



Understanding Plagiarism Checker: Institutional Policies on Plagiarism in Indonesian Private Higher Education Context

Anna Riana Suryanti Tambunan¹ · Fauziah Khairani Lubis²

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Medan

*

*Corresponding author. Email: annatambunan@unimed.ac.id

Abstract

Plagiarism is a significant problem for educational institutions around the globe. Previous research centered on the perspectives of Indonesian students on knowledge and plagiarism in Indonesia and abroad, as well as the comprehension and attitudes of Indonesian teachers on plagiarism practices. However, little study on institutional rules against plagiarism has been completed in Indonesia, despite similar research being conducted elsewhere. This study intends to explore university regulations about plagiarism in Indonesia. To obtain the data, three examples of plagiarism were retrieved from university library websites. The data were then coded thematically and analysed. Despite institutional variations, the data revealed that the three papers are dominated by moral and regulatory discourse and lack an educational approach to plagiarism. These three university policy statements are deemed crucial for enhancing institutional understanding and attitudes about plagiarism. These results also demonstrate the difficulty and complexity of understanding plagiarism and the significance of academic socialization in establishing knowledge and attitudes around it. We contend that institutional anti-plagiarism regulations are unlikely to be effective because they do not promote academic literacy and intertextual practice among students.

Keywords: *Indonesian context, plagiarism, plagiarism-checker, text-matching software*

1. INTRODUCTION

Plagiarism has long been a source of concern in higher education, and it continues to be a major issue for universities worldwide. Previous research in the context of Indonesian education has focused on student attitudes, knowledge, and involvement in plagiarism. Even though research like this has been done in other places, Indonesian institutions haven't paid much attention to their policies on plagiarism. Plagiarism is now a major problem in higher education, both globally and locally. Plagiarism has thus grown in popularity in recent decades [1], raising concerns about academic dishonesty [2]. Society has less faith in higher education's academic integrity because more "scandals" involving

students involve fraud and plagiarism [3] [4] emphasized that plagiarism is a major issue for institutions that want to maintain academic integrity. It is also a significant issue to ensure that educational institutions maintain and improve their quality. In response to this widespread "moral panic," more and more research is being conducted to determine what plagiarism is, how common it is, how people perceive it, what causes it, and what effects it has.

Plagiarism remains a contentious issue around the world, with debates centered on technology and the internet, internationalization, academic publishing pressures, and plagiarism detection methods. The majority of this research has focused on how Indonesian students perceive

plagiarism, what they know about it, how they understand it, and whether or not they engage in it [5]. The case of an Indonesian academic accused of plagiarism by an international journal made headlines in Indonesia and around the world twelve years ago [6]. Specific higher education regulations were drafted in a matter of months. This indicates a quick reaction to the event. This regulation also demonstrates that the Indonesian government regards universities as national centres of research and technology and that it is critical to prevent academic violations, including plagiarism, in these institutions. So, the Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia wrote Regulation of the Minister of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 17 of 2010 Concerning the Prevention and Overcoming of Plagiarism in Higher Education to explain what plagiarism is and how it works and to tell students and teachers how to stop and fix plagiarism.

In response to this comprehensive plan, Indonesian educational institutions have been working to prevent and reduce plagiarism [7] [8] [9]. Workshops, the publication of plagiarism information, web statements, the requirement to upload academic papers to the Digital Reference Center (Garuda) (Dikti 2011a), and peer assessment by a professional team are just a few of the strategies used (Dikti 2011b). Despite substantial study on institutional policies and their effectiveness in Western and other contexts, little attention has been paid to university rules against plagiarism in the Indonesian context [10] [11] [3]. Consequently, the purpose of this study is to close knowledge gaps about how Indonesian institutions define and address plagiarism. This article describes a study published by three Indonesian private universities on plagiarism policies (and academic violations in general). The goal of this research is to find out how plagiarism is brought up, talked about, and dealt

