



Using a Scenario-Based Method to Explore University Students' Views About Writing Assistance

Ami Möller¹ · Keith Comer¹ · Peter Rawlins¹ · Lisa Emerson¹

Received: 8 September 2024 / Accepted: 8 March 2025
© The Author(s) 2025

Abstract

Scenarios, or short descriptions of hypothetical situations, can serve as a methodological tool to gather insights and develop an understanding about participants' perceptions. Studies have made use of scenarios to gauge student beliefs about the acceptability of various writing activities that may be considered help, plagiarism, or something else. These studies often employed scenarios within surveys comprised of single- or multiple-choice queries, leaving little space for participants' views beyond binary responses and no room for their detailed explanations. Using scenarios as a way to start an in-depth discussion, however, offers opportunities to explore students' perspectives and reasonings on using writing assistance from third parties. This article describes a unique implementation of a bespoke set of scenarios in a qualitative study that examined undergraduate students' perceptions about third-party writing assistance. Using these distinctive scenarios represents a contribution to how we collect data on students' perspectives. This method is particularly applicable for qualitative research studies exploring complex participant perceptions about nuanced phenomena within education.

Keywords Scenarios · Qualitative methods · Student writing · Academic integrity · Writing assistance

✉ Ami Möller
ami.moller@openpolytechnic.ac.nz

Keith Comer
comerk@lanecce.edu

Peter Rawlins
p.rawlins@massey.ac.nz

Lisa Emerson
l.emerson@massey.ac.nz

¹ College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Introduction

Short scenes, often called vignettes or scenarios, are used by social science disciplines to gather information from research participants. The scenes are usually hypothetical instances or fictionalised accounts of actual events. In education research, academic integrity studies have often implemented scenarios through surveys that collect respondents' views (e.g., Barrett & Cox, 2005; Bašić et al., 2019; Jurdi et al., 2011; Paynter & Mills, 2004; Yeo, 2007). Such uses of scenarios provide valuable information on how individuals rate or label various activities. Embedding scenarios into a qualitative interview, though, can offer more insight into why individuals identify activities the way they do. Through an examination of scenario use within a study into students' perceptions of third-party writing assistance, this article argues that using a scenario-based method offers a more interactive and student-centred way of starting a discussion, as well as adding value by facilitating further exploration into participants' perceptions to reveal the depth of nuances beyond their reported ratings or categorisations.

Within the reviewed study, *third-party writing assistance* referred to activities where students receive assistance from a source other than their lecturer when composing written assessments. Examples include using an online tool to generate text, having a friend proofread work, consulting a phrasebank, and paying a professional editor for services. As evidenced by the array of activities discussed in the literature (such as Harwood et al., 2012; O'Neill & Russell, 2019; Roe & Perkins, 2022; Sutherland-Smith, 2013), third-party writing assistance varies by source, extent, substance, and quality of the assistance. Some types of writing assistance might be judged as legitimate means of obtaining appropriate help through the writing process. Others may be considered poor academic practice for students writing assessments. And some might even be deemed unpermitted, thus labelled misconduct. Considering the variation among such activities, the study aimed to reveal students' beliefs about the acceptability of a broad selection of writing assistance activities. A set of scenarios, developed for the study, were used to create semi-structured interviews with undergraduate students enrolled in bachelor's programmes at a university in Aotearoa New Zealand.¹

This article reviews the study's scenarios and contends their use holds advantages as a methodological tool for education research, especially with potentially nebulous topics like those within writing studies and academic integrity. To provide information on both scenario-based methodology and the use of scenarios in academic integrity research, this article is organised into four sections. The initial section introduces scenarios as a methodological tool within qualitative research and outlines common benefits and challenges to this approach. The next section reviews the use of scenarios in academic integrity research. The third section examines scenario use within the reviewed study: the development and implementation of scenarios;

¹ The study was approved (SOB 20/38) by Massey University Human Ethics Committee. Students provided informed consent prior to their interview; pseudonyms, often chosen by the students, were used to conceal their identities.

participant involvement; a brief overview of the reviewed study's findings; and researchers' and participants' reflections on the utility of the scenarios. The final section presents potential future uses for the scenarios.

Scenario Use as a Methodological Tool

Social science researchers use a number of terms, sometimes interchangeably, when referring to the hypothetical situations employed to elicit responses from participants. Examples include *story situations*, *descriptions*, and *vignettes* (Kim, 2012). While the term *vignette* appears common across qualitative methods literature, it also suggests a longer narrative format used to determine participants' thoughts about what should happen next, what advice they would offer characters in the story, or what they would intend to do if they were in the story (e.g., Crist & Popa, 2020; Rizvi, 2019; Schoenberg & Ravdal, 2000). The study reviewed here, though, opted to use the term *scenario* as it better aligned with the format of the scenes created: brief, specific situations used to prompt participants to share their views on various aspects of the situations. The scenarios all involved an undergraduate student completing a written assessment for submission. Each scenario outlined a different fictional, yet realistic, incident where the student sought and received some form of third-party writing assistance.

Using scenarios has been found helpful in eliciting participant responses that provide insight into their perceptions about a particular notion, situation, or phenomenon (Wilson & While, 1998). Scenarios can also be set as the focal point of a discussion, providing participants something on which to concentrate when considering and sharing their views. In this way, the scenarios help to facilitate a discussion without the need for direct questions about the participants' own behaviours or experiences, resulting in a less threatening approach to problematic or sensitive contexts or dilemmas.

Scenarios have been employed as a methodological tool in research across varied qualitative social science projects, with researchers reflecting on scenario use in disciplines as varied as healthcare (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2014), education (Stravakou & Lozgka, 2018), and anthropology (Torres, 2009). Scenarios can be of particular use for research into sensitive topics where participants may feel uncomfortable openly discussing their perspectives or have concerns sharing their beliefs about potentially socially undesirable behaviours or activities (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2014; Torres, 2009). Qualitative methods literature describes the advantages to using scenarios (e.g., Jenkins et al., 2010; Sampson & Johannessen, 2020; Skilling & Stylianides, 2020; Stravakou & Lozgka, 2018). Many of these benefits underscore how a scenario can help create a non-threatening, comfortable, and pleasant interview experience for participants while still gathering rich, detailed, and useful data. The following section details two commonly noted benefits offered by a scenario-based method of inquiry: depersonalisation of the research topic and flexibility to manage topic complexities.

