

THE (UN)ORIGINALITY OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS – AN ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL QUALITY STANDARDS

Katarina Krapež

University of Primorska, Faculty of management, Slovenia
katarina.krapez@eukalipta.si

Abstract :

The papers submitted to this conference must have scientific value and need to present original ideas. Originality is indispensable to the processes of creation and innovation at all levels, starting with scientific research. This paper focuses on originality in the sphere of scientific works, primarily in papers like this one. It examines contemporary standards related to the level and the nature of originality in scientific journals in order to illustrate the complexity of the notion and the dilemmas stakeholders (authors, journal editors, peer reviewers and publishers) are faced with when standards are absent or unclear. It argues that in the concept of active citizenship, academic journals can be seen as facilitators of transformative ideas only when the stakeholders ensure a high quality of writing, especially by promoting the original thinking of authors and an individual approach.

Research suggests that there is a general lack of contemporary debate on originality in scientific writing, with rare exceptions that focus on selected cases of wrongdoing – especially various forms of plagiarism. Essential questions about the nature and scope of the required originality in scientific papers remain unanswered. This imposes greater responsibility on the editors of scientific journals as well as article authors, as they have to individually develop standards related to originality. This paper emphasises the importance of paying greater attention to the dilemmas facing the stakeholders in scientific publishing related to evaluating the originality of scientific papers.

Keywords: originality, scientific papers, quality standards, active citizenship

1. SCIENTISTS AS ACTIVE CITIZENS

A citizen is motivated to be active and involved in the matters of society only when he understands and internalizes the idea that he has the power to transform and improve his environment.¹ Such an individual can help to critically assess and advance processes, products, and services in such a way that they serve society better.² For example, he can share knowledge by providing professional expertise or pass on his experience and skills by coaching in different areas. During this process the citizen employs his inner-drive and creative potential to improve something or create something new.³

This paper focuses on active citizenship in the sphere of science. Scientists (researchers and other academic authors) communicate ideas, knowledge, skills, and experience to society – i.e. to either professionals or the public – mainly (but not exclusively) through scientific papers. Within the concept of active citizenship, academic journals can be seen as facilitators of transformative ideas. To attain and sustain such an important role in society, the stakeholders (publishers, editors, peer reviewers) have to ensure a high quality of writing, especially by promoting the original thinking of authors and an individual approach.

The level of originality of a scientific text can be seen as one of the possible indicators of the transformative potential of the paper or journal. Therefore, this paper examines contemporary standards related to the level and nature of the originality of scientific papers. The analysis is limited to publicly published guidelines related to the required standard of originality in specific journals. Ordinarily, such guidelines are part of the instructions for authors on how to write a text, formulated by either the editor or publisher of the journal. Since the MakeLearn 2013 conference is hosting an Editors' Panel, which brings together editors from leading international scientific journals, the analysis is limited to these seventeen journals. To start with, the paper gives a short introduction to the contemporary understanding of originality.

2. THE TWO SIDES OF THE TERM 'ORIGINAL TEXT'

Originality is a rather broad, to some extent even antithetical term. The related adjective is used to indicate something that has been present or existing from the beginning or origin, in the sense of the first or the earliest stage of the existence of a thing (the Oxford Dictionary of English, 2003, p. 1242 and the Webster Comprehensive Dictionary, 1992, p. 890). What is original is therefore something primary, starting, or earliest (The Oxford Thesaurus, 1997, p. 321). Another meaning of the word is novel, fresh, or unusual (the Collins English Dictionary, 1995, p. 1102). These two meanings are opposites – original means initial or old and, at the same time, contemporary or new. The sentence “A recent article by John Meikle sheds strikingly *original* insight onto that long-simmering controversy over the Constitutional Framers' *original* intent,” Nimmer (2001, 195) gives an unambiguous example of such contradictory meanings. In the first part of the sentence, the term original indicates novelty or something that is different than the pre-existing, some sort of precedent. In contrast, in the second part

