

**Beat the Witch-hunt! Peter Levin's Guide to Avoiding
and Rebutting Accusations of Plagiarism, for
Conscientious Students**

incorporating a brief guide to referencing styles

The right of Peter Levin to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means – electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise – without the prior permission of the author. The making of multiple printouts and the copying of printouts by any means are expressly prohibited.

© Peter Levin 2003. Copyright protected. All rights reserved.

Contents

Page	
	Part I: The conscientious student's predicament
2	Introduction: The plagiarism 'witch-hunt'
2	Definitions and indicators of 'plagiarism'
4	The demand that students' work be 'original'
4	The peculiar nature of academic learning and how it forces you to plagiarize
	Selecting and copying
	Translating
	Getting the hang of reasoning
7	Summary (1): Six failures in the plagiarism-hunters' thinking
8	Summary (2): How students are disempowered
	Part II: What you can do
10	Check out your HEI's rules and regulations
10	Check out your HEI's practices
12	Be clear about your task as a student
13	Observe how your teachers structure their lectures
13	Check out past exam papers
13	Compare your teachers
13	Be aware that handing in an essay to your teacher is not like feeding a dog
14	Check out marking criteria
14	Master the language of the subject
15	Question what you read
15	Be clear why you want to use a particular quotation
17	Read more than one book
17	Check out original sources
17	Get as much feedback as you can from your teachers
17	Work with other students
18	Claim copyright for your own work
18	Resist temptation
	Part III: How to use and cite your sources
19	Using and citing sources
19	Incorporating extracts into your text
19	The bewildering variety of referencing styles and advice
21	Choosing a referencing style
	The author/date style
	The author/page style
	The numbered-note style
	The Vancouver-numeric style
24	Listing and detailing your sources
26	Noting details of your source
27	Finally ...
28	Appendix: Translating academic writing
30	Notes and references

Part I: THE CONSCIENTIOUS STUDENT'S PREDICAMENT

Introduction: The plagiarism 'witch-hunt'¹

'Plagiarism' is a subject on which some academics these days are exceedingly twitchy. They report increasing numbers of instances of students submitting written work that in whole or in part appeared to have been composed by other people, without citing the source.² Academia seems to be in the grip of a 'moral panic', its values, principles and interests seen as under attack from legions of plagiarizing students.³ Students are faced with regulations, instructions and injunctions that often contain emotive language and are open to different interpretations. In some cases they are required on arrival as first-years to sign statements attesting to their awareness and understanding of these regulations: welcome to the plagiarism witch-hunt!

The origins of the current concern seem to me to lie not so much in the existence of plagiarism as such – I argue below that the nature of academic learning is such that it *forces* students and academics to plagiarize: plagiarism is integral to the Western system of propagating knowledge and ideas through higher education – as in the fact that some students have been found to have been *cheating*. They have been caught submitting other people's material as their own with the intention of gaining higher marks than they would otherwise achieve.⁴ Cheating has given plagiarism a bad name.

Understandably, cheating is taken particularly seriously when the mark for the work submitted will count towards the student's degree result, because if it is not detected he or she may be awarded a better result than they 'deserve'. And this, of course, is seen as detrimental to the public standing of the institution's degrees, as well as unfair to other candidates.

In this climate there has come into being something of an anti-plagiarism 'industry' in the UK, mounting a 'witch-hunt' against plagiarism. Nationally, there is the Plagiarism Advisory Service (PAS), funded by the Joint Information Systems Committee⁵ and based in the Information Management Research Institute at Northumbria University, complete with Core Team, Management Board, Expert Group, Round Table and Steering Group, and incorporating a Plagiarism Detection Service.⁶ At the level of the individual higher education institution (HEI) we find a plethora of definitions of 'plagiarism' (see below) and of stern admonitions and threats of penalties if these are not heeded.

In Part I of this Guide I describe the predicament in which conscientious students find themselves, and offer an analysis of how this situation has come about. In Part II I offer a number of suggestions designed to help you to deal with it. Some will help you to be fully aware of the situation, others are practical suggestions that will help to keep you out of trouble. Part III outlines briefly the mechanics of using quotations and citing sources, in the author/date, author/page, numbered-note and Vancouver-numeric styles: I hope you will find it useful as a reference guide. In the Appendix you will find an illustration of the necessity and difficulty of translating academic writing, using a sample taken from the PAS website.

Definitions and indicators of 'plagiarism'

There are a number of definitions and indicators of 'plagiarism' in use in UK HEIs. You may be found guilty of 'plagiarism' if ...

- ◆ You are presenting or 'passing off' another person's work as your own. ... This covers 'any work by others, whether published or not, [including] the work of other candidates'.⁷

- ◆ You 'import' into your own work 'more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and identification of the source'⁸
- ◆ You make 'extensive use of another person's work, either by summarising or paraphrasing it merely by changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement'⁹
- ◆ You use 'the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source', or submit or present work as your own 'which is substantially the ideas or intellectual data of another'¹⁰
- ◆ You submit the same piece of work for two different assignments, even if they are to different departments.¹¹
- ◆ You make 'a deliberate attempt at passing off the ideas or writings of another person as your own'.¹²
- ◆ You take 'the words, ideas and labour of other people and [give] the impression that they are your own. ... If this is done with the deliberate intention to deceive your reader, it clearly deserves severe punishment. ... Plagiarism is simply theft'.¹³

Moreover

- ◆ '[It is] the university registrar's view that "plagiarism in part taints the whole".'¹⁴
- ◆ 'A widely shared understanding is that plagiarism occurs when someone tries to pass off someone else's work, thoughts or ideas as their own, whether deliberately or unintentionally, without appropriate acknowledgement. ... It's cheating! ... a form of academic misconduct or dishonesty.'¹⁵
- ◆ 'So far as undergraduates are concerned, plagiarism can be defined as the deliberate use of another person's work in your own work, as if it were your own, without adequate acknowledgement of the original source. If this is done in work that you submit for assessment, then you are trying to mislead the examiners. In other words, plagiarism is cheating ...'¹⁶
- ◆ '[The] incorporation of significant elements of [another's] work, even with acknowledgement or reference, is not an acceptable academic practice and will normally result in failure of that item or stage of assessment.'¹⁷

And there's a pertinent dictionary definition which is quite distinct from 'passing off':

- ◆ 'Plagiarism: the act of plagiarizing, i.e. appropriating (ideas, passages, etc.) from (another work or author).'¹⁸

Finally, there is some material that students in some institutions are told doesn't need acknowledging:

- ◆ 'Some material can be labelled "common knowledge" ... anything that is repeatedly mentioned in published materials but never cited ...'¹⁹
- ◆ 'Material is probably common knowledge if you find the same information undocumented in other sources; it is information you expect your readers to be familiar with; [or] if the information could easily be found in general reference sources.'²⁰

The demand that students' work should be 'original'

Welcome to another minefield! Different academics and institutions will give you different answers to this question. Peter Larkham tells us:

The current Western education system ... places particular emphasis on 'originality' in students' work ... Particularly for dissertations, whether at undergraduate level but most particularly for higher degrees, there is a significant stress on 'originality' [and] 'unaided work' ...²¹

Hugh Pyper puts it to his students at the University of Leeds:

Whatever the intention, it is ... wrong for anyone to be given credit for a piece of work which is not theirs. If it is not clear to the reader what is your original work and what you have derived from somewhere else, how is a marker to know what deserves credit?²²

Now look at the University of London Regulations for the Degrees of MPhil and PhD. It is a requirement for a PhD thesis that it 'shall form a distinct contribution to the knowledge of the subject and afford evidence of originality by the discovery of new facts and/or by the exercise of independent critical power'. In contrast, an MPhil thesis 'shall be either a record of original work or ... an ordered and critical exposition of existing knowledge and shall provide evidence that the field has been surveyed thoroughly'.²³ Originality is thus *not* a necessary condition for being awarded a University of London MPhil. Logically it should not be a necessary condition for gaining a Bachelor's degree either.

I would respectfully suggest that the whole point of going to university and pursuing a degree course is that you *are* aided in your work (despite what Larkham says) and that you *do* learn how to 'derive' your opinions and conclusions from the work of others (despite what Pyper says), given that – as noted above – the focus of academic learning is the views of other people. Larkham's and Pyper's writings seem to me to be further testaments to the confusion that exists in the academic world on the subject of plagiarism, by saying, in effect: 'To avoid accusations of plagiarism your work must be original.' This is a hugely tall order for students taking taught courses, especially first-year undergraduates.

The peculiar nature of academic learning and how it forces you to plagiarize

Academic teaching and learning take place in a world, the 'academic world', that is visibly distinct and different from the 'real world'. In the real world, 'out there', there are events and situations, and natural and man-made phenomena: in the academic world, there are descriptions. In the real world, there are processes and mechanisms: in the academic world – in our heads – there are theories and explanations, and ideas and critiques. You and I can't experience these mental constructs in the same way that we experience the real world: we have to learn about them through – in particular – the written word, in the books and articles that other people have written, and the spoken word, in lectures. As Diana Laurillard puts it, 'it is a peculiarity of academic learning that its focus is not the [real] world itself but others' views of that world'.²⁴ The great majority of what students are required to learn is based on the documented views – the perceptions and thoughts – of others, not on their own experience.

(Incidentally, one corollary of academics' preoccupation with 'views' is that they are in general not good at addressing and resolving practical issues. They tend to get bogged down in *views* of the issue: one might say with some justification that the academic approach – especially in the social sciences and humanities – is to discuss definitions rather than tackle the issue itself.

