

This is a final draft version of the article. For the full article, please go to: <http://alh.sagepub.com/content/8/2/173.abstract>

**Dahl, S. (2007): Turnitin®: Student reaction towards electronic submission and plagiarism detection, *Active Learning in Higher Education* 8 (2)**

**Turnitin®: the student perspective on using plagiarism detection software**

Stephan Dahl

Middlesex University Business School  
The Burroughs  
Hendon  
London NW4 4BT  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 20 8411 6840  
Fax: +44 20 8411 5357

**Abstract**

Recently there has been an increasing interest in plagiarism detection systems, such as the web-based Turnitin system. However, no study has so far tried to look at how students react towards those systems being used. This exploratory study examines the attitudes of students on a postgraduate module after using Turnitin as their standard way of submitting work and getting feedback. Overall, students reacted positively towards the system. However, the study also found evidence of a group of students who were less positive, which seemed to be a result of their insecurity about how to quote correctly.

**Keywords**

Turnitin, plagiarism, Internet, students view, electronic submission

## **Introduction**

Over the last few years there has been an increased concern at the extend of academic plagiarism in academic life (Szabo and Underwood, 2004). The academic community has responded with a number of different strategies to counter the perceived rise in plagiarism. These strategies were either student-centred by, for example, raising student awareness about plagiarism (Carroll, 2002), clarifying what constitutes plagiarism (Davis, 1993) or by introducing honour codes (McCabe, 2001). Another response was the introduction of increasingly more sophisticated detection systems (Frey, 2001). One of the major innovations is the introduction of electronic plagiarism detection systems, such as Turnitin®, a tool which allows the tutors to check for suspected plagiarism as well as evolving into a more all-round electronic submission and grading tool.

Plagiarism is a somewhat ambiguous concept, and the exact definition of what plagiarism is remains vague in many areas (Liddell, 2003). The finer details about what constitutes plagiarism and what not are contested, and in fact are often different from one subject area to another even within the same school or university. Much of this ambiguity in defining plagiarism has been seen as a major cause of why students (as well as faculty members) are often confused over what exactly plagiarism is, and how to combat it. In fact at least one study finds that a carefully worded definition of plagiarism may well reduce the incidence of plagiarism substantially (Brown and Howell, 2001). For the purpose of this paper, anything where a student incorporates a substantial, unacknowledged amount of material derived from the work (published or unpublished) of another student or source is seen as plagiarism (Plagiarism Advisory Service, 2006). However, irrespective of the finer details of any such definition, many educators perceive that plagiarism is steadily increasing, and that more students than ever plagiarize material from different sources, especially the internet (Underwood and Szabo, 2003). At the same time, many educators are unsure as to how confront this “tidal wave” of academic dishonesty: some educators seem to give up completely, while others have strong emotional reactions, ranging from feelings of anger to dismay (Wood, 2004).

There are various estimates as to how much plagiarism is taking place. Hansen (2003) suggests that 38% of students copy from conventional sources and 40% copy from internet sources. Szabo and Underwood (2004) in their study of self-reported plagiarism among science students report a rate of 32.2% of students admitting copy and paste content from the internet into their work unacknowledged. Other sources have indicated academic dishonesty rates as high as 75% (Eagle and Hunt, 2005), with business students apparently more prone to academic dishonesty (and plagiarism) than students from other disciplines (Smyth and Davis 2004).

## **Countering plagiarism by electronic means: what is being done?**

For the most part, plagiarism prevention has so far relied on punitive measures (Devlin, 2006), though the focus is increasingly shifting towards plagiarism prevention, for example by having clearer definitions of plagiarism (Brown and Howell, 2001), coupled with effective plagiarism detection (JISC, 2005). Detection relies on either traditional search methods, especially Google other search engines on the Internet, or on using software based solutions such as PlagiServe or Turnitin. While there is little doubt that the threat of using electronic systems to detect plagiarism may prevent students from plagiarizing, the systems used to be fairly one-dimensional, in that they focused mainly on plagiarism detection. The same is true of most research published in the area (for example Guader, 2004). While this research direction is certainly worthwhile, it tends to neglect how students feel about their work being systematically screened for plagiarism. However, as the detection systems become more integrated with the submission of assessments, and thus less of a standalone system, the relative importance of plagiarism detection may diminish overall.

In the early days of electronic plagiarism detection the system were standalone systems, doing little more than searching for similar phrases being used in websites and academic journals. This made detection fairly cumbersome, as it required individually uploading all assignments, and then reviewing the result once an originality report had been generated. Today, systems such as Turnitin make detecting plagiarism a lot more comfortable, with the system integrating into other university systems (such as WebCT) and providing easy to read, colour coded “originality reports” and scores on each

students work (see example screenshot).

