Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Lithuania

Full Report

Linas Stabingis

With contributions from Lina Šarlauskienė and Neringa Čepaitienė

Reviewed and edited by Irene Glendinning

October 2013

PPHEAE

Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Lithuania

Full report

1. Information sources

Information about Lithuania was collected through

- the three levels of on-line questionnaire (*students*, *teachers* and *senior managers*);

- structured interviews with *academics*, university *senior managers* and *individuals* concerned with academic integrity and research at national level and at higher education institutions;

- Documentation and on-line evidence.

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

The following legal acts, adopted by Parliament of the Republic of Lithuania were used as information sources about the legal environment for plagiarism prevention in Lithuania

- The Law on Copyright and Related Rights, adopted on 18th of May 1999;
- The Law on Higher Education and Research, adopted on 30 of April 2009.

Internal HEI documents available via the Internet and extracts from documents provided by participants in national level interviews were also used in this analysis.

The answers to questionnaires were received from students and teachers of various state universities of Lithuania. Vice-rectors of a few universities changed their minds about institutional participation in the survey after declaring absence of plagiarism cases in their universities. As survey participation is voluntary they had the right to choose not to participate, but their decisions were disappointing.

Views and opinions from university students and academic staff participants in the survey constitute most of the evidence presented in this report. Where possible in the following report the opinions of the participants, 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 Lithuania				
Country	Student responses	Teacher responses	Senior Management and National	Student Focus Groups	Organisations and Institutions
Lithuania (LT)	119	22	5	0	10

Breakdown of student responses	Home students	Other EU students	Non-EU students	Not known	Bachelor, diploma	Master, doctor	Blank, other
Lithuania (LT)	119	119	0	0	0	92	24	3

The survey was completed by 119 students and by 22 teachers, representing 10 HE institutions. The number of management questionnaire responses was low, only 4 top managers of universities and one national level expert provided their views. No international students studying in universities in Lithuania responded to the survey.

2. Higher Education in Lithuania

Lithuania has 47 HEIs, 23 of which are universities, 14 are public and 9 are private. There are 24 Colleges, 13 of which are owned by state and 11 are private (Studijos, 2013).

According the information, provided in the 2012 Statistical Yearbook about 174,800 students studied in Lithuania that year. 125,000 or 71.5% of all students studied in universities and 49,800 or 28.5% in colleges. In 2012 there were 95,500 bachelor (76.3%), 24,600 master's (19.7%), 2632 doctoral and post-graduate art programme students (2.1%) and 2343 residency and special professional programme students (1.9%) studying in universities of Lithuania (Statistical Yearbook..., 2012).

The number of international students in Lithuania is comparatively low – only 4453 or 2.5 percent from the total number of students in 2012. Some of them - i.e. 1093 or 24.5% were residents of various EU countries, 2753 or 61.8% from other European countries and 608 or 13.7% from other countries over the world – i.e. Africa, America, Asia, and Oceania (Statistical Yearbook of Lithuania, 2012). Most students from other countries were studying in European Humanities University, LCC International University and in Lithuanian University of Health Sciences (International students..., 2012.).

From 1st September 2011 HEIs in Lithuania introduced a new European study credit (ECTS) concept, which was required to align with the credits in the European Higher Education Area. Introduction of this system was based on following principles (Studijų kreditas, 2011):

1. The new study system is student oriented.
2. The essence of a student oriented system is a learning model with learning outcomes describing the curriculum (subjects and modules).
3. The crediting of study is connected with study time, but also determined by the achievement of learning outcomes and designed to facilitate student transfer and mobility.
4. Study programs may be subject or module oriented.
5. Study outcomes underpin the chosen study and assessment methods.

A 10 point scale is used for evaluation of study outcomes. Most importantly for the final grade no less than 50% has be assessed by written exam. An exam session is usually held at the end of each semester and lasts three or four weeks. All other study work has be completed and evaluated before the exam. The examiner may ask additional questions which are obligatory for passing the examination. Oral examinations can be organised for some study programs if this is included in the course description.

Opportunities for plagiarism depend largely on the nature of the tasks students are given. Therefore teachers' questionnaire asked respondents to comment on the typical assessment students were required to complete, including: "*what percentage of your programme assessment requires students to work individually or in a group*". Five teachers from 22 that participated in the survey said their courses had at least 80% of individual work and 20% of group work, four teachers declared ratio 70%/30%, three teachers 50%/50%, two teachers 100%/0% and others either did not answer this question or provided figures that did not add up to 100%.

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

Taking into account a low number of responses it is notable that there are many varied types of assessment set in Lithuanian universities. All students appear to have formal examinations, some independent work and many, but not all students have a major component such as a project to complete.

Table 2: Teachers' responses, assessment in HEIs of Lithuania			
Examinations	Assignments	Projects	Other
30	20	30	20
20	30	30	20
45	35	0	20
18	18	64	0
20	50	30	0
50	20	0	30
40	30	0	30
30	20	40	10
20	45	15	20
20	40	20	20
60	10	0	30
30	40	30	0
30	30	5	35
20	30	30	20
25	25	50	0
40	40	0	20
20	0	30	50
20	20	40	20
40	10	30	20
50	0	0	50
20	15	20	45
10	10	10	70

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

The Law on Higher Education and Research, adopted on 30 of April 2009, established state regulation of higher education and research, principles of quality assurance in higher education and research, legal basis of establishment, termination and restructuring of higher education and research institutions, awarding and recognition of higher education qualifications and scientific degrees, management of higher education and research institutions, organization and supervision of their activities and on other important aspects.

In the Law on Higher Education and Research the following regulation on issues of quality assurance in higher education and research is provided: "*Higher education and research institutions shall be responsible for the quality of research (artistic) activities, studies and other activities*" (Law on Higher..., 2009). Also, "*higher education and research institutions shall constantly carry out self-assessment of research (artistic) activities*" and "*constantly improve Activities of higher education and research, taking into consideration the findings of self-assessment and external evaluation*". "*The quality of research (artistic) activities and studies shall be ensured through the internal systems of quality assurance of higher education and research institutions, external evaluation and accreditation of study programmes, external evaluation of research activities and external evaluation and/or accreditation of higher education and research institutions*" (Law on Higher..., 2009).

The Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC) has responsibility nationally to organise quality assurance activities for higher education and research.

