



***STUDENTS UNDERSTANDING OF PLAGIARISM: A CASE STUDY OF THE  
CRIMINOLOGY AND FORENSIC STUDIES DISCIPLINE (CFSD), UNIVERSITY OF  
KWAZULU-NATAL (HOWARD COLLEGE), DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA.***

**By**

**Philani Magubane**

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Social  
Science in Criminology

University of KwaZulu-Natal, College of Humanities, School of Applied Human  
Sciences,  
Criminology and Forensic Studies Programme  
Howard Campus  
South Africa

2018

Supervised by Prof. Shanta B Singh.

***DECLARATION***

I, Philani Magubane declare that:

1. The research reported in this thesis, except where otherwise indicated is my original research.
2. This dissertation has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.
3. This dissertation does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.
4. This dissertation does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:
  - a. Their words have been re-written, but the general information attributed to them has been referenced
  - b. Where their exact words have been used, then their writing has been placed in italics and inside quotation marks and referenced.
5. This dissertation does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the Internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the dissertation and in the References sections.

---

Student's Signature

---

Date

---

Supervisor's Name

---

Signature

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

First, I would like to acknowledge God for this wonderful opportunity of allowing me to pursue my dream, despite of the challenges but I give God thanks and Glory. Secondly, I wish to thank and express my appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Shanta B Singh and my Co-Supervisor Ms Reema Nunlall for their time and patience in reading through my work and making useful suggestions and the necessary corrections. Their interest in my work and suggestions shaped my thoughts and opinions through the entire project. They helped me a lot.

I am also grateful to the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies, for helping me to achieve my project aim, my participants were from there, my colleague students, staff members of the Discipline have contributed for the success of this research.

Finally, I wish to thank my family, friends and church members of Assembly of God (Inner-City) for their mutual support and encouragement.

## *ABSTRACT*

Plagiarism has been generally distinct by different scholars; student plagiarism is defined as an academic dishonesty where students produce an academic work for others as their own (Jensen, Arnett, Feldman & Cauffman, 2002). The phenomenon is categorized as an “academic dishonesty” in the higher education institutions because is seen as a fraudulent act or efforts by a student to use unsanctioned or deplorable means in an academic work. It indicates unethical behavior or cheating. This behavior is seen as a serious matter and university are mandatory to increase more effort, resources and time in prevention of it, because without taking care of it can lead to impact even in the workplace after university. Academic fraud is a serious issue on academic writing as Weber (2012) states that student plagiarism sits as a special problem within higher education.

This study aims to explore students understanding of plagiarism within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline on how their understanding of the phenomenon shapes their actions or behaviour. This study adopted qualitative research approach and underpinned by descriptive-interpretive paradigms (hermeneutics) to provide insight into the social phenomenon under study. The study used in-depth semi-structured face-to-face interviews for depth insight and reach information. Data was collected from 20 students in the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline (CFSD) in the School of Applied Human Sciences under College of Humanities. A key selection criterion was level/ year of study, where 5 students from first year, 5 students from second year, 5 students from third year and 5 postgraduate students participated. This permitted for contrasts in terms of academic practices and understanding of plagiarism. Purposive sampling techniques were used to discover the sample.

The findings revealed that students within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies are fully aware of the existence of plagiarism and they framed their understanding in the criminological perspective, where they placed plagiarism phenomenon as a crime and deviant behaviour. The students’ reports and suggestions provided insight that they take plagiarism incidences seriously and they tried to avoid it in many ways because it against the university policy. The findings also revealed that students hardly read the university plagiarism policy and procedure document or paying more attention just because of their laziness. Strategies in prevention of plagiarism were suggested by students, such as workshops about plagiarism, and compulsory module about plagiarism.

## ***LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS***

CFSD	Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline
HE	Higher Education Institution
P	Participant
SCT	Self-Control Theory
SLT	Social Learning Theory
UKZN	University of KwaZulu-Natal

## *TABLE OF CONTENT*

<b>Declaration</b> .....	ii
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	iii
<b>Abstract</b> .....	iv
<b>Lists of Acronym and Abbreviations</b> .....	v
<b>Table of Content</b> .....	vi-viii
<b>1. Chapter one (Introduction)</b>	
1.1 Background of the study.....	1-5
1.2 Study Area.....	5
1.3 Motivation of the study.....	6
1.4 Purpose of the study.....	6
1.5 Objectives of the study.....	7
1.6 Key research questions.....	7
1.7 Chapter Sequence and Content.....	7
<b>2. Chapter two (Literature Review)</b>	
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 What is plagiarism.....	8-10
2.3 Types and Forms of plagiarism.....	10-12
2.4 Prevalence's of plagiarism.....	13-15
2.5 Student's understanding of plagiarism.....	15-16
2.6 Reasons for student plagiarism.....	16-21
2.7 Awareness of plagiarism.....	21-22
2.7.1 Plagiarism Policy and Procedures.....	22-23
2.8 Plagiarism Vs Prevention.....	23-26
2.9 Conclusion.....	26
<b>3. Chapter three (Theoretical Framework)</b>	
3.1 Introduction.....	27
3.2 Social Learning Theory (SLT).....	27-29
3.3 Self-Control Theory (SCT).....	29-30
3.4 Strain Theory.....	30-31
3.5 Conclusion.....	31

<b>4. Chapter four (Research Methodology)</b>	
4.1 Introduction.....	32
4.2 Research Paradigm.....	32
4.2.1 Descriptive- interpretive paradigm (Haematics).....	32-33
4.3 Research Methodological Approach .....	33
4.3.1 Qualitative Research Approach.....	33-34
4.4 Research Design.....	34
4.4.1 Phenomological Study.....	34-35
4.5 Sampling Strategy.....	35
4.5.1 Purposive Sampling Technique (Non-probability) .....	35
4.5.2 Sample Selection Criterion.....	36
4.5.3 Recruiting Strategy.....	36-37
4.6 Data Collection.....	37
4.6.1 Semi-structured Interviews (one-on-one).....	37
4.6.2 Recording and transcription.....	37-39
4.7 Data Analysis.....	40
4.7.1 Thematic Analysis.....	40
4.8 Ethical Consideration.....	41
4.9 Ensuring Trustworthiness.....	41-42
4.10 Limitation or Challenges of the study.....	42
4.11 Conclusion.....	42
<b>5. Chapter five (Findings and Discussion)</b>	
5.1 Introduction.....	43
5.2 Knowledge of plagiarism.....	44-47
5.3 Causes of plagiarism.....	47-48
5.4 Plagiarism vs Perceived Seriousness.....	48-49
5.5 Prevalence of plagiarism.....	49-51
5.6 Awareness of plagiarism.....	51-53
5.7 Strategies in prevention of plagiarism.....	53-54
5.8 Relationship of the study to the theory.....	54-55
5.9 Conclusion.....	55

<b>6. Chapter Six (Conclusion and Recommendations)</b>	
6.1 Introduction.....	56
6.2 General Conclusion.....	56
6.2.1 Student understanding of plagiarism.....	56-58
6.2.2 Identify if students plagiarize within CFSD.....	58-59
6.2.3 Level of awareness .....	59-60
6.2.4 Strategies in prevention of plagiarism.....	60
6.3 Recommendations.....	61
<b>References List.....</b>	<b>62-80</b>
<b>Appendix A (Turnitin).....</b>	
<b>Appendix B (Gate keepers' letter) .....</b>	
<b>Appendix C (ethical approval) .....</b>	
<b>Appendix D (Informed Consent Form) .....</b>	
<b>Appendix E (Interview Schedule) .....</b>	



## *Chapter one*

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Background of the study**

In the academia the use of information is common among every person in the world. The information is used in many ways, in the academic setting students use information to write their academic work. Therefore, students are required to have ethical responsibility in the way they use information (Botham, Erica, Ina & Cecilia, 2011). Plagiarism has a long and ancient history in higher education level (Cizek, 1999). Regulations are put in place to condemn plagiarism in different institutions especial universities. Le Heron (2001) states that university regulations universal, convict the practice of plagiarism and threaten punitive measures but appear reluctant to implement them for fear of trial. There is a widespread perception that plagiarism among university students is cumulative (Emerson, Rees, & MacKay, 2005) and it producing an increase in literature on the subject. Singh and Remenyi (2015) point out that there have been some intense illustrations of academic fraud at universities.

The act of plagiarism occurs where someone is not having an ethical responsibility in using of someone else information. The issue of academic dishonesty or academic misconduct involves both student and staff in higher education institutions. Moon (1998) mentions that for students, it is vital that they learn intellectually truthful behavior because that is part of being a graduate. It is not good on students if their universities plagiarize and thus advance undeserved qualifications. In addition, there are trending stories in media about plagiarism that, by their shocking angle, damage higher education for all of us (Moon, 1998). According to Chong (2013) there have been a number of reports of plagiarized research papers, and some journals are now using search tools on papers that they receive. Monitoring for plagiarism takes time and effort and money. Avoidance of it is a matter of some knowledge, skills and good habits, which mainly become integrated into the way in which you work (Emerson et al, 2005). The extent of cheating at universities is hard to gauge. This is largely because the most common reaction once cheating is exposed is that the institution becomes secretive (Singh & Remenyi, 2015)

The term 'plagiarize' is coming from the Latin word plagiary, means to kidnap (Karami & Danaei, 2016). Plagiarism is the cautious endeavour to mislead the reader over the fraud and demonstration of ideas, words and work of someone else. In that sense academic plagiarism happens when a writer frequently uses further than four words from a published document without recognising the author of the published source, where there is no use of quotation marks and accurate references while work is presented as the author's own academic work (Hexham, 1999). It is categorized as an "academic dishonesty" in the higher education institutions because is seen as a fraudulent act or efforts by a student to use unsanctioned or deplorable means in an academic work. It indicates unethical behaviour or cheating. This behaviour seen as a serious matter and university are mandatory to increase more effort, resources and time in prevention of it, because without taking care of it can lead to impact even in the workplace after university. Academic fraud is a serious issue on academic writing as Weber (2012) states that student plagiarism sits as a special problem within higher education.

The above is an unblemished indication of what plagiarism is about. Plagiarism is considered as a serious behaviour in the academic institution. It is considered as a visible delinquent that is related to an academic writing (O'Connor, 2003). Singh and Remenyi (2015) pointed out that there are several reasons why plagiarism is unacceptable in academic writing, the following are some reasons:

- Plagiarism committed intentionally is an act of deceit and may even constitute fraud.
- The plagiarist denies him or herself 'the opportunity to learn and practice' the skills of academic research.
- A plagiarist does not avail him or herself of the 'opportunity to receive honest feedback' on his or her academic skills.
- The plagiarist opens him or herself to future enquiry into his or her 'integrity and performance in general' (cited to The Penn State University website)

Therefore universities usually mention in their policies that plagiarism is a punitive wrongdoing, however, it is not always easy to determine what kind of consequence will be obligatory on authors who are found to have plagiarised (Singh & Remenyi, 2015). Academic dishonesty or plagiarism is more than just a student problem. Wideman (2008) argues that we are living in a world of technological access to almost unlimited informational resources. The development of technology, academic dishonesty such as cheating, collusion and plagiarism remains to fascinate significant attention from the media, academics, administrators and students (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne 1997; Ashworth, Freewood, and Macdonald 2003; Franklyn-Stokes & Newstead 1995; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield 2001; Petress 2003) cited by (Gullifer & Tyson,2010).

Current fiction proposes that the Internet and technology show a part in the increased number of student's plagiarism (Lamula, 2017). According to Harper (2006) states there was a positive correspondence between student plagiarism and the increased use of technology in education. Computers and other high tech equipment have changed the way people communicate, work and study (Myrick, 2005). The occurrence of digital properties offers an atmosphere where plagiarism such as cut and paste can be tremendously easy (Center for Academic Integrity, 2013). This is supported by a 2010 study which found that 95% of students were sufficiently experienced with the Internet to use it for cutting and pasting resources (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010)

As a result, with the initiation of additional current word processing software, “copy and paste” has become easy to do it because of advanced technology of our society. It has brought plagiarism a solution for many academic papers, as eminent by students (Barnbaum, 2002). Plagiarism is upfront, in other illustrations, it can be problematic to differentiate as it emanates in many forms, not all of which are that deceptive (Govender, 2009)

Plagiarism comes in different forms. Chong (2013) states that plagiarism happens in any field that involves a creation process, which includes written text, computer source code, art and design, and even music pieces. Hulupa (2014) also mentioned that there are types of plagiarism which have been addressed in previous research which are mainly multiple-choice tests, source code in programming languages and written text. Indeed, there are many types and forms of plagiarism. The focus of this study is based on written text plagiarism also known as academic fraud or dishonesty. In academic setting written text plagiarism is the measure form of plagiarism, as Shi (2012) support that written text plagiarism is the most common cases are found in academic settings. Higher education institutions commonly have policy and procedures documents that explain what plagiarism is. Maurer et al. (2006) state how plagiarism occurs in the academic setting, of which can be considered as academic fraud or dishonesty

Most of researchers show that the phenomenon of plagiarism is common. Before the development of technology in different countries, plagiarism was prevalent. Student plagiarism in universities is also prevalent. There are different studies that show prevalence of plagiarism in different universities, that reveals how important for student to understand better the act. Drake research discovered that 23% of college students have cheated sometime in their academic careers (as cited in Bolin, 2004). Bowers (1964) conducted a survey that reveals, 5,000 students in 99 higher education institutions presented that three quarters of the sampled students acknowledged to academic dishonesty of cheating. Clearly plagiarism does occur in different learning institutions, which place the rate of plagiarism in high level. The proportion of plagiarism has wide-ranging from one study to another. Moon (1990) around 60% of university students in the United Kingdom and United States have involved in some form of academic dishonesty certainly. In United States and Canada students of colleges and universities admit in engaging on plagiarism or exclusively cheating (McCabe, 2005a). McCabe (2005a) mentioned that plagiarism has amplified from 10% in 1999 to 40% in 2005.

The increase of plagiarism also impacts both locally and internationally. Maxwell et al. (2006) study of both local students and international, Asian students in Australia revealed a significant prevalent rate of 80% of respondents admittedly plagiarizing some time in some form. The accumulative proportion of plagiarism among students of sophisticated learning or high education has elevated apprehension and worries among academics. Duggan (2006) argues that scholars have contended that the occurrences of plagiarism were at the higher level, academics alleged they could accomplish but it has taken on a prevalent extent.

The reason for the increase of plagiarism rate is the great development of advanced technology: internet (Rosamond, 2002). Eckstein (2003) ever since information and communication technology was introduced to teaching and learning, academic misconduct has been an increasing problem leading to decline of academic integrity in the 21st century. The advancement of technology contributes greatly to the prevalence of plagiarism, 25% of students do cut and paste online without citation (Scanlon & Neumann, 2002).

This study aims to explore students' understanding of plagiarism within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline on how their understanding of the phenomenon shapes their action or behaviour with the purpose of notifying the institution on methods that might promote a better awareness of plagiarism and, therefore, prevent its incidence. It is apparent, therefore, that universities can benefit from learning about their own students' understanding of plagiarism to develop appropriate strategies to promote academic integrity. This study is exploratory in nature and will form part of a larger investigation.

## **1.2 Study Area**

This study was conducted at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) Howard College within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline (CFSD). Criminology and Forensic Studies, one of four disciplines within the School of Applied Human Sciences, is located on the Howard College Campus (Durban) and the Pietermaritzburg Campus (Pietermaritzburg) under College of Humanities. Howard College campus is situated on the Berea and offers spectacular views of the Durban harbour. This discipline area provides expert knowledge to deal effectively with crime, victimization and conflict and to promote a democratic and just society with a human rights ethos as set out in the South African Constitution and Bill of Rights and other relevant international legal frameworks and treaties. It introduces students to biological, psychological and social dimensions of criminal behavior and explores the application of these approaches to an understanding of the diversity of criminal behavior.

### **1.3 Motivation for the study**

This study was motivated by the scandal that was reported by Prega Govenders on Sunday Time on the 10th of June 2007, plagiarism scandal that rocked the University of KwaZulu-Natal, “exposé of the bogus doctorate awarded to Chippy Shaik”. It was a master’s thesis that was plagiarized. Research scientist Professor Photini Kiepiela, who abruptly resigned after admitting plagiarizing an article for a paper she had written and was responsible for supervising the student’s work (Sunday Time 10 June 2007). Another scandal took place on the 22nd of February 2004 reported by Christi Naude News24, where students cheated, named and shamed on all the campuses of the University of KwaZulu-Natal to stamp out the increasing number of cases of plagiarism (News24 22 February 2004). Within University of KwaZulu-Natal, there been outrages of plagiarism of which drove a researcher to conduct this study of understanding plagiarism in criminological perspective, because of the scandals mentioned above brought some perception to students that, employers will be looking UKZN students less attractive graduates for employment due to those plagiarism scandals that took place within UKZN.

