Croatian Journal of Education
Vol. 28; No.1/2026, pages: 119-146
Original scientific paper
Paper submitted: 15th January 2026
Paper accepted: 19th March 2026
https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v28.i1.41726

Academic Honesty through Teachers' Lenses: Metaphors on Plagiarism Detection Software Across Cultures

Abdülkadir Kabadayı[1] and Martin Skutil[2]
[1]Necmettin Erbakan University A.K., Faculty of Education
[2]Charles University, Faculty of Arts

Abstract

This research was conducted to obtain and compare teachers' metaphorical perceptions of "plagiarism detecting software - text" chains in both Czech and Turkish educational contexts. 15 Turkish and 19 Czech teachers participated in the study. The participants completed the phrase "A Plagiarism detection software – text is like . . . because . . ." to indicate their conceptualisations of the tools. Data was analysed qualitatively. As a result of the research, participants created 201 metaphors related to the "plagiarism detection software - text" concept chain across 9 conceptual categories. It was concluded that metaphors can be a powerful research tool for understanding teachers' insights into technological and educational phenomena related to sustainability.

Keywords: *Czech teachers; plagiarism detection tools; Qualitative; teachers' perspectives; text; Turkish*

Introduction

In the contemporary educational landscape, the rise of plagiarism and the advent of plagiarism-detecting software have sparked discussions among educators worldwide. While technology offers innovative solutions to combat academic dishonesty, its integration into educational practices brings forth complex implications and ethical considerations. Metaphor facilitates cognitive and expressive enhancement by enabling us to think and articulate one thing in terms of another. It provides tangible expressions for abstract concepts, allowing ideas to be grasped or released. Perceptual experiences, characterised as physical and relatively concrete, serve as an ideal source domain for

© Author(s) 2026
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0). https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

metaphor, whereas they are less likely to serve as a target domain (Speed, O'Meara, San Roque, & Majid, 2019). Kövecses (2017) posits that Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has been pivotal in addressing a fundamental issue in cognitive theory: the interpretation of the meaning of abstract concepts. Given that abstractions lack direct physical and perceptual experiences, CMT proposes that these abstract concepts derive meaning through conceptual metaphors that link them to physical or perceptual ones. Thus, metaphor functions as a mechanism for articulating and potentially conceptualising one thing in terms of another (Semino, 2008). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that metaphors permeate not only artistic genres such as literature but also the most neutral forms of language. Kövecses (2017) further contends that metaphor is not confined to language but extends to thought processes as well. Metaphors aid not only in verbalising aspects of the world but also in conceptualising them. The notion that domains are conceptualised in terms of others can be interpreted in various ways. Individuals might be guided by specific conceptual metaphors in their conceptualisation of a domain. Metaphor analysis aims to uncover the meanings beyond explicit, conscious expressions by examining the metaphors individuals employ to articulate their experiences and beliefs (Zheng & Song, 2010). In today's knowledge-driven world, the perception of knowledge as power necessitates diverse techniques and approaches to information access, including research. Metaphors serve as a data-collection method that encourages free thought and facilitates effective self-expression (Güneş & Fırat, 2015; in İşçitürk, 2023). Gibbs (2017) posits that metaphors are not merely specialised communicative tools but constitute an integral part of everyday cognition through conceptual metaphors. A substantial body of empirical evidence from cognitive linguistics and related fields illustrates the foundational role of conceptual metaphors in language, thought, culture, and expressive action. Metaphors that aid in conceptualising perceptions and presenting concrete depictions thereof facilitate the conveyance of information, enable informed actions, establish goals, and structure systems coherently (Hoglar, Gross, Hartman, & Cunliffe, 2008). Demir (2022) emphasises that understanding schools and their structures effectively requires insights into students' perceptions, a significant stakeholder group. Thus, metaphors emerge as potent instruments for comprehending schools and discerning the value and perception associated with them. Tartuk (2023) presents an intriguing perspective, highlighting the increasing relevance of artificial intelligence (AI) as a contemporary tool. According to Tartuk (2023), it is conceivable that nations will incorporate AI and coding literacy skills into their curricula to equip citizens to address emerging challenges and questions effectively. Currently, understanding AI is pivotal for leveraging technology effectively. This raises questions about the insights AI can offer. Wegner et al. (2020) identify two types of metaphors: learning-oriented metaphors that focus on learning processes and outcomes, and self-referential metaphors that centre on motivational aspects. Learning-oriented metaphors correlate with a

profound approach to learning, while self-referential metaphors relate to a superficial approach. They conclude that metaphors reflect the general level of reflection on learning, influencing the adoption of deep or superficial learning approaches. With the advancement of technology-integrated education, research on technology and teacher education abounds (Wu, 2025; Kanbur & Arcagök, 2024; Cvetković et al., 2024; Sadıku, 2024; Brčić, 2020; Jeremić et al., 2020; Kabadayı, 2012; Kabadayı, 2014). As for plagiarism, detection tools have rapidly developed and gained prominence in higher education, becoming a key policy concern—despite actual cases often being lower than perceived. It has long concerned educators, but violations became more noticeable during emergency remote teaching. Ahmad and Fauzi (2024, p. 65) liken plagiarism to a "contagious disease," emphasising its subtle spread and wide-reaching impact on students, educators, and institutions in higher education. Most teachers were worried about online misconduct. Research mainly highlights types of violations such as plagiarism, fabrication, the deliberate appropriation of other writers' text without attribution, and contract cheating (WPA Council, 2019; Akbulut et al., 2008; Blau et al., 2021; McIntire et al., 2024).Various forms of plagiarism, sometimes overlooked, underscore the urgent need for awareness and vigilance (Awasthi, 2019). Helgeson & Eriksson (2015) emphasise the importance of defining scientific misconduct, noting that "plagiarism" is a frequently invoked term in discussions of scientific integrity. Salemani et al. (2018) identify a primary reason for plagiarism as academic staff's failure to detect it. Plagiarism is a serious but easily detectable offence. Supervisors who engage closely with students can often identify misconduct, and most have access to software that makes plagiarism checking straightforward (Kumar et al., 2022). This result aligns with Batane's (2010) observation of reduced plagiarism rates when students were informed about Turnitin's plagiarism-detection mechanism. Similarly, Perkins et al. highlight the efficacy of interventions in reducing plagiarism. This perspective finds support in a recommendation by Waidi et al. (2018) to use plagiarism detection tools like "Plagiarism Checker," a free online tool that assesses the originality of a paper, proving invaluable for identifying and addressing plagiarism. Plagiarism detection tools have rapidly developed and gained prominence in higher education, becoming a key policy concern – despite actual cases often being lower than perceived (Anson & Kruse, 2023). Furthermore, Johnson (2023) proposed that cybersecurity tools can help prevent academic misconduct by blocking access to essay mills and prompting students to seek study support. Monitoring systems can flag unusual login activity that may suggest impersonation (Murdoch & House, 2019), while digital forensics can trace a document's creation (Johnson et al., 2022). Though still emerging, these approaches offer promising, tech-aligned ways to support academic integrity.

This research examined preschool teachers' perceptions of cross-cultural research in Turkey and the Czech Republic on "*Plagiarism detection software – Text*" chains through metaphors. The popularity of this research stems from the fact that plagiarism is no

longer just a "cheating" issue; it is a complex social and ethical problem that affects the reputation of institutions and the quality of education. The study of plagiarism metaphors is a mature and necessary field of study. By deconstructing the metaphors we use, such as "theft," "borrowing," or "digital copying", researchers can better understand why students struggle and how educators can move toward more supportive, rather than just punitive, models of academic integrity. Far from being an obscure or new idea, this research is a cornerstone of modern pedagogical theory.

Methodology

Research model

This research, prepared according to the qualitative research model to determine the metaphors of teachers in Turkey and the Czech Republic towards the concept of "*Plagiarism detection software - Te*xt" chains, is compatible with the "phenomenology" pattern (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006; Patton, 2014).

Sample

The study sample comprises a total of 34 preschool teachers, with 15 participants based in Turkey and 19 in the Czech Republic. All participants are currently pursuing a master's degree in early childhood education at accredited institutions in their respective countries. This purposive sampling was chosen to ensure that participants had both practical teaching experience and advanced academic training, making them well-positioned to reflect meaningfully on academic integrity issues. A common feature among all participants is their prior completion of a graduate-level course titled *Ethics in Academic Research*. This course covered fundamental principles of academic honesty, responsible research conduct, and the consequences of unethical practices such as plagiarism. As such, all respondents had baseline knowledge regarding the significance of academic integrity and its critical role in sustaining trust, quality, and ethical standards within educational and research environments. The inclusion of participants from two distinct cultural and educational contexts – Turkey and the Czech Republic – also enabled a cross-cultural comparison of perceptions of plagiarism and academic ethics. This diversity within the sample adds depth to the results and enables a more nuanced understanding of how cultural and institutional factors may shape educators' awareness and attitudes toward plagiarism and academic sustainability.

