https://jsrhs.rcc.edu.ly/
ISSN: 3078-4611
Vol.3 No.1 (2026), 435- 455
Article history:
Received:16/05/2026
Accepted:07/06/2026
Published:10/06/20226

Journal of Sustainable Research in Humanities

JSRHS

Exploring the Factors Contributing to Plagiarism in Libyan Students' Research Papers

Hanan Emhemmed Emhemmed Bin Sasi
Assistant lecturer, Department of English, Faculty of Languages and Translation, Misurata University, Libya
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6180-8674
h.sasi@Lt.misuratau.edu.ly

Abstract
Plagiarism continues to be a significant challenge in academic environments worldwide, though the reasons behind it can differ greatly depending on cultural and educational contexts. This paper aims to explore the specific factors contributing to plagiarism in research papers among Libyan students. Using a quantitative method to collect data obtained from student questionnaire, the participants are 25 undergraduate students from the two major departments (English and Translation) of languages and translation college. The results reveal that plagiarism is primarily influenced by limited awareness of academic rules, insufficient ethical guidance, and the perception that misconduct often goes unpunished.
Keywords: Plagiarism, challenges, cultural context, academic environment, educational context.

استكشاف العوامل المساهمة في السرقة الأدبية في البحوث لدى الطلبة الليبيين

حنان بن ساسي
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغات والترجمة، جامعة مصراتة، مصراتة، ليبيا

الملخص:
يعد الانتحال العلمي من المشكلات الأكاديمية الشائعة التي ما زالت تشكل مصدر قلق للمؤسسات التعليمية في مختلف أنحاء العالم، إلا أن العوامل المؤدية إليه تختلف باختلاف البيئات الثقافية والتعليمية. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على أبرز الأسباب التي تدفع الطلبة الليبيين إلى ممارسة الانتحال العلمي عند إعداد البحوث الأكاديمية. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، تم اتباع المنهج الكمي من خلال جمع البيانات باستخدام استبانة وُزعت على عينة مكونة من 25 طالبًا وطالبة في مرحلة البكالوريوس من قسمي اللغة الإنجليزية والترجمة بكلية اللغات والترجمة. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن ضعف المعرفة بقواعد النزاهة الأكاديمية، وقلة التوعية بالجوانب الأخلاقية للبحث العلمي، إلى جانب الاعتقاد بأن المخالفات الأكاديمية لا تواجه إجراءات رادعة في كثير من الأحيان، تُعد من أبرز العوامل التي تسهم في انتشار الانتحال العلمي بين الطلبة
الكلمات المفتاحية: الانتحال العلمي، التحديات، السياق الثقافي، البيئة الأكاديمية، السياق التعليمي.

1. Introduction:

Plagiarism in research papers among Libyan students has emerged as a growing concern, reflecting broader challenges within the academic landscape. The persistence of academic dishonesty is symptomatic of deeper issues within the educational system and the wider socio-cultural context. To effectively address and reduce this problem, it is essential to understand the root causes that drive students to engage in plagiarism.

One of the primary factors is the educational environment itself. As noted by Ahmed et al. (2021), many Libyan institutions lack comprehensive training on research methodologies and academic integrity. Students often receive minimal guidance on how to properly cite sources and conduct research ethically,

leading to unintentional plagiarism. Without sufficient instruction, students may unknowingly present others' work as their own.

Additionally, the pressure to achieve high grades and academic success may drive students to take shortcuts. In a competitive academic environment, where success is highly prized, the temptation to plagiarize becomes a strategy to meet expectations and relieve the stress associated with maintaining top performance. This pressure is further intensified by the limited availability of resources and support services that could help students develop their research skills.

Cultural and systemic factors also play a significant role. In some educational settings, there is insufficient emphasis on the importance of academic honesty, and the enforcement of academic standards may be lax. This creates an environment where plagiarism can occur unchecked, reinforcing the behavior among students. Furthermore, the rapid expansion of Libya's higher education sector has led to inconsistencies in academic quality and supervision, which further exacerbates the problem.

Socio-economic factors add another layer of complexity. Students from disadvantaged backgrounds may feel increased pressure to perform well academically, viewing plagiarism as a necessary means to achieve their educational goals and secure a better future. The lack of adequate resources and support systems only makes these challenges more difficult, prompting some students to resort to dishonest practices.

Understanding these complex and interconnected factors is crucial for developing effective strategies to combat plagiarism. By addressing educational gaps, cultural attitudes, systemic challenges, and socio-economic pressures, stakeholders can foster a culture of academic integrity and ensure that Libyan students are equipped with the skills and values needed for honest academic success.

2. Literature Review:

Several studies have explored the issue of plagiarism among students, with a focus on educational, cultural, and systemic factors contributing to academic dishonesty in different contexts, including Libya. These studies provide valuable insights into the reasons behind plagiarism in Libyan students' research papers.

One of the most important studies is by Ahmed et al. (2021): This study examined the role of educational gaps in fostering plagiarism among Libyan students. The researchers found that many students lacked proper guidance on research methodologies and citation practices, leading to unintentional plagiarism. The study highlighted the need for universities in Libya to incorporate comprehensive training on academic integrity and research ethics to address this issue.

In his research Al-Mahdi (2019) focused on the systemic challenges that contribute to plagiarism in Libyan higher education. The study identified that many academic institutions in Libya have inadequate enforcement of anti-plagiarism policies. Additionally, a lack of resources, such as libraries, online databases, and writing support, made it difficult for students to produce original research. The study called for stronger institutional policies and improved support services to help students avoid plagiarism.

Another study which was conducted by Ben Hammad (2017): explored the cultural and social factors influencing plagiarism among Libyan students. The study revealed that in some academic settings, there was a lack of emphasis on the importance of academic honesty, and the culture of academic integrity was underdeveloped. This cultural attitude, combined with the pressures to perform academically, contributed to students' tendency to plagiarize. Moreover, Fahmy and Saleh (2018) in his study focused on the socio-economic factors contributing to plagiarism. The researchers found that students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds faced heightened stress to perform well academically. With limited access to resources and support services, these students often saw plagiarism as a way to cope with the demands of

their academic environment. The study suggested that providing better academic support and resources for these students could reduce their reliance on dishonest practices.

