December 2004

# A Preliminary Study to Determine Attitudes towards Plagiarism in Information Systems

Roberts Dave
*University of Southern Queensland*

Raj Gururajan
*University of Southern Queensland*

# A Preliminary Study to Determine Attitudes towards Plagiarism in Information Systems

Dave Roberts & Raj Gururajan
Department of Information Systems
The University of Southern Queensland
Toowoomba, QLD 4350
email:  gururaja@usq.edu.au

## ABSTRACT

*Plagiarism, a component of academic misconduct has captured the headlines of many Australian media reports in recent months.  While many articles have been written in the education domain about plagiarism, limited empirical evidence was found on the factors leading to the attitudes of plagiarism and students opinion on these attitudes.  This is because many prior studies have focused their findings arising from the institutional data available on plagiarism and compiling these into a form of findings, without actually consulting either students or lecturers involved in teaching.  This study, to alleviate such criticism, followed a qualitative method to develop a theme to identify factors that can contribute to plagiarism in the opinion of lecturers and tutors.  This theme was then followed up by a quantitative method to extract perceptions towards these attitudes from students based on an adapted instrument.  The outcomes of the theme development and perception measurement are reported in this study with a hope that academics in educational setting can produce fair and more reliable assessment methods.*

## INTRODUCTION

Australian universities rely upon many international students in the current climate of tertiary education to improve their financial bottom line and this has realized a pattern of steady and continual shift in the way assessments are being conducted.  Students complete their assessments, sometimes including examinations, using the Internet Technology to gain Australian tertiary qualifications.  While this mode of conducting and completing assessments provides greater flexibility to students, dishonest practices used with assessments include copying from assignments set in previous years, collusion amongst students in preparing assignments, getting assistance from past students and using sources from the Internet.

Recently, there have been a number of cases of plagiarism attracting attention from the media.  The cases range from alleged plagiarism where material was directly copied from the Internet (Smith, 2003) to "soft marking" of student work (Elliot, 2003). Some of these cases have gained a significant amount of publicity and as such have been instrumental in tarnishing the reputation of the Australian higher education sector. It appears that these are growing to an unprecedented level in universities.

In the past decade academic misconduct has gained significant press coverage both overseas and within Australia (Cohen, 2003). It is strongly believed that the University systems conduct assessments in a reliable manner with appropriate quality controls and hence a valid indication of student ability. However, press reports that emerged in the recent months are a cause of concern as they report a trend towards a rise in academic misconduct in Australian tertiary institutions. However, from the students' point of view, it appears that the issues of plagiarism are blown out of proportion as the attitudes towards plagiarism from students are different to that of academics (Devlin, 2003).

This study investigates the attitudes of 'academic dishonesty' by students in a specific Australian University setting where the courses are also offered using a 'distance education mode'.  The scope of the study is restricted to assignments only as examinations are usually closed book and well monitored.  The specific aims of the study are (1) to identify various factors involved in plagiarism using a qualitative method and then (2) to test those factors using a quantitative method.  The first aim is in order to establish the extent to which students engage in academic cheating.  The second aim is to examine the perceptions of tertiary students on four aspects of cheating; what constitutes plagiarism (including collusion) in assignments, why cheating occurs in assignments, how cheating can be prevented in assignments and the attitude of students to cheating. The results are important for lecturers and administrators of Universities as

well as the wider educational community because the problems of 'academic dishonesty' are growing and solutions currently provided appear to be inadequate. The findings of this research would assist in making educational assessment fairer and more reliable irrespective of whether the assessment is conducted in the external or internal mode.

## PLAGIARISM IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

Currently, it is difficult to find statistics for the actual number of detected cases of plagiarism in Australian universities.  A quick online search was conducted and the results show that only a few universities in Australia publish the statistics related to plagiarism online (QUT, 2003; USyd, 2003). It seems that the actual number of detected cases compared to student population is relatively low. To further complicate the issue in some instances it is university policy not to allow publishing of the results to protect the individuals involved.  (Sunday Program, 2003)

It is justified to assume that only the clear cases of plagiarism are reported as they are the ones lecturers can easily detect and provide evidence.  This typically involves a direct cut and paste exercise from materials available online or other sources.

