

Training for Authorship license holders

Dr Irene Glendinning
Academic Integrity Lead
Office of Teaching and Learning



Agenda

- What is Authorship?
- When can Authorship be useful?
- Learning about what evidence can be useful and what can be misleading
- Deciding whether there is a case to answer
- Collating and preparing evidence for ACV, ACO and ACP meetings
- Understanding how to use the evidence to inform questions and present the evidence

Turnitin Authorship

- ~ 25 active license-holders – names in Staff Handbook
- Designed to support detection, evidencing of contract cheating
- Authorship report, on-line and csv
- Analyses portfolio of all submitted work for one student
- Authorship Dashboard – analysis and categorisation of all work submitted
- Student submissions: docx if possible not pdf
- Does not detect, can recommend investigation
- False positives and false negatives

When can Authorship be useful?

- Generating evidence for suspected cases of
 - collusion, sharing – materials, solutions
 - contract cheating,
 - content generated by AI tools
 - essay mills or ghost writers using AI generation
- Exploring all or part of a student's portfolio of work to check for authenticity – eg after a whistle-blower reports misconduct
- Investigating attempts to deceive, potentially across several assignments

Academic conduct procedures

Reg / Lead ACO: Triage

Is there a case to answer?

Yes: Assign ACO to case
No: pass back to tutor
More evidence needed or mark on merit

ACO: Initial decision

Consider evidence,

NCTA
PAP
Minor +
Contract cheating
Collusion

Mark on merit
Schedule ACO meeting
Schedule AC Viva
Schedule ACP

ACO meeting

Consider evidence, student responds

Decision on severity
History considered
Decision on outcomes using table and guidance notes

Guidance for student on next steps & educational element

AC viva

Academic process
Extra assessment
Student asked about process, content, sources, support etc

Student responds

Decision: Learning outcomes met?
Yes: NCTA
No: schedule ACO or ACP meeting

AC Panel

AD chair + ACOB + 1 academic
Registrar advises
ACOA presents the case
Student responds

Panel of 3 plus registrar
ACO presents case
Students responds, panel asks questions
Decision taken

Appeals mitigation

Are there valid grounds

Yes: Pass to ACP

No: refuse request

The Authorship Report

- Brings together all the work submitted via Turnitin by one student during their time at Coventry University
- Accessed via a Turnitin a submission ID
- On-line access to report and all student work
- Original submissions, including drafts, not Turnitin similarity report
- Red flags, Metrics, linguistic analysis, metadata
- Can customise the view
- May download all or part of the work
- Authorship report can be downloaded as a CSV file
- Can share URL with other license-holders

Example of Authorship CSV file

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X
filename	assignmer	class-nam	similarity	percent-ir	submissio	author-na	last-modi	date-crea	date-last	company-	page-size	created-w	keyword-l	editing-ti	revisions	has-replac	has-hidde	font-style	readabilit	vocab-rich	avg-sente	phrases-p	spelling-d
divya_kun	Professor	7027AFE -	99%	-	#####	Donna Crc	Divya K	#####	#####	Coventry	A4	Microsoft	-	2 minutes	2	No	No	15	12.73	35.03%	24.5	1.7	Yes
AUDITING	7033AFE-	7033AFE -	30%	-	#####	Divya K	Divya	#####	#####		US Letter	Microsoft		1 8 minutes	3	No	No	22	14.92	11.89%	27.41	2.44	Yes
GLOBAL_F	CW1: Indi	7030AFE -	23%	-	#####	Admin	Divya	#####	#####		US Letter	Microsoft		1 12 minute	4	No	No	17	16.4	12.82%	26.43	2.05	Yes
accountin	Individual	7034AFE -	14%	-	#####	User	Divya	#####	#####		US Letter	Microsoft		1 9 minutes	4	No	No	25	13.67	10.95%	26.21	2.23	No
Strategy_	7035AFE S	7035AFE -	22%	-	#####	Dell	Divya	#####	#####		US Letter	Microsoft		1 4 minutes	2	No	No	21	15.83	16.47%	32.65	2.14	Yes
RESEARCH	7010AFE C	7010AFE -	35%	-	#####	Divya K	Divya	#####	#####		US Letter	Microsoft	-	0 minutes	2	No	Yes	20	16.77	17.20%	28.54	2.29	Yes
divya_kun	Professor	7026AFE -	3%	-	#####	Donna Crc	Divya	#####	#####	Coventry	A4	Microsoft	-	0 minutes	2	No	No	15	12.75	34.02%	24.3	1.7	Yes
strategy_	7035AFE C	7035AFE -	16%	-	#####	-	Divya Kun	#####	#####		A4	Microsoft		1 43 minute	6	No	No	22	15.07	14.77%	27.16	2.18	Yes
0																							
1																							
2																							

