Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Hungary

Full Report

Irene Glendinning

October 2013

IPPHEAE

Impact of Policies for Plagiarism in Higher Education Across Europe

Plagiarism Policies in Hungary

1. *Information sources*

Information about policies and procedures for plagiarism in Hungary was collected through

- On-line surveys of higher education students, teachers and senior managers available in Hungarian;
- Interviews and email discussions with researchers and academics;
- Documentation, reports and on-line evidence.

Although limited, the information collected at these levels was crucial to set the context of both historical and recent development in Higher Education in Hungary and how this has impacted on student plagiarism. Interviewees were involved in reviewing this report and they have been made aware of the findings of the research. Views and opinions from university students, academic staff from the questionnaires form most of the evidence presented in this report. Where possible the *colour coded* voices of the participants, have been used to inform and enrich the narrative.

Table 1 summarises the responses received to different elements of the survey.

Table 1: Breakdown of Survey responses							
Country	Student Questionnaire responses		Teacher Questionnaire responses		Senior Management and National	Student Focus Groups	Organisations and Institutions
Hungary	5		21		5	0	11
Breakdown of student responses by domicile and award		Home students	Other EU students	Non-EU students	Not known	Bachelor, diploma	Master, doctor	Blank, other
Hungary	5	5	0	0	0	2	3	0

All student participants were Hungarian nationals / residents enrolled on undergraduate or master's programmes. The narrative responses indicated that at least one student respondent had completed an Erasmus study placement in Germany.

Many institutions and individual contacts across Hungary were asked to participate in the research. The low student response rate was very disappointing and therefore this can only be seen as an opportunistic sample that may not be representative of the whole Hungarian HE population. A specific reason was given by one contact for reluctance to participate:

> "*As I myself am not dealing with this area, I've tried to make some investigations into the matter and it seems that our university is just making the first steps how to handle student plagiarism, or how to work out the ways of the electronic checking of students' theses. I'm afraid that in this initial phase our university could not be a useful partner*" (institutional contact).

Further details were provided by the same contact about a different university where academic integrity policies and procedures were more developed. Attempts to make contact with the second university were unsuccessful.

2. *Higher Education in Hungary*

In 2008 there were 72 Higher Education Institutions (HEI) in Hungary with a population of 413,700 students (EUMIDA 2009 p191). These HEI consist of state institutions (universities and colleges), religious institutions and private institutions. Limited state funding necessitated that state universities and colleges needed to draw on their financial reserves for operation expenses and tuition fees are paid by students who were not accepted for state funding. Non-means-tested student loans were introduced in 2001, to cover tuition fees and living costs (Singh and Marcucci 2008 p7).

More recently Higher Education in Hungary policy has been subject to significant changes, including substantial cuts in student funding: "The government announced on December 5 [2012] that it will only fund 10,480 places next year, down from over 44,000 in 2011. This led to nationwide protests" (Füzessi 2013) followed by meetings between students and academics, where the following list of demands was drawn up:

1. We demand the complete reform of public and higher education.
2. The number of government-funded places should be reinstated to the 2011 level.
3. Stop budget cuts and compensate previous cuts.
4. Abolish the student contracts.
5. Do not limit the autonomy of universities.
6. Give a chance to disadvantaged students to enter higher education. (Füzessi 2013)

Despite some reassurances from the government, protests continued into January and February 2013. The current funding shortages may make it difficult for any additional research funding to be provided or enhancements to Higher Education resources for responding to plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

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

3.1 Quality Assurance and Accreditation

The Hungarian Accreditation Committee (HAC) is responsible for "evaluating higher education institutions and managing its own operations". Current institutional accreditation visits "*don't deal with plagiarism at all; there are no questions about this*" (national interview). HAC published a 14 point strategy for 2013-15, setting out the scope of its operations and the way it will operate in relation to other quality agencies, roles of HAC members and towards the HEIs it will assess. (HAC Strategy 2013-15). Although there is no mention of plagiarism or academic misconduct in the strategy, there are elements within the strategy that could be applied to the assurance of academic integrity.

The strategy defines the focus of an institutional assessment as "on quality requirements relating to the operation of higher education institutions and their faculties, their staff and infrastructure, research and organizational conditions, and examines the teaching and learning processes and outcomes" (Point 3 HAC Strategy 2013-15 p1). The strategy also indicates that both educational inputs and outputs will be evaluated "such as attained learning outcomes and competences" (Point 4 HAC Strategy 2013-15 p1). This last point should have relevance to upholding standards of academic integrity.

The following statement from Point 6 of the strategy is particularly encouraging for the IPPHEAE research: "Institutional accreditation will continue to focus on the existence and quality of the institutions' internal quality assurance" (Point 6 HAC Strategy 2013-15 p2). However the impact of such an audit on policies for academic integrity depends on what the visiting panelists and the institution being visited understand as essential requirements for a QA system. Critically, the final point (Point 14, p 2) of the strategy document makes reference to shortfall of state funding for HAC QA activities and the need to find alternative sources of revenue in order to fulfill their required role.

In response to the statement: *Our national quality and standards agencies monitor plagiarism and academic dishonesty in HEIs*, 80% of teachers said they were not sure with only 20% agreeing (Annex HU-1 Qu T5l). This suggests that if there are any national monitoring activities in place in Hungary they are not transparent to the academic community.

3.2 Teaching, learning and Assessment

The nature of student assessment can impact on understanding of plagiarism and affects the range of opportunities to plagiarise. To explore the national culture of assessment in Hungary the teachers' questionnaire contained a question asking for some indication of the breakdown of examinations, assignments and project work. Table 2 contains a summary of responses.

