

‘Thaths Dithpikabul’: a few words about something we don’t discuss

Rick Duley
North Perth, Western Australia, 6006
rickduley@gmail.com

Abstract

Plagiarism is like a lunatic asylum — everyone knows it exists, no-one wants to be associated with it. Senior university faculty resign hurriedly, yet university administration are hesitant to discuss the issue, often seeming to echo Warner Brothers’ Daffy Duck — “Thaths Dithpikabul” — while avoiding proaction. Stories of rampant transgression of the rules relating to Intellectual Property abound, yet few people seem to be even familiar with those rules, particularly since the passing of the Copyright Amendment (Moral Rights) Act, 2000. This article looks at the problem, the consequence of conviction and the challenge of eradicating this felony.

Keywords

cheating, copyright, ethics, intellectual property, moral rights, patent, plagiarism

Categories

K.3.2 Computer Science Education — Information Systems Education

K.4.1 Abuse and Crime Involving Computers — Ethics — Intellectual Property Rights

K.5.1 Copyrights — Patents — Proprietary Rights

K.7.4 Professional Ethics

Preamble: University Scandal

Saturday, July 6, 2002: readers of Melbourne’s *‘The Age’* scan the lead article headline *‘Plagiarism: Fresh claims against Monash uni head’*. One of the Monash vice-chancellors was accused by a junior colleague of copying another person’s work into his 1976 book *‘Drinking to Alcoholism: a Sociological Commentary’* — a charge supported by highlighted copies of both texts revealing several passages copied. This accusation followed the revelation by *‘The Times’* of London two weeks previously that the accused had admitted plagiarism in books published in 1979 and 1983. Despite these claims the Monash University Council had, the previous week, passed a unanimous motion of confidence in their vice-chancellor. *‘The Age’* requested a research fellow at the University of Melbourne’s Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics to examine the texts at the heart of the new accusation.

“ ‘A lot of academic work borrows in some way from other work and it’s very difficult to draw a sharp line, but on the face of it, it looks as though it’s on the wrong side of the line.’ he said. ‘...Plagiarism is important because it’s dishonest. There’s a particular issue with academic plagiarism; you’re holding yourself out to have expertise you don’t have. To what extent is [the accused vice-chancellor] an authority on the sociology of alcoholism?’ ” (Ketchell, 2002a)

One week later, *‘The Age’*, under the headline *‘Quiet rejoicing in Monash corridors’*, reported the accused’s *‘precipitate departure’* apparently when he was asked by the University Council to resign (Ketchell, 2002b). *Sic gloria transit!*

Prelude

Plagiarism persists. Plagiarists are regularly exposed and careers are often ruined as a result. Some commentators suggest that not only is this abomination as common as ever but also that it is becoming more common as globalised information via the Internet makes it easier to practice and harder to detect. 'Paper Mills' (where appropriate essays and research results may be downloaded across the Internet) are plentiful, providing intending offenders with a readily available supply of material for false presentation as original work or for inclusion of sections of downloaded text (or tables or illustrations etc.) via cut-and-paste:

"No longer relegated to back alleys of college campuses and discretely whispered about, the term paper industry is flourishing, prosperous, and reaching a much larger and much younger audience." (Fain, 1999, p.1)

Although paper mills regularly state that their material is only to be used for research and not presented for grading or publication (Rocklin, 1996, p.1) the self-description of their URLs (e.g. <http://www.schoolsucks.com/>, or <http://www.cheater.com>) might make one doubt the integrity of such a statement. Meanwhile longstanding plagiaristic techniques and opportunities seem as popular as ever:

"Students will be dishonest and use work that is not their own; this is an undeniable though unpleasant truth in education." (Buttfield, 2002)

"A 1995 study... found that 64% of students questioned about academic dishonesty reported that they themselves had copied with knowledge, 66% paraphrased without references and 54% copied without references." (Carroll, 2000)

and 'ever' goes back a long way — Samuel Johnson (1709-1784), so it is said, once commented to a student:

"I found your speech to be good and original. However, the part that was original was not good. And the part that was good was not original."