---

Figure 1 about here

---

However, such detection techniques are not without their critics. The systems have been criticised because the lack of “human” judgement, which in turn may make reliance purely on technical solutions unreliable (Carbone, 2001), or because these systems store large amount of student assessment for comparison (and profit) without the consent of, or at least a viable alternative for the students. This some argue may in itself be a copyright violation (Foster, 2002).

In recent years, Turnitin has however shifted the focus from primarily detecting plagiarism to offering other services to both educators as well as students: The services available now range from the possibility to deliver electronic feedback to the students, online grade books and attendance lists as well as the possibility of (anonymous) peer-reviews of assignments by students. In addition to functional enhancements, Turnitin now seemingly offers the possibility of a complete electronic submission of assignments, with submission deadlines being enforced by the system itself as well as issuing digital receipts to students submitting work. This enhanced functionality has certainly done much to deflect from the single objective of catching plagiarism and at least for educators has made Turnitin at least potentially a very valuable tool overall, while at the same time making submissions and feedback via Turnitin at least seemingly more convenient for students. However, as much as the functionality and integration may be enhanced, it is still ultimately the students and educators who have to use the system, and as such it seems important to see how students habitually using the system perceive Turnitin, especially given the perception of the system as primarily a plagiarism detection tool.

In summary, much of the available evidence suggests that education and detection can drive down plagiarism rates substantially (Park, 2004). However, much of the research published on plagiarism and plagiarism detection so far has been focused on the need for such systems and their efficiency in detecting plagiarism (Guader, 2004). No research to date has addressed the issue of the reaction of students towards the systematic use of such detection systems. Therefore the primary aim of this study was to find out how a group of students feel about using electronic submissions, visible usage of plagiarism detection systems and how they perceived the service in comparison to more traditional methods (for example, handing in paper assignments). This paper explores how a group of postgraduate students perceive the use of plagiarism detection software (Turnitin) in one module as a basis for further research.

This exploratory study examined the attitudes of postgraduate students on the Integrated Marketing Communication module, part of the MA in Marketing Communications at a large business school in London. The students on this module use Turnitin on a weekly basis to submit their assignments, obtain their grades and feedback as well as conducting regular peer-reviews of their peers' assignments. In addition to feedback and grades, students were also permitted to see their originality reports. The students did not receive any specific training regarding Turnitin. However, they did receive a step-by-step instruction sheet on how to set up an account and submit work.

## **Methodology**

The participants in this study were all students on the module. Before the beginning of a lecture the students were asked to fill out the study questionnaire. The students were advised that the questionnaire was voluntary, and all 24 students who were present at the time completed questionnaire. The questionnaires were anonymous and no incentive was given to complete the survey. Each questionnaire consisted of 22 statements to which the participants indicated their agreement or disagreement using a 5 point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5).

The first seven questions related to how students perceived Turnitin in comparison to conventional methods of submissions. Questions 8-14 related to how students perceived the originality report and how they felt about plagiarism being tackled by using a system such as Turnitin. Questions 15-18 gauged the students' confidence in terms of referencing and finally, questions 19-22 asked for an

overall evaluation of the students' experience and confidence in the system.

All items had the same polarity, with a lower score indicating strong agreement. Following the 22 statements, the students also got asked five open ended questions regarding which aspect of Turnitin they liked most and why, which least and why and how the system could be improved.

## Results

---

Table 1 about here

---

Overall, students seemed to find Turnitin easy to use: The mean score for the question whether or not students found Turnitin easy to use was 1.67, with 11 students strongly agreeing, 11 students agreeing and only one student answering "slightly disagree" to the question and one student was "undecided".

Similar to the first question, most students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that Turnitin was a convenient way to submit work. Again, one student was undecided and another student slightly disagreed; however no student indicated a strong disagreement.

The third question asked whether students preferred using Turnitin to handing in the work at the student office. Of all the questions asked, this was the most positive question in terms of answers given by students: 17 students strongly agreed to this statement, 5 agreed and only two were undecided. No student disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

The fourth question asked whether or not students preferred to hand in paper assignments, without specifically asking for submission either via the tutor or via the student office (that is, in person at a central location where the students get a paper receipt for their work). The answers here were also very much in favour of electronic submission, with 7 students strongly disagreeing with the statement, 11 disagreeing and only 2 students agreeing to this statement.