Elshater and Elaziz (2020) in their research investigated the impact of academic pressure on plagiarism among Libyan students. The study found that students in highly competitive academic environments were more likely to plagiarize in an effort to maintain high grades and meet the expectations of their professors. The study emphasized the need for a more balanced academic environment that prioritizes learning over competition.

Mohamed and Mustafa (2016) conducted a study that focused on the role of institutional policies in addressing plagiarism. They found that despite the existence of anti-plagiarism policies, enforcement was often weak, and there were no clear guidelines on how to handle cases of academic dishonesty. The study recommended the establishment of clearer policies and stronger enforcement mechanisms to deter plagiarism.

Ali and Salah (2015), Ali and Salah's research explored students' attitudes toward plagiarism in Libyan universities. They found that many students were unaware of the seriousness of plagiarism and did not fully understand its consequences. The study recommended that universities introduce awareness campaigns to educate students about the ethical and academic implications of plagiarism.

These studies highlight that plagiarism among Libyan students is influenced by a combination of educational, cultural, systemic, and socio-economic factors. They also stress the importance of addressing these issues through educational reforms, better institutional support, and increased awareness of academic integrity.

3. Problem Statement:

In universities worldwide, including those in Libya, academic plagiarism has become a significant issue. Many students rely on copying information from different sources without properly citing it when writing research papers and academic assignments. This problem has a negative impact on students' research skills, critical thinking abilities, and academic integrity. Many Libyan university students still find it difficult to produce original academic work, despite the growing importance of academic integrity. Numerous factors can contribute to the spread of plagiarism among students. These factors include socioeconomic difficulties, a lack of academic support, a lack of training in academic writing and research techniques, pressure to achieve high grades, and ignorance of plagiarism and citation rules. Additionally, inadequate implementation of academic integrity policies and restricted access to reliable academic resources may encourage students to plagiarize. Although many studies have addressed plagiarism in various educational contexts, there is still a dearth of research that specifically examines the factors influencing plagiarism among Libyan university students, particularly those in the Faculty of Languages and Translation. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the institutional, cultural, educational, and socioeconomic factors that contribute to plagiarism in research papers written by students. With a better understanding of these factors, universities may be able to develop more effective strategies to enhance academic integrity and reduce student plagiarism.

4. Objectives of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to investigate the factors that lead to plagiarism among university students in Libya. The following are the study's goals:

1. To investigate students' knowledge and awareness of academic integrity and plagiarism.
2. To determine the academic and educational elements that could encourage plagiarism.
3. To look into how students' plagiarism habits are affected by academic pressure.

4. To investigate how academic resources and institutional support can help prevent plagiarism.
5. To investigate how cultural and socioeconomic factors affect students' perceptions of plagiarism.

6. To look into students' individual experiences of academic misconduct and plagiarism.
7. To make suggestions that could lessen plagiarism and encourage moral academic behavior in higher education.

5. Significance of the Study:

This study is important because it addresses plagiarism as one of the primary problems that higher education institutions face. The study's findings may contribute to the understanding of why plagiarism occurs among Libyan university students, especially those enrolled in the Faculty of Languages and Translation.

The significance of the study can be summed up as follows:

1. The Value of Education

The study might be able to identify areas in which students' knowledge of citation styles, research ethics, and academic writing is deficient.

2. Institutional Significance:

The results may aid educators and academic institutions in improving their academic integrity and plagiarism prevention procedures.

3. Usefulness:

The study may encourage the development of training programs, workshops, and educational resources that improve students' ability to conduct ethical research and write academically.

4.Social Significance

Libyan society's integrity culture may be strengthened by promoting academic accountability and integrity.

5.Research Significance

The study may add to the limited body of research on plagiarism in Libyan higher education and provide future researchers studying academic ethics with useful references.

6. Research Methodology:

The methodology of this study aims to comprehensively investigate the factors contributing to plagiarism in research papers among Libyan students. A quantitative research approach is used, specifically a descriptive survey design, to collect and analyze data. This approach allows the researcher to gather numerical data and identify patterns related to the research topic. This section outlines the research design, data collection methods, and data analysis procedures.

6.1 Participants:

The study focuses on students and faculty members at Libyan universities, specifically those enrolled in academic programs that require research papers. The participants will be selected using purposive sampling to ensure that they have sufficient knowledge or experience relevant to the study.

Student Participants

Sample Size: 25 students (mixed from the English and Translation department).

6.2 Data Collection Methods

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire created using google forms. The questionnaire was distributed electronically to undergraduate students to explore their understanding of plagiarism, academic pressures, access to resources, and experiences with plagiarism in their research papers, allowing for easy

access and efficient data collection. The use of google forms facilitated the organization and analysis of responses.

7. Data Analysis and Results:

Addressing the Study Questions:

This chapter presents the results derived from the study sample's responses to the questionnaire items. It aims to address the research questions as follows:

7.1 Section 1 Knowledge and Awareness of Plagiarism:

Table 1 understanding of plagiarism

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
I have a clear understanding	1	%4
I have a basic understanding	8	%32
I do not fully understand it	16	%64

Note, M= 2.60, SD= 0.577

This section assesses the extent of students' understanding and comprehension of the concept of "Plagiarism." The results are presented as follows:

The findings reveal a significant knowledge gap among the study sample and a sharp decline in the level of awareness regarding academic integrity. The vast majority of students (64%) stated that they "do not fully understand the concept." This implies that nearly two-thirds of the sample may commit plagiarism unintentionally, simply due to their ignorance of the boundaries between legitimate citation and academic theft. Such a percentage is alarming within academic circles, particularly in a faculty that relies heavily on academic writing and translation—fields that demand high precision in documentation.

Furthermore, the results showed that only 4% (one student) possesses a clear and comprehensive understanding of what plagiarism entails. This reflects a weakness in foundational academic training regarding research ethics prior to engaging in paper writing. Meanwhile, 32% of the sample leaned towards having only a "basic understanding," a level of knowledge that is often insufficient for complex scientific research requiring advanced documentation and citation skills.