Collection of data

The use of metaphor prompts is particularly effective in educational research, as it enables participants to articulate abstract or complex ideas in more relatable and vivid terms. By engaging participants in this reflective exercise, the study aimed to uncover not only surface-level opinions but also deeper, nuanced insights into how such tools are perceived within academic and instructional contexts. Each response was treated as a conceptual unit of analysis and subjected to qualitative coding and thematic analysis

to identify common patterns, variations, and cross-culturally influenced perspectives among the participants. To explore participants' perceptions and conceptualisations of plagiarism-detection tools, a qualitative metaphor-elicitation approach was employed. Participants were invited to complete the semi-structured prompt: "*A plagiarism detection software – text is like . . . because . . .*". This open-ended phrase was designed to allow respondents to project their personal and professional experiences onto a metaphor, thus revealing their underlying beliefs, attitudes, and cognitive associations with plagiarism detection software especially in light of increasing concerns over academic integrity, surveillance, and trust in the digital age.

Analysing the data

Content analysis was conducted on the collected data, and the resulting metaphors and conceptual categories were linked to the relevant literature. The metaphors developed by the participants were analysed in five stages:

(1) The coding and sorting out stage: Initially, an alphabetical list of metaphors produced by teachers was created. Data collected from teachers were examined to determine whether a specific metaphor was clearly defined. Each teacher's expressed metaphors were coded. Twenty-three documents that either did not contain metaphors, included opinions instead, or failed to complete the "because..." statement were excluded from analysis. Subsequently, "example metaphor expressions" representing each theme were selected from participant forms, resulting in a "sample metaphor list." Based on this list, each association was linked to a specific theme, yielding a total of nine themes. The sample metaphor list was also used in the data analysis for each theme, along with its logical foundations.

(2) the category and theme development stage,

(3) organising and defining the data according to codes and themes,

(4) ensuring validity and reliability stage: To ensure the study's reliability, expert opinions were sought to confirm whether the mental images under the nine identified themes accurately represented those themes. A faculty member was provided with two lists: one containing alphabetically ordered sample metaphors and another listing the nine themes. The expert was asked to match the sample images to the themes without excluding any of them. The expert's matches were then compared with the researcher's themes, and agreement and disagreement counts were calculated to determine reliability using Miles and Huberman's formula (Reliability = Agreement / (Agreement + Disagreement) × 100). As a result of the two analyses, the formula "Reliability = Consensus/(Agreement + Disagreement)" created by Miles and Huberman (1994) was applied. The agreement between researchers was found to be 87 %, which is quite reliable, and

(5) interpretation of the findings, (Saban et al., 2006).

Results

Table 1

Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a guiding agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Navigator–Driver (4) Map–Passenger (4) Alarm–Thieves (3)	Object–Human (11)
		Recipe–Meal (4) Road Sign–Direction (3) Compass–Vessel (3) Map–Direction (1)	Object–Object (11)

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 21 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*as a guiding agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 4)* is "*Navigator–Driver*", and the lowest frequency is *"Map–Direction" (f = 1)*. Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 11: "Just as the ***navigator*** shows the ***driver*** the correct route step by step to reach the correct address, the similarity program also enables us to prepare quality work by showing the excessive quotations in the text step by step.**"**

Czech teacher CT 9: "Road signs help us determine the direction we want to go. Similarly, the anti-plagiarism system helps us find the right direction in the sense that we will work with the information according to the applicable rules.**"**

Table 2

Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a knowledge-transmitting agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Lawyer–Client (4) Teacher–Student (4) Psychiatrist–Patient (3) Parent–Child (3) Coach–Player (3) Medical Doctor–Patient (2) Police Officer–Thief (2) Guide–Tourist (1) Coach–Footballer (1)	Human–Human (23)

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 23 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a knowledge transmitting agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 4)* is "*Lawyer–Client*", and the lowest frequency is "Coach–Footballer" (f = 1*)*. Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 5: "The similarity program is just like a ***lawyer***. Just as a lawyer teaches his ***client*** all kinds of rules within the framework of the law, the similarity program provides information on how much someone has made mistakes and how to correct them.**"**

Czech teacher CT 7: "An anti-plagiarism program is like a parent. In the same way as a parent watches over their child, and teaches them how to move in society and the world in general, the anti-plagiarism program teaches them how to move in the world of information and work with it."

Table 3

Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a controlling agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Breathalyser–Driver (3) Lie Detector–Person (1)	Object–Human (4)
		Mechanic–Car (3) Bouncer–Nightclub (3) Chef–Meal (2)	Human–Object (8)
		Fingerprint Scanner–Finger (2) Face ID–Mobile Phone (2) PIN–Credit Card (2)	Object–Object (6)

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 18 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a controlling agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 3)* is "*Breathalyser–Driver*," and the lowest frequency is "Lie Detector–Person" (f = *1)*. Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 9: "The similarity program is likened to a ***breathalyser***. Just as a **breathalyser** checks whether or how much **alcohol** someone has drunk, the similarity program also reveals whether or how much someone has plagiarised."

Czech teacher CT 15: "Plagiarism is like an underage person under 18 trying to get into a nightclub – the nightclub represents information in the digital world. Plagiarism detection programs are then the two big bouncers at the entrance of this nightclub, who check the age of visitors upon entry and are tasked with not letting anyone under 18 into the club."

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 20 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a preventive agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 4)* is "*Police Dog–Smuggler*", and the lowest frequency is "*Surgeon–Surgery*" *(f = 1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 17: "The similarity check program is just like a ***police dog***. Just as the police dog prevents all kinds of illegal drugs from being smuggled across the border, the similarity program also prevents all kinds of illegal **smugglers** and excessive plagiarism in written texts from passing through the system."

Czech teacher CT 19: "An anti-plagiarism program can be likened to a security check at an airport or a sports match. If it works, there probably won't be an unexpected security risk, such as a terrorist attack."

Table 4
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a preventive agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Police Dog–Smuggler(4)	Animal–Human (4)
		Waterproof Material–Water (3) Customs–Goods (2) Exhaust–Gas (2) Medical Check–Illness (2) Car Check–Car Accident (2) Rust–Paint(1)	Object–Object (12)
		Security Check–Terrorist Attack (3) Surgeon–Surgery (1)	Human–Object (4)

Table 5
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a benefiting agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Pruning–Tree(4) Water Purifier–Water (4)	
		Washing Machine–Dirty Laundry (2) Temperature–Weather Conditions (2) Vacuum Cleaner–Rug (2) Charger–Mobile Phone (2) Bike Care–Good Ride (2) Not Cheating–Reward (2) Honesty–Good Social Climate (2) Fairness–Good Relationship (2)	Object–Object (24)
		Medicine–Patient (1)	Object–Human (1)

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 25 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a benefiting agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 4)* is "*Pruning–Tree*", and the lowest frequency is "*Medicine–Patient*" *(f = 1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 3: "I liken the similarity program process to a tree pruning process. By ***pruning the tree***, we create healthier branches and stronger roots, as well as strengthen the foundations of the work done and help increase its qualities."

Czech teacher CT11: "In my opinion, it is similar to, for example, in a relationship. If I am honest and open with someone, then we will build a good social relationship. Similarly, if I respect and use the anti-plagiarism system, it will likely improve the quality of my work."

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 28 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a diagnosing agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 4)* is "*X-Ray–Patient*", and the lowest frequency

is "*Gauge–Petrol*" *(f = 1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Table 6
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a diagnosing agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Analysis Lab–Blood(4) Detector–Mine(3) Litmus Paper–Acid/Base (2) Personal Scale–Weight (2) Electronic Scale–BMI (2) Manometer–Tyre Pressure (2) Socio-rating Scale–Classroom Climate (2) Gauge–Petrol (1)	Object–Object (18)
		X-Ray–Patient (4) COVID-19 Testing Kit–Patient (4) Blood Pressure Cuff –Patient (2)	Object–Human (10)

Turkish teacher TT 10:" The similarity program is just like an X-ray tool. Just as the ***X-ray*** tool reveals all the diseases of a ***patient*** who suffers, the similarity program also reveals plagiarism, including duplication, dishonesty, slicing, etc., in written texts.**"**

CT7: "Here, it is similar to a personal scale. If I keep track of my body weight, I will have enough information to know what I need to do to stay healthy. The same goes for the anti-plagiarism system. If I check my work on time, I should avoid plagiarism problems. "

Table 7
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a decision-making agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Touchstone–Gold (5)	Object–Object (5)
		Teacher–Exam Paper (4) Gardener–Harmful Weed (2) Tailor–Repair (1) Referee–Penalty (1) Director–Task (2)	Human–Object (10)
		Judge–Defendant (5) Parent–Child (3)	Human–Human (8)

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 23 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As a decision-making agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f = 5)* is "*Touchstone–Gold*", and the lowest frequency is "*Referee–Penalty*" *(f =1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT5: "I liken the similarity program to a ***touchstone***. The touchstone

is a stone used to determine whether precious materials like ***gold*** are genuine or contain fake alloys. It is also used in our language to measure the quality of something. Similarity programs are a program that measures how much of the work done similarly belongs to the individual, the different mixtures in it, and the quality of the work.**"**

Czech teacher CT15: A **parent** is, or should be, essentially such a decisive element in a **child's** upbringing. He should be able to decide what the child can and cannot do.

