



COPY RIGHT DECLARATION

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics

Education (TURCOMAT)

Title of the Article: The Plagiarism Tendency during Covid-19 Pandemic

Authors: Masda Surti Simatupang, Ramot Peter, Erni Murniarti, Hendrikus Male, Gunawan Tambunsaribu

I/We hereby assign copyright of the article named above (the Work), to the journal, **Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)**. I/We understand that Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) will act on my/our behalf to publish, reproduce, distribute and transmit the Work and will authorize other reputable third parties (such as document delivery services) to do the same. I/We warrant that the Work has not been published before in its current or a substantially similar form and is not under consideration for another publication, does not contain any unlawful statements. I/We warrant that “proof of consent” has been obtained for studies of named organizations and people. All authors have received a final version of the Work, take responsibility for the content and agree to its submission. I/We assert my/our moral rights to be identified as the author/s of the Work.

1. Signature _____
Author Name Masda Surti Simatupang Date 15 June 2021 Place Jakarta, Indonesia

2. Signature _____
Author Name Ramot Peter Date 15 June 2021 Place Jakarta, Indonesia

3. Signature _____
Author Name Erni Murniarti Date 15 June 2021 Place Jakarta, Indonesia

4. Signature _____
Author Name Hendrikus Male Date 15 June 2021 Place Jakarta, Indonesia

5. Signature _____
Author Name Gunawan Tambunsaribu Date 15 June 2021 Place Jakarta, Indonesia

Review Letter

Dear Corresponding Author,

Paper ID: Turcomat_2021_90

Paper Title: The Plagiarism Tendency during Covid-19 Pandemic

We are pleased to inform you that your research paper has been accepted for publication in **Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)** in Current Issue of 2021.

The blind peer review process results are given below

----- REVIEW 1 -----

Review Decision 1: Accepted

1. Originality: 79%
2. Article scope: 76%
3. Understandable: Yes
4. References: Cited Properly
5. Result: Satisfactory

----- REVIEW 2 -----

Review Decision 2: Accepted

1. Originality: 70%
2. Article scope: 90%
3. Understandable: Yes
4. References: Cited Properly
5. Result: Satisfactory

Final Decision: Accepted

For any further query feel free to contact us.

Regards

Editorial Team

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)
www.turcomat.org

The Plagiarism Tendency During Covid-19 Pandemic

Masda Surti Simatupang^a, Ramot Peter^b, ErniMurniarti^c, Hendrikus Male^d, GunawanTambunsaribu^e

^aAssociate Professor, Faculty of Letters and Language, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

^b Assistant Professor, Character Buiding Development Center, Information Systems Department, School of Information Systems, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta

^c Assistant Professor, Graduate Program of Education Administration, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

^dAssistant Professor, Faculty of Letters and Language, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

^eAssistant Professor, Faculty of Letters and Language, Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta

Abstract: During the Covid-19 pandemic, the teaching and learning process changes from offline to online. It influences university students' behavior in completing their assignments. They must access the internet for the learning activity, for instance, to search for literature, which they used to get from books in the library. They get the soft copy from the internet that tends to plagiarism action by copy-pasting. This study aims to identify the tendency of plagiarism and analyze the motive of plagiarism tendency. The methodology used in this study is a descriptive qualitative method by analyzing students' writing via Turnitin and interviewing. The subjects were UKI's students majoring in English education undertaking a Linguistics class. The results showed that most students tended to copy-paste the source for their essay writing to ease shortcuts. Those typical learning methods affected students' intention to finish their assignment instantly or fulfill their work in the last minute of due time. In conclusion, there was a tendency for university students to copy-paste caused by easy internet access and merely fulfilling their duty to submit their work at the last minute.

Keywords: Covid-19, learning, plagiarism, Turnitin

1. Introduction

The covid-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on the learning process. Online learning has tremendously replaced offline learning, and learning from home has been implemented as the merely choice of gaining an education (Mukhtar et al., 2020). Nevertheless, it is not what is expected of students. They prefer to study face-to-face rather than in online classes (Male et al., 2020; Adnan & Anwar, 2020). This is the impact since they previously studied face to face, it was suddenly changed to online mode. Students got bored quickly for learning at home in front of their gadgets, and their mood for learning changed from time to time (Irawan et al., 2020). However, some others believed that online learning is effective due to the pandemic situation but not effective because of more internet quota costs (Bahasoan et al., 2020).

Nonetheless, nobody predicts that pandemic Covid-19 will endure for a long time since it still exists from March 2020 until currently. It forces people to change their way of studying, working, and managing their activity. Working and learning from home cannot be avoided. Hence, online learning with an internet connection becomes the most appropriate choice. It denotes that everyone who deals with education should be possessed by technology literacy, such as students, lecturers, or staff, to explore the internet whenever they have a difficult task (Simatupang et al., 2020). In a short time, they should force themselves to adapt the learning style to keep updated information.

Higher education deals with academic integrity established in individual character involved within oneself. Educated people are expected to possess a well-behaved manner to reflect that they are trustworthy, reliable, and having integrity. Communities affiliated with the university are expected to have noble characters. *Universitas Kristen Indonesia* or UKI (Christian University of Indonesia) called the characters as UKI values (*Nilai-nilai UKI*) consisting of humility, sharing and caring, discipline, professionalism, responsibility, and integrity (UKI, 2019). With those values, it is expected that all academic members possess the morals of a Christian university. Universally, educated people are required to conduct trustworthy behavior by creating righteous work. Educators should ensure that all academic members employ the custom values and maintain academic integrity to avoid violations. However, the practice of a breach still exists in an educational environment (Uyun, 2018).