The research problem is that there is a theoretical dearth in understanding of student plagiarism in the criminological perspective, because criminological theories have been applied less to student plagiarism. Applying criminological theory to student plagiarism is necessary to further our understanding of academic dishonesty. In doing so, we can better understand the nuances this form of academic fraud, and create prominent strategies to detect and prevent plagiarism.

### **1.4 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to explore students understanding of plagiarism within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline on how do their understanding of the phenomenon shape their actions or behaviour with the tenacity of notifying the institution on methods that might promote a better awareness of plagiarism and, therefore, prevent its incidence

### 1.5 Objectives of the study

- To assess student understanding of plagiarism.
- To identify if student plagiarize within CFSD.
- To ascertain the level of awareness about plagiarism within CFSD.
- To establish strategies in the prevention of plagiarism within CFSD.

### 1.6 Key Research Questions

- How do students understand plagiarism?
- Do student plagiarize within CFSD?
- How is the level of awareness of plagiarism within CFSD?
- What are strategies in prevention of plagiarism within CFSD?

### 1.7 Chapter Sequence and Content

- **Chapter one** attends as the introduction which pursues to set the work into perspective. It entails of the background to the study, the study area, motivation of the study, purpose of the study, objectives and key research questions of the study, and chapter sequence and content.
- **Chapter two** emphasizes on the review of relevant literature on student understanding of plagiarism looking in the South African perspective, internationally and globally.
- **Chapter three** covers the theoretical framework of the study
- **Chapter four** outline the research methodology used for the study. It covers the research paradigm, research methodological approach, research design, sampling strategy, data collection instrument, data analyses, ethical consideration, ensuring trustworthiness and limitation or challenges of the study.
- **Chapter five** presents findings and discussion
- **Chapter six** conclusion and recommendations.

## ***Chapter Two***

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter outlines the literature review, factors that may contribute on student understanding of plagiarism. The main aim of the chapter is to discover in-depth various surface, notion and contextual factors that contribute to student understanding of plagiarism in the extensive review of literature. The reason for conducting literature review is to ensure that the researcher have a thorough understanding of the topic, to identify potential areas for research, to ascertain comparable work done within the area, to compare previous findings and to critique existing findings and suggest further studies. Review of the literature is one of the major and important aspects of research. The literature study helps to know what is done by other researchers in the specific subject and to grasp the essence of the work done by others. This section will address the notion of plagiarism, forms and types of plagiarism, prevalence of plagiarism, student understanding, and reasons for student plagiarism, awareness of plagiarism and strategies in the prevention of plagiarism. Basically this chapter is about review of literature about student plagiarism, studies that were conducted in relation with this study.

#### **2.2 What is Plagiarism?**

The phenomenon plagiarize is coming from the Latin word plagiary, means to kidnap (Karami & Danaei, 2016). Plagiarism is the cautious endeavour to mislead the reader over the fraud and demonstration of ideas, words and work of someone else. In that sense academic plagiarism happens when a writer frequently uses further than four words from a published document without recognising the author of the published source where there is no use of quotation marks and accurate references at the same time that work is presented as the author's own academic work (Hexham, 1999). And also Singh and Remenyi (2015) define plagiarism as the usage of other people's philosophies and words without giving the original author suitable credit.



The above is an unblemished indication of what plagiarism is about. Plagiarism is considered as a serious behaviour in the academic institution. It is considered as a visible delinquent that is related to an academic writing (O'Connor, 2003). The development of technology, academic dishonesty such as cheating, collusion and plagiarism remains to fascinate significant attention from the media, academics, administrators and students (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne 1997). As a result, with the initiation of additional current word processing software, "copy and paste" has become easy to do it because of advanced technology of our society. It has brought plagiarism a solution for many academic papers, as eminent by students (Barnbaum, 2002). Plagiarism is upfront, in other illustrations, it can be problematic to differentiate as it emanates in many forms, not all of which are that deceptive (Govender, 2009)

Plagiarism, a type of academic dishonesty, is often conceived as fraudulent behavior that diminishes the intellectual property of the original author and rewards plagiarists for their work (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). The term plagiarism is basically described as using others information without stating that, you obtaining credits for someone else work. Additionally, it can define as using another author's language, thoughts, ideas, or statements, and or portraying them as one's own authentic work but not endorsing the source (Marriam-Webster Dictionary, 2014). In the past during 1986, plagiarism was clarified as a scale ranging from sloppy paraphrasing to word for word transcription without acknowledging sources (Guruya & Guruya, 2017). While there is agreement about definitive cases of plagiarism, academics and writers have not agreed on a unified definition of plagiarism (Guruya, 2017).

In the academic setting is where this term is being explored. Plagiarism is an academic misconduct or academic fraud that results to fabrication. Guraya and London (2014) explain the term as an act of various research misconducts forms including the results fabrication, the data falsification, the data misinterpretation, special conclusions drawing and information or ideas plagiarism in a research report. Research misconduct goes with lack of acknowledgement. Karami and Danaei (2016) review the statistics based on researchers worldwide, more than 7.1 million researchers worldwide are passionately competing to get their research published in over 25,000 journals. Therefore it is clear that, the rate of plagiarism increases because of the competition of publications amongst the researchers.

The researchers are tense to get their work published in prestigious journals. While this pressure accompanies with insufficient time, no research skills and easily accessing information and articles available on the internet, plagiarism rate rises (Karami & Danaei, 2016). Whereas, Maurer, Kappe and Zake (2006) state that, 23% of the submitted articles have been turned down due to plagiarism. Bazdaric, Bilic-Zulle, Brumini and Petrovecki (2012) review that plagiarism commonality diverges from community to community as the rates display from 11 to 19% in medical institutions. The plagiarism rate goes up where the notions as intellectual property and copyrights are not entirely perceived and are not precisely honoured. As the intent says, plagiarism can either be unintentional or intentional (Jabulani, 2014). The prior form of plagiarism is generally perceived among students and young scholars. The authors in this phase differentiate between unintentional and intentional plagiarism.

Das and Panjabi (2011), state that unintentional plagiarism is also due to shortage of abilities how to appropriately approve the data sources and quote the work of others. Whereas intentional plagiarism is usually to intentionally copy others' work and provide it as though it is of one's own (Shi, 2012). Freckelton (2010) argues that there is no distinction can be made between intentional and unintentional plagiarism forms; both incur legal or financial penalties and can ruin a writer's prestige. Therefore, it is authoritative for the individual to appreciate how unintentional plagiarism occurs and what procedures to take to be protected against it. According to the Committee on Publication Ethics (CPE) (2013) it is very important if anyone going to submit their work has to check it in advance.

### **2.3 Types and Forms of Plagiarism**

This classification of plagiarism is comparatively due to its antique origins, placing plagiarism within a lawful dissertation, signifying that plagiarism refers to an act of theft of the individual ownership of intellectual work (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). This edifice of plagiarism assumes that information has an antiquity and that past authors must be recognized because deprived of due recognition, it has been argued that one splits the bonds between the author of the work and the conception (Stearns 1992). Certainly, Athanasou and Olasehinde (2002:2) proclaim that "The essence of cheating is fraud and deception", debatably a modest and straight classification of plagiarism. It is significant to gain a more nuanced gratitude of the numerous forms of plagiarism that can happen if a directed involvement is to be deliberated to address this delinquent (Chrysler-Fox & Thomas, 2017).

Plagiarism can occur in many forms based on the nature of the plagiarized production and some forms are very problematic to ascertain (Hulupa, 2014).

This segment will develop an understanding of the different forms of plagiarism. According to Roig (2006:66) “there are two main forms of plagiarism in existence”. Which are the plagiarism of ideas and the plagiarism of text.

### **2.3.1 Idea Plagiarism**

*“Appropriating an idea (e.g., an explanation, a theory, a conclusion, a hypothesis, a metaphor) in whole or in part, or with superficial modifications without giving credit to its originator...”*

*Roig (2006: 4)*

The above explanation endorses that if you take any idea from other author document or source you’re required to credit that owner in the right way. Price and Price (2005) consider this form of plagiarism as minor plagiarism. Wager (2014:35) view minor plagiarism as “text copied from other sources with acknowledgement of the author”. Referencing is the right way of crediting the owner of the work because if you not doing so that can be considered as fraud. This is a very trivial principle to apply and to avoid, as it entails the proper crediting of any ideas used. Roig (2006) goes on to state that both forms, unconscious as well as deliberate plagiarism, exist in idea plagiarism. Chrysler-Fox and Thomas (2017:4) concluded that “minor’ plagiarism was regarded as the inclusion of a citation that accompanied copied text”.

### **2.3.2 Text Plagiarism**

*“Copying a portion of text from another source without giving credit to its author and without enclosing the borrowed text in quotation marks...”*

*Roig (2006: 6)*

The statement above is straightforward, as any copying of verbatim (word for word) text is to be enclosed in quotation marks and properly referenced. According to Roig (2006), plagiarism of text is probably the most common form of plagiarism in existence. In Chrysler-Fox and Thomas (2017) journal this type of plagiarism is considered as a major plagiarism. Karami and Danaei (2016:3-4) also explain types of plagiarism:

“Plagiarism of ideas: stealing a novel idea or theory given anywhere. The plagiarist then performs research according to this idea/ theory and provides it as though it is of his own without crediting the source. Plagiarism of text: this form is also known as “word-to word” (copy-cut-paste) writing. This occurs when a researcher takes an entire paragraph from another source and includes it in his own research writing. Self-plagiarism: this happens when a researcher uses substantial parts of his study in two diverse publications employing similar findings or illustrations without referring to it. Collusion: asking someone else to write a piece of work for the plagiarist who then presents it as his own. Patch writing: by patch writing, we mean copying pieces of another one work and altering a few of the words or the word order to look as the original one”

Since plagiarism comes in different forms, Chong (2013:15) states that “it can happen in any field that involves a creation process, which includes written text, computer source code, art and design, and even music pieces”. There are types of plagiarism which have been addressed in previous research which are mainly multiple-choice tests, source code in programming languages and written text (Hulupa, 2014). In academic setting written text plagiarism is the measure form of plagiarism, as Chong (2013) supports that written text plagiarism is the most common cases are found in academic settings. Higher education institutions commonly have policy and procedure documents on plagiarism that explain what is considered to be plagiarism (Shi, 2012).

Maurer et al. (2006) state how plagiarism occurs in the academic setting, of which can be considered as academic fraud or dishonesty. The ghost writer or submitting someone else's work and insufficient referencing and direct copying, from one or multiple sources and paraphrasing (Jabulani, 2014). The above examples reveal how academic dishonesty occurs. The characteristics of plagiarism are often apparent from numerical and etymological traits. There are several factors that can indicate a plagiarism case, lexical changes involve the addition, deletion or replacement of words in the text and sudden change of vocabulary, such as the excessive use of new terminology within a document, is usually a good indication of copy-and-paste plagiarism (Clough, 2000). Syntactic changes in syntactic data are best pragmatic from substantial change of the structure of the editions and semantic changes this involves more fundamental modifications in the editions, usually constructed on substantial paraphrasing that can contain both lexical and syntactic changes (Clough, 2000).

### **2.3 Prevalence of Plagiarism**

Most of researchers show that the phenomenon of plagiarism is common. Before the development of technology in different countries, plagiarism was prevalent. Student plagiarism in universities is also prevalent. There are different studies that show prevalence of plagiarism in different universities, that reveals how important for student to understand better the act. Drake research discovered that 23% of college students have cheated sometime in their academic careers (Bolin, 2004). According to Bowers (1964) conducted a survey that discloses that 5,000 students in 99 higher education institutions indicated that three quarters of the sampled students admitted to some kind of academic dishonesty of cheating. Clearly plagiarism does occur in different learning institutions, which place the rate of plagiarism in high level (Price & Price, 2005). The proportion of plagiarism has wide-ranging from one study to another. According to Moon (1990) around 60% of university students in the United Kingdom and United States have involved in some form of academic dishonesty positively. In United States and Canada students of colleges and universities admit in engaging on plagiarism or exclusively cheating (McCabe, 2005a). McCabe (2005a) mentioned plagiarism has amplified from 10% in 1999 to 40% in 2005.

The increase of plagiarism also impacts both locally and internationally. Maxwell et al. (2006) study of both local students and international, Asian students in Australia revealed a significant prevalent rate of 80% of respondents admittedly plagiarizing some time in some form. The accumulative proportion of plagiarism among students of sophisticated learning or high education has elevated apprehension and worries among academics. Duggan (2006) argues that scholars have contended that the occurrences of plagiarism were at higher level academics alleged they could accomplish but it has taken on a prevalent extent.

The reason for the increase of plagiarism rate is the great development of advance technology: internet (Rosamond, 2002). According to Eckstein (2003), ever since information and communication technology was introduced to teaching and learning, academic misconduct has been an increasing problem leading to decline of academic integrity in the 21st century. The advancement of technology contribute great in the prevalence of plagiarism, 25% of students do cut and paste online without citation, 700 undergraduate surveyed reported to the survey (Scanlon & Neumann, 2002). As a result, the core reason for increase of plagiarism is because of the access of internet, student ended up misuse the internet for their advantage.

According to McCabe's (2005a) research survey piloted in the 2002/2003 academic year in United States and Canada accounts that about 36% of the respondents voluntarily reported one or more incidences of cut and paste plagiarism from internet sources. Additionally, in the survey by the Josephson Institute of Ethics (2006) accounts that 33% of high school students surveyed admitted to copying an internet document for a classroom assignment within the past 12 months and 18% did so two or more times. Moreover, Selwyn's (2008) study among undergraduate students in the United Kingdom higher institutions accounts that 60% of students have admitted to plagiarizing something from the internet in the last year and that those who are internet savvy are more likely to be engaged in plagiarism more .

The occurrences and applies of plagiarism have converted further common among internet users and those who have continuous access to the internet. Armstrong (2008) mention that studies have reported a straight association among students awareness, arrogances, to plagiarism and the proportion of incidence of plagiarism. If students deliberate plagiarism as a cheating and negative behaviour, they must be less prospective involved in such delinquency (Chrysler-Fox & Thomas, 2017)

Students apparent convinced acts of plagiarism as less serious, there is extraordinary tendency for them to involve in such acts (CPE, 2013). According to Rimer (2003) reports that 38% surveyed students who admitted to often engage in cut and paste plagiarism at least once a year, almost half of them considered their acts trivial or not cheating at all. Correspondingly, Wilkinson (2009:45) reports that of the surveyed students in his research, "more than one third (33%) cheated because they perceived cheating in course work to be common .

According to Marshall and Garry (2005a) these reported accumulative rates of plagiarism prevalence are questionable. They primary pointed out that numerous of these studies are assumed by asking students whether they have engaged in plagiarism. This is a very comprehensive method of decisive the authentic degree of plagiarism and greatest often than not the outcomes restrained out are not consistent to some extent. Schaefer (2010) argued that most studies on academic dishonesty are largely surveys that involve self-reported instances or motivations for plagiarizing. Therefore although quantitative data collected from surveys are dynamic in displaying a problematic subsists or regulates the possibility or series of the problem; and to give a true picture of the incidence of plagiarism.

Marshall and Garry's scenario-based research approach conducted among New Zealand university students indicated a plagiarism prevalence rate of 72% of students having involved in some form of serious plagiarism regularly (Abukari, 2016). A identified plagiarism activities by Babalola (2012) results showed that 69.2% often copied and pasted portions of text from the internet, 65.7% of respondents often copied verbatim from a textbook or a journal without using quotation marks, while 58.5% often included references they did not used in their work and 46.7% often submitted assignments without reference (Abukari, 2016). According to the research by Sentleng and King (2012) reports similar trends of various forms of plagiarism being prevalent in students 'works, here are the result: 38.8% of respondents admitted to paraphrasing works without acknowledgement sometimes, 48.2% have used summarized text in assignments without acknowledgement, while majority (49.6%) admitted to having invented references in their work sometimes . The incidences of plagiarism remain to rise virtually at a disturbing rate among students of higher education. (Abukari, 2016).