The Benefits to Using Scenarios

Using scenarios means that the situations presented are depersonalised, allowing participants to focus on the situation itself and not just whether they have experience with the circumstance or activity. By presenting the inquiry in this depersonalised way, researchers can gather data on participants' beliefs about aspects or characteristics within the scenarios with less potential for participants to feel confronted or embarrassed by direct, personal questions (Schoenberg & Ravdal, 2000). Depersonalisation can be particularly useful when researching subject matter regarded as controversial, sensitive, or otherwise tricky—or a topic that holds the potential to be considered so by some. Reviewing two separate qualitative interview studies, Sampson and Johannessen (2020) reported that the use of scenarios appears to help participants engage with the researchers and openly discuss their perspectives regarding sensitive topics.

Negative connotations are attached to many issues within academic integrity, as evidenced by research that focuses on acts of misconduct (e.g., Amigud & Lancaster, 2019; Nagy & Groves, 2021; Singh & Remenyi, 2016). Given such connotations, views about third-party writing assistance was deemed a potentially sensitive subject to explore. Depersonalising the inquiry through the use of scenarios in the reviewed study provided participants with a way to discuss their beliefs as well as the writing assistance situations themselves, irrespective of any first-hand experiences.

Depersonalisation does not, however, preclude participants from sharing their own experiences. With scenarios serving as an indirect route for gathering information about the participant's views, the need to base the interview on direct and potentially invasive questioning is removed. While drawing from personal experience is not required to respond to scenario-based questions, participants are still able to reveal their own experiences related to the scenarios if they feel so inclined. Scenario use means participants are then free to control whether they disclose personal experiences when responding to questions (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2014). In fact, some individuals may actually be more willing to share their own views when scenarios are used (Jenkins et al., 2010). It is possible that participants provide more ideas derived from personal experience without feeling pressured to do so or worried about being judged, two feelings that may otherwise influence what or how much participants share during research conditions not employing scenarios.

Scholars contend that using a set of carefully crafted scenarios allows researchers to 'manage complexity' (Gray et al., 2017, p. 74) that often exists within education topics. Developing hypothetical situations with slight variations, and even leaving space for participants to supply additional details, provides flexibility. Building scenarios this way means researchers can gather data on how the participants make sense of what is provided in the scenario as well as how they make sense of the scenario given any conditional aspects considered during interpretation. Such scenarios can offer the researcher another level of insight into participants' understanding of the researched phenomenon and lead to richer data covering nuances that may exist within the topic (Barter & Renold, 1999).

The Challenges to Using Scenarios

Using scenarios to gather information from participants allows researchers to learn about individuals' beliefs; as such, many scholars have stressed that this information cannot be relied on as an accurate pronouncement of how participants would behave or what action they would or would not take in reality (Addison, 2015; Skilling & Stylianides, 2020). The gap between belief and action means that researchers must be careful when analysing responses to scenarios and ensure that they are not purporting a measure of expected action based on reported beliefs. While this concern over assuming responses to hypothetical scenarios as predictions of actual behaviour has been widely discussed in both qualitative methods and social science literature, Jenkins et al. (2010) contended that participants' beliefs are valuable as representations of their attitudes and interpretations of the scenarios or situational characteristics therein, separate from any behavioural predictions. With no intention to translate participants' perceptions into findings about predicted or anticipated actions, a researcher can make use of scenarios to gather information without threat from this potential limitation.

Another potential challenge in using scenarios is the risk of inferior quality data caused by poor design. To anticipate and address concerns about quality, care must be taken in creating hypothetical situations relevant to the phenomenon being studied and believable to participants as realistic and possible events (Torres, 2009). Scenarios should be designed to present situations that participants are likely to be familiar with or could consider as possible within their given environment (Skilling & Stylianides, 2020). The scenarios used in the reviewed study were based on activities identified by earlier writing studies and academic integrity research as those which students engage in, may be aware of others engaging in, or may otherwise know or hear about while studying at university.

Scenario Use in Academic Integrity Research

Some studies regarding academic integrity have used scenarios to learn more about individuals' understanding of various aspects of integrity, writing, and potential academic misconduct (Dick et al., 2001; Higbee & Thomas, 2002; Tremayne & Curtis, 2021). Often, these studies presented the scenarios through a survey that asked respondents questions specific to each scenario. This section provides an overview of a selection of three such studies chosen for discussion here because, like the reviewed study, each one focused on undergraduate students' views about the acceptability of various activities students may engage in during the writing process.

Investigating perceptions about the distinction between collaboration and collusion, Barrett and Cox (2005) conducted a scenario-based survey of university students and staff. The scenarios presented potential misconduct involving Student A and Student B, who worked together to complete assignments. Respondents were asked whether each scenario was acceptable and whether they would label the incident collusion or plagiarism. A subsequent study used scenarios to collect not only students' views on what types of incidents constituted plagiarism

but also how they rated the severity of the activities (Yeo, 2007). The survey presented students with different scenarios of fictional students' engagement in activities the study considered as 'varying degrees of plagiarism' (p. 204) and asked them to identify which scenarios were plagiarism and rate each as minor, serious, or very serious. In Aotearoa New Zealand, Paynter and Mills (2004) made use of second person point of view scenarios that placed participants within the situations (e.g., 'a friend of yours offers you their assignment...' [appx. 1]). Students were asked to rate on a seven-point Likert scale how acceptable they considered the scenarios, some of which described writing assistance activities.

There are two constricting aspects with the scenario use in these studies. First, all these studies presented their scenarios in surveys. As such, rather than providing a means of starting a discussion for more in-depth investigation into how and why students perceive the activities being described, the scenarios functioned as summaries and endpoints of exploration. Using scenarios within a qualitative interview means that not only can ratings or categorisations of acceptability be reported (as done in these earlier studies), but also that the scenarios themselves can serve to further engage participants. The ensuing conversation allows a researcher to gather more detailed information about participant perceptions related to their determination of acceptability. Second, these studies exist within research that framed the investigation as a journey into academic misconduct, presenting the scenarios as established academic wrongdoings to be identified or classified by participants. The currently reviewed study, however, used scenarios from as neutral a position as possible. Scenarios were not described to participants as examples of plagiarism or instances of possible misconduct. Instead, the intention was to create an atmosphere where participants would consider the situations as they were objectively described, free of pre-determined terminology which conveyed a presupposition, label, or stance of 'this is misconduct' as defined by an institution or academic community.

