



Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning

ISSN: 0009-1383 (Print) 1939-9146 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vchn20

# A Primer on Plagiarism: Resources for Educators in China

Gregory C. Gray, Laura K. Borkenhagen, Nancy S. Sung & Shenglan Tang

**To cite this article:** Gregory C. Gray, Laura K. Borkenhagen, Nancy S. Sung & Shenglan Tang (2019) A Primer on Plagiarism: Resources for Educators in China, Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 51:2, 55-62

To link to this article: <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2019.1569974</u>

$\mathbf{n}$	
$(\bullet)$	
U	

Copyright Taylor & Francis



Published online: 26 Mar 2019.

0	-
	67.
<u> </u>	

Submit your article to this journal 🕝



View Crossmark data 🗹



## A Primer on Plagiarism: **Resources for Educators** in China By Gregory C. Gray , Laura K. Borkenhagen,

Gregory C. Gray is a Professor at Duke Kunshan University (China), Duke University (USA), and Duke-National University of Singapore (Singapore). He is a senior researcher and educator in the field of One Health.

Laura K. Borkenhagen is a Research Analyst at Duke University (USA). She coordinates multiple research studies in Southeast Asia and China for the Duke One Health team.

Nancy S. Sung is a Science Advisor at the National Science Foundation (USA) and formerly Head of the National Science Foundation's Beijing Office (China) from 2014-2018.

Shenglan Tang is the Executive Director, Global Health Program at Duke Kunshan University (China), and Associate Director of Duke Global Health Institute and Professor at Duke University (USA).

Nancy S. Sung, and Shenglan Tang

### In Short

- China now tops the list of countries with the largest annual number of scientific publications. At the same time, China also leads the list of countries with the highest proportion of scientific publication retractions.
- The rise in this academic misconduct in China has given Chinese researchers a bad reputation and likely led to lower manuscript acceptance rates in academic journals.
- Plagiarism can be thwarted by strengthening ethics training for students and researchers, as well as implementing penalties for plagiarism offenses in universities, research institutions, and academic journals.

n the past 20 years, China has experienced rapid development in scientific publication (Van Noorden, 2016). In 2016, more than 470,000 scientific articles were published by Chinese researchers, bringing China to the top of the list of countries with the largest number of published articles (National Science Board, 2018). At the same time, commitment to scientific ethics in China has come into question, as China also leads the list of countries with the highest proportion of retractions (Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017). Among reasons for retractions, plagiarism is a particular concern (Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017; Lei & Zhang, 2017; Mack, 2016; Qiu, 2015; Van Noorden, 2016).

A 2010 survey of Chinese researchers found that more than half of the respondents felt that academic misconduct was a serious problem in China, with the majority focusing on plagiarism or inappropriate authorship (Liao et al., 2017). When given the same survey 5 years later, these perceptions were essentially unchanged (Liao et al., 2017). Lei et al. found the retraction ratio in China has increased more than threefold during the past two decades with two large peaks in 2010 and 2015 (Lei & Zhang, 2017). About three quarters of all retractions were due to misconduct, and 41 percent of misconduct was due to plagiarism (Lei & Zhang, 2017) (Table 1).

Plagiarism in China has ranged anywhere from a few copied sentences to misappropriation of entire documents. Wei Yang, former president of the National Natural Science Foundation of China in Beijing, reported instances where documents such as grant proposals had been found for sale on the Internet (Qiu, 2015). Publications from China have also been criticized for their lack of references. Among Chinese articles retracted in 2016, the number of references per article was often below 10, which is often interpreted as an indication of lower-quality work (Ataie-Ashtiani, 2017).