The main objectives and activities of the Centre include the following (Activities..., 2013):

- To promote the quality of higher education institutions through:
  - external reviews and accreditation of HEIs;
  - external evaluation and accreditation of study programmes;

- o evaluation of applications for the provision of higher education and conduct of activities relating to higher education;
- To create conditions favourable for the free movement of persons:
  - o through the evaluation of foreign higher education qualifications;
  - o by organising a qualification examination (in case an unconditional positive evaluation is impossible);
  - o by providing information on higher education opportunities in other countries and in Lithuania and mobility opportunities for researchers.

By its activities the Centre implements the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

SKVC acts on a national level – its institutional reviews are compulsory to all HEIs in Lithuania. SKVC also conducts evaluation of study programmes at the request of HEIs. HEIs may apply for evaluation of their study programmes to foreign quality assurance agencies listed on the European Register of quality assurance agencies (EQAR).

According to the above legislation HEIs in Lithuania are responsible for creation and implementation of an internal quality assurance system for studies and are required to provide evidence of self-assessment and improvements to this system on a regular basis.

The principles of academic ethics are defined in Codes of Ethics of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). "*During institutional review of HEIs the procedures to ensure adherence to academic ethics are evaluated, checking whether they are in place, how they are implemented*" (National interview).

Also, in the opinion of a national interviewee "*As more publicity was given to the student plagiarism topic, we can guess that it is a serious problem in HEIs*" (National interview).

4. Academic Integrity and Plagiarism in Lithuania

4.1 Policies for plagiarism

The main legal act for regulating use of Intellectual property in Lithuania is The Law on Copyright and Related Rights, adopted on 18th of May 1999. The object of protection by this law is "*a literary, scientific and artistic works (copyright)*" (Law on Copyright..., 1999). This document states that use of intellectual property, including scientific production, is available only with the author's consent and payment of remuneration. No definition of plagiarism is provided in this law, but a definition of an illegal copy is given. According this law "*Illegal copy - work, related rights or sui generis rights produced or imported into the Republic of Lithuania without rights or their duly authorized representative permission (without a contract or in violation of the conditions laid down, except for the cases prescribed by law, the work related to the rights or sui generis rights may be reproduced without permission), as well as work related rights or sui generis rights copy of the rights without the consent of the cancelled or modified information rights management*" (Law on Copyright..., 1999)

No statistical data was found about the number of plagiarism cases in HEIs in Lithuania. These data are not publically available or on web sites of HEIs. This fact was confirmed by a national level expert by asking the question "*Do you have any statistics for your country showing number of plagiarism cases detected and the outcomes?*" The answer was "*No, there are no such data*" (National interview).

In 2012 and 2013 the Lithuanian Union of Students organised a survey about the Academic Integrity Code. Students were asked for this research to provide opinions about occurrence of 12 different categories of academic dishonesty, including "Use of all or some part of other person's work in your own work without acknowledging the author". In 2012 according to 25.3% of student participants it

was a common phenomenon, 25.2% said it was quite common and 33.0% believed it was not common (Tyrimo..., 2013).

Referring to the responses to part of question 5, summarised in Annex LT-1, only 32% of the students and 68% of teachers, who participated in the survey, agreed that their institution had policies and procedures for dealing with plagiarism. In addition, 59% of teachers said they "*believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism prevention*". 47% of students and 50% teachers who participated in the survey responded positively about availability of information to students about plagiarism prevention policies and procedures in HEIs.

During the survey the senior managers of studies in HEIs were asked "*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*" All respondents answered positively and one of them pointed out that the main measure for discouraging plagiarism was "*creation of repository for collection and storage students' written works*", another respondent added – "*giving individual tasks for assignments and requiring* [students] *to present the results publicly*".

To the question "*Are policies for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty separately defined*?" only one senior manager of studies answered positively, another pointed out that such a definition was made at institutional (not faculty) level and two said it had not been done.

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 following answer "*In 2011 the Rector's Conference of Lithuanian Universities has drafted strategic guidelines for assurance of academic honesty in HEIs*" (National interview).

The student and teacher responses to 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 Lithuania				
Assignment		Project or Dissertation		Sanction
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
50/42%	4/18%	10/8%	1/5%	No action would be taken
93/78%	16/72%	23/19%	5/23%	Verbal warning
61/51%	1/5%	33/28%	4/18%	Formal warning letter
81/68%	16/72%	55/46%	9/45%	Request to re write it properly
54/45%	13/59%	78/66%	11/50%	Zero mark for the work
30/25%	3/14%	53/45%	0	Repeat the module or subject
29/24%	1/5%	53/45%	2/9%	Fail the module or subject
22/18%	1/5%	45/38%	1/5%	Repeat the whole year of study
25/21%	1/5%	57/48%	12/55%	Fail the whole programme or degree
41/34%	3/14%	45/38%	11/50%	Expose the student to school community
23/19%	2/9%	42/35%	3/14%	Suspended from the institution
24/20%	0	44/37%	0	Expelled from the institution
32/27%	0	41/34%	0	Suspend payment of student grant
20/17%	0	6/5%	1/5%	Other

Survey shows big differences in students and teachers opinions about punishment of plagiarism. 42% of student respondents believed there would be no consequences and 78% - only verbal warning for plagiarising in their assignment. Only 4 teachers from 22 (or 18%) chose the answer "*No action would be taken*", but 72% of teachers chose "*Verbal warning*". The different picture is seen analysing responses about consequences in case plagiarism occurred in final project work or dissertation: only 8% of student respondents believed there would be no consequences and 19% believed there would be only verbal warning.

For answers about punishment of plagiarism in assignments 72% of teachers chose "*Request to re write it properly*" and 59% selected "*Zero mark for the work*". Respectively 68% and 45% of student respondents selected these two sanctions for plagiarism in assignments. In case of plagiarism in final work or dissertation 55% of participating teachers and 48% of students believed a student would "*Fail the whole programme or degree*" if plagiarism was found in their final work or dissertation. Most students believed that they would be awarded "*Zero mark for the work*" (66%) for plagiarism cases in final works or dissertations.   Approximately 45% and 21% of students respectively believed these sanctions would 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 some students believed that these sanctions could be applied in case of plagiarism in assignment (respectively 20% and 27%) and in final work or dissertation (respectively 37% and 34%).

