

KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

APPLIED LINGUISTICS MASTER'S PROGRAM

**EXPLORING TURKISH EFL AND ELT UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTORS'
PERCEPTION, ATTITUDE, AND AWARENESS TOWARD PLAGIARISM
THROUGH THE LENS OF MASTER AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS**

MASTER'S THESIS

Berat Ece KÖSE

SEPTEMBER - 2023

TRABZON

KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

APPLIED LINGUISTICS MASTER'S PROGRAM

**EXPLORING TURKISH EFL AND ELT UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTORS'
PERCEPTION, ATTITUDE, AND AWARENESS TOWARD PLAGIARISM
THROUGH THE LENS OF MASTER AND DOCTORAL STUDENTS**

MASTER'S THESIS

Berat Ece KÖSE

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU

SEPTEMBER - 2023

TRABZON

APPROVAL

Upon the submission of the dissertation, **Berat Ece KÖSE** has defended the study “**Exploring Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors’ Perception, Attitude, and Awareness toward Plagiarism through the Lens of Master and Doctoral Students**” in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics at Karadeniz Technical University, and the study has been found fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis by **unanimous / majority** on **10.11.2023**.

Committee Member		Decision		Signature
Title - Name and SURNAME	Mission	Accept	Refuse	
Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU	Supervisor	☐	☐	
Asst. Prof. Öznur SEMİZ	Member	☐	☐	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necat KUMRAL	Member	☐	☐	

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Tülay İLHAN NAS
Director

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, **Berat Ece KÖSE**, hereby confirm and certify that;

- I am the sole author of this work and I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution,
- this work contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other university or institution,
- no data and findings in the work have not been falsified or embellished,
- this is a true copy of the work approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Karadeniz Technical University, including final revisions required by them.
- I understand that my work may be electronically checked for plagiarism by the use of plagiarism detection software and stored on a third party's server for eventual future comparison,
- I take full responsibility in case of non-compliance with the above statements in respect of this work.

Signature.....

Date 29.09.2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my special appreciation to all people putting support behind, encouraging, and believing in me during thesis process. It took a long and stressful time to complete my thesis. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and sincere thanks to my thesis supervisor Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU for his continuous support and conscientious guidance for the research. I am wholeheartedly thankful to him for his patience throughout my thesis writing process, fatherly encouragement, and limitless tolerance. Without doubt, I would not be able to finish my thesis successfully with his help, patience, and suggestions.

Also, I would like to thank and express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Kemal SANCAK for his generous heart, which always offers support, guidance, encouragement, and insightful advice. I am wholeheartedly thankful to him for broadening my horizon for my life and beyond.

September, 2023

Berat Ece KÖSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
ÖZET.....	VIII
ABSTRACT	IX
LIST OF TABLES	X
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	XI

INTRODUCTION.....	1-3
-------------------	-----

CHAPTER ONE

1. FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY.....	4-10
1.1. Background of the Study.....	4
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	5
1.3. Significance of the Study	7
1.4. Purpose of the Study	9
1.5. Research Questions	9
1.6. Limitation of the Study	9
1.7. Outline of the Study	10

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11-35
2.2. The Origin of Plagiarism.....	12
2.3. Definitions of Plagiarism	13
2.4. Instructors' Messages about Plagiarism.....	14
2.5. University Instructors' Perception about Plagiarism	15
2.5.1. Perception	15
2.5.2. Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism.....	16
2.5.3. Instructors' Perception of the Different Forms of Plagiarism.....	17
2.5.4. Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism and the Cultural Context	18
2.5.5. The association between Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism.....	20

2.6. University Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism	22
2.6.1. Attitude	22
2.6.2. Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism	23
2.6.3. Instructors' Attitude toward the Different Forms of Plagiarism	24
2.6.4. Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism and the Cultural Context	25
2.6.5. The association between Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism	26
2.7. University Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism	28
2.7.1. Awareness	28
2.7.2. Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism	29
2.7.3. Instructors' Awareness of Artificial Intelligence (AI)	30
2.7.4. Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism and the Cultural Context	32
2.7.5. The association between Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism	32
2.8. Studies about EFL and ELT Instructors Perception, Attitude, and Awareness of Plagiarism	34

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY	36-47
3.1. Introduction	36
3.2. Research Design	36
3.3. Participants and Setting	38
3.3.1. Demographic Information of the Participants and Universities	39
3.4. Data Collection Tools	41
3.4.1. The Questionnaire	41
3.4.2. Semi-Structured Interviews	43
3.5. Piloting Process	44
3.6. Data Collection Process	45
3.7. Data Analysis Procedure	46

CHAPTER FOUR

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	48-76
4.1. Introduction	48
4.2. Analysis of Quantitative Data	48
4.2.1. Initial Information for the Questionnaire	48
4.2.2. Analysis of Perception Statements	53

4.2.3. Analysis of Attitude Statements.....	57
4.2.4. Analysis of Awareness Statements	61
4.2.5. Analysis of Initial Information about Artificial Intelligence	65
4.2.6. Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Statements	67
4.3. Analysis of Qualitative Data	69
4.3.1. Perception of the Concept of Plagiarism.....	69
4.3.2. Perception of Students Responsibility to Plagiarism	71
4.3.3. Perception of Instructors Responsibility to Plagiarism	72
4.3.4. Instructors Attitude toward Plagiarism Impact on Students' Plagiarism Behaviour	73
4.3.5. Awareness to Reducing Plagiarism.....	74
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	77
REFERENCES.....	82
APPENDIXES	97
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	112

ÖZET

Öğrencilerin intihal eylemleri üniversitelerde giderek büyüyor ve endişe edici bir sorun teşkil etmektedir. İntihal sorunu çoğunlukla üniversite öğrencisine atfedilse de üniversite eğitmenleri de istemsizce intihal sorununa sebep olabilirler. Bu sebeple, bu çalışmanın amacı Türk EFL ve ELT Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının intihale yönelik algılarını, tutumlarını ve farkındalıklarını yüksek lisans ve doktor öğrencilerin gözünden belirlemek. Ayrıca, bu çalışma Türk EFL ve ELT Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının öğrencilerine intihal konusunda açık ve tutarlı mesajlar aktararak intihale yol açmamasını bulmayı hedeflemiştir. Karma yöntem yaklaşımı benimsenerek veriler hem niceliksel hem de niteliksel olarak toplanmıştır. Nicel veriler 114 katılımcıdan anket yoluyla elde edildi. Özellikle nitel veriler, 7 kişinin yer aldığı yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Bulgular, Türk EFL ve ELT Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının yüksek intihal algısına sahip olduğunu göstermiştir. Fakat, onlar değiştirerek yazmak (sham paraphrasing) ve ikincil alıntılama (secondary citation) konusunda yüksek bir algıya sahip değillerdi. Ayrıca Türk EFL ve ELT Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının intihal konusunda olumsuz tutuma sahip oldukları ortaya çıktı. Özellikle bu üniversite öğretim elemanlarının kendini kendine intihal türüne (self-plagiarism) ve üçüncü kişinin bilgisi dahilinde yapılan intihal türüne (other plagiarism) karşı güçlü olumsuz bir tutum benimsemedikleri ortaya çıktı. Ayrıca Türk EFL ve ELT Üniversitesi Öğretim Elemanlarının intihal konusunda yeterli farkındalık düzeyine sahip oldukları görülmüştür. Dahası bu üniversite öğretim elemanlarının yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencilerine intihal konusunda açık ve tutarlı mesajlar aktardıkları tespit edilmiştir. Ancak öğrencilerin bu mesajlara çoğunlukla dönemin başındaki derslerinde maruz kaldıkları ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yükseköğretim, Türk EFL Eğitmenleri, Türk ELT Eğitmenleri, İntihal, Akademik Dürüstlük

ABSTRACT

The act of student plagiarism is a growing and concerning issue within the universities. Although the blame is mainly attributed to the students, it might be inadvertently aroused by the university instructors. In this regard, the aim of the present study is to determine Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness toward plagiarism through the lens of master and doctoral students. Additionally, it intended to identify whether Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors are able to provide their student with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. By adapting a mixed method approach, the data was collected both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative data was obtained through a questionnaire from 114 participants. In particular, the qualitative data, was gather through semi-structured interviews, in which 7 interviewees took part. The findings demonstrated that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors' have high perception of plagiarism. However, they did not have a high level of perception to sham paraphrasing and secondary citation. Moreover, it was revealed that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors' have a negative toward plagiarism. In particular, these university instructors did not possess a strong negative attitude to self-plagiarism and other plagiarism. Also, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors were found to have appropriate awareness level of plagiarism. In addition, it was found out that these university instructors transmitted their MA and PhD students with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. Nevertheless, it become clear that the students were exposed to these message mainly at the beginning of the courses.

Keywords: Higher education, Turkish EFL Instructors, Turkish ELT Instructors, Plagiarism, Academic Integrity

LIST OF TABLES

Table No	Table Name	Page Nr.
1	Overview of the Study's Methodology.....	36
2	Demographic Information of the Participants	39
3	Demographic Information about Participants Universities.....	40
4	Educating/Informing about Plagiarism.....	49
5	Usage of Anti-plagiarism Program.....	49
6	Avoiding Plagiarism	50
7	Consequences of Plagiarism	50
8	Factors Influencing to Commit Plagiarism.....	52
9	Perception of Plagiarism.....	54
10	Perception of Paraphrasing.....	56
11	Attitude toward Plagiarism	58
12	The Impact of Cultural Context on Plagiarism	59
13	Foreign Language and Plagiarism	60
14	Awareness of Consequences of Committing Plagiarism	61
15	Awareness of Institutional Plagiarism Policies	62
16	Awareness of Intentional Plagiarism	63
17	Awareness of Unintentional Plagiarism	63
18	Awareness of Paraphrasing.....	64
19	Background and Engagement Information about Artificial Intelligence.....	66
20	Awareness of Artificial Intelligence.....	68

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI	: Artificial Intelligence
EFL	: English Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
MA	: Master
PhD	: Doctor of Philosophy
SPSS	: Statistical Package for Social Sciences



INTRODUCTION

Plagiarism by students is a moral maze, because it raises important ethical and moral questions about good/bad or right/wrong behaviour and about acceptable/unacceptable practices. Who decides it is wrong, on what basis and for what reasons? Who is responsible for deciding on behavioural norms in the context of plagiarism?

(Chris Park, 2003: 474)

Without doubt, instructors have several responsibilities within the higher education institutions. However, the most important one is to provide students with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. According to Leask (2006) instructors need to convey the message that plagiarism is a serious act of wrongdoing. Similarly, Heberling (2002) stated that university instructors need to get across the message that plagiarism will not be tolerated. Especially, in order to send out these messages' instructors need to address, identify, and respond to plagiarism. Some university instructors carry out these issues precisely, some implement those rarely, and some do not even do those. Indeed, scholars have offered mounting evidence that the carried-out actions and reactions towards plagiarism varied among university instructors. For instance, Evering & Moorman (2012) highlighted that most of the instructors do not actively address plagiarism within the courses. Moreover, Zobel & Hamilton (2002) pointed out that many university instructors are unwilling to detect plagiarism because they are not regarding it as their duty. Also, De Maio et al., (2019) reported by reviewing the literature that there is a considerable diversity in instructors' responses toward plagiarism.

Certainly, university instructors need to construct an environment in which clear and coherent messages can be conveyed about plagiarism. In particular, EFL Instructors need to create such an environment as Lei & Hu (2014) emphasized they are the ones who are assigned to introduce the concept of plagiarism to their EFL students. Besides EFL Instructors, it is also significant that ELT Instructors establish this kind of environment for their students. In fact, the first step to establish this kind of environment is dependent upon EFL and ELT university instructors' perception of plagiarism. According to Sutherland-Smith (2008) instructors reflect their perceptions of plagiarism in their teaching and learning settings. Thus, instructors' perception mediate how students are educated regarding plagiarism. Furthermore, Husain et al. (2017) emphasized that the hold perception of plagiarism is able to influence one's utilized practices and made decisions toward plagiarism. Then, how plagiarism is practiced as well as how plagiarism is handled can vary as it depends on the university instructors' own perception of plagiarism. This means that students can receive inconsistent and conflicting information about plagiarism from different university instructors. The study of Flint et al. (2006) displayed that differences in instructors perception of

plagiarism resulted in misinforming students about the concept of plagiarism as well as acceptable and unacceptable practices. In this regard, it is significant to comprehend EFL and ELT Instructors perception of plagiarism, as instructors' perception of plagiarism can influence educational process of plagiarism.

To form such an environment also depend on EFL and ELT Instructors attitude. In this sense, Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra (2016) highlighted that as academic role model's instructors' stance toward plagiarism matters as it can impact students' behaviours toward plagiarism. Similarly, Husain et al. (2017) stated that university instructors' attitude toward plagiarism can directly shape students' behaviours either in a positive or negative way regarding plagiarism. Hence, instructors' attitude has a strong impact on students' behaviours. Students do not only observe their university instructors, but also adopt their instructors' attitude toward plagiarism. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that instructors' model appropriate attitudes toward plagiarism. However, Pickard (2006) identified that instructor's stance toward plagiarism varied within as well as outside of the courses. Moreover, Sutherland-Smith (2005) found that even university instructors who work in the same academic community widely differed in their attitudes toward plagiarism. Particularly, the variations of instructors toward attitude can send ambiguous and even wrong messages about plagiarism to the students. Indeed, Volpe et al. (2008) pointed out that instructors' different stances toward plagiarism does not enable students to receive clear messages; rather, it leads students to get mixed messages regarding plagiarism. Given that attitudes of university instructors can convey messages about plagiarism, it becomes important to grasp EFL and ELT Instructors stance toward plagiarism as it can signal correct or wrong messages to their students.

Promoting this kind of environment is not only based on EFL/ELT Instructors perception and EFL/ELT Instructors attitude, but also on EFL and ELT Instructors awareness of plagiarism. Specifically, awareness of plagiarism equips university instructors with reframing approaches to plagiarism. To be more specific, instructors' awareness of plagiarism has an effect on identifying and revising methods that can contribute to any occurrences of plagiarism. Within this context, Lancaster & Clarke (2008) emphasized that by possessing awareness of plagiarism instructors refrain from setting assignments that can give students opportunities to commit plagiarism. Being only aware of the traditional ways in which students can plagiarize is not sufficient, it is also valuable that university instructors are aware of the digital tools or Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools that can be used for cases of misconducts. In particular, the awareness of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools that can be used by students to write some paragraphs of the paper or the entire paper, can help instructors to remain alert against all forms of plagiarism. By being aware of plagiarism university instructors can not only take precautions against plagiarism, but also can raise and deepen students' awareness regarding plagiarism. In this respect, Pecorari (2013) highlighted that instructors' awareness of plagiarism can create and increase students' awareness about plagiarism. Then, awareness of plagiarism by university instructors can assist and even accelerate student's

familiarization with the concept of plagiarism. Clearly, all of these acts require to have high awareness of plagiarism. However, studies demonstrate that university instructors possess different degrees of awareness regarding plagiarism. For example, the research of Adiningrum et al. (2013) revealed instructors possessed lack awareness of plagiarism. A more recent study, Khathayut & Walker-Gleaves (2021) found out that instructors possessed low awareness of plagiarism. Having lack awareness of plagiarism as well as low awareness of plagiarism can have negative impacts such as presenting students with confusing messages about plagiarism. From this perspective, the study of Farahian et al. (2020) has displayed that instructors with lack awareness of plagiarism can contribute to false assumptions about plagiarism. Consequently, it seems essential to understand and to determine EFL and ELT Instructors awareness of plagiarism.

Although the messages that must be delivered to the students in terms of plagiarism are predetermined in the academia, it appears that students do not always receive these messages regarding plagiarism from their instructors. For such a critical area that interacts with students' thoughts, behaviours or values about plagiarism, the lack of clear as well as consistent messages regarding plagiarism can contribute to confusion surrounding plagiarism among students. Moreover, the deficiency of such messages can even lead students to consider plagiarism as an acceptable behaviour. This implies that students will inadvertently internalize the wrong messages about plagiarism. Specifically, Master Students (MA) and Doctoral Students (PhD) might be extra vulnerable to internalizing conflicting messages or even misleading messages regarding plagiarism as the notion of plagiarism is a foreign concept, which has also been highlighted by several scholars (Bloch, 2007; Kutieleh & Adiningrum, 2011; Pennycook, 1994; Scollon, 1995; Silfiani, 2018). Another potential reason for embracing this kind of messages by EFL/ ELT MA and PhD students is that they are new to the academia, which ultimately means they rely on as well as orient themselves in terms of their instructors. Therefore, it becomes crucial to examine EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism through the lens of master students and doctoral students.

CHAPTER ONE

1. FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

1.1. Background of the Study

Beyond any doubt, plagiarism is not a favoured topic by university students. While pursuing my bachelor's degree, it was not a favourite subject for me either. Especially during my thesis writing, it became a nightmare for me. Not only feeling an overwhelming sense of pressure to cite effectively, but also to successfully rephrase scholars' ideas. Further, being concerned about whether I have been committing any kind of plagiarism. Such difficulties severely demotivated me and even lead me believe that I am incapable of comprehending issues surrounding plagiarism. I am certain that there are also university students who see themselves as the main problem in understanding plagiarism issues. In addition to students, different scholars' studies (Deckert, 1993; Ha, 2006; Handa & Power, 2005; Walker & White, 2014) have also shown that instructors regard students lack understanding of plagiarism as students' own fault. Not only are students portrayed as the ones who are not able to grasp plagiarism issues, but they are also left alone in their struggles regarding plagiarism. I also was left alone with the complexities of plagiarism by my thesis supervisor. The only notice that I have received in the matter of plagiarism was a list of warnings such as plagiarism acts have serious consequences, stay away from committing plagiarism and so on. In each meeting, solely this aspect of plagiarism has been elaborated and emphasized by my supervisor. In particular, this approach of my instructor resulted in creating prejudice against the subject of plagiarism. The prejudice against plagiarism persisted not only while I was writing my bachelor's thesis, but also after I completed it. I even carried these prejudices against plagiarism into my master's education. However, one of my MA instructors eradicated these prejudices and even made me to enjoy the topic plagiarism. Of course, these conditions did not occur within just one or two courses. In fact, those conditions have developed throughout the semester as a result of receiving clear messages about plagiarism and being constantly exposed to these messages by the instructor. These messages were not just spoken aloud by the instructor; they were also integrated into dialogues, discussion, as well as practices regarding plagiarism. Then, by making plagiarism an ongoing topic in the courses, in which correct information regarding plagiarism is transmitted to students, can simplify the issues surrounding plagiarism. Specifically, being exposed to the right kind of messages about plagiarism has assisted in making the subject of plagiarism accessible for me, which also resulted in building confidence in it. Moreover, those messages made it easier for me to overcome the difficulties of plagiarism.

While I was exposed to messages about plagiarism, these were also reinforced by my instructor's behaviours. Seeing that the given messages were encouraged with behaviours triggered me to learn and research more about plagiarism. Furthermore, this fact invited me even more to stay away from plagiarism. Along with being equipped with the correct messages through my instructor's behaviours, these behaviours were also put into regular practice both inside and outside of the course throughout the term. Particularly, these behaviours were precisely exemplified and displayed by my university instructor. Being consistently exhibited and transmitted with these behaviours resulted in adopting the behaviours of my instructor. Not only did I embrace these behaviours, but also I transformed them into practice. Thus, it is crucial of instructors to incorporate the right behaviours into the subject of plagiarism as those can enhance and contribute to students' learning and development about plagiarism.

Besides the behaviours, university instructors' actions, approaches, norms, and values are critical elements in the process of communicating clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. To put it more precisely, every aspect of the instructor becomes meaningful to the students, especially where correct and consistent messages are given about the subject of plagiarism. That was what I have been thinking. However, through my observations within my MA education, I have realized that, in particular, being able to provide students with clear and consistent information regarding plagiarism is based on university instructors' perception, stance, and awareness of plagiarism. Thus, instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness toward plagiarism play a crucial role. Specifically, university instructors' perception, stance, and awareness of plagiarism can shape student's educational process. Also, those features of the instructors' can directly or indirectly affect students learning environment. These were precisely what I felt and experienced through my MA instructor's perception, attitude, and awareness toward plagiarism. By comprehending and specifically personally experiencing the tremendous impact that university instructors' perception, stance, and awareness toward plagiarism can have on students, both in and out of the courses, inspired and led me to examine Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. As a matter of fact, this study originated from the positive experiences that I made regarding the subject of plagiarism through my MA Instructor during my master education process.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Although plagiarism is considered as students' fault, it might be inadvertently aroused by university instructors. According to Dryden (1999) students are not the ones to be blamed for plagiarism; instead, it is generally the mistake of instructors as they offer students vague and inconsistent messages about plagiarism. Moreover, McCabe (2005) stated that not only do university instructors expose students to ambiguous and conflicting messages regarding plagiarism, but also about its avoidance. Furthermore, Sterling & Farr (2018) emphasized that instructors also send out contradictory messages in terms of acceptable and unacceptable plagiarism behaviours. Ultimately,

it seems that university instructors serve up their students with vague and inconsistent messages about plagiarism. Especially, such messages of instructors can contribute to a general failure of comprehending and interpreting the subject of plagiarism. Receiving these types of messages can also lead students to commit plagiarism, whether intentionally or unintentionally, and can even facilitate plagiarism among students. Then, not only can these messages of instructors' cause plagiarism problems, but also can pave the way for doing plagiarism.

Indeed, the offered messages about plagiarism from instructors play a powerful role. In this sense, Compton & Pfau (2008) claimed that the send out messages regarding plagiarism are key elements that ultimately lay the foundation for the educational process. Furthermore, Wickelgren & Holm (2008) emphasized that the offered messages about plagiarism are significant as those can potentially influence student's understandings, skills, as well as duties. Thus, university instructors' messages regarding plagiarism affect important aspects of students' learning about plagiarism. Whether students' learning in terms of plagiarism is shaped positively or negatively actually depends on the type of message that is offered by the instructors. While vague and inconsistent messages regarding plagiarism can have detrimental effects on students, clear and consistent messages about plagiarism can have beneficial effects on students. Within this context, Brown & Howell (2001) stated that clear and consistent messages of university instructors enable students to set frameworks about the subject of plagiarism. Also, Leask (2006) highlighted that instructors' clear as well as consistent messages regarding plagiarism are able to impact students' overall conceptualization of plagiarism and efforts to avoid plagiarism. Therefore, before anything else the given messages about plagiarism need to be clear and consistent. Particularly, EFL and ELT Instructors need to be sending out such kind of messages regarding plagiarism, as they are directly involved in students' learning and teaching processes of plagiarism. With respect to EFL University instructors, Sun & Hu (2020) emphasized that a key duty of EFL University Instructors is to offer clear and coherent messages about plagiarism. In terms of ELT Instructors, Amin & Mohammadkarimi (2019) stressed that ELT students need to be equipped with clear information about plagiarism by their university instructors. Clearly, it is important to provide EFL and ELT students with clear and consistent messages regarding plagiarism; however, it is more crucial to pass on these messages to EFL/ELT MA and PhD students as they are assigned to compose academic papers as well as dissertation. An additional reason for exposing EFL/ELT MA and PhD students to such messages is that they can be thought of or even seen as potential scholars of the future.

