

Electronic Plagiarism Detection Services: A Learning Tool or a Quick Fix?

E. Joel Heikes and John Kucsera

E-mail: joel.heikes@austin.utexas.edu, kucsera@austin.utexas.edu

Abstract

With the advent of nearly universal Internet access and the upsurge of paper mills, universities and colleges are scrambling to find effective solutions to the rise of plagiarism on campus. Some colleges and universities are implementing electronic plagiarism detection services. The two main rationales for using these devices are to deter and detect plagiarism as well as teach students proper writing and citation techniques (Martin, 2004). However, research has yet to determine if the student learning function of these tools is present. The purpose of the study was to assess if one electronic plagiarism prevention device, Turnitin, is being used to teach students proper writing and citation techniques or solely to deter and detect plagiarism. Our results showed that although instructors and students found the tool easy to use and believed it reduced plagiarism, students reported receiving little instructional value related to their writing. As a result, it appears that when detection services are introduced within college classrooms, instructors may use these tools mainly to detect and deter plagiarism rather than to teach students how to avoid plagiarism. We believe this challenge can be addressed by teaching instructors and students how to incorporate detection services into the writing process.

Literature Review

With the advent of nearly universal Internet access and the upsurge of paper mills, universities and colleges are scrambling to find effective solutions to the rise of plagiarism on campus. Many academics are also concerned about the effect of internet resources on academic integrity (Born 2003; Park 2003). According to a survey from the Center for Academic Integrity (2005) that investigated over 50,000 undergraduates

from more than 60 campuses, close to 40% of students reported they have plagiarized before (a 400% increase from a 1999 CAI survey) and 77% of students indicated that plagiarizing is a mild concern. Scanlon and Neumann (2002) found that nearly 25% of 698 students across nine universities have plagiarized with the aid of the Internet. Aside from student reports, many studies have determined actual plagiarizing rates from student papers and some of these findings are terribly alarming (e.g., in 2004, Soto, Anand, and McGee found 46 out of 220 students had plagiarized).

To address concerns about academic integrity, some colleges and universities are implementing electronic plagiarism detection services. These services offer software technology to compare students' papers to digital databases containing previously written materials. One such system is Turnitin. In 2003, over 400 universities nationwide had purchased access to this software (Bulletin, November, 2003; as cited in Jenson & Castell, 2004). Much of Turnitin's popularity is due to its usability, effectiveness, and ability to retain submitted student papers for future comparisons (see Royce, 2003; or Bull, Collins, Coughlin & Sharp, 2001). The two main purposes for using Turnitin and other detection services are to deter and detect plagiarism and more importantly, to teach students proper writing and citation techniques (Martin, 2004).

Many educators and librarians advocate that the most suitable approach to preventing plagiarism is through instruction (Aaron & Georgia, 1994; Burke, 2004; Center for Academic Integrity,

2005; Mulcahy & Goodacre, 2004; Vernon, Bigna, & Smith, 2001). Soto et al. (2004) empirically investigated the effects of plagiarism instruction and found that students who received the intervention plagiarized 50% less than students who did not receive the instruction. With this notion in mind, higher education institutions are beginning to implement required plagiarism instruction for students. At Yale University, for example, students are prevented from course registration until they complete an educational plagiarism module. However, even with such policies and procedures in place, institutions typically do not involve faculty in the process. (Aaron, 1992; Aaron & Georgia, 1994). For instance, McCabe (1993) concluded from surveying 789 faculty members and 3,228 students that colleges should worry less about policing dishonesty and focus more on teaching values of honesty and integrity.

As a result, many in academia are questioning whether plagiarism detection services such as Turnitin are being used as an instructional tool to help students learn how to write and cite sources appropriately or whether it is merely a technological “quick fix” for a more widespread erosion of academic integrity. Unfortunately, there is little empirical research that examines plagiarism detection software as an educational tool. Even the Intellectual Property Caucus of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC-IP; 2007) has suggested that in relation to academic integrity and the use of plagiarism detection services, future research should explore the effects of plagiary services on students’ proficiency with writing.

This paper is based on a one-semester pilot study of Turnitin plagiarism detection software involving 13 instructors and 76 students and focuses on the following questions:

- How instructionally useful is Turnitin in teaching students to write and properly cite source material?

- To what extent do instructors and students think that Turnitin helped students avoid plagiarism?
- How useful was Turnitin instructor training and related online plagiarism resources?
- How do instructors and students feel about using Turnitin in the future?

