Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Latvia

Full Report

Linas Stabingis

With contributions from Lina Šarlauskienė and Neringa Čepaitienė

Reviewed and edited by Irene Glendinning

June 2014

PPHEAE

Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Latvia

Full report

1. Information sources

Information about higher education in Latvia was collected through:

- three levels of on-line questionnaire (students, teachers and senior managers) in Latvian;
- structured interviews with academics, university senior managers and individuals concerned with academic integrity and research at national level and in higher education institutions;
- Documentation and on-line evidence.

Interviews about academic integrity and plagiarism with senior managers from Higher Education Institutions were conducted in different ways: face to face, by telephone and via Skype.

Research of legal environment of plagiarism prevention in Latvia was conducted by analysis of the following legal acts, adopted by Parliament or Cabinet of Ministries of the Republic of Latvia:

- Copyright Law, adopted on 27th of April 2000;
- Law on Institutions of Higher Education, adopted on 27th of December 1996;
- State Academic Higher Education Standard, adopted on 3rd of January 2002;
- Action Plan for the necessary reforms in higher education and research 2010 to 2012, adopted on 5th of August 2010.

Further information was captured by analysis of some internal documents from HEIs, available via the Internet or through extracts provided by interview participants.

The answers to questionnaires were received from students and teachers of various state universities of Latvia. No vice-rector from Latvia refused participation of students or teachers of their HEI in this survey, but as can be seen in Table 1, there was a very low response rate.

This report includes some views and opinions from university students and academic staff that participated in the survey. Where possible in the following report the opinions of the participants, translated into English, with colour coding, have been used to inform and enrich the narrative.

The breakdown of survey participants is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Breakdown of Survey responses in Latvia					
Country	Student responses	Teacher responses	Senior Management and National	Student Focus Groups	Organisations and Institutions
Latvia (LV)	16	7	3	0	6

Breakdown of student responses	Home students	Other EU students	Non-EU students	Not known	Bachelor, diploma	Master, doctor	Blank, other
Latvia (LV)	16	16	0	0	0	-	-	16

The survey was completed by 16 students and 7 teachers, representing 6 HE institutions. Only 2 senior managers of studies in HEIs and one national level expert responded to the survey. All the student responses were residents from Latvia. Taking into consideration very small amount of answers it is possible only to see some tendencies, but it is impossible to assume the findings are generalisable.

No statistical data was found about the number of plagiarism cases in HEIs in Latvia. These data are not publically available or included in web sites of HEIs. This was confirmed by the national level expert when answering the question "*Do you have any statistics for your country showing number of plagiarism cases detected and the outcomes?*" the expert's answer was "*Statistics showing the number of plagiarism cases is only responsibility of HEIs in Latvia. There are no statistics at national level, because collecting sensitive information can damage the positive image of HEIs*" (national interview). This view about reputational damage to institutions by publishing statisitics on breaches in academic integrity may account for the low response rate to the survey in Latvia.

2. *Higher Education in Latvia*

Latvia has 56 HEIs, 6 of which are universities, 26 are institutions of higher education and there are 24 HE colleges. There are 34 public institutions of higher education and 22 higher education institutions established by legal bodies. Universities and colleges implement academic and professional higher education programmes as well as scientific activities, research and artistic creativeness. Colleges provide first level professional higher education programmes. Colleges can be established by higher education institutions or be constituted as independent educational institutions (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

In the academic year 2011-12 about 97,000 HE students studied in Latvia. Of these students, 69,200 or 71.3% studied in public institutions of higher education and 27,900 or 28.7% in higher education institutions established by legal bodies. In the same year 79,300 students attended bachelor's level programmes or colleges programmes (81.7%), 15,200 attended master's level programmes (15.7%) and 2,500 attended doctoral level programmes (2.6% of total number of students) (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

The number of international students in Latvia is comparatively low. In the academic year 2011-12, there were 2717 foreign students (2.8% of students) from 74 countries around the world. 48% of this total were from other EU countries (and their share is increasing every year), while 31% represented the Commonwealth of Independent States the other 21% are from other countries over the world. The most popular subjects among foreign students are medicine, engineering and social sciences study programmes (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

In recent years the regulatory framework has been prepared, which will make it easier for universities to attract foreign students in the future, as well as implement joint study programs together with foreign universities, issue joint degrees and grant scholarships to foreign students. It is expected that in 2014 these measures will result in an increase of 10% in the number of foreign students in Latvia (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

In 1999 Latvia signed the Bologna Process Declaration and became full-fledged participant of the European Higher Education Area launched during the Bologna Ministerial Anniversary Conference on April 27th and 28th 2012 in Bucharest. The majority of Bologna Process reforms are already successfully implemented in Latvia: three-cycle degree system (Bachelor, Master and Doctoral studies), Diploma Supplement, ECTS, internal quality assurance systems, accreditation process of higher education institutions and study programmes (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

The modernisation process in higher education was carried out according to the European Union University modernisation agenda. Management reforms of university administration were continued in 2009 shifting from 'strong ruling' to 'soft steering' and granting the derived public person's legal status to the state founded higher education institutions. In order to strengthen the autonomy of higher education institutions, significant changes are introduced in the system of funding of higher

education institutions, thus ensuring the "block grant" funding of higher education institutions and allowing them manage their assets more freely (Higher education in Latvia 2012).

The nature of assessments set for students can influence the opportunities for plagiarism, therefore, the teachers' questionnaire asked respondents to comment on the typical assessment students were required to complete.

When asked "*what percentage of your programme assessment requires students to work individually or in a group*", three teachers said their courses had at least 80% of individual work and 20% of group work, one teacher declared ratio 70%/30%, one teacher 50%/50% and the others did not provide valid answers to this question

Teachers were asked to "*indicate the approximate percentage of assessment types that students have on their programme*". The responses to this question differed according many aspects: institutions and study programmes represented by respondents. The answers received from teachers' participated are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Teachers' responses, assessment in HEIs of Latvia			
Examinations	Assignments	Projects	Other
50	20	30	0
50	20	30	0
5	35	40	20
40	20	40	0
30	10	60	0
40	30	30	0
30	40	30	0

Assuming these responses are to some extent representative of other institutions and subjects, it appears likely that students in Latvia will be required to work was part of a team for part of their studies and will experience a range of different types of assessment, not just formal examinations. The students will need to gain skills in academic writing and understand how to find, apply and acknowledge good quality academic sources in their own work. In group-working situations students will need to be clear about how to distinguish their own achievements from the work of other students and team members.

3. *Quality Assurance in Latvia Higher Education - teaching, learning and assessment*

The main legal act regulating use of intellectual property in Latvia is Copyright Law, first version of which was adopted on 6th of March 2003. The objects protectable by this law are defined in following way: "*Copyright shall apply to works of literary works (books, brochures, speeches, computer programs, lectures, addresses, reports, sermons and other works of a similar nature), also unfinished works, regardless of the purpose of the work and the value, form or type of expression*" (Copyright..., 2003)

The Law on Institutions of Higher Education, adopted on 27th December 1996, established the state regulation on functioning of higher education institutions and principles of study quality assurance, sources for financing of activity of these institutions, relationship with the students and on other important aspects of governance.