¹ Such an understanding of citizenship is traditional. In traditional discourse on citizenship, as suggested by Kathleen Knight Abowitz and Jason Harnish, citizenship is seen as “something that happens when people are engaged in activity for, with, on behalf of, or even against others” (2006, p. 680). One of the key elements of the traditional definition of citizenship is the idea that individuals and groups act. This element is named agency. Contemporary discourse on citizenship challenges the notion of civic agency, for instance by calling into question whether modern citizens act and, if yes, in what ways they act. “Do they engage in discourse or ironic performance, empathetic dialogue or storytelling, conflict or peacemaking? Do they engage in their discourse through traditional public forums or through worldwide electronic transmissions?” (2006, p. 680)

² With the aim to help teachers educate students about citizenship, Banks (2008, p. 136) categorises citizenship into four levels: legal, minimal, active, and transformative. The most superficial level of citizenship, *legal*, is only a reflection of an individual's status and does not involve any kind of participation in public matters. The actions of *active citizens* are designed to support and maintain – but not to challenge – existing social and political structures. *Transformative citizenship*, on the other hand, involves civil action that promotes values, principles, and ideals, even if such actions challenge existing laws, conventions or structures. In this paper the term active citizenship is used in a broader sense and also encompasses the transformative component of citizenship.

³ An active citizen facilitates change. Crick (2000 & 2007) emphasises that there is a fundamental difference between an active and a good citizen. In a democratic state, being a good citizen means obeying the law and paying taxes, etc., but not necessarily participating in any matter that effects public policy. This is a somewhat “minimalist approach to citizenship”, as Crick sceptically suggests (2007, p. 243), and he calls for effective citizenship which combines individuals and gives them the power to change or resist change.

of the sentence, the same word is used in the sense of something primary, initial, or old. These two meanings of the word are, as recognised by Nimmer (ibid.), not only different, but even diametrically opposed.

However, none of the above meanings evidently relate to the issue of authentic authorship in scientific papers. Three dictionaries, the Webster Comprehensive Dictionary (1992), the Collins English Dictionary (1995), and the Oxford Dictionary of English (2003) list several other meanings of the words original and originality. Among them, the following could be helpful for understanding what editors, reviewers, or authors mean when they talk about the originality of a scientific text.

The term original (used as an adjective) means:

- immediately produced by one's own mind and thought; not copied or produced by imitation (Webster);
- able to produce works requiring thought, without copying or imitating those of others; creative; inventive (Webster);
- able to think of or carry out new ideas or concepts (Collins);
- being that from which a copy, translation etc., is made (Collins);
- not dependent on other people's ideas; inventive or novel (Oxford).

The term originality (a noun), as defined in these dictionaries, among other meanings, indicates:

- the power of originating inventiveness (Webster);
- the ability to create or innovate (Collins);
- the ability to think independently and creatively (Oxford).⁴

When we look at these meanings from the point of focus of the text, it seems that there are two sides of the term 'original text' that need to be considered.

- The first is *the negative side of the term*, which basically indicates what should be excluded from being considered or perceived as an original text. For example, a text can be original if it is not copied, not replicated, or not produced by imitation. Such a text must be produced by the author's own mind and thought.
- However, it is not sufficient that the text is merely not copied. *The positive side of the term* original indicates that a text that is labelled original must also be creative, inventive, or novel. Here, the emphasis is on the specific characteristics of the text, which is that it contains new ideas or concepts. Interestingly, the term 'originality' primarily indicates creativeness and inventiveness – the positive side.

The term 'original' stands at the fictitious and intangible border between a new text (and the knowledge, ideas, and concepts that it contains) and a text that has existed before. For example, an unoriginal text can be a text that is copied or a text that fails to reach the required level of creativity to be seen as original (for example, a text that tells nothing new). When we consider the (un)originality of a scientific text, such distinctions and borders can be a good starting point.

3. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ORIGINAL AUTHORIAL EXPRESSION IN SCIENTIFIC PAPERS

It is commonly deemed that the required level and nature of the originality of literary works is defined by law, specifically copyright law or authors' rights⁵. Such perception is to some extent misleading.

⁴ For a better understanding of both terms, it is also useful to study synonyms (and antonyms). The Oxford Thesaurus (1997, p. 321) lists several synonyms for both terms. Synonyms (and antonyms) of the term original include the following:

- authentic, genuine (antonyms: copy, duplicate, replica, etc.);
- creative, novel, innovative, unique, inventive, underived, unprecedented (antonyms: banal, stereotypical, time-worn, ordinary).

