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ABSTRACT

Higher education in Indonesia encourages university students to publish their work as part of lecturers’ assessments to inculcate an academic writing culture. Lack of students’ knowledge about plagiarism indicates a need for more studies on the effect of plagiarism on Online Learning Environment (OLE), Lecturers’ Assessment Practice (LAP), and Students’ Writing Skills (SWS). Lack of plagiarism awareness and prevention measures as well as lecturers’ feedback on student writing seems to exacerbate plagiarism practice. Therefore, this study assessed the influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on Student Plagiarism Practices (SPP). In this study, OLE refers to twelve subcontracts, including relevance, reflection, interaction, collaboration, tutor support, peer support, making sense, instructor support, authentic learning, active learning, student autonomy, computer competence, and material environment. LAP refers to language assessment and written work assessment. Meanwhile, SWS refers to subconstructs such as organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty. Finally, SPP refers to attitudes toward plagiarism and norms toward plagiarism. A multi-stage clustered sampling technique was used to select 155 lecturers teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) on Sulawesi Island as respondents. This study used a concurrent mixed method research design. A set of questionnaires was used to measure lecturers’ perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. An interview protocol was used to reveal EFL lecturers’ perceptions on student learning experiences for OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. The mean difference in lecturers’ perception on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification was also examined. The relationship between OLE and SPP; LAP and SPP; and SWS and SPP were investigated using simple linear regression. The influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on SPP was measured using multiple regression. This study showed that EFL lecturers’ perceptions on OLE were mostly at the expected level, whereas LAP and SPP were at the expected level while SWS mostly showed the difficult level. The results of the t-test showed that there was no significant mean difference in lecturers’ perception on OLE, LAP, and SWS based on gender and academic qualification. Simple linear regression showed that there was a significant relationship between OLE and SPP; and between LAP and SPP. Multiple regression results indicated that LAP had the most influence on SPP. Students’ learning experiences as reported by EFL lecturers in the interview results showed that reflection was dominant in OLE, and language assessment was dominant for LAP influence on SPP, especially for norms towards plagiarism. This study revealed that LAP has important implications for increasing students’ awareness on the importance of avoiding plagiarism, besides supporting the Ministry of Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia’s policy to prevent plagiarism.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Although online learning provides enormous advantages, it is not always regarded as an alternative method because inadequate equipment can weaken student learning. This technology should be appropriately used because students and teachers have individual outlooks on the teaching and learning process. The classroom environment not only expects and demands enhanced performance but also develops creativity to build and original and honest culture. In the academic environment, honesty is essential to encouraging integrity (Sutherland-Smith, 2008).

However, there is persistent worry by lecturers in a country where English is not the official language that a lack of writing ability might lead students to academic dishonesty. Some students are deficient in academic writing although English as Foreign Language (EFL) lecturers may have taught the required skills and students may have been able to pass necessary courses. Lecturers hope to improve student academic writing, but they use the established rating on assessment practice. Hence, what the lecturer expects from the student is not always the same as what the student achieves from the lecturer, especially in academic writing.

Finding valuable ways to develop student writing skills is a principle concern for EFL teachers (Lee and Schallert, 2008). Nevertheless, a lack of writing skill among EFL students might be attributed to poor teaching, curricular constraints, a lack of strict ratings, and assessment. Also, an undemanding breakdown on the part of lecturer
to teach the basic skills for creating the original works might influence students’ plagiarism practices. Whereas teaching techniques and content have changed over the years, a far greater cause of student inability to write without engaging in plagiarism may be due to a lack of writing assessment practices. Rating and grading students’ work and finding methods of responding to students writing might be the most stressful aspects of teaching for many lecturers. After lecturers return students’ work, they might have persistent uncertainties in fulfilling their students’ needs. Lecturers’ dissatisfaction might improve when they become conscious that most of their students confess they do not think about their assessment. Students’ habit of unconsciously considering lecturers’ assessments might be helpful in strengthening lecturers’ awareness of students’ writing ability.

