

# On plagiarism, patchwriting and the problems of overseas students in British universities

Malcolm Coulthard  
The University of Birmingham

## 0. Introduction

Although according to Angéilil-Carter (2002: 2) 'plagiarism is a modern Western concept which arose with the introduction of copyright laws in the Eighteenth century', its avoidance is now a basic plank of respectable academic scholarship. Student plagiarism is currently a hot topic, at least for those who teach and study in British and American universities. There are companies selling both off-the-shelf and written-to-order term papers and others, like *Turnitin.com*, offering an electronic detection service. Recently an Australian Rector was dismissed for persistent plagiarism earlier in his career and most Anglo-American universities have warnings against and definitions of plagiarism on their websites – indeed Pennycook notes that in the mid-90s Stanford University's documents about plagiarism were reproduced by the University of Oregon apparently without attribution, and suggests, whimsically, that there is 'one set of standards for the guardians of truth and knowledge and another for those seeking entry' (1996: 213), (example and quote taken from Pecorari, 2002, p 29).

The above raises a series of questions, which I will attempt to answer in what follows: what is plagiarism; why is it wrong; are there different types and degrees; how can it be detected; how prevalent is it; and should we modify our attitude towards it?

## 1. What is plagiarism?

Part of a definition produced by my own university is as follows – the highlighting in bold is mine as I wish to focus on those phrases:

### PLAGIARISM AND CHEATING IN EXAMINATIONS

Plagiarism is a form of cheating in which the student **tries to pass off someone else's work as his or her own.** ... **Typically, substantial passages are "lifted" verbatim** from a particular source **without proper attribution** having been made. To avoid suspicion of plagiarism, students should make appropriate use of references and footnotes.

[http://artsweb.bham.ac.uk/arhistory/declaration\\_of\\_aship.htm](http://artsweb.bham.ac.uk/arhistory/declaration_of_aship.htm)

A first problem is that, in the above University of Birmingham definition, plagiarism is seen as a conscious attempt to deceive - 'tries to pass off' - but teachers and markers cannot evaluate intentions, but only whether a text actually *does* pass off – in other words

many students may indeed be guilty of ‘passing off’ without being guilty of ‘intending to pass off’. For this reason the responsibility of knowing how to attribute properly and checking that one has done so, is passed over to the student, so that no teacher has to decide if the unacknowledged borrowing was deliberate or not. My own department has students sign a cover attached to all work submitted for assessment which says

I know what plagiarism is and I confirm that none of this work is plagiarised.

The most difficult part of the above Birmingham definition of plagiarism is ‘typically, substantial passages are lifted verbatim’. What in fact do ‘substantial’ and ‘verbatim’ mean? Certainly, the detection program Turnitin works by searching for longish identical strings, but much deliberate plagiarism is not of this kind at all. In the two short passages below, taken from published biographies of the American philanthropist Andrew Carnegie, we can see substantial similarities, which I have highlighted with **bold** for identical words and *italic* for close paraphrases, but Mackay strenuously denies plagiarism and is certainly not guilty under the above University of Birmingham definition:

a). With all of these problems it was little short of a miracle that the “stichting” board *was ready to lay the cornerstone* for the building *in the summer of 1907 at the opening of the Second Hague International Conference*. It then **took six more years** before **the Palace** *was completed* during which time there *continued to be squabbles over details, modifications of architectural plans and lengthy discussions about furnishings*. *For ten years the Temple of Peace was a storm of controversy, but at last, on 28 August 1913, the Grand Opening ceremonies were held.* (J F Wall, *Andrew Carnegie*)

b) The *foundation stone* **was not laid until the summer of 1907, in nice time for the opening of the Second Hague International Conference**. Actual construction of **the palace** *took a further six years*, delayed and exacerbated by constant *bickering over details, specifications and materials*. *For an entire decade the Peace Palace was bedevilled by controversy, but finally, on 28 August 1913, the opening ceremony was performed.* (J Mackay, *Little Boss: A Life of Andrew Carnegie*)

Nevertheless, many academics would want to classify the Mackay text as plagiarism on the grounds that it presents very similar content, in the same sequence, using many of the same words and, as we will see below, we now have a computer program which will enable plagiarism of this type to be detected.

