

## CHARACTER-BASED PERCEPTIONS OF PLAGIARISM IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING: A STUDY OF ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION LECTURERS

Endis Firdaus<sup>1\*</sup>, Aceng Kosasih<sup>1</sup>, Makhmud Syafe'i<sup>1</sup>, Alwan Husni Ramdani<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Nurfaizi Arya Rahardja<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Email: [endisf@upi.edu](mailto:endisf@upi.edu)

Received: January, 2025. Accepted: May, 2025. Published: June, 2025.

### ABSTRACT

Plagiarism remains a significant challenge in academic writing, especially in higher education contexts where scholarly integrity is paramount. This study aims to analyze the experiences of Islamic Religious Education (IRE) lecturers as researchers and authors in developing anti-plagiarism awareness and ethical writing practices. Drawing upon key factors related to plagiarism identified in prior literature, this study explores participants' character-based awareness and perceptions of plagiarism. A qualitative research design was employed, involving purposive sampling and data collection through artifact analysis and semi-structured interviews. The findings reveal that participants demonstrate varying levels of understanding and internalization of anti-plagiarism values shaped by personal character, institutional support, and academic norms. These insights offer practical recommendations for fostering academic integrity and emphasize the role of character education in developing ethically responsible scholars. The study contributes to the discourse on plagiarism prevention by highlighting the intersection between character formation and scholarly writing in religious education settings.

Keywords: Academic Crime, Plagiarism, Theft of Academic Works

### INTRODUCTION

Plagiarism has been used as an academic war drum with the rise of publishing and the seriousness of academics in eradicating this crime. In various parts of the world, research reports have been published by researchers who deliberately put up bodies against it, especially activists publishing academic scientific papers at various levels of international society. It can be categorized as almost representative of the existing part of the continent. As in the southernmost part of the world, Australia and New Zealand (Adam et al., 2016; Curtis et al., 2018), Asia including Indonesia (Adiningrum, 2015; Husain et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2019; Perkins, 2018). Representing Europe, such as Germany (Jaric, 2015), France (Mariani et al., 2017), and Russia (Mazov et al., 2016). As for Africa, Malawi (Selemani et al., 2018) and Mauritius (Dawka, 2016). Most research found is in the Americas (Bruton & Rachal, 2015; Moritz et al., 2015; Eaton, 2017; Sánchez-Vega et al., 2017).

Collaborative research between countries has also been carried out in several regions such as China-Pakistan on plagiarism program detection (Ullah et al., 2018), Germany-Serbia in plagiarism detection system research (Jaric, 2015), Singapore-USA-Korea on plagiarism involved learning evaluation (Kashian et al., 2015), Mexico, Spain, and Greece, in paraphrase identification research (Sánchez-Vega et al., 2017), Estonia-Helsinki-Finland on the concept and problem of plagiarism academic writing (Löfström et al., 2017), and Australian-Czech research on Student Perception Policy on Plagiarism in Higher Education: A Comparison of the UK, Czechia, Poland and Romania (Mahmud et al., 2018).

The theory of writing scientific papers has developed in such a way that its progress has given rise to prohibited actions carried out by writers in the form of plagiarism, palimpsest, and intertextuality that are difficult to separate. How different, however, intertextual borrowing to copy someone else's work and make it your own is an act for supposedly creative writing that teachers teach their students because it is generally intertext composition work borrowed, sampled, 'internalized,' 'bower birded' from other works. It occurs as a text 'mosaic of citations' as well as the idea of text in Roland Barthes' conclusions as a new network of past citations and explores the fine line between plagiarism, palimpsest, and intertextuality (Williams, 2015). At the same time, other research writings take inspiration from literary theory to analyze cases of scholarly cases that discuss the standard formulation of sensemaking methodologies taken and conclude that we need to rethink our tolerance for sensing styles and reaffirm our commitment to more traditional academic constraints (Basbøll, 2010).

Today's advancement of effective use of digital technology is essential for full inclusion in the Internet society. Digital researchers have produced several key frameworks, but these generally do not incorporate a social-contextual perspective. To explore this void and engage in effective theorizing action, activity theory is used to conceptualize digitally mediated action (Blayone, 2019) and research theory empirical studies by concluding that educators should adopt supportive approaches to motivate students to act consistently, ethically in their academic lives (Guo, 2011). Because computer technology and the Internet now make plagiarism easier. As a result, educational institutions should be more diligent in their efforts to reduce academic integrity practices, with findings showing that plagiarism and acceptance of responsibility to prevent it are important in reducing the problem (Heckler et al., 2013).

Theorizing with management in the seemingly ubiquitous issue of plagiarism in higher education (Pàmies et al., 2019), plagiarism has been flagged as a 'major problem' for universities. So (Stuhmcke et al., 2015) concluded his findings that the de-dichotomy of the current polarity of plagiarism would open up space for alternative considerations in dealing with plagiarism positively in an institutional context. IRE lecturers have an important role in providing Islamic moral examples to their students, including the ethics of writing scientific papers. They become absolute anti-plagiarism characters as academics who are obliged to make research ethics the soul and attitude that is firmly attached to them. IRE, taught by lecturers in Indonesia, has strong roots as the promotion of awareness on plagiarism continuously in student behavior and ethics is an obligation of Higher Education Institutions because plagiarism is more prevalent among students because lack of awareness of plagiarism ethics makes their ethics bad (Prashar et al., 2023). Therefore, even with theory and practice that has developed rapidly in such research, research that focuses on the results of special character analysis in religious researchers in Islamic moral ethics has not been widely studied, so this article can contribute to studies on IRE lecturers in Indonesia by taking the issue of plagiarism of scientific paper reports and their implications in line with the development of computerized application technology with the Internet.