Furthermore, increasing work loads have made it more difficult for academics to afford the time required to properly investigate plagiarism in student work. This increasing workload is clearly evident from the rising student staff ratios over the last decade. It is far easier and less time consuming to ignore it or pretend that plagiarism doesn't exist or matter and proceed marking the student work without considering from where the material is coming from or whose ideas are put forward.

Some even consider it a proper academic learning method (Spender, 2003) or even worse they don't themselves understand the issues involved in plagiarism. The casualisation of the academic workforce has in practice increased the number of non-academic and industry practitioners being involved in university teaching.  They are often without proper induction to academic teaching and especially lacking the understanding or experience of the potential impact of plagiarism to students work.

There are many different reasons why students plagiarise (Zobel & Hamilton, 2002). In ideal settings students should be provided with a supportive structure to reduce the need to plagiarise.  In addition, they should be provided with appropriate training to understand what is meant by plagiarism and how to incorporate references to other peoples work in a proper manner. In other words, ensuring that students have the basic skills required to incorporate other people's work and ideas to their own work and ideas would eliminate most of the cases currently considered to be plagiarised.

## PRIOR STUDIES

The influences of plagiarism and the subsequent publicity relating to 'soft marking' of international students work, the lack of understanding between creativity and copying text was discussed by (Cohen, 2003).  Cohen cited the lack of understanding of referencing issues as a major contributor to plagiarism in addition to mentioning aspects such as 'culture' contributing to the overall effects of plagiarism.  Various aspects of academic misconduct including plagiarism were discussed in prier studies (McCabe, 2003); (Devlin, 2003) including statistical evidence derived from the questionnaire administered by them on secondary students.   Studies have also explored 'dishonesty' covering a broad spectrum including students using crib notes in an exam (Hallet et al., 2003), copying answers from another student's paper (Melles, 2003), letting others copy a homework paper (Green et al., 2003), and ghostwriting (Cochrane, 2003). Studies have also reported that that gender and institutional affiliation influenced students cheating behavior (Chanok, 2003) and one of the determinants of cheating was a diminishing sense of academic integrity (Carrol, 2003).

In addition to the above academic studies, articles in the Campus Review, and the Higher Education Supplement and other newspaper have raised the consciousness of Australian academics to the issue of academic integrity in the tertiary sector, mainly referring to the problems arising out of plagiarism.  As a result of this adverse publicity, it was argued that the solutions proposed to fight against the academic dishonesty are difficult to maintain and even harder to implement and suggestions were provided to use greater efforts to overcome academic malpractice (Quinn & Ritter, 2003).

Studies that have researched the problems of plagiarism in 2003[1] can be categorized into two categories. They are quantitative studies using an instrument and qualitative studies where no proper methodology has been followed. For instance, McCabe (2003) used a quantitative techniques in her study to report the levels of plagiarism. While McCabe reported interesting statistics, very little information was found on the validity of the instrument used to collect the data. Carrol (2003) used a qualitative method in her study to extract six key factors influencing plagiarism. The study lacks instrument validation and the 'inference' made by the author based on this invalidated instrument. The study appears to be a mere observation than a rigorous framework developed to identify issues of plagiarism. Chanock (2003) studied issues of plagiarism as a Language and Academic Skills (LAS) perspective using an experiential learning type method without any rigorous research framework to derive her findings. Cohen (2003) used an action research method to address issues of inadvertent plagiarism among students. The findings reported by Cohen were derived from a set of workshop conducted to students and not from following a rigorous method traditionally found in IS research. Devlin (2003) on the other hand looked into the data available from her institution in determining a plagiarism continuum model. She used the data to identify common themes of plagiarism to develop the continuum. The research method in Devlin's study involved interviewing both staff and students. The study did not involve quantitative methods to support her continuum. Green (2003) employed a quantitative method in her study in identifying plagiarism issues among postgraduate students. The sample size was 27 and statistical validity of this sample size in generalizing results can be questioned. Further, the data analysis stopped at descriptive level and no reliability checks were conducted to guarantee the quality of data. Hallet et al. (2003) studied the issues of 'authenticity' using a case study approach, using a hypothetical case of apparent plagiarism. While the case study demonstrated the complex nature of issues involved in plagiarism, the applicability of this study to generailise the themes of plagiarism is yet to be tested. Hamilton et al (2003) studied plagiarism issues in terms of international student cultures using some cases available within their institution. While they were able to identify a number of points, they failed to develop a theme using the cases available and hence their findings were more of an observation. Melles (2003) used a literature survey in identifying multiple themes of plagiarism. Cochrane (2003) used action research method to study issues associated with plagiarism and used an 'example' to highlight important aspects.