Recent communications with national and international colleagues revealed no-one who denied the existence of the problem and it could well be a brave university which erected a billboard proclaiming, "We Don't Have Plagiarism Here!". (As we have seen, this does not only apply to students!) Also, few universities are likely to broadcast from their bell tower the frequency at which they encounter plagiarism so, in general, the subject seems to be one of those legally discussed between consenting adults in private (though not, one assumes, by Ladies).

"Talk to members of staff in any university and — particularly if you close the door behind you — deep concerns about student cheating and plagiarism will often emerge." (Moon, 1999)

It may be that it is this hush about the issue which actually nurtures this academic felony. Protecting the perceived innocence of all by prosecuting none may merely allow the guilty to prosper. Openly discussing and facing up to the problem could be a better approach. This article seeks to take that open approach, to elucidate what it is that constitutes plagiarism, to examine the possible consequences of conviction and to sound a call to action against what is rapidly becoming a plague.

Plagiarism Pleas

Definitions of plagiarism are common and unequivocal:

“The wrongful appropriation and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas (literary, artistic, musical or mechanical etc.) of another.” (The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989)

Sidebar 1: Origin of the Term ‘Plagiarism’

Plagiary †adj. plagiarizing XVI; sb. †kidnapper; plagiarist; plagiarism XVII. – L. *plagiārius* kidnapper, literary thief, f. *plagium* man-stealing, kidnapping – Gr. *Plágion*. Hence **plagiarism**, -ist XVII, -ize XVIII (The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Word Origins, 1986)

“Plagiarism is using others’ ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information.” (Writing Tutorial Services)

and the acts which constitute the practice are described in detail in Australian law (Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1968). Unfortunately these definitions don’t give a feel for the breadth of the problem and a deeper sense of the meaning of the term is to be found by considering a double negative. Consider the question, “*What is not ‘not plagiarism’?*” In other words, when people say, “*But, that’s not plagiarism!*”, are they right? More simply, does the excuse stand?

The “*I wasn’t taught to reference*” Excuse

Commentators sometimes blame instances of plagiarism on lack of, or faulty, instruction in the practice of referencing (e.g. (Clough, 2000), (Why do Students Plagiarise)). Lack of knowledge of how to cite a reference and lack of encouragement to commence building a database of reference material early in an academic career are matters which must be addressed by both faculty and institutions. At some universities, for example, students are supplied with bibliographic software free of charge for the duration of their study but such initiatives remain of little value if students are not encouraged to take advantage of them or, in fact, if their implementation is not expected in the assignment work the students hand in.

While the latter problem must be dealt with at school or faculty policy level, the former lies at the door of the individual educator. Somehow educators have to exercise a duty of care to transmit to students the challenge of research:

“Citing a source, whether paraphrased or quoted, reveals that they have performed research work and synthesised the findings into their own argument. Using sources shows that the student engaged in ‘the great conversation’, the world of ideas, and that the student is aware of other thinkers’ positions on the topic.” (Harris, 2002, p.3)

It is not unimportant that students may lack confidence in their own ability to produce work of an adequate standard. They may, for example, ask, “*Why can’t I use his words if they are better than any I could think of?*” (Carroll and Appleton, 2001, p.16):

“...students have serious concerns over their essay writing skills and their ability to avoid plagiarism. Institutions should therefore consider whether their current procedures for teaching study skills and essay writing really meet the needs of their students.” (Issues for Institutions to Consider, 2002)

Whichever way one looks at it, however, this excuse remains as invalid as, “I didn’t know the gun was loaded”.

“When using another person’s words, to avoid plagiarism one must always do both of the following:

- *provide a citation, either in the text or in a footnote and*
- *either enclose their words inside quotation marks or put their words in a block of indented, single-spaced text.*

I define these two things as the indicia of quotation, ... Plagiarism is the act of quoting material without including the indicia of a quotation.” (Standler, 2000)

Ignorance of the law, as in ordinary life, is no excuse and commission of plagiarism is cause for conviction of plagiarism.