This is nicely illustrated by Lorraine Stefani and Jude Carroll in *A Briefing on Plagiarism*, a publication of the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) Generic Centre. Key sections of this document are entitled 'The difficulties of defining plagiarism' and 'Helping students use definitions of plagiarisms (*sic*): you won't find a section on 'How to prevent cheating' or one on 'How to recognise cheating when you see it'.²⁵⁾

It seems to me that this peculiarity of academic learning, the fact that it deals primarily in *views* of the world, has some major consequences for the learning process. Getting a solid grounding in a subject must necessarily entail absorbing other people's views, internalizing them. Do this successfully and you won't know – you *can't* know – where your views begin and someone else's end. In much the same way as children are brought up by their parents and in the process take on unconsciously their attitudes, ways of being and thinking and looking at the world, and of course their language, successful students find themselves being brought up by their teachers and undergo an analogous 'bringing-up' process in the course of becoming a historian or physicist or whatever, similarly picking up attitudes, ways of being and thinking, and – crucially – ideas and language: expressions, turns of phrase, ways of describing, explaining, arguing. Without the solid grounding created by such a process, you won't have a firm base on which to develop and build views of your own.

Looking a bit more closely at what students actually do, it seems to me that academic learning proceeds in three reiterating stages: (1) selecting and copying; (2) translating; and (3) getting the hang of reasoning. It also seems to me that as a learner you are actually *forced*, in each of these stages, to engage to some extent in plagiarizing, in the sense that you have to appropriate the work of others.

Selecting and copying

The fact that academic learning is done primarily from other people's writing and lecturing²⁶ and through class and seminar discussions has important consequences for students. When you're learning something new, you necessarily have to start by selecting and copying other people's work.

You may know this activity as 'taking notes': I describe it as '*selecting and copying*' to bring out the fact that you have to select what notes to take. In a lecture you will usually not be able to write down everything the lecturer says: you will try to select what seem to you the most important points, and write those down. Faced with a book, you usually won't be able to copy out or photocopy the whole book, so you'll try to select relevant passages. But when you first encounter this material you probably won't be in a good position to judge relevance: a common feeling at this point is 'I'll get down as much as I can now, and try to make sense of it later'.

When you first take notes, the words are of course those of the author: they still 'belong' to that person. But the notes are *your* notes, and as you become familiar with them you appropriate them: you 'internalize' them, you incorporate them into your personal knowledge and understanding of the subject. So what you are doing, it seems to me, is performing a kind of private plagiarism. You are – *of necessity* – appropriating other people's material. And the more effectively that you do this, the more difficult it is to attribute sources.

It's not only students who encounter this difficulty. You may be interested to see a 43-page report prepared in May 2001 for the Joint Information Systems Committee: *Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide*. (Don't be confused by its title: this is *not* a guide to making a good job of

plagiarising.) Its authors, Jude Carroll and Jon Appleton, acknowledge that their suggestions and recommendations arise from a range of sources, not all of which they have cited:

Some ... are gleaned from the experience of colleagues or more experienced practitioners, from conversations with a wide range of people at conferences, and from consultations with student representatives ... Where appropriate, sources and research findings are cited but it has not always been possible to unearth the exact origin of ideas or to use publicly available sources.²⁷

The fact that experts in detecting plagiarism don't always find it possible to unearth the exact origin of ideas they have used, sits oddly with the frequently-encountered injunction to students that *they* must do so. And I think it corroborates my suggestion that taking in other people's ideas is something that can happen at a subconscious level, and that the nature of academic learning, where you are required to absorb the work of others, is such that it positively *forces* you to begin by plagiarizing, if only to yourself.

Translating

Much academic writing is not easy to understand at first reading. The subject matter is often complex, with tricky concepts to master. And, to put it bluntly, some academic writing is not very good. You are all too likely to come across authors who aren't consistent in the words they use, and who don't offer a decent 'map' to guide the reader through their material. You may even encounter some whose command of English grammar, punctuation and sentence structure is weak. And not a few writers get badly 'languaged up', producing a flood of 'academic-speak' if not actual gobbledygook.

This creates two nuisances that you have to deal with. First, it sets you a bad example and leads you to imitate this style of writing: it's worth making a conscious effort to resist this. Second, when you're reading this stuff it's really hard work to uncover the author's reasoning. To make head or tail of it you are forced to translate it into language that you can understand, that makes sense to you, even if your native language is English. I suspect that all intellectual learning actually involves an 'internal' translation process. (See the Appendix to this Guide for an illustration of the need for translating and what it entails.)

Translating involves expressing the statement on the page in front of you in different words, so you produce an 'equivalent' statement that, all being well, makes sense to you. That is to say, it involves you in *paraphrasing* the original statement. You can see from the definitions at the beginning of this Guide that paraphrasing carries the same dangers of plagiarizing as direct quoting does. Again, as with quotations, you are – of necessity – appropriating your paraphrasings as your own: you are 'internalizing' them, incorporating them into your personal understanding and conceptions of the subject matter. In my view, then, the standard of much academic writing is such that it too, like the very nature of academic learning, positively *forces* you to begin by plagiarizing, if only to yourself.

Getting the hang of reasoning

You'll know that you have got beyond selecting/copying and translating, when you can think and reason in the subject's language, just as when someone asks you a question in Spanish, say, and you can answer immediately in that language without having to translate the question into English, formulate your answer in English and then translate your answer into Spanish. Similarly with Economics: if someone asks you what the consequence is of 'shifting a curve', you can reply in the language of Economics without translating the diagram into English

words and sentences, working out the answer in English, and then translating back into economics-speak.

In my experience, having worked in the academic world for 36 years as an academic and in a student-support role, hardly any academics consciously teach students how to think like they themselves do. This is, I suggest, because (a) the way they think is so deeply internalized, so entrenched in their minds, that they take it for granted and are barely aware of it or of other ways of thinking; (b) someone who has become an academic in the first place has probably gained a top-class degree and done that by virtue of having a particularly good intuitive grasp of the subject: flair, talent, a gift, natural aptitude, call it what you will; and (c) internalized and intuitive processes are not easy to make explicit, precisely because one is not consciously aware of them. (Try for yourself to explain to someone else how something suddenly struck you; how when you came across something in a book it 'rang bells' with you; how you immediately saw how the bits of a puzzle might fit together.) In my view, too, the very culture of UK higher education promotes poor teaching, which does not help, to say the least.²⁸

The consequence of this will be – *is*, I venture to say – that the great majority of students, people who don't have this intuitive flair, find it takes a huge amount of hard work and dogged perseverance to get beyond the stages of selecting/copying and translating. If they don't make this breakthrough, they remain at those stages, where – as noted above – the danger of involuntary plagiarizing is considerable.

For students who do acquire fluency in reasoning, that danger is still there. To me, an appropriate analogy to this process is that of learning to dance. For some people, this involves first getting the moves into your head, then getting them into your feet, then getting them out of your head. At this point you're dancing without consciously thinking about it. For academics to demand of students who are fluent in a subject that they cite in a piece of written work every source that they've drawn on is like insisting that they learn to dance with their shoes tied together.

Summary (1): six failures in the plagiarism-hunters' thinking

Having spent some time checking out the regulations and instructions notified to students at HEIs up and down the country, as well as materials on the Plagiarism Advisory Service website, I have been shocked by what I have found. Academia seems to be in the grip of a 'moral panic', to use Stanley Cohen's phrase: its values, principles and interests are seen as under attack from legions of plagiarizing students. And students are faced with regulations, instructions and injunctions containing emotive language and terminology that is open to a variety of interpretations.

While I fully support efforts to detect and prevent deliberate attempts by some students to pass off other people's work as their own, as a long-standing academic (I started in 1967) I am dismayed by what I see of the thinking that lies behind some institutions' regulations and many recent contributions to the debate. I see six major failures:

- ◆ A failure to appreciate that plagiarism, in the sense of appropriating the learning of others, is integral to the Western system of propagating knowledge and ideas through higher education. This is because, as Diana Laurillard puts it in *Rethinking University Teaching*, 'it is a peculiarity of academic learning that its focus is not the world itself, but others' views

of that world'. The great majority of what we require students to absorb – not just learn, *absorb* – is based on the experience of others, not themselves.

- ◆ A failure to distinguish between plagiarism, in the above sense, and the deliberate passing-off of another's work as one's own, commonly referred to as 'cheating'. Cheating has given plagiarism a bad name.
- ◆ A failure to appreciate that much academic writing is so idiosyncratic and lacking in clarity that students have to translate it into language they can understand, a process in which close paraphrasing – often regarded as indicating a lack of understanding – is a necessary and important step.
- ◆ A failure to be realistic in their expectations of students. Given that experts in detecting plagiarism don't always find it possible to unearth the exact origin of the ideas they use – as Carroll and Appleton admit in their introduction to *Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide* – it seems very hard on students that *they* must do so. And the injunction to students that their work should be 'original' assumes a bizarre character given that originality is not a requirement for the University of London MPhil.
- ◆ A failure to separate emotions from practicalities. In many cases instructions and injunctions to students make use of highly emotive terms, like 'cheating', 'theft' and 'dishonesty'. While these terms may accurately convey the strength of feeling that academics hold on the subject, they are simply not appropriate to a rule-book. Moreover, given that there is widespread acceptance in all fields that there is such a thing as 'common knowledge' (although very few sets of plagiarism regulations acknowledge this), and that on the web 'open source' software and documents that carry no copyright claim are downloadable for free, I question whether one can legitimately be arraigned for the theft of something that is being given away.
- ◆ A failure to distinguish between phenomena and words, labels. The websites of many institutions carry the question 'What is plagiarism?' and/or an answer to this question in the form of a 'definitional' sentence beginning 'Plagiarism is ...'. The implication is that there is an unique behaviour or kind of behaviour which plagiarism unambiguously *is*. But 'plagiarism' is a *word* – a word to which different institutions attach different meanings, as we have seen: it is a *label* that signifies different behaviours to different people. One surely doesn't need to be exceptionally bright to see that the question should be 'What do we mean by "plagiarism"?' and that definitions should start with 'By "plagiarism" we mean ...' The failure to distinguish between a label and a phenomenon betrays a mind that is confused or superficial or both. I find it deeply dispiriting that people capable of such an elementary error are in charge of drawing up regulations for university students.

Summary (2): How students are disempowered

What does it feel like to be a student in these circumstances? Do any of the following apply to you?

- ◆ You get a message from your teachers – perhaps on your very first day at uni, if you have to sign a statement saying you're aware of and understand the institution's plagiarism regulations – that amounts to saying: 'We regard you as potentially dishonest, a cheat and a thief, and we are watching you.' What a welcome to the academic community!