Lecturers should concern themselves with a high-quality instruction plan as opposed to e-learning alternatives as a direct option to highlight quality rather than quantity. However, highlighting the quality of student writing in an online learning environment requires instructors to consider technology use for minimizing opportunities for academic dishonesty. However, Sutherland-smith (2008) stated that locating internet source material is often laborious and time-consuming. However, it is expected for teachers to use a range of approaches to recognize academic dishonesty using technology, such as the Google or Dogpile search engines, into which they type in “suspect” phrases or references.

Preventing student from plagiarism practices is not enough to use technology for plagiarism checks only. Townley and Parsell (2005) stated that it is a foolish solution to plagiarism practices in an internet environment to use only a specific technology. It is risky to refer to turnitin.com as an ideal solution; even if it provides valuable guidance and some supportive tools for both lecturers and students. Large classrooms, casualization of university teaching, and a shift from universities to economic procedures weaken scholar society. The solution to internet-promoted academic dishonesty should concern lecturers and students far more than student misuse of online resources. Solutions to internet plagiarism practices should focus on the prevention of plagiarism practice to strengthen academic integrity, not on the plagiarism practices itself. In contrast, Jones and Moore (2010) revealed that Turnitin, in general, is a vital tool in the struggle for anti-plagiarism practices and an ideal
prevention application. However, strong-minded student is capable on manipulating the implementation of the software. Therefore, academic staff who uses Turnitin must be aware of similarity in the form of ideas on papers submitted to Turnitin. Apparently, high similarity scores between submitted materials and resource materials indicates a cause for concern. However, low scores are not a guarantee free form plagiarism, so it also a cause of concern for lecturers. Eventually, academic staff and professor is required to cautiously continue all forms of plagiarism practices.

Whatever the assessment, EFL lecturers may also argue that learning environments have significant effect on students’ plagiarism practices. Students may engage in plagiarism practices due to the online learning process, thereby plagiarism incidences might influence the academic environment. Therefore, stimulating a good educational atmosphere to be conducive to learning might encourages students to avoid plagiarism practices. Moreover, how EFL lecturers assess students’ writing skills is also an aspect of the learning process as a positive learning environment to stimulate students to respect ethics in an academic environment.

One of the primary goals of academic writing in an EFL setting is to develop EFL students with honor codes that avoid plagiarism practices (McCabe and Trevino, 1993). Therefore, an academic writing course requires students to engage actively and intensively in academic writing practices. Students are expected not only to pass the writing course by completing writing course assignments, but they are also expected to practice writing skills in thesis writing as well as publish their scientific works either at national or international level. The publication policy is required for students’ study accomplishment, students’ future career, and university’s reputation. Expectation of publication has been increased both in quality and quantity at the university and research institution. Honesty in writing, which demands the students be conscious of plagiarism practices, is one of quality standard of scientific publication.
1.2 Background of Study

The number of studies addressed the influence on students’ plagiarism practices are limited. Hu and Lei (2015) studied the gender-relations to the disciplinary background to influence the perception of bachelor students on plagiarism. Male students with soft disciplinary backgrounds perceived higher rates of avoiding plagiarism practice than their counterparts. Female students with soft disciplines background had a similar perception of plagiarism practices. Eriksson and McGee (2015) examined the plagiarism practices of university and college students. The results suggested that males viewed plagiarism practices as less severe and suggested that more proactive strategies were required to prevent student plagiarism practices.

Can and Walker (2011) focused on student perceptions and attitudes towards written feedback for academic writing at the doctorate level. This study explained the distinctiveness of written feedback from written feedback providers (reviewers) and characterized the relationship of some factors in feedback practices. This study revealed that doctorate students preferred written feedback on content, organization, and grammar as well as other factors. Also, this research portrayed that doctorate students preferred balanced negative and positive comments in the feedback provided by reviewers.

