median is commonly reported as the common way of expressing the central tendency between groups (Rovai et al., 2014). There were four non-significant findings for the questions, and two significant findings determined for the variable of teaching status. Plagiarism scores for the first question of “*Madison understands the purpose of intellectual property rights in researching and citing sources for academic essays*” are statistically significant Part-time ( $Mdn = 2.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 1.0$ ),  $U = 3729$ ,  $z = -3.102$ ,  $p = .002$ . Also, statistically significance was determined for the last question of “*The instructor should not coach Madison on her writing, but instead the instructor should file a code of conduct report*” with scores of Part-time ( $Mdn = 2.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 1.0$ ),  $U = 4328$ ,  $z = -2.006$ ,  $p = .045$ .

Plagiarism scores for the four other questions included non-significant findings with scores of “*Madison plagiarized.*” Part-time ( $Mdn = 6.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 6.5$ ),  $U = 6290$ ,  $z = 1.854$ ,  $p = .064$ ., “*Madison intentionally plagiarized.*” Part-time ( $Mdn = 5.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 5.0$ ),  $U = 6224$ ,  $z = 1.636$ ,  $p = .102$ . “*The instructor should coach Madison on her writing, but there is no need to file a code of conduct violation report*” Part-time ( $Mdn = 4.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 3.0$ ),  $U = 4740$ ,  $z = -0.863$ ,  $p = .388$ . “*The instructor should coach Madison on her writing, as well as file a code of conduct report*” Part-time ( $Mdn = 5.0$ ) and Full-time ( $Mdn = 5.0$ ),  $U = 5899$ ,  $z = 1.029$ ,  $p = .303$ .

## Discussion

This follow-up study strengthened the original research by Greenberger et al. (2016), which determined that there might be a limited lens by which faculty view plagiarism, specifically misunderstanding. Faculty may struggle to fully understand the concept of accidental plagiarism or plagiarism due to misunderstanding due to factors such as generational misunderstanding. This study further investigated the theme of generational misunderstanding by instituting a larger sample and expanding the sample to include part-time faculty members. The first study conducted a small group allowing for a great amount of discussion and the development of the focus questions used in this study.

Two significant findings were determined for the questions of “*Madison understands the purpose of intellectual property rights in researching and citing sources for academic essays*” and “*The instructor should not coach Madison on her writing, but instead the instructor should file a code of conduct report.*” These findings occurred between groups of full-time and part-time faculty. A larger number of part-time faculty felt that Madison understood the purpose of intellectual property rights in researching and citing sources for academic essays. Also significant was that a larger number of part-time faculty felt that Madison needed no coaching and should receive a code of conduct violation report. Louw (2017) shared that the difficulty Gen Y and Z students experience defining plagiarism leads to an inability to apply that knowledge. This finding is particularly interesting since the groups compared are full- and part-time faculty. The first finding indicated that one group found that Madison not only understood plagiarism and proper citing—they also believed that Madison intentionally attempted to deceive their instructor and required no follow-up plagiarism instruction. There are several reasons that this could have occurred such as limited training for part-time faculty, awareness of conflicting institutional plagiarism policies, or exposure to the similarity software.

The other two significant findings were between college associations determined for the questions of “*Madison understands the purpose of intellectual property rights in researching and citing sources for academic essays*” and “*The instructor should not coach Madison on her writing, but instead the instructor should file a code of conduct report.*” The post hoc analysis revealed statistically significant differences between the College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions and College of Business. This finding could be impacted by the smaller sample size of College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions faculty. Another factor is that the College of Business utilized more part-time faculty than the College of Nursing and Healthcare Professions. Due to the nature of these two different disciplines or college affiliations, a view of this issue of generational misunderstanding of plagiarism naturally presents differences. These findings present a policy question of “Does one size fit all?” Can or should a plagiarism policy convey what happens across disciplines?

### **Limitations and Recommendations**

This study explores faculty perceptions of plagiarism due to generational misunderstanding. Plagiarism continues to be at the forefront of concern for faculty and education stakeholders. The vignette for this study provided a fictional story describing a learner who struggled with understanding the role of technology and intellectual property, which can be magnified for Generation Y and Z learners. Faculty must work to better understand the difference between students who struggle to differentiate what should and should not be cited and students are intentionally plagiarizing. Faculty may benefit from researching and understanding Generation Y and Z learners recognizing their innate use and access to technology and online resources.