Table 8
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphors (f)
As an evaluating agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Criminal Record–Citizen (4) Discipline Record–Student (4) Transcript–Student (3)	Object–Human (11)
		Examination–Mark (3) School–Marks (2) Credit Card–Account Debt (2) Traffic Record–Fine (1) Unfair Dealings–Punishment (1) Chronometer–Race (1)	Object–Object (10)
		Teacher–Feedback (3) Parent–Feedback (2)	Human–Object (5)

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 26 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "*As an evaluating agent*". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f=4)* is "*Criminal Record–Citizen*"*, and the lowest frequency is* "*Chronometer–Race*" *(f=1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 13:" The similarity program is just like a ***criminal record***. Just as the criminal record reveals all the crimes that a ***citizen*** has committed, the similarity program also reveals all the excessive quotations in the written texts.**"**

Czech teacher CT20: "For me, it's the same as in school. When I study continuously, I am responsible in school, so I get good grades. That's the feedback I can get then. In the same way, when I get a repost from the anti-plagiarism system, it is feedback for me as I have worked responsibly with various sources when creating a professional text. "

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that Turkish and Czech teachers created 17 distinct metaphor chains from the "Plagiarism detection software – text" theme within the conceptual category of "As a protecting agent". Among these metaphors, the one with the highest frequency *(f=5)* is "*Check-up–People*", and the lowest frequency is "*Insurance–Car*" *(f=1).* Turkish and Czech teachers' statements are given below:

Turkish teacher TT 20:" Just as a ***check-up*** reveals all kinds of diseases that a ***person*** suspects but cannot diagnose, in the same way, the similarity program guides them by revealing unnecessary and excessive quotations in the work presented by the author.**"**

Table 9
Teachers' Metaphor Themes on" Plagiarism detection software – text"

Conceptual Category	Source of Metaphor	Metaphors (f)	Type of Metaphor (f)
As a protection agent	Turkish & Czech Teachers	Check-up–People (5) Vaccine–People (4)	Object–Human (9)
		Sunscreen–Ultraviolet Rays (4) Climate–Hot and Cold Weather (1) Insurance–Car (1) Seat belt–Survival (1) Cycling Helmet–Survival (1)	Object–Object (8)

Czech teacher CT19: "It can be likened to a **bicycle helmet** that we should wear on a bicycle. If we have it and there's an accident, there's a good chance we'll get a lot of wear and tear, but not die. On the contrary, if we don't wear a helmet and fall off the bike, it can be fatal. Similarly, if we use an anti-plagiarism system, there is a chance that plagiarism will not be the reason for our failure or problems with the text. "

Discussion and conclusion

Plagiarism carries significant moral and ethical consequences in academia. This study delves into the metaphorical perceptions of teachers regarding "plagiarism detecting software - text" chains, exploring how educators in diverse cultural contexts conceptualise the use of such software in academic settings. Scholars such as Nakitare and Otike (2023) highlight its increasing prevalence worldwide. While numerous global studies (e.g., Al-Hussaini, 2022; Goodwin & McCarthy, 2020; Raj et al., 2021; Cheers et al., 2021; Ali, 2021; Brown et al., 2019) have documented its harmful effects, there is still a notable lack of research focusing specifically on postgraduate students in cross-cultural contexts (Odongo et al., 2025; Selemi et al., 2018). The comparative analysis in this study juxtaposes metaphorical perceptions of teachers from distinct cultural backgrounds, specifically the Czech and Turkish educational contexts. By exploring the cultural nuances and educational philosophies that shape teachers' metaphorical representations, this research aims to illuminate the diverse perspectives and contextual factors that influence attitudes toward plagiarism-detection technology. Understanding teachers' metaphorical perceptions of "plagiarism detecting software - text" chains not only enriches our understanding of the complexities surrounding academic integrity and educational technology but also informs the development of ethical guidelines and best practices for integrating plagiarism-detection tools into educational settings. By bridging the gap between theory and practice, this study contributes to ethical pedagogy in the digital age.

In this study, Turkish and Czech teachers generated 201 metaphors categorised into nine conceptual frameworks around the theme of "Plagiarism Detection Software – Text." This exploration is particularly significant because it builds on previous research

in academic honesty, educational technology, and intercultural differences. For instance, Bozlk (2002) investigated metaphor production among first-year university students, classifying metaphors into categories such as animal, object, human, and action metaphors. His results revealed a diverse range of conceptualisations, which serve as a foundation for understanding how individuals relate abstract concepts to more concrete experiences. Similarly, Kabadayı (2016) examined metaphors in educational contexts, categorising them under headings that reflect the multidimensional nature of educational tools.

Aligning with these foundational studies, our research extends the notion of metaphors as cognitive tools that facilitate understanding in complex domains, such as academic integrity. The participants in our study – Turkish and Czech teachers – created metaphor chains that illustrate their perceptions of plagiarism detection software. This process included four metaphor types: Human–Human, Human–Object, Object–Object, and Object–Human, reflecting a robust framework for analysing how educators interpret and apply these tools in their teaching practices.

In the "as a guiding agent" category, teachers produced 21 metaphor chains, evenly split between object–object metaphors (e.g., "Compass–Vessel") and object–human metaphors (e.g., "Map–Passenger"). This duality highlights a critical aspect of educational technology: the simultaneous roles tools can play in guiding both educators and students, resonating with the theoretical frameworks of constructivist learning, in which knowledge is constructed through interactions with people and tools.

The categorisation of metaphors also revealed that in the "as a knowledge transmitting agent" category, all 23 metaphor chains were classified as human–human metaphors, such as "Police Officer–Thief." This result underscores the social dimensions of academic integrity, suggesting that educators perceive plagiarism-detection tools as inherently intertwined with interpersonal relationships and ethical considerations. This standpoint aligns with the existing literature, which posits academic honesty as a socially constructed concept shaped by cultural and relational dynamics.

In examining the "as a controlling agent" category, the 18 metaphor chains represented a mix of object–object (34 %), human–object (44 %), and object–human (22 %) types. This distribution suggests that educators view plagiarism detection software as both a technological enforcement mechanism and a facilitator of ethical behaviour, echoing previous research that emphasises the dual role of educational technology in both assessment and learning. The metaphors such as "PIN–Credit Card" and "Mechanic–Car" illustrate a nuanced understanding of the balance between control and support, reinforcing the idea that technology should enhance rather than hinder the educational experience.

Further, the metaphors generated under the categories of "as a preventing agent" and "as a benefiting agent" reveal the educators' perceptions of these tools in fostering a culture of prevention and support within academic settings. The prevalence of object–object metaphors, such as "Customs–Goods" and "Washing Machine–Dirty Laundry," suggests a belief that plagiarism detection software can serve as a proactive measure

rather than merely a punitive one. This perspective is crucial in light of the growing emphasis on formative assessment practices within educational frameworks, where the goal is to support learning rather than to enforce compliance.

The diversity of metaphor chains created in the categories of "as a diagnosing agent" and "as a decision-making agent" further illustrates the complex interplay between technology and human agency in the educational context. For instance, the metaphor "COVID-19 Testing Kit–Patient" suggests a diagnostic function in plagiarism-detection software, indicating that educators see these tools as essential for identifying and addressing learning issues related to academic integrity. Such insights resonate with current discussions in educational technology that advocate integrating diagnostic tools to inform instructional strategies.

Finally, the results from the "as an evaluating agent" and "as a protecting agent" categories highlight the multifaceted roles that plagiarism detection software plays in educational settings. The metaphors generated in these categories reflect a strong connection to the principles of academic honesty, suggesting that educators perceive these tools not only as evaluative mechanisms but also as protective measures that safeguard the integrity of the academic environment.

Overall, this research contributes significantly to the academic discourse on academic honesty and technology-enhanced assessment practices. By employing metaphor analysis across two cultural contexts – Turkey and the Czech Republic – the study offers unique insights into how educators conceptualise plagiarism-detection tools, revealing underlying attitudes, beliefs, and concerns. The use of metaphor as a methodological lens deepens our understanding of academic integrity, moving beyond traditional quantitative metrics. Moreover, the cross-cultural comparison enriches the global literature on academic honesty by identifying culturally influenced perceptions and highlighting potential gaps in the integration of such tools into educational settings.