## 2. Why is plagiarism wrong?

As everyone knows, being a student involves learning from the writings of others and thus any piece of student writing is likely to be more or less derivative. In essence, what the teacher wants the student to do is to construct a new edifice using mainly existing bricks, but perhaps reordering and polishing some of them and certainly adding a few of his/her own. Mainly because the student’s writing is there to be assessed, there is a strong need for the student to indicate what is borrowed and what is original and, over time, conventions have grown up to allow students to do this. In the words of Pecorari, an academic reader assumes that students are working with the following conventions

1. that language which is not signalled as a quotation is understood to be original to the writer;
2. that if the content is marked only with a citation, the language is understood to be paraphrased, i.e. substantially and independently reworded; and
3. that language which is signalled as a quotation—most commonly by the use of quotation marks—is understood to have been transcribed verbatim from the source. (Pecorari op cit: 112)

Reinforcing the concerns about plagiarism is an educational tenet, certainly prevalent in the Anglo-American world, that one only really ‘knows’ something when one can put it into one’s own words, so there is a premium on the use of paraphrase rather than direct quotation. This, of course, can be strange to students coming from a different culture with different educational beliefs, particularly cultures which prize rote learning and/or give great status to the actual words used by an acknowledged authority. For such students a common view is that if the expert has managed to express his/her ideas succinctly, what right do they have to interfere with the wording.

An even finer line may mark where *collusion* begins - that is when students have illegally worked together on a piece for assessment - particularly in an educational culture which on the one hand encourages collaboration and even projects undertaken jointly, while on the other insists on assessing individual achievement. This dividing line can be particularly difficult for

a student from a collectivist culture, [for whom] there is nothing morally wrong with collusion ... in such a culture resources, including intellectual ones, are to be shared; opinions expressed are those of the group, not the individual. (Barker 1997: 115, quoted in Pecorari 2002: 38.

### **3 Are there different types and degrees of plagiarism?**

Traditionally plagiarism was defined the borrowing of text from printed sources, and it appears to be that which Mackay is guilty of – this can occur when someone is working directly from a source text as they produce their own derived text, but more often it is a product of a student making notes from a source without distinguishing between what has been recorded verbatim and what in a paraphrased form, and then at a later date creating their own text from their undifferentiated notes. More common nowadays, however, are two other types, *collusion*, when one student reproduces partially or totally the work of another and *internet plagiarism*, when students sew chunks of ‘found’ text together with some of their own original writing.

Whichever of the three variants of plagiarism the text includes, it can be mild or severe, it may be restricted to a small area of the work or can be pervasive. Interestingly, the detection of massive but localised plagiarism from a known book is easiest for the human detector and pervasive but less intense collusion is easiest for the computer, while both detectors have most difficulty with internet plagiarism.

### **4. On detecting collusion**

Some students submit work for assessment of which parts and occasionally the whole text is identical. This can occur in two ways, either the students work together, and in this context ‘work together’ can mean both work jointly on the whole piece and take it in turns to produce component pieces, or alternatively the completed work of one student may, with or without their knowledge, be used by one or more other students as the basis for their assignment – indeed it is not unknown for students to buy from other students and re-submit work which has already been graded in previous semesters. Although some students have been known to submit the borrowed text in identical form, the majority work on the original, just as Mackay did on the earlier Carnegie book, so detection is not over-easy for the marker. The three extracts below are taken from the beginnings of three essays, out of a batch of thirty submitted by trainee teachers, who were following a course in Language and Education and answering the question ‘Discuss the kind of policy a primary school should have towards bilingualism and multi-lingualism’.