The Study's Use of Scenarios

The study used scenarios as a way to better access students' views about third-party writing assistance. The scenarios aided in the collection of 'participants' constructions, perceptions or assumptions' (Gray et al., 2017, p. 78) since they provided contextualisation for the somewhat vague concept of third-party writing assistance. The use of these scenarios then rendered the concept of writing assistance as concrete real-world examples to help participants explain their beliefs, thereby offering insights into their construction of the writing assistance space. The scenario-based structure of the qualitative interview offered the participants ways to link the general and more abstract with the specific and more tangible (Mason, 2002). The development of the scenarios included the consideration of various vignettes used in previous research, the creation of a contextual premise, and reviews of third-party sources and scenario types.

Development of the Scenarios

Based on a review of academic integrity and writing studies literature examining students' academic writing activities,² including legitimate help seeking (e.g., Beisler & Medaille, 2016; Winder et al., 2016), and potentially plagiaristic situations (e.g., Bretag et al., 2019; Rogerson & McCarthy, 2017; Walker, 2010), the reviewed study aimed to develop a set of scenarios that covered a wide array of third-party writing assistance activities. Previous research that used a similar scenario-based method to solicit information from survey research participants was also consulted, including Barrett and Cox (2005); Dick et al. (2001); and Kim and LaBianca (2018).

When devising the scenarios, the principal researcher made an intentional choice to disregard preconceptions of the appropriateness or legitimacy of all activities. The scenarios were not written as a set of fictionalised instances of plagiarism or academic misconduct, nor were they developed to explicitly communicate prescribed judgements based on moral or ethical value. Rather, the scenarios were written as a set of hypothetical, but completely plausible, situations impartially describing a student's use of third-party writing assistance. This meant that the set of scenarios presented the research topic (writing assistance) without using loaded language or researcher-defined terminology for situations or activities. Avoiding judgements or labels also served as an attempt to further reduce the possible impact of social desirability bias (Krásničan et al., 2022), which can occur when gathering participant beliefs and attitudes about potentially sensitive topics. The scenarios developed for the study afforded participants the chance to provide their conceptualisations of the writing assistance scenarios with the terms they know or favour.

A Contextual Premise

With the use of multiple scenarios to cover a broad range of situations, a predominant premise was needed to provide participants with a backdrop for the situation described in each scenario. This contextual device placed each scenario within a setting relevant and familiar to the participants. The premise introduced the character at the centre of all the scenarios as an undergraduate student enrolled in the participants' institution; this student was tasked with a 4000-word research paper worth 70% of their final mark in one of their courses. Following this premise, each scenario presented a different incident in which the student sought and received some type of third-party writing assistance, varying by source of assistance, amount/quantity of assistance, and quality of assistance.

² The three subsections of this section were adapted from Möller (2023). As such, some paragraphs include wording similar to or the same as the original project. Presentation of this material conforms to best practice guidelines from the Text Recycling Research Project (Hall et al., 2021).

Third-Party Sources

The scenario set was designed to include a wide selection of sources of third-party writing assistance typically available to students. Research has confirmed students' social circles as a common source they turn to for help (Awdry, 2020; Bretag et al., 2019; Conrad, 2020; Ellis et al., 2019). Reflecting this fact, multiple scenarios described instances where the student requested help from a sibling, friend, or someone else personally known to them. Other scenarios included the involvement of individuals students consider to be potential resources: a professional editor, a lecturer from another course (other than the lecturer who set the assessment), or a learning advisor at the student's university. Increasingly, there are technological options available to students who seek assistance when completing written assessments (Dale & Viethen, 2021; Godwin-Jones, 2022; Perkins, 2023; Rogerson, 2020). The scenarios also included situations where the student used a digital source of writing assistance, such as a grammar or spell check application, an automated paraphrasing tool, or an online essay mill. Newer, more advanced tools that use generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) to produce text, like ChatGPT,³ were not represented among the scenarios since they were not available at the time of the study's development and data collection.

Scenario Type

Twenty-four scenarios were designed to cover four broad types of third-party writing assistance: collaborating, ghostwriting,⁴ editing, and repurposing. While the scenarios were not presented to the participants under these specific labels, or any other terms beyond 'writing assistance', this typology is used here to systematically discuss the wide range of situations covered by the scenario set. Refer to Appendix A for the complete collection of scenarios.

Five scenarios presented activities that involved some sort of collaborative action between the student and another party, such as a relative or classmate. Each of these scenarios was slightly different, presenting degrees of engagement by the student to complete their assessment. These situations were included based on research that showed students' perceptions of what collaboration looks like is often inconsistent (Barrett & Cox, 2005; Deale et al., 2019; Sutherland-Smith, 2013).

Another five scenarios covered ghostwriting activities, where the student had a third party complete some or all of the writing assessment. Scenarios of assignment

³ The study's data collection concluded September 2021; Open AI's ChatGPT was released November 2022.

⁴ The term ghostwriting has fallen out of favour among many academic integrity scholars, who instead use labels like *contract cheating* to convey the academy's view of such activities as overtly inappropriate within academic settings. Use of the term in the reviewed study, however, was deliberate. Ghostwriting is a legitimate form of writing assistance, with society accepting that politicians have others write their speeches and celebrities have others write their autobiographies. As such, this term aligned with the study's attempt to present scenarios of writing assistance without inherently negative values automatically assigned.

outsourcing, both through the use of a commercial website and by leveraging a favour from a friend, were included in the study. Including separate scenarios that made explicit the presence or absence of a monetary transaction was based on the reporting of various studies that found student engagement in both types of situations (Amigud & Lancaster, 2020; Bretag et al., 2019). Also included in this scenario subset was a situation describing the use of a paraphrasing tool, where the student used an online aid to paraphrase a section of text they sourced from a reference. Research indicates some students appear to use such tools during their writing process (Prentice & Kinden, 2018; Rogerson & McCarthy, 2017).

Nine scenarios were based on various situations involving editing. This subset was larger than the other scenario subsets because of both the increasing prolificacy of editing available to students (Dale & Viethen, 2021) and the varying 'weight of the interventions' (Burrough-Boenisch, 2013, p. 146) among editing activities (Harwood, 2019, 2023; Mossop et al., 2020). Scenarios ranged from instances of grammatical proofreading to substantive textual interventions to structure or context. Two of these editing scenarios focused on writing assistance sources typically on campus: course lecturers and learning advisors. Another editing scenario included the use of a popular application that checks spelling/grammar and offers other corrective recommendations. The research into students' use of editing assistance has presented an area ripe for differences in perceptions of acceptability, with findings that editing from a third party is sometimes recommended by instructors (Conrad, 2019) but could also be considered an inappropriate act that constitutes plagiarism (Lines, 2016).