with in Indonesian institutions, as well as to come up with ways that policies can be changed and improved to make them more relevant and effective.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The purpose of this research is to examine plagiarism policy documents from three private universities in North Sumatra, Indonesia. The goal is to fill the research gaps mentioned above and learn more about how Indonesian universities deal with plagiarism and how they discuss it. This university was chosen because of its website accessibility. The researchers discovered the documents in the university library websites. The three universities are in the Indonesian province of North Sumatra. Data collection was completed in 2021. Texts on academic ethics are gathered from university official websites, which include information such as general university regulations on academic integrity, plagiarism procedures and sanctions in particular, academic violations in general, and the use of text matching tools. The data set was then supplemented with policy documents on plagiarism and academic violations for analysis. The identified texts are read and analysed based on their location (on institutional websites), how they were gathered, and what they say.

The coding scheme, in particular, was created based on the related literature and our research question. The data is then modified repeatedly until the policy document's encoding reaches saturation, at which point no additional data can change the schema's encoding. Text-matching software use, instructor responsibilities, relevant methodology, and discourse have all been codified. The identified texts were read, and their location, structure, and content (as available on academic websites) were evaluated. The coding scheme is then iteratively adjusted in the policy document until

saturation is reached, at which point no new data can change the coding scheme under consideration. The title, type of academic violation handled, administrator, procedure for handling plagiarism cases, academic and disciplinary consequences, use of text-matching software, teacher responsibilities, and how to act are all included in the completed coding scheme.

3. FINDINGS & DISCUSSIONS

Findings

The results of this study are broken up into three parts: where the ethical policy text is, how it is put together, and what it says. The results of the analysis of the policy text are put into groups based on the categories from the previous coding scheme. Table 1 is a summary of the main ideas and traits found in academic ethics books.

Table 1. Summary of the main ideas and traits in academic ethics books

| Key feature | Private University 1 | Private University 2 | Private University 3 |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Document title | Pedoman Pencegahan Plagiat (Plagiarism Prevention Guidelines) | Pedoman Penanganan Tindakan Plagiarisme (Guidelines for Handling Plagiarism) | Panduan Anti Plagiarisme (Anti Plagiarism Guide) |
| Location | University official website | University official website | University official website |
| Affected parties | All faculty, students, and education staff | All faculty and students | All students |
| Academic Misconduct Category | a. Taking someone else's writing and passing it off as his own is known as "word for word plagiarism." b. The majority of other people's writings are based on a single source with no changes. c. Changing keywords and sentences without changing the main content of a source d. combining sentences from various sources to create a written work. e. Using the author's previous work without citations. This is also referred to as "self-plagiarism" or "auto-plagiarism." | a. referring to and/or quoting terms, words, and/or sentences, data, and/or information from a source without mentioning the source in the citation notes and/or without adequately mentioning the source; b. referring to and/or quoting terms, words, and/or sentences, data, and/or information from adequate sources at random; | a. quoting the words or sentences of another person without using quotation marks or identifying the source. b. using another person's ideas, points of view, or theories without crediting them. c. using the facts (data, information) of others without acknowledging their source. d. recognizing the writings of other people as one's own (changing the structure of other people's sentences without altering the meaning) without crediting the source. e. As your own work, you submitted a scientific paper that had already been written and/or published by someone else. |
| Committee | Plagiarism Unit and Ethics Commission | Libraries, research and community service institutions, and other similar organizations that deal with research, scientific works, and/or publications | University library |
| Punishments | Students may get the following punishments: a reprimand, a written warning, a delay in getting some student rights, the loss of credit for one or more courses, an honourable or dishonourable discharge from student status, or the loss of a diploma if the student has already finished a study program. | Student punishments include: reprimand; written warning; deferral of certain student rights Cancellation of the value of one or more courses obtained by students; status as a student; or "disgraceful dismissal from student status; or | Sanctions for students 1. Reprimand 2. Written warning 3. Postponement of granting some student rights 4. Cancellation 5. Dismissal with honor from status as a student 6. Dismissal with honor from status as a student |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Lecturers, researchers, and other educational staff could be given a verbal or written warning, have their rights taken away, lose their academic or functional positions, or lose the right to be proposed as a professor or principal research expert. | If a student has finished a course of study, his or her diploma could be taken away. Punishments for professors, researchers, and school personnel: Warning; written warning; deferral of granting rights for lecturers/researchers/educational staff; demotion and academic/functional positions; loss of right to be suggested as professor/professor; chief research expert | 7. Cancellation of diploma if you have graduated from the education process. |
| Application of text matching software | No mention | No mention | AiMOS or Academic Integrity Monitoring System |
| Existing strategies and conversations | Punitive & moralistic | Punitive & moralistic | Punitive & moralistic |