- ◆ You check with your mates at other universities and find that different places operate different definitions of 'plagiarism'. It might mean deliberate failure to acknowledge a source, or it might mean accidental failure too. In some places importing two phrases from someone else's work without quotation marks and citation of source can get you into trouble; in others there has to be 'extensive use' of their work. You are scarcely going to be reassured that the same standards are applied uniformly and impartially to assessment across the higher education system.
- ◆ You find out that many of the definitions involve the academics sitting in judgment on you. If you've been discussing a subject with other students over a late-night drink and the next morning you put in an essay an expression that's stuck in your mind but don't attribute it, will they think you *intended* to conceal the source? Will they think you've made *extensive* use of another student's work? Will they think that the work that you presented is *substantially* someone else's or that it incorporates *significant* elements of another student's work? You have been put in a position where you have to second-guess your teachers.
- ◆ The definitions don't help you with some very practical issues. If you have an idea that you think is your very own, will you be penalized if it turns out later that it's in someone's book? How can you judge whether something is common knowledge if you aren't told how to do so?
- ◆ Even if you're one of the majority of honest, conscientious, hard-working students, first you find you've got to ask yourself not just 'How do I avoid plagiarism?' but 'How do I avoid being suspected and accused of plagiarism?' And then you find there are no clear answers. Not only do you discover you're in a game you don't know the rules of: you're in a game where the other side is able to make the rules up as they go along.

What does all this add up to? If you feel confused, anxious and/or demoralized – in short, disempowered – I think you have some justification. I take support for this view from an observation by Stefani and Carroll in their *A Briefing on Plagiarism*. In a section headed 'The difficulties of defining plagiarism', they write:

[There] remains the issue of helping academics clarify their own thinking about the often-complex matters that surround plagiarism. It is probably not helpful to share this level of thinking with students, despite the current push towards transparency which we both endorse ... Students can be disempowered if they feel they are being asked to operate in areas of ambiguity and disputed meanings yet being punished when they get it wrong.²⁹

Yes, this evidently *is* an area of ambiguity and disputed meanings, and secretiveness and a lack of clear thinking on the part of academics can only help to keep it so. If you *do* feel disempowered, here must lie at least part of the explanation.

It's high time that academics and administrators recognised that some unconscious plagiarism in students' work is inevitable and perfectly reasonable, and focused their efforts on preventing the minority from deliberately passing off other people's work as their own. Meanwhile, what can you as a conscientious student do to gain some control over your destiny? In Parts II and III of this Guide I offer some suggestions.

Part II: WHAT YOU CAN DO

Check out your HEI's rules and regulations

It will pay you to become familiar with your institution's rule-book, code of practice, or whatever, on the subject of 'plagiarism'. This will help you to keep out of trouble, and to keep a level head if there are rumours flying around about what does and does not count as 'plagiarism'. And if you get on the wrong side of any of your teachers, knowing the rules and conforming to them will help you to avoid giving someone an excuse to accuse you of breaking them.

Notice how the rules are constituted. The more lengthy and detailed they are, and the more attention they give to spelling out offences rather than offering help, the more likely it is that those who drew them up are afflicted by paranoia on the subject. There may not be much that you can do about that, but you should at least be aware of it.

Keep an eye open too for inconsistencies in the rules. They provide evidence of the confusion that exists among academics. A policy riddled with inconsistencies and rooted in confusion is always open to challenge. Look out too for words and phrases that require those who enforce rules to make judgments in interpreting them: 'substantial', 'extensive use' etc. Such judgments too may well be open to challenge.

Finally, if you are expected to cite your sources in a particular style – it will usually be the Harvard style or the numbered-note style – make sure you know what you're doing. If you're given a style guide, follow it. If you aren't supplied with one, ask where you can get one.

Check out your HEI's practices

Rules and regulations are one thing: how they are enforced may be quite another. Someone in your student union should have the job of keeping track of hearings into cases of alleged plagiarism, paying particular attention to the evidence and criteria on which decisions in such cases are actually taken.

What can you do with this knowledge? Larkham helpfully describes six actual cases considered by a 'Faculty Cheating Committee' at his own institution, the University of Central England.³¹ I reproduce them here, in abridged form.

Case A (project report)

'It became plain that, although some quotations were appropriately acknowledged ..., other verbatim and highly derivative material was not. In some [places], three successive paragraphs [were] reproduced, with only the middle one being an attributed quotation. In [others] only a few words were changed or omitted. ... Elsewhere, material was described as "adapted from" published sources whereas it was actually reproduced verbatim. ... The student was found guilty [of plagiarism] and the project mark was set at zero ... [Staff] were convinced by the nature of the plagiarism that it represented a lack of skill in the complex academic task of writing and referencing ...'

Case B (project report)

'Plagiarised elements were detected on every page [of a 16-page sample], together with ... attributed quotations not found in the source cited, close paraphrases including lists in which the order of items was changed, and the changing or omission of odd words. In large

elements the structure of the published text was followed exactly, including the same section titles ... An external examiner ... confirmed the plagiarisms alleged, and that in a third chapter “much of the ... material here is also a direct lift”. ... The student was found guilty and, as this was a second offence, was required to withdraw from the course.’

Case C (project report)

‘Despite reminders, [the report] had not been shown in draft to the supervisor. Both markers became suspicious at significant changes in fluency and style. [Staff] were ... able to suggest one journal paper as a likely source. However, the copy in the University’s library had been razored from the bound journal. The external examiner ... happened to be editor of the journal in question, and [supplied] a replacement copy. Such was the extent of plagiarism that finding textual confirmation took a matter of moments ... The student offered no defence before the Cheating Committee and the standard 60-credit penalty was applied. ... No evidence could be found that this student had vandalised the library copy of the journal, although it was discovered that the student was not a member of any other Midlands academic library.’

Case D (coursework essay)

‘The assessment criteria specifically included the need for full and proper referencing. The essay, although including a reference list, did not include Harvard-style references within the text. Concerns were raised by the marker regarding the style and diction of the writer, which [were] more akin to [those] of a textbook than [of] a “normal” student essay. ... The marker chose, exceptionally, to offer the student the opportunity to include the references within the text, provided that no other alterations were made to the work. When the work was [resubmitted] sections of the text had been referenced to works not on the original reference list [and] the paragraphs that had raised original suspicion remained un-referenced. The student was interviewed and, when asked about the new references, responded that their omission from the original list had been an oversight. The marker then looked at the cited texts in detail, but was unable to source the new quotations cited in the essay. However, an inspection of other ... texts in the University library revealed [that the essay] comprised large verbatim sections from a text not given in either of the student’s reference lists. The attributed quotations included in the second submission were also derived from this text and, indeed, often followed larger sections that had been copied verbatim. The work was referred to the Cheating Committee, alleging plagiarism in both submissions. The student was found guilty.’

Case E (coursework essay)

‘The source of un-attributed verbatim material was immediately recognised by the marker as a text ... not listed in the student’s reference list. [Following] referral to the Cheating Committee ... the student did not reappear at the institution and did not respond to the charges. ... Unlike [Cases A, B and C], where [the] students had sought the advice of the Students’ Union advisory service and had been accompanied at the hearing by a member of the service, [this] student did not appear and was not represented. [Staff] made the Committee aware that there may have been mitigating circumstances [but] the Committee proceeded to hear the case, upheld the allegation of plagiarism and imposed the standard 60 credit penalty.’

Case F (five pieces of coursework)

‘Suspensions were raised independently by [two] dissertation markers ... Some were [substantiated by] using a ... web search engine ... [Some] material contained phrasing typical of a local authority report ... on telephoning the Chief Planning Officer of the authority in question, only one sentence was read out before it was recognised. ... Although the student was found guilty, the Committee chose to set the penalty of recording zero for each of the five individual courseworks: considerably less than the “standard” 60-credit penalty of the University regulations for a “first, or mild offence”. Staff were strongly of the opinion that this was a serious offence repeated on five occasions during [the year], and that this penalty sent the wrong messages to both this student and others.’

Comment

This sample of cases raises a number of questions that you can ask about decisions and practices in cases at your own HEI.

Do reports of cases reveal a similar primary concern (a) with cases where a sizeable amount of material is involved (note the mentions of ‘3 successive paragraphs’, ‘much is a direct lift’, ‘such was the extent’, ‘large verbatim sections’) and (b) with cases where there is evidence of a systematic effort to conceal the use of other people’s material (e.g. attributing only the middle paragraph of three, changing the order of items in a list, not citing a source from which large sections have been quoted verbatim)? If so, conscientious students can be optimistic that the institution is primarily concerned to prevent cheating rather than to enforce every minute detail of its plagiarism code, and that small-scale, inadvertent transgressions will not bring down upon them the full force of the regulatory machinery.

Note how much discretion academics have here. It is a matter for their judgment (a) whether the evidence supports the allegation that plagiarism has taken place; (b) if it does, whether it is a mild or severe offence; (c) whether there are extenuating circumstances; and (d) what the penalty should be. Different people may make different judgments (academics disagree with one another) and the membership of committees changes from year to year. Moreover, it appears from Larkham’s Case E that whether a student appears at a hearing or not, and is represented or not, may also influence the judgments that are made. However, a student charged with plagiarism is entitled to expect that his or her treatment will be consistent with previous cases, and if your institution shows what appears to be an undue concern with ‘petty’ plagiarism it will be worth examining the records of past cases to see whether they have been treated consistently: have similar cases incurred similar penalties?

It would also be worth inspecting cases to see whether students have been penalized on other grounds besides plagiarism. In Larkham’s Case A, ‘staff were convinced by the nature of the plagiarism that it represented a lack of skill in the complex academic task of writing and referencing’. So was it the plagiarism as such or the low standard of academic skill that was being penalized? If the latter, awarding a mark of zero might be considered rather harsh.