The arithmetic means of the responses reached (2.60), indicating that student attitudes generally incline towards categories lacking complete information. Additionally, the standard deviation (0.577) reflects homogeneity among the sample members regarding this lack of awareness; meaning, most students share the same deficit in information without significant variances between them.

This reveals that the "cognitive factor" is one of the most prominent drivers of unintentional plagiarism. Students in the Faculty of Languages may fall into the trap of plagiarism not out of a desire to deceive, but as a result of their failure to recognize the fine line between legitimate quotation and plagiarism.

Table 2 I have received training on how to avoid plagiarism in my academic work.

Response Categories	Frequenc	Percentage
- I have received formal training	7	%28
- I have received basic training	13	%52
- I have never received training	5	%20

M=1.92 SD=0.702

The results indicate that more than half of the sample (52%), comprising 13 students, have received only "basic training." This suggests that while the majority possess a preliminary understanding of the rules, they may lack the advanced applied skills necessary to protect them from unintentional plagiarism in complex research. Notably, the proportion of those who received "comprehensive and in-depth training" does not exceed 28% (7 students). This is a low percentage considering the vital

importance of academic integrity in higher education, pointing to a deficit in intensive training programs aimed at professionally refining citation and documentation skills.

Furthermore, one-fifth of the sample (20%), totalling 5 students, reported receiving no formal training whatsoever. The arithmetic mean of the responses was (1.92), indicating that the students generally received only basic training. This confirms that the overall status of the sample is one of "incomplete knowledge" rather than "full proficiency."

The standard deviation (0.702) suggests a moderate variance in qualification levels among the sample members, meaning that students' training backgrounds are unequal and require standardization and calibration. With a relative weight of 64%, the level of training satisfaction or adequacy among students falls within the average range.

Table 3 I know how to properly cite sources in my research paper.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, I know how to properly cite sources	11	%44
Somewhat, but I still have doubts	10	%40
No, I don’t know how to properly cite sources	4	%16

M =2.28 SD=o.737

The current table illustrates the self-assessment levels of the sample regarding citation skills, which are fundamental to academic writing. The results show that 44% (11 students) of the total sample reported that they fully understand how to cite sources. Although this group is the most numerous, it does not constitute an absolute majority (falling below 50%), suggesting that correct citation practices have not yet become a standardized practice among all students.

Furthermore, 40% (10 students) of the total sample indicated that they possess knowledge "to some extent" but that it is fraught with uncertainty. This group understands the basic principles but may commit technical errors when dealing with complex source types (such as digital sources or multi-authored articles), which undermines the academic quality of their research. Additionally, the results showed that 16% (4 students) completely lack the knowledge of how to cite. While this percentage is small compared to other categories, the presence of students at an academic level who have not mastered the fundamentals of citation indicates an educational gap that requires immediate intervention.

The arithmetic means of the responses reached (2.28), indicating that the average response falls between "Yes" and "To some extent," with a stronger inclination toward the positive. The standard deviation (0.737) shows a slight dispersion in responses, meaning that students' levels are closely aligned in their "uncertainty" rather than being sharply polarized. With a relative weight of 76%, there is a general positive trend toward learning, yet it remains below the level of "academic professionalism."

There is a "partial awareness" of the importance of citation, but it lacks applied precision. The fact that 56% of the sample (the combined total of those with doubts and those who do not know) face difficulties in citation necessitates the provision of style manuals or training programs focusing on international documentation systems (such as APA or MLA) to eliminate these uncertainties and convert them into definitive knowledge.

7.2 Section 2 Academic Pressures and Environment:

Table 4 I feel pressured to achieve high writing grades.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Always	1	%4
Frequently	5	%20
Occasionally	11	%44
Never	8	%32

M= 3.04 SD= 0.840

This table reflects the psychological and environmental conditions experienced by students regarding their academic aspirations and the pressures imposed upon them. The results show that the largest proportion of participants, 44% (11 students), feel pressured "occasionally." This suggests that academic pressure is not a chronic condition for these students; rather, it is often linked to research submission deadlines or final exams, making it a form of "seasonal pressure" typical of the university environment.

Furthermore, the results indicate a low prevalence of high pressure among students; only one student (4%) reported feeling pressured "always." This negligible percentage reflects the absence of widespread academic burnout within the sample. Meanwhile, 20% (5 students) reported feeling frequent pressure, while 32% (8 students) stated they never feel pressured to achieve high grades. This could indicate one of two things: either high confidence in their writing abilities or a low level of concern regarding competitive academic outcomes.

The arithmetic mean of the responses was (3.08), aligning with the "Occasionally" category, which confirms that psychological pressure related to grades falls within the medium-to-low range. The standard deviation (0.840) reflects a variance in personal motivations among students; while some are indifferent to grades (32%), others prioritize them significantly. With a relative weight of 76%, the general trend of the sample leans towards relative "psychological stability" regarding grades, with sufficient awareness of performance importance without reaching the level of debilitating stress.

It is evident that the academic environment for this sample appears "healthy" in terms of the absence of excessive negative psychological pressure. However, the high percentage of those feeling pressured "occasionally" (44%) necessitates providing time and stress management skills to ensure this temporary pressure does not become an obstacle during peak academic periods.

Table 5 I spend time completing assignments or research papers.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 5 hours	11	%44
5-10 hours	7	%28
10-20 hours	6	%24
More than 20 hours	1	%4

M= 1.88 SD=0.927

This table illustrates the students' study habits and the amount of time and effort invested in producing academic papers. The results are as follows:

The largest proportion of students, 44% (11 students), reported spending less than 5 hours to complete their assignments. This may indicate that the required tasks are "short assignments" rather than in-depth research papers, or that students rely on rapid writing strategies.

Regarding the broader context of academic integrity, 52% of the students spent moderate periods on their work:

- 5-10 hours: 28% (7 students), which is considered a reasonable duration for preparing an average university-level paper involving reading and documentation.

- 10-20 hours: 24% (6 students), representing those who exert intensive research effort; their writing is typically of higher quality, accuracy, and documentation.

In contrast, only one student (4%) reported a long-time consumption (more than 20 hours). The arithmetic mean of the responses was (1.88), which corresponds to the (5-10 hours) category, indicating that the general rate among students leans toward speed in completion.