One limitation was the small sample population of full-time faculty who participated in the survey. The small sample size led to uneven groups and use of the non-parametric test. Another limitation is that the researchers assumed that participants provided honest and thorough survey responses. The researchers encouraged participants to share their honest in-depth responses reminding them of privacy and confidentiality.

Future research should seek a more robust sample of the full-time faculty. Additional research needs to be conducted into the academic enculturation misunderstanding. Focus groups could be performed with part-time and full-time faculty to determine other factors regarding whether a code of conduct report is filed rather than coaching a student and/or coaching a student while still filing a code of conduct. Future research may want to focus on primary teaching levels (undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral) and plagiarism.

## References

- Adhikari, S. (2018). Beyond culture: Helping international students avoid plagiarism. *Journal of International Students*, 8(1), 375–388. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v8i1.170>
- Álvarez-Carmona, M. A., Franco-Salvador, M., Villatoro-Tello, E., Montes-y-Gómez, M., Rosso, P., & Villaseñor-Pineda, L. (2018). Semantically-informed distance and similarity measures for paraphrase plagiarism identification. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, 34(5), 2983–2990. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-169483>
- Awasthi, S. (2019). Plagiarism and academic misconduct: A systematic review. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 39(2), 94–100. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.39.2.13622>
- Bernadowski, C. (2019). ‘OMG it’s not a big deal’: Generation Z’s perceptions of academic integrity and cheating in the 21st Century: A phenomenological study. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 6(8), 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.68.6810>
- Brown, A. S., & Murphy, D. R. (1989). Cryptomnesia: Delineating inadvertent plagiarism. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 15(3), 432–442. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.15.3.432>
- Chen, A., & Zhu, W. (2001). Revisiting the assumptions for inferential statistical analyses: A conceptual guide. *Quest*, 53(4), 418–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2001.10491756>
- Chen, Y.-H., & Van Ullen, M. K. (2011). Helping international students succeed academically through research process and plagiarism workshops. *College and Research Libraries* 72(3), 209–235. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-117rl>
- Cowan, B. (2011, November 6). Why ‘digital natives’ aren’t necessarily digital learners. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. (2012). Rational ignorance in education: A field experiment in student plagiarism. *Journal of Human Resources*, 47, 397–434. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w15672>
- Desai, S. P., & Lele, V. (2017). Correlating Internet, social networks and workplace—a case of Generation Z students. *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought*, 8(4), 802–815. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-478X.2017.00050.7>
- Dunn, O. J. (1964). Multiple comparisons using rank sums. *Technometrics*, 6, 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1964.10490181>
- Eassom, H. (2016). 10 types of plagiarism in research. Discover the future of research. <https://www.wiley.com/network/researchers/submission-and-navigating-peer-review/10-types-of-plagiarism-in-research>
- 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, 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930802687745>
- Evering, L. C., & Moorman, G. (2012). Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JAAL.00100>
- Gardner, S. K. (2009). The development of doctoral students: Phases of challenge and support. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(6), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aehe.3406>
- Garg, R. (2016). Methodology for research I. *Indian Journal of Anaesthesia*, 60(9), 640–645. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5049.190619>

