Architecture Students' Attitudes Toward Plagiarism

Mimarlık Öğrencilerinin İntihale Karşı Tutumları

Fatma BAYSEN, Nermin ÇAKMAK, Ayten ÖZSAVAŞ AKÇAY

Architecture Students' Attitudes Toward Plagiarism

Fatma BAYSEN* iD *, Nermin ÇAKMAK*** iD *, Ayten ÖZSAVAŞ AKÇAY**** iD

Abstract

The present study aimed to reveal architecture students' attitudes to plagiarism. Quantitative approach with a cross-sectional design research was adopted for the present study. Faculty of architecture, Department of Architecture students (n=233) participated the study. Students answered to Attitude toward Plagiarism (ATP) scale. Data analysis carried out utilizing SPSS. Students' level of attitudes were found to be moderate for both three dimensions, Positive Attitudes, Negative Attitudes, and Subjective Norms. The students have lack of plagiarism knowledge. Students believe that plagiarism is not good but a community issue. The act to plagiarizing depends on situations. Methodological terms and time limit are leading in causing plagiarism. Plagiarism is primarily an expert issue and students should not be punished for the act, particularly for self-plagiarism. Girls are more sensitive to plagiarism issues than boys. Attitudes to plagiarism changes favorably with grade increase. Implications for librarians, educators, and policymakers are drawn.

***Keywords:** Plagiarism; attitude; architecture; architecture students.*

---

*   Corresponding Author, Assist. Prof., Near East University, Ataturk Faculty of Education, fatma.baysen@neu.edu.tr

**   Assist. Prof., Atatürk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Information and Document Management, nermin.cakmak@atauni.edu.tr

*** Assist. Prof., Near East University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Architecture, ayten.akcay@neu.edu.tr

Refereed Article / Hakemli Makale

Mimarlık Öğrencilerinin İntihale Karşı Tutumları

Fatma BAYSEN* iD *, Nermin ÇAKMAK*** iD *, Ayten ÖZSAVAŞ AKÇAY**** iD

Öz

Bu çalışmada mimarlık öğrencilerinin intihale ilişkin tutumlarının ortaya çıkarılması hedeflenmiştir. Çalışma enine kesit araştırması desenine göre uyarlanmıştır. Çalışma, Mimarlık Fakültesi, Mimarlık Bölümü öğrencileriyle (n=233) gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler, öğrencilerin "İntihale Karşı Tutum Ölçeği"ne verdikleri yanıtlardan elde edilmiştir. Verilerin çözümlenmesinde SPSS istatistik programı kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizi sonucunda öğrencilerin ölçeğin Olumlu, Olumsuz ve Bireysel Değerler boyutlarının üçüne ait orta düzeyde tutuma sahip oldukları tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin intihale ilişkin bilgileri yetersiz düzeyde çıkmıştır. Analiz sonucunda ortaya çıkan diğer önemli sonuçlar da şu şekildedir: Öğrenciler intihalin iyi bir davranış olmadığına inanmalarına rağmen, toplumsal hale gelmiş önemli bir sorun olduğunu düşünmektedirler. İntihal davranışı sergileyip sergilememe şartlara bağlıdır. Yöntembilimsel terimler ve zaman sınırlaması intihal davranışının önde gelen nedenleridir. İntihal, uzmanları ilgilendiren bir meseledir ve öğrenciler özellikle de atıf yapmaksızın eski çalışmalarını kullanmaları durumunda cezalandırılmamalıdırlar. Elde edilen verilere göre, kızlar erkeklere nazaran konuya daha hassas yaklaşmaktadırlar. Ayrıca, intihale ilişkin tutumlar sınıf düzeyi arttıkça daha olumluya doğru değişmektedir. Çalışma sonunda, kütüphanecilere, eğitimcilere ve politika geliştiricilere öneriler getirilmiştir.

Anahtar sözcükler: *İntihal; tutum; mimarlık; mimarlık öğrencileri.*

---

*   Sorumlu Yazar, Yrd. Doç. Dr., Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi, fatma.baysen@neu.edu.tr
**   Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü, nermin.cakmak@atauni.edu.tr
***   Yrd. Doç. Dr., Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Mimarlık Fakültesi, Mimarlık Bölümü, ayten.akcay@neu.edu.tr

Introduction

Scientific research is for improving knowledge of particular phenomenon by revealing information about any missing point, filling the knowledge gaps (Creswell, 2014, p.116). In other words, research depends on up to date knowledge of particular phenomenon. Thus, each study took advantage of literature should cite to those literature. Citing literature used in a study is a principle for scientific ethics. If the source of the information, idea or any approach used are not mentioned, the act of plagiarism, then not only the truth, trustworthiness, and objectivity of the study are suspected but it also harms that field's improvement (Kurbanoğlu, 2004, pp. 1-2). Thus, plagiarism is one of the influential obstacles for the enhancement of correct, trusted, and cumulative scientific knowledge.

A comprehensive definition for plagiarism can be found in Plagiarism.org, as:

> turning in someone else's work as your own; copying words or ideas from someone else without giving credit; failing to put a quotation in quotation marks; giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation; changing words but copying the sentence structure of a source without giving credit; copying so many words or ideas from a source that it makes up the majority of your work, whether you give credit or not. (What is plagiarism, 2017)

The definition is constituted by all unpublished and published materials. Materials include different formats as manuscripts of printed or electronic (Plagiarism, 2018). Moreover, tables, graphs, pictures, images, videos (Çakmak & Baysen, 2017; Çakmak, 2016; Ahmad, Mansourizadeh, & Ai, 2012), and piece of music are also included (What about images, 2017).

Plagiarism is spreading as a worldwide issue endangering the academic integrity among undergraduate students (Rathore, Fatima, Farooq, & Mansoor, 2018; Gottardello, Pàmies, & Valverde, 2017; Özbek & Çeyiz, 2017; Šprajc, Urh, Jerebic, Trivan, & Jereb, 2017; Starovoytova & Namango, 2016) and becoming an overwhelming issue encountered by the academicians (education institutes, educators, librarians, policymakers etc.) (Baysen, Hoškova-Mayerova, Çakmak, & Baysen, 2017a, 2017b; Gottardello, et al., 2017; Hue, Thom, & Le, 2018). As mentioned in detail in the Literature Review section there are many reasons causing students to plagiarize, intentionally or not (Cleary, 2017; Šprajc et al., 2017; Çakmak, 2015; Özenç Uçak & Ünal, 2015). The present study focused on the attitudes toward plagiarism as a factor for plagiarism. An attitude is the tendency to behave favorably or unfavorably to an object, individual, institution or an event (Ajzen, 2005; Franzoi, 2006; Olson & Kendrick, 2008). It is important to reveal students' attitudes toward plagiarism, thus can decrease or prevent unethical behaviors. Additionally, finding students' attitudes toward plagiarism would enhance programming, research method courses, and the role of libraries of higher education.