Therefore, even with the theory and practice that have developed rapidly in such research, research that focuses on the results of special character analysis on researchers in the field of religion in Islamic moral ethics has not been widely studied, so this article can contribute to the study of Islamic Religious Education lecturers in Indonesia by taking the issue of plagiarism in scientific work reports and its implications in line with the development of computerized application technology with the Internet. Various research on plagiarism in various parts of the world that we mentioned above has not shown any research that has academic, religious, and moral nuances in the form of striking lecturer characters from Islamic Religious Education. This study gap seeks to fill that emptiness so that it can further stimulate the spirit of more research in this field of study.

## METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach design with purposive samples conducted to access participants' experiences and perceptions. Critical analysis of content is used to help identify the main character traits of lecturers who write scientific papers and research reports with the aim of outlining relevant interpretations, clarifying, and providing support against anti-plagiarism by finding their special character in the face of scientific papers. This research took place in 40 universities that obtained research funds for R&D of Religious Education and Religious Higher Education of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, located on Java Island and Outside Java Island in Indonesia, each of which 10 of these divisions. Participants consisted of one IRE lecturer each (as a lead researcher) from each university. Participants' ages ranged from 36 to 55, with an average age of 40.5 years—gender: five females and 35 males. Research participation after reporting research articles is submitted to the Research and Development Institute for Religious Education and Religious Higher Education of the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia and is voluntary and anonymous. Documents obtained by researchers from the funding institution in the form of data documents artifacts of articles that are observed, reviewed, and analyzed. This study used the following two data collection instruments: (a) Bandura Self-Efficacy Scale for Independent Learning (Bandura, 1990) and (b) Self-report survey regarding lecturers' perceptions and experiences with plagiarism. Both parameters, as with many other self-report instruments, certainly have limitations, and the most notable is that the results depend entirely on the honesty of participants in response to such actions. Participants were asked to assess their perceived ability to use various strategies for writing scientific papers in research report articles.

All participants were interviewed to voluntarily report their perceptions and experiences of plagiarism in the scientific work they reported regarding the important factors of plagiarism. Research on this information collection about lecturers' awareness of anti-plagiarism forms their best character. Self-efficacy prediction is used and relied upon to determine the elements that contribute to the formation of good character performance of participants. Adopting the perception of respondents' ability to act as researchers using Bandura (1986). According to him, this self-efficacy plays a significant role in influencing individual character activities. Assessing a person's ability to perform a role based on his target ability is the theory of self-efficacy. The next research development, Marsden et al. (2005), stated that working seriously and evaluating the relationship between plagiarism and other elements, such as self-esteem and self-efficacy, including character, is found and used.

The research utilizes the recommendation Torracco (2005) in levels to analyze integrative literature review in selective categories and the best structure classification to regulate the determinants of plagiarism in this scientific work. This framework describes the determinant framework in the process depicted in Figure 1 in the flow of the procedures we do. In line with the journey of plagiarism, actions can occur due to triggering factors that stimulate plagiarism to be carried out or vice versa. How the determination of the Decision on the plagiarism procedure ensnares the perpetrators can be focused on research that proves the sophistication of this prohibited academic crime. Especially if done by lecturers who know each other fall into similar plagiarism activities (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; 1997; Jordan, 2001).



confusion about the definition of plagiarism, which in turn suggests that the practice of plagiarism may be more widespread than reported by participants.

From the aspect of cognition about plagiarism and writing academic works, in general, participants admitted that they already knew the basics. However, to prove the ability of ethics to write academic works in reality and the ability of cognition to use it in the writing of research reports, respondents were analyzed between their article artifact documents and their perceptions of plagiarism. It found irrelevance between the recognition of cognition and their written reality in his written work. Evidently, their academic resources are concerning. After deepening the excavation of cognition, the participants generally do not have experience reading critically in the field of writing academic papers, writing ethics, and guidelines for writing academic papers from each institution. When they wrote the research report article, participants did not pay much attention to the guidelines or style of writing as they should. As confirmed in his follow-up interview in the process of writing the article, from three samples taken, only one from Java Island knew the various styles of intercircle he knew. However, this knowledge is not necessarily used in the work process. However, it is more likely to see articles that have been written before, such as their articles as academic requirements for graduation from their alma mater, and imitate the style of counseling that already exists in previous works in their environment.

For example, the data is shown, among others: three artifact analyses, the following articles are titled, respectively: (a) Diversity Attitude of Students in Integrated Islamic Schools with the name of the researcher disguised, (b) Islamic Boarding Schools and Reasoning Moderation: Tracing the Construction of the Islamic Boarding School Curriculum with the name of the researcher disguised, (c) Social Construction of Moderate Islam Jamaah Maiyah Mocopat Intercession Against the Millennial Generation in Yogyakarta with the name of the researcher disguised.

The purposive sample used for these three articles is intended to find the perception of the character of IRE lecturers from the analysis of certain choices in line with the geographical and socio-cultural location that represents the urban character of Java Island as the largest cultural center of population in Indonesia, from outside Java which is relatively less influenced by urban cultural character, and from the capital of the country as its largest metropolitan. This difference in sample choices is expected to represent the character studied. The researchers found something that could prove the participants' characteristics of their work. With the differences in the characteristics of IRE lecturers from each socio-cultural background and geographical location, unique data can be found that can be collected.

The analysis of the first document, viewed from the article aspect, reveals a lack of critical thinking, primarily due to insufficient academic references and improper adherence to scholarly writing conventions. Instances of plagiarism were identified, notably through the omission of source attribution and the failure to include cited materials in the bibliography. Of the 38 listed references, only eight were peer-reviewed journal articles, indicating a significant imbalance and overreliance on outdated or irrelevant sources, many of which exceeded the acceptable currency threshold of seven years. Furthermore, more than eight entries in the bibliography were either not cited in the text or vice versa, suggesting potential academic dishonesty. The reference list was dominated by books, with minimal inclusion of empirical research or journal-based literature.