The “I thought we were supposed to discuss things” Excuse

As Joyce Currie Little put it:

“There are as many as five or six levels of the ‘type of collaboration’ with the extreme level being NO collaboration but individual work. Where is the line between collaboration and cheating? ...Each faculty member needs to make assignments with clear indication of expectations, and to give the students more awareness of the way they are expected to do the assignment.” (Stewart-Gardiner, Kay, Little et al. 2001)

There is a cultural aspect as well as is demonstrated by one Australian survey which showed that 35.3% of the postgraduate students surveyed thought that a high level of collaboration was acceptable, 23.3% admitted to have taken part in the activity and 38.8% said they had seen it done ((Sheard, Dick and Markham, 2001), see Table 1.) Pair programming, which is gaining a lot of attention in education and industry, eases the problem of collusion by expecting it (Williams and Kessler, 2001, p.8) and team projects reverse the problem by creating difficulties in assessment of individuals within a team (Wilkins and Lawhead, 2000) so the more one looks at this problem the more complex it seems.

Table 1: Australian Postgrads and Cheating

Scenario	OK	Done	Seen
High level of collaboration	35.3	23.3	38.8
Help from a Newsgroup	68.0	24.3	28.2
Pumping the lecturer	59.2	38.8	48.5
Reuse old assignment	40.2	15.5	29.1
Reuse friend’s assignment	21.6	17.5	41.7
Given answers	11.9	3.9	19.4
Buy assignment on the Internet	3.9	1.0	11.7
Find answers on the LAN	5.9	3.9	13.6
Get bogus medical certificate	5.9	2.9	28.2

“There is a fine line between legitimate collaboration and collusion.” (Moon, 1999)

Authors’ awareness of what constitutes plagiarism, perhaps combined with a stern admonition to err on the side of safety, may be the best solution especially if accompanied by some guideline as to what is expected of the writer such as:

“Unless your lecturer informs you otherwise, the following guideline should be used: Students may work together in obtaining references, discussing the content of the references and discussing the assignment, but when they write, they must write alone.” (Policy on Plagiarism)

The “*I got it from the Net*” Excuse

Variations on this theme include, “*It didn’t say it was copyright.*” and “*I thought the Internet was ‘public domain’.*” so there are two issues here — ‘What makes a file copyright?’ and ‘Is the Internet public domain?’

Under the Copyright Act (1968) and amendments Australian authors do not have to register or take any other action to ensure copyright of their work and they do not have to include a copyright claim in the work. Copyright arises automatically immediately on creation of the work and this includes computer programs. Even after the transfer of Economic (or Proprietary) Rights, the Copyright Amendment (Moral Rights) Act 2000 guarantees the original author the right:

- to be known as the work’s creator;
- to prevent others from claiming to be the creator of the author’s work;
- to prevent someone claiming that the author has written something he/she did not;
- to prevent someone altering the author’s work and still claiming it to be original.

(Australian Vice-chancellors’ Committee, 2002)

so there is no such thing as un-copyrighted Australian work on the Internet and the first issue doesn’t exist in Australia.

Similarly, since 1989 any work created in the USA is automatically copyright. As in Australia, there is no requirement to attach a copyright notice to the work (Standler, 2000) although the Digital Millennium Copyright Act suggests that authors take further steps to defend their copyright (Gibbs, 2000). What, then, about such work downloaded from the internet within Australia?

In December, 2002, Melbourne businessman Joseph Gutnick won the right to sue US conglomerate Dow Jones for libel in relation to material uploaded to a website in the United States. His right was supported by a unanimous decision of the High Court on the basis that downloading the allegedly offensive article in Australia constituted its publication in Australia and therefore made it’s content subject to Australian law (Shiel, 2002). In the light of this, it would seem that any material found on the Internet (i.e. the work is created and committed to a storage medium) and downloaded in Australia (i.e. subject to Australian Law) is automatically copyright. While it will probably take another High Court hearing to finally clarify this matter, it might, until then, be dangerous to make any assumption of Public Domain for Internet material.

