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Abstract: The discussion about plagiarism in Finnish higher education is scarce. The statistics provided by National Advisory Board on Research Integrity (2012) revealed only two cases of plagiarism in Finland in 2011. This is in sharp contrast with international figures of plagiarism. This paper introduces a study about referencing practices in electronically published theses. The data consist of a sample of theses published in Theseus data base (an electronic publication forum for universities of applied sciences in Finland). Altogether 91 randomly chosen theses in the area of health and business studies were analysed. Most students master referencing and follow the good writing practice. However, a significant amount of theses lack in referencing. Examples of writing malpractice are diverse. Quotations are presented without quotation marks, the primary source is not identified, and referencing can be misleading and unclear. Several plagiarised text columns were also found: text from existing source is taken, sentences might be slightly altered, and the sources of the original text are copied. Based on the data, there is evidence that plagiarism is present in Finnish students’ theses, and the writing instructions given by each HE institution are not always followed. It can also be concluded that local understandings of plagiarism and the criteria for accepted writing practice vary.

Introduction

Studying in higher education has changed. In educational discourse there has been a shift from teacher centeredness to student centeredness. Earlier, till the last decades of last century, studying meant attending lectures and taking exams, but along the change in the conception of learning students are supposed to learn more independently today. Barr and Tagg (1995, p. 13) defined this change in higher education as a change from ‘instruction paradigm’ to ‘learning paradigm’. Under the instruction paradigm the main activity of higher education institutions was to arrange lectures. The learning paradigm ended “lecture’s privileged position”, “college’s purpose is not to transfer knowledge”, but to “bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves” (Barr & Tagg 1995, p. 14–15). Both teachers and students in higher education today seem to share the view that taking an exam shows only superficial knowledge and memorizing. Written assignments, on the other hand, are considered to indicate the student’s actual learning and knowledge. While writing, it is believed that students gain broader knowledge as they also have to process the information they have studied.

It is a world-wide assumption that students learn at least the basics of academic writing before graduating from university. As Masters (2005, p. 282) puts it: “In academic writing, the need to quote and reference accurately is a given. To ensure accuracy, reference systems are designed in great detail (...).” Among the most used referencing systems are the APA style provided originally by American Psychological Association (APAstyle.org 2013), The Harvard Referencing system (see e.g. University of Exeter 2013) and MLA Referencing system provided by Modern Languages Association (see e.g. University of York 2013). The main idea in a referencing system is that the
author identifies the original author of the source and refers to that author when presenting text (citation) or content (paraphrasing) from that source.

Writing itself has completely changed in the last 10–15 years. Teachers in higher education took their initial studies in a completely different environment before the development of ICT. Writing meant taking a pen in your hand and moving it on paper. After you had made the plan of your essay or thesis, you rolled the paper in the typewriter and typed the assignment for the professor to do the evaluation. Word processing has developed from its early days, and processing your writing to the final form has become quicker and easier. At the same time, the sources that are used in higher education studies have changed their form. Previously, writing required students to visit the library, where it was possible to explore scientific publications, books and journals. Today, the world wide libraries have come to student’s laptops and tablets. Universities provide library services for their students, and libraries rely more and more on electronic resources. A vast selection of scientific journal articles is available for the student just by a click of a mouse. (Moore 2010.)

Ondrusek (2012) has conducted a literature review about students’ writing skills. Even if there is not much research evidence available about how students in higher education master (scientific) writing, she was able to make conclusions about students’ writing skills. She reminds us that writing plays an integral part in higher education, “and fluency with basic writing skills is a pre-requisite to advanced academic writing. This fluency depends on a student’s understanding of how to select a topic, organize ideas, and employ rules of writing mechanics”. Writing skills develop while studying and with support from teachers. (Ondrusek 2012, p. 184.)