To the question "*Do you have a set of standard penalties for cases of student plagiarism?*" 3 of 4 senior managers of studies answered positively and selected the following penalties: "*Verbal warning*", "*Formal warning letter*", "*Request to re write it properly*" and "*Expelling from the institution*". One of the managers answered negatively and pointed out this question is being considered before adoption in the institution he is representing.
The question "*Do the plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties differ according to a student's level or background?*" 2 of 4 managers of studies answered positively and 2 did not answer.
All senior managers answered differently to the question "*Are there other factors taken into account, e.g. first offences, international students, mitigation circumstances?*". According to one respondent no factors have be taken into consideration; according another – circumstances have be taken into consideration; one respondent pointed out that there were no cases in his institution, so it was impossible to answer this question and one respondent gave no answer to this question.
To the question "*Do you think teachers follow a consistent approach when they find cases of plagiarism or academic dishonesty, in particular?*" 2 of 4 senior managers answered negatively, one positively and one did not express his or her opinion.
Answering the question "*Who makes the decision about how to penalise a student believed to have plagiarised?*" 2 of 4 senior managers noted "*teacher and administration of the faculty*", one responded "*administration of the faculty*" and one said "*the head of institution or commission*".
In response to the question "*Is your institution typical and similar to other HEIs in the country?*" 2 of 4 senior managers answered negatively and two did not express an opinion.

Students' and teachers' answers about possible plagiarism cases in their own and colleagues work are very interesting in the light of responses about punishment of plagiarism. The results from the IPPHEAE survey showed that 45% of students and 69% of teachers' positively answered the question "*I believe one or more of my colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes*", but 33% of students' and 23% of teachers' were not sure about that. About two thirds of students (69%) and 36% of teachers participating in the survey positively answered the question "*I believe I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately)*"; 7% of students and 23% of teachers disagreed with this statement; 22% of students and 36% of teachers said they were not sure (Annex LT-1).
Answering the question "*How are plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties made known to staff?*" top managers of studies participated in the survey expressed following opinions: "*through documents of studies*", "*during meeting of faculty community or via Internet*", "*via Internet*" and one respondent said that teachers were not informed.
The senior managers responding to the question "*How are plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties made known to students?*" answered in a similar way: "*through agreement and other documents of studies*", "*during lectures*", "*via Internet*" and one respondent said that students were not informed.

The teacher questionnaire Question 6 asked "*who is responsible for monitoring and reviewing policies and procedures for academic integrity and plagiarism*". 12 teachers from 22 participants in the survey (55%) said they did not know at what level this was done – i.e. national, institutional or faculty, 6 respondents for all these activities chose "*institutional quality managers*", from 3 to 5 teachers (about 20%) chose answer *"national quality agency"* and 1 to 4 respondents selected *"faculty or subject level"*. But in reality according the Law on Higher Education and Research are HEI administrators are responsible for development, monitoring, reviewing and revising of study quality assurance system, including plagiarism prevention. The Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC) is responsible for organisation of external assessment and the accreditation of HEIs and study programs. This fact shows that only about third of teachers' participating in the survey were familiar with legal regulations and practices according monitoring and improvement of plagiarism prevention policies and procedures.

Answering the question "*Do you think plagiarism cases should be dealt with differently from other forms of academic dishonesty (exam cheating for example)?*" the national level expert noted "*Yes, it should be dealt with differently, because in some cases plagiarism happens because of lacking knowledge how to cite sources correctly. The prevention of the plagiarism also should be implemented, because in most cases careful and consistent work with students prevents plagiarism*" (National interview).

4.2 Staff development

The IPPHEAE surveys included questions about teachers' and students' interest in having more training on good practice and about scholarly academic writing and plagiarism prevention. The responses regarding Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for academic staff about detection and prevention of plagiarism show interest from some respondents to have more training on these issues. 23% of teachers' answered this question positively and 23% of teachers' said they were not sure about the necessity for such training.

3 of 4 senior managers answered the question "*Is any training provided for teachers about dealing with cases of plagiarism and academic dishonesty?*" negatively and one provided the answer "*seldom*".

In response to the question "*Do you think there should be more training about preventing plagiarism and academic dishonesty for staff and students?*" 2 of 4 senior managers answered "*probably yes*" and two expressed scepticism on necessity of training on plagiarism issues for teachers.

4.3 Use of digital tools for aiding academic integrity

Responses, provided in student and teacher questionnaires to the question "*What digital tools or other techniques are available at your institution for helping to detect plagiarism*?" did not identify the kind of software used for text similarities search in students' written works. Most respondents said they did not know the answer to this question and some mentioned Google.

For the follow-up question "*How are the digital tools used*?" 49% of students and 23% of teachers, chose "*It is up to the lecturers to decide whether to use the tools*"; 35% of students and 36% of teachers pointed out the choice "*For some courses students must submit their written work using the tools*" as it is shown in table 4. These figures suggest lack of familiarity of students and teachers with procedures for digital checking of written work, but perhaps some HEIs may provide other means for checking written work.

Table 4: Use of software tools	Student	Teacher
It is up to the lecturers to decide whether to use the tools	58/49%	5/23%
For some courses students must submit their written work using the tools	42/35%	8/36%
Students must submit all written work using the tools	18/15%	1/5%
Students may use the tools to check their work before submitting	28/24%	4/18%

The actual situation on capabilities for Lithuanian HEIs to conduct digital checks on written works was clarified as a result of a detailed case study in Lithuania of practices in selected universities. At present only one university uses specialised software tools for searching students' written work for text matches. Other HEIs in Lithuania are using some open source software or information search tools by keywords.

Most HEIs in Lithuania are uploading master's final works and doctoral thesis to special ETD collection of state owned repository (eLABa). The bachelor's final works are being uploaded to institutional repositories or are being saved on CDs, but the work is not being checked.

According to the opinion of the national level expert "*till 2012 HEIs themselves were initiating detection of plagiarism in students' works. In 2012 the Lithuanian Academic e-Library (eLABa) started a new project which aims at creating centralized system of students' works. The new system will be accessible to all HEIs and will provide an opportunity to check and compare students' works from all HEIs*" (National interview).

4.4 Encouraging a culture of academic integrity

One way to remind students about the necessity for appropriate use of intellectual property is to ask them to sign a declaration about the originality of written work and/or) academic honesty. Seeking to clarify the situation in HEIs on this issue the following question was included in student and teacher questionnaires "*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.

According to the data provided in Table 5 an equal number of students (24%) chose the answer "*Not sure + not able to answer*" and "*Never*". The same answer chose respectively 9% and 14% of teachers participated in the survey. Quite equal number of students chose and the other proposed answers "*On starting their degree*" (18%), "*For every assessment*" (22%), and "*For some assessments*" (13%). But most teachers (68%) selected "*For some assessments*" and only a few chose other options. Considering all answers provided it seems in most HEIs in Lithuania the decision whether to ask students to declare originality of written work depends on the teacher.

