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Abstract
This article describes a teaching intervention, which was informed by a community of practice approach, undertaken to manage a plagiarism problem at the University of Johannesburg (UJ), South Africa. In particular, many final year students were submitting assignments which were, to a large extent, plagiarised. As this problem posed a threat to the integrity of the academic programme, an intervention was necessary. To that end, a prevention-and-development approach was adopted. The intervention took the form of an action research project using critical reflection as a methodology. The intervention, especially phase two, was successful, although incidents of plagiarism were not completely eliminated. The teaching intervention proved to be both time and labour intensive. Formal training for students on what plagiarism is; how to correctly cite and reference; and how to write in an academically appropriate manner, was found to be necessary if plagiarism in higher education is to be dealt with within a developmental framework. It was further found that a prevention-and-development approach cannot be effective without a detection-and-enforcement system being in place.
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INTRODUCTION
This article describes a teaching intervention which was designed, to reduce high levels of student plagiarism at the University of Johannesburg (UJ), South Africa. That is, over a period of time, incidents of plagiarised assignments submitted by final year Geography and Environmental Management students had increased. Students submitted assignments which were poorly referenced, poorly paraphrased, or worse, included sentences, sections or paragraphs that had been copied verbatim from Internet sources (either without citation or with false citations). As this posed a threat to the academic integrity of the module, an intervention was deemed necessary. The intervention was guided by the community of practice approach and sought to reduce the incidence of plagiarism using an academic literacy model of teaching practice. This included teaching paraphrasing skills and the use of citations to build an academic argument, amongst others. As research on the African experience of plagiarism, is minimal (see Hattingh, Buitendag and Van der Walt 2013; Joy, Sinclair, Boyatt, Yau and Cosma 2013), this study will add to the literature. The study takes
the following structure. Firstly, plagiarism is defined, then, the literature pertaining to plagiarism is presented, followed by a description of the community of practice theoretical approach. The study then moves on to describe the methodology used and the intervention. Finally, the findings of the intervention are presented, along with some recommendations.

WHAT IS PLAGIARISM?

According to Park (2003), plagiarism is a form of intellectual dishonesty or intellectual theft. Intellectual dishonesty occurs when a person presents the ideas, words or results of another person as their own, without giving correct acknowledgement to the original author. It includes using sentences or paragraphs verbatim without quotation marks and/or suitable acknowledgement (Wilhoit 1994). The violation of fair usage practices with respect to direct quotes, including the extensive use of direct quotations even with acknowledgement is also considered to be plagiarism. This includes cutting and pasting from sources (Howard 2000). Incorrect paraphrasing, such as making only minimal or superficial changes to the original source, is also plagiarism. This can relate to the wording, sentence structure and/or overall composition or sequencing of an argument. A person using their own previously published or submitted work again, without acknowledgement is also a form of plagiarism (Maurer, Kappe and Zaka 2006).

Overall, plagiarism, then, is complex (Pennycook 1996; Pecorari 2003). There appears to be a type of scale to plagiarism, ranging from minor to major. Minor forms of plagiarism are usually related to the use of incorrect citation methods; incorrect or incomplete reference lists; accidental omission of some citations; or failing to use quotation marks correctly. With minor corrections, such problems can be easily resolved as they are more technical in nature. More serious forms of plagiarism include the cutting and pasting of text from websites and other sources (with or without acknowledgement); persistent failure to adopt proper academic citation procedures; and the complete omission of citations. These forms represent more serious forms of plagiarism as they go beyond mere technical mistakes, but rather speak to a conceptual misunderstanding of the author’s responsibilities towards the proper acknowledgment and use of sources. Lastly, major forms of plagiarism include faked citations or references; the deliberate copying of texts from sources in other languages (e.g. Russian) so as to avoid plagiarism detection tools (such as TURNITIN); submitting assignments from past students; and copying the assignments/work of peers. In this last category, the boundaries between what is plagiarism and what is academic fraud become blurred. For example, the transgression/s is/are severe and is/are unlikely to be accidental or due to conceptual misunderstandings. Awareness is also an issue that needs to be clarified. Not everyone is aware of what constitutes plagiarism and so may commit it unknowingly. It appears, too, that different individuals may have differing capabilities when it comes to avoiding plagiarism -- some can paraphrase better than others (Ashworth, Bannister and Thorne 1997; Howard 2000; Macdonald
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and Carroll 2006; Martin 1994). What is more, there is also a difference between accidental or unintentional plagiarism and between a first offence and a repeat one (Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Maurer et al 2006). Thus, many scholars call for people to be educated on what plagiarism is (Auer and Krupar 2001; Harris 2004; Wilhoit 1994; Young 2001).

