

The low quality in education and less hard work lead to plagiarism

Waqas¹, Mussawar Shah², Muhammad Ibrar³, Liaqat Ali⁴, Manzoor Ahmad⁵

¹(Quality Enhancement Cell, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar Pakistan)

²(Chairman, Department of Rural Sociology The University of Agriculture, Peshawar Pakistan)

^{3,4}(M.Phil Scholar, Rural Sociology, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar Pakistan)

⁵(Research Assistant, University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar Pakistan)

Abstract: This study was conducted to find out the effect of less hard work on plagiarism. Data was drawn from the University of Agriculture Peshawar. The results revealed that the majority of science and technology students commit plagiarism. It was also found that lack of hard work lead students to plagiarize. The results further interpreted that when one unit less hard work ($P=0.504$) increase predicted in students, the plagiarism less likely to increase 7%. Likewise, when less enforcement from supervisors ($P=0.045$) and less effort (to reduce plagiarism) ($P=0.058$) increase predicted one unit; the plagiarism increases more likely by 3, 3% respectively. It is recommended that government should follow-up the problem. Policies and penalties should be defined and displayed publicly.

Keywords: Plagiarism, less hard work, academic institution

I. Introduction

The Oxford advanced learner's dictionary defines plagiarism as the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own. It is a contentious issue in higher education, frequently th colorful rhetoric (Park 2003). At university level, it is perceived to be widespread and rising (Roberts 2002) due to less hard work (DeWitt 1996) that is necessary for success. Every destiny decays in the hands of laziness, idleness and slothfulness and there is no future for a lazy man in the kingdom of God (Abasiene 2013). Plagiarism transmitted most effectively through countless coined primarily by authors that is, virtual plagiarists, in their own defense (Randall 2001).

1. Introduction

Student's misconduct in higher education has largely overlooked the values of integrating individual and situational perspectives to the structural empirical examination (Ogilvie 2010). They have less code of conduct and students of business, science and technology have more probabilities to commit plagiarism (Power 2008). Even some students believe that cheating is impossible to eliminate but when they are being informed of the consequences they stop to work further (DeWitt 1996) subsequently, consequences in shape of procrastination emerged (Monfield 2009).

Teachers tend to use the term plagiarism rather than copyright infringement, but in a legal sense it is the same thing (Lakhan & Khurana 2008) because piracy is robbery, an infringement of a copyright, therefore, anything that is copyrighted can be pirated, almost anything worth copyrighting, is worth pirating (Craig, 2005). But plagiarism is not necessarily copyright infringement, nor is copyright infringement necessarily plagiarism. The two concepts diverge with respect to three main aspects of the offense: copying, attribution, and intent. In some way the concept of plagiarism is broader than infringement, in that it can include the copying of ideas, or of expression, not protected by copyright, that would not constitute infringement, and it can include the copyright law (Buranen 1999).

History of plagiarism could be traced back to the introduction of the Latin word *plagiarius* literally known kidnapper. The Great Britain began to awaken the idea of copyright in 1557 and the idea took firm root (Lakhan & Khurana 2008) whereas the concept of plagiarism introduced into English in 1601 with main ownership goes to Ben Johnson with the elaboration of literary theft (Valpy 2005). To reconstruct the history of plagiarism in ancient Rome, it is also vital to recognize that it was a pragmatic phenomenon, just as it is today (Marilyn 2001). By this I mean two things, one is that plagiarism was understood to accomplish something for its practitioners, namely, to win then credit they did not deserve. The other thing I mean by pragmatic is that individual constructed plagiarism through acts of reception, particularly in the form of accusations and denials, in order to do things practically and rhetorically with it (McGill 2012).

2. Less hard work and plagiarism

When someone commits to working hard, the rewards are tremendous and hard work sets in motion a marvelous, continuous cycle that keeps spiraling upward, allowing workers and customers to keep having more and more great experience (Crews 2004) whereas failure becomes the heritage of those whose hands refuse to

work (Abasiene 2013). Though, the lack of hard work or, even no hard work persists the students to plagiarize (DeWitt 1996) therefore, allowing plagiarism to be more easily due to the increasing availability of scientific literature on the internet proven to be doubled-edged sword (Long 2005). The unattributed incorporated work of others into an academic publication is widely regarded as a seriously inappropriate behaviour (Clarke 2006). The form of the robbery is called the plagiarism, which is formed of imitation, the sincerest shape of flattery, but imitation that reproduces another's words or research without credit is called plagiarism (Anderson 1946). Plagiarism, misappropriation, faulty citation, and copyrighting infringement are terms usually entail the aims of getting economics returns as analyzed (Marsh 2007).

