

This exam focuses on your abilities to read and write effectively in technical English. It consists of two parts.

1 Correct the following sentences by choosing the suitable words

Please write the number and the correct choice only.

- You should learn to (**1: differentiate, defferentiate**) the (**2: good, well**) from the (**3: bad, worse**).
- (**4: Lust, Last**) week, we went on a (**5: field, feild**) trip to the science (**6: mue-seum, museum, musium**).
- We all must help to (**7: achieve, ashieve, acheive**) (**8: peace, piece**) in Palestine.
- This book gives all the (**9: prooves, proofs**) of the mathematical (**10: theo-rems, thiolems**) that it contains in its first (**11: appendix, appendics**).
- It is important to train the (**12: laboor, labor**) forces in any (**13: cuntry, country**) and to prepare them for the (**14: tough, tuff**) worldwide (**15: com-pitition, competition**).
- Our market (**16: chair, share**) (**17: rose, rised**) by 10% in the first (**18: quar-ter, quarto, quartor**) of 2007.
- After treatment, the cows (**19: eight, eihgt, eite, ate**) all of the (**20: hay, hey**). The following day, their milk production almost (**21: dubled, doubled, duble, double**).
- The (**22: fierce, feirce**) chip design business is similar to a (**23: raise, race**) where everyone is running at the speed of (**24: lite, light**) for the (**25: cus-tomers', costumers'**) satisfaction. Can you (**26: imagine, emagine**) that the performance doubles every two years?
- What does the period from the (**27: creation, criation**) till 2005 and the period from 2005 till 2007 (**28: has, have**) in (**29: common, cummun**)? Answer: the net increase in computing performance is the same.
- The use of cell phones (**30: proliferates, prolipherates**) in Egypt every year. Some people are happy about this fact and some are not.

2 Academic writing

Please read the following articles then write *a single article* about plagiarism. I hope that this effort will help you in your future research careers. In your writing, please remember the following issues.

- Your work should be a coherent article with an introduction, body, and conclusion not just a list of unrelated points!
- If your article is divided into sections and subsections then those divisions should have informative titles and be numbered in sequence.
- Your article must not plagiarize! Clearly credit the ideas to their original authors and cite the provided articles as your references. You may cite other references as well obviously.
- The reference list should appear at the end of your article ordered alphabetically by the last name of the first author.
- Your article must address at least the following points and is expected to discuss other ideas either from the provided articles or from your own background information:
 1. How is plagiarism usually discovered?
 2. Give some reasons why university presses prefer caution when dealing with plagiarism cases.
 3. Why do graduate students sometimes keep quiet when their mentors plagiarize their own work?
 4. In your opinion, what is the appropriate action when the adviser plagiarizes the student?
 5. What is the appropriate level of information sharing and using between colleagues within a lab?
 6. If you were an adviser and one of your students wrongly accuses you of plagiarism, how will you respond?
 7. Discuss the possibility of forgiving plagiarists after some period of time indicating the length of that period and whether the punishments will be lifted gradually or abruptly.
- Your article should have neither spelling nor grammar mistakes.

2.1 Mentor vs. Protégé

By Thomas Bartlett and Scott Smallwood in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Friday 17 December 2004.

The professor published the student's words as his own. What's wrong with that?

Dwayne D. Kirk was proud of his paper, and with good reason: It was the first time his name—and his name alone—had appeared atop a scholarly article. He had spent two months doing research and writing, carefully considering each example, weighing every word. Now, after all that work, here was something, he says, that he could “really call my own.”

So he was understandably taken aback when, a year later, he saw his words below someone else’s name. And not just a sentence or two, but paragraph after paragraph, all lifted verbatim.

What’s more, the scholar who had appropriated his work was his mentor, Charles J. Arntzen, a professor of plant biology at Arizona State University at Tempe. Mr. Arntzen, 63, is a pioneer in the creation of edible vaccines, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and a former member of the editorial board at the journal *Science*. In 2001 he was appointed by President Bush to the President’s Council on Science and Technology.

Mr. Kirk, in contrast, is a 33-year-old graduate student whose career has barely begun.

This confrontation—which until now has been going on behind closed doors—is about authorship and giving credit where it is due. But like many other cases of alleged plagiarism, it is also about the power that a senior scholar can wield over a younger colleague.

When the Harvard University law professors Charles J. Ogletree Jr. and Laurence H. Tribe were caught plagiarizing this fall, they immediately pointed to oversights by their research assistants. Yet far more common than research assistants’ getting the blame for a professor’s plagiarism are the graduate students fuming quietly about their work’s being swiped by a mentor.

