Submission

- 📋 My Files
- 🗂 My Files
- 🎓 University

Document Details

Submission ID

trn:oid:::28592:82721009

Submission Date

Feb 19, 2025, 11:43 PM GMT+5:30

Download Date

Feb 19, 2025, 11:44 PM GMT+5:30

File Name

Discuss Cultural Differences.docx

File Size

18.2 KB

4 Pages

378 Words

2,140 Characters

0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Detection Groups

1 AI-generated only 0%
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.

2 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

Disclaimer
Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (it may misidentify writing that is likely AI generated as AI generated and AI paraphrased or likely AI generated and AI paraphrased writing as only AI generated) so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?
The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?
Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.

Discuss Cultural Differences

Student's Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course

Professor's Name

Date

2

Discuss Cultural Differences

As the CEO of a big tech company, navigating Pride events demands walking the line of authentic support and responsible corporate involvement. In our approach, we would focus on three key areas: In the first instance, we would want to see our Pride venue participation go beyond the provision of marketing opportunities. To my team and everywhere, this entails following policies all year round that tangibly help support LGBTQA+ employees – from comprehensive health coverage to inclusive human resources policies and active employee resource groups. Until we're willing to be truly committed to internal practice, we can't participate in Pride events with integrity.

Secondly, our Pride participation would be more focused on community partnership than corporate visibility. Rather than just putting our logo on floats or merch, we'd work with local LGBTQA+ organizations to find out what help they needed and what was important to them. In this way, the company could support the community either through providing technology resources, funding initiatives that directly benefit the community, or through offering mentorship programs.

Third, we will address valid criticism of corporate 'rainbowwashing' by remaining transparent about our company's stance on LGBTQA+ rights throughout its history (Maks-Solomon and Drewry, 2021). If we have failed previously, we would do so openly and explain what practical measures we are taking to avoid repeating the mistake. It could be showing how many of our workforce are diverse, recording policy changes, and setting up to be able to measure our progress.

What our participation in this would look like is using our platform and our resources to amplify the voices of LGBTQA+ individuals, not our voices. This also means giving speaking

3

opportunities to LGBTQA+ employees, showcasing their stories in our communications, and making sure that our Pridevers bleed free of the community's influence. If we can approach Pride participation with humility authenticity, with focus on tangible impact rather than publicity, we can add value to the celebration and, at the same time, respect its underlying purpose as a movement for equality and recognition.

Reference

Maks-Solomon, C., & Drewry, J. M. (2021). Why do corporations engage in LGBT rights activism? LGBT employee groups as internal pressure groups. *Business and Politics*, *23*(1), 124-152.