### **2.3 Student Understanding of plagiarism**

Many researchers argue that there is uncertainty on what is perceived as academic dishonesty among learners (Ashworth et al., 1997). Herman (2011) argues that students have appealed that they don't know what lecturers consider to be dishonest or cheating. Lathrop and Foss (2000) agree that there is an intrinsic conflict between lecturers desire to assign collaborative work to learners for preparation for future careers and the need to teach learners to do their own work. The point of crossing the line to cheating may differ by each lecturer (Williams, 2001).

Even though there is ambiguity among learners on what constitutes academic dishonesty, there is also a cavalier attitude toward cheating by learners in higher education (Ashworth et al, 1997). According to Weinstein and Dobkin (2002) research consistently reports that learners feel their cheating will not affect others. At the other hand, some researchers argue that students understand plagiarism to be a victimless crime; the only person that plagiarism is cheating is oneself (Karami & Danaei, 2016). Gillespie (2003) states that studies on self-reported plagiarism indicate that plagiarism are accepted among their peers and the likelihood of getting caught is slim, and if the learner does get caught, the punishment will be minimal. Gibbs (1975), (as cited by McCabe & Trevino, 1993) suggests that learners will not be deterred from misconduct, in this case cheating, unless they perceive they will get caught and

that the punishment is perceived to be severe. Learners will simply weigh the cost and benefits of plagiarizing based on their personal beliefs (Weinstein & Dobkin, 2002).

The prospective cost is the probability of getting caught and the apparent punishment. According to Wager (2014:4) “The perceived benefit is based on learner perception of how much plagiarism will improve his or her grade”. Under this concept, institutions must establish policy and inform students of the policy, and enforce the policy with strict consequences in order to deter plagiarism in the course (Karami & Danaei, 2016).

Students accepting plagiarism as the “norm” are the people responsible for the future “civil society and the economy” (Gillespie, 2003: 30). This arrogant attitude of students is not ending at graduation, but is continuing with resume fraud and altering of other learner scores (CPE, 2013).

#### **2.4 Reasons for student plagiarism**

The literature on plagiarism offers a wide range of explanations reasons on student plagiarism. These incorporate, however are not constrained to, time to finish assignments (poor time management), apparent disjuncture between award and exertion required, an excess of work to finish over an excessive number of subjects, strain to do well, perception that students will not get caught, anomie, inspiration, and individual variables (age, age, point average, gender, personality type) (Anderman, Griesinger, & Westerfield 1998; Anderman & Midgley 1997; Calabrese & Cochran 1990; Caruana, Ramaseshan, & Ewing 2000; Davis, Grover, & Becker 1992; Kibler 1993; Price & Price 2005; Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, & Armstead 1996; Park 2003; Perry et al. 1990; Roig & Caso 2005; Sheard, Carbone, & Dick 2003; Hulupa, 2014)

There are many reasons for student plagiarism. Intentional plagiarism as stated before, one of the most important reasons behind plagiarism is the severe pressure the researchers and academic staff undergoes to publish their research papers (Ambrose, 2014). Such researchers feel obliged to publish research papers in order to access funds, demonstrate their academic competency, hold on with their profession and achieve better posts in their career hierarchy (Triggle, 2007).The complication of the matter of academic dishonesty is apparent by the multiplicity of reasons provided for why students cheat (Wideman, 2008). Researchers argue that students cheat due to ignorance (Jocoy, 2006; Pickard, 2006) poor professors and teaching environments (Hinman, 2002; Rabi, Patton, Fjortoft, & Zgarrick, 2006; Anderman, 2007), inadequate policies and penalties regarding plagiarism (Macdonald & Carroll, 2006;



Martin, 2006), peer influence (Brown, 2002; Del Carlo & Bodner, 2003; Myrick, 2004; Petress, 2003; Rabi, et al.,2006), to improve grades (Cummings, Maddux, Harlow, & Dyas, 2002; Underwood & Szabo, 2004), opportunity (McCabe & Trevino, 1993), the Internet (Baum, 2005; Bruster, 2004), procrastination (Roig & Caso, 2005) underdeveloped moral reasoning (Austin, Simpson & Reyen, 2005; Clark, 2003; Lindh, Severinsson & Berg, 2007; Szabo & Underwood, 2004), (as cited by Wideman, 2008).

Dawson and Overfield (2006) propose that lot of students prompt confusion exercising proper practices for plagiarism avoidance. As a result, there is no understanding of plagiarism and that is why other students consider it as acceptable and others don't. Definitions on plagiarism might contrast considerably against dissimilar backgrounds and as an outcome; students do not always have a clear understanding of plagiarism (Beute et al., 2008). Students are not constantly alert of what institutes plagiarism. Conversely, in some cases where students are able to define plagiarism, there might be difficulties in the application of what they have learned (Foltýnek & Čech, 2013). Exposing student to literacy training might help students to ethical or non-ethical behaviour to the phenomenon of plagiarism. Lamula (2017) argues that training the students the adequate academic practices, does not guarantee that they will not plagiarise. This confounds exasperating to find out why they plagiarise as their intent is approximately difficult to govern. Students' can consequently plagiarise in spite of the acquaintance they obtain through their existences in university (Herman, 2011).

Placing of policy and procedures on plagiarism might also help for student to academic dishonesty, but institutional policies are deceptive in that they fugitive plagiarism and promote its avoidance while some students are not effectively associated with the phenomenon and the background issues associated with it (Luke, 2014). Lamula (2017) suggests that if university policies are reformed the ways in which plagiarism is regulated would change also. Plagiarism is often associated to academic dishonesty and deliberated as an unethical practice (Shi, 2012). There is a general assumption that students understand and aware of plagiarism, whereas is based on their unfamiliarity with academic discourses (Chrysler-Fox & Thomas. 2017). Lamula (2017:57) argues, "Plagiarism may be a condition facilitated by the students' ignorance as opposed to an intentional action". Whereas, Wood (2004) and Thompson (2005) mention that students do not remedy to plagiarism uniquely because they are dishonest or lack ethical values. Plagiarism may happen as an outcome of differing experiences or a failure for the students to recognise the importance of their work.

Moreover, plagiarism may occur when the students fail to see the repercussions of taking someone else's work and claiming it as their own (Luke, 2014).

Plagiarism may be a result of ignorance, unawareness, lack of understanding or perhaps the fact that English may not be the student's first language (Dores & Henderson, 2009). There are many reasons for student plagiarism contextual influences on plagiarism can be the categories of reasons for student plagiarism include perceptions of peer behaviour (Scanlon & Neumann, 2002). Students may continue to plagiarise because of time constrictions or due to their unawareness and uncertainty of the existence of punishments for academic dishonesty, while others do it in spite of knowing the consequences (Scanlon & Neumann, 2002; Park, 2004).

Additionally Sentleng and King (2012) suggest that students may plagiarise because they have negative attitudes towards their courses, while some do it because they claim that everyone is doing it. As a result, it imposes the idea of believing that chances of getting caught are little, so the focus is on the benefit of the act (plagiarism) without considering the risk of doing it. Students may engage in academic dishonesty just because they are lazy and confused about summarising and paraphrasing in their own words (Sentleng & King, 2012). Jabulani (2014) mentions that the students may not even consider their work as something important and worthwhile and should be protected. Therefore campaigns discouraging plagiarism are needed for fighting against academic dishonesty. Clement and Brenenson (2013) and Luke (2014) state that plagiarism is a means of achieving goals for the students. As a result, they plagiarise because they want to complete their assignments, get their degrees, acquire credentials (qualifications), get their dream jobs, and eventually money. Additionally, the peer pressure also plays a vital role on plagiarism because they ended up competing to one another (Wager, 2014)

It comes to a point where Lamula (2017) states that student tend to forget to follow institutional perceptions of plagiarism, students define plagiarism in terms of what their fellow peers are up to. Clearly social currents have an influence on student socialization. Koul's et al. (2009) emphasises that the way a person has been socialised within a society influences their attitudes towards plagiarism. Hence, indeed social life brings a lot of pressure on students; they ended up adequately view motive and intent without considering consequences of that act. In other words how one is socialised within society affects the way they perceive matters in general. Kutz et al. (2011) argue that the quantity of students who

comprehend plagiarism as a serious offence is diminishing because in part society has adopted a culture, based on appropriating and revising. The author states that plagiarism is no longer a matter of academic dishonesty and a violation of the codes of conduct but the formation of new norms and values within society (Park, 2004). Consequently exertions to attempt and understand plagiarism in the academic perspective must embrace cultural framework. Lamula (2017) argues that if institutional policies do not embrace this method they may be at risk of becoming out-dated and perpetuating what they are trying to avoid. Furthermore, broader partaking and mass access to higher education institutions may result in an unfamiliarity of the concept of plagiarism (Hosny & Fatima, 2014; Macfarlane et al., 2014). Hosny and Fatima (2014) further correlate the fear of future employment, high family expectations and competition among students as a contributing factor as to whether the students will plagiarise or not. Moreover, before anything else universities are businesses within the larger international economy; it is only natural that they admit a large number of students for profit (Bennett, 2011).

In many cases, these results were obtained through self-reported surveys of students and faculty, some of them involving thousands of students (Wideman, 2008). For instance, in 2002 to 2003, the Centre for Academic Integrity at Duke University conducted a study with data collected from 54 colleges and universities (McCabe, Butterfield & Trevino, 2006) (as cited in Wideman, 2008). Students have accredited deceitful actions (plagiarism); they have plaid the suitable case for the explanations behind the plagiarism as defined by the researcher, whereas the matter remains unsolved (Wideman, 2008). The study of cheating among graduate business students, researchers were only able to determine 12% of the variance in cheating suggesting that the survey did not provide enough variables from which students could choose to explain their cheating behaviours (McCabe, Butterfield & Trevino, 2006).

The increase level of cheating in academic setting considered as plagiarism is not only increasing but is becoming more socially acceptable (Vojak, 2007). Drinen (1999:32) states that “solving the problem of academic dishonesty is compromised when students feel a loyalty towards each other in that there is a reluctance to “rat” on each other”. In their study, Rabi, et al. (2006) found that 65% of students would not report a fellow student who cheated. As a result, peer influence also has a contribution on student plagiarism. Students deny themselves a chance to principal these abilities and constructing academic writing gradually problematic as they grow through completing their degree (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010). Underwood and Szabo (2003) state that postsecondary classes have become so large that

students look to each other for assistance. It was confirmed in Ashworth, Bannister and Thorne' (1997:198) study where they found students failed to condemn cheating behaviours with the justification that "all have their reasons". Therefore the prominence of peer influence and support seems to play a foremost part in student plagiarism.

Reasons for plagiarism are intricate and multidimensional that can be approximately accredited to poor language proficiency, weak educational backgrounds, and unawareness of the grave consequences of detected plagiarism (Amsberry, 2009). According to Bakhtiyaki et al. (2014:102) mentioned that "factors described in literature as the leading causes of plagiarism included: lack of ethical awareness and poor understanding of the principles of scientific writing" and unawareness of the consequences and gravity of plagiarism.

Considering external and internal factor that contribute to student plagiarism is very important. McCabe and Trevino (1997) examined both individual characteristics and contextual influences on academic dishonesty. Their results indicated that decision-making relating to academic dishonest behaviour is not only influenced by individual characteristics such as age, gender and grade point average, but also contextual influences such as the level of cheating among peers, peer disapproval of cheating, membership of societies for male and female students. Consequently, to better comprehend student perceptions of plagiarism, we must take into account not only individual student characteristics but also broader contextual factors (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). The supposition that the phenomenon plagiarism has joint meaning is due to the institution's dependence on university policy to be a mechanism together defines what plagiarism is and the conceivable result if breached (Lamula, 2017). According to Gullifer and Tyson (2010:345) having a good understanding of institutional policy reduces the risk of engaging in plagiarism. Therefore better understanding of the policy and procedures that are placed within the institution indeed engagement on academic dishonesty can decrease, because of better understanding makes an individual to take to an account the result of such act.

Jordan (2001) found that students categorized as non-frauds recounted better indulgent of institutional policy than did frauds. The deceptive nonexistence of knowledge of institutional policy is more compounded by contradictory and often ambiguous information delivered by academic staff, as they also struggle to enforce an accepted and clear definition of plagiarism (McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino 2003). According to a study conducted by Burke (1997), over half of the academics surveyed not only reported a lack of familiarity with the university's policy on plagiarism, but also did not refer to the policy when dealing with incidents. Therefore lack of clarity about plagiarism contributes on how student engage on plagiarism.

In the area of plagiarism there are numerous studies that show the reasons for students to plagiarize. Razera (2011) pointed out that student's lack time, skills and interest and ended up plagiarize. Therefore they spend more time on their social life activities and lack time for academic activities, whereas they lack skills of writing an academic papers. And they do not have interest for doing their academic works. Another reasons for student plagiarism is reaching of higher grades (Sheard, Carbone & Dick, 2002), deprived assignment design, less contact with the teacher or lecture due to large class size and lack of acquaintance about what is adequate due to ethnic differences (Relph & Randle, 2006)

## **2.5 Awareness of Plagiarism**

Marsden, Carroll, and Neil (2005) stress that the expenses to the public through inadequately trained graduates could pose a threat to public safety, welfare and financial decisions through inaccurate advice, the ramifications of which tarnish universities' reputations and increase media scrutiny. Furthermore, it has been optional that academic dishonesty is rising, necessitating universities to dedicate increasing time and resources to combat it. Especially, the obligation is on the academic handling the subject to appropriately classify plagiarism and denote the problem to proper university procedures (Sutherland-Smith, 2005). Therefore high level of awareness of plagiarism is required, because this act causes or posed threat to the public, because companies cannot hire graduates from the institution where plagiarism is a norm (Chong, 2013)

According to University of KwaZulu-Natal policy and procedure document for example, as authored by Vithal (2009: 3-4) plagiarism is defined as "any attempt to pass another person's work as one's own as means to mislead and deceive the reader". This might happen over the failure to recognize appropriately or suitably the original source. According to Razera (2011)

majority of the students appealed that they knew about the existence of a written policy for dealing with plagiarism, there was still vagueness concerning if they have ever plagiarized. This confirms that students are more conscious of plagiarism policies. The statistic reveals that 36% of online course students did not distinguish about an animation of policy for commerce with plagiarism (CPE, 2013). And also that were ambiguous if ever plagiarized displays that there is a nonexistence in the information transported from the lecturer or teacher to the students about plagiarism. There is a probability that the policy on how to covenant with plagiarism is not exclusively vibrant to the students (Razera, 2011), and also it can be lecturers or teachers are not giving students a clear explanation what is acceptable or unacceptable, or students do not bother to recite the policy. Singh and Remenyi (2015) also argue that campus students it seems that a way to increase the knowledge about plagiarism and the awareness of plagiarism in their department would be students being informed regarding the consequences of plagiarism. Furthermore, this can be anticipated from one of the remarks made by campus students, you cheat you are out of the course (Razera, 2011).

### **2.5.1 Plagiarism policy and procedures**

According to Lamula (2017) policy and procedure archives on plagiarism may not be an adequate technique of managing, tending to and dealing with the issue of plagiarism, and also lecturers are required to instruct students on reading policy and procedure on plagiarism. Howard (2001) mentions that students are having a responsibility to read these institutional policies and procedure records on plagiarism. This gives a clear point that lecturers could attempt to be more proactive in guiding, and characterizing to the students these policy documents. As indicated by Howard (2001) and Walker (1998) teachers could accomplish more in helping the students put into setting the idea of plagiarism by talking about various settings in which plagiarism can happen.

Brown and Howell (2001) emphasized that together the lecturers and policies should emphasise not only definition and context of plagiarism but they should emphasise the severity of the act of plagiarising. Therefore, emphasising the strictness of plagiarism is significant in that, students would not distinguish plagiarism as less of an offence. The augmented view in the strictness of plagiarism will discourage the students from plagiarising. Walker (1998) pointed out that approaches in dealing with plagiarism include the construction of faculty based policies. Faculty based policies would be attended by faculty associates managing the application and implementation of these policies.

Furthermore, measures on plagiarism and methods to produce virtuous ethical research should be perceptible, effortlessly reachable and well-advertised on a national and institutional level (Horn, 2013). Additionally, universities need to be attentive of where they are located and the demographics of students who enrol within. Thomas and De Bruin (2015) on the other hand argue that since observing that multiple authored material contained significantly less plagiarised material propose strict peer review as another solution to dealing with plagiarism.