When asked whether students prefer to get feedback electronically, overall 78% agreed or strongly agreed, with only one student disagreeing with this statement. Thus, the facility to give feedback seems to mostly be welcomed by the students. This outcome seemed slightly surprising, as the electronic feedback requires the student to read the feedback online rather than receiving a paper copy of the feedback.

All students preferred to obtain their grades electronically via Turnitin (20 students agreed, or strongly agreed). This seems hardly surprising given the enthusiastic response towards receiving electronic feedback.

The last question in this section was interesting in that it showed a strong support for the adoption of Turnitin in more modules: 87.5% of the students (21 students) would prefer to see Turnitin being adopted in other modules.

The next set of questions related to the core functionality of Turnitin as a tool to detect plagiarism and what effect this "originality report" has on the students. As all students could readily access their originality reports from each assignment, it can be assumed that they were sufficiently familiar to comment on these.

---

Table 2 about here

---

In the first question of this set (question 8) it was interesting to see how positive the students were regarding their originality report: 83% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they liked to see their report.

Overall the originality report appeared to be easy to understand for most students, although a

relatively large number of students (seven) indicated that they are undecided on this topic, and two students disagreed with the statement. The students did not receive any formal training on how to use Turnitin, thus it may not be entirely surprising that the students felt slightly insecure about how to understand an originality report.

Some 62% of the students either were afraid (15 students in total agreed or strongly agreed and a further 5 students were undecided) that they would be accused of plagiarism although it is not true after using the system. While this appears to be a high number at first, it seems well possible that this “fear” translates into less plagiarising, as students may as a result be extra careful when including material from other sources.

The next question (question 11) tried to find out if a potential fear translated into more careful consideration when including third party material: The answers seem to suggest that the students are split halfway on this topic: While some students are unsure some others seem to be quite confident in terms of including materials in their work. This seems indicative that the assumption that the mere presence of the system encourages students to critically evaluate the materials used may well be true.

Question 12 gauged if students felt anxious about the originality report – again the students appeared either anxious – or not anxious at all. Similar to question 11, this may be the result that some students are more confident in the kind of materials they use (and how they use them) and subsequently are not anxious about their originality score.

About half of all students (13 students) were actually happy that Turnitin made plagiarism harder. This seems at first slightly surprising, though it may actually be a reflection of the fact that some students feel disadvantaged by other students “getting away” with plagiarism. However, it is interesting to note that three students disagreed with the statement.

Most students seemed to see the systematic use of Turnitin as an indication of something being done about plagiarism. This may suggest that a more widespread use of the system may convey the message that plagiarism is taken seriously, although it appears that the use of Turnitin alone may not be sufficient to convince students that plagiarism is taken seriously. Possibly a more widespread introduction in other modules would enhance the perception.

The following four questions related to how confident students are with regards to plagiarism and citing correctly.

---

Table 3 about here

---

16 of the 24 students in total wanted to have more information about what plagiarism is. This seems to indicate that there is at least some uncertainty in this group of students as to what exactly is plagiarism. This high number of students is slightly surprising, as all students did receive a formal presentation at the beginning of their programme on plagiarism – and plagiarism detection.

While overall there are some students that are confident about writing a bibliography, a significant amount of students are not sure or are undecided how to write a bibliography.

However, although some of the students were not confident how to write a bibliography, the introduction of Turnitin seems to have had a positive effect in terms of students reading up on how to reference correctly, with just over half of students agreeing to this statement.

However, despite resources on referencing readily available, only about half of the students felt confident about quoting other peoples’ works correctly, which may indicate a further need to train the significant minority which seems to unsure about how to quote.

The last set of questions asked the students to evaluate the reliability of Turnitin both in terms of detecting the correct sources as well as overall stability of the system.

---

Table 4 about here

---

Generally, the students rated Turnitin as very reliable: None of the students disagreed with the statement and only 3 students were undecided.

At least two students indicated that the originality report did not find the sourced the students used for their assignments. Of course this may be either because sometimes the originality reports pick up on some random sentences or frequently used phrases from other assignments stored in the database, or it can be because some sources may not be available to Turnitin because of technical limitations.

In terms of the originality reports there was less confidence in the system: Although around half of the students found them generally accurate, 50% of the students were undecided.

Finally, the majority of students felt safe that their assignments will not get lost when using Turnitin, a possible concern especially for students who are less experienced with computers.

In the open ended feedback it was interesting that 22 answers stressed the convenience of the system in one form or another, e.g. by making it possible to submit without queuing at the student office or more generally in terms of the ease of use of the system. However, two students singled out the fact that something was done about plagiarism as the aspect they liked most about Turnitin.