There are many techniques to reveal people attitudes (focus-group, observations etc.) but attitude scales are the most widely used (Ajzen, 2005). The present study utilized "The Attitude toward Plagiarism (ATP)" constructed by Mavrinac, Brumini, Bilić-Zulle and Petrovečki (2010) which was used widely by other researchers (Kirthi, Pratap, Padma, & Kalyan, 2015; Quartuccio, 2014; Badea-Voiculescu, 2013).

Literature Review

Undergraduate Students and the Issue of Plagiarism

Most important aims of education includes gaining scientific thinking and research skills based on ethical values. Thus, academic integrity is one of the fundamental values of education (Schmelkin, Gilbert, & Silva, 2010). Academic fraud is defined as the act and attempt to show someone else's work as their own. Academic fraud includes cheating in the exams, copying other students' homework's, and plagiarism (Jensen, Arnett, Feldman, & Cauffman, 2002).

Students have difficulties in organizing and synthesizing collected data, and showing those found obeying the rules of in-text citation. These challenges divert undergraduate students to unethical behaviors, particularly the plagiarism (Çakmak, 2015, p. 219). The act of plagiarism can continue in the work life after higher education (Graves, 2008). Researchers found it important to understand the motivation after plagiarizing, how to decrease or prevent the act. Considering plagiarism as an issue has started with Bowers in 1964 who studied university students' perceptions of unethical actions (as cited in Howard, Ehrich, & Walton, 2014). Until to date the issue was researched in the fields of educational sciences (Polat, 2017; Ehrich, Howard, Tognolini, & Bokosmaty, 2015; Gullifer & Tyson, 2010); psychological and behavioral sciences (Obeid & Hill, 2017; Hollins, Lange, Dennis, & Longmore, 2016); health sciences (Suter & Suter, 2018; Ewing, Mathieson, Anast, & Roehling, 2017); library and information science-LIS (Çakmak, 2015; Özenç Uçak & Ünal, 2015; George, Costigan, & O'hara, 2013; Gibson & Chester-Fangman, 2011). Additionally, interdisciplinary studies were also carried out, such as different fields combining with LIS (Baysen et al., 2017a; Çakmak & Baysen, 2017; Šprajc et al., 2017; Gunnarsson, Kulesza, & Petterson, 2014).

The leading motivation to plagiarize are the facilities of internet and the information technologies (Šprajc et al., 2017). Students can access to publications (papers, books, multimedia, etc.) easily whenever they want through these technologies. Simplicity, in access to these researches can cause copying and pasting, easiness to plagiarism (Hue et al., 2018; Rathore et al., 2018; Gottardello et al., 2017; Barnhardt, 2016; Howard et al., 2014; Ural & Sulak, 2012). Other reasons causing intentional plagiarism include individual characteristics, pressure to get good scores, bad time management, laziness, and negligence (Cleary, 2017; Šprajc et al., 2017; Çakmak, 2015; Özenç Uçak & Ünal, 2015). Lack of proper ethical culture including academic regulations and policy of

plagiarism (Obeid & Hill, 29017) are also factors affecting the act of plagiarism. Additionally, teaching related factors are also effective in plagiarism, quality, type, and frequency of the assignments, whether the teachers follow the assignments or not (Çakmak, 2016). Finally, differences in socio-cultural and political environment (political corruption) are two other reasons can be listed (Kayaoğlu, Erbay, Flitner, & Saltaş, 2016; Sureda-Negre, Comas, & Oliver-Trobat, 2015). Intentional plagiarism is also widespread among international students who attend to programs following english language and not their mother tongue (Liu, Liu, Lee, & Majzuka 2010; Leask, 2006), because they are not skillful in English language.

Students may plagiarize not only intentionally, but they can plagiarize unintentionally. There many reasons to cause unintentional plagiarism: They do not know what plagiarism is, they do not know about the sanctions they are going to encounter if they do plagiarize, and they may have misconceptions regarding plagiarism (Baysen et al., 2017a; Çakmak & Baysen, 2017; Çakmak, 2016; Henderson, 2011). Moreover, they lack academic research, reading and writing skills (Ma & Qin, 2017); lack of knowledge of how to cite depending on different formats such as APA (American Psychological Association) and MLA (Modern Language Association of America) (Auer & Krupar, 2001).

On the other hand, Valentine (2006) stating plagiarism as a reading and writing process add that plagiarism is a complex issue reflecting the context of citation, students' texts, social and institutional relations, values, emotions, and particularly the attitudes. In this context the following section is going to deal with literature about attitudes to plagiarism, the issue held in the present study.

Attitudes Toward Plagiarism

Literature about attitudes to plagiarism is mostly inquired in the fields of medicine, dentistry, nursery, pharmacy and including undergraduates, postgraduates, graduates and faculty members' (Rathore et al., 2018; Naveen, Raveendran, Vanishree, Prasad, Narayan, & Vignesh, 2017; Kirthi et al., 2015; Badea-Voiculescu, 2013; Ghajarzadeh, Norouzi-Javidan, Hassanpour, Aramesh, & Emami-Razavi, 2012; Poorolajal, Cheraghi, Doosti Irani, Cheraghi, & Mirfakhraei, 2012; Mavrinac et al., 2010; Pupovac, Bilic-Zulle, Mavrinac, & Petrovecki, 2010). Fewer studies were carried out in the fields of psychology (Rocher, 2018), computer science (Walcott, 2016), educational sciences (Akpınar Dellal, Yönet, & Akın, 2017; Er & Gürgan, 2011 Howard et al., 2014), engineering (Starovoytova, & Namango, 2016; Songsriwittaya, Kongsuwan, Jitgarun, Kaewkuekool, & Koul, 2009), business (Quah, Stewart, & Lee, 2012) concerning university students' attitudes toward plagiarism. Additionally, in only few studies university students' from diverse disciplines were also inquired (Bašić, Kružić, Jerković, Buljan, & Marušić, 2018; Hue et al., 2018; Camara, Eng-Ziskin, Wimberley, Dabbour, & Lee, 2017; Ehrich, Howard, Mu, & Bokosmaty, 2016; Ehrich et al., 2015). In two studies Bašić et al. (2018) and Camara et al. (2017), included students from arts but they did not make any comparisons among

those attended the study and they did not mention if any students were belong to field of architecture.

