

WHY STUDENTS PLAGIARIZE: INTENT, UNAWARENESS, OR SPECIFIC IDENTITY?

By
Igor Mikeschin

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Balázs Vedres
Second reader: Jean-Louis Fabiani

Budapest, Hungary
2011

Abstract

The thesis focuses on student written plagiarism as a research problem. From prior research on plagiarism and scientific knowledge I developed three hypotheses: intentional plagiarism as an easy way to perform an assignment, unintentional plagiarism caused by misleading flow of digital texts, unawareness of instructions, and lack of feedback, and different identity of students, as opposed to scholars. The latter hypothesis was implicitly suggested by some of the authors on plagiarism in academia, but was not properly tested. I base my analysis on the interviews I conducted with the Law students of two graduate schools, Central European University in Budapest and Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences.

Acknowledgments

There are many people directly or indirectly contributed to my work. I selected four main groups: informants, organizers, academic advisers, and inspirers. Some people combined two or three roles from my list, thus I will only mention their major role for my thesis.

First of all I should thank my informants for being supportive and friendly with me. I appreciate their spending time with me, which was very kind of them, regarding their overloaded schedule. They were all cheerful and sincere, and wished me luck all the time. Thank you for your time and patience!

My Moscow part of research would be impossible without an access granted to my by the dean of the faculty of Law at Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences Dmitry Dozhdev, faculty manager Irina Volodina, and Vasily Zharkov, professor of sociology. I should also thank Katerina Guba, Feline Perrenet, and Teresa Lerch for their support. I am particularly indebted to the anonymous student in Budapest, who introduced me to many of his classmates and arranged two of my interviews, including the one he gave me.

I owe numerous pieces of advice and feedback to my advisers, Balázs Vedres and Jean-Louis Fabiani, my thesis writing instructor Alexandra Kowalski, and my academic writing instructor Eszter Timár. They all expressed great interest to my work, provided support, and showed patience.

This list would not be full without mentioning my inspirers, who supported me in much more various ways than they even know. These are my friends and classmates: Nicole Peloquin, Alexandra Kasatkina, Whitney Russell, and Tetiana Tsybulnyk. My family members did not merely supported me both morally and materially, but were also critical and patient to me. They are: Tatiana Artemyeva, Mikhail Mikeshin, Ludmila Mikeshina, Olga Mikeshina, and Sofia Mikeshina.

My studies were supported with CEU full MA scholarship. My research was funded by the grant from CEU foundation.

Table of Contents

"It is a rule that students copy-paste": Introduction.....	1
"Plagiarism is in the eye of the beholder"?: Establishing the field	4
Previous research on plagiarism	4
Men of science: The construction of the identity of scholars	9
Summary: Three hypotheses and research direction.....	12
"Do you have anything else to share with me?": Cases and methods.....	13
Pilot research.....	13
Cases.....	14
Methods	15
Overall impressions, advantages, and limitations of the cases	16
"And this is how plagiarism occurs": Data analysis and hypotheses testing.....	19
First hypothesis: Intentional plagiarism	25
Second hypothesis: Unawareness	26
Third hypothesis: Specific identity	32
Summary.....	36
"The more you become famous, the less you need a citation": Conclusion	38
References.....	40
Appendix.....	44

"It is a rule that students copy-paste"¹: Introduction

On the Internet, newspapers, underground stations, or even in Russian schools of every level one can easily find a leaflet, commercial, or ad advertising the ready-made, unique papers with all possible guarantees (See figure 1). Plagiarism or cheating is the widespread practice to get a degree in contemporary Russia. Students are demotivated by their professors, involved in plagiarism scandals. For example, the dean of the faculty of Sociology in the biggest and traditionally leading Russian university, Moscow State University, was proved plagiarizing (Radaev, 2007; Adamskiy et al, 2007), though he still holds his chair and even was awarded as a *distinguished member of higher education of Russian Federation* (Sociological Faculty of MSU Named After Lomonosov, website).



Figure 1. A flyer I picked at Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences in April 2011. It says: "VIP. Final thesis, term paper, library-research paper to order. VIP exclusive². Phone number (495) 728-3241. Individually ordered fulfillment (as distinct from the cheap works or ordered in the Internet) Quality is guaranteed!"

Plagiarism is an actual problem not merely in higher education. Many scandals and trials constantly reveal plagiarism in art, media, literature, and academia. Various professionals, namely lawyers, university professors, policemen, designers, politicians, musicians, or writers, either commit plagiarism in their work or also struggle against it. The problem of plagiarism involves numerous emotional and controversial issues of authorship, law, morality, ethics, cultural and historical perspectives.

In this huge flow of problems, approaches, and arguments I will focus on student plagiarism as a research problem. I reflected on this problem in my undergraduate research as an underinvestigated topic

¹ Student G in the interview.

² *VIP* and *exclusive* are very popular additions to any kind of ad in Russia, along with *elite* or *unique*. It commonly implies the highest quality of the advertised service or good and suggests a customer should feel as a very important person.

for sociology of scientific knowledge. I was particularly interested in the questions of originality, objectivity, and communality of scientific knowledge. I also encountered plagiarism in my undergraduate studies, when my classmates *copy-pasted* their papers and discussed the ways to avoid detection with each other.

In order to investigate such a vague concept as plagiarism one should look for answers to the three main questions: What is plagiarism? Why is it unacceptable? and How does it occur? The most problematic question with plagiarism is its definition, which is supposed to make clear the difference between appropriate and inappropriate referential practices. The definition of plagiarism should clearly distinguish common knowledge from someone's intellectual property, set the rules and limits for proper referencing, and the penalties for misconduct.

The attitudes to plagiarism can be grouped into two main directions: plagiarism is stealing and plagiarism is avoiding proper performance. Respectively, detection and sanctions are focused on these two criteria. When the authorship rights are the matter of concern, the plagiarist should somehow compensate to the damage, but when it is the improper performance, then the plagiarist should make the work over or simply get dismissed.

Although plagiarism is strictly unacceptable in the dominant Western educational culture, it still very often occurs on every level: undergraduate, graduate, or even scholarly. The main questions concerning the causes of plagiarism are the following: What rules should be applied to referencing? Does intent matter? and What are the main reasons of plagiarism?

I intend to contribute to all these questions in the narrow field of student plagiarism. My main research question is: What are the main intentional and unintentional causes for student plagiarism? The narrower questions, thus, include intention to find an easy way to perform an assignment, students' awareness of rules and proper instructions about them, and understanding of their role in the academia in relation to their application of rules.

In order to answer my questions I interviewed the Masters students in Law at two graduate schools, Central European University in Budapest and Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences. Both

schools are strict about plagiarism, at the same time there are still cases of plagiarism every year. I tested three hypotheses about possible causes of plagiarism: *intentional* plagiarism, *unawareness* of rules caused by lack of instructions and feedback, and *specific identity* misleading students' understanding of proper rules of referencing.

I argue that despite the variety of intentional reasons for students to plagiarize, lack of instructions, feedback, and clarity of rules also play important roles in their referential behavior. Although the students are mostly aware of the concept of plagiarism and possible sanctions for committing it, they can still be unsure about the rules, how to apply them in practice, and where to go for the help. Another significant factor of their misapplication of rules is the identity they construct as distinct from the identity of scholars.

The thesis contains three main parts. In the first part I establish the field of my research, place it into the context of previous research on plagiarism and science studies, and formulate the hypotheses. The second part discusses methodological problems: cases I am focusing on, methods applied, and the limitations of my research. The third part presents my data and analysis. It elaborates on the hypotheses I formulated and suggests possible solutions.

Previous research on plagiarism

The problem of plagiarism, though its definitions and boundaries change in time and space, concerned many individuals holding various positions in business, art, literature, science, politics—everywhere. The concept of authorship and plagiarism as its misattributing is subject to focus on for many social scientists as well, both explicitly and implicitly. Main issues contributing to the theory and history of academic plagiarism could be grouped into three main segments: definitions of plagiarism, plagiarism in time and space, and plagiarism in academia. The first segment, plagiarism in terms, represents theoretical approaches to the concept of plagiarism. This approach usually concerns the limits of authorship and discusses proper referencing. Historical and cultural perspectives on plagiarism are the most spread regards putting the concept into context. However, the issues concerning plagiarism in academia are specific to my interest here. They deal with numerous cases and numerous explanations of plagiarism by both students and their professors. It is obvious that some approaches may contain the two or three elements of my classification simultaneously. However, even those complex issues stress one particular aspect as the major one.

The definition of plagiarism as a misuse of others' pieces of works, putting them as one's own without proper reference, may seem obvious. However, even this narrow and simple looking definition is a result of a long lasting tradition in academic and scientific communities of dealing with this kind of deviance. First of all, the most disputed questions in theoretical approaches to plagiarism are the following: Who sets the boundaries of proper usage of the work of others? What are these boundaries in this particular case? Does intention matter? How can we measure or detect intention? Why does plagiarism happen? How should it be punished? Can we stop plagiarism? or How can we minimize it? The most fruitful one for my research would be the question raised, explicitly or implicitly, by most of authors in my review; it

3 Randall, 2001, p. vii.

was the main criterion for choosing their works for my paper. The question is: What can we learn from looking at the numerous cases of plagiarism?

One of the most notable books on plagiarism is the collection of articles edited by Lise Buranen and Alice M. Roy *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (1999) contributes to all three of the segments. The definitions of plagiarism are regarded in the first part and they are represented by various disciplines. The legal definitions, as observed by Laurie Stearns (1999, p. 5-18), always deal with the final result of what is called "copyright infringement". However, Stearns sees plagiarism as a process, and suggests the concept of "creative contract" as a legal metaphor referring to the "social contract" of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Every time when one creates some intellectual product, according to Stearns, one participates in a legal relationship which is protected by this "creative contract". Thus Stearns sees authorship from the legal standpoint: as a definite concept and subject to concrete determination.

Alice M. Roy interviewed about forty professors from different departments of her university asking them about their definition of plagiarism, the cases of plagiarism in their classes, and their attitude to it ("Why is plagiarism wrong or bad?") (Roy, 1999). Most of interviewees defined plagiarism as stealing or taking. Roy puts the question into postmodern discourse of writer, reader, and text relations: almost every paper, especially after involving writing centers into students' assignments, is a product of collaboration and revision that questions authorship in a serious manner. Thus Roy successfully questions the concept of plagiarism which is commonly taken for granted by her interviewees.

Marilyn Randall in her *Pragmatic Plagiarism: Authorship, Profit, and Power* (2001) goes further and stresses that plagiarism can never be found in the intentions or actions of the author, though she intentionally avoids analyzing plagiarism in academia and focuses on arts and literature. What makes the action plagiarism is its perception by viewers, readers, or any other recipients: "*Plagiarism is in the eye of the beholder*" (Randall, 2001, p. vii. Author's emphasis). She elegantly solves most problems of defining plagiarism, putting it into the phenomenological question: plagiarism appears when something is judged as *plagiarism* and something only becomes plagiarism if it leads to some action. Randall clearly shows

plagiarism as a social construction, which allows her to see it as a pragmatic category: different modes of plagiarism can be used as means of power, for instance, "guerilla plagiarism" is the way to subvert the dominant ideology to use it in political struggle.

