Repercussions of Plagiarism on University Degrees in the Virtual Context: The Case of the University of Extremadura

Cristina Faba-Pérez

Universidad de Extremadura, Badajoz, Espagne, cfabper@unex.es, orcid.org/0000-0002-0537-3231

Margarita Pérez-Pulido

Universidad de Extremadura, Badajoz, Espagne, marperez@unex.es, orcid.org/0000-0001-7300-2216

Abstract

This article deals with issues related to university plagiarism, students' knowledge of it, and its academic, economic, legal, social, and ethical repercussions. The project covers various university degree courses of the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences of the University of Extremadura (UEx), Spain. The objective was to analyse, during the 2021–2022 academic year, the real knowledge that students have about plagiarism and its repercussions, and to verify the students' situation regarding their knowledge of plagiarism, its typology, and its possible consequences. The methodological approach was based on a previous study about the legal and ethical regulations that affect this issue in general and the university environment in particular. Once the analysis of these documents had been carried out, a 17-item Likert-scale questionnaire was prepared which was responded to with a total of 267 students doing different degree courses of the aforementioned Faculty. Simple descriptive statistics were used to analyse the results. They showed that the group with most knowledge about plagiarism and its repercussions was that of the Master's students (2.27 out of 3). Of the options proposed as a means of identifying plagiarism, that most frequently identified (83.85%) was reproducing a text in a

work without citing the author. In general, the questionnaire results indicated that, although the scores were in the top half of the possible values in all cases, they were far from optimal in all of the degree courses analysed. In conclusion, it can be said that plagiarism has become an essential issue throughout the university world, particularly with the use of technology in the academic setting and its problems regarding intellectual property and copyright. The methodology used, applied to the degree courses of the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences of the UEx, allows the context to be analysed, the problem and its causes to be identified, and the imbalances to be corrected, since in many cases students are unaware that they are plagiarising.

Keywords: Academic plagiarism; Unawareness; Repercussions; Competencies; Learning; University

1. Introduction

This research was born out of a large part of the international university community's concern and ignorance about a phenomenon that is spreading ever more widely through society – plagiarism. In the international context, there are authors who argue for a difference in culture and values in the way governments, students, and teachers confront this phenomenon (Cahyono, 2009; Granitz & Loewy, 2007; Guangwei Hu, 2011; Heckler & Forde, 2015), while others see the increase in plagiarism to coincide with the use of the Internet but also pointing out that there are automatic tools which can be used to correct problems of academic integrity (Mphahlele & McKenna, 2019; Roe & Perkins, 2022). Another topic of interest is that of the regulations and strategies concerning plagiarism applied by institutions in different countries (Carroll, 2005; Devlin, 2003; University of Hull, 2018), or the importance of appropriate training and instruction as an effective tool to combat it (Lampert, 2008; Strittmatter & Bratton, 2014).

In Spain, this is reflected in the growth in recent years of the number of studies of plagiarism in the country's universities and the coincidence of this growth in the international context. Thus, some studies have been aimed at determining the different definitions and types of plagiarism (Alonso Arévalo, 2017; Boillos Pereira, 2020; Sarmiento Campos et al., 2022) or the external and internal factors that influence this practice (Cebrián-Robles

et al., 2018; Hernández-Ruiz, 2016; Sureda et al., 2009, 2013). Others have looked at the institutional perspective and the policies and regulations in this regard (Gómez Espinosa et al., 2021). Recent studies reflect the interest in the rise of cyberplagiarism (Cebrián-Robles et al., 2018; Comas et al., 2011; Comas-Forgas et al., 2021), a phenomenon which according to Olivia-Dumitrina et al. (2019) "can be defined as the appropriation of information in any format (text, images, video, etc.) from the Internet and its use as one's own without any reference to its author". Finally, there has been recognized the importance of adequate instruction (Gómez Espinosa et al., 2016; Muñoz-Cantero & Espiñeira-Bellón, 2020; Sureda et al., 2009) and collaboration between different agents (Gil Cano et al., 2017). Many repercussions have been addressed: academic, such as disciplinary sanctions; economic, such as avoiding the fair remuneration of authors, and the expense or profitability of anti-plagiarism tools; ethical, such as malpractice with respect to the values of university ethics; legal, such as respecting intellectual property and copyright laws and other national or university legislation and regulations; and social, such as the university's loss of prestige within society, or the contribution to a new culture where other values prevail (Abad-García, 2018; Alonso Arévalo, 2017; Codina, 2020; Duarte-Hueros et al., 2016; Egaña, 2012; Fernández Ramos, 2017; González-Teruel, 2022; Martínez Sala et al., 2019; Temiño, 2022). There has as yet been no holistic study of all these repercussions in the international and national context. Hence the importance of the present research study, despite its being exploratory in nature.

A detailed analysis of the institutional websites of Spain's universities provided the keys to how they tackle this issue. Some universities such as Cantabria, Huelva, Navarra, or Cartagena have what they call Declarations of Honesty,[1] which are standard forms that students have to fill in at the time of turning in any academic work, in which they declare that their work is unpublished, that they have not used other materials as their own, that the results of others have been clearly identified, and that the sources used have been correctly cited. Some universities include the intellectual protection of the authorship of academic works in their statutes and have regulations for the evaluation of student performance in which specific reference is made to plagiarism. An example is the University of Alcalá.[2] Academic plagiarism is also addressed on the websites of university library services offering information and learning, as is the case of the universities of Alicante with a comprehensive theoretical content on plagiarism, of Barcelona whose Learning and Research Resources Centre (CRAI) offers advice for instructors and for

students about detecting plagiarism in academic papers, of Carlos III which specializes in Master's study resources, and of Extremadura with guides about using Urkund.[3] In general, these resources are in the form of guides or courses, and structure their practical content around the resolution of cases, assumptions, and examples, and their theoretical content around the concept, its definition, influencing factors, legislation and regulations, and citation and bibliographic reference system. Spain's universities also provide anti-plagiarism tools and information about their use.

To carry out the present project, we considered the characteristics of the University of Extremadura regarding the tools it has to combat plagiarism, in particular, the guides available at the university library, the Urkund anti-plagiarism system, and documents related to the evaluation of end-of-studies projects in which there appears an item related to the evaluators' review of the originality of papers and the regulations of the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences about preparing end-of-studies projects, and a specific guide to preparing these projects.[4] In addition, the competencies taught in each of the Degrees studied were analysed to check whether any aspects related to the issue of plagiarism appeared in them directly or indirectly. The concept of competency had gained strength from the process of adaptation of university degrees to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). A competency is defined as a set of skills, practices, knowledge, and values that complete a person's learning, allowing them to act appropriately in a given context and adapt to continuous changes in the labour and professional market (Tejada & Tobon, 2006). Competencies may be basic, specific to the degree, and cross-cutting or generic. The cross-cutting competencies in this case are essential because they represent the social, communicative, ethical, and cognitive dimension that allows true adaptation to the profession's continuous changes. As an example, a list of competencies of this type can be found in the document designed for the Information and Documentation degree in Spain (Libro Blanco, 2004), in which the referent for specific competencies was taken to be the Euroguide LIS, and that for cross-cutting competencies the Tuning project.