The studies stated in the previous paragraph used mostly attitude tests to plagiarism. The results of these studies showed the attitudes toward plagiarism in different contexts. For example, Pupovac, Bilic-Zulle and Petrovecki (2008) studied with undergraduate students in four European countries (Spain, United Kingdom-UK, Bulgaria and Croatia) found that the plagiarism rate among the students is high and each student have acted at least plagiarism one time in their university lives. Students from UK, Bulgaria and Croatia were found to have positive attitudes toward self-plagiarism and did not define self-plagiarism as a type of academic fraud. Consistent results were recorded by different research about self-plagiarism (Bašić et al., 2018; Suter & Suter, 2018; Pupovac et al., 2010). Ehrich et al. (2016) working with Chinese and Australian university students found that cultural differences are effective in the attitudes toward plagiarism. In the study while 20% of Chinese students were in favour of plagiarism, the percentage decreased to only 6% for Australian students. The rate increases dramatically in both countries when self-plagiarism is concerned, 90%.

Badea-Voiculescu (2013) who studied with medicine students from Romania used Mavrinac et al.'s ATP and found that students' attitudes to plagiarism is positive. Badea-Voiculescu warned national authorities and academies for this unfavorable result and recommend to guide medicine students and to include academic honesty issues into the academic curriculum. Some other studies also found favorable attitudes to plagiarism (Kirthi et al., 2015; Rathore, Waqas, Zia, Mavrinac, & Farooq, 2015; Pupovac et al., 2010). Additionally, some studies found the relation between self-efficacy and plagiarism (Rocher, 2018) and cheating (Er & Gürgan, 2011). These two studies found contradicting results. Rocher (2018) found that there is a positive relation between self-efficacy and negative attitudes to plagiarism. In other words, increase in self-efficacy correlates with decrease in tendencies to plagiarize. On the other, Er and Gürgan (2011) interestingly found that girls' self-efficacy correlates with positive attitudes toward plagiarism.

Hue et al. (2018, pp. 561-562), tried to reveal the factors affecting the university students' attitudes to plagiarism. They found that pressure and internet facilities do not affect attitudes toward plagiarism. They found that the most effective factor is lack of awareness. Institution takes the second place, while personal attitude and lack of competence are weak factors. In the study of Pupovac et al. (2010), they found that "lack of writing skills", "lack of knowledge and awareness of academic integrity" and "scientific community" are effective on attitudes toward plagiarism.

Researchers made recommendations about the problems they encountered in their studies. For example, Hue et al. (2018), stated the need to increase the awareness of plagiarism as a first step. In other studies the awareness was proposed to increase through educational programs including subjects of citation, referencing rules,

academic honesty which enhance the skills of understanding and diagnosing the act of plagiarism (Bašić et al., 2018; Hue et al,, 2018; Rathore et al., 2018; Akpınar Dellal et al., 2017; Baysen et al., 2017a; Çakmak & Baysen, 2017; Ma & Qin, 2017; Obeid & Hill, 2017; Özenç Uçak, & Ünal, 2015; Poorolajal et al., 2012; Eminoğlu & Nartgün, 2009). Such courses should also include analyzing, criticizing, writing, and paraphrasing which progress academic skills (Hue et al., 2018). Thus, it is said to improve the attitudes toward plagiarism. In other words, it would decrease the tendencies to plagiarize (Poorolajal et al., 2012). The study carried out by Rathore et al. (2018) adopting focused workshops with medical students is accordance with these results. Rathore et al. (2018), included "scientific misconduct, plagiarism, ethical aspects of medical research and writing" in their workshops. The experimental study showed significant progress in attitudes toward plagiarism and increased awareness.

Plagiarism in Architecture Education

Architecture students are expected to collect examples related to their projects, to do a lot of assignments of case study and space analysis. Such assignments encourage and create a culture of copying and imitation in learning and creating (Opar & Havens, 2013; Öymen Gür, 2007). On the other hand, the students are encouraged to use and be inspired from project examples, particular websites, and important fundamental projects which causes confusion between plagiarism and inspiration (Allmer, 2016; Mostafa, 2011). Moreover, the students are not expected to cite those they are inspired (Opar & Havens 2013).

In the context of architecture, plagiarism can be categorized into two. One is about text-based plagiarism when theoretical subjects in doing homework and while writing articles. The second type is visual plagiarism realized while creating drawings and projects in studios (Opar & Havens, 2013). Carter (2018), stated that visual plagiarism is not a new one and takes the attention to coincidental, imitational or outright plagiarism. Mostafa (2011) and Allmer (2016) also state the difference in between plagiarism and inspiration. Then a question raises: How can we differentiate among these three concepts? Opar and Havens (2013) stated the importance of teaching the architecture students these concepts and the difference among them and put the responsibility to architecture staff and the librarians. Additionally, they put the prominence on collaboration of these two professions in this context.

In architecture, using technologies made the access to projects easier all around the world. Talking about student project contests Allmer (2016) stated that the projects exceeding inspiration levels are increased, but the same technology facilitate finding those extreme inspirations. Following, Allmer stated that prize cancellations did not prevent plagiarism.

Widespread type of plagiarism among architecture students include passing off, pastiche, parody, intertextuality, echoing, cutting and pasting, appropriate, and visual

(Garrett & Robinson, 2012; Porter, 2010; Mullin, 2009). Mullin (2009), stated that similar assignments and students working together may cause plagiarism.

There are many courses about "occupational ethics" named differently in architecture curriculums. These courses include Occupational Responsibility and Ethics (İstanbul Arel University[1]), Subjects of Occupation in Architecture (Eastern Mediterranean University[2]), Codes and Regulations (İstanbul Bilgi University[3]), Urbanization and Laws of Town Planning (İstanbul Technical University[4]), Ethics in Design (İzmir University of Economics[5]), Architectural Applications and Ethics (Harvard University[6]), Ethics and Practice and Ethics and Decision Making in Architecture (Carnegie Mellon University[7]) and Legal Aspects of Planning (Near East University[8]). These courses include architectures' responsibilities and rules and laws of ethics. In the course of Legal Aspects of Planning in the faculty of Architecture of Near East University plagiarism takes place trying to acknowledge the students about plagiarism (T. Salihoğlu, personal communication, October 15, 2018).

Summarizing when the issue is so sensitive and when plagiarism is a step away from inspiration, the number of research about architecture students' plagiarism issues is low (Allmer, 2016; Ejezi, 2015; Eweda, 2011; Mullin, 2009; Rimmer, 2002). A comprehensive literature showed that there is no study dealing with architecture students' attitudes toward plagiarism. Thus, the present study is an original one in this context.