In Finland, all higher education institutions provide writing guidelines on their websites and these guidelines are supposed to be used when students write and publish their theses. The guidelines are fairly homogeneous. Students are taught the referencing practices, they are advised to refer to the sources they use and give detailed information about the source in the reference list. In all guidelines and instructions, plagiarism is not accepted in any circumstances. All higher education institutions have agreed to follow national guidelines about good scientific practice. Plagiarism is defined as follows: “to present someone else’s research plan, manuscript, article or text, or parts thereof, as one’s own” (National Advisory Board on Research Ethics, 2002, p. 21).

However clear this definition of plagiarism may sound, to understand it seems to be problematic. Official figures of plagiarism are minimal: The statistics provided by National Advisory Board on Research Integrity (2012) recognised only two cases of plagiarism in Finland in 2011. This is in sharp contrast with international research results. For example Blum (2009) refers to studies conducted in US where 68% of college students admit copying text from the internet. In Finland’s neighbouring country Sweden, in 2011 altogether 517 cases of sanctioned student plagiarism cases in higher education were reported by Högskoleverket (2012, p. 7).

There is no research in Finland about how higher education students master academic writing or referencing techniques, neither is there generalizable research on plagiarism. Sloppy scholarship which in plagiarism research and literature refers to writing in which the author fails to give the reader reliable references in text has
neither received any interest in Finland. With no or only a few addressed plagiarism cases annually Finland has become a peculiar country among other countries that publicly try to tackle the problem of plagiarism. In individual suspected plagiarism cases reaching consensus over what is plagiarism and not acceptable is complicated and has led to conflicts within the university (e.g. Moore 2008). These kinds of conflicts have been analysed in many publications about plagiarism in higher education (e.g. Martin 2008; Larkham & Manns 2002; Posner 2007).

Electronic publishing of students’ theses has become common in Finland. Universities have their own publication forums, and some universities publish Master’s theses electronically on their web pages. The universities of applied sciences (UAS), on the other hand, have a common publication forum, Theseus, where students of all 25 UASes can publish their theses (Theseus 2013). When Kämäräinen (2012) analysed the use of Wikipedia as a source in UAS students’ theses he recognised over 30 different types of information sources the students used in their theoretical frameworks. He also made remarks of the reference lists in the theses. They were unfinished to that extent that Kämäräinen (2012) ends up stating: “It is obvious that the reference lists of the theses in data had not been checked and this can only mean that not even the teachers read them.”

**Methodology**

The study aims to clarify the referencing practices of Finnish higher education graduates in their theses. The accuracy and consistency of referencing in theses are analysed. The data consist of a convenient sample of theses published in Theseus data base. In early 2013, 40000 publications from 25 different universities of applied sciences are available. For the purpose of this study, altogether 48 theses in the area of health and 43 theses in the area of business studies have been scrutinised in order to determine the quality of referencing. Both Bachelor’s theses and Master’s theses are included in data. From every institution, the sixth latest Bachelor’s thesis in the area of nursing (or related area in one institution) was chosen (n=24) and the third latest Master’s thesis in the area of health (n=24). The same procedure was used in the area of business studies resulting to have both Bachelor’s (n= 23) and Master’s (n=20) theses in the data. The collection of data took place in September–November 2012 (the area of health) and December 2012–January 2013 in the area of business. All the theses were published in 2012.

The formation of the analytic tool was inductive. First, an overlook on the first texts was taken, and notes were made concerning referencing style within text and the formation of lists of references. After examining ten different theses in the area of health, the analysis frame was fixed. From every thesis in the sample the following was checked: referencing practice in text (consistency, accuracy) and the list of references (consistency, accuracy). If inconsistency or inaccuracy was noticed in referencing style or in the referencing list, some plagiarism check-up was taken using Google to identify plagiarism. Copying of pictures and figures was also paid attention to, but the analysis of this is excluded as this would deal with Finnish copyright law and different interpretations of copyright law, which cannot be dealt with in this context.
Table 1
Accuracy and consistency of referencing in students’ theses (n = 91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accurate and consistent</th>
<th>Some inconsistency</th>
<th>Constant inconsistency</th>
<th>Failed referencing/Plagiarism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Health Care (n = 24)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Health Care (n = 24)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration (n = 23)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration (n = 20)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cases (n = 91)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main results are presented first in quantitative form, and after that authentic examples of sloppy scholarship and plagiarism are given. The examples have been translated from Finnish to English except in case of word-to-word plagiarism. The names of the students whose theses have been analysed or the names of the institutions that have accepted and published these theses are not mentioned here to avoid whistle-blower reactions. In the analysis, comparisons are made to texts that are understood to be original (published earlier). These sources are listed separately after the reference list.