Turnitin Pilot Study

Turnitin is a software resource designed to help students avoid plagiarism or improper citation and assist instructors in identifying plagiarism in student work. The software is intended to encourage original writing and proper documentation practices by cross-referencing submitted materials with an archived database of journals, essays, newspaper articles, books, and other published work. Each submitted paper is returned in an *Originality Report* that identifies which passages match those in a large database containing billions of pages from both current and archived instances of the internet, millions of student papers previously submitted to Turnitin, and numerous commercial databases of journal articles and periodicals.

Turnitin was made available through an email invitation to all instructors at a large southwest university during the spring 2006 semester. Instructors and students accessed Turnitin through the campus, course management system, Blackboard, and student *Originality Reports* were made accessible to instructors who, in turn, decided whether to make them available for students.

Interested instructors were asked to register for one of nine 60, minute training sessions although attendance was not required for participation in the pilot. Instructors could also request a private consultation with training staff. A Web page introducing the software resource was created that invited instructor participation in the pilot. This page also provided links to the Turnitin Website

(www.turnitin.com), Blackboard tutorials for Turnitin, and a page on *Recommended Use*. The guidelines for use included encouraging instructors to use all available university plagiarism prevention resources including those available through the University Libraries, Undergraduate Writing Center, Student Judicial Services, and other University departments. Instructors were also verbally encouraged during training to use Turnitin as a tool to help students improve their writing and not simply as a method for plagiarism detection.

Methodology

Study Design

The purpose of the study was to assess the instructional usefulness of Turnitin (e.g., teaching students to write and properly cite source material), the tool's ability to help students avoid plagiarism, ease of use, the effectiveness of training sessions and online support resources, and student and instructor satisfaction. Planning for the Turnitin pilot study began in fall 2005 and included collaboration with the University Libraries, Writing Across the Curriculum program, and the Undergraduate Writing Center. The study plan included:

- An online instructor survey to assess ease of use, document types of use, evaluate training, and assess satisfaction with Turnitin.
- An online student survey to assess ease of use, document types of use, and satisfaction with Turnitin.
- Training session exit evaluations.
- Observation of a Turnitin training session.

While the training session evaluations and observation provided insight, findings from the instructor and student surveys are the basis for this paper.

Data Collection

Both the instructor and student surveys collected similar information from each user group about their use of Turnitin, the tool's ability to prevent plagiarism, and satisfaction with the tool including feelings about future use. Instructors were also asked about tool-related online resources and training. Both surveys were administered electronically using SurveyMonkey.

All instructors who attended a Turnitin training session or who registered for a session but did not attend were sent email invitations to participate in the instructor survey and a reminder. A total of 76 instructors were sent invitations to participate in the survey which was available to them April 10-17, 2006. Twenty-seven instructors responded (36%) with 13 (17%) having used the tool by the survey date in 17 courses. Frequencies for each survey item were calculated and responses to open-ended questions were analyzed for common themes. See Appendix A for a list of instructor survey items.

All students enrolled in the 17 courses using the Turnitin tool were sent email invitations to participate in the survey and a reminder. A total of 696 students were sent invitations to participate in the survey that was available to them April 11-19, 2006. One hundred forty-five students responded (21%) with 76 (9%) having used the tool by the survey date and, therefore, the final number of student responses used in our analysis. Frequencies for each survey item were calculated and responses to open-ended questions were analyzed for common themes (see Appendix B for a list of student survey items).

Findings

Demographic Characteristics

Thirteen instructors used Turnitin in 17 courses during the spring 2006 term. Most instructors (83%) used Turnitin for 1-4 written assignments. One instructor used Turnitin for 16 assignments and another used Turnitin for more than 20 assignments. Over half of these instructors were from the colleges of Liberal Arts and Engineering. Instructors who used Turnitin were most likely to be Lecturers or Assistant Instructors rather than tenure-track faculty members and to have ten or fewer years of university teaching experience. Table 1 provides a comparison of the demographic characteristics of instructors who used Turnitin with all instructors from the University.

Some surveyed instructors had not used Turnitin but were included in the survey sample because they had registered for the Turnitin training session but did not attend or attended the training session but subsequently decided not to use the tool. Instructors cited numerous reasons for not using Turnitin including its lack of compatibility with their particular assignments, the complexity of the tool, technical difficulties, their inability to attend training, having alternative forms of plagiarism control, and the perception that the effort required to use Turnitin was greater than the potential benefits.

