

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

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

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

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	Yes, it is unwise and taking other's rights. Yes, copy other's work without acknowledgment as if it was ours. Yes, but some materials need to copy. Yes, I know, but I copy if I do not understand, still mention the source. Yes, I know, and it is not good.
--	--

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?	Yes, if students are diligent to write. Maybe, but it is difficult not to copy-paste since students do not use critical thinking and write good English. I can do no copy-paste but need more time to understand my writing. No, I do not understand the materials. Possible if I understand. Yes, if students use their logic. Possible but difficult since many tasks with a tight deadline.
--	--

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

	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?	All citations must include references. Understand the law of copyrights. Write my opinion in an essay. I am making a paraphrase. I must have self-confidence in writing my creativity. Paraphrase the citation and mention the reference.
---	--

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>