From a cognitive and theoretical standpoint, the manuscript fails to demonstrate the current state of research in the field. Citations and referencing practices were neither methodologically sound nor ethically appropriate, highlighting substantial issues of academic misconduct. Most in-text citations could not be traced to the reference list, further reinforcing plagiarism concerns. Although a methodology section is present, including design elements and

field-based primary sources, the actual research implementation does not align with the described design. This misalignment undermines the validity of the research and obscures the connection between the chosen methods and the study's empirical reality.

Additionally, the manuscript lacks a clear articulation of the significance of the research field, fails to identify existing research gaps, and does not offer a critical review of prior studies. The stated objectives do not adequately reflect the study's outcomes, and the absence of a comparative discussion section limits the depth of analysis. Ultimately, the quality and coherence of the findings are compromised by poor citation practices, a lack of theoretical innovation, and the inclusion of irrelevant illustrative materials—factors that collectively diminish the academic contribution of the work.

Furthermore, this study critically examined the article in terms of originality and critical engagement with existing scholarship to assess its academic novelty. The analysis revealed that the study's orientation was primarily constructed around its title, abstract, and introduction, yet it lacked substantial evidence of critical thinking, as indicated by the insufficient use of relevant and up-to-date academic references. Of the 33 citations listed, only four were journal articles appropriate for scholarly referencing, while many sources were outdated or lacked relevance to the field. Additionally, over 17 citations were identified as potentially plagiarized, given their absence in the reference list, suggesting a serious deviation from accepted academic citation standards.

The literature review failed to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical and developmental context of the research area, and improper citation practices further undermined the scholarly integrity of the work. Although the research method section presented an acceptable structure, it relied heavily on secondary sources rather than primary methodological literature, indicating an indirect engagement with foundational research. The article also lacked a substantive discussion of its findings in relation to previous studies, thereby failing to establish its contribution to the existing body of knowledge or present clear implications for practice.

Moreover, the quality of the findings was compromised by limited originality in theoretical application and the presence of repeated expressions that closely mirrored other works without appropriate attribution. This pervasive issue of improper referencing and possible plagiarism severely affected the credibility and academic value of the article. While some coherent arguments related to the study's scope were identified, the inadequate integration of current and relevant literature weakened the overall scientific rigor and the potential for the article to contribute meaningfully to the academic discourse.

The analysis of the article's critical perspective and originality—particularly in the Title, Abstract, and Introduction sections—revealed a lack of critical engagement with relevant scholarship. The absence of sufficient and high-quality references hindered the depth of the literature review and failed to meet academic standards for scholarly work. From the 33 citations provided, only four were peer-reviewed journal articles, with the remainder being largely outdated or irrelevant, as most exceeded the recommended five-year publication window for currency in scholarly references. Furthermore, over 17 citations were identified as potentially plagiarized due to their absence in the bibliography, indicating serious breaches in academic integrity and referencing practices.

The Literature Review section did not demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of current theoretical and developmental debates in the field, nor did it reflect the state-of-the-art. The analysis suggests that the referencing practices were inaccurate and that a significant portion of the text may involve uncredited borrowing, undermining the scientific credibility of the work. In the Methodology section, the reliance on secondary sources was evident, even though primary methodological references were accessible and would have strengthened the study's

rigor. Although the Findings, Discussion, and Conclusions sections hinted at the potential for original contributions to the field, this potential remains underdeveloped due to the absence of robust support from recent and relevant literature.

Ultimately, the prevalence of inadequate citations and suspected plagiarism throughout the manuscript compromises its scholarly value. The article lacks adherence to standard academic writing conventions and fails to provide a reliable contribution to the field due to insufficient referencing, poor citation practices, and limited evidence of original critical insight.

The explanation of the contents of the three artifacts of the Target Article is about the following: First, with regard to the first title, it is found that the keywords that have been obtained regarding religious attitudes are quite clear, but in the second article there are those related to the sake of a better research code of ethics by not mentioning the specifics of the institution concerned, but it will be enough to disguise it with such an example word: " ... in one of the Pesantren in Indonesia"; likewise for the third article with enough mention in one of the provinces in Indonesia. Second, regarding the Abstracts in the three articles discussed, the three abstracts have not fulfilled the Abstract Component such as, among others, not meeting what is the need for this research, as well as its advantages, Process, and Completeness of Research Methods, Results / Conclusions, and the implementation of subsequent research. Third, its relation to keywords still seems to be just cutting up titles, but it should be a search tool that may be in the form of concepts, theories, jargon, names, and/or issues that are actually needed.

As for the Preamble, the article does not describe the relationship with the international academic world by writing about international issues (the last five years) from which countries' research reports have been held. Then, as a gap to find the problem, it should state the research that will be carried out by the researcher concerned in what case so as to find the research problem. Then, in the sub-study of Theoretical Studies or other terms, it is still necessary to find issues of theory, concepts, and/or discourses that have been found by researchers by whom and in any country until researchers find gaps with it that will be used by researchers in their research. In the discussion of Research Methods/Methodology, that discussion requires research design, and it is found that the discussion in the three articles is still only about the name and definition. What is needed is for the steps and process of the method to be carried out with the steps included in the analysis of the discussion. Only then are the steps carried out known as the steps of whose theory and what? Therefore, the most extended discussion in writing articles with analysis must be in this discussion, such as not explaining the narrative of his research design and the process of taking or collecting data until his findings. No less important in the discussion of the results of the research is the use of the sub-discussion of the "discussion" under study, which does not include any narrative that discusses the collection of material data discussed above to obtain findings and conclusions.