II. Review Of Previous Literature

PARK, (2003) conducted to study on plagiarism of student in higher education in the UK. His study explores seven themes. The first the meaning and context of plagiarism, the rest explores the nature of plagiarism, the perception of students about plagiarism, the extent and causes of plagiarism, the challenges posed by digital plagiarism and the need of academic integrity to promote. His conclusion regarding plagiarism shows that it is common and enlarges in its nature. The students frequently rationalize their cheating behaviour and mitigate the importance of plagiarism themselves. This is because of that students have lack of hard work (DeWitt 1996). Park further concluded that UK institutions need to develop cohesive frameworks to deal the student plagiarism in which robust detection will be workable whereas the penalty system should be implemented that must be transparent and applicable constants.

Ann, L. & Kathleen, F., (2005) explained in their book some hidden barriers to honesty and integrity of a student. There has been little open discussion about this barrier to date that is very difficult to overcome such culture. The culture of containing plagiarism is not getting roots due to public least interest and making public the hidden forces with because of the reluctance of parents' teachers and the other personalities belonging to school administration where they seldom take interest enforcing any academic policy with integrity. Such situation staying constantly in an academic institution become difficult to impose a checking criteria for plagiarism because if any case found takes too much time to be handled accordingly. In addition, emotional stress to a teacher in shapes of criticism other teacher and administrator has also been found one the obstacles. The only cause of this is that teacher avoiding the problem occurred and didn't report cases to concerned authorities imagining their students to be more honest in their work.

Bilic-Zulle, L., Frkovic, V., Turk, T., Azman, J. and Petrovecki, M. 2005, conducted a study on plagiarism that revealed that students are often confused and do not exactly know what plagiarism is. This raises many issues such as copying text directly and just including the source in the reference list, which is regularly not considered to be plagiarism. The strict warning and more detailed guidelines for essay writing, they took the task more seriously but not seriously enough to stop plagiarizing. When plagiarism detecting software becomes more widely accepted at universities and college level, the chances of getting caught will dramatically increase and the willingness of students to plagiarize will probably decrease.

Ashworth & Bannister, 1997; Ramsden, 1992; Howard, 2002) studies reveal that weaker students do not work hard to be the main culprits. Cheating might be looked upon as a symptom of some general malaise due to less hard work. The findings also show that students felt alienation from faculty members due to their demeanor and less contact with students. Consequently, students who constantly engage themselves very well to cutting and pasting techniques. It is pertinent to mention that there will be less incentive for students to resort to plagiarism. Importantly, to succeed, he's kind of an initiative is heavily dependent upon support at an institutional level.

Power, 2008 findings help to understand the reality of plagiarism. He interprets that the fallacy revolving around the notion of plagiarism is probably the misunderstanding on the part of the students with little or least interpretation. Inasmuch the students have no hard work, so, the problem of lack of confidence, poor art of writing, carelessness, poor time management and consistent stress are getting raised. Finally, impurity is probable reasons to emerge. Less probable stature students are more prone to plagiarize; however, students of the discipline of business, science and technology, the same inclinations received. This attitude could be associated with the situation where faculty involved, least botheration of integrity by giving an assignment in a variation on a semester to semester which leads to the students falling easy prey to plagiarism. Moreover, this study further show that students with poor background in English writing and citations from different corner of the world are also having more chance to be commit plagiarism.

DeWitt, (1996) results show that many cheating across the university with little exposure of problems threatening to the fabric dishonesty in the fall of students in their respective areas with reference to academic. Moreover, student or firm that it was impossible to eradicate cheating with little awareness how to act if some others are found while cheating. Ethical consternation has been always importance and containing such behavior. But the problem is to direct this factor as lacking the proper consensus.

Frost, 2005 stated in his book about major reasons which are found through research that students plagiarize due to ignorance and provided environment. The incidence of plagiarism to be unintentional and having links of ignorance about the citation and attribution practices. This usually occurred when foreign with little familiarity to western culture and structure against the plagiarism school taking, copying other in the same

words as intelligence and respects. Most of the studies have disclosed that plagiarism has once intentions as usually being committed on part of a person with a strong endorsement from the peers where little faire of be caught the after affects in the shape of penalties. Academic integrity and honesty in campus is strongly associated to student and teaching behavior.

