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Following an informal poll among ICA editors, deliberations by the Publications Committee and discussions at the mid-year board meeting in Seattle we are proposing 17 recommendations:

Review System

1. ICA should raise awareness about the importance of engaging in the review process by a) making it normative (e.g., indicating, for example, how many reviews per year are “typical” or “expected”) and b) providing recognition to reviewers (possibly during the ICA awards ceremony; letter).

2. Editors should offer Editorial Board membership for multiple constructive in-time reviews. Editors should also widen their network of through Associate Editors, Advisory Board Members and Editorial Board Members. Personal connections are crucial for finding the right reviewers and persuading them to serve.

3. ICA should publish a piece in Newsletter on how to write helpful, constructive, high-quality reviews. Such a piece should distil the fundamentals of writing a good review, based on input by ICA journal editors. One member of the Publications Committee, Sun Sun Lim (Nat U of Singapore) as volunteered to help draft such an article. ICA should set up Manuscript Central / Scholar One so that whenever someone agrees to review they automatically get sent these guidelines.

Recruitment and Training of New Editors

4. ICA shall announce calls for nominating new editors in mass email to members, in addition to postings in the Newsletter and on the website. The Publications Committee will proactively solicit additional applications by promising candidates. Allow for self-nominations.

5. ICA should pay special attention to letter of institutional support. In cases where the university may not understand or appreciate the importance of the position (especially if from abroad), ICA may write a letter to the institution (presidents, deans, chairs) underscoring the value and prestige of ICA editorships in an effort to boost support.
6. ICA should bring together past, current, and future editors to talk through key issues that arise for editors. This can be done each year at the ICA conference, and can give editors an opportunity to compare experiences, offer incoming editors tips (e.g., what is a reasonable desk reject rate; how to deal with an unhappy author; how to use an editorial board). With the assistance of Mike West, this could turn into a manual on *How to run an ICA journal successfully*.

7. ICA conferences should have a rotating slate of “professionalism” discussions, such as “leadership positions in the association”, “the value of reviewing”, and “how to become an editor”.

**Editorial Structure**

8. ICA shall install Associate Editorship structures across all journals. Associate Editors (AEs) serve as an important gatekeeping mechanism when desk-rejecting unsuitable papers early up-front so they don’t clog the review process. AEs broaden the editorial expertise beyond the Head Editors own areas of competence; broaden the international scope and appeal of a journal; allow for quick feedback on a number of strategic (e.g., proposals for special/themed issues) and operational decisions (e.g., desk rejects); and allow for a more even distribution of work. AEs serve as an additional pair of eyes when drafting letters to authors and preparing editorial decisions. All fundamental decisions are made in consultation with the Head Editor who coordinates and oversees the entire editorial operation. AEs should be chosen according to criteria that work best each journal’s specific mission (including geographic, thematic or methodological considerations).

9. Head Editors will process no less than 50% of the manuscripts and maintain the right to final decisions. The Head Editor should be free as to who is appointed as AE at her/his journal. Terms of AEs (and terms of editorial board members) should be tied to the appointment of the Head Editor. AEs receive training and vetting in the editorial process and may serve as a candidate pool for future editorship positions.

10. ICA should set up a task force to draft systematic, tailor-made criteria for each ICA journal as to which segments of the journal’s profile should be covered by its associate positions. Using predefined criteria for AE positions will help ensure long-term stability in the journal’s practiced mission. This task force should include all editors (plus further experts with knowledge and interest in the matter) and set up typical job descriptions of AEs, the journal specific criteria according to which they are appointed, and exchange best practice experiences on editorial workflow and division and labor. This task force should also set up workable criteria for the desk rejections which will become more frequent and necessary (to protect the reviewer pool).

**Editorial Board**

11. Editors shall create a separate Editorial Board and Advisory Board. Highly visible, big-name scholars can lend credibility and reputation to a journal. However, if they are unwilling or unable to serve consistently as reviewers, they may be moved to a newly installed Advisory Board. The editor would turn to these advisors not so much for full reviews but briefly argued decisions on key editorial matters. This will make room on the Editorial Board for younger scholars who deserve to be rewarded for their valued assistance (as ‘work horses’) in reviewing substantial number of papers.
12. Head Editors should be encouraged to update their EB immediately when assuming office. ICA should adopt a policy at all its journals that EB members are only appointed for limited terms (usually the tenure of the current editor), and that each EB is formally dissolved at the end of each editorship. Incoming editors should be told that the previous editorial board is disbanded but that they can invite members anew. Outgoing editors should provide their successors with meaningful information about the performance of each EB members so that the new editor can make informed decisions about who to appoint again and who to replace.