**Openings of Three Suspect Student Essays (Johnson 1997: 214)**

**a. It is essential for all teachers to understand the history of Britain as a multi-racial, multi-cultural nation. Teachers, like anyone else, can be influenced by age old myths and beliefs. However, it is only by having an understanding of the past that we can begin to comprehend the present**

**b. In order for teachers to competently acknowledge the ethnic minority, it is essential to understand the history of Britain as a multi-racial, multi-cultural nation. Teachers are prone to believe popular myths and beliefs; however, it is only by understanding and appreciating past theories that we can begin to anticipate the present**

*c. It is very important for us as educators to realise that Britain as a nation has become both multi-racial and multi-cultural. Clearly it is vital for teachers and associate teachers to ensure that popular myths and stereotypes held by the wider community do not influence their teaching. By examining British history this will assist our understanding and in that way be better equipped to deal with the present and the future*

The professor noted the marked similarities, (which I have highlighted, as in the Mackay extracts, by using **bold** for identity and *italic* for close similarity), interviewed the students and suggested that they had colluded. They denied the charge and proposed an alternative explanation for the observed similarities – ‘if you ask the same question you will get the same answer’ - in other words they were arguing that the similarities were caused by the identity of topic and not by collusion. Certainly there were no ‘substantial verbatim passages’, nor even identical sentences, to which the professor could point, but even so she felt that the actual topics chosen for mention, their sequencing and the similarity of the vocabulary used, indicated collusion. In solving this particular local problem Johnson developed a method which would lead to the development of a computer program, *Copycatch Gold*, that can identify examples of blatant major collusion without anyone needing to even read the students’ work.

Johnson suggested that in this particular case, but also more generally, we as readers are picking up the collusion by recognising repeated lexical items across the texts and she

therefore postulated that an over-sharing of lexis would in itself be strongly indicative of collusion. The psycholinguistic basis of this observation is the *idiolect*; in other words, because everyone has their own version of the language, including a unique set of lexical items plus favourite ways of encoding meanings, which has been built up over many years, any two speaker/writers will necessarily make different lexical co-selections, even when treating what is essentially the same topic.

To test this hypothesis Johnson took the first 500 words from the three suspect essays and from three other essays, from the same batch, about which she had no reason to be suspicious. She focussed only on the lexical and not the grammatical words, arguing that it is in lexical choice that idiolectal differences will be most clearly manifested. First she compared the lexical similarities of the three non-suspect essays and discovered that they shared 13 lexical types, which, as they were central to the topic of the essay made up some 20% of the lexical tokens. This gave her a baseline of an expected degree of shared lexis attributable to shared topic. When she compared the three suspect essays, however, she found they shared not 13 but 74 lexical types, which jointly made up some 50% of all the lexical tokens. Faced with this evidence the students admitted that they had perhaps colluded; student **a** said she had written her essay alone, but had ‘shown’ it to students **b** and **c**, who agreed that they had without telling her over-relied on her essay when writing their own. Woolls (2003) has produced a computer program to automatise the procedure; it not only calculates the amount of shared vocabulary, but will also put two texts side by side in a window and colour the shared vocabulary. This program can compare two hundred 3,000-word essays, provided they are in electronically readable form, each with all the others, in less than two minutes and will indicate which pairs share more than a chosen threshold of vocabulary. On one occasion two essays were found to share 97% of the vocabulary – on further investigation it turned out that the 3% of apparently unique vocabulary consisted of spelling mistakes – in other words the two essays were identical.

## 5. Internet plagiarism

Universities are now very worried about internet plagiarism as it is so easy for students to (re)search a topic and then cut and paste from the texts they find, inserting them seamlessly into their essays – or so they think. Although the text is physically seamless, the joins are usually evident to a skilled and careful reader because of the clash of styles between the student’s work and the ‘borrowed’, or even between extracts borrowed from two or more different sources. A clear example is this opening of a story written by an 11-year old girl

### **The Soldiers**

Down in the country side an old couple husband and wife Bradley and Kate.