Seventy-six students reported using Turnitin during the spring 2006 term. On average, students reported using Turnitin for three written assignments. Nearly half of these students were Engineering or Liberal Arts majors and most (70%) were Juniors or Seniors. Table 2 provides a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the students who used Turnitin with all students at the University.

Instructional Usefulness

Findings related to the usefulness of Turnitin to improve teaching and learning were mixed. While instructors reported that Turnitin saved them time

(67%) and helped them assess the quality of student work (92%), only about a third thought it helped students revise their papers or cite source material appropriately to a *Considerable* or *Very Great Extent*. Of greater concern, about half (52%) of surveyed students reported that Turnitin did not at all help them revise their papers and 45% reported that it did not at all help them properly cite source material. An additional 19% of students reported that help with revising papers was a skill *Not Applicable* to using Turnitin and 26% reported help with proper citation of sources as being *Not Applicable* to using Turnitin. Finally, 53% of students reported that Turnitin did not at all help them save time writing their papers.

Instructor and student perception of the degree to which Turnitin helped students revise papers and properly cite sources differed considerably. While 33% of instructors thought Turnitin helped their students to revise papers to a *Considerable* or *Very Great Extent*, only 6% of students shared this viewpoint. Similarly, while 34% of instructors thought Turnitin helped their students to properly cite source material to a *Considerable* or *Very Great Extent*, only 11% of students shared this viewpoint. Detailed results for the two instructional usefulness questions (revise papers and cite properly) on the instructor (I) and student (S) surveys are shown in Table 3.

Avoiding Plagiarism

Both instructors and students were positive about Turnitin's ability to help students avoid plagiarism to at least a limited extent. Eighty-one percent of instructors thought that Turnitin helped reduce plagiarism in their class to at least a *Limited Extent* compared to 71% of students. In contrast, only 34% of students thought Turnitin helped them (as individuals) avoid plagiarizing to at least a *Limited Extent* and 36% cited Turnitin's ability to detect plagiarism in other students' work as a benefit. Detailed findings for the two questions related to plagiarism avoidance and reduction from the instructor (I) and student (S) surveys are given in Table 4. It is notable that

of the 970 documents submitted to Turnitin during the pilot period, only 5% had a *similarity index* greater than 25%.

Usefulness of Training and Online Resources

Instructors who used Turnitin were asked about their satisfaction with the 60 minute Turnitin training sessions and online resources as part of the instructor survey (see Appendix A). These questions were designed so instructors could retrospectively evaluate the training and online resources after they had the opportunity to use the tool on their own.

All instructors who used Turnitin and attended a Turnitin training session found it to be at least somewhat useful but most of the plagiarism-related online resources were not widely used by instructors. Online resources specifically related to manipulating Turnitin within the Blackboard environment were the most used while more general resources related to plagiarism were used the least. Table 5 provides detailed use data for five plagiarism-related online resources available to instructors. Finally, most instructors who used Turnitin (58%) had never attended an available workshop about preventing plagiarism.

Table 1. Comparison of demographic characteristics of instructors who used Turnitin with all instructors from the University

Characteristic	Turnitin Instructor Users		All Instructors Percent
	Number	Percent	
College/School *			
Business	1	9%	7%
Communication	1	9%	5%
Engineering	3	27%	11%
Liberal Arts	4	36%	26%
Natural Sciences	2	18%	19%
Academic Rank			
Assistant Instructor	3	25%	<i>unavailable</i>
Instructor	0	0%	.7%
Lecturer	4	33%	21.2%
Assistant Professor	2	17%	16.7%
Associate Professor	1	8%	15.8%
Professor	2	17%	34.6%
Years of University Teaching Experience			
1-5	4	33%	<i>unavailable</i>
6-10	4	33%	
11-15	3	25%	
16-20	0	0%	
21-25	1	8%	
26-30	0	0%	
More than 30	0	0%	

* There were no instructor users in Architecture, Education, Fine Arts, Information, Geosciences, Law, Public Affairs, Nursing, Pharmacy or Social Work.