13. Editors should thank those members of the Editorial Board for their service who are rotated off after a change in editorship and informed about their term end.

14. Editors should continuously adjust their EB (also during their terms of office) to enlist people in areas where submissions are high. Editors should replace EB members who don’t respond to requests to review or whose fields of expertise are no longer matched by submissions.

15. EB members useful to a journal are called upon about three times a year and are expected to accept these review requests. Valuable ad-hoc reviewers should be considered for EB membership.

Lengthen the Editorship Term

16. ICA shall extend the term of office for ICA journals from three to four years. Three years is too short of a time to make an impact; it leaves too little creative scope and development opportunities for editors. On the other hand, five years may be too daunting for editor recruits. A four year term, with the possibility of an extension (by 1 or, under exceptional circumstances, 2 years) seems the best option. Any extension beyond the regular four years requires a “review” in the third year, which should include a performance appraisal, input from the associate editors, and feedback from the editorial board.

Length of Manuscript Submissions

17. ICA should not have a uniform page limit for its journals. Many of the most honored and cited articles would not be publishable under a rigid 30 page restriction. Editors should be given as much flexibility and discretion as possible with regard to page lengths. While authors should be encouraged to write parsimoniously, efficiently and to the point, editors should be encouraged to use a variety of articles forms to be able to accommodate those cases where contributions are legitimately longer. Editors may want to review the current “submission guidelines for authors” as printed on the journal websites in this light.
PROCEDURES AND SANCTIONS FOR DEALING WITH PLAGIARISM AND DUPLICATE PUBLICATIONS (‘SELF-PLAGIARISM’)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document defines various forms of plagiarism in the context of a statement of ethical principles for scholars in the field of communication (Appendix A). It lays out specific guidelines for avoiding plagiarism for authors, as well as guidelines for ICA and its editors for dealing with plagiarism when it appears. The document makes clear that plagiarism in manuscripts submitted to or published in ICA journals is unacceptable and will be met with consequences; said consequences will be adjusted depending on the magnitude of the plagiarism involved. This report also discusses self-plagiarism and outlines the very limited areas in which it may be acceptable.

DEFINITION

The International Communication Association (ICA) declares in its General Statement on Standards that it is committed to the highest academic principles. Any attempt to pass off another scholar’s work as one’s own is in violation of these principles. There have been many attempts to define plagiarism. The World Association of Medical Editors describes it as “the use of others’ published and unpublished ideas or words (or other intellectual property) without attribution or permission, and
presenting them as new and original rather than derived from an existing source. The intent and effect of plagiarism is to mislead the reader as to the contributions of the plagiarizer” (http://www.wame.org/resources/publication-ethicspolicies-for-medical-journals#plagiarism).

The U.S. Office of Research Integrity considers plagiarism to include both the theft or misappropriation of intellectual property and the substantial unattributed textual copying of another's work. Although plagiarism and misappropriation of intellectual property are related, they are not the same thing. The former may include misrepresenting ideas as one’s own even if they are not, strictly speaking, protected by copyrights or moral right. Interestingly the Office of Research Integrity does not regard the use of similar sentences and phrases describing very commonly used concepts or standardized techniques – as is often found in the Method section of research articles – as a serious breach of publication ethics (http://ori.dhs.gov/plagiarism.shtml; see also Mason, 2009). This is a first indication that there may be different types of plagiarism which demand different kinds of responses / sanctions.

Plagiarism is thus mainly an ethical problem that – as understood in academic circles – is not dealt with much in the legal literature. It is “considered to be scientific misconduct, an unethical publication practice, an academic dishonesty” but not necessarily a legal offense (Dobrenau 2012, p. 194). Whereas “copyright law protects a primarily economic interest that a copyright owner has in her work”, the rule against plagiarism “protects a personal or moral interest” that “transcends the marketplace”, such as “reputation and honor” (Green, 2002, p. 202, 207). It should be noted, though, that citations in academic circles are not only relevant for judging a scholar’s status and reputation but also for tangible rewards such as grants and scholarships, tenure and promotion, and other forms of career advancement (p. 188, 220). Nonetheless, lawyers have suggested that “plagiarism may best be dealt with internally by academic and professional institutions that should be capable of policing themselves” (Green, 2002, p. 235)

TYPES OF PLAGIARISM

Shafer (2011) distinguishes four groups of plagiarism. The first is “intellectual theft”, the deliberate copying of significant portions of text without attribution. This is the most serious but also the least frequent form of plagiarism. The second type is “intellectual sloth”, the copying of generic text without attribution, for instance the description of a commonly used concept or standard technique. This wide-spread borrowing of well-crafted language for often used elements usually occurs because authors do not express an idea or concept in their own words. Slater’s third type of unacceptable behavior is what he calls “technical plagiarism”: The use of verbatim text without identifying it as a direct quotation, but referencing it to the original source. An example of this wide-spread technique is to use an aptly phrased expression for an original idea and present the expression as one’s own (because it is not put in quotation marks) without stealing it (because the source is cited). The fourth type is “plagiarism for scientific English”. Authors suffering from a lack of language or writing proficiency (often non-native English speakers) are particularly vulnerable to excessive borrowing from others’ work. It often does not entail the copying of larger blocks of text from a single sources but “assembling a hodgepodge of sentences and sentence fragments from dozens of published articles” (Slater 2011, p. 491) to express ideas in proper English.