One type of violation is plagiarism. What is plagiarism? It is the act of violating regulation conduct in many conditions, such as writing assignments in a university classroom, and extensively violating ethical principle (Pecorari, 2008) or presenting other work as his or her work (Smith & Wren, 2010). Roberts (2008:2) defines it as using one's work or idea with paraphrasing but without acknowledgement. Another variety of plagiarism includes synonymizing and translating (Maurer et al., 2006). Similarly, students are considered plagiarism simply because they imitate others' work or writing, which is admitted as their creation, or cited other

author's materials as their product. The worse is that students occasionally copy the text in their essays, but they 'cleanse' their copy to avoid plagiarism detection (Wrigley, 2017).

One type of deception occurred in academic writing, like the final report or thesis (Rohendi, 2018). It takes place in UKI students' performance as well. Plagiarism mostly occurs in academic writing or essay writing when students do their final semester tests, write their essays, report their small research/ paper, and complete their undergraduate thesis. Even if the students have been informed not to plagiarize others' work, the practice of plagiarism still exists. It is even worse since the internet connection results in trouble-free clicking of enormous sources available (Windarti, 2018)(Obeid & Hill, 2017). Even though plagiarism practices are considered fatal, no severe punishments have been applied yet. So far, the only penalty is that the students are simply required to rewrite their work without having significant consequences. As a result, plagiarism seems just a minor crime for not having been considered 'guilty.' Therefore, universities must search for a solution to fight against plagiarism (Gullifer & Tyson, 2010).

With the aid of the internet, people can search for any information they need and gain shortly. The effortless manner of searching through the internet creates the chance for students to copy-paste the materials they need for any assignment they have to finish (Scanlon et al., 2012; Nurmina & Hartati, 2017; Howard, 2007). The copy-paste mode has been a quick solution for fulfilling their tasks (Murdiansyah et al., 2017). With the lecturers' information not to plagiarize, some students realize that it is forbidden to copy-paste some texts without informing the sources they have selected (Rosalia & Fuad, 2019). However, others still believe that their lecturers will not detect their plagiarism and the act continues. The actions of plagiarism continue mostly if the work is closed to the deadline.

This study aims to identify university students' tendency to do plagiarism in their academic writing and analyze their motives. The research questions include:

1. What is the description of Turnitin results of students' academic writing?
2. Why do the students tend to do plagiarism in their academic writing?

2. Significance of The Study

The problem of plagiarism is common in scientific writings, both by lecturers and students. If lecturers conduct it for publication purposes, their writings will be checked for similarities through Turnitin or another similarity checker to find out whether they are eligible for publication or not. As for student writing which aims to complete assignments in a course, Turnitin checks are rarely carried out. Nevertheless, student writings that have similarities with books or reference sources are very much found.

This study is significant since it investigates students' plagiarism when accomplishing their final paper submitted as their final test products. So, this research is significant because it provides information on how much cheating that students have committed. In this case, it is explained what Turnitin detects similarities and what is not. It provides benefits for all writers who will check Turnitin. Several studies have been conducted regarding plagiarism. Scanlon (2012:161) suggested that estimates of online plagiarism may be exaggerated, cause for concern remains. Uyun (2018:49) found that students work on papers together, and copy and paste are considered natural. They consider that it is not a fraudulent act but a form of solidarity to get a similar result. Melasari (2019) argued that simultaneously learning motivation, misuse of technology and information, and student integrity significantly affect academic cheating behavior. Those studies did not use the Turnitin similarity checker as the tool used in this study. In addition, the results of this study reveal students' perception of plagiarism and the reason they commit it. It will reveal the motivation of students to do plagiarism. Even though this research is done on a small scale, it can be an example of how students cheat and explain why students do it.

3. Methodology

The methodology used in this research is qualitative, which was conducted from September to November 2020. The participants were ten UKI students taking the course of Linguistics designed for the third semester. They were from the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, the Christian University of Indonesia, majoring in English Education. English is considered as a foreign language spoken mostly to students of the same department and their lecturers. For the rest of their time, they talk in Indonesian.

This research's first data was taken from ten students' essays on one particular topic: writing a 300-400-word essay with two weeks allotted preparation in the Linguistics class. They submitted their tasks by uploading through Microsoft Teams as usual. Their assignments (without References) were then evaluated through Turnitin checker (Turnitin.com) to check the similarity content to discover the plagiarism detection percentage. Turnitin is "a plagiarism detection system being considered for widespread use to combat a perceived "plagiarism epidemic"(Emerson, 2008). Using Turnitin checker, the researchers can detect the originality of students' essays

comparing to similar works or articles that have been published before. The Turnitin application results were analyzed individually to examine the similarity and the originality of students' composition.

The following data were gained from students' answers to written interviews concerning their opinion about plagiarism. Since it was an online class due to the pandemic of Covid-19, the interviews were arranged online by delivering questions using emails. We offered five open-ended questions relating to students' perception of plagiarism. Each participant was requested to answer the following questions:

1. Most of the students have copy-pasting of specific sources to do their assignment. Do you do it? Explain.
2. Do you know that copy-pasting is a part of plagiarism? Explain
3. Is it possible to do the assignment without copy-pasting? How?
4. What is your opinion about plagiarism?
5. How do you think for you to avoid plagiarism?

Each response was identified to get the various answers to each number to consider their multiple opinions. The replies then were classified into several different accounts so that all answers were grouped. To validate the data found, all authors read and analyzed if the data were valid.