Specifically, EFL/ELT MA and PhD students might be more inclined to assimilate any kind of offered messages regarding plagiarism by their university instructors. The main reason for this might be that the subject of plagiarism is complex and issues regarding plagiarism are also challenging, which has been stressed by different scholars (Angélil-Carter, 2014; DeVoss & Rosati, 2002; Evering & Moorman, 2012; Pecorari, 2016; Powell, 2012). Another reason for internalizing any kind of messages about plagiarism can directly stem from trying to fulfil the requirements in terms of

academic practice, as scholars (Bens, 2022; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Leask, 2006; Mathrani et al., 2021) have indicated in the literature. One more reason for adopting messages about plagiarism of EFL/ELT MA and PhD students might be that they are fresh to the academic environment, which may directly or indirectly lead them to be fixed on the instructors. Different motives, then, may lead EFL/ELT MA and PhD students to embrace their instructors' messages regarding plagiarism. To help EFL/ELT MA and PhD students to internalize, in particular, the right kind of messages regarding plagiarism, relies indeed on their instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. Considering that EFL/ELT MA and PhD students are ready to adopt the offered messages about plagiarism, it becomes significant to understand EFL and ELT University instructors' perception, stance, and awareness toward plagiarism through the eyes of EFL/ELT MA and PhD students.

1.3. Significance of the Study

There is no doubt that university instructors play an important role within in terms of plagiarism. Especially, university instructors are of critical importance since they are the ones who can directly associate students with the subject of plagiarism in higher education institutions. As frontline educators in universities who interact with students firsthand, it is not only of paramount importance to inform students about plagiarism, but also to offer clear information on the subject of plagiarism. On that note, Day (2008) put forward that even though instructors are assigned to teach their students about plagiarism, most of the instructors are not equipped with correct information regarding plagiarism, such as its definition, theories, and types. Additionally, the study of Bennett et al. (2011) displayed that many university instructors are not well-versed about the subject of plagiarism as well as issues of plagiarism. As a consequence of having lack or shallow information about plagiarism, instructors can neither offer nor convey students with clear messages regarding plagiarism.

Specifically, among all university instructors, it is of paramount importance that EFL and ELT Instructors give clear and consistent messages regarding plagiarism. According to Yamada (2003), as leading educators in English as a foreign language, EFL University Instructors play a critical and empowering role in providing students with clear and coherent messages about plagiarism. In a similar way, Ravari et al. (2022) highlighted that it is a key issue of ELT Instructors explicitly to inform students surrounding plagiarism and plagiarism issues. However, the research of Pourghasemian & Afzali (2018) demonstrated that EFL Instructors do not possess sufficient information regarding plagiarism. Also, the study of Rets & Ilya (2018) displayed that ELT University Instructors did not pass their students with appropriate information about plagiarism. The lack of precise information about plagiarism means that EFL and ELT students are not able to receive clear and coherent messages regarding plagiarism. Failing to give such kind of messages can mislead EFL and ELT students about plagiarism. Moreover, the deficiency of these messages, in particular

for EFL/ELT MA and PhD students can jeopardize their academic writings and master's dissertation. Furthermore, the failure of not giving such messages can not only induct EFL/ELT MA and PhD students' citation behaviours, but also their intentions. Also, the lack of messages can contribute to create a pro-plagiarism environment, particularly among EFL/ELT MA and PhD students. Obviously, EFL and ELT Instructors' lack and incorrect messages regarding plagiarism can have serious implications for EFL/ELT MA and PhD students. The reason for this lack as well as incorrect messages about plagiarism is related to the perception, attitude, and awareness of the EFL and ELT Instructors regarding plagiarism. Indeed, any kind of offered messages about plagiarism is dependent upon EFL and ELT Instructors' perception, stance, and awareness toward plagiarism. Thus, it is crucial to comprehend EFL and ELT University Instructors perceptions, attitudes, and awareness of plagiarism. However, by considering that EFL/ELT MA and PhD students are the ones who directly or indirectly experience the academic actions and inactions in terms of plagiarism, it becomes vital to examine EFL and ELT Instructors perception, stance, and awareness toward plagiarism through the eyes of EFL/ELT MA and PhD students.

The extant literature has mostly focused on investigating plagiarism from students' perspective upon their perception, attitude as well as awareness (Ehrlich et al., 2016; Fish & Hura, 2013; Jereb et al., 2018; Mahmud et al., 2019; Marshall & Garry, 2006; Power, 2009; Ramzan et al., 2012). Further, plagiarism has also been examined in terms of university instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness (Bennett et al., 2011; Crisp, 2007; Erikson & Sullivan, 2008; Greenberger et al., 2016; Hasanah & Dewantara, 2022; Razera et al., 2010; Wilkinson, 2009). However, limited attention has been paid to EFL Instructors perception, attitude as well as awareness toward plagiarism (Hu & Sun, 2016; Lei & Hu, 2015; Sun & Hu, 2020). On the other hand, there was not a study carried out that focused on ELT Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. To the best of my knowledge, there has not been a study that explored the perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism among EFL and ELT University Instructors in the context of Türkiye. Also, in the context of Türkiye, there has not been a single study that scrutinized EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, stance, and awareness toward plagiarism via the eyes of EFL/ELT MA and PhD students. To this end, this study aims to understand Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors the perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism through the lens of Turkish EFL/ELT MA and PhD students.

In the light of the present study, scholars, educators, supervisors, plagiarism policy developers, and even stakeholders in higher education institutions can have deep insights into Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors' conceptualization and communication about plagiarism. Moreover, the obtained data from this study can provide information about whether Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors approach issues of plagiarism individually or collectively within the master program. Also, the collected data can contribute to present accurate information about the cultural context factors regarding plagiarism of Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors. Lastly, the information about Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors' perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism may provide helpful

information for higher education institutions about devising specific courses, programs or even workshop sessions for master students as well as university instructors.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The present study aims to gain understanding of Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness toward plagiarism through the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT MA and PhD students. Also, it aims to focus on whether Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors are able to equip students with essential and necessary information regarding plagiarism.

1.5. Research Questions

Considering the purpose of this study and the prospective gains that can be deduced from it, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perceptions of plagiarism in the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT students?
2. What stance do Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors hold toward plagiarism in the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT students?
3. To what extent are Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors aware of plagiarism in the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT students?
4. To what extent are Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors aware of artificial intelligence on plagiarism in the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT students?

With these questions in mind, the following minor question has been formed:

1. To what extent are Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors able to provide Turkish EFL/ELT MA and PhD students with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism?

1.6. Limitation of the Study

As in almost every study, this one is also not exempt from limitations. The most visible limitation of the present study is that the findings cannot be generalized as the sample group of the study is relatively small. Specifically, by comparing the total number of Applied Linguistics, English Language and Literature, English Literature, English Culture and Literature, English Language Teaching, and English Translation and Interpreting Programs at Turkish universities, the small sample group cannot represent the whole population.

Another limitation of this study is that a relatively small number of participants were volunteers for the semi-structured interview. Especially, more participants could have offered and provided richer data for the study. In addition, due to different geographical location and availability, the interviews were conducted over a digital tool, where the researcher could only observe the facial expressions of the participants, but not the body language of the participants.

1.7. Outline of the Study

The design of this present study is based on five main parts. The first part, Introduction, gives information about the aim of the study. Also, this part offers a general look about the theme of the study by elaborating on the background of the study, statement of the study, significance of the study, purpose of the study and research questions.

The second part, Literature Review, provides a comprehensive insight into the origins of plagiarism, the concept of plagiarism, university instructors messages about plagiarism, university instructors' general perceptions of plagiarism and perceptions of different forms of plagiarism, university instructors' attitudes toward plagiarism and to the different types of plagiarism, university instructors' awareness of plagiarism, cultures influence on university instructors' perception, stance and awareness of plagiarism, and previous related studies. The third part, Methodology, offers information about the research design of the study and data collection instruments. Also, in this part detailed information are given about the participants.

The fourth part, Findings and Discussion, presents and reveals the findings from the questionnaire and interviews. Also, this part discusses and compares the current findings with the previous findings. Finally, the last part, Conclusion, serves to present the main results of the findings. Also, it offers to present the pedagogical implications and recommendations for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Indeed, a good deal of what is considered plagiarism in student writing may stem directly from the pedagogically mixed messages that teachers provide, and from curricular goals that often work at cross purposes.

(L.M. Dryden, 1999: 30)

Indisputably, university instructors are the core of plagiarism education and process, whether they accept it or not. According to McCabe & Pavela (2000), instructors are key figures for students in terms of educating and informing about plagiarism. Correspondingly, Gottardello & Karabag (2022) stated that university instructors have a crucial role in integrating and implementing the subject of plagiarism into the classroom. Since instructors are critical in the integration of plagiarism, it is also significant that they offer students clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. In fact, a fundamental responsibility of university instructors is to be able to give students accurate and precise information regarding plagiarism. However, as noted above, instructors can offer conflicting messages about plagiarism and, by doing so a direct contribution is made to plagiarism. Also, different scholars (Bens, 2022; Leonard et al., 2018; Power, 2009; Pritchett, 2010; Yarbrough, 1995) have emphasized that university instructors not only do provide students with ambiguous messages about plagiarism, but also give students mixed messages regarding plagiarism in and out the classes. Further, Radunovich et al. (2009) remarked that, in addition to vague messages, instructors largely offer inconsistent messages about plagiarism. Understandably, university instructors present and even expose students to vague messages about plagiarism as well as inconsistent messages. The reason for offering such kind of messages about plagiarism might be directly related with instructor's hold perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. Moreover, the possessed perception, stance, and awareness of instructors toward plagiarism might be diverse and even contradictory due to the fact that plagiarism is a complex construct, which has been highlighted by several scholars (Angélil-Carter, 2014; Bowers, 1994; Eaton, 2021; Evering & Moorman, 2012; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006; Sutherland-Smith, 2005; Powell, 2012; Price, 2002). Therefore, it seems initial to have a look on the definitions of plagiarism. Within this context, Pecorari & Petrić (2014) stressed out that not only considering the definitions of plagiarism in literature is important, but also the origin of plagiarism as the traditional view regarding plagiarism such as crime or theft is based indeed on this understanding. Thus, it becomes essential to regard the origin of plagiarism and the definitions of plagiarism.

2.2. The Origin of Plagiarism

According to Barnhart (1988), the word plagiarism, which refers to “literary theft”, originates from the Latin words, *plagarius* (kidnapper, seducer, plunderer, literary thief), *plagium* (kidnapping) and *plaga* (snare, net). The mentioned Latin word *plagiarus* turned into “plagiary” in the English Language, which refers to the “one who wrongfully takes another’s words or ideas” (Eret & Gokmenoglu, 2010). In the Webster’s Word Histories (1991), it is stated that the term *plagiarus* is known to be utilized in the period of the poet Martial, and this poet employed *plagiarus* to refer to “a literary thief of plagiarist”. Then, plagiarism is not seen as a recent theft or crime issue, but rather dates back to older centuries. In 1601, the word *plagiary* was introduced by Ben Johnson in “The Poetaster” (Terry, 2010). Even though Ben Johnson was the one who brought the concept of plagiarism in attention in the language of English, he was accused with doing plagiarism of Martial’s poem (Loewenstein, 2003). Not only Ben Johnson but also other writers too, such as T.S Eliot or Wilson Mizner (Randall, 2001) are accused of plagiarism. Obviously, it was not uncommon for playwrights, poets, or writers to steal from each other back then. In this regard, Park (2003) pointed out that plagiarizing other writers’ work was seen as a virtue back then. However, over time, the thoughts of the writers have changed, and some of them in particular started to describe plagiarism as “theft of thoughts” (Mallon, 1989), “forgery” (Groom, 2000), or “crime” (Franke, 1993). Although plagiarism was considered as theft or crime before, higher education institutions have adopted and oriented themselves regarding this view. On that note, Sutherland-Smith (2011) stated that this view about plagiarism has been widely accepted and has even become common within universities. Moreover, Pecorari & Petrić (2014) emphasized that several university policies and procedures about plagiarism has been structured and shaped in terms of this particular view. This event reinforces that the traditional view of plagiarism is embedded into the tools and products of higher education institutions.

The traditional view of plagiarism can not only be found in the plagiarism policy and procedure of universities, but also among instructors who work at higher education institutions. In light of this, Wheeler (2009) highlighted that plagiarism is seen as a serious academic crime by Western universities instructors. Further, Blum (2017) stressed that alongside Western instructors, Asian instructors also regarded plagiarism as a serious crime within the academic world. However, Patak et al. (2021) put forward that although plagiarism and plagiarism issues are considered as a serious academic crime of university instructors, they struggle to convey this message to the students. Whilst it is of utmost importance that university instructors adopt and internalize plagiarism as an academic crime, it becomes also of paramount importance that students discern that plagiarism is a serious offence and even a serious crime in the academia.

2.3. Definitions of Plagiarism

In addition to the origin of plagiarism, the definitions of plagiarism are fundamental as these might also rest on a view. In the literature, there are several definitions of plagiarism, and different descriptions are present. For instance, Oxford University defined plagiarism as “presenting someone else’s work or ideas as your own, with or without their consent, by incorporating it into your work without full acknowledgement”. Moreover, Howard (1995) stated that plagiarism is demonstrating the words of other human beings as one’s own while those belong to others. Correspondingly, Pears & Shields (2010) clarified that plagiarism is stating the ideas or works of others as one’s own without giving any credit to the original work. Samuel Jackson describes plagiarism as a “theft; literary adoption of the thoughts or works of another.” (Terry, 2010: 21) Also, the definition of John Ash (1795) strengthens the thought of plagiarism in terms of being a theft of others’ work. According to Pecorari (2003), plagiarism is seen as “a heinous crime within the academic community”. Similarly, Bryman (2016) believes that plagiarism is a kind of academic crime. It seems that the traditional view regarding plagiarism, which is “theft” or “crime”, is also present in the definitions of plagiarism. However, not only this view is existing among the definitions of plagiarism, but also diverse views are present such as adopting other people’s ideas or thoughts as one’s own, stealing others’ ideas or thoughts without making any reference to the original writer, and a serious offence in the academia. Obviously, through different eyes plagiarism is described and even evaluated disparately. Within this context, Sutherland-Smith (2005) pointed out that plagiarism is a complex matter which is ultimately comprehended differently among individuals. Similarly, Pecorari (2013) stated that plagiarism is a complicated phenomenon that results in vastly different formulations and interpretations of plagiarism among individuals. The complexity of plagiarism, then, causes to have diverse and even contradictory perceptions about plagiarism. In this case, there might be also varying attitudes and awareness of plagiarism by individuals. Then, the complexity of plagiarism may contribute to have further inconsistencies regarding plagiarism among individuals.

According to Walker & White (2014), plagiarism is not only interpreted differently among individuals, but also among university instructors. In addition, Gullifer & Tyson (2014) noted that there is not a common interpretation of plagiarism among university instructors. Further, the study of Bennett et al. (2011) has displayed that plagiarism is greatly misinterpreted among instructors. The diversity of instructors’ interpretation about plagiarism indicates that plagiarism is not a simplistic notion even for them. This complexity of plagiarism may lead instructors to have new and varying interpretations of plagiarism or, ultimately, to misinterpret plagiarism. Specifically, holding novel or varying formulations about plagiarism by instructors can have negative consequences, such as diversity in the practice of plagiarism, individual actions and inactions toward plagiarism, or variations in regulations. Most importantly, the availability of divergent interpretations of plagiarism by instructors can lend them to offer wrong messages or even mixed messages about plagiarism.

After all, the complexity of plagiarism can lead university instructors to give false information regarding plagiarism.

2.4. Instructors' Messages about Plagiarism

The literature indicates, especially through the historical context of plagiarism and definitions of plagiarism, that plagiarism is based on the traditional view, which is theft or crime. Besides this traditional view about plagiarism, university instructors also consider plagiarism as an academic crime that deserves punishment, which has been noted by scholars (Abasi & Graves, 2008; Bennett et al., 2011, Blum, 2009; Paterson et al., 2003; Pecorari & Shaw, 2010). Although instructors regard and accept plagiarism as a serious act of academic crime, they are not able to convey the right kind of messages regarding plagiarism. Herein, Leask (2006) claimed that apart from the message "plagiarism is wrong" (p.185), university instructors are entirely unsure what kind of messages need to be offered about plagiarism within higher education institutions. In this case, it should not be a surprise for instructors to come across with many plagiarism incidents both inside and outside of the courses. There is no doubt that plagiarism is present in the courses of higher education institutions. However, according to Davis (2011) plagiarism does not only exist, but also has occupied the classes. Also, scholars have offered accumulating evidence that plagiarism has exacerbated within the universities. For instance, Walker (2010) has revealed that over 31 % of the university students have been engaged in plagiarism acts. In a more recent study, Tremayne & Curtis (2021) have reported that more than 60 % of the students have plagiarized at least once in their academic life. It is apparent that the number of students who plagiarise are increasing. The blame for this prevalence of plagiarism can not be attributed only to students; university instructors might be mainly responsible for the growth of plagiarism within universities by not offering clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. Concordantly, Martin (1994) stressed out that the prevalence of plagiarism is the mistake of instructors as they are not exposing students to clear and coherent messages regarding plagiarism. Also, Yarbrough (1995) identified that several law instructors fail to give students relevant messages about plagiarism. Clearly, university instructors expose students to vague messages and even misleading messages regarding plagiarism. Following this line of thought, the given messages about plagiarism by instructors' mould students' standards of plagiarism, either explicitly or implicitly. Therefore, the offered messages regarding plagiarism by university instructors are crucial.

To deliver the correct plagiarism standards to the students, clear and coherent messages seem to be essential components for instructors. Further, it is of paramount importance that instructors send out such messages about plagiarism constantly throughout the class or program. This practice can, in one context, assist in creating a satisfying environment for students. In this sense, Bretag et al. (2019) highlighted that instructors' unambiguous messages regarding plagiarism enable to form plagiarism free areas. Then, the clear and consistent messages of university instructors are not only critical for conveying the right set of plagiarism standards for students, but also for establishing a

safe environment in terms of plagiarism for students. However, being able to give clear as well as consistent messages about plagiarism is based in particular on the university instructor's perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. Thus, it becomes important to understand the university instructor's perception, attitude as well as awareness toward plagiarism.

2.5. University Instructors' Perception about Plagiarism

University instructors' perception of plagiarism has been analysed under four headings: instructors' perception of plagiarism, instructors' perception of the different forms of plagiarism, instructors' perception association with the cultural context, and lastly the association between instructors' perception and the offered messages about plagiarism.

2.5.1. Perception

Before having a detailed look on instructors' perception of plagiarism, it is necessary to here to clarify exactly what is meant by the word perception. According to Fuchs (2020), perception, derived from the Latin root per-cipere, "to grasp through" refers to how an individual understands or interprets the elements of something. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2005) defined perception as "an idea, a belief, or an image you have as a result of how you see or understand something". Likewise, perception has been described as a thought or a belief held by an individual that rests on how issues are understood or seen by Collins Dictionary of the English Language (2010). Similarly, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2014) referred to perception as one's own beliefs that is influenced by the individual's understanding, interpretations, and consideration. A further definition is given by online Merriam-Webster (n.d.) which describes perception as an individual's personal judgment which is based on one's own understanding that also determines the personal behaviours or decisions.

In the literature, Louw (1998) defined perception as a process in which an individual attaches meaning to information as a result of one's own comprehension and interpretation of the surrounding. For Schmitz (2009) perception is a process that consists of receiving, collecting, organizing, and discriminating the information of an individual. Moreover, Kirkgöz (2018) believes that perception can be considered as a mixture of interpreted knowledge and thoughts which is obtained through prior impression or experience. In a similar way, Newton & Kinskey (2021) utilizes perception to refer to particular that it is a combination of understanding and interpretation of information which is driven by individual's previous background and knowledge. Although differences of opinion exist both in the dictionary definitions and scholars' definitions, there appears to be some agreement that perception involves the way an individual comprehends, interprets, and even considers something based on one's own beliefs, thoughts, impressions, or experiences.

2.5.2. Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism

There is no doubt that all instructors own a perception of plagiarism. The perception of plagiarism by instructors is fundamental, as it is a prerequisite for the conceptualization of plagiarism. Especially, the context of instructors' hold perception of plagiarism, where instructors form or develop their perceptions of plagiarism could assist in mediating the conceptualization of plagiarism. In light of this, Sutherland-Smith (2008) stated that previous learning experiences of instructors produces the essence of plagiarism perception for instructors, which seems also to be shaping the conventions about what constitutes plagiarism and what does not. Identically, Polio & Shi (2012) noted that the conceptualization surrounding plagiarism is in fact framed by the instructor's hold perception of plagiarism, which is created through prior learning settings or environments. Moreover, Khathayut & Walker-Gleaves (2021) pointed out that an instructor's former learning is generally present in and even guides one's own perception of plagiarism, which in turn is able to affect the conceptualization of what does and does not constitute plagiarism. Hence, instructors previous learning settings and backgrounds are critical elements since those are reflected and internalized in their perceptions about the conceptualization of plagiarism.

Besides this fact, the individual plagiarism perception of instructors may also influence the conceptualization of plagiarism. From this perspective, Flint et al. (2006) stressed that university instructors carry their own embodied conceptualization of plagiarism in and out of the classrooms due to their personal perception of plagiarism. Further, Chen & Chou (2017) highlighted that instructors bring their own plagiarism perceptions to the learning spaces within the higher education institutions, which directly as well as indirectly intersects with the conceptualization of plagiarism. This view is supported by Husain et al. (2017) who writes that instructors might be fully embedded in their own personal perception of plagiarism, which also has implications for the conceptualization of plagiarism, such as ultimately misinterpreting plagiarism or misconstruing the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable plagiarism practices. Arguably, then, instructors' personal mind-set of plagiarism can operate, either positively or negatively, in the design and frame of plagiarism conceptualization. Particularly if the situated perception of plagiarism by university instructors works in a negative way, instructors might not have a clear or even a straight-forward approach regarding the conceptualization of plagiarism.