**Quality of referencing practice**

Referencing practices of altogether 91 theses were analysed. The quality of referencing practice was classified into four categories: **accurate and consistent referencing** (both referencing in text and the reference list were consistent and accurate), **some inconsistency in referencing** (less than ten inconsistent or inaccurate entries noticed), **constant inconsistency in referencing** (ten or more inconsistent or inaccurate entries noticed) and **failed referencing/plagiarism** (at least three paragraphs in text were word to word copies of other author’s text and/or the student made false references at least three times). The main result of the analysis is presented in table one.

The results show that the majority of students master referencing practice. In 50 (55%) theses referencing followed the generally accepted norms of academic writing. The reader could rely on the references and find enough information about the publication in the reference list. There were detailed references to the sources that were used and the use of citations was correct. The sources that were referred to in text could be found in the reference lists in alphabetical order and the reference list provided relevant information about the source. Occasional mistakes, e.g. in spelling or in the reference list details were considered acceptable.
In the category of **some inconsistency in referencing** the texts were not completely finalised, but major mistakes were not noticeable. In 13 (14%) theses there was some carelessness in the text like mistakes in alphabetical order or year of publication in reference lists, referrals to web-pages instead of referring to the author, flaws in informing the reader the full information of the reference, “forgetting” to name the page of the cited source, or some references that were mentioned in text might not be found in reference lists.

The number of theses in which the referencing practice was unclear was significant \( n=28 \). The two last categories, **constant inconsistency in referencing** and **failed referencing/plagiarism** are analysed further in the following chapters under the titles of sloppy referencing and plagiarism. These two categories are overlapping, and only very clear word to word copying and misleading references were classified as plagiarism. In 17 of the theses \( 19\% \) flaws in citing and referencing were constant (the referencing style changed in the text, there was excessive use of secondary/tertiary sources, no details of the source were given so that the reader cannot find it, etc.). Clear-cut plagiarism was identified in 11 theses. Originally, plagiarism was not the main concern of this study and thus plagiarism was identified by putting exact sentences to Google search only after noticing constant inconsistency in references or reference lists. The 11 cases of plagiarism only represent the very obvious cases that were noticed “by plain eye”, and no conclusions about the amount of plagiarism in students’ published theses can be made. It is not known if electronic plagiarism detection had been used before publishing these theses in Theseus.

**Sloppy referencing**

Sloppy referencing refers to writing where the author fails to present clearly the source s/he has used. There were many kinds of inaccuracies in referencing and I have categorized them into five categories: undetailed citation, confusing reference, quotations without quotation marks, the primary source not identified, and misquoting.

In an **undetailed citation** the student writes about a detailed fact or a research result. Exact information is given without exact reference. The student has a reference in the text, but it is not detailed enough, for example the page number is not given. This type of citation was more common in theses in the area of health. Below is one translated paragraph as an example of undetailed citation practice. There are 51 sources used in this 48 pages long thesis but no page numbers at all are used in referrals to these sources.

During surgery, heating of the patient, fluids and gas placed intra-abdominally is used (Kairaluoma 2007). The use of wetted and heated gases may reduce post-operative pain, and the need for opioids as well as medication for nausea (White et al 2007). Thermal blankets and mattresses are also used (Rotko 2012). The heat balance should be measured during surgery (Kitching & O’Neill 2009).