The final five scenarios presented incidents where the student repurposed work or engaged in some level of 'patchwriting' where text is copied and then partially changed by replacing select words with synonyms, modifying grammatical structure, or making other alterations (Howard, 1993, p. 233). Repurposing scenarios included the use of the student's previous work made to fit their current assessment task, or the use of another's work (such as that of a friend enrolled in a previous semester). Other scenarios of patchwriting presented the utilisation of technological aids like a phrasebank of expressions common to scholarly writing or a synonym replacer tool. While some of these repurposing scenarios could happen without the involvement of a third party (e.g., reuse of one's own work), such instances were still included in the study for two reasons. Firstly, research has indicated that students may not consider it inappropriate to reuse previously submitted work (Bokosmaty et al., 2019; Ehrich et al., 2016; Palmer et al., 2019). Secondly, scholars have argued that activities involving patchwriting are not wholly unreasonable given the developmental process of learning to write (Howard, 1993; Jamieson & Howard, 2013; Pecorari, 2003). These repurposing scenarios, along with the collaborating, ghostwriting, and editing scenarios, provided a wide range of writing activities for participants to consider.

Participant Recruitment and Involvement

The recruitment of participants was multifaceted. Visiting several on-campus courses during initial sessions, the principal researcher provided an overview of the study's purpose and asked for volunteers. Along with this personal request for

participation, paper flyers were placed in select buildings on campus and digital flyers were shared with the student union and student-run social media groups comprised of both on-campus and distance undergraduates.

To ensure participants understood what it meant to be involved in the research, the interviewer reviewed the official study information sheet with each student prior to their interview. The confidential nature of the research was made explicit in this information sheet; it stated that participants would not be identifiable in any research output and that no responses would be linked to their student record. The interviewer explained the reason for the study and her position as a researcher with no teaching duties at the institution. The information sheet outlined what being a participant entailed and listed the rights of participants while taking part in the study. Students were then prompted to ask any questions they had about the research study. They were also reminded that they could ask questions at any time during the study. Agreement to participate was formalised when the student signed an informed consent form.

Individual interviews were conducted with 20 undergraduate students enrolled in bachelor's programmes across a variety of disciplines, including veterinary sciences, history, psychology, and business management. The majority of interviews took place in a neutral location reserved for private meetings on the university campus. When necessary, remote interviews were held online via a secure teleconference link.

Multiple participant perspectives into each individual scenario were collected. At least one of the five scenario subsets was provided to participants. The subsets were distributed on rotation: the first participant received the first subset, the next participant received the second subset, and so on—with the rotation starting again with the sixth participant. Being careful to respect participants' time, the researchers employed this distribution so that all 24 scenarios were reviewed, without requiring each participant to review every one of the 24 scenarios. Eighteen interviews used one of the five scenario subsets (where participants reviewed either four or five scenarios), and two interviews used two subsets of scenarios (where one participant reviewed nine scenarios and the other reviewed ten). The variation in number of scenarios used within an interview was due to participants' interest in extending the conversation into other scenarios and additional time being available at the conclusion of the conversation regarding the initial set of scenarios.

Implementation of the Scenarios

The scenarios were used as a way into a conversation regarding participants' views about third-party writing assistance. With the contextual premise described at the start of an interview, participants were given a subset of laminated cards, each describing a different situation of writing assistance. They were then instructed to read the scenario cards and place each card into one of three piles according to acceptability of the situation described. Participants completed the exercise by categorising the situation presented on each card, based on their interpretation of

whether the scenario was *acceptable*, *unacceptable*, or *indeterminable*—if they felt unsure about how to categorise the scenario.

After sorting the scenario cards, participants were asked questions that sought to identify the beliefs underpinning their choices about the acceptability of various writing assistance activities. The scenarios were accessible to the participants throughout the interview. Participants were able to reread the cards any time while they responded to questions and discussed their ideas and perspectives. The interview schedule of questions was organised to facilitate a conversation based on the order in which participants assigned acceptability to the scenarios. The order of questions, however, was not rigidly followed. Deviations from the interview schedule happened when the flow of discussions called for a change in question order or the addition of follow-up questions, as well as when participants wanted to revisit scenarios for further contemplation within and between questions.

Study Results

This section is a synopsis of the reviewed study's results, presenting findings that were made using the bespoke scenario set as a methodological tool. Employing the scenarios during interviews not only served as a starting point for a thoughtful discussion, but it also offered an interactive way to collect participants' explicit categorisation of each type of writing assistance scenario. Based on these categorisations, participants often perceived scenarios as unacceptable when the student used writing assistance that resulted in their assessment being completely or partially produced by another person or tool (as in ghostwriting scenarios). Most participants appeared to hold similar perceptions that scenarios were acceptable when the activity involved a discussion between the source of assistance and the student (as in some editing and collaborating scenarios). Results also indicated that sometimes participants were unsure about how to classify situations, rating them *indeterminable*. This uncertainty was seen across third-party writing assistance activities but was more common among editing and repurposing scenarios.

Thematic analysis showed that participants considered a variety of situational features when considering third-party writing assistance. These features were grouped according to the two main elements at the core of participants' viewpoints about the scenarios: labour and learning. The labour theme included views based on perceptions of the amount of effort a student invested in writing their assessment. Features participants believed indicated this unacceptability included passive participation or insufficient textual contribution resulting in a compromised status as author. Examples included students using a source of writing assistance to compose an assessment for them, or students accepting edits without informed discussion or autonomous contemplation. The learning theme comprised participants' views focused on concerns about whether the intended learning occurred via the assistance. When concentrating on what they saw as the absence of learning, participants identified features like students not understanding why changes were suggested as indicators the writing assistance was not acceptable. Participants' views—in both labour and learning themes—exposed reasons behind why students considered the acceptability

of each writing assistance scenario the way they did. As a result, the research findings go beyond quantified ratings of acceptability and expand our understanding about how students view what makes writing assistance [un]acceptable.