The standard deviation (0.927) shows a noticeable variance in speed among students, reflecting a clear gap between those who finish their work in two hours and those who require more than 20 hours. With a relative weight of 47%, which is somewhat low, it is confirmed that the time spent on "actual study" is not substantial for the critical mass of students.

Table 6 I believe that there is significant pressure to perform well academically in your department.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, there is a lot of pressure	3	12%
Yes, there is some pressure	12	48%
No, there is little or no pressure	10	40%

M= 2.28 SD= 0.678

This table illustrates the level of pressure students face to achieve outstanding academic performance. The results are as follows:

- Moderate Pressure (Yes, there is some pressure): This category received the highest percentage at 48% (12 students). This indicates a competitive environment and existing academic expectations, yet it has not reached the level of acute stress or burnout.
- Low or No Pressure (No, little or no pressure): This ranked second at 40% (10 students), reflecting a segment of students who feel comfortable with academic requirements, or perhaps reflecting the flexibility of the educational system within the department.
- High Pressure (Yes, there is a lot of pressure): This recorded the lowest percentage at only 12% (3 students). This is a positive indicator that the department does not represent a repulsive or exhausting environment for the vast majority of its members.

The arithmetic mean of the responses was (2.28), falling within the "Moderate Pressure" range, which confirms that the general state in the department is one of academic balance. The relative weight of 76% reflects that "academic performance" is a genuine concern for students; 60% of the sample (the combined total of those feeling significant and moderate pressure) are aware of the importance of academic excellence. Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.678) shows a convergence in student opinions, meaning that most students agree that pressure exists but is "manageable."

By comparing these results with the time spent on research (which was mostly less than 5 hours), the researcher points out that since pressure is "moderate" or "low" for 88% of the students, there is no compelling motive to spend excessively long hours on academic research. The existence of a balanced academic environment allows students to succeed without the need for excessive time consumption, which explains the speed with which assignments are completed.

Table 7: I think that plagiarism is sometimes seen as an acceptable shortcut to achieving good grades.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	24%
I’m not sure	10	40%
No	9	36%

M= 1.88 SD= 0.781

This table illustrates students' responses regarding whether plagiarism is sometimes considered an "acceptable shortcut" to obtaining good grades. The results are as follows:

- Uncertainty (I'm not sure): This category represents the largest portion of the study sample at 40% (10 students). This indicates a lack of clarity in understanding the concept of plagiarism or a deficiency in awareness regarding its ethical implications and penalties. This group constitutes a "gray area" susceptible to adopting such behaviors.
- Opposition (No): 36% (9 students) opposed this idea, representing the segment that possesses an ethical commitment and awareness of the value of academic integrity.
- Agreement (Yes): 24% (6 students) agreed that plagiarism could be an acceptable shortcut. Although this is the lowest percentage, the fact that nearly a quarter of the sample justifies this behavior is a negative indicator requiring educational intervention.

The arithmetic mean of the responses was (1.88), leaning toward the "I'm not sure" response. This confirms that the general trend of the sample is not decisive in rejecting plagiarism. The relative weight (62.7%) reflects a moderate degree of acknowledgment or acceptance of this phenomenon within the student environment. Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.781) indicates a dispersion of opinions, showing a clear gap between students who categorically reject the behavior and those who accept or hesitate to judge it.

By linking this result to the previous data (minimal study time + moderate academic pressure), the following can be inferred: since the majority spend less than five hours studying, resorting to plagiarism (among the 24% who agree and the uncertain group) may serve as a quick means to save time and effort while ensuring a passing grade. Additionally, the high percentage of "uncertain" responses may stem from students' lack of knowledge on correct citation and documentation, leading them to confuse legitimate study with illicit plagiarism.

7.3 Section 3 Resource Availability:

7.3.1 Research resources (books, articles, research materials, etc.) are accessible for my research and academic writing.

Table 8: I have access to (books, articles, research materials, etc.) for my research and academic writing.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Not accessible at all	1	4%
Moderately accessible	17	68%
Very accessible	7	28%

M= 2.24 SD=0.522

This domain examines the ease with which students can access books, articles, and the academic materials necessary for scholarly writing. The results are as follows:

- High Accessibility (Very accessible): 28% (7 students) out of the total sample of 25 reported that resources are easily available.
- Moderate Accessibility (Moderately accessible): This category represents the vast majority at 68% (17 students).
- Low Accessibility (Not accessible at all): Only one student (4%) reported that resources are not available at all.

The arithmetic mean of the responses was (2.24), indicating that the general situation is "good" and leans strongly toward moderate-to-high resource accessibility. The relative weight (74.7%) suggests that the

primary obstacle for students is not a "scarcity of information" or difficulty in finding it; rather, the challenge may lie in how to effectively utilize that information. Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.781) indicates a low dispersion in opinions, meaning that most students agree that resources are acceptably available (with responses clustered around the second and third options).

When comparing this result with the findings on "plagiarism" and "study time," it becomes evident that since 96% of the students have (moderate to high) access to resources, the tendency of some toward plagiarism or spending very little time on research is not due to a "lack of resources." Instead, it is likely attributable to weak analytical reading skills, time constraints, or low motivation.

7.3.2 the guidance and resources provided by my department are sufficient for conducting ethical research.

Table 9: I feel that my department provides enough guidance and resources for conducting ethical research.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, plenty of resources and support	6	24%
Some guidance, but not sufficient	16	64%
No, there is a lack of support	3	12%

M = 2.12 SD= 0.600

This table illustrates students' satisfaction with the support and resources provided by their academic departments for conducting research that adheres to ethical standards. The results are as follows:

- Ample Support (Yes, plenty): Only 24% (6 students) feel that the department provides sufficient resources and support.
- Lack of Support (No): 12% (3 students) reported a complete absence of support.
- Insufficient Guidance: The largest group of students, 64% (16 students), acknowledge the existence of guidance but find it "insufficient" to meet their academic needs.

