CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the finding of this study and elaborates the discussion for the finding. It is intended to answer the problems of the study. In finding, the researcher describes the process of collecting the data and the data finding. Whereas, in the discussion the researcher will deduce the finding.

A. Findings

The researcher has done the research and has gotten the complete data from all the techniques included documentation and interview. To gain the objectives of the research, the researcher has analyzed the data systematically and accurately. The data was then analyzed in order to give meaningful interpretation and draw inferences about the object of the evaluation. To report the findings of the research, the researcher will report the results one by one. It is specified as follows:

1. Plagiarisms within students' seminar proposals

As the result of analysis, it could be concluded that all of the seminar proposals that had been analyzed were plagiarized. So, the result of the first research problem is positive, indeed there is plagiarism in the eighth semester students' seminar proposals. Then what are the forms of plagiarism occurring in seminar proposals by eight semester students of PBI? The answer will be described each category followed by some examples from the seminar proposals directly.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

2. Forms of Plagiarism

To answer the second research problem, the researcher presented the findings in this table below and followed by explanation breakdown taken from the plagiarism matrix. In this study, the forms of plagiarism were divided into two general forms, "source not cited" and "source cited". The form "source not cited" will be explained in advance.

Table 2

The findings of plagiarism forms

No.	Indicators Source not cited	The number of finding	Title of seminar proposals
1.	Duplicating Title	1	• It Was Found In "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian".
2.	The Photocopy	15	• 2 Plagiarism Forms Were From "English Pronunciation Performance Of The Students At Pbi Iain Sunan Ampel, Sby". • 11 Forms Were Found In "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya". • 1 Was From "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian". • 1 Was From "Using Television To Increase The Student's English Speaking Skill In Mts. Al-Ghazali Batang-Batang".
3.	The Potluck Paper	2	• One Form Was Found In "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian". • Another Was From "The Correlation Between

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

			Parents' Involvement And Students' English Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya".
4.	The Ghost Writer	2	• One Was Found In "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian". • Another Was From "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya".
5.	Duplicating References	1	• It Is Found In "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian".
6.	Mosaic Plagiarism	1	• The Error Was Found In "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya".
7.	Paraphrase Plagiarism	1	• "The Correlation Between Parents' Involvement And Students' English Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya".
No.	**Source Cited**	**The number of finding**	**Title Of Seminar Proposals**
1.	Incomplete-citation plagiarism	-	
2.	Source plagiarism	4	• One Error Was Found In "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya". • Three Plagiarisms With This Form Were Found In "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian".
3.	The too-perfect paraphrase	31	• Six Plagiarisms With This Form Were Found In The Proposal Entitled "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya".

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

			• Seven Forms Were Found In "Analyzing Of 6th Semester Students' Understanding Texts With Different Genres At Pbi, Iain Sunan Ampel, Surabaya." • One Was Gotten From "The Correlation Between Parents' Involvement And Students' English Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya". • 11 Forms Were Found In "English Pronunciation Performance Of The Students At Pbi Iain Sunan Ampel, Sby". • Six Forms Were Found In "Using Television To Increase The Student's English Speaking Skill In Mts. Al-Ghazali Batang-Batang".
4.	The resourceful citer	3	• This Plagiarism Form Was Found In "English Pronunciation Performance Of The Students At Pbi Iain Sunan Ampel, Sby". • "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya". • Another Form Was Gotten From "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian".
5.	The forgotten footnote	1	• It Was Found In "The Correlation Between Parents' Involvement And Students' English Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya".
6.	The misinformer	2	• One Form Was Found In "The Correlation Between Parents' Involvement And Students' English Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya". • Another Was Gotten From "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya".
7.	"Disguised form"	8	• Six Forms Were Gotten From "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya". • One Was From "The Correlation Between Parents' Involvement And Students' English

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

			Achievement At Smkn 1 Surabaya". • Another Form Was Gotten From "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development On Learning Comparison For Basic 1 At Elen Course, Krian".

The explanation of the table is described as follows:

a. For the first category, **duplicating title**. It was rarely found in six proposals that had been analyzed because there was a certain requirement for this category, it was a work which the content included the arrangement of the statements and theories duplicated from the previous study at all. However, in fact, there was one proposal which title could be categorized into this type because the content was also same as the previous study. The title of this proposal was *"Constructivism Based Worksheet Development on Learning Comparison for Basic 1 at ELEN Course, Krian"*. Indeed the title of present study was similar with the previous study, *"Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) Berbasis Konstruktivis untuk Pembelajaran Bilingual pada Materi Pokok Bangun Ruang Sisi Lengkung di Kelas IX SMP."* Although the object was different yet the arrangement of content and theories was exactly same too.

b. The next category is **"the photocopy"**, it means that the writer copies word-for-word significant portion of the material/text/idea directly from a source without alteration. That must be underlined here is "the significant portion", it means not all the materials were duplicated directly but just a piece of information was copied directly from the original material. Most of students had done this plagiarism type in

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

their seminar proposals. It was a half bigger than "too perfect paraphrase" type that would be explained further. The example that has been derived from one of seminar proposals is *As most teachers do not have useful strategies or techniques for teaching EFL pronunciation and as they do not know what strategies are appropriate when they meet a specific problem, they simply avoid pronunciation instruction in the classroom by employing shrewd tricks.* It was taken from http://www.eltworld.net/howto/2009/01/teaching-efl-pronunciation-why-what-and-how/**.** The writer just borrowed the text from this site without citing the source and giving quotation marks. She inserted this text within her writing and claimed this sentence as her own because she didn't acknowledge any source. "Viper" successfully proved this text as plagiarism. This tool detected the original source.