### **Contextual Determinants and Lecturers' Perceptions of Plagiarism**

As seen in Figure 1, the determinants of plagiarism can be formed from various things related to the author and the policies of the relevant Institution. Whether or not it occurs is recommended by analyzing the emergence of the plagiarism determinant itself and whether it will occur or not. However, if it occurs, are there any signs of evidence that can be detected, then how to solve it, what actions can be taken through various factors in the context of experiences that are aware of their cultural life, their legal position, to using various technological devices to help the necessary Solutions. The treatment required for this research objective is an integrative approach that provides space for analyzing conceptual and empirical literature, as Whittemore and Knafl (2005) offer. By searching for recognized scientific articles such as Scopus, which has a wide reputation, the determining factors identified are very diverse

references. Indeed, the determining factors of prima donna events, although more complex and multidimensional diversity, also follow this, such as how preventive measures and their correlations.

The occurrence of plagiarism was identified based on its characteristics since the study was conducted between 1997 and 1970, the student factor being the oldest thing found (Whitley, 1998). This plagiarism continued until it spread to various other groups, including researchers and lecturers. They were carried away to do this despicable act. To massive (Bennett, 2005; Ellery, 2008b). However, the age factor studied by Walker (2010) showed that it turns out that the age of height shows that they are increasingly mature and less likely to commit plagiarism. However, in a busy society like in big cities, people think they can accept plagiarism (Jereb et al., 2017). This denied Wilks et al. (2016) that activity Plagiarism is not done for people with polite personality characteristics and high hospitality.

Serious penalties can be applied to prevent plagiarism (Teixeira & Rocha, 2006; 2010). If the perpetrator is caught (Do Ba et al., 2017), at least it can reduce the courage of students to do it. The punishment for plagiarism given in the perception of students who are excluded because of unintentional actions is very burdensome (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010; Newton, 2016). This act of unconscious plagiarism triggers uncertainty among students. As for Ashworth et al. (1997), they are always vague in understanding various problems like plagiarism (Risquez et al., 2013; Childers & Bruton, 2016). Although students do not have difficulty understanding the concept of plagiarism, their views are still captivated. For do it too (Cosma et al., 2017). Specifically, this research was conducted for lecturers whose existence appears as a continuation of their time as students whose scientific work continued after they became lecturers at universities.

### **The ability of lecturers and institutions to prevent plagiarism**

Several factors that make lecturers tend to commit plagiarism before preventing it need to be known first, namely that they do it because of, among other things, their motivation, as revealed in research. Ashworth et al. (1997) and Park (2003) believe that busy lecturers have narrow, burdensome time (Finchilescu & Cooper, 2018). They must simultaneously finish lots of tasks (Espinoza & Julián, 2015), which is why they do plagiarism in short. Rettinger et al. (2004) see action plagiarism as a result of a lack of motivation. So, this despicable act was deliberately done by them to get their college graduation because it is only for the purpose of a better assessment in a better way. easy (Franklyn-Stokes & Newstead, 1995; Park (2003). Therefore, their ability can also avoid plagiarism, no matter how much they do it. That without intention (Adam et al., 2017). It could be that they have minimal knowledge about plagiarism because there is not enough training (Ellery, 2008a; Mohamed et al., 2018) in how they cite the sources they are supposed to cite. (Chen & Chou, 2017).

In avoiding plagiarism, the individual experience factor of lecturers tends to support the occurrence of this violation even before it occurs. Lack of knowledge and attention of lecturers on plagiarism (Pickard, 2006; Marcus & Beck, 2011) makes them hesitant to obstruct plagiarism. De Jager & Brown (2010) prove that the imbalance occurs in the lecturer's view of preventing plagiarism in referencing skills with the reality of the lecturer's actual skills and knowledge. Several lecturers deliberately avoid their involvement in this plagiarism discussion even though it must result in a negative assessment of the lecturer. Therefore, lecturers need to involve themselves in training that explains plagiarism as well as prevention (Beute et al., 2008; Marcus & Beck, 2011). The involvement of students and lecturers is essential in various training and discussion forums and lectures on the prevention of plagiarism (Leask, 2006). Their training highlights improving writing skills, offering referencing software functions, and how to cite source with appropriate (Austin & Brown, 1999; Barrett & Cox, 2005). Promoting plagiarism



prevention to students and lecturers requires strategic steps by including information. This is in the syllabus (Lim & Coalter, 2006; Broeckelman-post, 2008), for it draws their pure ideas more firmly and goes well.

Most importantly, educational institutions are the right place for anti-plagiarism promotion and the most capable of eradicating plagiarism. There is a need for policies to prevent this despicable act from spreading. Proactive action by educational institutions against plagiarism is absolutely an academic policy to minimize it before it occurs rather than after the situation worsens. Institutions are able to program a set of sophisticated and multidimensional policies, as improvements (Levine & Pazdernik, 2018), which is not only that but can ensure massive promotion and communication in various institutions (Levine & Pazdernik, 2018). Policies will always have a good impact on reducing plagiarism (Brown & Howell, 2001; Teixeira & Rocha, 2006; 2010).

### **Determining Factors of Lecturers and Types of Actions**

Detecting effective plagiarism is an action that should be taken before and after the event occurs. Effective policies are implemented and practiced, and there will be no plagiarism. Then, positive input is needed to address the factors that cause plagiarism. Institutional plagiarism programs must take an educational approach. Awareness Lecturers and Students need awareness and training that strengthens the need for continuous training to gain awareness and skills (Palmer et al., 2017). Plagiarism is certain with their awareness; they always distance themselves from detection. The processing of recycled text and copy-paste from online or other sources of information is carried out skillfully without being able to be tracked as an error (Heather, 2010; Rosenberg, 2011) because patchwork treatment is hidden in such a way. Rogerson and McCarthy (2017) studied that students have specific tools to modify written work so that it cannot be detected by plagiarism detection devices for articles, assignments, sentences, words, and others.