Sue Clegg and Abbi Flint try to analyze plagiarism in a similar way as Randall does: to place a phenomenological question "What is plagiarism in its appearing?" (Clegg and Flint, 2006) They argue against the moral absolutism of judging plagiarism in contemporary British education. They show that students and professors mostly have different understandings of the difference between, say, acceptable paraphrasing and plagiarizing. Those differences commonly lie not merely in disciplinary boundaries and academic regulations, but in personal values of a particular student with his/her academic, cultural, and social background.

The cultural background of students is subject to focus for several authors on plagiarism, placing it into historical and cultural context, i.e. into *time and space*. Since I am concentrating on the particular cases in particular cultural frames the cultural differences between extreme examples may not be relevant to my research. However, it is still important to note that every definition of plagiarism evolves from the concrete cultural tradition, though variously defined and traced (e.g. Scollon, 1995; Pennycook, 1996; Buranen, 1999).

Plagiarism in academia is not the only issue that attracts attention of authors on plagiarism studies. However, it is probably the most heated one, since scientists seem to be the most authoritative source of expert knowledge. If scientists cheat, lie, or steal and it becomes visible, people may lose their trust in science, and science itself may also lose proper funding.

The most notable book on plagiarism in science is Marcel C. LaFollette's *Stealing into print: fraud, plagiarism, and misconduct in scientific publishing* (1992). The author concentrates on scientific journals as a case, examining the evaluation and review system in American science, namely, the effectiveness and ability to respond to numerous efforts of misconduct. This system, LaFollette argues, often fails to keep a balance between preserving the freedom of expression and authorship, just because those two issues may contradict each other. LaFollette deeply and accurately investigates such a vague concept as plagiarism

from various standpoints, namely the evaluating systems in contemporary science, self-representations of scientists, and moral and political measurement of scientific misconduct.

Horace F. Judson, in turn, approaches plagiarism in academia mostly from the moral standpoint. In his complex cultural-historical research (2004) he places fraud in science into the context of contemporary Western culture. He involves a huge amount of historical material with many cases of fraud in business, politics, and contemporary science arguing that all culture of Western society encourages scientists to cheat. The state as well as corporate funding of most important scientific projects demands better results in a shorter time; and the examples of Enron or the Catholic Church pedophilic scandals, Judson claims, represent the culture that presupposes any fraud and crime to be financially and politically covered. He concludes that scientists are much more interested in the final result than in the process of discovery. Judson thus has a one-sided moral regard on plagiarism, mostly judging, rather than truly analyzing it.

In his article Matthew C. Woessner (2004) also places plagiarism into contemporary culture, although he focuses on academia. He argues that academic regulations often force students to plagiarize. Using mathematical models in different cases (honest work, successful plagiarism, failed plagiarism) Woessner calculates the benefits and losses of plagiarism. He concludes that the strict punishment for plagiarism is much less than student's benefits from successful plagiarizing. Woessner's article represents a fruitful application of quantitative approaches to plagiarism, without any moral judgements.

Walter Enders and Gary A. Hoover according to the survey they conducted with economic journal editors (2004) argue that plagiarists are more likely to submit their papers in well-known journals and the editors mostly avoid making plagiarism public. The editors also, authors claim, would like to have a code of ethics for their discipline, like many other disciplines have, to have their guidelines for struggling with plagiarism and using more concrete sanctions. Thus Enders and Hoover not just approach plagiarism rationally, but also disclose the weaknesses of the referee system in one particular discipline, economics.

Susan D. Blum conducted an ethnographic study (2009) in her home university, Notre Dame. What she found is that students plagiarize not because of their immorality or disinterestedness with studies, as they are mostly very conscious about morality and motivated. There are many problems that cause their

plagiarizing. They are mostly in a hurry, being involved in lots of enterprises simultaneously. They are concerned about the evaluation of their work, which is literally the demand of the best performance by their parents and professors. And, most of all, they are disoriented in a huge word culture. They write and read blogs, emails, Internet pages, academic papers, which have absolutely different criteria of proper borrowing of others' words. However, every case of plagiarism, according to Blum, involves so many different factors that it is misleading to apply the 20th century values and methods to investigate 21st century student behavior. The concept of plagiarism is changing also, so the ethnographic study with the emphasis on estrangement was the way for Blum to understand the distant culture of contemporary students. Almost every researcher on plagiarism is seriously concerned about its digital forms. However, Blum clearly shows that these forms not merely allow students to find many new ways to cheat, they even construct the radically new environment, where the concept of authorship becomes even more vague.

Irene L. Clark in her chapter about writing centers in American universities (1999) describes the attitude of the faculty in University of Southern California. Clark presents a fresh view on writing centers work as one of the possible reasons of students plagiarism, though one of their main goals is to prevent it. From the late 70s even until 90s, she claims, the faculty was often against writing centers, decreasingly though. They accused writing centers of direct intervention into the content of papers, into professors' instruction, doing most of the job for students, and presenting the students works in a much better way than they are really able to do. In other words, many professors claimed that writing centers' assistance helps students to plagiarize. Clark distinguishes tutoring and editing the student's paper. Some of the writing instructors not just pointed out students' mistakes and fallacies but also wrote correct forms for them. Thus, there is a controversy in the role of writing centers: the purpose of establishing them is improving students' writing skills, including their ability to do proper references, and, at the same time, writing centers are often suspected of helping them plagiarize.

To summarize, there are two main groups of causes to plagiarize, which I select from the literature review: *intentional* misconduct, unintentional plagiarism caused by *lack of awareness*, and *different*

identity of scholars and students as one more possible reason. I will develop these three directions into hypotheses, which I will test in my empirical part.

Intention is the most widely spread explanation for plagiarism (LaFollette, 1992; Stearns, 1999; Judson; 2004; Enders and Hoover, 2004) and student plagiarism as well (Woessner, 2004). Students plagiarize because of lack of control, finding an easy way, saving time and effort, and trying to get a better grade.

Unintended plagiarism is mostly explained by students' unawareness about using sources and references. They either lack the required skills of using other's work (Clark, 1999) or are confused about a very vague concept of authorship (Roy, 1999; Buranen, 1999; Randall, 2001), which applies differently in different ways of communication and presentation and changes through time (Blum, 2010).

Thirdly, students may have different understandings of proper reference because of their different identity, in comparison to scholars (Scollon, 1995; Clegg and Flint, 2006). The identity of scholars prescribes particular rules of using each other's work, whereas students may not share this identity. Thus, the concept of plagiarism in respect to scholars may not be applied by students to their own work. This hypothesis was not seriously considered in the literature on plagiarism, hence it will be my contribution to test whether different identity of scholars and students can give an explanation to the student plagiarism.

Men of science: The construction of the identity of scholars

Considering students' identity in relation to the *junior scholar* concept I should define what is regarded as the identity of scholar. In other words, what does it mean to be a scholar? From the scope of science studies approaches I can roughly extract three main directions identifying *men of science*. I will group those directions according to the main elements they suggest as identifying: an access to expert knowledge, sharing scientific norms and values, and belonging to and recognition of scientific community; then I will apply them to define the scholar's identity.

Expert knowledge was the first approach ever to identify scientific knowledge. It started within epistemology and until the first half of the 20th century it does not imply any social or psychological factors affecting knowledge (Popper, 1959). However, in sociology of knowledge and sociology of science the knowledge-based approach to science was deeply influenced by the phenomenology of Alfred Schütz, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann. They identify different realities, namely everyday reality, reality of dreaming, religious reality, scientific reality. Most of those have their intersubjective knowledge shared by everyone who perceive and express it in language. Expert knowledge, which is the ideal type of scientific knowledge, is based on everyday knowledge, but it rejects everything that is taken for granted. Some elements of knowledge become expert only after reflection, which includes justification and testing of any kind (Schütz, 1970; Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

The phenomenological approach to knowledge influenced almost every sociological theory of science. Science and scientific knowledge was previously regarded, in the sociological framework, as influenced by social and psychological factors (Kuhn, 1962; Merton, 1973). Then, after the triumph of phenomenological sociology promoted by Berger and Luckmann (1966), scientific knowledge became regarded not merely as socially influenced but socially constructed (Latour and Woolgar, 1986; Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Bloor, 1991; Shapin, 2008).

The *normative* approach to science was mainly developed by Robert Merton in his model of scientific ethos (1973). In this model Merton reconstructs the system of values in the scientific community: universalism, communalism, disinterestedness, and organized skepticism (Merton, 1973; 270). Those values are prescribed to follow (or to intend to follow) in order to be recognized as a member of the community. However, those values are not merely ideal types, unreachable to follow purely, they also contradict with other values and with everyday practices of scientists, e.g., with originality, authorship, recognition, and social influence on (or social construction of) scientific knowledge. Lately, the normative approach was both criticized and developed into the larger system of roles and rules in science (Bourdieu, 2004; Ziman, 2000).

The identity of scientist as the member of *scientific community* was primarily developed by Thomas Kuhn (1962) and Robert Merton (1973). Kuhn rejects the accumulation of knowledge as the main principle of evolution of scientific knowledge and suggests the revolutionary model instead. The history of science, according to him, is the history of periods of domination of theories and their revolutionary change. Those theories were accepted by the scientific community and this acceptance became a marker for belonging to the particular paradigm, i.e. being a recognized scientist. The paradigm not merely represents a theoretical approach; it is also a framework for a larger community which can identify itself as representing the scientific discipline. Every scientific revolution forms the new community. In the early periods of revolutionary movement, the new-paradigm proponents are marginal, since they do not share the dominant theoretical approach. But if they win they automatically convert conservators into marginals.

For Merton, science is a social institution (Merton, 1973; p. 268), and the practitioners of science, besides infrastructure workers, form scientific community. Respectively, there are insiders and outsiders of science: the groups or individuals that belong or do not belong to the community (Merton, 1973; p. 112). The insiders and outsiders legitimate their condition with specific doctrines: approving the monopoly of specific groups in specific conditions to have an access to knowledge, or manifesting the equal rights to this access, respectively (Merton, 1973; p. 102).

Pierre Bourdieu views the scientific community as a field of symbolic production, i.e. the field of science. This field is a space for permanent competition for the monopoly to represent science. There are two types of cultural capital which are relevant in this competition: administrative and *pure scientific*. Every actor on the field of science has some amount of both, but usually one particular type prevails. The field is also characterized with its ability to resist external influence by any other field: of economy, of politics etc (Bourdieu, 2004).

