UNCONSCIOUS PLAGIARISM WITHIN THE COUPLE:

THE INFLUENCE OF RELEVANCE ON THE RATE OF PLAGIARISM

by

RUSSELL FARR SHEARER, JR.

(Under the direction of Richard Marsh and Steven Beach)

ABSTRACT

Unconscious plagiarism rates were examined within the context of self-evaluation maintenance theory. Participants from the undergraduate program at the University of Georgia brought in a dating partner of at least four months. The dating partners gave one another advice for either two highly relevant problems or two problems of low relevance as defined by self-expertise and personal importance. The participants rated the advice statements on helpfulness, comfort, and elicited feelings. Next, the participants were asked to give ideas for solutions to the problems and were subsequently asked where each idea came from, the partner or the self. Plagiarism was evident in each condition, low and high relevance, but receiving advice in the highly relevant area was found to elicit significantly more inadvertent plagiarism. Implications and possible reasons for the discrepancy are discussed.

INDEX WORDS: Advice, Couples, Unconscious Plagiarism, Cryptomnesia, Relevance

UNCONSCIOUS PLAGIARISM WITHIN THE COUPLE:

THE INFLUENCE OF RELEVANCE ON THE RATE OF PLAGIARISM

by

RUSSELL FARR SHEARER, JR.

B.S., The University of Georgia, 2000

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

UNCONSCIOUS PLAGIARISM WITHIN THE COUPLE:

THE INFLUENCE OF RELEVANCE ON THE RATE OF PLAGIARISM

by

RUSSELL FARR SHEARER, JR.

Major Professor: Richard Marsh

Committee: Steven Beach
Zachary Estes

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of The Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2004

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my lovely wife, Bly, who supported me unconditionally throughout this process and whom I love with all my heart. My greatest wish is to make her happy and proud.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Steven Beach and Richard Marsh for their much needed assistance and guidance. I would like to thank the members of my committee, Richard Marsh, Steven Beach, and Zachary Estes, for allowing me to take time out of their busy schedules. I also want to thank J.P. Jameson and Brandon Hurley for their ability to keep my research running smoothly. Finally, I would like to thank Gabriel Cook for his patience and willingness to teach me everything he knows about SPSS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A relationship allows ample opportunity to be in close contact with a significant other. The intimacy of a couple requires that each person interact with their partner in ways different from other daily interactions with strangers. Thus, in intimate relationships there is a dynamic between people not found in other areas involving interpersonal events. The potential for support from a significant other is greater (Beach, Martin, Blum, & Roman 1993; Dakof & Taylor, 1990; Berg-Cross & Cohen, 1995) and the perception of this support is important to understanding how two people interact when in an intimate relationship (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000). The following study uses theories of Self-Evaluation Maintenance (e.g., Tesser, 1988; Tesser & Smith, 1980) and unconscious plagiarism (Brown & Murphy, 1989) to explore how couples deal with giving and receiving advice and support from a loved one.

Tesser's (1988) self-evaluation maintenance (SEM) model is based largely on the idea that people compare and contrast themselves to others. More specifically, the way we perceive ourselves is dependant on two processes called reflection and comparison (e.g. Tesser & Collins, 1988; Tesser & Palhaus, 1983). Comparison processes are those in which someone compares oneself to another person which either bolsters self-esteem as would be the case when the other is outperformed or causes self-esteem saving adjustments to be made when one is outperformed by the other. If the adjustments to self-esteem do not work in the latter case, then there is great potential for negative effects on one's self-esteem. In contrast to these processes, reflection

occurs when the other performs well on a task and this outstanding performance increases one's self-esteem or when the other performs poorly on a task, which decreases one's self esteem.

In the case of close relationships such as marriage, these processes seem to take on an even greater significance because of the implications for marital happiness and success. The mediating factor in determining whether comparison or reflective processes will be engaged seems to be the relevance to one's self of the task being completed. The relevance of a task is defined as the importance to one's own self-definition. In tasks of low relevance or importance to the self, a husband or wife (the self) will usually reflect on the performance of the spouse (the actor) when that spouse performs well, resulting in heightened self-esteem for the self and the actor. In tasks of high relevance to the self, the husband or wife will usually go through comparison when the spouse performs well in these areas, resulting in a negative self-esteem outcome for the self and a potential positive outcome for the actor's self-esteem.