Be clear about your task as a student

Please permit me to offer you a description of a student’s task. I see it as having two ‘levels’. At one level – you know this perfectly well already – your task is to learn about a subject. But there’s another level. At this deeper level, your task is essentially that of learning to think – and in particular learning to reason – like a practitioner (whether academic or professional) in your discipline(s). You have begun to master that task when you get to the point where your

essays have some of your own reasoning in them. At that point, you are pretty safe from accusations of plagiarism.

Learning to reason is not easy. The problem is this. You will rarely encounter an academic who is up-front with you and says: 'This is how I reason, this is what I look out for, this is the kind of information I need to have, this is how my mind works.' Accordingly you have to notice and discover these for yourself. Fortunately there are a number of things you can do.

Observe how your teachers structure their lectures

Observe how your teachers structure their lectures. Do they start from a question and reason their way to an answer? If so, notice what kinds of question they find interesting and what methodology they are using. Or do they begin by saying 'In this lecture I shall argue ...'? If so, notice what kinds of reasoning they employ in their 'arguing' and how they select the material that they draw on. Even if they adopt a lazy approach – 'In this lecture I want to look at ...', or 'Today I want to cover ...' – you can notice what it is that catches their eye and what they do with it, or what unites the aspects they intend to cover and whether they are comparing and contrasting them, for example

Check out past exam papers

Complement your observations of lectures by looking at past exam papers and noticing what kinds of questions are asked. These provide some really useful additional pointers to how your teachers think. For example, if there's a high proportion of **direct questions** – 'Why did ...?' or 'Account for ...' – you should feel free to ask your teachers 'What is the methodology of explanation that you're using?' and to pursue them until you get answers that you understand and can put to use yourself. Pursue them extra hard if they ask you to explain things that did *not* happen (e.g. 'Account for the failure of ...'). If there's a high proportion of **'discuss' questions**, ask your teachers 'How do I "discuss"? What exactly do you expect me to do?' and observe how they themselves discuss in their lectures. If there's a high proportion of **'great writer' questions**, pay close attention to what your teachers actually do with the literature they set you to read. If there's a high proportion of **problem questions** and these are causing you difficulty, try to find a friendly teacher who will sit with you while you're struggling, listen to you as you attempt problems, and help you get on the right road. (Unfortunately most academics are predisposed to tell you what's what rather than listen to you, an approach which of course takes no account of where *you* are coming from.)

Compare your teachers

Few academics take exactly the same approach to a subject as their colleagues. So compare the approaches of different teachers, both within and across disciplines. Compare the ways in which they structure lectures, their preferences as to exam questions, how they use published materials. Ask yourself questions like 'Do economists think differently from economic historians?', and then try to put your finger on the differences that you observe. And compare notes with your fellow-students.

Be aware that handing in an essay to your teacher is not like feeding a dog

If you are one of a large cohort of students taking a course, it may sometimes feel as though having to supply essays at regular intervals is exactly like having to satisfy a dog by providing it with regular meals. The temptation is to do the equivalent of going to the supermarket, purchasing a tin of dog food, opening it and spooning it into a bowl. Beware! Academics want

home-prepared food, and they are going to judge you on it, which is why they are so antagonistic to your passing off shop-bought food as home-made. Even if you are using bought-in, ready-to-use ingredients, you must add something of your own – an additional ingredient or two, for example, or a variation on the method of preparation, cooking or presentation. Do your own little research project: try to work out what it is that will give your offerings ‘teacher appeal’. But note that teachers, like dogs, are not all alike: subtle variations may be necessary to appeal to different academic tastes.

Check out marking criteria

If you are being pushed to write an essay on a topic that is new to you, and so are at the ‘selecting and copying’ stage, you could probably use the notes you have taken to cobble something together, assembling a string of quotations and taking care to cite your source for each. If your quotations are relevant and presented in a logical order, they will show that you have done some reading and/or taken some notes in lectures, that you have an ability to distinguish the relevant from the not-relevant, and that you possess an appropriate concept of how an essay should be structured.

In my personal judgment, marking criteria *should* include evidence of reading, of a sense of relevance, and of a grasp of structure: an essay that demonstrates these qualities has some merit. However, I may be a lone voice here: nothing that I have read on the subject of plagiarism suggests that others share my view. It is possible that your own teachers would share it: you will need to ask. BUT essay topics and exam questions should be (which does not mean to say that they actually are) designed to see if you have progressed beyond that level, and in that case your teacher clearly would not be satisfied with such an essay. (If the topic is framed as a question, it is quite probable that you would not be answering it.)

If you are still at the ‘translating’ stage on the topic, your essay is likely to be made up of very simply paraphrased quotations: word-for-word substitution – probably involving you in looking many words up in an appropriate dictionary or textbook – while keeping the same sentence structure. Your teacher will be looking for you to cite the original sources: if you don’t do so, it will look as though you are trying to pass off the material as your own, and you could be accused of plagiarism. As with direct quotations, if your paraphrasings are relevant and presented in a logical order, they will show that you have ‘taken on board’ some material and have some sense of relevance and structure: in addition, the essay will show that you have begun to make progress in ‘digesting’ the material.

Would your teacher be satisfied with *this*? Again, you will need to ask. BUT, if the essay topic is designed to test your ability to reason (i.e. the main marking criterion is: Does this essay provide evidence of ability to reason?) your teacher clearly would not be satisfied. And again, if the topic is framed as a question, you would quite probably not be answering it.

Master the language of the subject

If you are to reason in any discipline you must be fluent in its language. Create your own dictionary/phrase-book and each time you encounter a word with a specialized meaning enter it into your dictionary with a note alongside of the meaning (or meanings) that it carries and examples of how it is used in the literature. If it is a word that different writers use in different ways, make a note on each of them: don’t just choose one or two and ignore the others. Make your notes in language that you can understand and are comfortable with. (This implies ‘proper’ translation, not merely looking up certain words in a dictionary and inserting

substitutes in their place.) Not only will making a translation help you to 'digest' the material and make it more memorable for you: your dictionary entry, because it has been fashioned by *your* mind, is more than likely to be different from anyone else's – it will bear *your* fingerprints – which will help to safeguard you from accusations of plagiarism.

Observe that for some subjects you may need a multiple dictionary. For example, in the case of economics you may need a four-column dictionary: economics-speak; ordinary English; diagrams; equations.

And whenever you look something up, don't forget to make a note of your source each time. When you're photocopying pages from a book save yourself some work by photocopying the title page and the page with publisher's details too. These will have information that you need for citing the source.

Question what you read

Get into the habit of questioning everything that you read. Ask yourself: 'Where does the writer get this from? How does he or she know? What assumptions or value judgments are being made here? How can I test that theory or model?' Check your answers with your teacher, at least while you're still gaining your confidence. This is a very good way of getting into the mind-set of writers and developing the skill of reading critically.

There is an important point here for Master's students who have done their first degree at a different university, especially one outside the UK. You may previously have been in an educational system where you were expected to be able to quote authorities and textbooks, and were rewarded for doing no more than this. At your present university it may not be the same. You are likely to find that you are expected to USE quotations to answer the question set for you. In other words, you have to digest the quotations you want to use – not merely reproduce them – and show in your essay that you have understood their relevance to the topic.

Be clear why you want to use a particular quotation

When you find something in a piece of writing that attracts you and you want to quote from it, please think about what you want to use the quotation *for*, and how you can get the maximum benefit out of it. You will find it enormously helpful if you can get into the habit of asking what your quotation from a particular source actually contributes to your essay. Many student essays simply prefix a quotation with the words 'According to X, ...' or 'X states ...' and fail to make clear the *significance* of the quotation, leaving the reader wondering 'So what?' A good essay *does* make the significance of a quotation clear, and this has a three-fold payoff: in thinking about significance you develop your skill in reasoning and critical thinking; you demonstrate to the reader that you have put thought into the essay; and you are helping to insure yourself against the danger of plagiarism because the thoughts are your own.

The contribution made by a quotation may take one of a variety of forms: facts, perceptions, figures of speech (metaphors and similes³²), definitions, assumptions, propositions, opinions, value judgments, claims (e.g. in the form of appeals to common sense), questions and reasoning. Each kind of contribution (a) needs to be referred to in a particular way; and (b) invites you to ask certain questions about it. In Box 1 on the next page I go through the list of kinds of contribution: I suggest how you should refer to contributions of each kind in your text and offer some questions that you can ask about them.

Box 1

Type of contribution	How to refer to it	Questions to ask about it
Fact	◆ X found, discovered, revealed, ascertained, notes, points out that ...	Is this fact universally accepted, accurate (so far as you can tell)? Have other significant facts been ignored? How am I using this fact?
Perception	X describes, identifies, distinguishes, categorizes; as X sees it, ...	Does X have a particular standpoint which causes him/her to perceive things in this particular way? Are there alternative standpoints?
Figure of speech	X regards ... as; compares ... to; suggests that ... is like ...	Is this an appropriate metaphor or simile? How does it assist my understanding? Do I want to adopt it?
Definition	X defines ... to mean ...	Do other writers have different definitions, i.e. attribute different meanings to the same term?
Assumption	X assumes, postulates, hypothesizes, conjectures, takes it for granted that	Do other writers make this assumption? Is it valid, justified? Do I wish to share it? If I make different assumptions, would I come to different conclusions?
Proposition	X argues, asserts, contends, suggests, hypothesizes ... that if A, then B; X supports, is critical of, criticizes	How can I test the validity of this proposition, whether it 'fits the facts'?
Opinion	According to X; X tells us, says, thinks, suggests, considers, comments, agrees that; X disagrees with; in X's opinion; it seems to X that	On what grounds (evidence) does X base his opinions? Do other people hold them? If not, why not? Do I agree with X?
Value judgment	To X, it should, ought; to X it is good, bad, beneficial, harmful	Do other people share X's value judgments? Why should I pay attention to them?
Claim	X claims that; in X's professional judgment; to X, it surely, must be, is obvious that; it cannot be	What is the authority on which X bases his/her claim? Why shouldn't I challenge that claim and authority?
Question	X asks/questions whether	Are these questions relevant? Are there other questions that I ought to be asking?
Reasoning	X infers from this evidence that; shows from his/her analysis that; X demonstrates how; concludes	Is this reasoning sound? Could other conclusions be drawn from the same evidence?