When in one afternoon they were having tea they heard a drumming sound that was coming from down the lane. Bradley asks,

“**What is that glorious sound which so thrills the ear?**” when Kate replied in her o sweet voice

“Only the scarlet soldiers, dear,”

The soldiers are coming, The soldiers are coming. Bradley is confused he doesn’t know what is happening.

Mr and Mrs Waters were still having their afternoon tea when suddenly a bright light was shining through the window.

**“What is that bright light I see flashing so clear over the distance so brightly?”** said Bradley sounding so amazed but Kate soon reassured him.....

The first paragraph is unremarkable, but the second shifts dramatically, “*What is that glorious sound which so thrills the ear?*”. The story then moves back to the opening style, before shifting again to “*What is that bright light I see flashing so clear over the distance so brightly*”. It is hard to believe that an author so young could write in both styles. When one meets a style clash like this in any student’s work and doesn’t recognise the source, the teacher’s first response is ever more likely to be to search the internet. Many people do this laboriously, by trying, as the police sometimes do in analogous circumstances, to re-create the crime, that is, in the case of plagiarism, by searching the kinds of topics that the student him/herself had probably searched. However, what the theory of idiolect and the practice of working with *Copycatch* have taught us is the importance to be attached to the distinctiveness and individuality of lexical selection and co-selection.

So, the most efficient way to search for suspected plagiarism is not by topic or even by phrases, but rather by choosing some five or six words which seem distinctive because they are rare or used in a rare meaning or form, or because they seem odd in terms either of the topic or of the student’s other vocabulary selections. Recent work with *Copycatch* (see Woolls 2002, 2003) has shown that an even more efficient procedure is to search using words which occur only once in the suspect text, the so-called *hapaxes*. In the case of *The Soldiers* if one takes as search terms three pairs of collocated *hapaxes* ‘thrills – ear’, ‘flashing – clear’ and ‘distance – brightly’ one again sees the diagnostic power of idiolectal co-selection. The single pairing ‘flashing – clear’ yields over half a million hits on Google, but the three pairings combined yield a mere 360 hits, of which the first thirteen are all from W.H. Auden’s poem ‘O What is that sound’. If one adds a seventh word ‘so’ and looks for it in the phrase ‘flashing so clear’ all of the hits returned are Auden’s poem.

**O what is that [glorious] sound which so thrills the ear**

Down in the valley drumming, drumming?

Only the scarlet soldiers, dear,

The soldiers coming.

**O what is that [bright] light I see flashing so clear**

**Over the distance brightly, brightly?**

Only the sun on their weapons, dear,

As they step lightly.

In incorporating the three lines from the poem into her prose story, the girl had simply omitted the ‘O’s and added the adjectives *glorious* and *bright*.

### How prevalent is plagiarism

We have seen that Anglo-American universities warn against plagiarism and that computer-assisted detection is becoming ever more sophisticated. In this context it is important to have some idea of how prevalent the problem is. Pecorari (ibid) investigated plagiarism in the work of a small sample of overseas postgraduate students in British Universities. She examined 3000 word extracts taken from the early drafts of the dissertations of nine Masters students and from the completed theses of eight PhD students. She focussed in particular on sections where the students were reviewing the literature, that is on the very sections where they should have been particularly aware of the need to indicate clearly where they were quoting, where they were drawing on the ideas of others, but expressing them in their own words, and where they were making a new contribution themselves. Her results were startling – if one applied the criteria strictly sixteen of the seventeen were guilty of plagiarism – yet, as a result of interviews with the students, Pecorari’s opinion was that none of them was consciously and deliberately plagiarising, in other words they were not trying to conceal what they were doing and, despite the University’s belief that everyone knows the rules, these students were obliviously breaking them. Below are two examples of what Pecorari (op cit: 116-7) found

#### Example 1 100% similarity

Student 1	Withers, 1991: 245
Plant tissue culture storage methodology has been under development for some 15-20 years. During that time, considerable progress has been made, particularly in the cryopreservation of living organism*.  *sic	Plant tissue culture storage methodology has been under development for some 15-20 years. During that time, considerable progress has been made, particularly in the cryopreservation of living organisms in general and of plant material in particular. (Ashwood,-Smith and Farrant, 1980; Kartha, 1985; Grout and Morris, 1987).