Content

1. Titles

The language used in the title of an institutional policy document can indicate a comprehensive approach to academic integrity. The title of the university document in this study indicates that they took a regulatory approach. Three of the titles, with words like academic norms and guidelines, are more likely to be regulative.

2. Affected parties

The document's intended audience is primarily comprised of students and faculty. In particular, the three university documents make it clear that the rules apply to all faculty, students, and students at all levels, including dissertation supervisors in one case.

3. Academic misconduct category

All of these publications address various forms of academic dishonesty, including duplicating a piece or the entirety of another student's paper, soliciting ghost-writers, and misrepresenting research data. The majority of the academic violations identified in the document are ethical in

nature rather than academic. In other words, this publication talks about immoral and illegal behaviour, but it doesn't say much about plagiarism, especially the more subtle kinds of transgressive intertextuality, like not giving credit when paraphrasing. Worse, all materials, registered copying, textual theft, and obvious copying are forms of academic dishonesty without difference, which can be quite confusing for the target audience. Additionally, the document elaborates on what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.

4. Committee

The supervisory committees at all three universities are trusted to handle cases of plagiarism and other academic violations. Two universities have delegated the investigation and resolution of plagiarism cases to research and community service institutes and university libraries, while others have established the Plagiarism Unit and Ethics Committee to deal with plagiarism-related incidents. Almost all of these groups have the same task: to investigate plagiarism and other forms of cheating in the classroom and make preliminary recommendations.

5. Rules and penalties

Procedures for dealing with cases of academic misconduct are detailed and vary across all documents. Some documents give detailed instructions on how to find plagiarism and what to do about it, while others just give an overview. Nonetheless, these documents highlight nearly identical procedures for dealing with allegations of academic misconduct. In other words, anti-plagiarism organizations receive reports of potential cases, investigate them, make preliminary recommendations, and write reports.

Once the university administration department has approved the recommendation, the sanction will be communicated to the student or staff member involved. They may request a re-examination. Likewise, the penalties for proven crimes are comparable. When plagiarism is found, a second chance is given to the students to fix their thesis and turn it in again. If the revised thesis fails to meet the institution's academic integrity requirements, the student will face serious consequences. Other forms of academic offense that can be imposed on students who commit plagiarism include a warning, detention, expulsion from university, or the revocation of a degree. Faculty sanctions range from warnings and demerit notes to demotion and termination. However, no information is available regarding which actions will result in which sanctions.

6. Application of text-matching software

Text-matching software is used by these three universities to identify similarities between student writing and other texts. The software similarity index is used by most of these universities as a way to check for plagiarism. The fact that universities have software demonstrates that they are concerned with fighting plagiarism and maintaining academic integrity. It also demonstrates that they

believe software will be an effective way to detect and prevent plagiarism. There is an undeniable link between text match rate and the presence of plagiarism. Text-matching software must be utilized for all undergraduate and advanced theses and dissertations, journal articles, and research reports, as well as student assignments. In addition, universities use varying similarity indices (ranging from 15% to 30%) as criteria. This shows that universities are very different in how hard or easy they are on students who plagiarize.

