Detecting and preventing plagiarism
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Why might this topic be included today?

• People have seen cases of plagiarism in dissertations
  At least one person has seen a case.
• People have heard others worrying about cases
• People have read about the issue in other contexts – if there, why not here?
• The cultural and language diversity of trainees worries people: ‘other games, other rules?’
• It is important to authenticate the dissertation - assuring the work is ‘the trainee’s own work’
Plagiarism occurs when someone

1. Uses words, ideas, or work products
2. Attributable to an identifiable person or source
3. Without attributing the work to the source from which it was obtained
4. In a situation in which there is a legitimate expectation of original authorship
5. In order to obtain benefit, credit, or gain.

(Fishman, 2010)
Defining plagiarism

Submitting someone else’s work product in a situation where original work would be expected, without sufficient transparency in acknowledging the originator of the work

Creating a false impression as to whose work is being assessed

Seeking to mislead as to the originator of the work being assessed
Types of plagiarism

1. Copying without showing it is a copy
2. Paying someone to do it for you
3. Not showing your sources [words and work] transparently enough
4. Working too closely with others and not acknowledging the shared work

Misunderstanding
Misuse
Misconduct
In 2012....

- Increased awareness and concern in some places
- Increased opportunity + ease of access to opportunity [networking, electronic sources, search engines etc]
- Increased mobility [moving from one set of assumptions on use to another]
- Increased diversity in language capability
- Increased pressure, increased credentialism
In 2012

Increased ...
• opportunity
• access
• diversity of previous experiences
• diversity in language skills
• mobility
• ?pressure

Decreased?
• assuming academic literacy
• assuming research literacy
• ?f2f contact; supervision time
• ‘time on task’
‘Plagiarism is submitting someone else’s work without correct acknowledgment and then claiming credit for the work as if it was your own.’

Trainee knows, cites incorrectly

Trainee intends to deceive

Trainee does not know the rules; does it wrong

misconduct

misuse

misunderstanding
What deters?

• clear guidance: knowledge and understanding
• research topics which are specific, local, recent, context specific.....
• supervision of the process
• skills teaching and intervention when identifying misunderstanding or misuse
• robust detection [no closed eyes] using a range of strategies
• well-publicised penalties
Students explaining why they copied:

“This person writes exactly what I think.”
“This person writes it better than I do.”
“This person writes English better than I do.”
“There is only one way to write this.”
“These are my own words. I copied them myself.”
“These are my own words. I copied from a book but I bought the book.”
Signs and signals to watch for

• no evidence of process
• variation and inconsistency: language, format, citation, UK and US
• type, recency and relevance of sources
• ? ‘.... this feels....

[Note: often, these are picked up by external examiners....]
what are the issues for supervisors?

• the question
• the protocol..... templated, under valued, possibly inauthentic?
• the process ..... especially the literature review. Discussion or description? CCP or authored?
• the data ..... authentic, real-time, relevant?
• the type of feedback to trainees. General or specific? Optional or requirement?
Issues for assessors

• Whose responsibility to identify and report?
• What happens when a case is identified
• How cases are managed
• What ways are there to learn from and evaluate outcomes?