This also includes university instructors who work in the same discipline. Even instructors from the same academic field possess varying conceptualization of what does and does not constitute plagiarism. For example, the detailed examination of instructors' perception of plagiarism by Roig (2001) showed that university instructors from the same discipline differed greatly in their conceptualization of what constitutes plagiarism, depending on their own perception of plagiarism. A broader perspective has been adopted by Eckel (2011) who argues that instructors of the same discipline do not only differ about the conceptualization of plagiarism, but also have widespread

disagreements about which incidents constitute plagiarism. Specifically, different conceptualizations of plagiarism by instructors within the same academic discipline imply that paraphrasing, summarizing, and even quoting issues are handled differently in and out of the classroom settings. Not only can diverse interpretations be seen in the general issues of plagiarism by the university instructors, but also in their applications to the plagiarism criteria's. It seems that the personal hold perception of plagiarism contributes to and even directs these differences in the realm of plagiarism. Within this context, Borg (2002) identified that university instructors' individual perception of plagiarism as a major cause for the divergent formulations and interpretations of plagiarism issues. Likewise, Evans-Tokaryk (2014) found that the personal plagiarism perception by instructors is the main reason for different approaches to plagiarism and disagreements, particularly regarding where the line is between plagiarism and collaboration. Obviously, due to the hold individual perception of plagiarism, there are also variabilities in the boundaries of collaboration and plagiarism among instructors. Problems and even conflicts can arise where difficulties or inconsistencies exist in delineating the line between plagiarism and collaboration. This, in turn, can cause vexing problems for students, such as being confused about plagiarism and collaboration or completely misinterpreting both of what constitutes plagiarism and collaboration. Such situations or problems can not only be noticed in the context of plagiarism and collaboration, but also in the different conventions of plagiarism. In fact, the hold personal perception of plagiarism by instructors seems to be also present in the different types of plagiarism. Thus, it becomes significant to scrutinize university instructors' perception of the different forms of plagiarism.

2.5.3. Instructors' Perception of the Different Forms of Plagiarism

Instructors' perception of plagiarism matters not only for plagiarism itself, but also for the different forms of plagiarism. The nuances between the various type of plagiarism can be driven by instructors' perception of plagiarism. To put it more clearly, the perception of plagiarism by university instructors sets the basis for the types of plagiarism. Moreover, Pecorari & Shaw (2012) asserted that the recognition, the link, as well as the engagement with the different types of plagiarism, besides establishing and setting the standards of it, are deeply rooted in instructors' perception of plagiarism. In a similar manner, Lei & Hu (2015) noted that university instructors' perception of plagiarism is a substantial element for the standards of plagiarism types, but especially for the identification and navigation of the different kinds of plagiarism. Aside from laying the foundation for the different types of plagiarism, the perception of plagiarism also leads to the implementation of actions and inactions related to the different forms of plagiarism.

Although the perception of plagiarism by university instructors' is pivotal in molding, guiding, and evaluating the forms of plagiarism, Marcus and Beck (2011) argued that there are generally contradictory perceptions of plagiarism among instructors regarding certain types of plagiarism, such as self-plagiarism or mosaic plagiarism. In fact, this argumentation has been supported by the study

of Halupa & Bollinger (2013), who identified that instructors' perception of self-plagiarism in general were conflicting and often inconsistent with each other. Also, Vincent-Robinson (2016) found out that the perception of self-plagiarism by instructors widely varied as to both what is acceptable and unacceptable republication. In addition, LeClercq (1999) who looked at law instructors' perception of plagiarism, showed that law instructors' perceptions differed not only in relation to self-plagiarism, but also in relation to mosaic plagiarism. The studies presented thus far provide evidence that university instructors perceptions toward the certain types of plagiarism are not monolithic but rather diverse and even inconsistent. These differing perceptions of university instructors regarding self-plagiarism or mosaic plagiarism clearly extend to the way students are trained, developed, as well as assessed about these types of plagiarism. Also, the different perceptions of university instructors about the types of plagiarism may facilitate misperceptions among students about the seriousness of certain acts of plagiarism. Further, university instructors varying perceptions about the types of plagiarism might create and foster an environment of plagiarism for students, which ultimately may affect their plagiarizing behaviours. Another negative consequence for students may be the lack of transparent messages about the certain forms of plagiarism. Overall, the different perceptions of university instructors regarding the types of plagiarism seem to be able to impact all the factors that play a role in ensuring that students are adequately equipped.

2.5.4. Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism and the Cultural Context

Undoubtedly, instructors' perception of plagiarism can be considered as the mediator of all general matters related to plagiarism. Even though the perception of plagiarism by instructors is essential and critical, as can be concluded from the studies above, instructors hold different and diverse perceptions of plagiarism among themselves. According to Yusof (2009), the cultural context of the instructor is the main reason for these different and varied perceptions of plagiarism by university instructors. Likewise, Denney et al. (2021) pointed out that instructors' different perceptions of plagiarism are mainly aroused and resulted from their own cultural context. It seems that the cultural context is fabricating and triggering the disparities about plagiarism among university instructors. Thus, the culture in which the university instructor has been raised or socialized becomes significant. Growing up or civilizing, especially in a culture, directly or indirectly drives the university instructor to adopt and internalize the standards of that culture. For example, if the university instructor grew up or lived in a Western culture, the one inevitably takes and embraces the standards or frameworks of that specific culture. The same matter applies to the university instructor who has been raised and cultivated in an Asian culture. Then, university instructors are culturally conditioned.

In terms of plagiarism, this means that university instructors are anchored and embodied in their cultural standards or frameworks of plagiarism. Previous studies (Bretag, 2005; Li & Casanave, 2012; Pecorari, 2008; Pennycook, 1996; Pennycook, 2001; Sowden, 2005) have also displayed that

instructors can become characterized by their own cultural framework of plagiarism, which can either empower or even dramatically modify instructors' relationship toward plagiarism. The cultural standards related to plagiarism clearly operate and impact how university instructors associate plagiarism with what can be considered as appropriate or not. In this vein, Bloch (2007) illustrated that while instructors from the Western culture consider plagiarism as a crime as well as an offense, instructors from the non-Western culture regard plagiarism as a way of imitating other people's writing. Also, Farahian et al. (2020) noted that western instructors view plagiarism as a problem and even unacceptable compared to non-Western instructors. These imply that each culture has its own standards regarding plagiarism, which in turn are ultimately adopted and exemplified by the university instructors. Indeed, different scholars acknowledged and illustrated that the standards or the frameworks for plagiarism differ from culture to culture. For instance, Hofstede (2011) pointed out that in collective cultures the prevailing view is that information belongs to the society, and therefore hold the view that it is not significant to credit the sources. Similarly, Kutieleh & Adiningrum (2011) stressed out that in many Asian cultures, such as Indonesian or Malaysia, the absence of attribution is not seen as plagiarism. Also, Li & Flowerdew (2018) noted that in Confucian cultures, copying or imitating other people's work is regarded as flattering. However, others (see Bennet, 2011; Brimble & Stevenson-Clarke, 2005; Duggan, 2006; Glendinning, 2014; Gu & Brooks, 2008; Handa & Power, 2005; Hayes & Introna, 2005; Ison, 2018; Leask, 2006; Lund, 2004; Michalska, 2012; Pecorari & Sutherland-Smith, 2021; Purdy, 2009) have highlighted that in both Western and European cultures, the individual is considered as the owner of information, and emphasis is placed on proper attribution to the sources.

Collectively, these studies outline that culture predisposes university instructors to perceive and even formulate plagiarism in a particular way. To be more precise, culture cultivates and mediates how instructors perceive plagiarism and attribute different meanings to plagiarism. In view of this, then the differing standards or frameworks of plagiarism across cultures mean that there can be divergences among university instructors' perception of plagiarism. This underscores the fact that culture is the result of differing perceptions of plagiarism among university instructors. In this aspect, plagiarism can be perceived differently by different instructors. This, in turn, can truly cause problems in how plagiarism is applied as well as how plagiarism is practiced by university instructors. This may have negative consequences such as misinforming about plagiarism, misleading practices about plagiarism, or misguiding about the severity of plagiarism. Aside these consequences, it can enhance and even reinforce students' incorrect assumptions regarding plagiarism like plagiarism is acceptable or plagiarism is treated indifferently within higher education institutions.

While culture seems to be solely causing differing perceptions of plagiarism among university instructors, in fact, it is also arousing differentiations in the conceptualization of plagiarism as well as in the practices regarding plagiarism. Considering that cultural can arouse and cause severe

problems and implication surrounding plagiarism and plagiarism issues, it becomes fundamental for university instructors to take into account and to be focused on the international standards for plagiarism rather than the cultural context.

2.5.5. The association between Instructors' Perception of Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism

To ensure that plagiarism is precisely comprehended and even completely avoided by university students, instructors' offered messages about plagiarism are key and fundamental components in the courses. Presenting students with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism is, in fact, closely related with the university instructor's perception of plagiarism. According to Chugh et al. (2021), the explicitly and implicitly given information regarding plagiarism are framed by instructors' perception of plagiarism. Also, Sun & Hu (2020) emphasized that perception of plagiarism can intervene whether correct, basic, or even brief information is offered by instructors. Naturally, university instructors' perception of plagiarism is critical as it is the basis for generating and introducing the information related to plagiarism. This then means that whether the essence of the act of plagiarism is precisely explained or reinforced is tied to the perception of plagiarism by instructors. In this regard, it can be noted that instructors' perception of plagiarism does not only operate in forming information about plagiarism, but also in passing and equipping students with the plagiarism knowledge.

Moreover, Gullifer & Tyson (2010) identified that the perception of plagiarism by instructors is effective in the learning and teaching contexts. Additionally, Elliott et al. (2013) stressed out that university instructors' perception of plagiarism directly affected their formal as well as informal learning and teaching approaches. Also, Maria & Liliana (2019) emphasized that instructors' perception on plagiarism can impact the carried out instructional practices regarding plagiarism. Obviously, instructors' perception of plagiarism can greatly influence the priorities and the mechanisms of plagiarism education. Indeed, the perception of instructors can predetermine and cover the entire framework of learning and education options. This implies that university instructors' choices, performances, and criteria brought and applied to the classroom are made within their perception of plagiarism. Understandably, the basic dimensions of plagiarism education and even the quality of teaching are depended upon instructors' plagiarism perception.

Apart from this, the perception of plagiarism by university instructors can structure and even administrate the applied actions as well as inactions in the direction of plagiarism. In this vein, Sutherland-Smith (2008) remarked that instructors' choices, performances, judgements, and decisions toward plagiarism are driven by one's own perception of plagiarism. In the same manner, Husain et al. (2017) noted that the actions and reactions of university instructors' surrounding plagiarism are intimately linked with their perception of plagiarism. Also, the carried-out studies

illustrate that the hold perception of plagiarism by instructors is an influencing factor for plagiarism issues. For example, the study of Robinson-Zañartu et al. (2005) found out that the possessed perception of plagiarism impacted instructors' preferences for plagiarism activities and practices. In another major research, de Jager & Brown (2010) identified that university instructors' perception of plagiarism influenced their engagement in identifying and responding to plagiarism. Moreover, the systematic study by Gottardello et al. (2017) demonstrated that the personal perception of plagiarism leads instructors to give fragmented or inconsistent responses to plagiarism. Furthermore, Choo & Paull (2013) identified that there are variations in the application of consequences toward plagiarism incidents by instructors due to the possessed perception of plagiarism. Correspondingly, Bowen & Nanni (2021) pointed out that instructors' plagiarism proceedings and penalties varied largely as a consequence of their own individual perception of plagiarism. Together, these studies outline that the personal perception of plagiarism is a critical resource for each university instructor as it sets and forms the boundaries for professional activities of plagiarism as well as issues surrounding plagiarism. The personal perception of plagiarism by the instructor does not only characterize the framework of plagiarism practices, but also determine how plagiarism is enforced, managed, and handled by the individual instructor. Given that each instructor's own perception of plagiarism is able to direct the actions and inactions relating to plagiarism, the way in which plagiarism is carried-out and practiced can alter from instructor to instructor. Then, widely different as well as varied practices regarding plagiarism exist among university instructors due to varying perception of plagiarism. Consequently, students may be exposed to inconsistent messages about plagiarism by different instructors. In addition to inconsistent messages, conflicting and even misleading messages can also be sent out to students by different university instructors.

There is a clear link between the varying perception of plagiarism by university instructors and the messages that are conveyed about plagiarism. Also, the fact that different perceptions of plagiarism by university instructors can be influencing the messages regarding plagiarism have been explored in some studies. For example, the study of Borg (2002) demonstrated that the divergences in instructors' perception of plagiarism caused students not to receive clear messages about plagiarism and plagiarism-related issues. Likewise, Liddell & Fong's detailed study (2005) showed that the varying perception of plagiarism by university instructors led to be offering obscure and inconsistent messages within the classroom. In another study, Marcus & Beck (2011) highlighted that the discrepancies between instructors' perception of plagiarism resulted in forming misperceptions about plagiarism among students. In addition, the systematic literature review by Gottardello et al. (2017) emphasized that the differences in university instructors' perception of plagiarism gave rise to misinterpretations regarding plagiarism and exacerbated cases of plagiarism among students. The studies presented thus far provide evidence that, as a consequence of the divergences in perception of plagiarism among instructors, students can not be presented or transmitted with relevant messages about plagiarism. Moreover, the lack of clarity among university instructors can arouse and foster false perceptions of plagiarism among students, such as that

plagiarism is a victimless act or that plagiarism is tolerated by different university instructors. Then, the differences in perception drive and reinforce the inaccurate messages regarding plagiarism and even challenge students' perception of plagiarism as well as students' plagiarism behaviours.

In view of all that has been mentioned so far, one may suppose that how plagiarism is perceived by university instructors is critical, as it determines not only what kind of messages are offered and given to students about plagiarism, but also what kind of instructional approaches are carried out in and out of the classes regarding plagiarism. In addition, the perception of plagiarism by university instructors covers the core aspects of regulations, standards, practices, and reactions toward plagiarism. Hence, university instructors' perception of plagiarism plays a significant and powerful role, in the learning opportunities and in the educational process of plagiarism for the students. That is to say, the issues of plagiarism as well as the issues surrounding plagiarism are mediated by the university instructors' perception of plagiarism. By considering these factors, it becomes particularly important to consider EFL and ELT University Instructors perception of plagiarism, as they are primarily responsible for introducing and informing students about plagiarism in the foreign language. From this point of view, Krishan et al. (2017) highlighted that a critical duty of EFL University Instructors is to provide EFL students with correct information regarding plagiarism since they are the ones who directly teach and educate students regarding plagiarism. Similarly, Zheng et al. (2018) stated that a fundamental task of EFL University Instructors is to inform EFL students concisely about plagiarism as they are actively preparing and familiarize students with plagiarism in the foreign language. Furthermore, in particular for ELT University Instructors, Nawaz (2017) noted that it is a core task for ELT University Instructors to implicitly clarify students about the general issues of plagiarism and the complexity of plagiarism. Therefore, it becomes significant to understand the perception of plagiarism by EFL and ELT University Instructors.

2.6. University Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism

University instructors' attitude toward plagiarism has been analysed under four headings: instructors' attitude toward plagiarism, instructors' attitude toward the different forms of plagiarism, instructors' attitude toward plagiarism and the cultural context and lastly the association between instructors' attitude toward plagiarism and the offered messages about plagiarism. Indeed,

2.6.1. Attitude

To be able to obtain an accurate picture of university instructors' attitudes toward plagiarism, a precise understanding of the term "attitude" is necessary. According to Fazio (2007), the term attitude has been initially utilized in arts, however; later it became generalized and started to be employed or referred to as a "mental set" as well as "attitude of mind" (p.1). Moreover, there are numerous definitions for the term attitude. For example, the Dictionary of the Social Sciences (2002)

defined attitude as a set of beliefs or values that is able to affect an individual's behaviour. In a similar way, the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2014) described attitude as a cluster of feelings, beliefs or opinions that are reflected in individual's behaviour. Furthermore, attitude has been depicted as the way through which an individual thinks, considers, and judges something by the Cambridge Learner's Dictionary (2012). Another description has been made by the Collins English Dictionary (2010) which referred to attitude as a state or a tendency that predisposes an individual to act in certain conditions.

The term attitude has not only been defined or mentioned by dictionaries, but also by several scholars. In this sense, Allport (1935) was one of the first scholars who addressed and defined attitude as "a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive and dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related" (p. 810). Also, Oppenheim (1966) described attitude as a state of readiness or a state of mental organization that predispose to an individual to act or react in a characteristic way to something or someone. Moreover, Wlodkowski (1985) believes that attitude is a state of mind that has powerful influences on an individual's behaviours either positively or negatively. Correspondingly, Ajzen & Fishbein (2000) referred to attitude as a state of mind or state of mental preparation that strongly directs and shapes an individual's behaviours towards any issue, object as well situation. Another definition has been made by Haddock & Maio (2007) who described attitude as an individual's cognitive evaluation that is driven by one's beliefs, thoughts, as well as feelings.

While the dictionary definitions of attitude share the understanding that attitude is based on the hold beliefs, feelings or values that results in designating and shaping an individual's behaviours, the scholars' definitions of attitude share the notion that attitude consists of states or components that determine and mediate how an individual behaves. In addition, it can be concluded that attitude not only predisposes certain behaviours, but also can precede and produce behaviours.

2.6.2. Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism

Considering the fact that an individual's attitude is able to affect and even guide future behaviours in a certain direction, instructor's attitude toward plagiarism becomes critical. Besides being significant, instructors' attitude toward plagiarism can play a powerful role in students behaviours including plagiarism behaviours. Especially, university instructors' attitude can explicitly or implicitly influence students' behaviours toward plagiarism, either in a positive or negative way. Within this framework, Choo & Paull (2013) noted that the attitude of instructors toward plagiarism can have a positive or negative impact on students' plagiarism behaviours. Similarly, Sun & Hu (2020) stated that instructors' attitude toward plagiarism can directly affect as well as shape students' behaviours toward plagiarism, positively or negatively. Whether students are influenced positively or negatively is dependent upon the attitude toward plagiarism that the university instructors

demonstrate both inside and outside the classes. In fact, students primarily observe their university instructors' stance toward plagiarism. Then, without questioning whether the displayed attitude by university instructors toward plagiarism is positive or negative, students completely adopt and internalize their university instructors' attitude toward plagiarism. Moreover, Whitley & Keith-Spiegel (2001) pointed out that students closely pay attention to how university instructors behave toward plagiarism, and then they start to replicate the same behaviours of their university instructors. As a matter of fact, it becomes crucial and essential of instructors to provide students with the right and relevant attitudes toward plagiarism. To achieve this, instructors need to demonstrate appropriate attitudes toward plagiarism both in and out the courses. However, studies that have been conducted by several scholars (Anderson & Steneck, 2011; du Rocher, 2020; Hu & Lei, 2016; Husain et al., 2017; Lindahl & Grace, 2018; Pickard, 2006; Pupovac et al., 2008; Vassileva & Chankova, 2019) have shown that instructors' attitudes toward plagiarism differ across the higher education institutions, although it is considered and denounced as a serious offence. Furthermore, the varied attitudes toward plagiarism by university instructors has been not only identified among instructors from different academic disciplines, but also among instructors from the same academic community. In this context, the detailed study of Razera de Azevedo (2010) displayed that instructors within the same academic field differed greatly in their attitudes toward plagiarism. Correspondingly, the case study of Stout (2013) demonstrated that there are great differences in the attitudes towards plagiarism among instructors who work in the same academic discipline. The studies presented thus far make it clear that students experience various attitudes towards plagiarism by their university instructors. Specifically, this can induce that students set off and develop false assumptions about plagiarism. In addition, being exposed to such attitudes by instructors can have a completely negative effect on the citation and plagiarism behaviours of students. Since university instructors possessed attitudes toward plagiarism can shape students general understanding as well as behaviours regarding plagiarism, it is also fundamental to consider and grasp the hold attitudes of university instructors toward the different types of plagiarism.

2.6.3. Instructors' Attitude toward the Different Forms of Plagiarism

There is no doubt that the attitude of university instructors toward plagiarism is significant and valuable in discouraging students from plagiarism behaviours. However, university instructors' attitude towards each different form of plagiarism is also essential as well as crucial to drive and shape strengthen students' perceptions of all types of plagiarism-related behaviours. In other words, instructors' attitude towards the different forms of plagiarism is able to affect and even strengthen students general or personal understanding of how to behave and stand towards the types of plagiarism. Furthermore, Pickard (2006) emphasized that attitudes of instructors toward the different kinds of plagiarism have a significant role in establishing and promoting ethical behaviours of students towards all types of plagiarism. Also, Kezar & Bernstein-Sierra (2016) stated that instructors' attitudes toward the different kinds of plagiarism can set example for students to act and

to engage in accordance with the ethical standards regarding the types of plagiarism. Then, the attitude of university instructors toward the different forms of plagiarism facilitates and contributes to the ethical shaping of students' approaches and behaviours towards the various forms of plagiarism.

University instructors need be clear and present with the ideals of the importance of attitude towards the different types of plagiarism. However, the conducted studies by several scholars (Eriksson & Sullivan, 2008; Gottardello et al., 2017; Husain et al., 2017; Introna et al., 2003; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012) illustrated that instructors are not present with the significance of attitudes towards the different forms of plagiarism, both in theory and in praxis. Moreover, the carried-out studies of scholars have shown that instructors possess different attitudes towards some types of plagiarism such as self-plagiarism, collusion, and paraphrasing. For instance, the study of Eriksson & Sullivan (2008) displayed that university instructors' attitudes towards self-plagiarism, paraphrasing and collusion varied greatly among themselves. In another major study, Sutherland-Smith (2008) found out that university instructors hold and modelled inconsistent attitudes towards self-plagiarism cases of students as well as paraphrasing cases across the university. Further, the literature review of Husain et al. (2017) demonstrated that there are major differences and inconsistencies in the attitudes of university instructors toward self-plagiarism. Collectively, these studies outline that instructors do not possess a unified attitude towards self-plagiarism, collusion, and paraphrasing, instead; they hold widely divergent and inconsistent attitudes towards these forms of plagiarism. Specifically, the lack of clarity in the attitudes of university instructors towards paraphrasing, self-plagiarism, and collusion can discourage or even hinder students' openness to learning and development, including plagiarism and its types. Moreover, such attitudes of instructors can reinforce and exacerbate a positive attitude towards unacceptable plagiarism behaviours among students. In this respect, Pecorari & Shaw (2012) stated that university instructors' diverse attitudes toward plagiarism and its kinds not only drive students to form and develop dishonest behaviours to the issues of plagiarism, but at the same time they receive wrong and even confusing messages regarding plagiarism as well as its types. Thus, the varied attitudes of university instructors increase the potential for students to receive incorrect and inconsistent messages in relation to plagiarism, types of plagiarism, and plagiarism behaviours.