There are actually four qualitatively different categories of relevance when the self and actor are spouses (Beach & Tesser, unpublished chapter): (a) those areas that are important only to the first partner and not the second, (b) those areas important only to the second partner, not the first, (c) those areas that both partners view as important, and (d) those areas that neither partner views as important. The focus of this study, however, is on categories (a) and (b) in which both comparison and reflection due to the task can be studied. More specifically, this study examines giving and receiving advice in an area that either is important to the self or is not important to the self. Getting advice and support from a spouse in areas that one views as important should result in comparison processes being evoked by that person. Conversely, getting advice in an area that one views as unimportant and not self-defining should result in reflection processes being evoked. The current study examines these types of interactions and

investigates the assimilation of advice from a partner into one's own plan on how to deal with a problem.

When a partner receives advice from their significant other in an area that is less relevant to them, that advice should be received positively due to engagement of positive reflectance processes. We assumed that positive reflection would activate in memory an emotional network of positive concepts (e.g., Bower, 1988). By contrast, when a partner receives advice in an area that they feel they have more knowledge and ability, the advice may be received poorly because negative comparison processes are engaged. According to our analysis, negative comparison would activate a network of negative concepts. This activation of concepts would be a direct result of how the advice from the partner was interpreted. Thus, when activation of differing concepts, both negative and positive, interacts with future planning, potential threat reduction could take place through the phenomenon of unconscious plagiarism.

The assimilation of advice into a plan for problem resolution could take many different avenues. A person could choose to take or to ignore advice based on a number of factors while simultaneously claiming either the plan was devised on their own or rightfully giving recognition to the original source of the advice. The implications of unconscious plagiarism on the future plans of a person receiving advice are far reaching. Unconscious plagiarism occurs when an idea is claimed to be one's own but incorporates substantial features encountered in the past (e.g., a drawing of a novel space creature having features of space creatures seen in the past). Events in which unconscious plagiarism can occur include devising new plans, new consumer goods, new melodies, new works of literature, and seemingly any other creative endeavor human beings undertake on a daily basis (Marsh, Ward, & Landau, 1999). Unconscious plagiarism can be explained as a source monitoring error in which memory about where an item originated is

erroneously attributed to one's self. The result of such a failure is that ideas are claimed as self-generated when the actual origin was not the self (Bink, Marsh, Hicks, & Howard, 1999).

One explanation of unconscious plagiarism states that it is a source-monitoring failure (Marsh, Landau, & Hicks, 1997). Using the topics of university improvement and traffic accident reduction the investigators had participants brainstorm solutions to these problems. After one week, the participants were asked to create four new solutions for each problem. The participants were clearly instructed to avoid solutions that had been previously mentioned in the prior session. After making up four "novel" solutions to the problems the participants were given the source monitoring task which consisted of labeling all statements from both sessions as their idea from last week, a peer's idea from last week, or brand new. The participants plagiarized statements from week one 21% of the time, but their source monitoring was accurate. The participants incorrectly claimed plagiarized items as their own only 0.5% to 5-6% on the source test. Unconscious plagiarism, then, seems to occur during idea generation because information about where an idea is coming from is not used even when the original source is readily available in memory.

The application of unconscious plagiarism in conjunction with the SEM model to the area of interactions between couples makes interesting predictions about the ways couples give and receive advice and support from each other. The openness that a spouse has to ideas coming from their partner about how to solve one of their own problems could be dependant on a number of factors such as helpfulness of the statement, the positive or negative impact of the statement, and how relevant the problem area itself is to one's self-schema. Unconscious plagiarism has also been shown to be higher when the source of the ideas is more credible (Bink, et al., 1999). Thus, if a spouse is viewed as more expert in an area, then there should be more

unconscious plagiarism when self-generating plans for that problem after hearing advice from that spouse. However, based on SEM theory, the threat to the self would be much less in this case because of reflection (e.g., the spouse excelling in an area that holds less self-defining relevance for the receiver of the advice therefore the receiver would bask in the reflected glow of the spouse).