Table 2: Teachers' responses, assessment in Hungarian HEIs - percentages				
Examinations	Assignments	Projects	Other assessment	Number of responses
80	10	10		2
70	10	20		4
70	15	15		2
70	30			1
65	25	10		1
65	20	15		2
60	30	10		1
60	20	20		2
50	30	20		1
45	20	20	15% oral test	1
40	20	40		1
30	50	20		1
30	30	30	10	1

All teacher participants that answered the question confirmed that their students are required to complete some non-examined assessments and most assessment included project work.

In response to a different question all teachers responding confirmed that some aspects of assessed group work were included, estimated between 10% and 50% of the assessment. Indeed, the reason this question was included in the survey is connected with complications that can arise when plagiarism occurs in assessed group work. One of the student respondents made an interesting comment about an experience on an Erasmus study placement in Germany:

"*About a half year ago … I realized one of my fellow students had copied word for word web text passages. I had a shock when I mentioned to the group as the others thought I had "too high expectations"… I think the students should bring to a group an unwritten rule that you all may write it as you want, but if the instructor separately points out that this is the rule then it should be followed. It did not occur to them to "redefine" the plagiarism and does not deal with members of the group that have different the opinions to other members of the group*" (student questionnaire – translated).

This experience of working with other students towards a combined team grade demonstrates how unfair treatment can result for members of a team if all are given the same penalty without some exploration of division of the work.

A national respondent explained practices for grading of student work:

"*student work, even the thesis, is mostly read by one reviewer, although I have recommended having two. Teachers are responsible for about 500 students*" and "*there is no requirement or incentive to follow up cases. Most professors don't. If a student is caught* [plagiarising] *then they can try again next year*" (national interview).

The same respondent also noted that "*as there are no records of* [plagiarism] *cases we don't know if a student cheats in every single subject*".

4.   *Academic Integrity and Plagiarism in Hungary*

4.1 Strategies, policies and procedures for academic integrity in Hungary

No evidence of previous research or investigations were found relating to aspects of academic integrity in Hungary and no statistics were located at national or institutional level about academic misconduct or plagiarism in Hungary.

There was no evidence of policies and procedures for academic integrity at national level in Hungary. However the IPPHEAE survey results indicate that some institutions have developed systems and regulations for dealing with plagiarism and academic dishonesty. "*Most* [HE institutions] *have policies* [for plagiarism] *now, but they tend to be at department level – bottom-up approach rather than institution-wide*" (national interview).

When teachers were asked who has responsibility for making decisions about plagiarism and applying penalties several responses were "*oktató*", which translates to "*instructor*". This was also confirmed by the national interviewee. This suggests that individual teachers have those roles and, as is the case for grading of student work, there is no formal check, oversight or accountability for handling academic dishonesty or plagiarism cases, at least in the institutions participating in the survey.

4.4 IPPHEAE survey findings on policies and procedures

As indicated earlier, the low response rate makes it impossible to generalise the IPPHEAE results for all Hungary. However the feedback is still useful as a guide to practice and experiences in respondents' institutions.

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

Table 3:					
What would happen if a student at your institution was found guilty of plagiarism in their assignment or final project/dissertation?					
Assignment		Project or Dissertation		Sanction	Feedback (S=student, T=Teacher)
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher		
20%	19%	0%	5%	*No action would be taken*	
40%	62%	20%	14%	*Verbal warning*	
0%	14%	60%	38%	*Formal warning letter*	*a few cases in a year*
80%	67%	60%	43%	*Request to re write it properly*	

20%	24%	0%	14%	Zero mark for the work	Elégtelen (translation: lowest grade, fail)
40%	14%	40%	29%	Repeat the module or subject	
0%	33%	40%	29%	Fail the module or subject	
0%	0%	0%	0%	Repeat the whole year of study	
0%	0%	20%	29%	Fail the whole programme or degree	
0%	0%	20%	5%	Expose the student to school community	
0%	0%	40%	10%	Suspended from the institution	szabályzat szerint (according to the rules)
0%	0%	20%	10%	Expelled from the institution	
0%	0%	20%	10%	Suspend payment of student grant	
Other comments (some translated)				Hand in new dissertation in the next round (next semester, typically)	
				Nothing	
				They have to completely rewrite it	
				Disciplinary proceedings	

The responses in Table 3 indicate that a range of sanctions is available in Hungarian HEIs for cases of plagiarism that have been identified. For both assignments and dissertations the most common penalties appear to be rewriting and submitting the work, with addition of either formal or informal warning in the case of the dissertation. The responses suggest that more serious penalties, such as suspension are regulated for institutionally and sometimes applied, particularly for plagiarism in the project thesis or dissertation.

The questionnaire responses about sanctions were confirmed by another participant: "*if we discover plagiarism in a thesis, we advise the student to rewrite the text and resubmit the thesis, usually to the same graduation deadline. No other sanctions were needed until now*" (national interview).

The national respondent described the Hungarian funding arrangements whereby the government pays institutions for each student that graduates. He explained that this funding arrangement discourages the practice of suspending or expelling students who commit more serous forms of cheating: Universities "*get the money by every student who studies there, so they have a large incentive to keep the students as long as possible so to have 3-5 years of funding for every student. Graduating is only a "side-effect" as you cannot tell half of your students in the last semester that "you are incompetent I do not let you graduate I only kept you for the money"*" (national interview).

4.5 Use of digital tools

Discussions by email with academic contacts in Hungary revealed that some institutions are creating their own databases of student theses, which appear to be managed through the institutional libraries.