Table 5: When students are signing a declaration		
Student # (%)	Teacher #	When
21/18%	1/5%	On starting their degree
26/22%	1/5%	For every assessment
15/13%	15/68%	For some assessments
28/24%	3/14%	Never
29/24%	2/9%	Not sure + not able to answer

72% of the students respondents said they became aware of plagiarism "*before they started their undergraduate/bachelor degree studies*" and 21% - "*During undergraduate/bachelor degree.* (Table 6). Only 7 students chose the answer "*I am still not sure about this*". But to the question about when they learned to cite and reference, only 37% of students chose the answer "*Before I started my undergraduate/bachelor degree studies*", 48% chose the answer "*During my undergraduate/bachelor degree*", 3 students chose the answer "*During my master's degree/PhD degree*" and 12% pointed out they are still not sure about this.

![IPPHEAE logo]

Table 6: When students learned to cite and reference	
44/37%	Before I started my undergraduate/bachelor degree
57/48%	During my undergraduate/bachelor degree
3/3%	During my master's degree/PhD degree
15/12%	I am still not sure about this

4.5 Student support and guidance

The questionnaires asked students and teachers how students gain necessary information about plagiarism and academic dishonesty (Student Question 6, Teacher Question 2/3). The summarised responses to this question are provided in Table 7.

Table 7: Ways that students become aware about plagiarism and academic dishonesty				
Plagiarism		Academic Dishonesty		
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
80/67%	10/45%	41/34%	10/45%	Web site
42/35%	10/45%	53/45%	9/41%	Course booklet, student guide, handbook
67/56%	17/77%	53/45%	11/50%	Leaflet or guidance notes
61/51%	17/77%	54/45%	20/91%	Workshop / class / lecture
66/55%	1/5%	46/39%	1/5%	From other sources
36/30%	0	27/23%	0	I am not aware of any information about this

Most students said that their main sources of information about plagiarism were "*Websites*" (67%), "*Leaflets or guidance notes*" (56%) and "*Other sources*" (55%). An equal number of students (45%) chose "*Course booklets, students' guides, handbooks*", "*Leaflet or guidance notes*" and "*Workshops, classes and lectures*" as main sources of information about academic dishonesty, but only 34% of students selected "*Web site*" as a source of information about academic dishonesty.

An equal number of teachers (77%) chose two answers "*Leaflet or guidance notes*" and "*Workshops, classes and lectures*". But teachers showed quite different view (in comparison with students) to main sources of information about academic dishonesty. As main source of such information teachers chose "*Workshops, classes and lectures*" (91%) and "*Leaflet or guidance notes*" (50%). Teachers believed the other sources of information about academic dishonesty, including websites, appeared to be less commonly used. However a significant minority of students said they were not aware of any information about plagiarism (30%) or academic dishonesty (23%).

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

Table 8: Services and student support for discouraging plagiarism		
Student	Teacher	Service or provision
28/24%	0	Academic support unit
56/47%	19/86%	Advice in class during course/module
28/24%	8/36%	Additional lectures, workshops:
60/50%	7/32%	Advice from tutors or lecturers
25/21%	11/50%	Guidance from the library
11/9%	0	University publisher
12/10%	1/5%	Academic writing unit/Study skills unit

According to the opinion of student respondents, "*Advice from tutors or lecturers*" (50%) and "*Advice in class during course or module*" (47%) were the main channels for support for discouraging

plagiarism. The teachers believed that "*Advice in class during course or module*" (86%) and "*Guidance from the library*" (50%) were available sources of support for discouraging student plagiarism. Only 21% of students saw that library as a provider of support for discouraging plagiarism.

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?*" responded "*Yes, the topic should be discussed more widely*" (National interview).

5. Perceptions and understanding of Plagiarism

5.1 Reasons for student plagiarism

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

Table 9: Understanding of the word "plagiarism"	
Students	*Copy of other work* (31 appearances)
	Copying (as a process) (15 appearances)
	Copying full text or part of it without showing author or source (12 appearances)
	Conversion or stealing of other person work, ideas, text or data (19 appearances)
	Illegal copy of work or use of material (4 appearances)
	Violation of authors rights (4 appearances)
	Writing manner "copy-paste" (3 appearances)
	Fake (3 appearances)
	Conversion / copying of other person ideas word to word without changes (2)
	Use or violation of copyright, without indicating the author's name or source (4)
	Copying, cheating, stealing
	copying of literary, scientific papers and other writings works
	Use of information as own for preparation of written works and for other purposes
	work written by copying other person spoken or written thoughts or ideas
	copied and misappropriated work without the permission of the author
	Illegal distribution of works such as music, movies, and other copyrighted works in possession them as own
	The task completed fraudulently
	Imitative work created by other work-based
	Stealing of ideas expressed in words
	Stealing of intellectual property
	Presentation the other person's work as your own
	Work or part of the work copied from another work or translation of another work without reference to the original source
	Presentation of all or part of work written by other person as own without the reference to the source
Teachers	*Use of text of other author without showing this in own text and list of references* (6 appearances)
	Copying of work, written by other person (4 appearances)
	Use of information or knowledge without showing the source (2 appearances)
	Copying other person ideas, but showing them as own
	Presenting copied work as own work without referring to original author or conversion of this work
	Presentation of work written by other person as own without showing real authors or without their permission
	Fraudulent use of other person work
	Making other person work as own after some changes
	Use of intellectual property created by others as own
	Everything what is presented without citing or showing author
	Stealing another author's ideas, text or ideas

	Embezzlement of ideas, text, audio, video and other creative and knowledge-intensive materials (by copying, paraphrasing, not quoting) without proper recognition of the author.
	Plagiarism is taking advantage from written work of other authors' texts and ideas without quoting and self-plagiarism is multiplication of own works without quoting previously issued works.
Senior managers	*Conversion of other persons ideas or works* (2 appearances)
	Use of other author work without showing real author
	Conversion of other persons work and taking copyright on oneself

Some of the responses in Table 9 are interesting. Several people imply a condition for plagiarism is no changes to the text and others tie this to infringement of copyright. Several respondents refer to fraud, stealing or cheating. However a good percentage of the responses make reference to lack of acknowledgement or rights of the author of the source being used. One of the teachers also identified self-plagiarism as a problem.