The scientific community is a subject for many sociologists of science. Their accent, though, is mostly shifted from the classical notion of community to the process of communication and to the network structure. For Niklas Luhmann, deeply influenced with Schütz and Talcott Parsons, science, as well as a

wider concept of society or any other type of reality, is a self-referent system of communications (Luhmann, 1990). Sociology of scientific knowledge (as well as related Science and Technology Studies approach) and network approaches also takes communication as the key-concept in the construction (or manufacturing) scientific knowledge (Latour, 1988; Knorr-Cetina, 1981; Shapin and Schaffer, 1985; Collins, 1998).

Thus, I come up with three major criteria for identifying one as a scholar: (1) the access to and participation in constructing expert (scientific) knowledge, (2) sharing the norms and values of the scientific community, and (3) recognition as a member of this community. I will base my analysis of students' identity and elaborate on my third hypothesis according to these criteria.

Summary: Three hypotheses and research direction

In my literature review on plagiarism and science studies I come up with three main hypotheses: the intent, unawareness, and specific identity of students as the three main causes for plagiarizing. These hypotheses are developed from the recent research on plagiarism and academic community, thus they only represent the already proposed and even somehow tested versions. However, these causes were investigated partly on the example of senior researchers and partly on students, moreover they were mostly based on US and UK universities, i.e. on two leading educational cultures. The variety and number of these cultures can be significant, thus I will test whether these hypotheses work with other examples.

I am going to contribute to the broad question of why students plagiarize. Even though I select three main hypothetical directions from recent research on the issue, the answers I intend to find in my research will not be the only possible ones. The causes for student plagiarism may be much more numerous and various, and I only investigate three main groups of them. There could be more detailed and more recent possible answers, which I leave for future research.

Pilot research

In order to formulate my research questions and problematique, I conducted a pilot research in November 2010. I interviewed six of nine instructors at the Center of Academic Writing at Central European University. Nobody refused to give me an interview, three others were just unavailable at the moment. My main questions to investigate were their ways to distinguish student written intended plagiarism from common knowledge and mistake, their attitude to sanctions for plagiarizing, their definitions of and attitude to plagiarism in general, and concrete cases of student plagiarism they dealt with (See Appendix: table 1). Firstly, three of my interviewees claimed that there are many cases of plagiarism every year, mostly unintentional though. There is only one instructor who has worked for CEU for a long time who said that there are very few cases every year. For two others it is their first year at CEU. All three instructors that have faced many cases of plagiarism made no difference between departments they work with in respect to frequency of plagiarism. Every one of them claimed that the distinction between common knowledge and plagiarism depends on the discipline, and three of them (all have worked for more than 5 years) said it is difficult to distinguish plagiarism from mistake, while two said that it does not matter. The definition of plagiarism as crime or stealing was clearly formulated by two instructors. All instructors preferred educating students and highlighting the suspicious parts to sanctions. Three instructors commonly report the cases of intentional continuous plagiarizing to the Department head (two of them to the professor who gave the assignment as well); two of those three and one who did not mention the Department head would still discuss the problematic pieces with a student.

The pilot research gave me an idea that despite the strictness and clear position about plagiarism (Central European University, 2010; Central European University, 2011) it still occurs relatively often. Secondly, I got the impression that the dichotomy of intentional-unintentional plagiarizing is problematic: there are different opinions on whether intention matters in terms of the definition of plagiarism,

4 Interview question. See Appendix: table 2.

application of sanctions, and specifying the reasons for plagiarizing. Thirdly, according to my pilot research, the background of students plays an important role in their possible plagiarizing behavior.

Cases

I chose two graduate schools as my fieldsites: Central European University (CEU) in Budapest, Hungary and Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences (MSSES) in Russia. There are three main reasons for concentrating on these two schools. Firstly, they are both accessible to me: I was studying at CEU at the moment of research and I am a Russian citizen and native speaker of Russian—the language of instruction at MSSES.

Secondly, MSSES is the only graduate school in Moscow, which is similar to CEU to some extent: it has only graduate education, is focused on the social sciences, and represents the *Western model* of education: the school gives joint degrees with the University of Manchester, education is seriously oriented on the Western tradition (e.g. English language is intensively taught), and it is an official statement of MSSES that the school is combining Russian and Western educational traditions (MSSES, website).

Thirdly, both schools are concerned with plagiarism. I learned about MSSES' concerns from my personal communication with my acquaintances at MSSES and other Russian students and overall situation with plagiarism in Russian academia (Gilinskiy, 2009). I learned the same about CEU in my pilot research. Moreover, from the literature review it became clear that even the highest rated universities in the world have many cases of student plagiarism (Buranen, 1999; Clark, 1999; Roy, 1999; Woessner, 2004; Clegg and Flint, 2006; Blum, 2009), thus I had no doubt about the fitness of my two cases in terms of investigating plagiarism.

In these two schools I focused my research on the departments of Law (in Moscow it is called a Faculty, according to the Russian educational model), because there were only two options of choosing two analogous departments in both schools: Sociology and Law. I did not choose Sociology because at CEU it has a joint program with Anthropology and at MSSES with Political Science. Moreover,

interviewing my classmates and colleagues would affect my research in an unpredictable manner, since my colleagues at MSSES are well aware of the methods I use and my classmates at CEU are also well aware of my research topic. Thus departments of Law were the only possible cases for me at these two schools.

I conducted my research from the 4 to 14 of April 2011 at Budapest, and from the 15 to 30 of April in Moscow. My informants were the Masters students in both schools with some exceptions: two undergraduate students from another university attending Masters course at MSSES once a week, one PhD student at MSSES, one already graduated Masters student at MSSES, and the dean of the Faculty of Law at MSSES. The total numbers of informants were: seven at CEU and six at MSSES (including the dean).

I also attended one lecture on Financial Law at MSSES in order to get an impression about the study process there. The students were very much involved into the discussion and asking questions. They very often record the professor during the class (with professor's permission) and then share the recordings with each other. The students are not merely interested in the topic, they also share their working experience and apply it to the discussion issues: "I had such a case yesterday", "I have a colleague who encountered the same last week", and so on.

Methods

I conducted semi-structured interviews (see Appendix: tables 2-4), recorded them and took notes. I realized that this method would give me much less selection than, for instance, a survey. However, this method was chosen because of three main reasons: the overall vagueness of the concept of plagiarism in terms of definition, application, and detection; my interest in rhetorics used by students for discussing plagiarism; and the flexibility of the method allowing me to apply my informants' understanding of the issue to the investigation immediately. During the interviews I asked many clarifying and additional questions. I also changed the order or dropped some of the questions, according to the responses. For instance, I was planning to ask my informants about the different stages of plagiarism and I even drew a

scale from the *clean* to *100% plagiarist* types of behavior in order to get their definitions. However, this idea did not work with my informants. They preferred to speculate about plagiarism as a definite behavior, without any gradations.

I developed the list of questions for my interview to make it look like a smoothly flowing conversation concerning referencing and plagiarism. At the same time it was implicitly structured and I always tried to keep the discussion following the main line. The structure includes formal introduction, elaborating on three hypotheses, ending formalities, and the linkages between them. The order of questions in the blocks of hypotheses also links different parts with each other. I also added the warm-up questions about my informant's background in order to let them start talking about familiar topic and place their further opinions into context, and the similar positive ending about their future plans. The lists of questions are provided in the Appendix: tables 2-4.

I transcribed the interviews using my personal version of the *F5 Transkriptionssoftware für den Mac*. For the data analysis I used the *Atlas TI* software, version 5.0.66, installed on the CEU computers. In this software I attached keywords to the significant pieces of the interviews and used them for navigating through the interviews during the analysis. My fieldnotes were handwritten in the notebook.

Overall impressions, advantages, and limitations of the cases

As I already mentioned, every informant I interviewed was very busy: either with class assignments and readings in CEU or with their work at MSSSES. CEU students study full-time, thus the possibilities to work besides their classes are very limited. There is evening education at MSSSES: all classes start at 6.30 p.m., except for Saturdays, which gives the students the opportunity to work. Moreover, although there are some stipend possibilities at MSSSES, there are relatively high tuition fees.

The interviews lasted from sixteen to forty four minutes. Since almost all of my informants were either in a rush or had lots of assignments to do, I had to make the interviews shorter. The same reasons forced me to conduct my interviews with three or two persons at the same time, which has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, there is an open discussion and everyone can add something to each

other. On the other hand, I had the possibility to hear much less opinions and gathered much less data than I planned. It is also important to note that Moscow transportation is usually very hard because of the heavy traffic jams and improper connections of the districts with Underground. It can take up to two hours or even two and a half hours to reach some spot from another part of Moscow. Thus, the students can often be late and the classes commonly start about ten or fifteen minutes later than scheduled.

The low number of my informants can be explained with their business: three students at CEU agreed in general but later postponed the interview because of their studies, one student at MSSES did not come to the interview, since the class before which we scheduled it was cancelled, and even the dean once rescheduled our appointment because he could not come in time and had to give a lecture afterwards.

Everyone in both schools was friendly and cooperative, though in a rush and commonly tired. Nobody refused to give me a recorded interview, though five people later postponed them. Nobody forgot about our appointments, though I did not provide for reminding them. One student at CEU introduced me to about seven of his classmates and was very helpful in arranging two interviews (in the first one he himself took part). The friendliness of my MSSES informants was higher than I expected, since Russians can be very suspicious, closed, and even aggressive to strangers. Thus, one of my first questions to the MSSES students (mostly before turning the recorder on) was whether I should address them with *Tbi* [Ty] (casual form of *you* in Russian, analogous to *Tu* in French) or *Bbi* [Vy] (respectful and formal plural form, analogous to *Vous* in French). Everyone agreed to the former. I tried to be as open as I could in expressing my goals and guaranteeing the anonymity to my informants.

My findings and conclusion can be only fully applied to the cases I used: students from two specific graduate schools. Thus, no simple generalizations are possible. However, I formulated my hypotheses in a way of testing some more general assumptions on two specific examples. These assumptions were mentioned by previous authors on plagiarism, reviewed in the previous part, and one of my research questions was: to what extent can we generalize them?

The students from my two cases can be called professionals in a full sense. Most of them work or have worked as lawyers or law consultants and they are all highly motivated in their studies. However, my

empirical cases remain workable, since plagiarism does occur relatively often even in this situation. Hence, there are some reasons for students to plagiarize even within a serious attitude towards a degree. My informants, despite their high motivation, all previously graduated from schools where plagiarism was widespread and mostly neglected by the faculty.

Two schools in my selection are definitely not identical and have three significant differences. Firstly, CEU is much more diverse in terms of nationalities: I interviewed students from different countries, including India, Honduras, Ethiopia, and others. At MSSES every student I met was from some Russian city, though the school also enrolls foreign students if they can speak Russian and are eligible in other formal criteria. Secondly, as I stated before, CEU students study full-time, while at MSSES education is part-time. Thirdly, CEU is significantly bigger in general. It has much more departments and programs and its own premises, while MSSES rents its premises and only has five faculties.