Coughlin (2015) studied plagiarism on regular Master students based on perspective with pedagogical, ethical and social economic implications. When various forces ensure that cheating is viewed as normal while detection and punishment are infrequent, many Master students engaged in plagiarism practices. Moreover, some universities provided inadequate training on strategies to prevent plagiarism. Many professors have little or no awareness on detecting student plagiarism practices, and they failed to take appropriate pedagogical instruction to prevent their students from engaging in plagiarism.

Hanna (2009) focused on writing apprehension and student perceptions of particular comments by teachers. Written comments might be equally significant to increasing student comfort and reducing student apprehension in writing. This study
places classroom teaching as essential to assisting students in the success of their writing efforts. In line with Sommers (2006), who was in the four year study of 400 hundred students found that instructor comments in final drafts frequently become the single space in writing instruction when students and teachers collaborate through feedback. Likewise, Lam (2013) focused on EFL student perceptions on writing ability, text improvement, and feedback using limited numbers of EFL pre-university students in Hong Kong with data collection concerned with the perceptions of students regarding their portfolio experiences.

Montgomery and Baker (2007) studied the writing issues in the form of students’ perception, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. The results of the study suggested that students received more than their teachers supposed in their feedback. Most students perceived that they were pleased with the amount of feedback in all areas of assessment. It is also suggested that students felt that teachers provided feedback based on student preferences or understanding. However, the limitation of this finding is that the emphasis was on local issues of grammar and mechanics on all drafts that may suggest to students to prioritize local errors. Moreover, theorists debate on how much feedback to give on local issues in a second language writing composition course, where the focus is on learning principles of composition.

Rovai (2000) and Beyth-Marom et al. (2003) focused on the internet learning environment as a fundamental aspect of distance learning. Rovai (2000) stated that the approach of assessment principles are implemented to guide student assessment in a traditional learning environment remains unchanged in an online learning environment. The assessment approaches in a traditional classroom is inadequate for distance education due to a lack of control over assessment conditions, available resources, and distance learner isolation. It is essential that lecturers have an obvious underlying principle for assessing students through certain methods as well as the methods for lecturers to interpret student performance.

Furthermore, Beyth-Marom et al. (2003) stated that an instructional designer should suit the learning environment to whoever will benefit more from each possible component or delivery medium. However, this study was restricted to achievement
variables and values. Therefore, other variables that could affect preferences for a specific learning environment should be studied, such as personality and cognitive variables. When computers and the internet will part of the learning environment in school and at home, working with computers would be one of the tools for a vibrant, friendly tool-kit for distance learners.

Jackson (2006) found that students need extra instruction and practice in how to paraphrase correctly. Students are deficient in this aptitude when reading sources or materials and writing scientific papers, especially in citing and referencing properly. Students seemed lack of understanding on the concept of synthesizing sources by composing it in their own words is one of elements of paraphrasing. Some instructors have started using tutorials in their regular classroom teaching. These instructors focus on providing examples of paraphrasing tutorials and use open-ended quiz questions on paraphrasing as part given assignments. This study needs further investigation to conclude the usefulness of this method.

The partnership between instructors and the library is remarkable for developing instructional resources for classroom use. Plagiarism, paraphrasing, and citing sources are presented in this tutorial, but ethics on instruction is lacking. Furthermore, Cumming (2001) studied the orientations that instructors adapt when conceptualizing curricula for ESL/EFL writing instruction. The adaptation would be appeared and could influence how teachers assessing students’ achievement. However, this study did not provide the design to investigate this matter, yet distinctions between specific purpose and general-purpose approaches to assessments have emerged as a notable trend across contexts and program types internationally.

Yugianingrum (2008) found that there are many academic papers, including EFL undergraduate theses that show low awareness of appropriate citing practices and poor supervisor attitudes toward the importance of citing other works properly. These problems may even threaten successful completion for most students. Increased requirements and the aforementioned reported problems make it a necessity to successfully facilitate and encourage student academic writing skills. The study comprised a textual analysis of bachelor theses to describe the type and manner of source citations and to interpret similarities and differences based on primary data.
analysis in both the literature and the linguistics field of study. He finally concluded that the authors of literature and linguistic theses violated general conventions about citation style, lack of citing skill, and low supervision awareness from the university.