> "*To start with, I think you could contact the director of our University Library. As far as I know, a database has already been set up for uploading the theses. I think she will be able to give you more information about this*";

> "*I advise you to contact one of the bigger universities in Budapest (I definitely know that … University has such policies and procedures). It seems that it is the university libraries which manage the electronic database where the students' theses must be uploaded*";
>
> (email discussions with academic contacts).

One questionnaire response from a teacher also confirmed that mandatory electronic submission of student thesis is already in place in at least one institution "*Szakdolgozat elektronikus formában beadva*

mindig ellenőrzésre kerül", which translates as "*The thesis is always administered and checked electronically*".

Questionnaire responses are summarised in Tables 4 and 5 about the use of anti-plagiarism tools.

Table 4: Digital tools and other techniques for detecting plagiarism – number of responses	Student #	Teacher #
Software (Kopi Sztaki.hu Plagiarism = 4, PBWorks=1), unspecified		10
Google, Google search, Google Scholar, internet	2	4
Neither, nothing		4
Don't know	2	1
Do you have any programme …	1	

Student and teacher Question 9: *How are the tools you named above used*?

Table 5: Use of software tools - percentages	Student	Teacher
It is up to the lecturers to decide whether to use the tools	60%	62%
For some courses students must submit their written work using the tools	0%	10%
Students must submit all written work using the tools	0%	5%
Students may use the tools to check their work before submitting	0%	14%
Other		

These responses suggest that HEIs in Hungary have not yet invested in licenses for commercial tools, but some are relying on free web-based resources. In 2003 funding was provided by the Hungarian government for the development of a software tool called Kopi (http://kopi.sztaki.hu/) for checking similarity of text and detecting plagiarism. Recent upgrades to add searching and matching tools and capabilities with some important visual enhancements, will be implemented from September 2013. However no funding has been provided for maintaining and enhancing this tool in the longer term.

The Kopi tool, which was named by two teachers, has the capacity for matching to sources translated into Hungarian from English: "*translation plagiarism is becoming a big problem here*"; "*the tool starts with Wikipedia, this is the number one source for plagiarism*" (national interview). A report of general tests using the 2012 version of this tool will be available in September 2013 (Copy-Shake-Paste blog).

It was welcome to discover the development of policies within institutions to collect electronic copies of theses from their students. In the longer term, to create an effective resource for deterring and detecting plagiarism, it is important that a shared repository is created of Hungarian language work, containing all types of student work and research papers, with tools to access this resource across institutions and to search for matches in text.

4.6 Making systems and procedures more effective

Many suggestions were made by respondents about what could be done to reduce student plagiarism. They include enhancements to guidance, teaching and learning and calls for stricter control and penalties:

"*Authentic teaching examples (own notes, lesson ppts links), plagiarism came to light after a student had a real need to be a deterrent example*";

"*It could be about time management or a project to teach students to not be in a position where they would pay no attention to the role of plagiarism*";

"It would be important to provide tutorial courses or lessons on copyright and targeted referencing";

"Use of devices or technology greatly increase the risk of getting caught, this is of great help in deterring";

"I think every course should call the students' attention, when they are required to write, to what are the consequences of plagiarism";

"In addition, when working in a group the students' attention should be drawn to the fact that the entire team will receive a penalty if a member plagiarized";

"A precise understanding of the rules would be an important reference for students. They would be made of aids that contain the exact reference sources can be found in modern ways as well";
(student questionnaire responses – all translated)

"Give case study type assignment where the student has to find out something new that (s)he won't find on the internet";

"Leading by example" (twice);

"Should be punished hard and educators should be interested to find out";

"If it is well known that there are consequences for plagiarism";

"Learning";

"Good practice to me is for smaller assessments, class essays";

"Teachers should explain severe penalties to students - but the trainers should also be aware of the rules on this?";

"Should be taught the correct way to cite, reference, they need to practice the right way";

"Analysis of specific examples";

"Control in all studies submitted in writing tasks plagiarism search system";

"Point control and regular monitoring and strict penalties"

(translated teacher questionnaire responses);

"Teaching: students and staff have to know about

1. *Plagiarism and how to avoid it*
2. *Detection*
3. *Consequences (currently if they catch you, even if you have plagiarised the whole thing, you just have to write it again)"* (national interview).

For the last point the respondent advocated a deterrent using a consistent and set of stricter sanctions than those currently deployed.

It is interesting to note that two students and a teacher provided examples of improving assessment in order to "design out" or discourage plagiarism. In addition 81% of teachers and 60% of students responded positively to the statement: *it is possible to design coursework to reduce student plagiarism*, with 10% of teachers and 40% of students not sure and 10% of teachers disagreeing with the statement (Annex HU-1

Qu S5o, T5t). However this view was contradicted in a different response that talked about the difficulties presented by large class sizes:

> "*I think it is a myth that this is possible, or at least it is very dependent on the subject/institution. If you have a seminar with 10-20 people, and one professor, than that's fine. In the technical field classrooms/subjects of 500 are not uncommon, and there you cannot have each year 500 new unique tasks. We talked about this with one of the professors and we could not find any possibility of having a homework and not having the possibility of plagiarizing for 500 students. Not having homework is not an option if you really want to engage your students in practicing at home and not only learning the theoretics by heart. (Like a programming assignment for IT students.) This is mainly so in the first 2-3 years, where there are quite big classes. Later, after specialising, the classes get smaller and teachers have more time for the students, they may know what each of them was doing*" (national interview).

The deterrent effect of anti-plagiarism tools was raised by one of the students. The comment about the need for teachers to lead by example is very pertinent.