However, these differences did not seriously affect my findings. While data collected at CEU gave me a much more diverse variety of backgrounds, the opinions about reasons for plagiarizing in both schools were almost the same. The more detailed comparison of the two schools will be done in the empirical part.

Another limitation of my cases is that I only focused on the Law students. In Western academic tradition Legal Studies are mostly considered as Humanities, while in Russia they are the kind of so-called *Humanitarian sciences*, along with social sciences, Economics, Philosophy, and so on. Since the classification of Legal Studies is a matter of a concrete tradition, I applied the science studies approach to the construction of the identity of scholar to Legal Studies as an example of academic or scientific community.

The most important limitation is based on the fact that I have no possibility to question *a plagiarist*. Even if some of my informants have ever committed plagiarism in their written work, they would never tell me, and even maybe would not acknowledge it to themselves. Thus the only information I can get for my research represents the standpoint of witnesses, but not the actual actors of the specific behavior called plagiarism.

"And this is how plagiarism occurs"⁵: Data analysis and hypotheses testing

According to the data I collected, CEU and MSSSES appeared to be much more similar, in terms of referential policy, than different. There are, though, some points of comparison: the diversity of the students' background, availability of information about concrete cases of plagiarism, instructions about proper referencing, methods of plagiarism detection, referential practices of students and professors, and the notion of colleague.

Firstly, I have to note that six students at CEU I interviewed was male and one female. At MSSSES the situation was the opposite: two of my interviewees was male (including the dean) and four female. However, at CEU it does not clearly represent the proportion of genders, since I also tried to approach three more female students and they agreed in general, but postponed the interviews because they were busy. At MSSSES this proportion is much more adequate, since in every class I saw (and I also attended one) there were about ten females and one or two males. I also have to state, that I tried to interview any student disregarding his/her race, gender, nationality, or any other factor.

CEU is definitely much more diverse in terms of nationality. I interviewed people from six different continents, while at MSSSES all of my informants were from Russia, though from different cities originally. At CEU I did not interview anyone from the US or UK, where the top-rated universities are situated. Everyone from CEU told me that plagiarism is a big problem in their home countries, and in this respect this case was very similar to MSSSES. For every informant from both schools the problem of plagiarism was much bigger on the undergraduate level, where they all faced it all the time. At Masters level plagiarism still occurs, almost everyone heard "something about somebody", mostly when someone was expelled or someone's misconduct was given as an example by the professor. However, in both schools my informants claimed that they enrolled with serious intentions and plagiarism is unacceptable for them personally.

5 Student G in the interview.

The information about concrete cases of plagiarism at CEU is very much limited, since it is a policy not to disclose it or make it public. I had an impression from the interviews with the Center for Academic Writing staff that it happens almost every year once or twice that somebody is caught in the act. However, the exact number of expulsions or, at least, requests for rewriting papers is unknown. At MSSES the information is more open. The dean at MSSES told me in the interview about two expulsions every year, one student also mentioned two cases this year and two cases in the previous year.

The instructions at CEU were clear and proper for my interviewees, with one exception of a student who claimed that she could not get the concept of common knowledge even in these classes. Everyone said that it is absolutely clear to them how to avoid plagiarism, and even if they are not sure about some particular case they prefer to cite more, just to stay clean. At MSSES the instructions of avoiding plagiarism are mostly clear for students, however there is no clarity in the citation standard required, but there is no strict rule in this respect either, since the papers are never published. Thus these latter kinds of instructions are mostly regarded as recommendations.

The methods used for detecting plagiarism are different in form, but very similar in principle. The professors rely on their intuition, first of all, and on their background when looking for suspicious passages in students' papers. Besides, the Turnitin software is officially adopted at CEU, thus some student papers may go through it. At MSSES professors mostly check suspicious phrases in Google.com, since the Russian analogue of Turnitin, Antiplagiat.ru, has not been purchased for MSSES, and its free version is very limited.

There were differences in students' opinions in two aspects: the referential practices of professors and students and the notion of colleague in respect to students and professors. At CEU it was mostly regarded as normal when students need to cite more sources because they have much less experience compared to scholars. Thus even the concept of common knowledge was case-dependent for them. At MSSES students acknowledged that the situation when scholars cite less than students often occurs, but they saw it as the wrong practice, for them it is not professional.

Table 1. Keywords arranged by four main blocks

Sections	Keywords in Atlas TI	Units of analysis
General information about the two schools	background and plans lots of written assignments cases strictness detection sanctions	background and future plans of the informants quantity of written assignments they have in comparison to their previous studies quantity and description of cases of plagiarism they encountered strictness of professors and schools about citation and plagiarism methods of detection of plagiarism practiced in the two schools sanctions for plagiarism applied in the two schools
<i>Intent hypothesis</i>	educational system legals specificity intent mistake	characteristics and comparisons of educational systems of current and previous degrees of the students specificity of the legal students in terms of referencing and citing reasons to plagiarize intentionally difference between mistake and intentional plagiarism
<i>Unawareness hypothesis</i>	instructions feedback common knowledge power point online rules authorship	characteristics and clarity of instructions the students had feedback they receive from their professors common knowledge and its difference from what needs to be cited referencing and citing in Power Point presentations referencing and citing in online forms: Facebook/VKontakte, blogs, emails difference between rules for referencing in written papers and other forms of writing concept and determination of authorship
<i>Specific identity hypothesis</i>	academic community colleagues hierarchy scholars vs students referencing contribution	Do students consider themselves as a part of the academic community? Do students consider professors to be their colleagues? degree of hierarchy in Legal Studies differences in citing practices of scholars and students value of students' contribution to the discipline

The opinions about the notion of colleague were divided at CEU, while at MSSES the same tendency was shown: at the undergraduate level there is a strong hierarchy, on Masters level the students work hard to approach their professors' scholarly status, and with their dissertations some of them actually achieve it. It is a topic for further research to trace this tendency through the PhD studies [*aspirantura*⁶] in Russia.

The comparisons between the two schools did not show a big difference in respect to the referential and plagiarism-related policy. There were some minor differences in details, mostly related to the funding opportunities and size of the two schools (MSSES has only five departments and it even rents its premises in the bigger university). Thus I am mostly using these two cases not to compare Russian and Hungarian or American case, since they both do not fit into any of these categories, but to test my hypotheses in order to support my arguments.

After transcribing my interviews I input them into the *Atlas TI* software and attached keywords to the main points expressed by my informants. Then I grouped them into four main sections (See table 1): three of them represent my hypotheses and one some general information about the informants and schools. Every keyword became a unit of data, on which I base my further analysis.

General information about the two schools

Although my informants came from different backgrounds, they all attended Law schools at the undergraduate level. Mostly all of them, except for two undergraduate students, have work experience as lawyers or law consultants. The majority are already professional lawyers and have absolutely definite reasons to obtain a Masters degree. Every graduate student I interviewed intends either to work or to apply for a PhD program in Law. Thus they are not just receiving any degree to fulfill formal criteria of university education for some job position, as it is often the case in Russia.

Both schools have a big number of written assignments, compared to the previous schools of my informants. Some of them evaluate the increase as "fifty percent" some as "incomparable". Only one of them, from CEU, stated that he has very few written assignments besides his thesis. My undergraduate

⁶ *Aspirantura* is not identical to the PhD studies, since in Russia there is a German two-degree system: candidate of sciences is a first step (with *aspirantura* as a study and research period) and doctor of sciences is a habilitation degree for senior scholars, who already has a significant work experience and number of publications.

informants were not specific about their impressions about whether there are many written assignments or not, but they named the exact number of their required pages per academic year, thirty. The dean at MSSES said that the Masters students at his school write about two hundred pages per year. According to him, sometimes there are so many assignments that students who failed to do them on time commit plagiarism in their theses in June just because of the rush, and the faculty only finds it out in July, when "it is too late"

When I was asking about some cases of plagiarism my informants may know about, I was basing on my own experience with my undergraduate classmates, who mostly *copy-pasted* the major parts, if not the whole papers, from the Internet without citation, and were explicit about it with each other, including me. Thus I expected to hear about some concrete cases or usual practices, without names. However, no one, except for the professors, told me about any concrete case of plagiarism, committed by his/her classmate. At the same time, they were all aware that it is very often the case in the undergraduate education, no matter what country they represent. Many of them even said that it is the only way to complete the assignments, moreover, it is the way expected from the faculty: "you know, [the] level of plagiarizing wasn't checked at all. So you were supposed to copy-paste whatever you want", "In my country that is not such a big deal. So you copy-paste a lot" (CEU students). One MSSES student was even more explicit about the common copy-pasting behavior:

Student G: It appears to me that it is taken for granted in the universities, or even not just taken for granted, but it is a rule that students copy-paste [списывают] the library-research paper.⁷

Mikeshin: Do you mean it is an unwritten rule?

Student G: You know, there is a...Honestly speaking, I will express my opinion. I don't like such a written assignment in the universities as the library-research paper. I think all this stuff should have been cancelled a long time ago. Because *it sucks!* Everyone knows how library-research papers are written. The student takes three books, or finds some course papers in Google, pays 500 roubles, gets all this stuff, mixes it, removes some words to pretend it's not plagiarism, yes. And actually submits.

⁷ The library-research paper (*referat*) [реферат] is one of the most popular kinds of written assignments for the undergraduate courses of minor significance to the discipline and in high schools. It is usually less than a term paper, and should contain a literature review on some problem with a summary. Typically it is the most popular paper-form available for downloading from the Internet.

When I was asking the students about the explanation the plagiarists use for their behavior, this question was implied in my interview guides, since I was expecting some concrete cases, they did not provide me too many examples. Usually they said that no explanations were needed, since nobody asked for any. The dean at MSSES said that "their excuses were unserious". The undergraduate student told me that the explanations were like "no time, no wish. Not everybody likes to write at all."

Both schools are very strict about plagiarism. According to the dean, MSSES even had a policy of expelling the student after the very first case of plagiarism, but the University of Manchester, which they have a joint degree with, insisted on giving students one more chance, so now they expel them after the second case. Sometimes students even use much more references than needed because of their fear of plagiarizing. There is even a fear of making a mistake: "We became paranoid...an unintended mistake could cost us a degree", "For CEU it's not different. If you accidentally didn't cite, it's your responsibility. So there's not a difference. You didn't cite—you didn't cite, then you plagiarized" (CEU students). It does occur at MSSES, but not so often for the dean: "We had a dissertation of this kind last year, and we had a dissertation of this kind the previous year. But this case is unique, when the person combined almost the whole paper from citations. Which means that he⁸ completely hid behind the other's thoughts"

For the detection of plagiarism at CEU students mostly told me about the *Turnitin* software and professors' experience that helps to determine the words of others. The Center for Academic Writing staff mostly uses Google.com, where they check the suspicious phrases. At MSSES professors do not commonly use the Russian analogue of *Turnitin*, *Antiplagiat*⁹, but mostly rely on Google.com and their experience and intuition. Both schools are strict in terms of sanctions and they expel students committing plagiarism. There are about two or three cases of plagiarism per academic year at the MSSES faculty of Law, according to the dean, and one or two at CEU per one Academic Writing instructor. However, the number varies for different instructors, and they do not actually know what happens with the student after they report the plagiarism he/she committed.

