

Date Published 10-1-2002

An Investigation of Plagiarism and Electronic Agents to Assist in Detecting Plagiarism

James Frost
Idaho State University

Gamewell Gantt
Idaho State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openspaces.unk.edu/mpjbt>



Part of the [Business Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Frost, J., & Gantt, G. (2002). An Investigation of Plagiarism and Electronic Agents to Assist in Detecting Plagiarism. *Mountain Plains Journal of Business and Technology*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://openspaces.unk.edu/mpjbt/vol3/iss1/3>

This Empirical Research is brought to you for free and open access by OpenSPACES@UNK: Scholarship, Preservation, and Creative Endeavors. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mountain Plains Journal of Business and Technology by an authorized editor of OpenSPACES@UNK: Scholarship, Preservation, and Creative Endeavors. For more information, please contact weissell@unk.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF PLAGIARISM AND ELECTRONIC AGENTS TO ASSIST IN DETECTING PLAGIARISM

**JAMES FROST & GAMEWELL GANTT
IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY**

ABSTRACT

The importance of integrity in business is echoed in the recent disclosures involving Enron, Worldcom, and several other major companies. Academically, the professor must always be aware of the potential for academic dishonesty from students. Academic dishonesty includes plagiarism. This paper reviews the motivations for plagiarism, the methods of detecting and preventing plagiarism, and two electronic agents that assist in plagiarism detection.

I. INTRODUCTION

Integrity (truth and honesty) is a critical component in the success of an organization and is a hallmark of organizational behavior. Tom Peters (1987) indicated the importance of organizational integrity in a statement of “control by means of simple support systems aimed at measuring the right stuff for today's environment, including standards of integrity.” Peter Senge (1990) commented on the critical nature of the commitment to truth in an organization. He stated, “We may begin with a disarmingly simple yet profound strategy for dealing with structural conflict: telling the truth.” Our recent experience with Enron, Arthur Anderson, Xerox and Worldcom is echoed in the statement by the Lt. Col. Oliver North. He is reported to have said, "I was provided with additional input that was radically different from the truth. I assisted in furthering that version" (On why his statements in relation to Iran-Contra were not "lies") (Longley, 2002). This statement embodies two concerns for educators. First, embellishments are both flagrant and widespread. They reduce the integrity as well as the viability of organizations. Departments within colleges of business need to stress integrity in all assignments submitted for credit in the college. While the authors have no personal knowledge whether Oliver North made the statement concerning Iran-Contra statements or not, it is found repeatedly on the World Wide Web (Zeiler, 2002; Anderson, 2002; unknown author, 2002; Mac, 2001; Hitt, 2002; unknown author 2, 2002). Students access the Web extensively for “research” assignments and sometimes unknowingly use advocacy sites that have only special interests in mind, not always truth and honesty.

The research paper is a useful tool to expand student knowledge in a specific domain. This is a stepping-stone as the student begins the process of life-long learning. However, the assignment of a “research paper” is far from a favorite student activity. It is an activity that they do not often visit and usually deals with a subject where they are uncomfortable due to lack of experience. In a study of 698 undergraduate students, 16.5% indicated that they “occasionally” cut and pasted text into a paper without a citation, only eight percent of the students reported having done so “often” or “very frequently” (Kellogg, 2002). Although this matches the findings of the authors in their own classes, other sources report a plague of plagiarism (Howard, 2001). This paper reports our investigation into electronic agents that aid in detecting plagiarism (academic dishonesty) and our findings.

II. WHAT IS PLAGIARISM AND WHY IS PLAGIARISM CONDUCTED?

One definition of plagiarism is “to steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own; use (a created production) without crediting the source; to commit literary theft; present as new and original an idea or product derived from an existing source” (Webster, 1981). Basically, plagiarism is taking someone else’s ideas and presenting them as the author’s own effort. This is a historic problem that may have expanded to the previously mentioned plague proportions in academic settings.

Stephen Wilhoit’s (1994) article titled "Helping Students Avoid Plagiarism" lists the following types of plagiarism:

- Buying a paper for a research service or term paper mill.
- Turning in another student's work without that student's knowledge.
- Turning in a paper a peer has written for the student.
- Copying a paper from a source text without proper acknowledgment.
- Copying materials from a source text, supplying proper documentation, but leaving out quotation marks.
- Paraphrasing materials from a source text without appropriate documentation.
- And, now with the Internet, we need to add another type of plagiarism: turning in a paper from a "free term paper" Website.