c. Then the next category is **"potluck paper".** It is a copy from several different sources, tweaking the sentences to make them fit together while retaining most of the original phrasing so that it looks like his/her own argument. In fact, it rarely occurred in students' seminar proposals. From six proposals, there were only two students who plagiarized this form. The example of this plagiarism form is highlighted with different colors to give delineation of plagiarism copied from several different sources. Constructivism is a theory of learning which posits that students learn by actively constructing their own knowledge. It explains that student finds, checks and transforms new information with its rules and revises unnecessary thought. When learners encounter something new they reconcile it with the previous knowledge and experience. They may change, or they may discard the new information as irrelevant.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

The sentence in grey highlight was plagiarized from von Glasersfeld; Fosnot; Duffy and Cunningham.[49] While blue highlight was translated from previous study: *"Teori konstrukvis menyatakan bahwa siswa harus menemukan sendiri dan mentransformasikan informasi kompleks, mengecek informasi baru dengan aturan-aturan dan merevisinya apabila aturan- aturan itu tidak lagi sesuai".*[50] Moreover, the green highlight was taken from university of Alberta site located at http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/techcur/theory/constructivism.htm.[51]

Another form also occurred with different case. It occurred in another student's proposal. Here is the example: *Some researcher focused parental involvement on parent aspirations for their children academic success or achievement, communication with their children about school, participation in the school event and activities, and communication with teachers about their children and supervision of children.* This text seemed to be combined from two sources possessed by Sophia Catsambis' research report and Laurie's dissertation. The researcher browsed these sources in "dogpile" and downloaded them. After being checked, the redaction form Catsambis is: *"Some researchers conceive of parental Involvement as participation in school activities; others, as parental aspirations for their children; and others, as*

---

[49] Miriam Schonik, Sara Kol, and Joan Abarbanel, "Constructivism in Theory and in Practice", English Teaching Forum Journal.Vol.44. No. 4, (http://eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol44/no4/p12.htm, accessed on July 20, 2012).

[50] Nurul Ilmiyah, "Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) Berbasis Konstruktivis untuk Pembelajaran Bilingual pada Materi Pokok Bangun Ruang Sisi Lengkung di Kelas IX SMP." *Unpublished Thesis.* (Surabaya: UNESA, 2010), 12.

[51] University of Alberta. Faculty of Education. "Theoritical Considerations: Constructivism", Integrating Technology into The Curriculum, (http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/techcur/theory/constructivism.htm, accessed on July 20, 2012).

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

involvement in children's learning activities at home."[52] While the redaction from Laurie is *"parental aspiration for their children's academic achievement, parents' communication with their children about education and school matters, parents' participation in school activities, parents' communication with teachers about their children, and parental supervision at home".*[53] It can be seen that the writer had altered the text slightly and sometimes removed and combined with both sources. So this is potluck plagiarism.

d. The other form of plagiarism is **"The ghost writer"**. It means the writer took another's work and wrote it back as his/her own whether the same language or translation of one language into another language. In fact, this plagiarism form included duplicating content, idea, & theory as defined by Mulyana. The writer duplicated the content precisely, structure and arrangement of text includes ideas and theories from previous study were same. It occurred when the research had the same topic. There were only two students plagiarized this form. First student whose seminar proposal entitled *"Constructivism Based Worksheet Development on Learning Comparison for Basic 1 at ELEN Course, Krian"* seriously duplicated the previous thesis entitled *"Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) Berbasis Konstruktivis untuk Pembelajaran Bilingual pada Materi Pokok Bangun Ruang Sisi*

---

[52] Sophia Catsambis, *"Expanding Knowledge of Parental Involvement in Secondary Education: effect on high school academic success"*, a research report, (Queens College, 1988), 1

[53] Laurie, Z.B *"The Relationship Between parental Involvement and Student Achievement in Three Working Class Elementary Schools"*, in dissertation, (Seton Hall University, 2009), 15.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

Lengkung di Kelas IX SMP."[54]The materials that he plagiarized were the content in chapter I: The background of study, Research questions, aims, and the significances; in the chapter 2: "development concept" , "definition and function of worksheet", "stages for developing worksheet", "constructivism based worksheet" and in the chapter 3. All the content from wordings, structure of sentences, how he delivered the ideas in each chapter, and the theory that he used were exactly duplicated from the previous study. None of his own idea was encountered in his seminar proposals. In addition, the second student just copied paste his chapter III especially in sub-chapter Methodology consisting of the arrangement of ideas, theories, and some examples from other PBI students' proposal entitled "Using Picture to Improve Student's Writing Skill in Descriptive Text at Eleventh Grade of SMK ANTARTIKA 2, sidoarjo" posted at http://www.scribd.com/doc/56141769/Using-Picture-to-Improve-Student.

e. **Duplicating references.** Copy paste the references in bibliography from previous study which has the same topic of discussion as the present study. It happened especially for the ghost writer. He/she just patched the references in bibliography directly from previous study. There was only one student whose proposal title is "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development on Learning Comparison for Basic 1 at ELEN Course, Krian" did this plagiarism form because all the contents of his seminar proposal were duplicated from the previous study entitled "Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) Berbasis Konstruktivis untuk

[54] Nurul Ilmiyah, "Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) Berbasis Konstruktivis.....