Globally, plagiarism is on the rise, the cause attributed by some scholars to access to the worldwide web and the growth of digital sources (Park 2003; Pecorari 2003; Young 2001). It is also often argued that university students are immersed in a global culture of plagiarism. That is, people in the public sphere routinely commit it -- such as downloading music and videos/movies. School textbooks have no citations, making for a poor example for student to mirror. Newspapers and books written for the general public also tend to have no citations or reference lists, and politicians seldom acknowledge their sources (Young, 2001; Larkham and Manns 2002; Martin 1994; Park 2003). Consequently it is unsurprising that Braumoeller and Gaines (2001) found that over half of all university students that they surveyed acknowledged having committed some form of plagiarism. In another example, the number of Austrian students who admitted to committing plagiarism, increased from 10 per cent in 1999 to 40 per cent in 2005 (Maurer et al 2006).

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

On the one hand, there seems to be a link between academic ability and plagiarism, with both Straw (2002) and Harris (2004) finding that academically weak students plagiarise much more than academically strong students. On the other hand, Deckert (1993) and Currie (1998) argue that plagiarism issues must be contextualised within the academic literacies debates. In particular, Deckert (1993) and Currie (1998) found that students whose home language is different to that of the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) plagiarise more than students whose home language matches the LoLT. Thus, plagiarism is a way of coping with a weak command of the LoLT. Work carried out by Pecorari (2003) seems to support this, as they found plagiarising to be a particular step in the process of learning to write academically. Thus, they argue that novice writers use plagiarism as they learn to write. This is known as ‘patchworking’, which, on the surface looks like plagiarism, but is merely a phase through which a junior writer passes (Howard in Pecorari 2003, 320). While this may indeed be true, it is difficult for a lecturer to know if patchworking is a sign of a novice writer or a sign of an academically weak student, using patchworking as a coping mechanism.

Auer and Krupar (2001) and Park (2003) argue differently. They maintain that students commit plagiarism as it offers a number of benefits. Firstly, they argue that plagiarism is a time-saving device -- students resort to plagiarism in order to complete an assignment in as little time as possible and/or to be able to submit an assignment on time. A number of scholars concur, having found that plagiarism often arises out of poor time management practices (Ashworth et al 1997; Harris 2004; McCabe and
Secondly, Auer and Krupar (2001) and Park (2003) argue that plagiarised assignments are often awarded higher marks than those which are students’ original work. Thus, there is considerable incentive to commit plagiarism. Therefore, universities need to ensure that the risks attached to committing plagiarism outweigh the benefits.

Indeed, a number of international studies on plagiarism have shown that the risks of being caught and punished are a significant determinant as to whether a student commits plagiarism or not (Ashworth et al 1997; Buckley, Wiese and Harvey 1998; Leming 1980; McCabe and Trevino 1993 and 1997; Scanlon and Neumann 2002). Larkham and Manns (2002) found that plagiarism was more prevalent in large classes, which they attributed to the likelihood that students are aware that detection of individuals committing plagiarism is overall lower. This leads many scholars argue that plagiarism is an institutional quality assurance matter, as allowing students to routinely commit plagiarism without censure is discriminatory against those students who have obtained module credits or a degree by meeting set academic standards through honest submissions (Howard 2000; Park 2003; Walker 1998; Young 2001). On this note, Young (2001), Park (2003, 2004) and Macdonald and Carroll (2006) maintain that dealing with plagiarism is a shared responsibility between academic staff, students and the institution.