7. Existing strategies and conversations

Strategies and policy documents that use key linguistic features and distinguishing themes identified in the literature are examples of punishment-dominated approaches [12] [13] [3]. Moral discourse is included in most university plagiarism policies.

4. DISCUSSION

Our textual analysis of the three universities' plagiarism policies revealed a lot of similarities between them in response to our research questions about the nature and focus of the policy documents we looked at, as well as their different approaches and ways of talking about plagiarism. First, most policy documents have a strong punitive stance that fits well with the moral relativism discourse. This moralistic orientation of punishment is evident in these documents' emphasis on preventing plagiarism through detection and punishment [12]. This is also evident in the wording of several document titles that emphasize "violations" and "punishments."

The use of text matching software to "detect" and "prevent" plagiarism is further evidence of universities' punitive stance. Most of the three universities do not view plagiarism as a subject to be taught and studied, as evidenced by the fact that the

vast majority of policy texts are directed solely at graduate students and, in the majority of cases, only pertain to "crimes" that must be caught and punished [12]. In addition to the moralistic focus of punishment, most policy documents have a procedural focus. This defines plagiarism as something that must be regulated, focuses on developing institutional procedures for dealing with plagiarism, and expects students to easily understand and follow institutional policies [14]. Many researchers have advocated for a paradigm shift in institutional approaches to plagiarism as well as a shift away from a moralistic, intertextual approach to punishment [15] [3]. Others have observed this approach [14] [16] in a number of international universities' plagiarism policies that have not yet reached students. [17] asserts that institutional policies evolve slowly.

According to the document analysis, the author of this policy statement appears to have a poor awareness of plagiarism. In contrast to prior research [10] [18] [19], neither of these texts gives exhaustive definitions and detailed explanations of the different types of plagiarism, much less intertextual examples [1] [4]. In addition, plagiarism is not viewed as a controversial concept [17] or an acceptable intertextual behaviour that may evolve over time and between disciplines [20] [21] [15]. Given that Indonesian students frequently lack understanding regarding plagiarism [22] [23] and that knowledge and attitudes about plagiarism are closely associated [22], the purpose of this study is not to advise students on what to do. Plagiarism is a squandered opportunity to help students comprehend why they plagiarize and enhance their learning.

In response to instances of academic misconduct, the three universities have since established regulating organizations. In the majority of instances, these committees do not appear to have

the last word on how specific incidents of academic misconduct should be handled. They must instead submit an investigative report to the relevant university administration department, which will then make the final determination. These power dynamics can result in inconsistencies and a lack of transparency in the handling of similar cases [10] [2]. All policy documents contain ad hoc and reactive solutions to plagiarism, which are tied to the desired performance of the regulating agency. Regulatory organizations can only intervene after a plagiarism incident has occurred. During the educational process, there is no proactive effort to offer students the opportunity to acquire legitimate intertextual practices and to prevent plagiarism [12]. This difficulty is exacerbated by the fact that subject matter experts (other than scientific writing supervisors) and writing teachers do not have an official responsibility for teaching students how to correctly employ academic literacy. Policies do not pay much attention to how faculty are involved in making and keeping an educational process for students.

Despite differences in the specifics of the procedures established by each institution, the use of text matching software is at the heart of almost all three universities' plagiarism handling procedures. The percentage match of computer-generated overall text is frequently and incorrectly interpreted as evidence of plagiarism. Text-matching software, in other words, is useful for raising awareness and teaching about plagiarism [24], is primarily used for profit [17], and is frequently regarded as a panacea for eradicating problems [3]. Most people do not think about how software like this can help students become better academic writers. Finally, our findings contribute to understanding the confusion and frustration experienced by foreign language student writers when confronted with the widely held and accepted notion of plagiarism in academic

writing. There are several explanations for plagiarism for foreign language writers in the existing literature.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The understanding of how academic offenses, in general, and plagiarism, in particular, are framed and handled in Indonesian higher education institutions can help explain why students from Indonesian educational backgrounds have negative perceptions of plagiarism.