Read more than one book

Read several books and articles on a topic – but *not* the whole book, just the relevant bits – and look for disagreements between authors. This is another good way of learning the skill of critical reading. Critical reading is like detective work. Try to track down the source of the disagreement. Is it a difference in assumptions? or in the data used? or in methods of analysis? And when you have tracked down the source of the disagreement, try to form your own judgment as to who is right. Judge for yourself if someone has made an unwarranted inference or logical error. If you're not confident about this, ask your teachers for help. They should be intrigued by problems like these.

Check out original sources

Many students who are starting a new subject find it reassuring to have a textbook that covers the whole course, or – failing that – to be pointed to a short introductory book or a review article or two. That's OK for starters, but such 'potted' treatments do little to help you to develop your reasoning in the subject, and in many cases they are inadequate as sources of quotations. So get into the habit of checking out the original sources that they draw on. Apart from anything else, this will help to alert you to the limitations and deficiencies that are to be found in secondary sources, and thereby further develop your skill of reading critically.

Get as much feedback as you can from your teachers

Consider your teachers as a resource. Try to uncover their ways of thinking and reasoning, and to adopt these for yourself. Deconstruct their exam questions; submit essays and essay outlines to them for feedback; if their comments are uninformative and do not help you to see what you should do to raise the standard of your work and the quality of your reasoning, press them for further and better particulars. It will pay you to be an active learner, rather than a passive recipient of teaching.

Work with other students

You may find that you are warned not only against committing plagiarism but also against committing 'collusion', conspiring with one or more other students to improve your marks by working together. Of course, students have always worked together – these may be among your most memorable and valuable learning experiences – and today we have the bizarre situation in many UK universities that on the one hand they are actually encouraging students to develop their teamwork skills, yet on the other hand they are warning them against collusion!

How should you respond to these mixed messages? I would certainly encourage you to work with other students: you will learn from them as well as from your teachers, and you will usually be able to express ideas and ask questions without feeling that you are being judged, which may not be the case in 'official' tutorials, classes and seminars. And you may find essays written by other students easier to learn from than texts written by academics, because they are written by people who are at a similar stage of the learning process to yourself. Indeed, you may find them mercifully free from the academic-speak and pontificating to which many academics are sadly prone. But do stop short of drafting essays or parts of essays together. The final selection of words must emerge from your own mind: it must be your own. Otherwise the sniffers-out of plagiarism will be on your tracks.

Claim copyright for your own work

It is not unknown for academics to get ideas from their students and pass them off as their own. If an essay or dissertation is genuinely your own work, and you have properly acknowledged material drawn from other sources, you are morally entitled to claim copyright for it. Indeed, if you have had to sign some kind of declaration that it is your own work, it follows that copyright belongs to you. To claim copyright, all you need do is add © Your Name 2003 (or whatever the year is) at the foot of the title page or at the end of the document. (In Microsoft Word, for © type [Ctrl] + [Alt] + [C].)

Resist temptation

To plagiarize and successfully conceal the fact takes hard work. You may as well devote that work to doing the job properly. Larkham mentions a student (Case A) who took from an original source the sentence 'The most influential figure in the history of British town planning is Ebenezer Howard, whose book *Tomorrow* first appeared in 1898' and rendered it as: 'The most influential figure in the history of town planning is Ebenezer (*sic*) Howard, whose book *Tomorrow* first appeared in 1898'. Just two minutes' work on the internet and a moment's reflection on the judgment made in that sentence would have enabled the student to write: 'The most influential figure in the history of British town planning is said by [the original author of the sentence] to have been Ebenezer Howard, who published his book *Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform* in 1898'. Had the student cited the author who made that statement, not only would there have been no plagiarism: he or she would have demonstrated to the reader (a) that they had done at least some checking of the original source (Howard), and (b) that they were aware that a judgment was being made by the secondary source. Incidentally, if you do make use of a quotation or other material from an internet source, the important thing is to cite the source just as if it were an orthodox one. That should be perfectly adequate protection from any accusation of plagiarism.

You may be tempted, especially if you are up against a deadline, to buy an essay from an outfit advertising on the internet and submit it as your own work. This really is asking for trouble. Doing this raises no subtle questions of what is meant by 'plagiarism': it is an absolutely clear-cut case of rule-breaking. The existence of highly developed plagiarism-detection software today makes it almost certain that you will be found out. You will be severely penalized – possibly being refused a degree or expelled from the institution – and subjected to a great deal of public humiliation, involving being branded as dishonest and a cheat. So I definitely do not recommend this course of action. Even if you submit a hand-written essay, it is almost impossible to avoid giving clues if you have used someone else's material word-for-word or in a close paraphrasing. Most academics love detective work, especially if they can feel righteous about it, and you are challenging them in their specialist field. Don't even try!

I would just add that in my experience students who actively try to master the language of their subjects, who question what they read, who read more than one book on a topic and check out original sources, and who actively seek feedback from their teachers and discuss their subjects with other students, tend to be the ones who get good results. Try to be one of them, and passing off other people's work as your own is the last thing you'll need to do in order to get good marks.

Part III: HOW TO USE AND CITE YOUR SOURCES**Using and citing sources**

Using other people's writings as sources and acknowledging their contribution by 'citing' the source – i.e. supplying a reference to it – is central to academic writing. Citing your sources is thus not only a way of providing you with an important protection against being accused of plagiarism: it is also good academic practice. In any worthwhile essay, dissertation or project report that you write, your reasoning will involve making use of what others before you have written. Citing your sources will enable the reader to check that you have used those sources appropriately and that your reasoning is sound. This is the intellectual – as opposed to the self-protective – justification for citing your sources.

Using and citing sources requires you to provide three things:

- 1 an extract from the source: a word-for-word quotation or your own paraphrase of a quotation
- 2 an insert of some kind in the text: a cue, marker or 'signpost' that directs the reader to a place where details of the source can be found
- 3 a listing of the details of your sources.

Incorporating extracts into your text

Short extracts: If you are quoting directly (rather than paraphrasing), and the extract is not more than a certain length – could be two lines, three lines, 30 words or 40 words: check with your referencing style guide – enclose it in quotation marks. Check with your style guide too to see whether these should be single or double quotation marks. If the extract already includes a word, phrase or sentence in quotation marks, the guide may tell you that these should be double if the 'outside' ones are single, and vice versa.

Longer extracts: If your extract is longer than two or three lines, indent it. Your referencing style guide may tell you whether it should be indented from both margins or only the left-hand one. An indented extract should not be enclosed in quotation marks.

Shortened extracts: It is permissible to shorten an extract by taking out words, so long as you do not change the author's meaning. (Never remove the word 'not', for example.) The fact that words have been taken out is shown by the insertion of (usually) three dots (i.e. full stops, or periods [USA]). Your own words can be inserted in place of the author's: this is usually done so that the extract still reads grammatically. Your own words should be enclosed in square brackets and again you must not change the author's meaning. If, as a result of your shortening, a word that was formerly inside a sentence now begins one, the first letter of that word may be enclosed in square brackets. (Again, consult your referencing style guide: it may or may not require this.)

Paraphrasing: If you are paraphrasing someone else's work, it is prudent to make it clear that you are doing so: use some formula like 'to paraphrase X, ...'; 'X appears to be assuming/arguing/suggesting ...'; 'in other words ...' (after an actual quotation).

The bewildering variety of referencing styles and advice

If you check out referencing styles on the web, prepare to be thoroughly bewildered. No sooner do you discover what looks like a comprehensive list, like that offered by the Libraries

of the University of St Thomas in St Paul-Minneapolis:³²

MLA (Modern Language Association) Style

Chicago Style (also known as Turabian)

APA (American Psychological Association) Style

Sociology (American Sociological Review [ASR] and American Sociological Association [ASA]) Style

Scientific Style (Council of Biology Editors [CBE], American Institute of Physics [AIP], Harvard)

than you come across this from the University of Melbourne Learning Skills Unit:

There are two methods of referencing: Harvard and Cambridge, and numerous variations within these two ...³³

and this from the Library of the University of Southern Queensland:

There are basically two different ways of referencing which are used – the Oxford or traditional system, and the Harvard system.³⁴

and this from June Hayles at Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London:

There are two common systems for referencing: the Harvard (author-date) system and the Vancouver (numerical) system. The Harvard referencing system [is] also known as the American Psychological Association system.³⁵

and this from Graham Shields and Graham Walton in the Learning Resources Department at Northumbria University:

There are two methods by which references can be displayed, the British Standard and Harvard.³⁶

Ho hum. There is no British Standard for displaying references. There *is* a British Standard, *BS 5605 : 1990 Recommendations for citing and referencing published material*. This recommends the use of one of three systems: 'Name and date system (Harvard system); Numeric system; Running notes'.³⁷

(Interestingly, if you do a Google search for 'Harvard referencing system' or 'Harvard referencing style', the sites thrown up – at least on the first 20 pages – are almost all from British or Australian universities: hardly any are from American ones. Evidently librarians and academics in American universities other than Harvard are unwilling to credit that institution with the title to a referencing style.)

So, please note: THERE IS NO SINGLE RIGHT WAY OF REFERENCING. Ask your teachers if they have preferences as to which referencing style you should use, *and* either to supply you with a style guide or to refer you to one. In some fields (medicine, law) there are standard styles in the UK and USA and other English-speaking countries, but in others there is not. Some publishers and journals have their own distinctive house style, too. As a second best, ask your teachers to suggest a book or a journal whose style you can follow.

The world of referencing styles is a strange one. It seems to be populated by people who have taken to an extreme the principle that consistency in a book or journal is to be desired. Thus instructions have proliferated that govern every little detail of a reference: e.g. how many of

the authors of a multiple-authored book should be named; whether first names or initials should be given, and whether they should be placed before or after the author's surname; whether the editor of a book should be denoted by 'edited by' or '(ed.)'; whether an indented quotation should be indented from the right margin as well as the left; and so on. Many also insist that the place of publication – Harmondsworth, Basingstoke etc. – be named, an anachronism in these days when publishers have offices all over the world and a book may be published in several countries simultaneously. Strangely, although for some years now every book published has had its individual International Standard Book Number (ISBN) – this is the identifier that booksellers use – the benefits of this system have not been taken up by the designers of referencing styles.