Therefore, it appears that in the Australian context, the studies that investigated plagiarism did not follow a rigorous approach in identifying the themes of plagiarism. In many cases, the studies were conducted by academics in the education domain, rather than from IS and the methods used to collect data, validating collected data and arriving at some of findings based on the data cast doubt as to whether the findings are applicable to be generalized. This has provided the impetus for this study to follow a rigorous approach in identifying the themes of plagiarism and then validate the themes using quantitative data.

**RESEARCH MODEL**

When the prior studies were reviewed, a number of issues such as ignorance, lack of proper definition and culture emerged as major contributors to plagiarism. Prior studies looked into the issues of plagiarism based on internal and external students, school children to tertiary students and in some cases academic publications leading to adverse publicity. When the sampling methods in these studies were examined, it appears that none of the studies made an effort to categorise the sample based on certain criteria and then plan their data collection activity. While there are practical complications in administering data collections exercises based on sample categories, this aspect is identified as a major weakness in prior studies. Further, the studies reviewed did not indicate the type of research framework one would expect in academic publications, data validity techniques and a justification for their data analysis. While almost all the studies reviewed provided generic information of plagiarism, based on a systematic procedure, a thematic procedure was not followed in these studies. These weaknesses were addressed in this study while developing the research model.

The research model involved in this study includes both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Due to the myriad of issues involved in plagiarism, the scope of the study is restricted to tertiary students and staff involved in an IS program in an Australian University. The student population comprises of both Australian and other overseas students. This research follows a conceptual paper published in the Teaching

---

[1] A 2003 Conference proceedings titled 'Plagiarism and other perplexities' was used for this purpose. This conference was hosted by University of South Australia as per DEST guidelines.

and Learning Forum and dealing with many 'plagiarism' cases in IS. Based on this collective experience, this research is designed to capture a cross-sectional snapshot and a dynamic longitudinal picture of 'plagiarism' in an IS department.

Factors identified for this research may be limited and needed to be expanded further to accommodate other unknown factors. According to Oritz & Clancy (2003), while prior studies indicate that a quantitative approach would suffice, a combined approach of qualitative and quantitative methods would provide strength to the research outcome. Experienced researchers indicate that there is a need to include qualitative approach to study the human, social and psychological factors (Remenyi et al., 1998) and hence this study will include an interview method in order to strengthen the research outcome. The interviews will be of semi-structured format to gain sufficient understanding on the topic from academics in tertiary setting. These interviews may help to identify any unknown factors that influence plagiarism in tertiary settings. The interviews will be conducted among enough respondents[2] to get a complete picture of the factors impacting plagiarism and collusion. Subsequent to the qualitative study, this research would employ quantitative methods such as survey/ questionnaire to collect data. The nature of the quantitative study would be determined by an initial exploratory study, which may demand specific approach to research issues.

In summary, the research would adopt the qualitative-quantitative interactive continuum model as suggested by (Zikmund, 1994) and (Remenyi et al., 1998), resulting in a positivist philosophical approach and would combine both qualitative and quantitative methods to determine the outcome of this research. Given the exploratory nature, these two techniques are essential to this study.

**RESEARCH FRAMEWORK**

The qualitative component in this study consisted of open interviews with four academic staff from a non English speaking background involved in teaching IS courses. The interview was conducted on the 13th of April 2004 for 90 minutes with a moderator who was conversant with the language of these academic staff. The questions were informal and non-structured as the objective of this exercise was to extract 'themes' of plagiarism in the opinion of these non English speaking academics. The following were some of the responses to the question 'Is plagiarism an issue?'