The availability of specialized text-matching software is likely to uncover a range of unethical publication techniques that may have gone unnoticed in the past. Roig (2010) distinguishes the following types of techniques (along with the failure to cite the original source):

- Direct plagiarism – Material of substantive length is copied verbatim from the source without attribution or the use of quotation marks.
- Truncation – Material is copied verbatim from the source with the original shortened by the deletion of beginning or ending words or phrase
• Excision – Material is copied verbatim from the source with one or more words deleted from the middle of sentences.

• Insertions – Material is copied verbatim from the source with additional words or phrases (often qualifiers such as “very”) inserted into the material from the original source.

• Reordering – Material is copied verbatim from the source with (a) sentences in a different order, or (b) words or (c) clauses in a given sentence in a different order.

• Substitution – Material is copied verbatim from the source with a synonym or phrase substituted for words or phrases of the original source.

• Change of tense or person or number – Material is copied verbatim from the source except that verb tenses have been changed (e.g., from present to past), or the pronouns have been changed e.g., from first to third person), or the sentence has been changed from singular to plural form.

• Change of voice – Material is copied (essentially) verbatim from the source, with sentences in the active voice changed to passive, or vice versa.

• Grafting – (a) Material is copied verbatim from the source with two or more simple sentences conjoined into a compound or complex sentence. (b) Material is copied verbatim from the source with part of two or more sentences from different sections of the original source joined to form a new sentence. (c) Words or phrases putatively original with the author are used to precede or follow material copied verbatim from the source.

• Patchwriting – Same as above, but from two or more different sources.

HOW TO PREVENT PLAGIARISM

ICA members in doubt about the integrity of their manuscript should feel encouraged to pre-screen their manuscripts before submission. It will protect them from the embarrassing experience that text matching software used in the ICA editorial offices detects plagiarism in their work.

In addition, the guidelines “Ethical Obligations of Authors to Prevent Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism”, together with additional resources (see Appendix A of this document) should be made available to ICA members.

Finally, ICA should encourage all graduate programs to incorporate formal instruction on avoiding plagiarism into their curricula, to submit graduate work to plagiarism checks and impose sanctions when it is discovered, and to impress on graduate students the importance of avoiding plagiarism.

SANCTIONS

Depending on the extent and type of copied material, it is possible to distinguish between “minor” and “major” forms of plagiarism. We hereby follow suggestions by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) which also recommends different kind of reactions depending on the seriousness of the misconduct. According to a COPE discussion paper:

• ”MINOR PLAGIARISM could be defined as verbatim copying of <100 words without indicating that these are a direct quotation from an original work (whether or not the source is cited), unless the text is accepted as widely used or standardized (eg the description of a standard technique)” (Wager, 2011, p. 9).

• ”MAJOR PLAGIARISM could be defined as verbatim copying of >100 words of original material in the absence of any citation to the source material, or unattributed use of original, published academic work, such as the structure, argument or hypothesis/idea of another person or group where this is a major part of the new publication and there is evidence that it was not developed independently” (Wager, 2011, p. 9).

We are aware that such a binary classification is artificial and inflexible to a certain extent. One should rather think of terms of a continuum here where the sanction must always be proportional to the magnitude of the violation. In addition, further criteria such as the degree of originality of the copied
material, its position and context in the article, and the authors’ background and intentions should be taken into account when making a judgment (see below).

Nonetheless, we will keep this distinction between “minor” and “major” as a heuristic tool to illustrate the varying degrees in offenses and sanctions (knowing that this is a crude simplification). As a rule, responses by journal editors should vary and always match the severity of each case. Responses should also vary in cases where there are multiple violations by an individual. ICA Publications Manager shall retain a record of all cases of plagiarism and in each case of a new violation will check the name against past violations. The Publications Committee will be made aware when a repeat violator appears.

The detailed PROCEDURES involved in any investigation are outlined further below in a step-by-step fashion. There is no automatism in applying sanctions, and each case will be decided on a case-by-case basis (as is laid out in the later sections of this document).