Finally, the characteristics of the hybrid and virtual teaching system implemented for the different degree courses were taken into account. This system is based on the use of the Moodle platform and the incorporation of continuous evaluation in accordance with the Bologna precept, founded on the practices or assignments that the students have to hand in progressively within the deadlines established throughout the year as planned by each instructor.

Given these premises, the present research attempts to respond to the following questions: 1) Do the students and faculty of the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences at the University of Extremadura know what academic plagiarism is, how it is defined, and what consequences of diverse nature does committing plagiarism entail? 2) Do the university degrees taught at the said Centre grant academic plagiarism the necessary importance to be included among their cross-cutting competencies? 3) Is it necessary for the University of Extremadura to hold Seminars or Conferences to convey the importance of plagiarism in the academic context?

To answer these questions, which are extrapolatable to other universities, degrees, and geographical areas, and taking as referent a recent teaching innovation project at the Centre focused on the repercussions of plagiarism in university degree courses in the virtual context and their relationship with the cross-cutting competencies of those degrees, an investigation was carried out with three objectives: (1) to analyse the knowledge that students and instructors have about plagiarism and its repercussions, in particular, their understanding of the relevant definitions and awareness of the consequences; (2) to study the cross-cutting competencies of the University Degrees involved and their relationship with plagiarism to verify the importance with which the University and its teaching staff address it; and (3) to implement specific learning about university plagiarism and its repercussions in order to disseminate and reinforce the importance of plagiarism in the academic environment.

The answers to the questions posed and the attainment of the objectives set represent an impulse given to Information-Sciences-related university studies in Spain since, although there has been such research carried out in other fields, we have not located any in this discipline that covers conjointly so many aspects of plagiarism (academic, economic, legal, ethical, and social) as well as its reflection in the cross-cutting competencies of the degrees.

2. Methods

The research was carried out during the 2021–2022 academic year, framed in the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences of the University of Extremadura, specifically, in the Bachelor's degrees in Information and Documentation (INDO), in Audiovisual Communication (CAV), and in

Journalism (PER), and in the Master's degree in Social Network Information Management and Digital Products on the Internet (GIRS). Also included were the students of the UEx's PhD program in Information and Communication (DOCTOR-INCO) and the teaching staff of the Teaching Innovation Group (GID) VIRTUALesMÁS (PDI-GID).

For the first two objectives, and based on all the information analysed, a questionnaire was designed divided into two Blocks: *Block I – Academic pla-giarism and its repercussions*, with 17 general items (item number 2 includes 8 options) about plagiarism and its academic, economic, legal, ethical, or social repercussions, and *Block II – Plagiarism and its relationship with cross-cutting competencies*, with 8 items (item number 4 includes 5 options) focused on the need to incorporate the topic into the subjects of the university degree courses (Table 1). As just noted, the design of the questionnaire was based on the relevance of the information collected and analysed in the introduction and bibliographic review part of this research. In addition, it was validated by 5 professors and researchers experts in the field (from the University of Extremadura and the University of Valencia) who were selected taking into account the impact factor associated with their publications.

In both blocks, the information collected came from the voluntary participa-tion of 267 anonymous students (85 of CAV, 54 of INDO, 111 of PER, 7 of GIRS, and 10 of DOCTOR-INCO) and the 13 instructors of the Innovation Group (PDI-GID). The selection of the sample of students took into account the following two criteria: 1) that they were officially enrolled in the 2021–2022 academic year in the different courses of the Bachelor's and Master's Degrees or in the Doctoral Program of the degrees analysed, and 2) that, in order to comply with the ethical considerations of informed consent, after being informed in the face-to-face and virtual classrooms about its scope, they would like to voluntarily participate in the research. Furthermore, the participants' confidentiality was achieved with the anonymity of the ques-tionnaires and their subsequent coding.

With regard to the overall sample size, it represents 45.56% of the total popu-lation (267 out of 586 according to the official data provided by the Centre's Secretariat). This can be considered an appropriate size, although it varied among the degrees analysed (30.80% CAV, 54.55% INDO, 86.05% PER, 19.44% GIRS, 21.74% DOCTOR-INCO), so that care must be taken in generalizing the segregated findings.

Table 1: Questionnaire about plagiarism and cross-cutting competencies.

Block I: Academic plagiarism and its implications	
1	Do you know what academic plagiarism is?
2	If so, indicate what it is:
	2.1. Reproducing a text in a work without citing the author
	2.2. Including literal sentences or paragraphs without putting quotation marks and without citing the author
	2.3. Paraphrasing a text or an idea by changing the order of the words without citing the author
	2.4. Not recognizing other collaborators or co-authors of a work
	2.5. Buying or copying a work and presenting it as your own
	2.6. Resubmitting a work used previously
	2.7. Copying a multimedia work
	2.8. Copying from the Internet without citing the author
3	Do you know the academic repercussions (disciplinary sanctions and failing) of plagiarising?
4	Do you know the economic repercussions (expenditure on technology) of plagiarising?
5	Do you know the legal repercussions (incurring an offence according to intellectual property and copyright laws and the penal code) of plagiarising?
6	Are you aware of the ethical repercussions (malpractice according to the university ethical values of honesty, responsibility, and work) of plagiarising?
7	Do you know the social repercussions (damage to academic learning and the prestige of the university and creating poorer professional futures) of plagiarising?
8	Do you know of any general or specific university regulations on plagiarism?
9	Do you know that there is an Anti-Plagiarism tool or System that can be activated in tasks, forums, etc. of the Virtual Campus to detect plagiarised work?
10	Do you consider it important not to plagiarise?
Block II: Academic plagiarism and its relationship with cross-cutting competencies	
1	Should instructors explain what plagiarism is and its repercussions?
2	Should plagiarism be present as a competency in all subjects?
3	In any subjects that you have taught or been taught, have you taught or been taught how to avoid plagiarism in papers? (0 in no subject; 1 in 1–2 subjects; 2 in 3–4 subjects; 3 in 5 or more subjects)
4	If so, how have you taught or been taught the way to avoid plagiarism?
	4.1. Giving instructions on how to present works, practices, TFG, TFM
	4.2. In class, as part of learning the subject
	4.3. In a specific seminar about it
	4.4. Advice guides or other information resources
	4.5. In comments, as part of the correction of papers, practices, TFG, TFM

All the participants scored their degree of knowledge of or agreement with the questions on a Likert scale from 0 to 3 (0 none; 1 minimum; 2 medium; 3 maximum). Such a 4-point Likert scale has also been used in other studies, for example those of Alamo et al. (2019), Blanco-Nistral et al. (2021), and Ayu et al. (2023). Simple descriptive statistics were applied for the analysis

of the results (using free spreadsheets). Given the quasi-experimental exploratory nature of the research, other types of statistics (e.g., inferential) were not considered.

For the third objective, to reinforce the importance that plagiarism should have on the academic environment, a Seminar was held entitled "*How to deal with university plagiarism: Are we prepared to take on its consequences?*" in which two experts in plagiarism from the University of Valencia (Spain) intervened. As mentioned above, these experts had been selected on the basis of the impact of their publications. They took part in the questionnaire's validation as well as participating as speakers in the Seminar. The Seminar was attended by 64 people.

