

Plagiarism Guideline - UMIT TIROL

(adopted by UMIT TIROL's Senate on 13.11.2012; last amended on 13.05.2014)

Section 1 – Plagiarism

1.1 Definition of plagiarism¹

„Plagiarism is understood as the use or imitation of other people’s work, either wholly or partially, without acknowledging the source and the author. In principle, plagiarism is a violation (third party plagiarism) or a misuse (self-plagiarism) of the copyright. Nevertheless, plagiarism as a scientific indiscretion is unrelated to and not the same as copyright infringement. Short passages from another author may be quoted; but this is subject to the requirement that the quotation is marked as such and the source is cited.

The following acts constitute cases of plagiarism in the scientific sense:

- a) The author submits a piece of work under his or her own name that he or she commissioned another person to write (ghost writer).
- b) The author submits the work of another person under his or her own name (complete plagiarism).
- c) The author submits the same piece of work (or parts thereof) for different publications, examinations or course assignments without referring to the original source (self-plagiarism).
- d) The author translates foreign language texts, or parts of foreign language texts, and submits these as his or her own work without acknowledgement of the source (translation plagiarism).
- e) The author uses extracts from another’s text without citing the source. This also covers the use of texts and parts of texts from the Internet without citation of the source.
- f) The author uses parts of another’s text and makes slight changes by altering a few words or their order (paraphrasing – see section 1.3) without acknowledgement of the source.
- g) The author uses parts of another’s text, paraphrases them and does indeed cite the relevant source, but not in the context of the adopted part or parts of the text (for

1

The basic text for point 1.1 was adopted from the „Information Sheet on the Treatment of Plagiarism“ published by the Teaching Committee of the University of Zurich and was then supplemented accordingly. We thank the President of the Teaching Committee Zurich, Univ. Prof. Dr. Otfried Jarren, for his permission to use the modified information sheet.

- example: concealment of the plagiarised source in a footnote at the end of the work).
- h) The author is mentioned as co-author in a scientific work without making his/ her personal contribution according to the principles of good scientific practice (fake authorship).

It is a fundamental principle of academic ethics that the ideas, words and theories of others as well as one's own, and third party or ceded copyrights should be attributed in the form of a citation, even if they are only used in the form of an analogy. The individual disciplines have their own particular regulations regarding citations which should be adhered to when submitting academic texts.

This requirement is, as a rule, waived for what is termed 'textbook' knowledge, i.e. common knowledge that may be presupposed in a particular discipline. However, if the presentation of this 'textbook' knowledge is taken from another author (e.g. from a particular textbook), then the source must be cited."

(http://www.lehre.uzh.ch/plagiate/20110314_LK_Plagiarism.pdf, as per 10.02.2009)

1.2 Prevention of plagiarism²

„Appropriately document your source whenever you use somebody else's apt phrase, text or idea. Make sure that you do this fully and consistently. When working on secondary literature and taking notes, carefully distinguish between your own thoughts and material you have found somewhere. If you are in doubt how to cite correctly ask your supervisor for the particular citation rules for the respective discipline.“

(https://engsem.unibas.ch/fileadmin/engsem/user_upload/redaktion/regulations/plagiarism.pdf, as per 01.04.2008)

Notwithstanding, it is always possible to screen the respective works with UMIT TIROL's plagiarism software (remark: during upload, the thesis will be saved on the plagiarism software database, copyright, however, will not be affected). Also supervisors and reviewers of the respective thesis are entitled to screen it. In this context, the student agrees that UMIT TIROL reserves the right to forward his/ her thesis to a third party as part of a plagiarism assessment and that the work will stay with this third person for future assessment if necessary. For further details please refer to umit.at/course/view.php?id=351.

2 The basic text for points 1.2. resp. 1.3. was adopted from the information sheet for the further description of plagiarism by the Philosophical-Historical Faculty of the University of Basel. We thank the Dean of Studies of the Philosophical-Historical Faculty of the University of Basel, Univ. Prof. Dr. Jürg Glauser, for his permission to use the modified information sheet.

1.3 Examples³

Original-Passage:

The poem requires our close attention and, if possible, our unriddling because it is a powerful symbolic enactment of the psychological dilemma facing the intelligent and aware woman, and particularly the woman artist, in patriarchal America.

Version 1:

The poem is a powerful symbolic enactment of the psychological dilemma facing the intelligent and aware woman, and particularly the woman artist, in patriarchal America.