Table 2. Comparison of demographic characteristics of Turnitin student users with all the students at the University

Characteristic	Turnitin Student Users		All Students Percent
	Number	Percent	
College/School *			
Business	21	17%	12%
Communication	18	14%	9%
Education	6	5%	7%
Engineering	35	28%	15%
Fine Arts	1	1%	4%
Liberal Arts	26	21%	26%
Natural Sciences	17	14%	20%
Student Status			
Freshman	7	5%	15%
Sophomore	24	18%	16%
Junior	50	37%	18%
Senior	44	33%	28%
Graduate student	10	7%	24%

* There were no student users in Architecture, Education, Fine Arts, Information, Geosciences, Law, Public Affairs, Nursing, Pharmacy or Social Work.

Table 3. Instructor (I) and student (S) ratings of the extent Turnitin was used to help students revise papers or cite source materials

To what extent did Turnitin:		Not at all	Limited Extent	Moderate Extent	Considerable Extent	Very Great Extent	NA*
help students/you revise papers?	I	8%	8%	17%	25%	8%	33%
	S	52%	19%	4%	4%	2%	19%
help students/you properly cite source materials?	I	17%	0%	25%	17%	17%	25%
	S	45%	12%	6%	10%	1%	26%

* Not Applicable

Table 4. Instructor (I) and student (S) ratings of the extent Turnitin was used to help students revise papers or cite source materials

To what extent:		Not at all	Limited Extent	Moderate Extent	Considerable Extent	Very Great Extent	NA*
do you think Turnitin helped your students/ you to avoid plagiarism?	I	8%	8%	17%	33%	25%	8%
	S	41%	12%	7%	11%	4%	25%
did Turnitin help to reduce plagiarism in your class?	I	9%	36%	9%	9%	27%	9%
	S	19%	21%	13%	19%	18%	10%

* Not Applicable

Satisfaction and Future Use

Instructors who used Turnitin were very positive about using it again in the future although general satisfaction with the tool was somewhat mixed. If available, most instructors (83%) would use Turnitin again. The remaining instructors indicated they would *Maybe* use Turnitin again. With regard to satisfaction with the tool, seven instructors (58%) reported being *Somewhat* or *Very Satisfied* with Turnitin while five instructors (39%) reported being *Somewhat* or *Very Unsatisfied* with Turnitin.

Compared to instructors, students were less enthusiastic about whether Turnitin should be used in the future. Half (51%) of student respondents indicated *Maybe* when asked if they would like to see Turnitin used in the future while 38% indicated *Yes*. Fifty-two percent of comments about future use were positive with most (27) focused on Turnitin's ability to prevent or identify plagiarism. About a third of the comments related to future use were negative and included student dislike of electronically submitting papers (8), the extra effort required to use the tool (5), and that the use of Turnitin might not be appropriate for all classes or assignments (3). Only one student had concerns about the use of Turnitin threatening their privacy. An additional

12% (10 responses) of students made neutral comments about future use such as "don't care," "indifferent" or "don't know."

Conclusions

Instructional Usefulness

Students and instructors view the use of Turnitin differently. The findings from our study seem to indicate that students do not understand how to use Turnitin to revise papers and improve citation practices, they are not being given the opportunity to revise, not being taught how to use Turnitin to revise their work, or they are choosing not to use the tool in these ways.

Second, while Turnitin can be used by students to revise their papers and properly cite source material, survey responses indicate that students are not gaining these benefits from the use of Turnitin. On the other hand, most instructors felt that Turnitin helped them to evaluate student work. Thus, while instructors appear to gain value from using Turnitin as a plagiarism detection tool, the tool does not seem to have been used to instruct students on how to properly cite source material or help them improve their writing through revisions. One reason for this

Table 5. Instructor (I) and student (S) ratings of the extent Turnitin was used to help students revise papers or cite source materials

How useful were the following online resources:	Not at all useful	A little Useful	Somewhat Useful	Very useful	Did not use
Recommended use guidelines for Turnitin Web page	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%
Using Blackboard and Turnitin – Turnitin/Blackboard tutorial	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%
Using Turnitin Originality Reports – Turnitin/Blackboard tutorial	0%	0%	33%	25%	42%
Preventing and Detecting Plagiarism Web Site (University Libraries)	0%	0%	25%	8%	67%
Prevent and Detect Plagiarism Seminar handout (University Libraries)	0%	0%	17%	8%	75%

disparity may be that instructor training on this topic was limited. If improved student writing and citation skills are among the expected outcomes of using the tool, examples and other instructional materials that model how Turnitin can be used to achieve these ends need to be developed. Such examples should be included in all training sessions and be made available to instructors online.