Data

The data was drawn from Quality Enhancement Cell (QEC) in The University of Agriculture Peshawar consisting of three academic years i.e. 2009, 2010 and 2011. The total population size of the mentioned years was recorded 278. All these scholars were processed through the entire process of Anti-Plagiarism, which is a mandatory step in degree fulfillment. The allocation proportion method devised by Uma Sekaran and Roger Bougie was used to select 93 sample size from the whole population (Sekaran 2003). Thus, in this study Binary Logistic Regression Model was used which is most appropriate econometric tool for regression analysis.

Binary Logistic Regression Model (BLRM)

General Regression Model

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_p X_p + \mu$$

There are various reasons when Y is of binary form, then the Linear Regression Model will not adequately. E.G. the Linear Probability Model is simple to estimate and use, whereas the most vital advantage is to provide the results of fitted probabilities i.e. less 0 or greater than 1. These limitations of the LPM can be overcome by using more sophisticated Binary Response Model asunder:

The logit model based on the logistic probability is specified as

$$P_i = E(Y = 1 | X_i) = F(Z_i) = F(\alpha + \beta_i \sum_{i=1}^n X_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-Z_i}} \quad (1)$$

Where $Z_i = \alpha + \beta_i \sum_{i=1}^n X_i + \varepsilon_i$ (The cumulative logistic density function) (2)

$$P_i = \frac{e^{Z_i}}{1 + e^{Z_i}} \text{ and } (1 - P_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{Z_i}} \quad (3)$$

Odd ratio is given by $\frac{P_i}{1 - P_i} = e^{Z_i}$ (4)

Taking a natural logarithm of eq. (4) we obtain

$$Z_i = \ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1 - P_i}\right) = \alpha + \beta \sum_{i=1}^n X_i + \varepsilon_i = L_i \quad (5)$$

Where

P_i = The probability that $Y_i = 1$, if respondents support the plagiarism

$1 - P_i$ = is the probability that $Y_i = 0$, if respondents do not support plagiarism

β_i Coefficient of explanatory variables to be estimated. The unknown parameters β_i are usually estimated by maximum likelihood.

X_i = explanatory variables, which include *low quality of education, lack of hard work, ignorance.*

$e = base$

ε_i = the stochastic error term,

$\ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1 - P_i}\right) = L_i$ (also called logit) is the log odds ratio of the probability

III. Results

Table I. Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents according to their observation about the relationship of low quality of education with plagiarism

Students of science and technology (where research is rather difficult) are more likely to plagiarize	Yes	72 (22.6)
	No	21 (77.4)
Teachers (Supervisors) have less enforcement on students to eliminate Plagiarism	Yes	74 (79.6)
	No	16 (17.2)
Teachers (Supervisors) do not report their student's cheating because they	do not want to deal with the problem	46 (49.5)
	do not have enough knowledge of plagiarism	33 (35.5)
	are curious to wind up his thesis's process	14 (15.0)
Making efforts to become aware about plagiarism and how to avoid it	Yes	71 (76.3)
	No	22 (23.7)

Sources used to eliminate Plagiarism	Help from related personnel	47 (50.5)
	Help from a friend	46 (49.5)
The working status of Anti-Plagiarism Cell in the University is good	Yes	70 (75.3)
	No	23 (24.7)
More strictly the checking criteria, less would be the plagiarism cases	Yes	67 (72.0)
	No	26 (28.0)
Quality Enhancement Cell needs to enhance	Staff cooperation	60 (64.5)
	Process of anti-plagiarism	25 (26.9)
	the checking criteria (more strict)	8 (8.6)