The “*It’s alright, it’s paraphrased*” Excuse

Paraphrasing is not, of itself, a defence against a charge of plagiarism. Simply changing some words and phrases and/or changing sentence order is not acceptable paraphrasing. Consider the example in Sidebar 2 which is taken from a website at Indiana University in the USA. This ‘paraphrase’ is unacceptable according to Indiana’ University’s Writing Tutorial Services (WTS) because only words and phrases or sentence order have been altered. Also, the information source remains uncited. WTS also point out that a direct lift of a phrase or sentence into a paraphrase must be placed within quotation marks and the page from which the phrase or sentence is taken must be identified. (Writing Tutorial Services)

The “*They’re my words*” Excuse

Until recently, most cited works in the computing field would be from scholarly publications — journals, proceedings of conferences, textbooks and the like. In these cases the author usually assigns the copyright (but, in Australia, not the Moral Rights) of the work to the publisher. As owner of the copyright, the publisher may institute infringement proceedings against an author who re-uses his own earlier, published work without citation. In the cases of work published privately, or on the Internet, without relinquishment of copyright, the excuse would appear to be valid. This is the legalistic argument on this issue but several ethical arguments also arise.

“Self-plagiarization in publication is wrong for several different reasons:

- *The number of scholarly publications is an important credential for authors in academia. Repeating the same publication inflates the number of publications, giving the plagiarist an undeserved good reputation.*
- *Most scholarly journals accept only new material for publication. Repeating previously published text is a fraudulent misrepresentation by the author to the editor of the journal.*
- *Publication of the same material more than once wastes space on library shelves, and wastes money in library budgets.*
- *Moreover, someone doing a diligent search of the literature could order copies of two or three “different” scholarly papers, which — when read carefully — contain essentially the same information, thus wasting photocopy expense, interlibrary loan expense etc.” (Standler, 2000)*

The “*That’s the way it’s done here*” Excuse

Stories are told of persons in supervisory positions in universities who insist on co-authorship rights on all publications created by those they supervise.

“When consulted for their views on plagiarism, members of the National Postgraduate Committee complained at length about papers published under their supervisor’s name or with the student as fifth author when the student did most of the work. ... These

Sidebar 2 : Unacceptable Paraphrase

Original

The rise of industry, the growth of cities, and the expansion of the population were the three great developments of late nineteenth century American history. As new, larger, steam-powered factories became a feature of the American landscape in the East, they transformed farmhands into industrial labourers, and provided jobs for the rising tide of immigrants. With industry came urbanisation the growth of large cities (like Fall River, Massachusetts, where the Bordens lived) which became the centers of production as well as of commerce and trade.

As ‘Paraphrased’

The increase of industry, the growth of cities, and the explosion of the population were three large factors of nineteenth century America. As steam-driven companies became more visible in the eastern part of the country, they changed farm hands into factory workers and provided jobs for the large wave of immigrants. With industry came the growth of large cities like Fall River where the Bordens lived which turned into centers of commerce and trade as well as production.

kinds of academic behaviours must be common or the humour in the following guidelines for marking would not work:

- *in the event that almost half the entire answer has been plagiarised and the marker recognises the source: fail*
- *less than half the answer has been plagiarised / marker recognises the source: deduct 20 marks*
- *marker feels they have read this particular script several thousand times before, but cannot quite remember where or when: no action taken*
- *in the event that the answer reveals extensive plagiarism of the marker's work: add ten marks!" (Carroll and Appleton, 2001, p.20))*

Neither would the humour in Tom Lehrer's Ode to Nicolai Ivanovich Lobachevsky:

*"Plagiarise,
Let no one else's work evade your eyes,
Remember why the good Lord made your eyes,
So don't shade your eyes,
But plagiarize, plagiarize, plagiarize —
Only be sure always to call it please, 'research!'" (Lehrer)*

Here we must consider the definition of authorship:

"... judicial interpretation of the term author indicates that it refers to the person who reduces the idea of information contained in the work into the relevant material form including electronic versions or formats." (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, 2002, Section 2.4.2(a))