Consequently, this has led to a bad reputation for Chinese researchers as a whole, with some journal editors admitting a prejudice when reviewing work from unfamiliar Chinese authors. This reputation is further damaged by the

### TABLE 1. REASONS FOR RETRACTION OF ARTICLESPUBLISHED BY CHINESE RESEARCHERS BETWEEN1997 AND 2016

Total number of publications	2,796,802	
Number of retracted publications	834	
Deliberate misconduct	634	
Plagiarism	258	
Fraud (fabrication, falsification)	160	
Faked peer review	100	
Duplicate publication	52	
No permission from institutions/researchers	64	
Honest/administrative error	117	
Other	70	
Reasons not given/retraction notes not found	13	

Source: This table is adapted from Lei et al. (2017).

observation that 36.6 percent of Chinese author retractions during the last two decades are from repeat offenders with more than five retractions due to "fraud, plagiarism, or faked peer review" (Lei & Zhang, 2017; p. 1416). Senior scientific scholars are calling for multifaceted interventions that range from setting up the Committee on Publishing Ethics to media exposure, with education in ethics as the centerpiece of strategies for change (Qiu, 2015).

As senior researchers and educators at a U.S./Chinese institution, Professors Gray and Tang have had their scientific works plagiarized by Chinese researchers. As the former senior research administrator for the U.S. National Science Foundation's efforts in China, Dr. Sung has witnessed the devastating impact of plagiarism on the reputation of Chinese researchers and their institutions. The aims of this review are to summarize the characteristics of different types of plagiarism, to offer suggestions for incorporating ethical training into Chinese educators' curricula, as well as to point to various available scientific ethics training resources.

#### **Types of Plagiarism**

Plagiarism has been defined in multiple ways. The U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Office of Research Integrity (1994) defines plagiarism as "the theft or misappropriation of intellectual property and the substantial unattributed textual copying of another's work." Merriam-Webster (2018) online defines plagiarism as "to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own; to use (another's production) without crediting the source; to commit literary theft; present as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source." This stealing can involve not only words but also processes, results, and images (Office of the President, 2000). There are a range of different types of plagiarism from unintentional to misappropriation of large bodies of text. A number of forms of plagiarism are discussed below and summarized in Table 2.

#### **Direct or Word Plagiarism**

The most common and familiar form of plagiarism is copying of another's words without appropriate acknowledgment, direct or word plagiarism. The severity of direct plagiarism ranges from copying a series of words to copying an entire manuscript. One standard for this form of plagiarism is if an author uses six consecutive words from another's work without using quotation marks, even if a reference has been cited (Masic, 2014). Reuse of graphics, figures, and photographs without the original publisher's written permission and cited source also falls under this category.

While direct plagiarism may seem like an easily recognized offense, there are still gray areas. For example, in scientific manuscripts, copying results and discussion sections is considered one of the most egregious forms of plagiarism; however, there are differing opinions regarding whether an author has committed plagiarism if he or she copies text from the methods section of his or her own previous report (Debnath, 2016; Vitse & Poland, 2012).

Туре	<b>Brief Descriptions</b>
Word plagiarism	Copying other's words or figures without quotation marks and/or citations
Idea plagiarism	Using other's ideas, designs, models, or processes without citations or permission
Self-plagiarism	Duplicating a publication or copying one's own published text or figures without
	citation or copyright agreement
Translation plagiarism	Translating articles into different languages without acknowledging the original authors
Sources plagiarism	Using incomplete or not detailed information about the source
Ghost and guest writing	Including unjustified or honorary authorship

TABLE 2. FORMS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PLAGIARISM

Direct plagiarism is especially common when a paper is written in a language other than the author's native language (Higgins, Lin, & Evans, 2016) and is made easier in recent decades by the widespread availability of online text (Pechenik, 2010). Anecdotally, one coauthor of this report has had large sections of his and his graduate students' published reports abstracted, compiled, and reported as a new work by a former collaborating Chinese scientist, who denied the offense upon confrontation. Only after confronting the Chinese author's academic dean and two journal chief editors was the plagiarized work retracted.

#### **Idea Plagiarism**

A foundation for scientific advancement is building on previous scientific findings and ideas. However, if an author presents others' ideas, designs, models, processes, and so on without citations, then this is considered idea plagiarism. This can be through copying previously, publically reported ideas, as well as from informal exposures to novel ideas. When compared to other forms of plagiarism (such as direct), idea plagiarism is more difficult to prove, especially if a record of presenting the idea has not been previously archived (Debnath, 2016; Vitse & Poland, 2012). Regrettably, the threat of idea plagiarism may inhibit scientists from discussing their work with other scientific groups lest another team beat them to peer-review publication and assume credit for the novel idea.