## **2.6 Plagiarism Vs Prevention**

According to Byrne and Trew (2005) in order to be operational, interventions that aim to reduce or prevent offending behaviour need to be based on a sound understanding of what leads people to offend, and what lead people to stop offending. Equivalent views are articulated by Ashworth, Bannister, and Thorne (1997) in relation to plagiarism. They contend that understanding the student viewpoint on plagiarism can meaningfully help academics in their efforts to communicate appropriate norms. Therefore there is value in understanding students' standpoints concerning plagiarism in command to develop effective strategies to stimulate academic integrity and prevent plagiarism. This implies that less understanding of plagiarism brings high level of academic dishonesty. Therefore, McCabe and Trevino (1993) identified a significant relationship between academic dishonesty and how students perceived both student and faculty understanding of institutional policy. According to the study by Roig (2006) evidently established that more than half of the students in their study could not identify clear examples of plagiarism, indicating that, whilst policy may exist, students have little knowledge or understanding of it. It is obvious, consequently, the universities can benefit from learning about their own students' discernments of plagiarism in command to develop suitable strategies to uphold academic integrity.

Karami & Danaei (2016) state that among the academic settings, committing plagiarism by the students, professors or researchers is taken as academic deceit or fraud, and the ones committing this crime are subjected to academic penalties, such as dismiss. The institution: the students/ junior researchers, the experts/senior staffs are responsible on prevention of plagiarism. Here, some recommendations are given for each group that may help to solve the ever growing problem of plagiarism, it is a must for students and junior researchers to avoid plagiarism, whenever no other one's idea, opinion, theory, facts, statistics, graphs, drawings

or any piece of information is adopted in their own research to credit an author by referencing correctly (Karami & Danaei, 2016). In case of including the exact words from another source in a piece of writing, these words should be put between quotation marks followed by crediting the source and as a scientific fact is taken from an original article, it should be written in the author's own words, not an exact copy of the paragraph from the source (Thomas & De Bruin, 2015). Rawat and Meena (2014) mention that using one of the plagiarism detection services is effective to distinguish the plagiarized pieces of writing not detected in the new manuscript. Scholarly writing requires training and practice like any other skill, and particularly for junior researchers, and for senior experts, it needs patience and time (Neill, 2008). According to Jabulani (2014) the most fundamental step to block plagiarism is to make sure that the institution students and researchers are equipped with the adequate knowledge about plagiarism, its forms, types, outcomes and how to avoid committing it. As stated,, it clear that that the students and researchers will remark the problem of plagiarism systematically and will appreciate its significance enhanced in case of being carried in cooperative workshops and seminars rather than in lectures, oral advice or warnings (Karami & Danaei, 2016) and it noted that several plagiarism-detection services and software programs have been made reachable as the useful tools for both students and experts; the students are able to check their writing for pieces that may have an exact match in the previously published articles (Shi, 2012). These services indeed can assist to decrease the rate of plagiarism within the institutions. Plagiarism –detection services are required to pay attention on plagiarism, they should ensure that the students get the meaning behind plagiarism and how to dodge it (Karami & Danaei, 2016).

Numerous authors have offered prevention techniques to lecturers against cyber plagiarists who know how to steal from the Web and online services (Ercegovic & Richardson, 2004). McKay (2014: 1315) proposes that tertiary institutions adopt a “prevention and development approach”. The approach consists of different mixed strategies of dealing with student plagiarism. Lamula (2017) made examples of mixed strategies, the enforcement of institutional honour codes through the signing of declarations, formalisation of research ethics courses, employment of tutors, institutional awareness initiatives. Additional ways to deter plagiarism would include one-on-one consultations with students by lectures and tutors and also student resubmissions of assignments (Lamula, 2017).



According to McKay (2014), the prevention and development approach is a more effective way of dealing with plagiarism unlike the acceptance of patch writing which promotes rewriting material. The approach would offer students with a deeper understanding of academic discourse which would improve their academic literacy over time. McKay (2014) does however note that the prevention and development approach is time and human resource intensive. Correspondingly, Glendinning (2014) proposes that strategies to discourage plagiarism amongst students need to be active rather than passive. Assignments and assessments must require students to apply their knowledge in order to develop the students writing skills. Postgraduate students need to actively engage and have close relationships with their supervisors through frequent consultations throughout the students' dissertation and writing process. The university needs to do away with techniques that encourage students to memorise and cram notes. It needs to facilitate an environment that revolves around encouraging critical thinking and innovation which would foster a culture of 'curiosity and honesty' amongst the students. The institution could adopt a culture of reflection and action which would assist in doing away with poorly defined policies (Lamula, 2017).

According to Carroll (2004) students will be less able to plagiarise if teachers change the assessment task and change what they ask students to submit for assessment each time the course runs. If students plagiarize, the remorseful cannot be placed completely on them. Carroll (2004) also mentions that when the course is perceived as uninteresting by the students, there is a higher chance that they will eventually cheat. Students should be educated and trained about what consent is and what is not correctly as well as what the results are in case of delinquency. Teaching them over and over about what is right and wrong can be a good strategy to prevent plagiarism.

According to Razera (2011) the development of the internet for the past decades made possible the spread of information (any information) worldwide. Thus, virtually everything is conceivable to be found in the internet, from articles and papers presented in prominent conferences, journals to websites with texts printed by unknown persons. The fact is that the internet is nowadays the greatest common assistant of students when it comes to research. Razera (2011) on one hand, states that it is intriguing that technology advanced itself in such a way that donates everyone the chance to access the major gathering of information in the world, but on the other hand, the usage of it is not always done in the proper way by the end-users, in this way facilitating the occurrence of plagiarism. It has always happened, but the difference is that nowadays the process for committing plagiarism is easier than it used to be

due to the easy access to electronic data. Students do not seem to be concerned to produce their assignments by using “copy and paste” from the internet, maybe because they think that everything on the internet can be commonly used which it is to some extent acceptable with a little remark that all the information on the internet was thought, created and written by someone who spent time doing it and therefore needs to be recognized for that or because they do not find references to the text source. When it comes to detection tools, there are several ones currently available in the market both for text and code plagiarism. Turnitin2 is a very popular tool used world-wide for detection of text plagiarism.

## **2.7 Conclusion**

Plagiarism is a broad area for research as numerous studies has been developed around it. There are different sentiments in defining the phenomena plagiarism. Plagiarism is entangled in an extensive assortment of ethical circumstances. The existence of the act is based on the understanding of the phenomena by students in higher education institutions. Furthermore institutions must be careful when fabricating policies and procedures of the demographics of the students that enrol within them, so that the policies are compatible with students. In the area of plagiarism there are numerous studies that show the reasons for students to plagiarize. Razera (2011) point out that student’s lack time, skills and interest and ended up plagiarize. Therefore they spend more time on their social life activities and lack time for academic activities, whereas they lack skills of writing an academic papers. And they do not have interest for doing their academic works. Another reasons for student plagiarism is reaching of higher grades (Sheard, Carbone & Dick, 2002). The review of literature created broad notion of the phenomenon of plagiarism among university students.

## *Chapter Three*

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Theories are articulated to explain, comprehend phenomena to challenge and encompass existing knowledge within the limit of serious bounding assumption. The theoretical framework is the structure that embraces or supports a theory of a research study. It also describes the theory that explains why the research problem under study exists. The purpose of this chapter is to pinpoint, describe and explain the theoretical conventions underlying the issue of student plagiarism. The chapter addresses the explanation of cause and factors that contribute to academic dishonesty (plagiarism) in a scientific proportion. Many theories have been developed by scholarly investigators to sustenance and provide direction to research investigations. The set of principles that explain how the event occurs frame the study in the scientific manner. The following three theories are theories that make much effort to describe the reason why and how do students engage on plagiarism and what factors play a role in this. These theories tie factual instances to assumptions that have been studied over decades. This research was therefore guided by the social learning theory, self-control and strain theory.

#### **3.2 Social learning theory**

According to Akers (2011:131) "Social learning is that individuals learn either prosocial norms or antisocial norms (i.e. deviant, delinquent and criminal behavior) through key learning mechanisms and processes". This study utilized Social learning theory to understand plagiarism. As such, whether students are motivated to involve in plagiarism is mainly based on their socialization within certain peer groups. Akers (2011:182) this theory reveals that "individuals are expose to normative definition favorable or unfavorable to illegal or law-abiding behavior". Society is one of the social institution where socialization occur, where deviant, delinquent and criminal behavior developed due to prosocial norms and antisocial norms In relation to plagiarism, students learned a deviant behavior through socialization within the culture of student life. This theory revealed that criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others in the process of communication. The best methods of communication such as interaction and observation has a huge role on the development of deviant behavior ,

this theory also argues, is more prevalent in individuals who associate and interact with individuals who exhibit criminal mind sets and behavior (Akers, 2011). The key learning mechanism played a huge role in the development of academic dishonesty (plagiarism). The learning criminal behavior comprises learning different methods, intentions, initiatives, justification and approaches. In relation with the study this theory evoked how do student learned the fraudulent behavior of plagiarism.

Learning and observing are core terms in this issue, because fraudulent behaviour of plagiarism is learned and observed. On other hand Bandura (1997) theorizes that learning is a **cognitive-process** that takes place in a social-context and can happen virtuously over observation even in the absence of straight reinforcement. Furthermore, the observation of behaviour, learning also happens over the observation of recompenses and retributions, Bandura (1997) a process known as '**vicarious-reinforcement**'. In addition the theory expands that behaviour is directed merely by reinforcements. Bandura and Walters (1977) cited by Madara, et. el (2016:115) outlined key-doctrines of social learning theory as follows:

- “(1) Learning is not purely-behavioural; rather, it is a cognitive-process that takes place in a social-context,
- (2) Learning can occur by observing a behavior and by observing the consequences of the behavior (vicarious reinforcement),
- (3) Learning involves observation, extraction of information from those-observations, and making decisions about the performance of the behavior (observational learning or modelling). Thus, learning can occur without an observable-change in behavior,
- (4) Reinforcement plays a role in learning, but is not entirely-responsible for learning, and
- (5) The learner is not a passive-recipient of information. Cognition, environment, and behavior all mutually influence each-other (reciprocal determinism)”.

Social learning theory appeals profoundly on the notion of modelling, or learning by observing behaviour (Madura, et al 2016). University students engage on social interaction with the key mechanism of modelling, learning and observing behaviours. Plagiarism is a deviant action that student engage to, for conforming behaviour. The theory denotes to the entire variety of learning mechanisms. A student learns to participate on academic dishonesty (plagiarism) or to abstain from such action over collaborations with others. This initiates in the household, but the further important inspiration on university students is the behaviours and approaches of their peers.

These peer groups convince the individual with normative definitions which categorise the act of plagiarism as erroneous or accurate, provide behavioural models of honesty or dishonesty, and provide social reinforcement for restraint or commission of the deviant act (Akers, 1985). Over interfaces with crucial groups of household or associates or predicted reinforcement or castigation for their engagements, but these interfaces also uncover the student to social norms which approve or disapprove plagiarism. Students learn these and take them in as their own attitudes, they will hold “definitions” favorable or unfavourable to plagiarism. Lersch (1999:321) mention “If a definition is favorable to a deviant act, the action becomes an acceptable and approved form of behaviour”. Therefore to the point that a student ethically rejects plagiarism, he or she will abstain; the further the student favours plagiarism the more likely he or she is to commit it. Other definitions may be favorable to deceitful because they attend to “neutralize the undesirability of the act and thereby make the act appear to be more justified or excusable in the eyes of the actor” (Akers, 1985). Deviant behavior is learned and constant over discrepancy strengthening.

### **3.3 Self-control theory.**

Self-control is required as individual for in the avoidance of criminal or deviant behaviour. For the above theory SL theory, during the process of socialization with the society different definitions are learned and observed, favorable or unfavorable, and also legal and illegal. It required a self-control technique in avoidance of criminal or deviant behaviour. This study also underpinned Self-control theory (SC) to understand, explain and describe student plagiarism.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990:87) defined self-control as “the tendency of people to avoid criminal acts whatever the circumstances in which they find themselves”. Consequently, low self-control can basically be defined as an absence of that predisposition. People with low self-control are considered as spontaneous, unresponsive, corporal, “risk-taking, short-sighted, and nonverbal. Gottfredson and Hirschi additional explained on the behavior and approaches of individuals with low self-control, asserting that such individuals have unusual orientation; they lack attentiveness, persistence, and determination; and they are self-centered and insensitive. Furthermore, in relation with this study of student plagiarism, student who lack self-control tend to exhibit adventure- uniformity. Students with low self-control practice the act of plagiarism after the learning mechanism because they are failing to control their selves, they can be characterized as having a negligible patience for obstruction; they do

not certainly value academic. The student constitutes the deviant behaviour (plagiarism) just because of lack of self-control, during socialization within the university as one of social institution, external factors contribute to student behaviour ended up failing to control themselves of not engaging to academic dishonesty (plagiarism) According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) low self-control is the constant paradigm that links all of these features, attitudes, and behaviors together. It is a paradigm that is identifiable in infantile, previous to the age of responsibility, and is constant throughout the life progression.

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990: 234) "Self-control theory predicts that individuals with low levels of self-control engage in a variety of criminal and analogous acts". This theory also reveals that students plagiarize in hunt of self-interest. Self-control has been used to elucidate fraud-like behaviors that do not violate criminal law such as academic dishonesty (Gottfredson and Hirschi's, 1990). In addition this theory predicts student intentions in engaging on plagiarism, it is because of their low level of self-control that drives them to engage to academic dishonesty.

### **3.4 Strain theory.**

Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Cohen (1955) and Merton (1968) pointed the derivation of this theory as elucidation collective 'crime patterns'. This theory points that individuals engage in criminal activity when they are obstructed from legally achieving cultural goals. Pressure and strains increase the likelihood of crime or deviant behaviour (Agnew's, 1992). In relation with this study students experience academic pressure and strains, lack of university facilities and ended up on engaging or developing deviant behavior of plagiarism, just because of pressure of submissions and strains of lot of work.

Numerous endeavours have endeavoured to regulate whether strains lead to undesirable sentiments and whether these sentiments, in turn, lead to deviant behaviour. A few studies also propose that sentiments such as depression, frustration, and fear could occasionally elucidate the consequence of strains on crime or deviant behavior (Agnew, 2006). Lately, researchers have optional that certain strains may be more likely to lead to some sentiments than others. For instance, strains that contain excessive action by others may be particularly possible to lead to anger. Correspondingly, strains that one cannot leak from may lead to depression. Moreover, convinced sentiments may be further possible to lead to some crimes and deviant behaviour than others. Depression, conversely, may be more favourable to drug use or deviant behaviour even to academic dishonesty.

In relation with the study, student's experiences depression, anxiety, pressure and stress to their academic life, it might be deadline for submissions and so forth. Strain may lead them to engage on academic dishonesty or plagiarism for them to deal with the strain they are facing. Strains may also lead to deviant behavior because they decrease one's level of social control.

Furthermore, strains may substitute the social learning of crime and deviant behaviour; that is, strains may lead individuals to subordinate with others who underpin crime and teach beliefs favorable to crime. As Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) have suggested, 'strained individuals may associate with other criminals in an effort to cope with their strains'. For example, university students engage to academic dishonesty or plagiarism to deal with their strains of deadlines.

Lastly, individuals who experience strains over a long period may develop personality traits conducive to crime, including traits such as negative emotionality. Several studies have found support for these arguments; that is, strains do tend to reduce social control, foster the social learning of crime, and contribute to traits such as negative emotionality (Agnew, 2006; Paternoster & Mazerolle, 1994). Strains, then, may increase the likelihood of crime and deviant behaviour for several reasons, not simply through their effect on negative emotions".

### **3.5 Conclusion**

These three theories have significance in elucidating the study on plagiarism because they evaluate all the underlying elements that emerge on university students in understanding of plagiarism. They are active in contemporary day society and can effectively put into perspective the basis of student understanding of plagiarism with relation to the environmental, social and socio-economic state of university. These theories created a coherence ideology on how plagiarism is constitute in the scientific approach or basically theoretically. University students engage on social interaction with the key mechanism of modelling, learning and observing behaviours. Plagiarism is a deviant action that student engage to, for conforming behaviour. The theory denotes to the entire variety of learning mechanisms. A student learns to participate on academic dishonesty (plagiarism) or to abstain from such action over collaborations with others, and students with low self-control practice the act of plagiarism after the learning mechanism because they are failing to control their selves, they can be characterized as having a negligible patience for obstruction; they do not certainly value academic.