Having myself spent several hours wading through websites that purport to offer definitive advice, looking for one that is comprehensive, accurate, consistent and easy to understand all the way through, and discovering that this has to be a candidate for the title 'most frustrating computer game yet invented', I offer the following suggestions for choosing a referencing style and putting it into practice.

Choosing a referencing style

There are, so far as I can see, four kinds of referencing style in general use. You can easily tell which is being used in a book or article that you're reading because they have different kinds of insert in the text. Look out for the following:

- ◆ Author, date, e.g. Smith (1980) or (Smith, 1980). Full details of Smith's publication are contained in a list at the end of the book, the chapter or the article. I refer to this as the **author/date** style.
- ◆ Author, page number, e.g. Jones (117) or (Jones 117). I refer to this as the **author/page** style.
- ◆ Superscript, e.g. ¹² The superscript, or raised number, directs you to a footnote (at the foot of the page) or endnote (at the end of the book, chapter or article) with the same number. Full details of the publication are contained in the footnote or endnote. I refer to this as the **numbered-note** style. (*BS 5605 : 1990* describes it as the 'running notes' method.) It is the style used in this Guide.
- ◆ Bracketed numbers, e.g. (12) Like the numbered-note style, the bracketed number directs you to a footnote (at the foot of the page) or endnote (at the end of the book, chapter or article) with the same number. The best-known version of this is the Vancouver style, but you'll also find it referred to as the 'numeric' style, so I refer to it as the **Vancouver-numeric** style. Unlike the numbered-note style, the same number (bracketed) may appear in more than one place in the text.

If you have an essay (or dissertation or report) to write, and you have some choice when it comes to selecting a referencing style, which one should you choose? Here are some things you should know about the four main kinds of style:

The author/date style

Varieties: In the UK and Australia the most common version of the author/date style is that known as the Harvard style. In the USA the APA, ASA/ASR and CBE and AIP styles are versions of this style. It is commonly used in the physical and life sciences and the social sciences.

Inserts in the text: In the text you place an insert giving the author(s) and date of publication. For example: 'Smith (1980) describes X as ...' or 'X has been described (Smith, 1980) as ...'. If Smith had two publications in 1980, they are differentiated by putting letters (a, b ...) after the year. So if you are referring to both at different places, your text with inserts would look something like: 'Smith (1980a) describes ...' and 'Smith (1980b) concludes ...'. You might also want or be required to include page numbers, so that the reader does not have to wade through Smith's book in its entirety to find your source. Then your text with inserts would look something like: 'Smith (1980a, p.13) describes ...' or 'Some writers have concluded (e.g. Smith, 1980b: 17-18) ...'. Your style guide should tell you whether or not you are required to prefix page numbers by p. or pp., and whether it should be '(Smith, 1980)' or '(Smith 1980)'.

Listing: For every different insert, you write a reference saying where the source can be found. At the end of your essay you attach a list of all the references, in alphabetical order of authors' surnames. This list might be headed 'Bibliography', 'List of references', or 'Works cited'. There are a number of ways in which entries in the list could be set out – different style manuals prescribe different ones – but they all have in common that they begin something like: 'Smith, T. (1980). ...'.

Usefulness: The author/date style is most useful where all your sources are books or journal articles with one or more designated authors. The insertion of dates in the text may be helpful, as Ritter points out, for following the progress of a debate.³⁹ This style also allows you to add or subtract references easily if you have occasion to amend your essay just before handing it in. It is less useful if you have to deal with 'messy' sources like newspaper articles and editorials, the publications of government bodies or other organizations where no author is credited, broadcasts on TV or radio, or websites. And it is of no use as a vehicle for 'parenthetical' comments – asides – that you don't want to place in the body of your essay.

Best websites: <http://www.lmu.ac.uk/lss/lis/docs/harvfron.htm> [Accessed 18 October 2003]
Dee, M. (1998) *Quote, Unquote: The Harvard Style of Referencing Published Material*. Leeds Metropolitan University

and

http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_apa.html [Accessed 17 October 2003]
Purdue University Online Writing Lab (OWL) (2001) *Using American Psychological Association (APA) Format*. Purdue University.

The author/page style

Varieties: The main (if not the only) version of this style is the MLA style, codified by the Modern Language Association in the USA.

Inserts in the text: In the text you place an insert giving the author(s) and the number of the page or date of publication. For example: 'Jones (117) describes X as ...' or 'X has been described (Jones 117) as ...'. If you are referring to two different publications both authored by Jones, they are differentiated by including the title, which may be abbreviated.

Listing: At the end of your essay you attach a list of all the sources you have cited, in alphabetical order of authors' surnames. This list should be headed 'Works cited'.

Usefulness: The author/page style is most useful where all your sources are books or journal articles with one or more designated authors. If your source is an article in a bulky newspaper, citing the page is good practice since it will help the reader to track down the article. It can

also work satisfactorily even if no author is credited, because you can cite the title instead. It is less good with websites and, like the author-date style, is of no use as a vehicle for 'parenthetical' comments – asides – that you don't want to place in the body of your essay.

Best website: http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_mla.html [Accessed 18 October 2003] Purdue University Online Writing Lab (OWL) (2000) *Using Modern Language Association (MLA) Format*. Purdue University.

The numbered-note style

Varieties: Numbered-note styles include the Chicago and Turabian styles well-known in the USA. In Australia, the so-called Oxford style and Cambridge style are also of this kind. In the UK, you may find it referred to as the traditional footnote style or the endnote style, or – as by the British Standards Institution – the 'running notes' style. It is commonly used in the arts and humanities, some social and political science fields, and law.

Inserts in the text: At every point where you wish to supply a reference or a comment of some kind, you insert a superscript, a raised number. You start with ¹, then ², and so on, through the essay. Even if you are referring to a source that you have already referred to, you give it a new number. (So no superscript number appears twice.) Variants of this style place the footnote number in round or square brackets.

Listing: For every superscript, you write a note giving the reference and/or making your comment. These notes may be placed at the foot of the page on which the superscript appears, in which case they are footnotes, or at the end of the essay, chapter or dissertation, in which case they are endnotes. The notes will be listed in numerical order to correspond with the superscripts. The list of endnotes can appropriately be headed 'Notes and references'.

In addition to the list of notes and references, you may be asked by your teachers to provide a bibliography. Normally this would be a list of books and articles that you have used for 'background' reading: ask whether works listed in your notes should also be listed in your bibliography.

Usefulness: The great thing about the numbered-note style is that you can use it not only for references but for those parenthetical comments and asides that would interrupt the flow if you put them in the body of your text: a comment on the reliability of a source, or on some quirk that it exhibits; a reminder to the reader what certain abbreviations stand for; a signpost to another source where a different point of view can be found; and so on. It is also convenient to use when you are citing an original source which a 'secondary' source led you to: you can simply cite the original and then say 'cited by' the secondary source.

The numbered-note style can be cumbersome if you've inserted all your superscripts and then decide you want to add or subtract a reference, because this entails renumbering all the subsequent references. One way of getting round this is by using your word processor's automatic footnote/endnote system: another way – which I use – is to type out each note within your text and enclose it within ## ... ##: when you've finalized the text you can find these one by one, remove each one from the text on to the clipboard and substitute the relevant superscript, and then copy them from the clipboard in batches of ten into your 'notes and references' list.

Best website: <http://www.usq.edu.au/library/resources/pathfind/lg-07.htm> [Accessed 18 October 2003] University of Southern Queensland Library (1999) *Guide to Footnotes and Referencing the Oxford System*

The Vancouver-numeric style

Varieties: The Vancouver style emerged from a meeting of editors of general medical journals in Vancouver, Canada, in 1978 to establish guidelines for the format of manuscripts submitted to their journals. The group agreed a set of guidelines which was first published in 1979 and defines the Vancouver style. The latest version, *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals*, is effectively the norm for biomedical journals. (See *Best website*, below.) The numeric system described very briefly in *BS 5605 : 1990* is very similar.

Inserts in the text: At every point where you wish to supply a reference to a source you have used, you insert a number in brackets (parentheses). (*BS 5605 : 1990* offers the choice of using superscripts instead.) Similarly to numbered notes, you start with (1), then (2), and so on, through the essay. BUT when you refer to a source that you have previously referred to, you insert its *original* number (*unlike* the numbered-note style). So if you refer to source no. 3 seven times, say, the insert (3) will appear seven times in your text.

Listing: For every insert, you write a reference saying where the source can be found. Your list of references will go at the end of your essay, in numerical order to correspond with the inserts. The list can appropriately be headed 'References'.

Usefulness: Like the author/date style, the Vancouver-numeric style is most useful where all your sources are books or journal articles with one or more designated authors. The inserts are less distracting than authors, dates and page numbers. But if you have referred to different parts of the book in different places in your text it does not offer you an elegant method of citing the different page numbers in a book: it is therefore most effective where your sources are relatively compact, like journal articles or self-contained chapters in a book.

The Vancouver-numeric style is more economical than the numbered-note style in that only one reference is needed for each source (and so you will have no occasion to use *ibid.*, *op. cit.* or *loc.cit.*) But it is less useful if you have to deal with 'messy' sources, and it is of no use as a vehicle for parenthetical comments.

Best websites: <http://www.icmje.org/> [Accessed 17 October 2003] International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (2001) *Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals*

and

<http://www.mds.qmw.ac.uk/biomed/kb/funmed/library%20stuff/citation.htm> [Accessed 4 October 2003] June Hayles (2002) *Citing references: Medicine and dentistry*. Main library information services. Queen Mary College (until recently Queen Mary and Westfield College)

Listing and detailing your sources

If you are using the author-date (e.g. Harvard) or author-page style, your list will be arranged in alphabetical order of author's (or first author's) surnames. For a single-author book, the layout will usually be as follows:

Author's surname | Author's initials or first name | Year of publication | Title (usually in italics but may be underlined) | Number of edition if not the first | Place of publication (followed by a colon) | Publisher

If you are using the Vancouver-numeric style, your list will be arranged in the numerical order of your bracketed inserts. For a single-author book, the layout will be as follows:

Author's surname | Author's initials or first name (but these can go before the surname if preferred) | Title (usually in italics but may be underlined) | Number of edition if not the first | Place of publication (followed by a colon) | Publisher | Year of publication

As you can see, the main difference from the Harvard style is that the date of publication is placed at the end of the reference rather than directly after the author's name.

