

Impressions of thesis retake in light of reparation of plagiarism

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Notes while reviewing Turnitin report of the resubmission:

- Executive Summary contains a few linguistic idiosyncrasies (e.g. particles) that suggest these lines were produced by student.
- Main findings has a few lay-out inconsistencies that suggest either a lack of attention, understanding of role of lay-out in conveying the message, or (but we have no clear evidence for this) copying of generated text without editing.
- First paragraph of Chapter 1 (p.1) is apparently the formulation as it appears in an example thesis from our program, as the generic parts match (i.e. everything outside of the words explicitly describing the topic) a thesis from last year (side note: that thesis was written under my own supervision). I suspect more students use that paragraph as a template from one of the thesis we provide in the workshops.
- Setting the stage on p.1 uses many passages and wordings literally
 - from the cited source 5.1.2e
5.1.2e (e.g. the use of 5.1.2e reveals these are not the words of the student, yet the quotes are missing).
 - Again, several sentences/almost an entire paragraph from the 5.1.2e
5.1.2e are copied without reference to the 5.1.2e. (*matched here as
5.1.2e
 - Last paragraph on page 1 is literally matching the above 5.1.2e
5.1.2e but referenced by another source:
5.1.2e -
where we don't find the same text (nor does the 5.1.2e
reference 5.1.2e).
- Page 2 shows many literal matches
 - With the source referenced in footnote 9, but no quotes are used for the wordings that are literal matches.
- Section 1.4 again apparently uses example theses as a template, including mentioning methods/sources in fact not used 5.1.2e. This implies the paragraph 5.1.2e
5.1.2e
- Section 2.1 is again more than half literal formulations from one (referenced) source without any use of quotation marks.

5.1.2e

- The text surrounding the listing of the [5.1.2e] (lower half of p.5) contains no quotes and appears literally the same in [5.1.2e]; the references to the document containing the [5.1.2e] [5.1.2e] [5.1.2e] provides no further specification of where in that document the [5.1.2e] appear.
- Second and third paragraphs on page 6 are marked to literally match an internet source that seems to be no longer available ([5.1.2e]).

This pattern continues throughout the rest of chapter 2: each paragraph, and sometimes a couple consecutive paragraphs, are marked by Turnitin to have a very high word-to-word similarity with an external source. While often (but not always) the source is being referenced through a footnote, never are quotation marks used to indicate that the wordings are not by the student. While this “patchwork” text does result in a text that contains relevant information on the thesis topic, as master thesis work this is problematic (as explicitly indicated in our standards and expectation and thesis workshops): the student should show they are capable of expressing THEMSELVES actively on the topic.

- On p. 11, first paragraph more than half matches [5.1.2e] literally, while this source is not referenced (let alone quoted with quotation marks). The match may be because much of the text is quoting articles from [5.1.2e] [5.1.2e] – so they may happen to be quoted in the same words in English in different source.
- Page 17 has strikingly few footnotes. First paragraph of 4.1.1 oddly has no reference while the words are shown to match [5.1.2e] as are many parts of page 18
- The parts a, b and c on page 21-22 are full of phrasing matching very closely [5.1.2e] [5.1.2e] (e.g. b in the thesis is more or less 6.4.2 in the book) while the book is only referenced at the bottom of page 18.

I find it very striking that the [5.1.2e] part (section 5.2) suddenly has so few matches. It also has a particular structure to it [5.1.2e] that seems to be missing in other parts of the thesis (that are more “patchwork” and refer less to the structure of the research, e.g. by pointing back at research subquestions). This raises other questions about the way this text was produced.

Impressions/additions 5.1.2e :

I've had a look, and I agree that issues remain. [...] At the end of last month, I followed-up with 5.1.2e to see to what extent 5.1.2e had started reworking 5.1.2e thesis.

5.1.2e

I've started to reworking on flagged sections, but not sure if there's anything I should change regarding the structure or substance.

31/07 21:09

I'm glad to hear you've started re-working it.

Structurally, it should be fine. Substance, too, for the most part. But please note that the large sections of copied text will require a proper rewrite. In other words, you cannot just ask ChatGPT to rephrase the text, find a few new sources, and call it a day (please do not use ANY generative AI—even for grammar—as this will be flagged). You need to develop your own argument that you've gleaned and synthesized from multiple sources—THIS is the result of research we are looking for, not whether you've found a source that has already written on the subject you're currently writing about and reiterating that information. Please also note that the problems identified extend beyond the section that relies heavily on 5.1.2e. Any copying of text from another source of several words that isn't a common phrase (e.g. a phrase that comes from legislation but has become commonly used), needs to be in quotation marks or rephrased in your own words.

Also, I would suggest you go back and rephrase the text you used generative AI on—if you used it for grammar, I hope you have the original text somewhere, and can revert back to it. Even if there are some grammatical mistakes, this is okay—we understand that people make them sometimes, but it's your own writing (I still make grammatical mistakes at times, and I'm not 5.1.2e). If your thesis comes back with high hits of generative AI as the first version did, we can't be sure you wrote it, and this will negatively impact your chances of passing upon resubmission. (This is why I spent a significant amount of time during the standards and expectations session on this; please refer to the slides on Bright space for more guidance if needed.)

I hope that helps, and good luck!

It seems as though in several places, 5.1.2e still relied on a single source, but merely changed the wording to attempt to avoid it being picked up by Turnitin, e.g. the entirety of p. 21 and parts of several other pages. 5.1.2e really does not seem to understand synthesizing information and forming 5.1.2e own argument (or 5.1.2e thought it would take too much time).

Impressions thesis coordinator:

I looked through the Turnitin report first, then compared it against the Word file to check/gauge assiduousness of what referencing is there. Your term, 5.1.2e, of "patchwork text" describes pretty well my overall impressions. To take only two examples: the second Turnitin match is, unless I'm mistaken, in fact your own work

5.1.2e. There is still an awful lot of patchwork text paraphrasing the original with a few updates (and it looks like many sources are also pulled over, but to be confirmed), against just the one reference (FN 108, which is itself inadequate, just the one author and no year, no publisher, as if to cover one's tracks.....). There are similar issues for Turnitin match 4 5.1.2e, again for only one reference (FN 63).

[5.1.2e] The suspected use of the work of 5.1.2e led to a separate follow-up, implying this was already an issue in the initial submission:]

Yesterday

Yesterday 13:08 Edited

5.1.2e 23:07

Hi both, I've just managed to get on this now. I looked through the Turnitin report first, then compared it against the Word file to...

Interesting remark about the reference to our work (5.1.2e and I) as there was a part I was wondering whether that did not come from our research

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Somehow I must have been distracted preventing me to dive into this deeper - so many other issues, but also: you have to be so careful checking Turnitin matches, whether they are the original source or just another place on the internet where the original source has been copied.

5.1.2e Yesterday 23:25 Edited

5.1.2e In the original submission, 5.1.2e discovered that 5.1.2e copied 2-3 paragraphs from our work, nearly verbatim, and only replaced 5.1.2e

Today

5.1.2e 09:56 Edited

5.1.2e

5.1.2e 5.1.2e 13:08

Interesting remark about the reference to our work (5.1.2e and I) as there was a part I was wondering whether that did not come from...

Yes, this was a tricky one to detect, as the source found by Turnitin sent us to a Springer copyright removal notice (or similar). No work mentioned on the webpage. However, the URL had the title of the work. So I put 2 + 2 together and we checked the relevant pages in your book