Whether or not plagiarism software can detect it, text detection experts warn, however, that all tools have their drawbacks (McKeever, 2004). Professors can detect plagiarism with their manual intelligence (Sutherland-Smith, 2005) and use a combination of experience with correct logic (McKeever, 2006). However, detecting plagiarism is difficult to realize if there is a lack of skills and willingness on the part of professors and lecturers to maintain the situation. This happens (Atkinson & Yeoh, 2008; Marcus & Beck, 2011). From Figure 1, plagiarism is an event that can be detected or not all, and it has consequences; if it is detected that someone is committing plagiarism, it shows that the procedure is not yet complete. An alternative response will occur in the third phase and the end of the plagiarism process. However, if it is not detected, someone who does this action will certainly not get a sanction, and there will be a possibility that the perpetrator will repeat the act.

In the case of a lecturer who has investigated the violations committed by his students and found the cause of someone committing plagiarism, what action is taken? lecturer (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998; Coren, 2011). In this situation, we sort out the determining elements in the responses of lecturers and their institutions. The tendency of lecturers to classify which plagiarism is intentional and which is not, where unintentional is not allowed and given sanctions (Sutherland-Smith, 2005). If it is found that there have not been enough cases of plagiarism, the lecturer will not. Want to take action against him (Coren, 2011). The lecturer's considerations will be on what level of error can be given. sanctions the (Robinson-Zañartu et al., 2005). Even lecturers will not take any action when the situation is not possible because they are worried about the response from students who sue or from the inevitable excesses of family and society. In relation to the lecturer's own personality in this research, he can be positioned the same for

his scientific work assignment. It is just that the one who acts as the assessor is a peer assessor, such as his senior lecturer or his scientific work reviewer, who is tasked with reviewing his work.

From the research experience that has been carried out, because there is a lack of clarity in cases of plagiarism as the primary determinant, of course, there will be no action that must be taken (Coren, 2011). It is not certain that there will be an action or vice versa, but the lecturer takes a stance not through sanctions but through the learning method he considers. More appropriate (de Jager & Brown, 2010). Professors are concerned about the impact on their professionalism as a good image (Austin & Brown, 1999). Facing this situation, there is a lack of courage because emotional pressure also shows the need not to act in any way (Keith-Spiegel et al., 1998). The most important reasons for not taking action are the lack of opportunity to seek visible evidence and the workload that is the main task rather than the consequences received (Atkinson & Yeoh, 2008; Sutherland-Smith, 2005).

Simon et al. (2003) confirm if there are plagiarism cases detected, intuitively because the scope includes institutions that involve integrity policies in cases managed by related institutions, then lecturers make a choice whether it is better to take it personally or handle it by the institution's own procedures. Like other research, it is observed that for reasons of fairness, lecturers prefer to handle their own cases rather than handing them over to the institution (Kwong et al., 2010). More cases were handled by lecturers by means of reassignment, failed assignments, or failing all courses taken (Larkham & Manns, 2002). Sutherland-Smith (2011) compares sanctions institutional look heavier besides making students get failure of all courses. Students are on the plagiarism warning list, material sanctions, up to dismissal as students. There may be differences when the lecturer's work is assessed by journal reviewers in internationally indexed publications.

Research results This illustrates (see Figure 1) two discussions, first the regularity and cognitive structure of plagiarism management, and second examining the determinants for each event in this process. The most likely in measuring the prevalence of plagiarism and examining the individual characteristics of lecturers to find profile plagiarism (Diekhoff et al., 1996; Whitley, 1998), then see motivation as the reason why lecturers like students do plagiarism (Park, 2003; Rettinger et al., 2004). The steps used go far beyond who and try to find out why. In this research, lecturers are more emphasized as a single unit of research that is interesting for researchers, then to prevent plagiarism, an investigation is carried out in focus on preventing plagiarism in universities (Brown & Howell, 2001; McCabe et al., 2002; Park, 2004), and next to actions by lecturers and universities (Barrett & Cox, 2005; Simon et al., 2003; Lim & Coalter, 2006), and finally research extends to the types of actions taken by lecturers and universities (de Jager & Brown, 2010; Sutherland-Smith, 2011).

The reality of the phenomenon of plagiarism in various related circles shows its seriousness in the absolute prevention carried out without stopping. The prevention shows that the actions carried out by universities are a combination of evidence of reality and recommendations from the conclusions of various research. The big question is whether the policies of the related institutions have been appropriately communicated, propagandized, and socialized through their distributors massively and continuously. The procedures they carry out must be adequate with facilities that are not difficult to access with the spirit of a better future. The mobility of intellectual work in facing this requires multiple models and schemes that penetrate descriptions that analyze more adequate mechanisms versus those faced (Pàmies et al., 2019).

The social trend of plagiarism shows a phenomenon that is more than just increasingly complex and massive in various institutions related to academia. Preventing plagiarism has been widely managed from the root of the problem, determining factors, processes, sustainability, and recommended solutions via various research. Researchers continue to follow all further

contextual developments that always highlight the actors involved. This handling from various circles has not shown integrated handling according to each perspective they have. Fierce debates have occurred in recent decades because plagiarism has developed and changed in line with technological sophistication. The problem that arises is the need to manage based on rules (Austin & Brown, 1999).

Considering the context of this phenomenon is crucial in the subsequent study of plagiarism management both national, international, and cultural contexts. Various research is available, but it still requires insight into the comprehensive context of culture, law, and technology. Institutions related to the academic world that are continuously involved are touted as actors or agents of change to get additional ammunition by improving their performance in identifying those that are tested in further research and increasing the seriousness of the level of occurrence in minor and major phenomena that still have gaps in their definition and characteristics to be able to provide reliable solutions.