In problem areas of low self-relevance, less unconscious plagiarism should occur because plagiarizing the ideas of the spouse would not be needed to avoid a threat to one's self-esteem that the partner is outperforming the self. Within the framework of SEM, unconscious plagiarism could be viewed as a threat reduction technique for those times when advice is given to a partner in an area that the partner views as highly relevant. In other words, partners receiving advice in highly self-relevant problem areas should commit more unconscious plagiarism in order to reduce the threat that their significant other is excelling in an area that they could not succeed in (assuming that needing advice is indicative of failure or is at least indicative of significant others implying that their partners are insufficient in terms of overcoming problems on their own).

To test these ideas about memory biases in couples receiving advice, we asked partners (separately, of course) to generate new ways of dealing with the problem areas about which they had received advice. The instructions for this task were clear and unambiguous that they should generate new ideas that neither they nor their partners had generated previously. After these new plans for dealing with the problem were generated, we asked people to rate whether the new ideas were truly their own or their partners as well as how long they had thought about such a course of action. We expected that new plans for dealing with the problems would inadvertently plagiarize their partner more often when it was a high relevance problem area to one's self (as a

threat reduction mechanism that was described earlier). In addition, the length of time one has believed to have had an idea in one's knowledge repertoire is another index of the appropriation of ideas (Wicklund, 1988). Therefore, if people did not explicitly claim that their partner's idea was their own, we expected that unconscious plagiarism would be captured by the duration judgment. By contrast, unconscious plagiarism was predicted to be less frequent in the low relevance problem area because there was no need to engage in negative comparison, but rather, the positive reflection would be enhanced by correctly attributing the ideas to the partner as the source of good advice.

CHAPTER 2

UNCONSCIOUS PLAGIARISM WITHIN THE COUPLE: THE INFLUENCE OF RELEVANCE ON THE RATE OF PLAGIARISM

Participants. The couples were undergraduate students recruited from the University of Georgia. The final sample included 35 couples (i.e., 70 individuals) that had been dating for a minimum of four months. Twenty-four additional couples were tested but were excluded from the sample because one member of the couple failed to follow instructions, they were not truly dating, or were thrown out due to equipment failure or experimenter error. Consequently, 18 couples were tested and used in analyses in the higher relevance condition and 17 in the low relevance condition. All individuals either received partial credit toward fulfilling a course research requirement or were compensated with $10.

The sample was composed of two 17-year-old participants, 17 participants 18 years of age, twenty-one 19-year-old participants, seven 20-year-old participants, eight 21-year-old participants, nine 22-year-old participants, one 23-year-old participant, and three participants who self-identified as over 24 years of age. There were 57 Caucasians, 4 African Americans, 4 Asian-Americans, 2 Latino/a Americans, and one participant who self-identified as 'other.' Two participants identified their relationship as casual/nonexclusive, 13 as casual/exclusive, 32 as dating seriously, 15 as dating seriously/talk of marriage, 4 as engaged, and 2 as married (see Table 1).

Materials. All participants completed the following questionnaires: Rosenberg's (1989) self-esteem scale, the Center for Epidemiological Studies (CES-D) depression scale (Radloff, 1977), Fincham's (Fincham & Linfeld, 1997) ambivalence scale, and the Narcissistic Personality

Inventory (NPI; Shulman & Ferguson, 1988). These measures were administered by software written in house.

Procedure. After a general overview of the basic procedures was explained and any general questions were answered, each experimenter led one member of the couple to a different individual testing room. The experimenter-participant pairing remained the same throughout all individual interactions in the experiment. Each experimenter defined the difference between high relevance and low relevance domains. In brief, high relevance domains were defined as those in which (a) they felt more experienced than their partner, (b) they usually made decisions about, and (c) they desired to have control over. Low relevance domains were defined as the converse. When the participants clearly understood these definitions, they were asked to generate two general problem areas from each of the high and low relevance domains being sure that each problem did not involve the other member of the couple. A list of potential domains was provided (e.g., Advancing my career, Finances/Money/Bills). These problem areas were rated by the participant on 10-point Likert scales for (a) my expertise and (b) partner expertise with 1 = no expertise and 10 = expert.

