

Copyright Breach: Notions, Aspects, and Keys

Nadia HAMIMED

Civil Engineering Department, Faculty of Technology
University of Abou Bekr Belkaid, Tlemcen, Algeria
Email: nadia.anglais@yahoo.fr

Received:10/18/2022

Accepted:01/04/2023

Published: 01/20/2023

Abstract

This paper aims to re-examine the scientific notions linked to plagiarism, its aspects and origins, its occurrence in society, and ways of ascertaining it to enhance the alertness and consciousness of teachers and learners of plagiarism. The objective of information yielding is the detection and finding of data and strengthening the individual conditions. By itself, plagiarism and employing different evil ways are not well-matched with this objective and purpose. A good number of scholarly researchers consent that plagiarism is a grave breach of issuing moral principles. In the latest decennaries, the knowledge-based body is truly worried about the rapid increase of plagiarism. Despite being prevalent, plagiarism is not coherent with the values and ethics of knowledge. Currently, certain mass media announce alarming reports of plagiarism within research-based issuings, comprising information usage by renowned researchers. The occurrence scale of plagiarism has been divulged in diverse inquiries and grows dissimilar in different spheres, nations, instructive extents, and eras. Effective prevention by employing appropriate directives at a convenient time, the proper communications between instructors and learners, and working out practical strategies, for this purpose, are attainable methods of undertaking plagiarism.

Keywords: Aspects, copyright breach, keys, notions, plagiarism

Cite as: HAMIMED, N. (2023). Copyright Breach: Notions, Aspects, and Keys. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Communication and Language in Virtual Spaces, January 2023*:177-188. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/comm1.14>

Introduction

Searching aims to bring in data, and the goal of bringing about information is to cultivate the person's circumstances, whereas examining through using dishonest or unethical ways guides scientific cheating, which is opposite to research-based creation. Undeniably, plagiarism is present in the scientific bulk despite being against basic knowledge-based principles. Plagiarism is unproductive, fruitless, unethical and, thus forbidden (DeVoss & Rosati, 2002). The legal ethos in culture joins the exciting parts of the relationship among individuals. Dishonest issues are quickly increasing in the domain of science. Henceforth, these issues in gathering facts, and alliances between scientists and publications will surely turn out to be more complicated to undertake.

The worldwide competition between the scientists of developing countries, especially Asian nations, is a current reality for western researchers who wish to be the former ones and the most outstanding in whole research areas. Researchers in developing countries are increasingly loving additional examination accounts, and this development has been accompanied by a governmental and conservative need for generated keys and more publications in methodologically attributed issuings. Plagiarism is a controversial topic in institutions of higher education, and it is increasingly widespread among students. Many taunts in university deeds result from the rise in the number of students (Roberts & Toombs, 1993).

If plagiarism becomes a common and regular activity, it will touch the well-being of science and damage the entire communal sphere. In this circumstance, no one will make an effort to do an investigation; instead, everyone will employ ready-made information made by previous scientists and will damage all facts. Such irrational actions will destroy the basis of scientific development and the whole thing. And if a nation mislays its solid scientific base, it will stay in previous accomplishments and will not come across as advancement.

Plagiarism is of the most severe issues in the University recently. In the latest years, the development in computer technology, i.e., management web pages to provide university help, followed by copy and paste tools, and many pre-manufactured articles, have led to an increase in plagiarism. Currently, some mass media reveal worrying accounts about plagiarism in scientific periodicals, including data management by renowned scientists. The values of research-based issuing are candidly related to the concepts of copyright in writing knowledge-based papers and concerning the violation of the patent. Sporadically, issuing editors deduce the skillfulness of authors for their lack of familiarity with issuing decrees.

The author of a book, paper, poem, or knowledge-based extract, goes along the daytime of developing a subject and puts down on paper the product of a life span of their continuous hard work. Of their own accord, the plagiarists do not only steal the writing of these efforts but also write down that product to their name. Plagiarism is not current however, due to the growth in information technology, it has got modern and different ways in opposition to the former era. Plagiarism was a relatively uncommon reality till 1990, yet it has expanded around the world in the previous years and has frightened the academic body (Hart & Friesner, 2004). In earlier times, several scholars acquiesced to data and some of them would not produce more than two articles in

their careers. Formerly, grave reevaluation values existed, and a small number of journals and scientists had trouble convincing the knowledge-based body to identify their ideas.