And for the term originality:

- creativeness, creativity, inventiveness, ingenuity, innovativeness, newness, unconventionality, daring, individuality, uniqueness, nonconformity, etc.

⁵ The difference between legal systems featuring either copyright or authors' rights is historical and based on two diverse legal traditions, i.e., the common law tradition (associated mainly with Anglo-Saxon countries) and the civil law tradition (typically associated with the countries of continental Europe). For a more complete description of both systems and the differences between them, see Sterling (2003, pp. 15–18).

The legislation (national copyright laws and authors' rights) in general only state that a creative work has to be a product of human intellect and creativity, for instance the work has to be 'original'⁶, or 'must have the imprint of the author's personality'⁷ in order to be protected, but does not give any indication of the required scope or level of originality of the work.⁸ Legal protection is ensured as soon as the creative work is minimally original. The law defines only the minimum threshold of originality for a work to be protected, but nothing more. Also, such minimum threshold is generally defined by national copyright/authors' rights law and not by international conventions such as the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (hereinafter: the Berne Convention).⁹ Consequently, there is no unified legal definition of either the term 'originality' or the minimum threshold of originality. Sterling (2003, p. 323) recognises that it would be desirable to have a harmonised approach throughout the world.

Therefore, the legal requirement for the originality of a scientific paper does not provide strong motivation for the author of a scientific text to produce a creative and original text. "[T]he law incentivises authors to produce works containing just enough originality to receive protection – but not more", emphasise Parchomovsky and Stein (2009, p. 1506), who argue that the result is neither efficient nor just, since all works, whether minimally or highly original, are rewarded with protection.

Consequently, the stakeholders in scientific publishing (authors, journal editors, peer reviewers, and publishers) can not find sufficient incentive to produce and publish transformative writing (in the sense of active citizenship) in the law alone. Such a situation reflects the need for effective self-regulation within professional circles.

4. ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL QUALITY STANDARDS REGARDING THE ORIGINALITY OF SCIENTIFIC TEXTS

The required level of originality of the scientific texts published in a particular scientific journal is predominantly determined by the editor of the journal or, in some cases, the publisher. The analysis herein showed that quality standards related to originality are most commonly published as a part of the guidelines or instructions for authors of scientific texts (guidelines/instructions/information for authors, authors' rights, and responsibilities) or as a part of specific policies related to ethics (a publication ethics resource kit or code of conduct) or as best practices, originality policies, etc. The purpose of such documents is to inform and support authors and editors in their decisions related to quality, ethics, and originality, e.g. "to assist authors in understanding acceptable and unacceptable practice" (Emerald's Originality Guidelines) or "to support journal editors in handling publishing ethics issues" (Elsevier's Publishing Ethics Resource Kit). The analysis was limited to documents that are published on the websites of the analysed journals.

The analysis covered fourteen international scientific journals whose editors are members of The Editors' Panel of the MakeLearn Conference 2013. All fourteen journals are double-blind reviewed research journals that publish diverse types of academic manuscripts, predominantly review papers, research analysis, case studies, etc. The journals cover topics in the broader fields of management, economics, and informatics. The journals are published by nine different publishers. Among them are three larger academic publishers (Emerald, Elsevier, Inderscience), one independent publisher of

⁶ The originality of a creative work is the most common legal standard in copyright legislation in countries with an Anglo-Saxon tradition. Goldstein (2001, p. 161) explains that according to this standard it is necessary that the work originated from its author and no one else, which also means that it must not be copied or 'pirated' from other works. For a detailed explanation, see Bently and Sherman (2005).

⁷ Such standards prevail in countries with an authors' rights tradition. In Germany, for instance, a creative work has to be a 'personal intellectual creation', while according to Italian legislation it has to have a 'creative character' (Goldstein, 2001, pp. 161–162).

⁸ As a general rule, copyright statutes in most countries do not define the term originality; interpretation of the meaning of the term has been left to the courts and legal theorists. For example, see Lichtman (2003), who describes the historical development of the standard of originality in the judicial system of the United States of America.