8 The *he or she* form is not used in the contemporary Russian, even in Academia. Commonly *he* is the neutral form without any references to gender.

9 *Antiplagiat* is an online system of plagiarism detection based on the Russian sources. It has limited possibilities in the free version and many professors, who actually do check their students' work, prefer Google.com. MSSES does not purchase the full version of *Antiplagiat*.

First hypothesis: Intentional plagiarism

For testing this hypothesis during my interviews I came up with four key concepts: the specificities of educational systems, specificity of the Legal students, intentional plagiarizing, and the notion of mistake (as compared to the intentional plagiarism). Students at CEU mostly compared its educational system with their undergraduate studies, or describe CEU as a positive example. The majority claimed that in their previous schools copy-pasting from the Internet was a widespread behavior and even the professors were indifferent to it. There is the same situation at Russian undergraduate level, where students are told about plagiarism, but nobody actually checks their papers, according to my informants. The educational system was discussed a lot with Russian students and professor, and it is the most notable difference between the two schools.

Since my cases of two Legal Studies departments could be very specific in relation to formal rules I had a special interest in whether the students studying Law are more careful in using the words of others than other students. Most students and professors did not see any difference between them and any other department in terms of plagiarizing behavior. The Legal Studies use much less Power Point presentations, than, for instance, sociologists, and one student at CEU told me that in the Business Law program they have very few written assignments as well.

The dean at MSSS claimed that he sees no difference between students from different disciplines in respect to plagiarizing: "It is not professional, I am sure. I mean, it is difficult for me to compare, I don't know how it is on the other faculties, but I think no. I mean, I see that it is definitely not a neglect of authorship rights, but mere hooliganism or cheating. It's an attempt to save time."

Intentional plagiarizing was described as an easy way to perform an assignment when the time is too short, when there is a lack of control, or, in the Russian case, when "the students think that *clever words* are expected of them. That is why they plagiarize", and also "because of their laziness" At the same time, one CEU student told me that nobody wants to plagiarize.

I was asking my informants about the difference between intended plagiarism and accidental mistake. Most of my informants stated that intention does not matter much, and if someone forgets to put the reference, one is plagiarizing. However, the dean at MSSSES claimed that it is always easy to determine whether the work was "careless" [небрежливая] or unassisted, and he never faced any difficulties in detecting intent. Some students suggested the quantity of such mistakes as criteria for the detection of plagiarism.

The hypothesis about intentional reasons of plagiarizing seemed obvious to me. It is one of the widest spread explanations of plagiarism in the academic literature, media, informal conversations, and my interviews as well. The intentional reasons my informants named were: laziness, time pressure, desire for a better grade with low self-confidence, and economy of time and efforts when control is weak. Everyone told me about downloading and copy-pasting papers from the Internet, cheating in the exams, cheating with special software, and even buying the paper. Hence, intentionality is still one of the major reasons to plagiarize and a subject for further research.

Second hypothesis: Unawareness

In this block I was asking the students whether they are aware of the rules of citing and referencing, and some problematic issues of authorship. Firstly I asked what kind of instructions they had and if they were clear enough for them. CEU students were absolutely satisfied with the instructions. They said that nothing was missed or unclear. MSSSES students had their instructions about proper referencing too, though not very detailed, as the dean claimed, but good enough for their school, since they do not publish their papers.

In the undergraduate studies for both groups of students there were almost no instructions about referencing. At the same time, the faculty expected proper referencing. It was implied, that students should know the rules from the high school:

Mikeshin: And what are the rules for citing the written sources you have? Did you have some special class or study topic, special instructions?

Undergraduate student: No, no.

Mikeshin: Nothing?

Undergraduate student: No, no. Well, it's implied, I guess, that everyone simply knows it.

Mikeshin: And are your professors strict about references, citation, and plagiarism?

Undergraduate student: Yes, yes.

Mikeshin: And they didn't instruct you how to avoid plagiarism, however they demand it from you. Is it implied that you learned it in high school or what?

Undergraduate student: Yes, I guess so.

In their undergraduate studies there was almost no feedback either. Even if the student was aware of plagiarism and wanted some clarification or advice, it was very hard or even impossible to get:

Student A: Well, [...] the course papers, I remember, we were not taught how to write them. And in my first year, when I wrote the course paper, I was afraid of plagiarizing something. But I didn't really understand a lot in Law. I wrote it for about two months. Finally I wrote something, but I understood that I didn't even look into my topic properly. Because I had no definite questions, I didn't know how to disclose it, how to structure it. Nobody really communicated with us. All the time everything was somehow built on fear to seem a a silly, stupid idiot: to come to the clever professor, who never has time for you. Yes, it was like that.

As my informants claimed, most of the professors on the undergraduate level did not care about students' written work. Thus if the student was not very interested in details and had no serious ambitions, he/she commonly plagiarized a lot. This mostly happened because there was no clear understanding of what is expected from the student:

Student G: I mean, what is a term paper, in principle? The student is required to analyze different positions and give some result, right? But the student commonly understands it like: "I don't need to analyze different positions. I don't need to show that someone said this, the other said that. I have to get rid of all these names and put down their words as mine." And this is how plagiarism occurs.

At the Masters level the feedback is commonly given. At MSSSES, though, there is no feedback from the professors until the paper is submitted. However, after evaluating the paper it is a rule, that a feedback should be given:

Dean: The work can be submitted only once. It is either submitted or not. The drafts are not discussed. The research problems *are* discussed, they are. But there is no preliminary evaluation. There isn't. Imagine someone comes with a draft, but

we don't like it. So what? Does it mean we already evaluated it? No, it cannot be like this.

[...]

Dean: There is no tutoring on the Masters program. Tutoring belongs to the undergraduate level. It is implied, that anyone knows. Well, there is a risk at some moment, yes. One submits and receives, say, 58 [of 100]. But we have a feedback, it is known why 58.

After the questions about instructions and feedback I tried to find out about their understanding of *common knowledge*. I have to note, that there is no such concept in everyday Russian, hence I formulated it as a *well-known fact* [общеизвестный факт] and I also usually mentioned *common knowledge* in English. Most of the students did not have any difficulties with the facts that do not need to be cited, except for one CEU student. However, everyone agreed that if one is not sure whether it is common or not, one would better cite some source to be secure. In this case it is usually treated not as a minor mistake, but as not a mistake at all, according to them. However, the dean at MSSSES argued against the extreme: when the whole paper is combined from citations, without any original work.

The students, except for the one mentioned, did not have any problems with defining common knowledge as well:

Mikeshin: And how about the common knowledge? How do you know if it's common knowledge and you don't have to cite it?

Student: Um, common knowledge is something that wouldn't require any kind of specialist definition. So, as long as it doesn't require any specialist definition, it can be just [put] like, for instance, Roma deprived people. That's common knowledge. Okay. So you can just put that in without saying that it was cited in this particular study and that particular study. But if you're going to the details of that, as to how they are deprived and marginalized, then you have to cite people and sources, because that's when you need detail to back up your statement.

Mikeshin: So it's a matter of intuition, right?

Student: It's not so much a matter of intuition, as it's a matter of rational thinking. Like what would be an ideal common knowledge. What about the historical fact? You know, like Gorbachov's reign, for instance, or Mahatma Gandhi. Everyone knows about them. You know, so you cannot um, you don't have to cite them. But if you have to cite a particular thing that they did, if you are talking about it, then you need to show certain historical evidence, like a date or somewhere that it was mentioned that, say for instance, that Gandhi was in South Africa, you know? Each needs to be mentioned that he was in South Africa, and so on, and so did, as given in some particular book.

Two students at CEU though argued that common knowledge is a matter of authority. They said that common knowledge is a different notion for an experienced scholar and for a beginner: "If you didn't write anything before, you have to cite everything. Because who am I to write something without identifying any source? I don't have any ground which I established, which [makes] me trusted in a particular field." However, the criteria of referencing were still clear to them.

Testing the hypothesis based on the Blum's book (2009) I was interested whether students are confused by a flow of digital and online texts in their referencing behavior. Firstly I asked them about Power Point presentations, if they have different criteria of referencing there and why. However, for the Legal students it was not a good example. Almost everyone stated that they rarely deal with them, and it is not widely used for Legal Studies at all. One of them does use Power Point relatively often, and he and two others were the only ones who assured me that they always reference and cite their sources in their presentations. They confirmed that it is a specificity of their profession and, moreover, a strict policy at CEU. One of them said though that they always submit a hard copy of their presentations, and if they did not, it would not be so strict: "because you want to be on the right side of the law." The dean at MSSSES claimed that it is clear and obvious that the pictures and movies one uses in the Power Point presentation are not his/hers, hence there is no need to cite them. As a criterion for distinguishing paper assignments and Power Point presentations in terms of referencing, he stated that the presentations are not graded. If they were graded, the citation requirements would appear immediately.

For other interviewees, when I encouraged them to speculate about referencing in Power Point presentations, the criteria were not so clear. The same persons suggested different criteria, as long as I was proposing some contradictions or objections. The criteria were: whether the work is published, public, or graded. One MSSSES student claimed that Power Point presentations is a relatively new genre and the rules have not been formed yet.

Also for this hypothesis I asked them about different ways of online communication they use: email, blogging, Facebook.com (or VKontakte.ru¹⁰ for Russians). Only one of my interviewees has a blog, and he rarely cites someone there. However, he stated that he always makes clear that the words are not his. None of my informants puts references in their emails, though they all use them a lot everyday. They also do not reference in their Facebook or VKontakte accounts, though some agreed that putting some "fancy quotation" without mentioning the author is not good. They were surprised at this question, but I assured them that I was just looking for some criteria of different referencing in different forms of writing.

Summarizing this block, I asked my interviewees for a summary of different rules for referencing in online sources and in their written papers (and their digital equivalents). As a general rule they all claimed that it should be clear when the words one cites are not his/her:

Mikeshin: So, the rules are different for blogging? If you cite someone in your paper assignment, so you give the author, the book, the publisher, and the year.

Student: It depends, if I'm making a particular article on something, which is, how do you put it, it's not just general ramble thoughts, you know. Then I definitely put in all the required citation and so on. But generally most of blogging is very personal, so...

Mikeshin: Then you can simplify?

Student: Yes, you can simplify to a certain extent. Because if I'm taking a quote online, it's possibly from an online source itself. So if I put in the author and the quote. It's generally good enough. Because it is not something that we are publishing for official use.

Thus the difference between written papers and online sources is the fact that one form is formal, with its formal requirements, which are commonly evaluated, and another is not:

Mikeshin: I see. And what about Facebook? Do you cite someone in Facebook?

