5-6-2019

The correlation between plagiarism perception and users trust about the accuracy of turnitin software at The University of Indonesia

Sofia Nur Aisyah
Departement of Information and Library Science, Airlangga University, sofiasyah@gmail.com

Rahma Sugihartati
Departement of Information and Library Science, Airlangga University, rahma.sugihartati@fisip.unair.ac.id

The correlation between plagiarism perception and users trust about the accuracy of turnitin software at The University of Indonesia

Sofia Nur Aisyah

Rahma Sugihartati[1]

ABSTRACT

Plagiarism is an act that violates the law, have been cases that have occurred in Indonesia and the world, and most have occurred in the academic scope. The cause of plagiarism is influenced by many factors, one of them is the lack of provisions or standards that clearly someone can be said to be the perpetrator of plagiarism. However, regardless of the actions that occur, technological advancements encourage software that can prevent the emergence of plagiarism, namely the Turnitin software. In this case one of the state universities, The University of Indonesia has used it in order to prevent and overcome plagiarism. But the absence of provisions or standards regarding plagiarism raises different perceptions in each person related to the problem of plagiarism, and this raises different beliefs as well when people use the Turnitin software. Therefore, this study discusses whether the perception of plagiarism in each person relates to the user's trust in the accuracy of Turnitin software, especially among the academic community of the University of Indonesia. The approach that used in this study is quantitative explanative by using the University of Indonesia academic community as many as 85 people as respondents. The results of the study indicate the correlation of perceptions of plagiarism (X) with the user's trust in the accuracy of Turnitin software (Y), and have a positive correlation. Based on the results of the coefficient t count of 3.590 while the t table is 1.663 (3,590>1,663) with a significance level of 0.05, then is rejected so that there is a correlation between variable X and Y. The correlation is classified as a low correlation, with a correlation coefficient of 0.389.

Keywords: plagiarism perception, trust, Turnitin software

1. Introduction

Plagiarism in the general public as well as the academic environment is increasingly prevalent, especially in universities, which threatens integrity and is an academic crime committed by academics (Idiegbeyan-ose, et al, 2018; Oyewole & Abioye, 2018; Kumar,

---

[1] Corresponding author. Email: rahma.sugihartati@fisip.unair.ac.id

2019). These actions occur because, there is an encouragement from increasingly sophisticated technological developments and the behavior of people who like instant work or jobs that do not require a long time in the process. The initial interpretation or definition of plagiarism itself is from the meaning of public dictionaries or single words which all indicate a kind of immoral intentions, lying, cheating, stealing, dishonesty, and fraudulent actions (Sutherland, 2008). It can be concluded that plagiarism is an act of theft of work that occurs a lot in the academic environment. Plagiarism is a disease that affects high school instructors or staff everywhere, which is included in pedagogical violations, such as violations of law (Drum, 1986).

In America the study of the percentage of plagiarism found that 30% of all respondents who were subjected to research had taken plagiarism in making college assignments and the remaining 70% acknowledged plagiarism by not including original sources and using or acknowledging other people's ideas of ideas as ideas own account (Sierles, 1998; Jendrek, 1992; Pavela, 1993; McCabe & Bowers, 1994). Plagiarism is considered common and is very common in students in four European countries (Pupovac et al, 2008). Research investigating the research proposals made by graduate students of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics studies found 42.6% indicated plagiarism (Gilmore et al, 2010).

Many factors give rise to someone finally choosing to do 'instant' work, starting from a lack of understanding related to how to write correct quotes, lazy, limited time given by teaching staff to do assignments, and other factors. As research conducted by Dahl (2007) which shows that students still do not understand and do not know how to write the right bibliography. Research by Betane (2010) states that 75% of respondents admit to taking information from the internet directly without writing the source, because retrieving information from the internet can save their time in doing tasks assigned by teaching staff. Other research suggests that the general factor of plagiarism is limited time in doing assignments, they are pressured by the time limit given so they prefer to copy rather than download and study academic material (Jerome, et al, 2018).

The number of cases that have occurred has led to a great awareness in the community, especially in the academic environment that this act of plagiarism must be avoided. With the development of technology and also the awareness of the dangers of plagiarism, various software or software emerged to prevent plagiarism, which made it possible to prevent and reduce acts of plagiarism, especially in the academic environment. The results of research conducted by Betane (2010) showed that there was a decrease of 4.3%, of the 20.5% plagiarism found before the software, to 16.2% after the software. One of these plagiarism prevention software is Turnitin software. Turnitin software is software that can check the level of similarity of text with reference sources used, the results are in the form of percentage numbers known as the Original Similarity Index (OSI). There are no definite numbers to justify that someone has committed plagiarism based on the results of a work inspection on turnitin software. This is what raises a big question, whether the results shown by Turnitin software are accurate to measure how much someone has taken plagiarism. When the plagiarism checker of the user, most of whom are students, feels confused about how much coverage a person can be said to be plagiarism, because of this detection tool the problem of quotation becomes sensitive if there is a slight error in writing (Savage, 2004).

The absence of a definite standard regarding the similarity index has made students confused with turnitin software users. This is also because the issue of quotations becomes more sensitive and this makes students feel 'scared' when using software such as turnitin, and user trust becomes questionable. The research conducted by Walker (2010) that turnitin software is not one way that can be done to prevent plagiarism, because respondents who some of the students claimed they did not plagiarize the tasks they were doing, even though the lecturers considered the assignments of students there were still stated as This plagiarism is seen from the comparison of tasks. Another study, namely in Dahl (2007) states that respondents consider the use of turnitin software to be positive and have an impact on their work to find out whether or not plagiarism is a work, but they are concerned that they will be called plagiarism, even though they feel they are not doing so, and their understanding of plagiarism also influences their assumption of turnitin software that is used to examine the

amount of similarity of reference sources on the internet with the work that has been made by respondents, or in this case is to prevent the academic community from acting plagiarism.

From the phenomena and the data described earlier, this study will discuss related to the perception of the University of Indonesia academic community about plagiarism, the trust of the University of Indonesia academic community on the accuracy of turnitin software results, and the relationship between Plagiarism Perception and User Trust in Turnitin Software Accuracy in University of Indonesia.

2. Literature review

Lack of knowledge about plagiarism encourages a person to finally take this action without thinking too far. Research conducted by Betane (2010) stated that students claimed to do plagiarism because of the time given is not enough, and 6.9% of respondents said they did not understand how to write well to write papers. Some students have confusing thought or ideas from the meaning or true definition of plagiarism, therefore people consider that plagiarism is an act of fraud and it must be reported (Genereux & Mcleod, 1995; Brown & Emmit, 2001; Karlins, Michael & Podlager , 1998). The existence of such that thing is what eventually someone acts plagiarism, in addition to another study by Errey (2002) from 42 respondents most said they already had an understanding of what plagiarism is, but 69% of respondents stated cutting and inserting a portion of the original word included sources with true that this is acceptable, different views arise here that unintentional plagiarism is a proper thing if it is according to the rules. However, when there is a plagiarism examiner that the majority are college students, they feel confused about how much coverage a person stated plagiarism, because the existence of detection tool the problem of quotation becomes sensitive if there is a slight error in writing (Savage, 2004).

The existence of several views related to plagiarism and the emergence of plagiarism detection tools cause confusion and ambiguous regarding what plagiarism is and how the detection device works. One of the detectors is turnitin software, this turnitin software make some students feel confused and find confusion so they feel 'scared' when using plagiarism

detection software such as turnitin. This leads to the questionable belief of turnitin software users, such as the research conducted by Walker (2010) that the presence of turnitin software is not one way that can be done to prevent plagiarism, respondents who some students claim they do not plagiarize the tasks they do, even though the lecturer considers the assignments of the students to still be stated as plagiarism seen from the comparison of tasks. In this case it can be seen that the trust of Turnitin software users still varies because of research that states that turnitin is not the only way to prevent plagairism. Other studies that agree with the existence of turnitin software as a way to prevent plagiarism is stated by Barrett & Malcolm (2006) that turnitin software can provide the possibility of plagiarism in a work, with the discovery of similarities in the use of sentences found on documents on the web or the internet. This is a big question and 'ambiguity' about the results of turnitin software and the problem of understanding plagiarism, evidenced by many studies that show the pros and cons of it, besides there is no of definite standards to declare someone to do plagiarism seen from the results of turnitin software .

Another study, namely in Dahl (2007) states that respondents consider the use of turnitin software is positive and have an impact on their work to find out whether there is plagiarism or not in a work, but they are worried with that tool they will be called plagiarism, even though they feel they are not doing so, and their understanding of plagiarism also influences their perception of turnitin software that is used to examine the amount of similarity of reference sources on the internet with the work that respondents have made, or in this case to prevent the academic community from plagiarism. The presence of plagiarism detection can indeed be beneficial and prevent plagiarism, but on the other hand this detection tool makes some students feel worried about plagiarism that is not intentionally done and finally this kind of tool is widely available directly to find out whether the task or work is made right really contain plagiarism (Dahl, 2007; Martin, Stubbs, & Troop, 2006; Badget & Scoot, 2009).

3. Method

This study uses a quantitative explanative approach using systematic random sampling techniques at the University of Indonesia. This study focused on 543 University of Indonesia academic community members who had used turnitin software as a research population and were taken as many as 85 academic communities of the University of Indonesia as a research sample. The data collection technique in this study was using questionnaires, observations, interviews, and previous studies as supporters in this study. Data processing techniques in this study are using scale categories to determine the size of users' perceptions and beliefs about the accuracy of turnitin software, and using Spearman rank correlation analysis techniques to determine whether there is a relationship between the plagiarism perception variable (X) and user trust about the accuracy of turnitin software (Y).

4. Results

The results of this study indicate a low category scale on the perception of plagiarism (X) with the results of the calculation of sub-variables and indicators on the relationship variable perceptions of plagiarism in this study, it is known that the total average for variable X which consists of two components and 35 indicator points, namely amounting to 96.54 with an average of 2.10. The results of the study on the user trust variable about the accuracy of turnitin software (Y) also included in the low-scale category with the calculation of sub-variables and indicators on the user trust variable about the accuracy of turnitin software in this study. From seven components and 14 indicator points in the form of questions on the questionnaire, which is equal to 30.88 with an average of 2.06. For the results of the statistical tests of these two variables using Spearman rank correlation, the perception of plagiarism (X) is related to the user's trust in the accuracy of Turnitin software (Y).

T-test Result

Coefficients[a]				
Model	Unstandardized	Standardized	T	Sig.

		Coefficients		Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.277	2.225		3.271	.002
	P_Plagiarism	.520	.145	.367	3.590	.001
a. Dependent Variable: K_Turnritin						

This decision is based on the results of the t test on Spearman rank correlation which is interpreted in table 3.37 which shows that (3,590 > 1,663), so it is rejected, which means there is a relationship between perceptions of plagiarism and user trust about the accuracy of Turnitin software.

Rank Spearman Correlation Test Result

Rank Spearman Correlation Test				
			Persepsi Plagiarisme	Kepercayaan Pada *Software* Turnitin
Spearman's rho	Persepsi Plagiarisme	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.389[**]
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	85	85
	Kepercayaan Pada *Software* Turnitin	Correlation Coefficient	.389[**]	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	85	85
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				

The relationship between variables X and Y is a significant relationship and classified as not so strong or low with a correlation coefficient of 0.389 or (r results of 0.389> r table 0.179), and has a positive relationship direction. This means that if the perceptions of plagiarism possessed by respondents are low, then low trust will be followed about the

accuracy of turnitin software. Conversely, if the perception of plagiarism possessed by the respondent is high, it will be followed by high trust about the accuracy of the turnitin software.

From the results and analysis described in the previous sub-chapter, all the results of this study indicate that the level of perceptions of plagiarism is still low, so that it relates to the user's trust in accuracy in turnitin software which is also relatively low. When looking at previous research that is the reference in this study, it is said that if students or respondents have a high level of perception on plagiarism, it will relate to their beliefs using turnitin software. The comparison seen in this study with previous research conducted by Dahl (2007) has similarities, in which Dahl states that the use of turnitin software is positive and has an impact on scientific work to find out plagiarism, and their understanding of plagiarism will also affect software turnitin. It can be seen here that the results of the study found that the use of turnitin software is increasing when respondents perceive plagiarism, such as the impression of poor plagiarism, plagiarism is a criminal act, and sanctions are given to the perpetrators.

This is also the same as other studies conducted by Betane (2010) if this study is compared, in which Betane discusses the use of turnitin software at Botswana University to reduce the occurrence of plagiarism by looking at the work that has been checked by turnitin software before and after, this as well as in the findings of the data in this study, the fact that with the use of turnitin software the level of plagiarism can be prevented and addressed early. Respondents also consider that it is true that turnitin software can be used as a tool that can reduce plagiarism. There is also another study which states that according to instructors at the University of Auckland using 60% turnitin software it is effectively used to improve student references in correct writing practice, because this turnitin software can show the results of similar works created with sources that are used as sources of reference in writing scientific work (Gulk & Tippin, 2003). This shows the similarity with this research, which with the turnitin software used in the University of Indonesia's library becomes a reference to learn how to write proper citing and shelling techniques according to the rules.

The comparison is inversely proportional to this study with other studies suggested by Walker (2010) that there are indeed significant results from the use of turnitin software in examining a work, that there is a decrease in plagiarism from 31.4% of tasks declared plagiarism to 26.2% after checked again using Turnitin software, this shows that when there is a turnover software the respondent or student is more alert to plagiarism. Other research suggests that there are positive comments from academic staff at Hofstra University, where the use of turnitin software is easy and effective, and there are many positive impressions to prevent plagiarism by subscribing to and using turnitin software (Burke, 2005). However, research conducted by Walker states that turnitin software is not the only way that can be done to reduce plagiarism (Walker, 2010). This is what is seen where there are different comparisons of this study with the research conducted by Walker (2010) that the presence of turnitin software may not necessarily prevent and overcome the occurrence of plagiarism.