McCabe and Trevino (1996) surveyed 1800 students in nine universities where 84% admitted to cheating on written assignments. Although this survey does not indicate that the students cheated at every opportunity, it does indicate that plagiarism is occurring. If plagiarism is not often detected, then the risk of plagiarizing to the student may be worth the non-existent or minimal punishment. A minimum penalty of minor reduction in grade or a stern rebuttal may thus encourage some students to plagiarize.

There are additional sources that contribute to plagiarism. The ease of searching and using materials without proper citation from the World Wide Web is extremely tempting for time-depleted students. The era of cut-and-paste requires our vigilance as recent research show that students are being tempted to do this more often than they were two years ago (Young, 2001). It may be that rational students weigh the options and what can be done in the time available. This can lead to undocumented text (not indicated by quotation marks) or a patchwork of materials from multiple sites. Williams (2001) mentions that “when vice is far easier than virtue, it should be no surprise that many harried, procrastination-prone students will eschew the virtuous route to an academic grade.” Moreover, it is the authors personal experience that many students are simply not aware of the importance of fully documenting each and every source used in their term papers. Many are also unaware of the technical difference between a footnote and a list of references consulted, often appended to the end of their research papers.

The vastness of the Web offers protection for a student that requires the diligence and dedication of instructors to detect intentional plagiarism. This detection process involves a great deal of time thereby robbing other students of the instructor’s preparation and instruction time. Manual methods of plagiarism detection are time-consuming and are not always rewarding. Even when plagiarism is detected/suspected, this initiates another round of scrutiny that involves even more of the professor’s limited time.

Unfortunately, many students from grade school through high school are instructed to conduct “research” by copying text directly from the World Wide Web. Although they are occasionally instructed to put quotation marks around the copied text, this concept is not always enforced. Further, the proper method of conducting research is not always taught in composition classes, so students are often not exposed to the techniques. A common technique is that the student will put quotation marks around a single sentence. However, the previous two to three paragraphs may be verbatim un-cited material from the same article. The student may claim that the single citation is for the entire set; however, that is not what is indicated in the submitted text. In some instances, the omission is inadvertent rather than intentional. In those instances, the infraction may be best dealt with through education rather than punishment. However, once efforts at education have occurred, sterner measures and sanctions may be required to change student behavior and to raise the overall level of student performance.

A student may be intimidated by the assignment and surrender to the influences of pulling the materials from more knowledgeable individuals whose analysis is easily accessed on the Web. They may also not realize the proper citation procedure and unwittingly plagiarize due to improper citation. This is occasionally a fallback student position when confronted with an accusation of plagiarism. While we can

state that proper citation procedures should be well known by college students, the fact of the matter is that some students, especially lower division students, may not have yet learned the importance of doing so.

Finally, there is an embarrassing reason to plagiarize: It is a habit of professional writers. Stephen Ambrose is a well-known history writer who allegedly admitted to a large range of plagiarism activities that he is accused of conducting in the past (Flores, 2001). Whether it is through poor note taking, short timetables for publication or just convenience, he and too many others may have been guilty of this offense at one time or another.

III. WHY ISN'T PLAGIARISM UNCOVERED?

There are many subscription-only paper mills that offer term (research) papers. Although a comprehensive list is not available, the authors note at least 500 paper mills accessible on the Web. A term paper is easily obtained if the student has a source of funds (credit card or money order). Upon payment the paper is forwarded electronically to the student via e-mail. The lists of subjects and titles are becoming more extensive. Papers can be custom built (ghost written) for individuals at prices around \$9.95 a page although some are free. In a few minutes a student can go from not having a topic selected to having a complete paper suitable for printing. Paper mills are difficult to scan, and it is often impossible to determine if a paper came from such a site.

When Burke (1997) sampled community college faculty, the faculty did not view dishonesty to be a serious problem at their institution. Therefore, the faculty may not have stressed the importance of submitting one's own work. If professors don't indicate the issue of academic honesty as important, students may feel less morally obligated to avoid academic dishonesty (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne, 1997). One may question the motivation that would create this environment.

A professor may choose informal methods to deal with academic dishonesty rather than deal with official procedures (Roig, & Ballew, 1994). There are several reasons for this approach. The attitude can come from time constraints. Following the multiple layers of possible sources to investigate suspected student plagiarism can involve many days dedicated only to confirming and reconfirming the student's actions. The end result may be a greatly reduced penalty after dedicating large quantities of professorial time and energy to the process.