Avoiding Plagiarism

Both instructors and students felt Turnitin helped to reduce plagiarism in their class. Most instructors and students who used the tool felt it helped students avoid plagiarism in their class to at least a limited extent. However, only a third of students thought Turnitin helped them, as individuals, avoid plagiarizing indicating that most students do not think they are the ones plagiarizing or improperly citing sources. For student respondents, then, preventing the plagiarism and cheating of *other students* was a primary benefit of the tool.

Training and Online Resources

Nearly all instructors were satisfied with the Turnitin training provided and found it useful, but online resources were not widely utilized and some critical topics were not addressed by the training. For example, only a few instructors reported having taken a plagiarism prevention workshop or having used an online plagiarism prevention handout. Similarly, half of instructors who used Turnitin did not use the online recommended use guidelines for the tool. While it is unclear if instructors were aware of these resources, use of the guidelines and other resources might have improved how students experienced Turnitin and reduced instructor difficulties with the tool. Creating a centralized Web page for all university plagiarism resources, including those related to Turnitin, would provide instructors with more direct and easy access to online resources. Finally, little training session time was devoted to teaching instructors how to use Turnitin to improve student writing or to help students learn how to properly cite source materials.

Satisfaction and Future Use

Overall, instructors who used Turnitin were satisfied with the tool and would use it again in the future. Turnitin's ease of use and ability to save instructor's time likely contributed to their satisfaction with the tool. Students, in contrast, were less certain about whether Turnitin should be used in the future. Although most written comments about future use were positive, they typically focused on Turnitin's ability to prevent or identify plagiarism committed by other students. Student ambivalence is not surprising given that few of them reported receiving any instructional value from using the tool and they may not fully understand how their instructor used it to evaluate their work. In addition, other research has determined that students are as likely to appreciate checks by Turnitin as they are to resent them (Humes, Stiffler, & Malsed 2003). Creating student-centered, online resources such as Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and troubleshooting tips, which specifically address student concerns and highlight the ways students can benefit from using Turnitin, would assist students in realizing the potential instructional benefits of the tool and reduce technical difficulties.

General Conclusion

The primary purpose of our study was to determine whether plagiarism detection services such as Turnitin are being used to decrease plagiarism by helping students learn how to write and cite appropriately, or through mere policing and deterrence. Our findings indicate the latter; Turnitin was primarily used for the technological quick fix of identifying and deterring plagiarism.

A possible explanation for this finding is that instructors may not be aware that detection services such as Turnitin could serve as a medium to improve student writing. We believe this limitation could be addressed by providing instructors specific training on how to use plagiarism detection devices to teach students proper writing

skills. Another possible explanation is that instructors may not feel it is their responsibility to teach these "writing skills" to students or do not have the time. One solution is to provide students with additional information and examples of how detection services can be used to improve their own writing, and in a fashion that would not interfere with instruction or the classroom curriculum (e.g., providing online resources).

We believe the general finding from this study has instructional implications for universities adopting electronic plagiarism detection services. Although users may be satisfied with electronic plagiarism devices and believe it deters student plagiarism as we found with Turnitin, university instructors may neglect to use these tools for the more educational approach to preventing plagiarism: teaching students how to write and cite appropriately. Therefore, these tools may merely conceal the problem of academic dishonesty, and more than likely, not be used to fix the underlying problem. As Madray (2007) stated, "Most students want to complete their research assignments honestly but find it difficult, simply because they are clueless on how to accomplish it" (p. 12).

While plagiarism detection services may be one more tool for policing dishonesty, they may be missing the larger issue of academic integrity. For instance, Gallant and Drinan (2006) concluded after surveying academic affairs administrators from 150 nationwide institutions, "many more institutions have in place the structural and procedural indicators for the policing and punishing of academic dishonesty than those for the promotion and education of academic integrity" (p. 74). Thus, universities using plagiarism detection services should also examine ways to help instructors educate students about proper writing and citation skills that will improve overall academic integrity on campus.

These study results must be interpreted in light of some potential limitations. First, the generalizability of this study is limited because it was conducted at a single institution and with a small number of participants. Therefore, future research is needed to cross-validate our results. Second, from our methodology, we were only able to determine attitudes and reflections of behavior, not actual behavior. As a result, future research should focus more on how electronic plagiarism detection services are being used in real-time by students and instructors. Third, we did not survey instructor's motives for participating in this pilot study before they used Turnitin. Therefore, we cannot determine if instructors who volunteered for this pilot viewed the technology solely as a plagiarism detection device before implementation. Fourth, due to our survey design, we could not match students' survey responses with their instructor's responses and the small sample size would have precluded any meaningful statistical analysis even if the matching were possible. Future research should be designed in a way that allows the relationship between instructor practices and student use of the tool to be examined. Finally, we believe it would benefit the field to empirically investigate whether training instructors, or providing student information, on how to use plagiarism detection tools to improve writing skills actually increases students' writing abilities and reduces plagiarism.