Cahyono (2009) concluded that not all Indonesian universities have strong commitments to avoiding plagiarism. Octaberlina (2009) argued that plagiarism continues in Indonesia because students are required to adhere uniformly to a thesis format, but the government has failed to require regulations dealing with plagiarism. The harsh prevalence of plagiarism encouraged Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (2010) to issue the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia on the Prevention and Combating Plagiarism in Higher Education. This regulation was issued in an attempt to avoid plagiarism; however, the contribution of this policy on student plagiarism practices needs further study. Indeed, the success of the regulation might be determined by lecturers understanding plagiarism.

Kutieleh and Adiningrum (2011) stated that lecturer understanding of plagiarism is inconsistent, which inhibits student creative thinking and academic writing quality. Hence, the Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi (2012) requires students to be published in a scientific journal for a bachelor degree, a national scientific journal for a master degree, and International Journal for the doctorate level. However, this needs further study to prove that this policy of getting published either at the national or international level can encourage plagiarism practice prevention. Manalu (2013) argued that student knowledge uncertainty towards plagiarism necessitates more attention by lecturers to teach paraphrase and quotation skills to develop student academic writing. Disregarding first writing skills and writing publication culture in an endeavor to encourage plagiarism practice prevention may make the student plagiarism virus more infectious in future academic settings. Previous studies might not represent the factors that influence student plagiarism practices due to different English language areas, online learning environments, assessment practices, and writing ability. These problems are located in a limited number of studies that inform that practices require further explanation regarding some issues on plagiarism. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the influence of
Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, and Student Writing Skill on Student Plagiarism Practices.

1.3 Statement of Problems

The reorganized elaboration of human awareness in an advancing environmental matrix that emphasizes personality theory to encompass a time-based agreement of the capabilities of movement, inequity, worth, adjustment, alteration, integration, and shift. In the classroom environment, teachers should integrate students into connection zones with essential ability platforms in favor of encouragement emphasis (Moos, 1980). Teachers are supposed to confirm that they sustain student productively in online learning by presenting enormous prospects and huge amounts of information. This classroom environment is required for improve work as well as creating innovation and individual growth.

The Indonesian government through Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (2010) responded to the plagiarism issue by issuing the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia on the Prevention and Combating Plagiarism in Higher Education. This regulation is expected to avoid incidences of plagiarism. Higher education in Indonesia encourages university students at all level as the Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi (2012) requires students to get published in a scientific journal for a bachelor degree, a national scientific journal fora master degree, and an International Journal for doctoral level degree. This policy aims at promoting students to get published under lecturer assessment to endorse an academic writing culture in an academic environment. Indonesia has experienced many failures in academic dishonesty. Many academic papers, including EFL undergraduate theses, show low awareness of appropriate citing practices and poor supervisor attitudes toward the importance of citing other works correctly (Yugianingrum, 2008). However, not all Indonesian universities are committed to avoiding plagiarism (Cahyono, 2005).
Plagiarism in Indonesia exists as a result of student requirements to adhere uniformly to a thesis format, with a failure by the government to successfully impose regulations to deal with plagiarism (Octoberlina, 2009). Adiningrum (2011) stated that missed cultural understandings and inconsistencies in lecturer understanding on plagiarism inhibit student creative thinking and academic writing. Student plagiarism practices seemed to be influenced by a lack of student understanding of plagiarism and academic writing teaching, especially in properly citing and quoting. Manalu (2013) revealed that the lack of student knowledge on plagiarism requires an endorsement of teaching paraphrasing and quotations to develop student writing skills and to promote plagiarism practice prevention.