Creating a new report

- Upload a set of material to compare
- Enter a Turnitin ID
 - Shows you all the work for the same student
 - Select which submissions to include in the report
 - Generate the report

Authorship: Metadata

- Metadata: Author name, Last modified by
- Page size (A4 / US Letter)
- Different software versions
- Timescale: Date created, Date last Mod, Editing time, #revisions

Authorship – linguistic analysis

- Hidden text, replaced characters, font styles, text as graphics
- Writing consistency:
 - Readability,
 - Vocabulary richness,
 - Sentence length
 - Phrases per sentence
- Spelling: American / British

Authorship – other clues

- Turnitin: Low or zero similarity
- Keywords, % in quotes
- Hidden text, replaced characters, font styles, text as graphics
- Images – can uncover falsification or repurposing
- References & in-text citations: Fake or fabricated, manipulated, copied as a block, irrelevant, foreign language, old dates
- Referencing & citation styles vary across submissions
- Writing styles and maturity of expression – writing consistency data from Authorship can help
- Formatting, auto-generate contents, inconsistencies, etc

Exploring the student's portfolio

- Look for the student's own voice across the different assessments
- Is there an example of the student's own writing for comparison – eg early self-reflection, diagnostic test, uploaded exam?

Use of AI tools: checklist

- Lack of critical thinking, largely factual content
- Repetition of content
- Inaccuracies and completely made up “facts”
- References irrelevant / unavailable / old / fabricated / copied – but some genuine
- Content generic, off the point – but getting better
- Grammar is just too perfect for this student
- Vocabulary, spelling (US/UK), sentence length – no “burstiness”
- Could this student have written this?
- Writing, content too advanced for this student
- Could it have been translated? – check language of references for clues
- Fabrication of data, references, facts – does it look genuine, repurposed, fake?
- Strange synonyms – could have used a paraphrasing tool or word spinner

These could also be signs of contract cheating

Essay mills and ghost writers also make use of these tools

Other checklists

- <https://outliar.blog/2021/10/19/resources-for-detecting-contract-cheating/>
- <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2022-10/substantiating-contract-cheating-guide-investigators.pdf?v=1588831095>

Checklists – could mean the student:

- ▶ used a ghost-writer (family, friend, alumni, colleague) or essay mill
- ▶ downloaded a document from a sharing web site
- ▶ reused work provided by another student, alumnus
- ▶ translated work written in another language, either written by the student or by someone else
- ▶ used an overly helpful proof-reader
- ▶ used software (DeepL, Quillbot, ChatGPT, etc) to generate or spin text
- ▶ plagiarised, fabricated or falsified data or results
- ▶ Independently used the same sources as another student

ID:

Introduction

Sustainable development tourism makes sustainable tourism and makes use to promote influential advancement in developing countries or areas that have gone through serious damage (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2017). As people travel far and wide from their home countries and inject millions into foreign countries for billions of dollars, the United Nations has recognised how crucial tourism can be as an agent of change in unstable environments and economies. Sustainable tourism proves to be very important as it is very important for everyone to realise that travelling should not be harmful in any manner (Garrigos-Simon et al., 2015). Travelling proves to be very important as it helps in the promotion of inclusive as well as sustainable economic growth. Similarly, it also helps in promoting resource efficiency and environmental promotion as well. It acts as the medium to maintain a mutual understanding along with peace and security as well.

As travel and tourism have the utmost capability in making the world a better place. The following proposal involves critically evaluating the challenging

White text examples

AAAAA%3Avdepr8Z7XDZwnLVii7zwtS93Rcpvnhn1Aeweqip4vVM1tDN7zQjwmvzPBQnae7w6DSg8Cx
TsqcP&journalCode=cgde20> [Accessed 17 January 2022].

XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH
JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo
au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG
HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll
;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD
FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú
koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC
SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag
my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ
XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx bib mm
Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP
[[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot vivo xxx
bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY UUU III
OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if www or tot
vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE RRR TTT YYY
UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ away sass did if
www or tot vivo xxx bib mm Hoh gag my jùjú koku lolll ;;; oxo au egg XXX CCC VVV AAA WWW EEE
PPP TTT YYY UUU III OOO PPP [[[ZZZ XXX CCC SSS DDD FFF GGG HHH JJJ KKK RRR WWW QQQ

Hidden characters

Dear Boris,

As your legal advisor, I will be providing you with advice on forming a valid contract, regarding the incident you have encountered along with the possible conditions you have or may not have met. My advice will prompt you in detail on the following four elements that form a valid contract alongside additional aspects to consider.

A contract is a binding agreement made between two or more parties, that can be written or executed orally, where the terms within the contract are enforceable by law. One type of contract is a unilateral contract, whereby only one party makes a promise, without initially acquiring an agreement from the other party. This was identically described in an article as mentioned 'The distinguishing feature of the unilateral contract is that the second party (the offeree) has not made a promise in return.' (Pettit, 1983). Alternatively, a bilateral contract is an agreement between two parties in which each side agrees to fulfill their side of the arrangement.

Offer

Academic Conduct documentation

- **Staff registry page** <https://share.coventry.ac.uk/staff/ps/Registry/Pages/Academic-and-Research-Integrity.aspx>
 - Staff Handbook – Sept 2023 version
 - Combined Checklist for contract cheating and misuse of AI
 - Guidance notes on AI for staff and students
- **Student guidance notes:** <https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/Pages/Academic-and-Research-Integrity.aspx>

Guidance for staff and students on use of AI tools

- Student use of artificial intelligence tools for
 - Paraphrasing
 - Translation
 - Text generation (essay bots)
 - Graphical object and video generation
 - AI detecting tools
- Guidance notes and PPT for staff and use with students
- Guidance for students

Multiple suspicions of contract cheating

- Several anomalies can surface together for one student
- Often includes work already marked and confirmed
- Can manage these as a single case, details Handbook 5.3 and 5.4
- Also extract from 8.3:
 - The letter of notification to the student must set out the nature and purpose of the viva to be conducted and make clear what materials, if any, the student is required to bring with them and/or allowed to make use of during the viva;
 - The work that will be discussed should be clear to the student in the letter;
 - Should more than one assessment submission have raised suspicions, then full details should be explained in the letter (see 5.3 for more discussion about this);
- See letter #13 for ACV
- Serial contract cheating > expulsion

Guidance on using the evidence

- Don't share the authorship report or CSV file with student
- Compare a few different submissions / modules
- Put together the evidence for unexplained differences
- Use to inform questions for the Academic Conduct Viva (ACV)
- Present the evidence at ACO or ACP meeting
- Use **balance of probabilities**, not **beyond reasonable doubt**

Analysis of work PGT submitted by Student xxxx / URL of Authorship report / Synopsis

All except one of the submissions uses US spelling - zzzzz has 71.43% British spelling – suggests a different author.

Six different names appear in metadata, either Author or Last Modified by fields.

One submission yyyyyy CW2 uses a strange font DengXian and unspecified software.

One piece of work wwww has reasonably good grammar, much better than the other submissions, but the references in this essay are generic rather than specific to this assignment.

Readability scores vary between 10.45 bbbbb CW2, Author and mmmm and 15.84 dddddd – Author name mmmm, last modified by kkkkkk – the lack of progression in readability scores, highest score in April 2021, lowest in June 2021 does suggest different authors.

Different referencing styles across the work eg (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992) compared to (Roome and Bergin, 2006), (Harvey, Stoner, Hochwarter, & Kacmar, 2007), (Mattoo, and Ruta, 2020), (Chen et.al, 2019), (Borhan et al. 2013), (Wright, 1921), (Sander, 2017), (Habibu V. K, 2013), (Gurl 2017) – no comma throughout the paper, group work but individual submission.

Quite a lot of generic, old and irrelevant sources included.

Different approaches to using an auto-generated list of contents – only one submission uses this, two more have manually created contents, one of these with no page numbers.