In conclusion, the results support the notion that metaphors can serve as effective pedagogical and research tools to explore complex and abstract educational technologies. This study not only provides a nuanced understanding of how educators across different cultural contexts perceive plagiarism-detection software but also contributes to the development of culturally responsive academic integrity policies and teacher-training programs that align with sustainable education goals.

Limitation of the study

One limitation of the cross-cultural qualitative research involving 15 Turkish and 19 Czech teachers is that, while the sample is clearly defined, it may not fully represent the diverse perspectives and experiences of all teachers in each country. The relatively small sample size limits the generalisability of the results to broader populations, as cultural differences and educational practices can vary significantly across regions and contexts in Turkey and the Czech Republic. Therefore, the insights gained may reflect specific viewpoints rather than a comprehensive understanding of the entire educational landscape in these countries.

Implications for further studies

This comparative study highlights the intricate challenges of adopting and implementing plagiarism detection software across diverse educational environments. It offers critical insights for educators, policymakers, and researchers committed to promoting academic integrity and fostering ethical educational practices. In light of these findings, academicians, teacher trainers, policymakers, and educational leaders in both the Czech Republic and Turkey need to organise comprehensive professional development training sessions for teachers. These sessions should focus on the effective use of plagiarism-detection software, covering its features, implications, and best practices for integrating it into the curriculum. Training should not only cover the technical aspects of the software but also help teachers understand its educational value and how it can enhance academic integrity.

Additionally, educators should be encouraged to engage in critical reflection on the role that plagiarism-detection software plays in the educational landscape. Facilitating discussions and debates on the ethical considerations, potential limitations, and benefits of using such tools will empower teachers to make informed decisions about their implementation. This reflective practice can help educators articulate their own beliefs about academic integrity and the role of technology in supporting it. It is also crucial to raise teachers' awareness of cultural differences in attitudes toward academic integrity and plagiarism. Understanding how these cultural contexts shape perceptions can help create more effective and sensitive educational practices. To support this, cross-cultural dialogue should be fostered between Czech and Turkish educators. Such exchanges will allow for the sharing of diverse perspectives and insights regarding plagiarism detection software, creating a richer understanding of its role in various educational settings.

Furthermore, collaborative research projects should be encouraged, focusing on the impact of plagiarism-detection tools on teaching and learning across different cultural contexts. These projects can provide valuable data and insights that contribute to the body of knowledge surrounding academic integrity and technology in education.

Lastly, it is imperative to provide teachers with access to supportive resources, including guidelines and best practices for the responsible use of plagiarism detection software. This support could involve developing manuals, online courses, and workshops to equip educators with the tools and knowledge to implement these technologies effectively in their classrooms. By addressing these professional development needs, we can ensure that teachers are well-prepared to navigate the complexities of academic honesty and to foster ethical learning environments for their students.

References

Ahmad, H., & Fauzi, M. A. (2024). Plagiarism in academic writing in higher education institutions: A bibliometric analysis. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, *6*(1), 64–84. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.623

Akbulut, Y., Sendag, S., Birinci, G., Kilicer, K., Sahin, M. C., & Odabasi, H. F. (2008). Exploring the types and reasons of Internet-triggered academic dishonesty among Turkish undergraduate students: Development of Internet-Triggered Academic Dishonesty Scale (ITADS). *Computers & Education*, *51*(1), 463–473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.06.003

Al-Hussaini, A. J. (2022). Factors influencing plagiarism among postgraduate students in Saudi Arabia: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *44*(3), 334–349.

Ali, M. F. (2021). Attitudes towards plagiarism among faculty members in Egypt: a cross-sectional study. *Scientometrics 126*, 3535–3547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03872-8

Anson, C. M., & Kruse, O. (2023). Plagiarism detection and intertextuality software. In *Digital Writing Technologies in Higher Education* (pp. 231–243). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36033-6_15

Awasthi, S. (2019). Plagiarism and academic misconduct: A systematic review. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, *39*(2), 94–100. https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.39.2.13622

Batane, T. (2010). Turning to Turnitin to fight plagiarism among university students. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(2), 1–12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.13.2.1

Blau, I., Goldberg, S., Friedman, A., & Eshet-Alkalai, Y. (2021). Violation of digital and analog academic integrity through the eyes of faculty members and students: Do institutional role and technology change ethical perspectives?. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 33*(1), 157–187. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-020-09260-0

Bozik, M. (2002). The college student as learner: insight gained through metaphor analysis. *College Student Journal*, *36*(1), 142.

Brčić F. (2020). Students-future teachers' self-assessment of competence for computer-assisted teaching. *Croatian Journal of Education, 22*(Sp.Ed.3), 11–20. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v22i0.3905

Brown, A., Miller, J., & Taylor, L. (2019). Paraphrasing plagiarism in postgraduate theses: A rising concern. *International Journal of Academic Integrity*, *12*(2), 67–82.

Brown, N., & Janssen, R. (2017). Preventing plagiarism and fostering academic integrity: A practical approach. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice, 5*(3), 102–109. https://jpaap.ac.uk/JPAAP/article/view/245

Cheers, H., Lin, Y., & Smith, S. P. (2021). Evaluating the robustness of source code plagiarism detection tools to pervasive plagiarism-hiding modifications. *Empirical Software Engineering, 26*(5), 1–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-021-09990-4

Culwin, F., & Lancaster, T. (2001). Plagiarism issues for higher education. *Vine, 31*(2), 36–41.

Cvetković B. N, Stošić, A. S., Tasić Mitić I., & Stojadinović A. (2024). Preschool teachers' views on the use of digital technologies in working with preschool children. *Croatian Journal of Education, 26*(3), 793–821. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v26i3.542

Çelik, Ö., & Lancaster, T. (2021). Violations of and threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching. *The Literacy Trek, 7*(1), 34–54. https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.932316

Demir, Ü. (2022). Students' metaphorical perceptions regarding the concept of school, school satisfaction levels and elements affecting satisfaction. *Education Quarterly Reviews, 5(*Special Issue 2), 511–525. https://ssrn.com/abstract=4300415

Gibbs, R.W. (2017). *Metaphor war*. Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, J., & McCarthy, J. (2020). Explaining plagiarism for nursing students: An educational tool. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing, 15*(3), 198–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2020.03.004

Hass, A. (2022). Using plagiarism feedback as assessment for learning to socialise students into disciplinary writing: A theoretical perspective. *South African Journal of Higher Education 36* (2), 133–50. https://doi.org/10.20853/36-2-4648

Helgesson, G., & Eriksson, S. (2014). Plagiarism in research. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, *18*(1), 91–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-014-9583-8

Hoglar, R., Gross, M. A., Hartman, J. L., & Cunliffe, A. L. (2008). Meaning in organizational communication. *Management Communication Quarterly. 21*(3), 393–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318907309929

İşçitürk, G. B. (2023). Metaphorical perceptions of teacher candidates regarding distance education during the pandemic period and post-pandemic period. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, 14*(4), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.04.004

Jeremić, C. B., Pećanac, R., Stanković, E., & Đurđević, T. (2020). Music technology software in adopting music teaching, *Croatian Journal of Education, 22*(1), 263–286.

https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v22i1.3282

Johnson, C. (2023). *Understanding academic integrity and plagiarism in the digital age: Can digital forensics techniques help prevent and detect academic misconduct?* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Wales].

Johnson, C., Davies, R., & Reddy, M. (2022). Using digital forensics in higher education to detect academic misconduct. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00104-1

Kabadayı, A. (2012). Investigating pre-service preschool teachers' attitudes to internet use, *Croatian Journal of Education, 14*(2), 230–255

Kabadayı, A. (2014). Analyzing the factors that affect preschoolers' parents' choice of toys, *Croatian Journal of Education, 16*(1), 43–55

Kabadayı, A. (2016). Türk kültüründeki çocuk oyunlarında "saymaca-ebe-oyun alanı" üzerine öğretmen metaforları [Teachers' metaphorical images on "counting jingle – it – playground" in children's plays of Turkish culture], *Journal of Human Sciences*, *13*(2), 3252–3265. https://doi.org/10.14687/jhs.v13i2.3893

Kanbur, B. N., & Arcagök, S. (2024). Augmented reality technology – mediated activity plan suggestion for developing preschoolers' social problem-solving skills, *Croatian Journal of Education, 26*(4), 1105–1154 https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v26i4.5481

Kövecses, Z. (2008). Conceptual metaphor theory: Some criticisms and alternative proposals. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, *6*(1), 168–184. https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.08kov

Kövecses, Z. (2017). Levels of metaphor. *Cognitive Linguistics, 28*(2), 321–347. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2016-0052

Kumar, R., Pratap, B., & Pateria, R. K. (2022). An effect on academic integrity due to plagiarism: A review. *Library Progress International, 42*(1), 206–219. https://doi.org/10.48165/bapas.2024.44.2.1

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McIntire, A., Calvert, I., & Ashcraft, J. (2024). Pressure to plagiarize and the choice to cheat: Toward a pragmatic reframing of the ethics of academic integrity. *Education Sciences*, *14*(3), Article 244. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030244

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*: *An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Murdoch, K., & House, D. (2019, March). *Ghost in the shell: What happens when contract cheating meets online impersonation* [Conference session]. ICAI Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA, United States.