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

Table 10: Reasons student plagiarise – student and teacher questionnaires		
Student	Teacher	Possible reason for plagiarism
35/29%	10/45%	They think the lecturer will not care
75/63%	15/68%	They think they will not get caught
74/62%	12/55%	They run out of time
61/51%	16/72%	They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment:
46/39%	15/68%	They don't see the difference between group work and collusion
71/60%	17/77%	They can't express another person's ideas in their own words
49/41%	9/41%	They don't understand how to cite and reference
41/34%	8/36%	They are not aware of penalties
54/45%	3/14%	They are unable to cope with the workload
41/34%	4/18%	They think their written work is not good enough
24/20%	2/9%	They feel the task is completely beyond their ability
70/59%	21/95%	It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet
11/9%	0	They feel external pressure to succeed
23/19%	22/100%	Plagiarism is not seen as wrong
44/37%	9/41%	They have always written like that
33/28%	2/9%	Unclear criteria and expectations for assignments
38/32%	12/55%	Their reading comprehension skills are weak
36/30%	1/5%	Assignments tasks are too difficult or not understood
26/22%	7/36%	There is no teacher control on plagiarism
18/15%	8/36%	There is no faculty control on plagiarism
34/29%	9/41%	The consequences of plagiarism are not understood

"*They think they will not get caught*" (63%) was the most common reason for plagiarism selected by student participants and the fourth most common selection of teachers (68%). The next most common student selections were "*They can't express another person's ideas in their own words*"(60%), "*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*"(59%) and "*They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment*"(51%). Fewer students from HEIs in Lithuania selected "*Feeling*

external pressure to succeed" (9%), "*There is no faculty control on plagiarism*" (15%) and "*Plagiarism is not seen as wrong*" (19%) as reasons for plagiarism.

All the teacher respondents chose "*Plagiarism is not seen as wrong*" (100%) as a reason for student plagiarism, but only 19% of students selected that reason. The next most common responses from teachers were "*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*" (95%), "*They can't express another person's ideas in their own words*" (77%) and "*They don't see the difference between group work and collusion*" (68%). Few teachers chose the options "*They feel external pressure to succeed*" (0%), "*Assignments tasks are too difficult or not understood*" (5%) and "*Unclear criteria and expectations for assignments*"(9%). In contrast the last two reasons were chosen respectively by 30% and 28% of students participants.

These results show lack of mutual understanding between students and teachers and lack of activity of study administrators to solve these problems.

5.2 Understanding academic writing conventions

Several questions were included in the questionnaires for students as a means of determining how consistently respondents understood the necessity for citing and referencing. Summarised results of responses to the question "*What are the reasons for using correct referencing and citation in scholarly academic writing?*" are provided in Table 11. Most students chose the following answers: "*To avoid being accused of plagiarism*" (80%) and "*To strengthen and give authority to your writing*" (63%). It is noteworthy that only 38% of student respondents believed acknowledging the author was important.

Table 11: Reasons for referencing and citation	
95/80%	To avoid being accused of plagiarism
67/56%	To show you have read some relevant research papers
45/38%	To give credit to the author of the sourced material
75/63%	To strengthen and give authority to your writing
65/55%	Because you are given credit/marks for doing so
4/3%	I don't know

The responses of students and teachers to the question about using a specific referencing and citing styles are summarised in Table 12. Most students (71%) and teachers (91%) agreed there was a "*referencing style students are required or encouraged to use in written work*". Worryingly only 36% of students said they were confident about referencing and citation.

Table 12: Referencing styles						
Yes		No		Not sure or not able to answer		Questions
student	teacher	student	teacher	student	teacher	
85/71%	20/91%	6/5%	0	28/24%	2/9%	*Is there any referencing style students are required or encouraged to use in written work?*
43/36%		9/8%		67/56%		*Are you confident about referencing and citation?*

Students were asked "*What do you find difficult about academic writing?*" (Student Question 13). The summarised responses to this question are provided in Table 13. 50% and more of students opted for the first three answers, but the most common difficulty students from HEIs in Lithuania reported was "*Finding good quality sources*" (71%) and least common was the option "*Understanding different referencing formats and styles*" (35%). This finding is really important,

since much effort by teachers can be placed on the mechanics of formatting references, but the students see other study skills as more problematic.

Table 13: Difficulties with academic writing	
85/71%	Finding good quality sources
59/50%	Referencing and citation
60/50%	Paraphrasing
42/35%	Understanding different referencing formats and styles

The following scenario was provided as a means to identify understanding by students and teachers what plagiarism really is: "*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 provided descriptions of 6 different variations of quotation and referencing. Students and teachers were asked to choose whether they thought the described cases were plagiarism and in each case whether the student should be penalised.

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 writing or language skills could account for some text matching. The summarised results of students' choices are provided in Table 14 and teachers' choices - in Table 15.

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	48/40%	44/37%	13/11%	10/8%	38/32%	word for word with no quotations
b	16/13%	49/41%	39/33%	12/10%	19/16%	word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations
c	10/8%	22/18%	46/39%	36/30%	7/6%	word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations
d	18/15%	33/28%	45/38%	19/16%	21/18%	with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations
e	11/9%	27/23%	49/41%	25/21%	11/9%	with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations
f	9/8%	19/16%	43/36%	41/34%	10/8%	with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations

Table 14: Student responses about possible cases of plagiarism

Most of the student participants (77%) correctly identified the most obvious example of plagiarism, case (a), with 10% not sure and 8% denying this was plagiarism. However only 32% of student respondents thought a penalty should be applied.   The responses about case (d) are particularly diagnostic of students' grasp of acceptable practice. Although this case is, arguably, slightly more serous that case (a) in that there could be an attempt to evade detection of acquisition and unacknowledged use of material by changing some words, there was a significant shift of opinion towards accepting this type of practice. Presumably since some words had been changed this was no longer believed by some respondents to be plagiarism.

Table 15: Teacher responses about possible case of plagiarism						
Qu 19	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	17/77%	5/23%	0	0	15/68%	word for word with no quotations
B	6/27%	9/41%	5/23%	2/9%	9/45%	word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations
C	1/5%	2/9%	6/27%	12/55%	2/9%	word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations
D	11/50%	6/27%	3/14%	2/9%	11/50%	with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations
E	4/18%	8/36%	7/32%	3/14%	9/45%	with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations
F	2/9%	2/9%	4/18%	14/64%	2/9%	with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations

As to be hoped, most of the teachers demonstrated rather more understanding than the students about the status of the six cases. All 22 teacher participants agreed that case (a) was plagiarism, but only 68% agreed there should be punishment. Half the teachers also agreed that case (d) was a serious case of plagiarism and 27% believed it was case of plagiarism, 14% were not sure about this case and 9% believed that this case was not plagiarism. The lower rate of acceptance of case (d) as serious plagiarism by teachers is of concern. It is important to establish a common global definition of acceptable academic conduct and agree conventions for use and acknowledgement of sources. If academic teachers cannot agree the basic rules it is unsurprising to find that students may be confused.