The arithmetic mean was (2.12), which is lower than the mean for "Resource Availability" (2.24). This indicates that students find it easier to access "the book" than to find "ethical guidance" from the department. The relative weight (70.7%) reflects a state of implicit dissatisfaction, as the vast majority of students (76%) fall between having insufficient or no support at all. The standard deviation (0.600) indicates a variance in student opinions, suggesting that some students may receive better guidance from certain supervisors than others within the same department.

The researcher points out that if 76% of students perceive ethical guidance as insufficient, it is natural for some to fall into the trap of plagiarism. This is not necessarily out of malice, but rather due to a lack of clear standards or the absence of training workshops. While previous results showed that resources are available (74.7%), this result highlights that "how to handle these resources ethically" (70.7%) is the weakest link. The student possesses the tools but lacks the "manual" for ethical use. Thus, it is clear that students need more than just a "library"; they require orientation sessions, written manuals, and regular follow-up focusing on academic integrity.

7.3.3 Accessing academic materials (e.g., journal articles, books) for my research.

Table 10: I face difficulties accessing academic materials (e.g., journal articles, books) for my research.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Frequently	12	48%
Occasionally	8	32%
Never	5	20%

M= 2.28 SD= 0.791

This table illustrates the availability of the cognitive infrastructure for researchers (such as scientific articles and books). The results reveal significant logistical and technical challenges:

- Frequent Difficulties: 48% (12 students) face continuous and persistent difficulties in accessing scientific material. This represents the largest group, pointing to a major gap in accessible databases.
- Ease of Access (Never face difficulties): Only 20% (5 students) are able to obtain everything they need easily.
- Intermittent Obstacles: 32% (8 students) face occasional barriers when trying to access certain specialized sources.

The arithmetic means of the responses reached (2.28), which is considered relatively high in the context of "problems," as it approaches the "Frequently" category. This serves as an alarm regarding a resource crisis. The relative weight (76%) expresses the severity of this challenge; obtaining resources represents a burden of 76% on the student, which may force them to resort to informal methods or settle for lower-quality sources.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.791) indicates a notable variance in students' ability to access resources; some students might have better search skills or access to external libraries, while the rest suffer from "knowledge isolation."

The researcher points out that when 80% of students (ranging between constant and intermittent difficulty) struggle to access original and reliable sources, their incentive increases to "cut and paste" material that is easily available online instead of the arduous search for peer-reviewed scientific articles that might carry a financial cost. Combined with previous findings showing that the department provides insufficient guidance (70.7%) and that sources are difficult to reach (76%), the student is caught in a "pincer" between the lack of information and the lack of guidance, which ultimately undermines the quality of the academic research produced.

7.4 Section 4 Cultural and Systemic Factors:

7.4.1 The cultural emphasis on academic success influences students' likelihood to plagiarize.

Table 11: I think that the cultural emphasis on academic success influences students' likelihood to plagiarize.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, it greatly influences	7	28%
Yes, but not much	14	56%
No, it doesn’t influence	4	16%

M= 2.12 SD =0.665

This table illustrates the extent to which students believe that the cultural emphasis on academic success influences the likelihood of resorting to plagiarism. The results are as follows:

- Direct Cultural Influence: 28% (7 students) believe that a societal culture that "sanctifies" grades and success is the primary and direct driver of plagiarism.
- Personal Decision: In contrast, 16% (4 students) argue that plagiarism is a purely personal decision, independent of external pressures.
- Combined Influence: The majority of students, 56% (14 students), acknowledge the influence of culture but believe other factors share the responsibility (such as laziness or a lack of skills).

The arithmetic mean reached (2.12), indicating that the sample's opinion fluctuates between "limited" and "significant" influence, with a stronger inclination toward recognizing a cultural impact. The relative weight (70.7%) signifies a general conviction—exceeding two-thirds—that society exerts indirect pressure, pushing students toward plagiarism to ensure quick success and meet the expectations of those around them.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.665) indicates homogeneity in student opinions; the vast majority (84% when combining the first and second options) agree that the cultural environment is not innocent regarding the phenomenon of plagiarism. This finding suggests that plagiarism is not merely an "ethical weakness" on the part of the student, but rather a response to an external environment (systemic and cultural) that prioritizes numerical success above all else.

The researcher points out that there is a clear acknowledgment by the study sample that the cultural climate surrounding the educational process is a "pressured" one, contributing 70.7% to shaping student behaviour toward plagiarism. This necessitates a reconsideration of academic evaluation criteria, shifting them toward being based on merit and genuine research rather than mere grades, Superficial achievement, or copied work.

7.4.2 Plagiarism goes unnoticed or is not penalized at my department.

Table 12: I feel that plagiarism goes unnoticed or is not penalized at my department.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Frequently	6	24%
Occasionally	10	40%
Rarely	5	20%
Never	4	16%

M = 2.72 SD= 1.0214

This table illustrates how often students perceive that plagiarism goes unnoticed or unpunished within their department. The results are as follows:

- Regularly Unnoticed: 24% (6 students) believe that plagiarism consistently passes without detection, suggesting a weakness in detection tools or leniency on the part of evaluators.
- Occasionally Detected: The majority of students, 40% (10 students), confirmed that plagiarism is only sometimes caught.
- Strict Supervision: Only 36% of the sample feels the department is strictly vigilant (20% responded "Rarely" and 16% responded "Never" regarding plagiarism passing unnoticed).

The arithmetic mean reached (2.72), indicating that the general sample opinion leans toward the phenomenon occurring "Occasionally" to "Frequently." The relative weight (68%) places this trend in the (Moderate-to-High) range, pointing to a conviction among most students that the "chance of escaping" punishment for plagiarism is significantly high.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (1.021) reflects a significant variance in students' personal experiences. This disparity suggests the absence of a "unified standard" for penalties within the department; some faculty members may be strict, while others are perceived as highly lenient.

The researcher points out that when 64% of students (the combined total of "Frequently" and "Occasionally") feel that plagiarism might pass safely, the psychological barrier and fear of punishment collapse. This transforms plagiarism into a "risk worth taking." This gives the impression that the department either lacks modern technical software for plagiarism detection or that the teaching staff lacks the time or motivation to scrutinize student work.