In the analysis of the sub-fields of results, findings, and conclusions, what is needed is a narrative of new ideas formulated by researchers or report authors carefully in the form of the latest narratives that allow readers to briefly be enlightened by the results of their research. An accurate analysis and a comprehensive brief conclusion from the data collection findings are needed. Furthermore, at the end of the report, it is absolutely necessary to have a reference with the offer of a style of counseling that is in accordance with the target journal that will publish it, such as APA (American Psychological Association), Chicago Manual Style, Cite Them Right Harvard, IEEE, Chicago Manual of Style, Modern Humanities Research, Modern Language Association or, Modern Humanities Research and others.

In discussing this research, we explained the characteristics of the participants as IRE lecturers who bring Islamic morals into their duties. Dealing with plagiarism is a difficult concept to define. Religious and moral holders should be role models in propagating anti-plagiarism. Although most institutions of higher education have policies aimed at minimizing and addressing student plagiarism, little research has examined the way plagiarism is constructed discursively in university policy documents or the relationship and disconnect between institutional and student understanding of plagiarism at higher levels (Adam et al., 2016). Amidst the international opportunities available to academics and students, plagiarism continues to plague Indonesia's higher education sector (Adiningrum, 2015). The fast-growing plagiarism rate among students in higher education has become a serious concern for academics around the world (Amiri & Razmjoo, 2015). Among lecturers is also no exception, although this research has not been done much with a focus on lecturers, educators, and professors who are constantly struggling in the academic world and become a transmission to students and subsequently to society in general. Asthana (2017) concludes that the chaos of unclear plagiarism is a solution that brings the appearance of research character and ethics to be echoed to all levels of scientific stakeholders, especially on moral duties such as IRE lecturers, because there are still certain elements who defend the existence of plagiarism. This policy is intended to prevent plagiarism and notify authors of expectations for publications in journals. It states in clear terms that deliberate acts of plagiarism and similar offenses will be duly reprimanded. This policy is included in this issue and posted on the journal's Website. IRE lecturers should be role models who provide enlightenment to their students so that the authority of their duties is absolute as if they do not allow errors or shortcomings in their scientific work.

Many studies test their ability to admit plagiarism and explore the relationship between the level of study and attendance in lectures related to reference rules and plagiarism with lecturer-student attitudes and knowledge, such as to test the knowledge of plagiarism perpetrators (Bašić et al., 2018). So, the data obtained from this lecturer level will significantly

affect the students. At the same time, it will inhibit the development of academic scientific characteristics at various existing levels.

## CONCLUSION

The article's academic rigor remains insufficient for publication in reputable international journals. Despite efforts to present research findings through participant interviews, the work lacks critical engagement, methodological clarity, and adherence to ethical standards—particularly in addressing issues of plagiarism, which remains a serious global concern. Significant revisions are needed to align with current methodological developments and ethical practices. Furthermore, the study highlights gaps in the professional competence of IRE lecturers, particularly in research literacy and academic writing. Strengthening their capacity in these areas is essential to ensure their role as both educators and ethical role models. Future studies should explore deeper structural factors and leverage digital tools to enhance academic integrity and reduce the risk of plagiarism in scholarly work.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, L., Anderson, V., and Spronken-smith, R. (2016). 'It's not fair': policy discourses and students' understandings of plagiarism in a New Zealand university. *Higher Education*, 74, 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0025-9>
- Adiningrum, T. S. (2015). Reviewing Plagiarism: An Input for Indonesian Higher Education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13, 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9226-6>
- Amiri, F., and Razmjoo, S. A. (2015). On Iranian EFL Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14, 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9245-3>
- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., and Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in Whose Eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381034>
- Asthana, R. (2017). Plagiarism and JMEP'S Publication Ethics Policy. *Journal of Materials Engineering and Performance*, 26(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11665-016-2478-5>
- Atkinson, D., and Yeoh, S. (2008). Student and staff perceptions of the effectiveness of plagiarism detection software. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 24(2), 222–240. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1224>
- Austin, M. J., and Brown, L. D. (1999). Internet Plagiarism: Developing Strategies to Curb Student Academic Dishonesty. *Internet and Higher Education*, 2(1), 21–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-7516\(99\)00004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1096-7516(99)00004-4)
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1990). *Multidimensional scales of perceived self-efficacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Pertanyaan. Stanford University.
- Barrett, R., and Cox, A. L. (2005). "At least they're learning something": The hazy line between collaboration and collusion. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264226>
- Basbøll, T. (2010). Softly constrained imagination : Plagiarism and misprision in the theory of organizational sensemaking. *Culture and Organization*, 16(2), 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551003769318>
- Bašić, Ž., Kružić, I., Jerković, I., Buljan, I., and Marušić, A. (2018). Attitudes and Knowledge About Plagiarism Among University Students: Cross - Sectional Survey at the University of Split, Croatia. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 25, 1467–1483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-018-0073-x>