Student comments included several references to the need to be given more information about consequences of plagiarism and about techniques from improving writing. However this feedback appears to be contradicted by the responses to student questionnaire question 5b *I would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty*, where 80% of students disagreed and 20% were not sure Annex HU-1 Qu S5b). Perhaps their advice was intended for other students and they believed they had already had enough guidance themselves?

38% of teacher respondents agreed that *one or more of my colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes*, with 29% disagreeing, but 81% of the teacher respondents disagreed with the statement: *I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately)* (Annex HU-1 Qu T5n, T5o). 80% of students agreed that they had *come across a case of plagiarism committed by a student at this institution*, with 20% not sure (Annex HU-1 QU S5j).

67% of the teacher respondents agreed that their *institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism prevention* (Annex HU-1 Qu T5c) with 29% not sure and 5% disagreeing and 47% of the teachers agreed that their institution was serious about *plagiarism detection* with 43% not sure and 10% disagreeing (Annex HU-1 Qu T5d).

When asked whether *policies, procedures and penalties for plagiarism and academic dishonesty* are made available to students (Annex HU-1 Qu S5d, T5e), 60% of students agreed and 40% were not sure. Of the teacher responses to the same question 62% agreed, 29% were not sure, 10% disagreed. The uncertainty in some responses suggests more could be done within the institution to disseminate this information to students and to teachers.

On questions about consistency of application of policies and procedures 48% of the teachers disagreed that *teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism*, with 48% not sure and 0% agreeing, but 34% of teachers agreed that *responses are consistent between students* and 29% agreed that teachers *follow the required procedures*, with 29% and 38% respectively disagreeing with these statements. In comparison 40%, 60% and 100% of student respondents agreed with the three statements about consistency of approach (Annex HU-1 Qu S5l, T5q, S5m, T5r, S5n, T5s). The teachers' responses imply that some students accused of academic dishonesty may not receive appropriate or fair advice and sanctions.

5.   *Perceptions and Understanding of Plagiarism*

5.1 Support and guidance

One way of showcasing academic integrity is to ask students to sign some form of statement about integrity and honesty. In some countries and institutions this can take the form of a formal ceremony, but in other institutions can be a more routine part of enrolling or submitting assessment. Responses about when *students are required to sign a declaration about originality and academic honest* from the student and teacher questionnaire are summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: When do students sign a declaration? (select as many options as apply)		
Student	Teacher	When
0%	0%	On starting their degree
20%	14%	For every assessment
40%	62%	For some assessments
20%	5%	Never
0%	10%	Not sure
20%	10%	Not applicable

These responses suggest that some students sign honesty statements for specific work, but there is no overall or consistent policy about asking students to sign. The national interviewee believed it was becoming common in Hungary to ask students to submit a statement with their work: "*most have one page stating that it is their own work, but really they don't know what plagiarism is*"; "*This is for theses only. Almost all institutions have this one page mandatory statement. This is not the case for homework and assignments*". (national interview).

Responses from students suggest that they believe they do understand what plagiarism is:

Student *Question 2: I became aware of plagiarism*…

> 40% of students said they were aware about plagiarism before they started university, 60% became aware of this during their undergraduate degree.

Student *Question 3: I learned to cite and reference*…

> 20% of students said they learnt about academic writing conventions before starting their bachelor degree, 80% during bachelor degree.

Student Question 6, Teacher Questions 2 and 3 asked about the forms of awareness-raising. The responses in Table 7 show a difference between knowledge of students and teachers about available information and resources. The teachers appeared to assume that students just learn about academic integrity in the classroom, but clearly, there are other media and sources that students make use of. A sizeable minority of respondents were not aware of any information, but institutions that do provide information appear to be covering both plagiarism and the wider range of possible academic dishonesty categories.

Students become aware of plagiarism and of other forms of academic dishonesty (e.g. cheating) as an important issue through:

Table 7: Ways that students become aware about plagiarism and academic dishonesty				
Plagiarism		Academic Dishonesty		
Student	Teacher	Student	Teacher	
20%	62%	40%	29%	*Web site*
40%	33%	0%	19%	*Course booklet, student guide, handbook*

20%	14%	60%	24%	*Leaflet or guidance notes*
60%	71%	40%	67%	*Workshop / class / lecture*
40%	5%	20%	24%	*I am not aware of any information about this*
				Other:
				Diploma regulation writing requirement
				Plagiarism policy
				The press

Table 8 summarises responses to Student Question 12, Teacher Question 14: *Which of the following services are provided at your institution to advise students about plagiarism prevention?*

Table 8: Services and student support for discouraging plagiarism		
Student	Teacher	Service or provision
0%	43%	*Academic support unit*
60%	81%	*Advice in class during course/module*
40%	43%	*Additional lectures, workshops:*
0%	95%	*Advice from tutors or lecturers*
40%	57%	*Guidance from the library*
0%	5%	*University publisher*
20%	10%	*Academic writing unit/Study skills unit*

The main channel for education of students about plagiarism and academic dishonesty appears to be through tutors, formal classes, additional lectures or workshops and support from institutional library. The responses confirm that specialist services and information for supporting students in academic integrity and academic writing were available in some participant institutions. Although student numbers are low, it is interesting to note the lack of any student responses to the option *advice from tutors or lecturers*. Another source of information was suggested:

> "*I think the media is missing. Because of* [publicity about plagiarism by the President of Hungary Pál] *Smitt and others we had a quite large media coverage of plagiarism and a lot of students got their knowledge about plagiarism from there. I think I don't have to mention to you how false those facts have been, where people said that it is normal to copy tens or hundreds of pages if at the end you state that you also used this source; and a lot of other false informations. Sadly the media does plagiarise a lot, so they are not an authentic source of academic integrity*" (national interview).