Also, a professor's integrity may be under scrutiny to prove a student's plagiarism after detecting discrepancies. The instructor may be suspected of gender, race or religious bias in making the accusations. Moreover, students may threaten professors with lawsuits. Further, there may be an unfortunate lack of educational or administrative support. The student may be from another department or college in the

university, and the accusation may be viewed as a detriment to that unit rather than an effort to address a serious problem.

IV. METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS

It is imperative that all written assignments, especially research/term papers, are submitted electronically or on magnetic media in a readable format. This requires a caveat that the student must scan all files for viruses prior to submitting the paper. Intentionally submitting a virus-laden file to a professor should reward the student with an "F" for the class (this should be an item in the syllabus). Providing an electronic file facilitates the following techniques of checking for potential plagiarism. A beginning point for plagiarism detection is to check the "author" under the file's document properties tab. If the student is careless, the original author's name may appear in the properties of the document. The creation date should also be examined to see if it is current or prior to the date the paper was assigned. A file creation date that is out of the appropriate range is another indicator of potential plagiarism. If the properties tab of the document does not carry the name of the student or indicate development on a university machine, there is cause for suspicion.

The professor can search the World Wide Web with search engines (like Google or Ask Jeeves) using the title first followed by additional searches using key phrases from paper. A unique phrase is copied and pasted into the search engine. Each search may find multiple sites of commonality. Each "hit" must then be investigated to determine if the text does come from that site. The technique is repeated multiple times with suspect phrases that are unique in order to reduce the number of Web hits. This is a labor-intensive process and may be viewed by the students as a "criminal-police relationship instead of a student-teacher relationship" (Howard, 2001).

An examination of the document may reveal changes in the quality of writing in the paper. These changes are usually in the middle of the document as the student pastes a "chunk" of Web site text into the paper to satisfy the size or length requirement of the assignment. The plagiarized part may also be positioned at the beginning of the document while the remainder of the paper is of a lesser quality. If the undergraduate's paper starts off with a good understanding of the topic and then decays to a mundane discussion of less serious composition, the professor should look deeper. Often, the student may be assuming that the professor will not read all parts of the paper or will only scan some parts and not read the paper in detail.

The professor should be cognizant of phrases not common to the student's level of understanding. Although there are statements in the common vernacular, if the paper sounds like a graduate students or a professional's understanding, the instructor should dig further to prove or disprove plagiarism. If students use phrases that they would not commonly use, it is a cause for possible concern. An example would be an

international student using a phrase from a US president that would not normally be within their common vernacular.

Our recommendations include the following suggestions and guidelines for controlling and detecting indications of plagiarism. If the references included in the bibliography or footnotes are over four years old, then this dated paper may be from a paper mill. Always insist on recent articles, preferably from peer-reviewed journals, not from newspapers or periodicals. A further indicator of a paper mill effort is dead URLs (uniform resource locators – the Web site's address). The footnote or bibliography must contain the URL reference to any World Wide Web based materials as well as the date accessed. In the electronic version, the professor only has to click on the reference and the browser automatically goes to that site. If the site is 404 or repeatedly not available, then the document may be an old paper mill product. Web sites do go away after a period of time which reduces the effectiveness of the Web as a resource. A further control is to insist on only recent (*e.g.*, within the last four years) publication dates for references.

V. ELECTRONIC ASSISTANTS

There are several electronic tools to facilitate the search of Web sites and scrutinize for paper mill submissions. Our investigation focused on two electronic tools, Essay Verification Engine - EVE2 and the services from www.Turnitin.com (www.plagiarism.org). EVE2 is a robust and useful tool from www.canexus.com/eve that costs \$19.95 for unlimited, single station use (a site license is \$400). A full-blown version can be downloaded for trial/demonstration purposes from the Web site, however, the twenty-dollar investment to reduce the time involved searching the Web using search engines and eliminating potential Web sites manually is worth the investment. Any user who has searched manually for potential Web sites of research/term papers will appreciate the effectiveness of this tool.

The user must have Web access and allow enough time for analysis by EVE2. The professor should plan on adequate time for personal evaluation of the results of the investigation. Word and WordPerfect files are readable by EVE2 for quick plagiarism checks. The authors believe that all files should be converted to flat text files for further analysis with this product.