#### Self-Plagiarism

Self-plagiarism involves an author or authors presenting previously reported work as new; this may include portions of a previous report or republication of an entire article (Vitse & Poland, 2012). A chief motivator for replicate publication is to increase publication counts for career advancement. While using text from a previous report might be forgiven in describing a component of a similar method, an author should cite and often gain publisher permission to redundantly report research results.

As a rule of thumb, the overlap of an author or team of authors' previous publications should be no more than one third (World Association of Medical Editors, 2018). Additionally, if an author has previously reported preliminary or partial data in a scientific forum (e.g., international conference), he or she should cite that previous presentation in the more complete scientific manuscript submitted to a scientific journal for publication (Anderson & Steneck, 2011). Such previous preliminary reports can lead to conflicts in copyright permissions, which scientific journals may need to explore.

#### **Translation Plagiarism**

Similar to direct plagiarism, another form of plagiarism is to translate novel data or ideas from one language to another, representing it as unique and one's own creation without crediting the original work. For example, one co-author of this article, together with his colleagues, published a Chinese book based on a nationwide health service survey in the early 1990s. A Chinese student studying at a UK university used the data from the book to write up his PhD dissertation, without citing or mentioning the original work. Another coauthor of this report drafted a detailed scientific proposal to a U.S. granting agency, sharing it with a Chinese collaborator. Later it was learned that the Chinese collaborator engaged his student in translating the document into Chinese for submission to a Chinese funding agency without notifying or crediting the original author. Translational plagiarism may also occur during the peer review of grant proposals or scientific manuscripts when a reviewing scientist plagiarizes the original text and ideas from a reviewed work.

#### **Source Plagiarism**

Source plagiarism occurs when authors do not read original sources of new scientific information and instead glean information from those sources by reading and crediting only secondary sources. The problem with source plagiarism is the possible misinterpretation of the original report by reviewing only the secondary source's interpretation. This can result in the spreading of inaccurate information.

Hence, when citing novel research, one should be careful to review and credit the original published work (Mohan, Shetty, Shetty, & Pandya, 2015). If the original resource is not clearly cited, the authors could be criticized for concealing the original data source and for making it difficult for future researchers to recognize and benefit from the original researchers' work (Mohan et al., 2015). When gaining access to an original source is a barrier or when referencing the ideas proposed by the secondary source, it is imperative that the secondary source be cited properly as a review.

#### **Ghost and Guest Writing**

Ghost writing occurs when someone contributes significantly to manuscript development but is not credited for their work (Citrome, 2017). Conversely, guest or honorary authorship occurs when someone is recognized as an author but has not met criteria for authorship. Often guest authors are recognized for their administrative or other governance authority for the research work or included due to their scientific accomplishments simply to enhance the probability of publication of the manuscript in a desired journal (Citrome, 2017).

A secondary form of guest authorship is the inappropriate designation of multiple authors as first authors or as senior authors with an indication "that these authors contributed equally" when they clearly could not have contributed equally to the work. This seems an especially unethical and even a ridiculous impossibility when the "equally contributing" authors exceed more than two persons. However, many institutions in China drive such unethical multiple recognition by only valuing the first and senior authorship positions in a scientific manuscript. Ghost and guest authorship can often be fueled by "blurring of lines" when it comes to what defines contribution worthy of authorship (Rohwer, Young, Wager, & Garner, 2017; p. 6).

#### WHO IS PLAGIARIZING AND WHY?

Students, researchers, and professors in any country have the potential to plagiarize, although some may have more motive or be more susceptible to unintentional plagiarism than others. Students and young researchers may experience greater pressure to be productive publishers in pursuit of

While researchers in the United States also face competitive pressures, with their career advancement also depending on high-impact publications, they are more likely than Chinese researchers to have had specific training on research misconduct such as plagiarism. a degree or career advancement, leading to less regard for ethical guidelines (Debnath, 2016; Rohwer et al., 2017).