4.Result and Discussion

Results and discussion from the Turnitin Checker

Table 1. Similarity Checking of the Turnitin

No.	Students	Percentage of Similarity	Words Count	Sources of similarity
1.	A	95	890	culturalstudiesnow.blogspot.com 56% media.neliti.com 40%
2.	B	93	566	studfile.net 70% Submitted to University of Thi-Qar 11% www.academypublication.com 5% Submitted to University of Newcastle 5% Submitted to University of Salford 2%
3.	C	86	570	pdfs.semanticscholar.org 51% home.uchicago.edu 26% www.thoughtco.com 9%
4.	D	83	1,148	stiba-malang.com 36% www.oxfordbibliographies.com 27% www.kompasiana.com 12% www.drshadiabanjar.blogspot.com 6% repositori.umsu.ac.id 1%
5.	E	82	598	studfile.net 34% www.glossary.sil.org 17% orca.cf.ac.uk 13% Hanoi University 7% etheses.iainponorogo.ac.id 5% Submitted to University of Kent at Canterbury 4% Submitted to CVC Nigeria Consortium 3%
6.	F	79	832	media.neliti.com 42% www.scribd.com 31% www.pustaka.ut.ac.id 5% jurnaltarbiyah.uinsu.ac.id 1%
7.	G	66	707	eprints.uns.ac.id 19% mafiadoc.com 11% documents.mx 7% pt.scribd.com 7% Submitted to Yonkers High School 7% Submitted to Leeds Trinity and All Saints 6% Submitted to CVC Nigeria Consortium 4% slideplayer.com 4%
8.	H	65	848	refubium.fu-berlin.de 31% www.ens.cm 12%

				infopedia.su 8% Submitted to University of Huddersfield 8% Adaoma, Eugenia. "Analyzing the Political Speeches of Obama" 6%
9.	I	61	873	philpapers.org 18% ojs.academpublisher.com 15% jurnal.uns.ac.id 8% Submitted to University of Diyala 7% www.thoughtco.com 5% Submitted to University of Edinburgh 4% Submitted to Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara 2% digilib.uinsby.ac.id 2%
10.	J	57	729	Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan 16% Submitted to University of Edinburgh 15% plato.stanford.edu 11% Submitted to Bloomsbury Colleges 7% Submitted to iGroup 3% Submitted to Middlesex University 3% Al-Shawi, Muna A. "Translating Euphemisms: Theory and Application", AmarabacMagazin, 2013 2%

Interpretation of table 1

Table 1 showed that all students committed plagiarism with more than 50 per cent similarity. It proved that it was ubiquitous for the students to plagiarize with or without acknowledgement of the sources. The comfortable internet accessibility intensified students to cite any specific texts they intended, either from local or overseas connections. All are our mouse clicks, and only in few minutes, a bunch of information concerning any topics we search are just in front of us and are ready to be downloaded. Even if the texts were in PDF or image format, they could be converted to a word. All are just a piece of cake. Students who do not want to type can copy-paste the text from the word format they have just changed. What a wonderful world we have that any intended texts have been shifted from internet sources to be saved in our gadget in only a few seconds. The internet of things causes copy-pasting to turn out to be effortless. After copy-pasting some texts, several students did not mention the source next to the texts they cited in writing their essay. Others said the original authors quoted precisely equivalent to the original texts without placing the quotation marks. They assumed that copy-pasting (from 2-20 lines) was legal to act by acknowledging the real sources. It signalled that students did not consider that copy-pasting is serious misconduct. Each student's similarity was described below.

Student A accomplished the highest 95% similarity, which meant that almost all words were taken from the sources. His writing was copied from two sources based on the Turnitin checker, although he included ten references. Nearly all of his paper was full of colors (similar to the database). The only 5 per cent without color was some words he wrote with a quotation mark. This student was considered 'clever, innovative, and active'; however, he did the most similarity. The hidden reason is that he wanted to get the highest score. When he was asked why plagiarism (he was not informed of his 95% similarity), he denied doing full plagiarism. He defended that he never totally quoted from sources. He confessed to copy-pasting, only with inserted his argumentation regarding the text that he imitated.

Student B was similar to student A, committing 93% plagiarism. From Turnitin results, she copied from five different references, while in her work, she did not include the sources even though she mentioned some authors' names in her texts. Her 93% similarity indicated that she copied almost all sources for her paper and copied the unnecessary symbols that only occurred in the originals but were not necessarily inserted in her work. After copying some texts (with or without mentioning the resources), she continued to copy other sources without explaining any single words from her view. The rest, seven per cent, were numbers with brackets. In her interview, she said she copy-pasted because of a lack of understanding of the materials not to create a single sentence.

Student C performed 86% similarity and duplicated almost all of her work from three sources (in her composition, she mentioned five references). Her writing, which was not highlighted, was a copy of the texts with quotation marks. It showed that her work was not better than the previous ones since all her writing was copied from the sources, which meant 100% copy-pasting. She confessed to copy-pasting, but she argued that she copied only a little bit, which was hard to explain.

Student D copy-pasted 83% of her work. From the Turnitin result, it was copied from five references. In her writing, she wrote only four authors as references. She imitated almost all words from the sources; only some parts of the conclusion were probably written using her expression. It was slightly better compared to the other three students (A, B, and C). She admitted to copying from the sources for not comprehending the materials. She reasoned that if using her own words would produce many errors.

Student E cited from seven sources, whereas in her work, there were only five references. Her similarity of 82% did not mean that it was better than the other four due to similar copy-pasting techniques. The undetected words, phrases, or sentences were five examples with quotation marks and some mistyped terms. Thus, 17% was not her original work. She did not deny copy-pasting since she dealt with difficulties in figuring out the lessons. She was confused about writing her essay correctly, so she decided to copy most of her work without paraphrasing the sentences, merely mentioning the original authors.

With 78% similarity, student F did not suggest that this work was more satisfactory than the previous results. Almost all of her writing was quoted from sources. The 28% not detected by Turnitin included phrases or sentences with quotation marks. She made a lot of mistyped words or phrases which Turnitin could not recognize. It denoted that her work was not more proper than the earlier work. In the written interview, she stated that she copy-pasted since it caused her effort easier. Thus, all compositions (A-F) belonged to similar types of awful products.

Student G, with 66% similarity, cited five references at the end of her essay. However, after duplicating the texts in her paper, she did not acknowledge the original authors for all quotations in her work. She admitted that she made a copy of precisely the same with the sources. She could not paraphrase or deliver critical thinking because of not understanding the class materials well. The rest, 34 %, were not highlighted; however, they were copy-pasting, with mistype, incorrect space, and misspell as well.