This encouragement does not seem to affect student plagiarism practices. The lack of student insight on plagiarism practices indicates a need for more studies on online learning environment, lecture assessment practice, and student writing skills. A lack plagiarism practice prevention as well as lecturer feedback on student writing seems to exacerbate plagiarism practices. Hence, this study aims to determine the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment (OLE), Lecturer Assessment Practice (LAP), Students Writing Skills (SWS), and Student Plagiarism Practices (SPS). Differences based on gender and academic qualification on EFL lecturer perceptions towards OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP were examined. The relationship and influence of independent variables (OLE, LAP, SWS) and the dependent variable (SPP) were also investigated. Finally, this study aims to find out EFL lecturer perceptions of the student learning experience on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study aims to receive current information from lecturers regarding the factors affecting student plagiarism practices. The objectives of this study are:
(i) To determine the EFL lecturers’ perception on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills, and Students’ Plagiarism Practices.

(ii) To examine differences on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills, and Students’ Plagiarism Practice based on gender and academic qualification.

(iii) To investigate the relationship between independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills) and dependent variable (Students’ Plagiarism Practices).

(iv) To find out which variables are good predictors of plagiarism practices.

1.5 Questions of the Study

Based on the objectives of the study above, the researcher formulated the study questions as follows:

(i) What is the level of EFL lecturers’ perception on Online Learning Environment, Lectures’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills, and Students Plagiarism Practices?

(ii) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturer’s perception on Online Learning Environment based on gender and academic qualification?

(iii) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Lecturers’ Assessment Practice based on gender and academic qualification?

(iv) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Writing Skills based on gender and academic qualification?

(v) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Plagiarism Practices based on gender and academic qualification?
(vi) Is there any significant relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students’ Plagiarism Practices?

(vii) Is there any significant relationship between Lecturers’ Assessment Practice and Students’ Plagiarism Practices?

(viii) Is there any significant relationship between Students Writing Skills and Students’ Plagiarism Practices?

(ix) Is there any significant influence between the independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills) and the dependent variable (Students’ Plagiarism Practices)?

(x) What is the EFL lecturers’ perception based on students’ experiential learning on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students Writing Skills, and Students’ Plagiarism Practices?

1.6 Hypothesis

(i) Hypothesis null 1: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Online Learning Environment based on gender.

(ii) Hypothesis null 2: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Online Learning Environment based on academic qualification.

(iii) Hypothesis null 3: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Lecturers’ Assessment Practice based on gender.

(iv) Hypothesis null 4: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Lecturers’ Assessment Practice based on academic qualification.

(v) Hypothesis null 5: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Writing Skills based on gender.
(vi) Hypothesis null 6: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Writing Skill based on academic qualification.

(vii) Hypothesis null 7: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Plagiarism Practices based on gender.

(viii) Hypothesis null 8: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers’ perception on Students’ Plagiarism Practices based on academic qualification.

(ix) Hypothesis null 9: There is no significant relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students’ Plagiarism Practices.

(x) Hypothesis null 10: There is no significant relationship between Lecturers’ Assessment Practice and Students’ Plagiarism Practices.

(xi) Hypothesis null 11: There is no significant relationship between Students Writing Skills and Students’ Plagiarism Practices.

(xii) Hypothesis null 12: There is no significant influence between the independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills) and the dependent variable (Students’ Plagiarism Practices).

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study determined the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Students Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study also examined differences on EFL lecturer perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification. The relationship and influence of the independent variables (OLE, LAP, SWS) with the dependent variable (SPP) were the main issues, which were investigated in this study. EFL lecturer perceptions from student experiential learning on Online Learning
Environment, Lecturers Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices were also found out in this study. This study implemented a concurrent mixed method design with questionnaire and interview protocol instruments. MNSQ fit statistics and inferential statistics were applied for the quantitative part, and thematic analysis was used for the qualitative part.

1.8. The Significance of the Study

This study is expected to be enormously worthwhile for readers, especially for EFL lecturers who wish to obtain information on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Students’ Writing Skills, and Students’ Plagiarism Practices. Readers can gain information on differences from EFL lecturers’ perception on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification. The reader is also expected to get information on the relationship and the influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on SPP.