**Confusing referencing** is in question when the student gives information about the source in different ways in different parts of the thesis. The following is an example of a thesis in which the student had copied a figure from an internet source. The reference is given, but the number of the page is missing. The title of the figure (translated)
is: “Figure 4. Sources of every day customer information behind experiencing value (Korkman & Arantola 2009)” In the list of references the student writes the names of authors in different order: “Arantola, H.& Korkman, O.” The reference is accurate, but there is inconsistency between the reference in text and the reference list. In his text the student has referred to different pages of Arantola & Korkman 2009, to Korkman & Arantola without a year or page numbers and to Korkman et al. 2009 to a page. The Google search was confusing as well. There was another thesis in which, quite in the same way, references were made to Korkman & Arantola, but in the reference list there was Arantola & Korkman. Later in the Google search it was found out that the source Arantola & Korkman does not exist, and the right reference should consistently be made to: Korkman, O. & Arantola, H. 2009.

In the data there are numerous instances where the students write quotations without quotation marks. If any kind of reference was given this was seen as sloppy referencing, but in case of missing references this kind of writing practice was considered plagiarism. In table 2 one example is presented. The copying is almost word to word and thus the example has not been translated. Exactly same wording is highlighted in student’s text and the missing highlighting shows where a synonym has been used.

Similar sentences were found in a document published by the Ministry of Finance presenting the customer approach of national IT service unit. The student has picked sentences from the original document and formed paragraphs consisting of copied sentences. There are no references at all in the student’s text when she writes about customer management (two pages) and thus this is an example of plagiarism as well.

In the data it is common that the primary source is not identified. Thus secondary sources and even tertiary sources are used also in central parts of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Example of direct quotation without quotation marks or reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student in 2012, one paragraph:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ministry of Finance 2008, sentences in different paragraphs:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theses. Accordingly, referencing remains unclear. It is also common to use general introductory internet pages as a source. Table 3 presents one example where the student writes about the main concept of her thesis: welfare. The text is a copy of study material in VirtuaaliAMK (Virtual University of Applied Sciences). She has quoted text without quotation marks. The study material has some references but the student ignores them, and she also makes a mistake in naming the source. The copying here is (almost) word to word with minor changes to the text.

**Misquoting** means that the reference given in text is incorrect and misleading. At one page in her 50 page Master’s thesis the student refers to an article by Almeida et al. 2001 in the following way (text translated):

Irritability, fatigue and stress may prevent the parent to notice the child’s needs or tighten the relationship between them. Even good educational principles do not necessarily help, if the parent loses his/her head due to stress and exhaustion. (Almeida, Wethington and Macdonald 2001.)

There is no other reference in the thesis to this source. In the reference list the student writes:


The first thing the reader starts to wonder are the page numbers as they are given backwards. The correct publication details are: Journal of Marriage and Family 63 (2), 417–429. In this short paragraph the student has made many mistakes. *Paternal* in the title has become *parental*, there are mistakes in the title of the journal and in reporting the volume and number of the issue. The page numbers are incorrect. Additionally, the content the student has written is not from this article. The origin of the text remains unknown.

Another example of misquoting or a false reference (text translated) is presented below:
The minimum number of nursing staff is significant above all for nursing staff stability in the organisation. It has been shown that for each additional patient i.e. increase in workload effects nursing staff 15 per cent increase in job dissatisfaction and 23 per cent increase in probability of burnout. Thus, the use of substitutes has significance in the skilled personnel for work and to coping at work. (Pitkäaho 2011, 113; Aiken, Sloane, Cimiotti, Clarke, Flynn, Seago, Spelt & Smith 2010, 904–906.)

The student has referred to two original texts, Pitkäaho’s (2011) doctoral dissertation (in Finnish) and to an article by Aiken et al. 2010. Neither of the references is correct. On page 113, Pitkäaho (2011) does not write about the issue the student writes in the paragraph, and in her dissertation there is no concept of ‘minimum number of staff’ or ‘job dissatisfaction’.