Based on a predetermined randomization scheme, couples were classified as falling into one of the two experimental conditions (i.e., high relevance or low relevance). If the couple had been classified in the high relevance condition, then the experimenter asked them to generate a specific problem from within each of the two domains that the participant claimed had high relevance. If the couple had been classified in the low relevance condition, the specific problems were generated from that domain, one problem per area. After the two specific problems had been generated, the participant then rated on 10-point Likert scales (a) how much control they

felt over solving the problem, (b) how likely the problem was to continue into the foreseeable future, and (c) how urgent a solution to the problem was needed.

When both participants had finished the problem generation and rating tasks, the two experimenters swapped coding sheets in order to have the other member generate advice on their partner's two specific problems. The experimenter asked each participant to generate five specific pieces of advice (or supportive statements) for each specific problem (i.e., 10 statements in total). Once these data had been collected, each member of the couple was asked to complete the computerized versions of the questionnaires described earlier, as well as a demographics inventory. Participants remained in their individual testing rooms away from their partners during this time, and the two experimenters convened in a nearby conference room. For all couples, the experimenters jointly transformed each statement given by each individual into a directive piece of advice. These pieces of advice all began with the directive "You should…." In those cases when advice was given in a negative form (e.g., do not do X) the experimenters rephrased this in a more positive form (e.g., you should do X less). In the event that a participant generated less than five pieces of direct advice (as would be the case when a supportive comment was made), the two experimenters together fabricated a direct piece of advice that would, in their collective opinion, address the problem. In addition to advice statements, the experimenters generated a condition inconsistent item for each specific problem. This condition inconsistent item, always the third item in the sequence of statements, was a non-directive support comment and was not read to the participants until the comment-rating phase directly after the LDT was completed. This item was included as an attention-focusing item so that ratings would not be too homogenous due to inattention to the task.

Once each participant had finished the computerized questionnaires, the experimenter returned and informed the participants how the lexical decision task would be conducted. The experimenters then read the five pieces of advice for each problem (ostensibly) generated by their partner and the lexical decision task began immediately thereafter. After completion of the lexical decision task, each participant was asked to rate each piece of advice and the condition inconsistent support item in sequence on a 10-point Likert scale for (a) how helpful the advice was, (b) how good the advice made them feel, and (c) how comfortable they would be if this advice was being said in person to them by their partner.

Subsequent to rating the statements after the lexical decision task a series of follow-up questions were asked. First, participants were asked (a) how important it was for the participant to be in control, (b) the perceived level of expertise their partner had in each of the two specific problems, and (c) their own level of expertise in each of these two specific problems. Second, to assess the degree to which they adopted their partner's advice, each participant was asked to generate five ways of dealing with each of the two specific problems (i.e., 10 ways of dealing with the problems). After all ten courses of action were specified, participants rated each of these self-generated solutions for (a) whether the idea was solely their own (new) idea, their partner's idea, or some mixture of both, (b) how long they had held this course of action, and (c) the likelihood they would carry out their self-generated specific courses of action. Third, a series of global satisfaction measures was assessed that included (a) how close they felt to their partner, (b) to what extent they would attempt to use the advice that they had received in the experimental session, (c) how much of their partner's advice was independent of their own courses of actions, and (d) how good they felt about receiving advice in the session.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Participant characteristics. Participants were compared on the CES-D, the Ambivalence scale, and the NPI to check for any between condition or between gender differences. No differences were found. Accordingly, these variables were not used as control variables.

Quality of Advice. To test the possibility that participants in different conditions received advice of differing quality, or that they perceived advice as being of different quality across conditions, we examined recipient ratings of helpfulness, comfort, and good feelings of the advice. No significant effects were found for condition or for gender or their interaction.