Aim and Research Questions

The study aimed to reveal architecture students' attitudes toward plagiarism. The study intended to answer number of questions regarding attitudes of Architecture students toward plagiarism,

1. What is the level of attitudes toward plagiarism including three dimensions,
   a. Positive attitudes
   b. Negative attitudes, and
   c. Subjective Norms
2. What is the distribution of attitudes to each scale item depending on the degree of agreement?
3. Is there any significant difference between number of agreements and disagreements to each item?

---

1   See https://www.arel.edu.tr/faculty-of-engineering-and-architecture/department-of-architecture/course-contents
2   See https://www.emu.edu.tr/en/programs/architecture-undergraduate-program/880?tab=curriculum
3   See https://ects.bilgi.edu.tr/Course/Detail?catalog_courseId=9940156
4   See http://darch.itu.edu.tr/dersler/
5   See http://mmr.fadf.ieu.edu.tr/en/tasarimda-etik
6   See www.gsd.harvard.edu/course/issues-in-architectural-practice-and-ethics-spring-2011/
7   See http://coursecatalog.web.cmu.edu/collegeoffinearts/schoolofarchitecture/courses/
8   See https://neu.edu.tr/academic/faculties/faculty-of-architecture/departments/department-of-architecture/courses/

4. Does gender create a significant difference regarding attitudes toward plagiarism?
5. Does grade level create a significant difference regarding attitudes toward plagiarism?

Method

Quantitative research approaches were adopted for the present study. Cross-sectional survey design was followed. Cross-sectional research design is suitable for collecting and analyzing data at one point of time to make inferences about a population (Creswell, 2014, p. 42).

Participants

Near East University, Faculty of Architecture, Department of Architecture students (n= 233) attended the present study. Students came from different nations found in the Middle East, Turkey, North Cyprus, and Africa. Of these 182 (78%) are boys and 51 (22%) are girls. Students are from different grades, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th (Table 1). Students ages ranged from 17 to 30 (Table 2).

Table 1. Grade Distribution

Grade	f	%
1	96	41
2	55	24
3	50	22
4	32	14
Total	233	100

Table 2. Age Distribution

Age	f	%
17	2	1
18	20	9
19	33	14
20	60	26
21	26	11
22	22	9
23	21	9
24	22	9
25	16	7
26	5	2
27	2	1
28	2	1
29	1	.4
30	1	.4
Total	233	100

Data Collection

The Attitude toward Plagiarism (ATP) consisted of twenty-nine items prepared by Mavrinac et al. (2010) was used for the present research. Items 1-12 were related with Positive attitudes to plagiarism, considering plagiarism as an acceptable act. Seven items 13- 19 regarded negative attitudes toward plagiarism dimension, disapproval. Lastly, subjective norms dimension was dealt in 10 items from item 20 to item 29, prevalence of plagiarism and acceptance of such behavior in the academic and scientific communities. The scale was formed as a five Likert type. It consisted choices of strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and, strongly disagree.

Data Analysis

The items were scored depending on agreement level. Score given to strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree and strongly agree were 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Thus, the minimum and the maximum scores were 12 and 60 respectively for the Positive attitudes to plagiarism. Negative attitudes toward plagiarism scored as minimum of 7 to maximum of 35. The subjective norms minimum and maximum scores were 10 and 50 respectively.

For data analysis SPSS was used. Number of students, the percentages answering for disagree or agree, and the means were calculated. To reveal if there is any significant difference in the number of the answers Chi Squares were also calculated. The number of students answering as strongly disagree and disagree (Ds) form one group of students, while those answers accumulated as strongly agree and agree (As) formed the other group of answers.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1

The mean score for both three dimensions, Positive, Negative, and Subjective Norms were found as "Moderate" (Table 3). This result shows that Architecture students have moderate positive, negative, and subjective norms attitudes toward plagiarism. It can be interpreted that the architecture students are candidate to plagiarism, although they have negative attitudes to plagiarism, they may have positive attitudes in different circumstances. This finding is consistent with those found in the literature (Walcott, 2016; Kirthi et al., 2015; Rathore et al., 2015; Pupovac et al., 2010).

Table 3. Descriptive Results

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Positive Attitudes	233	17.00	51.00	36.2918	5.62022	Moderate
Negative Attitudes	233	7.00	31.00	21.3305	3.52794	Moderate
Subjective Norms	233	10.00	42.00	30.1116	5.23956	Moderate

Research Questions 2 & 3

The number of students answering "Neither agree nor disagree" are high. Percentages of this type changes between 28- 46, which is significant. The percentages show that students are not sure for their attitudes toward plagiarism. It seems that the issue is still virgin for about quarter to half of the students.

Results of significant differences in the number of students in favor or unfavorable to plagiarism are remarkable (Items 3, 4, 7, 11, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 28). Following discussions used not only those items found significantly difference but also the others supporting that particular inference (Table 4).

Students believed that plagiarism is a community issue. People plagiarize, it is a reality (Items 20, 22, 24, 26). This result is consistent with Pupovac et al. (2010, p. 309). Students know that they should cite when they use their colleagues' work. They know that getting permission from colleagues is not enough (Item 10). Although plagiarism is not to steal a tangible asset (Item 15), it is still an important issue, one should not plagiarize (Items 13, 17, 19, 25). The act of plagiarism becomes more sensitive when scientists are concerned (Item 18). Scientists who plagiarize should be punished, they should be unveiled (Item 16). Students think that plagiarism is an act showing decline in moral and ethical issues. Consistently the act of plagiarism can be considered to stop such a decline (Item 14). This finding is consistent with Kirthi et al. (2015, p.1259, p. 1261) and Pupovac et al. (2010, p.309, p. 311).

Although students are against plagiarism, their attitudes change remarkably when students are considered (Items 2, 4, 7, 9, 29). They think that teachers should not automatically define the act of plagiarism as plagiarism, they should go easy, consider the context, and act accordingly (Items 4, 7, 28). Instructors should know that there are restrictions which make plagiarism inevitable (Item 27). One of those limitations, teachers should consider is that it is not always possible to write an idea without using words not used before. Writers should use common words (Item 1). Methodological terms are leading in causing plagiarism. Students think that they cannot use any other word instead of particular terms (Item 8). Copying few sentences verbatim is not something bad (Item 23) which was also found by Pupovac et al. (2010, p.309) and Walcott (2016, p. 76). Students significantly stated that there is no need to stop self-plagiarism (Item 3). Self-plagiarism may rise from the desire to inspire from previous work (Item 21). The reason not to avoid self-plagiarism can lie in their misbeliefs. They believe that self-plagiarism is a kind of minor offense and they should not be punished for such act. (Item 5). This finding is consistent to many studies (Bašić et al., 2018; Suter & Suter, 2018; Ehrich et al., 2016; Walcott 2016; Kirthi et al., 2015; Howard et al., 2014; Pupovac et al., 2010; Pupovac et al., 2008).