⁹ The exceptions are the countries of the European Union (EU), where the trend is towards a uniform standard (Goldstein, 2001, p. 164). It would seem likely that, as suggested by Sterling (2003, p. 323), "the criterion of originality expressed as 'the author's own intellectual creation' could become a standard for all categories of authors' works throughout the EU".

three different journals (ToKnowPress), university publishers (the University of Primorska and Jagiellonian University Press) and professional associations (the International Association for Computer Information Systems, the Polish Academy of Sciences Committee on Production Engineering, the Polish Association for Production Management, and the Academy of Performance Measurement). In three cases the analysis covered a number of journals published by the same publisher (Inderscience – 6 journals; ToKnowPress – 3 journals, the University of Primorska – 2 journals). Three of the fourteen journals are ranked by the Thompson Reuters (formerly ISI) citation indexes. Table 1 (below) contains a detailed list of the journals with information on publishers, ranking, websites, and analysed documents.

The question analysed first was who among the stakeholders (authors, journal editors, peer reviewers, and publishers) determined the originality standards for a particular journal. The analysis showed that standards are most commonly determined by professional organisations (especially the Committee on Publication Ethics – COPE). Journals that are members of this organisation refer authors to these standards. Larger academic publishers (Emerald, Elsevier, Inderscience) have also adopted their own in-house policies (e.g. Originality Guidelines by Emerald, Ethical Guidelines for Authors by Inderscience, The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit and Author Rights and Responsibilities by Elsevier). In the other journals analysed the originality standard was determined by either the editor of the journal or the publisher as a part of the instructions/guidelines/information for authors. In most cases, such document contains only the general requirement that articles have to be the author's original work.

The analysis suggests that professional organisations in the field of publication ethics, especially the Committee on Publication Ethics – COPE, play an important role in the promotion and monitoring of originality in research publications. COPE is a non-profit organisation that provides advice, services, and forums to editors and publishers on all aspects of publication ethics and, in particular, how to handle cases of research and publication misconduct. COPE provides best practice guidelines¹⁰ and access to an extensive database of individual cases. Another example of cooperation among journals and professional associations in the field of ethics and originality standards is the Journal of Computer Information Systems, which is published by the International Association for Computer Information Systems. The Journal refers potential authors to the association's Code of Research Conduct, which provides extensive guidelines related to originality in scientific texts, with a focus on undesirable practices, such as plagiarism.

The duties and responsibilities of the stakeholders in scientific publishing with regard to ensuring an appropriate level of originality are diverse, as indicated the analysis. The analysed documents assign the greatest part of responsibility for ensuring the originality of papers to the author, followed by the editor of the paper and the peer reviewer. The Publishing Ethics Resource Kit of Elsevier, for example, lists the duties related to originality (and plagiarism) exclusively under author, while the editor has the duty to decide whether the text is appropriate for publication and meets all the required standards. The reviewer's duty is to ensure acknowledgement of sources. The majority of the other documents analysed focus predominantly on the author's obligation to submit an original manuscript. COPE prescribes ethical and best practices guidelines for every stakeholder in scientific publishing, with a focus on editors and peer reviewers. According to COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers (COPE EGPRReviewers), the reviewer's chief duty is to detect cases of unoriginality (and other irregularities) and notify the journal. According to COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (COPE BPGJEditors), good editors should "publish clear instructions in their journals about submission and what they expect from authors" (Part 3: Relations with authors). In relation to reviewers (Part 4), COPE BPGJEditors directs editors to "encourage reviewers to ensure the originality of the submissions and be alert to redundant publication and plagiarism". All stakeholders should be concerned with quality assurance (COPE BPGJEditors, Part 8), while editors are responsible for setting up and having in place effective systems for the detection of falsified data (either for routine use or when suspicions are raised). COPE BPGJEditors (Part 12) also advises editors to adopt systems for detecting plagiarism, "e.g. software, searching for similar titles" in submitted papers. Seven (out of fourteen) journals (see Table 1), all by larger academic publishers,

¹⁰ For issues related to originality, see COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors and COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.

indicated on their websites that they use software to check the originality of submissions received. Submissions are checked either routinely or when suspicions are raised.¹¹