Unconscious Plagiarism. Statements made by participants about potential plans for solving their problem were coded to reflect the level of similarity to the advice given by their partner; ideas that were identical to or changed only a few words (maintaining the major content of the idea) of the participant's advice were coded as highly similar. The ideas that were coded as highly similar were then coded for unconscious plagiarism. The coding consisted of information about how long the participant had had the idea (today, 1 week or less, 2 to 3 weeks, more than a month) and where the idea came from (myself, mostly me partly my partner, mostly my partner partly me, or my partner). Highly similar ideas that the participants identified 'me alone' as the source were then considered as plagiarized items.

A second calculation of plagiarism rates was conducted by counting solution statements that were highly similar to advice statements and were also identified by the participant as having been held for 2-3 weeks or more.

In order to analyze the significance of gender and condition in unconscious plagiarism, a 2 X 2 X 2 [gender (within) X number of ideas copied X condition] mixed model analysis of variance was conducted. There was a main effect of condition $F(1,32) = 5.604$, $p < .024$. Responsible for this main effect was the difference in mean number of ideas unconsciously plagiarized in each of the conditions, 2.5 out of ten items in the low relevance condition and 3.74 out of ten items in the high relevance condition (see Table 3). This difference supported the hypothesis that more items would be plagiarized in the high relevance condition. No main effect of gender was found. Finally, no interaction between gender and condition was found. Because no interactions and no main effect of gender were found we collapsed across gender to better explicate the results (see Table 4). The main effect of condition was still apparent as shown by a univariate analysis of variance $F(1,33) = 5.201$, $p < .029$. These findings support our hypothesis that receiving advice in high relevance problem areas would result in more unconscious plagiarism by participants.

The second analysis of plagiarism rates using the participants' judgments of time the ideas were held and the similarity of the items to the received advice was conducted using, again, a 2 x 2 x 2 mixed model analysis of variance. This analysis showed a main effect of condition, $F = 8.384$, $p < .007$ and no interactions. Participants in the high relevance condition plagiarized 4.12 items out of ten on average; however, participants in the low relevance condition plagiarized 2.59 items out of ten on average. Again, the hypothesis was supported by the high relevance advice being plagiarized significantly more than the low relevance advice.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This study attempted to examine the ways in which people in dating relationships incorporate advice from their partners into their own solutions to the problems they encounter. The self-evaluation maintenance model was used to derive predictions about likely patterns of unconscious plagiarism. In the past, it has been shown that highly credible sources, i.e. sources more expert than the self, are more often unconsciously plagiarized than sources with less credibility (Bink, et al., 1999). The SEM model suggests the possibility that unconscious plagiarism might also be used as a defensive tool to protect the self against unwanted or unpleasant comparisons. If so, advise from the partner would be differentially plagiarized depending on its ability to threaten the self even if it was otherwise no more credible. Accordingly, from an SEM perspective one would predict that negative comparison situations would result in a self-evaluation maintenance adjustment in order to reestablish the prior self-evaluative state.

The SEM model (Tesser, 1988) is quite versatile in the type of adjustments that are recognized as having the potential to re-establish self-evaluation following a challenge or threat. One possibility is to discredit the source of the threat. For example, to the extent that the source is viewed as not having "truly outperformed" the self, the performance of the other will not be threatening. In the context of receiving advice from a partner in an area in which the self had claimed greater expertise, unconscious plagiarism can serve the function of discrediting the source by allowing one to claim, in effect, that "I already knew that." Accordingly, unconscious plagiarism reduces the perceived imbalance in performance between the self and the partner and

so minimizes the threat to self-evaluation. In the current paradigm, the adjustment was hypothesized to be the unconscious plagiarism of ideas that a person's significant other gave as advice. The outcome of this study shows that advice received in a problem area of high self-relevance was plagiarized more often than advice received in a low self-relevance area.

The advice itself did not differ in any meaningful way. The self-report measures of helpfulness, comfort with the idea of face-to-face reception of advice, and the feelings the advice inspired did not differ between the low and high relevance conditions. Thus, it is likely that something inherent in the context of the problem area itself is driving the differences in plagiarism rates between the two conditions. Subjectively, the advice did not differ in quality. This is important, because it suggests that increased plagiarism was not a function of advice being perceived as more credible. In addition, the participants had already indicated that they viewed themselves as being more expert in the high relevance area and less expert in the low relevance area. Accordingly, the result cannot be attributed to greater perceived expertise or credibility of the partner. Indeed, the results are opposite to what one would predict based on current theories of unconscious plagiarism.