One reason for their silence is fear of retribution. After all, graduate students depend on professors to help advance their careers. Indeed, after filing his complaint, Mr. Kirk writes in an e-mail message, he now understands “why other people who face these kinds of situations choose not to make their grievances known.”

CUTTING AND PASTING

Before charges of plagiarism soured their relationship, Mr. Kirk and Mr. Arntzen were close colleagues, even friends. When Mr. Arntzen was president of the Boyce-Thompson Institute, a nonprofit research organization affiliated with Cornell University, he hired Mr. Kirk as a research specialist. From the beginning, Mr. Kirk impressed his boss. “He’s a very bright guy,” Mr. Arntzen says.

Mr. Arntzen left Boyce-Thompson for Arizona State in 2000. Three years later Mr. Kirk followed him, accepting a paid position as a researcher at the university and enrolling in the graduate biology program. The professor had written a letter of recommendation for Mr. Kirk, and the two had discussed the possibility of Mr. Arntzen’s serving as his adviser. Mr. Kirk acknowledges that the professor “has certainly played a big role in promoting my career.”

The aura of mutual admiration began to fade in July 2003. That’s when Mr. Kirk discovered that Mr. Arntzen had copied large portions of his paper without his permission. About one-third of Mr. Arntzen’s article—which was published as a chapter

in the 2004 book *Vaccines: Preventing Disease and Protecting Health*— was taken directly from Mr. Kirk’s paper, which was published two years before in the book *Genetically Modified Foods*. The graduate student’s paper was not cited, but Mr. Arntzen did mention Mr. Kirk among the dozen people he thanked in the acknowledgements.

Mr. Arntzen does not deny copying Mr. Kirk’s paper. He says that he “did some cutting and pasting,” and that the practice is common in scientific circles. (In fact, most of the passages not taken from Mr. Kirk’s paper come from an article that Mr. Arntzen wrote with another Arizona State researcher.)

The professor wrote his chapter over one weekend, he says, adding that borrowing passages is a way to “conserve energy.” He felt justified in doing so, he says, because Mr. Kirk is a member of his research team and members often share materials with each other. Mr. Arntzen also argues that because his paper was not a peer-reviewed article, the standards for plagiarism are different.

Not so, says Mark S. Frankel, director of the program on scientific freedom, responsibility, and law at the American Association for the Advancement of Science. “The idea that it’s in a book instead of a peer-reviewed article is a poor excuse and one that’s unacceptable,” he says. “Generally speaking, having one-third of your published work come from someone else without permission is a good case for a plagiarism charge.”

As for Mr. Arntzen’s contention that what he did is common in science, that may be true, but that still doesn’t make it OK, says Marcel C. LaFollette, author of *Stealing Into Print: Fraud, Plagiarism, and Misconduct in Scientific Publishing*. “If they are other people’s words, you are under an obligation, whether you are a scientist or a historian, to use quotation marks.”

GETTING AT THE TRUTH

There are two versions of what happened in this case —Mr. Kirk’s and Mr. Arntzen’s— and those versions are substantially different.

According to Mr. Kirk, beginning in August 2003, he and the professor discussed the matter many times over several months but were “unable to agree on a resolution.”

That’s not Mr. Arntzen’s story. He says he immediately agreed to list Mr. Kirk as a co-author. “We agreed that when the galley proofs came, I would change the authorship,” he says. Unfortunately, says Mr. Arntzen, the publisher did not provide prepublication galleys of the article.

There was no such agreement, according to Mr. Kirk. In addition, the editor of the book about vaccines, *Ciro A. de Quadros*, insists that Mr. Arntzen was provided with a copy of the article before it was published. “He saw the paper,” says Mr. de Quadros. “He can’t be blaming me for that.”

After the book was published, Mr. Arntzen says he called Mr. de Quadros and asked him to insert a correction that would add the names of Mr. Kirk and two other colleagues to the list of authors. “I called him up,” says Mr. Arntzen. “I said, ‘Ciro, there’s a concern.’”

That’s not what happened, according to Mr. Kirk. He says he sent the editor an e-mail message informing him that the chapter contained plagiarized material. Only after he told Mr. de Quadros what had happened did Mr. Arntzen agree to make a change, Mr. Kirk says.

The editor backs up Mr. Kirk's version. He says he first heard about the matter from Mr. Kirk. "I called Charlie and said, 'What's going on? You put us in a bad position,'" Mr. de Quadros says.