While more than half (ten out of fourteen; see Table 1) of the journals analysed (i.e. the documents on their websites) contain a general requirement regarding the originality of submissions, only two briefly explain what scope or level of originality is expected. Emerald's Originality Guidelines state that content has to be based on authors' "own research" and "expressed in their own words", and continue with a description of undesired practices, especially plagiarism. The document of Elsevier entitled Author's Rights and Responsibilities states that submissions have to be "entirely original works" and require that if "authors have used the work and/or words of others, that this has been appropriately cited or quoted". Nine out of ten journals that state that submissions have to be the author's original work also contain a list of undesired practices, i.e. a description or cases of unoriginality (unoriginal text), especially plagiarism. The journals that devote more attention to the development of originality standards are either journals published by larger academic publishing houses (Emerald, Elsevier, Inderscience) and/or TR ISI-ranked journals.

¹¹ Publishers of these journals (Emerald, Elsevier, and Inderscience) are members of the non-profit, independent organisation Publishers International Linking Association (PILA), which operates the CrossCheck service, which allows publishers to verify the originality of works. CrossCheck uses the originality detection software iThenticate to compare manuscripts against a database of more than 30 million articles. For more on this, see the CrossRef organisation website at <http://www.crossref.org>.

Table 1: A list of the scientific journals analysed with information on published guidelines on the required standard of originality.

Title of the journal (Publisher; TR ISI-ranked journal?*)	Internet address	Does the website provide any guidelines related to the required originality of submitted papers?	If yes, Internet address	The most important characteristics of the guidelines	Is the originality of the submissions checked with software?
<p><i>Industrial Management & Data Systems</i> (Emerald; a TR ISI-ranked journal)</p>	<p>http://www.emeraldinsight.com/imds.htm</p>	<p>Yes, Emerald's Originality Guidelines policy is focused on originality issues.</p>	<p>http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/writing/originality.htm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed guidelines, focused specifically on originality, plagiarism, and attribution (references to other publication) • the purpose of the guidelines: "to assist authors in understanding acceptable and unacceptable practice" • a general requirement for originality (content has to be based on the authors' own research and expressed in their own words) • definitions of diverse types of plagiarism which should be avoided • a limitation on the republication of original work • a general notice related to the procedure for handling allegations of plagiarism 	<p>The editor may make use of iThenticate software for checking the originality of submissions received. The guidelines state that Emerald was the first academic publisher to adopt such software.</p>
<p><i>Expert Systems with Applications</i> (Elsevier; a TR ISI-ranked journal)</p>	<p>http://www.journals.elsevier.com/expert-systems-with-applications/</p>	<p>Yes, the Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (PERK); an online resource supporting journal editors in handling publishing ethics issues. Relevant policy document: Author Rights and Responsibilities. Also: Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors published by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).</p>	<p>http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk and http://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-rights-and-responsibilities#responsibilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • online access to several policies and documents related to publishing ethics issues, e.g. authorship complaints and plagiarism complaints • the purpose of the kit: an overview of standards of expected ethical behaviour for all parties involved in the act of publishing • general requirement of "entirely original works" (if the authors have used the work and/or words of others, these has to be appropriately cited or quoted) • a general statement on the unacceptability of diverse forms of plagiarism (e.g. 'passing off' another's paper as the author's own paper, copying or paraphrasing substantial parts of another's paper (without attribution), claiming results from research conducted by others) • a general statement on the unacceptability of simultaneous submissions (multiple, duplicate, or concurrent publications) • a general requirement regarding proper acknowledgment of sources 	<p>CrossCheck is a service that allows publishers to verify the originality of published works. The editor may make use of iThenticate software for checking the originality of submissions received.</p>