Measures of depression, narcissism, and ambivalence were examined but did not account for the differences between high and low problem areas and rates of unconscious plagiarism. The participants receiving advice in high and low relevance areas were equal in terms of severity on each of these three measures. The results are based on participants whose levels on each measure were non-clinical. In the future, it would be interesting to examine rates of unconscious plagiarism within clinical samples of depressed participants, in particular. The externalizing characteristics of depressed patients could result in lower levels of plagiarism due to their tendency to attribute positive outcomes to chance rather than to themselves.

An interesting finding is that both genders plagiarized in similar patterns. While there were no a priori hypotheses proposed for differences between the genders, the results showing no differences suggest that males and females undergo similar self-evaluation saving measures when faced with advice in a highly relevant area.

The implications of the findings that advice is plagiarized more often in areas of high self-relevance are far reaching. Relationship satisfaction could suffer if someone was not able to process potentially self-threatening advice by attributing solutions to the self rather than the actual source, the partner. In order to circumvent negative comparison, a person claims advice as his or her own idea. This in turn lowers the perceived threat to their own self-evaluation and could potentially lower negative feelings directed at their partner. The partner no longer outperforms the self by being able to offer advice for a problem because the advice that was offered is claimed by the self and incorporated into one's own repertoire of potential future plans in overcoming the difficulty. Thus, the solution falsely comes from within and not from an external source.

One departure from the past unconscious plagiarism paradigms was the inclusion of source monitoring failures as a criterion for the calculation of plagiarism rates. The method used in the current study focused on source monitoring failures, judgments about the time the highly similar solutions were held, and ratings of similarity of solutions generated by the self to the advice received from the partner. The differences between this method and past methods (e.g., Bink, et al., 1999; Marsh, et al., 1997) which calculated plagiarism rates based solely on similarity ratings are theoretically important because the source monitoring failures were shown to be lower in the previous research when looked at separately from the plagiarism itself. Therefore, this method along with previous research shows that sometimes source monitoring

failures contribute to the rates on plagiarism. The disparity in the results comes when attention is directed to the source of the information by asking participants to identify the source. In the previous research the plagiarism rates dropped (Marsh, et al., 1997) when participants were focused on the source before generating their own plans. The current study views unconscious plagiarism as a threat reduction process, or a motivated process, used to increase self-evaluation instead of just a phenomenon of undirected attention. The past research posits that unconscious plagiarism takes place when a participant is not consciously called to attend to source monitoring information, but in the current study the differences in plagiarism rates between conditions were shown while taking into account the source monitoring failures. So, based on the current research, either the participants do have the source information and ignore it even when their attention is called to it or they do not actually have the source information. The most consistent interpretation of the past results with the current research is that the threat of receiving advice is more important than accurately admitting where the advice originated, thus the motivation to ignore the information that is available outweighs actually identifying correctly the source of the idea. The information is probably available, as shown in the past, but it is not used even when attention is called to where the advice originated when self-evaluation is added to the recall process.

The participants were not admonished to use only new ideas in their solutions to their own problems. If a participant called an idea that was rated as highly similar (almost no variation between the advice statement and the self-proposed solution statement) his or her own, then that item was coded as plagiarized for use in the first analysis. In the past, studies (Bink, et al., 1999; Marsh, et al., 1999) used similarity ratings alone to determine the rates of unconscious plagiarism. Because the current study examined unconscious plagiarism as a threat reduction

technique employed after negative comparison, the inclusion of source monitoring failures as a factor in the rates of plagiarism is warranted due to the actual process of plagiarism *in vivo* being one in which a source monitoring failure would occur. The inclusion of source monitoring failures as a criterion in the calculation of plagiarism rates, then, increases the ecological validity of the measure and allows conjectures to be made about what happens outside of the controlled laboratory settings. Also, the plagiarism in the current study occurred minutes after the advice was initially heard, which differs from the past studies in which source judgments occurred a week after the ideas were first created. In a real life situation, a person would not be admonished to not use his or her partner's ideas in solution generation. The person may in fact use the partner's advice, as the current study shows, but claim it as their own even when asked for the source explicitly. If a person realizes that he or she did not create the solution to a problem, then it may follow that no reduction of threat would take place.