In the Law on Institutions of Higher Education and the autonomy of HEIs in Latvia is defined in following way: "*The autonomy of an institution of higher education shall be expressed in the right to select the ways and forms for the implementation of the tasks set forth by the founders of the institution of higher education and corresponding to this Law, as well as in responsibility for the quality of education acquired in an institution of higher education, appropriate and efficient utilisation of financial and material resources, and compliance with the principle of democracy and*

with the laws regulating the operation of institutions of higher education and other regulatory enactments" (Law on Institutions..., 1996)

Accordingly the Law on Institutions of Higher Education HEIs shall implement their internal quality assurance system, within the scope of which (Law on Institutions..., 1996):

1) A policy and procedures for assuring the quality of higher education shall be established;
2) Mechanisms for the creation of their study programmes, for internal approval, for supervision of activities and periodic inspection thereof shall be developed;
3) The criteria, conditions and procedures for the evaluation of student results, which enable reassurance of the achievement of the anticipated study results, shall be developed and made public;
4) Internal procedures and mechanisms for assuring the qualifications of academic staff and the work quality shall be developed;
5) It shall be ensured that information regarding student results, graduate employment, the satisfaction of students with the study programme, the work effectiveness of academic staff, the study funds available and the disbursements thereof, essential indicators of the activities of an institution of higher education is compiled and analysed.

In this law the rector's personal responsibility is set out for quality of studies. Among the other duties a rector of HEI "*shall be responsible for the quality of education to be acquired in the institution of higher education, the quality of conducted scientific research and implemented artistic and creative work*" (The Law on Institutions..., 1996).

In the State Academic Higher Education Standard, adopted by Cabinet Regulation on 3rd of January 2002 are provided following principles of guiding the evaluation of study programmes (State Academic..., 2002):

1) Mandatory assessment principle – i.e. need to get a positive assessment of the contents of the acquisition;
2) Principle used in the valuation of diversity – i.e. the assessment of learning programs use different forms of testing and basic forms of testing have be test and examination;
3) Compliance requirement assessment – i.e. during the test work students have to be given the opportunity to demonstrate their analytical, creative and research abilities, acquired knowledge and scientific knowledge literacy.

According to this legislation HEIs in Latvia are responsible for creation and implementation of an institutional quality assurance system for study programmes and have to provide regular self-assessment and improvement of this system. The Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia ensures development and implementation of a policy in the fields of higher education (National interview). The institution responsible for offering help for educational and scientific establishments for HEIs in Latvia is the State Service of Education Quality (SSEQ) founded in 2009 under the supervision of the Ministry of Education and Science. Among the other responsibilities delegated to this institution are the following functions: to carry out state monitoring (supervision) in education and science and to organize and coordinate research into education quality (State Service..., 2009).

4. Academic Integrity and Plagiarism in Latvia

4.1 Policies for plagiarism

On 5th August 2010 the Cabinet of Ministers of Republic of Latvia adopted an Action Plan for the necessary reforms in higher education and research during the period 2010-12. The action plan

included the pledge "to reduce the prevalence of plagiarism by creating or improving in HEIs codes of ethics and internal regulations, foreseeing strengthening responsible of students and academic staff for plagiarism, recommending HEIs creation of good quality working places and databases for storage of Bachelor's and Master's thesis and dissemination of information materials on protection of intellectual property". In order for this plan to be implemented HEIs were obliged to (Action plan..., 2010):

- Change the internal regulations and codes of ethics to strengthen the liability of staff and students for plagiarism cases.
- Prepare materials and start dissemination of information about protection of intellectual property rights and negative impact of plagiarism on quality of study process.
- Start creation of good quality working places and databases for storage of Bachelor's and Master's thesis to make it possible in the future to create a single repository for all HEIs for storage of students' works.

The national interviewee indicated the importance of measures for plagiarism prevention: "*Student plagiarism is still an actual issue in HEIs in Latvia in recent years and now*", but also added "*However there are no specified indicators of increases in the incidence of plagiarism in Latvia*" (national interview).

Answering the question "*Are there any nationally imposed policies, procedures and penalties for dealing with student plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty?*" the national level expert noted that "*The national policy obligates HEIs to reduce plagiarism, which includes enforcement of HEIs' ethics codes and other internal normative acts to heighten responsibility of academic dishonesty. Moreover, the national policy recommends to HEIs to create a common data base and to popularize protection of intellectual property (explanation activities, informative materials). For example, in year 2013 seven HEIs have signed an agreement to generate a common net for dealing with extermination of plagiarism*". Answering the other question "*Are there plans to introduce or modify national policies, procedures and penalties for dealing with student plagiarism?*" the same expert pointed out "*There is a plan to maintain the national policy in the matter to conduce the best practise in HEIs*" (national interview).

To clarify the impact of state institutions' control on plagiarism prevention policies, the national expert was asked "*Is accreditation of institutions or course affected by the HEI's policies?*" and it was received following answer "*Yes, because HEIs' policies on the matter of plagiarism is one of the elements within HEIs' internal quality systems which is to be evaluated through the accreditation process*" (national interview).

To the question "*Is there a quality monitoring body in your country?*" the national expert provided the following answer "*There is State Service of Education Quality (SSEQ) in Latvia. Responsibilities of the SSEQ include oversight of policies and procedures on academic dishonesty*" (national interview).

Referring to the responses to part of question 5, summarised in Annex LV-1, 51% of the students and 4 of 7 of teacher respondents agreed that their institution had policies and procedures for dealing with plagiarism. However only 25% of students and 4 of 7 teacher respondents agreed that *information was available to students about plagiarism prevention policies and procedures* and 50% of student respondents said they were not sure about the availability of such information for students. This finding suggests that more could be done to communicate with students about the institutional policies.

The senior managers for studies also were asked to comment on the robustness of policies on plagiarism prevention in their HEIs of faculties through the question "*Do you believe your institution/faculty has a robust approach to the prevention of student plagiarism? Please explain what methods you adopt for discouraging plagiarism*" Both respondents that participated in this

survey positively answered this question. The first respondent explained that "*Plagiarism Prevention is used in the human factor. All student work is read carefully. Studies thesis (Bachelor / Master) are fulfilled several semesters and intersections shall be inspected*" and the other – "*Yes. Our teachers frequently meet students and are in position to follow development of paper*".

To the question "*Are policies for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty separately defined*?" only one top manager of studies participated in the survey answered positively "*Yes, at the University level*" and the other pointed "*We do not yet, but such policies should be*".

The national level expert answering the question "*Are there any guidelines, policies or initiatives at the national level to encourage prevention of student plagiarism?*" provided the following answer "*On August 5, 2010 the Cabinet of Ministers adopted the Regulation No.458 "Reform plan in higher education and science 2010-2012", there at national level have issued tasks for HEIs in both matters - prevention and detection of student plagiarism*" (national interview).