Student H, with 65% similarity, meant that most of her work was duplicating. She did not include any acknowledgment to the original authors after each copy-pasting; only seven references existed, in any case. However, two paragraphs (35%) from all eight paragraphs were probably written with her own words, with some mistakes due to ungrammatical words/ phrases, mistyping, and improper spaces. She admitted that she had copy-pasted sentences from the sources since it was fast and not hard to do, mostly if it was closed to the deadline.

Student I had 61% similarity. However, she did not include complete references, just two links. One of the links was some google scholar keywords, with no particular article; the other was one article from google. From the Turnitin report consisting of eight different highlight colors, it was apparent that she copied from some sources that she probably forgot to mention the sources. The rest, 39%, which seemed to be her original work, was not precisely her own words. She did numerous typos or misspelled, and copy-pasting the unnecessary phrases/sentences, for instance, "We have already encountered conversational implicature in Chapter 2." Furthermore, she copy-pasted the uncompleted sentences so that the real meaning could not be achieved. Those reasons possibly affected the undetected copy-pasting sentences or phrases. It implied that almost 100 per cent of student I's work was copy-pasting. In the written interview, she confessed to copying due to not comprehending the course materials.

Student J, who had 57% similarity among the students, did not put references or bibliography at the end of her essay, just three links instead. However, from the Turnitin printout, the similarity was highlighted with seven different colors, perhaps taken from seven sources. After checking student J's paper, however, the researchers discovered three sources, in any case. The rest, 43% that did not belong to similarity, possibly did not mean that J wrote using her thinking. Turnitin did not recognize the 43% of the writing due to the following details: first, student J copy-pasted almost all work together with the text numbers. As a result, she numbered in her paper from number 97 until 101, then continued to 11a until 11b. It caused chaos numbers that some phrases or sentences undetected. Second, student J copied pieces by pieces that produced unconnected meaning from one paragraph to the next. Third, words or phrases wrote in brackets or between quotations, even though written precisely similar to the source, were not diagnosed. Fourth, sentence(s) or a paragraph between misspelling and not appropriate copying were not discovered. Fifth, one copy-pasting section ending with no punctuation, the next paragraph with incorrect punctuation (spaces) were not recognized. Sixth, sentences or one paragraph unrelated to the previous sentence or paragraph were not identified. Several unique words, for instance, implicature and explicature, were not highlighted.

From the interpretation of all students' results in Table 1, it was believed that all students copy-pasted their work almost 100 per cent. Even though the Turnitin checker's results turned out to be 57% - 95% similar, the researchers discovered that all students copied more than those facts, even almost 100 per cent. The essays/ articles/ reports which are not highlighted or undetected as similar by Turnitin probably due to the following factors:

1. Words, phrases, or sentences in quotation mark;
2. Numbers with brackets;
3. Mistype or misspell words/ phrases, incorrect spaces;
4. Ungrammatical words/ phrases;
5. Unmeaningful pieces of words/ phrases
6. Unique/ uncommon words.

Results and discussion from students' written interview

The next table 2 to table 6 were summarized from students' interview about their perceptions of doing

copy-pasting when writing essays, report, or thesis. The researchers elaborated their analysis based on the ten students' answers. Each table included brief answers, and those with more or less similar ideas will be recorded as one answer. Therefore, most tables did not consist of ten answers since some of their comments meant the same. In this case, the researchers described various responses to the intended questions.

Table 2. Why students plagiarize

Why do you copy-paste?	<p>I am never copy-pasting 100% since I always give comments after quoting.</p> <p>I do not understand and do not know what to write.</p> <p>I copy-paste for difficult materials but not all.</p> <p>I copy-paste so I can understand the materials.</p> <p>I copy-paste but mention the sources.</p> <p>To make my work easy.</p> <p>I cannot think critically.</p> <p>Copy-pasting is easy to do, specifically if tight to the deadline.</p> <p>To get the reference</p>
------------------------	---

Interpretation of table 2

Table 2 displayed some reasons for students to copy-paste the sources. The questions directly asked why they copy-pasted after the researchers got the results of the Turnitin. All admitted to doing plagiarism. Most of them stated that having inadequate knowledge of creating good English sentences caused them to copy the internet materials. It assumed that the students did not bother to copy because they could get familiar with the materials they dealt with or finished their task tightly to the deadline. They believed that by inserting the original author, they could copy-paste the texts as they intended.

Table 3. Students' knowledge of plagiarism

Do you know if copy-paste is plagiarism? Explain	<p>Yes, it is unwise and taking other's rights.</p> <p>Yes, copy other's work without acknowledgment as if it was ours.</p> <p>Yes, but some materials need to copy.</p> <p>Yes, I know, but I copy if I do not understand, still mention the source.</p> <p>Yes, I know, and it is not good.</p>
--	---

Interpretation of table 3

Table 3 indicated that all ten students realized that copy-pasting meant committed plagiarism. They knew that it was not permitted. In other words, none of them said, "No, I do not know about plagiarism." It implied that they altogether understood that copy-pasting was dishonor behavior. Nevertheless, it could not be avoided since they insisted on doing it for the sake of their lack of understanding.

Table. 4 Possibility of not copy-pasting

Is it possible to do the assignment without copy-pasting? How?	<p>Yes, if students are diligent to write.</p> <p>Maybe, but it is difficult not to copy-paste since students do not use critical thinking and write good English.</p> <p>I can do no copy-paste but need more time to understand my writing.</p> <p>No, I do not understand the materials.</p> <p>Possible if I understand.</p> <p>Yes, if students use their logic.</p> <p>Possible but difficult since many tasks with a tight deadline.</p>
--	---

Interpretation of table 4

Table 4 showed that it was impossible for them not to copy-paste even though they mentioned the contrary. The condition of not copying became unachievable for many reasons: unable to write in English correctly, needed extra time to understand English texts, and write own words and dealt with a tight deadline. As a result, students had a high tendency to copy, and it became their terrible practices. They felt insecure if not imitating the sources.