EVE2 creates a permanent report from text files, which is useful for documenting the analysis results. Web time to perform the analysis is an important consideration. One analysis conducted by the authors involved 2½ hours of continuous Web time for EVE2 to analyze 13 text files (250 M). Another analysis involved on-line time of 7 ½ hours for 18 text files (800 M). A benchmark is approximately 100M per hour using high-speed university Internet access (not Internet2 though). An instructor must plan on longer on-line time if using a dial-up access (modem) through an on-line service like America On-Line. In a test by the

authors using a dialup service, the analysis of an 800M file was only halfway completed after twelve hours. The general message is that the tool performs an intensive search of Web sites; however, it does require substantial computer and Web cycle time to do so. After the Web analysis is completed the instructor can and should review the reports on each file manually.

EVE2 analyzes a large number of sites on the Web. This includes sites with free term papers such as the following:

<http://www.collegetermpapers.com>

<http://www.essaydepot.com>

<http://www.123student.com>

The analysis is fast and furious; and it does not require intervention of the operator. The tool proceeds unattended; therefore, the analysis can be conducted in the evening with the reports on each file available for review in the morning. The reports return a “percent plagiarized” figure for each paper; however, this number can be misleading. It will sometimes detect false positives; in essence, reporting segments that are cited as being plagiarized. Also, it occasionally reports sections of a paper as being plagiarized (by underlining the section in red) that cannot be traced. EVE2 is an effective tool to relieve the professor of the labor involved in manually using generic search engines to locate suspicious phrases from individual papers. However, the higher the “percent plagiarized” reported for a paper does not necessarily indicate the likelihood that the paper is indeed plagiarized. Therefore, the critical importance of negating possible false positives cannot be over emphasized.

In reviewing student papers from actual classes, the authors did not find entire student papers taken verbatim from Web sites. However, major components that initially appeared to have been lifted from the Web without citation were uncovered. Students sprinkled a sentence of original commentary with several sentences of un-cited material. A report that indicated suspicious activities from a sample paper is attached in the Appendix. Interestingly, a large portion of the first paragraph of this paper appears come from a free paper mill site although only 7.81% of the whole paper is reported as plagiarized. This emphasizes one important concept when working with EVE2: After the World Wide Web is examined, the instructor’s work is just beginning. Each EVE2 report must be examined to determine if the text indicated as plagiarized is factual or not.

Another tool utilized in our study is the resource offered by www.Turnitin.com. This site offers a comprehensive package for the professor teaching multiple sections of a class and goes beyond the offerings of EVE2. Turnitin searches the Web, as does EVE2; however, it also houses the reports and students upload their papers directly into the site. Students can be allowed access to review other student papers and repeated submissions are possible. On the selected date, the

instructor can begin the analysis for plagiarism. The report is completed in twenty-four hours. There are options to allow students to resubmit if needed. The storage and reporting areas allow for multiple sections, multiple instructors, and multiple classes. Turnitin.com offers a more systemic approach than EVE2 in that Turnitin.com detects similarities between classmates and all papers that have been submitted to it. Over time this will become a rich resource to detect paper mill submissions.

The services of Turnitin.com are on a per paper basis. One hundred investigations cost \$100. Site licenses are prorated for high schools, two-year and four-year schools. The service appears to be appropriate for a unit that wants to analyze and compare papers from multiple sections. This will change over the next couple of years as college needs mature.

It is informative to view some brief descriptive statistics to compare both electronic agents (EVE2 and Turnitin). Table 1 shows the color coding and percent matching text for Turnitin's system. The color codes progress from blue to red as the amount of matching text from the Web or their database is identified. Turnitin does not provide a numerical analysis of the links found. However, it does provide an "Overall Similarity Index" which is numbered, and color coded for each paper submitted to indicate the following:

Overall Similarity Index used by Turnitin
Table 1

Turnitin Color Code	Percent matching text
blue (1)	less than 20% matching text
green (2)	20%-25% matching text
yellow (3)	26%-50% matching text
orange (4)	51%-75% matching text
red (5)	76%-100% matching text

The summary data in Table 2 is extracted by pivot table analysis of the data in Attachment 2 - DATA FROM EVE2 AND TURNITIN (sorted by EVE2's - percent plagiarized). Therefore, to describe Table 2, ten papers color coded as blue have an Overall Similarity Index of less than 20% matching text. None of the papers investigated were reported in the red zone by Turnitin. As Turnitin searches the Web and its internal database, the electronic agent records any "similarities" and reports them. Papers with little similarity to text on the web and are categorized as blue.