The international literature then moves on to make a number of recommendations as to how plagiarism should be dealt with. These recommendations fall into two categories, namely: a prevention-and-development category; and a detection-and-enforcement category. As a number of scholars see plagiarism as poor scholarship, the solution is better training of students, or a prevention-and-development approach (Ashworth et al 1997; Bowers 1994; Fialkoff 2002; Gray 2002; Leatherman 1999). This includes the development of academic literacy skills, where students are taught how to build an academic argument and avoid plagiarism (Auer and Krupar 2001; Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Park 2003; Pecorari 2003; Young 2001). For Wilhoit (1994) and Park (2003) this will at least eliminate unintentional plagiarism. Strong calls are also made for getting students to sign an ‘honour code’ or ‘code of ethics’ as well as plagiarism declarations (Ashworth et al 1997; Martin 1994; Park 2003; Rowe 2007; Young 2001). Park (2003) found that universities which have an honour code of some sort or a plagiarism declaration have lower incidences of plagiarism than those which do not. Park (2003) recommends public signing ceremonies of these codes of ethics, as well as individual plagiarism declarations on each assignment. The value of these codes and declarations is the establishment of ‘rules of engagement’ and mitigation of misunderstandings (Park 2003, 483). Furthermore, rules and regulations pertaining to plagiarism need to be made publically available (Ashworth et al 1997; Macdonald and Carroll 2006; Maurer et al 2006).

Most scholars agree, however, that a detection-and-enforcement approach must occur in tandem with a prevention-and-development approach. In terms of detection, many scholars recommend the use of electronic plagiarism management systems or plagiarism-detection software, such as TURNITIN (Braumoeller and Gaines 2001;
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Maurer et al 2006; Park 2003; Young 2001). However, no plagiarism-detection software system is fool proof, so it cannot be the only mechanism used. Researchers also recommend the use of keying in key words/segments from the assignment into Internet search engines, such as Google. In addition, academics have to be vigilant and look for signs of plagiarism, which include: (1) mixed referencing styles; (2) a lack of references; (3) mixed formatting; (4) anomalies in writing style; and (5) big discrepancies between test and assignment scores (Harris 2004; Maurer et al 2006; Park 2004; Rowe 2007; Young 2001). If plagiarism is detected, then the next step is to impose penalties. Park (2003) is at pains to stress that penalty systems need to be robust, transparent and consistently applied. This includes keeping a plagiarism register. Importantly, the system cannot be laborious or complex, because this will take up academic staff time and reduce the willingness of staff to engage in the process. In fact, Auer and Krupar (2001) maintain that plagiarism flourishes when academic staff seldom penalise those who commit it. They cite a number of reasons for why staff do this, including: (a) a lack of knowledge (or understanding) of the university’s plagiarism policy; (b) plagiarism can be hard to prove; (c) it is time consuming and labour intensive; (d) fear of the negative consequences sanctions may have on the student (censure will ‘ruin’ the student); (e) fear that a plagiarism case may have a negative reflection on them; and (f) fear of being challenged by the student, reported to authorities for discrimination and the like.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The study made use of the community of practice theoretical framework as it dovetails well with a prevention-and-development approach. This framework maintains that in order for newcomers (students) to move from being newcomers to full practitioners of the discipline, they have to gain mastery over the knowledge and skills of the community of practice. This is a process that requires mediation by more knowledgeable insiders (academics/lecturers) (Lave and Wenger 1991). It is argued here that acquiring the ability to cite sources correctly and learn from the literature -- as opposed to rewriting it verbatim -- is an important part of learning to be a legitimate member of a community of practice. The process of learning this is what Wenger (1998) calls ‘reification’ and refers to learning the ‘way things are done’ within a community of practice. Each discipline usually has its own ‘way of doing’ citations and referencing, and particular norms of practice with respect to paraphrasing and the use of direct quotations. Students have to learn these ‘ways of doing’ in order to be recognised as legitimate members of the discipline (McKay and Simpson 2013). Within this perspective, then, plagiarised assignments reflect a mismatch between what the discipline insider (academic) views as the correct manner of operating within the discipline and what the student has presented. From this perspective, this mismatch occurs when the community’s ‘way of doing’ has not been made overt. Onus for decrypting (or de-coding) the discipline’s citation system and manner of presenting written material lies with the discipline insider,
who must share with the newcomers (students) the routines, tools, symbols and the like that make up a practice (Wenger 1998). Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that this is necessary as students entering university seldom possess the shared cultural system necessary for academic success. So, the cultural system -- in this case, what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, how to cite and paraphrase -- prevailing at the university needs to be brokered by the academics (Wenger 1998).