Once a decision has been reached, the following RESPONSES/SANCTIONS are available (taken from Wager, 2011; ACM, 2010; Shafer, 2011):

I. ICA Publications:

- **MINOR PLAGIARISM IN SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT:**
  
  *Editors decide on their own judgment of the situation without having to involve the Publications Committee:*

  - Editor (with cc: to ICA Publications Manager) writes to authors letter of explanation and education where there appears to be genuine misunderstanding of principles, and attaches ICA’s General Statement Of Standards (on website) and Plagiarism Policy (this document) and Guidelines on Ethical Obligations by Authors (Appendix A); and
  - Editor instructs authors to rewrite plagiarized text / to credit sources properly / to identify quotations properly (as part of revise-and-resubmit process); or
  - Editor rejects paper based on violations of ICA’s General Statement Of Standards and Plagiarism Policy; in accompanying letter, editor points out that minor plagiarism has been detected and advises the authors that this should be corrected before resubmission (rejection but new submission possible); or
  - Editor rejects paper based on violations of ICA’s General Statement Of Standards and Plagiarism Policy, no resubmission possible; in accompanying letter of reprimand the editor issues a warning as to future conduct; letter is cc’ed to chair of the Publications Committee although there will be no formal investigation coordinated by Publications Committee.

- **MINOR PLAGIARISM IN PUBLISHED ARTICLE:**
  
  *The Publications Committee will be involved in the decision process. Subsequently:*

  - Editor publishes a notice of plagiarism or a corrigendum in the printed and digital version of the journal or
  - Editor requires author to publish an apology in which the misrepresentation is corrected (for instance by noting that text was used without appropriate acknowledgment)
  - Or other penalties as decided by committee (see Procedures below).

- **MAJOR PLAGIARISM IN SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT:**
  
  *The Publications Committee will be involved in the decision process. Subsequently:*

  - Editor presents findings to all authors and asks them to respond; asks the authors if all or only some of them are responsible for the plagiarized sections, decides if any authors were unaware of the plagiarism and, if so, whether they are in any way responsible for the behavior of the other authors; and
Editor issues a letter of reprimand with a warning as to future conduct (cc’ed to chair of the Publications Committee and ICA Publications Manager), and rejects the article or/and
Editor demands in addition a letter of apology to ICA (for its own records) and/or to the plagiarized authors or/and
Publications Committee contacts the institutions of the authors considered to be directly involved with the plagiarism (or as supervisors/mentors should take responsibility for it)\(^1\) or/and
Committee imposes further sanctions such as banning authors from submitting to the journal for a period of time; or banning authors from submitting to any ICA journals or conferences for a period of time

- **MAJOR PLAGIARISM IN PUBLISHED ARTICLE:**

  *The Publications Committee will be involved in the decision process. Subsequently:*
  - Same as for submitted article, then retract article or
  - Publication of a notice, corrigendum or erratum or
  - Publication of an editorial giving full details of the misconduct or
  - Refusal to accept future submissions from the individual, unit, or institution responsible for the misconduct, for a stated period or
  - Other form of penalty as decided by committee.

II. ICA Conferences:

- **MINOR PLAGIARISM IN CONFERENCE SUBMISSION:**
  - Manuscript is automatically rejected; no further investigation or sanction

- **MAJOR PLAGIARISM IN CONFERENCE SUBMISSION:**
  - Manuscript is automatically rejected; same sanctions as for major plagiarism in submitted articles. ICA Publications Manager is informed of the case and keeps a record.

The more drastic sanctions may be reserved for cases that show multiple violations and for authors who show repeated misconduct. The detailed PROCEDURES are outlined further below.

**ASSESSING THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE MISCONDUCT AND OF THE SANCTION**

In order to determine how serious an act of plagiarism is and how it should be sanctioned, ICA editors and the Publications Committee will take the following factors into account when reaching a verdict. The factors and their descriptions are taken from a COPE discussion paper (Wager 2011):

**Extent**

The most drastic cases are those where entire papers are republished under another name. Entire papers can also be plagiarized by translating them into another language. Copying entire papers under a new name usually involves copyright issues. More difficult and more common are smaller cases:

“Scholarly works often summarize the work of other researchers. It may be difficult to draw a line between legitimate (and accurate) representation of other studies and copying original material. Researchers may also feel that little harm is done if they use similar language to another publication so