Student: No. Sometimes I've used very fancy quotations and that's when I put in, but some sort of. That's it.

Mikeshin: So just to make clear that it's not yours?

Student: That's not mine.

10 VKontakte.ru is the Russian analogue for Facebook.com. The latter is usually used by Russians for communicating with their foreign friends and colleagues. The design and the interface of the former very much resemble Facebook.com, hence there is a widespread opinion that the whole idea of VKontakte.ru was plagiarized. It is one of the most visited Russian language sites.

Mikeshin: Okay, but what are the general differences, how could you define them? With these online sources, email, blogging, Facebook, and written works.

Student: One would be formal, the other would be informal. Like Facebook is a networking site and it's more on a social scale.

Mikeshin: But it's much more public than your written work.

Student: I agree. But it's informal. It is not to be cited and taken seriously.

One student at MSSSES also suggested as a difference that the paper work is more public than the Power Point presentation, which contradicts the common practice of reading students papers by one or two professors only, stated by the dean.

For the unawareness hypothesis I mostly intended to test Blum's theory of students being lost in the flow of texts, mostly digital, and thus plagiarizing unintentionally, confusing the different referential modes (Blum, 2009). From my informants it turned out that Blum's theory does not work with my two cases. Most of the students I interviewed do not use online communication so often as to be confused with different rules of referencing there and in their writings. Moreover, even those who have blogs, use email a lot, or are active in Facebook or VKontakte account did not have any difficulties with distinguishing papers and digital texts in terms of application of rules. Blum argues: "The Internet and electronic communication have affected much about their lives—and not just because the Internet makes copying easy and tempting. It has *changed* how they think of texts." (Blum, 2009, p. 4. Author's emphasis) I did not get such an impression from my informants. Maybe Russian students in MSSSES all came from the *old academic tradition*, where written assignments may have the primary importance. However this was not the case at CEU either, where students came from very diverse backgrounds and from six different continents, and for all of them the difference between online texts and hard papers was obvious. The opinions about citing in Power Point presentations were different, but there still were no influence to their perception of written text from the digital forms.

Determination of authorship was not a problem for any of my informants. Even the concept of common knowledge, which is commonly discussed as a significant topic at the Academic Writing classes at CEU, did not seem problematic for students of either school. They all suggested citing more in order to avoid any suspicions of plagiarism. They also proposed to make clear all the time when one uses the

words of others as the main criterion for referencing. The main reasons for systematic unintentional plagiarizing for everyone I talked to was definitely lack of instructions and feedback. One can make a mistake, they claimed, but if it happens too often, than one either does it intentionally or does not know how to reference properly. Most of them complained that in the undergraduate level there is a definite rule that plagiarism is unacceptable, though there are no clear instructions of how to avoid and define it. Moreover, if one seeks for the support and advice about proper referencing it is very hard to get, since the feedback is almost not given. The whole unawareness hypothesis is verified to the extent that lack of instructions and feedback are the main reasons for students to plagiarize unintentionally, but the flow of digital texts does not affect my informants' citing practices at all.

Third hypothesis: Specific identity

I was looking for the self-identification of students in comparison to scholars. According to the formulation of my hypothesis, I embraced all three main factors of identity construction in my questions. For the factor of the access to and participation in constructing expert (scientific) knowledge I asked whether they commonly make a significant contribution to their discipline; for the factor of sharing the norms and values of the scientific community I asked whether they consider themselves as colleagues to their professors, share rules, norms, and values with them; and for the recognition as a member of this community I asked whether they consider themselves as a part of the academic community and whether their professors regard them as their colleagues.

For some of them the notion of the academic community was inseparable from the question of being a colleague to their professors. Thus even within CEU, for instance, there were both opinions: some considered students to be the part of academia: "future scholars", while others did not: "they must have a different status in order for them to be teaching you." In case of Russian students and their dean it was more consistent: the general opinion looked like in the undergraduate studies students are definitely not the part of the academic community, but the Masters program is the transitional period for them to

become the part, and this period commonly ends with the Masters dissertation. The dean at MSSES even claimed that the audience of Masters students is much more valuable than colleagues:

Mikeshin: To what extent do you consider students to be part of the academic community? [...]

Dean: [...] It is a very difficult question. It is a very difficult question. If we limit our view to the Masters studies, then it is easier to say. I would not consider a student as a part of the academic community at all. Speaking about the Masters level, this question is definitely raised. I am afraid that the main and first thing is that it is an audience. If people attempt to write unassisted works, and it is their assignment, and they discover some kind of information or somehow apprehend the professor's, lector's position, they are the most valuable listeners. Yes, more valuable than the colleague.

Mikeshin: And what is the difference? Between the colleague and valuable listener.

Dean: The difference is that your colleague may not be interested in your problematique, but the one who writes his works under your supervision is inevitably interested in it. And it is a very demanding listener, it is a very demanding audience.

Respectively, the opinions about being colleagues to professors are divided. I separated the questions of whether the students consider their professors to be their colleagues and, vice versa, whether their professors consider and treat them as colleagues. The dean at MSSES did not consider Masters students as colleagues, at least not before they submit a high-level dissertation. Despite the fact that every student from MSSES I interviewed was employed as a lawyer, the dean argued that "they did not look at things from the academic standpoint." At the same time, it is easier for a student, he said, to treat professors as colleagues, since it is their job, to see them like this, and to enter the community with their progressing work.

The students claiming that they do not consider themselves as colleagues with their professors pointed out the different roles of being a professor and being a student: "they're not colleagues. He's a professor and you're a student, and that's all." The ones who feel themselves to be colleagues claimed that the Masters students are too experienced in the field to be treated differently. However, in the undergraduate level, according to everyone, students are never treated as colleagues: "in undergraduate, of course, you're treated like a kid."

The main reason for students not to have a sense of equality with their professors is the well-defined hierarchy in Legal Studies, which almost every student told me about. This hierarchy is based both on the different experience and different roles of students and professors. Although the students can be called colleagues and they can have more or less close relations with their professors, the trend line can be drawn: from their undergraduate level when "you're treated like a kid" to the Masters stage as a liminal period that commonly ends with initiation in the form of a dissertation. This trend line was much more explicit at MSSS:

Mikeshin: Do you consider students to be part of the academic community? For instance, do you consider your professors to be your colleagues? Is their status equal to yours? Or they are somewhat higher, on the next step?

Student G: We are somewhat approaching it now. Personally I am approaching this feeling somehow. But in general, it is hard for me, by the way. In principle, as I see it, our professors are not monsters [людоеды¹¹], for sure, but they put up a barrier. I mean, there is a hierarchy. It is in relations, one can feel it.

Student A: Well, basically when it was your first degree then you definitely felt like an *absolute student*, there was no commonness to the academic community. Now it feels like it is not every professor, in principle. Because one professor, the only one, he called us *colleagues* even when we were students. And he kind of realized that yes, some students come to work from the second year of studies, and to learn some things which are inaccessible even for this professor, I don't know. Well, they finally became equal and grew up to be a colleague in a full sense.

Student M: Well, to call is one thing, but the result, reality is absolutely other. [Student A: Well, yes] Even in the first degree, I think the students don't even pretend to any kind of academism, to some extent.

According to these questions I wanted to go further and to find out whether this hierarchy or these different roles lead students and professors to different referential practices. Generally I asked them whether students have to cite more, since they are less experienced and have to give more evidence. For CEU students the referential practices mostly differ, it is a matter of experience and authority:

Student T: I think it is like if you didn't write anything before. If you didn't write anything before, you have to cite everything. Because, who am I to write something without identifying any source? I don't have any ground which I established, which made me to be trusted in a particular field. For example, if a given human writer or a judge of European Human Right court writes something without citation, people believe him. Because he has a knowledge of

11 Literally *cannibals*.

[incomprehensible] If it is a student like me, who am I to say something which doesn't have authority?

[...]

Student T: For me it depends on who [is] writing the book, for example. If for example, you know, in Public International Law Shaw is writing, there is no[t] much citation in the book. Because he's already famous in that field. He do[es]n't need to cite authority or something like that. If for somebody who's big now, who's writing the thesis on Public International Law, there [is] a citation for each and everything, almost. Unless there [is] some additional explanation or emphasis.

Mikeshin: So the references are the matter of authority?

Student T: So the more you became famous, the less you need [a] citation.

For MSSES students such a difference was familiar in practice, but they considered it wrong. They regard it as vanity or even disrespect to others:

Mikeshin: Is there such a thing, like you are less experienced, you have less knowledge, and you have to establish your arguments more, provide more sources? Don't you have such a situation?

Student Z: No.

Mikeshin: You mean, everything is in the frames of formal rules?

Student B: Well, every person evaluates himself. If this person has such a self-esteem that he doesn't feel like he has to provide any arguments, then it's up to him.

Mikeshin: I see.

Student B: If he thinks that he doesn't have to explain anything from his high position.

Another question related to the students' self-identity is the point whether or not they generally make a contribution to their discipline. The most widespread response I received was that it happens, but not all the time: "Yes, often students come up with the ideas and professors elaborate on them, and win fantastic prizes. It does happen sometimes." The opinions varied from the student work being simply an introduction to the discipline to the claim that it happens very often and the student dissertations are often used and even cited by their professors and other students.

In the specific identity hypothesis I intended to look at the ways Masters students identify themselves in comparison to their professors, and how it affects their referential practices. The situation with the two schools was slightly different: at CEU the opinions varied from totally different roles and strong

hierarchy to almost colleagues' relations, whilst at MSSES students regard their Masters stage as a period of becoming a part of the community, with their dissertation as initiation. There is a strong hierarchy in Legal Studies in general, and my two cases for some students are the exception, where the professors are much closer to them. Respectively, I asked to what extent this difference or hierarchy may affect their academic writing: should students cite more because of their more limited experience? Despite the fact that formally the rules are the same for any academic writer, most CEU students admitted that more experienced scholars can afford less citation than their students, who do not have research experience or even authority to rely on. At MSSES this was regarded as misconduct, and as a widespread practice, at the same time, which even causes plagiarism of the scholars. Specific identity affected students' understanding of proper referencing, but not their regards on plagiarism. This hypothesis needs further research to be tested in full, but I can now argue that in the situation of the lack of instructions and feedback specific identity can be one of the reasons of unintentional plagiarism.

Summary

In my project I suggested three main hypothetical directions in order to contribute to the question of *why students plagiarize*. Firstly, I tested one more time the hypothesis of *intent* as one of the main reasons of student plagiarism. Students commit it to save time, get a better grade, perform better than they believe they can, and because of a lack of control. I identified a trend in student's behavior: if one wants to have a career in his/her discipline, one commonly avoids plagiarizing, as distinct from those who just need a formal degree.