Moreover, this "absence of justice" unfairly penalizes diligent students while rewarding those who plagiarize. If a plagiarizer receives grades similar to those of a hardworking student without consequence, the system indirectly encourages others to follow the same path. The table indicates a clear regulatory loophole in the department with a relative weight of 68%. The general trend confirms that the lack of a deterrent penalty and the inconsistency of detection standards serve as a "green light" for the persistence of plagiarism.

7.4.3 Academic integrity policies are strictly enforced by teachers and department members.

Table 13: I believe that teachers and department members enforce academic integrity policies strictly.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, they are very strict	11	44%
Yes, but not consistently	11	44%
No, there is little enforcement	3	12%

M= 2.32 SD= 77.3

The results show an equal split in opinions between those who perceive strict adherence to policies by faculty members—representing 44% (11 students) of the total sample—and those who believe that enforcement exists but lacks consistency (44%). This suggests a variance in implementation between different instructors or across different situations, which may be attributed to differing assessments of academic errors or varying leadership styles within the classroom.

The findings indicate that the vast majority of the sample (88%) acknowledge that policies are enforced; however, nearly half of this majority has reservations regarding the "consistency" and "continuity" of such enforcement. Meanwhile, only 12% (3 students) indicated that there is little enforcement, suggesting that total leniency is not a common phenomenon in the department.

The arithmetic mean reached (2.32), falling within the positive range, which indicates a trend in responses toward confirming the existence of strict enforcement. The relative weight (77.3%) confirms that academic integrity policies are held in high regard and reflect a commitment within the faculty. Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.690) points to a degree of convergence in student opinions, with no significant gaps or sharp dispersions in viewpoints on this matter.

In general, the overall trend toward policy enforcement is "relatively high", with a relative weight of 77.3%. This indicates a solid awareness of academic integrity, alongside a necessity to enhance the consistency of its execution.

7.5 Section 5 Socio-Economic Factors:

7.5.1 Economic pressures or financial constraints influence students' decisions to plagiarize.

Table 14: I think that economic pressures or financial constraints influence students' decisions to plagiarize.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, significantly	13	52%
Yes, to some extent	7	28%
No, not at all	5	20%

M =2.32 SD= 0.802

This table illustrates students' perceptions of the impact of economic pressures or financial constraints on their decisions to resort to plagiarism. The results are as follows:

- Very Significant Impact: More than half of the sample, 52% (13 students), believe that financial pressures have a "very significant" influence on students' academic behavior. This represents the highest percentage in the study, indicating a collective awareness that financial status is not a marginal factor but a primary driver of certain dishonest behaviors.
- Limited Impact: 28% (7 students) agreed that an influence exists but within certain limits.
- No Impact: Only a minority, 20% (5 students), believe that economic factors play no role at all in driving students toward plagiarism. This reinforces the principle that academic integrity cannot be separated from the learner's social context.

The arithmetic mean reached (2.32), indicating a bias in responses toward agreement; thus, the general opinion within the sample tends to confirm the relationship between poverty or financial pressure and plagiarism. The relative weight (77.3%) indicates the strength of this belief, a high value that places economic factors at the forefront of reasons that might justify (from the students' perspective) a weakness in integrity.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.802) shows a "moderate" variance in opinions. Although there is general agreement on the existence of an impact, there is a slight division between those who see it as an inevitable influence and those who view it as a secondary one.

The results confirm that academic integrity is not merely an abstract ethical decision; rather, it is a behavior heavily influenced by the student's financial stability.

7.5.2 Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds often have fewer resources and less academic support available to complete research assignments.

Table 15: I think students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds have fewer resources and less academic support available to complete research assignments.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, they have fewer resources	9	36%
Somewhat, but resources are still available	10	40%
No, resources are available to everyone equally	6	24%

M=2.12 SD=0.781

This table illustrates the concept of equal opportunity and its relationship with educational resources. The results reveal a conscious split in the sample's opinions:

- Conditional Accessibility: The largest segment, 40% (10 students), chose the response "Somewhat, but resources are still available." This indicates that students recognize the existence of a socio-economic gap, yet simultaneously believe in the availability of alternatives—such as university libraries or open-access resources—that a diligent student can utilize regardless of their financial status.
- Direct Impact of Deprivation: 36% (9 students) believe that financial hardship leads directly to a "resource deficit." This percentage reflects the real-world challenges of accessing personal computers, scientific journal subscriptions, or even a quiet study environment.
- Perceived Equality: In contrast, 24% (6 students)—the minority—believe that resources are equally available to everyone. This view is often based on the fact that the faculty provides the same services to all students regardless of their backgrounds.

The arithmetic mean reached (2.12), falling within the middle range (lower than the previous question's mean of 2.32). This suggests that the belief in a specific "resource deficit" is less intense than the belief in

the impact of general financial pressure. The relative weight (70.7%) reflects a "moderate" level of agreement regarding the existence of a resource gap. Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.781) indicates a convergence in viewpoints with minor variance, implying that conditions for providing support may vary from one specialization to another.

The overall result is rated as "Moderate," signifying an acknowledgment of "inequality" in accessing resources. However, this has not yet reached the stage of a comprehensive crisis that entirely obstructs research; there remains a conviction that available resources (despite their deficiency) can suffice if the student exerts additional effort.

The researcher points out several challenges faced by underprivileged students:

1. Technological Gap: Affluent students possess the latest devices and high-speed internet at home, whereas others may need to commute to the university or internet cafes to use a computer.
2. Support Systems: Students from higher economic backgrounds may receive preparatory courses or assistance from educated family members, while students from disadvantaged backgrounds may lack this "moral and cognitive support."
3. Time Constraints: A student who works to support themselves lacks the most critical research resource: "Time," making their utilization of available resources significantly more difficult.

7.6 Section 6 Personal Experience with Plagiarism:

7.6.1 Attempts at plagiarism.

Table 16: I tempted to plagiarize.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, several times	5	20%
Yes, once or twice	7	28%
No, never	13	52%

M =1.68 SD= 0.802

This table assesses the personal integrity of students through their experiences with the temptation of plagiarism. The results are as follows:

- No Temptation: More than half of the sample, 52% (13 students), stated they have "never considered" plagiarism. This percentage reflects a strong ethical deterrent or sufficient awareness of the consequences among a broad segment of students.
- Occasional Temptation: 28% (7 students) reported feeling tempted "once or twice." This group likely faces fleeting temptation under exceptional pressures—such as time constraints or the difficulty of the material—rather than it being an inherent behavior.
- Frequent Temptation: 20% (5 students) admitted to considering plagiarism "several times." This indicates a group suffering from persistent pressures or a deficiency in research skills, making plagiarism a "standing option" in their minds.