If you are using the numbered-note style, your list will be arranged in the numerical order of your superscripts. This style does offer you some choice in laying out your references. For a single-author book, here are three possibilities:

Author's surname | Author's initials or first name | Title | Number of edition if not the first | Place of publication (followed by a colon) | Publisher | Year of publication | Page number(s)

Author's initials or first name | Author's surname | Title | Number of edition if not the first | Place of publication (followed by a colon) | Publisher | Year of publication | Page number(s)

Author's initials or first name | Author's surname | Year of publication (in brackets) | Title | Number of edition if not the first | Page number(s) | Place of publication (followed by a colon) | Publisher

If you are using the numbered-note style, you may find yourself referring to the same source a number of times. There are conventions that you can use to save yourself copying out the reference afresh each time: the '*ibid.*', '*op. cit.*' and '*loc. cit.*' conventions. *ibid.* is an abbreviation of *ibidem*, a Latin word meaning 'in the same place'. *op. cit.* is an abbreviation of *opere citato*, a Latin phrase meaning 'in the work cited'. *loc. cit.* is an abbreviation of *loco citato*, Latin for 'in the place cited'. (As you can see, I'm adopting the convention here of putting words that are in a foreign language in italics.) You can use *ibid.* when a note refers to the same source as does the previous note, either the same page or a different one. You can use *op. cit.* to refer to a work previously cited in the same list. And you can use *loc. cit.* when you are referring to the same place in a work previously cited in the same list. For example:

- 18 P. Levin (1997) *Making Social Policy*, p. 30. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 65 [Same author and book as in previous note but different page]
- 20 *Ibid.* [Same author, same book and same page as in previous note]
- 21 J.G. March and H.A. Simon (1958) *Organizations*, pp. 140-1. New York: Wiley.
- 22 Levin, *op. cit.*, p. 222. [The work by Levin previously cited in this list, but a different page]
- 23 March and Simon, *loc. cit.* [The work by March and Simon previously cited in this list, and the same page]

If the use of Latin strikes you as too archaic for words, you can do something like this:

- 18 P. Levin (1997) *Making Social Policy*, p. 30. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 19 Levin, note 18, p. 65 [Same author and book as in previous note but different page]
- 20 As note 19 [Same author, same book and same page as in previous note]
- 21 J.G. March and H.A. Simon (1958) *Organizations*, pp. 140-1. New York: Wiley.
- 22 Levin, note 18, p. 222. [The work by Levin previously cited in this list, but a different page]
- 23 As note 21 [The work by March and Simon previously cited in this list, and the same page]

There are actually British Standards (*BS 1629 : 1989* and *BS 5605 : 1990*) that give recommendations for citing and referencing published materials,⁴⁰ and these can be applied to whichever style you're using, so they're available if you haven't been given any specific instructions about style.

Best website: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/library/services/publications/References.pdf>

[Accessed 19 October 2003] University of Nottingham Library i-Services (2001) *References*

This very useful guide to laying out references is based on the British Standards. It covers such complications as papers given at conferences, theses, reports, official publications, internet sources and CD-ROMs. One warning, though: if you are using the numbered-footnote system, *ignore* sections 12 and 13.

Noting details of your sources

Whichever referencing style you are using, when you have found a source and copied out the quotation you want, you will need to record the following details:

For a 'unitary' book (i.e. written as a whole, not a compilation of chapters by different authors):

- The name(s) of the author(s)
- The title and subtitle
- The year of publication
- The edition, if not the first
- The publisher
- The city or town where the publisher's main office is situated
- The number(s) of the relevant pages.

For a chapter in a 'compilation' book:

- The name(s) of the author(s) of the chapter
- The title of the chapter
- The title and subtitle of the book
- The name(s) of the editor(s) of the book
- The year of publication
- The publisher
- The city or town where the publisher's main office is situated
- The number(s) of the relevant pages.

For an article in a journal:

- The name(s) of the author(s)
- The title of the article
- The title of the journal and any standard abbreviation of the title
- The year of publication
- The number of the volume of the journal
- The part number of the journal and month/season⁴¹ of publication
- The number(s) of the relevant pages.

For an item on a web page

- The URL (uniform resource locator) of the page, otherwise known as its web address
- The date on which you accessed the page.

It is sensible to copy and paste the URL into a document to guard against errors in copying by hand, especially if the URL is one of those monster database-generated ones whose rhyme and reason are known only to the webmaster.

AND

Be sure to store the web page electronically, and also to print it out, so you have it to refer to if the page is subsequently altered or becomes unavailable. And watch out for line breaks (NEVER insert a hyphen, as this will change the URL) and for underscores concealed by an underline.

Finally

Whichever style you use for your essays, term papers, dissertation, project report or whatever, try to be 100 per cent accurate, complete, and consistent in your referencing style. In particular, pay attention to spelling authors' names correctly. A spellchecker won't help you with these, and errors in spelling names will give a poor impression to the reader.

Appendix: Translating academic writing

In order to demonstrate the need that students have to translate academic writing, and the painstaking work that that can involve, I have selected a passage on the subject of 'plagiarism' taken from the article by Larkham to which I have referred above and which is available on the Plagiarism Advisory Service website. In the left-hand column I have reproduced the original: in the right-hand column is my attempt to make sense of it.

What is Plagiarism? (A)

Hawley (1984) views plagiarism as being a continuum (B) ranging from sloppy paraphrasing to verbatim transcription with no crediting of sources: indeed, "definitional precision constitutes one of the most salient problems in any discussion of acceptable versus unacceptable documentation" (Hawley, 1984, p. 35). It is this variability that produces problems in attempting to 'prove' many instances of alleged plagiarism, and seeking to apply appropriate sanctions. Nevertheless, a strong similarity between two texts remains *prima facie* evidence of plagiarism. Brownlee (1987) has suggested that the major problem surrounding plagiarism (C) is not that of misunderstandings of the mechanics of scholarship or documentation (although many, eg McCormick, 1989; Nienhuis, 1989, (D) feel that it is), but one of the practice of scholarship (E), especially where students are under time pressures while needing to review literature and formulate their own ideas. It is possible that changes to more continuous assessment and away from reliance on traditional unseen examinations have exacerbated the problem: and some universities are deliberately moving back to requiring each module to comprise at least 50% examination assessment in response.

Scollon (1995) takes issue with these 'traditional' views of plagiarism. (F) He

(A) The question: 'What is plagiarism?' implies that there is only one answer, that plagiarism is an activity or behaviour which everyone recognises as such when they see it. As we have seen, 'plagiarism' is a word – a label – to which different people attach different meanings. It would be better to ask: 'What is meant by "plagiarism"?' To fail to put the word in quotes is to confuse the label with the activity, the description with the actuality.

(B) '[Views] plagiarism as being a continuum'. I think Larkham means that Hawley has identified a range of plagiarizing activities which can be arranged on a kind of 'offensiveness' scale.

(C) '[The] major problem surrounding plagiarism'. If the 'surrounding' metaphor baffles you, try 'The major problem associated with plagiarism'.

(D) You might want to question whether two examples support the assertion that 'many ... feel'.

(E) In relaying Brownlee's suggestion 'that the major problem ... is ... one of the practice of scholarship', Larkham is telling us something *about* the problem but not what he sees the problem *as*. Perhaps we should translate the suggestion as: 'Students are particularly prone to commit plagiarism because they are untutored in the practice of scholarship, hence the problem is how to provide that tutoring.'

(F) What 'traditional' views? The only 'view' put forward thus far is Hawley's of 'plagiarism as being a continuum'. We can only guess what Larkham means by "'traditional" views of plagiarism'.

rightly suggests (G) that this type of view implies much about the nature of discourse, the person(s) communicating, and the (private or individual) ‘ownership’ of discourse. In particular, communication – including issues involving plagiarism – is “a cultural model which can be located in terms of a particular historical moment and a particular cultural group” (Scollon, 1995, p. 5; and see Howard, 2000, (H) for a discussion on Western theories of authorship). Scollon views this as developing into a particular economic/ideological system, that of Europe at the time of the Enlightenment, and a particular view of authors as manufacturers of texts but texts as commercial products. This ideological system (I) values particular concepts, (J) including individual autonomy, rationality, originality and objectivity (Scollon, 1995; Lanham, 1983). Of course, the universities experiencing problems of plagiarism are strongly rooted in this particular ethic and milieu. (K)

There are, however, various value-sets which do not regard plagiarism as an issue (L) – and certainly not as a problem. (M) This is particularly true of some creative arts (cf Randall, 2001). (N)

(G) ‘Scollon ... rightly suggests’: an alternative wording would be ‘Scollon suggests, and I agree with him’. Notice how the wording actually used disguises the fact that the opinion expressed is that of the author alone: it makes the opinion seem more authoritative. Translate this as: ‘Larkham agrees with Scollon’s suggestion.’

(H) Larkham does not give page or chapter references to Howard’s book, nor to some other books mentioned. Other referencing lapses include not saying in what journal an article by M. Fritz was published, and consistently omitting when citing websites to say when they were accessed. A student could lose marks for doing this.

(I) Observe how ‘economic/ideological system’ has become transmuted into ‘ideological system’. Perhaps we have to treat these terms as interchangeable.

(J) I have difficulty with ‘This ideological system values particular concepts’. Perhaps we should translate it as: ‘People who subscribe to or are caught up in this system value individual autonomy.’

(K) ‘Which particular ethic and milieu?’ Larkham is introducing new terms here. My translation is: ‘The ethic and milieu associated with this ideological (or economic/ideological) system’.