However:

"Students are largely regarded as owning research data, inventions and publications resulting from their enrolment, even when engaged in a collaborative research project." (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, 2002, Section 1.6)

Joint publication, therefore, is another minefield. Who is entitled to claim authorship? In the Biomedical field, the requirements for claim to authorship are quite specific:

"Authorship credit should be based only on 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the article and revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) final approval of the version to be published. Conditions 1, 2, and 3 must all be met." (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, 2001)

Things are not so clearly defined in the Australian academic context, at least nothing so precise has surfaced in the author's research on the matter. Joint publication is seen by the Vice-chancellor's Committee as a way in which supervisors can significantly assist students, but they point out that the supervisor should be careful not to usurp credit for the student's work, keeping to AVCC guidelines, treating students as colleagues and respecting the ethics prescribed by their profession (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, Section 63). To clarify the issue of Professional Ethics within the University system, the author approached the Economic, Legal and Social Implications Committee of the Community Affairs Board of the ACS, writing:

“At universities around the world (not merely in Perth or in Australia) academics who have supervisory duties concerning postgraduate students regularly (though not always) expect that their names will be included on the authorship list for any document written by the student for publication. I have heard of cases in which senior academics require their names to be placed first on the list (usually the indicator of primary authorship) on any such paper leaving their sphere of influence.”

and received the response:

“The conduct you describe is a breach of the moral rights provisions of the Copyright Act... Accordingly, as illegal conduct, it would also infringe the ACS Code of Ethics.”
(Argy, 2002)

Quod erat demonstrandum.

The “But, you used our ...” Excuse

Once again, with respect to universities, students are not employees and the university’s right to ownership of student Intellectual Property under common law or statute does not apply. Therefore a university cannot claim that right and if the student assigns that right then the student is due for payment of some consideration. It has not been established that the benefits of enrolment represent adequate consideration:

“...while it may be argued that students use resources of the institution through teaching, libraries, material and other assistance, it can be argued that the funding provided by the Commonwealth together with the fees paid by the student fully account for such use.” (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, 2002, Section 4.3 - p.26)

University faculty, as employees of the institution, are in a different situation and ownership of Intellectual Property is a much more complex issue involving the place and time at which the work was done, the facilities involved and the use to which the work is to be put. This is generally dealt with and spelt out in a contractual agreement between the institution and the faculty member (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, 2002, p.42).

In the commercial world, in the first instance, the rights of the employer again take precedence. Copyright of work produced as part of one’s job remains the property of the employer unless this is overridden by some negotiated contractual arrangement (Australian Vice-chancellors' Committee, 2002, p.12).

The ONLY Valid Excuse

Deciding what is plagiarism and what is not is often difficult. Whatever might be the basis on which the decision is made, it seems that the only safe excuse for including previously published work or ideas in a document is the presence of appropriate and correct citation.

Publishing, Perishing or Punishing

‘*Publish or Perish*’, often described as a ‘*syndrome*’, is a term used to describe the pressure applied to university faculty to publish papers.

“In the past half century, nearly every university has adopted the practice of tenuring or dismissing a new faculty member within six years; most junior faculty are severely pressed to publish papers in prestigious journals, a habit many retain for life.”
(Denning, 1997, p.132)

In other words, failure to publish can cost you your job — a powerful incentive to publish by whatever means must be employed. Little wonder people are tempted to cut corners.

“How amazing it is that the people who feel that they’ve got no choice but to cut corners with their academic work are very senior not junior academics,” [a professor from RMIT] says. ‘They get into a rut where they... tend to think reputation relies on publishing a book every two years. Senior academics who you would be surprised by are taking short cuts that they shouldn’t be.’” (Schwartz, 2002)

People in the commercial world may be under less pressure and, perhaps, be less likely to succumb to the temptation to plagiarise. Certainly, in the academic world, the pressure to publish has taken on a life of its own and has become a rating system somewhat removed from the original intention of sharing scientific knowledge. We now have an unseemly race to be published with the prizes awarded to those who are published in the ‘best’ journals.