> *Yes, it is an issue*
>
> *It is immoral, something wrong, needs punishment*
>
> *Considered to be a serious problem*
>
> *Administering Australian institutions should use the same rules for both undergraduate and postgraduate students*
>
> *Definition becomes difficult due to cultural differences as in their culture 'memory and verbatim reproduction' is allowed*
>
> *If students were weak in referencing, this should not be taken serious*
>
> *Their education system allows 'rote' learning and then reproduction of the same in assignments*

To the question, 'How do you change students to write assignments properly – as per the standards dictated by Australian universities', the responses were as follows:

> *Tell them in the first instance, educate them, NOT punish them at the first instance*
>
> *Staffs with non English speaking background have difficulty in understanding guidelines written in English*
>
> *Different referencing standards also introduce difficulty*
>
> *Lack of in-text referencing and end-text referencing is not considered plagiarism*
>
> *It is your system – NOT our system*

---

[2] Sampling methods are outlined in a later section.

*If some statements are reproduced, then it is not plagiarism*

*If a paragraph is reproduced, then it is serious*

*You pay less attention on content but more attention on how it is written*

*We check ideas NOT how well it is presented*

The question 'What are the common forms of plagiarism', the following responses were obtained:

*Not expressing one's own ideas*

*Similarities in assignments*

*Cheating is a big issue (such as copy rather than lack of referencing)*

We asked the question, 'How do you detect plagiarism?'.   The responses were:

*By spelling mistakes*

*By looking at he logical structure of assignments*

*"Too good to be true" syndrome*

*Deviations from any standard types of answer coming from materials provided*

*Reproduction*

In response to the discussion above, the question 'Is the concept of plagiarism different in your country?' was asked.  The responses were:

*Yes.  The plagiarism criteria was dictated by teachers*

*The Australian system of plagiarism cannot be implemented in our country because rote learning is encouraged in our culture*

*Memorising contents and reproducing the same in exams and assignments is quality of excellence*

*Ideas are important and contents follow ideas*

*Organisation of materials is not that important*

The response to the question 'How to do the right thing' was as follows:

*International tutors need to be provided with Australian experience to understand plagiarism issues*

*Students can be inducted prior to commencement of their studies*

*A manual can be prepared with clear guidelines (perhaps in students' native language)*

*Providing proper infrastructure to handle issues of plagiarism such as detection etc*

*Using only one referencing standards instead of many*

*To be clear on the definition as different universities have varying definitions of plagiarism*

*To provide some practical training*

*To address non familiarity of this concept*

*To clarify 'unintentional mistake' from copying*

*Provide feedback on the first assignment well before the commencement of the second assignment*

*To educate staff and students on this issue alike*

*To educate parents as well because they have significant input in student learning*

When the above data were analysed and interpreted, certain themes emerged.  For instance, it appears that these academics felt that in specific cases plagiarism can be justified and should not be punished.  These academics felt that if only a minor component is reproduced, if there is a lack of referencing, if the idea is

well presented, then students should not be punished as the culture encourages rote learning. These academics also indicated that in cases where significant component of materials reproduced verbatim, students should be punished. An interesting theme that emerged during the interview was that the overseas students were not well educated in aspects of plagiarism and the standards differ between various Australian universities. They also indicated that there must be a uniform procedure among all Australian universities in handling plagiarism issues.

Once the interview was complete, two student sets were surveyed using an existing instrument. This instrument was adopted from a text book and the survey instrument is enclosed as Appendix A. The first set of students were overseas enrolled in an IS program in an Australian University. These students were given both on-line and face-to-face teaching. The second set involved students enrolled in an on-campus mode of study in the same university. The two student populations were studying in two different campuses, in different states and have no contact with each other.

The instrument was distributed for data collection to students of IS. The overseas student samples returned a total of 78 filled-in questionnaires and the on-campus students returned a total of 48 questionnaires. The data was entered in a spreadsheet and manually checked for accuracy. Once the accuracy of data entry was verified, the data was sent to an SPSS file for analysis. The instrument was not tested for content validity because the instrument was used by the author of text book in previous years and hence was assumed to be a valid instrument.

## DATA ANALYSIS

The data was initially tested for standard descriptive and ensured that the basic checks were carried out. Then a reliability analysis was performed on the two sets of data. However, when the reliability scores were examined, the Cronbach Alpha value was 0.4846 and 0.4464 for the overseas samples set and the on-campus set respectively. As these values were not considered reliable, it was decided that the instrument used was not reliable in terms of statistical validity and hence a factor analysis was performed on the data sets.