After challenging Mr. Arntzen, Mr. Kirk says, he began to be cut out of important research projects at Arizona State. This fall he filed a formal complaint against Mr. Arntzen with the university. An investigation is being conducted, but a spokesman for Arizona State declines to comment on its progress.

FEW FIGHT BACK

Disagreements between senior and junior scholars occur all the time. Often, though, junior scholars keep their complaints to themselves because they see little to gain from challenging their bosses. When they do complain, it usually means appealing to administrators who have worked with those same senior scholars for years.

Among the few to fight back and win is Carolyn R. Phinney, a psychology researcher at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. She charged that a professor there had fraudulently used her ideas to get a federal grant. After years of legal battles, she won a \$1.67-million settlement from the university.

More common is what happened to Sheng-Ming Ma, a graduate student in mathematics at Columbia University. He was kicked out of graduate school and took a job making sandwiches at Subway after unsuccessfully trying to stop a professor from publishing a proof that Mr. Ma said he had devised. He sued, but the case was dismissed.

Antonia Demas argued for years that a professor of nutrition at Cornell University was unfairly taking credit for her ideas about an elementary-school nutrition curriculum. The professor even claimed as his own awards that Ms. Demas had won. After the case received national attention, she heard from dozens of graduate students around the country with similar complaints (The Chronicle, April 12, 2002).

Some critics of the heavy use of research assistants have suggested that changing the culture surrounding published acknowledgements might help. Instead of just thanking assistants, scholars should explain clearly what work they did.

Yet, particularly in science labs, graduate students are just extensions of the senior scholars rather than researchers in their own right. Richard C. Lewontin, an emeritus professor of biology at Harvard, recently chastised scientists in general for a "pervasive dishonesty" that allows researchers to take credit for work they did not do.

"Regardless of the actual involvement of the laboratory director in the intellectual and physical work of a research project," Mr. Lewontin wrote in the New York Review of Books, "he or she has unchallenged intellectual-property rights in the project, much as a lord had unchallenged property rights in the product of serfs or peasants occupying dependent lands."

Mr. Arntzen continues to argue that he had the right to use Mr. Kirk's words without his permission. The charge of plagiarism hit him "like a brick," he says, adding that he considers the controversy to be nothing more than a personal misunderstanding.

He is willing to concede, however, that in many cases "the mentor doesn't fully appreciate the independence the person they're mentoring has come to feel for themselves." Even after Mr. Kirk accused him of plagiarism, the professor still has nothing but praise for his protégé.

“He’s excellent,” says Mr. Arntzen. “He writes very well.”

EXAMPLE OF PLAGIARISM

Original: Protocols defining Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) must be redefined for pharmaceutical plant materials, and the processing and handling practices that follow the raw product. . . . The preferred utility of current crop and food species for the production of oral vaccines will mandate containment as an essential parameter for any production of these materials. Such containment can be provided by appropriate greenhouse facilities, or by significant geographic isolation from related crops. Transfer of technology for manufacture in target locations such as developing countries, will require equal standards for containment to ensure integrity of the product, and of the technology as a whole. As pharmaceutical materials, all such tissues will be highly controlled and could not be released like other transgenic plants used for agricultural commodity production.

Dwayne D. Kirk, “Edible Vaccines: A Decade of Development,” *Genetically Modified Foods*, Editora UFV, 2002.

Not So Original: Protocols setting good manufacturing practices must be redefined for pharmaceutical plant materials, as well as for processing and handling practices that utilize the raw product. The use of crop species that currently are part of the food supply to produce oral vaccines will mandate crop stewardship (genetic separation from the food supply) as an essential parameter for any production of these materials. Such containment can be provided by appropriate greenhouse facilities, or by significant geographic isolation from related crops. Transfer of technology for manufacture in locations such as developing countries will require equal standards for crop stewardship to ensure integrity of the product, and of the technology as a whole. As pharmaceutical materials, all such tissues will be highly controlled and could not be released like other transgenic plants used for modern agricultural commodity production.

Charles J. Arntzen, “Oral Vaccines Derived From Transgenic Plants,” *Vaccines: Preventing Disease and Protecting Health*, Pan American Health Organization, 2004.

2.2 University Presses Choose Caution in Responding to Accusations of Plagiarism

By Peter Monaghan in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Friday 17 December 2004.

THE WORST FORM OF FLATTERY: Plagiarism is an academic sin that university-press officials dare not speak about too openly.