IV. Discussions

Less hard work of students that lead those to plagiarize particularly revealed in a survey of medical students by DeWitt (1996). His findings revealed students' satisfaction that cheating is impossible to eliminate but whenever they become aware of cheating and consequences to them then they stop to work further more. Hence, this view of DeWitt (1996) showed the lack of hard work of students. Mr. Clark F. Power (2008) also analyzed it in his book in *Moral education* that students who are enrolled in academic institutions have less code of conduct. In addition to this the students of business, sciences and technology have more probabilities to plagiarize. This is clear from the Power's analysis that students of major subjects are more likely to plagiarize where research is rather difficult. If research is difficult in the major subject, then students must have enhanced their efforts more. Therefore, respondents were asked about those areas of studies where research is difficult, so, they are more inclined to plagiarism. Almost 72 (22.6%) of the overall respondents replied "Yes" and the rest were i.e. 21 (17.4%) replied "No". Ann Lathrop (2005) explained in his book that mostly teachers avoid reporting his student's cheating because he is being criticized by other colleagues. More than half of the total respondents i.e. 74 (79.6%) replied "Yes" and support the view that teachers do not advise students to reduce plagiarism while the rest were have contradiction to this view i.e. 16 (17.2%). The other statement that teachers do not report their student's cheating because of any reasons as shown in the above table, i.e. 46 (49.5%) respondents replied *not to deal with the problem*, 33 (35.5%) *have less knowledge of plagiarism* while 14 (15.0%) respondents consider *teachers are curious to wind up his thesis process*. This is clearly revealed that the majority of respondents who considered teachers are lazy and quitter who disgusted to involve in such cases, as a result, teachers conceals plagiarism of their students and do not report it. The next statement has been inquired from respondents about their hard work and efforts to reduce plagiarism. Almost more than half of the overall respondents i.e. 71 (76.3%) revealed their interest to know about plagiarism and its policies while 22 (23.7%) respondents were less concerned regarding such practice. It has been concluded that the majority of students wanted to learn about plagiarism and the right method of removing the large similarities. Subsequently, another statement supports the prior one whether they have replicated the honest responses. Although this statement is for those respondents who replied positively in response to the earlier inquiry, but simultaneously related to the entire sample size in the broadest sense to know whether they had practiced plagiarism ever in their career and what sources they used. Therefore, 47 (50.5%) have taken *help from related personnel* and 46 (49.5%) *from their friends*. It has been concluded from the above statement that majority of students when caught in plagiarism, turns to their friends rather to follow the standard procedure. Moreover, the respondents were asked about the full functionality of cell in the University concerned that deals and test plagiarism in student's theses. Approximately 70 (75.3%) of the total respondent replied "Yes" and acknowledged that concerned cell is fully functional and in working position while 23 (24.7%) were completely disappointed from the functions of Anti-Plagiarism Cell. This view was supported in the next statement in order to evaluate the respondent's view. Respondents were asked about a proposition that strict criteria of plagiarism less would be the cases of plagiarism. A very remarkable result received which indicate clear evidence of respondent's views that if the plagiarism policy and checking criteria become strict, plagiarism would be lessened. Almost same results received prior to this one, i.e. 67 (72.0%) replied "Yes" and the rest, i.e. 26 (28.0%) replied No. The result of both statements are extremely related which revealed that the majority of people want an established program of alleviating plagiarism. Afterward the respondents were also inquired for appropriate suggestion for improving the existing cell of Anti-Plagiarism in University. In response to the final statement 60 (64.5%) respondents replied that *staff cooperation* must be enhanced and more cooperative than other department, 25 (26.9%) were suggested the *process of Anti-Plagiarism* should improve while 8 (8.6%) suggested that checking criteria need to be more efficient and easier. The majority of the respondents was suggested that staff must be more cooperative.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Table I Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

Chi-Square	DF	Sig.
11.523	4	.021
11.523	4	.021
11.523	4	.021

Table II Model Summary

-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
117.391 ^a	.117	.155

Table III Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Chi-square	DF	Sig.
2.640	6	.852

Table IV Variables in the Equation

Dichotomies Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Science and Technology students	-.355	.532	.446	.504	.701
No enforcement for plagiarism by Supervisor	-1.138	.567	4.033	.045	.320
Efforts to reduce plagiarism	-1.048	.553	3.594	.058	.351
Constant	2.467	.912	7.315	.007	11.783

V. Discussions

Table I is the Omnibus Test of model coefficient that explains the three categories of the model. It explains the result of Chi-square ($X^2 = 11.523$), the Degree of Freedom = 4 and the significance level of the overall model ($P = 0.021$). Inasmuch, the P value is less than 0.05 therefore, that shows the model is significantly better predictor as a whole.

Table II is the Model Summary Table that interprets the Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.155$. It shows that how much variation is there in the dichotomous variable and the predictor variable. The variance as shown in the table is 15% explained by the predictor. It further interprets that the 11 to 15 percent variation in plagiarism is explained by the predictor variable.

Table III is the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test which also gives three categories as mentioned in Table I. However, the value of Hosmer and Lemeshow as and when resulted more than 0.05; then the overall model is a better predictor. The significant value as shown in the table is 0.852.