Researchers can learn more about how institutional factors influence Indonesian students' knowledge and attitudes about plagiarism, as well as their intertextual practices, by using institutional policy documents. Document analysis reveals that institutional policies on plagiarism have shifted, and text matching software is increasingly being used.

REFERENCES

- [1] Curtis, G. J., & Vardanega, L. (2016). Is plagiarism changing over time? A 10-year time-lag study with three points of measurement. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(6), 1167-1179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1161602>
- [2] Stuhmcke, A., Booth, T., & Wangmann, J. (2016). The illusory dichotomy of plagiarism. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(7), 982-995. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1053428>
- [3] Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies. *Semiotica*, 187, 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2011.067>
- [4] Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: Plagiarism by university students e literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471-488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301677>
- [5] Akbar, A., & Picard, M. (2019). Understanding plagiarism in Indonesia from the lens of plagiarism policy: lessons for universities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 15(7), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-019-0044-2>
- [6] The Jakarta Post. (2010). Graduate Deplored by lecturer for plagiarism <https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2010/04/20/graduate-deplored-lecturer-plagiarism.html>. Accessed 02 August 2022.
- [7] Adiningrum, T. S. (2015). Reviewing Plagiarism: An Input for Indonesian Higher Education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13, 107-120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-015-9226-6>
- [8] Adiningrum, T. S., Wihardini D., & Warganegara, D. L. (2013) Awareness or understanding? A case study of assessing Indonesian academic staff understanding of plagiarism. *Education & Society*, 31(1), 69–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7459/es/31.1.06>
- [9] Siaputra, I. B., & Santosa, D. A. (2015) Academic integrity campaign in Indonesia. In: Bretag T (ed) *Handbook of academic integrity*. Springer Reference, Singapore
- [10] Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism: A complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 233-245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262536>
- [11] Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher, & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229-245). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- [12] Hu, G. (2015). Research on plagiarism in second language writing: Where to from here? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 100-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.004>
- [13] Kaposi, D., & Dell, P. (2012). Discourse of plagiarism: Moralism, proceduralism, developmental and inter-textual approaches. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33(6), 813-830. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2012.686897>
- [14] Adam, L., Anderson, V., & Spronken-Smith, R. (2017). 'It's not fair': Policy discourses and students' understandings of plagiarism in a New Zealand university. *Higher Education*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0025-9>
- [15] Pecorari, D., & Petric, B. (2014). Plagiarism in second-language writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269-302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000056>
- [16] Kaktin, S. L. (2014). Appraising plagiarism policies of Australian universities. *Text*

& Talk, 34(2), 117-141.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2013-0040>

[17] Price, M. (2002). Beyond "Gotcha!": Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, 54(1), 88-115. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1512103>

[18] Pecorari, D. (2013). *Teaching to avoid plagiarism: How to promote good source use*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

[19] Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism? Analyses of 10 North-American college websites. *System*, 31(2), 247-258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00023-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00023-X)

[20] Flowerdew, J. (2015). Language re-use and the notion of culture: A response to Diane Pecorari's "Plagiarism in second language writing: Is it time to close the case?". *Journal of Second Language*

Writing, 30, 109-110.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.008>

[21] Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2015). Chinese university students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Ethics and Behavior*, 25(3), 233-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.923313>

[22] Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2015). Chinese university students' perceptions of plagiarism. *Ethics and Behavior*, 25(3), 233-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.923313>

[23] Valentine, K. (2006). Plagiarism as literacy practice: Recognizing and rethinking ethical binaries. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(1), 89-109.

[24] Dahl, S. (2007). Turnitin? The student perspective on using plagiarism detection software. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 8(2), 173-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787407074110>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