Secondly, I tested to what extent can the Blum's approach (2009) can be applied to the Masters students from my two cases, and other possible reasons to plagiarize based on *unawareness*. It turned out that Blum's understanding of students being lost in the flow of digital texts as a reason of misunderstanding authorship does not work with my cases. However, as Blum also notes (2009, p. 177), the students are under great pressure and in a lack of instructions, which very often occurs at the

undergraduate level in every country represented by my informants, one can easily make a mistake, and actually very frequently does.

The third hypothesis I tested was whether students (Masters students in my case) construct a *specific identity*, whether or not they identify themselves as colleagues to their professors, and, in turn, does this identity influence their referential behavior. I found that even though they have a definite understanding of plagiarism and difference between their own and their professors' roles, they often apply different criteria to referential practices of students and scholars.

Thus, I came up with my contribution to the main question of *why students plagiarize* as following: they either do it intentionally to save as much time and effort as their institutions let them to, or they do not get enough instructions and feedback, or they do not apply the rules of scholarly writing to their own work.

"The more you become famous, the less you need a citation"¹²: Conclusion

My paper has addressed the question of the reasons of student plagiarism. As my own contribution I have developed three general hypotheses: the intentional reasons, unintentional reasons caused by unawareness, and by the different identity of students, as opposed to their professors. These three hypotheses were tested on the students of Masters program in Law at two graduate schools: Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences in Russia and Central European University in Budapest, conducting semi-structured interviews with them and the dean of the faculty of Law at MSSSES.

I found that all three hypotheses provide good explanation to my research question. Intent is still one of the most spread explanation for student plagiarism. Students commit plagiarism in order to find an easy way to fulfill an assignment in the situation of indifference and lack of control from their professors. Student unawareness is usually caused by lack of instruction and feedback from professors. Even when students do not want to plagiarize, they are often just unaware of rules and definitions, for instance, when they want to look as clever as possible. The specific identity of students does not allow them to automatically apply the rules of referencing and citing for scholarly work to their papers. The widespread example of this difference is the acknowledged practice of more authoritative scholars, who cite less sources to support their arguments.

My contribution is to summarize previous research on plagiarism in academia, identify the main hypotheses from it, and suggest one more hypothesis, concerning specific identity, which was implicitly proposed in some literature on plagiarism (Scollon, 1995; Clegg and Flint, 2006), but was never fully elaborated; and also to test all three on my two cases. To summarize, the answer to the research questions I raised is the following: students plagiarize intentionally as an easy way to perform the assignment, unintentionally lacking proper instructions and feedback from their professors, or because they do not share the identity of scholars with their professors and, consequently, they apply different rules to their work.

¹² Student T in the interview.

After summarizing my findings the further research directions have become evident. Although the intent hypothesis was elaborated by some authors before (Randall, 2001; Clegg and Flint, 2006) it still needs to be put in a broader theoretical context, mainly from the standpoint of theories of power and control, and rational choice. To be more precise there are three main questions to investigate: determination of student's referential behavior by control from their faculty, rationality of their reasons for plagiarizing and avoiding plagiarism, and plagiarism as deviant behavior.

The unawareness hypothesis also raises the question of intent, namely the significance of intent in the detection and sanctioning practices of faculty. The problem of feedback and instructions should also be investigated in more detail, precisely the construction of relations between professors and students in order to affect positively referential practices.

The specific identity hypothesis raises an important question of the students' identity itself, namely the characteristics and difference of the identity of students, as distinct from the identity of scholars, their understanding of their role and place in the academia, their determination of academia itself, and their identification of the professors.

Generally, in my paper I continued the recent trend of critical reflection on plagiarism, free from moral judgement and conclusions taken for granted. I both summarized the previous unsystematic research on plagiarism and contributed to it with my three hypotheses. These hypotheses allowed me to raise new questions and, consequently, to formulate the main directions in *plagiarism studies*, particularly in the field of student plagiarism.

References

- Adamskiy, Aleksandr; Bikbov, Aleksandr; Voronkov, Viktor; Zdravomyslov, Andrey; Zenkin, Sergey; Mansurov, Valeriy; Yadov, Vladimir; and Chernysh, Mikhail. 2007. "Expert Conclusions of the Working Group of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation Concerning the Situation at the Sociological Faculty at MSU" [Экспертное заключение Рабочей группы Общественной палаты РФ по ситуации на Социологическом факультете МГУ] <http://www.sociolog.net/zakluchenie.doc> (Retrieved May 25, 2011)
- ATLAS.ti. Version 5.0.66 [Computer software] 2005. Berlin, Scientific Software Development
- Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bloor, David. 1991. *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blum, Susan D. 2009. *My Word!: Plagiarism and College Culture*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2004. *Science of Science and Reflexivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Buranen, Lise. 1999. "But I Wasn't Cheating: Plagiarism and Cross-Cultural Mythology" in *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 63-74.
- Central European University. 2010. "Guidelines for the Implementation of 'Academic Dishonesty, Plagiarism and Other Offences' of the CEU 'Student Rights, Rules and Academic Regulations'", *CEU Official Document G-1009-1*. (<http://www.ceu.hu/sites/default/files/Guidelines%20on%20Academic%20Dishonesty%20G-1009-1.pdf>; Retrieved May 18, 2011)
- Central European University. 2011. "Student Rights, Rules, And Academic Regulations", *CEU Official Document R-0709-2*. (http://www.ceu.hu/sites/default/files/Student_rights_March2011.pdf; Retrieved May 18, 2011)
- Clark, Irene L. 1999. "Writing Centers and Plagiarism" in *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 155-168.
- Clegg, Sue and Flint, Abbi. 2006. "More Heat than Light: Plagiarism in Its Appearing", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27, 3, pp. 373-387.
- Collins, Randall. 1998. *The Sociology of Philosophies: A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

- Enders, Walter and Hoover, Gary A. 2004. "Whose Line Is It? Plagiarism in Economics" in *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42, 2: 487-493.
- F5 Transkriptionssoftware für den Mac. [Computer software] 2010. Dr. Dresing & Pehl GmbH.
- Facebook.com <http://www.facebook.com> (Retrieved May 10, 2011)
- Gilinskiy, Yakov. 2009. Total'nyi Plagiat kak Norma Rossijskoy Nauchnoy Zhizni" [Total Plagiarism as a Norm of Russian Scientific Life] in *Troitckiy Variant*, 44. p. 12.
- Goldblatt, David. 1984. "Self-Plagiarism," in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 43, 1: 71-77.
- Judson, Horace F. 2004. *The Great Betrayal: Fraud in Science*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt.
- Knorr-Cetina, Karin D. 1981. *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*. Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LaFollette, Marcel C. 1992. *Stealing Into Print: Fraud, Plagiarism, and Misconduct in Scientific Publishing*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Lakatos, Imre. 1978. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Latour, Bruno and Woolgar, Steve. 1986. *Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1988. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Luhmann, Niklas. 1990. *Essays on Self-Reference*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. 1992 [1979]. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Merton, Robert K. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- MSSSES. *Partners*. MSSSES (<http://www.mssses.ru/en/about%20us/> Retrieved May 18, 2011)

- Pennycook, Alastair. 1996. "Borrowing Others' Words: Text, Ownership, Memory, and Plagiarism," in *TESOL Quaterly*, 30, 2: 201-230.
- Pinch, Trevor J. and Bijker, Wiebe E. 1987. "The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts: Or How the Sociology of Science and the Sociology of Technology Might Benefit Each Other", in Bijker, Wiebe E., Hughes, Thomas Parke, and Pinch, Trevor J. (editors). *The Social construction of technological systems*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Price, Margaret. 2002. "Beyond 'Gotcha!': Situating Plagiarism in Policy and Pedagogy," in *College Composition and Communication*, 54, 1: 88-115.
- Radaev, Vadim. 2007. "Conclusions on the Faculty and Study Materials of Selected Departments at the Faculty of Sociology, Moscow State University Named After M. V. Lomonosov" [Заключение о преподавательском составе и учебных материалах отдельных кафедр факультета социологии МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова], Polit.Ru <http://www.polit.ru/science/2007/07/18/radaev2.html> (Retrieved May 25, 2011)
- Randall, Marilyn. 2001. *Pragmatic Plagiarism: Authorship, Profit, and Power*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Roy, Alice M. 1999. "Whose Words These Are I Think I Know: Plagiarism, the Postmodern and Faculty Attitudes" in *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 55-62.
- Schütz, Alfred. 1945. "On multiple realities" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 5 (4), pp. 533-576.
- Scollon, Ron. 1995. "Plagiarism and Ideology: Identity in Intercultural Discourse," *Language in Society*, 24, 1: 1-28.
- Shapin, Steven and Schaffer, Simon. 1985. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the experimental life*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Shapin, Steven. 2008. *The Scientific Life: A Moral History of a Late Modern Vocation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sociological Faculty of MSU Named After Lomonosov [Социологический факультет МГУ им. Ломоносова]
http://www.socio.msu.ru/?subaction=showfull&id=1297100208&archive=&start_from=&ucat=1&
(Retrieved May 18, 2011)

Stearns, Laurie. 1992. "Copy Wrong: Plagiarism, Process, Property, and the Law," in *California Law Review*, 80, 2: 513-553.

Vkontakte.ru <http://vkontakte.ru> (Retrieved May 10, 2011)

Woessner, Matthew C. 2004. "Beating the House: How Inadequate Penalties for Cheating Make Plagiarism an Excellent Gamble", *Political Science and Politics*, 37, 2, pp. 313-320.

Ziman, John. 2000. *Real Science: What It Is, and What It Means*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Table 1. Questions for pilot interviews with the Center of Academic Writing staff.

How do you distinguish plagiarism from common knowledge?
How do you distinguish student mistake from intended plagiarizing?
What sanctions should be applied to written academic plagiarism in general terms? How should it be treated?
Do you think the formal instructions concerning plagiarism you use in your work are concrete? Do you have any difficulties applying them?
What are the main reasons for you in your work why student plagiarism is unacceptable?
In what terms do you convince students not to plagiarize?
How do you treat intended plagiarism in student written work? What if the student continues plagiarizing?
Are there any ways of avoiding or softening sanctions for student?
How many cases of plagiarism do you remember (during your work for CEU)?
Please, specify the departments, if it is possible
Please, describe some most recent or most memorable cases

Table 2. List of questions for CEU students with comments.

Questions	Topics and comments
Permission for recording and notes-taking, guarantee of anonymity Introduction of myself and my purposes: Igor Mikeshin, 1 year MA in Sociology and Social Anthropology. Topic: Student referential practices, use of the work of others Gratitude	Formal introduction
Tell me please about your background: where you are from, what school you graduated from	Warm-up background question
Do you have a lot of written assignments here? Compared to your undergraduate studies? What are the main rules you use to refer to the works of others? Did you have a special class or study topic concerning the proper referencing? Do you think these instructions were clear enough? Was something missed in these instructions?	Linkage to the first hypothesis: Quantity of written assignments, Instructions
Are your professors very strict about referencing? How do they detect plagiarism? How do you know if you are using the common knowledge or you need to cite? How do you distinguish the student mistake from intended plagiarism?	First hypothesis: Intentional plagiarism. Finding an easy way to fulfill the requirements, estimating risks of being caught and benefits of saving time and submitting some better piece of work

Do you know someone from your class who recently plagiarized? Maybe from your undergraduate?