Table IV is the variables in the equation (Wald criterion Table) which highlights that merely four dichotomous variables were taken from the whole univariate analysis to test the relationship with criterion variable (plagiarism). The independent variables (Science student $\langle P=0.504 \rangle$, no enforcement $\langle P=0.045 \rangle$ and Reducing efforts $\langle P=0.058 \rangle$ have significant contribution to the model except the first dichotomous variable which has not been contributed significantly to the model. The B which shows the actual data coefficient those are necessary in the regression equation to make predictions. The Wald test is conducted to determine if the predictor variable makes a significant contribution to the model. The Exponentiated value of B basically explains the odds ratio for each of the independent variable. When one unit change predicted in the dichotomies or independent variable the odds ratio would raise more likely in case the value is between 0 and 1 otherwise the odd ratio would increase less likely.

Now, in this case when *lack of hard work* in the students of science increased one unit, the plagiarism is 7% less likely to increase. This view was supported in the work of Power (2008) & DeWitt (1996); also found in their study the lack of hard work of many science and technology students where research is rather difficult other than the rest of the sciences. Bilic-Zulle, *et al*, (2005) worked with medical students and found that only 17% students did not plagiarize whereas the rest commit plagiarism. However, when *no enforcement on a student by supervisor* increased one unit, the plagiarism is 3% more likely to increase. The work of Ann Lathrop (2005) supported this view. Moreover, his findings revealed too, that most of the teachers do not report their student's cheating. In this way the results further explores that when one unit increase predicted in *lesseffort to reduce the plagiarism*; the plagiarism is increased 3% more likely. The analysis of Clark F. Power (2008) interprets that most students have less code of conduct which emphasize them to plagiarize.

VI. Conclusion

The study was related to the less hard work of students and consequential causes of plagiarism. It has been concluded from the above univariate and bivariate statistics that the majority of students, particularly in the discipline of science and technology is more likely to plagiarize where research work is rather difficult and technical. Similarly, the teachers (supervisors/advisors) did not report the plagiarism of their students because of not involving in these matters. Many of the students did not ready to familiarize themselves the basic criteria of reducing plagiarism, resultantly; they are being caught themselves in such academic problems. Although, they were at the trouble of plagiarism, however, they did not even contact the concerned authorities rather than to revert their friends; the most less satisfactorily sources. The following recommendations were made in light of the above results and conclusions:

V. Recommendation

1. A special awareness programs are indispensable to arrange in the academic institutions in which the issues, the importance and criteria of plagiarism should be highlighted. These programs should not be limited to

the circle of post graduate institutions, but to be spread arranged in schools and college level. Awareness in electronic and print media can also be made easier if government organizes relevant events.