By reading this thesis, readers are also expected to find information on new references from the questionnaire on online Learning Environments, Lecturers’ Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. Because this study uses the mixed method, the reader is also expected to get an overview of the new protocol interview on plagiarism practices. The theme that emerged from the qualitative methods in this thesis can be used as a reference or preliminary conceptual framework about the factors that cause students to engage in plagiarism. This study also reckoned the self-reflection of EFL lecturers on the effort which they assess student scientific works to discourage plagiarism engagement. This study is also a conceptual framework for the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, especially for Universitas Negeri Makassar to nurture endeavors on plagiarism deterrence.
1.9 Theoretical Framework

The theory of Murray in the late Murray (2007) on personality exploration underlies this study. The exploration of personality theory emphasizes the reorganized elaboration of human perception in a moving environmental matrix comprised of a temporal unity of motile, discrimination, value, assimilation, adaptation, integration, differentiation, and reproduction. In the context of the classroom environment, teachers should integrate students into relationship areas with necessary skill programs by emphasizing task oriented support (Moos, 1980). Teachers should ensure that they support students efficiently dealing with online learning sources, which offer enormous opportunities and information (McKimm et al., 2003). This type of classroom environment not only expects and demands better performance but augments creativity to create original and personal development. In the context of examinations, factors affecting Plagiarism Practices, Online Learning Environments, Lecturer Assessment Practices, and Students Writing Skills were four vital issues.
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**Figure 1.1:** Theoretical Framework
Murray's theory on personality exploration is the primary foundation for this study. Exploration, as mentioned in exploration in personality theory, provides an essential emphasis on systematically redefining human perception in a dynamic environment. The presence of a brief unitary time determines the dynamic of the environment. Differences lead people to the process of adaptation, assimilation, integration, and even reproduction, which characterizes dynamism. What is interesting in the theory of exploitation is the element of value. In this case, dynamism is also highly determined by the existence of elements of value. A person who values an object will determine a pro and con attitude that can, of course, encourage the emergence of integration, assimilation, or even discrimination.

In the context of the classroom environment, teachers should promote integration principles. Teachers must strive to realize necessary writing skills with the accomplishment of task completion (Moos, 1980). The existence of task targets is provides learning encouragement to achieve desired targets. However, Teachers also should fully support students to efficiently access online learning resources (McKimm et al., 2003). The presence of online learning resources, of course, offers excellent opportunities and unlimited information access. A classroom environment in the midst of an online environment is undoubtedly expected to produce a much better output and increased creativity to create original scientific works and personal self-development to prevent plagiarism practices.

1.10 Conceptual Framework

Some theories underpin the conceptual framework of this study. The concept of the Online Learning Environment in this study comes from an exploration in personality theory by the late Murray (2007), an evaluation of classroom learning environment by Moos (1980), and ABC learning and teaching by McKimm et al. (2003). Exploration in personality theory emphasizes human perception, which is regularly elaborated in a dynamic environment that has an element of integration and value (the late Murray, 2007). Integration and fundamental values should emphasize task-oriented support (Moos, 1980). This is so that teachers guarantee support for
accessing online reading resources (McKimm et al., 2003). For the Online Learning Environment, the researcher used a questionnaire developed by Walker and Fraser (2005), Clayton (2007), and Taylor and Maor (2014). This variable consists of relevance, reflection, interaction, collaboration, tutor support, peer support, making sense, instructor support, authentic learning, active learning, student autonomy, computer competence, and material environment.

The theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment” and “ABC Learning and Teaching” underpins Lecturer Assessment Practices in this study. In the context of evaluating classroom learning environments, teachers should integrate students into relationship areas with necessary skills programs by emphasizing task oriented support (Moos, 1980). In ABC learning and teaching theory, teachers should ensure that they support students in efficiently dealing with learning information that enables students to access broad information sources. These theories comprise the basis of a questionnaire that meets teacher elements of assessment to ensure adequate skill in doing a task. Specifically, the Trinity Inclusive Curriculum (2012) focusing on written work assessment and Brown and Hudson (1998) focusing on alternative assessment of language. These two issues are considered related to the form of assessment by EFL lecturers.