Table 5. Students' perception of plagiarism

What is your opinion about plagiarism?	<p>Plagiarism is a bad habit that will impact to future.</p> <p>Plagiarism is an action for copying another's product.</p> <p>Copying other's opinions without paraphrasing is called plagiarism.</p> <p>Put someone's opinion as a reference.</p> <p>Plagiarism breaks the rule of law.</p> <p>Plagiarism is an evil action by copying other's work.</p> <p>Plagiarism will weaken your creativity and understanding.</p>
--	--

	Plagiarism is an easy way to complete an assignment.
--	--

Interpretation of table 5

Students' interpretation of plagiarism is considered superb since most of them agreed that copy-pasting should not be acted upon since it broke the rule of law or belonged to evil action (see table 5). Their knowledge, however, did not match their performance. Their understanding of plagiarism should have prevented them not to do it. All students consciously managed to do plagiarism to quickly complete their work even though they realized it was not right.

Table 6. How to avoid plagiarism

How do you think for you to avoid plagiarism?	<p>All citations must include references.</p> <p>Understand the law of copyrights.</p> <p>Write my opinion in an essay.</p> <p>I am making a paraphrase.</p> <p>I must have self-confidence in writing my creativity.</p> <p>Paraphrase the citation and mention the reference.</p>
---	---

Interpretation of table 6

Table 6 illustrated all students' views of preventing plagiarism, all of which were excellent responses. All of them suggested several essential solutions that can be achieved, for instance, paraphrasing with acknowledgment, being confident with their creativity, and adding their views of the given topics. Once again, their awareness of avoiding plagiarism did not guarantee their behavior not to plagiarize. In other words, students kept copy-pasting despite their knowledge of preventing plagiarism.

5. Conclusion

The Turnitin checker results proved that all students were inclined to plagiarize with 57 – 95% similarity. It verified that copy-pasting is a common phenomenon and one of the realities that educators should realize. It suggested that students assumed that copying was not considered severe, with or without mentioning the author's names. The copy-pasting behavior has become a lousy tendency that cannot be avoided. Even though Turnitin results displayed students' similarity with colorful marks, the undetected similarity of 43 – 5% did not mean that students wrote their essay using their own words. The researchers discovered that the students copy-pasted almost all of their papers. Words, phrases, and sentences which the Turnitin checker did not detect can be categorized as follows:

- First, words, phrases, or sentences were written in quotation marks.
- Second, numbers quoted from the source were copied with brackets.
- Third, words were written with mistyping or misspell.
- Fourth, words/ phrases were written with incorrect spaces.
- Fifth, phrases were written ungrammatically.
- Sixth, unique/ uncommon words written in the text.

Those six categories were discovered in those ten students' essays, which Turnitin did not detect as a similarity. According to students' answers in the written interviews, they tended to plagiarize with some motives. They copy-pasted because of no confidence to write good English, hard materials, and tight deadlines. The student plagiarism tendency was mainly affected by their character that was accustomed to copy-pasting. They purposely did copy-paste, although they admitted that it was plagiarism. Realizing that imitating sentences precisely to the references with or without acknowledgment were considered unmoral, students still insisted on copy-pasting. It appeared unworkable for them not to copy-paste since they have no self-confidence to produce their writing. We concluded that students did not realize the plagiarism category. They tended to do plagiarism, but there is no definite rule from the university to prevent it. There is no penalty for plagiarism, which is written as academic rules, nor mutual agreement among lecturers to punish those who do it. The lecturers probably urge students not to copy-paste for their creativity. As a result, the practice is just normative without a legalistic penalty.

References

- Adnan, M., & Anwar, K. (2020). Online Learning amid the COVID-19 Pandemic: Students' Perspectives? *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, 2(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.46627/silet.v1i3.46>
- Bahasoan, A., Ayuandiani, W., Mukhram, M., & Rahmat, A. (2020). Effectiveness of Online Learning In Pandemic Covid-19. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 1(2), 100–106. <https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v1i2.30>
- Emerson, L. (2008). Plagiarism, a Turnitin Trial, and an Experience of Cultural Disorientation. In C. Eisner & M.