2. Strong faculty must be the focal point of academia's to nominate them for teaching, supervising, advising, and guiding the students/scholars in their research/dissertation report writing.
3. Government can play a vital role in structuring and implementing a criterion for appointing teachers and implement the plagiarism policy in the academic institutions which should be free of favoritism and nepotism.
4. Plagiarism policy must be clearly defined and penalties be displayed publicly. For this purpose every institution should have a Plagiarism Standing Committee, which can help the people to clarify the misconception and deal the cases of plagiarism.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abasiene, Itoro. 2013. Fundamental keys to success. Author House, UK. P.26
- [2]. Abro, A. Pervaiz. 2010, Corruption in Education, DAWN News, Posted at April 18, 2010
- [3]. Anderson, Judy. 1946. Plagiarism, Copyright Violation and other Thefts of Intellectual Property: An Annotated Bibliography with a Lengthy Introduction. Published by MacFarland & Company Publishers, USA p-202
- [4]. Ashworth, P. & Bannister, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2). Available: Academic Search Elite database. [30 July 2002].
- [5]. Bilic-Zulle, L., Frkovic, V., Turk, T., Azman, J. and Petroveck, M. 2005. Prevalence of Plagiarism among Medical Students. *Croat Med Journal*. Vol-46(1): 126-131
- [6]. Buranen, L. & Roy, A.M., 1999. Perspective on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world. Published by State University of New York Press. P.9
- [7]. Chrispen, C. 2012. Quality Research Supervisory Practices at a Distance: Exploring the Experiences of Zimbabwe Open University Postgraduate in Education Students. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*. Vol. 1, No. 4, pp 1-19
- [8]. Clarke, Roger. 2006. Plagiarism by Academics more Complex than it seems. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*. Vol. 7: Iss. 2, p91
- [9]. Craig, P., Honick, R. & Burnett, M. 2005. Software Piracy Exposed. Syngress Publishing, Inc. USA. P.4
- [10]. Crews, Michael. 2004. Hard Work: success made easy. Published in SDG Press Books, USA. Ed.2. P.86.
- [11]. Daudpota, Q. Isa, 2011. Fake journals and plagiarism in Pakistan. Published at <http://www.technologytimes.pk>
- [12]. Dempsey, E. 2011. HEC Probe finds Peshawar University's VC committed plagiarism. Published at <http://digitaljournal.com/article/310475>
- [13]. Dempsey, E. 2012. Peshawar University Faculty promoted over plagiarized research. Published at <http://digitaljournal.com/article/310476>
- [14]. DeWitt, C. B. 1996. Cheating in medical school: A survey of second-year students. *Journal of the Association of American Medical CollegesUSA*. Vol: 71(3):267-73.
- [15]. Flint A., Clegg, S. & Macdonald, R. 2006. Exploring staff perceptions of student. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 145–156
- [16]. Howard, R.M. (2002). Don't police plagiarism: Just teach! *Education Digest*, 67(5). [Online]. Academic
- [17]. Lakhani, S. E. & Khurana, M. K. 2008. Intellectual property, copyright, and fair use in education. *Journal of Academic Leadership*. Vol-6, 1-4
- [18]. Lathrop, Ann & Foss, Kathleen, 2005. Guiding students from cheating and plagiarism to honesty and integrity; Strategies for change. Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc. USA
- [19]. Long, T.C., Errami, M., George, A.C., Sun, Z. & Garner, H. R., 2009. Responding to Possible Plagiarism. Accessed on <http://www.sciencemage.org>.
- [20]. Marilyn, Randall. 2001. Pragmatic plagiarism: authorship, profit, and power. University of Toronto Press. P.3
- [21]. Marsden, Helen., Carroll, M. & James T. N. 2011. Who cheats at university? A self-report study of dishonest academic behaviours. Published online at *Australian Journal of Psychology*, V-57 Issue 1, pages 1–10
- [22]. Marsh, Bill. 2007. Plagiarism: Alchemy and Remedy in Higher Education. Published by Suny press, The State University of New York, USA, p-1-2
- [23]. Marsh, Bill. 2007. Plagiarism: Alchemy and Remedy in Higher Education. Published by Suny press, The State University of New York, USA, p-1-2
- [24]. Maureen, M. Dawson and Joyce, A. Overfield. 2006. Plagiarism: Do Students Know What It Is? Division of Health Science, School of Biology, Chemistry and Health Science, Manchester Metropolitan University, Oxford, Manchester, UK
- [25]. McGill, Scott. 2012. Plagiarism in Latin literature. Published in the University Press, Cambridge, UK. P.5
- [26]. Monfield, Loren. E. 2009. How to Overcome Plagiarism by Reducing Procrastination? Published at Yahoo! Contributor Network
- [27]. Ogilvie, James & Stewart, Anna. 2010. The Integration of Rational Choice and Self-Efficacy Theories: A Situational Analysis of Student Misconduct. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, April 2010; vol. 43, 1: pp. 130-155.
- [28]. Park, C. 2003. In other (people) words: Plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471–488.
- [29]. Park, C. 2003. In Other (People's) Words: plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Carfax Publishing Taylor & Francis Corporation. Vol. 28, No. 5.
- [30]. Plagiarism Policy, 2007. Higher Education Commission Islamabad – Pakistan
- [31]. Power, F. Clark. 2008. Moral Education: A Handbook. Published by Greenwood Publishing Group, Vol: 1, 542
- [32]. Power, F. Clark. 2008. Moral Education: A Handbook. Published by Greenwood Publishing Group, Vol: 1, 542
- [33]. Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- [34]. Roberts, D. M. & Toombs, R. (1993) A scale to assess perceptions of cheating in examination related situations, *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 53, 755–762.
- [35]. Sadiq, Qasim. 2011. A Moral Angle to an Academic Dangle. *The Dawn Newspaper*, March 11, 2011
- [36]. Sekaran, Uma and Roger Bougie. 2010. *Research Methods for Business. A skill building Approach*. 5th Ed. Chichester: Wiley.
- [37]. Valpy, F.E.J. 1828. *Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language*. Printed by A.J. Vaply Red Lion Court, London. p.345 entry for plagiarism, quotation: the crime of kidnapping