The variable of “Student Writing Skills” is also underpinned by the theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment”. It is advisable for teachers to integrate students with relationship spaces using necessary skills programs with task-oriented support (Moos, 1980). Accordingly, the primary skill for accomplishing this task is writing skill. The researcher modified the variable of Student Writing Skills from some studies and rubrics (Brown and Bailey, 1984; Tullos, 2014; Arizona Department of Education, 2011; Trauth, 2007; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013). Student Writing Skills includes organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty.

The variable of “Student Plagiarism Practices” is underpinned by the theory of Murray (the late Murray, 2007) and ABC Learning and Teaching (McKimm et al., 2003). Personality exploration highlights value and reproduction. The better students
perceive value, the higher the quality of reproduction regarding a given task. Moreover, in ABC Learning and Teaching theory, teachers should provide explicit support to help student access substantial learning resources while emphasizing academic integrity to avoid plagiarism practices. In this study, the researcher modified a questionnaire provided by Mavrinac et al. (2010), who studied attitudes toward plagiarism.
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**Figure 1.2**: Conceptual Framework
1.11 Definition of Terms

The definition of terms deals with a brief explanation of the specific abbreviations for all the variables in this study. The researcher provides the abbreviation of EFL to avoid ambiguity with ESL. The Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices are briefly described as variables in this study.

1.11.1 English as a Foreign Language

EFL in this study context is taught as a compulsory subject at academic settings (Mistar, 2014), but it is not an official language. It is commonly accepted that EFL is attributed to the position of English in countries where English is not the official language (Broughton et al., 2002), but it is still taught in an academic setting. English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2014) is defined as “English as taught to people whose English is not the main language and where English is not the official or main language for the public in a country.” English in Indonesia is not used as a communication tool as it is not the primary language. However, in Indonesia, English is a mandatory subject for in secondary schools to enable students to learn the four necessary language skills regarding listening, reading, writing, and speaking.

1.11.2 Online Learning Environment

The Online Learning Environment (OLE) in this study is student learning conditions and the way they influence how students successfully learn using computers and courses provided on the internet. The Online Learning Environment is derived from e-learning and environment. E-learning is learning done by studying at home using computers and courses provided on the internet (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2014b). The environment is defined by Cambridge Dictionaries Online
(2014c) as “the conditions that people live or work in and influence how people feel or how effectively people can work.” The potential for online learning in an academic setting has grown. Students can now access knowledge from textbooks and from lesson materials from outside the school. Teachers and students can access extensive information from libraries around the world. The online environment can provide information on various media as the internet is an extensive library. Students and teachers can improve learning in the classroom by accessing information from various sources on the internet through websites or other education providers. Pearson and Trinidad (2005) studied that educators need learning theories knowledge, best practice models in designing and implementing learning online, and feedback in specifying attempts to match the favourite of students’ learning environment. Furthermore, Walker and Fraser (2005); Clayton (2007) revealed that distance education is an essential learning environment. However, Taylor and Maor (2000a) ensemble teachers, lecturers, and researchers as well as for those who concern on the online academic role to promote the university teaching reform.

1.1.3 Lecturer Assessment Practice

The Term Lecturer Assessment Practices in this study is an approach that necessitates students to achieve or produce something before examinations to enhance the ability of students to master specific subjects. Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2018) defines assess as “to decide the quality or importance of something.” Lecturers are expected to allow students to be assessed in the standard classroom. Lecturers should provide students assignments that correspond to crucial pedagogical performance. Moreover, lecturers should highlight the process of learning to produce and tap into higher stage thinking and analytic skills. For better assessment practices, lecturers also should afford information about both the strengths and weakness of points raised by students. Brown (2001) reported that assessment principles, in general, might include assessment shapes learning, it is, therefore, changing learning must be in line with changing the assessment method. Brown (2004) describes the relationship among the reasonable cost, proper time limit, flexible to administer, and time-efficient to provide score or evaluation. This in line with National Council of
Teachers of English (2013) that pedagogical and curricular goals enlighten the best assessment practice whereby teachers design assessments based on the context of assessment in classroom. Trinity Inclusive Curriculum (2012) concerned on the understanding of the coursework, skill to explain, evaluate, reflect, and apply theory as well as research skills, for instance, the ability to learn, assess, organize, and synthesize resources in an academic setting.