REFERENCES

- Aaron, R. M. (1992). Student academic dishonesty: Are collegiate institutions addressing the issue? *NASPA Journal*, 29, 107-113.
- Aaron, R. M., & Georgia, R.T. (1994). Administrator perceptions of student academic dishonesty in collegiate institutions. *NASPA Journal*, 31, 83-91.
- Born, A. D. (2003) How to reduce plagiarism. *Journal of Information Services Education*, 14(3) 223-224.
- Bull, J., Collins, C., Coughlin, E., & Sharp, D. (2001). *Technical review of plagiarism detection software report* (Technical Report). Luton, Bedfordshire (UK): University of Luton, Computer Assisted Assessment Centre.
- Burke, M. (2004). Deterring plagiarism: A new role for librarians. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 6 (2). 26-31.
- Center for Academic Integrity (2005). *Summary of research by Donald L. McCabe*. Retrieved August 2nd, 2007 from the Center for Academic Integrity Website: <www.academicintegrity.org/cai_research.asp>
- Gallant, T. B., & Drinan, P. (2006). Institutionalizing academic integrity: Administrator perceptions and institutional actions. *NASPA Journal*, 43(4), 61-81.
- Humes, C., Stiffler, J., & Malsed, M. (2003) *Examining anti-plagiarism software: Choosing the right tool* (Technical Report). Claremont, CA: Claremont McKenna College.
- Intellectual Property Caucus of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC-IP). *CCCC-IP Caucus Plagiarism Detection Service Position Statement*. Retrieved August 30th, 2007 from the CCCC-IP Website: <<http://ccccip.org/cccc-ip-caucus-plagiarism-detection-serv>>
- Jenson, J., & Castell, S. D. (2004). 'Turn It In': Technological challenges to academic ethics. *Education, Communication & Information*, 4(2/3), 311- 330.
- Madray, A. (2007). Developing students' awareness of plagiarism: Crisis and opportunities. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, June, 1-17.
- Martin B. (2004). *Plagiarism: Policy against cheating or policy for learning?* Retrieved August 9th, 2007 from the University of Wollongong Website: <<http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/04plag.pdf>>
- McCabe, D.L. (1993). Faculty response to academic dishonesty. *Research in Higher Education*, 34(5), 647-659.

- Mulcahy, S. & Goodacre, C. (2004). Opening Pandora's box of academic integrity: Using plagiarism detection software. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer & R. Phillips (Eds), *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ASCILITE Conference* (pp. 688-696). Perth, 5-8 December. <<http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/mulcahy.html>>
- Park, C. (2003). In other people's words: Plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons. *Assessment in Higher Education*, 25(5), 471-488.
- Royce, J. (2003). Has Turnitin.com got it all wrapped up? *Teacher Librarian*, 30(4), 26-30.
- Scanlon, P. M., & Neumann, D. R. (2002). Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43, 374-385.
- Soto, J. G., Anand, S., & McGee, E. (2004). Plagiarism avoidance: An empirical study examining teaching strategies. *Journal of College Science Teaching* 33(7), 42-48.
- Vernon, R. F., Bigna, S., & Smith, M. L. (2001). Plagiarism and the web. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 37, 193-196.

E. Joel Heikes, Ph.D., is a Research Associate in the Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment at The University of Texas at Austin, USA. He has published in the areas of gender and work as well as educational evaluation. Current work includes the evaluation of instructional programs and technologies with an emphasis on the measurement of student learning as well as developing the Instructional Assessment Resources (IAR) website to support best practices assessment and evaluation in higher education. This website is available at <<http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/assessment/iar/>>

John Kucsera, MA., is a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Psychology at The University of Texas at Austin, USA. John provides assistance to the Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment by evaluating instructional programs and technologies, supporting the development of instructional resources on assessment and evaluation, and teaching workshops on student assessment. His research interests include teaching effectiveness and educational programs for social equality.