## *Chapter Four*

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

It is very important for the researcher to understand an area of the study to be familiar with the research methods it uses. Different research methods have diverse purposes and different levels of validity. Methodology provides advice on how to develop and organize a research paper in social sciences, actions to be taken to investigate a research problem. The argument in the previous chapter addressed literature to explain the notion and nature of plagiarism in higher institution specifically universities and also reviewed an explanation of the theoretical framework within this study. This chapter attends to explain the research methodology that was implemented in order to attain data that would address the objectives of the study. Precisely, the chapter explains the research paradigm, methodological approach, design and offers information on the techniques of sampling as well as data collection and analysis. The ethical considerations that pragmatic to the study, the argument of trustworthiness as well as the challenges and limitations of the study are concisely drawn.

#### **4.2 Research Paradigm**

##### *4.2.1 Descriptive-interpretive paradigm (hermeneutics)*

This study used descriptive-interpretative paradigm to address student's understanding of plagiarism. This paradigm is supreme diligently associated with qualitative research approach. According to Cohen and Manion (1994:360) descriptive-interpretive paradigm has the intention of understanding "the world of human experience". The reason for using this paradigm is because it explains the social world as subjective, as to understand, describe and explore people's feelings and experiences in human terms and in rich details. For stance the main aim of this study was to explore student understanding of plagiarism within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College). This paradigm grasped the inner meaning and context of the plagiarism phenomenon in question by focusing on the subjective manner (Bryman, 2012). Furth more Creswell (2003:8) mentions that based on this paradigm researcher tends to rely upon the



“participants’ views of the situation being studied” and distinguishes the influence on the research of their own contextual and experiences. Since the purpose of descriptive-interpretative paradigm is to understand people’s experiences and understanding about a certain phenomenon (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). In this case CFSD at UKZN serve as natural setting where the students make their living.

### **4.3 Research methodological approach**

#### *4.3.1 Qualitative research approach*

This study utilized the *qualitative research approach* which has the main purpose of understanding how people outlook a definite issue and how they feel about it. This technique of research used by social scientists is intended to manuscript sufficiently the productivity and variety of implications people attribute to phenomena (Burton, 2000). According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994:105) “a qualitative research focuses on interpretation of phenomena in their natural settings to make sense in terms of the meanings people bring to these settings”. The qualitative research approach contains data collection of personal experiences, contemplation, stories about life, interpretations, interviews, visual text and collaborations which are substantial to people’s life. The reason for this approach it permits a researcher to gain a profounder considerate of precise organizations or occasion, rather than an apparent account of a large sample of a population. Neuman (1997) mention that it purposes to offer a clear rendering of the structure, order, and broad patterns found in the research data. Qualitative research studies typically serve one or more of the following purposes (Peshkin, 1993: 134-1350)

- *Description*: they can reveal the nature of certain situation, setting, and processes. relationships, systems, or people
- *Interpretation*: they enable a researcher to (a) gain new insight about a particular phenomenon, (b) develop new concepts or theoretical perspective about the phenomenon and (c) discover the problems that exist within the phenomenon.
- *Verification*: they allow a researcher to test the validity of certain assumption, claims, theories or generalization within real-world contexts.
- *Evaluation*: they provide a means through which a researcher can judge the effectiveness of particular policies, practices or innovations.”

Therefore in this study, qualitative approach revealed the nature of plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, and other system. It enabled the researcher to gain new insight about plagiarism and discovered the problems that existed about plagiarism. This approach allowed a researcher to test theories within real world contexts related to the phenomenon plagiarism. This developed the judgment by the researcher about the effectiveness of plagiarism policies and procedures' within the University of KwaZulu-Natal.

This methodological research approach was relevant because the main aim of the research was to explore student's understanding of plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The phenomenon "plagiarism" was subjective, and it contributed to the objectives of the study of assessing student understanding of plagiarism, identifying if students plagiarize, ascertaining the level of awareness and the establishment of strategies in the prevention of plagiarism. The following are the characteristics of qualitative approach:

"1. Qualitative research methods usually collect data at the sight, where the participants are experiencing issues or problems. These are real-time data and rarely bring the participants out of the geographic locations to collect information. 2. Qualitative researchers typically gather multiple forms of data, such as interviews, observations, and documents, rather than rely on a single data source. 3. This type of research method works towards solving complex issues by breaking down into meaningful inferences that is easily readable and understood by all. 4. Since it's a more communicative method, people can build their trust on the researcher and the information thus obtained is raw and unadulterated".

(Bryman, 2012:53)

## **4.3 Research Design**

### *4.3.1 Phenomenological study*

This study adopted a *phenomenological study design*. Leedy and Ormrod (2005:139) define phenomenological as a person's perception of the meaning of an event, as opposed to the event as it exists external to the person". Phenomenological and associated approaches can be applied to single cases or to serendipitous or deliberately selected samples. Since this study underpinned qualitative methodological approach, phenomenological study design was relevant because students within CFSD at the UKZN were able to identify issues which elucidate inconsistencies and system failures and to lighten or draw attention to different situations about plagiarism. According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005:142) "phenomenological research can be robust in indicating the presence of factors and their effects in individual cases, but must be tentative in suggesting their extent in relation to the population from which

the participants or cases were drawn”. This design centred the phenomenon “plagiarism”, where student’s perceptions are drawn within the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The reason for this design, the study aimed to explore student understanding about plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College). This design drawn students perception about plagiarism, as this event of plagiarism takes place external to the students. A range of approaches can be used in phenomenological-based research, such as interviews, conversations, participant observation, action research, focus meetings and analysis of personal texts (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005).

## **4.5 Sampling Strategy**

### *4.5.1 Purposive Sampling technique (Non- probability)*

The study used non- probability sampling method called *purposive sampling*. Non-probability sampling is a sampling technique where samples are collected in a manner that does not provide all the individuals in the population equivalent odds of being selected (Neum, 2011). In relation to this study, a purposive sampling technique was used to select participants for the study. According to Neuma (2011) states that purposive sampling is the techniques in which the researcher looks for particular subjects who will serve the purpose of the research. Therefore students within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) were selected according to their study levels: first year ,second , third year and postgraduate students. Since the main aim of the study was to explore students understanding of plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard), students understanding of the phenomenon of ‘plagiarism’ as explore to all the levels of study within CFSD. Hence the researcher selected a sample on the purpose of the study. This means participants were selected because they were likely to generate useful data for the study. It is not a question of right or wrong but rather of ‘fit’ to purpose.

According to Marshall (1996:45) “The researcher actively selects the most productive sample to answer the research question”. In recognition of this, it can encompass emerging an outline of the variables that might influence participant involvement and will be grounded on the researcher's applied knowledge of the research extent and also the obtainable literature and indication from the study itself. If the subjects are notorious to the researcher, they might be stratified conferring to notorious public outlooks or opinions (Marshall, 1996). Throughout elucidation of the data it is significant to contemplate subjects who sustenance initial clarifications and, additional subjects who disagree (approving and disapproving samples).

#### *4.5.2 Sample Selection Criteria and recruiting strategy*

A suitable sample size for a qualitative study is one that effectively answers the research question (Marshall, 1996). The amount of required subjects frequently becomes apparent as the study progresses such as new sets, themes and elucidations stop incipient from the data (data saturation). Patton and Cochran (2002) support that “sample sizes are typically small in qualitative work and one way of identifying how many people you need is to keep interviewing until, in analysis, nothing new comes from the data” (p.9). Therefore that point is called ‘saturation’.

The study aims to explore students understanding of plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College). Therefore the study population were students from the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies. Sample selection criteria: A sample of 20 students, five from each level of study; first year to postgraduate students both males and females. Since the total population of potential key informants was small, this was essentially a non-probability sampling called purposive sampling techniques. The reason for that sampling technique was that students from CFSD were likely to generate useful data for the study according to the main aim of the study. According to Marshall (1996) states that qualitative sampling commonly entails a flexible, logical approach. It was advantageous to use this approach because it lied in its simplicity and the participants fulfilled the published selection criteria. The aim was to advance an understanding and an interpretative outline of the process of the study with contribution of students to the exploration of the phenomena plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College).

##### *4.5.2.1 Recruiting Strategy*

London (2010:45) states that recruiting strategy can usefully be defined as “practices and activities carried out by the researcher with the primary purpose of identifying and attracting potential participants for the study”. This definition highlights the significant of the researcher in a process in terms for strategizing for suitable participants for the study based on the main aim of the study to address research questions as well. After the researcher came up with sampling strategy approach, as the main aim of the study to explore students understanding of plagiarism with CFDS. The researcher approached the lecturers from the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) to ask for permission, to approach classes and students were asked to participate voluntary to this study. The researcher got names of those 20 students and planned with them for one to one interviews that took place in Malherbe Library (study venue), which was a conducive environment for interviews.

## **4.6 Data Collection**

### *4.6.1 Semi structured Interview (one-one on interview)*

According to Patton and Cochran (2002) argues that to use qualitative methods means that you will be generating data that is predominantly in the method of words, not figures. Furth more the supreme common data collection methods are different types of individual interviews (general or key informants) and group discussions. For instance in this study data was collected amongst the population of students (first to postgraduate level of study) at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies. The researcher used one-on-one interviews which are semi structured in nature which took 20-30 minute per each session. According to Patton and Cochran (2002:11) “Semi-structured interview are conducted on the basis of a loose structure and made up of open-ended questions defining the area to be explored”.

The reason for semi-structured interviews is that allow the respondents to openly share their perceptions or, where relevant, their experiences of the phenomenon being studied. For instance in this study students from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) within CFSD were allowed to openly share their understanding about plagiarism, answering the research questions that were entailed to achieve the study objectives. Semi-structured interviews trail a structure contingent on the nature and purpose of the research topic, the resources and methodological standards, and the type of objectives that prerequisite to be addressed (Burton, 2000). Additionally they also permit for the researcher to further probe for

amplification in cases where the researcher is not clear what the response mean. Bryman (2012:25) argues that data collection approaches for qualitative research commonly encompasses the “direct interaction with individuals on a one to one basis and direct interaction with individuals in a group setting”.

In this study the data collection approach entailed interaction between a researcher and the students one on one. This brought the benefit of the study that the information was richer and had a deeper insight into the phenomenon under study (plagiarism). For data collection there main methods for collecting qualitative data are:

- Individual interviews
- Focus group
- Observations
- Action Research

(Bryman, 2012)

This approach of the interview gave the researcher the freedom to probe the interviewee to elaborate or to follow a new line of inquiry introduced by what the interviewee is saying. Patton and Cochran (2002) argues that semi-structured interview work paramount when the interviewer has a set number of areas he/she wants to be certain to be addressing. For instance in this study this semi-structured interview (one-on one) was fairly informal and participants felt they were taking part in a conversation or discussion. The researcher used interview skills but the most skills the researcher used which required careful consideration and planning, as follows mentioned by Patton and Cochran (2002):

Good quality qualitative research involves:

- Thought
- Preparation
- The development of the interview schedule
- Conducting and analysing the interview data with care and consideration

(Patton & Cochran, 2002)

#### 4.6.2 *Recording and transcription*

According to London (2010) data transcription is a process where the recorded interviews from the research partakers are presented in a written form. As a result, every qualitative researcher is very important to go through that phase of data transcription. The data collected in this study was recorded and then transcribed. Each interview was recorded using a device cell phone and transferred to a backup storage device USB, after that interviews were manually transcribed by the researcher there was no use of computer software to assist accomplish and transcribe data. Predominantly, the reason to manually transcribe it was less costly than hiring professional transcribers since there was no funding for this study. An advantageous part of manually transcribing the interviews was that the researcher was able to engross deeper in to the research, and also to translate participant's responses in to English because some other students used IsiZulu.

During the transcribing the main goal was to find out about the participants' statements and also portray their understanding questions posed. The main aim of the study was to gain the students understanding of plagiarism. Therefore, finding out about the students' understanding concerning the area of plagiarism was central in the transcription process. The researcher also engaged to verbatim transcription during a manually transcribing where was able to capture the students tone, emotions, feeling and punctuation. Verbatim transcription refers to the process where the researcher attempts to capture the inter-individual nature of human communication (Halcomb & Davidson, 2006). Therefore all this was noted down to the note book in the written word during the transcription, every participant view was transcribed related to the main aim of the study where the central phenomenal was plagiarism.

## 4.7 Data analysis

### 4.7.1 Thematic analysis

This study used thematic analysis to analyse data. According to Patton and Cochran (2002:25), “A thematic analysis is one that looks across all the data to identify the common issues that recur, and identify the main themes that summarise all the views you have collected”. Therefore is basically a process of analysing data using themes incipient from the data. This is the supreme common method for qualitative study. For instance in this study the researcher reads through the data that was collected using semi-structured interview (one-on one) from students within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College) and categorised key ideas and words into linking themes and views. The researcher also made note of patterns and themes that were depicted in the data strengthens qualitative interpretation. It was the only way that the researcher came up with logical explanations that addressed the objectives of the study. The researcher followed the key stages of thematic analysis:

- 1 ***Read and annotate transcripts***: this is the most basic stage. Here you do not provide an overview of the data, but make preliminary observations. This is particularly useful with the first few transcripts, where you are still trying to get a feel for the data.
2. ***Identify themes***: The next step is to start looking in detail at the data to start identifying themes: summaries of ‘what is going on here’. In the margins of each transcript or set of notes, start to note what the interviewee is referring to. Try to make these as abstract as possible. This means not just summarizing the text.
3. ***Developing a coding scheme*** .These initial themes can now be gathered together to begin to develop a coding scheme. This is a list of all the themes, and the ‘codes’ that we will apply to the data. Each broad code can have a number of sub codes.
4. ***Coding the data***. The next step is to start applying these codes to the whole set of data, by either writing codes on the margins of transcripts or notes or (if using computer software) marking the text on line”

(Patton & Cachran, 2002)



#### **4.8 Ethical Consideration**

Researchers required protecting their research partakers; advancing a conviction with them; upholding honor of the research; protecting against misconduct and offensiveness that might replicate on their societies or institutions, and cope with new challenges (Creswell, 2009). Codes of conducts of the researcher are predominantly to ethical issues in research. Before conducting the research permission was attained from the relevant gatekeepers. Gatekeepers are frequently individuals of authority that might also permit or prohibit the researcher from functioning with certain population or sample (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). Working with students in the university, the researcher asked for permission from the Registrar of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. An Ethical Clearance Form was filled and sent to the ethics committee in order to acquire permission to work with the students. Other ethical issues that were considered were informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality regarding the discretion of the participants. Participants were provided with precise information in order to appreciate the aim and technique of the study and voluntarily and freely decided to participate. The names, private details and any information that might be used to identify the students interviewed were removed. Data was collected and presented as it is and no way did the researcher pursue to deploy the data to attain anticipated results.

#### **4.9 Ensuring trustworthiness**

- *Credibility*

It is when the researcher confirms that there is compatibility between the fabricated authenticities that occur in the attentions of the respondents and those that are accredited to them (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). In this study, the researcher achieved credibility through collecting data from the participants and ensuring that the data is relevant to the topic, by asking relevant questions to the participants. The central phenomenal during the interview was plagiarism, everything was involving around finding out the student understanding plagiarism.

- *Transferability*

Transferability refers to the degree of which the verdicts can be useful in other contexts or with other respondents (Babbie and Mouton, 2001). In this study, transferability was achieved by ensuring a thick description took the participants as expects during interviews.

- *Dependability*

Dependability was achieved by describing the methods of data collection and analysis.

- *Confirmability*

Confirmability means “the degree to which the findings of a study are the product of [its] focus and not of the biases of the researcher” (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). Confirmability was achieved by listening to the audio recorded during the interview, and reading notes that the researcher made while conducting an interview, and confirmed the findings with the supervisor.

#### **4.10 Limitations or challenging’s of the study**

According to Babbie & Mouton (2001) the limitations of the study are those features of the study that obstructed or predisposed the interpretation of the findings from the research, and all studies have limitations. The potential limitation of the study was honesty-can be described as one of the limitations since the researcher was not sure if the participants were sharing their point of views honestly since the researcher did not have the assurance if the participants were not holding or was telling the false information. Funding was also a challenge in conducting this study; a research did not have funding for an editor and other expenses

#### **4.11 Conclusion**

This section described actions that were taken to investigate a research problem and the rational for the application of procedures or techniques used to identify, select and analyze information applied to understand the phenomena of plagiarism. Thereby, allowing the reader to critically evaluate a study’s overall validity and reliability. Research in contemporary stints is gradually used to discover social authenticity. It is consequently pragmatic in various methodological perspectives which each have a stated purpose. This chapter drew the selected methodological approach that was used in the exploration of student understanding of plagiarism which addressed the ultimate objectives of the research in a methodologically appropriate way. It also portrayed the incentive for choosing the approaches explained above. This methodology was designated with the aim of efficiently addressing the qualitative objectives and research questions that channelled the study.