**METHODOLOGY**

The teaching intervention reported on made use of the action research methodological framework, in conjunction with a cyclical reflective process (Opie 2004). In particular, the implementation, monitoring and successes (or lack thereof) of the intervention, were assessed using the critical reflection technique (Larrivee 2000). The report presented here represents part of this critical reflection process. It is the author’s intention to apply the findings of the action research project in the future, highlighting the ability of action research to facilitate formalised, systematic change to teaching interventions over time. Critical reflection was selected as a methodology because it allows academics to reflect on their personal and professional belief systems, in this case, a personal interest in the community of practice theoretical framework (Larrivee 2000). Furthermore, careful reflection on the outcomes of the teaching intervention is more rigorous using critical reflection than the typical reflective exercises that most educators undertake (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000). Overall, Opie’s (2004, 80) model was used, as set out below:

(a) analysis of the problem;
(b) designing and implementation of a suitable intervention;
(c) monitoring, analysis and evaluation;
(d) revised intervention; and
(e) monitoring, analysis and evaluation.

**ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM**

In the 2010 academic year, 29 out of a class of 34 students, were identified by TURNITIN as having committed some sort of plagiarism. It is important to note here that a low TURNITIN score does not automatically mean there is no plagiarised text, nor does a high score automatically mean there is plagiarised text. One of the reasons for this is that TURNITIN does not pick up all online documents (such as PDFs) nor does it check against published work that is unavailable online. Thus, academics have to scrutinise the reports and decide if plagiarism has occurred or not. For this reason, any assignment with a TURNITIN score below 30 per cent was not penalised for plagiarism, because the nature of the assignment forced students to cite parts of environmental legislation verbatim, and so the TURNITIN score was artificially
high. Overall, however, careful examination of the reports showed that the use of TURNITIN green, red and amber scoring criteria can be broadly useful. Assignments with a green score, seldom contained plagiarised text; whereas assignments with an amber or red TURNITIN score almost always do. Those with red scores had much more of the assignment plagiarised than those with amber scores. For the 2010 academic year, students with plagiarism problems had TURNITIN scores ranging from a low of 31 per cent to a high of 55 per cent (that is, students with a score of 50 per cent or more had copied more than half of the assignment verbatim from various worldwide websites). Furthermore, in 2010, two students continued to plagiarise in subsequent assignments, despite verbal warnings not to do so. In order to mitigate for serial plagiarism, in 2011, the assessment opportunities were adapted − one of the assignments was replaced with a formal test. Unfortunately, more students plagiarised in 2011. The class size itself had also increased (by 44 percent), so in absolute numbers, the plagiarism problem also increased. In 2011, students with plagiarism problems had TURNITIN scores for their assignment ranging from a low of 31 per cent to a high of 93 per cent. Of concern was that two students (with TURNITIN scores of 91 per cent and 93 per cent, respectively) obtained these high scores by committing self-plagiarism -- they submitted work that they had previously submitted to other modules at the university. Clearly, an intervention of some sort was necessary.