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

Pembelajaran Bilingual pada Materi Pokok Bangun Ruang Sisi Lengkung di Kelas IX SMP". So automatically he also plagiarized his bibliography too. The highlight of the example below indicates the plagiarism itself followed by the researcher's analysis in the brackets:

Darwati. 2008. *Pengembangan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa (LKS) dalam bentuk komik untuk Pembelajaran Bilingual pada materi pokok PLDV di kelas VII.* Surabaya: Unesa

(This is an unpublished thesis in UNESA library. The author of previous study used this thesis as the reference. It is still possible for the author of previous study to use this thesis as her reference because she studied in UNESA. In other word, she could borrow this thesis in UNESA library because she was a student there. However, it is impossible for the author of "Constructivism Based Worksheet Development on Learning Comparison for Basic 1 at ELEN Course, Krian" to have this thesis because he is not the student of UNESA. Moreover, based on the in-depth interview with him, he admitted that he did not have "Sakti Card" which can be used to borrow book in cross campus libraries or public libraries. When the researcher also asked about Darwati's thesis, he said that he did not have it too. Therefore, it can be concluded that mentioning this thesis as the reference in his bibliography is another kind of plagiarism).

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2004. *Pedoman penyusunan Lembar Kegiatan Siswa dan scenario Pembelajaran Sekolah Menengah Atas.* Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Direktorat jendral Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Direktorat Pendidikan Menengan Umum.

Halim, ridwan. 2007. *Pengantar hokum Indonesia.* Gramedia, Indonesia.

(the researcher had traced this source in internet but there was no result. This source is also the reference of the author of previous study. So, the student might have just patched this source in his bibliography).

Rakes, G. C., Flowers, B. F., Casey, H. B. & Santana, R. (1999). An Analysis of Instructional Technology Use and Constructivist Behaviors in K-12 Teachers. International Journal of Educational Technology,http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v1n2/rakes/index.html

Sells,B.B. dan Richey,R.C. 1994. The Defination And Domain Of The Field. Association For Educational Communication And Technonology. Washington DC.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

Twomey Fosnot, C. (1989). *Enquiring teachers, enquiring learners: A constructivist approach for teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

W.R. Borg. & Gall, M.D.1983. *Educational Research.* London: Longman.

(In fact, the sources mentioned above are the primary or original sources that have been used by the student's references and they are difficult to be accessed in internet. It means that the references used by the student have cited some theories from the original sources above. Thus, it was a guiltiness when the student mentioned those original sources in student's bibliography because the student did not really have those sources).

f. The next plagiarism form is **"paraphrase plagiarism".** The work might be paraphrased, it means that the writer had successfully rewritten the ideas that he cited but she did not credit any source. It is actually the most difficult item to be detected because the tools of plagiarism detection were not adequate to detect paraphrased work. So the researcher had tried with extra effort to find this plagiarism form among students' work and finally the researcher found just one incident in the students' proposal entitled "The Correlation between Parents' Involvement and Students' English Achievement at SMKN 1, Surabaya". The redaction is: *But, the style of parents' involvement is different one another. Laurie also gave a statement that parents of different social classes often exhibit different ways of communicating their expectations to their children.* The student acknowledged it as Laurie's statement, but he researcher found the similar idea from Epstein about the difference of style of parental involvement to their children because of social status in the research report of Sophia Catsambis. It is stated by Epstein in Sophia Catsambis's report that *"Parental involvement may, therefore, vary by factors such as students' grade level, socioeconomic and race/ethnic background, family relationships and experiences,*

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

and school policies"[55] After being checked, the researcher didn't find this statement in the thesis of Laurie. It is actually Epstain's argument that is cited by Sophia Catsambis in her research report. The way she paraphrased her work is right but she failed to give the correct source information dealing with this argument.

g. **Mosaic plagiarism**. The essential content of the source is retained. The paper's appearance is altered slightly by changing key words and phrases and it is presented without citing the source. Same as paraphrase plagiarism, this plagiarism type was also rarely found. Hence in this study, the researcher found one student's work entitled "The Implementation Of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya" had plagiarized this type: *The length of time it takes to learn to play or master a game can vary greatly from game to game. Learning time does not necessarily correlate with the amount or complexity of rules; some games, such as chess or Go have simple rules that can still lead to complex scenarios.* Let's compare with the original text: *"The amount of time required to learn to play or master a game varies greatly from game to game. Learning time does not necessarily correlate with the number or complexity of rules; some games, such as chess or Go, have simple rule sets while possessing profound strategies".*[56] In student's work, there were some words and phrases altered slightly in the first and last paragraph he did not credit the source.

---

[55] Sophia Catsambis, *"Expanding Knowledge of Parental Involvement in Secondary Education: effect on high school academic success"*, a research report, (Queens College, 1988),2.
[56] "Board Game" on http://www.wikipedia.com/ .

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

These following examples are plagiarism "source cited", that is, plagiarism incidents because of guiltiness in referencing.

h. **Incomplete-citation plagiarism**: Plagiarism also exists when a source is cited for only a part of the material copied. The source for the whole passage quoted or paraphrased should be given, rather than for only a portion of the passage. The writer tries to blur out which one is his/her work and which one is from the source. The result shows that no students plagiarized this form.

i. **Source plagiarism**: Material is taken from one author that has been gathered from another. The writer does not give the original author from whom the material is taken. It should be indicated in the footnote where the writer found the material. The finding shows that almost all students plagiarized this type. It is emphasized by their admissions in interview. There were several reasons why they did this plagiarism. First, many students cited a source from another source and it was so difficult to find the primary source that he had cited from another. Usually the primary source was not available in internet. But the case was that the student still cited this primary source in their footnote or bibliography without giving information that it had been gotten from secondary source that he took. As the example of student's work: *1) Twomey Fosnot (1989) defines constructivism by reference to four principles: First, learning, in an important way, depends on what we already know. Second, new ideas occur as we adapt and change our old ideas. Third, learning involves inventing ideas rather than mechanically accumulating facts. Fourth, meaningful learning occurs through rethinking old ideas and coming to new conclusions about new ideas which conflict*