Initially a generic factor model was constructed to see any possible cluster of factors. This yielded four sets of factors with the fourth set consisting of only one significant factor for both sets of data. Therefore, it was decided that a factor analysis with 3 factor model will be performed. The factor analysis was then performed with a rotated varimax option and this yielded 9 significant factors for both data sets. The following table shows the significant factors contributing to plagiarism for both sets, as well as their average rankings.

Table 1: Results of Factor Analysis

### Plagiarism Attitude Scale

**Directions:** This is an attitude scale, which measures how you feel about plagiarism. It is *not* a test with right and wrong answers. Please consider your honest opinions regarding the items and record your responses. Do *not* place your name on this scale. Your instructor may give you further instructions.

| Factors extracted for local and overseas population | FACTORS | | AVERAGES | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Local | O-Seas | Local | O-seas |
| 1. Sometimes I feel tempted to plagiarize because so many other students are doing it. | 0.548 | 0.587 | 4.10 | 3.77 |
| 2. I believe I know accurately what constitutes plagiarism and what does not. | | 0.685 | 2.44 | 2.55 |
| 3. Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the final exam ahead of time and memorizing the answers. | 0.630 | | 2.54 | 2.35 |

6

| Item | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. If my roommate gives me permission to use his or her paper for one of my classes, I don't think there is anything wrong with doing that. | 0.699 | 0.739 | 3.62 | 3.56 |
| 5. Plagiarism is justified if the professor assigns too much work in the course. | 0.755 | 0.724 | 3.92 | 3.36 |
| 6. The punishment for plagiarism in college should be light because we are young people just learning the ropes. | 0.538 | 0.499 | 3.42 | 2.60 |
| 7. If a student buys or downloads free a whole research paper and turns it in unchanged with his or her name as the author, the student should be expelled. | 0.675 | 0.724 | 2.21 | 2.38 |
| 8. Plagiarism is against my ethical values. | | | 1.96 | 2.16 |
| 9. Because plagiarism involves taking another person's words and not his or her material goods, plagiarism is no big deal. | 0.876 | 0.546 | 3.73 | 3.37 |
| 10. It's okay to use something you have written in the past to fulfill a new assignment because you can't plagiarize yourself. | 0.625 | 0.765 | 2.19 | 3.17 |
| 11. If I lend a paper to another student to look at, and then that student turns it in as his or her own and is caught, I should not be punished also. | 0.610 | | 2.52 | 2.66 |
| 12. If students caught plagiarizing received a special grade for cheating (such as an FP - Fail for Plagiarizing) on their permanent transcript, that policy would deter many from plagiarizing. | | 0.672 | 2.56 | 3.00 |

The factor analysis yielded some interesting results. For instance, questions 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were considered to be significant factors of plagiarism by both groups. These factors deal about temptation, nothing wrong, justification, light punishment and severe punishment. While the first four factors indicate that plagiarism should not be considered serious in certain circumstances, the last factor indicates that students involved in plagiarism need to be 'expelled' from their programs when the assessment is significantly copied. When the average values were compared for the two groups, for factors 4 and 7 both groups had similar averages. In other words, the results of the factor analysis and descriptive indicate that if students have permission to reproduce information from their room mates or sources known to them, then it should not be treated severely. If there was a blatant copy, then this form of plagiarism should result in the student being expelled from the program.

Factor 8 was not considered significant by both groups. In other words, the question that 'plagiarism is against my ethical values' was not considered to be a serious issue by both sample sets. This factor also scored the lowest averages for both groups.

The factors 1, 5 and 6 were comparable to both groups. These factors – 'I am tempted to plagiarise because many others are doing it', 'Plagiarism is justified because of heavy work load' and 'Punishment should be light because we are just learning the ropes' – indicate that students felt that the punishment is too high in the university where these students are enrolled. When the averages were compared for these factors, local students scored high on averages than overseas students for these three factors. This indicates that on-campus students were monitored closely on plagiarism issues than overseas students. This can be attributed, perhaps, to the same lecturer or tutor who marks the assignments of on-campus students compared to different tutors involved in marking the overseas students' assignments.