The problem in the 19th century was getting information, and that was the cause of why many results and productions have contended. Currently, nonetheless, scholars, students, issuings, and, papers have very much increased. If there was no problem with the growth in the number of documents, peer-reviewing the document is the main problem. It is undoubtedly presumed of analysis to master the subject of a piece. Nevertheless, are there enough specialists to reevaluate the significant number of articles? No specialist can corroborate that they have studied the whole expert articles in their area of knowledge, and this guides certain plagiarists to take advantage of the situations. In the early 17th century, the word plagiarism was initially litigated by Ben Jonson. It was extremely tough for authors to preserve their writing before founding copyright decrees. However, as plagiarism increased in the 18th century and copyright regulations were thus plainly named and established by the middle of a similar century, raiders tackled a change in society's opinion and strong ethical views concerning plagiarism. Given the happening of plagiarism in the Knowledge-based group and its destructive consequences on research-based growth, this article aims at analyzing the aspects, notions, and keys to the plagiarism issue. This study aims to re-examine the scientific ideas linked to plagiarism, its characteristics, and origins, its occurrence in society, and ways of ascertaining it to enhance the alertness and consciousness of teachers and learners of plagiarism.

Literature Review

Copyright Breach: An Overview

Copyright breach elicits a parcel of college exercises, both for makers and clients of copyright-protected fabric. In Canada, copyright is administered by Act Copyright. The Copyright Act was initially approved in 1921 and substantially revised in 1988 and 1997. The Copyright Act is presented through five main concepts: work, ownership, infringement, exceptions, and balance.

1. Work: Copyright concerns any “original scholarly, sensational, melodic and aesthetic work” (s.5(1) of the Act), subject to some specifications. Copyright ensures the first expression of thought instead of the idea itself. No copyright exists within the essential actualities, but there can be copyright security for the depiction, manifestation, or portrayal of those realities.

2. Ownership: In most cases, the creator or maker of a work is the first proprietor of the copyright (s.13(1) of the Act), and copyright is promptly upon the production of the work. For united origin, the proprietorship is allocated among the creators. In case you are the proprietor of the copyright in work, at that point, there are particular things that nobody else can do with that work unless you unequivocally allow it. These incorporate publishing, duplicating, distributing, conveying, acting, or passing on the piece or any significant parcel of the work (subject to certain exemptions). The proprietor (s) of copyright may dole out or permit their rights, in entirety or portion, through a composed understanding (s.13(4) of the Act).

3. Infringement: In case you're not the copyright proprietor of a given work and you are doing something with that work without the owner's authorization that regularly as it were, the owner can do beneath the Act, at that point, you're encroaching that owner's copyright (s.27(1) of the Act). Be that as it may, copyright encroachment isn't continuously dark and white. There are several circumstances, mainly including "exceptions," where much remains open to elucidation.

4. Exceptions: The Copyright Act presents the rights of proprietors, yet it also traces "user rights" via express exemptions. Some of these express exemptions to copyright encroachment relate to "educational institutions" (s.29.4) of the Act) in addition to "libraries, chronicles and historical centers in instructive institutions" (s.30.4) of the Act). There is as well a particular exemption that connects to works accessible on the web (s.30.04) of the Act). Be that as it may, "fair dealing" may be the foremost imperative source of client rights (s.29) of the Act. Fair managing pertains when the utilization of work falls inside an extent of particular reasons, counting "private study," "research," and "education," and in which some variables are fulfilled. In case your utilization of somebody else's copyright-protected work is seen as good managing, at that point that utilization does not infringe on copyright and, the proprietor's consent is not needed. Be, that as it may, whether or not a utilization is a reasonable management may be a question of elucidation.

Some Preeminent Court of Canada choices has given direction on deciding what tallies as proper managing. Yet, these choices have too clarified that deciding the decency of coping with copyright-protected fabric is ideally executed on a case-by-case premise. Further particularities approximately suitable management will take after in an afterward post.