In the student’s 67 page long thesis there is only one reference to Aiken et al. 2010. She refers to pages 904–906 of the article. However, in the Aiken et al. (2010) article those first pages deal with nurse ratios in three USA states, and the relation between nurse-patient ratio and patient mortality. Thus, the issues the student writes about in her text cannot be found on those pages (nor in the whole article). It remains unclear where the student has taken the exact percentages to her paragraph and why references are made in a misleading way to those two sources that do not contain the information.

Plagiarism

Several plagiarised text columns were also found within the sample (n = 91). In altogether 11 theses plagiarism was identified without using plagiarism detection software. Plagiarism was evident and typically it was cut and paste plagiarism, text was copied from several sources. In many cases some of the wording had been changed: synonyms were used, the sentences were shortened or word and sentence order changed. In table 4 one example of plagiarism is presented.

The text and the references have been copied word to word. The student has also copied the references from the original authors’ reference list. A further proof of copying is that also the mistakes that are understandable in a given text have been transferred to the copied text (“researcherer”). The copied link in student’s reference list, however, does not work due to removing -. The link in the original authors’ reference list is correct.

Another example of plagiarism represents recycling of text published earlier in the same database Theseus (Table 5). In a similar way as in the previous example, the reference is copied word to word and the reference list is identical except a spelling mistake made in the word “Publisherss”.

Conclusion

Students learn to write and cite in their higher education studies, and they become familiar with at least one referencing style that the university or study field in question prefers to use. The analysis of a sample of theses (n=91) published in the Finnish Theseus database produced knowledge about referencing skills of graduating students in universities of applied sciences. The majority of graduates in this sample (55%) master the recommended referencing procedure and in that way are able to follow an
ethically sound writing practice. The theses are written in a way that they show student learning about their chosen subject and are proofs of student expertise. However, in this sample almost one third (31%) of the graduates did not follow good writing and referencing practice in their theses. This result poses questions to universities of applied sciences: What kind of learning do these theses show and what kind of text is accepted as a thesis in higher education?

There is not much discussion about plagiarism in Finnish higher education, and officially, the only authority reporting plagiarism is Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. In the context of higher education discussion about plagiarism has proven to be difficult. In the data presented in this paper there is evidence of student plagiarism that is accepted in universities of applied sciences. The results show how text from existing source is taken and used as student’s own writing. Sentences might or might not be slightly altered, sources of the original text are copied to reference lists, and nothing convinces the reader that the student herself/himself has written the text based on learning due to reading the named source. Also, many of the practices categorised under the blurry concept of sloppy scholarship would be seen as plagiarism in many other countries. In theses that include plagiarism it is difficult to find learning in which students have constructed knowledge for themselves (Barr & Tagg 1995, p. 15) instead of just copying text from one document to another.
This study revealed plagiarism and sloppy scholarship in theses that have been accepted as final assignments for Bachelor’s or Master’s degrees. Plagiarism in thesis texts was identified by using the definition of Finnish Advisory Board on Research Ethics (2002, 21) when “someone else’s text, or parts thereof” were “presented as one’s own”. As there is neither research about the amount of plagiarism nor practically any officially recognised plagiarism cases in Finland, the evidence produced in this study needs careful consideration. The conclusions also need to be careful as there is proof of strong reactions with ad hominem accusations towards the rare whistle-blowers in Finland (Moore 2008). The evidence is in sharp contrast with the educational discourse in Finland in which quality is the key concept.

The results, however, suggest that Finnish higher education disagrees with Ondrusek’s (2012) conclusion that a student with deficiencies in writing skills is not able to fulfill degree requirements, and that there might be a hidden problem of plagiarism in Finnish higher education. The results can also mean that in Finnish higher education plagiarism is understood and defined differently than in the national definition or in international literature. There seems to be variation in how plagiarism is understood and in the criteria for an acceptable writing practice.
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