<i>Journal of Computer Information Systems</i> (International Association for Computer Information Systems; a TR ISI-ranked journal)	http://iacis.org/jcis.php	Yes, the Manuscript Submission Policies and Code of Research Conduct, published by the Association for Information Systems (AIS).	http://iacis.org/jcis/guidelines.php and http://home.aisnet.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all manuscripts must be the authors' original, unpublished work the manuscript must not be under consideration for publication elsewhere (limitations related to the publication of conference proceedings) the research described in the paper has to comply with the AIS Code of Research Conduct (the code contains extensive information on plagiarism – a definition, examples, etc.) 	No/not mentioned.
<i>International Journal of Diplomacy and Economy</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijdi	<p>Active Citizenship by Knowledge Management & Innovation Yes, Inderscience 2013, Zadar, Croatia</p> <p>Ethical Guidelines for Authors. Also: Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors published by COPE.</p>	http://www.inderscience.com/info/inauthors/index.php	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a general requirement that an article has to be the author's original work a paper should not have been published before (exceptions regarding conference papers) or be under consideration for publication elsewhere a general statement on the unacceptability of diverse forms of plagiarism (e.g. word-for-word copying, use of unique terms or concepts without attribution, paraphrasing or abbreviated restatement without attribution, false citation, self-plagiarism) 	All academic papers are screened upon submission. Inderscience is a member of the CrossRef organisation and uses Ithenticate software.**
<i>International Journal of Management in Education</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijmie				
<i>International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijmed				
<i>International Journal of Services and Standards</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijss				
<i>International Journal of Innovation and Learning</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijil				
<i>International Journal of Sustainable Economy</i> (Inderscience)	http://www.inderscience.com/ijse				
<i>International Journal of Business Development and Research</i> (ToKnowPress)	http://bus.ku.ac.th/journal/	The Author Guidelines only provide instructions related to copyright.	http://bus.ku.ac.th/journal/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4&Itemid=5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> articles submitted to the journal should not have been published before in their current form, or be under consideration for publication by other journals 	No/not mentioned.***
<i>International Journal of Management, Knowledge and Learning</i> (ToKnowPress)	http://www.mfdds.si/en/strani/1221	Yes, Author Guidelines.	http://www.mfdds.si/en/strani/1222 and http://www.mfdds.si/en/strani/1221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the introductory web page only generally states that the journal publishes original and review papers the Author Guidelines states that papers should not be published in any other journal or be under simultaneous consideration by another publication. 	No/not mentioned.
<i>International Journal of Synergy and Research</i>	http://www.ijsr.umcs.lublin.pl/	No, the Author Guidelines do not	http://ijsr.umcs.lublin.pl/?page_i	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Author Guidelines do not mention originality, but state that the journal requires "unique attributes" 	No/not mentioned.

(ToKnowPress)		contain a general requirement regarding original works.	d=20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> when listing possible forms of manuscripts, the Author Guidelines mention original papers, empirical studies, literature, and research reviews providing new perspectives, etc. 	
<i>Management</i> (University of Primorska)	http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/IS/SN/1854-4231.htm	No, the Instructions for Authors only provide guidelines related to copyright.	http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/IS/SN/1854-4231/authors.htm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> authors have to ensure that submitted articles have not been published before and that they are not in the process of being published in another journal 	No/not mentioned.
<i>Managing Global Transitions: International Research Journal</i> (University of Primorska)	http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/IS/SN/1581-6311.htm	Yes, Information for Authors.	http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/IS/SN/1581-6311/motinfo.htm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> only a general statement that manuscripts are accepted on the understanding that they are original and not under simultaneous consideration by any other publication 	No/not mentioned.
<i>Contemporary Management Quarterly</i> (Jagiellonian University Press)	http://www.wzkw.ortalnik.uj.edu.pl/	No, the Instructions for Authors only provide guidelines related to copyright.	http://www.wzkw.ortalnik.uj.edu.pl/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=158&Itemid=90	-	No/not mentioned.
<i>Management and Production Engineering Review</i> (Polish Academy of Sciences Committee on Production Engineering & Polish Association for Production Management)	http://www.revie.w.univtech.eu	The Information for MPER Authors does not provide guidelines related to originality.	http://www.revie.w.univtech.eu/ and http://www.revie.w.univtech.eu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the introductory web page only generally states that the main purpose of the journal is to publish the results of cutting-edge research advancing the concepts, theories, and implementation of novel solutions in modern manufacturing the journal also welcomes papers presenting original research results 	No/not mentioned.
<i>International Journal of Performance Measurement</i> (Academy of Performance Measurement)	http://performancesforum.org/index.html	No, the Authors' Guidelines do not contain a general requirement regarding original works.	http://performancesforum.org/author_guidelines.html and http://performancesforum.org/cfp.html	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the introductory web page states that the journal publishes original and review papers, research analyses, technical reports, case studies, literature reviews, etc. 	No/not mentioned.