Table 4. Distribution of Responses Toward Items and Significance Results

No	Item	Strongly Disagree (f; %)		Disagree (f; %)		Neither agree nor disagree (f; %)		Agree (f; %)		Strongly agree (f; %)		Ds vs. As	Gender	Grade
Positive attitudes														
1	Sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something.	17	7	45	19	69	30	96	41	6	3	A(102)> D(62); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
2	When I do not know what to write, I translate a part of a paper from a foreign language.	27	12	47	20	65	28	73	31	21	9	A(94) >D(74); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
3	Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful (one cannot steal from oneself).	16	7	40	17	74	32	69	30	34	15	A(103) >D(56); p<.001	p>.05	III> I, II p<.05
4	Short deadlines give me the right to plagiarize a bit.	23	10	46	20	81	35	57	25	26	11	A(83) >D(69); p>.05	p>.05	IV, III, II>I p<.001
5	Self-plagiarism should not be punishable as plagiarism.	7	3	41	18	100	43	60	26	25	11	A(85) >D(48); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
6	It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work.	37	16	47	20	83	36	55	24	11	5	D(84) >A(66); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
7	Young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism.	20	9	52	22	89	38	62	27	10	4	A(72) =D(72); p>.05	p>.05	III,IV>I; III>II p<.05
8	It is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same.	10	4	35	15	79	34	84	36	25	11	A(109) >D(45); p<.001	G(3. 67) > B (3.25); p<.05	p>.05

Table 4 continue

#	Statement													
9	If one cannot write well in a foreign language (e.g., English), it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language.	34	15	52	22	72	31	63	27	12	5	D(86) >A(75); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
10	If a colleague of mine allows me to copy from her/his paper, I am NOT doing anything bad, because I have his/her permission.	42	18	60	26	66	28	50	22	15	6	D(102) >A(65); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
11	Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value.	23	10	48	21	96	41	55	24	11	5	D(71) >A(66); p>.05	p>.05	III>I p<.05
12	Could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing.	27	12	53	23	82	35	58	25	13	6	D(80) >A(71); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
Negative attitudes														
13	Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit.	13	6	47	20	99	43	51	22	23	10	A(74) >D(60); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
14	In times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism.	16	7	35	15	80	34	85	37	17	7	A(102) >D(51); p<.001	p>.05	p>.05
15	Since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets, it should NOT be considered very important.	27	12	63	27	81	35	49	21	13	6	D(90) >A(62); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
16	The names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community.	14	6	37	16	96	41	69	30	17	7	A(86) >D(51); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
17	Plagiarized paper does no harm to science.	24	10	50	22	85	37	57	25	17	7	D(74) =A(74); p>.05	p>.05	II, III>IV p<.05
18	Plagiarists do not belong to the scientific community	21	9	48	21	84	36	60	26	20	9	A(80) >D(69); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
19	Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam.	21	9	58	25	75	32	56	24	23	10	D(79) =A(79); p>.05	G (3.35)>B (2.91) p<.05	p>.05

Table 4 continue

Subjective Norms

20	Those who say they have never plagiarized are lying.	18	8	42	18	82	35	46	20	45	19	A(91) >D(60); p<.05	p>.05	III>I p<.05
21	Sometimes I copy a sentence or two just to become inspired for further writing.	17	7	28	12	71	31	94	40	23	10	A(117) >D(45); p<.001	p>.05	p>.05
22	Authors say they do NOT plagiarize, when in fact they do	16	7	46	20	91	39	60	26	20	9	A(80) >D(62); p>.05	G (3.35) > (2. 93) p<.05	p>.05
23	I do NOT have bad conscience for copying verbatim a sentence or two from my previous papers.	21	9	41	18	76	33	72	31	23	10	A(95) >D(62); p<.05	p>.05	p>.05
24	Sometimes I am tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it (students, researchers, physicians).	24	10	61	26	67	29	69	30	12	5	D(85) >A(81); p>.05	p>.05	p>.05
25	It is NOT so bad to plagiarize	34	15	41	18	90	39	54	23	14	6	D(75) >A(68); p>.05	p>.05	III>I p<.05
26	I work (study) in a plagiarism-free environment	39	17	51	22	85	37	43	19	15	6	D(90) >A(58); p<.05	p>.05	III>I; IV>I p<.05
27	Sometimes, it is necessary to plagiarize.	25	11	38	16	78	34	67	29	25	11	A(92) >D(63); p<.05	p>.05	III>I; IV>I p<.05
28	Plagiarism is justified if I currently have more important obligations or tasks to do.	17	7	46	20	106	46	55	24	9	4	A(64) >D(63); p>.05	p>.05	III>I p<.05
29	I keep plagiarizing because I haven't been caught yet.	50	22	61	26	69	30	35	15	18	8	D(111) >A(53); p<.001	G (2.24) <B (2.72); p<.05	p>.05

Research Question 4

Considering gender as a variable, there are significant difference between girls and boys mean in only few items. Girls suffer to find different words for methodological terms than boys. Girls consider plagiarism as a worse act than the boys. Girls find it more unbelievable regarding the idea that authors do not plagiarize. Girls disagree that they plagiarize. Girls' degree of disagreement is bigger than those of boys. Summarizing girls are more sensitive to plagiarism issues. Girls find it more difficult not to plagiarize, but they do not intend to plagiarize. They know that people are plagiarizing. Consistent results are revealed in the literature stating that the girls are more sensitive to plagiarism issues and consider plagiarism more than the boys (Akpınar Dellal et al., 2017; Baysen et al., 2017a; Özbek & Çeyiz, 2017; Walcott, 2016).

Research Question 5

Considering grade as a variable, there are significant differences in the attitudes between students attending different grades. First and third graders took the most attention, in the most significant difference case. First and third grades seem to represent the extremes. With few exceptions a general interpretation can be drawn. Attitudes change by grade level. The change is in favor of students and plagiarism. Students passing to higher grades become more aware of the plagiarism and its necessity at least in some conditions. Additionally, they start believing that plagiarism is not so harmful and can be ignored, not punished. Consistent result was revealed by Akpınar Dellal et al. (2017). They found that there are significant differences among different grades of first, third, and the fourth graders.