2.6.4. Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism and the Cultural Context

Certainly, attitudes that are exhibited or modelled by instructors towards plagiarism across higher education institutions matters. However, the demonstrated attitudes of university instructors towards plagiarism both inside and outside the classes, can be shaped by the university instructors' own cultural context. Then, the cultural context of instructors needs to be taken into account to as it can be a chief factor that can create and mediate the attitudes towards plagiarism. Within this framework, Zemack-Rugar et al. (2007) pointed out that the cultural context of an individual can set

the basis for general attitudes or behaviours, including the attitudes toward plagiarism. Furthermore, Kasler et al. (2021) stated that generally through the cultural context an individual is loaded with certain attitudes or behaviours towards concepts, issues, as well as conditions. Hence, the acquired attitudes in the cultural context of university instructors are brought directly or indirectly into the higher education institutions. This also means that instructors are embedded in the attitudes towards plagiarism and its issues by the cultural context. Given that all instructors do not stem from the same cultural context, the potential of instructors to represent and model diverse attitudes toward plagiarism broadens. According to Hofstede (1991), different cultures imply encountering and facing different teachings, learnings, approaches, attitudes, or behaviours within universities. Moreover, East (2006) pointed out that different cultures hold different attitudes towards plagiarism and plagiarism issues, which also extend to university instructors professional and personal attitudes in terms of plagiarism and plagiarism issues. From this perspective, then an instructor with a Western cultural context possesses completely another attitude towards plagiarism than an instructor with an Asian cultural context. Indeed, in the literature, scholars have illustrated the adopted or the hold attitudes towards plagiarism by instructors with different cultural contexts. For instance, Pecorari (2003) highlighted that while university instructors from Eastern or Western culture hold a punitive attitude towards plagiarism, university instructors from the Asian culture hold a lenient attitude towards plagiarism. In a similar way, Hayes & Introna (2005) emphasized that university instructors from Western cultures generally nurtured negative attitudes toward plagiarism compared to university instructors from non-Western cultures. Also, Berlinck (2011) noted that university instructors with an Eastern or Western cultural context in general promote negative attitudes toward plagiarism across higher educations, as opposed to university instructors with an Asian cultural context. However, the study by Hu & Sun (2017) demonstrated that Chinese university instructors, whose cultural context is Asian, hold negative and punitive attitudes towards plagiarism and plagiarism issues. Overall, these studies outline that the cultural context of a university instructor can greatly impact how one stand and even behave toward plagiarism. In this case, there can be significant differences about the demonstrated or modelled attitudes towards plagiarism among instructors, which can ultimately end up jeopardizing students' relationship to plagiarism and students' behaviour towards plagiarism. Therefore, it becomes crucial of instructors to focus and follow either the attitude standards towards plagiarism of academia or higher education institutions.

2.6.5. The association between Instructors' Attitude toward Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism

The attitude of instructors plays a central role not only in the interaction of students' behaviour toward plagiarism, but also in transferring messages about plagiarism to students. More specifically, university instructors' attitude toward plagiarism contains, carries, and reflects messages regarding plagiarism. According to Nayak et al. (2015) messages relating to plagiarism are most visible for students in the attitudes of instructors towards plagiarism. Moreover, Valentine (2006) emphasised

that attitude of university instructors towards plagiarism can directly or indirectly signal messages about plagiarism to the student body. Hence, university instructors' attitude toward plagiarism is an important and a valuable component for the sending out or even offering messages in relation to plagiarism.

Given that attitudes of instructors towards plagiarism can convey students with messages regarding plagiarism, it becomes fundamental of instructors to offer clear and consistent messages about plagiarism with their attitudes. Especially for such a critical issue, university instructors need to be modelling and reflecting ethical attitudes in the actions and inactions to plagiarism, both in and out of the classroom. From this perspective, Granitz & Loewy (2007) emphasised that instructors who identify and respond to plagiarism cases inside and outside the courses, in fact, exhibit students to ethical attitudes in terms of plagiarism. Also, Flowerdew & Li (2007) noted that demonstrating consistent procedures in deterring, detecting, and penalizing plagiarism can flourish and reinforce the ethical attitudes toward plagiarism among students. However, several studies have revealed that university instructors neither modelled nor reflected ethical attitudes in the activities and practices toward plagiarism. For example, the study of McCabe (1993) illustrated that even though university instructors witnessed plagiarism incidents in the papers of the students, they neither did confront the students nor penalize the plagiarism incidents. Moreover, Keith-Spiegel's et al. comparative study (1998) identified that university instructors choose not to deal with minor plagiarism cases such as self-plagiarism and collusion. Further, the study by Barrett & Cox (2005) found out that many instructors at a UK university did not pay attention to plagiarism and even did not take action against plagiarism acts of students. In another major study, Walker & White (2014) found that university instructors with longer teaching experience were reluctant and refrained from dealing with plagiarism incidents due to seeing it as time consuming and additional workload. Also, the study of Crossman (2019) reported that sessional instructors within the university exhibited difficulties in identifying and detecting specific cases of plagiarism in students' papers, such as self-plagiarism, other plagiarism, or collusion.

Together, these studies make it clear that students experience different attitudes and behaviours toward plagiarism by their university instructors. This also means that students are not exposed to clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. Inevitably, this will reinforce undesirable messages regarding plagiarism, for example, plagiarism is not wrong, plagiarism is tolerated, or plagiarism is a victimless crime. Apart from this, the lack attitudes of instructors in the actions and inactions toward plagiarism can contribute to the development of unethical attitudes and behaviours toward plagiarism among students. Also, such kind of attitudes of university instructors can create and encourage a cheating environment within the higher education institutions. Obviously, the discrepancy between university instructors' attitudes can create dangerous situations for students and even for universities. Considering all that has been mentioned so far, it can be concluded that the attitudes of university instructors are able to set and intertwined with offering messages about plagiarism, approaches

toward plagiarism, as well as practices and regulations regarding students' behaviour toward plagiarism. Moreover, the attitudes of instructors toward plagiarism characterize students' interaction with plagiarism as well as its types, and students' skills associated with ethical standards. Then the attitudes of university instructors on the subject of plagiarism are a decisive factor for the reflection and integration of ethical, attitudes, behaviours, norms, as well as values. Specifically, by taking these facts into account, it becomes critical and valuable area of interest to comprehend EFL University Instructors attitude toward plagiarism since they are role models for the students regarding to plagiarism and plagiarism issues. In this vein, Bretag (2016) noted that given that EFL Instructors are seen as role models or mentors by their students, they can directly or indirectly associated students with ethical attitudes and behaviours towards plagiarism. In addition to EFL University Instructors, it is necessary to grasp the attitude of ELT University Instructors towards plagiarism, as it can affect students' emergent attitude towards plagiarism. In this sense, Amin & Mohammadkarimi (2019) stated that ELT students can be directly affected by their university instructors' attitudes to plagiarism. Thus, it becomes significant to understand EFL and ELT University Instructors attitude toward plagiarism.

2.7. University Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism

University instructors' awareness of plagiarism has been analysed under four headings: instructors' awareness of plagiarism, instructors' awareness of artificial intelligence, instructors' awareness of plagiarism and the cultural context, and lastly the association between instructors' awareness of plagiarism and the offered messages about plagiarism.

2.7.1. Awareness

Before delving into instructors' awareness of plagiarism, it is essential and fundamental to understand what the word and the term "awareness" mean. According to Online Etymology Dictionary (n.d), awareness stems from the Old English *waer* that means "wary and cautious" and refers to the state of being completely conscious. Also, the term awareness has been defined and exemplified by several dictionaries. For instance, Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2013) defined awareness as being in the state or condition of knowing about something. Similarly, Oxford Learner's Dictionary of Academic English (2014) described awareness as the state or condition of being completely in the knowledge regarding something. Moreover, awareness has defined as an ability of an individual that enables to understand and recognize something through one's perception or sense by the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2014). A further depiction has been made by Colins English Dictionary (2019) who referred to awareness as having a conscious knowledge and acting in relation to such consciousness.

The term awareness has also been considered and clarified by scholars. According to Fuks et al. (2008), awareness is a having an accurate or conscious knowledge about subjects, facts, issues, and events. Correspondingly, Vivacqua et al. (2009) described awareness as holding a precise understanding of individuals towards matters, situations, or conditions. Furthermore, Beuschel et al. (2009) defined awareness as an ability of recognizing the possessed information and transforming that information into knowledge. Moreover, Reinhardt et al. (2012) depicted awareness as a cognitive ability of an individual that allows to understand, perceive, and interpret something. In addition, Djoub (2016) utilized awareness as an ability of individual's that assists comprehending and directly responding to the occurrence. All in all, both the dictionary definitions and the scholars' definitions share the understanding that awareness means to be completely conscious or to have knowledge about something.

2.7.2. Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism

Instructors' awareness of plagiarism is vital as it is a precondition for recognizing and eliminating any kind of potential way that can lead or contribute to plagiarism. More precisely, awareness to plagiarism by university instructors enables to be looking out purposefully and determines the problematic activities, practices, approaches, tools, areas, or ways that can encourage students to plagiarize. The instructors' awareness of plagiarism then not only assists in approaching plagiarism actively or even critically, but also creates and structures learning or teaching environments that do not permit any kind of plagiarism incident. In light of this, Bamford & Sergiou (2005) highlighted that awareness of plagiarism by university instructors resulted in being familiar with where confusion regarding plagiarism as well as plagiarism issues for students can occur and ultimately finding or having solutions to the arising problems. In the same manner, Glendinning (2016) emphasized that awareness of plagiarism by university instructors can serve in identifying the deficient factors to plagiarism, be it the actions of instructor, student, or higher education institution. Aside from taking alert to any kind of plagiarism threats, instructors' awareness of plagiarism also involves considering and reviewing the learning, teaching, course structure, and assignment design. To be more precise, by possessing awareness of plagiarism, instructors can set and construct specific program structures, practices, tasks, or assignments for students that predispose to increase students' awareness of plagiarism and to eradicate any lacking method towards plagiarism and its related issues. According to Baughan (2013), awareness of plagiarism by university instructors can impact and reframe the employed activities, practices, materials, rules, or procedures regarding plagiarism both in and out the courses. In addition, Graham-Matheson & Starr (2013) stressed that awareness of plagiarism by instructors can assist in employing authentic practices to introduce the subject of plagiarism, establishing personalized assignments, or adjusting double controls for given tasks, rather than standard-based exercises, tasks, and controls that might make it easier for students to commit plagiarism. Furthermore, Pecorari (2013) noted that the awareness of plagiarism by university instructors do not only facilitate to take into account specific approaches, methods, models, or tools

in relation to plagiarism, but also is linked with generating and fostering students' awareness of plagiarism. While these carried out issues by the instructors can certainly form and increase students' awareness of plagiarism, associating students with universities plagiarism policies and procedures can also reinforce and even sharpen their awareness of plagiarism. Including plagiarism policies and procedures of the higher education into the tutorials can enforce to acquire the seriousness of committing plagiarism and contribute to the recognition of plagiarism as a serious offense among students. From this point of view, Sutherland-Smith (2008) highlighted that introducing as well as incorporating students with the universities plagiarism policies and procedures can entrench students' awareness of plagiarism such as that plagiarism has serious consequences, and that plagiarism is not tolerated in the university. Also, Carroll & Zetterling (2009) emphasized that by integrating the higher education's plagiarism policies and procedures into the subject materials, instructors can simultaneously train students about plagiarism and guide students to stay away from plagiarism. Thus, the awareness of plagiarism by university instructors' is an important milestone as it places effort into strengthening students' awareness of plagiarism and thereby mitigate the plagiarism among students. In addition to these facts, by having awareness of plagiarism university instructors are able to spot and combat problematic areas or issues that may cause plagiarism or related problems. Moreover, university instructors' awareness of plagiarism can generate instructors to be scrutinize or to be informed about new educational practices to plagiarism, novel negative approaches toward plagiarism, and new preventative ways to plagiarism. All of these mentioned aspects, make it clear that it becomes important to grasp and focus on university instructors' awareness of plagiarism.

2.7.3. Instructors' Awareness of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Without doubt, instructors need to be in the awareness that advances in technology or rapid developments of digital writing tools can motivate students to get information and create their entire task, paper, or even parts of their dissertation through the internet, the digital tools, as well as the computer-generated products. Especially, university instructors need to possess awareness about the Artificial Intelligence (AI) because it is capable to produce as well as to write a complete academic paper, or specific part of the academic paper. Moreover, the Artificial Intelligence (AI) can form and fabricate original content as if were written by an individual. Then, Artificial Intelligence (AI) undertakes actions or practices that are indeed the duty of students within the higher education institutions. Hence, university instructors need to be aware and familiar with the services of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that are offered to the individuals. From this angle, Stockel-Walker (2022) noted that by having awareness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) instructors can enable to perceive and consider the potential problems, challenges, or implications that the Artificial Intelligence (AI) world may arise in higher education institutions. Furthermore, Eke (2023) stated that by getting familiar with and paying closer attention to the Artificial Intelligence (AI) world instructors can recognize, master and even identify the inappropriateness of the various types of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

tools like ChatGPT, Bing Chat, DALL-E, and LaMDA. Naturally, by possessing awareness of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) world university instructors can always be one step ahead and develop alternatives to any kind of occasion.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) should not only attract the attention of university instructors, but also higher education institutions. Indeed, the Artificial Intelligence (AI) world has drawn universities attention since it simplifies the plagiarism process for the students. This matter has also hit the headlines of the newspapers such as Independent, Financial Times, and Guardian in which the reporters (Fazackerly, 2023; Sankaran, 2023; Staton, 2023) stressed that several universities like Cambridge University, the City University of New York, Queensland University, Sciences Po University, Sophia University and so on have prohibited the usage of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in their own networks and devices. Also, universities have explicitly addressed and defined Artificial Intelligence (AI) in their plagiarism policies and procedures for their students. For instance, Cambridge University (2023) described Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a tool or technology that takes over and accomplishes the task of the human being. Correspondingly, Queensland University (2023) defined Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a computer-generated technology that is capable to operate and perform a work like a human being. Given that Artificial Intelligence (AI) is able to create and produce human-like contents, works, or essays, it can become tempting for students to utilize Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in their assignments, papers, and dissertations. If this is the case, then students are committing plagiarism. In this vein, Frye (2022) highlighted that paragraphs, texts, or entire papers that are created with Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools constitutes plagiarism. Also, Anders (2023) noted that utilizing Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to write the assignment or the academic paper and then converting it as one's own work qualifies as plagiarism. Since the usage of such tools can facilitate and encourage students to plagiarize, it becomes crucial of university instructors to make students aware of the relationship between the Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and plagiarism. In this way, university instructors can directly clarify and shape students' engagement with these tools. Further, instructors' awareness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools can assist in reforming their task or assignment approaches such as requiring several outlines, drafts, or asking specific questions to be sure that the computer-generated tools are not utilized.

Although it might seem that Artificial Intelligence (AI) world can cause disruption or implication for students' learnings and writings, instructors' awareness of such kind of world can demonstrate or ensure to take, adopt, and then apply critical precautions, which in turn can prevent plagiarism among students. For this reason, it becomes extremely crucial and fundamental that university instructors are equipped themselves with the awareness of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

2.7.4. Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism and the Cultural Context

In fact, instructors' awareness is a significant factor for the development and growth of oneself, students, and universities. University instructors' awareness is also an essential component for understanding and noticing that students with different backgrounds or with different cultural context hold different beliefs, norms, and values. By being aware that culture may have already created, and shaped students' perception of specific subjects or issues such as plagiarism, instructors can directly equip students with appropriate perception and awareness of plagiarism in the courses. Not only can this be taken into account by university instructors' general awareness, but also by university instructors' awareness of plagiarism can grasp the role of culture in learning and teaching. More specifically, awareness of plagiarism by instructors can serve in noticing the cultural differences of international students toward plagiarism and then associated students with the necessary plagiarism information and awareness. According to Nash (2018) university instructors' awareness of plagiarism can identify whether students with differing cultural context are acculturated with practices toward plagiarism, citation standards, and consequences of committing plagiarism. Furthermore, James et al. (2019) noted that the awareness of plagiarism by instructors can enable to discern that students' cultural context can cause problems or implications in perceiving plagiarism and can completely shape students' awareness of plagiarism. However, not only the cultural context of the students can create difficulties or challenges with regard to plagiarism, but also the cultural context of the university instructors. For example, Paterson et al. (2003) maintained that the cultural context of the instructors can impact their awareness surrounding plagiarism and plagiarism issues. Moreover, Sowden (2005) highlighted that university instructors can possess different levels of awareness of plagiarism as a result of the cultural context. Also, Dayyeh & Skakiyya (2018) stated that the cultural context of instructors can affect the undertaken awareness activities on plagiarism within the classroom, and the engagement with plagiarism issues. Together, these studies make it obvious that university instructors' cultural context drive their awareness of plagiarism, learning and teaching practices, and roles in preventing plagiarism. This implies that university instructors need to be cautious and aware about the impact of their own cultural context, as it is linked to crucial factors that ultimately end up shaping students' outcomes to plagiarism.

2.7.5. The association between Instructors' Awareness of Plagiarism and the Offered Messages about Plagiarism

Instructors' awareness of plagiarism is not only significant for maintaining to hinder potential plagiarism issues or to raise students' awareness, but also it is substantial in signalling to the student body that plagiarism is not tolerated within and outside higher education institutions. Clearly, through awareness of plagiarism university instructors can demonstrate and reinforce messages about plagiarism. In this matter, Serviss (2016) pointed out that awareness of plagiarism by instructors is able to offer and reinforce messages regarding plagiarism. Furthermore, Huang (2017) stressed that

the carried-out awareness of plagiarism by university instructors such as modifying lacking approaches, carefully structuring tasks and controls, or implementation of institutional policies and procedures can send out critical messages about plagiarism. Then, each step of instructors' awareness of plagiarism that intersects with practice, specification, and policies indeed conveys messages related to plagiarism. Obviously, there is a connection between university instructors' awareness of plagiarism and the send out messages about plagiarism.

While it is crucial of university instructors to offer messages regarding plagiarism, it is highly important to provide students with clear and consistent messages in relation to plagiarism. Specifically, in order to do this, university instructors need to be holding high awareness of plagiarism. By having high awareness of plagiarism, instructors can enhance the quality of the education on plagiarism and take effective prevention measures against plagiarism, so that clear and coherent messages about plagiarism are given to the students, both explicitly and implicitly. According to Glendinning (2016) university instructors' high awareness of plagiarism is linked with prioritizing core education activities, enforcing institutional policies and procedures, as well as remaining vigilant against plagiarism, which leads to the perception and impression that plagiarism is not an unacceptable practice among students. Also, Zamani et al. (2023) noted that through possessing high awareness of plagiarism, university instructors can notice whether the created learning or teaching environment provides and strengthens students' awareness of plagiarism avoidance. However, conducted studies from several scholars (Adiningrum, 2015; Ali, 2023; Collins & Amodeo, 2005; Eldin & Ela, 2016; Mostofa et al., 2021; Paterson et al., 2003; Rathore et al., 2015) displayed that instructors possess low awareness of plagiarism. For example, the study of Walker & White (2014) displayed that university instructors possessed low awareness of plagiarism. Another study by Abou-Zeid (2016) identified that several instructors in Egypt hold low awareness of plagiarism and too the related issues. Also, Bowen & Nanni (2021) study revealed that mostly Thai university instructors possessed weak awareness of plagiarism and some even hold poor awareness of plagiarism. These results mean that instructors are not able to offer clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. This also implies that university instructors fail to be establishing and raising students' awareness of plagiarism. Moreover, such kind of awareness by university instructors can result in lack familiarity with the advances or changes in technology or digital world, which ultimately can create opportunities for students to commit plagiarism. Not only can cause this kind of awareness not to be familiar with the novel developments of tools or technology, but also can lead not to notice or identify the gaps in the learning and teaching ability of avoiding plagiarism. Aside from not being able to convey and reinforce the relevant messages about plagiarism to the study body, it can be understood that university instructors low or poor awareness of plagiarism can have serious implications for students' outcomes and even for higher education institutions. Naturally, university instructors possessed awareness of plagiarism is a fundament component for actively engaging in initiatives, empowering learning, teaching, and assessment strategies, and enhancing skills and awareness of students. By considering these issues, it becomes clearly significant to

understand EFL and ELT University Instructors awareness of plagiarism as they can directly impact students to demonstrate their learnings and provide students with relevant awareness of plagiarism. Hence, it becomes essential and vital to understand the awareness of plagiarism by EFL and ELT University Instructors.

2.8. Studies about EFL and ELT Instructors Perception, Attitude, and Awareness of Plagiarism

It appears that very few studies have examined the perception and attitude of EFL University Instructors toward plagiarism. Studies that have concentrated specifically on the perception of plagiarism among EFL University Instructors have also addressed their attitude toward plagiarism. Currently, there is a lack of studies that examine the awareness of plagiarism among EFL University Instructors. Further, there appears to be a lack of studies analysing and integrating the perception, attitude, and awareness of EFL University Instructors regarding plagiarism. Also, there was not a study that considered ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness in relation to plagiarism. To date, there has not been a study conducted in Türkiye regarding EFL and ELT Instructors' perceptions, attitudes, and awareness of plagiarism.

The study of Lei & Hu (2015) examined 112 Chinese EFL Instructors perception and attitude toward plagiarism. While 57 of the EFL Instructors had an academic experience from oversee countries such as America and Australia, 55 of the EFL Instructors possessed a local academic experience. The findings of the study demonstrated that EFL Instructors possessed varied perception of plagiarism; however, EFL Instructors who had an oversee experience possessed higher perception of plagiarism. In addition, the study revealed that EFL Instructors with oversee experience possessed a stronger negative attitude toward plagiarism compared to other instructors. Also, the research of Hu & Sun (2016) investigated Chinese EFL Instructors perception as well as attitude toward plagiarism. The results of the research displayed that while most of the EFL Instructors possessed high perception of plagiarism, some of the EFL Instructors had a low perception of plagiarism. Additionally, the research found out that EFL Instructors hold different attitudes toward plagiarism. Most of the Chinese EFL Instructors hold a zero tolerance toward plagiarism, but few Chinese EFL Instructor possessed a positive attitude toward plagiarism. Moreover, the study of Sun & Hu (2020) explored Chinese EFL Instructors perception and attitude toward plagiarism. The study was conducted with 13 EFL Educators who were from different universities of China. The findings of the study demonstrated that EFL Instructors possessed a high perception of plagiarism. Also, the study identified that some of the EFL Instructors possessed a positive attitude toward plagiarism because they have been regarding it as a learning strategy. Overall, these studies demonstrate the need for more research about EFL Instructors in terms of plagiarism, especially in the context of Turkey. In addition, no studies have been conducted on ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism, in the context of Turkey, which also indicates the need for further research.

Having comprehension about Turkish EFL and ELF Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness toward plagiarism can offer information for prospective instructors as well as for institutions.



CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents and describes the methodology followed in the study. It is divided into four sections: research design of the study, participants and setting, data collection, and at last data analysis. Initially, it focuses on the nature of the study. Moreover, it provides justification for the utilization of mixed method as a research methodology. It then proceeds with the description of the participants, the setting, and the data collection tools. Lastly, it elaborates on the piloting process, data collection process, and data analysis procedure.

Table 1: Overview of the Study's Methodology

Research Method	Mixed Method
Participants	114 participants
Setting	Karadeniz Teknik University, Atatürk University, Akdeniz University, Ankara Social Sciences University, Anadolu University, Atılım University, Beykoz University, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Bursa Teknik University, Çankaya University, Dokuz Eylül University, Ege University, Erciyes University, Fırat University, Gaziantep University, Hacettepe University, Hacı Bayram Veli University, İstanbul University, İstanbul Kültür University, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Kafkas University, Kapadokya University, Medeniyet University, Necmettin Erbakan University, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Pamukkale University, Selçuk University, Trakya University, Uludağ University, Yaşar University, Yıldız Teknik University
Sampling Method	Convenience Sampling
Piloting	The questionnaire was applied to the first-year M.A students, who were enrolled in the applied linguistic program at Karadeniz Technical University in the academic year 2022-2023.
Data Collection	1. Questionnaire 2. Semi-Structured Interviews
Data Analysis	The questionnaire was analysed through SPSS (v. 25). The structured interviews were analysed through content analysis.

3.2. Research Design

This study utilizes both quantitative and qualitative research methods, in other words mixed method. According to Creswell (1999), mixed method consists of utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods within the single study. In a similar way, Dörnyei (2007) described mixed method as incorporating quantitative and qualitative approaches in a single study. Thus, by choosing

mixed method the researcher does not employ and adopt only a single research method, instead; utilizes two different methods within the single study. Specifically, in the present study, the reason for making use of mixed methods is that it can deepen and enrich the examination by combining the strengths of each research method. From this perspective, Creswell (2014) stressed that mixed method provides “more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone” (p.48). In fact, this line of thought has been supported by Bryman (2004), who indicated that particularly the availability of qualitative data within a study can facilitate and strengthen the analysis of the quantitative data. Then, through the mixed method, the researcher has the opportunity to gain a deeper comprehension and to interpret the collected data in a simpler and more efficient way. In this study, the mixed method enabled to determine Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors practices, reactions, and engagements surrounding plagiarism and plagiarism issues. Moreover, it offered and presented in depth-data how Turkish EFL and ELT University communicated about plagiarism both in and out the tutorials. Also, the mixed method assisted in obtaining a complete picture of the plagiarism problem and added depth to the answers in terms of the research questions.

In this mixed method, the researcher adopted the sequential explanatory mixed method research design. The sequential explanatory mixed method design is characterized by Teddlie & Tashakkori (2009), as collecting and analysing primarily the quantitative data in the research, then collecting and considering the qualitative data. Correspondingly, Creswell & Clark (2017) described sequential explanatory mixed method design as consisting of two phases, in which the initial phase of research is devoted to gathering and analysing quantitative data, while the step phase consists of obtaining and analysing the qualitative data. In view of these definitions, it can be concluded that sequential explanatory mixed method design is structured as collecting and analysing the quantitative and qualitative data in order. In the present study, at first, quantitative data was collected through an online questionnaire and qualitative data was gathered via semi-structured interview afterwards.

Indeed, Morse (1991) put forward that the benefits of sequential explanatory mixed method research design lie in its simplicity and in the opportunity of obtaining in-depth quantitative analysis. Also, Dörnyei (2007) noted that sequential explanatory mixed method research design is easier to apply, facilitate to analyse the results, and provide rich ultimate findings for the study. Thus, this research design allows the researcher to obtain rich or extensive data and assists in the interpretation of the analyses of the quantitative data. In this regard, the sequential explanatory mixed method research design in this study lead to have a deeper understanding and even to contextualized accurately the quantitative findings of EFL and ELT Turkish University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. In addition, it was preferred by the researcher due to being practical and following a certain sequence.

3.3. Participants and Setting

In line with the goals and main concerns of this study, it was implemented to Master students (MA) and Doctoral students (PhD) of Applied Linguistics, English Language and Literature, English Literature, English Culture and Literature, English Language Teaching, and English Translation and Interpreting during the 2022-2023 academic year. Specifically, MA students and PhD students have been chosen as participants because composing original dissertation or academic paper can be regarded a turning point and being potential future scholars. From this perspective, Gilmore et al. (2010) pointed out that especially for MA students and PhD students writing or publishing a thesis is a milestone as it is generally their first step to the academic world. Another underlying reason for selecting MA and PhD students as a sample is that they inevitable are introduced and integrated by their instructors to the academic world. In this sense, Farahian et al. (2020) emphasized that master and doctoral students are mostly influence by their academic supervisors because of guiding them to the academic research ethics and closely being engaged in the dissertation writing process.

Moreover, this study employed and adopted convenience sampling method. The main reason for this is that it offers researchers to collect information from participants that are easily accessible and volunteer to take part. According to Dörnyei (2007) convenience sampling is kind of non-probability or non-random sampling in which participants are chosen because of specific criteria's such as the ease of access, availability at a particular time, or the willingness to participate. Correspondingly, PlanoClark & Creswell (2014) stated that convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method where participants are selected to the research due to meeting certain criteria like being geographical proximity, availability, convenient, and desiring to take part in the research.

The participants were connected through faculty members that have been advised and recommend by my supervisor and through the head of the department, to whom e-mail writing were written and send out. The advised faculty members were searched on the internet and their e-mail addresses were noted. Also, the head of the departments of all Applied linguistics, English Language and Literature, English Literature, English Culture and Literature, English Translation and Interpreting, and English Language Teaching in Türkiye, were searched online and both personal and academic e-mails were written down. Before sending the e-mail to the faculty members and the head of the departments, the e-mail was first and foremost send to my supervisor to receive an approval. In this e-mail, I firstly provided information about myself and my supervisor, then elaborated on the aim of the study, and then kindly requested the attached online survey to be forwarded to the master students and doctoral students. These actions were not solely aimed at increasing the number of participants but were also undertaken in strict accordance with ethical principles, demonstrating a commitment to responsible and ethical research conduct.

In this study, the survey was distributed through an online survey tool, namely Google Form. The primary reason to utilize Google Form was that it enables the opportunity to reach large audiences. Another reason was that the audience is able to access Google Form from anywhere in the world. Moreover, at the beginning of the survey, the purpose of the study and necessary information for the study were clarified, the contact information of the researcher was offered, and an informed consent form was placed. Also, at the end of the survey, e-mail addresses were collected from participants who would like to join voluntarily to an interview in relation to plagiarism and plagiarism issues. When the procedure was completed, 114 participants responded to the survey. The demographic information about the participants is given and summarized in Table 2 below.

3.3.1. Demographic Information of the Participants and Universities

As Table 2 indicates, a total of 114 students took part in this study, 75 of the participants were master students while 39 were doctoral students. Moreover, students age ranged between 20 and over 35. In terms of age, 81 of the students were female on the other hand 33 of them were male. It can be said that female students outnumbered male students by a percentage of 42,2 %. While 30 participants were first-year MA students, 37 were second-year MA students, and 8 were third-year MA students. With regard to doctoral students, 17 of the participants were first-year PhD students, 10 were second-year PhD students, 8 were third-year PhD students, and 4 were fourth-year PhD students. Moreover, among the 114 participants, 61 of them were from the English Language Teaching program, 40 of them were from the English Language and Literature program, 7 of them were from the English Culture and Literature program, 4 of them were from Applied Linguistics program, and 1 were from English Literature Program. This diversity of the sampling can notably offer rich data about the dynamic realities surrounding plagiarism and plagiarism issues in the programs. Also, regarding the language of the thesis, 113 students wrote their thesis in English, while 1 student wrote their thesis in Turkish.

Table 2: Demographic Information of the Participants

Demographic Information of the Participants	Options	Number	Percentage
Age	20-24	3	%2,6
	25-29	46	%40,4
	30-34	31	%27,2
	35 or over	34	%29,8
Gender	Female	81	%71,1
	Male	33	%28,9
Current Academic Status	First-year MA student	30	%26,3
	Second-year MA student	37	% 32,5
	Third-year MA student	8	%7
	First-year PhD student	17	%14,9

Table 2: (Continue)

Demographic Information of the Participants	Options	Number	Percentage
Current Academic Status	Second-year PhD student	10	%8,8
	Third-year PhD student	8	%7
	Fourth-year PhD student	4	%3,5
Program	Applied Linguistics	4	%3,5
	English Language and Literature	40	%35,1
	English Literature	1	% 0,9
	English Culture and Literature	7	%6,1
	English Translation and Interpreting	1	% 0,9
	English Language Teaching	61	%53,5
Master Thesis / Doctoral Thesis	in English	113	%99,1
	in Turkish	1	%0,9

Also, Table 3 illustrates, participants attended to the online survey from various universities. While twenty-four were state universities, seven were private universities. With regard to state universities, the online survey were sent and carried out in: Atatürk University (1), Akdeniz University (2), Ankara Social Sciences University (3), Anadolu University (1), Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University (1), Bursa Teknik University (2), Dokuz Eylül University (1), Ege University (1), Erciyes University (2), Fırat University (4), Gaziantep University (4), Hacettepe University (3), Hacı Bayram Veli University (3), İstanbul University (1), Kafkas University (8), Karadeniz Technical University (10), Medeniyet University (5), Necmettin Erbakan University (1), Ondokuz Mayıs University (16), Pamukkale University (12), Selçuk University (2), Trakya University (1), Uludağ University (10), and Yıldız Teknik University (6). Also, the private universities from which participants took part included the following ones: Atılım University (3), Beykoz University (1), Çankaya University (3), İstanbul Kültür University (1), İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University (1), Kapadokya University (3), and Yaşar University (2).

Table 3: Demographic Information about Participants Universities

Demographic Information about Participants Universities	Universities	Number	Percentage
State University	Atatürk University	1	%0,9
	Akdeniz University	2	%1,8
	Ankara Social Sciences University	3	%2,6
	Anadolu University	1	%0,9
	Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University	1	%0,9
	Bursa Teknik University	2	%1,8
	Dokuz Eylül University	1	%0,9
	Ege University	1	%0,9
	Erciyes University	2	%1,8
	Fırat University	4	%3,5

Table 3: (Continue)

Demographic Information about Participants Universities	Universities	Number	Percentage
State University	Gaziantep University,	4	%3,5
	Hacettepe University	3	%2,6
	Hacı Bayram Veli University	3	%2,6
	Istanbul University	1	%0,9
	Kafkas University	8	%7
	Karadeniz Teknik University	10	%8,8
	Medeniyet University	5	%4,4
	Necmettin Erbakan University	1	%0,9
	Ondokuz Mayıs University	16	%13,8
	Pamukkale University	12	%10,5
	Selçuk University	2	%1,8
	Trakya University	1	%0,9
	Uludağ University	10	%8,8
	Yıldız Teknik University	6	%5,3
Private University	Atilim University	3	%2,6
	Beykoz University	1	%0,9
	Çankaya University	3	%2,6
	Istanbul Kültür University	1	%0,9
	Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University	1	%0,9
	Kapadokya University	3	%2,6
	Yaşar University	2	%1,8

From Table 3, it can be concluded that the highest participation was made from the Ondokuz Mayıs University, Pamukkale University, Karadeniz Teknik University, and Uludağ University.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

As mentioned above, both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools were utilized in this study. The questionnaire and the interview were applied to master students and doctoral students to scrutinize through their lenses Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism.

3.4.1. The Questionnaire

To develop a valid and reliable questionnaire, an intensive literature review on the subject was carried out by the researcher. The literature was searched and examined with using the following key words: plagiarism, plagiarism in the academic world, plagiarism in higher education institution, plagiarism and technology, plagiarism and artificial intelligence, the cultural context and plagiarism, perception of plagiarism, attitude toward plagiarism, and awareness of plagiarism. Not only the

internet was scrutinized, but also books, articles, and related questionnaire. Moreover, my supervisor advised and recommended to consider the questionnaire of Hochstein et al. (2008), which resulted in gaining an inspiration for forming and writing plagiarism scenarios. Also, my supervisor suggested to regard his own study and questionnaire regarding plagiarism, Kayaoğlu et al. (2016), which has assisted in grasping how a questionnaire can be adapted and developed. These factors served in creating the first drafts of the questions for the questionnaire.

There are several factors that the researcher must consider while preparing a questionnaire. First and foremost, the questions or the statements in the questionnaire have to accurately reflect the nature of the investigation and provide the desired information. However, Oppenheim (1992) highlighted that it is also crucial that the questions or the statements in the questionnaire should not be negative and double-barrelled. Besides the statements or the questions, the instructions in the questionnaire need to be clear and concise so that the participants do not have any problem or difficulty in comprehending. By considering these facts, the questionnaire started to be prepared and formed at the beginning of January 2022. Feedbacks, supplementations, and suggestions were made by my supervisor and thus the questionnaire was revised by the researcher. In particular, the questionnaire was exactly revised ten times. Naturally, the process was long and continued until every question or statement could be understood by all participants with the same meaning.

The language of the questionnaire was English. In fact, the questionnaire consisted of five parts; however, with the advice and recommendation of my supervisor two more part was added. The first part included demographic questions before starting with the main context of the study. The second part contained initial questions for participants about plagiarism and surrounding plagiarism issues. The third part examined participants perception of plagiarism and paraphrasing skills. The fourth part mainly focused on participants stance toward plagiarism, but also considered participants cultural perspective to plagiarism and participants association with writing in a foreign language and plagiarism. The fifth part investigated participants awareness of plagiarism. The sixth part comprised of questions that directly asked participants knowledge and familiarity to artificial intelligence. The last part also included questions about artificial intelligence and the relationship between artificial intelligence and plagiarism. In the fourth, fifth, and seventh part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to rate their agreements with the items on a five-point likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Detailed information about the questionnaire, which consisted of six parts, is given in the following section.

In the first part, totally 6 items were included and asked. These questions were related to demographic information to obtain participants' age, gender, higher education institution, program, academic status, and the language of the dissertation. The second part intended to comprehend participants background regarding plagiarism such as plagiarism education experience, guidance for avoiding plagiarism by instructors and universities, information about the consequences of

committing plagiarism, usage of plagiarism tools, and the impact of classmates to plagiarism incidents. Moreover, this part consisted of 15 items. In the third part, the aim was to examine and understand participants perception of plagiarism, perception of the different types of plagiarism and detect the plagiarized paragraphs. In particular, to understand participants perception of plagiarism and perception of the different types of plagiarism 12 different plagiarism scenarios were composed and asked. In addition, to investigate participants ability to identify plagiarized paragraphs, two paragraphs were taken from the Simon Fraser University Plagiarism Tutorial.

The fourth part, intended to find out participants attitude toward plagiarism and for this Harris (2001) items were adopted and modify in terms of Turkish participants. Moreover, in this part six questions were directly related with discerning participants cultural contexts impact on plagiarism. Also, there are two questions that examine participants experience with writing academic in the foreign language and committing plagiarism. The fifth part, aimed to identify participants awareness of the consequences of plagiarism, awareness of institutional policies and procedures to plagiarism, awareness of intentional plagiarism, awareness of unintentional plagiarism, and awareness of paraphrasing. Paraphrasing awareness comprised two items, while the other categories of awareness contained sixteen items in total. The sixth part, which included four items, intended to discern participants familiarization with artificial intelligence technology and tools. Specifically, the questions or the statements of the final part were composed and formulated by my supervisor. In the final part, the aim was to understand participants awareness of the role that artificial intelligence can play in plagiarism. This part contained 12 items. Overall, the questionnaire consisted of seven parts and 89 items in total.

3.4.2. Semi-Structured Interviews

Although questionnaire is considered as a versatile tool for gathering large amounts of variables in the shortest possible time, there are also variables that need to be addresses with “what”, “why”, as well as “how”. Especially, to fulfil the gaps of the questionnaire, interview can be utilized and carried out. According to Dörnyei (2007) there are three types of interviews, which are structured interview, unstructured interview, and semi-structured interview. Specifically, semi-structured interview is considered by scholars as the most effective and most preferred data collection method. According to Longhurst (2003) pointed out that semi-structured interview consists of asking a series of open-ended questions, which are also supplemented with follow-up questions, that enable the researcher to obtain a deeper understanding of the specific topic or problem through the participant. Moreover, Laforest (2009) stressed that even though semi-structured interview comprise of small sample size of participants, it is highly an effective method as it can make it easier for researchers to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of a particular topic. Besides filling the gaps of the questionnaire, to gain more comprehensive information and to present rich data about Turkish EFL

and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism through MA and PhD students, semi-structured interviews were planned and carried out.

First and foremost, the items of the questionnaire were taken into account while questions for semi-structured interview were prepared. In addition, my supervisor advised to consider the relevant literature review and specifically recommended to regard the study of Wilkinson (2009). Based on the suggestions of my supervisor and the studies, the questions for the interview took their final forms. In total, five questions were developed and formed by the researcher. The first question was concerned with the participants perception of the concept of plagiarism. The following question sought to discover participants responsibilities in terms of plagiarism. The third question focused on comprehending university instructors' responsibilities to plagiarism by the participants. The next question addressed the impact that university instructors offered approaches could have both in and out of the classroom. The fifth question was asking participants the ways of reducing plagiarism within the tutorials as well as higher education institutions. Moreover, at the end of the interview participants were asked whether they would like to add anything more.

The semi-structured interview was carried out over Zoom because of participants different geographical location and availability. Even though the interview was conducted in a digital format, it took place in a friendly atmosphere. Before starting with recording the interviews, participants were clarified about their privacy and security throughout the study. After a detailed explanation on the privacy for the participants, the interview s to be applied by the researcher. The interviews began to be carried out in the second week of May and finished at the end of May. Each interview took about 12-15 minutes. In total, seven participants were voluntary to take part in the interviews. In terms of the participants, 4 were from Karadeniz Teknik University, who were Master Students and 3 were from Gaziantep University, while 2 students were Master Students, one was Doctoral Student.

3.5. Piloting Process

Without doubt, a crucial element of the research process is piloting. Especially, piloting of the data collection tools is necessary and efficient to determine their practicality, reliability, and validity before their implementation. From this perspective, Prescott & Soeken (1989) emphasized that piloting can be seen as a small version of the planned research in order to assess the validity of the research study, verify the appropriateness of the methodological tools, and identify problematic items or areas prior to data collection process. Hence, by piloting the data collection tools, the researcher is able to detect the problematic items, the unnecessary items to the research study, and poorly composed items that cannot be understood with the same meanings by all participants in practice. For this reason, it becomes fundamental and valuable to pilot the questionnaire and the interview before it is applied to the main participants.

The questionnaire and the interview utilized in this study were piloted once with Master Students. Moreover, the questionnaire was administrated to 7 MA students, who were from the Applied Linguistic Program of Karadeniz Teknik University. Before starting the piloting process, the researcher clarified MA students about to mark down questions or statements that were unclear, incomprehensible, and confusing to them. After the clarification, the MA students began to read and fulfil the questionnaire. After all the participants were finished, the items which caused problems in understanding were written down by the researcher. Besides the questionnaire, the semi-structured interview questions were also presented to the participants to determine any ambiguous and unclear questions. With regard to the interview questions, the participants did not have problems in understanding the questions. However, in terms of the questionnaire, the participants stated that three items from the second part and the culture items from the fourth part of the questionnaire were not clear for them. After participants feedback were noted, suggestions and recommendations were also made by my supervisor such as to shorten the introduction of the questionnaire and to clarify a few ambiguous words. Based on the feedback of my supervisor and the participants, the items on the questionnaire were rearranged. The feedbacks and the adjustments were directly applied to the questionnaire and then send out via email to the supervisor. Additionally, a group of esteemed PhD holders and field experts in the Department of English Language Literature at Karadeniz Technical University were consulted, and their feedback was carefully considered. Based on the input received from both my supervisor and the participants, adjustments were made to the questionnaire. These feedback-driven adjustments were promptly incorporated into the questionnaire. Upon obtaining my supervisor's approval, the questionnaire was prepared using Google Forms.

3.6. Data Collection Process

The data collection process of this study lasted almost two months. Especially, to collect the quantitative data, an online version of the questionnaire was prepared by means of Google Form to be able to reach more participants. The participants were invited via a link, which was initially send to their head of the department and their university instructors. In fact, contacting the university instructors and the head of the department via link, including a brief explanation about the aim of the study, was completely suggested, and advised by my supervisor. However, only 85 participants filled out the form in the first attempt, therefore a kindly reminder, including again the aim of the study and the link, was sent to the university instructors and head of the department. Thanks to this attempt, the online questionnaire was filled out by 115 participants. However, the last participant was excluded from the present study due to being from the History Program. This was the only difficulty that were experienced within the online questionnaire.

The next step of the study after the online questionnaire process was the implementation of semi-structured interview with the volunteer participants. Of the 114 participants who took part in the online questionnaire, 7 of them agreed to participate in the interview. After their agreement, the

participants were contacted by the researcher and the date as well as the time of the interviews were determined according to the participant's availability. The choice of language for the interview was English, and this decision was made in accordance with their preferences, not imposed upon them. Moreover, at the end of each interview, participants were kindly asked whether they would agree on follow up interview in case of need. All participants were kind enough to agree to this issue. Subsequently, the researcher reviewed the recordings and promptly transcribed them into word document. This meticulous transcription process spanned approximately nine days to complete document.

3.7. Data Analysis Procedure

The data analysis process of this study was carried out in two stages: quantitative and qualitative analyses. Specifically, for the quantitative analysis, the researcher made usage of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences Program (SPSS, v.25). To be more precisely, the data obtained through the questionnaire were analysed through descriptive statistical techniques which provide information through numerical summaries as well as factor analysis in the SPSS Program. Moreover, the data collected from the Master and Doctoral students via the online questionnaire was extracted from Google Form as an Excel file and were directly transferred into the SPSS Program. Next, the researcher coded each item of the questionnaire. Before analysing the obtained data, the researcher considered and determined the Cronbach's Alpha value. The value of the whole questionnaire was found to be 0,667. According to Griethuijsen et al. (2015), the values over 0,60 or 0,70 can be evaluated as reliable. Once the reliability of the items was completed, the researcher started to calculate the frequencies and the percentages of the responses.