The factor 2, 'I believe I know accurately what constitutes plagiarism' was significant to overseas students but not to local students. This may be due to the number of cases detected and the education imparted on this issue to overseas students and their lack of familiarity on this subject and subsequent education provided to them. Similarly, local students considered the factor 'Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the final exam ahead of time and memorizing the answers' significant and this implies the difference in culture where local education system does not encourage rote learning at tertiary level but meaningful learning.

Similarly factors 11 and 12 on punishment yielded significance on different dimensions. For instance local students felt that they should not be punished if they helped another student to complete an assignment. On the other hand, overseas students felt punishment might deter students from plagiarism.

Factors 9 and 10 that deal with the content issues were significant factors towards plagiarism to both groups. Both groups of students felt that if another person's words were copied, it is no big deal and past own work can be reproduced to fulfill assignment needs.

## DISCUSSION

The factor analysis clearly indicates that students are tempted to plagiarise because others do it, if permission given by a friend to copy his or her work then it is not plaigiarism, too much work load results in plagiarism, punishment for plagiarism should be light and if a substantial portion is plagiarized, then it should result in punishment. While these factors appear to be the common attitudes towards plagiarism, the student groups differ in factors such as the belief they have on what constitutes plagiarism, the granularity of values they hold about plagiarism, helping students to complete assignments and the adverse effect of such help when caught, and punishment as a means of deterrence. The local students clearly differ from overseas students on these issues and the respective cultures appear to be contributing to these differences. Further, it also appears that students in both groups feel that the issue of plagiarism can be justified and the punishment level in many cases to be high. It is interesting to note that both groups felt that plagiarism is not against their ethical values.

The findings of this study, especially cultural impact on plagiairism and its values on students are supported by many previous studies including Melles (2003). Previous studies have indicated that in many Eastern cultures reproducing materials from authoritative sources is an acceptable practice and in some instances lead to academic achievement (Quinn & Ritter, 2003). Previous studies also imply that in many language backgrounds, modifying original source is a major learning strategy and sometimes an insult to the original source (Melles, 2003). This is clearly shown in the division in the attitudes between the two different sets of students.

When the empirical data were compared with the interview data, some interesting solutions emerge. For example, one could ask whether the testing strategy we use to assess students performance is the right approach as there appears to me too much emphasis on 'writing style' rather than testing factual knowledge and understanding (Quinn & Ritter, 2003). Previous studies have identified these problems and argue for different style of assessment types including interviewing students (Hamilton et al., 2003). These studies suggest that there is a necessity to reduce the need for examination-type assessment, which focuses on writing styles only.

The data analysed and the interviews conducted also reveal that the issue of plagiarism is not well explained and not well understood due to many variations and standards on this issue. In fact, when we scanned some university web sites in Australia on this issue, the granularity, interpretation, punishment and procedures associated with this issue is varying between universities and between faculties. This varying view appears to have caused confusion among students. A major implication of this is the necessity for a uniform procedure in dealing with plagiarism issues and an educational kit based on these uniform procedures. There is support from some previous studies for this approach.

## CONCLUSION

This preliminary study is an attempt to provide empirical evidence towards the attitudes of plagiarism. Two groups of students – local and overseas – were surveyed in conjunction with an informal interview session with some overseas non-English speaking tutors. It appears that both the tutors set and the students set appear to be justifying plagiarism in certain cases with a unanimous attitude that when substantial portions are reproduced, the act of plagiarism warrants severe punishment. Surprisingly, both student sets felt that plagiarism is not against their ethical values.

The results of this study, while providing some new information, are not ready for generalization as only a small segment was surveyed. Further, the instrument was not statistically reliable and hence the outcomes can be questionable. However, student opinions can't be ignored and there are some lessons for academics including issues such as over work by students, necessity for uniform guidelines, education aspects to overseas students and a consistent policy among faculties.

**REFERENCES**

Carrol, J. (2003). *Six things I did not know four years ago about dealing with plagiarism.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Chanok, K. (2003). *Before we hang that highwayman - The LAS adviser's perspective on plagiarism.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Cochrane, E. (2003). *Ethical integrity and the research endeavor: Contemporary issues.* Paper presented at the Educational Integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Cohen, J. (2003, 21 November 2003). *Addressing inadvertent plagiarism: A practical strategy to help Non-English speaking background (NESB) students.* Paper presented at the Educational Integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, University of South Australia.