Reflections: The Value of Using the Scenarios

The researchers found that structuring interviews around the scenarios helped create an environment conducive to sharing perceptions and beliefs. While each scenario served as a starting point for interview questions, they also existed as discussion items on their own. The depersonalisation that the scenarios provided meant participants were afforded a sense of distance when responding to questions about the activities in the scenarios. Participants could express their perceptions based on what the scenarios presented as opposed to being required to draw from their own personal experiences. This led to the interviews forging a conversational quality as participants openly discussed their views, asked questions (rhetorical and non-rhetorical), and appeared comfortable enough to express themselves in a relaxed thinking-out-loud manner as they considered the scenarios.

Presenting the scenario cards for participants to sort during the initial exercise made the task engaging, amplified the student-centred quality of the interviews, and produced the unintended result of participants' sharing their ideas about scenarios in a way that was reminiscent of a talk aloud method. The participants were able to easily refer back to scenarios throughout the interview, which led to their reading, arranging, comparing, rereading, and talking through the underpinnings of their beliefs about the acceptability of each writing assistance scenario. Similar to the gains achieved through a think-aloud protocol or technique, the study's implementation of scenarios provided insight into the participants' thought processes (Charters, 2003). When asked about their consideration of certain writing assistance activities, some participants explained their views by comparing scenarios, such as:

This one just mentions that they just proofread it and make the changes and he doesn't know why (*gesturing to card VIII*) but this one (*tapping card XVIII*) talks about how he suggests changes to grammar instruction and explains why, so that's still up to the person who is writing it to understand those things after the help he's got, you know. (Harriet)

Sometimes participants would deviate from their initial judgement about a writing assistance activity, return to the scenario to read it again and then voice an opinion that revealed more about their perceptions. One example of such an instance exposed just how central the notion of rewriting was to one participant's conception of what did and did not constitute plagiarism:

I don't think- it's hard to say because it says he uses the synonym tool in Word to replace certain words. I'm just reading it again. (*Thirteen second pause as participant rereads card IX.*) Yeah, the fact that he only replaces certain words could fall under plagiarism because he's not rewriting the whole thing he's only replacing certain words...it has potential to be unacceptable because he uses that tool to replace words in the source text with similar words but...if

he's rewriting it then that would be okay but...yeah it could be unacceptable.
(Zoe)

While not designed as a formal use of think-aloud procedure, as exemplified by Reinhart et al. (2022), the scenarios led many participants to verbalise their thoughts as they decided the acceptability of the various writing assistance activities. As demonstrated in the aforementioned participants' comments, having the scenarios to refer back to and compare allowed participants to present their explanations of where and why they drew distinctions in the acceptability of varying incidents of third-party writing assistance. Providing the ability for scenarios to be engaged with in this fashion was advantageous to the research since it helped participants access their beliefs within a potentially nebulous topic, which then highlighted the nuances within their perceptions of writing assistance acceptability. In doing so, the scenario-based engagement produced a deeper layer of richness to the data collected during the interviews.

Using the scenarios to present the real-life situations helped accelerate the discussion of undefined, and not entirely concrete, notions (e.g., the space between acceptable and unacceptable writing help; the concept of plagiarism) to something more tangible for the participants. Participants considered the scenarios as realistic, with some even discussing real-life versions of the activities described in scenarios that they had witnessed. Participants' reflections of the scenarios as plausible were seen in comments like, 'I've definitely had friends do this one (*holding up card VII*) and that one (*gesturing to card XI*)...it seems easy (*laughs*) to be completely honest... and just convenient' (Liv) and 'I know a lot of friends who used to send their work over to get checked and then just do that [what is done in the scenario XIX]—so yeah this isn't new' (Ji-woo). Using the scenarios helped participants work through how they perceived various aspects of third-party writing assistance. They were able to employ the scenarios to identify observable examples of these abstract concepts and point to specific aspects within the scenarios as they explained their opinions and beliefs.

Many participants found reviewing and discussing the scenarios a helpful, and even an eye-opening, experience. Towards the end of their interviews, multiple participants made comments about how the process of having the scenarios in front of them made them think more deeply about aspects of writing assistance than they had ever done previously. One of the responses provided after completing the scenario sorting exercise and interview exemplified this sentiment among participants: 'Aw very cool—that's very interesting actually, I enjoyed that! I had to read through them all...once you get a base of what they are actually saying—yeah very interesting' (Emily).

Both these researcher observations and participant comments highlight the benefits of the data collection process employing scenarios as a methodological tool. Using the scenarios strengthened the study through the provision of a relaxed, conversational—yet still orderly—pathway to participant's thoughts and beliefs about the writing assistance sought and received by students. Installing the scenarios as a qualitative method of data collection allowed for a deeper dive into university students' ideas about the acceptability of writing assistance. Discussions about

scenarios revealed participants' reasoning behind considerations of when scenarios were acceptable and unacceptable, as well as what caused uncertainty about indeterminable situations. As a result of the interactive and engaging implementation of scenarios, the participants were supported in conveying their beliefs, which led to the researchers being provided with better insight into university students' perceptions.

While the scenario-based method was useful in gathering valuable data through an engaging interactive experience for participants, there were also limitations—in implementation and in the scenario set itself. Within implementation, the distribution of scenarios into subsets for review by participants could limit results since how the scenarios are grouped might impact how participants consider them. The study used small subsets, comprised of similar scenarios, from the full set of 24 scenarios. Other subset combinations could be used by pairing more diverse scenarios together; or, if time permitted, researchers could ask each participant about every scenario. Similarly, the distribution could also be altered to use a randomised assignment or a 'participant's choice' set-up. Another limitation was within the scenario set itself. The advent of large language models (including ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini), as well as GenAI being embedded into popular operating systems (e.g., Microsoft Copilot and Apple Intelligence) mean the current scenario set has limits in addressing these increasingly common types of third-party writing assistance. To explore how GenAI influences perceptions about writing assistance, the set could be updated to include situations where students employ such tools whilst composing assessments—thereby expanding the scope of the scenario set.

Future Uses and Conclusion

The implementation of scenarios in the study holds utility for future research that seeks to gain a better understanding of the reasons behind participants' perceptions. Two specific advantages of this scenario method are the flexibility of use for multimodal studies, and the potential for scenarios to further amplify the student voice when utilised in future action research.