Table 2 also shows the correspondence between Turnitin's and EVE2's analysis of the papers. EVE2 provides an analysis of "percent plagiarized" for each paper and reports the web sites with matching text that were found. The results from EVE2's investigation and Turnitin's analysis are shown in Table 2 as an average of the EVE2

results for those papers within each of the Turnitin color codes and EVE2's analysis in terms of matching text.

Turnitin's colors of yellow and green reveal an average increase consistent with an increase in EVE2's evaluation of matching text. Both agents complement each other as each tool provides similar findings except for isolated instances. The following Table 2 summarizes the data from Attachment 2, DATA FROM EVE2 AND TURNITIN (sorted by EVE2 percent plagiarized).

Table 2 – Summary data from EVE2 and Turnitin

Turnitin Color code	EVE2 Data	Total
Blue – less than 20% matching text Sample number = 10	Average of EVE2 Percent Plagiarized Average number of Web Sites Found	2.2% 2.8
Green – 20%-25% matching text Sample number = 44	Average of EVE2 Percent Plagiarized Average number of Web Sites Found	10.3% 18.1
Yellow – 26%-50% matching text Sample number = 6	Average of EVE2 Percent Plagiarized Average number of Web Sites Found	28.8% 60.3
Total Average of EVE2 Percent Plagiarized		11.1%
Total Average number of Web Sites Found by EVE2		20.4

It is important to note that after this analysis with electronic tools, the paper that was linked to a paper mill indicated only 7.81% text on the Web (by EVE2) but was marked as yellow by Turnitin. This could indicate a need to use both tools. However, it is more important to always note the character of the Web sites with matching text in any analysis using these tools. Matching text from a paper mill site should be viewed more critically than matching text from a general news site.

VI. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Foster (2002) indicates that the use of Turnitin.com may open universities to lawsuits.

Lawyers say the problem with Turnitin.com is that student papers are copied in their entirety to the services' database, which is a potential infringement of students' copyrights. And the copying is sometimes done without students' knowledge or consent, which is a potential invasion of their privacy.

This is one motivation to have the students upload their papers to the service or to obtain signed written consents from the students prior to performing Web detection. Potential liability may also exist in violation of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

Two other plagiarism detection products were not analyzed as part of this study. Both sites were avoided. The sites offer free examination for plagiarism. However, they may have some association with Web paper mills because the detection services appear to have the same IP address as paper mills to which they could be related. For additional information on detecting sites that may have a relationship with suspected paper mills one may visit Standler (2002), Plagiarism in Colleges in USA.

VII. PENALTIES

Once the professor has examined each paper at length and determined plagiarism exists, some action should be taken. What is sufficient? Should the student be put on academic probation or immediately dismissed from school? Is dropping the final grade one letter adequate? Should the student fail the class or just the assignment? A department standards committee is the best resource to address these questions. If penalties are standardized across the curriculum, and if students are made aware of the penalties for violations, positive changes in student performance may occur.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Plagiarism is a real concern in today's colleges. The importance of honesty and integrity is being revisited in the business world, and college of businesses must take a lead role in turning integrity into an asset. The students must be aware of the consequences of academic dishonesty while being given an opportunity to learn from their mistakes.

Education and awareness are the best way to avoid student plagiarism. Departmental plagiarism policies should be included in course syllabi. Make the students aware that the papers will be checked with Web sites and to accurately document all quotations. Inform the students of proper citation procedures. Identify a narrow topic for the class term paper. Select a specific citation method and require adherence to it (a submission with a variety of citation styles may indicate a paper mill source). Require a proposal for the paper with bibliography. Discourage students from changing their paper topics late in the semester. Require papers early in the semester. Require all references to be from within the last four years, unless historic references are needed. Demand journal articles, not just newspaper articles or Web sites. Do not hesitate to take action against intentional plagiarism; a strong policy needs to be backed up with determination and balanced with adequate prior education.