The participant judgments about the time that they held the plagiarized ideas are important. While not an explicit measure of source monitoring, the judgment of holding a newly plagiarized idea for 3 weeks or more is important because of the implications for creating false memories. The partner's ideas are claimed as being known by the participant for a long duration of time even though the idea was first heard only minutes ago within the time course of the experiment. For the idea to not be plagiarized, the participant would have to recognize that the idea had been created moments ago and would have had to respond accordingly by saying that they had held the idea for less than a week's time. Thus, a person receiving advice that is threatening to their self-evaluation has two options shown by this experiment. The first is to claim advice statements as their own creations, thereby not recognizing their partner's contributions. The second is to falsely claim that the ideas have been held for a long duration of

time, which precludes their partner from having created the idea because the self already created it long ago. In each case, the self receives all the credit for solving the problem and the partner receives little or none at all. The outcome of this transferal of credit could be negative feelings by the partner who actually did come up with the solutions to the problem, but this would need to be independently investigated in the future.

One possible next step is to investigate the reaction of partners to the plagiarism that takes place in the high relevance area. A person who recognizes that they proposed a solution only to have it claimed by someone else could react negatively to not receiving recognition in helping with the outcome of the problem. Another avenue for future study is to apply the current procedures to married couples in order to see if people in differing levels of relationships are as threatened by receiving advice in a highly relevant area as indicated by rates of plagiarism.

REFERENCES

Beach, S. R. H., Martin, J. K., Blum, T. C., & Roman, P. M. (1993). Effects of marital and co-worker relationships on negative affect: Testing the central role of marriage. American Journal of Family Therapy, 21(4), 313-323.

Beach, S. R. H., & Tesser, A. (unpublished chapter). This is to be a chapter in an edited volume by M. Kernis (Ed.), Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem. New York: Plenum.

Berg-Cross, L., & Cohen, M. S., (1995). Depression and the marital relationship. Psychotherapy in Private Practice, 14(1), 35-51.

Bink, M. L., Marsh, R. L., Hicks, J. L., & Howard, J. D. (1999). The Credibility of a Source Influences the Rate of Unconscious Plagiarism. Memory, 7(3), 293-308.

Bower, G. H., & Gluck, M. A. (1988). From Conditioning to Category Learning: An Adaptive Network Model. Journal of Experimental Psychology, General, 117(3), 227-247.

Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the Nature and Determinants of Marital Satisfaction: A Decade in Review. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 62(4), 964-980.

Brown, A. S., & Murphy, D. R. (1989). Cryptomnesia: Delineating Inadvertent Plagiarism. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition, 15(3), 432-442.

Dakof, G. A., & Taylor, S. E. (1990). Victim's Perceptions of Social Support: What is Helpful from Whom? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 58(1), 80-89.

Fincham, F. D., Linfield, K. J. (1997). A new look at marital quality: Can spouses feel positive and negative about their marriage? Journal of Family Psychology, 11, 489-502.

Marsh, R. L., Landau, J. D., & Hicks, J. D. (1997). Contributions of Inadequate Source Monitoring to Unconscious Plagiarism During Idea Generation. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 23(4), 886-897.

Marsh, R. L., Ward, T. B., & Landau, J. D. (1999). The Inadvertnet Use of Prior Knowledge in a Generative Cognitive Task. Memory & Cognition, 27(1), 94-105.

Neely, J. H. (1977). Semantic Priming and Retrieval from Lexical Memory: Roles of Inhibitionless Spreading Activation and Limited-Capacity Attention. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 106(3), 226-254.

Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a Self-Evaluation Maintenance Model of Social Behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 21, 181-227.

Tesser, A. & Collins, J. E. (1988). Emotion in Social Reflection and Comparison Situations: Intuitive, Systematic, and Exploratory Approaches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 695-709.

Tesser, A. & Palhaus, D. (1983). Ther Defnition of Self: Private and Public Self Evaluation Maintenance Strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 672-682.