In terms of negative points, the sometimes wrong (or at least confusing) originality report and slow network connections were the most often named, although some students chose not to indicate any negative points at all.

Although the dataset is very limited in terms of numbers, it is still interesting to highlight some interesting correlations that can be observed in the data set.

---

Table 5 about here

---

From the data in the table, there appears to be a group of students who finds Turnitin both convenient as well as easy to use ( $\rho$  Convenient/Easy=.668). This group of students, not surprisingly, also wants more modules to adopt Turnitin ( $\rho$  Convenient/More Modules=.517 and  $\rho$  Easy to use/More Modules=.538). Students in this group are generally happy that something is being done about plagiarism ( $\rho$  Convenient/Happy\_Plag=.663 and  $\rho$  Easy to use/Happy Plag=.530). Interestingly, those that find Turnitin easy or convenient to use are not necessarily the same students as those that prefer electronic feedback ( $\rho$  Convenient/Feedback Elec=.146 and  $\rho$  Easy to use/ Feedback Elec =.000)..

At the same time, students who are happy that something is being done about plagiarism, maybe unsurprisingly, tend to be sure about how to quote ( $\rho$  Happy Plag/Unsure Quoting=-.545). However, students who were unsure of how to quote tended to prefer paper assignments ( $\rho$  Unsure Quoting/Pref Paper=.517). Further, those students that were the most likely to prefer paper submissions were most likely to be anxious about their originality report ( $\rho$  Anxious Orig/Pref Paper=.745). In turn, those students who were anxious about their originality reports also were very likely to be unsure of how to quote correctly ( $\rho$  Anxious Orig/Unsure Quoting=.713). This could possibly suggest that more information of how to quote correctly might overcome the feeling of anxiousness for some students and at the same time might suggest that some students do not actively seek to plagiarise, but rather feel insecure about how to avoid it (and subsequently adopt a negative attitude towards plagiarism prevention).

Finally, interestingly there appears to be a correlation between finding the originality report easy to understand and reading up on how to reference correctly ( $\rho$  Read how ref/ Orig Easy=.571). This may indicate that there is indeed a formative element in students seeing (and understanding) their originality reports, resulting in more attention being paid to correct use of referencing.

## **Discussion and Implications**

The findings of this small study seem to strongly support the more widespread adoption of Turnitin.

Although there are some limitations of the study, such as the exploratory and small sample of postgraduate only students, the results seem to be broadly positive for the use of Turnitin. While there are some concerns over the interpretation of originality reports, most students in this study were largely positive about Turnitin. Some students explicitly welcomed the introduction as a way to reduce plagiarism, though most students seemed to prefer the convenience of electronic submission in comparison to the more traditional submission via the student office.

Overall it appears that there are mainly two types of students: Those that are confident in how to avoid plagiarism and how to quote correctly, and these students tend to be happy about the introduction of Turnitin. However, a different group of students tends to be less positive about Turnitin, though this seems mostly a result of their own lack of knowledge and insecurity about plagiarism and what is acceptable when quoting, rather than a malicious intent to plagiarise. This relative lack of students who deliberately set out to cheat is consistent with other studies (e.g. Macdonald and Carroll, 2006), and underlines the fact that education together with effective detection is a viable way to cut plagiarism.

As such, the introduction of Turnitin (and therefore the visible use of detection systems) seems to have a noticeable effect on students: Firstly the effect seemed formative, with at least some students seeking advice on how to reference correctly and secondly the effect seemed deterrent; as only two cases of plagiarism were detected during the semester. This is a surprisingly low rate if any of the plagiarism rates reported in the literature is to be applied (e.g. Szabo and Underwood, 2004; Eagle and Hunt, 2005). Yet, the fact that two cases were found also highlights that even with visible detection methods in place plagiarism does still occur, thus the introduction of electronic detection is a tool to reduce, but not to eradicate, plagiarism, which again is consistent with the literature (Carroll, 2005).

As the students did not receive any special training on how to use Turnitin, it may be somewhat less surprising that some students seemed to be confused about the originality reports (though generally not about how to operate the website), and what they meant in terms of plagiarism. This seems to support the argument by Brown and Howell (2001), that a clear definition of plagiarism will potentially reduce incidences of plagiarism.

Of course, this study was exploratory in nature, and therefore further research would be desirable to find out if the findings of this study can be replicated. Research with larger groups of students would be especially useful. In addition, research on students from different types of institutions, on different degrees and on undergraduate as well as postgraduate students would be desirable. Conversely, it would also be interesting to see if after receiving more training on how to reference correctly, students' perceptions of Turnitin would be more positive.