\(^1\) Informing an author’s institution is generally considered to be a relatively serious action to take. As Wager (2011, p. 6) states, “It may have serious consequences for the researcher concerned. Editors therefore tend to be reluctant to inform institutions except in serious cases of misconduct and when they feel they have well-founded suspicions of wrong-doing. However, if contacting an institution is viewed, not as a potential punishment for the author, but as an attempt to engage the institution in dialogue and work together to prevent future problems, one might argue that editors should contact institutions more often and definitely in cases where they feel junior researchers have received inadequate training or guidance, since this is something the institution may be able to remedy.”
long as the source is properly cited. If the original authors summarized their findings clearly and succinctly it could be argued that little is gained by forcing other authors to paraphrase this. However, others will argue that any verbatim copying should be indicated by using quotation marks, otherwise they would consider it to be plagiarism.” (Wager, 2011, p. 4)

**Originality**

The amount of copied material should not be taken as the only benchmark. As Wager (2011, p. 4) points out, the “originality needs to be considered in conjunction with extent.” Academic papers often contain technical matters or address widely-used ideas that need to be distinguished from original ideas.

**Context / Section in paper**

Certain sections of research reports may be more likely to include non-original material. For instance, in the Methods section the use of standardized descriptions may even add precision. “Therefore editors may view text similarity in Methods sections differently from that in other parts of a paper” (ibid.). On the other hand, “review articles and the discussion sections of research papers are expected to provide an original synthesis of, and commentary on, previously published work. Therefore, apart from quotations, the words may be expected to be the author’s own. (..) However, editors may also consider the consequences of the copying and its potential to mislead readers. In this respect, copying a few sentences from the Discussion section of another researcher’s paper may be considered less harmful, and less deceitful, than the theft of data (which may constitute not only plagiarism but also data fabrication since the work was not done by the copier). Thus, if an editor finds a paper that appears to describe legitimate, original research, but includes some sentences taken from the Discussion of another author’s paper on a related topic, the editor may simply ask the author to indicate that these are direct quotations, or to paraphrase the copied text, before publication. If the copying is discovered after publication, the editor may suggest that it can be rectified by a correction rather than a retraction and may not feel that the author’s institution should be informed.” (Wager, 2011, p. 5)

**Attribution**

“Academic publications are expected to reference other works and may also quote from them. Inexperienced or poorly trained authors may mistakenly believe that so long as another work has been cited, parts of it can be reproduced in their own work. While copying parts of cited work is probably not intended to deceive the reader in the same way as copying unattributed material, the practice is generally considered to be poor scholarship and inappropriate for an academic journal. Editors may have a role in educating authors if they discover this type of copying, especially if it is detected before publication.” (Wager, 2011, p. 5)

**Intention**

“Intention to deceive is often considered a factor distinguishing misconduct from careless work or honest error. However, it is usually impossible to prove intent and therefore may be less useful in practice than in theory. Extreme forms of plagiarism, such as copying an entire paper and submitting it under a different author’s name to another journal can only be deliberate. Editors must use their own judgment to determine whether authors’ explanations for less extreme forms of copying are plausible or could have occurred through honest error.” (Wager, 2011, p. 6)

**Author seniority**

“Since editors may believe that some forms of plagiarism result from poor mentorship or supervision rather than intentional misconduct, their response may vary according to the seniority of the authors involved. Editors may apply different sanctions to junior authors who they believe genuinely did not know they were doing something inappropriate from those applied to experienced researchers who are
expected to know better. Thus, an editor may respond to the copying of a paragraph from a cited paper by asking a junior author to paraphrase (if detected before publication) or issue a correction (if detected after publication). However, for a similar degree of copying by a senior author, the same editor might reject or retract a submission and consider informing the author’s institution.”

**English Language**

Many foreign scholars need English language publications as much for their career as native English speakers. As Wager (2011, p. 7) points out, some may even have been encouraged, when learning English as a second language, to adapt sentences and ‘borrow’ structures from published works. This often results in what Wager calls “patchwork writing”. CrossCheck may pick this up with a high similarity score but the matched text will be found to come from multiple sources, and each copied section will be short. “Some editors may see little harm in authors who describe their own methods and findings accurately, but using sentence structures taken from other publications. Others may regard this as a sign of poor scholarship or a form of minor plagiarism. The acceptability of ‘patch’ writing probably depends on the originality of the writing being copied.” Purists will say that “using textual material without proper attribution is plagiarism, even when it is done in relatively small amounts” (Roig, 2010, p. 297).

**PROCEDURE**

Procedures for processing claims follow those outlined in the INFORMS (2009) *Guidelines for Copyright and Plagiarism*. They are reproduced here with small ICA-specific adjustments:

The editors and their editorial offices are the primary means of detecting misconduct in manuscripts submitted to their publications. Complainants shall bring cases of suspected author misconduct to the attention of the editors and provide the following relevant documentation:

- Full contact details of the complainant and information on the relationship to the allegation (e.g., author of plagiarized work, reviewer or editor of plagiarizing work).
- Written detailed description of the alleged misconduct, including full citations to the plagiarizing paper and to those papers plagiarized.