Indeed, many of them—even those who report no experience of plagiarism at their institutions—prefer to err on the side of caution, and even anonymity, when discussing it. Says Jennifer Snodgrass, the editor for reference and special projects at Harvard University Press: “In the current climate, which tends to sensationalize such issues, an accusation of plagiarism, even when unfounded or ultimately disproved, can be enough to damage a scholarly reputation.”

Niko Pfund, academic publisher at Oxford University Press, concurs: “There’s little to be gained from discussing individual cases in public, so it’s one of those subjects where people understandably lay low.”

Despite plagiarism’s recent prominence in the news, some academic publishers doubt that plagiarism is increasing. At worst, says Marlie Wasserman, director of Rutgers University Press, “we’re talking about a tiny percentage—one out of 200 books—that has some kind of issue, and it can go either way.”

Yet undercurrents of doubt remain, even among those who hold this view. Ms. Wasserman suspects that plagiarism “happens more than we realize,” because while many problems are solved at presses, untold others are settled quietly in author-to-author exchanges.

Press officials agree that careless, rather than conscious, plagiarism predominates. “A lot of cases involve a new assistant professor whose dissertation didn’t include sufficient citations” and comes to the press as a manuscript with inadequate “detail work,” says William H. Hamilton, director of the University of Hawaii Press.

“The significant amount of scholarly work circulating on the Internet creates many more opportunities for plagiarism, deliberate or unwitting,” cautions Ms. Snodgrass. Some editors even wonder whether an Internet-aided “culture of plagiarism” among undergraduates is gradually being transmitted up the academic food chain.

Yet academic publishers do admit that plagiarism is often impossible to detect in manuscripts until an accusation is lodged. Even expert readers cannot possibly know all the relevant literature, says Mr. Hamilton. So ultimately plagiarism is “almost impossible to protect against.”

Plagiarism usually is discovered when scholars, naturally curious about developments in their field, uncover intellectual theft. “People with half a brain realize this—that there are people very well versed in the discipline,” says another press director, who preferred to speak anonymously. “But still some people plagiarize, anyway, for whatever reasons—pathology, or let’s face it, the need to have a publication to get a job, which makes them desperate.”

Plagiarism is a messy business. So it is small wonder that even presses whose books are victimized by intellectual theft want to settle such allegations quietly and without much fuss—let alone a lawsuit.

A few years ago, for instance, an author whose book was published by the University of California Press discovered that a young English scholar had extensively plagiarized from that work in a book published by a small British academic press.

The California book was a music title, and that made the discovery likely, says Mary C. Francis, an editor at California. “The groups of people who study these topics are fairly small,” she notes. (Ms. Francis would not divulge the names of the scholars involved.)

The original author identified the extent of the plagiarizing: paragraph after paragraph, page after page. “Part of what made it so astonishing was that it was so blatant,” says Ms. Francis. Presented with these facts, the British publisher did not dispute the charges. “There was no court case, but lawyers were involved,” she says. Under an agreement, the British publisher withdrew the offending book, and published an explanation on its Web site. It also agreed to inform bookstores, and anyone who

ordered the book, why it was no longer available.

Says Ms. Francis: “We dealt with the other press as a press. We never had contact with the young author, and there was never contact between the authors.” She believes that “it does not work out to have the two authors confront one another. It is believed here automatically that if we published the book, then we will act.”

Being on the other side of the plagiarism problem is even more of a headache. “Obviously, the integrity of the imprint is the most important factor for a publisher,” says Oxford’s Mr. Pfund. “One tailors one’s responses, depending on the severity of the offense, from including an errata slip in the book and making changes in future printings to retrieving all extant copies and pulping them, and pulling the book from the market.”

Forgiving transgressors among one’s own authors will depend on their explanations, says Mr. Pfund. “How one approaches each case depends on a number of variables: the nature of the problem, the plagiarized party’s disposition, and the author’s explanation being the most significant,” he says. “If an author is mortified, immediately apologizes, and can provide a reasonable explanation that, while not excusing the matter, sheds light on how it occurred and is somewhat satisfactory to both the plagiarized and the two presses involved, the conversation tends to be markedly different from a situation where an author is dismissive of another’s claims or offers a weak or breezy explanation. The ultimate outcome may not be different, but how you get there could well be.”

Press directors say they, like academics, can take consolation from certain realities of plagiarism. Phil Pochoda, director of the University of Michigan Press, says that almost all plagiarism is pointless anyway. “There’s nothing is to be gained,” he says. “What will a few paragraphs do in terms of your argument? The risk is far, far greater than any possible reward.”