It became clear from positive teacher (85%) and student (100%) responses that most students studying in Hungary receive guidance in techniques for scholarly academic writing and anti-plagiarism issues (Annex HU-1 Qu S5a, T5a). None of the students and only 31% of the teachers agreed that they would like to have more training, with 80% and 41% respectively disagreeing (Annex UK-1 Qu S5b, T5p). The national and senior management respondents said they were sure that more training should be provided for both teachers and students.

5.2 Responses about plagiarism

All participants were asked to reflect and comment on the question: *what leads students to decide to plagiarise*? Their responses are summarised in Table 9.

Responses to Student Question 14, Teacher Question 17 and national interview:

Table 9: Reasons student plagiarise – student and teacher questionnaires			
Student	Teacher	National	Possible reason for plagiarism
20%	43%	*1*	*They think the lecturer will not care*
80%	90%	*1*	*They think they will not get caught*
80%	81%	*1*	*They run out of time*
60%	76%		*They don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment*
20%	24%	*1*	*They don't see the difference between group work and collusion*
20%	48%	*1*	*They can't express another person's ideas in their own words*
40%	29%	*1*	*They don't understand how to cite and reference*
20%	29%		*They are not aware of penalties*
60%	38%		*They are unable to cope with the workload*
0%	14%		*They think their written work is not good enough:*
20%	19%		*They feel the task is completely beyond their ability*
60%	95%	*1*	*It is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*
0%	0%	*1*	*They feel external pressure to succeed*
60%	52%	*1*	*Plagiarism is not seen as wrong*
40%	24%		*They have always written like that*
20%	14%		*Unclear criteria and expectations for assignments*
0%	29%		*Their reading comprehension skills are weak*
20%	10%		*Assignments tasks are too difficult or not understood*
20%	24%	*1*	*There is no teacher/ faculty control on plagiarism*
Other comments		*1*	*Some students don't use their time wisely*
		1	*Lack of citing and referencing skills is the most important point*
		1	*Difficulty in expressing ideas particularly applies to technical subjects*

All the options suggested except *they feel external pressure..* were selected by at least one of the participants. Distinct differences emerged in the responses from students and teachers suggesting that some teacher participants were not aware of some of students' perceptions of motivations for plagiarism. The most selected options by students were (80%) *they think they will not get caught,*(80%) *they run out of time*, (60%) *they are unable to cope with the workload* and (60%) *it is easy to cut and paste from the Internet*. The teachers also favoured the same options (90%, 81% and 95% respectively).

 Some students and teachers selected *they don't want to learn anything, just pass the assignment* (S 60%, T 76%) and *plagiarism is not seen as wrong*(S 60% and T 52%). A lower percentage of the teachers also highlighted possible deficiencies in skills and personal organisation.

In a separate question 40% of student participants agreed with the statement that *the previous institution* [where] *I studied was less strict about plagiarism than this institution*, with 40% disagreeing and 20% opting for not applicable (Annex HU-1 S5q).

Tables 11, 12 and 13 summarise responses to questions about different aspects of academic writing.

Table 11 summarises responses to Question 10 of the student questionnaire exploring understanding of basic academic writing conventions: *What are the reasons for using correct referencing and citation in scholarly academic writing*?

Table 11: Reasons for referencing and citation	
60%	*To avoid being accused of plagiarism*
60%	*To show you have read some relevant research papers*

40%	*To give credit to the author of the sourced material*
0%	*To strengthen and give authority to your writing*
20%	*Because you are given credit/marks for doing so*
0%	*I don't know*

It was disappointing to see from responses in Table 11 that 60% of student respondents believed the purpose of referencing and citation is to defend themselves against accusations of plagiarism, also none of the students saw the relevance of sources *to strengthen and give authority* to their work. There was a very clear signal that a referencing style convention is applied in the institutions responding, with most students saying they were positive about referencing and citation (Table 12). Finding good quality sources was the aspect of academic writing where most difficulty was reported by student respondents. Referencing and citation was not selected by any student respondent (Table 13).

Table 12: Referencing styles, Student Question 11, Teacher Question 10a						
Yes		No		Not sure		Question
student	teacher	student	teacher	student	teacher	
100%	90%	0%	10%	0%	0%	*Is there any referencing style students are required or encouraged to use in written work?*
80%		0%		20%		*Are you confident about referencing and citation?*

Student Question 13: *What do you find difficult about academic writing*?

Table 13: Difficulties with academic writing	
60%	*Finding good quality sources*
0%	*Referencing and citation*
20%	*Paraphrasing*
20%	*Understanding different referencing formats and styles*

According to the national interviewee "*A lot of people really do not know what plagiarism is. They learn about it at some universities and courses but not at technical universities; they do not have anything, they don't have the opportunity to do this*"; "*many use Wikipedia"* instead of finding academic sources.

When asked whether teachers understand what plagiarism is, the response was "*in many cases not*". On the subject of whether there is evidence of teachers plagiarising: "*I have seen teachers plagiarise slides from other universities and take pictures from the Internet without permission*". A further example was provided of unethical practice by academic staff, often called self-plagiarism or auto-plagiarism: "*many republish the same research with different titles, due to the pressure to publish*" (national interview).

The survey included questions that explored respondents' understanding about what constitutes plagiarism. Students (Question 15) and teachers (Question 19) were asked to identify possible cases of plagiarism based on a brief scenario, and suggest whether some "punishment" should be applied. The purpose of this question was to try to establish what behaviour different people viewed as plagiarism and whether they believed some sanction should be applied in such cases. Tables 14 and 15 summarise the responses from students and teachers respectively.

Student Question 15, Teacher question 19: Examples of possible plagiarism:

Table 14: Student responses to possible cases of plagiarism					
Qu	Is it plagiarism?			Punish ment?	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
	Yes	No	Don't know		
a	100%	0%	0%	60%	word for word with no quotations
b	80%	0%	20%	20%	word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations
c	80%	0%	20%	20%	word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations
d	60%	20%	20%	0%	with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations
e	80%	20%	0%	20%	with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations
f	20%	60%	20%	0%	with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations

Table 15: Teacher responses to possible case of plagiarism					
Qu	Is it plagiarism?			Punish ment?	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
	Yes	No	Don't know		
a	100%	0%	0%	76%	word for word with no quotations
b	47%	38%	33%	33%	word for word with no quotations, has a correct references but no in text citations
c	48%	24%	29%	10%	word for word with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations
d	43%	29%	29%	10%	with some words changed with no quotations, references or in text citations
e	62%	10%	29%	29%	with some words changed with no quotations, has correct references but no in text citations
f	38%	38%	24%	10%	with some words changed with no quotations, but has correct references and in text citations

All six cases (a-f) may be categorised as plagiarism, but some (c,f) could be construed as poor academic practice or perhaps patch-writing due to poor language skills could account for some matching (b,e). However given that the scenario says 40% of the paper is identical to other work, there should normally be an investigation of this work, possibly leading to a sanction, before any academic credit was awarded.

Considering the responses in Tables 14 and 15 to part (a), the most obvious example of plagiarism, it is notable that while the all students and teachers were clear this was a case of plagiarism, with most respondents agreeing that punishment may be appropriate for such conduct. Responses to the other options were unexpected, causing the author to double check the accuracy. Only 43% of teacher respondents and 60% of students believed scenario (d) was plagiarism, which is particularly odd, since this case is of similar seriousness to scenario (a). This suggests that some students' confidence in understanding academic writing conventions may be misplaced and that some of the teachers may themselves be inadvertently plagiarising. The low number of respondents opting for "punishment", other than for scenario (a) may reflect a culture in Hungary where it is unusual to apply sanctions for plagiarism.

Although this was a small sample, the participants expressed interest in the research and took part voluntarily, making it more likely that the results would be slightly skewed towards better the informed within the HE teaching community. Therefore it is of concern that 60% of teachers were unable to identify scenario (d) as a clear case of plagiarism.

As referred to earlier in 2012 the President of Hungary Pál Schmitt was forced to resign from this post after his doctorate was rescinded. It had been revealed that 197 pages from his 1992 doctoral thesis of 215 pages were copied from other research. There were clear conflicts of interest and potential for undue influence concerning overlaps in the membership of his thesis committee and the Hungarian Olympic committee and Academy, both chaired by the President (Wikipedia, Schmitt 2012). The President's initial response to the accusations was denial, which caused some concern: "*When politicians found to have plagiarised they don't do it nicely – they don't say 'sorry I should not have done it'. People high up should set an example*" (national interview). In common with similar cases elsewhere in the world, this high profile example also raises important questions about the university quality assurance and examining systems that did not detect or respond to unethical practices applied to the highest levels of assessment.

6. *Examples of good practice*

It was very encouraging to find that some institutions are taking the problem of plagiarism seriously by developing software and institutional databases of work and student submission systems. "*Many teachers know this is a problem and try to fight it. They value student accomplishment and want to reward the students who have earned it*" (national interview).

It was clear that the students responding to the survey were well informed about plagiarism and academic dishonesty. They understood the consequences to them of local policies for academic integrity and most had mature views about how to deter plagiarism. Their teachers had ensured that they understood how to construct references and add citations to the sources in their work.

An email discussion group of university senior managers and librarians is focusing on complexities and possible responses that can be implemented in Hungary to address student plagiarism. This group could become a catalyst for driving the necessary changes to policies and procedures throughout higher Education in Hungary.

7. *Discussion*

The small number of student responses received to the survey from Hungary presented a major obstacle for understanding the situation in higher education across the country. The voluntary nature of the responses may be biased towards students and teachers who are more engaged and interested in this topic than would be generally the case. However the available information has helped to provide an interesting insight into how policies for academic integrity are being developed and implemented in a small number of Hungarian HE institutions. The student responses to the open questions were particularly helpful in capturing a deeper understanding of their viewpoint.

Sound quality assurance of student assessment is and essential prerequisite for underpinning academic integrity. The recent history of underinvestment in higher education in Hungary is likely to have reduced the priority institutions have placed on developing strategies and implementing policies for quality assurance and academic integrity. The published HAC strategy for 2013-15 is a major step forward, but this needs to be supported and fully funded to allow HAC to deliver the services it has promised. If implemented as described, this will certainly help to enhance quality and standards across the Hungarian Higher Education sector.

The development of software and resources for detecting plagiarism in some institutions is a good indication that the serious threats presented by easy availability to students of massive amounts of material are understood by educationalists. However institutional and departmental responses are unlikely to be as effective in deterring inappropriate conduct as a coordinated nationally supported initiative.

In the current economic climate it may prove difficult to find extra funding to support research and development, either nationally or institutionally. However a relatively small investment for exploring the situation in Hungary combined with the development of suitable resources for applying across the whole of the country could have far reaching impact on academic standards and student attainment.

There appear to be differences between institutions on what policies have been developed for detecting plagiarism and academic dishonesty. The institutional policies and systems described by the survey participants appear to rely on individual instructors or teachers to independently identify cases of suspected misconduct and decide on the penalties. Where there is no oversight and accountability for such decisions, there is no way of knowing how consistent and fair the outcomes are, which is evident from some survey responses.