What exactly did he/she do? Was he/she caught doing it? What sanctions was (would be) applied to him/her?

Why do you think did he/she do it: what explanation he/she gives? Was it an easiest way to submit an assignment?

What are the most spread explanations they use? Is it a time pressure, lack of proper instructions, lack of control, or anything else?

Do you have a different explanation for his/her behavior? (Was it an attempt to find an easy way to fulfill the requirements or the attempt to submit a better piece of work?) Any other thing?

Is the authorship of some given piece of information always easy to determine? Can you easily find the author of some concrete words?

What is the difference between paper assignments, (and oral) and Power Point presentations in terms of referencing? Do you put any references in your presentations? Do put references for images, videos, (or for someone's ideas)?

Do you use any kind of referencing in your emails? Do you use them a lot? (Is it different for your emails to professors or to your classmates and friends)?

Do you have a blog? (Do you cite something in your blog? What kind of references do you put there? Why?)

Do you cite in Facebook? How and why?

What are the general differences for you in citing others in presentations, emails, blogs, Facebook, and written works? (Is it lack of control, general rules or something else? When it's enough just to mention the author? When it's not necessary to mention at all?)

Do you think that students have different rules for referencing in their class papers than scholars in their publications? What are the differences?

Do scholars mostly refer to different sources rather than students?

Do you consider the students as part of academic community, community of scholars?

Do they have the same set of norms, of values? What are the differences?

Do you consider students as junior scholars or they are a specific group compared to scholars?

Do you consider your professors to be your colleagues? Or they have some superior status?

Do your professors treat you as a colleague?

Second hypothesis: Unintended plagiarism. Unawareness of students about how to use sources and references. Lack of required skills of using other's work or confusing with a very vague concept of authorship, which applies differently in different ways of communication and presentation (online, oral, Power Point, written)

Third hypothesis: Different understanding of proper reference because of students' different identity, in comparison to scholars. The identity of scholars (the access to and participation in constructing expert knowledge, sharing the norms and values of scientific community, and recognition as a member of this community) prescribes particular rules of using each other's work, whereas students may not share this identity. Thus, the concept of plagiarism in respect to scholars may not be applied by students to their work.

Do students significantly contribute to their discipline, in general? (Why not (yes)?)	
What are your future plans? Are you going to continue your studies or work?	Positive ending
Do you have anything else to share with me or to ask me? (Introduce me to a classmate) Gratitude, guarantee of anonymity	Final formalities

Table 3. List of questions for students at MSSES (translated and adopted).

Questions	Topics and comments
Разрешение делать записи в блокноте, разрешение записывать на диктофон Благодарность Представиться: Игорь Микешин, Студент Магистратуры отделения социологии и антропологии Центрального Европейского Университета в Будапеште Тема исследования: Практики работы с источниками у студентов Ты или Вы?	Formal introduction
Расскажи пожалуйста, откуда ты, какой университет закончил(а)	Warm-up background question
У вас много письменных заданий? Больше чем в предыдущем университете? Какими правилами ты пользуешься для использования письменных источников? У вас был специальный курс или тема, посвященная цитированию? Инструкции были понятны? У тебя есть ощущение, что в них чего-то не хватало?	Linkage to the first hypothesis: Quantity of written assignments, Instructions
Твои преподаватели очень внимательны к ссылкам и цитированию? Как они выявляют плагиат? Как ты определяешь, что нужно цитировать, а где ты просто используешь общеизвестный факт? Как отличить случайную ошибку от плагиата? Знаешь ли ты кого-нибудь, кто допустил плагиат в письменной работе? Может быть в прошлом университете? Что именно он/она сделал/а? Его/ее поймали на этом? Как его/ее наказали?	First hypothesis: Intentional plagiarism. Finding an easy way to fulfill the requirements, estimating risks of being caught and benefits of saving time and submitting some better piece of work

<p>Как ты думаешь, почему он/она это сделал/а? Как он/она это объяснил/а? (Так было проще? Не было времени? Никто все равно бы не узнал?)</p> <p>Как обычно студенты оправдывают свой плагиат?</p> <p>Есть ли у тебя другое объяснение его/ее плагиату?</p>	
<p>Насколько легко определить, кто автор конкретных слов?</p> <p>В чем разница между письменными заданиями, устными выступлениями, и презентациями? Ты цитируешь кого-нибудь в презентациях? Ставишь ссылки на чужие слова, изображения, фотографии, фильмы?</p> <p>Много ли ты пользуешься электронной почтой? Ставишь какие-нибудь ссылки в письмах?</p> <p>У тебя есть блог? Цитируешь кого-нибудь в блоге? Ставишь ссылки на изображения и слова других людей? Почему?</p> <p>Цитируешь в Контакте? Как и почему?</p> <p>Какие основные различия между цитированием в презентациях, письмах, блогах, в Контакте и в письменных работах? (Правила, возможность контроля? Что-то еще?) Когда достаточно просто упомянуть автора?</p>	<p>Second hypothesis: Unintended plagiarism. Unawareness of students about how to use sources and references. Lack of required skills of using other's work or confusing with a very vague concept of authorship, which applies differently in different ways of communication and presentation (online, oral, Power Point, written)</p>
<p>Как ты думаешь, для студентов и ученых, исследователей действуют разные правила использования письменных источников? (В чем разница?) Они обычно используют разные источники или те же самые?</p> <p>Считаешь ли ты студентов частью академического сообщества?</p> <p>У них и у ученых, исследователей разные нормы, ценности?</p> <p>Как тебе кажется, студенты—это молодые исследователи, или это отдельная особая социальная группа?</p> <p>Ты считаешь преподавателей своими коллегами? Или они имеют какой-то более высокий статус?</p> <p>А преподаватели считают вас, студентов, своими коллегами? Относятся как к коллегам?</p> <p>Делают ли студенты существенный вклад в свою дисциплину? Почему?</p>	<p>Third hypothesis: Different understanding of proper reference because of students' different identity, in comparison to scholars. The identity of scholars (the access to and participation in constructing expert knowledge, sharing the norms and values of scientific community, and recognition as a member of this community) prescribes particular rules of using each other's work, whereas students may not share this identity. Thus, the concept of plagiarism in respect to scholars may not be applied by students to their work.</p>
<p>Какие у тебя планы на будущее? Будешь продолжать учебу или будешь работать?</p>	<p>Positive ending</p>
<p>Хочешь еще что-нибудь мне рассказать или спросить у меня?</p> <p>(Представить меня однокласснику)</p> <p>Благодарность, анонимность</p>	<p>Final formalities</p>

Table 4. List of questions for the dean at MSSSES (adopted from the questions for students at MSSSES).

Questions	Topics and comments
<p>Могу ли я упомянуть Ваше имя в моей работе или Вы предпочитаете остаться анонимным?</p> <p>Разрешение делать записи в блокноте, разрешение записывать на диктофон</p> <p>Благодарность</p> <p>Представиться: Игорь Микешин, Студент Магистратуры отделения социологии и антропологии Центрального Европейского Университета в Будапеште</p> <p>Тема исследования: Практики работы с источниками у студентов</p>	Formal introduction
<p>Вы преподаете не только здесь, но и в других университетах?</p>	Warm-up background question
<p>Много ли на Вашем факультете письменных заданий для студентов? Какова основная цель этих заданий?</p> <p>Какими правилами необходимо пользоваться студентам для использования письменных источников? У вас есть специальный курс или тема, посвященная цитированию?</p>	<p>Linkage to the first hypothesis:</p> <p>Quantity of written assignments, Instructions</p>
<p>Насколько преподаватели внимательны к ссылкам и цитированию? Как выявляется плагиат?</p> <p>Как можно определить что нужно цитировать, а где используется общеизвестный факт?</p> <p>Как отличить случайную ошибку от плагиата?</p> <p>Часто ли студенты допускают плагиат в письменной работе? Умышленно или неумышленно?</p> <p>Какие санкции применяются за плагиат? Они строго расписаны или зависят от ситуации?</p> <p>Характерно ли для студентов-юристов более внимательно относиться к авторским правам при написании письменных работ?</p> <p>Что именно считается плагиатом?</p> <p>Как Вы думаете, каковы основные мотивы плагиата у студентов? (Они идут простым путем? Недостаток времени? Слабый контроль?)</p> <p>Как обычно студенты оправдывают свой плагиат?</p>	<p>First hypothesis: Intentional plagiarism. Finding an easy way to fulfill the requirements, estimating risks of being caught and benefits of saving time and submitting some better piece of work</p>
<p>Насколько легко определить, кто автор конкретных слов?</p> <p>В чем разница между письменными заданиями, устными</p>	<p>Second hypothesis: Unintended plagiarism. Unawareness of</p>

<p>выступлениями, и презентациями? Нужно ли ставить ссылки на чужие слова, изображения, фотографии, фильмы в презентации? Какими соображениями или правилами нужно руководствоваться при этом? (Когда достаточно просто упомянуть автора или поставить ссылку?)</p> <p>Какими правилами и соображениями нужно руководствоваться при цитировании в электронной почте, в блогах, в социальных сетях? (Публичность versus формальности)</p>	<p>students about how to use sources and references. Lack of required skills of using other's work or confusing with a very vague concept of authorship, which applies differently in different ways of communication and presentation (online, oral, Power Point, written)</p>
<p>В чем разница между студентами и преподавателями, учеными, исследователями в отношении цитирования? Нужно ли студентам больше обосновывать свои аргументы, в связи с меньшим опытом и авторитетом? (Они обычно используют разные источники или одни и те же?)</p> <p>В какой степени Вы считаете студентов частью академического сообщества? У них и у ученых, исследователей разные нормы, ценности?</p> <p>Как Вам кажется, студенты—это молодые исследователи, или это отдельная особая социальная группа?</p> <p>Считают ли студенты преподавателей своими коллегами? Или преподаватели для них имеют какой-то более высокий статус?</p> <p>Считают ли преподаватели студентов своими коллегами?</p> <p>Делают ли студенты существенный вклад в свою дисциплину? Почему?</p>	<p>Third hypothesis: Different understanding of proper reference because of students' different identity, in comparison to scholars. The identity of scholars (the access to and participation in constructing expert knowledge, sharing the norms and values of scientific community, and recognition as a member of this community) prescribes particular rules of using each other's work, whereas students may not share this identity. Thus, the concept of plagiarism in respect to scholars may not be applied by students to their work.</p>
<p>Хотите ли Вы что-то мне еще рассказать или спросить у меня?</p>	<p>Positive ending</p>
<p>Большое спасибо за Ваше время и за Вашу помощь!</p> <p>Анонимность?</p>	<p>Final formalities</p>