The editor shall review all evidence and make a preliminary judgment regarding the claim. As part of the editor’s deliberation, it is required that the authors be contacted and provided an opportunity to rebut the charge.

- Minor instances of plagiarism in submission that have not yet been published can be resolved by the editor alone, choosing the appropriate responses as outlined above in the section on “Sanctions”.
- All other cases that seem to justify a charge of plagiarism shall be forwarded to the chair of the Publications Committee (PC) for further review. The PC chair shall appoint an ad hoc committee that includes her/himself and at least three other persons who may or may not be members of the PC. In addition, the journal’s editor may be appointed as well.

The ad hoc committee shall first contact the author(s) in writing and ask for a response to the charge. Based on the response, the ad hoc committee may obtain additional information, which may include a review of the manuscript in question by experts to help determine the level of plagiarism. *In severe cases the ad hoc committee should also seek the advice of the ICA President and the ICA Executive Committee.* Based on these deliberations, the ad hoc committee shall determine whether the charge is to be upheld and, if so, the sanction which is to be enforced against the authors. Sanctions may be applied unevenly in the case of multiple authors.

Once the finding and the sanction is determined, the PC chair will communicate the results in writing to the author(s) and make the finding known to all other editors of the association’s journals. If the
charge is not upheld, the process ends and no further actions are taken. In particular, the results are only communicated to those persons already involved in the process.

The decision of the committee may be appealed within 30 days by written notification to the ICA Executive Director. In this case, the PC chair will appoint an appeal committee, which includes the PC chair but may not include any other members of the ad hoc committee. The appeal committee will review the charges and make a final determination. The result will be communicated back to the author(s) within 60 days of receipt of the appeal notification.

If a determination of plagiarism has been made, and after any appeals are exhausted, the ad hoc committee will determine appropriate steps, including notification of the employer(s) of the author(s), and if the paper has appeared in print, public notification to the readership.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Policy on confidentiality follows the procedures adopted by ACM (2010) which are reproduced here with minor ICA-specific adjustments:

All aspects of an investigation will be treated with the utmost regard for confidentiality. The names and contacts of the person(s) making the claim and their relationship to the allegation (e.g., author of plagiarized work, reviewer or editor of plagiarizing work) will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose and duration of the investigation. However, in order to ensure timely and effective resolution, details of a claim will be circulated to individuals on a need-to-know basis. As part of the investigation, it may be necessary for ICA to contact current and/or past employers of the authors. ICA, at its discretion, may decide to inform the general ICA membership of the plagiarism investigation. However, during the investigation, under no circumstances will ICA disclose any individual author's name, paper titles, referees, ad hoc investigation committee members, or any other personal or specific information regarding a plagiarism claim to the general membership.

DUPLICATE PUBLICATIONS (‘self plagiarism’)

DEFINITION

‘Self-plagiarism’ occurs when authors “re-use in whole or in part their own previously disseminated ideas, text, data, etc. without any indication of their prior dissemination”, thereby passing it off as new and original material (Roig, 2010, p. 297). “The key feature in all forms of self-plagiarism is the presence of significant overlap between publications and, most importantly, the absence of a clear indication as to the relationship between the various duplicates or related papers. Because of the latter, the word ‘covert’ should always be added to these designations (e.g., covert duplicate publication, covert redundant publication, etc.).” (ibid.)

Self-plagiarism is not always unethical. It must just be transparent and limited in extent. If pre-published material is used, it must either be clearly indicated in the article or in the cover letter to the journal editor.

For social-scientific papers:

- A certain degree of self-plagiarism is acceptable in the METHOD section of those manuscripts that come out of a larger research program. It would be unrealistic, and in some cases even undesirable, to generate novel descriptions of common concepts and techniques if a perfectly accurate description had been worked out before by the author.
• A small amount of overlap in the INTRODUCTION / THEORY sections of such manuscripts is allowed only if it is necessary to understand the programmatic character of a study or to underline a new contribution compared to previous ones.

• Self-plagiarism in the RESULTS / DISCUSSION sections is strongly discouraged and must always be shared with the editors of a journal. For editors to accept manuscripts with pre-published results they would need to see significant value in the new manuscript and believe that it will reach a different community of readers.

For humanistic, historical, theoretical, ethnographic or interpretive papers:

• For the same reasons as listed above, a certain degree of self-plagiarism is acceptable in the THEORY sections of those manuscripts that come out of a larger research program, IF it is a matter of setting out a theoretical or contextual argument, and the empirical material (ethnographic description, archival research, textual analysis, etc) is substantially different.