- Bennett, R. (2005). Factors associated with student plagiarism in a post-1992 university. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 137–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264244>
- Beute, N., van Aswegen, E. S., and Winberg, C. (2008). Avoiding plagiarism in contexts of development and change. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 51(2), 201–205. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2007.912407>
- Blayone, T. J. B. (2019). Theorising effective uses of digital technology with activity theory. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 00(00), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2019.1645728>
- Broeckelman-post, M. A. (2008). *Academic Dishonesty - Definition*. 51(2), 206–211. <http://www.deltacollege.edu/dept/ar/catalog/cat1011/1841.htm>
- Brown, V. J., and Howell, M. E. (2001). The efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism: Do they change students' views? *Research in Higher Education*, 42(1), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018720728840>
- Bruton, S. V., and Rachal, J. R. (2015). Education Journal Editors' Perspectives on Self-Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13, 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-014-9224-0>
- Chen, Y., and Chou, C. (2017). Are We on the Same Page? College Students' and Faculty's Perception of Student Plagiarism in Taiwan. *Ethics and Behavior*, 27(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2015.1123630>
- Childers, D., & Bruton, S. (2016). "Should It Be Considered Plagiarism?" Student Perceptions of Complex Citation Issues. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9250-6>
- Coren, A. (2011). Turning a Blind Eye: Faculty Who Ignore Student Cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(4), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9147-y>
- Cosma, G., Joy, M., Sinclair, J., Andreou, M., Zhang, D., Cook, B., and Boyatt, R. (2017). Perceptual comparison of source-code plagiarism within students from UK, China, and South Cyprus higher education institutions. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3059871>
- Culwin, F., and Lancaster, T. (2001). Plagiarism issues for higher education. *Vine*, 31(2), 36–41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720010804005>
- Curtis, G. J., Cowcher, E., Greene, B. R., Rundle, K., Paull, M., and Davis, M. C. (2018). Self-Control, Injunctive Norms, and Descriptive Norms Predict Engagement in Plagiarism in a Theory of Planned Behavior Model. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 00(00), 1–15.
- Dawka, S. (2016). Is Plagiarism on the Curriculum of our Medical Schools? *Medical Science Educator*, 00(00), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-016-0252-9>
- de Jager, K., and Brown, C. (2010). The tangled web: Investigating academics' views of plagiarism at the University of Cape Town. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(5), 513–528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903222641>
- Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Clark, R. E., Williams, L. E., Francis, B., and Haines, V. J. (1996). College cheating: Ten years later. *Research in Higher Education*, 37(4), 487–502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01730111>
- Do Ba, K., Do Ba, K., Lam, Q. D., Le, D. T. B. A., Nguyen, P. L., Nguyen, P. Q., and Pham, Q. L. (2017). Student plagiarism in higher education in Vietnam: an empirical study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(5), 934–946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1263829>
- Eaton, S. E. (2017). Comparative Analysis of Institutional Policy Definitions of Plagiarism : A Pan-Canadian University Study. *Interchange, Trost* 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-017-9300-7>

- Ellery, K. (2008a). An investigation into electronic-source plagiarism in a first-year essay assignment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(6), 607–617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701772788>
- Ellery, K. (2008b). Undergraduate plagiarism: A pedagogical perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 507–516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701698918>
- Espinoza, L. A., and Julián, M. N. (2015). How to correct teaching methods that favour plagiarism: recommendations from teachers and students in a Spanish language distance education university. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(8), 1070–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.966053>
- Finchilescu, G., and Cooper, A. (2018). Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty in a South African University: A Q-Methodology Approach. *Ethics and Behavior*, 28(4), 284–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2017.1279972>
- Franklyn-Stokes, A., and Newstead, S. E. (1995). Undergraduate Cheating: Who does what and why? *Studies in Higher Education*, 20(2), 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079512331381673>
- Gullifer, J., and Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: A focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903096508>
- Guo, X. (2011). Understanding Student Plagiarism: An Empirical Study in Accounting Education. *Accounting Education: An International*, 20(1), 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2010.534577>
- Heather, J. (2010). Turnitoff: Identifying and fixing a hole in current plagiarism detection software. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(6), 647–660. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.486471>
- Heckler, N. C., Rice, M., and Briyan, H. C. (2013). Turnitin Systems: A Deterrent to Plagiarism in College Classrooms. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 45(3), 229–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2013.10782604>
- Husain, F., Al-Shaibani, G. K. S., and Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2017). Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Plagiarism and Factors Contributing to Plagiarism: a Review of Studies. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 15, 167–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9274-1>
- Jaric, I. (2015). High time for a common plagiarism detection system. *Scientometrics*, 106, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1756-6>
- Jereb, E., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., and Šprajc, P. (2017). Gender differences and the awareness of plagiarism in higher education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21(2), 409–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-017-9421-y>
- Jordan, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 233–247. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_3)
- Kashian, N., Cruz, S. M., Jang, J., and Silk, K. J. (2015). Evaluation of an Instructional Activity to Reduce Plagiarism in the Communication Classroom. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13, 239–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9238-2>
- Keith-Spiegel, P., Tabachnick, B. G., Whitley, B. E., and Washburn, J. (1998). Why professors ignore cheating: Opinions of a national sample of psychology instructors. *Ethics and Behavior*, 8(3), 215–227. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb0803\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb0803_3)
- Kwong, T., Ng, H. M., Kai-Pan, M., and Wong, E. (2010). Students' and faculty's perception of academic integrity in Hong Kong. *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, 27(5), 341–355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10650741011087766>