5. Balance: There exists a couple of challenging series of rights that copyright law endeavors to maintain in poise. The Copyright Act characterizes the rights of makers and proprietors, yet it moreover diagrams the exemptions that frame the premise for the rights of clients. This adjustment ponders the genuine conspiracy in suitably securing the financial rights of makers with the open intrigue in permitting a few restricted utilize of copyright-protected works by clients. Keeping up this adjustment is crucial to elucidation in copyright law.

Recognition of these five key concepts ought to assist both makers and clients of copyright-protected materials to consider their rights. Copyright statutes have been set up to assist the open intrigued, which is ideally achieved when clients get it and regard the reasonable rights of makers and when makers get it and regard the sensible rights of clients.

Plagiarism, on the other hand, is an infringement of academic integrity. The Persian dictionary of Dekhoda characterizes the word "steal" as robbing someone's ownership with double-dealing and traps or taking hold of something without the proper to do so. The term plagiarization starts from the term "plagiarise," meaning ruffian, cheat, cheater, and academic

outlaw. Copyright infringement, for the most part, indicates victimizing contemplations or terms which are prevalent to the degree of society data (Fialkoff, 1993).

Plagiarism implies the use of tools from unknown sources, or citation of materials from reported references, and not acknowledging that the words have been stolen word by word from those references. Copyright breach is taking others' thoughts, words, or work as if they were yours. Scott Stebelman perceives plagiarism as "claiming as your own the writings and research papers that originally belong to others" (Stebelman, 1998, pp. 48-50). Karim Vessal and Farrokh Habibzadeh define it as "ascribing others' ideas, processes, results, and words to oneself without due acknowledgment" (Vessal & Habibzadeh, 2007, p. 641).

Utilizing sections from print writing with modest changes within the terms without conceding the beginning is also an illustration of literary theft. Using not-in-print pictures without the proprietors' assent is also considered academic theft. Literary theft is a shameless activity in research-based writing. Plagiarization can occur in assorted shapes: ransacking considerations and taking pieces of sections. Self-plagiarism happens when an author utilizes his individual once in past printed composing without recognizing this truth (Dellavalle, Banks, & Ellis, 2007). The self-copyright breach is portrayed in three diverse strategies within the relevant writing:

- 1) Publishing a paper that crosses a modern work without acknowledging it.
- 2) Isolating an enormous portion of work into some modest parts and publishing them one by one.
- 3) Re-publishing the indistinguishable work.

Obvious, on the other hand, means progressing data and supportive expressions via providing limited period security for journalists and manifestations employing full privileges concerning their work and developments. Journalists of analytical work are requested to convey the obvious of their jobs to the editor or the diary. Analysts' veracity depends on earnestness and clarity in giving and transferring data (Hayes, 2005).

Publishing results is distributing the indistinguishable discoveries in a few or a few issuings, various computations of the break-even with answers within the ponder and thus in grave deficiencies within the investigation. Antiquated distributions happen when closeness exists, without recognizing it, among one or two publications as to their results about data, reasons, or keys. It may contain coordination with assist scholars, their results, or their models. The foremost critical and severe occasions incorporate the nonattendance of recognizing the beginnings. Most scholarly analysts concur that copyright infringement could be a genuine issue within the morals of distribution. Literary theft shows up in numerous shapes: taking thoughts and taking writings, (word-by-word plagiarism). Plagiarism is no doubt an occasion of wrongdoing. Taking a portion of the content and rethinking it may be an extreme issue within the humanities and writing where development in stating and persuasiveness are essential. But within the domain of science, it is the logical substance itself, not its expert articulation, which is important. Knowledge-based

distributions point to some degree different from the non-research-based ones. For illustration, therapeutic distributions are issued to improve restorative science and community physical condition by putting out the discoveries of the knowledge-based consider. In some areas like writing and social sciences, differing scholars have disparate suppositions. Creators endeavor to duplicate their comprehension and assumptions of wordings through a choice of predominant and fitting terms. Hence, each word, with its coordinated foundation, claims a position in communicating the noteworthiness to the group of onlookers. (Hayes, 2005)