Overall, however, it was reassuring to find that the students reacted positively to the introduction of Turnitin. When considering that one of the arguments against the use of Turnitin is that it treats students as criminals (Carbone, 2001), the reaction of students when asked directly seems reassuring for educators who are considering whether or not to use electronic plagiarism detection systems such as Turnitin. Also the research supported the view that few students actively set out to cheat, but rather that a combination of both education and detection have the potential to cut down on plagiarism – and that the students are very much in favour of this approach.

## References

- Brown, V. J. and M. E. Howell (2001). 'The Efficacy of Policy Statements on Plagiarism: Do They Change Students' Views?' *Research in Higher Education* 42(1): 103.
- Carbone, N. (2001). 'Turnitin.com: A pedagogic placebo for plagiarism.' TechNotes <http://bedfordstmartins.com/technotes/techtiparchive/ttip060501.htm> [accessed 21-08-2006]
- Carroll, J. (2002). Detering student plagiarism: where best to start? *Improving Student Learning Symposium*, Oxford, Oxford Centre for Staff Development.
- Carroll, J. (2005). 'Handling student plagiarism: moving to mainstream.' *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching* 1(2).
- Davis, B. G. (1993). 'Preventing academic dishonesty.' Tools for Teaching <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/bgd/prevent.html> [accessed 21-08-2006].
- Devlin, M. (2006). 'Policy, Preparation, and Prevention: Proactive minimization of student plagiarism.' *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management* 28(1): 45-58.

- Eagle, L. and L. Hunt (2005). Dealing With The Dark Side: The Link Between Academic Dishonesty and Future Work Practices, Massey University Department of Commerce.
- Foster, A. L. (2002). Plagiarism-Detection Tool Creates Legal Quandary: When professors send students' papers to a database, are copyrights violated? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*: A37.
- Frey, C. (2001). Chips and cheating: Teachers are looking out for tech assisted dishonesty, even using software to detect plagiarism. *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles.
- Guader, H. (2004). 'The Hunt for Plagiarism.' *Internet Reference Services Quarterly* 8(4): 27.
- Hansen, B. (2003). 'Combatting Plagiarism.' *CQ Research* 13(32): 773-796.
- JISC (2005). Institutional issues in deterring, detecting and dealing with student plagiarism, *Final Report*, Joint Information Systems Committee.
- Liddell, J. (2003). 'A Comprehensive Definition of Plagiarism.' *Community & Junior College Libraries* 11(3): 43.
- Macdonald, R. and J. Carroll (2006). 'Plagiarism - a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach.' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 31(2): 233-245.
- McCabe, D. L. (2001). 'New research on academic integrity: The success of 'modified' honor codes.' Synfax Weekly Reports, <http://www.collegepubs.com/ref/SFX000515.shtml> [accessed 21-08-2006].
- Park, C. (2004). 'Rebels without a clause: towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students.' *Journal of Further and Higher Education Volume* 28(3): 291-306.
- Plagiarism Advisory Service. (2006). 'The Little Book of Plagiarism.' [http://www.lmu.ac.uk/the\\_news/oct03/PlagiarismFinal.doc](http://www.lmu.ac.uk/the_news/oct03/PlagiarismFinal.doc) [accessed 21-08-2006]
- Smyth, M. L. and J. R. Davis (2004). 'Perceptions of Dishonesty among Two-year College Students: Academic versus Business Situations.' *Journal of Business Ethics* 51(1): 63.
- Szabo, A. and J. Underwood (2004). 'Cybercheats: Is Information and Communication Technology Fuelling Academic Dishonesty?' *Active Learning in Higher Education* 5(2): 180.
- Underwood, J. and A. Szabo (2003). 'Academic offences and e-learning: individual propensities in cheating.' *British Journal of Educational Technology* 34(4): 467.
- Wood, G. (2004). 'Academic Original Sin: Plagiarism, the Internet, and Librarians.' *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30(3): 237