Tesser, A. & Smith, J. (1980). Some Effects of Friendship and Task Relevance on Helping: You Don't Always Help the One You Like. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16, 582-590.

Radloff, LS (1977). The CES-D Scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychology Measures, 1:385-401.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*, Revised Edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Shulman, D. G., & Ferguson, G.R. (1988). Two methods of assessing narcissism: Comparison of the Narcissism-Projective and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*, 857-866.

Table 1

Demographic Information

AGES

AGE	Frequency	Percent
17	2	2.9
18	17	25.0
19	21	30.9
20	7	10.3
21	8	11.8
22	9	13.2
23	1	1.5
24+	3	4.4
Total	68	100.0

ETHNICITIES

ETHNICITY	Frequency	Percent
White/Caucasian	57	83.8
African American	4	5.9
Asian-American	4	5.9
Latina/Hispanic	2	2.9
Other	1	1.5
Total	68	100.0

YEAR IN COLLEGE

YEAR	Frequency	Percent
Freshman	33	48.5
Sophomore	14	20.6
Junior	7	10.3
Senior	13	19.1
Total	67	98.5

SERIOUSNESS OF RELATIONSHIP

	Frequency	Percent
casually/non-exclusive	2	2.9
dating casually/exclusive	13	19.1
dating seriously	32	47.1
dating seriously/talk of marriage	15	22.1
Engaged	4	5.9
married	2	2.9
Total	68	100.0

Table 2

Word list used in lexical decision task

IMAGINATIVE
INTELLIGENT
SOPHISTICATED
CLEVER
INVENTIVE
INGENIOUS
RESOURCEFUL
LOGICAL
SMART
CAPABLE
PROFICIENT
COMPETENT
SKILLED
ADEPT
KNOWLEDGEABLE
UNITELLIGENT
DULL
IDIOTIC
STUPID
SLOW
DENSE
BRAINLESS
THICKHEADED
MORONIC
CHILDISH
SIMPLISTIC
INEPT
BUNGLING
INEFFECTUAL
USELESS
VOCABULARY
RETIREMENT
ELECTRICITY
IMPORT
PHONOGRAPH
RIVERSIDE
TRACEABLE
CANDIDATE
SKIRT
SUBSTANTIAL
BALCONY
TELEGRAPH

MEAL
GADGET
LOCOMOTIVE
INSUFFICIENCY
RANCH
MODERATION
BARREL
TEXT
CHEESE
HIGHRISE
GLAMOROUS
PATROLMAN
SURGEON
CASINO
BANJO
TYPICALLY
ENCYCLOPEDIA
BASKET
ACTOR
FACTORY
ABSTRACT
LEGEND
MEDICINE
TANGENT
BASEMENT
THERMAL
MOUNTAIN
MYSTERY
COCKTAIL
CALENDAR
FARMER
GIANT
MIDNIGHT
ADMISSION
GARAGE
SELDOM
SILVER
BARREL
LUXURY
SUBSTANCE
BUTTER
VEHICLE
VETERAN
CONSUMER
DEALER
BENCH

MAGAZINE
BASEBALL
POWDER
EQUATION
LEARN
GARDEN
MACHINE
OCCASION
YELLOW
COMPUTER
ORIGINAL
WINDOW
ISLAND
YESTERDAY
AFTERNOON
LIBRARY
BUILDING
AGENCY
MUSICAL
NORMAL
MAJOR
TEACHER
TOMORROW
ACADEMIC
WEATHER
OBJECTIVE
JUDGMENT
VILLAGE
FUNCTION
LIQUID
AMOUNT
COLOR
AIRCRAFT
BACKGROUND
HABIT
PLANET
ACADEMY

Table 3

Mean number of items plagiarized by gender

	CONDITION	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
MALE	Low Relevance	2.29	2.0238	17
	High Relevance	3.47	2.5278	17
FEMALE	Low Relevance	2.71	2.1727	17
	High Relevance	4.00	2.1213	17

Table 4

Mean number of items plagiarized by condition

CONDITION	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Low Relevance	2.50	1.5612	17
High Relevance	3.67	1.4653	18