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

with our old ideas. 2) Constructivism Characteristics. 3) This study is research and development which can be defined as a process used to develop and validate educational products (Borg & Gall, 1983: 772). For the first comment: Actually this Twomey Fosnot's statement was found in the thesis of Audrey gray entitled "constructivist teaching and learning" at http://www.saskschoolboards.ca/research/instruction/97-07.htm, but the writer did not acknowledge this source. The second comment: in the proposal, it was stated that this idea was taken from Rakes, flowers, casey & Santana (1999) define some characteristics of constructivism approach. But indeed it originated from http://www.quasar.ualberta.ca/techcur/theory/constructivism.htm. It was the source used by the student where the ideas of Rakes, Flower, Casey and Santana were actually cited here. The third: actually the idea from Borg and Gall (1983) was taken from "a research of education development (penelitian pengembangan dalam bidang pendidikan) by Muhammad Asikin and Adi Nur Cahyono. But the writer did not credit the source where actually he got this idea.[57]

j. **Too perfect paraphrase:** the definition is the writer copies word-for-word of an author's argument and cites the source properly but does not give quotation marks the argument that has been copied word-for-word. From the forms of plagiarism defined in this study, this form was the most plagiarized by the students. As the admission from the students directly, they did not know about what they did was constituted as plagiarism. They had just known recently that taking the material

[57] Asikin, Adi N.C, "R&D", (paper presented at the research school FMIPA Unnes), 1.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

directly from the source must be put in quotation marks. In advance, exactly at the time when they wrote seminar proposals, they did not know about this rule. In short, this plagiarism incident can be considered as "unintentional plagiarism" since many students did not feel that what they did was indeed included plagiarism because they had given reference. Another reason also emerged, some students really did not know the information about this rule before so that the plagiarisms that they did were unintentional. As the example that the researcher took from a student's work: *This theory is proposed by Piaget and Vygotsky (Brown, 2000;11) which argue that all human being construct their own version of reality, and therefore multiple contrasting ways of knowing and describing are equally legitimate.* It was plagiarism because this theory was duplicated directly from Brown but the researcher didn't put in quotation marks.

k. **The resourceful citer:** The writer properly cites all sources, paraphrasing, and using quotations appropriately but it is still plagiarism because almost no original work from the writer. In this study, the researcher found three students plagiarized this form. They only duplicated the arguments directly from the original sources without trying to paraphrase or summarize although they had given the reference. Moreover, sometimes they claimed those arguments as their own because they used them for their paper but they did not acknowledge any sources. As the example, the first student whose proposal title is "pronunciation performance by the fourth semester students in IAIN SUPEL, SBY" did this plagiarism in chapter II. Almost no ideas from the student in the chapter II, she just took and combined ideas from some

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

sources and then put it into paragraphs. In fact, she had tried to give acknowledgement properly for all the arguments that she used, but most of them were direct quotations. There was no effort to paraphrase and/or summarize those sources.

In addition, she also did not add her own argument. On the other hand, different incident occurred toward the second student whose proposal entitled "The Implementation of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya". He did this plagiarism in his background and in the chapter III. In fact, the major ideas in background of the study should be originated from the writer's own ideas but in this case the student gave his own argument only in the last paragraph, the rest was others' arguments. Moreover, it was getting worse in the chapter III especially in sub chapter "research design". He just copied and pasted the previous study of PBI students' proposal entitled "Using Picture to Improve Student's Writing Skill in Descriptive Text at Eleventh Grade of SMK ANTARTIKA 2, sidoarjo" posted at http://www.scribd.com/doc/56141769/Using-Picture-to-Improve-Student. The last incident also occurred in the third student who committed plagiarism with type "the ghost writer". So, he could be automatically asserted as plagiator of this form.

l. **The forgotten footnote**: The author's name is credited as the source but the writer neglects to give other specific information like the location of the material referenced. This plagiarism form was rarely done by the students, only one student made an error because she did not give the specific page in footnote from where this material was taken, so that the researcher was difficult to trace this text. For instance,

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

The impact of parental involvement arises from parental values and educational aspirations and that these are exhibited continuously through parental enthusiasm and positive parenting style.[58] She took this material from Professor Charles Desforges with Alberto Abouchaar , "The Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Education on Pupil Achievements and Adjustment: A Literature Review" Produced by the Department for Education and Skills at www.dfes.go.uk/research.

m. Disguised source: The definition is the writer takes the material from others but doesn't cite the right source. He seems to disguise the material that he takes directly from the substantive source by using other source. In fact, this form is new, it has not been covered yet by all the plagiarism theories that the researcher used for this study. This problem emerged during the researcher was conducting the analysis hence the researcher argued it could be constituted as new phenomena of plagiarism because the student took the material from a source but she/he did not give the right source or disguised the original source. According to student who wrote "The Implementation of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya", he intentionally did it because most of the materials that he used indeed were from the forbidden sources to be referenced such as article from commercial website (ex: www.x.com) and blogs. So the student decided to disguise the original source and gave the source address such

[58] "The Correlation between Parents' Involvement and Students' English Achievement at SMKN 1, Surabaya", 7-8.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

as from books, journals, theses, and dissertations in order that the materials he took looked like the credible materials. Therefore, the researcher considered it as the new phenomena in plagiarism. To give more understanding, it can be checked in the plagiarism matrix that has been enclosed.

n. The misinformer: The writer provides inaccurate information regarding the sources. He/she violates the originality. This form was also rarely done by the students in their proposals. From two students who plagiarized this form, both of them only plagiarized this type once. Here is the example taken from student's previous study in chapter II with proposal title "The Implementation of 'English Board Games' To Improve Students' English Speaking Skill At The Year 8 Of Mts Nurul Hikmah, Surabaya": *Several studies have investigated native English teacher in speaking skill. The studies have described how native speaker as English teacher is. A study was conducted in university of Muhammadiyah Gresik by Alfiyatuz Zuhriyah (2010). By the Title "**Teaching English Using Games**" the study investigated the parts of a balanced activities applied by Games in teaching English and the students response toward native teacher's way.* The student took Alfiyatuz zuhriyah's study as his previous study. After the researcher had checked this study, it was found that the writer gave inaccurate information regarding the title of this study (written in bold). In fact, the original title is "Teaching English By Native Speaker in The Speaking 1 Class At The University of Muhammadiyah Gresik". The other example can be checked in plagiarism matrix in the enclosure.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