In any case, in scholarly writing, the writer's perusers involve scholastics looking for data established on real verification. Hence, the author is expected to see and donate an account precisely. Unlike scholarly researchers, a research-based distribution author ought to seek a specific and well-recognized research-based way and affirm that he will not be affected in his decisions since it can put in peril the genuineness or consistency of the discoveries. Subsequently, on the off chance that or not the writer is influential, to the degree he is, as it were, an onlooker whose paper is established on built-up knowledge-based ways, confirmation, and truth, he can publish his answers about and might be expressed to have sought after a by and prominent typical manner

Plagiarism, on the whole, involves attaching someone else's writing to yourself and not providing acknowledgment to the original writer, duplicating somebody else's thoughts or terms, not offering acclaim to the author, without inserting quotation punctuations, presenting false data concerning credentials, altering the words at the same time maintaining the arrangement of a passage from a different basis and not recognizing it, and reproducing a big number of terms or thoughts from different sources with or with no due credit to the authors. (Maurer, Kappe, & Zaka, 2006).

One more description of plagiarism calculates the methods of plagiarizing with: "copy-past" which suggests duplicating word for word, copying thoughts, which involves hiring a notion that is not usually recognized, paraphrasing, which signifies altering the syntactic arrangement, employing equivalences, reorganizing the initial passages, or writing again the identical matter in distinct wording, creative copying, which implies submitting others' writings by utilizing a dissimilar means like passage, tone, or picture, reproducing cyphers, specifically, employing further plan' cyphers, data and meanings without the accurate authorization or sources, utilizing disused links, inserting citations punctuations or further sources marks and not giving the true source data, wrong utilization of quote signs, not acknowledging the cited passages of a passage, false referencing, that is, inserting bad sources data or sources which are not real and copying by translating, which involve a translation of a quote and not proving the source to the initial passage.

Some examples of learners' plagiarism are the following: taking data from a basis and attributing it as their information, for example, purchasing a preordered writing, plagiarizing a whole work and not identifying it, displaying other learner's paper without informing them,

exhibiting another student's writing and ascribing the article as his work, reproducing ideas of a couple of passages and giving the correct quotations and not utilizing citation signs to render the person who reads think that they have rephrased the information without citing them, and summarizing phrases from different origins and acknowledging them (Park, 2003).

Identifying plagiarism is confronted with several issues. Among the issues is distinguishing the quantity of plagiarism since it can wrap a broad range. Another issue is the query as to what extent the modification in the initial data can cause plagiarism (Roig, 2001). Roig states that a lot of learners strive between paraphrasing and recapitulating since they are unable to make the difference between them. The further problem is that the majority of writers consider that they do not need to give the source of general information; however, one may inquire what ordinary information is and who describes this knowledge.

Two kinds of plagiarism can be identified relating to purposes. Number one is intended plagiarism, in which the writer is entirely conscious of copying and desires to commit it. Number two is unintended plagiarism in which someone copies because he is not good at writing. Such a kind could be averted (Park, 2004). Further categorization, there are four classifications of plagiarism,

- 1) Accidental plagiarism, which occurs because of a lack of awareness of plagiarism, or insufficient understanding of referencing or citation;"
- 2) unintentional plagiarism, where, due to the wide amount of knowledge in the scientific area, a person may unknowingly present ideas similar to those of others;"
- 3) intentional plagiarism, where a person deliberately and knowingly copies part or all of somebody else's work without giving credit to them; and
- 4) self-plagiarism consists of reusing one's published work in a different form without acknowledging it.

(Maurer et al. 2006, pp. 1050-1084)

These types are further explained as the following:

- Intentional plagiarism is the word-for-word translation of a field of somebody else's work without attribution and citation marks. They consider literary theft of somebody else's work unscrupulous, scholastically untrustworthy, and grounds for disciplinary activities, counting removal. (Maurer, Kappe, & Zaka, 2006).
- Self-plagiarism happens when a learner submits their claim of past work or blends parts of past results, without consent from all teachers included. For case, it would be unsatisfactory to consolidate a portion of a term paper you composed in tall school into a paper doled out in a college course. Self-plagiarism applies to submitting the same piece of work for assignments in entirely different classes without past consent from both teachers. (Maurer et al., 2006).