Finally, electronic agents are a blessing in the Web-based world. A professor that is serious about detecting plagiarism should take advantage of the tools that are now available and being refined. However, the electronic agents do not indicate

plagiarism as a yes/no answer. Each evaluation must be investigated further. The professor must make a decision on the severity of the plagiarism and the appropriate penalty if intentional plagiarism is confirmed.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Kare, The Crossing Press, <http://www.crossingpress.com/growth.php3>, accessed September 5, 2002.
- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P.). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 1997, p. 187-203.
- Burke, J. L., Faculty perceptions of and attitudes toward academic dishonesty at a two-year college. Unpublished dissertation. 1997.
- Flores, Christopher and Hebel, Sara, A Historian Meets His Little Bighorn, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 18, 2001.
- Foster, Andrea L., Plagiarism-Detection Tool Creates Legal Quandary, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 17, 2002, p. 37.
- Hitt, Dave, The Facts, <http://www.davehitt.com/facts/epa.html>, accessed September 5, 2002.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore, Forget About Policing Plagiarism. Just Teach., *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 16, 2001, p. 24.
- Kellogg, Alex, P., Students Plagiarize Online Less Than Many Think, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February, 1, 2002, P. 44.
- Longley, Robert, Goofy Government Quotes, <http://usgovinfo.about.com/blquotes3.htm>, accessed June 29, 2002.
- Mac, October 2001, http://home.ptd.net/~samb1/10_01A.html, accessed September 5, 2002.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. What we know about cheating in college: Longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28(1), 1996, p 28-33.
- Peters, Thomas J. *Thriving On Chaos : Handbook for a Management Revolution*, New York : Knopf : Distributed by Random House, 1987.

Roig, M., & Ballew, C.. Attitudes toward cheating of self and others by college students and professors. *Psychological Record*, 44(1), 1994, p. 3-12.

Senge, Peter, *The Fifth Discipline, The Art and Practice of The Learning Organization*, Double Currency, 1990, p. 159.

Standler, Ronald B., Plagiarism in Colleges in USA, <http://www.rbs2.com/plag.htm>, accessed March 21, 2002.

Unknown author 2, Culturedose.com,
http://www.culturedose.com/mboard_index.php?subject=1180, accessed September 5, 2002.

Unknown author, Subverting the US Republic,
<http://www.ushispanic.net/Republic/Repub1.html>, accessed September 5, 2002.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 9th ed, (Springfield, Ma: Merriam 1981, p. 870

Wilhoit, Stephen, "Helping Students Avoid Plagiarism," *College Teaching*, Fall 1994, p. 161-164.

Williams, Frank, Letters to the Editor: Designing Courses to Make Cheating Hard, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 17, 2001, p. 21.

Young, Jeffrey R., The Cat-and-Mouse Game of Plagiarism Detection, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 6, 2001, p. 26.

Zeiler, Frederika, Dog Day Humor,
<http://www.topangaonline.com/wboard/messages/1315.html>, accessed September 5, 2002.

ATTACHMENT 1

Plagiarism Report
Generated by EVE 2.3
5/16/2002 11:14:20 AM

Amount of document detected to be plagiarized: 7.81

Please Note: Because plagiarism on this paper is below 15%, please check these results carefully to make sure plagiarism has in fact occurred.

Matching material was found on these sites:

http://www.collegetermpapers.com/TermPapers/Social_Issues/Napster1.shtml

<http://www.essaydepot.com/essayme/993/>

<http://www.mtv.com/news/articles/1424796/20000728/story.jhtml>

http://www.123student.com/social_issues/133.shtml

http://www.collegetermpapers.com/TermPapers/Music/Napster_Contravercy.shtml

<http://216.239.35.100/search?q=cache:dxw6kMHZWzAC:www.essaydepot.com/essayme/993/+++%22change+the+way+people+would+listen+share+and+acquire+music+and%22&hl=en>

<http://216.239.35.100/search?q=cache:->

jdu1oX4xs8C:www.studentgod.com/Coursework/GCSE_Coursework/9.12.101.How_the_Internet_has_changed_the_face_of_the_pop_industry.doc+++%22encouraging+the+illegal+copying+and+distribution+of+copyrighted%22&hl=en

<http://216.239.35.100/search?q=cache:dxw6kMHZWzAC:www.essaydepot.com/essayme/993/+++%22time+making+an+album+putting+their+heart+and+soul+into+it+that%22&hl=en>

<http://216.239.35.100/search?q=cache:dxw6kMHZWzAC:www.essaydepot.com/essayme/993/+++%22encouraging+the+illegal+copying+and+distribution+of+copyrighted%22&hl=en>

Student essay with matching content underlined for easy detection:

[Matching material identified by EVE2]

THE NAPSTER PROJECT

INTRO

The young man took a deep breath as he entered the courtroom. With the world watching and his attorney present, he took the stand to defend his actions. It had been two and a half years since the events that would affect him and the rest of the world had been set in motion. In 1998, this computer science major from Northeastern University sat in front of his computer and created something that would shake the very ground that artists, industry, and technology stand upon. The young man's name is Shawn Fanning, and his creation was Napster. Though Fanning was unaware of it at the time, Napster would forever change the way people would listen, share, and acquire music, and the music industry would never be the same.