3. Students' perceptions on plagiarism

From the finding breakdown above, it can be concluded that all seminar proposals that the researcher analyzed were plagiarized by the students. The problems emerged then, did the students understand what they had done? What is plagiarism according to them? Why did they plagiarize? What are their suggestions for course improvement? These questions underlie the researcher to find out the data finding confirmation through interview. Thus, the researcher had conducted the interview toward six students whose seminar proposals were proven plagiarized. Moreover, it was also conducted to some PBI students to know their perspectives regarding plagiarism.

In the process of conducting this interview, there were many obstacles indeed. The first obstacle was the time, it was so difficult to meet the eight semester students directly because most of them were busy with their job so that they were infrequently in the campus or in their boarding houses. So it needed enough long time to accomplish this interview. It was conducted along the last June until 19th of July 2012. The second obstacle was the sensitivity of the topic. Indeed it was intentionally done to interview the students directly in face to face not in e-mail or facebook chat because the topic of the problem is sensitive. Like an investigation of the police to the stealer, sometimes they were reluctant to answer honestly to the researcher and even sometimes they were not serious in answering the questions because of the close relationship with the respondents that in this case is "friend-relationship". Moreover, the topic of the researcher's study had been known by most of the students in PBI, so

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

that when the researcher intended to invite them discussing this topic, they were not serious and told the information lie and even tried to disguise their statements to avoid from plagiarism accusation. Hence the researcher formed this interview like having chat, not too formal and the settings were made as relax as possible, not too strict like the police investigating the stealer in one place one situation. For instance, on one day, an interviewee was invited in the seashore under the bridge of "SURAMADU" and then the interview happened there; the other was invited in the canteen of the campus; there was also an interview conducted in *Gazebo* (a place where people sit around idly or play internet); sometimes it was also done in the interviewee's boarding house; and even the researcher also stayed a night in one of the interviewees' house. Moreover, the questions were not given all at once in order but randomly and open depended on the response of the interviewee. All of those ways were aimed to gain the information in depth and authentically. As the consequence, it indeed lengthened the process of interviewing and each interviewee needed one hour minimal to be interviewed.

The result of interview will be presented in each question within elaborate explanation followed by the student's direct response breakdown in quotation marks as the followings:

a. Defining plagiarism and its indicators

On the whole, the students had a clear understanding of the main concept of plagiarism. They also understood that plagiarism can be intentional or unintentional. One defined it as "*.....menggunakan ide/statement milik orang*

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

lain ke dalam karya sendiri tanpa memberi pengakuan terhadap apa yang diambilnya. Adapun juga masih disebut plagiat jika tidak mengikuti prosedur pengutipan yang benar, meskipun dia sudah berusaha memberi pengakuan (referencing the sources). Ini disebut plagiat tidak sengaja karena mungkin dia belum tahu tata cara pengutipan yang benar". The other argued with different terminologies but still in the same concept such as plagiarism is a kind of cheating, taking someone's work and admits as his/her own, stealing someone's argument/idea without giving acknowledgement, and using another's idea without proper reference.

In the other hand, they had different perspectives in categorizing plagiarism. Their answers were varied and some showed their lack understanding concerning the indicators of plagiarism. For instance, two students defined direct quotation without giving quotation marks. As one said, *".....mengambil langsung statement orang lain tanpa mengubah sedikitpun kata-katanya atau istilah lainnya adalah 'copy-paste' maka langsung dikasih source-nya"*. Another said that we need not put quotation marks as it had been given the source. However according to the theory stated that "A direct quotation means taking another person's exact words. The exact words used must be put in **quotation marks** and given **reference** to acknowledge the source from where it is taken."[59] Moreover, there was also another student argued that quotation marks were not needed anymore when the direct

[59] Language and Learning Skills Unit (a booklet): "Avoiding Plagiarism" .....6.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

quotation was so long until more than three lines. It was just formed in indent paragraph.

b. The guiltiness of plagiarism

When they were asked dealing with the guiltiness of plagiarism, most of the students indeed considered plagiarism is wrong. As one student stated that *".....it's like a kidnapping, doing plagiarism means stealing someone's property. So, someone who plagiarizes their work, he/she is like a thief"*. In contrary, there was a ridiculous argument from a student. She did not consider that plagiarism is guiltiness if someone takes materials from internet. She argued that all materials provided in internet are allowed to used or plagiarized because she thinks that the authors who have uploaded their works in internet mean that they allow everybody posses their materials. In exception, plagiarism can be committed as an error when someone took his/her friends' past works like a paper mill and power point presentation and used it again. She said, *"plagiat itu tidak salah, selama nyari source di internet karena menurutku source yang ada di internet itu halal dipakai untuk pembaca, kecuali kalau berupa pdf memang tidak boleh karena kalau tulisan yang sudah dikemas dalam pdf tidak bisa di otak-atik atau istilahnya 'copy-paste'. Nah, ini menandakan bahwa sudah ada larangan dari si penulis emang. Beda lagi kasus plagiat kalau mengambil punya teman sendiri seperti memakai makalah atau PPT teman dulu yang sama topiknya, dibuat lagi untuk mengumpulkan tugas*

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

yang sama atau dibuat presentasi.....wahhhh....bisa disebut mematikan kreatifitas teman, sama aja tidak menghargai karya mereka".