• A certain degree of self-plagiarism is acceptable in the description of empirical material (ethnographic description, archival research, textual analysis, etc) IF the theoretical or contextual argument is significantly different.

• Self-plagiarism in the THESIS or CONCLUSION is strongly discouraged and must always be shared with the editors of a journal. For editors to accept manuscripts with pre-published results they would need to see significant value in the new manuscript and believe that it will reach a different community of readers.

Every time authors are in doubt about issues of self-plagiarism they are strongly advised to discuss this openly with the editor of the target journal.

TYPES OF SELF PLAGIARISM

Roig (2010) distinguishes several forms of self-plagiarism, some more and some less severe:

• Covert Duplicate Publication / Presentation – Submitting a paper to a journal or conference which had been previously published in a journal or conference proceedings. Some common characteristics:
  o A different title.
  o Different order of authors.
  o Text MAY differ somewhat, but the data are the same.

• Covert Redundant Publication – Occurs when some portion of previously published data is used again in a new publication with no indication that the data had been published earlier. Some common characteristics:
  o A different title.
  o Perhaps a different order of authors.
  o Text MAY differ somewhat.
  o Portions of earlier published data perhaps with new data are presented as new.
  o Previously published data are analyzed differently with no indication as to their earlier origin.

• Covert text recycling – Reusing portions of previously published text in a new publication without a reference to the origin of the earlier published text. Typical instances are:
  o covert augmented publication (meat extender strategy) – Occurs when a simpler study is made more complex (for a second journal publication) by the addition of more observations or experimental conditions.
covert fragmented publication (salami strategy) – Occurs when a complex study is broken down into two or more components and each component is analyzed and published as a separate paper.

Please note: All of these practices (particularly meat extender and salami) are acceptable AS LONG AS the reader is made aware of the origin of the earlier material. As Roig (2010) explains, the essence of all these forms of self-plagiarism is that the reader is not made aware of the duplication.

ACCEPTABLE PRACTICES

Acceptable forms of re-using one’s own work are outlined in the INFORMS (2009) Guidelines for Copyright and Plagiarism which are reproduced here with minor adjustments:

- It is essential that editors and reviewers be told by the authors when any portion of a paper is based heavily on previous work, particularly about the extent to which a paper depends on pre-published work.
- More extensive word-for-word copying of one’s own work is permitted (with permission from the holder of any copyright), but this must be clearly indicated in the article. This does not apply to previous documents such as working papers and theses which were written as part of the research. If an entire section is copied from another source (coauthored by at least one author of the submitted paper), it should contain words to the effect “This section is taken from section x.x of Roberts and Smith (1994)” (where Roberts and/or Smith are coauthors of the submitted paper). If the results of a section are based in large part on material presented in another paper (without significant copying), the section should contain words to the effect “This section is based on section x.x of Roberts and Smith (1994).” Alternatively, a paper might include an opening footnote with a statement such as: An earlier version of this paper was …. The sections on […] and […] originally appeared in …. This paper adds results [ideas, analysis, improvements, ....] in sections […].
- Authors should always cite related work even if that work is their own, even if the journal has double blind review. If an author is concerned that such citation would reveal their identity, thereby circumventing the double blind process, they should nevertheless include a “blinded” citation in the manuscript, i.e., a citation that does not include their name.
- If material from a previous paper is used as the basis for new research, it should be cited, but there is no need to inform the journal handling the original submission.
- If material from a manuscript currently under review is essentially presented again as the main contribution (as opposed to being used as the basis for new research) in a second manuscript (as might happen in a book chapter or conference proceedings paper), the editor of the journal reviewing the original submission must be notified.
- Reuse of empirical data to support new analysis must clearly identify the original source of the data and the degree to which the data is being reused or analyzed in a new and innovative way.

Self-plagiarism in empirical research includes: i) copying or using any data without citation, ii) duplicating analysis without citation which is essentially the same as the earlier paper, iii) copying, or direct reproduction, of charts and graphs that represent data from a previous publication in effectively the same way as an earlier paper, without citation.
SANCTIONS

Sanctioned are only “covert” forms of text recycling, not those made transparent.

- **Fragmented publication** strategy (i.e. dividing a larger research project into smaller segments) is
  - acceptable without sanctions if the related publications are organized in a way that each report gives a well-rounded account of a particular aspect of the larger study, if each new report offers a clear and stand-alone benefit to scientific communication, and if the relations between the reports are made transparent.