Referring again to questions from Annex LT-1, 42% of students agreed and 77% of teachers confirmed "*students receive training in techniques for scholarly academic writing*". At the same time 65% of students and only 23% of teachers said they "*would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty*". Also, 23% of teachers pointed out they are not sure about the necessity of training on these issues. Based on the results provided in Table 14 and Table 15, it would appear that more and various training activities should be organised for students on understanding and ability to identify the cases of plagiarism in practice. Training should be provided for teachers on definitions and recognising cases of plagiarism, but crucially improvement of tasks for assignments and clarifying criteria of evaluation of these assignments.

6. Proposals to avoid plagiarism and examples of good practice

Students and teachers respondents 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 most interesting responses from students and teachers are provided below.

Most students did not provide any suggestions for how to deter plagiarism. Some students who responded said simply "*Hard to say*", "*I don't know*" or "*I have no idea*". But 55 students (46%) provided some very interesting proposals. 13 of the 22 teacher respondents also suggested themes:

> It is necessary raise awareness about plagiarism and to improve teaching, training and consulting on proper academic writing, citing and referencing. Students made the following

proposals: "*Students need more knowledge about the preparation of written works, these knowledge have be submitted using practical examples to be easier understand how to do*", "*To provide more information on correct paraphrasing of the text*" and "*Are need workshops that students understand what is plagiarism and how it should be avoided, or how to properly cite another author's idea or to change it in own words*".   Some teachers' suggestions were similar to those from students: "*It is necessary to teach students how to cite other authors*", "*First thing – on first year of studies to familiarize with an academic ethics, later on – with practice of literature source search and punishment for plagiarism. I think if the students should know requirements, will decrease and number of plagiarism cases*".

It is necessary to provide more information about available services to avoid plagiarism, penalties for plagiarism cases and strengthening of control. Most interesting students proposals about this areas were: "*Databases should be established for collecting students written work and used for checking newly uploaded works*" and "*More attention should be paid to students' awareness of plagiarism penalties, but also provide explanations about how to organize preparation of written work and how have cite other authors*". These comments from teachers echoed the same theme "*Students must understand the nature of plagiarism. There must be in HEIs a clear system of plagiarism cases evaluation and its strict compliance*", "*Students' works have be accepted only in digital format and provided checking of them using computer programs*".

It is necessary to improve the tasks for assignments and to foresee in syllabuses more time for preparation of written works. Students suggested: "*The topics of assignments should be more understandable and required lower amount of text*", "*It is worth avoiding tasks in assignments that require rewriting notes from textbooks, articles or restating the texts and request more creative work*" and "*It is necessary to motivate students to work independently and to allow development of their own ideas*". Teacher suggestions: "*It is necessary to prepare tasks for students which require creativity without possibility to find appropriate text in internet or other sources*" and "*For assignments have be prepared tasks requiring the creative in its implementation - events analysis using outlined methods or analysis of specific practical situations in particular topics*".

The national level expert answering the question "*What more do you think could be done to reduce student plagiarism?*" expressed the opinion "*The lecturers should work more consistently with the students*" (National interview). Describing examples of good practice this expert mentioned "*Creation of the national database of students' works is a good example*" and pointed out that "*good examples from other HEIs would help to improve their own measures*" (National interview).

All the above suggestions should be taken into consideration by administrators of HEIs.

The national expert provided a positive answer to the question "*Does the national government provide funding for supporting initiatives in HEIs to counter plagiarism?*" stating that "*Ministry of Research and Higher Education has financed several events organized by students' bodies on the topic of academic dishonesty*"(National interview).

7. Discussion

Lithuania is ahead of some countries in developing a national language repository for master and doctoral theses. The IPPHEAE project developed software tools to use with the digital archive for

searching and matching newly uploaded work against the Lithuanian language repository. It was disappointing that the Lithuanian team elected not to make use of the tools developed.

To take advantage of the head-start, it is essential that the Lithuanian resources are deployed nationally and internationally for aiding detection of plagiarism and as a resource for indexing and searching with more positive research motivation. However in common with some other countries, it is critical that the standard of all student work is seen as important, starting at bachelor level, with semester assignments being checked and not just final project work and masters' theses.

The presence of a repository of language-based sources is unlikely to help with the identification of ghost-written work or work derived from copyright or translated materials. Serious incidences of deliberate plagiarism, deception and cheating will continue to go undetected unless academic tutors recognise how ubiquitous such temptations are to students and how easy, quick and inexpensive it is to acquire documents that are often created to order.

The challenge lies ahead to reach some understanding about apparent differences of viewpoint between academics on how to define plagiarism and what would constitute acceptable practice for students on bachelor or master's programmes. The light sanctions applied in cases of plagiarism, including the expectation of students that the only penalty should be a verbal warning (78%) or no action (42%) demonstrated a disproportionately high level of tolerance for this type of unacceptable conduct. There needs to be urgent serious discussion in Lithuania to establish where the borderline lies between acceptable and unacceptable academic practice in student work. An agreed set of sanctions should be developed for different categories of misconduct. These decisions then should be communicated to teachers and students for immediate implementation.

Some student participants proposed "*motivation of students to work independently and to allow development of their own ideas*", or allowing students to propose the tasks for assignments. These proposals are very interesting and such approaches have proved successful motivators elsewhere (for example in Canada, Denmark, Finland and UK). However there should be further consideration about the extent to which such strategies for pedagogy and assessment could be adapted to suit higher education in Lithuania.

More than twice the percentage of students compared to teachers indicated that they would like to have more training about aspects surrounding academic integrity. These figures show urgent need to improve teaching and training on citing and referencing, but also to review existing teaching and training practices in HEIs on this issue, to improve communication among teachers and students on these topics and to examine the role of administrators of HEIs and faculties for providing leadership regarding these processes.

Taking into consideration that 46% of student participants provided serious and rational proposals on plagiarism prevention in students' work, it is possible to conclude that plagiarism is not an invincible phenomenon in HEIs of Lithuania. Active involvement of motivated students in process of study quality improvement would be a worthwhile approach for developing measures to counter plagiarism and for deterring other forms of academic dishonesty. It is possible that motivated students could help teachers and HEIs administration in identifying the main reasons for plagiarism in a particular HEI or faculty, and help to find effective ways to avoid this phenomenon. Students could also be asked to contribute ideas on motivating other students to be honest, to increase their competences by avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty.

There appears to be shortage of dialogue between academics in Lithuania about what constitutes good practice in academic integrity and how this can be shared across institutions. The prevalence of unchecked plagiarism will almost certainly contribute to the erosion of academic standards in Lithuania if it continues to go unrecognised or ignored by some institutions.

8.   Recommendations for Lithuania

8.1 Nationally and internationally

8.1.1   It is recommended that a state legal regulation is adopted for encouraging the development and use of digital text matching tools. All HEIs should be obliged to allow the collected written work of students and other academic papers and documents that could be used for plagiarising to be accessed when checking newly uploaded work.

8.1.2   A definition for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty should be agreed at state level and assistance should be available to encourage HEIs to create an ethical culture of academic integrity.

8.2 Institutionally

8.2.1   It is recommended that institutions define more clearly their understanding of plagiarism and the penalties for plagiarism cases in students' written works. Examples should be provided of possible manifestation in works of particular study programs and clearly described cases when these penalties have been applied.

8.2.2   Fair and consistent procedures for handling allegations of potential academic misconduct should be are prepared, adopted and made accessible to students and teachers. The procedures should include maintaining oversight, punishment for plagiarism and hearing of students' appeals.

8.2.3   HEIs in Lithuania are advised to build on the IPPHEAE research to better understand why students are plagiarising, what difficulties students' meet preparing their written works. The findings should be used to improve the teaching and training process on avoiding plagiarism.

8.2.4   HEIs in Lithuania need to apply more effort to improving teaching and training for students on correct academic writing practices, including citing and referencing and understanding the essence of formal requirements.

8.2.5   It is recommended that HEIs in Lithuania make more visible the information about policies and procedures for plagiarism prevention and punishment, about services available for students and teachers on plagiarism avoiding, the divisions and persons, responsible for provision for students of services on plagiarism prevention.

8.2.6   Institutions are advised to conduct regular monitoring and maintain oversight of teachers' use of procedures for fair handling of misconduct and applying penalties. The academic community have been regularly familiarised about results of such monitoring and invited to discuss new challenges on this issue.

8.2.7   In the longer term institutions should consider adopting more sophisticated policies, such as those advocated by institutions elsewhere, where trained academic conduct officers are responsible for considering accusations and deciding on penalties according to a consistent institutional systems and sanctions frameworks (for example Carroll 2005, Park 2004, Macdonald and Carroll 2006, Morris and Carroll 2011, Tennant and Rowell 2010).

8.3 Individual academics

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

8.3.2   Student respondents listed among their main reasons for plagiarism lack of time for preparation of assignments (62% of students who responded) and lack of ability to express another person's ideas in their own words (60% of students who responded). Therefore teachers are advised to pay more attention to time management skills of students, allowing sufficient time for preparation of written assignments and training on proper academic writing.

8.3.3   Teachers are requested to be more principled when applying penalties according to the regulations and precisely follow procedures of punishments. According the survey 63% of students believed they would not get caught for plagiarism and 29% believed the teacher would not care about that.

9   Conclusions

According to national legislation HEIs in Lithuania are responsible for development and implementation of study quality systems. An external evaluation of their achievements in this respect is made during institutional accreditation.

There are no policies on plagiarism prevention and procedures on discouraging of plagiarism in students' written works common to all members of the academic community, within or across institutions in Lithuania. HEIs in Lithuania are currently in the process of creating a study quality assurance system, in which measures for prevention of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty should be included.

Most students in Lithuania believe the institutions in which they are studying have serious approach to the problems of plagiarism, know about penalties that should be applied when plagiarism is found, but 69% of students, who participated in the survey, agreed they have had plagiarised and 41% of students said they don't understand how to cite and reference. These figures demonstrate the necessity to improve the process of teaching and training on correct academic writing and avoiding plagiarism.

Student participants provided some serious and rational proposals for reducing plagiarism in students' work. This suggests it is worth involving motivated students in the process of study quality improvement and the search for effective plagiarism prevention measures.

It is strongly advised that all student work at bachelor and master's levels from all HEIs in Lithuania is collected and stored in the state-wide repository eLABa.   The repository should be made accessible to digital text matching tools for identification of possible plagiarism cases in students' written works. All HEIs should be required to use the digital tools.

HEIs in Lithuania are advised to define and communicate more clearly what they understand by plagiarism, their policies for reducing the number of incidences and the procedures for handling accusations.

The combination of initiatives recommended at national, institutional and individual levels should serve to drive up academic standards by promoting good scholarship across the whole of the higher education sector in Lithuania.

References

Activities of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. (2013) Web site
http://www.skvc.lt/en/content.asp?id=71 (accessed 8/8/13)

Carroll, J. (2005) *Handling Student Plagiarism: Moving to Mainstream* [online] http://bejlt.brookes.ac.uk/vol1/volume1issue2/perspective/carroll.html edn

Code of Academic Ethics (2006). Web site http://www.vu.lt/site_files/SD/Studentams/SP/SRD/VU_AEK.pdf (accessed 8/7/13)

Code of Academic Ethics (2012). Web site http://www.asu.lt/darbuotojams/lt/ (accessed 15/7/13)

Description of internal study quality assurance (2012). Web site http://www.asu.lt/ (accessed 17/7/13)

Description of policy on institutional management quality assurance of (2012). Web site http://www.asu.lt/ (accessed 16/7/13)

International students in Lithuania. (2012). Web site http://www.emn.lt/.../8.International-Students-in-Lithuania-EN.pdf (accessed 8/8/13)

Law on Copyright and Related Rights. (1999). http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=417078

Law on Higher Education and Research. (2009). Web site http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter3/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=438419 (accessed 10/7/13)

Quality manual (2012). Web site http://www.asu.lt/ (accessed 17/7/13)

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

Park, C. (2004) *Rebels without a Cause: Towards an Institutional Framework for Dealing with Student Plagiarism*, Journal of further and Higher Education 28 (3), 291-306

Statistical Yearbook of Lithuania. (2012) Web site http://web.stat.gov.lt/uploads/metrastis/1_LSM_2012.pdf (accessed 9/8/13)

Studijos. (2013). Web site http://www.smm.lt/web/lt/smm-studijos/aukstosios-mokyklos

Studijų kreditas. (2011). http://www.smm.lt/web/lt/smm-studijos/studiju-kreditas (accessed 9/8/13)

Tennant, P. and Rowell, G. (2010) *Benchmark Plagiarism Tariff for the Application of Penalties for Student Plagiarism and the Penalties Applied*. UK: Plagiarismadvice.org

Tyrimo Akademinio sąžiningumo indeksas 2013 pristatymo medžiaga. (2013) Web site http://www.old.lss.lt/dokumentai/leidiniai-tyrimai-94/lt/tyrimas-pdf-1573.html (accessed 9/8/13)

The rules of collection and use of data base for students' written works. Web site http://www.vu.lt/lt/studijos/studiju-procesas/studijas-reglamentuojantys-dokumentai/ (accessed 9/7/13)

The rules of work of appeals commission on study results assessment in academic core unit of university (2012). Web site http://www.vu.lt/site_files/SD/Studentams/apeliacijos%20nuostatai_2012-12-19.pdf (accessed 11/7/13)

The rules for preparation, defence and storage of final works (2005). Web site http://www.vu.lt (accessed 10/7/13)

Annex LT-1: Responses to Question 5

Table 16: Student and teacher responses to questionnaire Question 5 (Lithuania)												
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)	24/ 20%	0	23/ 19%	3/ 14%	16/ 13%	2/ 9%	31/ 26%	11/ 50%	19/ 16%	6/ 27%	6/ 5%	0
This institution has policies and procedures for dealing with plagiarism (s5c;t5b)	5/ 4%	1/5%	11/ 9%	0	25/ 21%	9/ 41%	57/ 48%	8/ 36%	17/ 14%	3/ 14%	4/ 3%	1/ 5%
I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism prevention (t5c)	-	0	-	1/5%	-	7/ 32%	-	8/ 36%	-	5/ 23%	-	1/ 5%
I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism detection (t5d)	-	0	-	1/5%	-	13/ 59%	-	5/ 23%	-	2/ 9%	-	1/ 5%
Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to students (s5d;t5e)	4/ 3%	1/5%	10/ 8%	1/5%	37/ 31%	9/ 41%	44/ 37%	9/ 41%	12/ 10%	2/ 9%	12/ 10%	0
Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to staff (t5f)	-	0	-	1/ 5%	-	6/ 27%	-	12/ 55%	-	3/ 14%	-	0
Penalties for plagiarism are administered according to a standard formula (s5e;t5g)	4/ 3%	0	15/ 13%	4/ 18%	50/ 42%	11/ 50%	37/ 31%	6/ 27%	7/ 6%	0	6/ 5%	1/ 5%
I know what penalties are applied to students for different forms of plagiarism and academic dishonesty (s5f;t5h)	3/ 3%	0	8/ 7%	3/ 14%	51/ 43%	6/ 27%	30/ 25%	9/ 41%	9/ 8%	4/ 18%	18/ 15%	0
Student circumstances are taken into account when deciding penalties for plagiarism (s5g;t5i)	3/ 3%	1/ 5%	6/ 5%	0	27/ 23%	9/ 41%	55/ 46%	8/ 36%	17/ 14%	2/ 9%	11/ 9%	2/ 9%
The penalties for academic dishonesty are separate from those for plagiarism (t5j)	-	1/ 5%	-	2/ 9%	-	14/ 64%	-	4/ 18%	-	1/ 5%	-	0
There are national regulations or guidance concerning plagiarism prevention within HEIs in this country (t5k)	-	1/ 5%	-	4/ 18%	-	6/ 27%	-	6/ 27%	-	2/ 9%	-	3/ 14%
Our national quality and standards agencies monitor plagiarism and academic dishonesty in HEIs (t5l)	-	2/ 9%	-	3/ 14%	-	6/ 27%	-	5/ 23%	-	1/ 5%	-	5/ 23%
The institution has policies and procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty (s5h;t5m)	3/ 3%	0	12/ 10%	2/ 9%	50/ 42%	3/ 14%	33/ 28%	13/ 59%	5/ 4%	2/ 9%	16/ 13%	2/ 9%
I believe one or more of my teachers/colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes (s5i;t5n)	4/ 3%	0	7/ 6%	0	39/ 33%	5/ 23%	44/ 37%	14/ 64%	9/ 8%	1/ 5%	16/ 13%	2/ 9%
I have come across a case of plagiarism committed by a student at this institution (s5j)	2/ 2%	-	7/ 6%	-	33/ 28%	-	43/ 36%	-	25/ 21%	-	9/ 8%	-
I believe I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately) (s5k;t5o)	3/ 3%	1/ 5%	5/ 4%	4/ 18%	26/ 22%	8/ 36%	52/ 44%	8/ 36%	30/ 25%	0	3/ 3%	1/ 5%
I would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty (s5b;t5p)	0	3/ 14%	12/ 10%	3/ 14%	25/ 21%	5/ 23%	62/ 52%	3/ 14%	15/ 13%	2/ 9%	5/ 4%	6/ 27%
I believe that all teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism (s5l;t5q)	2/ 2%	0	15/ 13%	5/ 23%	44/ 37%	12/ 55%	43/ 36%	3/ 14%	7/ 6%	0	8/ 7%	2/ 9%
I believe that the way teachers treat plagiarism does not vary from student to student (s5m;t5r)	6/ 5%	0	14/ 12%	4/ 18%	51/ 43%	11/ 50%	34/ 29%	4/ 18%	3/ 3%	2/ 9%	11/ 9%	1/ 5%
I believe that when dealing with plagiarism teachers follow the required procedures (s5n;t5s)	5/ 4%	0	11/ 9%	4/ 18%	46/ 39%	13/ 59%	37/ 31%	2/ 9%	10/ 8%	1/ 5%	10/ 8%	2/ 9%
It is possible to design coursework to reduce student plagiarism (s5o;t5t)	5/ 4%	0	14/ 12%	1/ 5%	35/ 29%	1/ 5%	46/ 39%	12/ 55%	12/ 10%	8/ 36%	7/ 6%	0
I think that translation across languages is used by some students to avoid detection of plagiarism (s5p;t5u)	9/ 8%	0	19/ 16%	1/ 5%	43/ 36%	11/ 50%	28/ 24%	8/ 36%	12/ 10%	1/ 5%	8/ 7%	1/ 5%
The previous institution I studied was less strict about plagiarism than this institution (s5q)	14/ 12%	-	13/ 11%	-	31/ 26%	-	38/ 32%	-	5/ 4%	-	18/ 15%	-
I understand the links between copyright, Intellectual property rights and plagiarism (s5r)	2/ 2%	-	7/ 6%	-	33/ 28%	-	60/ 50%	-	13/ 11%	-	4/ 3%	-