(L) I suppose the statement ‘value-sets ... do not regard ...’ has to be translated as ‘there are people who subscribe to other values who do not regard ...’.

(M) What’s the difference between an ‘issue’ and a ‘problem’? Is a problem more urgent?

(N) No page or chapter references are given for Randall’s book. *cf.* is short for the Latin word *confer*, which in English means compare. Larkham doesn’t say why we should compare what he writes with what Randall writes. Are we meant to infer that Randall supports him?

Notes and references

- 1 I use quotation marks in five ways: (a) to indicate that the enclosed material is a quotation, taken from a publication or utterance; (b) to emphasize that the enclosed item is a *word* that is being used in a special way and the meaning of which requires to be made explicit, e.g. 'plagiarism'; (c) to denote that the enclosed term is a figure of speech (a metaphor or simile), not to be taken literally, e.g. 'industry' and 'witch-hunt'; (d) to imply 'so-called', sometimes poking fun at the self-important (e.g. 'authority' would imply 'so-called authority'): note that (c) and (d) are not mutually exclusive; and (e) to indicate 'supposedly', or 'as some people would say'.
- 2 'Last week a poll of 31 British universities by BBC Radio 4's *The World At One* 'uncovered' what most academics already knew – that plagiarism has become a widespread practice. The survey found 1,600 cases of plagiarism this year and most of the universities polled indicated that there has been a significant increase in cheating.' F. Furedi, 'Shortcut to success', *The Times Higher Education Supplement* (aka *The Times Higher*), July 25, 2003
- 3 The term 'moral panic' was popularized if not coined by Stanley Cohen and is defined and characterized in his book *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (MacGibbon & Kee, 1972).
- 4 At the University of Central England cases of alleged plagiarism are reviewed by a Faculty Cheating Committee. Peter J. Larkham (undated) *Exploring and dealing with plagiarism: traditional approaches* http://online.northumbria.ac.uk/faculties/art/information_studies/lmri/IJSCPAS/site/pubs_goodprac_larkham.asp Accessed 9 August 2003. Its title evidently conveys accurately the Committee's concern with cheating, but try completing the sentence: 'A steering committee steers, a cheating committee ...'
- 5 The Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) is a body funded by the UK Higher and Further Education Funding Councils. Its mission is 'to help further and higher education institutions and the research community realise their ambitions in exploiting the opportunities of information and communications technology by exercising vision and leadership, encouraging collaboration and co-operation and by funding and managing national development programmes and services of the highest quality'. http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=jisc_tor Accessed 8 October 2003
- 6 The website of the JISC Plagiarism Advisory Service is at http://online.northumbria.ac.uk/faculties/art/information_studies/lmri/IJSCPAS/site/about.asp Accessed 8 October 2003
- 7 'Work submitted by a candidate for assessment must be his/her own. The passing off of the work of others as the work of the candidate is plagiarism. Plagiarism refers to any work by others, whether published or not, and can include the work of other candidates. Any quotation from the published or unpublished works of other persons, including other candidates, must be duly acknowledged.' Extract from the on-line Calendar of the London School of Economics and Political Science, Regulations on Assessment Offences in Taught Degree and Diploma Courses, para. 9. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/documents/general/disciplinaryAndOtherRegulationsAndProcedures.pdf> Accessed 8 October 2003
- 8 'Plagiarism: the representation of another person's work as one's own or the use of another person's work without acknowledgement, e.g. the direct importation into one's work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and identification of the source; ...' Bournemouth University, *Regulations for the Assessment of Students on Taught Programmes of Study*, para.E5.2 (xiii) http://officialdoc.bournemouth.ac.uk/regulations/academicpolicie_/eassessmentregu/eassessmentregu.doc Accessed 8 October 2003
- 9 Bournemouth University, *Ibid.* (As note 8)
- 10 *Ibid.* (As note 8)
- 11 University of Essex (2000), *What is plagiarism.* http://www.essex.ac.uk/plagiarism/definition_of_plagiarism.htm Accessed 9 October 2003

- 12 St Loye's School of Health Studies (Affiliated to University of Exeter) (2003) *Citing Bibliographical References Using Harvard*, Introduction. <http://www.ex.ac.uk/Affiliate/stloyes/harv.htm> Accessed 10 October 2003
- 13 Hugh S. Pyper (2000) *Avoiding Plagiarism, Advice for Students* http://online.northumbria.ac.uk/faculties/art/information_studies/lmri/jiscpas/site/pubs_student_avoidin_g.asp Accessed 8 October 2003. The pdf and Word versions of the document carry a different title, *Plagiarism*, and do not carry the author's name or a claim to copyright, nor do they give his institutional affiliation. (Author and institution are identified as properties of the Word document but not as properties of the pdf version.) Withholding these details may lead to one's paper being reproduced elsewhere without acknowledgment.
- 14 Larkham, *op. cit.* (See note 4.)
- 15 LTSN (Learning and Teaching Support Network) Physical Sciences (2002) *Plagiarism: Prevention, Detection and Punishment*. http://dbweb.liv.ac.uk/ltsnpsc/briefing_papers/plag6.htm Accessed 9 October 2003 Test your skill at critical reading: have you ever tried to do something unintentionally? And did you notice the tautology in the statement 'tries to pass off someone else's work ... as their own ... without appropriate acknowledgement.?'
- 16 University of Edinburgh Biology Teaching Organisation (2002) *Plagiarism and Copying*. <http://www.bto.ed.ac.uk/guide/plagiarism.html>
- 17 University of East London (2001) *Plagiarism – A Guidance Note for Students*, Para.1 <http://uel.ac.uk/ga/plagiarismstudents.doc> Accessed 9 October 2003
- 18 *Collins English Dictionary*, updated edition (1982) London & Glasgow: Collins
- 19 University of Greenwich Academic Registry (2002) *Skills for Learning: Avoiding Plagiarism*. <http://gre-guns2.gre.ac.uk/DOMINO/INTRANET/STUDSERV/stwebpag.nsf/0/d10676d95a17d1e8802564ed0040ba18?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=4> (128 characters in this URL) Accessed 9 Oct 2003
- 20 University of East London, *op. cit.* (See note 17) Para. 4
- 21 Larkham, *op. cit.* (See note 4)
- 22 Pyper, *op. cit.* (See note 13)
- 23 See the LSE Calendar on line, under Research Programmes (MPhil and PhD), at <http://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/documents/graduate/research/regulationsClassificationSchemeAndCodeOfPractice.pdf> Accessed 18 October 2003
- 24 Diana Laurillard (1993), *Rethinking University Education*, London & New York: Routledge, Ch.1 & p50. Her observation applies with particular force, I think, to the humanities and social sciences, subjects in which many exam questions take the form of requiring you to 'discuss'.
- 25 Lorraine Stefani and Jude Carroll (2001) *A Briefing on Plagiarism* LTSN Generic Centre http://www.ltsn.ac.uk/application.asp?section=generic&app=resources.asp&process=full_record&id=10 Accessed 18 October 2003 Interestingly, definitions seem to figure very differently in the mindsets of academics in different fields. To a natural or physical scientist, a good definition of X is 'concrete'; it will enable you to recognise X when you see it. To a social scientist, looking for generalizations rather than explanations, a good definition is one that is all-encompassing and consequently liable to be quite abstract.
- 26 While many subjects involve practical work and making your own observations, the tradition that 'you read for a degree' is deeply entrenched in at least the older universities in the UK.
- 27 Jude Carroll and Jon Appleton (2001) *Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide* JISC, p.8 <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/pub01/brookes.pdf>, p.8. Accessed 9 October 2003 Carroll and Appleton do acknowledge 'the irony and possible conflict of this situation in a report on the citation of others' ideas'.

-
- 28 Peter Levin (2003) *How the culture of UK higher education promotes poor teaching and can alienate students from working-class backgrounds – and what should be done about it* http://www.uni-blog.net/the_culture_of_UKHE.PDF Accessed 18 October 2003
- 29 Stefani and Carroll, *op. cit.* (See note 25), p.5
- 30 Larkham, *op. cit.* (See note 4) The abridgment is mine.
- 31 Metaphor: a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action that it does not literally denote, e.g. 'an entrenched tradition'. Simile: a figure of speech that expresses the resemblance of one thing to another of a different category, e.g. 'He turned as red as a beetroot'.
- 32 St Thomas Libraries (2003) *Citing sources: Style manuals and Citation Guides*. <http://www.stthomas.edu/libraries/guides/quickref/citing/citing.htm> Accessed 28 September 2003
- 33 Learning Skills Unit, Equity & Learning Programs, University of Melbourne (undated) *Referencing: the Cambridge system* <http://www.union.unimelb.edu.au/scc/helpcards/Cambridge.pdf> Accessed 18 October 2003
- 34 University of Southern Queensland University Library (undated). *Guide to Footnotes and Referencing the Oxford System* <http://www.usq.edu.au/library/resources/pathfind/lg-07.htm> Accessed 3 October 2003
- 35 June Hayles (2002) *Citing references: Medicine and dentistry*. Main library information services. Queen Mary and Westfield College <http://www.mds.qmw.ac.uk/biomed/kb/funmed/library%20stuff/citation.htm> Accessed 4 October 2003
- 36 Graham Shields and Graham Walton (2001) *Cite them right! How to organise bibliographical references*. Learning Resources Department, Northumbria University <http://www.unn.ac.uk/central/isd/cite/> Accessed 19 October 2003
- 37 British Standards Institution (1990), *BS 5605 : 1990 Recommendations for citing and referencing published material*, London: BSI, pp.3-4
- 38 R.M. Ritter (2002) *The Oxford Guide to Style* Oxford: OUP, p.505
- 39 It's also a convention to put words that are in a foreign language in italics.
- 40 British Standards Institution (1990), *op. cit.* (As note 37), and British Standards Institution (1989), *BS 1629 : 1989 Recommendation for references to published materials*. (*BS 1629 : 1989* has been amended by BSI publication AMD 10180 published 15 November 1998, and *BS 5605 : 1990* has been amended by AMD 10182 published 15 December 1998).
- 41 The issues of journals that are published quarterly in the UK may be styled Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter.