Academic Integrity: Preventing Students' Plagiarism with TURNITIN

Ismail[1]; Umiyati Jabri[2]

[1,2]English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Enrekang, Indonesia

[*]Email: smileummaspul@gmail.com; umiyatijabri@gmail.com

Abstract: *The problem of plagiarism in writing scientific articles is intellectual dishonesty and received a lot of attention during this research, and relatively few students understand about plagiarism. A total of 16 respondents from final year students of the English education department involved in this research. The single group pretest-posttest comparative method was used to assess an action to determine the performance gap between the two time periods, before and after the intervention. Student papers were first submitted to measure their level of plagiarism without their knowledge. The results showed that Muhammadiyah Enrekang students practiced plagiarism on average 50.88%. Subsequently, the students were introduced by Turnitin's plagiarism detecting software and advised to examine their writing using software. The learning model intervention is then carried out with development training. The results showed that the average level of plagiarism among students decreased by 18.81%. In terms of students' perceptions of using Turnitin as a standard way of submitting their final assignments and to get feedback, the overall student reaction to the system used was positive. To avoid plagiarism, a more systematic approach should be taken by the University towards the problem of academic dishonesty, and in particular by students for the specific reasons why they practice plagiarism.*

Keywords: *Academic dishonesty; plagiarism; avoid plagiarism; learning model intervention*

Introduction

Today, the Internet is inseparable from academic life in universities. In higher education, the internet influences every learning and offers new insights that concern students more easily. Even through the internet, teaching can take place online which can contribute to improving education (Ma et al., 2008). But at the same time, the internet has brought about and caused increasing concerns about plagiarism cases (Park, 2003; Pecorari & Petrić, 2014). Duplicating other people's work via Internet access is easy for anyone. Recent Pew Research Center investigations show that over the past decade, a large proportion of college leaders (55%) believe that plagiarism has increased, and the Internet is largely (89%) to blame (Watters, 2011).

Plagiarism acts carried out by students can be considered as dishonest behavior (Klein, 2011). But ironically, students often emphasize that plagiarism has become a culture around the world (Nadeak, 2013; Park, 2003). In other words, other people also do it publicly, such as compiling papers,

research, newspapers, online news, books and other works that do not have quotations and even politicians rarely acknowledge their sources (McKay, 2014), whether consciously or unintentionally (Nadeak, 2013). On the other hand, plagiarism can be a pressure for academics (Sutherland-Smith, 2005), exposing the allegation (Nitterhouse, 2003; Wilson & Ippolito, 2008) that plagiarism must consider various variables because it can contribute to the emergence of disputes in the academic community. Teachers are unlikely to report plagiarism (Murtaza et al., 2013; Sisti, 2007a) because they are worried that it can interfere with their students' practice (Chien, 2014). Lecturers will not report plagiarism if it is not prone to disturbing (Lathrop & E, 2000; Thomas, 2004) formal regulations for the continuity of potential students in research (Sutherland-Smith, 2005). As a result, proving cases of plagiarism or student cheating becomes difficult and taboo.

Plagiarism is a complex issue (Wilson & Ippolito, 2008). However, universities must be consistent in producing knowledge and have a commitment to prevent plagiarism. Prevention is better than cure, plagiarism prevention helps protect the privacy of one's scientific writing (Ismail, 2017; Sukaesih, 2018). A positive response from higher education to plagiarism is very important in the interests of academic integrity (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; McCabe, 2005; Nitterhouse, 2003; S.-M. Orim, 2014) and individual students. Therefore, tertiary institutions are obliged to provide education to students, lecturers, and the public about moral values and academic ethics not to be involved with plagiarism. Plagiarism is a moral error, so it must be prevented (Batane, 2010).

With the increasing influence of computers and the internet, plagiarism has become a problem at the Muhammadiyah University of Enrekang, academic dishonesty and student moral dilemmas continue to increase. Anecdotal evidence shows that most students working on paper assignments detected plagiarism. The results of observations have found that some plagiarism content of papers written by students has a similarity level, starting from 77%, some even reaching 99%. On the other hand, there are no regulations and policies implemented by universities to prevent student plagiarism.

In order to minimize plagiarism, which is feared to have an epidemic impact on campus, this study aims to: (1) overcome academic dishonesty by measuring the level of plagiarism in student papers with TURNITIN software; (2) promoting innovative practices for students in teaching and learning to write scientific papers. To achieve this goal, the focus of this research is expected to answer the following two research questions: (1) How far is the level of student plagiarism in writing scientific papers? (2) What are the students' perceptions about the detection and prevention of plagiarism through TURNITIN? This research is expected to be useful in determining policies for the University of Muhammadiyah Enrekang to assess the originality of student scientific works. Another benefit is that it provides academic knowledge to students and lecturers who have responsibilities and uphold academic integrity by educating students on moral and ethical values.

Literature Review

The most common term to define plagiarism is stealing, copying and explaining other people's work or ideas without the original author's name (Park, 2003) and publishing it as a self-concept. Meanwhile, Ercegovac & Richardson, (2004) views plagiarism as an act of copyright ownership and dishonesty by copying or stealing ideas or texts and presenting them as their own without acknowledging the first author or contributor. Plagiarism is seen by (Roig, 1997, 2006), as an act of cheating on taking over ideas, concepts, techniques, or written phrases that are accidental or accidental. However Roig's concept differs from the University of Coventry in that only

deliberate plagiarism is considered plagiarism (Wilson & Ippolito, 2011). While the definition (D. S.-M. I. Orim, 2017; Sisti, 2007b) is more general because it refers to the process of dishonesty in education, namely cheating that can occur in all forms of formal education.

Without intending to offend the element of ethnocentricity, that most students who often plagiarize are someone who is in a place, culture or institution where there is student dishonesty by plagiarizing scientific papers massively. It cannot be assumed that academic dishonesty has been worrying and cheating has occurred (Mccabe, 2005; Wilson & Ippolito, 2011). If plagiarism behavior is left unchecked and considered normal, student morality will be affected in the future (Aryani, 2014). In line with Aryani's opinion, (Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; Lathrop & E, 2000) has the view that moral is a theory that directs action and ethics as an emphasis on practice and choice that leads to implications.

Therefore, it may be that the practice of plagiarism or academic lies when they are students will have an impact when they have worked by justifying all means, instantaneous, full of lies, and even corruption to achieve certain goals (Aryani, 2014). So it is only natural when Wilson & Ippolito, (2011) state that plagiarism is an academic crime.

Accessing the internet is a skill that allows students to access millions of files in a short time. However, accessibility that is too easy can encourage plagiarism which can damage academic integrity (Darbyshire & Burgess, 2014; Park, 2003). Previous researchers, have identified the causes of plagiarism so that students take risks in their writing. Park has released several reasons why students engage in plagiarism, including: (1) Thinking professors won't care; (2) Thinking they will not be caught; (3) Has no moral or ethical reasons not to copy; (4) Unaware of the punishment; (5) (5) it is very easy to copy and paste from the internet; (6) there is an external burden to complete the task quickly; (7) lack of respect for author rights; (8) has the view that the lecturers are not careful in examining their writing; (9) Believe that regulations will not be enforced (McKay, 2014). Meanwhile, Wilson & Ippolito, (2011), (2011) also added that (10) Lack of skills in writing research works; (11) Product oriented writing assignments; and (12) cultural factors, causing students to commit plagiarism.

In recent years, one of the web-based plagiarism detection software that has gained popularity for fighting plagiarism is TURNITIN. TURNITIN serves as a deterrent that can check the similarity of the script and stop student plagiarism (Dahl, 2007; Batane, 2010). It seems important to see how students perceive TURNITIN as a plagiarism detection tool.

Various reasons have been identified, and methods suggested in the previous literature to reduce academic dishonesty. However, in practice, students' behavior towards plagiarism has not provided a significant deterrent effect. Some of the lack of methods in previous research and literature focuses more on finding the final results and raising significant causes or reasons for why plagiarism is practiced. Based on anecdotal evidence, the main trigger for most students at the University of Muhammadiyah Enrekang to practice plagiarism is due to low writing skills from both technical and academic aspects. In addition, there is a low understanding of plagiarism and the use of detection services, low self-efficacy, moral and character issues, and management of educational institutions that have not implemented regulations wisely.

Method

Respondents in this study were the seventh semester students of the English education department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Enrekang (convenience sampling) which consisted of 16 students who participated in this study. The respondents are final year students and especially need thesis writing and are

required to compile a research proposal and have experience submitting assignments online.

The single group pretest-posttest comparative method was used to assess an action by determining the performance gap between two time periods, before and after the intervention. The level of student plagiarism was measured using TURNITIN without notification at the beginning of data collection. The learning model intervention is then carried out with development training which includes: (1) Introduction of TURNITIN; (2) Ethical Considerations in Preparing research proposals; (3) Citation, Footnotes, References, and the Employment of Electronic Devices; (4) Language for Academic Writing. In this training, special attention is given to research proposals for students who empirically develop a moral reasoning phase based on character development (Wilson & Ippolito, 2011). This part of the study will be useful for controlling, reducing, and educating students as future generations in using ethical information. After the intervention was carried out and the TURNITIN software was introduced, students returned to submit their research proposal assignments to be tested again to determine the level of originality of their writing and feedback was given. This reflects that students understand earlier that their paper will be examined through software. At the end of the intervention stage, questionnaires were distributed to find out students' perceptions about the use of the TURNITIN software in preventing plagiarism. The questionnaire consisted of 12 quantitative and qualitative questions. Quantitative questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS, and qualitative questionnaires were analyzed using categorization, synthesis, and model search and interpretation. After calculating the student's plagiarism score, the paper (research proposal) of each student is evaluated and divided into four classifications. Four classifications in this study are used to measure the level of

student plagiarism, namely: high-scale plagiarism, medium-scale plagiarism, small-scale plagiarism and legitimate research (Batane, 2010) which is determined based on the amount of information traced in the TURNITIN originality report (Table 1). The next section summarizes the scope, phases and results of this research by presenting a research table on the results of the level of student plagiarism by focusing on writing student thesis proposals. Next, we summarize the conclusions and lessons learned.

Table 1. Classification of Plagiarism

Indicator	Percentage of Plagiarism	Note
High-scale plagiarism	80 – 100	Rejected
Medium-scale plagiarism	21–79	Major revision
Small scale plagiarism	1–20	Accepted - Minor revision
Legitimate	0	Accepted

Findings and Discussion

Plagiarism in this research is described as acknowledging other people's work for academic awards. This data provides an overview of the various research questions used when filling out questionnaires to participants. The results of qualitative and quantitative data are then analyzed and presented simultaneously as a form of learning for students.

Student Plagiarism Level
Student Plagiarism Level before TURNITIN

In measuring the level of plagiarism of students at the Muhammadiyah University of Enrekang, an email version of the first article was collected and processed through TURNITIN without the student knowing it. In this study, the percentage of plagiarism in scientific papers of students participating in the research was analyzed. The following table shows the student's average plagiarism level on the first assignment (pre-test).

Table 2. The level of plagiarism of students' first article draft before TURNITIN

No.	Author/Paper ID	Plagiarism percentage	Note
1	1387660484	39.00	Major revision
2	1387653587	24.00	Major revision
3	1387651114	34.00	Major revision
4	1387648501	53.00	Major revision
5	1387645597	57.00	Major revision
6	1387652111	86.00	Rejected
7	1390272615	66.00	Major revision
8	1390283073	60.00	Major revision
9	1390275946	28.00	Major revision
10	1390284061	43.00	Major revision
11	1390278505	46.00	Major revision
12	1390274012	52.00	Major revision
13	1387645597	57.00	Major revision
14	1390274571	59.00	Major revision
15	1390318665	62.00	Major revision
16	1390277952	48.00	Major revision
	Average Score	**50.88**	

Based on an analysis of plagiarism level in the first draft of students' papers, it is evident from table 3 that the student articles are evaluated and rated according to four categories: (1) high-scale plagiarism (80-100); (2) medium-scale plagiarism (21-79); (3) small-scale plagiarism (1-20); and (4) valid (0%). This category is determined based on the proportion of the level of plagiarism in the students' draft article as shown in Table 3.

The percentage level of student plagiarism as seen in the table 3 indicates that 6.25 percent of student articles is classified as high-scale plagiarism, which means that their papers have a plagiarism rate of approximately 80-100 percent or rejected. Meanwhile, the students' articles categorized as medium-scale plagiarism were 93.75 %% or major revision. In contrast, none of the students had a draft of the article that was identified as small-scale plagiarism and plagiarism-free.

Table 3. Classification of plagiarism level of first draft article / proposal of students before TURNITIN

Indicator	Scale	Paper indicator	Percentage of Plagiarism	Note
High-scale plagiarism	80 – 100	1	6.25	Rejected
Medium-scale plagiarism	21–79	15	93.75	Major revision
Small scale plagiarism	1–20	0	0	Accepted - Minor revision
Legitimate	0	0	0	Accepted

The students' draft articles that have been scanned using the TURNITIN software returned to students for revision. This type of

mechanism definitely provides students an opportunity for reaction and inquiry. Some students stated "we were tested without us

knowing it"; but most students were happy with this program," because they think it can help them do a better job of writing (Editing, 2020) their articles properly. On this occasion, the problematic part of the article was shown to students for revision. In addition, researchers used this time to discuss with students how to write good academic papers, especially writing scientific articles. Students are introduced and trained in various materials such as: Writing quotes and references; write the introduction, compile the research methodology; report research and discussion results, write conclusions and abstracts, signal words, introduce reference sources such as Google Scholar, MENDELEY and introduction to TURNITIN's anti-plagiarism software. Likewise, at this stage students were

introduced to forms of plagiarism as violations and academic dishonesty.

The level of student plagiarism after TURNITIN introduction

During the assignment and completion of the final (fifth) draft of the article, students realized that their articles would be checked for plagiarism through the TURNITIN application. At this point, student plagiarism was 18.81%, which reflects a marked decline in plagiarism compared with the first draft report. The comparison between the level of plagiarism in the first and the last draft articles shows the effectiveness of the TURNITIN software and the specific academic guidance applied to reduce the plagiarism level of students.

Table 4. The level of plagiarism in the article / proposal draft of the two students after being introduced to TURNITIN

No.	Author/Paper ID	Average plagiarism percentage	Note
1	1387660484	17.00	Minor revision
2	1387653587	8.00	Minor revision
3	1387651114	12.00	Minor revision
4	1387648501	23.00	Major revision
5	1387645597	29.00	Major revision
6	1387652111	32.00	Major revision
7	1390272615	21.00	Major revision
8	1390283073	18.00	Minor revision
9	1390275946	9.00	Minor revision
10	1390284061	26.00	Major revision
11	1390278505	21.00	Major revision
12	1390274012	14.00	Minor revision
13	1387645597	13.00	Minor revision
14	1390274571	19.00	Minor revision
15	1390318665	24.00	Major revision
16	1390277952	15.00	Minor revision
	Average	**18.81**	Minor revision

The plagiarism level in the first draft reached 50.88%, while the second article draft assignment had a plagiarism rate of 18.81%. This indicates that the introduction of anti-plagiarism software and special academic guidance has a deterrent effect on students by 32.06%. This evidence is shown in table 4 that

The results showed that the average level of plagiarism in the first draft article of students before the implementation of TURNITIN was 50.88%. These findings indicate that there were major problems that must be overcome by educational institutions to take a more cohesive and organized strategy (Batane, 2010). This percentage is greater than the findings of previous studies

the level of high-scale plagiarism and medium-scale plagiarism has decreased significantly. Meanwhile, the revision of student article drafts is getting better and the plagiarism level has decreased and most are on a small scale or minor revision of (56.25%) (Accepted).

showing that low plagiarism levels should be between 17 and 20% for a graduate (Weinstein & Dobkin, 2002). In line with these findings, Saeed et al. (2011) emphasized that plagiarism is a prevalent phenomenon in developing countries and is becoming increasingly common in higher education institutions (Adebayo, 2011)

Table 5. Classification of the plagiarism percentage level in the last draft of student articles

Indicator	Scale	Paper indicator	Percentage of Plagiarism	Note
High-scale plagiarism	80 – 100	0	0	Rejected
Medium-scale plagiarism	21–79	7	43.75	Major revision
Small scale plagiarism	1–20	9	56.25	Accepted - Minor revision
Legitimate	0	0	0	Accepted

It seems that after the TURNITIN and academic writing training were implemented for students, the plagiarism level of the students fell by 18.81% in the final draft of their articles. These results indicate that TURNITIN has a big effect on student plagiarism elimination by 32.06 percent. These results also show that plagiarism is not generally gone, even though students know that their articles will be scanned through the TURNITIN application. However, plagiarism on a large scale can be reduced (Batane, 2010).

Students' perceptions about TURNITIN Software

At the end of the intervention stage, students were given a questionnaire to gain insight into plagiarism and the application of the TURNITIN software. Intervention for 1 month on academic ethics, paraphrase, references, and introduction to TURNITIN software was carried out so that students had an understanding of what plagiarism was. Based on table 5, overall students claim TURNITIN is easy to use, that is, 75% of students strongly agree and agree, and only a small proportion disagree and strongly disagree (25%).

Table 5. Student responses to the use of TURNITIN software

No.	Student Perceptions	Student Response (N=16)			
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
1	TURNITIN is easy to use	6.25	18.75	50.00	25.00
2	I find it easy to make revisions after checking the script on TURNITIN	12.50	18.75	37.50	31.25
3	I am happy to see the report on the originality of my article	12.50	25.00	31.25	31.25
4	I easily understand the plagiarism level of my scientific work after checking on TURNITIN	18.75	25.00	37.50	18.75
5	I'm glad that TURNITIN makes plagiarism that much more difficult	6.25	18.75	43.75	31.25
6	I was worried about the originality of my scientific work after checking through TURNITIN	18.75	50.00	12.50	18.75
7	I need training in scientific writing and further use of TURNITIN	25.00	50.00	18.75	6.25
8	I am worried that I will be accused of plagiarism	-	6.67	60.00	33.33
9	I feel confident that I will properly cite someone else's work	12.50	25.00	31.25	31.25
10	TURNITIN can find the reference source used for my final project	12.50	18.75	37.50	31.25
11	In general, the TURNITIN originality report is correct and reliable	6.25	18.75	50.00	25.00
12	I do not hesitate to publish my scientific work after checking in TURNITIN	12.50	31.25	37.50	18.75

The second question asks whether students find it easy to make revisions after checking the manuscript at TURNITIN. The treatment given during the training showed that 68.75% of students agreed and strongly agreed with the ease of making improvements to the manuscript after checking at TURNITIN. Meanwhile, around 62.50% of students were happy to see the report on the originality of their articles, and 56.25% of students easily understood the plagiarism level of scientific papers after checking on TURNITIN. As many as 75% of students feel happy because TURNITIN makes plagiarism avoidable. Meanwhile, students' concerns about the originality of scientific papers after examination through TURNITIN were not reflected in this statement, only a small proportion of 31.25% of students felt worried.

The next section of the questionnaire asks about students' concerns about the score or level of originality of the scientific paper after examination by TURNITIN. As many as 75% of the students were not worried about the level of plagiarism after checking, and 25% were worried. Another important aspect of the questionnaire is the anxiety that students will be accused of plagiarism. Of all the questions asked, this question was the most positive in terms of the answers given by the students: 15 (93.33%) students were very worried if they were accused of plagiarism, and only one student was less worried. This can be interpreted that students will be very careful when they quote from other sources.

With various reference sources available, both online and in print, and application support for references, not all students feel confident that they are able to cite reference sources correctly. About

62.50% of the students believed and the remaining 37.50% did not feel sure that they were able to do the citation correctly. When they were asked whether the TURNITIN application could find a reference source to support for their final project, most 68.75% of students agreed and strongly agreed, and the remaining 31.25 disagreed with this statement.

In response to a question about the reliable TURNITIN originality report, about 75% of the participating students reported agreeing and strongly agreeing that the TURNITIN scan results are reliable. It is interesting to note in the last question that about 56.25% of the students did not hesitate to publish their scientific papers after checking plagiarism. It seems that the introduction of TURNITIN has a positive effect in terms of reducing the level of plagiarism among students.

Overall, the training provided strongly supports TURNITIN adoption in reducing plagiarism cases. Although there are limitations in this study, such as a small student sample, the results appear broadly positive for the use of TURNITIN. Some students explicitly welcomed introductions as a way to reduce plagiarism.

Thus, the introduction of TURNITIN has a real effect on students in detecting the similarities of their writing. The effect is that at least some students are looking for clues about how to refer correctly. The effect can certainly provide a deterrent effect by decreasing the plagiarism level of students by 18.81% in the final draft of their article.

Conclusion

This study reports that the TURNITIN used to detect plagiarism results can provide a conceptual understanding of the level of plagiarism of students at the Muhammadiyah University of Enrekang. Although the current study is based on a limited sample, the results provide in-depth knowledge about the extent of plagiarism among students of the Muhammadiyah University of Enrekang, with the detection effect being able to reduce the plagiarism rate by up to 32%. Although the software does not completely eradicate plagiarism, for students, it is important to remember that they are not only violating the intellectual property rights of others, but they will also sacrifice their intellectual dignity by deceiving themselves for the opportunity to improve their knowledge and skills.

One of the interesting results of this study was that after intervention in writing references, citation, paraphrasing and writing well, students' perceptions of the introduction of TURNITIN became more positive. This study argues that to improve academic integrity for students, learning environment factors need to be changed to avoid plagiarism. Institutions need to implement policies and take action to provide assignments that are attractive to students but vulnerable to plagiarism. The results show that the educational culture at the Muhammadiyah University of Enrekang currently does not seem to be strict about plagiarism among students. In conclusion, plagiarism detection software should be a platform for fostering academic integrity for students holistically and thoroughly.

This study only addresses a small part of the broader field of study on plagiarism and academic integrity. There are several things that have not been explored that need to be investigated further, including a development model to prevent student plagiarism; how consistently institutional policies can be applied; and a detailed investigation of the submission of students' final project manuscripts detected by plagiarism.

References

Adebayo, S. O. (2011). Common Cheating Behaviour Among Nigerian University Students: A Case Study of University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria. *World Journal of Education*, *1*(1), 144–149. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v1n1p144

Aryani, F. (2014). Model character development training (CDT) untuk meningkatkan perilaku anti plagiat mahasiswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, *47*(1), 21–28.

Batane, T. (2010a). Turning to Turnitin to Fight Plagiarism among University Students. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(2), 1–12.

Batane, T. (2010b). Turning to Turnitin to Fight Plagiarism among University Students Tshepo. *Educational Technology & Society*, *13*(2), 1–12.

Chien, S.-C. (2014). Cultural constructions of plagiarism in student writing: Teachers' perceptions and responses. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(2), 120–140.

Darbyshire, P., & Burgess, S. (2014). Strategies for Dealing with Plagiarism and the Web in Higher Education. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics*, *1*(4), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.15209/jbsge.v1i4.89

Editing, U. P. (2020). Using Peer Editing and Peer Feedback Techniques in Writing to Private University Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, *10*(3), 383–395. https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v10.i3.2020 01

Ercegovac, Z., & Richardson, J. V. (2004). Academic Dishonesty, Plagiarism Included, in the Digital Age: A Literature Review. *College & Research Libraries*, *65*(4), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.65.4.301

Ismail, I. (2017). Is it Application of Extended Writing Truly Push Writing Student Ability? *Edumaspul - Jurnal Pendidikan*, *1*(2), 15–23. https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v1i2. 22

Klein, D. (2011). Why Learners Choose Plagiarism: A Review of Literature. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, *7*, 97–110.

Lathrop, A., & E, F. K. (2000). *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era. A Wake-up call.*

Ma, H. J., Wan, G., & Lu, E. Y. (2008). Digital cheating and plagiarism in schools. *Theory into Practice*, *47*(3), 197–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802153 809

Mccabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v1i1.14

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.21913/ijei.v1i1.14

McKay, T. M. (2014). Combating plagiarism using a community of practice approach. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *28*(4), 1315–1331. https://doi.org/10.20853/28-4-394

Murtaza, G., Zafar, S., Bashir, I., & Hussain, I. (2013). Evaluation of student's perception and behavior towards plagiarism in Pakistani universities. *Acta Bioethica*, *19*(1), 125–130. https://doi.org/10.4067/s1726-569x2013000100013

Nadeak, B. (2013). Plagiarisme dan Ketidakjujuran Akademis. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, *2*(2), 56–62. https://scholar.google.co.id/scholar?hl=id &as_sdt=0%2C5&q=PLAGIARISME+D AN+KETIDAKJUJURAN+AKADEMIS %2C+Bernadetha+Nadeak&btnG=

Nitterhouse, D. (2003). Plagiarism – Not Just an ``Academic'' Problem. *Teaching Business Ethics*, *7*(3), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:102501701924 6

Orim, D. S.-M. I. (2017). Conceptual Review of Literature on Student Plagiarism: Focusing on Nigerian Higher Education Institutions. *World Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(1), 216. https://doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v4n1p216

Orim, S.-M. (2014). *An investigation of plagiarism by Nigerian students in higher education.* Coventry University.

Park, C. (2003). In Other (People ' s) Words : plagiarism by university students — literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *28*(5), 471–488. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930320001

20352

Pecorari, D., & Petrić, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, *47*(3), 269–302. http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/2588/1/2588.pdf

Roig, M. (1997). Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized? *Psychological Record*, *47*(1), 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395215

Roig, M. (2006). Ethical writing should be taught. *British Medical Journal*, *333*(7568), 594–596. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38968.61129 6.F7

Sisti, D. A. (2007a). How do high school students justify Internet plagiarism? *Ethics and Behavior*, *17*(3), 215–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420701519 163

Sisti, D. A. (2007b). How do high school students justify Internet plagiarism? *Ethics and Behavior*, *17*(3), 215–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420701519 163

Sukaesih, S. (2018). Permasalahan Plagiarisme Dalam Penelitian Kualitatif Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Politikom Indonesiana*, *3*(1), 210. https://journal.unsika.ac.id/index.php/pol

itikomindonesiana/article/view/1424/117 9

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *4*(1), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2004.07.00 7

Thomas, D. A. (2004). How Educators Can More Effectively Understand and Combat the Plagiarism Epidemic. *Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal*, *2004*(2), 421–430. https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/elj/v ol2004/iss2/10

Watters, A. (2011). *How to Combat Plagiarism*. https://www.edutopia.org/blog/plagiaris m-internet-or-assignment-audrey-watters

Wilson, F., & Ippolito, K. (2008). Working together to educate students. In Student plagiarism in an online world: Problems and solutions. In *IGI Global*. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59904-801-7.ch005

Wilson, F., & Ippolito, K. (2011). Student Plagiarism in an Online World. In *Student Plagiarism in an Online World*. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59904-801-7.ch005