Implications

The finding that considerable number of students are not sure for their attitudes toward plagiarism opens a challenging, but optimistic situation for the educators. Crude attitudes are more volatile to change in positive direction than those anchored.

Students consider plagiarism as an important issue, representing ethical approaches of a community. Thus, shareholders of plagiarism issue should take the advantage of unfavorable belief to plagiarism to improve ethical understanding.

Students think that plagiarism is a scientist issue and students should not be blamed for plagiarism. Students should be aware of that they are the important part of the science world. On the other hand, teachers should reconsider their expectations from the students particularly about time constrains.

Teachers should encourage students to fight against terminology fear. Students must know that in those cases of mandatory terminology use, the plagiarism rate would not increase as they imagine. Teachers should tell about the mechanism of plagiarism

rate calculation. Additionally, students should aware that an optimum amount of matching is inevitable and acceptable.

The significant difference in between the grades shows that the students lack plagiarism knowledge in the high schools. Thus, it is important to inform the students before university to ensure its improvement through university years.

Workshops may be beneficiary to create proper attitudes toward plagiarism including learning of citation, writing references, and knowledge of plagiarism. These programs can also be organized as distant learning. Moreover, creating negative attitudes toward plagiarism all shareholders should cooperatively work together, including librarians, educators, and school managers. Such a collaboration was found to work (Rathore et al., 2018; Camara et al., 2017; George et al., 2013).

ATP and similar scales may be used periodically to find the needs of students' to develop new programs. A new scale designed for architecture including materials pictures, images, and projects and asking the right to use them can be inquired.

Finally, it is important to develop a plagiarism guide and protocol for the universities and particularly Near East University Faculty of Architecture.

Acknowledgement

References

Ahmad, U. K, Mansourizadeh, K., & Ai, G. K. M. (2012). Non-native university students' perception of plagiarism. *Advances in Language and Litrarcy Studies*, 3 (1), 39-48. doi: 10.7575/aiac. alls.v.3n.1p.39

Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality and behavior* (2nd ed.). England, New York: Open University Press Maidenhead.

Akpınar Dellal, N., Yönet, H., & Akın, E. B. (2017). Üniversite kimliği ve akademik sahtekârlık: Yabancı dil öğretmen adaylarının akademik sahtekârlığa ilişkin tutumları. In N. Akpınar Dellal & M. V. Coşkun (Eds.), *Bilimde etik ve demokratik eğitim (Ethics in science and democratic education)* (pp.79-94). Turkey: Lambert Academic Publishing, Retrieved from https://www.researchgate. net/publication/323727579_Universite_Kimligi_ve_Akademik_Sahtekarlik_Yabanci_Dil_ Ogretmen_Adaylarinin_Akademik_Sahtekarliga_Iliskin_Tutumlari

Allmer, A. (2016). Meslek etiği: Öğrenci yarışmalarında ödül iptalleri, intihal ve etik. *Mimarlık*, 389, May-June. Retrieved from http://www.mo.org.tr/mimarlikdergisi/

Auer, J., & Krupar, E. M. (2001). Mouse click plagiarism: The role of technology in plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it. *Library Trends, 49*(3), 415-432. Retrieved from https://www. ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/8353/librarytrendsv49i3d_opt.pdf

Badea-Voiculescu, O. (2013). Attitude of Romanian medicine students towards plagiarism. *Romanian Journal of Morphology & Embryology, 54*(3 Suppl), 907-908. Retrieved from http://www.rjme.ro/RJME/resources/files/541313907908.pdf

Barnhardt, B. (2016). The "epidemic" of cheating depends on its definition: A critique of inferring the moral quality of "cheating in any form". *Ethics & Behavior*, 26(4), 330-343. doi:10.1080/10508422.2015.1026595

Bašić, Z., Kružić, I., Jerković, I., Buljan, I. & Marušić, A. (2018). Attitudes and knowledge about plagiarism among university students: Cross sectional survey at the University of Split, Croatia. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 1-17. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-018-0073-x

Baysen, E., Hoškova-Mayerova, Š., Çakmak, N., & Baysen, F. (2017a). Misconceptions of Czech and Turkish university students in providing citations. In A. Maturo, Š. Hoškova-Mayerova, D.-T. Soitu, & J. Kacprzyk (Series Eds.), *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control Series: Vol. 66 Recent trends in social systems: Quantitative theories and quantitative models* (pp. 183-190). Switzerland: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-40585-8_16

Baysen, E., Hošková-Mayerová, Š., Çakmak, N., & Baysen, F. (2017b). Misconceptions regarding providing citations: To neglect means to take risk for future scientific research. In Š. Hošková-Mayerová, F. Maturo, & J. Kacprzyk (Series Eds.), *Studies in Systems, Decision and Control Series: Vol. 104 Mathematical-statistical models and qualitative theories for economic and social sciences* (pp. 177-186). Switzerland: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-54819-7_12

Camara, S. K., Eng-Ziskin, S., Wimberley, L., Dabbour, K. S., & Lee, A. M. (2017). Predicting students' intention to plagiarize: An ethical theoretical framework. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 15*(1), 43-58. doi: 10.1007/s10805-016-9269-3

Carter, D. (2018, March 19), How can designers deal with plagiarism [blog]. Retrieved from https://www.creativebloq.com/features/how-can-designers-deal-with-plagiarism

Cleary, M. N. (2017, November 27). Top 10 reasons students plagiarize & what teachers can do about it (with apologies to David Letterman). *Phi Delta Kappan,* 99 (4), 66-71. Retrieved from http://www.kappanonline.org/cleary-top-10-reasons-students-plagiarize/

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th. ed.). Thousand Oaks ve London: Sage Publications.