- Vicinus (Eds.), *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age* (pp. 183–194). The University of Michigan Press. <http://library1.nida.ac.th/termpaper6/sd/2554/19755.pdf>
- Gullifer, J. M., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students perceptions of plagiarism: A focus group study *Journal: Studies in Higher Education* Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: A focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903096508>
- Howard, R. M. (2007). Understanding "Internet plagiarism." *Computers and Composition*, 24(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2006.12.005>
- Irawan, A. W., Dwisona, D., & Lestari, M. (2020). Psychological Impacts of Students on Online Learning During the Pandemic COVID-19. *KONSELI: Jurnal Bimbingan Dan Konseling (E-Journal)*, 7(1), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.24042/kons.v7i1.6389>
- Male, H., Murniarti, E., Simatupang, M. S., & Siregar, J. (2020). Attitude OF Undergraduate Student's towards Online Learning during Covid-19 Pandemic. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/ Egyptology*, 17(4), 1628–1637.
- Maurer, H., Kappe, F., & Zaka, B. (2006). Plagiarism - A survey. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 12(8), 1050–1084. <https://doi.org/10.3217/jucs-012-08-1050>
- Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., & Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, Limitations and Recommendations for online learning during COVID-19 pandemic era. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 36(COVID-19-S4), S27.
- Murdiansyah, I., Made Sudarma, & Nurkholis. (2017). Pengaruh Dimensi Fraud Diamond Terhadap Perilaku Kecurangan Akademik (Studi Empiris Pada Mahasiswa Magister Akuntansi Universitas Brawijaya). *Jurnal Akuntansi Aktual*, Vol. 4(No. 2 Juni 2017), hlm. 121-133. <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/jaa>
- Nurmina, & Hartati, N. (2017). Perilaku plagiat mahasiswa antara niat dan keterampilan menulis. *Jurnal RAP UNP*, 8(2), 170–179.
- Obeid, R., & Hill, D. B. (2017). An Intervention Designed to Reduce Plagiarism in a Research Methods Classroom. *Teaching of Psychology*, 44(2), 155–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628317692620>
- Roberts, T. S. (2008). Student Plagiarism in an Online World: An Introduction. In T. Roberts (Ed.), *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (pp. 1–9). IGI Global.
- Rohendi, H. (2018). Perilaku Kecurangan Akademik Pada Mahasiswa Akuntansi Politeknik Negeri Bandung. *Ekspansi*, 10(1), 75–81.
- Rosalia, R., & Fuad, A. J. (2019). Peran Dosen Dalam Meminimalisasi Perilaku Plagiasi Mahasiswa. *Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education Studies (IJIIES)*, 2(1), 61–77.
- Scanlon, P. M. (2012). Student Online Plagiarism: How do We Respond? *College Teaching*, 51(4), 161–165.
- Simatupang, M. S., Murniarti, E., & Peter, R. (2020). Students' Learning Attitudes as Impact of Online Learning Materials. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/ Egyptology*, 17(4), 1744–1757.
- Smith, N., & Wren, K. R. (2010). Ethical and Legal Aspects Part 2: Plagiarism-"What Is It and How Do I Avoid It?". *Journal of Perianesthesia Nursing*, 25(5), 327–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jopan.2010.08.002>
- UKI, T. R. (2019). *Rencana Strategis Universitas Kristen Indonesia 2019-2024*. UKI Press.
- Uyun, M. (2018). Orientasi Tujuan Dan Efikasi Akademik Terhadap Kecurangan Akademik Pada Mahasiswa Fakultas Psikologi Uin Raden Fatah Palembang. *Psikis: Jurnal Psikologi Islami*, 4(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.19109/psikis.v4i1.1938>
- Windarti, A. (2018). Literasi Digital dan Perilaku Kecurangan Akademik. In *Seminar Nasional Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan* (pp. 1–698).
- Wrigley, S. (2017). Avoiding 'de-plagiarism': Exploring the affordances of handwriting in the essay-writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 167–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417735611>

The Plagiarism Tendency During Covid-19 Pandemic

SK: Surat Penugasan Kaprodi No. 179a/UKI.F2.PS/SDM.8/2021

Paper Title: The Plagiarism Tendency During Covid-19 Pandemic

Journal: Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)

Vol: Vol.12 No.14(2021), 4600- 4607

Published: 31 Juli 2021

Page: 4600- 4607

LINK article: <https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmater/article/view/11381/8423>

LINK Journal: <http://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmater/issue/view/49>

Link Google Scholar:

https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=GkpnXo0AAAAJ&sortby=pubdate&citation_for_view=GkpnXo0AAAAJ:hC7cP41nSMkC

Link Perpus UKI:

<http://repository.uki.ac.id/6143/2/20212022GASALPAPERThePlagiarismTendencyPAPER.pdf>

Penulis 1: Masda Surti Simatupang

Penulis 2: Ramot Peter

Penulis 3: Erni Murniarti

Penulis 4: Hendrikus Male

Penulis ke-5: Gunawan Tambunsaribu

Abstracting / Indexing

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education is abstracted and indexed in:

Google Scholar

[Google Scholar](#) | Citations: 15829 | h-index: 53 | i10-index: 371



TÜBİTAK

ULAKBİM

[TR Dizin](#)

Scopus[®]

[SCOPUS](#)

Coverage: 2018-2020 | Current Status: Inactive

DOAJ

[DOAJ](#)



[ERIH Plus](#)

Current Status: Inavtive



[EBSCO](#)

Coverage: 10-01-2014 to 01-31-2021 | Current Status: Inactive



[ProQuest](#)

Current Status: Active



About the Journal

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) was founded as an international journal from the reflection of information technology (IT) especially for mathematics education idea. We are intended to combine computers and mathematics as "information technology for mathematics education" in this journal because of the fact that a recent indication of the increasing range of work for researchers and educators comes from two sources; computers and mathematics education. We are fortunate that technology provides us with windows to look at education from new ways. Due to this opportunity we can pose many appropriate research questions and conduct many innovative research studies in our field. These fields mainly include the topics as below:

- training in-service mathematics teachers on IT through in-service courses,
- training pre-service mathematics teachers on IT through undergraduate programs,
- understanding how students learn mathematics and solve problems,
- identifying what student learn and think in mathematics,
- assessing and evaluating mathematics curriculum,
- designing and producing distance learning tools for teachers and students.

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) will contain articles on these topics or related issues with these topics. These topics are dynamic and open to change. TURCOMAT as a journal in this field is also undergoing change and development. This journal will include articles that are international, scholarly, refereed and organized by editors. Surely, this journal will grow with your supports as readers and researchers. We are enfusiastically waiting your manuscripts for next issues. We have greatly enjoyed reading the articles submitted to the current issue of this journal. We have also greatly enjoyed meeting new authors to discuss their research approaches and conclusions.

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) is an open access, international and double blind peer-reviewed journal. Articles sent to TURCOMAT are requested to evaluate by two referees as long as suitable for our focus and content. Two positive decisions are required for an article to be considered for publication. In case one of the referees reviews the articles positively and the other negatively, Editorial Board examines referees reviews and may decide to send the article to a third referee to evaluate or return it to its author. If any of the referees accept the article with revisions requiring, Editorial Board makes the final decision and reserve the right to reject it in case revision are not made.

The manuscripts submitted to Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) should satisfy the conditions indicated below. **Otherwise, manuscripts will be sent back to the authors.**

- The manuscript should not have been published previously or should not be under consideration for publication elsewhere.
- Manuscripts should be sent the system from "**Submit a Manuscript**" section after signing up. Please **do not** forget to register yourself as an "author".
- The papers should be prepared with Microsoft Word Software or any software supported by Microsoft Office.