Two of the papers include stats, but not clear where all of these came from

Conclusions I found two pieces of work that look as though they were written by the student. There is one exam and one piece of group work that I did not evaluate. The remaining 9 pieces of work are suspicious and show signs of having been written by someone else.

Followed by list of submissions and module details
(anonymised report in the [shared OneDrive folder](#))

Facing Academic Integrity Threats (FAITH)

- Erasmus+ Cooperation and partnerships in higher education
- Feb 2022-Feb 2025
- Lead partner Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Türkiye
- Partners ENAI, Konstanz, Maribor, Porto
- PR1: Academic Integrity Policies: Good practice
- PR2: Proactive approach to deterrence
- PR3: Victim support portal

Resources for Coventry University Group

- Teaching Knowledge Base page:
<https://teach.coventry.domains/articles/academic-and-research-integrity/>
- Staff portal Registry page:
<https://share.coventry.ac.uk/staff/ps/Registry/Pages/Academic-and-Research-Integrity.aspx>
- Student portal Registry page:
<https://share.coventry.ac.uk/students/Registry/Pages/Academic-and-Research-Integrity.aspx>

Essential reading

All free to download:

OIAHE (2018) Good Practice Framework – Disciplinary Procedures.

<https://www.oiahe.org.uk/media/2045/good-practice-framework-disciplinary-procedures-section.pdf>

QAA (2022). Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education 3rd edition.

<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/guidance/contracting-to-cheat-in-higher-education-third-edition.pdf>

TEQSA (2020), Toolkit to support quality assurance agencies to address academic integrity and contract cheating.

<https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/inqaahe-teqsa-qbbg-academic-integrity-toolkit-v1-0.pdf?v=1594958272%20#HigherEd%20#AcademicIntegrity>

Links to relevant research

Awdry, R. GEMS survey: <http://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/gems/> [accessed 14/05/2020]

BBC Panorama, 13th Nov 2017, Student Loan Scandal <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b09g5l1c> [accessed 14/05/2020]

BBC File on 4, 16th January 2018 Degrees of Deception. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b09ly731> [accessed 14/05/2020]

Bretag, T., Harper, R. (2017) Infographic, preliminary Survey findings: <https://sitemockupsite.files.wordpress.com/2016/08/preliminary-survey-findings-infographic-v2.pdf> [accessed 14/05/2020]

CIQG & IIEP (2016). *Advisory Statement for Effective International Practice Combatting Corruption and Enhancing Integrity: A Contemporary Challenge for the Quality and Credibility of Higher Education*. IIEP / UNESCO, CHEA, CIQG. Available online at: <http://www.chea.org/pdf/advisory-statement-unesco-iiep.pdf> accessed 14/05/2020

Dawson, P., Sutherland-Smith, W., (2018) Can markers detect contract cheating? Results from a pilot study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol 43, 2018 – Issue 2, DOI <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1336746>

FAITH (n.d.) Facing Academic Integrity Threats. <https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/faith/>

Foltýnek, T., Dlabolová, D., Glendinning, I., Lancaster, T., Linkeschová, D.(2017) *South East European*

South East European Project on Policies for Academic Integrity, Project report, commissioned by Council of Europe, April 2017. <http://plagiarism.cz/seppai/> [accessed 14/05/2020]

Glendinning, I., Orim, S., King, A. (2019). *Policies and Actions of Accreditation and Quality Assurance Bodies to Counter Corruption in Higher Education*, published by CHEA / CIQG 2019. Executive summary, full report and media coverage: <https://www.chea.org/quality-assurance-combatting-academic-corruption-resources> [accessed 14/05/2020]

IPPHEAE project reports: / <http://plagiarism.cz/ippheae/> [accessed 05/02/2018]

Rogerson, A (2017), Detecting contract cheating in essay and report submissions: process, patterns, clues and conversations <https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=2344&context=buspapers>

Sutherland-Smith, W., Dullaghan, K. (2019), You don't always get what you pay for: User experiences of engaging with contract cheating sites, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol 44, 2019 - issue 8, pp 1148-1162 DOI:10.1080/02602938.2019.1576028

TEQSA (2017) Good Practice Note. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating-safeguard-academic> [accessed 14/05/2020]