The student and teacher responses to the Question 7: "*What would happen if a student at your institution was found guilty of plagiarism in their assignment or final project/dissertation?*" are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Sanctions for plagiarism in HEIs of Latvia				
Assignment		Project or Dissertation		Sanction
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
6/38%	1	1/6%	1	No action would be taken
14/88%	1	1/6%	3	Verbal warning
0	1	4/25%	1	Formal warning letter
8/50%	3	7/44%	3	Request to re write it properly
6/45%	5	4/25%	0	Zero mark for the work
3/19%	3	2/13%	1	Repeat the module or subject
6/38%	3	2/13%	4	Fail the module or subject
2/13%	2	4/25%	0	Repeat the whole year of study
1/6%	1	9/56%	2	Fail the whole programme or degree
0	1	2/13%	0	Expose the student to school community
1/6%	1	6/38%	1	Suspended from the institution
1/6%	0	4/25%	0	Expelled from the institution
2/13%	0	1/6%	0	Suspend payment of student grant
1/6%	0	1/6%	0	Other

The responses indicate some differences in students and teachers opinions about punishment of plagiarism. 6 of 16 (38%) students believed there would be no consequences and 14 (88%) only a verbal warning for plagiarising in their assignment. This compares to just 1 teacher of 7 choosing these two options. Answering about punishment of plagiarism in assignments the majority of teachers (5 of 7), chose "*Zero mark for the work*" and three teachers chose each of the following possible consequences: "*Request to re write it properly*", "*Repeat the module or subject*" and "*Fail the module or subject*".

When asked about consequences of plagiarism occurring in final project or dissertation, 9 students from 16 (56%) chose the answer "*Fail the whole programme or degree*" and only 1 student believed there would be no consequences or it will be only verbal warning.

In case of plagiarism in final work or dissertation 4 teachers selected "*Fail the module or subject*" and 3 teachers chose "*Verbal warning*" or "*Request to re write it properly*". The answer "*Fail the whole programme or degree*" in case of plagiarism in final work or dissertation was selected by 2 teachers from 7 respondents. Only one student and one teacher believed this sanction would be applied for plagiarism in assignments.

Most of students believed that the penalty would be "*Fail the whole programme or degree*" (9 of 16) or "*Request to re write it properly*" (9 of 16) for the plagiarism cases in final works or dissertations

and appropriately 1 and 8 of students believe these sanctions should be applied in cases of plagiarism in assignments. None of the teacher respondents chose the following sanctions: "*Expelled from the institution*" and "*Suspend payment of student grant*". But a few students believed that these sanctions could be applied in cases of plagiarism in assignments (respectively 1 and 2 of 16) and in final work or dissertation (respectively 4 and 1 of 16).

These results suggest that although very light sanctions may be applied for minor work, there may be more serious consequences for misconduct in final work. The differences in perceptions between students and teachers support the earlier suggestion that there may not be enough communication to students about the policies and consequences of academic misconduct.

Both senior managers answered the question "*Do you have a set of standard penalties for cases of student plagiarism?*" positively and one of them added that the "*Student should be excluded from university*". To the other question "*Do the plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties differ according to a student's level or background?*" both senior managers answered negatively and one of them added "*but the first incident is penalised softer*" and the other "*Plagiarism is plagiarism. Study level here does not matter*". One senior manager positively answered the question "*Are there other factors taken into account, e.g. first offences, international students, mitigation circumstances?*" and the other did not answer this question. The strong response ("plagiarism is plagiarism") from one senior manager respondent is indicative of a very "black and white" approach to plagiarism, suggesting the complexity of this area is not fully understood.

Answering the question "*Do you think teachers follow a consistent approach when they find cases of plagiarism or academic dishonesty, in particular?*" one senior manager answered "*I have no data*" and the other "*I do not know, but I think yes*".

Students and teachers were asked similar questions about consistency of approach and their responses are summarised in Table 3a.

Table 3a: Questions about consistency of approach	Disagree		Not sure		Agree	
Question	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers
I believe that all teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism (s5l;t5q)	6/38%	4	5/31%	2	5/31%	1
I believe that the way teachers treat plagiarism does not vary from student to student (s5m;t5r)	6/38%	3	4/25%	2	6/38%	2
I believe that when dealing with plagiarism teachers follow the required procedures (s5n;t5s)	1/6%	1	11/69%	1	3/19%	3

Table 3a shows differences of opinions, with teachers and students divided or uncertain in their views about whether the same procedures are followed and whether student outcomes are fair and consistent.

Answering another question "*Who makes the decision about how to penalise a student believed to have plagiarised?*" one senior manager noted "*dean*" and the other "*teacher, programme leader, dean, vice-rector and rector*".

When the senior managers' responses are considered together with those from teachers and students the implication is that there may be inconsistencies in both approach for students accused of academic misconduct and sanctions applied, which would result in disparities in outcomes for different students.

The question "*Is your institution typical and similar to other HEIs in the country?*" one senior manager answered positively and the other said "*don't know*".

In the light of responses to the questions about punishment of plagiarism there are interesting answers from students and teachers about possible plagiarism cases in their own and colleagues' work. Results of students' and teachers' responses (Annex LV-1) show that 10 of 16 students and 2

of 7 teachers' positively answered the question "*I believe one or more of my colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes*", but 3 of 16 students' and 3 of 7 teachers' were not sure about that. However only 2 of 16 students (13%) and 1 of 7 teachers positively answered another question "*I believe I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately)*", 44 % of students and 4 of 7 teachers disagreed with this statement and 6 of 16 (38 %) of students and 2 of 7 teachers said they were not sure about that (Annex LV-1). This result, whereby a majority of respondents confirm that other people plagiarise but most deny they have done so themselves, is in line with results from some other EU countries.

Answering the questions: "*How are plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties made known to staff?*" and "*How are plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties made known to students?*" one senior manager noted "*through guidance documents*" and the other answered only second question by noting "*through teachers and programme leaders*".

Answering the question "*who is responsible for monitoring, reviewing and revising policies and procedures for academic integrity and plagiarism*" 4 teachers of 7 participating in the survey said this was done at faculty or subject level. According the Law on Institutions of Higher Education administrations of HEIs are responsible for development for monitoring, reviewing and revising of study quality assurance system, including plagiarism prevention, but they could delegate some duties on these issues to faculty level. The external assessment of study quality system in particular HEI could be made during HEIs accreditation. This fact shows that only about third of teacher participants were familiar with legal regulations and practices according monitoring and improvement of plagiarism prevention policies and procedures.

The national expert participant very clearly expressed his position on formation and monitoring plagiarism prevention policies in HEIs. Answering the question "*Do you think plagiarism cases should be dealt with differently from other forms of academic dishonesty (exam cheating for example)?*" expert pointed that "*Plagiarism case is a variety of academy dishonesty; there are no principal differences in dealing with them in HEIs in Latvia*". Answering the other question "*Do you know whether HEIs in your country have separate procedures, policies and penalties for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty?*" said "*Yes, the national policy requires from HEIs to have their own separate procedures, policies and penalties for academic dishonesty*". The expert's answer to the question "*Do you have any evidence about whether policies and procedures in HEIs in your country are effective for prevention and detection of plagiarism?*" was "*HEIs' records are showing that situation is controllable*". Answering the question "*Is there monitoring of issues concerning plagiarism and academic dishonesty in HEIs at national level?*" expert noted "*There is one actual monitoring technique which is HEIs' annual reporting to Ministry of Education and Science. This reporting system includes plagiarism issues*" (national interview).