For further information, please see the "[Manuscript Template](#)". You can make changes on the sample manuscript by keeping the same format.

Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. In this context, journal allows to share the published scientific content in order to support and develop universal open access so long as giving reference and keeping content.

The names and email addresses entered in this journal site will be used exclusively for the stated purposes of this journal and will not be made available for any other purpose or to any other party.

TURKBILMAT Education Services authorized for the publication of the article. However, the authors reserve the following rights:

- The right to make copies for their own purposes, provided that non-commercial purposes.
- The right to use all or a portion. of the article for the author's future works, such as books and lectures, with the mention of the bibliography of the Journal.
- The right to use on their personel web pages (such as Academia) on condition of giving reference.

Peer Review Process

1. The candidate manuscripts submitted to the TURCOMAT are subject to strict peer-review process. All manuscripts are peer-reviewed by minimum two peers of the same field. Since 2009, the journal has followed strict double blind peer review policy to ensure neutral evaluation. During this review process, identity of both the authors and reviewers are kept hidden to disable biased evaluation. For each submitted manuscript, a section editor will be assigned. Submissions will be considered by the section editor and will be sent to the peer-reviewers if not rejected. TURCOMAT tends not to reject the manuscripts except lack of novelty, methodological content or weak presentation. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the scientific committee think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which

are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

2. As soon as the reviewers deliver their opinion, FINAL decision about the manuscript (accepted or accepted with minor revision or major revisions required or rejected) will be sent to the corresponding author. Reviewers are asked if they would like to review a revised version of the manuscript. The editorial office may request a re-review regardless of a reviewer's response in order to ensure a thorough and fair evaluation. Reviewers who may have offered an opinion not in accordance with the FINAL decision should not feel that their recommendation was not duly considered and their service not properly appreciated. Experts often disagree, and it is the job of the editorial team to make a FINAL decision.
3. If one of the reviewers finds the manuscript not suitable for the journal, and the other advises major revisions, the Editorial Board may reject the paper or send the manuscript to a third referee.
4. If authors are encouraged to revise and resubmit a submission, there is no guarantee that the revised submission will be accepted.
5. Two positive decisions are required for an article to be considered for publication. In case one of the referees reviews the articles positively and the other negatively, Editorial Board examines referees reviews and may decide to send the article to a third referee to evaluate or return it to its author. If any of the referees accept the article with revisions requiring, Editorial Board makes the final decision and reserve the right to reject it in case revision are not made.
6. If the editors / section editors considers the article not suitable for publication in TURCOMAT, candidate manuscripts may be rejected without review.
7. The Editorial Board of the journal is responsible for deciding which of the articles submitted to the journal should be published.
8. The editor may be guided by the policies of the journal's editorial board and constrained by such legal requirements as shall then be in force regarding libel, copyright infringement and plagiarism.
9. The editor confers with other editors or reviewers in making this decision.
10. The reviewers evaluate manuscripts for their intellectual content without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, religious belief, ethnic origin, citizenship, or political philosophy of the authors. TURCOMAT is responsible for hiding any kind of information belongs to authors before publication.
11. The editorial staff must not disclose any information about a submitted manuscript to anyone other than the corresponding author, reviewers, other editorial advisers, and the publisher, as appropriate.
12. Referees are asked to deliver their views clearly and with the support of scientific arguments. Reviews should be conducted objectively. Personal criticism of the author is inappropriate. Referees should express their views clearly with supporting arguments. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language (Unnecessarily harsh words may be modified or removed at the editors' discretion). It is expected that the reviewers should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach an Editorial Decision. As TURCOMAT, we strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and they can improve the manuscript based on the comments of referees. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.
13. In is no doubt, the evaluation process assists editorial board to make a final decision. The main target of the process is also assist authors to improve the quality of their papers.
14. Manuscripts received for review are treated as confidential documents.

15. A reviewer should also call to the editor's attention for any substantial similarity or overlap between the manuscript under consideration and any other published paper of which they have personal knowledge.
16. Authors of contributions and studies research should present an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its significance.
17. Authors should reflect the research process clearly. As it is known, TURCOMAT is devoted not only for academicians, but also teachers and teacher candidates. The results of any paper are expected to help audience of the journal so that they are able to benefit how to improve their teaching quality. Fraudulent or knowingly inaccurate statements constitute unethical behavior and are unacceptable.
18. The authors should ensure that they have written entirely original works, and if the authors have used the work and/or words of others that this has been appropriately cited or quoted. TURCOMAT strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/web links. Studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new data-set, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. Self-plagiarism, also referred to as 'text recycling', is a topical issue and is currently generating much discussion among editors. Opinions are divided as to how much text overlap with an author's own previous publications is acceptable. We normally follow the guidelines given in COPE website. Editors, reviewers and authors are also requested to strictly follow this excellent guideline (Reference: Text Recycling Guidelines: <http://publicationethics.org/text-recycling-guidelines>). Plagiarized manuscripts would not be considered for publication. If plagiarism is found in any published paper after internal investigation, a letter would be immediately sent to all the authors, their affiliated institutes and funding agency, if applied and subsequently the paper will be retracted.
19. Authors should not publish manuscripts describing essentially the same research in more than one journal or primary publication.
20. Submitting the same manuscript to more than one journal concurrently constitutes unethical publishing behaviour and is unacceptable.
21. Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the conception, design, execution, or interpretation of the reported study. Submission of a paper to this journal indicates that the author(s) have agreed the content of the paper. One author should be indicated as corresponding author for all publication related communications. All correspondence and proofs would be sent to the corresponding author, who will be treated as final representative voice for all authors regarding any decision related to manuscript, unless otherwise requested during submission. This journal would not be responsible for any dispute related to authorship of a submitted paper. Any change in the authorship (such as addition or deletion of author(s) or change in the sequence of author list) should be intimated to the editorial office through a letter signed by all authors before publication of the paper. In absence of any signed letter, approval of 'Galley proof' by corresponding author will work as 'certificate of final agreement of authorship'. Generally any change in the authorship after final publication, is not entertained and COPE guidelines are followed for any dispute.
22. All sources of financial support for the project should be disclosed.
23. When an author discovers a significant error or inaccuracy in his/her own published work, it is the author's obligation to promptly notify the journal editor or publisher and cooperate with the editor to retract or correct the paper.
24. TURCOMAT is published both, hard-copy and online. After publication of a manuscript, authors will be sent a hard-copy.
25. The manuscript should not have been published previously or should not be under consideration for publication elsewhere. However, TURCOMAT consider extended version of any work that has been presented at a conference or symposium (Significant amount of

changes should be made before submission to the journal and proper citation of the conference paper is required).