Nakitare, J. & Otike, F. (2023). Plagiarism conundrum in Kenyan universities: An impediment to quality research, *Digital Library Perspectives, 39*(2), 145–165. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLP-08-2022-0058

Odongo, S. O., Njoroge, R. W., & Njoroge, G. G. (2025). Plagiarism awareness and practice by postgraduate students in public universities in Kenya: From an academic integrity standpoint. *Regional Journal of Information and Knowledge Management, 10*(2),167–181. https://doi.org/10.70759/btrn7w35

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* [Qualitative research & evaluation methods] (3rd ed.). M. Bütün & S. B. Demir (Eds.). Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B. & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 16*(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8

Raj, J. P., Venkatachalam, S., Amaravati, R. S., Siby, N., Oommen, A. M., Jose, J. E., George, M., Ramraj, B., Penumutsa, V. S., Bodda, D. R., Rajad, R., Reshmi, R., Inbaraj, L. R., Rajiv, S., Bhandare, B., Aiyappan, R., Mathew, P., Saleem, A. K., Shetty, R., . . . Manderwad, G. P. (2021). Extent of awareness and attitudes on plagiarism among post-graduate resident doctors and junior medical faculty in India: A cross-sectional, multicentric study. *BMJ Open, 11*(6), Article e046904. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046904

Saban, A., Koçbeker, B. N., & Saban, A. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmen kavramına ilişkin algılarının metafor analizi yoluyla incelenmesi [Examining the perceptions of prospective teachers regarding the concept of teacher through metaphor analysis]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 6*(2), 461–522.

Sadiku A. (2024). Positive and negative impacts of technology use in young children: The need for parents to learn how to guide their children in using technologies, *Croatian Journal of Education, 26*(3), 1001–1027. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v26i3.5488

Sagoro, E. M. 2013. Pensinergian mahasiswa, dosen, dan lembaga dalam pencegahan kecurangan akademik mahasiswa akuntansi [Synergy between students, lecturers and institutions in preventing academic fraud in accounting students]. *Jurnal Pendidikan Akuntansi Indonesia 11*(2): 54–67. https://doi.org/10.21831/jpai.v11i2.1691

Selemani, A., Chawinga, W. D. & Dube, G. (2018). Why do postgraduate students commit plagiarism? An empirical study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 14*(1), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0029-6

Semino, E. (2008). *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge University Press.

Speed, L. J., O'Meara, C., San Roque, L., & Majid, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Perception metaphors.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Šprajc, P., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., Trivan, D., & Jereb, E. (2017). Reasons for plagiarism in higher education. *Organizacija*, *50*(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.1515/orga-2017-0002

Tartuk, M. (2023). Metaphorical perceptions of middle school students regarding the concept of artificial intelligence. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 11*(2), 108–116. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.11n.2p.108

Wajdi, M., Sumartana, I. M., & Hudiananingsih, N. P. D. (2018). Avoiding plagiarism in writing a research paper. *Soshum Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *8*(1), 94–102. https://doi.org/10.31940/soshum.v8i1.769

Wegner, E., Burkhart, C., Weinhuber, M., & Nückles, M. (2020). What metaphors of learning can (and cannot) tell us about students' learning. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *80*, Article 101884. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101884

WPA Council. (2019). *Defining and avoiding plagiarism: The WPA statement on best practices*. http://wpacouncil.org/aws/CWPA/pt/sd/news_article/272555/_PARENT/layout_details/false

Wu Q. (2025). Using virtual reality technologies in cello teaching in China. *Croatian Journal of Education, 27*(3), 957–987. https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v27i3.6129

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (6. Baskı). Seçkin Kitabevi.

Abdülkadir Kabadayı
Necmettin Erbakan University A.K.,
Faculty of Education, Elementary Dept.
Meram Kampüsü Yeni Meram Konya Turkey
Feritpaşa Mah. Kerkükü Cd. Goncagul, 7/28 Selçuklu Konya
akkabadayi03@gmail.com

Martin Skutil
Charles University, Faculty of Arts
Rokinatského 62 500 03 Hradec Králové,
The Czech Republic
martin.skutil@ff.cuni.cz

Akademska čestitost iz perspektive nastavnika: metafore o softveru za otkrivanje plagijata u različitim kulturama

Sažetak

Ovo istraživanje provedeno je kako bi se dobile i usporedile metaforičke percepcije učitelja o lancima „softver za detekciju plagijata – tekst" u češkom i turskom obrazovnom kontekstu. U studiji je sudjelovalo 15 turskih i 19 češkihučitelja. Sudionici su dovršili frazu „Softver za detekciju plagijata - tekst je kao... jer..." kako bi naznačili svoje konceptualizacije alata. Podatci su analizirani kvalitativno. Kao rezultat istraživanja, sudionici su stvorili 201 metaforu povezanu s lancima koncepata „softver za detekciju plagijata - tekst" u 9 različitih konceptualnih kategorija. Zaključeno je da se metafore mogu koristiti kao moćan istraživački alat za razumijevanje uvida učitelja o tehnološkim i obrazovnim fenomenima za održivost.

Ključne riječi: *kvalitativno; o**či učitelja; č**eški učitelji; tekst; turski; alat za detekciju plagijata*

Uvod

U suvremenom obrazovnom okružju, porast plagijata i pojava softvera za otkrivanje plagijata potaknuli su rasprave među edukatorima diljem svijeta. Dok tehnologija nudi inovativna rješenja za borbu protiv akademske nečestitosti, njezina integracija u obrazovne prakse donosi složene implikacije i etička razmatranja. Metafora olakšava kognitivno i ekspresivno poboljšanje omogućujući da razmišljamo i artikuliramo jednu stvar u smislu druge. Pruža konkretne izraze za apstraktne koncepte, omogućujući da se ideje shvate ili objave. Perceptivna iskustva, koja se karakteriziraju kao fizička i relativno konkretna, služe kao idealna izvorna domena za metaforu, dok je manje vjerojatno da će služiti kao ciljna domena(Speed, O'Meara, San Roque i Majid, 2019). Kövecses (2017) tvrdi da je konceptualna teorija metafore (KTM) bila ključna u rješavanju temeljnoga problema u kognitivnoj teoriji: tumačenja značenja apstraktnih koncepata. S obzirom na to da apstrakcijama nedostaju izravna fizička i perceptivna iskustva, KMT smatra da ti apstraktni koncepti dobivaju značenje putem konceptualnih metafora koje ih povezuju s fizičkim ili percepcijski utemeljenima. Dakle, metafora funkcionira kao mehanizam putem kojeg artikuliramo i potencijalno konceptualiziramo