This approach provides a simple yet engaging way of presenting a set of scenarios for discussion, while also being malleable to different modes of interview administration. To replicate the implementation of scenarios in the study's in-person interviews, sessions conducted remotely used a virtual bulletin board via Padlet (2022). Participants could move scenario cards around on their screen, placing them in one of the three piles displayed on the bulletin board. The interviewer could see the participant's categorisations in real time, thereby reproducing the way the scenarios were used during in-person interviews. The ease of which the scenario sorting exercise can be replicated in a remote setting also provides flexibility that research projects often need, while maintaining an implementation process that is relatively consistent regardless of administration mode. This advantage could be significant for qualitative research studies in education, given not only the logistical aspects of gaining access to participants, but also operational challenges brought about by events like the Covid-19 pandemic.

The scenario-based method served as a way to explore perspectives among students themselves. While the scenarios helped start the discussions, it was the students who steered the course of the conversation as they shared their opinions and beliefs. Using the scenarios as a methodological tool engaged the participants and helped to centre the research around the student voice. This method is therefore well-suited for use in action research that seeks to involve students further in the investigation process. Within the education discipline, participatory action research calls for practitioners to serve as researchers (Efron & Ravid, 2013) and work alongside students in a collaborative partnership (Bradbury et al., 2019) to generate results and change existing practices (Kemmis, 2009). Moving further towards research *with* students—as opposed to research *on* students—(Cook-Sather, 2018), scenario use can help facilitate an inquiry that incorporates students as partners in the tasks of answering research questions and working to identify implications and develop responses. This advantage could be particularly beneficial to both the research and practice efforts within academic integrity, where a holistic approach that involves all stakeholders is considered best practice (Bretag, 2013; Morris & Carroll, 2016).

The use of scenarios in this study served as a way to start a discussion with participants regarding their beliefs about a topic relevant to their lives as students writing assessments. Reaching beyond the common use of single- or multiple-choice survey questions and instead employing a scenario-based interview approach meant that the researchers were able to collect qualitative data that provided greater dimension to participants' conceptions of third-party writing assistance. In addition to the benefits of scenarios established by earlier research and corroborated by this study, the scenario-based approach demonstrates its value as a methodological tool for examining highly nuanced phenomena. Creating an interactive exercise to consider the scenarios and having the scenarios accessible to participants throughout their interview proved to provide the researchers with greater insight into students' perceptions. Moving forward, this scenario-based method could also advantage participatory action research and multimodal studies in education.

Appendix A: Writing Assistance Scenarios

-
- | | |
|-----|---|
| I | Oliver writes a draft and puts it through Grammarly, making all the changes the programme suggests |
| II | Oliver starts writing but feels he cannot seem to get going. He takes what he has written to a friend and asks them for help. The friend corrects the spelling, grammar, and sentence structure of what Oliver wrote. The friend also writes additional sections of the paper for Oliver. |
| III | Oliver copies a passage from a journal and pastes it into a paraphrase tool website, like Quillbot, that then provides a paraphrased version of the original text. Oliver puts this paraphrased text in his paper and cites the original reference according to APA style. |
| IV | While writing his paper, Oliver uses the University of Manchester's Academic Phrasebank to help make his writing sound more scholarly. He copies phrases from the phrasebank into his paper, plugging in his topic words. |
-

-
- V Oliver visits a student file sharing site where he has previously found helpful lecture notes from class sessions he was unable to attend. He finds assessments similar to his assigned research paper. Adding to his draft, he takes short sections from multiple papers and inserts them into his paper, rewriting some of them.
- VI Oliver asks his older sister to help him by proofreading his drafted paper. She sits with him, pointing out mistakes she says he needs to address. Through their discussion, Oliver understands all the comments she makes. Oliver then sits at the computer and revises his paper.
- VII Oliver gets a paper written by someone he does not know from a website. He purchases the paper and pays through the website.
- VIII Oliver asks his flatmate to help him by proofreading his drafted paper. The flatmate sits at the computer and changes grammar, sentence structure, and the organisation of the paper. Oliver is not sure why some of the changes were made.
- IX Oliver tries to paraphrase part of a reference he wants to include in his paper but feels like it is not working. He uses the thesaurus/synonym tool in Word to replace certain words in the source text with similar words.
- X Oliver takes his drafted paper to another lecturer to review before submitting it to his course instructor. The lecturer provides Oliver with feedback in the form of both comments and rewritten sentences. Oliver revises his paper to include the rewritten sentences.
- XI Oliver gets a paper written by his friend who owes him a favour. He did not pay for the paper.
- XII Oliver starts writing his paper and asks for help from his father. Oliver and his father talk about Oliver's ideas for the paper, including topic choice, organisation, and possible references. Oliver reflects upon the discussion with his father and returns to writing his paper.
- XIII Oliver and a classmate get together to work on their papers. They discuss their topics and ideas about what to write. They share references. They draft their papers independently and review each other's work making corrections to spelling and grammar.
- XIV Oliver pays a professional editor to review his drafted paper. The editor corrects spelling, grammar, and punctuation. The editor also recommends changes to improve the clarity of Oliver's statements through comments written in the margins. Oliver discusses the comments with the editor and changes his writing based on the comments.
- XV Oliver gets a paper written by someone he does not know from a website. He did not pay for the paper.
- XVI Oliver asks his mother to proofread his drafted paper before he submits it. She makes corrections to spelling and punctuation. She makes adjustments to the content and the wording that alters Oliver's argument in the paper.
- XVII Oliver locates a paper he previously wrote and submitted for a different course. Since the assessment prompt was similar, he updates the title page to reflect the current course and instructor name.
- XVIII Oliver takes his drafted paper to the Centre for Teaching and Learning. A Learning Advisor suggests changes to grammar and structure and explains the comments to Oliver. Oliver sits at the computer and makes edits based on the Learning Advisor's comments.
- XIX Oliver pays a professional editor to review his drafted paper. The editor corrects spelling, grammar, and punctuation. The editor also recommends changes to improve the clarity of Oliver's statements and provides rewritten sentences via Word's track changes mode. The editor emails the paper back to Oliver and they do not discuss the comments. Oliver accepts all the changes made.
- XX Oliver gets permission from a friend to use their marked paper from an earlier semester. Oliver rewords each sentence so that the wording is different while the original meaning is retained.
- XXI Oliver asks to see a classmate's paper to get an idea about what they are expected to do for the assessment. The classmate provides their paper to Oliver to review. Later, Oliver writes his own paper based on what he liked and remembered from the classmate's paper.
-

- XXII Oliver drafts a paper and asks a friend to proofread it. The friend reviews his paper and circles all the spelling and grammatical errors that Oliver should correct, as well as offering ideas on additional content to support Oliver's argument in the paper. Oliver goes through and makes changes to his paper, correcting errors and adding supporting information his friend told him about.
- XXIII Oliver drafts a paper and asks a friend to edit it. The friend reviews his paper and circles all the spelling and grammatical errors that Oliver should correct. Oliver goes through and makes corrections to his paper.
- XXIV Oliver and a classmate get together to work on their papers. They divide up the task between themselves, with Oliver writing his sections and the classmate writing their sections. They then combine the sections into one paper, each editing their own copy.
-

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by CAUL and its Member Institutions. No funding was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors have no competing interests to declare relevant to the content of this article.