In working in China, we have learned that some Chinese degree programs will not permit a student to graduate until the student publishes a first author peer-reviewed manuscript in a scientific journal of relatively high impact. Students under such pressure are also often more naïve to some forms of plagiarism, making them more likely to unintentionally commit offense (Armstrong, 1993; Debnath, 2016). One study in which Chinese college students enrolled in English as a second language classes found that while all of these students understood the word "plagiarism," less than 50 percent had received formal instruction on plagiarism (Zhang, 2014). This illustrates the importance of proper scientific ethics training early in an academic career.

While students and young researchers may be thought to have the motive to plagiarize, more experienced researchers have faced similar pressures and also been found guilty of plagiarism (Dyer, 2016; National Post, 2012; Retraction Watch, 2018). Over the past decade, more and more Chinese universities and research institutions have used a number of peer-reviewed publications and their impact factor scores as important criteria when considering promotion of faculty and researchers. Also, frequently, financial incentives are offered to the first and senior authors of manuscripts published in high-impact journals, especially in leading institutions. These incentives are often not trivial, with some institutions offering bonus payment of up to \$165,000 for a single publication (The Economist, 2018). Consequently, there is much competitive pressure to win publication in high-impact English journals, and sometimes this pressure outweighs caution regarding ethical guidelines.

Ignorance to some of the nuances of plagiarism extends beyond students to more senior Chinese researchers. For instance, one study in which in-depth interviews with Chinese researchers were conducted found that many did not see a problem with reporting methods or reusing text without citations (Li, 2013). Ultimately, researchers at any level may be the perpetrators of plagiarism whether through ignorance, the unethical behavior of a trusted team member, or simple malfeasance.

While researchers in the United States also face competitive pressures, with their career advancement also depending on high-impact publications, they are more likely than Chinese researchers to have had specific training on research misconduct such as plagiarism. For example, both the U.S. National Institutes of Health (2018) and the National Science Foundation (2018) require that institutions receiving grants develop instruction in the Responsible Conduct of Research, covering plagiarism as one of many topics. The Natural Science Foundation of China, which is the primary funder of basic science research in China, does not have such requirements of its grantees. Formal programs at universities in China tend to be limited to covering issues of data security and do not attend to issues such as responsible conduct of research, including plagiarism. Another cultural issue is the Chinese notion of "imitating the master"—the sense that one learns from and honors a great artist by copying his technique, rather than by innovating. This cultural value, intended as a form of respect, does not justify or excuse the disproportionate level of retractions among Chinese-authored publications. It may, however, diminish the seriousness of plagiarism in the minds of Chinese students in the absence of formal training in scientific ethics.

#### WHY IS PLAGIARISM HARMFUL?

Simply put, plagiarism is an act of denial of due credit. In general, researchers earn favorable recognition through their published works. Plagiarism, if not corrected, undermines this merit-based system by inappropriately rewarding plagiarizing authors for the honest labor of other authors who developed the original work (Armstrong, 1993; Mohan et al., 2015). Hence, plagiarism may be viewed as a form of stealing, corruption, or other malfeasance directly attacking the scientific community, which relies on ethical scientific behavior.

Plagiarism also wastes the time and energy of scientific journal staff, panels of peer reviewers, and the scientific community in general who must often rely on journals to publish new knowledge to push their research fields forward. Plagiarism can also impact the success and value of ethical scientists in that review and publication of their works may have to be unnecessarily postponed while the journal and peer reviewers evaluate the plagiarized manuscript (Anderson & Steneck, 2011).

Perhaps worst of all, plagiarism has the potential to skew a body of research by reporting published data multiple times (Anderson & Steneck, 2011). This could alter conclusions made in reviews and meta-analyses, and ultimately could influence evidence-based decisions made by clinicians, scholars, and many other professionals.

#### STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING PLAGIARISM

#### **Research Ethics Training**

The first defense against plagiarism is appropriately educating students, researchers, and research faculty regarding the various types of plagiarism and the consequences of such scientific ethics violations. One study published in 2017 suggested that institutional policies on plagiarism in China lack adequate guidelines for ethics education and training (Hu & Sun, 2017). Students, researchers, and research faculty must be very familiar with the requirements to correctly cite previously published or unpublished works and how quotation marks are to be used when exact text is extracted.