The response from the national respondent is remarkable in several aspects. Firstly confidence was expressed or implied that institutional policies were effective or at least that the situation was under control. However it appears that this confidence was based on annual data provided by institutions. Since policies and procedures appear to vary within and across institutions, it is not clear what the institutional data represents and whether recording of incidences of academic dishonesty is consistent across institutions. Furthermore, it is not understood how this data is analysed and what characteristics of institutional and national statistics are used to support the assertion that the current policies are effectively preventing and detecting cases of plagiarism.

4.2 Staff development

The IPPHEAE surveys include questions about teachers' and students' interests in having more training on good practice about proper academic writing and plagiarism prevention. The responses from academic staff about detection and prevention of plagiarism indicate interest from some respondents to have more training or Continuing Professional Development (CPD) on these issues. 4

teachers out of 7 participants provided positive answers to this question about the necessity of such training and 2 answered negatively.

Both senior managers answered the question "*Is any training provided for teachers about dealing with cases of plagiarism and academic dishonesty?*" negatively, but their opinions differed when answering another question "*Do you think there should be more training about preventing plagiarism and academic dishonesty for staff and students?*"; one of them answered positively and the other negatively.

The national level expert answering the question "*Do you think there should be more training about preventing plagiarism and academic dishonesty for staff or students?*" noted that "*Both the national policy and HEIs' internal actual procedures are effective in Latvia, but additional training for staff and students could be useful*"(national interview).

The national level expert answering the question "*Have you ever come across cases of academics and teachers plagiarising materials or research?*" noted "*One case of plagiarism was being investigated in University of Latvia in 2010; three academic personnel were involved in the case due to incorrect use of intellectual property*" (national interview).

4.3 Use of digital tools for aiding academic integrity

Responses from students' and teachers' questionnaires to the question "*What digital tools or other techniques are available at your institution for helping to detect plagiarism*?" did not identify the software used for searching for text similarities in students' written works. 50% of student respondents were aware of some digital tools or a shared database of sources available for this purpose. However, only two of the teacher respondents showed any knowledge of text matching tools.

In response to the question "*How are the digital tools used*?": 6 of 16 students and 4 of 7 teachers, chose "*It is up to the lecturers to decide whether to use the tools*" as shown in table 4. These figures could be interpreted in two ways: it is either the case that students and teachers were not familiar with procedures for checking written work or different HEIs were using different procedures for checking work.

Table 4: Use of software tools	Student	Teacher
It is up to the lecturers to decide whether to use the tools	6	4
For some courses students must submit their written work using the tools	0	1
Students must submit all written work using the tools	1	0
Students may use the tools to check their work before submitting	1	0

The real situation on possibilities to digitally check written works in Latvia was clarified during a case study of practices in selected universities. To date only one university uses specialised software tools for plagiarism cases search in students' written works. The other HEIs in Latvia are uploading the bachelor's and master's final works into institutional repositories or are saving student work to CD and, in case of necessity, are using some open code software or information search tools by keywords.

4.4 Encouraging a culture of academic integrity

One way to remind students about the requirements for correct use of intellectual property is to ask them to sign a declaration about written work originality and (or) academic honesty. Students and teachers were asked "*When are students required to sign a declaration about originality and academic honesty?*". The students' and teachers' answers to this question are provided in Table 5.

Table 5: When students are signing a declaration		
Student # (%)	Teacher #	When
5/31%	1	On starting their degree
1/6%	0	For every assessment
5/31%	4	For some assessments
1/6%	0	Never
4/26%	2	Not sure + not able to answer

According to the data, provided in Table 5, equal number of students 5 of 16 chose the answer "*On starting their degree*" and "*For some assessments*". The answer "*For some assessments*" was chosen by 4 teachers out of 7. Analysing the answers it seems that most HEIs in Latvia delegate the decision to teachers on whether to request that students sign a declaration of originality of written work. One of the reasons for that could be lack of national regulations or guidance concerning plagiarism prevention within HEIs. Both senior managers answering the question "*Are there national regulations or guidance concerning plagiarism prevention within HEIs in this country?*" noted that they did not know.

Most of the students who answered the question about when they became aware of plagiarism said this was "*before they started their undergraduate/bachelor degree studies*" (11 of 16 selected this option), "*During undergraduate/bachelor degree*" (3 of 16 selected this option) and 2 students chose the answer "*I am still not sure about this*". Exactly the same choices were made by students when answering a question about when they learned to cite and reference as it is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: When students learned to cite and reference	
11/68%	Before I started my undergraduate/bachelor degree
3/19%	During my undergraduate/bachelor degree
0	During my master's degree/PhD degree
2/13%	I am still not sure about this

It is unusual, compared to results for other countries, to find such a high percentage of students who claim to have learnt academic writing practices before starting higher education. In paragraph 5 we will explore how well students and teachers really understood the concepts.

4.5 Student support and guidance

The students' and teachers' answers to the question about ways students gain necessary information about plagiarism and academic dishonesty (Student Question 6, Teacher Question 2/3) are provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Ways that students become aware about plagiarism and academic dishonesty				
Plagiarism		Academic Dishonesty		
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
10	3	5	3	Web site
2	2	0	1	Course booklet, student guide, handbook
3	2	1	1	Leaflet or guidance notes
9	5	7	5	Workshop / class / lecture
8	0	6	0	From other sources
0	1	6	2	I am not aware of any information about this

10 students of 16 said their main source of information about plagiarism was "*Web site*", 9 said that "*Workshops, classes and lectures*" and 8 said "*From other sources*". Regarding academic dishonesty, most of students selected (7 of 16) "*Workshops, classes and lectures*", 6 of 16 chose "*From other sources*" and 6 of 16 agreed they were "*not aware of any information about*" academic dishonesty.

From the point of view of teachers the main source of student information about plagiarism and academic dishonesty is "*Workshops, classes and lectures*" (chosen by 5 out of 7 teachers). Web sites as source of information about plagiarism and academic dishonesty was selected by 3 out of 7 teachers.

The answers of students' and teachers' to the question "*Which of the following services are provided at your institution to advise students about plagiarism prevention?*" are provided in Table 8.

Table 8: Services and student support for discouraging plagiarism		
Student	Teacher	Service or provision
2	1	Academic support unit
11	7	Advice in class during course/module
3	1	Additional lectures, workshops:
10	7	Advice from tutors or lecturers
7	3	Guidance from the library
2	0	University publisher
1	1	Academic writing unit/Study skills unit

According to student participants their main support for discouraging plagiarism was "*Advice in class during course or module*" (11 answers from 16) and from "*Advice from tutors or lecturers*" (10 answers from 16). The teachers also selected the same two sources. About half of students (7 of 16) and teachers (3 of 7) selected *Guidance from the Library* as an important source of support for discouraging plagiarism. Although teachers believed they were the primary source of information, it is clear that some students did not solely reply on their teachers to provide this information.