Discussions with participants from across Europe indicated that ghost-writing and use of "paper mills" (for purchasing student work to order) are seen as particularly problematic to identify and prove, compared to cases of "cut and paste" plagiarism and poor academic practice. One response from a Hungarian participant confirmed "*yes, it is the same problem as in other countries. The most frightening thing is, that it looks like that in some cases these are underpaid teachers, who know exactly how to play the system*".

8.   Recommendations for Hungary

8.1   Nationally

8.1.1   The National government should consider monitoring the effectiveness and consistency of policies and procedures applied for academic integrity in Higher Education institutions.

8.1.2   National leadership and support should be provided to HE institutions, ideally from HAC, to encourage Higher Education institutions to development consistent institution-wide policies and systems for handling cases of plagiarism and academic dishonesty.

8.1.3   Research should be funded to supplement the IPPHEAE research, locating examples of good practice both inside Hungary and elsewhere, from which a programme of guidance could be developed to help academic within institutions to appreciate tried and tested techniques for deterring plagiarism.

8.1.4   As several other countries have done (Lithuania, Slovakia) Hungary should consider developing an open-access national digital repository for research papers, all levels of student theses and student work. This would supersede any institutional databases being developed and provide the corpus to allow searching for similarity of work between and within institutions.

8.1.5   Funding should be provided to maintain and enhance the software tool developed in 2004 (http://kopi.sztaki.hu/) and for further research into plagiarism in Hungary.

8.1.6   Practical and financial support for purchasing licenses for software matching tools should be investigated by the Department of Education following the example of JISC in the UK (JISC Electronic Plagiarism Project, Rowell 2009). This national move could ensure affordable access by

Hungarian institutions to an effective aid to plagiarism detection and deterrent, that also has proven applications for formative teaching about academic writing (Davis 2009, Ireland and English 2011).

8.1.7   According to survey participants the workload of academic staff and size of classes in universities – typically 500 students – makes it difficult for teachers to implement techniques for deterring plagiarism that have been found to be effective elsewhere in the world, such as setting individual assignments and mentoring students to improve their writing skills. Even in this difficult economic climate, at the first opportunity funding should be provided to alleviate this problem, perhaps through employment of more teaching assistants in universities.

8.2   Institutionally

8.2.1   Higher Education institutions should maintain records of cases of academic misconduct and sanctions applied to students, at all levels of education, as a means of monitoring repeat cases of plagiarism and consistency and fairness of approach.

8.2.2   Each institution should conduct an internal review of their policies and procedures for both detecting and deterring academic misconduct to determine whether

> All suspected cases of academic dishonesty, at all levels, are being followed up;
> Cases identified are dealt with in a consistent manner;
> Students found are provided with information, support and guidance to discourage accidental plagiarism;
> Equivalent penalties are being applied for similar cases of misconduct.

8.2.3   Holistic and consistent institutional policies should be developed to address any deficiencies identified in the course of the review recommended in 8.2.2, aided by reference to similar developments elsewhere (Carroll and Appleton 2001, Macdonald and Carroll 2006, Neville, 2010, Park 2004, Morris 2011).

8.2.3   Institutions should encourage academic research into aspects of academic integrity with a view to developing more effective approaches and highlighting good practice.

8.2.4   Institutions should consider purchasing licenses for effective software tools for aiding the detection of student plagiarism through text matching.

8.2.5   Where electronic submission of work has been introduced it should apply to all text-based written work, not just dissertations. Furthermore, policies and regulations should be developed to ensure the tools are used appropriately, their limitations understood and the outputs interpreted correctly.

8.2.6   Institutions should ensure all students have received training and information about

> Policies and procedures for academic integrity;
> The consequences of academic dishonesty or plagiarism;
> Referencing and citations techniques;
> Use of sources and paraphrasing;

8.2.7   Institutions should consider involving students in the development of institutional policies and procedures for quality and academic integrity.

8.2.8   Institutions should consider point 8.1.7 and look for ways of reducing the staff-student ratio.

8.3   Individual academics

8.3.1   Students should be provided with appropriate information about

> Policies and procedures for academic misconduct;
> The nature of plagiarism and its consequences;
> How to maximise their chances of achieving a high grade through scholarly activities.

8.3.2   Academic teaching staff should be encouraged to engage in continuing professional development (CPD) in order to improve their academic practice (including pedagogy, innovative methods of assessment, understanding, handling plagiarism and academic integrity) and regularly objectively reflect on and evaluate their own teaching and the student experience.

8.3.3   Academic teaching staff should consult regularly with colleagues within and across institutions, to ensure best practice in aspects of deterring student plagiarism is widely disseminated, including introduction of software tools for aiding detection of plagiarism and for formative learning.

8.3.4   Suspected cases of plagiarism and academic dishonesty should be identified and dealt with fairly and transparently according to consistent institutional procedures.

8.3.5   Academic staff interested in the IPPHEAE research may wish to consider conducting research and development on this subject about Hungary.

9.   Conclusions

Hungary has a good opportunity to build on the existing infrastructure in its HE sector and learn from the experience of other countries in the areas of quality assurance and academic integrity. Although the economic climate is difficult, some investment will be needed to ensure the resulting systems are appropriate and proportional to meet evolving challenges in safeguarding academic integrity.

All members of the higher education sector and community, from government ministers to students, have a role to play in the development of equitable polices and systems for assuring and enhancing academic standards in Hungary.