Differences in this study with other studies that are not the same can also be seen by a study conducted by Savage (2004), whose findings suggest that the plagiarism examination by a detector causes confusion from students, because when there are few writing errors, the detector states plagiarism in his work. In addition, this plagiarism check also makes students confused about how much coverage a person can be said to have committed plagiarism. This is said to be inversely proportional to this research, that students are still confused in the results shown and what can lead to plagiarism, while in this study most of the respondents already know various things about plagiarism and already know the provisions of the detection device in the form of turnitin software.

Some researches and opinions of experts have suggested that the perception of plagiarism with the user's trust in accuracy in turnitin software has shown a relationship to some extent, which there are some results that show that software can be used to prevent and overcome plagiarism in the academic world. Moreover, from the results of comparisons with previous studies found similarities related to the topics discussed, the fact that the occurrence of plagiarism perceptions can affect users' beliefs about turnitin software, which can be seen in the research conducted by Dahl (2007), Betane (2010), and Gulk & Tippin (2003).

However, after comparison with other studies, this study with research conducted by Walker (2010) and Savage (2004) shows the inequality. This is due to the existence of several findings and explanations that are not in accordance with this study, therefore the results of the comparison show inequality.

5. Conclusion

This research shows that there is still a low correlation between perceptions of plagairism and the user's trust in the accuracy of turnitin software at the University of Indonesia. Therefore, there needs to be more understanding of all matters relating to plagiarism and about the use of turnitin software itself. This can be done by conducting socialization by the library as an organizer of various information literacy programs, with themes or topics that can be used are all things about plagiarism and about turnitin software. In addition to further understanding, workshops on scientific writing techniques and how to use turnitin software can also be done. Attention to plagiarism also needs to be increased by the academic community and teaching staff, this is done so that there is an alertness to the actions of plagiarism in order to reduce plagiarism in the academic environment.

References

Betane, Tshepo. (2010). Turning to Turnitin to Fight Plagiarsm among University Students. Journal Educational Technology & Society, 13 (2), 1-12. Retrieved from http://www.ifets.info/journals/13_2/1.pdf

Burke, Margaret. (2005). Deterring Plagiarism: A New Role for Librarians. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Dahl, Stephan. (2007). The Student Perspective on Using Plagiarism Detection Software. Sage Publication Vol 8 (2): 173-191. DOI: 10.1177/1469787407074110

Drum, Alice. (1986). Responding to plagiarism. College Composition and Communication, 31(2), 241–243.

Errey, L. (2002) Plagiarism. Something Fishy... or just a Fish Out of Water? Oxford Brookes University Teaching Forum, Volume 50, pp. 17-20. Retrieved from http://www.brookes.ac.uk/virtual/NewTF/50/T50errey.pdf

Gilmore J, et al. (2010). Weeds in the flower garden: An exploration of plagiarism in graduate students' research proposals and its connection to exculturation, ESL, and contextual factors. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 6(1): 3–28.

Gulik C., Tippin, D. (2003). The University of Auckland's Turntin.com trial - Semester 2, 2003: Evaluation Report.

Idiegbeyan-ose, Jerome; Et al. (2018). Towards Curbing Plagiarism in Higher Institutions of Learning: The Strategic Role of the Library. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Kumar, Suresh. (2019). Similarity Index of Doctoral Theses Submitted to Universities in Kerala: An investigation. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

McCabe, D. L, & Bowers, W. J. (1994). Academic Honesty Among Males in College: A 30-year Perspective. Journal of College Student Development, 35, 5-10.

McCabe, D. (2003). Academic dishonesty survey study. Unpublished study, Rutgers University

Moorman, Christine, Rohit Deshpande, & Gerald Zaltman. (1993). "Factors Affecting Trust in Market Research Relationships". Journal of Marketing. Vol 57 (81-101).

Oyewole, Olawale & Abioye, Abiola. (2018). Awareness of Plagiarism Acts and Policy by Postgraduate Students in University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Pupovac V, Bilic-Zulie & Petrovecki, M. (2008). On academic plagiarism in Europe: An analytic approach based on four studies. In: R Comas and J Sureda (coords) An Academic Cyberplagiarism. Retrieved From http://www.uoc.edu/digithum/10/dt/eng/pupovac_billic_zulle_ petrovecki.pdf

Savage, S. (2004) *Staff and Student Responses to a trial of Turnitin Plagiarism Detection Software* (2004) Proceedings of the Australian Universities Forum. Retrieved from http://www.auqa.edu.au/auqf/2004/program/papers/Savage.pdf

Schiffman, Leon G. Kanuk, Leslie Lazar, (2007). Consumer Behavior (8th Edition). Pearson Education. New Jersey.

Sutherland, Wendy-Smith. (2008). Plagiarism The Internet and Student Learning: Improving Academic Integrity. 270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016: Routledge

Walker, John. 2010. Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education,* Vol. 35, No. 1 (41-59).