26. It is compulsory for the authors to ensure that no material submitted as part of a manuscript infringes existing copyrights, or the rights of a third party.
27. TURCOMAT is determined to promote integrity in research publication. We have great respect and we generally follow the guidelines, given by Committee on Publication Ethics ([COPE](http://publicationethics.org)) for any publication disputes, authorship disputes, etc. For these kinds of disputes, we generally visit and follow the COPE website and author(s) are also requested to do so. Excellent guidelines, related to COPE's Code of Conduct and its advice to tackle cases of suspected misconduct, are available in this link (<http://publicationethics.org/resources/flowcharts>).
28. The copyrights of all papers published in this journal are retained by the respective authors as per the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).
29. The research must meet all applicable standards for the ethics of experimentation and research integrity.

CopyEditing

The copyediting stage is intended to improve the flow, clarity, grammar, wording, and formatting of the article. It represents the last chance for the author to make any substantial changes to the text because the next stage is restricted to typos and formatting corrections. The file to be copyedited is in Word or .rtf format and therefore can easily be edited as a word processing document. The set of instructions displayed here proposes two approaches to copyediting. One is based on Microsoft Word's Track Changes feature and requires that the copy editor, editor, and author have access to this program. A second system, which is software independent, has been borrowed, with permission, from the Harvard Educational Review. The journal editor is in a position to modify these instructions, so suggestions can be made to improve the process for this journal.

CopyEditing Systems

1. Microsoft Word's Track Changes

Under Tools in the menu bar, the feature Track Changes enables the copy editor to make insertions (text appears in color) and deletions (text appears crossed out in color or in the margins as deleted). The copy editor can posit queries to both the author (Author Queries) and to the editor (Editor Queries) by inserting these queries in square brackets. The copyedited version is then uploaded, and the editor is notified. The editor then reviews the text and notifies the author. The editor and author should leave those changes with which they are satisfied. If further changes are necessary, the editor and author can make changes to the initial insertions or deletions, as well as make new insertions or deletions elsewhere in the text. Authors and editors should respond to each of the queries addressed to them, with responses placed inside the square brackets. After the text has been reviewed by editor and author, the copy editor will make a final pass over the text accepting the changes in preparation for the layout and galley stage.

2. Harvard Educational Review

Instructions for Making Electronic Revisions to the Manuscript Please follow the following protocol for making electronic revisions to your manuscript: **Responding to suggested changes.** For each of the suggested changes that you accept, unbold the text. For each of the suggested changes that you do not accept, re-enter the original text and **bold** it. **Making additions and deletions.** Indicate additions by **bolding** the new text. Replace deleted sections with: **[deleted text]**. If you delete one or more sentence, please indicate with a note, e.g., **[deleted 2 sentences]**. **Responding to Queries to the Author (QAs).** Keep all QAs intact and bolded within the text. Do not delete them. To reply to a QA, add a comment after it. Comments should be delimited using: **[Comment:]** e.g., **[Comment: Expanded discussion of methodology as you**

suggested]. Making comments. Use comments to explain organizational changes or major revisions e.g., **[Comment: Moved the above paragraph from p. 5 to p. 7]**. Note: When referring to page numbers, please use the page numbers from the printed copy of the manuscript that was sent to you. This is important since page numbers may change as a document is revised electronically.

An Illustration of an Electronic Revision

1. Initial copyedit.

The journal copy editor will edit the text to improve flow, clarity, grammar, wording, and formatting, as well as including author queries as necessary. Once the initial edit is complete, the copy editor will upload the revised document through the journal Web site and notify the author that the edited manuscript is available for review.

2. Author copyedit.

Before making dramatic departures from the structure and organization of the edited manuscript, authors must check in with the editors who are co-chairing the piece. Authors should accept/reject any changes made during the initial copyediting, as appropriate, and respond to all author queries. When finished with the revisions, authors should rename the file from AuthorNameQA.doc to AuthorNameQAR.doc (e.g., from LeeQA.doc to LeeQAR.doc) and upload the revised document through the journal Web site as directed.

3. Final copyedit.

The journal copy editor will verify changes made by the author and incorporate the responses to the author queries to create a final manuscript. When finished, the copy editor will upload the final document through the journal Web site and alert the layout editor to complete formatting.



Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Fakultas Sastra dan Bahasa

SURAT PENUGASAN

Nomor: 179a/UKI.F2.PS/SDM.8/2021

Ketua Program Studi S1 Sastra Inggris Fakultas Sastra dan Bahasa Universitas Kristen Indonesia dengan ini menugaskan dosen:

Nama : Gunawan Tambunsaribu, S.S., M.Sas.

NIDN : 03-2801-8305

untuk menulis artikel dengan judul **The Plagiarism Tendency During Covid-19 Pandemic** pada Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT) Vol. 12 No. 14 (2021).

Demikian surat penugasan ini diberikan agar dapat dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Jakarta, 19 Oktober 2021

Kaprodi Sastra Inggris,



Mike Wijaya Saragih S.S., M.Hum.

NIP. 12 18 61