WHAT IT IS

With the aid of business funding, Napster was launched in 1999. It marketed a demand that had existed, it seems, since the invention of the audio record: people that wanted one or two songs but not the entire record. Now this supply was accessible, only with Napster the songs were also free. Napster allowed Internet users to share and download MP3 files directly from any computer connected to the Napster network.

The software works by downloading a client program from the Napster site and then connecting to the network through this software, which allows sharing of MP3 files between all users connected to the network.

WHY THE FUSS

Matching text sample found by EVE2 (matches in italics)

Web site text: <http://www.essaydepot.com/essayme/993/>

Name: Andy Chang

Submitted: 11.14.01

Word Count: 1762

"This site kicks-ass!!"

The Future of Music

In 1998, a computer science major at Northeastern University, sat in front of his computer and started to create a program that would help the common man, spark controversy, and change and revolutionize the music industry. His name is Shawn Fanning, and his creation is Napster. Napster would forever change the way people would listen, share and acquire music, and the music industry would never again be the same. Napster, launched early in 1999, allows Internet users to share and download MP3 files directly from any computer connected to the Napster network. The software is used by downloading a client program from the Napster site and then connecting to the network through this software, which allows sharing of MP3 files between all users connected to the network. While Napster does not condone copyright infringement, there is no opportunity in the software to stop this from happening, or for a percentage to be paid to artists whose songs are being duplicated for free. Unlike similar file-sharing applications (such as Gnutella, or Freenet), Napster limits users to uploading/downloading of MP3 files only. These files are compressed wave (.wav) files. The advantage of MP3 files is that they are approximately one-tenth the size of the corresponding .wav file and can be close-to-CD-quality. It is for this reason that many artists, record labels and other music industry stakeholders are concerned by the MP3 file format and applications like Napster that simplify the sharing of copyrighted material. The reaction from recording artists has been varied, but primarily anti-Napster. Hip-hop artist Jay-Z had this to say: "I believe that if someone spends time making an album, putting their heart and soul into it, that their music shouldn't be traded so freely."

[Author's note: compare the italicized text from the "Future of Music" paper found by EVE2 on the web site www.essaydepot.com with the last three sentences of the first paragraph of the student paper above analyzed by EVE]

ATTACHMENT 2

DATA FROM EVE2 AND TURNITIN (sorted by EVE2 Percent plagiarized)

EVE2 Percent Plagiarized	Turnitin Color Code	# of Matching Sites Found
59.02	Yellow	180
36.35	Yellow	45
34.13	Green	92
31.63	Green	71
30.87	Yellow	35
30.23	Yellow	113
26.34	Green	9
25.1	Green	45
23.85	Yellow	36
22.97	Green	31
21.93	Green	27
18.74	Green	6
16.85	Green	29
16.68	Green	21
16.16	Green	30
14.67	Green	20
13.61	Green	15
13.46	Yellow	4
13.14	Green	53
12.87	Green	55
11.89	Green	40
11.31	Green	2
11.23	Green	10
10.14	Green	3
10.12	Green	8
9.99	Black	9
9.57	Green	8
9.46	Green	32
9.01	Green	13
8.79	Green	35
8.68	Green	13
8.00	Green	17
7.81	Yellow	9
7.61	Green	9
6.88	Green	13
6.71	Blue	7

EVE2 Percent	Turnitin	# of Matching Sites
6.25	Blue	8
6.21	Green	3
6.06	Green	27
6.04	Green	14
5.09	Green	8
4.61	Green	22
4.53	Green	2
4.44	Green	4
3.76	Green	4
3.63	Blue	3
3.04	Black	3
2.67	Green	2
2.49	Blue	7
2.20	Green	1
2.04	Blue	1
1.86	Green	2
1.04	Blue	2
0.00	Blue	0
0.00	Green	0
0.00	Black	0
0.00	Green	0
0.00	Green	0
0.00	Blue	0
0.00	Blue	0
0.00	Blue	0