Comment: Obvious plagiarism. Word-for-word repetition without acknowledgment.

Version 2:

The poem requires our close attention and, if possible, our unriddling because it is a powerful symbolic enactment of the psychological dilemma facing the intelligent and aware woman, and particularly the woman artist, in patriarchal America (Gelpi 124).

Comment: Still plagiarism. Indicating the source from which you have taken the idea is not enough. The language is the original author's, and only quotation marks around the whole passage plus the reference in brackets would be correct (see "Version 4" below).

Version 3:

Emily Dickinson's poem enacts the psychological dilemma facing the intelligent female writer in patriarchal America.

Comment: Still plagiarism. A few words have been changed or omitted, but the student is not using his or her own language and does not cite the source.

Version 4:

"The poem requires our close attention and, if possible, our unriddling because it is a powerful symbolic enactment of the psychological dilemma facing the intelligent and aware woman, and particularly the woman artist, in patriarchal America" (Gelpi 124).

Comment: Correct. The quotation marks acknowledge the words of the original writer and the information in bracket tells us the source of the quote. (The complete bibliographical reference must be given in the list of works cited).

Version 5:

Emily Dickinson's poem must be read in a figurative way. According to Albert Gelpi, the poet uses symbolic language in order to metaphorically express "the psychological dilemma" 3 female artists like herself experienced in nineteenth-century "patriarchal

³ Vgl. FN2.

America" when the writing of poetry was regarded as a male prerogative (124).

Comment: Correct. The student uses his or her own language in order to paraphrase Gelpi's opinion, puts the original words in quotation marks, and indicates the source. He/ she uses Gelpi's opinion for the development of his or her own argument. (The complete bibliographical reference must be given in the list of works cited).

Version 6:

Emily Dickinson's poem must be read in a figurative way. The poet uses symbolic language in order to express the quandary of female artists such as experienced in the society of nineteenth-century America, which regarded the writing of poetry as a male prerogative (Gelpi 124).

Comment: Correct. The student uses his or her own language in order to paraphrase Gelpi's statement and indicates the source. Gelpi's opinion is used to develop the student's own argument. (The complete bibliographical reference must be given in the list of works cited).

(https://engsem.unibas.ch/fileadmin/engsem/user_upload/redaktion/regulations/plagiarism.pdf, as per 01.04.2008)

1.4 Adopting one's own texts (prevention of self-plagiarism)

When adopting someone else's text literally, the adopted passage shall always be placed in commas, whereas in case of the reuse of one's own text an unmistakable textual indication shall be included in the text. Also in this case the adopted passage (beginning and the end of the citation) must be clearly identifiable. The textual indication has to precede the adopted passage.

Examples for the clear textual indication of reused texts ([source] refers to the author's own text):

- a) The following section 3.7 is adopted from [source].
- b) This section and the two following sections represent a revised version of the implementations from [source, section 2].
- c) The presentation of this section largely follows [source].

Section 2 – procedure and consequences of plagiarism

2.1 Plagiarism in written homework and seminar papers

Cases of plagiarism in written homework and seminar papers shall be communicated to the respective Study and Examination Board (STUKO). The examiner forwards the respective work to STUKO specifying the substantial facts. For now, the work shall be graded „insufficient“. The student is then free to make use of the right provided for in the Study and Examination Regulations to „object“ to the assessment, and additionally has the right to “express his/ her opinion to the suspicion of plagiarism”. If STUKO classifies the homework or seminar paper under consideration of the substantial facts as plagiarism according to section 1.1, the incident has to be recorded in the student file. The work shall be classified as insufficient and has to be repeated entirely.

2.2 Plagiarism in academic final theses (Bachelor’s and Master’s theses)

Cases of plagiarism in academic final theses shall be communicated to the responsible Study and Examination Board. The examiner forwards the respective work to STUKO specifying the substantial facts. For now, the work shall be graded „insufficient“. The student shall receive the assessment including a short description of the facts for a comment (time limit four weeks) in accordance with the right to be heard. Then, STUKO shall find a decision based on the facts at hand. If the suspicion of plagiarism is confirmed the work shall be assessed „insufficient“. This assessment is regarded as failed attempt according to the applicable Study and Examination Regulations. The number of retrials depends on the provisions stated in these Regulations.