- **Covert text recycling** is …
  - acceptable without sanctions in the range of 1-10% as long as it is confined to the Method section or other generic parts of the manuscript that are not its main contribution;
  - to be treated as “covert redundant publication” if more than 30% are recycled. Available sanctions: Same as for “covert redundant publications”;
  - to be treated as “minor plagiarism” if the recycled text ranges between approx. 11% and 29%. Available sanctions depending on severity: Educational letter by editor about ICA policies where there appears to be genuine misunderstanding of principles; or: educational letter plus instruction to rewrite as part of R&R process; or: rejection for violation of ICA policies but permission to resubmit corrected manuscript; or: rejection plus letter of warning (cc’ed to Publications Manager and Publications Committee). Cases are decided by editor without formal investigation by PC.

- **Covert redundant publications** and **covert augmented publications** where papers with over 30% of pre-published text or data are submitted to an ICA journal or an ICA conference should be sanctioned in the same way as ordinary “major plagiarism” is. Available sanctions are (depending on circumstances):
  - Rejection; or same plus letter of warning (cc’ed to chair of the Publications Committee and ICA Publications Manager); or same plus demanding an apology to ICA from author; or same plus further sanctions imposed by Publications Committee including letter to home institution or temporary submission ban. Publications Committee reserves right to waive any penalties, or use different ones, after review of individual case (see Procedures for details).

- **Covert duplicate publications** (or covert duplicate conference paper submissions) where an entire pre-published paper is submitted should be sanctioned similarly to ordinary “major plagiarism” is. Available sanctions are (depending on circumstances):
  - Rejection; or same plus letter of warning (cc’ed to chair of the Publications Committee and ICA Publications Manager); or same plus demanding an apology to ICA from author; or same plus further sanctions imposed by Publications Committee including letter to home institution or temporary submission ban. Publications Committee reserves right to waive any penalties, or use different ones, after review of individual case (see Procedures for details).

HOW TO PREVENT SELF-PLAGIARISM

Same as for plagiarism. Appendix A advises authors not to self-plagiarize, to always cite all relevant works (including one’s own), and to avoid questionable forms of fragmentation.

PROCEDURES and CONFIDENTIALITY

Same as for plagiarism.
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APPENDIX A

The following ethical guidelines were set by the Editors of the Publications Division of the American Chemical Society (ACS) and are reproduced here in part from http://pubs.acs.org/userimages/ContentEditor/1218054468605/ethics.pdf; with ICA-related modifications:

Ethical Obligations of Authors to Prevent Plagiarism and Self-Plagiarism

An author should cite those publications that have been influential in determining the nature of the reported work and that will guide the reader quickly to the earlier work that is essential for understanding the present investigation. An author is obligated to perform a literature search to find, and then cite, the original publications that describe closely related work. For critical materials used in the work, proper citation to sources should also be made when these were supplied by a nonauthor.

Fragmentation of research reports should be avoided. A scientist who has done extensive work on a group of related studies should organize publication so that each report gives a well-rounded account of a particular aspect of the general study. Fragmentation consumes journal space excessively and unduly complicates literature searches. The convenience of readers is served if reports on related studies are published in the same journal, or in a small number of journals.

In submitting a manuscript for publication, an author should inform the editor of related manuscripts that the author has under editorial consideration or in press. Copies of those manuscripts should be supplied to the editor, and the relationships of such manuscripts to the one submitted should be indicated.

It is improper for an author to submit manuscripts describing essentially the same research to more than one journal of primary publication, unless it is a resubmission of a manuscript rejected for or withdrawn from publication. It is generally permissible to submit a manuscript for a full paper expanding on a previously published brief preliminary account (a working paper) of the same work. However, at the time of submission, the editor should be made aware of the earlier communication, and the preliminary communication should be cited in the manuscript.

An author should identify the source of all information quoted or offered, except that which is common knowledge. Information obtained in the course of confidential services, such as refereeing manuscripts or grant applications, should not be used without explicit permission from the investigator with whom the information originated.

The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons appropriate and none inappropriate. The submitting author should have sent each living co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and have obtained the co-author’s assent to co-authorship of it.

Plagiarism is not acceptable. Authors should not engage in plagiarism - verbatim or near-verbatim copying, or very close paraphrasing, of text or results from another’s work. Authors should not engage in self-plagiarism (also known as covert duplicate publication) - unacceptably close replication of the author’s own previously published text or results without acknowledgement of the source. ICA applies a “reasonable person” standard when deciding whether a submission constitutes self-plagiarism/duplicate publication.

INCLUDE HERE SUMMARY OF WHAT IS APPROVED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ICA BOARD
Resources for avoiding plagiarism:

http://writing.mit.edu/wcc/avoidingplagiarism
http://library.rwu.edu/howdoi/plagiarism.php
http://www.scanmyessay.com/plagiarism/how-to-avoid-plagiarism.php
http://libguides.usc.edu/content.php?pid=83009&sid=616087
http://www.cse.msu.edu/~alexliu/plagiarism.pdf