5. Perceptions and understanding of Plagiarism

5.1 Reasons for student plagiarism

All respondents: students, teachers and senior were asked to define in one phrase what they understood by the word plagiarism. The translated main responses are provided in Table 9.

Table 9: Understanding of the word "plagiarism"	
Students	*copying other thoughts, ideas or words*
	Copying of property without modification and combination
	It's copying or presenting as one's own the work of others (mostly scientific work, but not limited to that)
	Use the other person work or ideas and stressing that they are own
	Plundering and exploitation of another person's work or ideas
	Using work made by another person
	Use of material, without reference to the source
	Use of ideas or some parts of work, done by other person, without reference to the author
	It is use of the other author's ideas, text or parts creative work, without mention of the author in references
	Use the other people ideas, thoughts or opinions express in written form and (or) publication as his own. Especially when the text is copied or translated and is not quoted
	It is an abuse of a precise idea or somebody else created working copy without asking author's permission
	Putting on your own name on another person's work or part of it
	Stealing - ownership of other person naming of his own
	Lack of imagination
Teachers	*Copying and publishing other's authors work as his own without reference to the original work*
	Copying the publication or any part of it and not showing the author
	In essence – use of other author work. Formally - matching a certain amount of text
	Complete recopying and serving as its own other's author material without references
	Presenting other's author research results without reference to the author
	Stealing of another author idea
	Academic dishonesty through copying or rephrasing ones work while attributing the authorship to himself
Senior managers	*Plagiarism is the use of the works of other authors, without reference*
	Published elsewhere text inclusion into own paper without explicit reference to the source

Analysis of the answers in Table 9 shows that many of the students are using "stock phrases" that perhaps they have learned during their classes, but most students appear to be well informed about a definition. Some students included more restrictive comments, such as "*mostly scientific work*" and copied "*without modification*". The teachers and senior managers were generally more focused in their use of language. Table 9a deconstructs the commonly used definitions from Table 9.

Table 9a: Analysis of terms used by respondents in their brief descriptions of plagiarism				
Level	Verbs	Subjects	Objects	Qualifiers
Students	Use (6) Copy (5) Plunder (1) Steal (1) Exploit (1)	Work (8) Ideas (7) Thoughts (2) Material (1) Text (1) Opinions (1) Property (1)	Of another person (7) Of another author (4) Of the creator (1)	As one's own (4) Without referencing (3) That was not quoted (1) Without permission (1) Without modification (1) For publishing (1) That was translated (1)
Teachers	Copy (4) Use (1) Steal (1)	Work (2) Ideas (1) Text (1) Material (1)	Of another author (5) Of another person (1) Published work (1)	As one's own (3) Without referencing (3) For publishing (1)
Senior managers	Use (2)	Work (1) Text (1)	Of another author (1) Published elsewhere (1)	Without referencing (2) As one's own paper (1)

Respondents from all target groups – i.e. students, teachers and senior managers were asked "*What leads students to decide to plagiarise?*" (Student Question 14, and Teacher Question 17). The responses from teachers and students HEIs in Latvia are summarised in Table 10.

Table 10: Reasons student plagiarise – student and teacher questionnaires		
Student	Teacher	Possible reason for plagiarism
3	1	They think the lecturer will not care
13	6	They think they will not get caught
9	5	They run out of time
13	4	They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment:
4	3	They don't see the difference between group work and collusion
8	5	They can't express another person's ideas in their own words
8	2	They don't understand how to cite and reference
6	1	They are not aware of penalties
4	2	They are unable to cope with the workload
4	2	They think their written work is not good enough
6	1	They feel the task is completely beyond their ability
13	7	It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet
2	0	They feel external pressure to succeed
4	2	Plagiarism is not seen as wrong
11	2	They have always written like that
6	1	Unclear criteria and expectations for assignments
8	3	Their reading comprehension skills are weak
2	1	Assignments tasks are too difficult or not understood
10	1	There is no teacher control on plagiarism
4	0	There is no faculty control on plagiarism
9	4	The consequences of plagiarism are not understood

The three most important reasons for plagiarism all chosen by 13 students out of 16 from the list of proposed reasons were: "*They think they will not get caught*", "*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*" and "*They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment*". The next most popular

options were "*They have always written like that*" chosen by 11 students and "*There is no teacher control on plagiarism*" chosen by 10 students, "*They run out of time*" (9 choices of 16 respondents), "*The consequences of plagiarism are not understood*" (9 choices of 16 respondents), "*They can't express another person's ideas in their own words*" (8 choices of 16 respondents), "*They don't understand how to cite and reference*" (8 choices of 16 respondents) and "*Their reading comprehension skills are weak*" (8 choices of 16 respondents).

These responses appear to contradict the assertion by the senior managers that institutional policies are working well. It was disappointing that most student participants selected options about lack of motivation to receive knowledge and obtain competences and interest of students just to pass the studies and to get a diploma. However it is encouraging that only 4 of 16 students chose the answer "*Plagiarism is not seen as wrong*".

All seven teacher participants chose the answer "*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*". Almost all teachers chose: "*They think they will not get caught*" (6 choices of 7 respondents), "*They run out of time*" (5 choices of 7 respondents), "*They can't express another person's ideas in their own words*" (5 choices of 7 respondents), "*They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment*" (4 choices of 7 respondents) and "*The consequences of plagiarism are not understood*" (4 choices of 7 respondents). Notably no teacher chose the answer "*There is no faculty control on plagiarism*", but 4 of the 16 students believed this was a factor.

The senior managers answering the same question "*Why do you think students plagiarise?*" provided following answers: "*It saves efforts*" and "*Because plagiarism is the easiest way to perform the tasks assigned*". The national level expert chose a combination of following three answers "*They think they will not get caught*", "*They run out of time*" and "*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*" (national interview).

5.2 Understanding academic writing conventions

Several questions were included in the questionnaires for students and teachers as a means of determining how consistently respondents understood the necessity of citing and referencing. Table 11 summarises responses to the question "*What are the reasons for using correct referencing and citation in scholarly academic writing?*" Most students chose: "*To give credit to the author of the sourced material*" (12 choices of 16 respondents), but 10 out of 16 students opted for the more negative reason "*To avoid being accused of plagiarism*".

Table 11: Reasons for referencing and citation	
10	To avoid being accused of plagiarism
6	To show you have read some relevant research papers
12	To give credit to the author of the sourced material
8	To strengthen and give authority to your writing
4	Because you are given credit/marks for doing so
1	I don't know

The responses from students and teachers to the questions about use of referencing and citing styles and students' confidence to use them are summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: Referencing styles						
Yes		No		Not sure or not able to answer		Questions
student	teacher	student	teacher	student	teacher	
12/75%	7	0	0	4/25%	0	Is there any referencing style students are required or encouraged to use in written work?
10/62%		0		6/37%		Are you confident about referencing and citation?

