

## CLOSEOUT FOR M92110044

This case was brought to the attention of OIG by [REDACTED] a program director in the Division of [REDACTED] in the Directorate for [REDACTED] on November 10, 1992. The program director had received an allegation of misconduct in science in a letter from [REDACTED] the complainant, who is a faculty member in the Department of [REDACTED]. The complainant had served as an ad hoc peer reviewer for proposal [REDACTED]. The complainant alleged this proposal, submitted by [REDACTED] the subject and a faculty member in the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED], contained text plagiarized from a published article by [REDACTED], the original author.

OIG compared the subject's proposal with the original author's article and found six blocks of text in the proposal that originally appeared in the article. Although the introduction to the proposal contained a citation to the original author's article, none of the transcribed blocks of text were offset by quotation marks or indentations. A citation to the original author's work did not accompany each block of text. When contacted by OIG, the subject explained that the same text had appeared in his dissertation, and that his dissertation had been reviewed and approved by the original author. The original author had not commented on the subject's use of the material in the dissertation. The subject said that he was quoting his dissertation in his proposal and that he was so familiar with the wording of the copied text that he had failed to correctly attribute the work to the original author. When contacted by OIG the original author said that he had actively advised the subject in graduate school and that the graduate students learned about ethical conduct in science informally through contact with their mentors. The original author further indicated that he had not closely read the subject's dissertation and had not noticed the transcribed material.

OIG concluded that the subject's failure to offset each block of copied text by quotation marks or indentations and to accompany each block with a citation was attributable to inadequate training. OIG explained the concept of plagiarism to the subject and provided him with a copy of "On Being a Scientist," (a publication of the National Academy of Sciences). This publication contains a brief, but clear, discussion of plagiarism and other forms of misconduct in science. The subject reviewed the material. At OIG's request he revised the text in question in his proposal, enclosing each block of copied text in quotation marks, and providing a citation. OIG reviewed and approved these changes. The subject then amended his proposal by forwarding, to the NSF program, copies of the corrected pages to replace the original pages. These pages were incorporated into the proposal jacket.

OIG feels that this young investigator's failure to adequately mark and cite all blocks of verbatim text are attributable to inadequate training in research documentation. As a result of OIG's actions he has developed a greater understanding of plagiarism and misconduct in science. He has taken the appropriate remedial action. This case is closed without further action.

CLOSEOUT FOR M92110044

[REDACTED]

7-16-93

Staff Scientist, Oversight

Concurrence:

Donald E. Buzzelli 7/16/93  
Donald E. Buzzelli  
Deputy Assistant Inspector General,  
Oversight

James J. Zwolenik 7/14/93  
James J. Zwolenik  
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

PK Swishie  
for Montgomery K. Fisher  
Counsel to the Inspector General

cc: Assistant Inspector General for Oversight  
Inspector General  
Counsel to the Inspector General