**Description of the 2012 intervention**

The 2012 intervention took the shape of two 2-hour classes during the lecture periods and class hand outs on research ethics, paraphrasing and referencing. A detailed declaration regarding plagiarism -- in order for all students to come to a common understanding of what plagiarism is -- was distributed, discussed and signed (see Appendix 1). This plagiarism declaration had been used successfully by the lecturer previously, with extended BSc degree students (McKay 2013). The 2012 intervention met with success, with only 13.8 per cent of the class recording TURNITIN scores of 31 per cent or more for their assignments. Detailed scrutiny of TURNITIN reports for the rest of the students, however, revealed additional plagiarism problems not reflected in the TURNITIN score. This included incorrect recording of references and a poor referencing and citation style. Overall some 47 per cent of students still had problems avoiding plagiarism. Critical reflection and one-on-one discussions with students indicated that some students were committing plagiarism due to low levels of competence in academic writing and referencing. In line with the prevention-and-development approach, these students were sent to a librarian for additional training in referencing and/or to the UJ Writing Centre for additional help with academic writing. It seemed to be that part of the problem was that students did not take an informal intervention seriously (that is, many students seemed to operate within a surface approach to learning framework, whereby a topic which is not formally tested, is dismissed as irrelevant). Thus, it was decided to adopt a more formal approach for the future. In 2013, the intervention was adapted with
the introduction of a formal test. To this end, lectures and classes on referencing, research ethics, how to avoid plagiarism and paraphrasing would lead up to a formal test, marks for which would count towards the module mark.

Description of the 2013 intervention

As the formal approach required students to pass a test, with the marks counting towards their final module mark, the 2013 intervention was further adapted to include budgeting provision for a tutor. This was to give students the best possible chance of passing the test. The introduction of a tutor can be viewed as a strengthening of the prevention-and-development approach. Thus, lectures, training by a tutor, as well as formal testing, took place for the 47 students registered for the module. The lectures took a similar format as for the previous year. This included the use of learner-centred teaching material covering topics such as proper and improper paraphrasing; various ways to cite sources in the text; and what plagiarism is. The assistance provided by the tutor was extensive and took the shape of help with referencing, academic literacy and general academic competencies. Appendix 2 contains details on this aspect of the intervention. Once more, as for 2012, the plagiarism declaration was discussed in class and all students signed it. Study material pertaining to referencing, paraphrasing and ethical research was made available to students in order for them to use it to study for the formal test. Most students managed to pass the test (above 50%), although some had to write several supplementary tests before they did. Despite the tutor running several classes with the students on paraphrasing, referencing and academic writing in general and being available for one-on-one consultations, three did not manage to pass at all.

Formal testing aside, the results for the second phase were significant, with much lower TURNITIN scores across the board (see Table 1). There is a caveat to the lower 2013 TURNITIN scores, however. In particular, the assignment task was adapted so that environmental legislation need not be cited verbatim by the students, thus, some of the decline in the TURNITIN scores must be attributed to this. Because of this change, using TURNITIN scores of over 30 per cent as an indicator of plagiarism also had to change. Upon detailed scrutiny of the TURNITIN reports by the lecturer, it was clear that only scores of 23 per cent or less could be considered free of plagiarism. Overall, the formal intervention was deemed more successful than the informal one, with only 4.25 per cent of the 2013 class falling into the ‘over 23 per cent’ category on TURNITIN.