jednu stvar u smislu druge (Semino, 2008). Lakoff i Johnson (1980) tvrde da metafore prožimaju ne samo umjetničke žanrove poput književnosti, već i najneutralnije oblike jezika. Kövecses (2017) nadalje tvrdi da metafora nije ograničena na jezik, već se proteže i na misaone procese. Metafore pomažu ne samo u verbaliziranju aspekata svijeta već i u njihovom konceptualiziranju. Pojam da se domene konceptualiziraju u smislu drugih može podrazumijevati različita tumačenja. Pojedinci bi se mogli voditi specifičnim konceptualnim metaforama u svojoj konceptualizaciji domene. Analiza metafora ima za cilj otkriti temeljna značenja izvan eksplicitnih i svjesnih izraza ispitivanjem metafora kojima se pojedinci koriste za artikuliranje svojih iskustava i uvjerenja (Zheng i Song, 2010). U suvremenom društvu utemeljenom na znanju, shvaćanje znanja kao izvora moći podrazumijeva primjenu različitih tehnika i pristupa u pristupanju informacijama, uključujući istraživačke metode. Metafore služe kao metoda prikupljanja podataka koja potiče slobodno razmišljanje i olakšava učinkovito samoizražavanje (Güneş i Fırat, 2015, In İşçitürk, 2023). Gibbs (2017) tvrdi da metafore nisu samo specijalizirani komunikacijski alati, već čine sastavni dio svakodnevne spoznaje putem konceptualnih metafora. Značajan skup empirijskih dokaza iz kognitivne lingvistike i srodnih područja ilustrira temeljnu ulogu konceptualnih metafora u jeziku, mišljenju, kulturi i ekspresivnom djelovanju. Metafore koje pomažu u konceptualizaciji percepcija i predstavljanju konkretnih prikaza istih, olakšavaju prenošenje informacija, omogućuju informirane akcije, postavljaju ciljeve i koherentno strukturiraju sustave (Hoglar, Gross, Hartman i Cunliffe, 2008). Demir (2022) naglašava da učinkovito razumijevanje škola i njihovih struktura zahtijeva uvid u percepcije učenika, kao ključnoga dionika. U tom kontekstu metafore se pojavljuju kao snažni alati te za razumijevanje škola i prepoznavanje vrijednosti i percepcije koje su s njima povezane. Tartuk (2023.) predstavlja intrigantnu perspektivu, ističući sve veću relevantnost umjetne inteligencije (UI) kao suvremenoga alata. Prema Tartuku (2023.), zamislivo je da će nacije uključiti umjetnu inteligenciju i vještine programiranja u svoje nastavne planove i programe kako bi opremile građane za učinkovito rješavanje novih izazova i pitanja. Trenuačtno je razumijevanje umjetne inteligencije ključno za učinkovitu primjenu tehnologije, pri čemu se otvaraju pitanja o vrstama uvidima koje umjetna inteligencija može ponuditi. Wegner, Burkhart, Weinhuber i Nückels (2020) identificiraju dvije vrste metafora: metafore usmjerene na učenje koje se usredotočuju na procese i ishode učenja te samoreferencijalne metafore usmjerene na motivacijske aspekte. Metafore usmjerene na učenje koreliraju s dubokim pristupom učenju, dok se samoreferencijalne metafore odnose na površan pristup. Zaključuju da metafore odražavaju opću razinu promišljanja o učenju, utječući na usvajanje dubokih ili površnih pristupa učenju. Što se tiče plagijata, alati za njegovo otkrivanje brzo su se razvili te stekli značajnu ulogu u visokom obrazovanju, postajući pritom važnim predmetom obrazovnih politika, unatoč tome što je stvarna učestalost plagijata često manja od percipirane. Iako ova problematika već dulje vrijeme zabrinjava obrazovne djelatnike, povrede akademske čestitosti postale su uočljivije tijekom izvanrednih

okolnosti nastave na daljinu. Ahmad i Fauzi (2024, str. 65.) uspoređuju plagijat sa „zaraznom bolešću", naglašavajući njegovo suptilno širenje i širok utjecaj na studente, edukatore i institucije u visokom obrazovanju. Većina nastavnoga osoblja iskazivala je zabrinutost zbog neprimjerenoga ponašanja u mrežnom okružju. Istraživanja pritom ponajprije ističu različite oblike kršenja akademske čestitosti poput plagijata, izmišljanja, namjernoga prisvajanja tuđega teksta bez navođenja izvora i ugovorne prevare (WPA Council, 2019; Akbulut i sur., 2008; Blau i sur., 2021; McIntire, Calvert i Ashcraft, 2024). Različiti oblici plagijata, ponekad zanemareni, naglašavaju hitnu potrebu za osvješćivanjem i budnošću (Awasthi, 2019). Helgeson i Eriksson (2015.) naglašavaju važnost definiranja znanstvenoga nedoličnog ponašanja, pri čemu je „plagijat" često korišten pojam u raspravama o znanstvenom integritetu. Salemani, Chawinga i Dube (2018) identificiraju primarni razlog plagijata kao neuspjeh akademskoga osoblja u otkrivanju plagijata. Plagijat je ozbiljan, ali lako uočljiv prekršaj. Nadzornici koji blisko surađuju sa studentima često su u prilici uočiti neprimjereno ponašanje, a većina njih ima pristup softveru koji olakšava provjeru plagijata (Kumar i sur., 2022). Ovaj nalaz u skladu je s Bataneovim (2010) opažanjem smanjenja stopa plagijata kada su studenti upoznati s Turnitinovim mehanizmom za otkrivanje plagijata. Slično tome, Perkins, Gezgin i Roe ističu učinkovitost intervencija u smanjenju plagijata. Ova perspektiva nalazi podršku u preporuci Waidija, Sumartane i Hudiananingsiha (2018) o korištenju alata za otkrivanje plagijata poput „Plagiarism Checkera", besplatnoga *online* softvera koji procjenjuje originalnost rada, što se pokazalo neprocjenjivim u identificiranju i rješavanju plagijata. Alati za otkrivanje plagijata brzo su se razvili i stekli značajnu ulogu u visokom obrazovanju, postajući pritome predmetom obrazovnih politika unatoč tome što je stvarni broj plagijata često manji nego što se misli (Anson i Kruse, 2023). Nadalje, Johnson (2023) je predložio da alati za kibernetičku sigurnost mogu pomoći u sprječavanju nedoličnoga akademskoga ponašanja blokiranjem pristupa bazama eseja i poticanjem studenata da traže podršku za učenje. Sustavi za praćenje mogu označiti neobičnu aktivnost prijave koja može sugerirati lažno predstavljanje (Murdoch i House, 2019), dok digitalna forenzika može pratiti kako je dokument stvoren (Johnson i sur., 2022). Iako su još uvijek u nastajanju, ovi pristupi nude obećavajuće, tehnološki usklađene načine za podršku akademskoj čestitosti.

Ovo istraživanje provedeno je kako bi se ispitala percepcija odgojitelja djece predškolske dobi kao međukulturalne studije u Turskoj i Češkoj Republici o lancima „softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" putem metafora.

Metodologija

Model istraživanja

Ovo istraživanje, pripremljeno prema kvalitativnom modelu istraživanja kako bi se utvrdile metafore učitelja u Turskoj i Češkoj Republici prema konceptu lanaca „softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst", kompatibilno je s obrascem „fenomenologije" (Yıldırım i Şimşek, 2006; Patton, 2014).

Uzorak

Uzorak studije obuhvaća ukupno 34 odgojitelja djece predškolske dobi, od kojih 15 sudionika živi u Turskoj i 19 u Češkoj. Svi sudionici trenutačno studiraju magisterij iz ranoga odgoja i obrazovanja na akreditiranim institucijama u svojim zemljama. Ovo namjerno uzorkovanje odabrano je kako bi se osiguralo da sudionici posjeduju i praktično iskustvo u nastavi i naprednu akademsku obuku, što ih čini dobro pozicioniranima za smisleno promišljanje o pitanjima akademskoga integriteta. Zajednička značajka svih sudionika jest prethodno završen poslijediplomski tečaj pod nazivom „Etika u akademskim istraživanjima". Ovaj tečaj obuhvaćao je temeljna načela akademskoga poštenja, odgovornoga provođenja istraživanja i posljedice neetičnih praksi poput plagijata. Kao takvi, svi ispitanici imali su osnovno znanje o važnosti akademskoga integriteta i njegovoj ključnoj ulozi u održavanju povjerenja, kvalitete i etičkih standarda unutar obrazovnoga i istraživačkoga okružja. Uključivanje sudionika iz dvaju različitih kulturnih i obrazovnih konteksta – Turske i Češke – također je omogućilo međukulturalnu usporedbu percepcija povezanih s plagijatom i akademskom etikom. Ova raznolikost unutar uzorka doprinosi većoj dubini nalaza i omogućuje nijansiranije razumijevanje načina na koji kulturni i institucionalni čimbenici oblikuju percepciju i stavove edukatora prema plagijatu i akademskoj čestitosti.

Prikupljanje podataka

Korištenje metafora posebno je učinkovito u obrazovnim istraživanjima jer omogućuje sudionicima da artikuliraju apstraktne ili složene ideje na razumljiviji i živopisniji način. Uključivanjem sudionika u ovu refleksivnu vježbu, studija je imala za cilj otkriti ne samo površna mišljenja, već i dublje, nijansirane uvide u to kako se takvi alati percipiraju unutar akademskih i nastavnih konteksta. Svaki je odgovor tretiran kao konceptualna jedinica analize i podvrgnut je kvalitativnom kodiranju i tematskoj analizi kako bi se identificirali zajednički obrasci, varijacije i perspektive pod utjecajem različitih kultura među sudionicima. Kako bi se istražile percepcije i konceptualizacije alata za otkrivanje plagijata, sudionici su uključeni u kvalitativni pristup korištenjem elicitacije metafora. Sudionici su pozvani da ispune polustrukturirani upitnik „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst je kao... jer...". Ova fraza otvorenoga tipa osmišljena je kako bi ispitanicima omogućila projiciranje svojih osobnih i profesionalnih iskustava na metaforu, otkrivajući tako svoja temeljna uvjerenja, stavove i kognitivne asocijacije sa softverom za otkrivanje plagijata, posebno u svjetlu sve veće zabrinutosti za akademskučestitost, nadzora i povjerenja u digitalnom dobu.

