1. WHAT ARE THE PRACTICES YOU HAVE USED?
Our Constructive Feedback and Plagiarism Reduction (CFPR) Program has involved several education strategies from 2007-2012 (see Owens & White, 2012).

One of these strategies involves students being given a paragraph taken from a published journal article. Details of its origin are clearly noted (e.g., from p.131 of a paper by Walker and Stickgold, 2006)

- Students are asked to write an entire paragraph based on a focussed question that relates to the article and information contained within it.
- Students are then given feedback not just on the quality of their writing, but on how appropriately they have referenced from the source.
  - In many cases when this exercise is conducted, students simply do not reference at all. If they have paraphrased information from the paragraph they are told they have negligently plagiarized its content; if they have taken the exact words they are informed about serious or verbatim plagiarism.
  - In an additional exercise, the paper excerpt may contain another (secondary) reference; and in this case even more students struggle to correctly cite the secondary source accurately (e.g. Marlin, 2004, cited in Walker & Stickgold, 2006).
- **Online version.** The first part of this exercise was conducted in tutorials in 2008. Here students submit their paragraphs online which are then run through similarity detecting software (WCopyfind), and then results with constructive feedback are returned and presented online a week later (see White, Owens & Nguyen, 2008). The results and constructive feedback for that initial exercise in 2008 are still available for students to view online in 2012.
- **In class version.** Since 2011, this exercise has been conducted entirely in tutorials. This has the advantage of immediate feedback. Students are given a sheet with the course paragraphs and work through exercises, and between tasks switch computers to mark their colleagues work. The tutor instructs them on how to mark, and it is certainly compelling for students when they are told to label their colleague’s work as plagiarized if their referencing was sloppy, incorrect, or absent (see Owens & White, 2012).

2. WHAT MAKES THE CFPR PROGRAM EFFECTIVE?
While the information on plagiarism we provide to students is comprehensive, and online mastery exercises also help, this approach of requiring students to actually write, and instantly detect their misunderstanding of referencing, is the most immediate and powerful intervention we have.

3. WHAT EVIDENCE IS THERE THAT THE CFPR PROGRAM WORKS?
The CFPR program reduced both resource and person-to-person plagiarism in extremely large cohorts where each semester’s cohort ranged in size from 950 to 2,000 students (Total N = 14,338).
Additional analyses revealed that these low plagiarism rates of first-year students were sustained when they progressed into the four Psyc2000 units and eight Psyc3000 units with only a total of n= 9 (out of a Total N = 10,000 + students) cases of plagiarism detected between 2008-2011.

One could confidently argue that these numbers indicate more than a reduction in plagiarism cases but an elimination of plagiarism in undergraduate Psychology. Interestingly, in these senior units only plagiarism detection software and warnings were utilised (as in our initial 2007 first-year intervention), however almost all the Psychology students progressing to second and third year had experienced our more comprehensive CFPR program in first year. The subsequent success across all three years of Psychology, during the period 2008-2011, strongly suggests first year is the most appropriate time to educate students in writing and referencing practices, as the evidence shows that the lessons learnt at the introductory level are clearly carried forward into later years.