If STUKO decides in a given case that it is a case of plagiarism but that there has been no significant fraudulent intent – see the implementations in section 3 – STUKO can in this case refrain from the assessment "insufficient" and the student shall have the possibility to revise and resubmit his/ her work. In this case the attempt will not be counted as failed attempt.

Upon request of the student, STUKO can decide if the work may be repeated once. If the suspicion is not confirmed, the procedure (assessment, oral examination etc.) will continue according to the respective Study and Examination Regulations.

If STUKO classifies the academic final theses as plagiarism according to section 1.1, the incident has to be recorded in the student file.

2.3 Plagiarism in doctoral theses

Plagiarism in doctoral theses shall be communicated to the respective Doctoral Affairs Committee. The examiner forwards the respective work to the Doctoral Affairs Committee specifying the substantial facts. For now, the work shall be graded

„insufficient“. The student shall receive the assessment including a short description of the facts for a comment (time limit four weeks) according to the right to be heard. Then, the Doctoral Affairs Committee shall find a decision based on the facts on hand. If the suspicion of plagiarism is confirmed the work shall be assessed „insufficient“ and the student shall be exmatriculated. He/ she cannot be accepted for any other UMIT TIROL study programme. If the suspicion is not confirmed, the procedure (assessment, oral examination etc.) will continue according to the respective Doctoral Regulations. If the Doctoral Affairs Committee classifies the doctoral thesis as plagiarism according to section 1.1, the incident has to be recorded in the student file. If the Doctoral Affairs Committee learns about a case of plagiarism in a scientific paper written by the student which is not part of the doctoral thesis, the Committee may treat it equally to a case of plagiarism in the doctoral thesis and may act as described above. The Doctoral Affairs Committee is not obliged to search for cases of plagiarism outside the doctoral thesis autonomously.

2.4 Plagiarism in habilitation theses

Plagiarism in habilitations shall be communicated to the Habilitation Committee. The Committee decides on the further steps and informs UMIT TIROL's Senate. If the Habilitation Committee classifies the habilitation thesis as a case of plagiarism according to section 1.1, two external reviewers shall additionally assess the matter, they shall decide whether the presented work or parts of it are to be classified as plagiarism in terms of section 1.1 of UMIT TIROL's Plagiarism Guideline. The scientific advisory board shall be informed about this procedure.

If both reviewers decide that there is no evidence of plagiarism, the habilitation procedure has to be continued by the Habilitation Committee. Else the habilitation procedure has to be terminated at this point. The affected habilitation applicant cannot submit another habilitation request at UMIT TIROL.

If the Habilitation Committee learns about a case of plagiarism in a scientific paper written by the habilitation applicant which is not part of the habilitation thesis, the Committee may treat it equally to a case of plagiarism in the habilitation thesis and may act as described above. The Habilitation Committee is not obliged to search for cases of plagiarism outside the habilitation thesis autonomously.

2.5 Plagiarism in appeal, qualification and appointment procedures

Here, the standardised procedure indicated in point 2.4 shall apply. In any case, the procedure will be led by UMIT TIROL's Senate and the Rector instead of the Habilitation Committee.

Section 3 – relevance of plagiarism

The relevance of plagiarism related to the classification as scientific plagiarism according to section 1.1 shall be decided on by the respective committees mentioned in section 2.

The assessment standard for plagiarism, according to the academic concept, increases with the academic importance of the respective work in quantitative (extent/ percentage of the plagiarised text), qualitative (relevance of the plagiarised text concerning the topic) and formal (vagueness in citation) terms. Thus, when assessing a case for plagiarism, at first it is necessary to determine extent, quality and form of the plagiarism, then the respective committee, under the principle of the assessment of evidence, has to prove if deceit results from plagiarism or if there are other reasons (in particular negligence or lack of experience) that have caused the plagiarism, whereby also here the assessment standard depends on the importance of the work. The respective committees shall in any case justify their decisions, and, in particular, document transparent and understandably the assessment standard applied by them.

Section 4 – further legal consequences

A breach of the Plagiarism Guideline may result in consequences concerning industrial law, public services law, study law, criminal and civil law in accordance with the applicable legislation.

Hall in Tirol, 13.11.2012



Univ.-Prof. Dr. Rainer Schubert
Senate Chairperson



Univ.-Prof. Dr. Christa Them
UMIT TIROL Rector