Analiza podataka

Analiza sadržaja provedena je s podatcima dobivenim istraživanjem, a dobivene metafore i konceptualne kategorije povezane su s relevantnom literaturom. Metafore koje su razvili sudionici analizirane su u pet faza: (1) faza kodiranja i sortiranja, (2) faza razvoja kategorija i tema, (3) organiziranje i definiranje podataka prema

kodovima i temama, (4) faza osiguranja valjanosti i pouzdanosti i (5) interpretacija nalaza (Saban, Koçbeker ve Saban, 2006). Kao rezultat dviju analiza primijenjena je formula „pouzdanost = konsenzus / (slaganje + neslaganje)" koju su kreirali Miles i Huberman (1994). Utvrđeno je da je slaganje između istraživača 87 %, što je prilično pouzdano.

Rezultati

Tablica 1

Kada se pregleda Tablica 1, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 21 različit lanac metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „kao vodeći agent". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „navigator-vozač", a najnižom učestalošću je „karta-smjer" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i češkim učitelja dane su u nastavku:

Turski učitelj TT 11: „Baš kao što navigator pokazuje vozaču ispravnu rutu korak po korak kako bi došao do ispravne adrese, program sličnosti također nam omogućuje pripremu kvalitetnoga rada tako što korak po korak prikazuje prekomjerne citate u tekstu."

Češki učitelj CT 9: „Prometni znakovi pomažu nam odrediti smjer u kojem želimo ići. Slično tome, sustav protiv plagijata pomaže nam pronaći pravi smjer u smislu da ćemo raditi s informacijama u skladu s važećim pravilima."

Tablica 2

Kada se pregleda Tablica 2, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 23 različita lanca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao agent za prijenos znanja". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „odvjetnik-klijent", a najnižom učestalošću je „tehnički direktor-nogometaš" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 5: „Program sličnosti je baš kao odvjetnik. Kao što odvjetnik uči svojega klijenta svim vrstama pravila unutar okvira zakona, program sličnosti pruža informacije o tome koliko je netko napravio pogrešaka i kako ih ispraviti."

CT 7: „Program protiv plagijata je poput roditelja. Na isti način na koji roditelj pazi na svoje dijete i uči ga kako se kretati u društvu i svijetu općenito, program protiv plagijata uči ga kako se kretati u svijetu informacija i raditi s njima."

Tablica 3

Kada se pregleda Tablica 3, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 18 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao kontrolni agent". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 3) jest „mjerač alkohola - vozač", a najnižom učestalošću „detektor laži - ljudska bića" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 9: „Program sličnosti uspoređuje se s mjeračem alkohola. Baš kao što mjerač alkohola provjerava je li i koliko je netko popio alkohola, program sličnosti također otkriva je li i koliko je netko plagirao."

Češki učitelj CT 15: „Plagiranje je kao da maloljetna osoba mlađa od 18 godina pokušava ući u noćni klub - noćni klub predstavlja informacije u digitalnom svijetu. Programi za otkrivanje plagijata tada su dva velika izbacivača na ulazu u ovaj noćni klub, koji provjeravaju dob posjetitelja pri ulasku i zaduženi su da u klub ne puste nikoga mlađeg od 18 godina."

Tablica 4

Kada se pregleda Tablica 4, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 20 različitih metaforičkih lanaca u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao sredstvo prevencije". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „pas za narkotike – krijumčar", a najniža učestalost je „operator – operacija" (f = 1). Metafore turskih i čeških učitelja navedene su u nastavku:

TT 17: „Program provjere sličnosti je poput psa za narkotike. Kao što pas za narkotike sprječava sve vrste ilegalnih droga koje krijumčari prenose preko granice, program sličnosti također sprječava sve vrste ilegalnih krijumčara i prekomjernoga plagijata u pisanim tekstovima da prođu kroz sustav."

CT 19: „Program protiv plagijata može se usporediti sa sigurnosnom provjerom u zračnoj luci ili sportskoj utakmici. Ako funkcionira, vjerojatno neće biti neočekivanoga sigurnosnog rizika, poput terorističkoga napada."

Tablica 5

Kada se pregleda Tablica 5, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 25 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao korisni agens". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „orezivanje - drvo", a najnižom učestalošću „lijek - pacijent" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 3: „Proces s programom sličnosti uspoređujem s procesom orezivanja stabla. Orezivanjem stabla stvaramo zdravije grane i jače korijenje, kao što i jačamo temelje obavljenoga posla i pomažemo u povećanju njegove kvalitete."

CT11: „Po mojemu mišljenju, slično je, na primjer, u vezi. Ako sam iskren i otvoren s nekim, tada ćemo izgraditi dobar društveni odnos. Slično tome, ako poštujem i koristim sustav protiv plagijata, to će vjerojatno pozitivno utjecati na kvalitetu mojega rada."

Tablica 6

Kada se pregleda Tablica 6, vidi se da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 28 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao dijagnostičko sredstvo". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „rendgen – pacijent", a najnižom učestalošću je „mjerač – benzin" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 10: „Program sličnosti je poput rendgenskoga alata. Kao što rendgenski alat otkriva sve bolesti pacijenta koji pati, program sličnosti također otkriva plagijat, uključujući dupliciranje, nepoštenje, rezanje itd. u pisanim tekstovima."

CT7: „Ovdje je slično osobnoj vagi. Ako pratim svoju tjelesnu težinu, imat ću dovoljno informacija o tome što trebam učiniti da bih bio zdrav. Isto vrijedi i za sustav protiv plagijata. Ako na vrijeme provjeravam svoj rad, trebao bih izbjeći probleme s plagijatom."

Tablica 7

Kada se pregleda Tablica 7, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 23 različita lanca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao agent za donošenje odluka". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 5) jest „kamen dodira - zlato", a najnižom učestalošću je „Sudac – Kazna" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 5: „Program sličnosti uspoređujem s kamenom dodira. Kamen dodira je kamen koji razlikuje jesu li dragocjeni materijali poput zlata pravi ili ne, te lažne legure u njima. Također se koristi u našem jeziku za mjerenje kvalitete nečega. Programi sličnosti su program koji mjeri koliko rada obavljenoga na sličan način pripada pojedincu, različite mješavine u njemu i kvalitetu rada."

CT1 5: „Roditelj je, ili bi trebao biti, u biti odlučujući element u odgoju djeteta. Trebao bi biti u stanju odlučiti što dijete može, a što ne može učiniti."

Tablica 8

Kada se pregleda Tablica 8, vidi se da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 26 različitih lanaca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao agent za evaluaciju". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 4) jest „kaznena evidencija - građanin", a najniža učestalost je „kronometar – rasa" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i čeških učitelja dane su u nastavku:

TT 13: „Program sličnosti je baš kao kaznena evidencija. Kao što kaznena evidencija otkriva sve zločine koje je građanin počinio, program sličnosti također otkriva sve pretjerane citate u pisanim tekstovima."

CT 20: „Za mene je to isto kao i u školi. Kada kontinuirano učim, odgovoran sam u školi, pa dobivam dobre ocjene. To je povratna informacija koju tada mogu dobiti. Na isti način, kada dobijem ponovnu objavu iz sustava za borbu protiv plagijata, to je za mene povratna informacija jer sam odgovorno radio s raznim izvorima prilikom stvaranja profesionalnoga teksta."

Tablica 9

Kada se pregleda Tablica 9, vidljivo je da su turski i češki učitelji stvorili 17 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom

kategorijom „Kao zaštitno sredstvo". Među tim metaforama, ona s najvećom učestalošću (f = 5) jest „pregled - ljudska bića", a s najnižom učestalošću „osiguranje - automobil" (f = 1). Izjave turskih i češkiх nastavnika dane su u nastavku:

TT 20: „Kao što pregled otkriva sve vrste bolesti na koje osoba sumnja, ali ih ne može dijagnosticirati, na isti način, program sličnosti vodi je otkrivajući nepotrebne i pretjerane citate u radu koji je predstavio autor."

CT 19: „Može se usporediti s biciklističkom kacigom koju bismo trebali nositi prilikom vožnje biciklom. Ako je imamo i dogodi se nesreća, velika je vjerojatnost da ćemo se ozlijediti, ali nećemo umrijeti. Naprotiv, ako nemamo kacigu i padnemo s bicikla, posljedice mogu biti kobne. Slično tome, primjenom sustava protiv plagijata, povećava se vjerojatnost da plagijat neće biti razlog našega neuspjeha ili problema pri radu s tekstom."