- Larkham, P. J., and Manns, S. (2002). Plagiarism and its treatment in higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), 339–349. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877022000021748>
- Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor-implications for academic staff development. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 183–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262486>
- Levine, J., and Pazdernik, V. (2018). Evaluation of a four-prong anti-plagiarism program and the incidence of plagiarism: a five-year retrospective study. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1094–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434127>
- Lim, C., and Coalter, M. (2006). Academic Integrity An Instructor's Obligation. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(2), 155–159. Retrieved from <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>
- Löfström, E., Huotari, E., & Kupila, P. (2017). Conceptions of Plagiarism and Problems in Academic Writing in a Changing Landscape of External Regulation. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 00(00), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-017-9285-y>
- Mahmud, S., Bretag, T., and Foltýnek, T. (2018). Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism Policy in Higher Education: a Comparison of the United Kingdom, Czechia, Poland and Romania. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9319-0>
- Marcus, S., and Beck, S. (2011). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism at queensborough community college. *Community and Junior College Libraries*, 17(2), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763915.2011.591709>
- Mariani, J., Francopoulo, G., and Paroubek, P. (2017). Reuse and plagiarism in Speech and Natural Language Processing publications. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 19, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00799-017-0211-0>
- Marsden, H., Carroll, M., and Neill, J. T. (2005). Who cheats at university? A self-report study of dishonest academic behaviours in a sample of Australian university students. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 57(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530412331283426>
- Mazov, N. A., Gureev, V. N., and Kosyakov, D. V. (2016). On the Development of a Plagiarism Detection Model Based on Citation Analysis Using a Bibliographic Database. *Scientific and Technical Information Processing*, 43(4), 236–240. <https://doi.org/10.3103/S0147688216040092>
- McCabe, D. L., and Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778446>
- McCabe, D. L., and Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379–396. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024954224675>
- McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., and Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 357–378. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014893102151>
- McKeever, L. (2006). Online plagiarism detection services-saviour or scourge? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262460>
- Mohamed, M. E., Mohy, N., and Salah, S. (2018). Perceptions of undergraduate pharmacy students on plagiarism in three major public universities in Egypt. *Accountability in Research*, 25(2), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2018.1435997>

- Moritz, R., Karina, V. R. A., Rocha, D. A., Catelani, F., and Jose, A. (2015). Plagiarism Allegations Account for Most Retractions in Major Latin American / Caribbean Databases. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 22, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9714-5>
- Newton, P. (2016). Academic integrity: a quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(3), 482–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1024199>
- Palmer, A., Oakley, G., and Pegrum, M. (2017). A Culture of Sharing: Transnational Higher Education Students' Views on Plagiarism in the Digital Era. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 11(4), 381–404. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJME.2017.10005984>
- Pàmies, M., Valverde, M., Cross, C., Pàmies, M., Valverde, M., Organising, C. C., and P, M. M. (2019). Organising research on university student plagiarism: a process approach process approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1658714>
- Park, C. (2003). In other (People's) words: Plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301677>
- Park, C. (2004). Rebels without a clause: Towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28(3), 291–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877042000241760>
- Perkins, M. (2018). Understanding the Relationship between Language Ability and Plagiarism in Non-native English Speaking Business Students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 16, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9311-8>
- Pickard, J. (2006). Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262528>
- Prashar, A., Gupta, P., and Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). Plagiarism awareness efforts, students' ethical judgment and behaviors: a longitudinal experiment study on ethical nuances of plagiarism in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(6), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2253835>
- Rettinger, D. A., Jordan, A. E., and Peschiera, F. (2004). Evaluating the motivation of other students to cheat: A vignette experiment. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(8), 873–890. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-5952-0>
- Rettinger, D. A., and Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(3), 293–313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-008-9116-5>
- Risquez, A., O'Dwyer, M., and Ledwith, A. (2013). "Thou shalt not plagiarise": From self-reported views to recognition and avoidance of plagiarism. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.596926>
- Robinson-Zañartu, C., Peña, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Peña, A. M., Afshani, R., and Nguyen, L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 20(3), 318–337. <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.2005.20.3.318>
- Rogerson, A. M., and McCarthy, G. (2017). Using Internet based paraphrasing tools: Original work, patchwriting or facilitated plagiarism? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-016-0013-y>



- Rosenberg, M. (2011). Principled Autonomy and Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-011-9132-5>
- Sánchez-Vega, F., Villatoro-Tello, E., Montes-y-Gómez, M., Rosso, P., Stamantos, E., and Villaseñor-Pineda, L. (2017). Paraphrase plagiarism identification with character - level features. *Pattern Analysis and Applications*, 22, 1-. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10044-017-0674-z>
- Selemani, A., Chawinga, W. D., & Dube, G. (2018). Why do postgraduate students commit plagiarism? An empirical study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0029-6>
- Simon, C. A., Carr, J. R., McCullough, S. M., Morgan, S. J., Oleson, T., and Ressel, M. (2003). The other side of Academic Dishonesty: The relationship between faculty scepticism, gender and strategies for managing student academic dishonesty cases. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 193–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301669>
- Stuhmcke, A., Booth, T., Wangmann, J., Stuhmcke, A., Booth, T., and Wangmann, J. (2015). The illusory dichotomy of plagiarism. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1053428>
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 83–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.007>
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies. *Semiotica*, 187(1), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2011.067>
- Teixeira, A. A. C., and Rocha, M. F. (2006). Academic Cheating in Austria, Portugal, Romania and Spain: A Comparative Analysis. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1(3), 198–209. <https://doi.org/10.2304/rcie.2006.1.3.198>
- Teixeira, A. A. C., and Rocha, M. F. (2010). Cheating by economics and business undergraduate students: An exploratory international assessment. *Higher Education*, 59(6), 663–701. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9274-1>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Ullah, F., Wang, J., Farhan, M., Jabbar, S., and Wu, Z. (2018). Plagiarism detection in students' programming assignments based on semantics: multimedia e-learning based smart assessment methodology. *Multimed Tools Application*, 79, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-018-5827-6>
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070902912994>
- Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(3), 235–274. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018724900565>
- Whittemore, R. (2005). The integrative review: updated methodology. *Methodological Issues in Nursing Research*, 52(5), 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmn.2007.11.006>
- Wilks, D. C., Cruz, J. N., and Sousa, P. (2016). Personality Traits and Plagiarism: an Empirical Study with Portuguese Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14(3), 231–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-016-9261-y>
- Williams, P. (2015). Plagiarism, Palimpsest and Intertextuality. *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, 12(2), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2015.1036887>
- Zhang, T., Lee, B., and Zhu, Q. (2019). Semantic measure of plagiarism using a hierarchical graph model. *Scientometrics*, 00(00), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03204-x>