- Unintentional plagiarism happens when a student borrows expressions from a source without utilizing citation marks or finding equivalent words for the author's dialect while keeping to the same standard structure and meaning as the first. Some of the time called "patchwriting," this kind of rewording, whether purposefulness or not, is scholastically untrustworthy and culpable – indeed, in case you reference your source. (Maurer et al., 2006).
- Accidental literary theft happens when an individual ignores to quote their sources or misrepresents their head, or inadvertently summarizes a source by utilizing similar words, bunches of words, and, or sentence structure without attribution. Learners must learn how to quote their references, and to require cautious and precise notes when doing investigations. The need for aim does not absolve the understudy of obligation for plagiarization. Cases of inadvertent plagiarization are taken as indeed, as any other plagiarization and are subject to the same results as different sorts of plagiarization. (Maurer et al., 2006).Aspects of Copyright Breach

Peter Ashworth states that plagiarism is so ambiguous that many learners are frightened of unintentional plagiarism at the same time as writing what they consider to be their thoughts (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne, 1997) Investigations reveal that learners' and instructors' dissimilar comprehensions of copyright breaches. For specific instructors, particular meanings are affected by university ethics like the patent, individual exertion, and union in higher education (Flint, Clegg, & Macdonald, 2006). The increase of data, within the entire of its advantages, has as well produced a fast escalation in plagiarism.

Many aspects influencing learners' approaches concerning copyright breach are unawareness, the need for the individual asset in their instruction, circumstantial values, and the need for reliable methods surrounded by and in various fields (Auer & Krupar, 2001). Other aspects provoking copyright breaches are weak engagement in the knowledge procedure and concentrating on obtaining a university level, the learner's living way, relatives' weights, etc., are among the reasons that push learners to attempt to obtain the highest scores with no effort and within no time (Macdonald, 2000). Previously, learners used books in libraries to get back knowledge and rewrite it. Nowadays and with the fast advance of the web, the such procedure has altered, and most instructors think that laptops have facilitated cheating and copyright breaches. Shelley Angellil-Carter states that transparency does not exist on aspects affecting plagiarism all over a college. Knowledge is effortlessly easy to get through the Internet, and text-treating applications can be done with no trouble plagiarizing data (Grover, 2003)

In certain nations, a heavyweight is on scholars to issue, i.e., they must publish their work in journals with great influence features or other globally cataloged journals. Otherwise, they will not be upgraded despite owning elevated educational abilities. Thus, several researchers may

commit principled errors because of such conditions to advance and speed up with issuing. Literary problems are mainly taken into account in the issue of copyright breaches.

Deceiving and copyright are tolerable actions among instructors and learners of nations in which little consciousness of plagiarism exists. An investigation shows that learners with greater confidence in identifying copyright breaches do this less than other students and happen to own superior writing talents, self-assurance, and inventiveness (Martin, 2005). Learners' search for rapid cuts, their weak attention to the study topic, their weak scheduling abilities, misconduct of time, their need for skillfulness in research-based writing, and their notice in disregarding rules are the causes of why learners commit copyright breaches.

Another investigation reveals that among the most causes of why learners commit copyright breaches are the following:

1. An actual shortage of comprehension. Some learners copy involuntarily, for example, if they are unfamiliar with correct methods of citing, rewording, citing, and referring to or/and if the significance of 'ordinary information' and the phrase 'in their personal wording' is not clear to them.
2. Competence reward. Learners commit plagiarism to obtain a superior position and to gain time.
3. Schedule organization. Many calls are on learners' management of time, comprising friends' pressure for a dynamic community living, engagement in university activities, relatives' duties, and weight to finish diverse work exercises in a brief period. Thus, it is not surprising that Silverman (2002) wraps up that learners' overburdened existence makes them so weak to commit plagiarism.
4. Individual principles/approaches. Specific earners see that there is no motive why they must not commit copyright breach or commit it as a result of community weight since they feel good doing it, or for the reason that they consider small cuts as intelligent and tolerable.
5. Disobedience. For many learners, a copyright breach is a concrete method of revealing opposition and conveying disrespect for authority. The student may as well see the mission given as not significant and not defying.
6. Learners' approaches towards instructors and classroom. Many learners plagiarize since they have unenthusiastic methods toward activities and exercises that instructors believe have significance, but do not matter to the student (Howard, 2002).
7. Refusal or renunciation. Other learners refuse to think that they are plagiarizing or find means of codifying it by putting the guilt on others.