Diskusija i zaključak

Plagiranje nosi značajne moralne i etičke posljedice u akademskoj zajednici. Ova studija istražuje metaforičke percepcije nastavnika u vezi s lancima „Softver za otkrivanje plagiranja - tekst", istražujući kako nastavnici u različitim kulturnim kontekstima konceptualiziraju korištenje takvoga softvera u akademskim okružjima. Znanstvenici poput Nakitarea i Otikea (2023) ističu njegovu sve veću rasprostranjenost diljem svijeta. Iako su brojne globalne studije (npr. Al-Hussaini, 2022; Goodwin i McCarthy, 2020; Raj i sur., 2021; Cheers, Lin i Smith, 2021; Ali, 2021; Brown, Miller i Taylor, 2019) dokumentirale njegove štetne učinke, još uvijek postoji značajan nedostatak istraživanja usmjerenih posebno na poslijediplomske studente u međukulturalnim kontekstima (Odongo i sur., 2025; Selemi, Chawinga i Dube, 2018). Komparativna analiza provedena u ovoj studiji uspoređuje metaforičke percepcije učitelja iz različitih kulturnih okružja, s posebnim naglaskom na češki i turski obrazovni kontekst. Polazeći od kulturnih nijansi i obrazovnih filozofija koje oblikuju metaforičke reprezentacije učitelja, ovo istraživanje nastoji osvijetliti različite perspektive i kontekstualne čimbenike koji utječu na stavove prema tehnologiji otkrivanja plagijata. Razumijevanje nastavničkih metaforičkih percepcija lanaca „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" ne samo da produbljuje uvid u složenost koja okružuje akademsku čestitost i obrazovnu tehnologiju, nego i pridonosi oblikovanju etičkih smjernica te najboljih praksi za integraciju alata za otkrivanje plagijata u obrazovne okvire. Premošćivanjem jaza između teorije i prakse, ova studija doprinosi etičkoj pedagogiji u digitalnom dobu.

U ovoj studiji, turski i češki nastavnici proizveli su 201 metaforu u 9 konceptualnih kategorija u lancu „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst". Bozlk (2002) zamolio je 49 studenata prve godine sveučilišnoga studija da proizvedu četverostruke metafore. Na kraju studije prikupio je 35 metafora i klasificirao ih kao 37 % životinjskih metafora, 29 % metafora o predmetima, 26 % metafora o čovjeku/ ljudima i 8 % metafora djelovanja. U drugoj studiji, metafore „Brojenje zveckanja na igralištu" raspravljane su kao alati za obrazovanje/osposobljavanje pod naslovima „Radnja-čovjek-predmet", „Radnja-životinja-predmet", „Radnja-predmet-predmet", a sudionici su ocijenjeni u

smislu obrazovanja i osposobljavanja (Kabadayı, 2016). Paralelno s ovim studijama, u ovoj fazi istraživanja, sudionici su stvorili lance metafora koji bi mogli zadovoljiti koncept „Softvera za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst". Pokušali su objasniti ovaj lanac metafora unutar okvira 4 vrste metafora. Ove vrste metafora određene su kao „čovjek-čovjek", „čovjek-objekt", „objekt-objekt" i „objekt-čovjek".

Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 21 različit lanac metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao vodeći agent". Sudionici su izradili 2 vrste metafora kao 50 % objekt-objekt poput „kompas-plovilo" i 50 % objekt-čovjek poput „karta-putnik".

Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 23 različita lanca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao prijenosnik znanja". Sudionici su izradili 1 vrstu metafore kao 100 % čovjek-čovjek poput „policajac-lopov". Sudionici su stvorili 18 različitih lanaca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao kontrolni agent". Izradili su 3 vrste metafora: 34 % objekt-objekt poput „PIN - kreditna kartica", 44 % čovjek-objekt poput „mehaničar - automobil", 22 % objekt-čovjek poput „detektor laži - ljudska bića".

Turski učitelji za otkrivanje plagijata i češki učitelji stvorili su 20 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao preventivni agent". Izradili su 3 vrste metafora: 20 % životinja-čovjek poput „pas s narkoticima - krijumčar", 60 % objekt-objekt poput „carina - roba" i 20 % čovjek-objekt poput „operator - operacija".

Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 25 različitih lanaca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao korisni agent". Producirali su 2 tipa metafora kao 96 % objekt-objekt poput „perilice rublja - prljava odjeća" i 4 % objekt-čovjek poput „lijek-pacijent". Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 28 različitih lanaca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao dijagnostički agent". Izradili su 2 vrste metafora: 65 % objekt-objekt poput „manometar - tlak u gumama" i 35 % objekt-čovjek poput „komplet za testiranje na Covid - pacijent".

Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 23 različita lanca metafora u okviru teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao agent za donošenje odluka". Izradili su 3 vrste metafora: 22 % objekt-objekt poput „touchstone-zlato", 44 % čovjek-objekt poput „krojač-renovacija" i 34 % čovjek-čovjek poput „sudac-osumnjičenik".

Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 26 različitih lanaca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata - tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao agent za procjenu". Izradili su 3 tipa metafora kao što su 42 % objekt-čovjek poput „transkript-učenik», 39 % objekt-objekt poput „zapisnik o prometnom prekršaju-kazna" i 19 % čovjek-objekt poput „učitelj-povratna informacija». Turski i češki učitelji stvorili su 17 različitih lanaca metafora iz teme „Softver za otkrivanje plagijata – tekst" pod konceptualnom kategorijom „Kao zaštitno sredstvo". Izradili su 2 tipa metafora: 53 % objekt-čovjek poput „cjepivo-ljudska bića" i 47 % objekt-objekt poput „sigurnosni pojas - preživljavanje".

Ovo istraživanje nudi značajan doprinos akademskom diskursu o akademskoj iskrenosti i tehnološki poboljšanim praksama ocjenjivanja. Primjenom analize metafora u dva kulturna konteksta - Turskoj i Češkoj - studija pruža jedinstven uvid u to kako nastavnici konceptualiziraju alate za otkrivanje plagijata, otkrivajući temeljne stavove, uvjerenja i zabrinutosti. Korištenje metafore kao metodološke leće dodaje dubinu našem razumijevanju akademske čestitosti, pomičući se dalje od tradicionalnih kvantitativnih metrika. Štoviše, međukulturalna usporedba doprinosi obogaćivanju postojeće literature o akademskoj čestitosti identificiranjem kulturno uvjetovanih percepcija i isticanjem potencijalnih nedostataka u načinu na koji se takvi alati integriraju u obrazovne okvire. Nalazi podupiru ideju da metafore mogu poslužiti kao učinkovit pedagoški i istraživački alat za istraživanje složenih i apstraktnih obrazovnih tehnologija. Time ova studija doprinosi razvoju kulturno osjetljivih politika akademskoga integriteta i programa osposobljavanja učitelja koji su usklađeni s ciljevima održivoga obrazovanja.

Ograničenja studije

Jedno od ograničenja međukulturalnog kvalitativnog istraživanja u kojem je sudjelovalo 15 turskih i 19 čeških učitelja jest to što, iako je uzorak jasno definiran, možda ne predstavlja u potpunosti različite perspektive i iskustva svih učitelja u svakoj zemlji. Relativno mala veličina uzorka ograničava generalizaciju nalaza na širu populaciju, budući da se kulturne razlike i obrazovne prakse mogu značajno razlikovati među regijama i kontekstima u Turskoj i Češkoj. Stoga dobiveni uvidi mogu odražavati specifična gledišta, a ne sveobuhvatno razumijevanje cjelokupnog obrazovnog krajolika u tim zemljama.

Implikacije za daljnja istraživanja

Ova komparativna studija osvjetljava složenost povezanu s usvajanjem i primjenom softvera za otkrivanje plagijata u različitim obrazovnim okružjima te pruža vrijedne uvide edukatorima, kreatorima politika i istraživačima usmjerenim na akademsku čestitost i etičke obrazovne prakse. Na temelju rezultata istraživanja, sveučilišni nastavnici, edukatori ***učitelja, kreatori*** obrazovnih politika i učitelji trebali bi osigurati sveobuhvatne programe stručnog usavršavanja za učitelje u češkom i turskom kontekstu usmjerene na primjenu i implikaciju softvera za otkrivanje plagijata. Također bi trebali poticati učitelje na kritičko promišljanje o ulozi softvera za otkrivanje plagijata u obrazovanju te poticati rasprave o etičkim razmatranjima, ograničenjima i prednostima korištenja takvih alata u akademskim okružjima. Osim toga, savjetuje im se podizanje svijesti među učiteljima o kulturnim razlikama u stavovima prema akademskoj ***čestitosti*** i plagijatu. Nadalje, trebali bi poticati međukulturni dijalog između čeških i turskih edukatora radi razmjene perspektiva i uvida o softveru za otkrivanje plagijata te poticati suradničke istraživačke projekte usmjerene na ispitivanje utjecaja ovih alata na poučavanje i učenje u različitim kulturnim kontekstima. Također, preporučuje osigurati učiteljima pristup potpornim resursima, smjernicama i primjerima dobre prakse za odgovorno korištenje softvera za otkrivanje plagijata.