Ethical Approval A subsection of the manuscript was adapted from the first author's doctoral thesis (Möller, 2023), which was approved by Massey University Human Ethics Committee (SOB 20/38). As such, some paragraphs include wording similar to the original project. Presentation of this material conforms to best practice guidelines from the Text Recycling Research Project (Hall et al., 2021).

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Addison, S. J. (2015). Using scenarios as part of a concurrent mixed methods design. In F. Lyon, G. Möllering, & M. N. K. Saunders (Eds.), *Handbook for research methods on trust* (2nd ed., pp. 154–169). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782547419.00024>
- Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2019). 246 reasons to cheat: An analysis of students' reasons for seeking to outsource academic work. *Computers and Education*, 134, 98–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.01.017>
- Amigud, A., & Lancaster, T. (2020). I will pay someone to do my assignment: An analysis of market demand for contract cheating services on Twitter. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 541–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1670780>
- Awdry, R. (2020). Assignment outsourcing: Moving beyond contract cheating. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(2), 220–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1765311>
- Barrett, R., & Cox, A. L. (2005). 'At least they're learning something': The hazy line between collaboration and collusion. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264226>

- Barter, C., & Renold, E. (1999). The use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Social Research Update* (25), 1–1. <https://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU25.html>
- Bašić, Ž, Kružić, I., Jerković, I., Buljan, I., & Marušić, A. (2019). Attitudes and knowledge about plagiarism among university students: Cross-sectional survey at the university of Split. *Croatia. Science and Engineering Ethics*, 25(5), 1467–1483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-018-0073-x>
- Beisler, M., & Medaille, A. (2016). How do students get help with research assignments? Using drawings to understand students' help seeking behavior. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 42(4), 390–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.04.010>
- Bokosmaty, S., Ehrich, J., Eady, M. J., & Bell, K. (2019). Canadian university students' gendered attitudes toward plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(2), 276–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1359505>
- Bradbury-Jones, C., Taylor, J., & Herber, O. R. (2014). Vignette development and administration: A framework for protecting research participants. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 17(4), 427–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2012.750833>
- Bradbury, H., Lewis, R., & Embury, D. C. (2019). Education action research: With and for the next generation. In C. A. Mertler (Ed.), *The Wiley handbook of action research in education* (pp. 5–28). Wiley.
- Bretag, T. (2013). Challenges in addressing plagiarism in education. *PLoS Medicine*, 10(12), e1001574. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001574>
- Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., Saddiqui, S., & van Haeringen, K. (2019). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(11), 1837–1856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1462788>
- Burrough-Boenisch, J. (2013). Defining and describing editing. In V. Matarese (Ed.), *Supporting research writing: Roles and challenges in multilingual settings* (pp. 141–155). Chandos Publishing.
- Charters, E. (2003). The use of think-aloud methods in qualitative research: An introduction to think-aloud methods. *Brock Education Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v12i2.38>
- Conrad, N. L. (2019). Revisiting proofreading in higher education: Toward an institutional response to editors Canada's guidelines for ethical editing of student texts. *TESL Canada Journal*, 36(1), 172–183. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i1.1309>
- Conrad, N. L. (2020). Proofreading revisited: Interrogating assumptions about postsecondary student users of proofreading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 46, 100871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100871>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2018). Tracing the evolution of student voice in educational research. In R. Bourke & J. Loveridge (Eds.), *Radical collegiality through student voice: Educational experience, policy and practice* (pp. 17–38). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1858-0_2
- Crist, E., & Popa, D. (2020). Information literacy and cultural context: Chinese English language learners' understandings of information authority. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(4), 646–661. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.4.646>
- Dale, R., & Viethen, J. (2021). The automated writing assistance landscape in 2021. *Natural Language Engineering*, 27(4), 511–518. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1351324921000164>
- Deale, C. S., Lee, S. H., Bae, J.-I., & White, B. J. (2019). An exploratory study of educators' and students' perceptions of collaboration versus cheating in hospitality and tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2019.1679695>
- Dick, M., Sheard, J., & Markham, S. (2001). Is it okay to cheat? The views of postgraduate students. In *Proceedings of the 6th annual conference: Innovation & technology in computer science education* (pp. 61–64). <https://doi.org/10.1145/377435.377474>
- Efron, S. E., & Ravid, R. (2013). *Action research in education: A practical guide*. Guilford Publications.
- Ehrich, J., Howard, S. J., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(2), 231–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.927850>
- Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., Rozenberg, P., Newton, P., & Saddiqui, S. (2019). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. *Higher Education Research & Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1680956>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(2), 5–24. <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/cb19de41-9ddc-4475-8ed6-72b3a8d19cfc/content>