In this first example the student has reproduced 28 running words without adding or subtracting a single word. There is no acknowledgment of the source of the ideas, which Withers himself attributes to five other people, let alone of the fact that the wording comes directly from Withers. In other words, the reader is implicitly ‘invited’ to assume that both the ideas and their textual encoding are the author’s own.

#### Example 2 90% similarity

Student 2	Scherer & Magee, 1990: 226
<i>C. albicans</i> is capable of a yeast to hyphal phase transition (dimorphic transition) and *variety of high frequency phenotypic transitions, ranging from differences in colony morphology to differences in cell shape, surface and permeability. These two properties may be important in	<i>C. albicans</i> is capable of a yeast-to-hyphal-phase transition (dimorphic transition) and a variety of high-frequency phenotypic transitions, ranging from differences in colony morphology to differences in cell shape, surface, and permeability. These two properties may be

pathogenesis (Scherer and Magee, 1990; Soll, 1992).  *sic	important in pathogenesis (Soll, 1988) and are of great intrinsic interest as biological processes
---	--

Here the student does acknowledge the sources of the ideas, but in doing so not only implies that he has read the original Soll, despite the mistyped date, but also that the actual encoding is his own and not a word-for-word borrowing from Scherer and Magee, with a word omitted by mistake.

Citing many such examples, Pecorari clearly demonstrates that there is

a widespread tendency for novice academic writers to import language from written sources into their own texts, without a form of attribution which is likely to be recognized and correctly interpreted by the reader' (ibid: 224)

If this is indeed the reality, that students, despite warnings about the consequences of plagiarism, are using a pervasive strategy which Pecorari, (following Howard 1995), labels *patchwriting*, then Universities must take serious account of it – if any law is being broken by a significant proportion of the relevant population, then one must either rethink the law or massively improve both the enforcement of it and the population's understanding of the justification for it – any enforcement which punishes an unlucky few scapegoats is both unjust and counter-productive.

### **Should we modify our attitude towards plagiarism?**

It is evident from what has gone before that Pecorari is justified in drawing the following conclusions about patchwriting (ibid p 225):.

1. patchwriting should be treated as a non-stigmatizing matter;
2. patchwriting should be recognized as a widespread strategy;
3. it should be addressed explicitly;
4. its root causes, rather than the symptoms, should be addressed;
5. expectations from novice writers should be reasonable;
6. standards for source use should reflect diverse practices;
7. care should be taken not to do more harm than good in addressing source use;
8. and [real] plagiarism is a legitimate concern, and should be treated as such.

Barker (quoted in Pecorari p 38) makes the following helpful observation:

In our individualist, British culture, copying is an offence and dealt with as such.... We intend that the individual should feel guilt at infringing the rules. To a student from a collectivist culture, however, there is nothing morally wrong with collusion. It does not contravene the moral code; indeed it may be construed as cooperation. In such a culture resources, including intellectual ones, are to be shared; opinions expressed are those of the group, not the individual. (1997: 115)

## **Conclusions**

What we do not yet know is how far the British native speaker students have similar strategies to those Pecorari identified in her sample of overseas students – although we do know that occasionally native speaker students are punished for the offence of patchwriting. The last such student to be detected in my own department said in mitigation that he had made notes from a book, returned the book to the library and then based parts of his essay on the notes; then in doing so, he said, he had forgotten that the ‘notes’ were in fact verbatim but unidentified quotations. My colleagues did not pardon him, but my worry is that the ‘crime’ may be widespread, while the convicted criminals are an unlucky few.