Çakmak, N. (2015). Lisans öğrencilerinin intihal ile ilgili kavram yanılgıları [Undergraduates' Misconceptions Concerning Plagiarism]. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, *29*(2), 212–240. Retrieved from http://www.tk.org.tr

Çakmak, N. (2016). *Lisans öğrencilerinin bilgi arama süreçleri ile ilgili kavramları, tutumları ve düşünceleri [Undergraduate students' concepts, attitudes and thoughts regarding information search process]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Çakmak, N., & Baysen, E. (2017). Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü öğrencilerinin bilgi arama süreci deneyimleri: Kavram yanılgıları [Department of Information and Records Management students' information search process experiences: Misconceptions]. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 31(3), 305-333. doi: 10.24146/tkd.2017.17

Ehrich, J., Howard, S., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism. *Studies in Higher Education*, *41*(2), 231-246. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2014.927850

Ehrich, J., Howard, S., Tognolini, J., & Bokosmaty, S. (2015). Measuring attitudes toward plagiarism: Issues and psychometric solutions. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *7*(2), 243-257. doi: 10.1108/JARHE-02-2014-0013

Ejezi, K. E. (2015). Ethical perspectives on implementation of computer aided design curriculum in architecture in Nigeria: A case study of Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Uli. *International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation*, *9*(12), 4198-4203. Retrieved from http://www.waset.org/publications/10003076

Eminoğlu, E., & Nartgün, Z. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekarlık eğilimlerinin ölçülmesine yönelik bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması [A scale development study to measure academic dishonesty tendency of university students]. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(1), 215-240. Retrieved from http://www.insanbilimleri.com

Er, K. O., & Gürgan, U. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik algıları ve kopya çekmeye ilişkin tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *Balikesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 14*(26), 1-18. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=90c35d08-347d-48b6-ad4b-7aefeca2eb58%40sdc-v-sessmgr05&bdata=Jmxhbmc9dHImc2l0ZT1lZHMtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=78004670&db=a9h

Eweda, N. H. (2011). Intellectual property in architecture: Between legislations and ethical manifestations with special reference to the Egyptian case. *Archnet-IJAR, International Journal of Architectural Research, 5*(3), 93-106. doi: 10.26687/archnet-ijar.v5i3.209

Ewing, H., Mathieson, K., Anast, A., & Roehling, T. (2017). Student and faculty perceptions of plagiarism in health sciences education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2017.1356913

Franzoi, S. L. (2006). *Social psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Garrett, L., & Robinson, A. (2012, July). *Spot the Difference! Visual plagiarism in the visual arts.* EVA London, Electronic Visualisation and the Arts (EVA) Conference. Retrieved from http://www.research.ucreative.ac.uk/1194/1/ewic_ev12_s2paper1.pdf

George, S., Costigan, A., & O'hara, M. (2013). Placing the library at the heart of plagiarism prevention: The University of Bradford experience. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, *19*(2), 141-160. doi: 10.1080/13614533.2013.800756

Ghajarzadeh, M., Norouzi-Javidan, A., Hassanpour, K., Aramesh, K., & Emami-Razavi, S. H. (2012). Attitude toward plagiarism among Iranian medical faculty members. *Acta Medica Iranica*, *50*(11), 778-781. Retrieved from http://acta.tums.ac.ir/index.php/acta

Gibson, N. S., & Chester-Fangman, C. (2011). The librarian's role in combating plagiarism. *Reference Services Review*, *39*(1), 132-150. doi: 10.1108/00907321111108169

Gottardello, D., Pàmies, M. del M., & Valverde, A. M. (2017). Professors' perceptions of university students' plagiarism: A literature review. *BiD: Textos Universitaris de Biblioteconomia i Documentació*, 39. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1344/BiD2017.39.12

Graves, S. M. (2008). Student cheating habits: A predictor of workplace deviance. *Journal of Diversity Management-First Quarter, 3*(1), 14-22. Retrieved from http://clutejournals.com/index.php/JDM/article/view/4977

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

Gunnarsson, J., Kulesza, W. J., & Petterson, A. (2014). Teaching international students how to avoid plagiarism: Librarians and faculty in collaboration. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 40*(3-4), 413 417. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2014.04.006

Henderson, T. (2011). *The biggest misconceptions about plagiarism*. Retrieved from http://www.sooperarticles.com/writing-articles/article-writing-articles/biggestmisconceptions-about-plagiarism-276836.html

Hue, H. T., Thom, N. T., & Le, T. T. N. (2018). Factors that influence on students' attitudes towards plagiarism: The case of Vietnam. In *9th International Conference on Socio-Economic and Environmental Issues in Development, 11-12 May 2018* (pp. 552-563). Labours: Social Publishing House.

Hollins, T. J., Lange, N., Dennis, I., & Longmore, C. A. (2016). Social influences on unconscious plagiarism and anti-plagiarism. *Memory, 24*(7), 884-902. doi: 10.1080/09658211.2015.1059857

Howard, S. J., Ehrich, J. F., & Walton, R. (2014). Measuring students' perceptions of plagiarism: Modification and Rasch validation of a plagiarism attitude scale. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 15 (4), 372-393. Retrieved from https://ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers/1461/

Jensen, L. A., Arnett, J. J., Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (2002). It's wrong, but everybody does it: Academic dishonesty among high school and college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 27*(2), 209-228. doi: 10.1006/ceps.2001.1088

Kayaoğlu, M. N., Erbay, Ş., Flitner, C., & Saltaş, D. (2016). Examining students' perceptions of plagiarism: A cross-cultural study at tertiary level. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *40*(5), 682-705. doi: 10.1080/0309877X.2015.1014320

Kirthi, B., Pratap, K., Padma, T. M., & Kalyan, V. S. (2015). Attitudes towards plagiarism among post-graduate students and faculty members of a teaching health care institution in Telangana: A cross-sectional questionnaire based study. *International Journal of Advanced Research, 3*(8), 1257-1263. Retrieved from http://www.journalijar.com/

Kurbanoğlu, S. S. (2004). *Kaynak gösterme el kitabı*. Ankara: ÜNAK

Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor-implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 183-199. doi: 10.1080/02602930500262486

Liu, X., Liu, S., Lee, S.-h., & Magjuka, R. J. (2010). Cultural differences in online learning: International student perceptions. *Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(3), 177–188. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.13.3.177?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents

Ma, R., & Qin, X. (2017). Individual factors influencing citation competence in L2 academic writing. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, *24*(2-3), 213-240. doi:10.1080/09296174.2016.1265793

Mavrinac, M., Brumini, G., Bilić-Zulle, L., & Petrovečki, M. (2010). Construction and validation of attitudes toward plagiarism questionnaire. *Croatian Medical Journal*, *51*(3), 195-201. doi: 10.3325/cmj.2010.51.195

Mostafa, M. (2011). Inspiration versus Plagiarism: Academic integrity in architectuural education. *International Journal of the Construction Education*, 1(3), 85-99.