8. Inticement and occasion. It is more straightforward and enticing for learners to cheat because knowledge turns out to be easier to get on the net and web search means to render it effortless and faster to locate and plagiarize.

9. Shortage of prevention. According to some learners, the advantages of copying are more important than the dangers, especially if they are sure that there is a tiny or no possibility of being detected, and if so, there is a minor reprimand (Park, 2003).

A number of the apparent obstructions to altering the organization of copyright breach are: an unwillingness by personnel to treat a situation of assumed plagiarizing because of the time and amount of work comprised in verifying cheating; an unwillingness to be the only one who has the guts to disagree where it has been to some extent frequent run through to be silent to specific relatively slight occurrences of copying; an insight that the University is unwilling to proceed on alleged copyright breach and that consequently the exertion used by personnel is probable to be unproductive with regards to deterring or penalizing copying; a concern of endangering friendly rapports with learners by appearing or being strict by a concentration on reducing copyright breach; a fear that persuing through with occurrences of recurring copying which can guide to learner ejection might harm the worldwide status of the university; and a additional unease that this harm to quality can bring about decreased worldwide staffings; fright of pestering from the learner(s) indicted of copying or/and from their classmates; concern of learners' protests if charges of copyright breach are comitted, this can be a problem for certain sessional personnel who were worried that a student protest may signify being fired from their job.

Keys to Avoid Copyright Breach

1. Understand the directives for writers given by the journal.
2. Never forget to recognize the parts and involvement of others and the origins of thoughts and terms if they are reworded or abridged.
3. Utilization of literal or word-for-word passage/data must be surrounded by citation punctuations.
4. Recognize the origins employed in the publication.
5. While rewording, comprehend the information entirely and paraphrase what you have understood.
6. If you are unsure if the idea or data is general information, you must reference such knowledge.
7. Check and proofread references to be sure they are accurate.
8. Provided that the answers of one multifaceted research are best produced like a unified totality, the work should not be divided into various distinct papers.
9. When handing over work for publication having problematic/theory, approaches, information, debates, or deductions that have previously been issued or circulated critically (for instance, already printed as a paper in a distinct journal or as an article published on the web), warn the copyholders and the persons who read. Copyholders should be notified in the motivation letter, and readers should be updated by emphasizing and referring to the former printed publication.

10. When handing over work for possible publication, in case of distrusts or hesitation about repetition or replication of a document coming from identical research, the writers should update the copyholders of the kind of the product and include the other works (printed, in the media/handed over, unprinted) that may belong to them an article under deliberation. Increasing previous information that was already brought out with new extra information and introducing it like original research can be a moral violation and should be entirely divulged to the copyholders.
11. Write effective cover letters to the editor, especially regarding the potential for overlap in publication. The cover letter should detail the nature of the overlap and previous dissemination and ask for advice on the handling of the matter.
12. Be acquainted with the fundamental aspects of patent rules.

Moral issues in science are rapidly augmenting and have become contentious problems in colleges and instructive study institutions. These issues have as well been mirrored in mass media reports lately. The development of knowledge automation, the rivalry between nations, the fast expansion of information, and the express increase of based-research journals, the need for excellent illumination of copyright breaches and diverse comprehension of it, the need for consciousness, misuse of time, and weak culture, etc., have entirely been a factor to the occurrence of copying in the scientific area. This has concerned scientific universities and has pushed them to respond to it.