* Thomson Reuters maintains citation databases covering thousands of academic journals, including the Science Citation Index (SCI), as well as the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (AHCI). All of these are available via the Thomson Reuters (ISI) Web of Knowledge (formerly ISI Web of Knowledge) database service: http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/science_products/a-z/isi_web_of_knowledge

** All journals published by Inderscience Publishers, except the International Journal of Diplomacy and Economy, are listed in the Ithenticate members' database <http://www.ithenticate.com/search>

*** The journal is not listed in the Ithenticate members' database; the journal's website does not mention that the publisher verifies the originality of submissions with software.

5. CONCLUSION

In scientific publishing, there is increasing interest in issues related to the originality of scientific papers. The majority of the analysed journals have adopted some manner of guidelines or policies related to originality issues. However, the results do not suggest that professional standards related to the originality of scientific texts are either unified or precisely defined. Journals predominantly require 'the originality of submissions', but do not explain what 'original' means exactly.

The analysis shows that, for now, the stakeholders in scientific publishing are preoccupied with tracking down evident cases of unoriginal writing, especially plagiarised text, in order to lower the risk of being held responsible for professional misconduct. Especially larger academic publishers offer extensive web-based resources on the subject of plagiarism and other forms of wrongdoing, while the websites of other publishers provide information (usually a short description) on unacceptable practices, i.e. primarily different types of plagiarism.

The findings suggest that currently much less attention is devoted to the question of what makes a specific text original and how to increase the level of originality in scientific papers. The first part of the paper lists several meanings of the term original and discusses which of them could be helpful when stakeholders in scientific publishing need to define originality. The term originality primarily indicates creativeness and inventiveness, i.e. the ability to think (write) independently and the power to innovate. It would be beneficial if, in the future, debate on the originality of scientific papers also partially focused on the positive side of the term and provided some incentive for transformative academic writing.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Banks, A. J. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129–139.
2. Bently, L. & Sherman, B. (2004). *Intellectual Property Law* (2nd Ed.). Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
3. Code of Research Conduct (Association for Computer Information Systems). (2013, 26th May). Retrieved from <http://home.aisnet.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=1&subarticlenbr=15>
4. *Collins English Dictionary* (3rd Ed., 1995). Entry on Original and originality (p. 1102). Great Britain: HarperCollins Publishers.
5. COPE Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors and COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers. (2013, 26th May). Retrieved from <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>
6. Crick, B. (2000). *Essays on Citizenship*. Great Britain: Continuum.
7. Crick, B. (2007). Citizenship: The Political and the Democratic. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), 235–248.
8. Goldstein, P. (2001). *International Copyright: Principles, Law and Practice*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
9. Knight Abowitz, K. & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 653–690.
10. Lichtman, D. (2003). Copyright as a Rule of Evidence. *Duke Law Journal*, (52)4, 683–743.
11. Nimmer, D. (2001). Copyright in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Authorship and Originality. *Houston Law Review*, 38(1), 1–217.
12. Originality Guidelines (Emerald). (2013, May 26). Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/writing/originality.htm>
13. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. (2nd Ed., 2003) Entry on Original and originality. (p. 1242). Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
14. Parchomovsky, G. & Stein, A. (2009). Originality. *Virginia Law Review*, 95(6), 1505–1550.
15. Publishing Ethics Resource Kit (Elsevier). (2013, May 26). Retrieved from <http://www.elsevier.com/editors/perk>
16. Sterling, J. A. L. (2003). *World Copyright Law: Protection of Author's Works, Performances, Phonograms, Films, Video, Broadcasts and Published Editions in National, International and Regional Law*. Great Britain: Sweet & Maxwell.
17. The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. Retrieved from http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/berne/trtdocs_wo001.html

18. *The Oxford Thesaurus*. (2nd Ed., 1997). Entry on Original and originality. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
19. *Webster Comprehensive Dictionary: International Edition*. (Vol. 2, 1992). Entry on Original and originality. (p. 890). Chicago, IL: J. G. Ferguson Publishing Company.