Table 1: Comparing TURNITIN scores between 2012 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0--5%</th>
<th>6--9%</th>
<th>10--20%</th>
<th>21--23%</th>
<th>24--30%</th>
<th>31--42%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the 2012 year, detailed scrutiny of the 2013 assignments and TURNITIN reports revealed additional plagiarism problems, such as incorrect referencing and citation styles. To assist the students further (and in line with the prevention-and-development approach) all the assignments were deemed to be first drafts to allow for the students to get formative feedback by the lecturer and the tutor (feedback was generic and individual; written and oral). This feedback was not confined only to referencing and citations, but also to academic writing style, how to build an academic argument and content. Students were then tasked with re-drafting and re-submitting the assignments and could consult the academic, the tutor, the librarian and the UJ Writing Centre for additional assistance. The assignments were then re-marked and these marks recorded (the first draft marks were not). This system, although time consuming and labour intensive, enabled the assignment to be a valid assessment tool, determining the students’ ability and enabling those who wanted to, to significantly improve their writing skills and their final module marks.

FINDINGS

Firstly, neither intervention eliminated plagiarism completely. In order to determine the reason for this, the students’ assignments were scrutinised so as to identify what types of plagiarism problems they were still struggling with. This was done to help inform a post-2013 intervention. The analysis revealed multiple types of plagiarism problems. The first sort of problem could be deemed minor. This included students not paying close attention to departmental writing and referencing guidelines (despite being available from the library and on the university’s version of Blackboard) and so making multiple citation mistakes -- such as omitting the date or page number from a citation or direct quotation. Many students had too few references or cited a source only once, even if it had been used multiple times in the assignment. Reference lists seldom matched the in-text citations. The use of a citation/referencing tool such as Mendeley or RefWorks may help solve this problem in the future. The second sort of problem was deemed to be more serious in nature, such as using non-academic sources (Wikipedia in particular). Despite being told not to use Wikipedia, students did so anyway and simply did not reference it as a way of disguising the fact that they had. In general, students relied heavily on web-based source material, shunning the academic sources which were provided by the lecturer (which had also been uploaded onto Blackboard as PDFs). Thirdly, there were major incidences of plagiarism, where students copied from each other, with significant overlap in paragraph structure, content and citations.

Secondly, not all of the problems displayed by the student assignments could be attributed to plagiarism. Many assignments showed evidence that the students were not coping with the LoLT and the consequence of which was plagiarism. In particular, assignments were riddled with grammatical and spelling errors, even the so-called final draft. Despite being aware of the UJ Writing Centre, few made use of this free service. The tutor also noted a type of abusive attitude towards tutors.
and lecturers by some students. For example, students felt that it was the lecturer’s and/or tutor’s role to act as editors, type setters, language support assistants and academic writing consultants *ad infinitum*. For instance, students would submit what was effectively a first or rough draft in the belief that it was the role of the lecturer and/or tutor to fix all language and citations errors (A Karam, pers comm, 24 March and 8 April 2013). A possible underlying cause of this practice is that students are adopting a surface, rather than a deep approach to learning.

Thirdly, class size seems to matter. As the size of the class increased, so did the size of the plagiarism problem. Fortunately, the intervention demonstrated that this increase does not have to be automatic. A lecturer can reverse the trend with the judicious use of a multi-faceted teaching intervention. One aspect of the interventions which proved essential was the use of a plagiarism declaration (although a declaration alone does not solve the problem). This leads to the fourth finding, namely, that despite signing and submitting the declaration, some students still committed plagiarism, and when confronted, feigned ignorance as to what plagiarism was! Even with classes on what plagiarism is, how to avoid it and unpacking the declaration as a class, some students (when confronted with their plagiarised text) claimed to still not understand what plagiarism is or their duty to avoid it. Saying ‘I didn’t know’ was a standard defence. In this regard, it seems that some students see their own role in plagiarism management as passive. For them, signing the declaration did not mean that they accepted responsibility for ensuring that they did not commit plagiarism. Furthermore, it was found that some students signed the declaration as a routine procedure. Seemingly students are unaware of the legal and other expectations the institution and the academic assume once a declaration is signed. Such attitudes could indicate that the students are still immature and/or naïve. It was also found that some students either did not submit the declaration or submitted it unsigned. This problem could only be overcome by the lecturer refusing to mark such assignments until this was rectified.