However, her argument is wrong because according to the theory,

> "Incidents of plagiarism in science corrupt the soul of the perpetrator ... Erode the integrity of the discipline, and diminish the esteem of science in the minds of the general public. If plagiarism in science were allowed to become widespread, science would ultimately be destroyed".[60]

Plagiarism involves stealing another's intellectual property. It can ruin the originality that becomes the core of academic value. For many scientists, included an author, the originality is what makes the whole job of them to be valuable. In short, "when students plagiarize another's work, they hurt the person from whom they steal. Moreover, they also hurt themselves, because they failed to acquire the research, analytic, and writing skills that they would have learned by doing the assignment honestly"[61]. So it's really wrong when there is someone argues that plagiarism is right.

c. *Difficulties in writing to avoid plagiarism and the solution*

When they were asked about the difficulties in writing to avoid plagiarism, all of them had ever tried to write without plagiarizing but it was indeed very difficult. Yet some solutions had ever been tried like quotation, paraphrasing, note taking, and summarizing. From eight students who were

---

[60] Betts, D. "*Retraction of an Article Published in The Canadian Journal of Physics*" (Canada: Canadian Journal of Physics, 1992) in the book of Diane Pecorari, *Academic Writing*..... 1-2.
[61] Prof. Arief Furqon, Ph.D, "Plagiarism", (handout presented at workshop Against Plagiarism Toward Academic Writing, PBI, IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, 2010), 2.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

interviewed, almost all of them liked to use quotation when taking another's idea from books, articles, theses, or dissertations because it's the easiest way rather than the others. As the researcher asked, *"usaha apa yang paling sering kamu lakukan agar tidak plagiat?"* most of students stated, *".....paling sering ya copy paste langsung materi dari sumber dan dikasih source, ini paling mudah daripada ribet-ribet mikir untuk menulis kembali materi itu atau paraphrase namanya karena waktu deadline tugas mesti mepet-mepet"*. While only a student preferred to paraphrase than the other strategies. She was used to paraphrasing since she was in semester four after joining the class Writing 4 taught by Mrs. Siti Asmiyah, M.Tesol. She admitted that she always did note-taking. If there was compatible argument or theory with her study, she read it first as careful as possible and then took a note or translated it firstly if the language was English. Finally, she rewrote those materials with her own words from her note taking. This student's admission was right, from the finding shows that this student's proposal was not found any serious plagiarism. When she took the argument or theory from others, she often paraphrased it.

In the other hand, in fact most of the students also admitted that they often took 'short-cut' or plagiarized when there were many assignments given by the lecturers with a short-time deadline. The reasons why they preferred to take 'short-cut' to accomplish their assignments will be elaborated below.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

d. Why students plagiarize

Based on the students' responses dealing with the reasons why they plagiarized, the researcher has specified the reasons to be two general reasons, intentional plagiarism and unintentional plagiarism. It is aimed to make the reader easy to read. Next, the researcher will show the students who had these reasons.

Intentional plagiarism:

1. Laziness
2. Searching (copy-paste) is enjoyable

   The advance of technology like internet provides plenty of materials that are easily browsed and downloaded. Thus, it makes the students easy to get the materials they need and copy paste it for their assignments.
3. Poor planning

   Suddenly the due date of the assignment arrives.
4. "But their words are better"

   The students prefer to use the wordings of the original source because it is better than rewriting it by own words.
5. "Everyone else is doing it"

   The students prefer to plagiarize their works because most of the students also do it.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

6. Making the grade

   The students think their work will be better through plagiarizing. The wordings, structure of sentences, ideas, and content will be more sophisticated so that the lecturer will give good mark.

7. No punishment/remedial

   Many students feel that they enjoy doing plagiarism because it's easy to do and can be 'a short-cut' to accomplish their assignments. Nevertheless, the lecturers are not too strict dealing with the assignments. They never scrutinize their assignments carefully to see whether theirs are plagiarism or not. In fact, until now there is no significant consequence for what they have done. Their marks were still good instead.

8. Too difficult material

   Many resources of PBI students are in English, so that they felt difficult to understand the materials and they were also afraid of being misunderstood when they wrote by their own words. Therefore, plagiarism was their choice to deal this problem.[62]

Unintentional plagiarism:

1. Citation confusion

   The students do not know how to cite properly.

[62] Prof.Arief Furqon, Ph.D, "Plagiarism".....5.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

2. Plagiarism vs. Paraphrasing and summarizing

   The students do not know the difference between plagiarism and paraphrasing and summarizing.

3. No deep understanding in defining plagiarism indicators

   There are so many indicators that constitute plagiarism too, such as "collusion plagiarism", "submitting past assignment", "searching and copy-paste the materials from internet without acknowledging the sources". But the fact shows that there was still a student had misconception dealing with plagiarism indicators.[63]

As the result of interviews, it can be concluded that most of those reasons described above became the factors of why they did plagiarism. The factor that is the most frequently done by the students is "poor planning". From eight interviewees, six of them admitted to do plagiarism because of short-time deadline of the assignments. The second factor included "laziness", "no punishment/remedial", "making the grade", "their words are better". Each item of the second factor had ever been done by four students. The next factors are "too difficult material" and "searching (copy-paste) is enjoyable". Each item had ever been done by three students. The last factor that is scarcely done by students is "everyone else is doing it". Only a student has ever done plagiarism because of this factor.