Conclusion

This study has examined the scientific notions linked to plagiarism, its aspects and origins, its occurrence in society, and, ways of ascertaining it to enhance the alertness and consciousness of teachers and learners of plagiarism. So far, the results have generally indicated that several institutions concentrate on finding out and hounding, whereas others focus on avoidance and instructing the correct action. Constant pressure on uncovering copyright breaches has made for the growth of information recovery methods in the current time. Still, these are not sufficiently efficient, and even if they existed, they would not be the greatest keys. Efficient deterrence employing appropriate instructions at the right time, the proper communications between instructors and learners, and working out suitable strategies for this purpose are possible ways of undertaking plagiarism.

About the Author:

Dr. Nadia HAMIMED is a lecturer at the Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Technology, Tlemcen University. She holds a Ph.D. in Comparative Literature. She has more than two publications in international peer-reviewed journals and wrote in two international books. She participated in more than six global communications and twelve national conferences. Her research fields are didactics, women's writing, culture, and comparative literature. 0000-0002-6379-8465

References

- Ashworth, P. and Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1998). "Guilty in whose eyes?" University students perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381034>

- Auer N. J., & Krupar E. M. (2001). Mouse click plagiarism: The role of technology in plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it. *Library Trends*, 49 (3), 415-432.
- Blum, S. D. (2009). *My Word! Plagiarism and Academic College Culture*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Blum, S. D. (2016). What it means to be a student today. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity*. (pp.1055-1073). Singapore: Springer.
- Dellavalle, R., Banks, M. A., & Ellis J.I. (2007). Frequently asked questions regarding self-plagiarism: How to avoid recycling fraud. *Journal of J Am Acad Dermatol*, 57(3), 527. Doi: 10.1016/j.jaad.2007.05.018
- DeVoss D., & Rosati A. (2002). "It wasn't me, was it?" *The Journal of Plagiarism and the Web. Computers and Composition*, 19, 191-203.
- Fialkoff, F. (1993). There's no excuse for plagiarism. *Library Journal*, 28(5), 471-488.
- Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring Staff Perceptions of Student Plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30(2), 145-156.
- Grover, D. (2003). Plagiarism and the internet: the use of correlation techniques to detect plagiarism. *Journal of Computer Law and Security Report*, 19(10), 6-8.
- Hart, M., & Friesner, T. (2004). Plagiarism and poor academic practice—a threat to the extension of e-learning in higher education? *Electronic Journal on learning*, 2(1), 89-96.
- Hayes, N., & Inrona L. (2005). Cultural values, plagiarism, and fairness: When plagiarism gets in the way of learning. *The Journal of Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213-231.
- Howard, R. M. (2016). Plagiarism in Higher Education: An Academic Literacies Issue? – Introduction. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 499-501). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_70
- Macdonald, R. (2000). Why don't we turn the tide of plagiarism to the learners' advantage? *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com>
- Martin, D. F. (2005). Plagiarism and technology: A tool for coping with plagiarism. *The Journal of Education for Business*, 80(3), 149-152.
- Maurer, H., Kappe, F., & Zaka, B. (2006). Plagiarism—a survey. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 12(8), 1050-1084. DOI: 10.3217/jucs-012-08-1050
- Pakjou, A., Izadi, M., Masoudipour Sh., & Fazel M. (2011). The pattern of travel medicine ethics in international cooperation programs. *Journal of Military Medicine*. 13 (2), 117-123
- Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students in literature and lessons. *Journal of Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (5), 471-488.
- Roberts M. D., & Toombs, R. (1993). A scale to assess perceptions of cheating in examination-related situations. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 755-62.
- Roig, M. (2011). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Journal of Ethics & Behavior*, 4(3), 307-323.
- Stebelman, S. (1998). Cyber cheating: Dishonesty goes digital. *Journal of American Libraries*, 29(8), 48-50.
- Silverman, G., (2002). It's a bird, a plane, and it's Plagiarism, Buster! *Newsweek*, 40 (3), 12.
- Vessal, K., & Habibzadeh F. (2007). Rules of the game of scientific writing: fair play and plagiarism. *The Journal of The Lancet*, 369(9562), 641-576. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(07)60307-9.