For the analysis of qualitative data, the transcribed forms of the interview were read several times by the researcher. This process was carried out by the researcher to understand more deeply the participants' comments on the questions and to capture similar or repetitive statements of the participants. From this perspective, Cohen et al. (2007) indicated that reading the qualitative data multiple times enables the researcher to comprehend or to interpret the data in terms of the participants and to identify or to determine the same patterns of the participants expression. Especially, the similar and repetitive statements of the participants were underlined, and then summarized into one or two paragraphs by the researcher. While the important statements of the participants were underlined and labelled, also the relevant data was started to be coded by the researcher. There the researcher utilised quantitative content analysis to identify the main themes, the similar expressions, and the statements or the patterns that can provide answers to the study. According to Erlingsson & Brysiewicz (2017) the content analysis procedure consists of "a) familiarising oneself with the data and the hermeneutic spiral, b) dividing up the text into meaning units and subsequently condensing these meaning units, c) formulating codes, and d) developing

categories and themes” (p.95). After the coding process was completed, as a final procedure the unrelated data from the analysis was excluded.



CHAPTER FOUR

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the findings and the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data collection tools are presented respectively. While the quantitative data collected through the questionnaire was analysed with SPSS, the qualitative data gathered from semi-structured interview was analysed through content analysis. The major aim of this comprehensive analysis is to reveal Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism through the lenses of Master and Doctoral Students.

4.2. Analysis of Quantitative Data

4.2.1. Initial Information for the Questionnaire

This part comprises the analysis of fifteen questions that took part in the initial information part of the questionnaire. In addition, in this part, each item was presented within frequency tables and followed by its interpretation. The first question in this part was the “educating/informing about plagiarism”. In particular, the second question was a follow-up question for students who responded with “yes” to the first question: the students clarified that they were exposed to information about plagiarism mainly by the university instructors. The third question in this part asked whether students were associated with the plagiarism policy of their higher education institutions.

As it is illustrated in Table 4 below, most of the students (85,1%) were provided with information about plagiarism within their programs. However, there were also students (14,9%) who were not educated or informed about plagiarism in their programs. Moreover, it becomes obvious that the information process regarding plagiarism was mainly carried out through the university instructor (89,9%), articles or books (57,6%), online resources (48,5%), and discussion (41,4%) respectively. The least utilized tool in relation to the information process about plagiarism was institution (30,3%). Also, it could be understood and noted that 83 of the students (72,2%) were clarified about their higher education institution plagiarism policy by the university instructor. While 31 of the students (27,2%) were neither informed of nor related within the program by their university instructors about the university’s plagiarism policy.

Table 4: Educating/Informing about Plagiarism

Educating/Informing about Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
1. Have you received any information regarding plagiarism by the instructors?	Yes	97	%85,1
	No	17	%14,9
2. If yes, through which means were you made familiar with plagiarism? (select by crossing all that apply to you)	Via Instructor	89	%89,9
	Via Institution	30	%30,3
	Via Articles/Books	57	%57,6
	Via Discussions	41	%41,5
	Via Online Resources	48	%48,5
3. Have you been informed about <u>your</u> university's plagiarism policy?	Yes	83	%72,2
	No	31	%27,2

The fourth item in this part was related to whether students had the opportunity to utilize anti-plagiarism program within their program. Furthermore, the fifth item was a follow question for students who replied with “yes” to the fourth item. On the other hand, the sixth item was a follow question for those students who replied with “no” to the fourth item.

As it can be seen from Table 5 illustrated below, majority of the students (54,4%) had no access to anti-plagiarism program. However, only 52 of the students (45,6%) were able to make use of anti-plagiarism program to check their tasks or academic papers. With regard to the students, who were able to utilize anti-plagiarism only 16 of them (21,9%) employed it always to the papers. While 21 of the students (28,8%) were applying anti-plagiarism program often in their papers, 16 of the students were employing it sometimes toward the papers. Also, few students (4,1%) preferred seldomly to use anti-plagiarism program for their papers. In addition, even though 17 students (23,3%) of the students had the potential to utilize anti-plagiarism program, they did not choose to use it for their assignments or papers. In terms of the students, who were not able to implement their papers in an anti-plagiarism program, most of the students (59,5%) made it clear that they would always use it. Moreover, few students (8,3%) indicated that they would often make use of the anti-plagiarism program for their papers. Whereas 20 of the students (23,8%) would prefer to apply and consider it sometimes toward their paper, 3 of the students (3,6%) would seldomly employ and place their assignment into an anti-plagiarism program. There were also some students (4,8%) who would not utilize the anti-plagiarism program for their paper or assignment.

Table 5: Usage of Anti-plagiarism Program

Usage of Anti-plagiarism Program	Options	Frequency	Percentage
4. Do you have access to anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate, and etc?	Yes	52	%45,6
	No	62	%54,4
5. If yes, before submitting your paper, do you check it with an anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate, and etc?	Never	17	%23,3
	Seldom	3	%4,1
	Sometimes	16	%21,9

Table 5: (Continue)

Usage of Anti-plagiarism Program	Options	Frequency	Percentage
5.If yes, before submitting your paper, do you check it with an anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate, and etc?	Often	21	%28,8
	Always	16	%21,9
6.If no, would you prefer to utilize an anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate and etc for your paper?	Never	4	%4,8
	Seldom	3	%3,6
	Sometimes	20	%23,8
	Often	7	%8,3
	Always	50	%59,5

The seventh question in this part was about students' commitment to avoid plagiarism in their assignments or papers. On the other hand, the eighth question was about whether students were acknowledged about the plagiarism controls of their papers or assignments within the program.

As can be observed from Table 6, majority of the students (63,2%) searched and sought advice from their university instructors in order to prevent plagiarism issues in their papers. However, 42 students (36,8%) did not look out for their instructors' assistance to avoid plagiarism in the assigned tasks or papers. Additionally, it could be seen that most of the students (94,7%) were informed about the plagiarism controls of their program. Only, few students (5,3) were not clarified that papers would be examined in terms of plagiarism.

Table 6: Avoiding Plagiarism

Avoiding Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
7.Before submitting your written papers, do you seek the advice of your teachers to prevent plagiarism?	Yes	72	%63,2
	No	42	%36,8
8.Were you informed during the Master/Doctoral program that students' paper would be checked for plagiarism?	Yes	108	%94,7
	No	6	%5,3

The ninth item in this part was about the plagiarism cases encountered within the scope of the program by the students. The tenth item, in particular, was a follow-up question for the students who responded with "yes" to the ninth item, who expressed the actions that were carried out by the instructors. Moreover, the eleventh item was associated with the consequences of committing plagiarism. In addition, to the eleventh item a follow-up question for students who replied with "yes" to it, in which they clarified the ways of being related to the consequences of plagiarism.

Table 7: Consequences of Plagiarism

Consequences of Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
9.Have you witnessed a plagiarism occurrence during the Master/Doctoral program?	Yes	22	%19,3
	No	92	%80,7

Table 7: (Continue)

Consequences of Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
10.If yes, what action was taken by the instructor?	Received verbal warning	7	%22,6
	Received a lower grade	5	%16,1
	Resubmitted the paper / assignment	3	%9,7
	Suspended from the course	6	%19,4
	Took no action	5	%16,1
	Others...	5	%16,1
11.Have you been informed about the consequences of committing plagiarism?	Yes	97	%85,1
	No	17	%14,9
12.If yes, how were you informed? (select by crossing all that apply to you)	Via Instructor	85	%89,5
	Via Institution	25	%26,3
	Via Course Syllabus	36	%37,9
	Via Online Sources	27	%28,4
	Others...	2	%2,4

According to Table 7, most of the students (80,7%) did not face incidents of plagiarism within the program, but there were some students (19,3%) who witnessed plagiarism acts. Specifically, students who encountered plagiarism within the program made it clear that university instructors mainly preferred to deal with plagiarism incidents by warning verbally (22,6%) and by expelling from the course (19,4%). It was followed by giving a lower grade (16,1%), taking no action (16,1%), and other actions (16,3%) included confronting the student face to face. The least utilized and applied action against plagiarism incidents by instructors were to the permission of resubmission of the paper/assignment (9,7%). In addition, Table 7 reveals that many of the students (85,1%) were related to the consequences of committing plagiarism. These students were introduced to the consequences of plagiarism mainly by their university instructors (89,5%). Also, the students were made familiar with the consequences of plagiarism through the course syllabus (37,9%). Further, university instructors employed and benefited from the online sources (28,4%) and the institution (26,3%) to associate students with the consequences of committing plagiarism. Especially, university instructors made less usage of discussion (2,4%) in terms of associating students with the consequences of plagiarism. However, there were also students (14,9%) who were not informed about the consequences of plagiarism.

The thirteenth question in this part was asked whether the high demand of the program lead students to commit plagiarism. Moreover, the fourteenth question addressed the impact of self-efficacy on plagiarism. The last question was related to the role of peer influence on plagiarism.

Based in the Table 8 below, most of the students (54,4%) seem to consider that high demands of the program do not contribute to their perform plagiarism. Whereas some of the students (32,5%) seem to be in the opinion that the high demands within the program can slightly cause to commit

plagiarism, 12 of the students (10,5%) felt and regarded the effect of it as much. Furthermore, 3 of the students (2,6%) clarified that the programs high demands had a major impacted on their plagiarism performance. Additionally, majority of the students (41,2%) revealed that their self-efficacy highly influenced their plagiarism behaviours. Similarly, a vast majority of the students (41,2%) indicated that they were significantly affected by their self-efficacy with regard to carrying out plagiarism. Some of the students (14%) were only slightly influenced by their self-efficacy to commit plagiarism. There were 4 students (3,5%) who did not at all consider self-efficacy to be affected to do plagiarism. Through Table 8, it could also be comprehended that most of the students (38,6%) were slightly tempted to commit plagiarism due to the peer influence. While 24 of the students (21,1%) made it clear that their classmates significantly impacted them in terms of committing plagiarism, 20 of the students (17,5%) considered the effect of classmates to be as a major influence. Only some students (22,8%) were in the opinion that their classmates did not at all shape them to be engaged in plagiarism.

Table 8: Factors Influencing to Commit Plagiarism

Factors Influencing to Commit Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
13.Master courses/Doctoral courses have high demands such as completing multiple assignments in a short time or competition to receive high grades. Does this cause you to ignore plagiarism to some extent?	Not at all	62	%54,4
	Slightly	37	%32,5
	Much	12	%10,5
	Very Much	3	%2,6
14.When you need to submit papers to the instructors, how much pressure do you put upon yourself?	Not at all	4	%3,5
	Slightly	16	%14
	Much	47	%41,2
	Very Much	47	%41,2
15.How much pressure do you feel on you due to your classmates for writing successful papers?	Not at all	26	%22,8
	Slightly	44	%38,6
	Much	24	%21,1
	Very Much	20	%17,5

Based on the results, it can be evidently understood that many of the university instructors provide their students with information regarding plagiarism. These university instructors utilize various instruments, particularly to inform and educate students about plagiarism. Moreover, most of the university instructors offered information about plagiarism controls for students' assignments or academic papers. In addition, several university instructors clarified students about the consequences of committing plagiarism. Especially, to clarify students about the consequences of plagiarism university instructors were making usage of different tools. Although university instructors responded to plagiarism incidents, mainly they preferred to warn verbally the student and suspend the student from the course.

However, there also university instructors who do not offer students any information about plagiarism. The lack of information can be seen not only with regard to the subject of plagiarism, but also with regard to the higher education plagiarism policy. The deficiency of university instructor is also visible in the fact that they do not receive the need and the desire of students to use anti-plagiarism software for their assignments or academic papers. In addition, university instructors need to be noticing that students can be encouraged to plagiarize due to the high demands within the program. Aside from this fact, university instructors must also perceive that peer pressure and pressure oneself can cause students to be engaged in plagiarism.

4.2.2. Analysis of Perception Statements

With regard to the first research question, which intended to reveal Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception of plagiarism through the lenses of MA and PhD students, the participants responded to 14 items. While the first 12 items from the questionnaire were related with the general perception of plagiarism and perception of the different forms of plagiarism, 2 items dealt with the perception of paraphrasing. Moreover, the frequencies and percentages of the items were presented in Table 9 and Table 10. In particular, the items with the highest and lowest mean in each Table were marked as bold and examined.

The first example of the plagiarism scenario was about purloining. According to the results, most of the students (92,1%) considered this sample as plagiarism. However, 2 of the students (1,8%) did not regard it as plagiarism. The following plagiarism scenario dealt with unethical collaboration. Specifically, more than half of the students (54,4%) were in the opinion that the occurrence in the scenario is plagiarism. While 26 students (22,8%) did not see it as plagiarism, 26 of the students (22,8%) were not even sure whether it was plagiarism or not. The third plagiarism scenario consisted of sham paraphrasing. Almost half of the students (43,2%) did not take into account that this situation means plagiarism. Only, some of the students (20,7%) were not confident whether it constructs plagiarism or not. The next scenario was about other plagiarism. A vast majority of the students (93%) viewed the sample incident as plagiarism. There were also 4 students (3,5%) who did not consider it as plagiarism and 4 students (3,5%) who were not entirely sure whether it constituted plagiarism. The fifth scenario did not constitute an act of plagiarism. Most of the students (84,2%) identified that the occurrence does not compromise plagiarism. However, few of the students (6,1%) were not sure enough whether it was plagiarism or not. The sixth plagiarism scenario dealt with ghostwriting. The majority of the students (85,1%) considered the example situation of ghostwriting to be plagiarism. Only 8 students (7%) did not find it involves plagiarism.

It can also be inferred from Table 9, that almost all students (98,2%) regarded the sample scenario of illicit paraphrasing as plagiarism. While 1 student (0,9%) did not view it as constituting plagiarism, 1 student (0,9%) did not have certainty whether it comprised plagiarism or not. The eighth

scenario was about the usage of secondary source. Especially, plenty of the students (50,9%) did not think that citing a source within a source was plagiarism. In addition, there were 31 students (27,2%) who were not sure whether it constituted plagiarism or not. The ninth plagiarism scenario dealt with common knowledge. Many of the students (66,7%) were in the opinion that common knowledge does not require attribution. On the other hand, 17 students (14,9%) seem to be viewing not providing attribution to common knowledge as plagiarism. The next plagiarism scenario was about verbatim plagiarism. Nearly all of the students (94,7%) agreed that the sample situation means plagiarism. Although this sample contained plagiarism, only a small number of the students (1,8%) did not see it as plagiarism. The eleventh scenario was related to mosaic plagiarism. To be precise, 94 of the students (82,5%) illustrated that the example occurrence of mosaic plagiarism needs to be viewed as plagiarism. However, 6 of the students (5,3%) did not identify it as plagiarism. The last plagiarism scenario was about self-plagiarism. More than half of the students (51,8%) clarified that reusing previous work or paper for them implies plagiarism. On the other hand, there were some students (18,4%) who were not clear whether it constituted an act of plagiarism.

Table 9: Perception of Plagiarism

Perception of Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
1.Students are assigned to present their research proposals in the course. During the presentation, Student A thinks that Student B's ideas are interesting. Student A then starts to write down some sentences of Student B's paper. Student A put those sentences in his/her own paper without any modification.	Yes	105	%92,1
	No	2	%1,8
	Not Sure	7	%6,1
2.Student A has to write a paper for a MA/ PhD course. Student A asks Student B for help in terms of writing the paper scientifically. Student B agrees and offers some suggestions. Student B also writes two paragraphs for Student A's paper. Student A submits the paper as one's original paper.	Yes	62	%54,4
	No	26	%22,8
	Not Sure	26	%22,8
3.The student takes a sentence word by word from a book and changes two or three words of the sentence to demonstrate that the sentence has been paraphrased. The student then acknowledges where the information was taken.	Yes	40	%36,8
	No	48	%43,2
	Not Sure	23	%20,7
4.As part of a research methods course, Student A is required to write an academic paper. In the previous semester Student B had written an academic paper for this course. Student A has access to this information. Student A asks Student B whether it is possible to make use of the written paper. Student B lends the paper over, and Student A submits the whole academic paper as his/her own paper.	Yes	106	%93
	No	4	%3,5
	Not Sure	4	%3,5
5.The student takes a paragraph from a scientific paper. The student changes the language and the structure of the paragraph. The student also utilizes different examples than in the original paragraph. The student provides references to the origin of the source.	Yes	11	%9,6
	No	96	%84,2
	Not Sure	7	%6,1

Table 9: (Continue)

Perception of Plagiarism	Options	Frequency	Percentage
6.The student has to write a specific academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course in a week. The student finds a professional writer who writes papers in return for money. The student receives the paper soon and submits it as his/her original paper.	Yes	97	%85,1
	No	8	%7
	Not Sure	9	%7,9
7.Student A and Student B have to write a general academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course. Student A has not done anything regarding the paper. However, Student B has already written his/her paper. Student A is aware that Student B has accomplished his/her paper. Without taking permission Student A takes Student B's written paper. Student A then writes the same paper up and submits it.	Yes	112	%98,2
	No	1	%0,9
	Not Sure	1	%0,9
8.The student reads an academic article. The student then utilizes the secondary citations and refers to the secondary citations in his/her paper.	Yes	25	%21,9
	No	58	%50,9
	Not Sure	31	%27,2
9.The student uses common knowledge information as an introduction sentence. The student does not give any reference to common knowledge.	Yes	17	%14,9
	No	76	%66,7
	Not Sure	21	%18,4
10.The student takes word for word information from an academic article. The student takes and puts these words into his/her own paper without acknowledging where the information was taken.	Yes	108	%94,7
	No	2	%1,8
	Not Sure	4	%3,5
11.The student has to write a paper on a specific subject. The student finds and reads information in different academic articles. The student then takes and compose the information by paraphrasing it on the paper without mentioning the source of the information.	Yes	94	%82,5
	No	6	%5,3
	Not Sure	14	%12,3
12.The student has to write a general academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course. Last semester, the student wrote a general academic paper for another M.A./ PhD course. The student chooses to make use of this paper and submits his/her previously written paper.	Yes	59	%51,8
	No	34	%29,8
	Not Sure	21	%18,4

Especially, to obtain a detailed picture of Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception of plagiarism, two items regarding perception of paraphrasing were included in this part. The first item was an example of an acceptable paraphrasing, while the second item was an unacceptable form of paraphrasing.

According to Table 10, plenty of the students (61,4%) were in the opinion that the first sample was correctly paraphrased, even though it was not an acceptable form of paraphrasing. On the other hand, only 44 of the students (38,6%) identified that the example is not an appropriately paraphrased. In terms of the second item, a vast majority of the students (82,5%) considered the given sample to be an unacceptable practice of paraphrasing. However, there were also few students (17,5%) who regarded and accepted the example as an acceptable form of paraphrasing.

Table 10: Perception of Paraphrasing

Perception of Paraphrasing	Student Version	O	F	P
13.“Other than genetic research, there is no consensus on the cause of dyslexia. Research suggests that, because dyslexia is more common among males than females, the dyslexic’s left hemisphere may have been overexposed to testosterone during fetal development. Another view holds that the left hemisphere develops slower. Other researchers suggest that dyslexia is caused by trauma during fetal development or childbirth” (Downson,2013,19)	To date, there is no agreement on what causes dyslexia. Since dyslexia is more common among males than females, some researchers believe that the dyslexic’s left hemisphere may have received too much testosterone during fetal development. Another view holds that the same hemisphere may develop slower. Finally, some researchers suggest that th dyslexic child may have experienced some form of trauma during fetal development or during childbirth. (Downson,2013,19)	Yes	44	%38,6
		No	70	%61,4
14.“The Coca-Cola Co. is testing a new vending machine that lets thirsty consumers buy a Coke by dialing the phone number located on the machine near the coin slot. Dial the number and out pops your pop. The wireless phone account is charged for the soda. Students and staff at the Institute of Technology in Helsinki are using the prototype. Coke says it is waiting to see how the phone-ready vending machine fares there before possibly rolling it out elsewhere, maybe even in the U.S.” (Pappas, 1999,p.45)	The Coca-Cola Company has developed a prototype vending machine that allows people to use their cell phone to order a soft drink. Customers can charge their desired beverage to their wireless phone account by simply calling the telephone number posted on the machine. Coca-Cola is currently testing their invention in Finland with students and staff at the Institute of Technology in Helsinki. If the trials are successful, Coca-Cola is considering introducing its invention into American and international markets. (Pappas, 1999,p.45)	Yes	20	%17,5
		No	94	%82,5

According to these results, it can be stated that university instructors passed their students with a high perception of plagiarism. However, university instructors’ perception of the different types of plagiarism varied greatly. In particular, university instructors possessed a quite high level of perception to illicit plagiarism, direct plagiarism, other plagiarism, and purloining, respectively. On the other hand, university instructors hold a high perception to ghost writing and mosaic plagiarism. With regard to self-plagiarism, university instructors possessed a moderate level of perception. Specifically, to sham paraphrasing and secondary citation, university instructors hold a low level of perception. Indeed, having a moderate perception or low level of perception toward these specific types of plagiarism can cause inadvertently a plagiarism environment for students. This is because possessing such kind of perception to plagiarism can result in failing to identify and respond to the plagiarism incidents of these plagiarism types. In addition, it can lead to students being miseducated and even completely misinformed about these specific types of plagiarism. Certainly, it creates detrimental effects for students and higher education institutions.

From the results, it could also be comprehended that university instructors hold a moderate perception of paraphrasing. Especially, university instructors’ moderate level of perception of

paraphrasing implies that students might not be offered appropriate information on how to paraphrase correctly. Furthermore, in this case, it can be difficult for the university instructors to decide whether students' sentences or phrases are being paraphrased properly. As a consequence of this perception, students can be faced with inconsistent treatment to paraphrased material. In particular, if this is perceived by the students, the consequences can be negative and serious. Therefore, university instructors need to be enhancing their perception in relation to the lacking types of plagiarism and paraphrasing.

4.2.3. Analysis of Attitude Statements

In line with the second research question, the fourth part of the questionnaire was dedicated to identifying Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors attitude toward plagiarism. For this purpose, the 12 attitude items from Harris (2001) were applied to the participants. Moreover, the items were designed according to a five-point Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Also, the highest frequency and percentage for each item in Table 11 were marked as bold.

It can be inferred from Table 11, even though majority of the students hold a negative attitude towards plagiarism, there were also students whose attitude towards plagiarism was positive. In terms of what does and does not compromise plagiarism, almost 85 percent of the students clarified that they know the conventions surrounding to plagiarism. However, 3,5 percent of the students possessed a different opinion and made it obvious that they were not familiar with what exactly is plagiarism and what is not. Next, more than 95 percent of the students stated that they considered plagiarism as a kind of theft. Less than 5 percent of the students were neutral about this consideration of plagiarism. Moreover, nearly 85 percent of the students indicated that they were not triggered to commit plagiarism by other students' plagiarism incidents. On the other hand, fewer than 10 percent of students agreed that other students' positive plagiarism behaviours encouraged them to carry out plagiarism. Furthermore, almost 90 percent of the students regarded committing plagiarism as a serious issue. Nevertheless, 3,5 percent of the students were in the opinion that carrying out plagiarism acts was not a serious problem. Also, more than 70 percent of the students did not see heavy workload as a contributing factor for committing plagiarism. On the contrary, almost 15 percent of the students considered heavy workload as a cause for doing plagiarism. While nearly 50 percent of the students declared that specifically students who made usage of downloaded paper and presented it as their own paper should be expelled from the program, less than 25 percent of the students did not see it as a reason to be banned from the master's or doctoral program.