“Evaluations of scientists depend on numbers of papers, positions in lists of authors, and journals’ impact factors. In Japan, Spain and elsewhere, such assessments have reached formulaic precision. ...What began as someone else’s measure has become our (own) goal. ...Young researchers see a paper in a good journal as their initiation into the scientific elite. The established seek publication in leading journals to certify their high opinion of themselves. All are learning that building capital in the hard currency of the audit society can be safer and easier than founding a reputation on discoveries.” (Lawrence, 2003, p.259)

Many commentators complain that this has led to lowering the value of the content because the measure of success is not what is published but where it is published and how often it is published. Whatever the result, the pressure is on and people who do succumb, whatever their background, whatever their position — academic, student or practitioner — lay themselves open to a wide range of forms of retribution.

Postgraduate Plagiarism

Universities make their own rules but the general range of punishments, which may depend on judgement of the severity of the act and the perpetrator’s degree of intent, include: zero marks for assignment/examination; fail mark for unit; suspension; expulsion. Some commentators put a more cheerful face on the prospect. For example:

“A working party of our Early Modern historians (the seventeenth century is considered to be the golden age of corporal punishment) has been constituted to decide on [appropriate penalties for plagiarism], but is currently deadlocked between advocates of ‘breaking on the wheel’ and those who favour impalement. Until the new penalty system is fully developed, current policy will continue...” (Plagiarism!)

On the other hand others point out that the more harsh the available penalties the more likely that they won’t be used, or that you’ll only catch the ones who don’t cheat well enough, or that there’ll always be some who try to beat the system just for the thrill of it. This raises the

question of whether such reasoning can be legitimately used for comfortable inaction. In turn, this leads us to matters of ethics and professional integrity. In the end, it is a matter of reputations — reputations of students, faculty and universities:

“Students need to know that if the university is tarred with the plagiarism brush, their award is compromised.” (Macdonald, 2000)

Professorial Plagiarism

As the Monash Vice-chancellor found out, the taint of plagiarism persists and some might say that a graceful resignation was light punishment indeed, although it is common. Demotion is another sentence commonly applied such as in the 1995 case in Hong Kong where the City University Council demoted a Dean to a professorship, with reduction in salary, expressing *“unease at the lack of sufficient acknowledgement of materials used”* and stating that *“such conduct was neither proper nor acceptable for a member of an academic community”* (Weldon, 1995). Rather more long-lasting retribution might be exacted by the revocation of degrees by the plagiarist’s *alma mater* as has been known to happen. Further, double jeopardy can exist, i.e. the plagiarist, having being convicted and punished by the institution, is not protected from further action. For example, in the United States a variety of punishments may be exacted each regarding a different aggrieved and a different offence:

“It is legally permissible for a plagiarist to be:

- 1. expelled by a college — or have their degree rescinded by a college —*
- 2. sued in civil court by the owner of the copyright (e.g. the true author or his/her assignee) for copyright infringement,*
- 3. tried in criminal court on charges of fraud, and*
- 4. have a licencing board revoke or suspend their licence to practice law, medicine, or some other profession.”* (Standler, 2000)

Under Common Law, much the same situation applies in Australia. Notice, furthermore, that Standler goes on to point out that there is no point in the culprit complaining about severity of punishment:

“In every plagiarism case that I have found involving a student or professor, the court upheld the punishment imposed by the college. Further, the court often make gratuitous, pejorative comments about the bad character of the plagiarist, which show that is unwise for a plagiarist to complain about how he/she was treated.” (Standler, 2000)

Practitioner Plagiarism

In the commercial world there may be less pressure to publish, and even less to plagiarise if one is to except pecuniary reward. However, the legal ramifications of the discovery in a ‘real world’ situation of what, in academia, would merely be termed ‘plagiarism’ are far-reaching and complex — far beyond the modest aims of this article. In the first place there would be the intracorporeal situation (where the offence takes place within one workplace with the plagiarised being a fellow worker or the employer) and in the second there would be the extracorporeal situation (where the plagiarised could be anyone, or any company, from anywhere). If that is not confusion enough add breach of copyright, breach of patent, commercial piracy, fraud, industrial espionage and theft (of intellectual property) — and a corporate lawyer would probably add more to the list. Because money is more directly

involved, punishment is more likely to involve money and/or imprisonment. Academia is definitely a safer environment — there you are only likely to lose your job!