14

Most students (75%) positively answered the question "*Is there any referencing style students are required or encouraged to use in written work?*" and others said they were not sure or not able to answer, but all teachers agreed that there was a standard referencing style. Only 62% of students surveyed positively answered the question "*Are you confident about referencing and citation?*".

The students were asked "*What do you find difficult about academic writing?*" and their responses are summarised in Table 13. "*Finding good quality sources*" was chosen by 13 students of 16 students and 6 students chose "*Referencing and citation*". "*Understanding different referencing formats and styles*" was chosen by only 5 students of 16 participating in the survey.

Table 13: Difficulties with academic writing	
13	Finding good quality sources
6	Referencing and citation
4	Paraphrasing
5	Understanding different referencing formats and styles

To identify whether students and teachers really understand what plagiarism is, a question was included on the questionnaire based on this scenario: "*Assuming that 40% of a student's submission is from other sources and is copied into the student's work as described below, indicate your judgement on plagiarism*". The question went on to describe 6 different cases involving quotation and referencing. Students and teachers were asked to state which of the cases they believed described plagiarism and whether to penalise students in each of these cases.

In reality all six cases in this situation may be categorised as plagiarism, but some cases could be construed as poor academic practice, or perhaps patch-writing due to poor language skills could account for some matching. The summarised results of students' choices are provided in Table 14 and teachers' choices in Table 15.

Table 14: Student responses about possible cases of plagiarism (n=16)						
Qu 15	Is it plagiarism?				Punishment?	*Assuming that 40% of a student's submission is from other sources and is copied into the student's work as described in (a-f) below, indicate your judgement on plagiarism*
	This is serious plagiarism	This case is plagiarism	Not sure about this case	This is definitely not plagiarism		
a	9	5	1	1	11	*word for word with no quotations with no quotations, references or in text citations*
b	2	7	6	1	8	*word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations*
c	0	5	5	6	4	*word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations*
d	1	2	6	7	3	*with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations*
e	0	3	12	1	1	*with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations*
f	0	1	3	12	0	*with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations*

Over half of students (9 of 16) thought that case (a), when 40% of text is provided in students' written work from other source "*word for word with no quotations*" is serious plagiarism and 5 of 16 believed it was plagiarism. Only one student thought it was not plagiarism and one was not sure. In addition, 11 of 16 students thought this case deserved punishment. The responses for case (d) "*with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations*" are particularly diagnostic of understanding about academic source use. Cases (a) and (d) are equivalent in severity in that no attempt has been made to acknowledge the 40% of text taken from other sources. However, only

15

three of the 16 respondents believed this described a case of plagiarism, which implies that students may be plagiarising without realising.

The opinions of teachers about these six cases (Table 15) were quite similar to the students' views. Surprisingly not all teachers believed case (a) was plagiarism, although they all agreed case (b) "*word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations*" was either plagiarism or serious of plagiarism and 5 teachers believed this case should be penalised. Surprisingly only one of the teachers identified case (d) as serious plagiarism, with three teachers sure it did not describe plagiarism and the remaining three saying they were not sure.

Table 15: Teacher responses about possible case of plagiarism						
Qu 19	Is it plagiarism?				Punishm ent?	*Assuming that 40% of a student's submission is from other sources and is copied into the student's work as described in (a-f) below, indicate your judgement on plagiarism*
	This is serious plagiarism	This case is plagiarism	Not sure about this case	This is definitely not plagiarism		
a	4	1	1	1	3	*word for word with no quotations with no quotations, references or in text citations*
b	1	6	0	0	5	*word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations*
c	0	1	3	3	1	*word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations*
d	1	0	3	3	1	*with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations*
e	1	3	3	0	3	*with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations*
f	0	0	2	5	0	*with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations*

The results set out in Tables 14 and 15 are of concern. It appears that the teachers and students who responded to the survey may believe they are following good practice when they may not be making use of academic sources in an appropriate manner.

Reviewing responses to two questions from the student and teacher questionnaire (Annex LV-1), 44% of student respondents agreed and 4 of 7 teachers confirmed that "*students receive training in techniques for scholarly academic writing*". At the same time 63% of students and 4 of 7 teachers said they "*would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty*". Comparing these results with data provided in Table 14 and Table 15, it would seem worthwhile to organise more and different training activities for students and teachers on understanding and ability to identify the cases of plagiarism in practice. For teachers there is a clear need for discussions on ways for deterring student plagiarism.

6. Examples of good practice and ideas for deterring plagiarism

The national level decision to allow the quality agency SSEQ to include audit of policies for plagiarism in their institutional accreditation process is to be commended. Moreover the annual collection of institutional statistics on academic misconduct as a means to monitor the situation nationally is a step in the right direction. However it is important that the limitations and lack of comparability of these statistics are fully understood.

It was encouraging to find that some institutions are collaborating on the creation of a repository of academic sources to be utilised for aiding the detection of plagiarism. Clearly, more work needs to be done on this important development.

Students and teachers participating in the survey were asked to provide in the questionnaire "*any suggestions or ideas on how to reduce student plagiarism (you may describe any examples of good practice followed at your institution concerning plagiarism detection and prevention)*". The responses from students and teachers are provided below.

14 students of 16 participating in the survey provided ideas for how to deter plagiarism in students' written works, some of which should be taken seriously by administration of HEIs. The ideas were brought under three groups:

1. It is necessary raise of awareness about plagiarism and penalties in case plagiarism was discovered and improvement of process of teaching, training and consulting how to avoid it. As an example it was chosen following opinion of student: "*The teachers have to give a little more support for explaining how to write, how to use citations and references to reduce the number of [cases of] unintentional plagiarism*".
2. It is necessary to strengthen control: "*It is necessary to use special equipment to detect this type of cases*".
3. Training of teachers is required in order to motivate students to avoid plagiarism and for renewing tasks for assignments: "*Train the trainers so that they are able to interest students in the subject material and to show how avoid plagiarism*" and "*Most common proposal to change tasks, thus should exclude the possibility to write the work by copying it from the other years*".

One student participant provided a very wide and interesting proposal, which has elements included in all above mentioned above categories: "*It is necessary to define precisely what plagiarism is and the penalties should be applied. It is insufficient to provide information about university regulations, but also it is necessary to regularly remind students of requirements laid in these documents. It is necessary to provide diverse information for first-year and final year students, clarification of reasons why students do it (intentionally or unintentionally) and act accordingly. In case of potentially unintentional plagiarism [students] should be required to rewrite the work and other penalties should not be applied. There is a need for more examples from university point of view about what is considered as plagiarism and what is not and consultations how to write properly (not all students are able to remember all things after single explanation)*".

It is encouraging to note that this student has particularly understood the main challenges and proposed very practical and workable ways that institutions should start to address them.