Appendix A: Turnitin Instructor Survey Items

Directions: Please respond to the following questions about Turnitin as completely as possible. Your responses are anonymous and will be used to assess training efforts and evaluate the long-term viability of using Turnitin at UT Austin.

1. Have you used Turnitin for a class assignment?

Yes (Go to Ease of Use Section)
No

2. What were your reasons for not using Turnitin (Choose all that apply)

 - Turnitin is too complicated to use
 - There were insurmountable technical difficulties
 - The effort required to use Turnitin was greater than the potential benefits
 - Too much work for students
 - Too much student resistance
 - It sends a negative message to students about their integrity
 - Turnitin did not work for my particular assignments
 - I use another form of plagiarism control
 - Plagiarism is not a problem in my courses
 - Other (please specify)

3. Describe how you typically check for plagiarism.(open-ended)

4. What would encourage you to use Turnitin in the future? (open-ended)
(Go to Training Section)

Ease of Use

(Matrix using the following scale: Very difficult, Somewhat difficult, Somewhat easy, Very easy, Did not use)

How easy was it for you to:

5. locate Turnitin on the course Blackboard site?
6. submit drafts/papers to Turnitin?
7. understand the Originality Report (results)?
8. find the source material identified in the originality report?
9. use Turnitin overall?

10. What would make Turnitin easier to use? (open-ended)

11. Did you encounter any technical difficulties while using Turnitin?

Yes
No (Skip to Usefulness Section)

Electronic Plagiarism Detection—Heikes and Kucsera

12. What kind of technical difficulties did you have while using Turnitin (Choose all that apply)?

- Website wouldn't load/display properly
- Could not upload documents
- Could not download reports
- Could not view reports
- Could not login
- Could not sync roster
- Could not remove papers
- Other (please specify)

13. What methods did you use to resolve your difficulties (Choose all that apply)?

- Sought assistance from ITS support
- Sought assistance from Blackboard support
- Sought assistance from DIIA staff
- Contacted Turnitin technical support
- Consulted online Turnitin tutorials
- Consulted DIIA Turnitin training materials
- Other (please specify)

14. Were your difficulties resolved to your satisfaction?

- Yes
- No

Instructional Usefulness

(Matrix using the following scale: Not at all, limited extent, moderate extent, considerable extent, very great extent, not applicable)

To what extent:

- 15. has plagiarism been a problem in your classes in the past?
 - 16. do you think Turnitin helped your students to revise their paper?
 - 17. do you think Turnitin helped your students to avoid plagiarizing?
 - 18. do you think Turnitin helped your students to properly cite source material?
 - 19. did Turnitin help you to evaluate student work?
 - 20. did Turnitin help you to save time?
 - 21. did Turnitin help to reduce plagiarism in your class?
22. For how many assignments have you used Turnitin this semester? (Pull down menu 1-20)
23. List the courses for which you used Turnitin. (open-ended)

Electronic Plagiarism Detection—Heikes and Kucsera

24. How useful were the Originality Reports (results) in assessing student work?

- Not at all useful
- Somewhat useful
- Very useful
- Did not use reports for student assessment

25. Please describe how you used Turnitin in your class(es).

26. What benefit did you experience from using Turnitin?

27. What did you dislike about using Turnitin?

28. How does Turnitin compare to other methods you have used to check for plagiarism?

29. Overall, how satisfied are you with Turnitin?

- Very unsatisfied
- Somewhat unsatisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Very satisfied

30. If available, would you use Turnitin again in future semesters?

- Yes (Go to Training Section)
- Maybe (Go to Training Section)
- No

31. Why don't you want to use Turnitin again in future semesters?

Training

(Matrix using the following scale: Not at all useful, Somewhat useful, Very useful, Did not use)
How useful were the following online resources:

- 32. DIIA recommended use guidelines for Turnitin Web page
- 33. *Using Blackboard and Turnitin* - Turnitin/Blackboard tutorial
- 34. *Using Turnitin Originality Reports* - Turnitin/Blackboard tutorial
- 35. *Preventing and Detecting Plagiarism* Web site (UT Libraries)
- 36. *Prevent and Detect Plagiarism Seminar* handout (UT Libraries)

37. Have you ever attended a workshop about preventing plagiarism?

- Yes
- No

38. Did you attend the Turnitin training sponsored by DIIA?

- Yes
- No (Go to the Demographics Section)

Electronic Plagiarism Detection—Heikes and Kucsera

(Matrix using the following scale: Not at all useful, Somewhat useful, Very useful)

How useful were the following training components from the DIIA training session in helping you use Turnitin?