It was significant and remarkable to notice that more than 30 percent of the students possessed a positive attitude toward self-plagiarism. Only 48 percent of the students hold a negative attitude toward self-plagiarism. Further, almost 10 percent of the students revealed to have a positive attitude toward using other students' paper with permission. However, a considerable number of the students

(79,8%) hold a negative attitude toward other plagiarism, which is a type of plagiarism. Moreover, more than 30 students agreed that plagiarism should not be punished harshly. On the other hand, 52 of the students were in the opinion that serious punishment needed to be applied to plagiarism. Next, approximately 20 of the students did not believe that lending a paper to another student deserves a punishment. Nevertheless, plenty of the students (67%) hold the view that handing out a paper to another student needs to be punished. In addition, most of the students (70%) agreed that giving low grades to plagiarists can deter students from doing plagiarism. On the other hand, less than 10 percent of the students did not believe that receiving lower grades would prevent plagiarism. Finally, the vast majority of the students (92%) revealed that committing plagiarism contradicted with their ethical values. However, only 4 of the students (3,6%) did not consider carrying out plagiarism as a violation of ethical values.

Table 11: Attitude toward Plagiarism

Attitude toward Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
I believe I know what does and does not constitute plagiarism.	25	21,9	70	61,4	15	13,2	4	3,5	0	0
I think plagiarism is a form of stealing.	87	76,3	25	21,9	2	1,8	0	0	0	0
Sometimes I feel tempted to plagiarise because other students are doing it.	0	0	9	7,9	9	7,9	41	36	55	48,2
Plagiarism involves taking other person's word, not property; therefore, plagiarism is not a big deal for me.	0	0	4	3,5	6	5,3	35	30,7	69	60,5
In the case of heavy workloads, I think plagiarism is inevitable.	4	3,5	11	9,6	16	14	41	36	42	36,8
I think MA/PhD students who utilize and submit downloaded paper as their own paper need to be suspended from the master/doctoral program.	21	18,4	35	30,7	33	28,9	19	16,7	6	5,3
I believe I can use my own paper for another course because you cannot plagiarise from oneself.	8	7	27	23,7	23	20,2	35	30,7	21	18,4
If another student allows me to submit his/her paper for another course, I think I'm not doing anything wrong.	1	0,9	10	8,8	12	10,5	34	29,8	57	50
I believe that plagiarism needs to be punished lightly as plagiarism is a complex concept.	5	4,4	28	24,6	29	25,4	38	33,3	14	12,3
I think I should not be punished for handing out a paper to another student who submits it as one's own paper.	5	4,4	12	10,5	20	17,5	40	35,1	37	32,5
I believe to discourage students from plagiarism acts, students need to receive failing grades (such as FF).	34	29,8	53	46,5	19	16,7	6	5,3	2	1,8
Plagiarism is against my ethical values.	66	57,9	39	34,2	5	4,4	2	1,8	2	1,8

Specifically, to gain a comprehensive understanding of EFL and ELT Turkish University Instructors' attitude toward plagiarism, six items were designed in this part to reveal the impact of cultural context on plagiarism behaviours. The highest and lowest results responses of the participants were emphasised in Table 12.

From Table 12, it can be deduced that generally students were not shaped positively by their own cultural context towards plagiarism. However, some students expressed a positive attitude toward plagiarism due to the cultural context. Regarding the importance of citing the original author within the cultural context, quite a lot of students (82%) were in the opinion that citing the original author was valuable in their own cultural context. Only 3,5 percent of the students believed that their own cultural context gave no significance to crediting the author. Furthermore, over 25 students agreed that their cultural context regard self-plagiarism as acceptable. On the other hand, more than half of the students (52,6%) stated that self-plagiarism was unacceptable in their cultural context. Moreover, approximately 60 percent of the students saw plagiarism as an act of imitation. On the contrary, almost 25 percent of the students indicated that plagiarism does not mean for them imitating other scholars' writings.

Also, Table 12 illustrated, that more than 20 students (18,4%) declared that utilizing other people's example sentences or phrases was viewed as a learning opportunity in their cultural context. Apart from these students, approximately 55 percent of the students disagreed that benefiting from other people's sentences cannot be considered as a learning opportunity. Next, plenty of the students (50%) revealed that plagiarism was viewed as a serious issue in their cultural context. Nevertheless, 24 of the students emphasized that their own cultural context did not consider plagiarism as a serious problem. Last but not least, almost 50 percent of the students were in the opinion that embedding previous work into a new work was not acceptable in their culture context. However, more than 15 percent of the students clarified that their cultural context did not see it as inappropriate.

Table 12: The Impact of Cultural Context on Plagiarism

The Impact of Cultural Context on Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
I believe it is crucial in my country to cite the original writer.	66	57,9	28	24,6	16	14	3	2,6	1	0,9
I believe it is <u>acceptable</u> to reuse some sentences from one's pre-existing work for another work in my country.	3	2,6	24	21,1	27	23,7	34	29,8	26	22,8
For me plagiarism is imitating other scholars' work.	26	22,8	40	35,1	21	18,4	22	19,3	5	4,4
I think making use of other people's sentences or phrases is seen as a <u>learning opportunity</u> in my country.	5	4,4	16	14	31	27,2	45	39,5	17	14,9
I think plagiarism is considered as a <u>serious problem</u> in my country.	14	12,3	43	37,7	33	28,9	18	15,8	6	5,3

Table 12: (Continue)

The Impact of Cultural Context on Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
I believe it is <u>inappropriate</u> in my country to use a part of a previous work in a new written product.	15	13,2	41	36	39	34,2	18	15,8	1	0,9

The fourth part of the questionnaire also included two items that were intended to reveal whether foreign language difficulties contribute to plagiarism. In particular, participants were asked to determine how far they agreed or disagreed with the items regarding the potential role of writing in a foreign language as a cause of plagiarism.

According to Table 13, the vast majority of the students (81,6%) did not believe that having difficulties in foreign language writing could be a justification for carrying out plagiarism. On the contrary, some of the students (7,9%) were in the opinion that plagiarism can be committed due to the problems encountered in writing a foreign language. Furthermore, more than half of the students (58,8%) agreed that there is a connection between inadequate writing skills in foreign language and plagiarism. However, 23 of the students (20,2%) did not see a relationship between plagiarism and lack of proper writing in foreign language.

Table 13: Foreign Language and Plagiarism

Foreign Language and Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
If a student has difficulties in expressing oneself in the foreign language, it is appropriate that she/he commits plagiarism.	1	0,9	8	7	12	10,5	30	26,3	63	55,3
I believe there is a direct relationship between insufficient writing skills in foreign language and plagiarism.	23	20,2	44	38,6	24	21,1	19	16,7	4	3,5

As for the attitudes toward plagiarism, it could be emphasized that university instructors conveyed the students with a high negative attitude toward plagiarism. In particular, university instructors have effectively transmitted students with the attitude that plagiarism is a crime, and that plagiarism violates the ethical values. Furthermore, university instructors have sufficiently reflected their attitudes towards the fact that plagiarism needs to have consequences. Nevertheless, university instructors were insufficient in demonstrating a high negative attitude toward some types of plagiarism. These were specifically self-plagiarism and other plagiarism, respectively. The lack of negative attitude toward self-plagiarism and other plagiarism can send students the message that textual acts of this type of plagiarism are acceptable. Hence, it is not only crucial to hold a negative to the general issues of plagiarism, but also to each type of plagiarism by the university instructors.

It could also be concluded that university instructors hold different attitudes towards the connection between foreign language difficulties and committing plagiarism. The varied attitudes of university instructors can great influence students' attitudes and behaviours associated with plagiarism. In addition, it could be deduced that plagiarism was reflected and internalized within the cultural context as quite negative. It was remarkable to notice that even though the culture of Türkiye is Asian, where primarily plagiarism is considered as acceptable, the Turkish cultural context holds a negative perception and stance toward plagiarism.

4.2.4. Analysis of Awareness Statements

Regarding the third research question, which aimed to figure out Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors awareness of plagiarism, participants were asked to respond to 20 items.

In particular, to provide a detailed overview, the awareness items were divided into five categories. Each of the categories was illustrated with a Table. In addition, in each Table the significant frequencies and percentages of participants were highlighted.

Indeed, the first category was devoted to the awareness of consequences of committing plagiarism. As it can be observed in Table 14, students replied differently to the items. First and foremost, a considerable number of the students (84,3%) indicated that they were aware of the consequences of committing plagiarism. On the other hand, 5 of the students (4,4%) revealed that they were not familiar with the consequences of plagiarism. Furthermore, almost half of the students (39,5%) expressed neither to agree nor to disagree that there were no strict penalty concerning plagiarism issues. However, approximately 25 percent of the students believed that strict punishment exist for plagiarism. Unintentional plagiarism was also considered as an offense that needed to be punished by nearly half of the students (42,9%). Only 29 of the students were in the opinion of that unintentional plagiarism does not require to be punished. Specifically, in terms of intentional plagiarism 89,5 percent of the students agreed that it needs to be punished. In contrast, fewer than 5 students disagreed and believed that intentional plagiarism does not require to be punished.

Table 14: Awareness of Consequences of Committing Plagiarism

Awareness of Consequences of Committing Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1.I believe I know the consequences of doing plagiarism.	50	43,9	40	40,4	13	11,4	5	4,4	0	0
6.I think there is no strict punishment for plagiarism.	10	8,8	30	26,3	45	39,5	20	17,5	9	7,9
10.I think that there is no need to take action against unintentional plagiarism.	3	2,6	26	22,8	36	31,6	38	33,3	11	9,6
15.I think that <u>intentional plagiarism</u> needs to be punished.	44	38,6	58	50,9	9	7,9	0	0	3	2,6

With respect to the second category, which focused on the awareness of institutional plagiarism policies, consisted of 4 items.

Especially, the analysis of the items revealed that the students not only agreed with the items as much as they disagreed, but also they remained significantly neutral to some items. In terms of whether the higher education institutions plagiarism policies were clear or not, more than half of the students (56,8%) regarded the plagiarism policies as clear. Nevertheless, over 20 percent of the students found that the plagiarism policies of their institution was not unambiguous. Moreover, almost 60 percent of the students agreed upon that higher education institutions can identify and detect the plagiarism acts. Whereas approximately 20 percent of the students were in the opinion that plagiarism incidents can not be identify by the university institutions. Also, nearly 40 percent of the students remarked neither to agree nor to disagree concerning their institutions zero tolerance policy to plagiarism. However, only 14 of the students (12,3%) believed that their higher education institution adopted and supported zero-tolerance policy toward plagiarism. In addition, less than half of the students (37,7%) marked neither to agree nor to disagree with the instituion's lack of policies towards different forms of plagiarism. On the other hand, more than 15 percent of the students agreed that their higher education institution does not have adequate polices for the different types of plagiarism.

Table 15: Awareness of Institutional Plagiarism Policies

Awareness of Institutional Plagiarism Policies	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
2.I think the plagiarism procedures of the institution is not clear.	6	5,3	17	14,9	26	22,8	47	41,2	18	15,6
7.I believe that institutions are able to catch students who commit plagiarism.	19	16,7	47	41,2	26	22,8	18	15,8	4	3,5
11.I believe my institution has zero tolerance toward plagiarism.	18	15,8	38	33,3	44	38,6	14	12,3	0	0
16.I believe that my institution has a lack of policies regarding dealing with each type of plagiarism.	4	3,5	16	14	43	37,7	38	33,3	13	11,4

The third category in this part, which was about awareness of unintentional plagiarism, students were also asked to respond to four questions. The highest and the lowest responses were emphasised in the table.

According to Table 16, the responses of the students seemed to be quite positive. Initially, quite a lot of students (66,7%) were of the opinion that it is inappropriate to let a friend compose some parts of the paper. In contrast, a small number of the students (3,5%) strongly disagreed to this issue and regarded it as an appropriate act. In the following question, 42 students (36,8%) reflected intentional plagiarism as misquoting the origin of the source. However, 43,8 percent of the students did not see intentional plagiarism as a misrepresentation of the source. It was also remarkable to notice that a number of the students (66,7%) were aware of the differences between intentional and

unintentional plagiarism. On the other hand, for the same item, more than 15 percent of the students declared that intentional and unintentional plagiarism mean the same thing. For the last item, in this category, a considerable number of the students (88,6%) regarded offering a paper to another student in exchange for money as an unethical behaviour. However, there were few students (4,4%) who believed that selling a paper to another student is an ethical behaviour.

Table 16: Awareness of Intentional Plagiarism

Awareness of Intentional Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
3.If my close friend volunteers to write some parts of my paper, I think it is appropriate.	4	3,5	17	14,9	17	14,9	41	36	35	30,7
8.I believe that <u>intentional plagiarism</u> can be seen as misquoting the origin of the source.	11	9,6	31	27,2	22	19,3	29	25,4	21	18,4
12.I think that there is no difference between <u>intentional and unintentional plagiarism</u> .	5	4,4	13	11,4	20	17,5	52	45,6	24	21,1
17. I think it is an unethical activity if a student sells one of his/her papers to another student.	65	57	36	31,6	8	7	3	2,6	2	1,8

In terms of the fourth category, students were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed and disagreed with the items that were concerned with their awareness of unintentional plagiarism.

Based on Table 17 below, it could be observed that students have different levels of awareness about unintentional plagiarism. With respect to an exemplary description of unintentional plagiarism, plenty of the students (70,2%) agreed that it implies to fail to cite sources appropriately. On the contrary, 7 students (6,2%) believed that unintentional plagiarism can not be seen as a failure to cite sources. Next, 71,1% of the students revealed that making usage of short sentences from other students constituted plagiarism. Only one student remarked the “strongly disagree” option regarding the same item. Furthermore, more than 60 percent of the students were of the opinion that it was not appropriate to only refer accurately within the paper. In contrast, some students (18,4%) indicated that it was not a problem to only cite sources within the paper, but not in the reference section. Concerning whether incorrect paraphrasing was appropriate or inappropriate, many of the students (34,2%) remained to be undecided. While 5,3% of the students saw it as appropriate, also 5,3% regarded it as inappropriate.

Table 17: Awareness of Unintentional Plagiarism

Awareness of Unintentional Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
4.I believe unintentional plagiarism means failing to cite sources accurately.	17	14,9	63	55,3	27	23,7	6	5,3	1	0,9

Table 17: (Continue)

Awareness of Unintentional Plagiarism	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
9.If a student uses only two short sentences of another student's paper for his/her own paper, I think there is nothing wrong.	1	0,9	11	9,6	21	18,4	53	46,5	28	24,6
13.If a student accurately refers to a work within the paper but not in the references part, I believe there is nothing wrong.	4	3,5	17	14,9	22	19,3	49	43	22	19,3
18.If only one sentence is <u>incorrectly paraphrased</u> in a student's paper, I think there is nothing wrong.	6	5,3	34	29,8	39	34,2	29	25,4	6	5,3

In an attempt to figure out participants awareness of paraphrasing, 2 items were designed. Especially, the items that received the highest and lowest score were emphasized in Table 18.

It can be deduced from the table that students were less aware regarding paraphrasing. Almost half of the students (44,7%) believed that there is nothing wrong with paraphrasing a phrase too closely to the original, as long as reference was offered. While 30 students (26,3%) selected the "disagree" option concerning this item, 5 students (4%) marked the "strongly disagree" option. In terms of an exemplary definition of paraphrasing, the vast majority of the students (89,5%) regard paraphrasing as only modification of key words and rearrangement of the sentence structure. However, only 3 of the students did strongly disagree with this description of paraphrasing.

Table 18: Awareness of Paraphrasing

Awareness of Paraphrasing	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
5.I believe it's acceptable if the paraphrased phrase is too close to the original phrase for which correct reference is provided.	11	9,6	40	35,1	28	24,6	30	26,3	5	4
14.I think that paraphrasing includes only modification of key words and rearrangement of the sentence structure.	44	38,6	58	50,9	9	7,9	0	0	3	2,6

Based on the findings, it can be pointed out that university instructors have sufficient awareness of plagiarism. Moreover, university instructors demonstrated different levels of awareness to plagiarism, for each category that was selected for this study. Especially, university instructors hold a high level of awareness to intentional plagiarism and unintentional plagiarism. In this sense, a high level of awareness of intentional and unintentional plagiarism can help students to correctly distinguish between the relevant types and to be aware that both acts constitute plagiarism. In terms of awareness to the consequences of plagiarism, university instructors possessed an appropriate level of awareness. With regard to awareness of the institutional plagiarism policy, the awareness of university instructors is moderate. In fact, university instructors need to be holding great awareness

to the consequences of plagiarism and to the institutional plagiarism policy in order to deal effectively with plagiarism problems and to reduce the cases of misconducts. On the other hand, instructors possessed varied awareness to paraphrasing. It was also identified that instructors hold varied perceptions to paraphrasing.

4.2.5. Analysis of Initial Information about Artificial Intelligence

Before directly delving into Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors awareness of Artificial Intelligence on plagiarism, the sixth part of the questionnaire was designed to identify the participants' background and engagement with Artificial Intelligence. This part compromised of four items that were based on options. All of the items were presented in one table.

Demonstrated in Table 19, it could be concluded that students' backgrounds and interactions concerning Artificial Intelligence varied. A remarkable number of the students (70,2%) declared that they were familiar with Artificial Intelligence tools such as ChatGPT. However, approximately 30 percent of the students indicated that they were not familiar with ChatGPT. In terms of whether students ever made use of AI-generated technology or tools to write an assignment or paper, a significant number of the students (73,7%) expressed never having applied them to the paper or assignment. In contrast, 14 of the students (12,3%) stated to have utilized AI-generated tools to generating ideas or to get inspiration to write. Moreover, fewer than 15 percent of the students reported to employ AI-generated tools for proofreading or correcting the paper or assignment. Additionally, 2 of the students (1,8%) clarified to implement AI-generated tools into their paper but without giving attribution or obtaining permission of the university instructor. Only 1 student (0,9%) remarked to utilize AI-generated tools for the paper by providing citation.

Also, it was remarkable to notice that more than 50 of the students (45,6%) considered the consequences of using AI-generated text without citation as failing the assignment or the paper. Some of the students (26,3%) preferred to receive a warning from the university instructor as a consequence of employing AI-generated text without attribution. For the same item, 30 students believed lowering the grade of the assignment or the paper is an appropriate outcome. However, approximately 10 percent of the students were of the opinion that making usage of AI-generated text without citation should have no consequences. While 1 student declared that the consequence for carrying out plagiarism through AI-generated text should be suspension from the course, 3 students stated to be undecided about the consequences. With respect to what extent students are confident to distinguish between AI-generated text and human-written text, nearly half of the students (43,9%) expressed not being confident at all. While 23 of the students (20,2%) emphasized to be slightly confident about this issue, over 25 percent of the students remarked to be moderately confident. Furthermore, approximately 10% of the students indicated to be very confident in their ability to distinguish

between AI-generated text and human-written text. Only 1 student found oneself to be extremely confident in recognizing whether a text was written by human being or Artificial Intelligence.

Table 19: Background and Engagement Information about Artificial Intelligence

Background and Engagement Information about Artificial Intelligence	Options	Frequency	Percentage
1.Are you familiar with ChatGPT?	Yes	80	%70,2
	No	34	%29,8
2.Have you ever used AI-generated text in an academic assignment or paper?	No, I have never used AI-generated text in an academic assignment or paper.	84	%73,7
	Yes, but only for proofreading or correction purposes.	13	%11,4
	Yes, but only to generate ideas or inspiration for my own writing.	14	%12,3
	Yes, but I cited the source of the AI-generated text in my assignment or paper.	1	%0,9
	Yes, without citation or permission from the instructor for any purpose.	2	%1,8
	Others	0	%0
3.If you were caught using AI-generated text in an academic paper without attribution, what consequences do you think you should face?	No consequences	10	%8,8
	Warning from the instructor	30	%26,3
	Lower grade on the assignment or paper	18	%15,8
	Failing the assignment or paper	52	%45,6
	Others	4	%3,5
4.How confident are you in your ability to distinguish between AI-generated text and human-written text?	Not at all confident	50	%43,9
	Slightly confident	23	%20,2
	Moderately confident	29	%25,4
	Very confident	11	%9,6
	Extremely confident	1	%0,9

Regarding the information about artificial intelligence, it could be stated that master's and doctoral students are quite familiar with artificial intelligence tools. These students did not only familiarize themselves with artificial intelligence technology, but they also utilize it widely. For university instructors, this means that they need to be informing themselves about artificial intelligence technology or tools. In addition, instructors need to have an awareness of artificial intelligence tool impact on plagiarism. By having awareness university instructors can determine the problematic area and take effective prevention strategy against artificial intelligence tools.

Moreover, the reason for making usage of artificial intelligence tools varied among the MA and PhD students. While the primary reason for utilizing seemed to be for correction purposes, generating ideas or inspiration, it was also employed for writing a paper with offering citation and for any purpose without offering any citation. Aside from displaying differences in the usage for the artificial intelligence tools, master and doctoral students also differed in terms of the consequences concerning the use of artificial intelligence use within academic paper. In particular, it was significant to notice that some of these students were in the opinion that using texts or papers that were created

through artificial intelligence tools without any citation do not deserve consequences. This indicates that MA and PhD students are not equipped with the awareness that every digital tool the student utilizes for the academic paper needs to be properly cited. In addition, such a lacking awareness of students can contribute to develop false assumptions about plagiarism. Furthermore, the master's and doctoral students differed greatly in their ability to distinguish between AI-generated text and human-written text. In this sense, it was fundamental to comprehend that quite many students would fail to identify whether a text is written by a human or artificial intelligence. Being not able to recognize the differences between human-written and artificial intelligence written text highlights that students have lack academic writing skills.

4.2.6. Analysis of Artificial Intelligence Statements

In line with the fourth research question, the last part of the questionnaire was dedicated to bringing light to what extent Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors aware of Artificial Intelligence on plagiarism in the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT students. Moreover, this part of the questionnaire was made up of 12 items. Also, the highest and lowest responses were highlighted in the table.