It is also important that researchers understand how to distinguish original ideas or conclusions in previous work from their own thoughts (Pechenik, 2010). Pechenik's guide offers many suggestions for avoiding plagiarism in the early notetaking and outline drafting stages of a written work. Keeping a record of where thoughts or text originated from, as well as distancing oneself from the original body of work can help reduce unintentional plagiarism (Pechenik, 2010). Another cultural issue is the Chinese notion of 'imitating the master'-the sense that one learns from and honors a great artist by copying his technique, rather than by innovating. This cultural value, intended as a form of respect, does not justify or excuse the disproportionate level of retractions among Chinese-authored publications. It may, however, diminish the seriousness of plagiarism in the minds of Chinese students in the absence of formal training in scientific ethics.

Further, it is important to consult primary literature as much as possible and avoid citation of reviews of secondary sources (Price, 2014). Reviewing primary literature not only prevents the temptation of using someone else's summarizing thoughts but also helps preserve the findings of the original works. A list of resources for such scientific research ethical training is available in Table 3.

The second defense in preventing plagiarism is to strengthen ethics training by appealing to the moral fabric and integrity of researchers from multiple value systems, any one of which may register as important to an individual. In China, this could mean appealing to researchers to avoid the stain of corruption that undermines the Communist party's success, or appealing to the teaching of Confucius to avoid dishonoring one's family through public humiliation from an ethics violation, or appealing to one's value of right and wrong based on the Judeo-Christian commandment of not stealing. Whatever the effective strategy, there seems to be a need for compelling Chinese research professionals to avoid crossing the moral

#### TABLE 3. SOURCES FOR ETHICAL TRAINING ON PLAGIARISM

A Short	Guide to Writing About Biology	
Source:	Jan A. Pechenik. New York: Longman; 2010 [Print]	
Defining	the Role of Authors and Contributors	
Source:	International Committee of Medical Journal Editors	
URL:	http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-	
	and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-	
	contributors.html	
How to A	Avoid Plagiarism: Learn How to Reference Correctly	
Source:	Leeds Beckett University	
URL:	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N6jwy5ZFgnI	
Internat	ional Bioethics Training	
Source:	National Institutes of Health	
URL:	https://www.fic.nih.gov/Programs/Pages/	
	bioethics.aspx?utm_source=funding-news&utm_	
	medium=email&utm_campaign=funding-news	
Internat	ional Standards for Editors and Authors	
Source:	The Committee on Publication Ethics	
URL:	https://publicationethics.org/node/11184	
Plagiari	sm: How to Avoid It	
Source:	Bainbridge State College	
URL:	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2q0NlWcTq1Y	
Promoti	ng Integrity in Research and Its Publication	
Source:	The Committee on Publication Ethics	
URL:	https://publicationethics.org/	
Promoti	ng Research Integrity in a Global Environment	
Source:	Tony Mayer and Nicholas Steneck. World Scientific; 2011 [Print]	
Publishi	ng Ethics for Journals	
Source:	Springer	
URL:	https://www.springer.com/gp/authors-editors/editors/ publishing-ethics-for-journals/4176	
Service Avoiding Plagiarism, Self-Plagiarism, and Other Ouestionable Writing Practices: A Guide to Ethical Writing		
Source:	The Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of	
	Health and Human	
URL:	https://ori.hhs.gov/avoiding-plagiarism-self-plagiarism-	
	and-other-questionable-writing-practices-guide-ethical-	
	writing	
Ten Typ	es of Plagiarism	
Source:	Write Check Videos	
URL:	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EF5eFeJMplA	
Twenty-	Eight Guidelines at a Glance on Avoiding Plagiarism	
Source:	The Office of Research Integrity, U.S. Department of Health and Human	
URL:	https://ori.hhs.gov/plagiarism-0	
Understanding Plagiarism		
Source:	York St. John University	
URL	https://www.youtube.com/watch?y=ptHIA5hMpio	

"redline" of plagiarism even under high pressures from the scientific work environment.

#### **University and Institution Policies**

Plagiarism prevention can also be employed at higher levels through written policies at academic and scientific institutions that would aggressively discourage misconduct. In academia, students, researchers, and faculty should be warned that writing assignments will often be screened with plagiarism detection software, and when detected, violators will be punished following concrete written policies. Examples of violations should be publicly communicated such that individuals and their institutions are named.