## *Chapter Five*

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data collected from the study. The predominant aim of the study was to explore students understanding of plagiarism within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College). The study was conducted using a semi- structured interviews (one-on-one) and 20 students were interviewed within CFSD five each level of study (first year to postgraduate), interviews were analysed using a thematic analysis process. The researcher paid more attention to the data collected during transcription process where the literature and theory were used in order to accurately enhance the data and the subsequent findings. Key words or ideas were categorised into appropriate themes that explained the phenomenon under study of which is plagiarism. Data attained from the study was presented under the following thematic areas which are in tandem with the research questions of the study

- Knowledge of plagiarism
- Causes of plagiarism
- Plagiarism vs perceived seriousness
- Prevalence of plagiarism
- Awareness of plagiarism
- Strategies in prevention of plagiarism

## 5.2 Knowledge of plagiarism

This theme was developed where students were asked about what they think plagiarism is. This was to enable the researcher to determine their knowledge of the concept of plagiarism. These were their responses in verbatim, according to their level of study (first year to postgraduate's students).

### *First Year Students:*

*P1: (smiling)..... I once saw our lecturer read for us the plagiarism policy section from our course outline.... And he did not dwell on it, he said we must avoid copy and paste from Google and I was confused (rolling eyes)..... So I ended getting clear knowledge that plagiarism is an academic dishonesty.....*

*P2: Plagiarism is when you take an author's text as it and use it on your own particular assignment, without referencing or indicating their work in your text or assignment.....*

*P4: Plagiarism is when someone uses work that is not his or her and uses it as it belongs to him, they do not acknowledge the original author of the work.....*

During the interview the researcher found out that first year students also understand about plagiarism. Most of them, they were able to give definitions of their own understanding about the concept plagiarism. As participant 2 and participant 4 revealed that plagiarising is about presenting someone else work as your own without referencing and indicating that is someone else work. Their responses supported by Karami and Danaei (2016) as they define the concept of plagiarism as the condition when someone states that an idea or its expression belongs to him/her that actually is someone else's. They showed a great understanding of the concept, and they also revealed that even lecturers emphasize the issue of plagiarism referring to the plagiarism policy document of the university, According to University of KwaZulu-Natal policy and procedure document for example, as authored by Vithal (2009: 3-4) plagiarism is defined as "any attempt to pass another person's work as one's own as means to mislead and deceive the reader". As participant 1 mentioned that lecturers tell them about plagiarism.

## **Second Year Students:**

*P6: It is where someone copies another person's work and makes it as if it is their own.....*

*P8: I did not know about the term until I reached University last year. Even at High school teachers did not mention a thing about plagiarism. Hence during my first year we were told that plagiarism is an offense that can lead you to Disciplinary hearing (Rolling her eyes)...*

*P9: I can say Plagiarism is a crime.....because you basically stealing someone else information and presenting it as your own...*

*P10: mmmh .... (Scratching his head) alright according to my own understanding plagiarism is taking someone's work and change to be yours.....*

According to the responses of second year students, showed that they fully understand about plagiarism. They were also able to give their own definitions of the term without doubting. As participant 8 mentioned that they were told about plagiarism during their first year, that it is a serious offense that can lead to Disciplinary hearing if you doing it. It revealed that understanding the concept is not enough but you also need to know the consequences of the act. Participant 9 revealed plagiarism as a crime because is about stealing of information and make it your own, as stealing is categorised as a crime. Participant 9 placed his understanding of the concept in the criminological perspective. Placing plagiarism within a lawful dissertation, signifying that plagiarism refers to an act of theft of the individual ownership of intellectual work (Ashworth, Freewood, & Macdonald 2003; Stearns 1992; Sutherland-Smith 2005).

## **Third Year Students**

*P12: Plagiarism is when someone uses work that is not his or her and uses it as it belongs to him, they do not acknowledge the original author of the work.....*

*P13: I think is a university terminology because (ngalizwa ngifika lana e Howard) I heard it from here at Howard. It about copying and pasting from the internet without referencing.....*

*P15: It is stealing the work of someone else without crediting him or her.*

Third year students also showed a great understanding of the concept of plagiarism. Participant 13 also mentioned that the term ‘plagiarism’ is a university terminology. They also showed that it is all about not acknowledging and crediting the author. As Stearns (1992) mentions that this edifice of plagiarism assumes that information has an antiquity and that past authors must be recognized because deprived of due recognition, it has been argued that one splits the bonds between the author of the work and the conception. The participants brought those ideas about the conception and the authors. Recognition is very important in writing an academic you as participant 15 mentioned:

*P15: I think recognition of the author is very important in an academic writing .....*

### **Postgraduate**

*P16: Plagiarism is a serious offence that can lead you to go through Disciplinary Hearing because you invading the University Policy using other people information without recognising them.....*

*P17: Plagiarism is a crime ....P18: It is an academic dishonesty.....*

*P20: Comes in different forms .....It is a deviant behaviour that people are not aware of ....that it is a serious offence that can destroy your academic life.... (With serious face).....*

Postgraduates understanding of the concept were on another level because they mentioned that plagiarism is a serious offense. They gave their definitions in the criminological perspective, showed that they are seniors within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline (CFSD). As participant 20, mentioned about different forms of plagiarism the time she gave her understanding of the concept. Participant 20 mentioned that plagiarism occur in different forms as Chong (2013) states that plagiarism happen in any field that involves a creation process, which includes written text, computer source code, art and design, and even music pieces. Also Participant 18 defined plagiarism as an academic dishonesty as supported by the study of Maurer et al. (2006) state how plagiarism occurs in the academic setting, of which can be considered as academic fraud or dishonesty

Students from each level of study are fully understood about the concept of plagiarism. Their understanding were according to their level of study because most of the first year students, their definitions were around on copying and pasting without indicating and referencing. Second year students understood the copying and pasting of work without referencing but their understanding was on acknowledging the author. Third year and postgraduate students took it to another level deriving their own understanding in the criminological perspective where they defined a concept as crime because it involves stealing without crediting the author of the work. They also defined the concept as an academic dishonesty as the study of Howard (1995) revealed that in the institution context plagiarism is defined as an academic dishonesty. It involves cheating academically, as Athanasou and Olasehinde (2002:2) proclaim that “The essence of cheating is fraud and deception”, debatably a modest and straight classification of plagiarism

### **5.3 Causes of plagiarism**

It is alleged that students ‘plagiarism behaviours are determined by definite causes. In other words an individual will not develop certain behaviour without an incentive. Therefore, students are always having reasons and causes to plagiarize. Hence, in an endeavour to authenticate those causes, the participants were asked about the causes of plagiarism. The following is a verbatim during the interview:

*P5: It is caused by late writing of assignments so ended up doing copy and paste.....*

*P7: No putting enough effort on doing your own work.....*

*P12: Plagiarism is caused by laziness. The one who plagiarizes does not want to think of his or her own ideas and lack of information may also be a cause.....*

*P17: Plagiarism is caused by being in the position of running out of ideas, pressure of deadlines ended do copy and paste and also caused by sake of submitting without acknowledging the author. Also students have that mentality of if you copy and paste you develop innovative ideas that will make them pass, and failure of being committed to assignments wanting short cuts.....*

*P18: Poor knowledge of plagiarism can cause someone to plagiarise.....*

The reason of finding out about reasons or causes of plagiarism to students, they may understand the concept of plagiarism but not paying more attentions of the reasons or causes that develop that behaviour as this is supported by Foltýnek and Čech (2013) in some cases where students are able to define plagiarism, there might be difficulties in the application of what they have learned. In relation with the social learning theory, Akers (2011:182) states that this theory reveals that “individuals are exposed to normative definition favorable or unfavorable to illegal or law-abiding behavior”. Therefore behavior is constructed. Participant 5 revealed that plagiarism can be caused by late writing of assignment of which is time management, can lead to plagiarism behavior and Participant 12 mentioned laziness as the cause of plagiarism. These findings validate the discovery of Ambrose (2014) where 42% of the students of South African University reportedly plagiarized because of laziness and poor time management

Participant 18 revealed that poor knowledge of plagiarism can cause plagiarism. This finding is supported by many studies (Devlin & Gray, 2007; Pennycook, 1996; Bennett, 2005; Pickards, 2006; Razera et al., 2010) where the insufficiency of understanding of the phenomenon plagiarism is frequently credited as the motive why the occurrences of plagiarism are escalating. Participant 17 mentioned the issue of pressure of deadlines that also contribute to the cause of plagiarism. This also validates the study of Ramzan et al. (2012) where that revealed that approximately 62.3% of students from some designated universities in Pakistan agreed that the pressure of deadline for submission was contributing to the plagiarism behaviour of student

#### **5.4 Plagiarism Vs perceived seriousness.**

Participants reported that, if a student had deliberately plagiarised, the apparent consequences for plagiarism were deliberated to be too severe. For example, the following responses (verbatim) replicate the participants understanding that the act of plagiarism is not as serious as the university extravagances it:

*P1: Not very serious.....P2: it is not serious for me because I have never been in that position to be discipline for plagiarism acts.....*



Participant 1 and 2 perceived plagiarism as an act that is not serious because during the interview the researcher posed the question on how serious is plagiarism according to their understanding. This findings endorse the study of Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) where their findings reveals that students perceive academic dishonesty less seriously than academic staff, and incline to underrate the incidence of student plagiarism. Based on the findings most of student who perceived plagiarism as less serious act was first year students and second year students. These results are also steady with Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead (1995) study which revealed that plagiarism (academic dishonesty) is perceived by students to be the slightest serious act. Additionally the study of McCabe and Trevino (1996) also revealed that copying without citation, and collusion were not measured serious offences

Third year and postgraduate students perceived plagiarism as a serious act. As participant 8 mentioned that it is very important and it can be addictive if you frequently doing it. Participant 15 revealed that one can be held accountable for the act of plagiarism. Whereas participant 20 mentioned that as serious as plagiarism, it can seriously affect academic life of a student.

*P8: It is very serious and it can be addictive....*

*P9: My point of view it very serious.....*

*P15: it is very serious as one can be held accountable for committing it....*

*P20: Plagiarism is very serious as many students still practice it, have that mentality that they will not be caught, of which it can affect their academic life.*

These findings endorse by CPE (2013) study that revealed that this arrogant attitude of students plagiarism is not ending at graduation, but is continuing with resume fraud and it can be addictive and impact negatively to an academic life of the student

## **5.5 Prevalence of plagiarism**

According to numerous studies revealed that an incidence of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is common within higher institution. Drake research discovered that 23% of college students have cheated sometime in their academic careers (as cited in Bolin, 2004). According to Bowers (1964) conducted a survey that reveals 5,000 students in 99 higher education institutions showed that three quarters of the sampled students admitted to some

kind of academic dishonesty of cheating. Clearly plagiarism does occur in different learning institutions, which place the rate of plagiarism in high level. This section therefore sought to determine the prevalence of plagiarism among students within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and the following question were asked on how common is plagiarism within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies. The following is the verbatim during the interview:

*P1: Very common in many universities and high school, students copy most from text books...*

*P6: It very common because we as students, we are lazy to think and ended up taking peoples work so it's common for every one...*

*P9: It is very common amongst university students especially...P16: Very common especially honours students who are still new from research field.....*

*P18: It is very common amongst students in secondary school. It also occurs to a certain level at tertiary level.....*

According to participants' responses, they indicated that all the levels of study admitted that plagiarism is common. This finding reverberates with that of Sentleng and King (2012) that 50.3% of undergraduate students studying at higher education institution in South Africa admitted to plagiarism. Which revealing that they are aware of the incidences of plagiarism as participant 1 mentioned that students copy from text books of which is a main common form of plagiarism, Roig (2006), plagiarism of text is probably the most common form of plagiarism in existence. Their responses indicated that plagiarism still predominant amongst universities as Moon (1990) endorse that around 60% of university students in the United Kingdom and United States have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty certainly.

Students were asked about how they avoid plagiarising the materials which was aiming to achieve the content on how prevalent is plagiarism at the higher education institutions. Most of students indicated that they ensure that they reference their work properly.

*P5: I always make sure that I reference my work.....*

*P8: I try to read people's work and reference my work....*

*P11: By referencing any piece of work, I use.....*

*P15: Doing more research and giving myself enough time to gather information.....*

*P20: I avoid by properly referencing the work.*

Participant 5, 8, 11 and 20 indicated that they reference properly, that is the way they use to avoid to plagiarise the material. This finding supported by the findings of Ramzan et al. (2012) to their survey those 65.9% respondents indicating that they often reference their assignments before submission to avoid plagiarism.

### **5.5 Awareness of plagiarism**

This segment shows the findings of level of awareness of plagiarism amongst the students at University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard College). Awareness of plagiarism is another sign of the knowledge of the understanding of the phenomenon. Students who are well aware of the incidence of plagiarism are likely to understand fully about plagiarism in all aspect. Students were asked questions related to find out about the level of awareness of plagiarism within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies, where the researcher asked the chances of being caught if you plagiarise. The following is the verbatim during the interview:

*P4: 50% maybe because some texts are put on turn it in some are not....*

*P9: There are greater chances of being caught with advanced university systems such as turn it in.....*

*P17: Depending on the popularity of the document of the person who plagiarized, the degree of being caught is high.....*

Students indicated that there are high chances to be caught if you plagiarise. Participants 9 mentioned that it is because of the advanced university system such as turn it in that place the chances of being caught high. Students are aware of the system of detecting plagiarism. Dawson and Overfield (2006) support that there are greater chances of being caught plagiarised due to new system of detecting plagiarism to high education institution.

In essence, students were asked about university policy and procedure documents. Their responses were negative toward the policy of plagiarism, because they revealed that lecturers are often mentioning about the plagiarism policy and procedure document for them to ready. Which the most of the students, they hardly read the policy but they are aware about it. Their responses as follow:

*P3: I heard about the plagiarism policy and procedure document but I do not know where to find it (laughing).....*

*P6: To our course outline they put plagiarism policy and procedure section ....but I hardly go through it....*

*P18: I am aware of the plagiarism policy document but I never read the document.....*

Brown and Howell (2001) emphasized that together the lecturers and policies should emphasise not only definition and context of plagiarism but they should emphasise the severity of the act of plagiarising. Therefore, emphasising the strictness of plagiarism is significant in that, students would not distinguish plagiarism as less of an offence. According to Lamula (2017) policy and procedure archives on plagiarism may not be an adequate technique of managing, tending to and dealing with the issue of plagiarism. Lectures are required to instruct students on reading policy and procedure on plagiarism.

Students showed great responses that they fully aware of plagiarism.

*P8: I am fully aware of plagiarism.....*

*P15: My lecturer told us about plagiarism....*

*P16: My supervisor told me about plagiarism.....*

*P20: I can say we are fully aware of plagiarism in fact....it may be our attitude toward it and so...I am personally aware since my undergrad lecturers used to tell us about plagiarism so that we will be aware of it.....*

Students indicated that they are fully aware of plagiarism. These findings are same as the findings of Ndwande (2009) that information or awareness about plagiarism could be attained through discipline, lecturers, supervisors, literature, conference and workshops. As Sing and Guram (2014) stated that 43% of respondents reportedly indicated that they learned about plagiarism through their supervisors.