Lastly, it seems that some students commit plagiarism if they think they can get away with it. Unless transgressors are dealt with, some commit plagiarism if they think the risk of being caught and/or punished is low. Thus, students need to know that the lecturer is actively scrutinising the TURNITIN reports and their assignments for the correct acknowledgement of sources. If they know this, then students become more careful in their submissions. To this end, a prevention-and-development approach cannot be a standalone approach; a detection-and-enforcement approach is also required. Certainly, this entire study would not have been possible without use of the plagiarism-detection software. Furthermore, enforcement must be strong enough to deal with rogue students who simply refuse to comply. For example, across all four years, it was found that a small minority of students demonstrated that a prevention-and-development approach will not work for them. In the 2010 academic year, verbal warnings did not prevent repeat offences. In the 2011 academic year, some students committed fraud by submitting the same assignment twice. In 2012 and 2013, some students contrived to elude TURITIN completely. Three students did
this by initially not submitting their assignments to TURNITIN on time. This created a lot of additional work for the lecturer, who had to (firstly) check to establish who had not submitted assignments, then track down the errant students, and then listen to the excuses they proffered (one claimed that TURNITIN was ‘down’, another that their memory stick with the electronic version of the assignment was stolen/went missing). Clearly they hoped the time and trouble involved in chasing them would be too much for the lecturer and so they would avoid scrutiny. The lecturer then had to re-open TURNITIN, check if they submitted the second time (which they did not) and then follow up again. All three continued to elude TURNITIN and the lecturer, thereby demonstrating that unless students are co-operative, managing a plagiarism problem can be extremely frustrating, time consuming and annoying. As all three subsequently failed the module, it is worth exploring the relationship between poor academic ability and propensity to commit plagiarism. One of these three registered for the module again in 2014, committed plagiarism again and failed again. He was subsequently allowed to write a supplementary examination, as this was the last module of his degree.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In summation, preventing plagiarism with the prevention-and-development approach is human resource and time intensive, as is managing cases of plagiarism. Thus, a number of time-saving strategies need to be put into place. Some of which can be done at the level of the individual academic, others at the level of the university. It is recommended that academics structure assessment tasks in ways that limit the opportunities for plagiarism. This can include requiring students to submit their original sources along with the assignment; requiring an assignment to be submitted in stages; asking for a summary of sources; or asking students to submit a meta-learning essay on what they learnt from doing the assignment. It is also recommended that universities implement formal training of students, by holding classes during Orientation Week, and setting compulsory modules on research ethics and information on their websites. Universities should have plagiarism policies and/or academic ethics policies publically displayed in multiple spaces. Departments, faculties and universities also need to keep a plagiarism register (a list of serial plagiarisers or students who have been found to have committed major incidents of plagiarism, including evading plagiarism-detection processes). It is further suggested that universities move with haste to entirely online submissions where plagiarism-detection software is merged both with online plagiarism declarations and the official class list. This will force students to electronically tick a box to indicate they know what plagiarism is before their assignment can be uploaded. The integration of mark sheets and class lists with plagiarism management systems will eliminate the possibility of students evading plagiarism-detection software. However, students also need a shift in attitude. To this end, universities must make it clear to students that they cannot simply shirk their responsibilities regarding acknowledgment of
sources, in the same way that that they are expected not to cheat in their examinations.