Postlude

Having considered the matter of what isn't plagiarism — and discovered that it leaves a wide range of things that are plagiarism — and having looked at some of the somewhat deleterious effects on the culprit that being convicted of plagiarism may have, we should pay some attention to the effect of the felony on society. Many careers are built on academic qualification and status. Plagiarism, if not exposed, can lead to false levels of academic qualification and status. Aside from the question of natural justice, matters of public health, welfare and safety may be brought into play. Personal reputations can be jeopardised. On top of all that, the public perception of entire professions could be placed at risk. No profession can allow any form of academic or intellectual fraud to be a safe shortcut to professional recognition whether it be in the form of a degree or certificate, or as a commercial or political appointment. Many commentators write in terms of a 'rising tide' of plagiarism in schools and universities and there is no apparent reason to assume that such a practice learnt during education will not be continued in the commercial world.

Perhaps all professionals should heed another Warner Brothers' character, Bugs Bunny, and cry, "*Of course, you realise, this means war!*" Wherever this plague breaks out, it must be exposed, rectified, and the perpetrator appropriately punished. Such a declaration of war, however, places the onus on those who endeavour to publish honestly to take care to not, themselves, be at fault. In the end, the catch-cry has to be:

"If you write, get it right!"

Reference List

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Word Origins (1986). Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press.

The Oxford English Dictionary (1989). Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press.

Issues for Institutions to Consider. Joint Information Systems Committee (2002) [Web Page] URL <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/plagiarism/issuesforinst.html> [Accessed: November 1, 2002].

Why do Students Plagiarise. Joint Information Systems Committee [Web Page] URL <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/plagiarism/whyplagiarise.html> [Accessed: November 1, 2002].

Plagiarism! University of Western Australia, Perth WA [Web Page] URL <http://www.arts.uwa.edu.au/HistoryWWW/PLAGIARISM> [Accessed: November 8, 2002].

Policy on Plagiarism. Curtin University of Technology, Perth WA [Web Page] URL <http://www.cbs.curtin.edu.au/current/Plagiarism.cfm> [Accessed: November 8, 2002].

ARGY, P. N., Chairman, Legal and Social Implications Committee of the Community Affairs Board of the Australian Computer Society, Inc.; (October 29, 2002), E-mail to Rick Duley Re: Ethics Query for ACS

AUSTRALIAN VICE-CHANCELLORS' COMMITTEE. Ownership of Intellectual Property in Universities: Policy and Good Practice Guide, AVCC (2002) [Web Page] URL

http://www.avcc.edu.au/news/public_statements/publications/IP_ownership_discussion_paper.pdf [Accessed: October 31, 2002].

AUSTRALIAN VICE-CHANCELLORS' COMMITTEE. Universities and their Students: Principles for the Provision of Education by Australian Universities, AVCC [Web Page] URL http://www.avcc.edu.au/news/public_statements/publications/report.pdf [Accessed: October 22, 2002].

BUTTFIELD, A. Plagiarism, University of Western Australia, Perth WA (2002) [Web Page] URL <http://www.cs.uwa.edu.au/~butffa02/plagiarism/node1.html> [Accessed: November 8, 2002].

CARROLL, J. Plagiarism: Is there a virtual solution, Teaching News Oxford Brookes University (2000) [Web Page] URL http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/ocsd/2_learnthch/plagiarism.html [Accessed: May 1, 2003].

CARROLL, J. and APPLETON, J. Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide, Joint Information Systems Committee (UK) (2001) [Web Page] URL <http://www.jisc.ac.uk> [Accessed: October 31, 2002].