- Gilmore, J., Strickland, D., Timmerman, B., Maher, M., & Feldon, D. (2010). Weeds in the flower garden: An exploration of plagiarism in graduate students' research proposals and its connection to enculturation, ESL, and contextual factors. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 6(1), 13–28. [https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/biol\\_facpub/2/](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/biol_facpub/2/)
- Greenberger, S., Holbeck, R., Steele, J., & Dyer, T. (2016). Plagiarism due to misunderstanding: Online instructor perceptions. *Journal of Scholarship of Learning and Teaching*, 16(6), 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i6.20062>
- Hayes, N., & Inrona, L. D. (2005). Cultural values, plagiarism, and fairness: When plagiarism gets in the way of learning. *Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213–231. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb1503\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb1503_2)
- Holbeck, R., Greenberger, S., Cooper, L., Steele, J., Palenque, S. M., & Koukoudeas, S. (2015). Reporting plagiarism in the online classroom. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*, 11(2), 202–209. [https://jolt.merlot.org/Vol11no2/Holbeck\\_0615.pdf](https://jolt.merlot.org/Vol11no2/Holbeck_0615.pdf)
- Institute of International Education (2015). Open Doors report on international educational exchange. <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Jereb, E., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., & Šprajc, P. (2018). Gender differences and the awareness of plagiarism in higher education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21(2), 409–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9421-y>
- Louw, H. (2017). Defining plagiarism: Student and staff perceptions of a grey concept. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31(5), 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.20853/31-5-580>
- Lovett, A. (2016). Teaching about plagiarism with a lyrical approach. *Teacher Librarian*, 43(4), 39–41. <http://teacherlibrarian.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2B-lovett.pdf>
- Moss, S. A., White, B., & Lee, J. (2017). A systematic review into the psychological causes and correlates of plagiarism. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28(4), 261–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1341837>
- Nahm F. S. (2016). Nonparametric statistical tests for the continuous data: The basic concept and the practical use. *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, 69(1), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.4097/kjae.2016.69.1.8>
- Owunwanne, D., Rustagi, N., & Dada, R. (2010). Students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in higher institutions. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 7(11), 59–68. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ906756>
- Prentice, F. M., & Kinden, C. E. (2018). Paraphrasing tools, language translation tools and plagiarism: An exploratory study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0036-7>
- Reeves, T. C., & Oh, E. (2008). Generational differences. In J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, J. van Merriënboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 295–303). Routledge.
- Rovai, A. P., Baker, J. D., & Ponton, M. K. (2014). *Social science research design and statistics: A practitioner's guide to research methods and IBM SPSS analysis*. Watertree Press.
- Salleh, M. H. B. M. (2011). Academic dishonesty: Factors that contribute plagiarism in technical college in Malaysia. *Kolokium Pembentangan Penyelidikan Polimas*.
- Schoenberg, N. E., & Ravdal, H. (2000). Using vignettes in awareness and attitudinal research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(1), 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136455700294932>
- Simon, M., & Tierney, R. (2011). *Use of vignettes in educational research on sensitive teaching functions such as assessment*. <https://docplayer.net/96698594-Use-of-vignettes-in->

- [educational-research-on-sensitive-teaching-functions-such-as-assessment-marielle-simon-university-of-ottawa-robin-tierney-canada.html](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2014.12.003)
- Smedley, A., Crawford, T., & Cloete, L. (2015). An intervention aimed at reducing plagiarism in undergraduate nursing students. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 15, 168–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2014.12.003>
- Starovoytova, D. (2017). Plagiarism under a magnifying-glass. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(15), 109–129. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1143987.pdf>
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino Jr., A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541–542. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-5-4-18>
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2010). Retribution, deterrence and reform: The dilemmas of plagiarism management in universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 32(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800903440519>
- Trushell, J., Byrne, K., & Simpson, R. (2012). Cheating behaviours, the Internet and Education undergraduate students. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 28, 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2011.00424.x>
- Walker, A. L. (2008). Preventing unintentional plagiarism: A method for strengthening paraphrasing skills. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(4), 387–395. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ828976>
- Weber-Wulff, D. (2014). *False feathers: A perspective on academic plagiarism*. Springer-Verlag.
- Wheeler, G. (2009). Plagiarism in the Japanese universities: Truly a cultural matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.004>
- Yu, H., Glanzer, P. L., Johnson, B. R., Sriram, R., & Moore, B. (2018). Why college students cheat: A conceptual model of five factors. *Review of Higher Education*, 41(4), 549–576. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2018.0025>

## Corresponding Author

Thomas Dyer, Associate Professor  
College of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Grand Canyon University  
3300 W. Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85017, 602-639-7615  
[Thomas.dyer@gcu.edu](mailto:Thomas.dyer@gcu.edu)

## **Appendix A.**

### **Generational Misunderstanding Vignette**

Madison is a 21-year-old assistant web designer who began working full-time right after high school. As a web designer, her role is to update client webpages with premade messages. She loves it. Shortly after starting, she realized the senior designers all had bachelor's degrees. To move up in the company, she would have to go back to school, but her full-time schedule would not allow her to attend college on campus. She decided to enroll in an online program. Madison grew up with computers and the internet, so she figured that she could always just "Google it" if she had any problems with an assignment. In her first online course, she was assigned her first essay that required scholarly research. Her instructor encouraged the class to use the university library. Before Madison got too far on her assignment, she decided to check her Facebook page to see what her friends were up to. She then checked her Twitter and posted "Getting ready to knock out this paper. #College #DoWork." Madison found too much information on Google, so she decided to go to Wikipedia. Even though she had to do some searching in Wikipedia she found four different web pages to cut and paste into her essay. Once she cut and pasted from the four web pages, she decided to include the website "wikipedia.com" in her reference list. Madison was happy that her first essay was easier than she thought it would be. She was able to find all the information required to write the paper and even provide a source of where she obtained the information.