Appendix 1: Summary of questions and statistical data

		Mean	Std. D	Ra	Min.	Max.
1	I find Turnitin easy to use	1.67	.761	3	1	4
2	I find Turnitin a convenient way to submit my assignments/coursework	1.62	.770	3	1	4
3	I find Turnitin more convenient than handing in my work at the student office	1.38	.647	2	1	3
4	I prefer handing in paper assignments	3.96	.908	3	2	5
5	I prefer getting my feedback electronically rather than on a paper based coursework front sheet	2.00	.798	3	1	4
6	I prefer to see my grades electronically on Turnitin rather than on a paper based coursework front sheet	1.83	.702	2	1	3
7	I would prefer it if more modules would use Turnitin for submitting assignments/coursework	1.79	.779	3	1	4
8	I like to see my originality report	2.04	.859	4	1	5
9	I find the originality report easy to understand	2.33	.816	3	1	4
10	I am afraid that I may be accused of plagiarism based on the originality report although it is not true	2.33	1.129	4	1	5
11	Turnitin makes me unsure about what materials I can quote or use in my assignments	3.08	1.213	4	1	5
12	I get anxious about my originality score when I submit my work to Turnitin	2.83	1.274	4	1	5
13	I am happy that Turnitin makes plagiarism a lot harder	2.37	.970	3	1	4
14	Turnitin makes me feel as if something is being done about plagiarism	2.13	.900	3	1	4
15	I would prefer to get more guidance about what plagiarism is	2.29	.806	3	1	4
16	I am confident when writing a bibliography	2.75	.944	4	1	5
17	I have read up about how I should reference something correctly after starting to use Turnitin	2.50	.933	3	1	4
18	I feel confident about quoting other peoples' works correctly	2.58	1.018	3	1	4
19	Turnitin usually finds the sources I use for my assignments	2.46	.721	3	1	4
20	Overall, Turnitin is reliable	1.96	.550	2	1	3
21	Overall, Turnitin originality reports are accurate	2.50	.722	3	1	4
22	I feel safe that my work will not get lost when submitting it via Turnitin	2.04	.955	3	1	4

Ra=Range N=24

Appendix 2: Answers to 'What do you like best about Turnitin'

- The convenience of submitting electronically
- Convenience of doing it from almost everywhere
- It is electronic, no que (sic) at the student office
- submitting online sitting in our room
- easy to use, receipt, confident that work will not get lost
- comfortable
- it is a easy way to handing in my coursework and haven't wait in a long q. It is easy know my grades and feedback
- straight forward to use
- not having to queue up at the student office and having to deal with the rude staff there, flexible times
- I like the fact that I do not need to stand in endless queues to submit my work
- fast, easy entrance
- fast, easy and convenience
- I like the way to submit because it is easy sure that my assignment has sent as it shows on screen
- I don't have to go to university to hand in my works, I even don't have to print it out
- It is a very good system, especially plagiarism
- The quick way of submit
- It is much more convenient than submitting paper assignments
- Good method for submitting work
- When I have to submit my paper, it's easy to use
- Convenient to hand in assignment, student office will have more time to deal with other issue rather than submitting students' works
- submit work online
- No long queue for assignment submission, easy to use, no paper work
- Great that something is being done about cut and paste culture

- forces students to work not copy. Good for honest students

Appendix 2: Answers to 'What do you like least about Turnitin'

- Originality Report
- peer review takes lots of time
- I want to write in the corrective way
- Some quotes /references when referenced properly were seen as plagiarism
- Originality reports confusing
- I believe I reference properly but I always get plagiarised on my references
- sometime it is slow
- sometime it can not open or sometime it is slow
- Sometime system doesn't work well but I'm not sure that because of my internet network or turnitin
- Sometime, I'm not quite sure if my work is submitted already though there's a receipt sent to me
- pattern of website, anyway it still computer not people
- it makes me feel anxious about plagiarism although I put all the references when I see the result I get panic
- originality is not that reliable
- The formatting after submission
- Sometimes, I can't open my turnitin page. It said my UserID/password invalid
- So far, I have not struggled with Turnitin
- I think there is as such no problem with turnitin, overall it is well designed and easy to use
- I think turnitin is great
- Originality report includes correctly referenced quotes as plagiarism

Table 1: Questions relating to ease of use

	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Average
1	'I find Turnitin easy to use'	45.8% (11)	45.8% (11)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	1.67
2	'I find Turnitin a convenient way to submit my assignments/coursework'	50% (12)	41.7% (10)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	1.62
3	I find Turnitin more convenient than handing in my work at the student office	70.8% (17)	20.8% (5)	8.3% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1.38
4	I prefer handing in paper assignments	0% (0)	8.3% (2)	16.7% (4)	45.8% (11)	29.2% (7)	3.96
5	I prefer getting my feedback electronically rather than on a paper based coursework front sheet	25% (6)	50% (12)	16.7% (4)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	2.00
6	I prefer to see my grades electronically on Turnitin rather than on a paper based coursework front sheet	33.3% (8)	50% (12)	16.7% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1.83
7	I would prefer it if more modules would use Turnitin for submitting assignments/coursework	37.5% (9)	50% (12)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	1.79