### **5.6 Strategies in prevention of Plagiarism**

This segment will show the findings of strategies in prevention of plagiarism amongst the students of the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard). Students were asked about what to be done order to avoid plagiarising amongst students. Students gave different suggestions about ways that can help students to avoid plagiarism. The following are their responses:

*P4: I think compulsory Workshops for plagiarism might help to find out what causes students to plagiarise .....*

*P9: I think students should be given an opportunity to review the theorists and be open for their own philosophy and theories.....*

*P11: Nothing will help students to be less plagiarized because even some of the lectures cannot do it properly and they confuse us....*

*P13: By working on time and putting enough effort....*

*P16: Teach them proper referencing and invest lot of time in teaching about referencing .....*

*P19: Compulsory module for plagiarism for every faculty can help in prevention of plagiarism.....*

Students came up with different ideas about strategies in prevention of plagiarism. As participant 4 mentioned that compulsory workshops about plagiarism might help students for the incidence of plagiarism to find what cause students to plagiarise as Byrne and Trew (2005) argue that to be operational, interventions that aim to reduce or prevent offending behaviour need to be based on a sound understanding of what leads people to offend, and what leads people to stop offending , participant 9 mentioned that giving students opportunity to open for their own philosophy and theories can avoid plagiarising materials. Participant 11 revealed a confusion where she mentioned that nothing that can help students to avoid plagiarism because some of other lecturers cannot do to properly as well. But working on

time and putting more effort might help student to avoid plagiarism mentioned by participant 13. Investing lot of time in teaching about referencing might help students as well as participant 16 stated. Participant 19 suggested that a compulsory module for every faculty about plagiarism can help in prevention of plagiarism. This finding endorse that the students and researchers will remark the problem of plagiarism systematically and will appreciate its significance enhanced in case of being carried in cooperative workshops and seminars rather than in lectures, oral advice or warnings (Karami & Danaei, 2016)

### **5.7 Relationship of the study to the theory**

Based on the findings of the study, students mentioned about learning about plagiarising from other students, as they revealed that plagiarism is common to higher education institution just because of learnt behaviour that is adopted by students. Akers (2011:182) social learning theory reveals that “individuals are exposed to normative definition favorable or unfavorable to illegal or law-abiding behavior”. Society is one of the social institutions where socialization occurs, where deviant, delinquent and criminal behavior developed due to prosocial norms and antisocial norms. In relation to the findings, students learned a deviant behavior through socialization within the culture of student life within university as they mentioned that plagiarism is common. This theory revealed that criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others in the process of communication. The best methods of communication such as interaction and observation has a huge role on the development of deviant behavior , this theory also argues, is more prevalent in individuals who associate and interact with individuals who exhibit criminal mind sets and behavior (Akers, 2011). The key learning mechanism played a huge role in the development of academic dishonesty (plagiarism). The learning criminal behavior comprises learning different methods, intentions, initiatives, justification and approaches.

Self- control theory also was used to link the findings of the study, student understands of plagiarism also framed by self-control. They mentioned that there are factors that lead to student plagiarism that drives them to have low self-control, driven those factors, they mentioned a lot such as pressure to deadlines, laziness and so forth. According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) low self-control is the constant paradigm that links all of these features, attitudes, and behaviors together. It is a paradigm that is identifiable in infantile, previous to the age of responsibility, and is constant throughout the life progression.

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990: 234) "Self-control theory predicts that individuals with low levels of self-control engage in a variety of criminal and analogous acts". This theory also reveals that students plagiarize in hunt of self-interest. Cloward and Ohlin (1960), Cohen (1955) and Merton (1968) pointed the derivation of this theory as elucidation collective 'crime patterns'. This theory points that individuals engage in criminal activity when they are obstructed from legally achieving cultural goals. According to students responses pressure and strains increase the likelihood plagiarism. Students experience academic pressure and strains, lack of university facilities and ended up on engaging or developing deviant behavior of plagiarism, just because of pressure of submissions and strains of lot of work.

#### **4.8 Conclusion**

From the analyses of the data gathered, it revealed that students within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies are fully aware of the existence of plagiarism. Therefore they were able to give relevant definition of the concept plagiarism with an understanding. They applied their understanding of the concept in the criminological perspective, revealing plagiarism as an offence, crime, deviant behaviour and action of stealing. Plagiarism does occur in different learning institutions, which place the rate of plagiarism in high level, therefore sought to determine the prevalence of plagiarism among students within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and the question were asked on how common is plagiarism within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies. The students' reports and suggestions provided insight that they take plagiarism incidences serious and they tried to avoid it in many ways because it against the university policy. They revealed that referencing properly is the method that can be used to avoid plagiarism. The findings also revealed that students are hardly read the university plagiarism policy and procedure just because of their laziness. Strategies in prevention of plagiarism were suggested by students such as workshops for plagiarism, compulsory modules on plagiarism for every student.

## *Chapter Six*

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

This study was conducted with the aim of exploring students understanding of plagiarism at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard) within Criminology and Forensic Studies Discipline (CFSD). Sum up of the key points of the research are the essential features of the research and the significant outs of the investigation. Recommendations are required in dealing with the research problem. In this chapter investigation of achievement of the research objectives are made to state whether objectives were achieved or not. Research objectives describe what we expect to achieve by the research. The research is guided by research objectives for the achievement of the findings, therefore conclusions and recommendations are required to analyses whether the main aim of the study was achieved or not. This chapter highlights the general conclusions that were drawn from the analyses of the collected data. Recommendations based on the findings of this study are also offered. The general conclusions are guided by the research objectives, which the researcher aimed to address.

#### **6.2 General Conclusions**

Underpinned by the methodological framework of this study, general conclusions were drawn which were guided by the following objectives that the researcher aimed to address:

- To assess students understanding of plagiarism.
- To identify if students plagiarize within CFSD.
- To ascertain the level of awareness about plagiarism within CFSD.
- To establish strategies in the prevention pf plagiarism within CFSD.



### **6.2.1 Students understanding of plagiarism**

This study shows that students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Howard) within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies got a fully understanding of plagiarism. Their understanding were according to their level of study because most of first year students their definitions were around on copying and pasting without indicating and referencing. Second year students understood the copying and pasting of work without referencing but their understanding was on acknowledging the author. Third year and postgraduate students took it to another level deriving their own understanding in the criminological perspective where defined the concept as crime because it involve stealing without crediting the author of the work. They also defined the concept as an academic dishonesty as the study of Howard (1995) revealed that in the institution context plagiarism is defined as academic dishonesty. It because it about cheating academically, as Athanasou & Olasehinde (2002:2) proclaim that “The essence of cheating is fraud and deception”, debatably a modest and straight classification of plagiarism

They showed causes of plagiarism which indicated that they understand about plagiarism and it implications. The reason of finding out about reasons or causes of plagiarism to the students, they may understand the concept of plagiarism but not paying more attentions of the reasons or causes that develop that behaviour as this is supported by Foltýnek and Čech (2013) in some cases where students are able to define plagiarism, there might be difficulties in the application of what they have learned. In relation with the social learning theory, Akers (2011:182) states that this theory reveals “individuals are expose to normative definition favorable or unfavorable to illegal or law-abiding behavior”. Therefore behavior is constructed. Participant 5 revealed that plagiarism can caused by late writing of assignment of which is time management, can lead to plagiarism behavior and Participant 12 mentioned laziness as the cause of plagiarism. These findings validate the discovery of Ambrose (2014) where 42% of the students of South African University reportedly plagiarized because of laziness and poor time management.

Participant 18 revealed that poor knowledge of plagiarism can cause plagiarism. This finding is supported by many studies (Devlin and Gray, 2007; Pennycook, 1996; Bennett, 2005; Pickards, 2006; Razera et al., 2010) where the insufficiency of understanding of the phenomenon plagiarism is frequently credited as the motive why the occurrences of plagiarism are escalating.

Participant 17 mentioned issue of pressure of deadline that also contribute to the cause of plagiarism. This also validate the study of Ramzan et al. (2012) where that revealed that approximately 62.3% of students from some designated universities in Pakistan agreed that the pressure of deadline for submission was contributing to the plagiarism behaviour of student

Participant 1 and 2 perceived plagiarism as an act that is not serious because during the interview the researcher posed the question on how serious is plagiarism according to their understanding. This findings endorse the study of Brimble and Stevenson-Clarke (2005) where their findings reveals that students perceive academic dishonesty less seriously than academic staff, and incline to underrate the incidence of student plagiarism. Based on the findings most of student who perceived plagiarism as less serious act was first year student and second year students. These results are also steady with Franklyn-Stokes and Newstead (1995) study which revealed that plagiarism (academic dishonesty) is perceived by students to be the slightest serious act. Additionally the study of McCabe and Trevino (1996) also revealed that copying without citation, and collusion were not measured serious offences.

Third year students and postgraduate perceived plagiarism as a serious act. As participant 8 mentioned that it is very important and it can be addictive if you frequently doing it. Participant 15 revealed that one can be held accountable for the act of plagiarism. Whereas participant 20 mentioned that as serious as plagiarism, it can seriously affect academic life of a student

### **6.2.2 Identify if students plagiarize within CFSD**

According to numerous studies revealed that an incidence of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is common within higher institution. Drake research discovered that 23% of college students have cheated sometime in their academic careers (as cited in Bolin, 2004). According to Bowers (1964) conducted a survey that reveals 5,000 students in 99 higher education institutions showed that three quarters of the sampled students admitted to some kind of academic dishonesty of cheating. Clearly plagiarism does occur in different learning institutions, which place the rate of plagiarism in high level. This section therefore sought to determine the prevalence of plagiarism among students within CFSD at the University of KwaZulu-Natal and to identify where they plagiarize.

According to participants responses indicated that all the level study admitted that plagiarism is common. This finding reverberates with that of Sentleng and King (2012) that 50.3% of undergraduate students studying at higher education institution in South Africa admitted to plagiarism. Which revealing that they are aware of the incidences of plagiarism as participant 1 mentioned that students copy from text books of which is a main common form of plagiarism, Roig (2006), plagiarism of text is probably the most common form of plagiarism in existence. Their responses indicated that plagiarism still predominant amongst universities as Moon (1990) endorse that approximately 60% of university students in the United Kingdom and United States have engaged in some form of academic dishonesty certainly.

Student were asked about how do they avoid plagiarising the materials which was aiming to achieve the content on how plagiarism because prevalent at the higher education institutions. Most of students indicated that they ensured that they reference their work properly. Participant 5, 8, 11 and 20 indicated that they reference properly, that is the way they used to avoid to plagiarise the material. This finding supported by the findings of Ramzan et al. (2012) to their survey that 65.9% respondent indicating that they often reference their assignments before submission to avoid plagiarism. Therefore students indicated that they tried to avoid plagiarism by referencing properly because they understand that plagiarism is very serious it can affect their academic life

#### **6.2.4 Level of awareness about plagiarism**

Awareness of plagiarism is another sign of the knowledge of the understanding of the phenomena. Students who are well aware of the incidence of plagiarism are likely to understand fully about plagiarism in all aspect. Students were asked questions related to find out about the level of awareness of plagiarism within the Discipline of Criminology and Forensic Studies, where the researcher asked the chances of being caught if you plagiarise.

Student indicated that there are high chances to be caught if you plagiarise. Participants 9 mentioned that it because of the advanced university system such as turn it in that place the chances of being caught high. Students are aware of the system of detecting plagiarism. Dawson and Overfield (2006) support that there are greater chances of being caught plagiarised due to new system of detecting plagiarism to high education institution.

In essence, students were asked about university policy and procedure documents. Their responses were negative toward the policy of plagiarism, because they revealed that lecturers frequently mention about the plagiarism policy and procedure document for them to ready.

Which the most of the students, they hardly read the policy but they are aware about it. Brown and Howell (2001) emphasized that together the lecturers and policies should emphasise not only definition and context of plagiarism but they should emphasise the severity of the act of plagiarising”. Therefore, emphasising the strictness of plagiarism is significant in that, students would not distinguish plagiarism as less of an offence. According to Lamula (2017) policy and procedure archives on plagiarism may not be an adequate technique of managing, tending to and dealing with the issue of plagiarism. Lectures are required to instruct students on reading policy and procedure on plagiarism

Students indicated that they are fully aware of plagiarism. These findings are same as the findings of Ndwande (2009) that information or awareness about plagiarism could be attained through discipline, lecturers, supervisors, literature, conference and workshops. As Sing and Guram (2014) stated that 43% of respondents reportedly indicated that they learned about plagiarism through their supervisors.

#### **6.2.5 Strategies in the prevention of plagiarism**

Students came up with different ideas about strategies in prevention of plagiarism. As participant 4 mentioned that compulsory workshops about plagiarism might help students for the incidence of plagiarism to find what cause students to plagiarise as Byrne and Trew (2005) argue that to be operational, interventions that aim to reduce or prevent offending behaviour need to be based on a sound understanding of what leads people to offend, and what leads people to stop offending, participant 9 mentioned that giving students opportunity to open for their own philosophy and theories can avoid plagiarising materials. Participant 11 revealed a confusion where she mentioned that nothing that can help students to avoid plagiarism because some of other lecturers cannot do to properly as well. But working on time and putting more effort might help student to avoid plagiarism mentioned by participant 13. Investing lot of time in teaching about referencing might help students as well as participant 16 stated. Participant 19 suggested that a compulsory module for every faculty about plagiarism can help in prevention of plagiarism. This finding endorse that that the students and researchers will remark the problem of plagiarism systematically and will appreciate its significance enhanced in case of being carried in cooperative workshops and seminars rather than in lectures, oral advice or warnings (Karami & Danaei, 2016)

### 6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and drawing from the students' suggestions for dealing with plagiarism in university, the following recommendations were made:

- During orientation of first year students each faculty must pay much attention and prominence on plagiarism. Where sessions will be compulsory so that most of students will attend during orientation program, where students will be updated about the concept of plagiarism, causes, result in academic life and ways to prevent it. Where academic writing will be promoted.
- There is a university policy and procedure on plagiarism due to being ignorance to students. Faculty must construct realization among students to read the policy on plagiarism. Policies on plagiarism must be shown in any other boulevard such as the university website, notice boards for the achievement of considerable awareness of plagiarism students amongst students.
- Lectures only are not enough in alerting students about plagiarism, Workshops and seminars are required to create awareness about plagiarism amongst students. Where those workshops and seminars will be compulsory so that most students will attend. Those programmes must be introduced early.
- The university must take to consideration to establish a new compulsory module about plagiarism. Where students will be taught about plagiarism in depth.
- Raising awareness of the issue of plagiarism among students can be a good initiative for the aim of developing understanding of academic integrity and authorship.
- The researcher also recommend for encouraging the use of quality information and correct referencing, basically improving academic writing skills for good quality of writing without plagiarizing.
- To carry out further work in critical thinking and challenging the lecturer can be a good idea to fight against plagiarism
- And also to run the workshop through blended learning, to build in more advanced critical thinking tutorials

## ***REFERENCES LIST***

- Abukari, Z. (2016). Awareness and Incidence of Plagiarism among Students of Higher Education: A Case Study of Narh-Bita College. University of Ghana, Legon Department of Information studies.
- Agnew, R. (1992), "Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency", *Criminology*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 47-87.
- Agnew, R. (1985). "A revised strain theory of delinquency", *Social forces*, 64(1), 151-167.
- Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured Into Crime: An Overview of General Strain Theory*. Los Angeles: Roxbury. V, 238 pp
- Amsberry D. (2009). Deconstructing plagiarism: international students and textual borrowing practices. *Ref Libra*; 51:31-44.
- Ambrose CT. (2014). Plagiarism of ideas. Benjamin Rush and Charles Caldwell a student-mentor dispute. *Pharos Alpha Omega Alpha-Honor Med Soc Alpha Omega Alpha*; 77:14-23.
- Anderman, E. M. (2007). The effects of personal, classroom and school goal structures on academic cheating. In Eric M. Anderman & Tamera B. Murdock (Eds.). *Psychology of Academic Cheating*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press
- Akers, R.L. (2011), "A social learning theory of crime", in Cullen, F.T. and Agnew, R. (Eds), *Criminological theory: Past to present*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 130-142.
- Akers, R.L. (1985). *Deviant Behavior* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth
- Ashworth, P., P. Bannister, and P. Thorne. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education* 22, no. 2: 187-203.
- Athanasou, J.A., and O. Olasehinde. (2002). Male and female differences in self-report cheating. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation* 8, no. 5.
- Armstrong, L. (2008). Final year undergraduate student plagiarism: Academic staff and students perceptions. *Learning and Teaching in Action*, 7(3), 16-20.
- Babalola, Y. T. (2012). Awareness and incidence of plagiarism among Undergraduates in a Nigerian Private University. *African Journal of Library, Archives & Information Science*, 22(1), 53-60.