Devlin, M. (2003, 21 November 2003). *Educational Integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities*, University of South Australia.

Elliot, T. (2003). Top in enterprise, bottom in integrity. Financial Times (London), 2 June, 13.

Green, M., Williams, M., & Van Kessel, G. (2003). *How to help postgraduate students identify plagiarism...don't just tell them.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Hallet, R., Woodley, C., & Dixon, J. (2003). *Constructing 'authenticity': feigning an inexpert authority.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Hamilton, D., Hinton, L., & Hawkins, K. (2003). *International students at Australian universities: Plagiarism and culture.* Paper presented at the Adelaide, University of Adelaide.

McCabe, D. (2003). *Promoting academic integrity - A US/Canadian perspective.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Melles, G. (2003). *Challenging discourses of plagiarism and the reproductive ESL learner.* Paper presented at the Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

Oritz, E., & Clancy, C. M. (2003). Use of information technology to improve the Quality of Health Care in the United States. *Health Services Research, 38*(2), 11-22.

Quinn, P., & Ritter, L. (2003). *Are examinations necessary as part of assessment practice for educational integrity: A plagiarism focus.* Paper presented at the Educational Integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Adelaide.

QUT (2003). The BGSB position on Plagiarism & Cheating. [verified 20 June 2004] http://www.bgsb.qut.edu.au/currentstud/policyprocedures/plagcheat.jsp

Remenyi, D., Williams, B., Money, A., & Swartz, E. (1998). *Doing Research in Business and Management*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Smith, A. (2003). The darkening shadow of stolen words. The Age, August 24.

Spender, D. (2003). Where's the disgrace if you cut and paste? The Australian, August 20.

Sunday [program transcript] (2003). The Newcastle plagiarism scandal. [verified 20 June 2004] http://sunday.ninemsn.com.au/sunday/political_transcripts/transcript_1352.asp

USyd (2003). Teaching and Learning Committee Agenda. [verified 20 June 2004] http://www.usyd.edu.au/su/ab/committees/TLCommittee/2003/Jul03_agenda.pdf

Zikmund, W. (1994). *Business research methods* (International Ed. ed.). Orlando, FL: The Dryden Press.

Zobel, J. and M. Hamilton (2002). Managing student plagiarism in large academic departments. Australian Universities Review, 45(2), 23-30. http://www.nteu.org.au/freestyler/gui/files/file3e24f50f9f1fd.pdf

# APPENDIX A

# Plagiarism Attitude Scale

**Directions:** This is an attitude scale, which measures how you feel about plagiarism. It is *not* a test with right and wrong answers. Please consider your honest opinions regarding the items and record your responses. Do *not* place your name on this scale. Your instructor may give you further instructions.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. Sometimes I feel tempted to plagiarize because so many other students are doing it. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 2. I believe I know accurately what constitutes plagiarism and what does not. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 3. Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the final exam ahead of time and memorizing the answers. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 4. If my roommate gives me permission to use his or her paper for one of my classes, I don't think there is anything wrong with doing that. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 5. Plagiarism is justified if the professor assigns too much work in the course. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 6. The punishment for plagiarism in college should be light because we are young people just learning the ropes. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 7. If a student buys or downloads free a whole research paper and turns it in unchanged with his or her name as the author, the student should | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 8. Plagiarism is against my ethical values. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 9. Because plagiarism involves taking another person's words and not his or her material goods, plagiarism is no big deal. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 10. It's okay to use something you have written in the past to fulfill a new assignment because you can't plagiarize yourself. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 11. If I lend a paper to another student to look at, and then that student turns it in as his or her own and is caught, I should not be punished also. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 12. If students caught plagiarizing received a special grade for cheating (such as an FP - Fail for Plagiarizing) on their permanent transcript, that policy would deter many from plagiarizing. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Harris, R. 2001, *The plagiarism handbook: strategies for preventing, detecting, and dealing with plagiarism*, Pyrczak Publishing, Los Angeles, CA.

## COPYRIGHT