3. Results

This section presents the results referring to the first two objectives grouped into the two Blocks mentioned in Methods, followed by the results concerning the third objective.

3.1. Block I: Academic Plagiarism and its Repercussions

One observes in Table 2 that the group with the highest mean score on knowledge about plagiarism and its repercussions was that of the GIRS Master's students (2.27). There follow the three Bachelor's degrees INDO (1.74), CAV (1.72), and PER (1.66), and lastly the PhD students (1.65). The instructors' knowledge about this subject stood at 1.95. A positive aspect is that, out of 3 points, all of the groups scored above halfway, although the highest value was just 2.27. The mean of all the groups in knowledge of plagiarism and its repercussions was 1.83 out of 3.

Regarding the items of the first Block, the most highly scored was I.10 *Do you consider it important not to plagiarise?* (2.87), followed by I.1 *Do you know what academic plagiarism is?* (2.44). In last place was I.4 *Do you know the economic repercussions (expenditure on technology) of committing plagiarism?* with only 0.81. In this case, out of 3 points, there were 3 items that did not exceed halfway: I.4 about the economic repercussions (0.81), I.5 about the legal repercussions (1.30), and I.8 about knowledge of any regulation on

Table 2: Block I: plagiarism and its repercussions.

Average (0–3)										
	I.1	I.3	I.4	I.5	I.6	I.7	I.8	I.9	I.10	Mean
STU-CAV	2.22	1.60	0.77	1.25	1.95	1.71	0.95	2.38	2.63	1.72
STU-INDO	2.39	1.62	0.83	1.20	1.77	1.80	1.03	2.21	2.79	1.74
STU-PER	2.41	1.61	0.62	1.03	1.72	1.44	0.94	2.38	2.78	1.66
STU-GIRS	2.86	2.29	1.29	1.71	2.43	1.86	2.29	2.71	3.00	2.27
STU-DOCTOR-INCO	2.22	1.40	0.60	1.40	1.90	1.60	0.80	1.90	3.00	1.65
PID-GID	2.54	1.77	0.77	1.23	2.42	2.15	1.15	2.54	3.00	1.95
Mean	2.44	1.71	0.81	1.30	2.03	1.76	1.19	2.35	2.87	

All the groups.

plagiarism in the university (1.19). Item I.4 (economic repercussions) had the lowest mean scores of all the items for the different groups, even the teaching staff, while for I.5 (legal repercussions) the Master's and PhD students were those with the highest means, as was also the case for Item I.8 (university regulations).

With regard to Item I.2, in the case of knowing what plagiarism is, identifying it among the different options proposed, Table 3 shows that the group which reached the greatest percentage of knowledge was again the GIRS Master's students (75%), followed by the PhD students (71.25%). The GID teaching staff reached 73.08%. However, all the cases exceeded 50%, even the 3 Bachelor's degrees that obtained the lowest values. The mean of

Table 3: Item I.2. How do you identify plagiarism?

Average percentage									
	I.2.1	I.2.2	I.2.3	I.2.4	I.2.5	I.2.6	I.2.7	I.2.8	Mean
STU-CAV	83.24	75.82	39.03	48.12	80.97	31.16	56.23	77.51	61.51
STU-INDO	67.63	66.52	44.38	38.71	80.68	35.40	37.46	61.00	53.97
STU-PER	76.50	62.67	37.53	37.17	74.92	40.15	59.15	69.27	57.17
STU-GIRS	85.71	100.00	71.43	57.14	71.43	57.14	71.43	85.71	75.00
STU-DOCTOR-INCO	90.00	80.00	60.00	70.00	80.00	50.00	70.00	70.00	71.25
PID-GID	100.00	84.62	76.92	53.85	84.62	53.85	61.54	69.23	73.08
Mean	83.85	78.27	54.88	50.83	78.77	44.61	59.30	72.12	

All the groups.

all the groups when it came to identifying what plagiarism is was 65% out of 100%.

The greatest knowledge among all the groups corresponded to I.2.1 *Reproducing a text in a work without citing the author* (83.85%), followed by I.2.5 *Buying or copying a work and presenting it as your own* (78.77%) and I.2.2 *Including literal sentences or paragraphs without putting quotation marks and without citing the author* (78.27%). There also stand out for their percentages I.2.3 *Paraphrasing a text or an idea by changing the order of the words without citing the author* (54.88%) and I.2.4 *Not recognizing other collaborators or co-authors of a work* (50.83%). The last, and only one that did not reach 50%, was I.2.6 *Resubmitting a work used previously* (44.61%).

Studying in detail the three Bachelor's degrees by year, one observes in Table 4 that the mean scores hardly varied between the years, although the 1st year was in first place (1.72), the 3rd in last place (1.69), and the 4th in penultimate place (1.70). This result was the opposite of what was expected since, as the years advance, the degree of knowledge about plagiarism should increase as the students are getting closer to completing their end-of-studies projects. What is noteworthy is that in all cases they exceeded the halfway mark out of a possible 3 total, although the greatest score was only 1.72. The mean of the three Bachelor's degrees in knowledge about plagiarism and its repercussions was 1.70 out of 3.

Of the Bachelor's degrees, INDO (1.74) was ranked first and PER (1.66) last, although all were slightly above the halfway score. PER showed a downward trend over the four years.

Table 4: Block I. Plagiarism and its repercussions.

Average percentage

Year	CAV	INDO	PER	Mean
1st	1.68	1.76	1.72	1.72
2nd	1.63	1.63	1.91	1.71
3rd	1.81	1.64	1.61	1.69
4th	1.75	1.92	1.39	1.70
Mean	1.72	1.74	1.66	

Degrees/Years.

Table 5: Item I.2. How do you identify plagiarism?

Average percentage

Year	CAV	INDO	PER	Mean
1st	62.88	32.69	51.49	49.02
2nd	66.67	66.67	62.92	65.42
3rd	54.69	63.75	60.29	59.58
4th	61.81	52.78	53.98	56.19
Mean	61.51	53.97	57.17	

Degrees/Years.

With regard to Item I.2, choosing among the different proposals if they know what plagiarism is, one observes in Table 5 that the 2nd year was the best in identifying the various forms of plagiarism (65.42%) and the 1st was poorest (49.02%). Indeed, due to INDO's low percentage (32.69%), the 1st was the only year that did not exceed 50%. The maximum value was just 65.42%, and the mean of the three Bachelor's degrees in identifying what plagiarism is was 57.55%.

Although the three Bachelor's degrees exceeded 50% in identifying the various forms of plagiarism, no values were obtained close to 100% as would have been desirable. CAV (61.51%) was the top placed and INDO (53.97%) was the last.

3.2. Block II: Plagiarism and its Relationship with Cross-Cutting Competencies

This Block firstly inquired into whether the term "plagiarism", as well as its synonyms (copy, paste, piracy, etc.), appears explicitly in the listed competencies of the Bachelor's degrees studied[5], not just in cross-cutting competencies. In this regard, it was found that "*it is not mentioned*" in any of those competencies.

Of the 58 competencies laid out in the CAV Degree, only two refer to the need for a conscience of solidarity and respect for human rights (CT5) and to know about the ethics and deontology and the legislative framework governing the communicator's professional practice and everyday work (CE25). Of the

36 competencies of the INDO Degree, four refer to knowledge of the legal and ethical aspects of the use and transfer of information, documents, and sources on any support (CG1), the ethical commitment to the management of information (CT9), a conscience of solidarity and respect for human rights (CT14), and the ability to authenticate, use, design, and evaluate information sources and resources (CE11). Of the 41 competencies of the PER Degree, four refer to a conscience of solidarity and respect for human rights (CT5), to discerning the ethical and deontological principles of journalistic practice and apply them to the profession (CE2), knowing the legislative framework, the right to information and freedom of expression (CE3), and the use of information sources and resources in journalistic production (CE5). Of the 32 GIRS Master's competencies, four refer to knowledge, management, and responsible use of networks and technology (CG1), the use of technologies as a tool for intellectual work (CT2), the acquisition of methodological knowledge to face professional challenges ethically (CT4), and knowledge of the legislative framework governing the network, analysing the freedom of expression, intellectual property, and access to information on digital media (CE5). The term and the concept of plagiarism applied to the academic environment does not explicitly appear in these competencies, and the ethical, legal, social, or economic aspects are mainly oriented to the context of professional practice.

Table 6 lists the results of Block II about the importance of explaining what plagiarism is and that it forms part of the cross-cutting competencies of the Bachelor's degrees. The GIRS Master's students attained the highest mean score (2.52), followed by the INDO students (2.21). These therefore were the

Table 6: Block II. Plagiarism and competencies.

Average (0–3)				
	II.1	II.2	II.3	Mean
STU-CAV	2.47	1.97	1.30	1.91
STU-INDO	2.75	2.28	1.60	2.21
STU-PER	2.69	2.34	1.34	2.12
STU-GIRS	2.86	2.71	2.00	2.52
STU-DOCTOR-INCO	2.10	2.60	1.70	2.13
PID-GID	2.92	2.46	1.15	2.18
Mean	2.63	2.39	1.52	

All of the groups.

groups who demanded greater involvement regarding plagiarism and the need for it to be taught. In last place were the CAV students (1.91), but they too, like the rest of the groups, exceeded the halfway of the total possible 3, reiterating the call for its inclusion as a university competency. The mean score of all the groups about the need to include plagiarism in the learning competencies was 2.18 out of 3.

Item II.1, *Should instructors explain what plagiarism is and its repercussions?*, is that which aroused most interest in the groups as a whole (2.63), while II.3 *In any subjects that you have taught or been taught, have you taught or been taught how to avoid plagiarism in papers?* only reached a value of 1.52 out of 3, i.e., it is close to the halfway point, which implies the need for instructors and the Bachelor's degree courses to undertake the inclusion of competencies about plagiarism.

With regard to Item II.4, *How have you taught or been taught the way to avoid plagiarism?*, one observes in Table 7 that none of the groups exceeded an average of 50%, an aspect that has to be considered as not very positive. The greatest percentage (42.86%) corresponded, once again, to the GIRS Master's students, and in last place were the CAV students (29.12%). The GID teaching staff reached a percentage of 40%. The average of all the groups on how they were taught to avoid plagiarism was 36.46% out of 100%, thus not reaching the halfway point of 50%.

The way in which most of the students learn, and consequently the instructors teach, about aspects related to plagiarism can be seen in II.4.1 (the only

Table 7: Item II.4. How have you taught or been taught the way to avoid plagiarism?

Average percentage

	II.4.1	II.4.2	II.4.3	II.4.4	II.4.5	Mean
STU-CAV	48.42	28.76	6.06	35.42	26.96	29.12
STU-INDO	59.99	49.46	8.89	26.03	39.78	36.83
STU-PER	63.18	29.31	4.33	30.06	32.74	31.92
STU-GIRS	100.00	14.29	0.00	57.14	42.86	42.86
STU-DOCTOR-INCO	40.00	60.00	10.00	40.00	40.00	38.00
PID-GID	69.23	23.08	0.00	38.46	69.23	40.00
Mean	63.47	34.15	4.88	37.85	41.93	

All of the groups.

one to surpass 50%, with 63.47%) *Giving instructions on how to present works, practices, TFG ("trabajo de fin de grado" – bachelor's end-of-studies project), TFM ("trabajo fin de máster" – master's end-of-studies project).* Also significant is the low percentage of II.4.2 *In classes, as part of learning the subject* (34.15%) or that of Item II.4.4 *Advice guides or other information resources* (37.85%), in this case, the use of the library as a provider of resources about plagiarism. Far distant is Item II.4.3 *In a specific seminar about it*, with only 4.88% of the cases, it was significantly different. An attempt has been made to palliate this low value with the organization of the Seminar on Plagiarism.

Studying in detail the three Bachelor's degrees by year to see the relationship between plagiarism and competencies, one observes in Table 8 that all exceeded the halfway point of the total 3 possible, i.e., they were concerned with there being teaching about plagiarism in their university studies, with the 1st and 4th years being in first place (both with 2.17) and the 3rd in last place (1.98). The mean of the three Bachelor's degrees about the need to include plagiarism in the learning competencies was 2.08 out of 3.

With regard to the Bachelor's degrees, although there were no major differences between the three, INDO led the way regarding the need to incorporate plagiarism into their studies, with a mean of 2.21 out of 3 and an ascending trend line, and CAV was positioned in third place (1.91).

Finally, regarding Item II.4 about the methods used to avoid academic plagiarism, no year reached 50% (Table 9). The years that were closest to this halfway value were the 1st (36.09%) and the 4th (35.96%), and the furthest away the 2nd. The mean of the three Bachelor's degrees about how avoiding plagiarism has been taught was 32.62% out of 100%.

Table 8: Block II. Plagiarism and competencies.

Average (0–3)				
Year	CAV	INDO	PER	Mean
1st	2.05	2.21	2.26	2.17
2nd	1.81	2.08	2.09	2.00
3rd	1.87	2.10	1.98	1.98
4th	1.93	2.44	2.15	2.17
Mean	1.91	2.21	2.12	

Degrees/Years.

Table 9: Item II.4. How have you taught or been taught the way to avoid plagiarism?

Average percentage

Year	CAV	INDO	PER	Mean
1st	34.55	32.31	41.43	36.09
2nd	27.78	28.33	34.67	30.26
3rd	17.50	40.00	27.06	28.19
4th	36.67	46.67	24.55	35.96
Mean	29.12	36.83	31.92	

Degrees/Years.

Similarly, none of the Bachelor's degrees reached the halfway value, with INDO being in first place with 36.83% and CAV in last place with 29.12%. These low results regarding the offer of methods to palliate the knowledge of plagiarism demonstrate the need to undertake actions for improvement in this regard.

3.3. Learning about University Plagiarism

In order to satisfy the third objective of this study, and as a consequence of the low percentage of activities organized by the University of Extremadura around this theme, in the month of April 2022 a Workshop was organized entitled "*How to deal with university plagiarism: Are we prepared to take on its consequences?*" in which experts of international prestige belonging to the University of Valencia (Spain) intervened dealing with plagiarism from the perspectives of the development of research and its knowledge, and its implementation for the preparation of academic papers.

The said Workshop had 64 attendees from the University of Extremadura. In the distribution of attendees by groups, there was a predominance of students (40; 63%), followed by instructors (22; 34%) and others (2; 3% – administration and service personnel).

Table 10 lists the distribution of the 40 students. Although most belonged to Bachelor's degrees taught at the Faculty of Documentation and Communication Sciences of the UEx, some others also participated. There was a predominance of the Journalism Degree with 40% (16 students),

Table 10: Distribution of students in the plagiarism workshop.

Students	Absolute	%
Single-Speciality Degree Journalism	16	40
Doctorates UEx	11	27.5
Joint Plan Degree Journalism/Audiovisual Communication	6	15
Joint Plan Degree Audiovisual Communication/Information & Documentation	3	7.5
Degree Primary Education	1	2.5
Degree Psychology	1	2.5
Single-Speciality Degree Information and Documentation	1	2.5
Joint Plan Degree Journalism/Information and Documentation	1	2.5
Total	40	100

followed by PhD students from various UEx doctoral programs, although with a predominance of the Program in Information and Communication with a percentage of 27.5% (11 students).

4. Discussion

The students of the Bachelor's degrees at the University of Extremadura and the instructors who were part of this teaching research project said that they know what plagiarism is and that they consider it to be important. This positive attitude towards the importance given to "not committing plagiarism" (question I.10, with a mean of 2.87 out of 3) is corroborated in the study of Enamudu and Akonedo (2021) who analysed a sample of 342 students from the Faculty of Education of the University of Ibadan (Nigeria), and obtained a greater proportion of students with a positive attitude to "not committing plagiarism" than with a negative attitude (although with the difference not being very pronounced), and a significant weak positive relationship being visible between the students' academic motivation and their attitude towards plagiarism.

The students who gave more importance to not committing plagiarism corresponded to the last levels (Master's and PhD, with 3 out of 3), and were in fact those most prepared by the instructors due to the development of the end-of-studies projects and doctoral theses), and the successive corrections they had undergone by the tutors and directors. In addition, in our Master's virtual space, the students have a selection of resources about plagiarism, citation systems, and bibliographic references, and take a subject with

specific content about intellectual property. The fact of the Master's students not plagiarizing, i.e., their awareness of the use of sources of information, the provenance of ideas, and the orderly presentation of content that relates it to the underlying theories, has also been found in other studies such as that of Cuevas Salvador (2022).

The instructors also say they know and give importance to not committing plagiarism in their twofold role of teaching and research (with a mean of 3 out of 3). However, it must be said that the most subtle forms of plagiarism were less known to them (resubmitting a work used previously, and not recognizing other collaborators or co-authors), basically related to the conditions of publication in scientific journals. According to Hernández-Ruiz (2016), the commonest malpractices by researchers are the non-submission of unpublished papers, submission to various journals simultaneously, and the absence of permission to reproduce material subject to copyright.

Although all the groups said they knew what plagiarism is, the low averages the responses presented about its repercussions show that this knowledge is relative. They were unaware of the economic repercussions in terms of the expense of obtaining an anti-plagiarism tool for institutional use, as well as the economic upheaval that it can mean to the authors with respect to their remuneration for copyrights. This is linked to the ignorance about the legal repercussions in all its aspects, perhaps to a lesser extent in the Master's and PhD students, whereas the Bachelor's degree students learn them as they pass the different years. In general, all the groups are more aware of the ethical repercussions (question I.6, with a mean of 2.03 out of 3) than the legal (question I.5, with 1.30 out of 3). Most studies on plagiarism focus on the importance of the ethical dimension and are based on ethical behaviour and values. Granitz and Loewy (2007) and Strittmatter and Bratton (2014) go into depth into ethical behaviour towards plagiarism from the perspective of different ethical theories. However, in 1989 the study by Cohen and Crornwell (1989) had already noted the importance of establishing a difference between the legal and the ethical in university students' learning about plagiarism and behaviour towards it, which Temiño (2022) continues to defend today. The general ignorance about the legal repercussions that the different groups of this study showed themselves to have is related to the low average of the question I.8 "*Do you know of any general or specific university regulations on plagiarism?*". This should serve to encourage greater diffusion and instruction of the existing anti-plagiarism regulations of the University and the general

laws that refer to this matter. Examples are the University Student's Statute of 2010 which specifies offences related to intellectual property as part of the rights and duties of the student and speaks of the recognition of the authorship of works elaborated during the academic period, or the University Coexistence Law of 2022 which considers plagiarizing a work or committing fraud in the elaboration of an academic end-of-studies project or doctoral thesis to be a very serious offence, with sanctions ranging from expulsion to the loss of matriculation fees. Egaña (2012) points out another interesting aspect that leads students to not wanting to use citations in their academic papers. This is the concept of originality prevailing in today's culture whose social effect lies in not recognizing creation based on the ideas of others. This is a mistake according to Codina (2020), who argues that no scientific or academic work can be totally original because it always has to start from the ideas of others, and that there is no contradiction between this and not committing plagiarism.

In general, students are more familiar with and recognize with greater ease the types of plagiarism related to citation systems and the use of bibliographical references (as shown for example by question I.2.1 *Reproducing a text in a work without citing the author*, with means between 90% and 67.63%), leaving aside such issues as recognizing collaborators and co-authors, paraphrasing a text, or resubmitting a work used previously (this last being question I.2.6 scoring between 57% and 31.16%). Self-plagiarism is a recurring unknown typology, as is demonstrated in the work carried out by Cebrián-Robles et al. (2018) on students of five Spanish universities. A consensus among authors who research into plagiarism is in differentiating intentional plagiarism from unconscious plagiarism. Boillos Pereira (2020) establishes a taxonomy of unconscious plagiarism based on a study of first-year undergraduates in Education at the Basque Country University, using the reports of a plagiarism detection software package. The results indicate a significant number of cases of cases of paraphrasing without citing the source, which supports the idea of the need for learning about this aspect of the problem. González-Teruel (2022) provides very interesting examples of paraphrasis and summary as a type of unconscious plagiarism. Sarmiento Campos et al. (2022) draw attention to conscious plagiarism as a socially tolerated university practice which is barely ever recognized and penalized. Other authors refer to conscious plagiarism as a consequence of the instructor's approach to the subject, the teaching-and-learning methods, the workload, or the pressure of continual

evaluation and work delivery deadlines (Hernández-Ruiz, 2016; Muñoz-Cantero & Espiñeira-Bellón, 2020; Sureda et al., 2009), and, especially in the digital environment, the degree of difficulty of the tasks (Gómez Espinosa et al., 2021).

As the Bachelor's degrees studied are taught in a hybrid and virtual form, and are closely related to multimedia content and the Internet, knowledge about plagiarism on the Internet (question I.2.8) exceeds a mean of 70% in both students and instructors, but not in the case of copying a multimedia work which does not reach 60% (question I.2.7). Copying from the Internet without citing the author seems to be a well-known type of plagiarism given the high percentages it obtained in all the groups, among which the Master's and CAV stand out (85.71% and 77.51%, respectively). Despite this solid knowledge of what is meant by plagiarism using the Internet, in the study with a national scope carried out by Comas et al. (2011), more than 60% of the students state that they put works together with snippets from the Internet without citation, and more than 85% believe that their peers have done the same. Especially in the digital environment, there is a great lack of knowledge deriving from the legislation related to intellectual property and copyright, not only regarding plagiarism but also regarding unauthorized downloading, installation of programs without a licence, and the non-legal copying of digital materials (Duarte-Hueros et al., 2016).

In our work, the PhD and Master's students stand out in their knowledge of the types of plagiarism (with means of 71.25% and 75%, respectively), except for the purchase of a work (question I.2.5), an issue which the Bachelor's degree students seem to be more familiar with. In 2011, Comas et al. (2011) already noted this as being the most fraudulent modality in the future. In a subsequent study conducted on students at the University of the Balearic Islands (Sureda et al., 2013), the percentage of students who said they believed that on some occasion their peers had paid to have a work done or purchased one was 32.2%. In the opinion of Comas-Forgas et al. (2021), the problem lies in the existence of websites where academic works can be bought and sold, and the advertising they use which encourages plagiarism and is a cause that negatively influences students. The conclusions of that study allude to the importance of ethics in the face of the legal vacuum that currently exists about this issue and that universities should resolve.

Both the instructors and the students were familiar with the anti-plagiarism tools available due to the inclusion of Urkund in the Moodle platform to verify practices and academic papers (question I.9, with a mean of 2.35 out of 3). Anti-plagiarism tools also establish typologies of plagiarism (Abad-García, 2018). Even so, they have their limitations since they fail to detect some of the types, the content used to carry out the checks is limited, they provide erroneous data or offer no relevant interpretation of those data, and they do not detect the plagiarism of ideas which is difficult in the case of paraphrasis or summary (Fernández Ramos, 2017; Lampert, 2008). Still, authors such as Martínez Sala et al. (2019) argue in favour of teaching anti-plagiarism programs to students and their use by instructors. Their study on 3rd year Advertising and Public Relations undergraduates at the University of Alicante notes the students' use of anti-plagiarism platforms, apps, and free mobile phone apps to the detriment of the university's official program, Turnitin. In their opinion, the weak point continues to be an improvement in knowledge about the concept and types of academic plagiarism.

With regard to the relationship of academic plagiarism with cross-cutting competencies, it has to be said that none of the 179 competencies of the Bachelor's degrees involved in this research study make any mention of plagiarism. In addition, the results denote a clear need to include plagiarism in teaching, and reveal how small is the percentage of teaching methods on ways to avoid it. The students demand its teaching by instructors (question II.1, with means between 2.75 and 2.1 out of 3) and consider that it should be a cross-cutting competency (question II.2, between 2.71 and 1.97 out of 3). The instructors believe that it should be explained (II.1, with a mean of 2.92 out of 3), and that it also should be a cross-cutting competency (II.2, with 2.46 out of 3), but they have neither taught content related to it in their subjects (question II.3, with 1.15 out of 3, and question II.4.2, with just 23.08%) nor have they made use of the library, their thematic guides, or information resources (II.4.4, with 38.46%). The instructors were more dedicated to giving guidelines and practical comments than to teaching content in class and in seminars, fundamentally when correcting a works for end-of-studies projects and doctoral theses (II.4.5, with 69.23%), in a personalized way and not as a consequence of any policy of the institution. This need for the students to know what academic plagiarism is through their academic learning, whether taught on the part of the teaching staff or from the institution itself, is corroborated by the work of Muñoz Cantero et al. (2021) who analyse a sample of

Bachelor's and Master's students in the branch of Social and Legal Sciences from the University of La Coruña (N = 1,985).

Although there was an uneven response from the different degrees on the way in which most of the students learn about aspects related to plagiarism, the PhD students pick them up as part of learning the subject of their thesis (II.4.2, with 60%), and the Master's and Bachelor's students by means of instructions (II.4.1, with proportions varying between 100% and practically 60%). The study of Sureda et al. (2013) presents a student's perspective on the appropriate measures to reduce academic plagiarism. The greatest percentages refer to the organization of workshops and seminars for the students (37.8%) and for the instructors (34.5%), followed by awareness campaigns (25.5%). The need to organize seminars on plagiarism is fundamental in environments in which it is hardly ever used as a training method, as is the case at hand, where the low percentage obtained as a teaching method for students to learn about aspects related to plagiarism (question II.4.3, 4.88%) is particularly notable. To palliate this low value, we organized our Seminar on Plagiarism, with very positive results in participation, especially among the students since 63% of them belong to the said group. Conversely, less successful measures are the use of anti-plagiarism tools (9.3%) and regulations that include sanctions (5.4%). Different studies show the importance of the teaching-and-learning method and the relationship in class between the instructor and the students. This is the case of Muñoz-Cantero and Espiñeira-Bellón (2020) whose focus is on individualized attention for works of a theoretical nature. Others consider teaching precise instructions for the citation systems and bibliographical references, the design of the activities or coordination in the workload that the students are set, as well as collaboration in literacy programs between different agents of the University, especially the university library and the instructors or faculties, personalized assistance and workshops on visibility and reflection, not just offering information (Gil Cano et al., 2017; Lampert, 2008; Strittmatter & Bratton, 2014).

5. Conclusions

Although the present research has certain limitations as were noted in the methodology, the conclusions drawn from the results and their discussion

provide a response to the research questions and the objectives set out at the start of this work, and suggest that this research has been productive and has revealed the university community's need for learning about academic plagiarism, with it being necessary to continue working in this line since, as Granitz and Loewy (2007) or Strittmatter and Bratton (2014) note, dishonest behaviour will transcend the purely academic limit to end up being replicated in the professional and organizational context.

Hence, it is necessary to deepen further into the concept, typology, factors, and repercussions of academic plagiarism in terms of all its dimensions – social, legal, economic, as well as academic – on the part of students and instructors who are part of the Faculty and of these three Bachelor's degrees. This is for themselves, for the university community, and for society in general. The usual tendency is to present plagiarism research from a single dimension. While the commonest dimension researchers use is the ethical, it must be borne in mind that ethics are linked to the legal and social aspect, and that this aspect cannot be understood without the economic and academic dimensions. Taking all the dimensions of plagiarism in the teaching-learning process into account may help to understand this phenomenon with greater accuracy, especially in light of the recent arrival of technologies such as artificial intelligence.

Likewise, it is necessary to create a university culture that Gómez Espinosa et al. (2021) have summarized significantly in four essential points: an internal policy, a conjoint learning plan, the definition of common values, and cross-cutting work in the academic curriculum. This Faculty has regulations, the latest being a Resolution of December 2023 on the Norms of coexistence and disciplinary regime of the UEx student body (University of Extremadura, 2024) in which there appear mentions of plagiarism in various articles, but the existing regulations do not specify or offer precise instructions on how to avoid plagiarism and do not cover all of its typology. Neither is there any joint institutional policy about the creation of values and documents of commitment for instructors and students. There are tools which are known by part of the university community, but attention has to be paid to the new forms of conscious plagiarism, such as purchasing works or the application of artificial intelligence to the preparation of academic works, with most recently the popularization of the ChatGPT tool. To this end, it is proposed to establish more precisely specified regulations and action protocols such as those that already exist in some foreign and Spanish universities, for example, that

developed for students by the Rovira i Virgili University (2017). These should be of standardized use by all members of the university community, like any other type of already existing document, and also be disseminated by the students themselves through the Student Council as their governing and representative body.

Finally, the teaching-and-learning methods and the cross-cutting competencies in the different degree courses must be subjected to revision. Some have been shown to be effective, such as personal tutorials or instructions, but it would also be positive to introduce other collaborative procedures, such as visibility and reflection on the issue through the organization of workshops and seminars. In our case, the high attendance of teachers and students (especially the latter) at the Seminar held demonstrates its efficacy as a learning method. The conferences and seminars can offer a holistic vision of the problem of plagiarism, and can be carried out in collaboration with other agents of the university itself, such as the University Library Service which can provide examples from professional practice, and which would be in consonance with the definition that has been made of a cross-cutting competency.

Despite the complexity and obstacles involved in carrying out a research of these characteristics – (1) coordinating various degree courses (with the voluntary participation of students concerned about continuous assessment, exams, …), (2) working on a complicated theme (plagiarism) that a large majority of the university community knows little about, and (3) having a limited budget and limited time for the research and its dissemination, the participation of the various groups in the program activities (students, instructors, lecturers, and assistants) has been invaluable.

Acknowledgements

References

Abad-García, M. F. (2018). El plagio y las revistas depredadoras como amenaza a la integridad científica. *Anales de pediatría*, *90*(1), 57e1–57e8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anpedi.2018.11.003

Alamo, C., Baader, T., Antúnez, Z., Bagladi, V., & Bejer, T. (2019). Escala de desesperanza de Beck como instrumento útil para detectar riesgo de suicidio en universitarios chilenos. *Revista chilena de neuro-psiquiatría*, *57*(2), 167–175. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-92272019000200167

Alonso Arévalo, J. (2017). Qué es el plagio y cómo detectarlo? *Desiderata LAB*, *6*, 24–26.

Ayu, S. M., Gustina, E., Sofiana, L., Wardani, Y., & Sukarelawan, M. I. (2023). Physical and psychological violence victimization scale in adolescents dating: Confirmatory factor analysis and Rasch model. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *12*(1), 96–105. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i1.22250

Blanco-Nistal, M. M., Tortajada-Soler, M., Rodriguez-Puente, Z., Puente-Martínez, M. T., Méndez-Martínez, C., & Fernández-Fernández, J. A. (2021). Percepción de los pacientes sobre los cuidados de enfermería en el contexto de la crisis del COVID-19. *Enfermería Global*, *20*(4), 26–60. https://doi.org/10.6018/eglobal.479441

Boillos Pereira, M. M. (2020). Las caras del plagio inconsciente en la escritura académica. *Educación XXI*, *23*(2), 211–229.

Cahyono B. Y. (2009). How Australian and Indonesian Universities treat plagiarism: A comparative study. *Urnal Illmo Pendidikan*, *12*(3). https://www.academia.edu/70517313/How_Australian_and_Indonesian_Universities_Treat_Plagiarism_A_Comparative_Study

Carroll, J. (2005). Handing student plagiarism: Moving to mainstream. *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching*, *1*(2).

Cebrián-Robles, V., Raposo-Rivas, M., Cebrián-de-la-Serna, M., & Sarmiento Campos, J. A. (2018). Percepción sobre el plagio académico de estudiantes universitarios españoles. *Educación XXI*, *21*(2), 105–129.

Codina, L. (2020, July 20). ¿Existe un porcentaje de plagio aceptable en trabajos académicos? *Lluis Codina. UPF*. https://www.lluiscodina.com/plagio-tesis-doctorales/

Cohen, E., & Cornwell, L. (1989). A question of ethics: Developing information system ethics. *Journal of Business*, *8*(6), 431–437.

Comas, R., Sureda, J., Casero, A., & Morey, M. (2011). La integridad académica entre el alumnado universitario español. *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia)*, *37*(1), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052011000100011

Comas-Forgas, R., Morey-López, M., & Sureda-Negre, J. (2021). La publicidad en buscadores de las plataformas españolas de compraventa de trabajos académicos: análisis del tráfico, costes y palabras clave. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, *44*(3), e298. https://doi.org/10.3989/redc.2021.3.1767

Cuevas Salvador, J. (2022). Educación hacker y alfabetización mediática e informacional: nuevas alianzas entre el alumnado universitario y el plagio en internet. *Edutec: Revista electrónica de tecnología educativa*, *82*, 29–44. https://doi.org/10.21556/edutec.2022.82.2641

Devlin, M. (2003). Policy, preparation, prevention and punishment: One Faculty's holistic approach to minimising plagiarism. In H. Marsden, M. Hicks, & A. Bundy (Eds.), *Educational integrity: Plagiarism and other perplexities, Refereed proceedings of the Inaugural Educational Integrity Conference* (pp. 39–47). University of South Australia Library.

Duarte-Hueros, J., Duarte-Hueros, A., & Ruano-López, S. (2016). Las descargas de contenidos audiovisuales en Internet entre estudiantes universitarios. *Revista Comunicar*, *XXIV*(48), 49–57. https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-05

Egaña, T. (2012). Use of bibliography and academic plagiarism among University Students. *RUSC Universities & Knowledge Society Journal*, *9*(2), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v9i2.1209

Enamudu, J. O., & Akonedo, S. O. (2021). Academic motivation and attitude towards plagiarism by undergraduates in Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, Article 5750. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5750/?utm_source=digitalcommons.unl.edu%2Flibphilprac%2F5750&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages

Fernández Ramos, A. (2017). Estrategias y herramientas tecnológicas para evitar el plagio académico. In *La infodiversidad y el uso ético del conocimiento individual y colectivo* (pp. 253–275). Instituto de Investigaciones Bibliotecológicas y de la Información, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. http://eprints.rclis.org/31326/

Gil Cano, D., Nonó Rius, B., & Planas Campistol, I. (2017). Diez propuestas para evitar el plagio entre los estudiantes universitarios. *Bid: textos universitaris de biblioteconomia i documentació*, *39*(desembre). https://bid.ub.edu/sites/bid/files/pdf/39/es/gil.pdf

Gómez Espinosa, M., Francisco, V., & Moreno-Ger, P. (2016). El impacto en el diseño de actividades en el plagio de Internet en Educación Superior. *Comunicar*, *48*, 39–48. https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-04

Gómez Espinosa, M., Emeterio, M. C. S., & Navaridas-Nalda, F. (2021). Percepciones sobre el plagio académico en un contexto de enseñanza digital universitaria. *Bordón*, *74*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2022.90340

González-Teruel, A. (2022, April 6). Integridad académica y plagio… y modo de evitarlo. *Cómo afrontar el plagio universitario: ¿estamos preparados para asumir sus*

consecuencias? [Conference presentation], I Conferences on Teaching Innovation 2022, Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación y la Comunicación, Universidad de Extremadura, Badajoz, Spain, https://hdl.handle.net/10550/82364

Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *72*(3), 293–306.

Guangwei Hu, J. L. (2011). Investigating Chinese University Students' Knowledge of and attitudes toward plagiarism from an integrated perspective. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, *62*(3), 813–850. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00650.x

Heckler, N. C., & Forde, D. R. (2015). The role of cultural values in plagiarism in higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *13*(1), 61–75.

Hernández-Ruiz, A. (2016). La política editorial antifraude de las revistas científicas españolas e iberoamericanas del JCR en Ciencias Sociales. *Comunicar*, *XXIV*(48), 19–27. https://doi.org/10.3916/C48-2016-02

Lampert, L. D. (2008). *Combating student plagiarism: An academic Librarian's guide*. Chandos Publishing.

Libro Blanco. (2004). *Título de Grado en Información y Documentación*. Agencia nacional de Evaluación de la calidad y Acreditación. https://www.aneca.es/documents/20123/63950/libroblanco_jun05_documentacion.pdf/d1955bf5-01ea-4e0c-80b5-8aa1c22d3fb2?t=1654601815557

Martínez Sala, A. M., Alemany-Martínez, D., & Segarra Saavedra, J. (2019). Las TIC como origen y solución del plagio académico. Análisis de su integración como herramienta de aprendizaje. In R. Roig-Vila (Ed.), *Investigación e innovación en la Enseñanza Superior: nuevos contextos, nuevas ideas* (pp. 1208–1218). Octaedro. https://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/10045/99038

Mphahlele, A., & McKenna, S. (2019). The use of Turnitin in the higher education sector: Decoding the myth. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(1), 1–11.

Muñoz-Cantero, J. M., & Espiñeira-Bellón, E. M. (2020). El desempeño docente como condición para evitar el plagio académico. In E. De la Torre Fernández (Ed.), *Contextos universitarios transformadores: Boas prácticas no marco dos GID. IV Xornadas de Innovación Docente. Cufie. Universidade da Coruña. A Coruña* (pp. 421–434). Cufie: Universidade da Coruña. https://doi.org/10.17979/spudc.9788497497756.421

Muñoz Cantero, J. M., Espiñeira Bellón, E. M., & Pérez Crego, M. C. (2021). Measures to combat plagiarism in learning processes. *Educación XX1*, *24*(2), 97–120. https://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.28341

Olivia-Dumitrina, N., Casanovas, M., & Capdevila, Y. (2019). Academic writing and the Inter-net: Cyber-plagiarism amongst university students. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, *8*(2), 112–125. https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2019.7.407

Roe, J., & Perkins, M. (2022). What are automated paraphrasing tools and how do we address them?. A review of a growing threat to academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *18*, Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00109-w

Sarmiento Campos, J. A., Ocampo Gómez, C. I., & Castro Pais, M. D. (2022). Estudio del plagio académico mediante escalamiento multidimensional y estudio de redes. *Revista de Educación*, *397*(jul–sept), 293–321.

Strittmatter, C., & Bratton, V. K. (2014). Plagiarism awareness among students: Assessing integration of ethics theory into library instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, *75*(5), 736–752. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.75.5.736

Sureda, J., Comas, R., & Morey, M. (2009). Las causas del plagio académico entre el alumnado universitario según el profesorado. *Revista iberoamericana de educación*, *50*, 197–220.

Sureda, J., Comas, R., Casero, A., Gili, M., Urbina, S., Oliver, M. F., Salvà, F., & Mut, B. (2013). *El plagio y otras formas de deshonestidad académica entre el alumnado de la Universitat de les Illes Balears: resultados generales, por género y por ramas de estudios*. Informe de recerca. https://doi.org/10.3306/IRIE.INFORME.RECERCA.N6.2013

Tejada, C., & Tobon, S. (2006). *El diseño del plan docente en Información y Documentación acorde con el Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior: un enfoque de competencias.* Facultad de Ciencias de la Documentación. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. https://docta.ucm.es/bitstreams/88c6bb4d-7a8e-4ebb-9d43-ad1b2196ed15/download

Temiño, I. (2022, March 21). Una ley contra el plagio académico, ¿será la solución? *Expansión.* https://www.expansion.com/juridico/opinion/2022/03/21/6238ada4468aeb47188b467b.html

Universidad de Extremadura. (2024). RESOLUCIÓN de 22 de diciembre de 2023, del Rector, por la que se ejecuta el Acuerdo adoptado por el Consejo de Gobierno por el que se aprueban las Normas de Convivencia y el Régimen disciplinario del estudiantado de la Universidad de Extremadura y se ordena su publicación en el Diario Oficial de Extremadura. *DOE*, *1*, 244–287.

Universitat Rovira i Virgili. (2017). *Prevención, detección y tratamiento del plagio en la docencia. Guía para estudiantes.* https://www.urv.cat/media/upload/arxius/crai/plagi/Castell%C3%A0/060418_es_guiaestudiants_web.pdf

University Coexistence Law of 2022. https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2022-2978

University of Hull (UK). (2018). *Regulations Governing Academic*. https://www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/university-and-region/key-documents/docs/regulations-governing-academic-misconduct.pdf

University Student's Statute of 2010. https://www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2010-20147

Notes

_____

[1] Examples of Academic Declarations of Honesty can be consulted at https://www.uhu.es/fhum/documentos/estudios/informacion/normativas/fhum/anexoII.pdf and at https://etsae.upct.es/downloadFile/7dOLZX4jRE.

[2] University of Alcalá, Biblioguides, Plagiarism, Legislation against plagiarism: https://uah-es.libguides.com/plagio/legislacion.

[3] The websites of these libraries can be consulted at https://biblioteca.ua.es/es/investiga-y-publica/pi/plagio.html; https://crai.ub.edu/es/que-ofrece-el-crai/elaboracion-trabajos-academicos/plagio; https://uc3m.libguides.com/TFM/plagio and https://biblioguias.unex.es/plagio_academico/software_antiplagio.

[4] These norms may be consulted at https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/informacion-academica/tf-estudios/NormativaTFE2022.pdf and at https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/informacion-academica/tf-estudios/Recomendaciones%20para%20la%20elaboracion%20de%20TFE_2022.pdf.

[5] The competencies taught in the different degree courses may be consulted at the following URLs: CAV https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/titulaciones/info/competencias?id=1704 INDO https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/titulaciones/info/competencias?id=1706 PER https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/titulaciones/info/competencias?id=1709 GIRS https://www.unex.es/conoce-la-uex/centros/alcazaba/titulaciones/info/competencias?id=1708 INCO https://www.unex.es/organizacion/servicios-universitarios/servicios/doctorado/funciones/tercer_ciclo/fichas-pd-rd-99-11-1/Memoria%20pagina_web.pdf.