CONCLUSION
The study has demonstrated that a teaching intervention, especially a formalised one, can significantly reduce the incidence of plagiarism to the extent that it no longer poses a risk to academic quality. Furthermore, the intervention described here demonstrates that a community of practice approach, with a focus on prevention-and-development, is useful, although it is both time and human resource intensive. Most importantly, the intervention makes clear that a prevention-and-development approach goes hand-in-hand with a detection-and-enforcement one. Some recommendations with respect to reducing the academic workload, while simultaneously managing plagiarism, have been made. Importantly, it may be that students commit plagiarism for a number of reasons, including low levels of competency in citation/referencing, low levels of competency in the LoLT and the adoption of a surface, rather than a deep approach, to learning. Even deviant behaviour (such as eluding TURNITIN) and poor time management could perhaps be attributed to a surface approach to learning. Much more research into these aspects of plagiarism may be required.
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APPENDIX ONE

Plagiarism Declaration
I hereby declare that any work submitted for this module is my own and has not been published, even partially, anywhere else, by myself or anyone else.

I understand that plagiarism is:

- Presenting the ideas, words or results of another person as my own, without giving correct acknowledgement to the original author.
- Using the ideas or words of another person without giving necessary credit to that person or source.
- Using verbatim sentences from articles, books and web documents without quotation marks and suitable acknowledgement.
- Using paragraphs or sections from articles, books and web documents verbatim, even with acknowledgement.
- Using another person’s direct words without quotation marks, even if I acknowledge the source.
- Paraphrasing the author’s words in such a manner that there is no substantial change between mine and the author’s, regardless of acknowledgment of the source.
- Using ‘cut and paste’ to directly copy sentences, paragraphs, diagrams, maps, tables and other information from an internet, digital or printed source into an assignment without acknowledgement and without adaptation (where necessary).
- Copying the work of other students and ‘passing it off as my own’.
- Self plagiarism: Using my own work, previously submitted for this or any other module, without acknowledgement.

I am aware that the university views plagiarism as a serious offence. I am aware that should I be found to have committed plagiarism, I will be disciplined. I commit to achieving a ‘green’ TURNITIN score, although accepting that such a score in itself doesn’t automatically mean I haven’t committed plagiarism.

I, ______________________________________ (FULL NAME AND SURNAME), with student number ______________________ do hereby declare that I understand what plagiarism is and undertake not to engage in such behaviour.

________________________________              __________________________
SIGNATURE                                                               DATE
NOTES

1. Definition: repeated, written down, or copied word for word.
2. That is: To a reader there is no obvious difference between what I have written and what the original author wrote. This can relate to wording, sentence structure and/or composition.
3. I understand that it is not an acceptable practice to simply cut and paste maps, diagrams and tables into my assignment. An effort needs to be made to adapt them, and the source must be acknowledged at all times (including page number/s).
APPENDIX 2

Tutor Contribution Summary – by Andrew Karam

Tutor interventions aimed at reducing minor incidences of plagiarism

- Demonstrating various reference techniques following Departmental Guidelines or Harvard Referencing method.
- Explaining how in-text citations differ from reference lists.
- Showing how to cite in-text references with respect to the different sources, i.e. books, internet, journal, government publication, newspaper, etc. sources differ from one another.
- Explaining how a reference list should be compiled.
- Pointing out the differences between direct and indirect quotes and how a page number should follow the author and year when citing in-text, as well as, including the necessary quotation marks if an extract of a source has not been paraphrased.
- Explaining how TURNITIN operates.

Tutoring interventions aimed at improving academic literacy

- Emphasising the importance of using the Writing Centre.
- Demonstrating the correct way to write an abstract, an introduction and a conclusion.
- Assisting students to construct a logical, coherent argument in academic English though a drafting and re-drafting process.
- Pointing out language and grammatical errors during the drafting phase.
- Interpreting Departmental Guidelines with respect to the general format and structure of an essay/written report.

Tutoring to offer general guidance with respect to conducting research

- Examples of good time management, how to work under pressure and independently.
- Showing students how to search for sources using the various online databases.
- Illustrating the difference between academic and non-academic internet references.
- Emphasising the importance of journal articles and books as a means of acquiring more accurate and viable (peer-reviewed) information for researching purposes as oppose to the information generally provided by internet and non-academic internet sources.