CLOUGH, P. Plagiarism in natural and programming languages: an overview of current tools and technologies, University of Sheffield, Sheffield (UK) (2000) [Web Page] URL <http://www.dcs.shef.ac.uk/~cloughie/papers/Plagiarism.pdf> [Accessed: October 17, 2002].

DENNING, P. J. (1997): A New Social Contract for Research. *CACM* 40(2): 132-134.

FAIN, M. Cheating 101: Easy Steps to Combating Plagiarism, (1999) [Web Page] URL <http://www.coastal.edu/library/easystep.htm> [Accessed: October 15, 2002].

GIBBS, J. L. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Association for Computing Machinery (2000) [Web Page] URL <http://www.acm.org/ubiquity/views> [Accessed: November 5, 2002].

GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, *Copyright Act*, 1968

HARRIS, R. Anti-Plagiarism Strategies for Research Papers, (2002) [Web Page] URL <http://www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm> [Accessed: October 16, 2002].

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS. Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals, ICMJE (2001) [Web Page] URL <http://www.icmje.org/> [Accessed: November 4, 2002].

KETCHELL, M. *Plagiarism: Fresh claims against Monash Uni head*, "The Age", (Jul 6, 2002a); Fairfax, Melbourne, VIC

KETCHELL, M. *Quiet rejoicing in Monash corridors*, "The Age", (Jul 13, 2002b); Fairfax, Melbourne, VIC

LAWRENCE, P. A. (2003): The politics of publication. *Nature* 422 259-261.

MACDONALD, R. Talking Shop: Why don't we turn the tide of plagiarism to the learners' advantage?, The Times Higher Education Supplement (2000) [Web Page] URL <http://www.thes.co.uk> [Accessed: January, 2002].

- MOON, J. How to stop students from cheating, The Times Higher Education Supplement (1999) [Web Page] URL <http://www.thes.co.uk> [Accessed: November 1, 2002].
- ROCKLIN, T. Downloadable Term Papers: What's a Prof. to Do?, (1996) [Web Page] URL http://www.uiowa.edu/~centeach/resources/ideas/termpaper_download.shtml [Accessed: October 15, 2002].
- SCHWARTZ, L. *Perilous pursuit of publish or perish*, "The Sunday Age", (May 14, 2002); Fairfax, Melbourne, VIC
- SHEARD, J., DICK, M., and MARKHAM, S. Questionable Work Practices: The Views of Postgraduate Students in IT Courses, (2001) [Web Page] URL <http://www.csse.monash.edu.au/~mdick/ITICSEWorkingGroup/index.html> [Accessed: September 20, 2002].
- SHIEL, F. *Gutnick wins right to sue at home*, "The Age", (Dec 11, 2002); Fairfax, Melbourne, VIC
- STANDLER, R. B. Plagiarism in Colleges in USA, (2000) [Web Page] URL <http://www.rbs2.com/plag.htm> [Accessed: October 15, 2002].
- STEWART-GARDINER, C., KAY, D. G., LITTLE, J. C., CHASE, J. D., FENDRICH, J., WILLIAMS, L. A., and WOLZ, U. (2001) "Collaboration vs Plagiarism in Computer Science Programming Courses," *Proceedings of the 32nd SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, Charlotte, NC (USA),406-407,
- WELDON, S. Dean is demoted after Jackdaw claims, The Times Higher Education Supplement (1995) [Web Page] URL <http://www.thes.co.uk> [Accessed: November 5, 2002].
- WILKINS, D. E. and LAWHEAD, P. B. (2000) "Evaluating Individuals in Team Projects," *Proceedings of the 31st SIGCSE Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education*, Austin, TX (USA),172-175,
- WILLIAMS, L. A. and KESSLER, R. R. (2001): Experiments with Industry's "Pair Programming" Model in the Computer Science Classroom. *Computer Science Education* 11(1): 7-20.
- WRITING TUTORIAL SERVICES. Plagiarism: What it is and how to recognize and avoid it, Indiana University, Bloomington IN (USA) [Web Page] URL <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/wts/plagiarism.html> [Accessed: October 15, 2002].

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.