LUND UNIVERSITY

This is how Urkund works:

1. The teacher informs you that Urkund will be used for written project reports. The teacher will provide you with an email address to which you send your report.

2. You write your report in any word processing program.

3. You send in your project to Urkund by attaching the document to an email which is sent to the email address specified by the teacher. You will get a confirmation from Urkund that your document has been received.

4. On the way to you teacher the document is scanned and processed by Urkund. The report is stored in the Urkund database and compared with all other documents in the database and with books, scientific articles and other material available on internet.

5. When the analysis is completed your report together with the analysis is forwarded to your teacher. From the analysis the teacher can easily detect if any parts of your text show overlap with other sources (see example on the next page). The teacher can also if needed go into a more detailed analysis of specific parts of your text.

6. The analysis compares your work (at the left side) with the sources (to the right side) and indicates where the teacher should direct his/her attention (i.e. to parts that show overlap with other sources). After comparing your text with the sources the teacher can determine whether there should be suspicion of plagiarism or not. Urkund does not make any judgments regarding plagiarism – only draws the attention to similarities between texts.

7. Your report is stored in the Urkund database. This means that it will be included in future analyses of texts sent in to Urkund and that your work is protected against plagiarism. Your report is, however, not made available to the public, other researchers, journalists etc.

8. As the author you have the right to exclude your report from future comparative analyses (except from analysis made by Lund University). Your report will then not be included in the comparison when other texts pass through Urkund.

The text above is a translation from Urkunds Swedish webpage
http://www.urkund.se/SE/index.asp and from the confirmation email that is sent out by Urkund when you send in a project.

Jep Agrell
Director of Studies, Biology Education
Lund University

On the next page you can see an example of an analysis from Urkund

Postal address *Ecology Building* Visiting address *Sölvegatan 37* Telephone Int *+46 46-222 7317, +46 46-222 0000,*
Telefax Int *+46 46-222 4206* E-mail *jep.agrell@bioll.lu.se* URL *http://www.biol.lu.se*

Left side: As student entered the text in the submitted document.
Right side: As the text appears in the source.

Instances from: http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/155494/file/625388.pdf

0: http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/155494/file/625388.pdf 44%	0: http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/155494/file/625388.pdf 44%
CO2 enrichment could thus have significant impact on insects and this could in turn affect plant populations. Behavioral insect responses, especially altered preferences, are central in this process (	CO 2 enrichment can thus have significant impact on insect populations (Coviella and Trumble 1999), which in turn would affect plant populations. Behavioural responses, especially altered host plant preferences, are central in this process
1: http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/155494/file/625388.pdf 60%	**1: http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/155494/file/625388.pdf 60%**
Changes in herbivore host plant preferences in an altered atmospheric environment also play an important role for predictions about how much herbivores consume. Insects fed CO2 enriched foliage commonly exhibit increased consumption rate, presumably as a response to reduced food quality, i.e. compensatory consumption, see Lindroth 1995, Lindroth 1996). However, a potentially important alternative response, i.e. selection of another food source, has not been accounted for in most experiments (Körner 2000). Available data suggest that elevated CO2 levels do not increase consumption if herbivores have several food plants available (Peters et al. 2000).	Changes in herbivore host plant preferences in an altered atmospheric environment also play an impor- tant role for predictions about herbivore consump- tion. Insects fed CO 2 enriched foliage often exhibit increased consumption rate, presumably as a response to reduced food quality (compensatory consumption, Fajer et al. 1989, Roth and Lindroth 1995, Lindroth 1996, Bezemer and Jones 1998, Agrell et al. 2000). However, an alternative response, i.e. selection of an alternative food source, has not been possible in most feeding experiments (Ko ¨ rner 2000). Available data actually suggest that elevated CO 2 levels do not increase consumption if herbivores have several food plants available (Peters et al. 2000).

The examples below are translated from "Urkunds Plagiathandbok":

http://www.urkund.se/SE/documents/Urkunds_plagiathandbok.pdf

Which of these situations should be considered plagiarism?

A. To write down or copy a shorter paragraph word by word from another source, without specifying the original author(s).

B. In agreement with you supervisor/teacher continue to work with a text you have written yourself.

C. Translate the text of another author to a new language without specifying the original author(s).

D. Use an existing text without specifying the original author(s), but making small adjustments regarding order of words and sentences, and by changing words into synonyms and removing/adding words.

E. To read several texts and rework their contents into a new text that does not look like any of the original sources, without making any references to the author(s).

F. Rewrite 3-4 sentences word by word and in association with the text refer to the original author(s).

G. Translate a text you have written yourself to another language and use the result.

H. Expand a text of your own that has previously been graded without stating which parts that are "old".

I. Rewrite 3-4 sentences word by word, mark it with quotation marks and in association with the text and refer to the original author(s).

Answer: A,C,D,E,F,H are plagiarism, B, I are not. G may be considered as cheating under certain circumstances, but is not plagiarism.