The teachers were less active in comparison with students providing proposals for deterring of plagiarism. Only 4 teachers of 7 provided following proposals: "*Constantly focusing students' attention on this issue*", "*Explaining requirements they should be able to check themselves*", "*There should be policies at schools that plagiarism for very serious penalties up to exclusion from the educational institution*" and "*Changing public attitudes*".

The national level expert answering the question "*What more do you think could be done to reduce student plagiarism?*" expressed opinion "*The already established procedures need to be followed including all penalties to reduce student plagiarism / The lecturers should work more consistently with the students*", but this respondent did not describe any examples of good practice concerning plagiarism detection and prevention in this country (national interview).

Answering the question "*Does the national government provide funding for supporting initiatives in HEIs to counter plagiarism?*" the national level expert noted that "*There are no separate positions or programmes in the state budget specifically related to the issue of supporting initiatives in HEIs to counter plagiarism. Such initiatives are being covered within HEIs' budgets*" (national interview).

7. Discussion

Attitudes of students and teachers on sanctions that should be applied in cases of plagiarism in student assignments or final work vary considerably. It is encouraging to see that more serious sanctions are expected by students and teachers when plagiarism is found in projects or dissertations compared to sanctions applied for plagiarism in other work such as essays. It is good that participants understood the difference in scale, but the observed level of tolerance for academic misconduct seems to be too high. If students do not expect to be penalised for plagiarism they will ignore the risk of punishment, particularly when preparing their final work.

The student participants demonstrated good awareness of plagiarism and one student proposed ideas for responding to cases based on whether the plagiarism was intentional or unintentional. It was impressive to note that 14 of 16 student participants provided proposals deterring plagiarism in students' written work. In their proposals students paid attention to necessity to raise awareness about plagiarism and what penalties would apply if plagiarism was found. They also suggested improvements to the process of teaching, training and consulting about how to avoid it, to the necessary strengthening of control and for the need for teacher training in how to motivate students to avoid plagiarism. One student also included a comment about the deterrent value of renewing tasks for assignments.

Research in other countries (Macdonald and Carroll 2006, Morris and Carroll 2011, Bretag 2013) has demonstrated that the design of assessments that require students to think critically are important for improving deep learning and also discourage plagiarism. The training of teachers should make use of such research into good practice in pedagogy.

HEIs are advised to collaborate with motivated students. They are really able to help academic staff and HEIs administration in identifying main reasons of plagiarism in particular HEI or faculty, in finding effective ways to avoid plagiarism, in generating ideas on motivation other students to be honest and in solving other important study quality problems.

Understanding the reasons students plagiarise can help to steer institutional strategy for upholding academic values and integrity and understand where the response should focus. It was surprising to find that 13 of 16 students indicating reasons for plagiarism chose the answer "*They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment*".   However, it is clear from survey responses that it is not just about lack of motivation. There are many diverse reasons for student plagiarism that need to be factored in.

Over half the teachers said there should be more training for staff concerning good practice about academic writing and avoiding plagiarism. The responses from some teachers (to survey question 19) raise concern that not all the teachers understood what constitutes plagiarism. It must be priority to ensure that there is a common understanding amongst academic teaching staff about what is acceptable academic practice, otherwise inappropriate practices will continue to be taught to students.

The survey results show the necessity to concentrate not only on teaching about citing or referencing, but also the possibility of improvement of existing teaching and training practice in HEIs on this issue by including new topics, for example, legal regulation and use of intellectual property, respect for copyright, styles of referencing, negative impact of plagiarism on students competences and others.

The national respondent indicated that national quality agency SSEQ has responsibility for oversight of educational quality, which includes academic conduct. However no information has been located about how this duty is carried out and what evidence is used to assess the effectiveness of institutional policies.   The reluctance of institutions to participate in the IPPHEAE research, together with the lack of statistics on misconduct cases at any level, makes it difficult to know how well

institutional policies are working, specifically for deterring cases of misconduct and detecting and applying sanctions for cases that arise.

The assertion by the national expert that maintaining statistics is avoided to prevent impact on institutional reputation, suggests a culture of secrecy. This type of closed culture will impede progress for encouraging Latvia to develop sound strategies for improving academic quality, standards and integrity.

8. Recommendations for Latvia

8.1 Nationally

8.1.1 The creation of repositories for collection and storage of students' written works should be financially supported by the state. This activity requires much time, efforts and financial resources, therefore precludes provision of financing by HEIs from their own resources.

8.1.2 Legal regulation for encouraging the development and use of digital text matching tools in HEIs should be strengthened. Moreover all HEIs around the country should be required to collect and upload student work for checking against other work in the repository. This will help to safeguard against students resubmitting work prepared by students in other HEI.

8.1.3 In the longer term the Latvian language repository should be extended to connect to a wide range of other resources, to enable matches against papers in other languages and Internet-based resources.

8.1.4 The national agency for quality and standards (SSEQ) should develop clear guidelines for institutions on what constitute effective policies for upholding academic integrity. They should include scrutiny of institutional policies in the institutional accreditation and audit procedures.

8.2 Institutionally

8.2.1 It is recommended that HEIs prepare, adopt and made accessible to students and teachers procedures for fair handling allegations, maintaining oversight and punishment of plagiarism as well as procedures for hearing student appeals.

8.2.2 HEIs in Latvia are advised to organise discussion with participation of academic staff and motivated students about improving students' teaching and training on correct academic writing, citing and referencing and understanding essence of formal requirements. They are advised to make more visible information about policies and procedures for plagiarism prevention and punishment, about services available for students on plagiarism avoiding and intellectual property preservation.

8.2.3 HEIs in Latvia are advised to start collecting students' written works in institutional repositories or, at least, save the work in digital form. This will provide the future possibility to upload them for sharing when a joint repository for storage of students' written works from all HEIs in the country has been be created and implemented.

8.2.4 The HEIs are advised to become more engaged in academic staff development, because most of the teachers who responded said they would welcome and benefit from training and discussions about intellectual property rights, plagiarism recognition and prevention and training for students to motive them to avoid plagiarism.

8.2.5 The HEIs in Latvia are advised to develop policies and procedures for consistent and fair handling of allegations of academic misconduct, including maintaining oversight on the

penalties applied. The academic community should be familiarised regularly about results of such monitoring and invited for discussion on this issue.

8.3   Individual academics

8.3.1   Teachers are advised to provide advice and guidance on aspects of academic writing, on requirements for citing, end referencing, policies and guidance about sanctions and consequences for academic misconduct and sources of such information, services, available inside institution on these issues and internal divisions or individuals responsible for provisions of these services.

8.3.2   Teachers are requested to be more principled when applying penalties according regulations and precisely follow procedures of punishments, because according the survey 81% of students think they will not get caught and 63% believe there is no teacher control on plagiarism.

8.3.3   Teachers are recommended to pay more attention on consulting students on proper academic writing because 50% of students participating in the survey expressed interest in having more teaching and training on these issues.

9. Conclusions

The low response rate to the survey makes it difficult to draw any firm conclusions from this small sample about how plagiarism is being addressed and effectiveness of policies for academic integrity in Latvia. The above recommendations have been drafted to serve as guidance at national, institutional levels and for individual academics, based on what has been found to be effective elsewhere.