Mullin, J. A. (2009). Appropriation, homage, and pastiche: Using artistic tradition to reconsider and redefine plagiarism. In C. P. Haviland & J. A. Mullin (Eds.), *Who owns this text? Plagiarism, Authorship, and Disciplinary Cultures* (pp. 105-128). Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1025&context=usupress_pubs

Naveen, N., Raveendran, N., Vanishree, N., Prasad, K., Narayan, R. R., & Vignesh, D. (2017). An effectual analytics and cross sectional study on plagiarism among dental post graduates of Bangalore city. *International Journal of Applied Dental Sciences*, *3*(3), 23-26. Retrieved from http://www.oraljournal.com/

Obeid, R., & Hill, D. B. (2017). An Intervention designed to reduce plagiarism in a research methods classroom. *Teaching of Psychology*, *44*(2), 155-159. doi: 10.1177/0098628317692620

Olson, M. A., & Kendrick, R. V. (2008). Origins of attitudes. In W. D. Crano & R. Prislin (Eds.), *Attitudes and Attitude Change* (pp. 111-130). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Opar B., & Havens, B. (2013, Nowember 11). *Plagiarism by design*. Retrieved from http://www.acsa-arch.org/acsa-news/read/read-more/acsa-news/2013/11/11/plagiarism-by-design

Quartuccio, K. (2014). *Positive and negative attitudes and subjective norms toward plagiarism of RN to BSN students in an accelerated online program* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Case Western Reserve University, Ohio.

Öymen Gür, Ş. (2007). Mimarlıkta taklit: Eski türkü-yeni Aranjman. *Mimarlık*, 333, 37-40. Retrieved from http://www.mo.org.tr/mimarlikdergisi/

Özbek, O., & Çeyiz, S. (2017). University students' opinions on cheating and plagiarism. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *3*(8), 323-335. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.832326

Özenç Uçak, N., & Ünal, Y. (2015). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Bilgi ve Belge Yönetimi Bölümü öğrencilerinin akademik sahtekârlık ve intihal konusundaki görüşleri. In *Prof. Dr. İrfan Çakın`a Armağan* (pp. 251-264). Ankara: Hacettepe Universitesi. Retrieved from http://www.bby.hacettepe.edu.tr/yayinlar/dosyalar/32-U%C3%A7ak-%C3%9Cnal-251-264.pdf

Plagiarism. (2018). *University of Oxford*. Retrieved from https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism?wssl=1#

Polat, M. (2017). Türkiye'de öğrenciler neden kopya çeker? Bir meta-sentez çalışması. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 7*(1), 223-242. Retrieved from http://ebad-jesr.com

Poorolajal, J., Cheraghi, P., Doosti Irani, A., Cheraghi, Z., & Mirfakhraei, M. (2012). Construction of knowledge, attitude and practice questionnaire for assessing plagiarism. *Iranian Journal Public Health, 41*(11), 54-58. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3521886/

Porter, M. (2010). A consideration of academic misconduct in the creative disciplines: From inspiration to imitation and acceptable incorporation. *EMERGE*, 2, 1-16. Retrieved from http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/12099/

Pupovac, V., Bilic-Zulle, L., Mavrinac, M., & Petrovecki, M. (2010). Attitudes toward plagiarism among pharmacy and medical biochemistry students-cross-sectional survey study. *Biochemia Medica*, *20*(3), 307-313. Rerieved from https://hrcak.srce.hr/59293

Pupovac, V., Bilic-Zulle, L., & Petrovecki, M. (2008). On academic plagiarism in Europe. An analytical approach based on four studies. *Digithum*, 10, 13-18. doi: 10.7238/d.v0i10.507

Quah, C. H., Stewart, N., & Lee, J. W. C. (2012). Attitudes o business students' toward plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 10*(3), 185-199. doi: 10.1007/s10805-012-9157-4

Rathore, F. A., Fatima, N. E., Farooq, F., & Mansoor, S. N. (2018). Combating scientific misconduct: The role of focused workshops in changing attitudes towards plagiarism. *Cureus*, *10*(5). e2698. Doi:10.7759/cureus.2698

Rathore, F. A., Waqas, A., Zia, A. M., Mavrinac, M., & Farooq, F. (2015). Exploring the attitudes of medical faculty members and students in Pakistan towards plagiarism: A cross sectional survey. *PeerJ*, 1-12. doi: I 10.7717/peerj.1031

Rimmer, M. (2002). Crystal palaces: Copyright law and public architecture. *Bond Law Review, 14*(2), 320-346. Retrieved from http://'epublications.bond.edu.au/blr/vo114/iss2/4

Rocher, A. R. (2018). Active learning strategies and academic self-efficacy relate to both attentional control and attitudes towards plagiarism. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 1-14. doi: 10.1177/1469787418765515

Schmelkin, L. P., Gilbert, K. A., & Silva, R. (2010). Multidimensional scaling of high school students' perceptions of academic dishonesty. *The High School Journal*, *93*(4), 156-165. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=1c5066de-a0bc-4d77-85ce-ac1a8d4f0976%40sdc-v-sessmgr05

Songsriwittaya, A., Kongsuwan, S., Jitgarun, K., Kaewkuekool, S., & Koul, R. (2009). *Engineering students' attitude towards plagiarism: A survey study*. Paper presented at the Procedings of The ICEE & ICEER 2009 Korea: International Conference on Engineering Education & Reseacrh. Retrieved from http://www.ineer.org/

Šprajc, P., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., Trivan, D., & Jereb, E. (2017). Reasons for plagiarism in higher education. *Organizacija*, *50*(1), 33-45. doi: 10.1515/orga-2017-0002

Starovoytova, D., & Namango, S. S. (2016). Viewpoint of undergaruade engineering students on plagiarism. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(31), 48-65. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1122526

Sureda-Negre, J., Comas, R., & Oliver-Trobat, M. F. (2015). Academic plagiarism among secondary and high school students: Differences in gender and procrastination. *Comunicar*, *English ed., 22*(44), 103-111. doi: 10.3916/C44-2015-11

Suter, W. N., & Suter, P. M. (2018). Understanding plagiarism. *Home Health Care Management & Practice*, *30*(4), 151-154. doi: 10.1177/1084822318779582

Ural, M. N., & Sulak, S. A. (2012). Plagiarism via internet on undergraduate students in Turkey. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, *2*(3), 229-234. Retrieved from http://www.wjeis.org/

Valentine, K. (2006). Plagiarism as literacy practice: Recognizing and rethinking ethical binaries. *College Composition and Communication*, *58*(1), 89-109. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/20456924

Walcott, P. (2016). Attitudes of second year computer science undergraduates toward plagiarism. *The Caribbean Teaching Scholar, 6*, 63-80. Retrieved from https://journals.sta.uwi.edu/cts/index.asp

What about images, videos, and music? (2017, May 18). *Plagiarism.org*. Retrieved from https://www.plagiarism.org/article/what-is-plagiarism

What is plagiarism. (2017, May 18). *Plagiarism.org*. Retrieved from https://www.plagiarism.org/article/what-is-plagiarism