- Bakhtiyari K, Salehi H, Embi MA, Shakiba M, Zavvari A, Shahbazi- Moghadam M, et al. (2014). Ethical and unethical methods of plagiarism prevention in academic writing. *Inter Educ Stud*.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*, Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY, US: W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Barnbaum, C (2002). *Plagiarism: A Student's Guide to Recognizing It and Avoiding It*.
- Bazdaric K, Bilic-Zulle L, Brumini G, Petrovecki M, (2012). Prevalence of plagiarism in recent submissions to the Croatian Medical Journal. *Sci Eng Ethics*; 18:223-39
- Beute, N., Van Aswegen, E. S., and Winberg, C., (2008). Avoiding plagiarism in contexts of development and change. *Education, IEEE Transactions on*, 51(2), pp. 201-205
- Bennett, T., and Silva, E., (2011). Introduction: Cultural capital—Histories, limits, prospects. *Poetics*, 39(6), pp. 427-443.
- Bolin, A. U. (2004). Self-control, perceived opportunity, and attitudes as predictors of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(2), 101-114.
- Bowers, W. (1964). *Student Dishonesty and its Control in College*, New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University
- Bothma, T., Erica, C., Ina, F., & Cecilia, P. (2011). *Navigating information Literacy: Your Information society survival toolkit (3rd ed.)*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- Bobbie, E. and Mouton, J. (2001) 'Objectivity and Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research', in *the Practice of Social Research*, Oxford and New York: Oxford
- Burton, T. (2000). *Technology in education - keeping students honest*. Presented at International Resource Management Association 2000.
- Burke, J.L. (1997). *Faculty perceptions of and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at a two year college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia
- Brimble, M and Stevenson-Clarke, P (2005), 'Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian universities', *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 32,no. 3, Dec 2005, pp. 19-44.

- Brown, V. J., & Howell, M. E. (2001). The efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism: Do they change students 'views? *Research in Higher Education*, 42, 103-118.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press
- Byrne, C.F., and K.F. Trew. (2005). Crime orientations, social relations and involvement in crime: Patterns emerging from offenders' accounts. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 44, no. 2: 185–205.
- Carroll, J. (2002). *A handbook for deterring plagiarism in higher education*. Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. Oxford, UK: Oxford Brookes University
- Carroll, J (2004). From PowerPoint slides and handouts at session on plagiarism at University of Portsmouth, Nov (2004).
- Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on Tests: How to Do It, Detect It, and Prevent It*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc, Mahwah, New Jersey
- Colin, N. (2007). *The Complete guide to referencing and avoiding plagiarism*. New York: Open University Press.
- Cohen, A.K. (1955), *Delinquent boys: The Culture of the Gang*, Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education* (fourth edition). London: Routledge
- Committee on Publication Ethics (CPE). (2013). [http://publicationethics.org/files/plagiarism A.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/plagiarism_A.pdf) Date of access: 12 September 2018
- Chong, M.Y. (2013). *A Study on Plagiarism Detection and Plagiarism Direction Identification Using Natural Language Processing Techniques*. University of Wolverhampton, Doctor of Philosophy.
- Chrysler-Fox, P.D. & Thomas, A., (2017). Managing plagiarism of South African Honours students: Does an intervention have any effect? *KOERS— Bulletin for Christian Scholarship*, 82(1). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.19108/KOERS.82.1.2305>
- Clement, G., and Brenenson, S., (2013). *Theft of the Mind: An Innovative Approach to Plagiarism and Copyright Education*.



Clough, P. (2000). Plagiarism in natural and programming languages: an overview of current tools and technologies. Technical report, University of Sheeld, Sheeld, UK,

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960), *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*, Free Press, and New York, NY

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications

Das N, Panjabi M. (2011). Plagiarism: why is it such a big issue for medical writers? *Perspective Clin Res.*; 2:67-71.

Dawson, M.M. and Overfield, J.A., (2006). Plagiarism: Do students know what it is? *Bioscience Education*, 8(1), pp.1-15.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Devlin, M & Gray, K (2007), 'In their own words: a qualitative study of the reasons Australian university students plagiarize', *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 181-198.

Dores, R. M. and Henderson, I. W. (2009). Plagiarism- Self-seeking aggrandisement, error, ignorance or theft. Elsevier Inc. Volume 161, Issued no.2 pp. 160-161.

Duggan, F. (2006). Plagiarism: Prevention, practice and policy. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 151-154.

Eckstein, M. A. (2003). *Combating academic fraud toward a culture of integrity*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning: UNESCO

Emerson, L.; Rees, M. T.; and MacKay, B., (2005). Academic Integrity: Creating a Learning Context for Teaching Referencing Skills, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2(3),

ETS Policy Information Center (1999). By Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. Educational Testing Service is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Ercegovac, Z., and Richardson, J. V., (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital age: A literature review. *College and Research Libraries*, 65(4), pp. 301-318.

Foltýnek, T., and Čech, F., (2013). Attitude to plagiarism in different European countries. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 60(7), pp. 71-80.

Franklyn-Stokes, A, Newstead, S (1995). Undergraduate cheating: who does what and why? *Studies in Higher Education*, 20 (2) 159 – 72

Freckelton I. (2010). Plagiarism in law and medicine: challenges for scholarship, academia, Publishers and regulators. *JLaw Med*; 17: 645-59

Gillespie, K. (2003). The frequency and perceptions of academic dishonesty among graduate students: a literature review and critical analysis. University of Wisconsin – Stout.

Glending, L. (2014). *Fighting plagiarism: Critical Analysis*. University of Johannesburg. .

Gottfredson, M.L. and Hirschi, T. (1990), *A General Theory of Crime*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.

Govender, S. (2009). *Forensic Computing Strategies for Ethical Academic Writing*. School of Information Systems & Technology Faculty of Management Studies. University of KwaZulu-Natal.

Govenders, P. (2007, 10 June). Expose of the bogus Doctorate Awarded to Chippy Shaik. *Sunday Times*, p.25.

Gullifer, J. M. and Tyson, G. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: a focus group study, *Studies in Higher Education*, 35:4, 463-481, DOI: 10.1080/03075070903096508

Guraya SY, Guraya S (2017). The confounding factors leading to plagiarism in academic writing and some suggested remedies: A systematic review. *J Pak Med Assoc* 2017; 67 (5): 767-772

Guraya S, London N. (2014). Ethics in medical research. *J Microsc Ultra struct'* 2:121-26

Halcomb, E.J. and Davidson, P.M, (2006). Is verbatim transcription of interview data always necessary? *Applied Nursing Research*, 19(1) pp.38-42

Harper, M. G. (2006) .High tech cheating. *Nurse Education Today*. 26, 8, 672-679.

- Helgesson G, Eriksson S. (2015). Plagiarism in research. *Med Health Care Philo.* 18:91-101
- Hexham, I (1999). *The plague of plagiarism - Department of Religious Studies. The University of Calgary.*
- Hosny, M. and Fatima, S., (2014). Attitude of students towards cheating and plagiarism: University case study. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 14(8), pp. 748-757
- Horn, L., (2013). Promoting responsible research conduct in a developing world academic context. *South African Journal of Bioethics and Law*, 6(1), pp. 21-24.
- Howard, R.M., (2001). Forget about policing plagiarism: Just teach. *The Chronicle*, 11(16), pp.1-4.
- Halupa, C.M. (2014). Exploring student self-plagiarism. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1):121– 126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p121>.
- Institute of Ethics (2006). *Cheating and Plagiarism*. South Africa: Touchstone.
- Jabulani, S. (2014). An analysis of the language of attribution in university students' academic essays. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(3):1–10.
- Jensen, L.; Arnett, J.; Feldman, S. and Cauffman, E. (2002). "It's wrong but everybody does it: Academic dishonesty among high school and college students", *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, 209-228.
- Jocoy CL, DiBiase D. (2006). Plagiarism by adult learners online: A case study in detection and remediation. *Inter Rev Res Open Dist Learn*.
- Jordan, A.E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior* 11, no. 3: 233–47.
- Karami, M & Danaei, G.H, (2016). A brief review of plagiarism in Medical Science Research paper. *Pharmaceutical and Biomedical research*. July. 20.
- Koul, R., Clariana, R. B., Jitgarun, K., and Songsriwittaya, A., (2009). The influence of achievement goal orientation on plagiarism. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(4), pp. 506-512.
- Kutz, E., Rhodes, W., Sutherland, S., and Zamel, V., (2011). Addressing plagiarism in a digital age. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 9(3), 3.

- Lamula, S.P. (2017). Students' understanding, perception and experience of plagiarism: A case study of the University of KwaZulu-Natal Pietermarisburg Campus. University of KwaZulu-Natal, College of Humanities, School of Social Sciences, Sociology Programme Pietermaritzburg Campus, South Africa
- Lathrop, A. and Foss, K. (2000). Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wakeup Call. Libraries Unlimited Inc, Englewood,
- Le Heron J. (2001). Plagiarism, learning dishonesty or just plain cheating: The context and countermeasures in Information Systems teaching. Colorado. Australian Journal of Educational Technology. Massey University. 2001, 17(3), 244-264
- Lersch, K.M. (1999). Social learning theory and academic dishonesty, International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 23:1, 103-114, DOI: [10.1080/01924036.1999.9678635](https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.1999.9678635)
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). Practical research: Planning and design (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- London, K. (2010). Research Writing: Recruiting Strategy. Primrose Circle, Sandra.
- Luke, B., (2014). Misconduct versus misunderstood? Scaffolding education and learning. Accounting Education, 23(4), pp. 383-385.
- Madura, D.S., Namango, S.S & Katana, H. (2016). Theories and Models Relevant to Cheating-behaviour. Research on Humanities and Social Sciences. Vol.6 no.17, p108-135
- Maurer HA, Kappe F, Zaka B, (2006). Plagiarism– a survey. J Universal Comput Sci (JUSC); 12:1050–84
- Marden, H. Carrol, M. and Neill, J. T. (2005). Review of plagiarism: Issues for teachers and learners. International Education Journal,
- Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2005a). NESB and ESB students' attitudes and perceptions of plagiarism. Paper presented at the 2nd Asia-Pacific Educational Integrity Conference, Newcastle, Australia (2-3 December, 2005).

- Marshall, M.N (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice*; Vol 13: page 522-525.
- Mackenzie, N., and Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research*, Vol 16.
- Maurer U, Brem S, Kranz F, Bucher K, Benz R, Halder P, et al. (2006). Coarse neural tuning for print peaks when children learn to read. *Neuroimage*.33 (2):749–75
- Maxwell, A., Curtis, G. J., & Vardanega, L. (2006). Plagiarism among Local and Asian Students in Australia. *Guidance & Counselling*, 21(4), 210-215.
- Meena, M. (2014). The perspectives on student cheating: Toward an integrated model of academic dishonesty. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(3), 129–145
- Merton, R. (1968), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Glencoe, III: The Free Press.
- McCabe, D. (2003). Academic dishonesty survey study. Unpublished study, Rutgers University.
- McCabe, D. L. (2005a). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 1(1), 10-11.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L.K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64, 522-538.
- McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1996). What We Know About Cheating in College: Longitudinal Trends and Recent Developments. *Change*, 28(1), 28-33.
- McCabe, D. L. & Trevino, L. K. (1997). 'Individual and Contextual Influences on Academic Dishonesty: A Multicampus Investigation', *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 38, no.3, pp. 379-396.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 522-532.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & 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.

- McKay, T.M., (2014). Combating plagiarism using a community of practice approach. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 28(4), pp. 1315-1331
- Moon, J (1990). Cheating and plagiarism in undergraduate education, UcoSDA Briefing Paper 57, Sheffield, UcoSDA.
- Moon, J. (1999, September 3). How to stop students from cheating. *Times Higher Education Supplement*. Retrieved on March 18, 2016
- Myrick, F. (2005). Pedagogical integrity in the knowledge economy. *Nursing Philosophy*, 5(1), 23–29.
- M-W. Marriam-Webster Dictionary (2014).dictionary.
- Ndwandwe, J. (2009). Teaching and Plagiarism. *South African Journal. Teaching Education News*, 7(5).
- Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research method: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup>ed.). Bostin: Allyn & Bacon.
- Naude, C. (2004, 22 February). Student’s cheated, named and shamed all the Campuses of University of KwaZulu-Natal. *News24*, p.20.
- Neuman, W.L. (1997). *Social research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Neville, C. (2007). *The complete guide to referencing and avoiding plagiarism*. New York: Open University Press.
- O’Connor, S. (2003). Cheating and electronic plagiarism – Scope, consequences and detection. Paper presented at the Educause in Australia Conference, May 6–9, in Adelaide, Australia.
- 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), pp. 291-306.
- Paternoster, R., & Mazerolle, P. (1994). General strain theory and delinquency: A replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31(3), 235-263.
- Patton, M.Q. and Cochran, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage

- Peshkin, A. (1993). The goodness of qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 22 (2), 23-29.
- Price, J. & Price, R. (2005). Finding the true incidence rate of plagiarism. *International Education Journal*, 6(4):421–429.
- Razera, D. (2011). Plagiarism awareness, perception, and attitudes among students and teachers in Swedish higher education—a case study. Paper presented at the 4th International Plagiarism Conference—towards an authentic future. Northumbria University in Newcastle Upon Tyne-UK, 21-23 June
- Rabi, S. M, Patton, L. R, Fjortoft, N. and Zgarrick, D. P. (2006). Characteristics, prevalence, attitude and perceptions of academic dishonesty among pharmacy students. *American Journal of pharmaceutical Education*. 70 (4). 1-8. Doi. 10.5688/aj 700473 PMID: 17136192.
- Ramzan, M., Munir, M. A., Siddique, N. and Asif, M. (2012). Awareness about plagiarism amongst University students in Pakistan. *Higher Education*. 64 (1): 73-84.
- Relph, A. and Randle, K. (2006) 'Using Assessment on the Front-Line in the Battle against Plagiarism.
- Rimer, S. (2003, September 3). A campus fad that's being copied: Internet plagiarism seems on the rise. *The New York Times*, (U S edition).
- Roig, M. and Caso, M. (2005). Lying and Cheating: Fraudulent Excuse Making, Cheating, and Plagiarism, *the Journal of Psychology*, 139:6, 485-494
- Roig, M., (2006). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics and Behaviour*, 11(3), pp. 307-323.
- Rosamond, B. (2002). Plagiarism, academic norms and the governance of the profession. *Politics*, 22(3), 167-174.
- Scanlon, P. M., and Neumann, D. R., (2002). Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(3), pp. 374-385.
- Selwyn, N. (2008). Not necessarily a bad thing ...: A study of online plagiarism amongst students. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 465-479.

- Sentleng, M. P., & King, L. (2012). Plagiarism among undergraduate students in the Faculty of Applied Science at a South African Higher Education Institution. *South African Journal of Libraries & Information Science*, 78(1), 57-67.
- Scanlon, P. M., & Neumann, D. R. (2002). Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(3), 374-385.
- Schaefer, (2010). A case study of faculty perceptions of student plagiarism. (Unpublished Mphil Dissertation), Graduate Studies of Texas A & M University, United States, America.
- Sheard, J., Dick, M., & Markham, S. (2002) Faculty and student cheating and plagiarism: Perceptions and practices of first year IT students. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 7th Annual Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education Aarhus, Denmark
- Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2):134–148. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.003>.
- Singh S, Remenyi D. (2015). Plagiarism and ghost-writing: The rise in academic misconduct. *S Afr J Sci*. 2016; 112(5/6), Art. #2015-0300, 7 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2016/20150300>
- Stearns, L. (1992). Copy wrong: Plagiarism, process, property, and the law. *California Law Review* 80, no. 2: 513–53
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora’s Box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 4, no. 1: 83–95.
- Terre Blanche, M., Durkheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in practice. Applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Thomas, A. and de Bruin, G.P. (2015). Plagiarism in South African management journals, *South African Journal of Science*, 111(1/2): Art#2014-0017.
- Triggle CR, Triggle DJ. (2007). what is the future of peer review? Why is there fraud in science? Is plagiarism out of control? Why do scientists do bad things? Is it all a case of: “all that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing” *Vasc Health Risk Manag*; 3:39-53.
- Vithal, R., (2009). UKZN Plagiarism Policy and Procedures, Ref: CO/05/0412/09



- Vojak, C. (2007). What market culture teaches students about ethical behaviour? *Ethics and Education*, 1(2), 177–195
- Walker, J. (1998). Student Plagiarism in Universities: What are we doing about it? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 17:1, 89-106, DOI: 10.1080/0729436980170105.
- Weber, A.E. (2012). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior* 11, no. 3: 233–47.
- Wager, E. (2014). Defining and responding to plagiarism. *Learned Publishing*, 27(1):33–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20140105>
- Weinstein, J. & Dobkin, C. (2002). Plagiarism in U.S. higher education: Estimating Internet plagiarism rates and testing a means of deterrence. University of California, Berkeley.
- Widemen, M.A. (2008). Academic Dishonesty in Postsecondary Education: A literature review. *Academic Dishonesty in Postsecondary Education*
- Williams, D., (2001). Plagiarism and redundancy. *Biomaterials*, 28(16), pp. 2535.
- Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 98-105
- Wood, G. (2004). Academic original sin: Plagiarism, the internet, and librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(3), pp. 237-242.