(N) = Number in brackets gives actual number of students

Table 2: Questions relating to originality report

	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Average
8	I like to see my originality report	20.8% (5)	62.5% (15)	12.5% (3)	0% (0)	4.2% (1)	2.04
9	I find the originality report easy to understand	12.5% (3)	50% (12)	29.2% (7)	8.3% (2)	0% (0)	2.33
10	I am afraid that I may be accused of plagiarism based on the originality report although it is not true	25% (6)	37.5% (9)	20.8% (5)	12.5% (3)	4.2% (1)	2.33
11	Turnitin makes me unsure about what materials I can quote or use in my assignment	4.2% (1)	37.5% (9)	20.8% (5)	20.8% (5)	16.7% (4)	3.08
12	I get anxious about my originality score when I submit my work to Turnitin	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	8.3% (2)	2.83
13	I am happy that Turnitin makes plagiarism a lot harder	20.8% (5)	33.3% (8)	33.3% (8)	12.5% (3)	0% (0)	2.37
14	Turnitin makes me feel as if something is being done about plagiarism	29.2% (7)	33.3% (8)	33.3% (8)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	2.13

(N) = Number in brackets gives actual number of students

Table 3: Confidence in citing

	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Average
15	I would prefer to get more guidance about what plagiarism is	12.5% (3)	54.2% (13)	25% (6)	8.3% (2)	0% (0)	2.75
16	I am confident when writing a bibliography	8.3% (2)	29.2% (7)	45.8% (11)	12.5% (3)	4.2% (0)	2.50
17	I have read up about how I should reference something correctly after starting to use Turnitin	12.5% (3)	41.7% (10)	29.2% (7)	16.7% (4)	0% (0)	2.58
18	I feel confident about quoting other peoples' works correctly	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	33.3% (8)	20.8% (5)	0% (0)	2.46

(N) = Number in brackets gives actual number of students

Table 4: Questions relating to reliability

	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Average
19	Turnitin usually finds the sources I use for my assignments	4.2% (1)	54.2% (13)	33.3% (8)	8.3% (2)	0% (0)	1.96
20	Overall, Turnitin is reliable	16.7% (4)	70.8% (17)	12.5% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.50
21	Overall, Turnitin originality reports are accurate	8.3% (2)	37.5% (9)	50% (12)	4.2% (1)	0% (0)	2.04
22	I feel safe that my work will not get lost when submitting it via Turnitin	33.3% (8)	37.5% (9)	20.8% (5)	8.3% (2)	0% (0)	2.75