A recognition of serious consequences for plagiarism can be a powerful deterrent to bad scientific behavior. Many institutions in the United States, Canada, and European countries have written policies regarding punishment for acts of plagiarism, while only a few universities and institutions in China have clearly developed similar policies. One would think that having such noplagiarism-will-be-tolerated policies and enforcing them would give Chinese institutions a strong stamp of quality their faculty might acknowledge in manuscript submissions.

As for preventing ghost writing and guest authorship, researchers should be pointed to international guidelines for authorship such as that drafted by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2018). Minor contributors to a project should only be recognized in the acknowledgments. In addition to adhering to the scientific ethics code themselves, all co-authors on an article need to be vigilant to protect their reputation by ensuring that their colleagues have not intentionally or unintentionally plagiarized data. Authors may also wish to screen their draft manuscripts prior to journal submission to avoid any potential embarrassments.

#### **Academic Journal Policies**

Recognition of plagiarism can occur at the time of manuscript submission through manuscript software screening, through peer review, or after publication. Recognition of plagiarism after publication is clearly more painful for the plagiarizing authors and also for the journal; it embarrasses all involved, especially if formal retractions are demanded by the original authors or the original publishing body. Recognition of plagiarism before publication may not have the same negative impact since the journal may choose to simply reject the manuscript, not wishing to confront the authors or to notify the authors' institutional administrators. This "no action" response compounds the problem, however. If the authors are not confronted and are ignorant of their ethical violation, they may simply submit the manuscript to another journal, continuing the ethical problem. If the authors are confronted and in denial, they may again choose to push the problem down the road to another journal.

One co-author of this article was asked to review the same paper submitted sequentially to two different journals, having pointed out to the first that the authors had failed to properly cite sources of data. A better deterrent would be for the journal to explain in the instructions to authors that suspected plagiarized manuscripts will be rejected, and the authors, their institutional leadership, and if egregious, the funding sources will be formally notified. In the notification the journal may indicate a willingness to reexamine the manuscript should the suspected plagiarism be mitigated. This type of journal response would likely inhibit intentional plagiarism and nudge institutions to make sure their researchers had appropriate ethical training.

Research publications are very important. They can have a profound impact on health policy, clinical interventions, and future funded research. As China's scientific enterprise moves toward center stage in the world, it is imperative that appropriate attention be paid to training its scientists to avoid plagiarism and to adopt global standards for research integrity.  $\Box$ 

#### ORCID

Gregory C. Gray () https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4628-5908

The views expressed in this article do not necessarily represent the views of the National Science Foundation or the US Government.

#### REFERENCES

■ Anderson, M. S., & Steneck, N. H. (2011). The problem of plagiarism. *Urologic Oncology*, 29(1), 90–94. doi:10.1016/j.urolonc.2010.09.013

Armstrong, J. D. (1993). Plagiarism—What is it, whom does it offend, and how does one deal with it. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, *161*(3), 479–484.

■ Ataie-Ashtiani, B. (2017). Chinese and Iranian scientific publications: Fast growth and poor ethics. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 23(1), 317–319. doi:10.1007/s11948-016-9766-1

■ Citrome, L. (2017). Authorship: Musings about guests and ghosts. *International Journal of Clinical Practice*, *71*(7). doi:ARTN e1298610.1111/ijcp.12986

■ Debnath, J. (2016). Plagiarism: A silent epidemic in scientific writing—Reasons, recognition and remedies. *Medical Journal Armed Forces India*, 72(2), 164–167. doi:10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.03.010

Dyer, O. (2016). Peer reviewer stole article and published it as his own. BMJ, 355, i6768. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6768

■ Higgins, J. R., Lin, F.-C., & Evans, J. P. (2016). Plagiarism in submitted manuscripts: Incidence, characteristics and optimization of screening—Case study in a major specialty medical journal. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, *1*(1), 13.

■ Hu, G., & Sun, X. (2017). Institutional policies on plagiarism: The case of eight Chinese universities of foreign languages/international studies. *System, 66*, 56–68.