### **a) Temporary solutions**

The life of the average overseas student in a British university is not easy – for various reasons students are being admitted with a less than satisfactory competence in written and spoken English, but are then expected to produce high quality written work. When they fail to do so, they see the value of the content of their assessed work undervalued because of the poor quality of the form.. Sadly most institutions do not invest sufficient resources in academic writing courses to improve the students’ writing ability quickly enough and so the students quite understandably either resort to patchwriting, sewing together published text they know is linguistically acceptable, or worse to buying the help of a ghost-writer, whose contribution may be anything from improving an original text to writing a new one from scratch.

If institutions are accepting students who do not have the linguistic competence to produce texts in English of an acceptable level and at the same time are unwilling to relax rules which proscribe patchwriting, they have an obligation to improve their academic writing provision as well as to teach much more explicitly the dangers of resorting to patchwriting and the ways of avoiding doing so. One new resource is a computer program called *Copycheck*, which can be used to teach students what is and is not (recognisable as) plagiarism and also to allow them to check for themselves whether what they have written would be identified as plagiarism.

Essentially the program enables the student to put his/her own text on one side of the computer screen-page and the text, from which they have been deriving the information, on the other side. The program then highlights all words which are identical in red; feedback is then visual and immediate; the more a student works on the original to make it his/her own, by ‘translating’ it into his/her own language, the less red the screen becomes. This program is currently being piloted as a teaching tool for overseas students in a number of British universities, including my own.

The *Copycheck* program would certainly have been useful to the British Government and saved some very red faces, had it been used on the document entitled ‘Iraq – its infrastructure of concealment, deception and intimidation’, which was presented to the United Nations and praised by US Secretary of State, Colin Powell, shortly before the invasion of Iraq, in February 2003. This document was later discovered to have been substantially plagiarised from a recently published article and thus was not, as originally

claimed, a text based on the most up-to-date British intelligence. In the Appendix is an extract from the document as marked up by *Copycheck*; the differences between the two texts are highlighted in **bold**; in other words, everything not highlighted is common to the two texts – it is evident that there is surprisingly little in bold and that some of the contributions of British Intelligence are simply anglicisations of American spelling.

### **b) Long term solutions**

In the long term universities will need to confront the question of whether they should relax the rules on patchwriting, as partial and random enforcement is grossly unfair, or change their methods of assessment to ones which do not require an overseas student to produce long stretches of high quality English prose. Two possibilities are: a move to multiple-choice examinations, which are already common in many countries and a system which pairs non-native with native student in the production of joint project-based work. Whatever the long term solution eventually chosen we will have to cope with the problem of patchwriting for a long time yet.

### **References**

- Angélil-Carter S (2002) *Stolen Language? Plagiarism in Writing*, London, Longman.
- Barker, J. (1997). The purpose of study, attitudes to study and staff-student relationships, in D. McNamara & R. Harris (eds.). *Overseas Students in Higher Education: Issues in Teaching and Learning* 108-123, London: Routledge.
- Howard, R.M ((1995) Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57, 788-805.
- Johnson, A (1997) Textual kidnapping - a case of plagiarism among three student texts? *Forensic Linguistics: The International Journal of Speech Language and Law* 4 (2): 210-225
- Pecorari D. E. (2002) *Original Reproductions: an Investigation of the Source Use of Postgraduate Second Language Writers*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2002
- Pennycook, A. (1996) Borrowing others' words: text, ownership, memory and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 201-230.
- Wools 2003 *Copycatch* and *Copycatch Gold* are available from David Wools at CFL Software Development, for more details see [www.copycatchgold.com](http://www.copycatchgold.com).