The arithmetic mean reached (1.68), indicating that the general trend of the sample leans toward "non-plagiarism." As the mean approaches (1), it signifies that "Never" is the dominant response. The relative weight (56%) reflects a moderate degree of exposure to temptation. This is a significant figure in an academic setting, as nearly half of the sample (48% total of those who responded affirmatively) have faced this internal psychological conflict.

Furthermore, the standard deviation (0.802) reflects a dispersion in responses, suggesting a clear variance in ethical values or academic circumstances among the participants.

The general result indicates that while the majority still resist the idea of plagiarism, "temptation" is strongly present for nearly half of the students. This requires the faculty to go beyond merely imposing penalties and instead address the "root causes of temptation," such as reducing assignment loads and providing greater support for students in academic writing skills.

7.6.2 Reasons for plagiarism

Table 17: The main reason for plagiarism is

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of understanding about plagiarism	5	20%
Time constraints /pressure	8	32%
Lack of resources or guidance	4	16%
Desire to get good grades	2	8%
Other	6	24%

M = 3.16 SD= 1.491

This table illustrates the underlying motivations behind plagiarism behavior. The results are as follows:

- Time Constraints and Pressure: This was the leading cause of plagiarism for 32% (8 students) of the sample. This suggests that plagiarism is often an "emergency act" or a "crisis solution" resulting from poor time management or an accumulation of academic assignments, rather than a deliberate desire to cheat for its own sake.
- Lack of Awareness of Academic Rules: 20% (5 students) confirmed they fell into plagiarism due to a lack of understanding of academic regulations. This reflects "unintentional plagiarism" caused by a knowledge gap in writing and documentation skills.
- Lack of Resources or Guidance: 16% (4 students) identified the absence of clear direction or the scarcity of resources as a departmental responsibility that leads students to resort to illicit citation.
- Desire for High Grades: Only 8% (2 students) cited the direct intent to cheat for higher marks. The fact that this reason received the lowest percentage reinforces the hypothesis that students justify plagiarism as a "necessity" rather than an "ambition."
- Unspecified Reasons: A significant proportion, 24% (6 students), chose unspecified reasons, which opens the door to possibilities such as indifference or the ease of accessing digital information.

The arithmetic mean reached (3.16), a relatively high value reflecting a significant diversity in justifications. It leans clearly toward external factors (time, guidance) rather than internal motives. The standard deviation (1.491) indicates a sharp dispersion in student responses, meaning each group has a distinctly different motivation from the others. The relative weight (63.2%) reflects a moderate degree of agreement that these factors are the actual drivers of this behavior.

The results indicate that plagiarism is not merely an ethical issue; it is primarily a technical and time-related problem. A student facing time pressure and a lack of information perceives plagiarism as a necessary "way out".

7.6.3 Consequences of plagiarism.

Table 18: I believe that students who plagiarize should face consequences.

Response Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, strict consequences	5	20%
Yes, but more lenient consequences	6	24%
No, they should be given another chance	10	40%
No, there shouldn’t be consequences	4	16%

Mean 2.48 SD 1.004

This table illustrates student perspectives on "disciplinary justice" in cases of academic plagiarism. The results are as follows:

- Strict Consequences: Only 20% (5 students) of the total sample believe in the necessity of severe penalties.
- Lenient Consequences: 24% (6 students) lean toward reduced penalties, indicating a desire to balance accountability with a consideration of the student's circumstances.
- Corrective Approach (Second Chance): The largest group, 40% (10 students), rejects immediate punishment and prefers being given another opportunity. This trend reflects a culture of "learning from mistakes" rather than "exclusion."
- No Consequences: Conversely, 16% (4 students) believe there should be no consequences at all—a stance that may stem from an underestimation of the gravity of plagiarism or excessive empathy toward peers.

The arithmetic mean (2.48) indicates that the general sample opinion is not extreme toward absolute rigor or total leniency; instead, it leans toward "middle-ground" and educational solutions. The standard deviation (1.004) points to a dispersion of opinions and a lack of consensus, showing a clear divide between supporters of "punishment" and advocates for a "second chance." The relative weight (62%) reflects a moderate weight for supporting penalties in general, yet it remains lower than expected in an academic environment that is supposed to sanctify integrity.

The researcher points out that the "second chance" option receiving the highest percentage (40%) suggests that students view plagiarism as a cognitive error that can be rectified, rather than an ethical crime warranting immediate punishment. When 56% of the sample (the combined total of those seeking a second chance or rejecting punishment altogether) do not support direct penalties, it implies a weakness in the culture of "general deterrence" within the faculty. This may encourage recurring instances of plagiarism as long as the consequences are uncertain or deferred.

Linking this to the previous section, it appears that students who face the "temptation" of plagiarism are the same ones who tend to demand second chances and lenient penalties—a form of "proactive self-defense." The results show a general student inclination to prioritize "humanitarianism" in dealing with academic errors over legal rigor. While educational in nature, this trend may hinder the eradication of plagiarism by diminishing the prestige of the laws governing scientific research. This highlights the need to balance "punitive awareness" with "academic guidance".

8. Findings and Discussions:

The findings outline the results of the data analysis and addresses the study's primary questions, categorized according to the main domains of the questionnaire:

1. Knowledge and Awareness:

• Conceptual Ambiguity: The results indicate that 64% of students do not fully understand the concept of plagiarism, while only 4% have a clear understanding. This suggests that most plagiarism instances may be "unintentional," resulting from a lack of regulatory knowledge.

• Deficiency in Training: 20% of the sample received no formal training on avoiding plagiarism, while 52% relied on basic training only, confirming a state of "incomplete knowledge."

• Documentation Challenges: Although 44% believe they know how to cite sources, 56% (the combined total of those with doubts and those who do not know) face significant practical difficulties.