1.11.4 Student Writing Skills

A primary meaning of writing as defined by Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2014b) is “a person’s style or forming letters and words with a pen or pencil, or something is written. Skill in this research is one dimension of knowledge saving, which is expanded extensively and deeply through practice.” Thus, writing skills is a fundamental skill that can be obtained in school and is vital means of written communication. Unfortunately, students often ignore this skill. Writing skills is a meaningful way to express thoughts while communicating ideas and views to others. In this study, writing skills are very dependent on mastery of the elements of writing. These writing elements are organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty. Helping students to develop their writing skills is expected to avoid plagiarism practices. The students writing skill in this study is related to some studies and rubrics (Arizona Department of Education, 2011; Association of American College and Universities, 2013; Brown and Bailey, 1984; Trauth, 2007; Tullos, 2014). Students writing skill includes organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing and summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty.

1.11.5 Student Plagiarism Practice

The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2014) defines plagiarism as “the act of using another person’s words or ideas without giving credit to that person.”
Plagiarism in this study is using other people’s words, but with a lack of quotations, improper citations, or poor paraphrasing. Plagiarism occurs when someone uses previous descriptions of a research method, but fails to quote or cite their sources. Plagiarism also occurs if someone translates a part of a paper from a foreign language, but she/he has no idea what to write. A self-published work that does not provide citations is also plagiarism. Plagiarism also happens due to the lack of understanding of what plagiarism is. Some students also are tempted to plagiarize because they are in an environment where many other students are doing it. Mavrinac et al. (2010) and Pupovac et al. (2010) advised that ostensible formula, academic integrity, and awareness of the possible relationships impresses to begin the research. Ma et al. (2008) described the impact of the internet in the learning environment from the negative (plagiarism) and positive aspect (plagiarism deterrent).

1.12 Summary

The limited number of studies on plagiarism practices indicates that this is an area that requires further investigation. Therefore, this study aims to measure the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study also investigates difference based on gender and academic qualification on EFL lecturer perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. This study examines the relationship and the influence of independent variables (OLE, LAP, and SWS) on the dependent variable (SPP). Finally, this study also explored EFL lecturer perceptions from student experiential learning on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study is expected to provide information on new references concerning the questionnaire for Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. The reader is expected to get an overview of a new protocol interview on plagiarism practices. The themes that emerged through the qualitative methods in this thesis can be a reference or preliminary conceptual framework for readers about how factors influence students to engage in plagiarism.
The conceptual framework of this study is underpinned by the concept of an Online Learning Environment as an exploration of Murray’s personality theory, “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment” theory, and “ABC Learning and Teaching”. Lecturers’ Assessment Practice is underpinned by the theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment” and “ABC Learning and Teaching.” The variable of “Students’ Writing Skills” is also underpinned by the theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment.” The variable of “Students’ Plagiarism Practices” is underpinned by Murray’s personality theory and “ABC Learning and Teaching”.

EFL in this study is a compulsory subject at academic setting, but it is not an official language. The Online Learning Environment (OLE) in this study is the conditions of students who learn on a computer and the way this influences how they learn. Lecturer assessment practices in this study is an approach that necessitates students to achieve or produce something before examinations to enhance the ability of students to master certain subjects. Writing skills is a basic skill that can be obtained at school and is a vital means of written communication. Plagiarism in this study is using other people’s words, but with a lack of quotations, improper citation, or poor paraphrasing. The next chapter discusses the literature review of this study.
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