## Appendix – A Comparison of the UK Government Document with its Source

IRAQ – Its infrastructure of concealment, deception and intimidation <i>UK Government release February 2003</i>	Iraq's security and intelligence network Ibrahim al-Marashi <i>Middle East Review of International Affairs</i>
In 1980, Saddam appointed 'Ali Hassan al-Majid, who would later be the architect of the regime's anti-Kurdish campaign, as its director to <b>instil</b> the ideology of the <b>Ba'ath</b> Party into the agency.	In 1980, Saddam appointed 'Ali Hassan al-Majid, who would later be the architect of the regime's anti-Kurdish campaign, as its director to <b>instill</b> the ideology of the Ba'ath Party into the agency
<b>Al-Amn al-Aam</b> was given more political intelligence responsibilities during the Iran-Iraq War.	<b>General Security</b> was given more political intelligence responsibilities during the Iran-Iraq War.
When Majid was put in charge of repressing the Kurdish insurrection in 1987, General 'Abdul Rahman al-Duri replaced him until 1991 when Saddam Hussein's half-brother, Sabawi Ibrahim al-Tikriti, (who had served as its deputy director prior to 1991) then became head of this agency.	When Majid was put in charge of repressing the Kurdish insurrection in 1987, General 'Abdul Rahman al-Duri replaced him until 1991 when Saddam Hussein's half-brother, Sabawi Ibrahim al-Tikriti, (who had served as its deputy director prior to 1991) then became head of this agency.
In 1991, Saddam <b>Hussein</b> provided it with a paramilitary wing, Quwat al-Tawari, to reinforce law and order, <b>although these units are ultimately under Al Amn al-Khas control.</b>	Saddam provided it with a paramilitary wing <b>known as Quwat al-Tawari (Special Forces) after the 1991 Gulf War</b> to reinforce law and order.
After the 1991 Gulf War, Quwat al-Tawari units were <b>believed to be</b> responsible for hiding Iraqi ballistic missile components.	After the 1991 Gulf War, <b>al-Quwat al-Tawari</b> units were <b>believed to be</b> responsible for hiding Iraqi ballistic missile components
It also operates the notorious Abu Ghuraib prison outside of Baghdad, where many of Iraq's political prisoners are held.	It also operates the notorious Abu Ghuraib prison outside of Baghdad, where many of Iraq's political prisoners are held
<b>Qusay Hussein</b> supervises the Special Bureau, the Political Bureau and the Administration Bureau, the agency's own military brigade, and the Special Republican Guard.	<b>The director-general of Special Security</b> supervises its Special Bureau, the Political Bureau and the Administration Bureau, the agency's own military brigade, and the Special Republican Guard.
Its own military brigade serves as a rapid response unit independent of the military establishment or Special Republican Guard.	Its own military brigade serves as a rapid response unit independent of the military establishment or Special Republican Guard.
In the event of a coup attempt from within the regular military or Republican Guard, Special Security can easily call up the Special Republican Guard for reinforcements as this unit is also under its control	In the event of a coup attempt from within the regular military or Republican Guard, Special Security can easily call up the Special Republican Guard for reinforcements as this unit is also under its control
The Security Bureau: The Security Bureau is divided into a Special Office, which monitors the Special Security agency itself to assure loyalty among its members. If necessary, it conducts operations against suspect members.	The Security Bureau: The Security Bureau is divided into a Special Office, which monitors the Special Security agency itself to assure loyalty among its members. If necessary, it conducts operations against suspect members.
The Office of Presidential Facilities, another unit of the Security Bureau, guards these places through Jihaz al-Hamaya al-Khas (The Special Protection Apparatus).	The Office of Presidential Facilities, another unit of the Security Bureau, guards these places through Jihaz al-Hamaya al-Khas (The Special Protection Apparatus).
It is charged with protecting the Presidential Offices, Council of Ministers, National Council, and the Regional and National Command of the Ba'th Party, and is the only unit responsible for providing bodyguards to leaders.	It is charged with protecting the Presidential Offices, Council of Ministers, National Council, and the Regional and National Command of the Ba'th Party, and is the only unit responsible for providing bodyguards to leaders
The Political Bureau: The Political Bureau collects and analyses intelligence and prepares operations against "enemies of the state."	The Political Bureau: The Political Bureau collects and analyses intelligence and prepares operations against "enemies of the state."