2. Academic Environment and Pressures:

• Healthy Academic Climate: 44% of students feel pressure to achieve high grades only "occasionally," and 32% never feel such pressure, indicating a relatively healthy environment free from academic burnout.

• Rapid Completion: 44% of students complete their research in less than 5 hours, a very short duration that may incentivize plagiarism to save effort.

• Acceptance of Plagiarism: 40% are unsure if plagiarism is an acceptable shortcut for success, while 24% explicitly admit it is an acceptable means to achieve higher grades.

3. Resource Availability and Support:

• Tools vs. Guidance: Although 96% find resources accessible (to varying degrees), 76% perceive ethical guidance from the department as "insufficient" or "non-existent." The student possesses the "tools" but lacks the "ethical manuals."

• Access Barriers: 48% face frequent difficulties in accessing specialized scientific materials, which may encourage "cut and paste" practices from the internet as an easy alternative.

4. Cultural and Systemic Factors:

• Societal Pressure: 70.7% of students believe that a culture prioritizing "numerical success" and grades is a primary driver of plagiarism.

• Weak Deterrence: 64% of students believe that plagiarism might pass undetected or unpunished (occasionally or frequently), weakening the psychological barrier and fear of consequences.

Inconsistent Enforcement: There is a divide regarding faculty rigor; 44% perceive an inconsistency in the application of penalties, creating a sense of a lack of unified standards.

5. Economic Factors:

•Financial Constraints: 52% believe that financial pressures significantly influence plagiarism decisions, asserting that academic integrity is inseparable from the student's financial stability.

•The Resource Gap: 76% acknowledge a resource gap between affluent and underprivileged students (lack of computers, journal subscriptions, and available time), making the latter more vulnerable to plagiarism pressures.

6. Personal Experience and Attitudes Toward Punishment:

Temptation vs. Integrity: While 52% have never considered plagiarism, 48% have faced this temptation (20% several times, 28% once or twice).

Preference for Leniency: 40% prefer granting a "second chance" when plagiarism is detected, while only 20% support strict penalties, reflecting a student inclination toward academic tolerance rather than disciplinary rigor.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations:

The study results confirm that plagiarism at the Faculty of Languages is a complex phenomenon. Its primary driver is "cognitive ignorance" of the rules, bolstered by "weak ethical guidance" from the department, and justified by "economic and cultural pressures," all within a general perception of the "possibility of escaping punishment."

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are directed toward faculty administration, teaching staff, and students:

1. Educational and Training Initiatives:

•Early Integration: Prioritize the teaching of scientific research ethics and academic writing during the early stages of the curriculum (First or Second Semester).

•Practical Workshops: Organize intensive, periodic workshops for senior students (Fifth Semester) focusing on the practical application of international documentation standards (e.g., APA, MLA) and the ethical handling of digital resources.

•Integrity Manuals: Develop a "Student Guide to Academic Integrity," available in both print and digital formats, clearly defining the boundaries between legitimate citation and plagiarism.

2. Regulatory and Disciplinary Frameworks:

•Unified Penalty Charter: Establish a clear and unified charter for academic penalties to be applied strictly and consistently by all faculty members, ensuring there are no loopholes that encourage dishonest behavior.

•Public Awareness of Consequences: Clearly announce the consequences of plagiarism on bulletin boards and faculty digital platforms to strengthen the deterrent effect among students.

3. Resource Provision and Equal Opportunity:

•Institutional Subscriptions: Seek to provide students with free access to international databases and scientific journals to reduce reliance on unreliable open-source materials.

•Infrastructure Support: Provide computer labs equipped with high-speed internet within the faculty for extended hours to bridge the technological gap between affluent and underprivileged students.

•Device Loan Programs: Encourage the adoption of "laptop loan" policies to ensure that socio-economic differences do not hinder a student's ability to conduct honest research.

4. Pedagogical and Supervisory Roles:

•Process-Oriented Supervision: Activate the role of academic supervisors in monitoring the research process incrementally, rather than evaluating only the final product, to ensure the authenticity of the work.

•Reforming Evaluation Criteria: Urge faculty members to focus evaluation on the "research process" and critical analysis rather than solely on final results or numerical grades.

5. Socio-Economic Support:

•Financial and Logistical Aid: Academic institutions should provide financial support or facilitated resource access for struggling students to mitigate the material motives that drive them toward plagiarism.

•Promoting Equity: Ensure that academic integrity is built upon the principle of equal opportunity, providing the necessary tools for all social groups to succeed fairly.

References

Ahmed, M., El-Sheikh, M., & Ali, S. (2021). *The impact of academic integrity education on student awareness of plagiarism in Libyan universities*. Journal of Academic Ethics, 19(3), 211-228.

Bretag, T. (2016). *Challenges in addressing plagiarism in education*. PLOS ONE, 11(6), e0154500.

Carroll, J. (2007). *A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Chen, H., & Zhang, L. (2018). *Cultural and contextual factors influencing plagiarism behaviour among Chinese students in higher education*. Higher Education Research & Development, 37(6),

Gullifer, J. M., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). *Perceptions of academic honesty and the incidence of plagiarism: A review of the literature*. Journal of Academic Ethics, 8(2), 115-128.

Jones, A., & Waller, D. (2020). *Plagiarism and academic integrity in higher education: A review of international practices*. Higher Education Quarterly, 74(4), 431-448.

Kurt, G., & Gursoy, S. (2018). *An analysis of academic plagiarism among students in Turkey: A focus on social and cultural influences*. International Journal of Educational Development, 61, 160-167.

McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1997). *Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation*. Research in Higher Education, 38(3), 379-396.

Michaels, R. (2014). *Plagiarism in higher education: The influence of students' awareness and the perception of enforcement policies*. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36(1), 75-88.

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). *Plagiarism, the internet, and the ethics of academic practice*. Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 2(2), 51-62.

Turnitin. (2021). *The state of plagiarism in higher education: A global perspective*. Turnitin Report. Retrieved from https://www.turnitin.com

Wang, W., & Li, Z. (2019). *Exploring plagiarism and academic dishonesty in Chinese higher education: The role of cultural and institutional factors*. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 28(2), 1-9.