■ International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. (2018). Defining the role of authors and contributors. Retrieved from http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html

■ Lei, L., & Zhang, Y. (2017). Lack of improvement in scientific integrity: An analysis of WoS retractions by chinese researchers (1997–2016). *Science Engineering Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s11948-017-9962-7

■ Li, Y. (2013). Text-based plagiarism in scientific writing: What Chinese supervisors think about copying and how to reduce it in students' writing. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *19*(2), 569–583.

■ Liao, Q.-J., Zhang, Y.-Y., Fan, Y.-C., Zheng, M.-H., Bai, Y., Eslick, G. D., . . . He, H. (2018). Perceptions of Chinese biomedical researchers towards academic misconduct: A comparison between 2015 and 2010. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *24*(2), 629–645.

*(continued)* 

#### **REFERENCES (CONT'D)**

■ Mack, C. (2016). Plagiarism. *Journal of Micro/Nanolithography MEMS MOEMS*, *15*(4). doi:10.1117/1111.JMM. 1115.1114.040101

■ Masic, I. (2014). Plagiarism in scientific research and publications and how to prevent it. *Materia Socio-Medica*, *26*(2), 141–146. doi:10.5455/msm.2014.26.141-146

■ Merriam-Webster. (2018). Definition of plagiarize. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ plagiarizing

■ Mohan, M., Shetty, D., Shetty, T., & Pandya, K. (2015). Rising from plagiarising. *Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery*, *14*(3), 538–540. doi:10.1007/s12663-014-0705-x

■ National Institutes of Health. (2018). Responsible conduct of research (RCR) training and applying for an NIH training grant. Retrieved from https://www.training.nih.gov/rcr\_and\_applying\_for\_nih\_training\_grants

■ *National Post*. (2012). Top Canadian scientist and award-winning student caught in "blatant plagiarism" of text. Retrieved from https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/university-of-waterloo-researchers-issue-retraction-and-apology-after-using-u-s-experts-text-and-information

■ National Science Board. (2018). *Science and engineering indicators 2018*. Alexandria, VA: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/indicators/

■ National Science Foundation. (2018). Responsible conduct of research (RCR). Retrieved from https://www.nsf. gov/bfa/dias/policy/rcr.jsp

■ Office of the President. (2000). Office of Science and Technology Policy: Federal policy on research misconduct. *Federal Register*, 65(235), 76260–76264.

Pechenik, J. A. (2010). *A short guide to writing about biology*: New York, NY: Longman.

■ Price, B. (2014). Avoiding plagiarism: Guidance for nursing students. *Nursing Standard*, 28(26), 45–51; quiz 52. doi:10.7748/ns2014.02.28.26.45.e8514

■ Qiu, J. (2015). Safeguarding research integrity in China. *National Science Review*, 2(1), 122–125. doi:10.1093/nsr/nwv002

■ Retraction Watch. (2018). Plagiarism costs author five papers in five different journals. Retrieved from http:// retractionwatch.com/2017/06/28/plagiarism-costs-author-five-papers-five-different-journals/

■ Rohwer, A., Young, T., Wager, E., & Garner, P. (2017). Authorship, plagiarism and conflict of interest: Views and practices from low/middle-income country health researchers. *BMJ Open*, *7*(11), e018467.

■ *The Economist*. (2018). Tsinghua University may soon top the world league in science research. Retrieved from https://www.economist.com/china/2018/11/17/tsinghua-university-may-soon-top-the-world-league-in-science-research

■ U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Office of Research Integrity. (1994). ORI Policy on Plagiarism. Retrieved from https://ori.hhs.gov/ori-policy-plagiarism

■ Van Noorden, R. (2016). China by the numbers. *Nature News*, 534(7608), 452. doi:doi:10.1038/534452a

■ Vitse, C. L., & Poland, G. A. (2012). Plagiarism, self-plagiarism, scientific misconduct, and VACCINE: Protecting the science and the public. *Vaccine*, *30*(50), 7131–7133. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.08.053

■ World Association of Medical Editors. (2018). Self plagiarism of textbook chapters. Retrieved from http://www. wame.org/about/self-plagiarism-of-textbook-chapters

■ Zhang, C. (2014). Plagiarism in their own words: What Chinese and American students say about academic dishonesty. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *37*(3), 373–391.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.