- 39. Explanation of Turnitin
- 40. Hands-on exercise
- 41. Handouts
- 42. Email updates

- 43. What would make DIIA's Turnitin training more useful to you? (open-ended)

Demographics

- 44. What is your college (pull down menu)

- 45. What is your academic rank?

- Assistant Instructor
- Instructor
- Lecturer
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

- 46. How many years of university teaching experience do you have?

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- More than 30

Thank You for completing the survey! Please click <DONE> to submit your responses.

Appendix B: Turnitin Student Survey Items

Directions: Please respond to the following questions about Turnitin as completely as possible. Your responses are totally **anonymous** and will be used to evaluate the long-term viability of using Turnitin at UT Austin.

1. Did your instructor require you to use Turnitin?

- Yes
- No

2. Have you used Turnitin for one or more class assignments this semester?

- Yes
- No (Go to Demographics page)

Ease of Use

(Matrix using the following scale: Very difficult, Somewhat difficult, Somewhat easy, Very easy, Did not use)

How easy was it for you to:

3. locate Turnitin on the course Blackboard site?
4. submit drafts/papers to Turnitin?
5. understand the Originality Report (results)?
6. retrieve/download you paper?
7. use Turnitin overall?

8. What would make Turnitin easier to use? (open-ended)

9. Did you encounter any technical difficulties while using Turnitin?

- Yes
- No (Skip to Usefulness Section)

10. What kind of technical difficulties did you have while using Turnitin (Choose all that apply)?

- Website wouldn't load/display properly
- Could not upload documents
- Could not download reports
- Could not view reports
- Could not login
- Could not remove papers
- Other (please specify)

11. What methods did you use to resolve your difficulties (Choose all that apply)?

- Sought assistance from my instructor
- Sought assistance from ITS support
- Sought assistance from Blackboard support
- Sought assistance from DIIA staff
- Contacted Turnitin technical support
- Consulted online Turnitin tutorials
- Other (please specify)

Electronic Plagiarism Detection—Heikes and Kucsera

12. Were your technical difficulties resolved to your satisfaction?

Yes (Go to Instructional Usefulness section)

No

13. How could technical difficulties be resolved better? (open-ended)

Instructional Usefulness

Directions: For the next section of questions, you should consider *plagiarism* to include any instance of copying or paraphrasing someone else's work without properly crediting (citing) the true author, unauthorized collaboration with another student, or turning in the same paper for more than one course without permission.

(Matrix using the following scale: Not at all, limited extent, moderate extent, considerable extent, very great extent, not applicable)

To what extent:

14. did Turnitin help you to revise your paper?

15. did Turnitin help you to avoid plagiarizing?

16. did Turnitin help you to properly cite source material?

17. did Turnitin help you to improve your paper writing skills?

18. did Turnitin help you to save time writing your paper?

19. do you think Turnitin helped your instructor to evaluate your work?

20. do you think Turnitin helped to reduce plagiarism in your class?

21. How do you feel about having to use Turnitin?

22. For how many of your assignments was Turnitin used? (Pull down menu 1-20)

23. How many of your courses this semester use Turnitin? (Pull down menu 1-10)

24. How did your instructor inform you that Turnitin was being used in your courses? (Choose all that apply)

Verbally, the first week of class.

Verbally, when the assignment was given

Verbally, after the assignment was completed

In writing, in the syllabus

In writing, on the course Blackboard site

In writing, in the assignment instructions

In writing, after the assignment was completed

I was never informed that Turnitin was being used.

25. What benefit(s) did you experience from using Turnitin? (open-ended)

26. What did you dislike about using Turnitin? (open-ended)

Electronic Plagiarism Detection—Heikes and Kucsera

27. Prior to the current semester, has anyone you know ever plagiarized in a UT Austin course?

- Yes, intentionally
- Yes, accidentally
- Unsure

28. Prior to the current semester, have you ever plagiarized in a UT Austin course?

- Yes, intentionally
- Yes, accidentally
- No
- Don't know

29. Would you like to see Turnitin used more in the future?

- Yes
- Maybe
- No

30. Please explain your response to question 29. (open-ended)

Demographics

31. What is your college/school (pull down menu)

32. What is your UT Austin status?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate student

33. Is English your first or native language?

- Yes
- No

Thank You for completing the anonymous survey! Please click <DONE> to submit your responses.