Moreover, six students also admitted they were still confused about what constituted plagiarism included the indicators of plagiarism, how to differ plagiarism

[63] Prof.Arief Furqon, Ph.D, "Plagiarism".....5.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

with paraphrasing and summarizing and how to cite properly. According to them, it occurred because of lack drilling and information concerning plagiarism from the lecturers. As the consequence, they enjoyed plagiarizing because of abovementioned factors.

e. Student suggestions for course improvement

Most of students felt that the plagiarism incidents frequently occurred in the students' assignments because of the low system in the campus especially in department and from the lecturers. According to them, the lack of plagiarism monitoring from all the stakeholders in the campus expands the opportunity to plagiarize because not only it has been a "short-cut" to accomplish the assignments easily and fast but also there is no significant consequence to do this. Therefore, plagiarism becomes such a hobby of the students because they enjoy doing it for the sake of their assignments. In fact, it cannot be neglected forever because it can destroy the academic integrity. Some suggestions were given by the students in interview.

From the small scale first, the lecturers. They commented almost the lecturers were not strict in giving the paper assignments. Although they often plagiarized their assignments, almost no lecturer considered it as a serious problem. They did not ask and discuss more about their plagiarized assignments. It is still unknown about the reason why the lecturers did it, it was unintentionally done because they were not able to detect the students' plagiarism or even let it out because of their bustle. In the end,

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

the students still got good marks for their plagiarized works. It happened from the first semester until eighth semester. Only few lectures were strict enough such as Mrs. Asmiyah, Mrs. Silfia Asningtias, and Mr. Arief Furqon. For instance, Mrs.Asmiyah and Mrs. Silfia always warned and drilled the students to learn about plagiarism and the strategies not to plagiarize. Moreover, in Mrs. Asmiyah's class, the students did not submit the assignments in paper but in soft file and then sent it via e-mail, so the plagiarism incidents in student's assignment could be detected soon. She also told the researcher in a preliminary interview that she is administering a new policy for her class,that is, deciding the topic for students in academic writing or proposal in Writing IV. It is aimed to minimize the plagiarism incidents because she has had the sources about the topic. As well as Mr. Furqon, he always drilled students to write properly although it needed long process. The students began to make the outline first, develop the outline, translate into Indonesian, and then develop the ideas into English.[64]

Many students hoped the firmness that some lecturers did as mentioned above is also administered by all the lecturers of Writing 1 until 4 and also the lecturer of Indonesian subject. They should give understanding about plagiarism and its indicators and also the strategies to avoid plagiarism. Then, these strategies should be drilled continuously in order that the students will more understand and always remember. Moreover, for all the lecturers are hoped to give significant consequence

[64] This information is based on the researcher's own experience and some students' information in the interview.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

for the students who plagiarize their assignments since semester one. It can be giving back the assignment which is proven plagiarism to the students.

For the large scale, the campus and the department. All of the students felt that they were still confused about what constituted plagiarism such as the indicators and the strategies to avoid it. Sometimes they also did not know how to cite properly because every lecturer had his/her own rule. It also occurred when they intended to write without plagiarism, they were always confused about the understanding of plagiarism and how to write without plagiarism. They felt that they were lack information dealing with plagiarism because the lecturer never gave the deep understanding about plagiarism definition, its indicators, and the right way to avoid it. Thus, they were still confused how to differ which one is right and which one is wrong. They thought this problem occurred because there is still no adequate rule made by the department dealing with plagiarism definition and indicators, the right way to avoid plagiarism and the rule of writing or *"tata cara penulisan"* that can be applied for all the students and the lecturers. They suggested to department to make this policy/rule as soon as possible and then share it in a workshop attended by all the lecturers and all the students. It is aimed to make the same perceptions toward the lecturers and the students regarding the plagiarism definition, its indicators, and the rule of writing to avoid plagiarism.

For the campus, the curriculum staff should make the patent policy dealing with plagiarism that can be applied for all the students and the lecturers in IAIN. It can be formed in a booklet like what other foreign universities have done and then it is

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

shared in a seminar. Moreover, the advance of technology makes everything easier. Many sophisticated plagiarism detection tools are available now such as "*Turnitin*". It's a peer-check /cross-campus assignments. Any plagiarism incidents in students' or lecturers' assignments can be easily detected through this tool. Therefore, the students really recommend the campus to use this tool for the sake of maintaining the academic integrity.

B. Discussion

Based on the finding description above, there are several things that can be noted down. It will be elaborated based on the findings of each research problem.

For the first research problem, the finding proved that all of the seminar proposals that have been analyzed were plagiarism.

Based on the finding of the second research problem, it shows that the students did not plagiarize all the indicators that the researcher decided before. The plagiarism forms that occurred in students' seminar proposals were: duplicating title, the photocopy, the potluck paper, the ghost writer, duplicating references, paraphrase plagiarism, mosaic plagiarism, source plagiarism, the too-perfect paraphrase, the resourceful citer, the forgotten footnote, the misinformer, and disguised source.

The plagiarism form *"The Too-Perfect Paraphrase"* was the most frequently done by all the students because most of them liked to duplicate the materials directly from the sources without altering the sentences, yet they did not know that direct quotation must be put in quotation marks. They thought that giving the source as the

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

reference was enough. Then the second plagiarism form that was also frequently done was *"The Photocopy"*, three students were also found did this plagiarism form for several times because they admitted that it was easy to get the same idea from the sources and they preferred to use the wordings of original source because they thought that the words were better than their writing. The others were *"the misinformer"* and *"disguised source"*, there were also three students plagiarized this form. The next forms were *"the potluck paper"*, *"the ghost writer"*, *and "the resourceful citer"*, two students were found plagiarized these forms. The rest forms such as *"duplicating title"*, *"duplicating references"*, *"paraphrase plagiarism"*, *"mosaic plagiarism"*, *"source plagiarism"*, *and "the forgotten footnote"* were ever done once by one student.