The establishment of a national policy in 2010 to reduce plagiarism is an excellent starting point. The SSEQ has an important role to play in providing oversight and leadership for the country as a whole in respect of academic integrity and quality. The autonomous HE and research institutions need to ensure that they have strong, proportional and fair policies and procedures and that these are operating as intended.

To some extent the apparent culture of denial and secrecy about plagiarism, based on fear of reputational damage, may be hampering progress on developing sound strategies for addressing cases of plagiarism and academic misconduct. A more open discussion between academics and managers across educational and research institutions in Latvia is advocated in order to establish a common understanding and purpose and to share ideas and resources. This in turn should ensure that academic standards and practices in Latvian institutions are aligned with those in other countries in Europe and beyond.

References

Action Plan for the necessary reforms in higher education and research 2010 to 2012. (2010). Web site http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/view.do?id=3453 (accessed 24/10/13)

Bretag, T. (2013) Academic Integrity Policy Toolkit, http: www.unisa.edu.au/EAIP [accessed 22/07/2014]

Copyright Law. (2000). Web site http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=5138 (accessed 18/10/13)

Ētikas kodekss (Code of Ethics at LLU) Web site http://www.llu.lv/getfile.php?id=44502 (accessed 8/10/13)

Higher education in Latvia. (2012). Web site http://izm.izm.gov.lv/education/higher-education.html (accessed 2/10/13)

Intelektuālā īpašuma pārvaldības koncepcija (Intellectual Property Management Concept) Web site http://www.llu.lv/getfile.php?id=3974 (accessed 10/10/13)

Iekšējās kārtības noteikumi studējošajiem (Internal rules for students) Web site http://www.llu.lv/getfile.php?id=44503 (accessed 10/10/13)

Iekšējās kārtības noteikumi studējošajiem (Internal regulations for students) Web site http://www.lu.lv/par/dokumenti/noteikumiunkartibas/latvijas-universitates-ieksejas-kartibas-noteikumi-studejosajiem (accessed 9/10/13)

Law on Institutions of Higher Education. (1996). Web site http://izm.izm.gov.lv/laws-regulations/2095.html (accessed 16/10/13)

Macdonald, R. and Carroll, J. (2006) Plagiarism: A Complex Issue Requiring a Holistic Institutional Approach. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 31 (2), 233-245

Morris, E. and Carroll, J. (2011) *Policy Works - Recommendations for Reviewing Policy to Manage Unacceptable Academic Practice in Higher Education*. UK: Higher Education Academy

State Academic Higher Education Standard. (2002). Web site http://likumi.lv/doc.php?id=57183 (accessed 12/10/13)

State Service of Education Quality. (2009) Web site http://izm.izm.gov.lv/links/6825.html (accessed 21/10/13)

Noteikumi par akadēmisko godīgumu (The rules of academic honesty) Web site http://www.lu.lv/par/dokumenti/noteikumiunkartibas/godigums (accessed 8/10/13)

Studiju nolikums (Regulations of Study Process) Web site http://www.llu.lv/getfile.php?id=42210 (accessed 11/10/13)

The Academic Ethics Codex Web site http://www.lu.lv/fileadmin/user_upload/lu_portal/eng/general-information/documents/regulations/The_Academic_Ethics_Codex_of_UL.pdf (accessed 6/10/13)

Annex LV-1: Responses to Question 5

Table 16: Student and teacher responses to questionnaire Question 5 (Latvia)												
Statement	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Not sure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		6. Not applicable	
	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T	S	T
Students receive training in techniques for scholarly academic writing (s5a;t5a)	2/13%	0	2/13%	0	5/31%	3	6/38%	2	1/6%	2	0	0
This institution has policies and procedures for dealing with plagiarism (s5c;t5b)	0	0	1/6%	1	7/44%	2	6/38%	3	2/13%	1	0	0
I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism prevention (t5c)	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	1	-	0
I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism detection (t5d)	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	0
Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to students (s5d;t5e)	2/13%	1	2/13%	0	8/50%	2	3/19%	2	1/6%	2	0	0
Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to staff (t5f)	-	1	-	0	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	0
Penalties for plagiarism are administered according to a standard formula (s5e;t5g)	2/13%	1	3/19%	0	8/50%	3	2/13%	2	1/6%	1	0	0
I know what penalties are applied to students for different forms of plagiarism and academic dishonesty (s5f;t5h)	1/6%	1	5/31%	2	7/44%	0	2/13%	3	1/6%	1	0	0
Student circumstances are taken into account when deciding penalties for plagiarism (s5g;t5i)	1/6%	0	2/13%	0	12/75%	1	1/6%	4	0	0	0	2
The penalties for academic dishonesty are separate from those for plagiarism (t5j)	-	0	-	1	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	1
There are national regulations or guidance concerning plagiarism prevention within HEIs in this country (t5k)	-	0	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	0	-	0
Our national quality and standards agencies monitor plagiarism and academic dishonesty in HEIs (t5l)	-	1	-	0	-	5	-	1	-	0	-	0
The institution has policies and procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty (s5h;t5m)	1/6%	1	0	0	10/63%	4	4/25%	1	1/6%	1	0	0
I believe one or more of my teachers/colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes (s5i;t5n)	1/6%	0	2/13%	2	3/19%	3	6/38%	1	4/25%	1	0	0
I have come across a case of plagiarism committed by a student at this institution (s5j)	0	-	1/6%	-	4/25%	-	6/38%	-	5/31%	-	0	-
I believe I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately) (s5k;t5o)	1/6%	1	6/38%	3	6/38%	2	0	0	2/13%	1	1/6%	0
I would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty (s5b;t5p)	1/6%	0	1/6%	2	4/25%	0	7/44%	1	3/19%	3	0	1
I believe that all teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism (s5l;t5q)	4/25%	2	2/13%	2	5/31%	2	5/31%	1	0	0	0	0
I believe that the way teachers treat plagiarism does not vary from student to student (s5m;t5r)	3/19%	1	3/19%	2	4/25%	2	5/31%	2	1/6%	0	0	0
I believe that when dealing with plagiarism teachers follow the required procedures (s5n;t5s)	0	0	1/6%	1	11/69%	1	2/13%	2	1/6%	1	1/6%	2
It is possible to design coursework to reduce student plagiarism (s5o;t5t)	0	1	4/25%	0	2/13%	1	7/44%	3	3/19%	2	0	0
I think that translation across languages is used by some students to avoid detection of plagiarism (s5p;t5u)	0	0	4/25%	1	4/25%	0%	8/50%	4	0	2	0	0
The previous institution I studied was less strict about plagiarism than this institution (s5q)	1/6%	-	1/6%	-	2/13%	-	4/25%	-	1/6%	-	7/44%	-
I understand the links between copyright, Intellectual property rights and plagiarism (s5r)	1/6%	-	3/19%	-	4/25%	-	6/38%	-	2/13%	-	0	-