(N) = Number in brackets gives actual number of students

Table 5: Correlations of answers

	CONVENIENT	EASY_TO_USE	CON_STDO	PREF_PAPER	FEEDBACK_EL EC	GRADES_ELEC	MORE_MODUL ES	LIKE_ORIG	ORIG_EASY	AFFRAID_FALS E	UNSURE_QUO TING	ANXIOUS_ORI G	HAPPY_FLAG	SOMETHING_D ONE	GUIDANCE	CONFID_BIOG	READ_HOW_R EF	CON_QUOTING	FINDS_SOURC E	RELIABLE	ORIG_ACCURA TE	FEEL_SAFE
CONVENIENT	1	<b>.668</b>	.469	-.272	.146	.201	<b>.517</b>	-.041	.138	-.250	-.431	-.421	<b>.663</b>	<b>.573</b>	-.306	-.075	-.030	.069	.323	.475	.196	.141
EASY_TO_USE	<b>.668</b>	1	<b>.530</b>	-.461	.000	.217	<b>.538</b>	.089	.117	-.118	-.298	-.374	<b>.530</b>	.381	-.118	-.060	-.122	-.019	.290	.381	.000	.140
CON_STDO	.469	<b>.530</b>	1	<b>-.638</b>	.440	<b>.622</b>	<b>.679</b>	.049	-.165	-.179	-.263	-.396	.390	.289	-.219	-.053	-.252	.050	.082	.290	.233	.114
PREF_PAPER	-.272	-.461	<b>-.638</b>	1	<b>-.622</b>	<b>-.557</b>	<b>-.566</b>	-.109	-.039	.396	<b>.517</b>	<b>.745</b>	-.377	-.206	.314	.038	.077	-.161	-.302	-.352	-.431	-.199
FEEDBACK_ELEC	.146	.000	.440	<b>-.622</b>	1	<b>.715</b>	<b>.502</b>	.000	.274	-.099	-.234	-.442	.288	.310	-.416	-.059	.301	.331	.312	.405	.390	.418
GRADES_ELEC	.201	.217	<b>.622</b>	<b>-.557</b>	<b>.715</b>	1	<b>.649</b>	-.060	-.051	-.256	-.340	-.470	.351	.034	-.371	-.066	.066	.203	.157	.432	.514	.335
MORE_MODULES	<b>.517</b>	<b>.538</b>	<b>.679</b>	<b>-.566</b>	<b>.502</b>	<b>.649</b>	1	.144	.251	-.264	-.487	<b>-.606</b>	.511	.349	-.453	.103	.269	.379	.100	<b>.486</b>	.193	.071
LIKE_ORIG	-.041	.089	.049	-.109	.000	-.060	.144	1	<b>.537</b>	.120	-.003	.007	.033	.049	.170	-.040	.136	.269	.319	.188	-.175	.104
ORIG_EASY	.138	.117	-.118	-.039	.274	-.051	.251	<b>.537</b>	1	.157	-.249	-.195	.220	.473	-.418	.226	<b>.571</b>	<b>.593</b>	.394	.226	-.147	.260
AFFRAID_FALSE	-.250	-.118	-.179	.396	-.099	-.256	-.264	.120	.157	1	<b>.518</b>	<b>.614</b>	-.357	-.086	.032	-.367	.165	-.290	-.303	-.327	-.533	.027
UNSURE_QUOTING	-.431	-.298	-.263	<b>.517</b>	-.234	-.340	-.487	-.003	-.249	<b>.518</b>	1	<b>.713</b>	<b>-.545</b>	-.488	<b>.552</b>	-.437	-.038	<b>-.569</b>	-.244	-.255	-.347	-.266
ANXIOUS_ORIGIN	-.421	-.374	-.396	<b>.745</b>	-.442	-.470	<b>-.606</b>	.007	-.195	<b>.614</b>	<b>.713</b>	1	-.510	-.398	.346	-.145	-.146	-.492	-.387	-.321	-.378	-.173
HAPPY_FLAG	<b>.663</b>	<b>.530</b>	.390	-.377	.288	.351	.511	.033	.220	-.357	<b>-.545</b>	<b>-.510</b>	1	<b>.592</b>	-.257	.154	-.024	.341	.303	<b>.520</b>	.279	.405
SOMETHING_DONE	<b>.573</b>	.381	.289	-.206	.310	.034	.349	.049	.473	-.086	-.488	-.398	<b>.592</b>	1	-.352	.294	.078	.487	.243	.275	-.100	.348
GUIDANCE	-.306	-.118	-.219	.314	-.416	-.371	-.453	.170	-.418	.032	<b>.552</b>	.346	-.257	-.352	1	-.300	-.376	-.322	.059	-.069	-.187	-.129
CONFID_BIOG	-.075	-.060	-.053	.038	-.059	-.066	.103	-.040	.226	-.367	-.437	-.145	.154	.294	-.300	1	.198	<b>.611</b>	-.208	-.105	-.191	.253
READ_HOW_REF	-.030	-.122	-.252	.077	.301	.066	.269	.136	<b>.571</b>	.165	-.038	-.146	-.024	.078	-.376	.198	1	.321	-.032	.297	-.065	.122
CON_QUOTING	.069	-.019	.050	-.161	.331	.203	.379	.269	<b>.593</b>	-.290	<b>-.569</b>	.492	.341	<b>.487</b>	-.322	<b>.611</b>	.321	1	.212	.045	.000	.421
FINDS_SOURCE	.323	.290	.082	-.302	.312	.157	.100	.319	.394	-.303	-.244	-.387	.303	.243	.059	-.208	-.032	.212	1	.379	.459	.161
RELIABLE	.475	.381	.290	-.352	.405	.432	.486	.188	.226	-.327	-.255	-.321	<b>.520</b>	.275	-.069	-.105	.297	.045	.379	1	.492	.252
ORIG_ACCURATE	.196	.000	.233	-.431	.390	.514	.193	-.175	-.147	<b>-.533</b>	-.347	-.378	.279	-.100	-.187	-.191	-.065	.000	.459	.492	1	.032
FEEL_SAFE	.141	.140	.114	-.199	.418	.335	.071	.104	.260	.027	-.266	-.173	.405	.348	-.129	.253	.122	.421	.161	.252	.032	1

Bold = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
 Italics = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).