As the result of the interview, it can be concluded that most of the students plagiarized their seminar proposals intentionally. The major reason of why they plagiarized was "poor planning". It means that they liked to postpone their assignments until the deadline came. In this occasion, they felt suppressed so that they could not think well. Thus, plagiarism was their short-cut to accomplish their assignment. Sometimes it also occurred when the assignments from different lecturers came altogether. There was no time to arouse their idea, so it caused them to plagiarize too.

The opportunity to plagiarize such this was also supported by other factors: there was no significant penalty from the lecturers to students who plagiarized their assignment; internet provided all materials that they need, it could be gained easily;

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

no self-confidence to write by their own words, the wordings from original source were felt better than theirs; making the grade was also the reason why they plagiarized, they felt they would get good mark through plagiarizing, using someone's arguments/idea from original source was better than they wrote by their own arguments; and the laziness was also the main factor instead.

While there were also some students did plagiarism unintentionally. Firstly, they felt they did not plagiarize their work, they had done it on the right track but the research finding showed that their works were plagiarism because of some mistakes in their referencing. After being interviewed, they admitted that they were indeed confused how to cite properly and how to paraphrase correctly. Sometimes they were also confused with indicators of plagiarism. They felt that they were still lack of understanding plagiarism.

C. Acknowledging Sources: The Ways to Avoid Plagiarism

Acknowledging sources means the ways to credit another person's work. When we use information obtained from another source including ideas, theories/opinions, and examples, we must give a full reference to that source. This means to avoid plagiarism.

1. **Direct Quotation.** "A direct quotation means taking another person's exact words".[65] The exact words used must be put in **quotation marks** and given **reference** to acknowledge the source from where it is taken. For example:

[65] Language and Learning Skills Unit (a booklet): "Avoiding Plagiarism" .....6.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

a. For short quotes:

According to Brown,"During the last fifteen years, there has been a steady change in emphasis from examination-based assessment to the continuous assessment of coursework."[1]

---

[1]Brown, G. Assessment: A Guide for lecturers LTSN Generic Centre Assessment Series No3,2001.(http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources.asp?process=full_record&section=generic&id=3, accessed on May 10, 2006).

b. For long quotes (indent paragraph):

Especially for a long quote that is more than three rows, it is written in independent paragraph and the paragraph is indented as the following example:

> There is still no any research regarding plagiarism disclosure at IAIN; whereas this problem indeed has long been the crucial phenomena in academic institutions even it has been such a hobby of many students. If it is not overcome soon, it will threaten the academic integrity in IAIN. As one editor of a scholarly journal commented:
>
> > "Incidents of plagiarism in science corrupt the soul of the perpetrator ... Erode the integrity of the discipline, and diminish the esteem of science in the minds of the general public. If plagiarism in science were allowed to become widespread, science would ultimately be destroyed".[1]

[1] Betts, D. "*Retraction of an Article Published in The Canadian Journal of Physics*" (Canada: Canadian Journal of Physics, 1992) in the book of Diane Pecorari, *Academic Writing*..... 1-2.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

2. Paraphrasing

"A paraphrase is an indirect quotation and means rewriting someone else's ideas in your own words".[66] Yet the source must be cited although the ideas are fully rewritten in own words.

Commonly, many students misunderstand about the ways to paraphrase correctly. Some cases occur such as some words/terms/phrases are slightly changed only with its synonyms, they still keep the structure of the original sentences; the original text is kept but they switch only the structure of the sentences (active-passive and conversely); and even the sentences are rearranged in such a way and most wordings are also altered with its synonyms, but it is still plagiarism as the writer fails to reformulate the ideas of the content. They think that by changing the words with its synonyms is not plagiarism anymore but it is indeed a misleading thought.

> "Paraphrasing requires the writer to reformulate the ideas in the original text in his/her own words. To paraphrase correctly, you must change and rewrite the original language completely, including the original sentence structure. The paragraph paraphrased should show the writer's understanding of the topic and also lets the reader know that the information has been obtained from another source. If you retain even short phrases or distinctive words from the original text without enclosing these words in quotation marks, it is plagiarism".[67]

---

[66] Language and Learning Skills Unit (a booklet): "Avoiding Plagiarism" .....7.
[67] Language and Learning Skills Unit (a booklet): "Avoiding Plagiarism" .....5,7.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

For example:

a) Original sentence:

Yong's argument cited by M.Swan and B.Smith, "the Internet has changed the appearance of libraries and how librarians work today. The library is no longer confined to the four walls of a building. It has, instead, extended into cyberspace. Many librarians have gone into cyberspace to locate online resources".[1]

[1]M. Swan and B. Smith (eds), Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 279-295.

b) Paraphrase:

According to Yong cited by M.Swan and B.Smith, recent developments in Internet technologies have brought about a major transformation of libraries and the way that librarians conduct their work. Extending beyond the physical space of the library itself, many resources are now found online and are therefore easily accessed by library users and librarians alike.[1]

[1]M. Swan and B. Smith (eds), Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 279-295.

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id

3. Summarizing

A summary is "a sum of the writer's thinking".[68] Practically, it is the main point of the writer's idea. It is actually different with a paraphrase, the paraphrase requires alteration of the original statement by own words in such a way. In short, a summary should be shorter than the paraphrase because it is just the main point of the writer's ideas/arguments. In addition, we do not need to give quotation marks for the summary but crediting the source of the original text is a must.

For example:

a. Direct Quotation ⟶ In discussing the importance of teaching study skills, Jordan (1997: 8) comments that 'study skills are not something acquired instinctively'.
b. Paraphrase ⟶ As students do not obtain study skills automatically, it is very important to teach them these skills (Jordan, 1997).
c. Summary ⟶ It is important to teach study skills to students (Jordan, 1997).

[68] WCU Writing and Learning Commons Mini-Course

digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id digilib.uinsby.ac.id