References

Bonaccorsi, A., Brandt, T., De Filippo, D. Lepori, B., Molinari, F., Niederl, A. Schmoch, U., Schubert, T., Slipersaeter, S. (2010) *Feasibility Study for Creating a European University Data Collection* (EUMIDA project report and dataset) http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/docs/en/eumida-final-report.pdf   [28/05/2013]

Carroll, J. and Appleton, J. (2001) *Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide* [online] available from <www.plagiarismadvice.org/documents/brookes.pdf> [06/12/11]

Davis, M. (2009). The role of Turnitin within the formative process of EAP: a tool for global academic culture. *BALEAP 2007 Conference Proceedings*

Füzessi, K. (2013) *Higher Education under threat in Hungary.* Opendemocracy.net web site*, 11/02/2-13.* http://www.opendemocracy.net/k%C3%A1roly-f%C3%BCzessi/higher-education-under-threat-in-hungary [Accessed 24/07/13]

Hungarian Accreditation Committee (2013) HAC Strategy 2013-15, downloaded from
http://www.mab.hu/web/index.php?lang=en [accessed 24/07/13]

Ireland, C.,English, J. (2011). Let them plagiarise: Developing Academic Writing in a Safe Environment. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 1(1) 165-172

JISC Electronic Plagiarism Project: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/plagiarism/archive/detection.aspx [accessed 23/04/2013]

Kopi text similarity and plagiarism checker: http://kopi.sztaki.hu/index.php?check=0 [accessed 24/07/13]

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.

NARIC web site: http://enic-naric.net/index.aspx?c=Hungary

Neville, C. (2010). *The Complete Guide to Referencing and Avoiding Plagiarism.* Open University Press.

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.

Morris, E., *Policy Works* (2011) Higher Education Academy for England
http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/academicintegrity/policy_works.pdf [accessed 06/05/13]

Rowell, G. (2009) *A National Strategy for Ensuring Authenticity in Student Work,* EDULearn13 Conference, Barcelona, Spain 6th-8th July 2009

Singh, M., Marcucci, P. (2008) *Higher Education Finance and Cost-Sharing in Hungary.*
http://gse.buffalo.edu/org/inthigheredfinance/files/country_profiles/europe/hungary.pdf [Accessed 24/07/13]

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

Tennant, P. and Duggan, F. (2008) *Academic Misconduct Benchmarking Research Project: Part 2. The Recorded Incidence of Student Plagiarism and the Penalties Applied*. UK: The Higher Education Academy and JISC.

Wikipedia, Schmitt (2012) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/P%C3%A1l_Schmitt_academic_misconduct_controversy [accessed 8/8/2013]

Author: Irene Glendinning

With contributions from Anna Michalska and Stella-Maris Orim

October2013

PPHEAE

Annex HU-1: Responses to question 5: (1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree)

Table 16: Student and teacher responses to questionnaire Question 5 (percentages) (S n=5; T n=21)

Qu	Disagree (1,2)		Don't know		Agree (4,5)		Question
	student	teacher	student	teacher	student	teacher	
S5a T5a	0%	5%	0%	10%	100%	85%	Students receive training in techniques for scholarly academic writing and anti-plagiarism issues
S5b T5p	80%	41%	20%	19%	0%	31%	I would like to have more training on avoidance of plagiarism and academic dishonesty
S5c T5b	0%	5%	20%	14%	80%	81%	This institution has policies and procedures for dealing with plagiarism
T5c		5%		29%		67%	I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism prevention
T5d		10%		43%		47%	I believe this institution takes a serious approach to plagiarism detection
S5d T5e	0%	10%	40%	29%	60%	62%	Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to students
T5f		10%		19%		71%	Plagiarism policies, procedures and penalties are available to staff
S5e T5g	0%	15%	40%	19%	60%	62%	Penalties for plagiarism are administered according to a standard formula
S5f T5h	40%	19%	20%	10%	40%	71%	I know what penalties are applied to students for different forms of plagiarism and academic dishonesty
S5g T5i	40%	62%	40%	19%	20%	19%	Student circumstances are taken into account when deciding penalties for plagiarism
S5h T5m	20%	15%	20%	24%	60%	62%	The institution has policies and procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty
T5j		39%		14%		47%	The penalties for academic dishonesty are separate from those for plagiarism
T5k		38%		38%		19%	There are national regulations or guidance concerning plagiarism prevention within HEIs in this country
T5l		38%		52%		5%	Our national quality and standards agencies monitor plagiarism and academic dishonesty in HEIs
S5i T5n	60%	29%	0%	19%	40%	38%	I believe one or more of my teachers/colleagues may have used plagiarised or unattributed materials in class notes
S5j	0%		20%		80%		I have come across a case of plagiarism committed by a student at this institution
S5k T5o	80%	81%	0%	14%	20%	5%	I believe I may have plagiarised (accidentally or deliberately)
S5l T5q	0%	48%	40%	48%	40%	0%	I believe that all teachers follow the same procedures for similar cases of plagiarism
S5m T5r	20%	29%	20%	33%	60%	34%	I believe that the way teachers treat plagiarism does not vary from student to student
S5n T5s	0%	38%	0%	33%	100%	29%	I believe that when dealing with plagiarism teachers follow the existing/required procedures
S5o T5t	0%	10%	40%	10%	60%	81%	It is possible to design coursework to reduce student plagiarism
S5p T5u	0%	10%	40%	33%	60%	57%	I think that translation across languages is used by some students to avoid detection of plagiarism
S5q	40%		0%		40%		The previous institution I studied was less strict about plagiarism than this institution
S5r	0%		0%		100%		I understand the links between copyright, Intellectual property rights and plagiarism