- Gray, D., Royall, B., & Malson, H. (2017). Hypothetically speaking: Using vignettes as a stand-alone qualitative method. In D. Gray, V. Clarke, & V. Braun (Eds.), *Collecting qualitative data: A practical guide to textual, media and virtual techniques* (pp. 45–70). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107295094.005>
- Hall, S., Moskovitz, C., & Pemberton, M. (2021). *Text recycling: Best practices for researchers*. <https://textrecycling.org/resources/best-practices-for-researchers>
- Harwood, N. (2019). ‘I have to hold myself back from getting into all that’: Investigating ethical issues associated with the proofreading of student writing. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17(1), 17–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9322-5>
- Harwood, N. (2023). Lecturer, language tutor, and student perspectives on the ethics of the proofreading of student writing. *Written Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221146776>
- Harwood, N., Austin, L., & Macaulay, R. (2012). Cleaner, helper, teacher? The role of proofreaders of student writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(5), 569–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.531462>
- Higbee, J. L., & Thomas, P. V. (2002). Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating. *NASPA Journal*, 40(1), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.1187>
- Howard, R. M. (1993). A plagiarism penitence. *Journal of Teaching Writing*, 11(3), 233–246.
- Jamieson, S., & Howard, R. M. (2013). Sentence-mining: Uncovering the amount of reading and reading comprehension in college writers’ researched writing. In R. McClure & J. Purdy (Eds.), *The new digital scholar: Exploring and enriching the research and writing practices of NextGen students* (pp. 109–131). Information Today.
- Jenkins, N., Bloor, M., Fischer, J., Berney, L., & Neale, J. (2010). Putting it in context: The use of vignettes in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 175–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109356737>
- Jurdi, R., Hage, H. S., & Chow, H. P. H. (2011). Academic dishonesty in the Canadian classroom: Behaviours of a sample of university students. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 41(3), 1–35. <http://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/1/2304>
- Kemmis, S. (2009). Action research as a practice-based practice. *Educational Action Research*, 17(3), 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790903093284>
- Kim, E.-Y.J., & LaBianca, A. S. (2018). Ethics in academic writing help for international students in higher education: Perceptions of faculty and students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 16(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9299-5>
- Kim, J. (2012). Scenarios in information seeking and information retrieval research: A methodological application and discussion. *Library & Information Science Research*, 34(4), 300–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2012.04.002>
- Krásničan, V., Foltýnek, T., & Dlabolová, D. H. (2022). Limitations of contract cheating research. In S. E. Eaton, G. J. Curtis, B. M. Stoesz, J. Clare, K. Rundle, & J. Seeland (Eds.), *Contract cheating in higher education: Global perspectives on theory, practice, and policy* (pp. 29–42). Springer.
- Lines, L. (2016). Substantive editing as a form of plagiarism among postgraduate students in Australia. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(3), 368–383. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1013919>
- Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative interviewing: Asking, listening and interpreting. In T. May (Ed.), *Qualitative research in action* (pp. 225–241). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849209656>
- Möller, A. (2023). University students’ and staff’s perceptions of third-party writing assistance and plagiarism: A mixed methods study [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Massey Research Online. <https://mro.massey.ac.nz/items/292c3f8d-0cf3-469f-a4dc-8faa7a1d4394>
- Morris, E. J., & Carroll, J. (2016). Developing a sustainable holistic institutional approach: Dealing with realities “on the ground” when implementing an academic integrity policy. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 449–462). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_23
- Mossop, B., Hong, J., & Teixeira, C. (2020). *Revising and editing for translators: Fourth edition* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158990>
- Nagy, V., & Groves, A. (2021). Rational choice or strain? A criminological examination of contract cheating. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2021.1874603>
- O’Neill, R., & Russell, A. M. T. (2019). Stop! Grammar time: University students’ perceptions of the automated feedback program Grammarly. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(1), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3795>
- Padlet (Version 3.0). (2022). [Application]. Wallwisher, Inc. <https://padlet.com/>

- Palmer, A., Pegrum, M., & Oakley, G. (2019). A wake-up call? Issues with plagiarism in transnational higher education. *Ethics & Behavior*, 29(1), 23–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2018.1466301>
- Paynter, J., & Mills, C. J. (2004). *Academic plagiarism: An analysis of current technological issues* Operational Research Society of New Zealand Conference, Auckland, New Zealand. <http://www.orsnz.org.nz/conf39/Papers/PaynterJ.pdf>
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004>
- Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(2), 1–24. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol20/iss2/07/>
- Prentice, F. M., & Kinden, C. E. (2018). Paraphrasing tools, language translation tools and plagiarism: An exploratory study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0036-7>
- Reinhart, A., Evans, C., Luby, A., Orellana, J., Meyer, M., Wieczorek, J., Elliott, P., Burckhardt, P., & Nugent, R. (2022). Think-aloud interviews: A tool for exploring student statistical reasoning. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 30(2), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26939169.2022.2063209>
- Rizvi, S. (2019). Using fiction to reveal truth: Challenges of using vignettes to understand participant experiences within qualitative research. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/forum: Qualitative Social Research*. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.1.3101>
- Roe, J., & Perkins, M. (2022). What are automated paraphrasing tools and how do we address them? A review of a growing threat to academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00109-w>
- Rogerson, A. M. (2020). The use and misuse of online paraphrasing, editing and translation software. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *A research agenda for academic integrity* (pp. 163–174). Edward Elger.
- Rogerson, A. M., & McCarthy, G. (2017). Using Internet based paraphrasing tools: Original work, patchwriting or facilitated plagiarism? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-016-0013-y>
- Sampson, H., & Johannessen, I. A. (2020). Turning on the tap: The benefits of using ‘real-life’ vignettes in qualitative research interviews. *Qualitative Research*, 20(1), 56–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794118816618>
- 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>
- Singh, S., & Remenyi, D. (2016). Plagiarism and ghostwriting: The rise in academic misconduct. *South African Journal of Science*, 112(5/6), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2016/20150300>
- Skilling, K., & Stylianides, G. J. (2020). Using vignettes in educational research: A framework for vignette construction. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 43(5), 541–556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2019.1704243>
- Stravakou, P. A., & Lozicka, E. C. (2018). Vignettes in qualitative educational research: Investigating Greek school principals’ values. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(5), 1188–1207. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3358>
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2013). Crossing the line: Collusion or collaboration in university group work? *Australian Universities’ Review*, 55(1), 51–58. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1004398.pdf>
- Torres, S. (2009). Vignette methodology and culture-relevance: Lessons learned through a project on successful aging with Iranian immigrants to Sweden. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 24(1), 93–114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10823-009-9095-9>
- Tremayne, K., & Curtis, G. J. (2021). Attitudes and understanding are only part of the story: Self-control, age and self-imposed pressure predict plagiarism over and above perceptions of seriousness and understanding. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(2), 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1764907>
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070902912994>
- Wilson, J., & While, A. E. (1998). Methodological issues surrounding the use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 12(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13561829809014090>
- Winder, R., Kathpalia, S. S., & Koo, S. L. (2016). Writing centre tutoring sessions: Addressing students’ concerns. *Educational Studies*, 42(4), 323–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2016.1193476>
- Yeo, S. (2007). First-year university science and engineering students’ understanding of plagiarism. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 26(2), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360701310813>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.