As it can be inferred from the Table 20, even though many of the students were aware of the negative impact of artificial intelligence on plagiarism, some of the students were completely unaware of it. It was significant to observe that 74,6% of the students regarded making usage of AI-generated text in the paper as plagiarism. While 2,6 percent of the students disagreed on that such act does not constituted plagiarism, 2,6 % of the students strongly disagreed. Concerning whether it is ethical to employ text generated Artificial Intelligence tools without citation, plenty of the students (74,6%) considered it as unethical. However, almost 5 percent of the students found it as ethical. Next, more than half of the students (56,2%) believed that those who apply AI-generated text into their papers should be required to acknowledge it. For the same item, 4 students (3,5%) remarked to strongly disagreed. Moreover, approximately 31 percent of the students remained to be undecided about how AI-generated text should be handled. While 11 of the students (36,8%) strongly agreed on treating AI-generated text differently than plagiarism, 31 students also expressed to agree. Indeed, this item was asked again to the participants, in particular the sixth item, with minor modifications in wording, which also resulted in obtaining similar results.

Furthermore, quite a lot of students (74,6%) were in the opinion of that it is inappropriate to employ AI-generated text into papers without the permission of university instructors. On the other hand, some of the students (11,4%) found utilizing AI-generated text in papers without instructors' permission to be appropriate. Also, a vast majority of the students (91,2) believed that schools and higher educations should teach the use of Artificial Intelligence in an ethical manner. For the same item, only one student (0,9%) strongly disagreed with this issue. With respect to whether AI-

generated text will increase in the future, a remarkable number of the students (86,8%) expressed a positive awareness. Only 1 student (0,9%) believed strongly that AI-generated text will not take over in the future. Next, plenty of the students (85,9%) viewed the usage of AI-generated text as a serious problem for the academia. There was one student (0,9%) that did not regard it as a growing concern for the academic environment. In addition, around half of the students (41,2%) emphasized to be undecided whether AI-generated text can be employed in unpublished papers. Less than 5 students were only highly aware that AI-generated text cannot be utilized for unpublished papers and dissertations. In terms of whether considering ChatGPT as ethical or not when it is utilized for editing the paper, approximately half of the students (43%) agreed upon on it. In contrast, 16 of the students regarded it as unethical. To the last item, which focused on whether rewriting information that was created by ChatGPT constitutes plagiarism, over 40 percent of the students responded to be undecided. Nevertheless, more than 20 percent of the students classified it as plagiarism.

Table 20: Awareness of Artificial Intelligence

Awareness of Artificial Intelligence	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1.Using (ChatGPT) AI-generated text in an academic paper without attribution is a form of plagiarism.	39	34,2	46	40,4	23	20,2	3	2,6	3	2,6
2.Using text generated by AI tools without citation is ethical.	7	6,1	4	3,5	18	15,8	44	38,6	41	36
3.Students should be required to disclose if they used AI-generated text in their assignments or papers.	19	16,7	45	39,5	32	28,1	14	12,3	4	3,5
4.I think AI-generated text should be treated differently than other forms of plagiarism, such as copying and pasting from online sources.	11	9,6	31	27,2	35	30,7	19	16,7	18	15,8
5.I believe using AI-generated text in an academic paper without permission from the instructor is acceptable.	3	2,6	10	8,8	16	14	49	43	36	31,6
6.AI-generated text should be treated differently than other forms of plagiarism, such as copying and pasting from online sources.	10	8,8	29	25,4	32	28,1	26	22,8	17	14,9
7.Schools and universities should teach students about the potential ethical issues related to using AI to help write assignments.	66	57,9	38	33,3	9	7,9	0	0	1	0,9
8.I think AI-generated text will become more common in the future.	60	52,6	39	34,2	13	11,4	1	0,9	1	0,9
9.The use of AI-generated text is a growing concern in the academic world.	56	49,1	42	36,8	15	13,2	1	0,9	0	0
10.I think AI-generated text can be utilized in unpublished papers, but not in dissertations.	4	3,5	16	14	47	41,2	33	28,9	14	12,3
11.If ChatGPT is only utilized for editing writer's paper, then it can not be considered as unethical.	8	7	49	43	39	34,2	14	12,3	4	3,5
12.Rewriting information that are created by ChatGPT can not be considered as plagiarism.	8	7	19	16,7	47	41,2	21	18,4	19	16,7

According to the findings, it can be concluded that university instructors hold a quite sufficient level of awareness to artificial intelligence on plagiarism. There was also a great awareness of the danger that artificial intelligence could cause for the academia by the university instructors. Especially, instructors transmitted students with a great awareness that making usage of artificial intelligence tools without offering citation constitutes plagiarism. In addition, students were made aware that AI-generated texts can lead to unethical behaviours and therefore requires to be taught within the higher education institutions.

However, university instructors were not able to provide students with a comprehensive awareness of the fact that rewriting information that was actually created by artificial intelligence tools constitutes plagiarism. Not only were students less aware that rewriting the content of AI-generated text is a form of plagiarism, but also were less aware that the AI-generated text cannot be implemented into unpublished papers and dissertation, since this would constitute plagiarism. Having less awareness as to what constitutes plagiarism, especially in AI-generated text, can lead students to formulate and interpret plagiarism differently in relation to the computer-controlled world. Then it is necessary to identify the potential problematic areas for students and to raise students' awareness that those situation can result in misconducts.

4.3. Analysis of Qualitative Data

This part of the study is solely dedicated to the findings and analysis of the data that was collected through the semi-structured interview. The obtained data was examined through content analysis which included repeated readings, note-taking, and coding. Moreover, the analysed data in the semi-structured interview, to which 7 students were volunteer, was described in line with the research questions. In fact, the interview consisted of 5 predetermined main questions and follow-up questions based on the volunteer students' responses. In particular, due to the confidentiality, the volunteer students' responses were coded as S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, and S7. The responses of the students were presented and discussed at the end of the chapter.

4.3.1. Perception of the Concept of Plagiarism

In the first question of the interview, the students reflected on their perceptions regarding the notion of plagiarism. Many of the students expressed that plagiarism implies for them making usage of other people's words or sentences without acknowledging the original source. While one interviewer stated to perceive it directly carrying out crime in the academic community, also another interviewer considered the concept of plagiarism as consciously copying other person's work. For instance, according to the S3:

....I quite believe that the concept of plagiarism involves the act of copying that is actually done with an intention by the person.

In other respects, according to S7:

...to be honestly, for me the term plagiarism means deliberately performing crime within the academia because especially those who have written an academic paper for the course, or a dissertation are acknowledged with the fact that plagiarism constitutes a serious offence within the higher education.

Specifically, students who responded to the notion of plagiarism as using other people's words or sentences without citing the original source were asked a follow-up question. This question was intended to determine whether it is difficult to perceive the concept of plagiarism or not. In particular, four of the interviewers emphasized in a similar way it is not simple to perceive the notion due to being an abstract concept. On the other hand, two of the interviewers noted that the concept of plagiarism is quite complicated to perceive as it is expected to be perceived immediately by the university instructors. S1 and S4 clarify this issue as below:

S1: I think that the concept of plagiarism is not easy and even can be considered as complex, however, this issue is not fully recognized by the university instructors. I firmly believe that university instructors see plagiarism as a black-white issue and thus expect from us as students to comprehend the term within one or two tutorials, which is quite not possible I guess.

S4: In fact, I definitely think that the notion of plagiarism seems to be straightforward at the first glance, but the more one gets into it, the more it becomes complicated to understand it. Especially, university instructors assume that the notion of plagiarism is directly understood by the students.

In contrast, S2, S5, and S6 considered the difficulty of the notion of plagiarism as follows:

Certainly, plagiarism is not a simple topic. For myself I can state that plagiarism is an abstract issue that has to be clarified and demonstrated by the instructors or supervisors. I am pointing this out because instructors or supervisors are the ones who are bound to teach students about plagiarism in all contexts. In particular, integrating the term plagiarism into the courses or the curriculum can make it easier for students to be equipped with an adequate knowledge of plagiarism. This process, for example, has quite simplified plagiarism for me. But this does not mean I have changed my opinion about plagiarism; indeed, I still see and think it is an abstract notion.

As it can be deduced from the statements of the interviewers, there is not a universal perception regarding the concept of plagiarism among students. Even though interviewers' perception in relation to the concept of plagiarism varied greatly among themselves, they had an appropriate perception of the term plagiarism. In addition, the concept of plagiarism was found to be perceived as complex by the interviewers. These issues make it obvious that university instructors have provided information regarding the concept of plagiarism, but they neither perceived students' difficulties with the concept of plagiarism, nor simplified the process for the students.

4.3.2. Perception of Students Responsibility to Plagiarism

The second question aimed to find out whether students perceived to be responsibility for plagiarism or not. With regard to the responsibility to plagiarism, even though the majority of the interviewers stated that the primary responsibility does not lie with themselves, they declared to have some responsibilities like reading about plagiarism, practicing citation, or informing oneself about higher education institutions plagiarism policies and procedures. The interviewers' comments are given below:

S1: I think my responsibility to plagiarism is to read about plagiarism in articles besides the things that are offered within the tutorials by the instructor. By all means I think that the main responsibility belongs to the instructor in terms of plagiarism.

S3: I am not entirely sure, but I guess my responsibility to plagiarism is to research and read up on my university's plagiarism policies.

S4: I believe I have some responsibilities toward plagiarism such as practicing citation or exercising paraphrasing. Not only do I need to familiarize myself with practicing, but also I need to ensure that I am up to date on the referencing styles. However, in my opinion, the responsibility to inform and educate students about plagiarism lies with the university instructor.

S5: I think my responsibility is to stay away from plagiarism in order to do that I need to be following the guidelines that my instructor and my university offer regarding plagiarism.

S6: I believe as a student my responsibility is limited to familiarizing myself with the types of plagiarism and informing myself about the institutional plagiarism policies.

S7: My responsibility regarding plagiarism is to first and foremost familiarize myself with plagiarism apart from the information that is provided by the instructor or university. I am quite aware that it is also my responsibility to write academic papers without any plagiarism incident.

However, one interviewer stated that to be viewing plagiarism solely the responsibility of university instructors. In this sense, S2 declared the following:

S2: I do not think that I have any responsibility for plagiarism. I mean I am only a student, all responsibility towards plagiarism belongs to the instructor. I am not experienced as an instructor concerning plagiarism. Therefore, it is definitely the duty of the instructor to teach students about plagiarism and to provide students with the necessary skills to avoid plagiarism.

As can be seen from the interviewers' comments', university instructors in particular are seen as responsible for plagiarism. Although students attributed the main responsibility for plagiarism to the university instructors, to some extent students were in the knowledge that they were also responsible when it came to plagiarism. Also, there was even one student who was not even sure about one's own responsibility towards plagiarism. Especially, students showed different opinions about their responsibility in terms of plagiarism. Thus, students were neither informed nor familiarized with their responsibilities related to plagiarism. This situation clearly indicates that university instructors have deficiencies in this regard.

4.3.3. Perception of Instructors Responsibility to Plagiarism

The third question in the interview was about identifying the instructors responsible for plagiarism. In particular, all of the interviewers declared that the key responsibility of university instructors is to teach profoundly about plagiarism including the types of plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, and referencing. The respondents of the interviewer revealed explained the instructors' responsibility for plagiarism as below:

S1, S3, and S4: In my opinion university instructors' have one main responsibility, which is to teach students about plagiarism. However, this teaching needs to be carried out comprehensively because plagiarism is an extensive topic. Not only because it comprises of different types, but also it encompasses paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, and citing. This variety already implies that the subject of plagiarism is not simple. In particular, to make plagiarism understandable in every sense for students, instructors need to be devoting more lessons and activities to plagiarism in the master or doctoral courses. There might be some students who have proper knowledge about plagiarism, but this does not mean that no need for comprehensive education concerning plagiarism. Quite the opposite, the more detailed plagiarism is handled, the more students will try to avoid from committing plagiarism.

S2, S5, S6, and S7: I believe that university instructors have several responsibilities to plagiarism, but the most important one I think is to educate students thoroughly and seriously about plagiarism. With thoroughness and seriousness, I mean actually that plagiarism needs to be dealt with in detail as it is not a subject that can be acquired or learned within one or three tutorials. Aside from this, plagiarism is a broad topic that requires to be addressed and practiced within the tutorials with the assistance of the instructor. Specifically, instructors need to be exemplifying each type of plagiarism and the ways of accurate citing as well as referencing.

In addition, two of the interviewers regarded having open discussion about the topic of plagiarism within the courses as a crucial part of responsibility of the instructors.

S1: I would like to add one more responsibility of the instructors in terms of plagiarism. ... I think that discussing the subject of plagiarism openly with the instructor and classmates within the lesson is also a fundamental responsibility because it enables students to get actively involved and deepen their understanding about plagiarism.

S4: Although I believe that the primarily responsibility of instructors is to teach students about plagiarism. Another critical responsibility of instructors for plagiarism is to integrate students into a discussion about plagiarism. Specifically, through discussion students current understanding of plagiarism and its types can be comprehend by the instructors.

Herein, the interviewers were asked an additional question. This question focused on determining whether instructors were perceived as being primarily responsible for preventing plagiarism. Most of the interviewers responded it is the responsibility of university instructors to prevent plagiarism incidents. Except one interviewer, who stated to be seeing it as a shared responsibility between the instructor and student. This interviewer's statement is illustrated below:

S7: I do not believe that only instructors are responsible for preventing plagiarism. It is not a correct attitude to except everything from the university instructors in terms of plagiarism. Certainly, instructors play an important role in the topic of plagiarism such as addressing

thoroughly plagiarism within the tutorials, enhancing students understanding of plagiarism, and protecting students from plagiarism. Besides this fact, as students we have also crucial roles such as to develop ourselves in writing academically, to practice the rules of citation, to familiarize ourselves with plagiarism and its types of plagiarism outside of the classroom, and to stay away from plagiarism. Basically, in my opinion, it needs to be a shared responsibility between the student and the instructor.

According to the interviewers', it can be stated that university instructors have several responsibilities in terms of plagiarism. The interviewers not only believed that the university instructors have a variety of responsibilities when it comes to plagiarism, but also were in the opinion that they have crucial responsibilities towards plagiarism. In particular, they highly gave importance to be taught deeply surrounding plagiarism and its issues. This implies that students want to be introduced to plagiarism by their university instructors. It also means that students want to acquire and get familiarized with the subject of plagiarism comprehensively rather than superficial. In this sense, it seems that university instructors do not perceive the needs of the students. The ignorance of this issue can result in exacerbating the plagiarism problem among students.

From the interviewers it could also be inferred that university instructors are primarily seen as responsible for plagiarism prevention. There was only one interviewer who was in the knowledge that plagiarism prevention is indeed a shared responsibility. It appears that university instructors have not clarified their own responsibilities and those of the students' responsibilities for plagiarism. In this case, students can perceive that they are not responsible for plagiarism.

4.3.4. Instructors Attitude toward Plagiarism Impact on Students' Plagiarism Behaviour

This question of the interview focused on whether instructors' stance toward plagiarism both in and out of the classroom impact student's behaviour toward plagiarism. Many of the interviewers were in the opinion of that instructors' attitude toward plagiarism can significantly influence students' plagiarism behaviours. The statements about this item are given below:

S1: Yes, I believe that instructors' attitude toward plagiarism can affect students' behaviours toward plagiarism because they are role models for students. As role models, they can directly affect students' attitudes and behaviours to plagiarism.

S3: I strongly believe that an instructor's attitude toward plagiarism can shape students' behaviour toward plagiarism. For example, in terms of my instructors I can proudly declare that they hold a negative attitude and even a harsh attitude toward plagiarism, which also impacted my personal beliefs, my attitudes, my values and norms toward plagiarism. Having experienced it by myself, I can point out that it does not only affect the attitude or the behaviour toward plagiarism, but also in every aspect the student.

S4: I think that instructors' stance can have an influence on students' behaviours toward plagiarism. Specifically, to influence students' behaviours toward plagiarism it becomes important of the instructors to reflect a negative attitude toward plagiarism. To be more precisely, I think that instructors need to be demonstrating a correct attitude toward all kinds of plagiarism incidents even to accidental plagiarism otherwise the student will adopt a lenient attitude toward plagiarism.

S6: In my opinion students can be affected by their instructors' attitude towards plagiarism as they are the most influential one's in the universities for us as students.

S7: I am quite certain that instructors' stance towards plagiarism impact students' plagiarism behaviours. I am certain because my instructors attitude affected my attitude and my behaviour toward plagiarism. In fact, I was not holding a strong attitude toward plagiarism, but through my supervisors this issue changed. Basically, instructors' stance toward plagiarism is a key as it either can lead the student to have a negative or positive attitude.

On the other hand, two of the interviewers pointed out that instructors' attitude toward plagiarism do not have an impact on students' behaviour toward plagiarism.

S2: Actually, I do not think that instructor's attitude can really affect a student behaviour in terms of plagiarism because if a student is determined to do plagiarism, nothing can stop the student from doing it.

S5: I do not believe that instructor's attitude can influence students' behaviour toward plagiarism. As long as a student does not perceive plagiarism as wrong or as a problem, the student will definitely not have a negative attitude toward plagiarism. Especially, I think that attitudes or behaviours toward plagiarism are depended on students rather than instructors.

Based on the responses of the interviewers, it could be comprehended that many university instructors' attitude affected students' attitude and behaviour towards plagiarism. Above all, the attitude and behaviour of the students were predominantly negatively influenced towards plagiarism. Some of the student were quite highly impacted by their university instructors so that they completely adopted and internalized their own university instructors' attitude and behaviour toward plagiarism. These facts demonstrate that university instructors have the right attitudes towards plagiarism both in and out the courses. In addition, it reveals that university instructors not only do possess negative attitudes towards plagiarism, but also can reflect it to their students. However, there were also university instructors who were not able to influence their students' attitude toward plagiarism in a negative way. Whether these university instructor possessed a negative attitude is not clear, but it is obvious that they were not able to reflect it to the students.

4.3.5. Awareness to Reducing Plagiarism

The last question of the interview for the interviewers was about the ways in which plagiarism could be reduced. In particular, more than half of the interviewers highlighted that making usage of specific papers for each student can be the most beneficial for minimizing plagiarism, apart from reminding students about universities plagiarism policies before the assignment is assigned and using anti-plagiarism detection programs for the assignments. Below are significant samples of the interviewers:

S3: I think there are many ways to reduce plagiarism, but I guess the most important one is to assign each student with a certain subject so that the student cannot make usage of the internet and of their classmates. Another way to decrease plagiarism can be to remind students of the

university's plagiarism policy before assigning a specific topic to them in order to highlight the severity of the plagiarism, which will help in deterring students from committing plagiarism.

S4: In my opinion there are three issues that can be utilized to mitigate plagiarism. The first one is to refrain from assigning similar assignment for each student. I mean every student should be assigned with a specific topic that makes it difficult for the one to plagiarize and take any help from a third person. After this process, students should be reminded about their universities plagiarism policy so that they are faced with the consequences of plagiarism. The last one is to utilize anti-plagiarism tools for the assignments.

S6: Yes, I believe that plagiarism can be reduced. I think the most ideal way to reduce plagiarism is to be assigning every student with a specific subject. One of my instructors, did this throughout the whole semester, for example. But I also believe that declaring to the students that anti-plagiarism software is utilized for the academic papers can be a quite useful to decrease plagiarism issues. In addition, clarifying students again about the university's plagiarism policy before they are assigned with a task or paper can be a practical in reducing the incidences of plagiarism among students.

S7: Of course, plagiarism can be decreased. To decrease plagiarism, I would use the same approaches that my university instructors and supervisor employed in the program. In particularly those were offering specific assignments to each student, reminding students about the consequences of doing consequences and using anti-plagiarism software to inspect the assignments.

Nevertheless, two of the interviewers expressed that requiring draft versions of the assignment could a be effective way to reduce plagiarism. The statements about this issue are presented below:

S1: I quite believe that plagiarism can be decreased. Actually, there are several actions that can be applied such as informing students about plagiarism, illustrating the consequences of plagiarism, addressing the higher education plagiarism policy, and so on. However, I believe that requiring draft versions of the assignments can definitely be more effective in decreasing plagiarism and even deter students from committing plagiarism.

S5: Yes, I do think that plagiarism can be reduced. Aside from employing anti-plagiarism programs on the papers, in my opinion the best way to reduce plagiarism is to require multiple drafts of the assigned paper.

On the other hand, one interviewer was in the opinion of that plagiarism could not be reduced. Here is the example of the comment:

S2: I do not believe that plagiarism can be reduced. Although various precautions are taken by universities or instructors, plagiarism still continues among students.

Taking the interviewers' responses into consideration, it could be concluded that students are differently aware of plagiarism. While most of the students were highly aware about the steps that can be taken towards preventing plagiarism, one interview was less aware of how to curb plagiarism. In particular, the students with high awareness were not fixated on just one prevention action; instead, they were exposed to and familiar with divergent prevention measures. In fact, this implies that those students' university instructors have a high level of awareness of plagiarism. Only through a high level of awareness can different prevention strategies be offered and implemented by the university

instructors. Not only does it enable to provide different strategies, but also to effectively combat plagiarism. In contrast, the student with less awareness of plagiarism made it clear that his/her university instructors do not possess a high level of plagiarism awareness.

All in all, the findings of both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools revealed that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors hold a high perception of plagiarism. However, the perception of these Turkish University Instructors differentiated regarding the different types of plagiarism. In particular, they hold a low perception of sham paraphrasing and secondary citation. Regarding the concept of plagiarism, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors have sufficient perception, but their perception of the concept of plagiarism relative to its complexity was low and even lacking. In case of the responsibility to plagiarism, these university instructors did not equip their students with the perception that it is a shared responsibility. As a consequence of this issue, EFL/ELT students were in the perception that almost all responsibility belonged to the university instructors.

With respect to the attitude towards plagiarism, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors demonstrated and adopted negative attitude towards plagiarism. On the other hand, these Turkish University Instructors hold a low level of negative attitude towards self-plagiarism and other plagiarism. Although these university instructors significantly impacted EFL/ ELT students' attitudes in a negative way, they can have inadvertently shaped their students' attitude towards self-plagiarism and other plagiarism positively. In terms of awareness of plagiarism, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors general level of plagiarism awareness is sufficient. Moreover, the awareness of these Turkish University Instructors, especially regarding intentional and unintentional plagiarism, is at a high level. Nevertheless, Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors level of plagiarism awareness regarding the consequences of plagiarism, institution's plagiarism policies, paraphrasing were quite divergent. Specifically, these university instructors were highly aware of the prevention strategies that could be utilized against plagiarism. Also, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors were quite aware that artificial intelligence can facilitate for students to commit plagiarism and exacerbate plagiarism problems.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The last part of the study ends with an overall summary and potential pedagogical implications by illustrating the key findings that could make difference and could be utilized for further research. Also, recommendations are presented at the end of the closing part.

In this study, it was attempted to understand Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism through the eyes of Turkish EFL/ELT master and doctoral students. Also, it aimed to comprehend whether Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors are able to provide their student with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. The analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data revealed the following results.

Firstly, when Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors perception of plagiarism through the lenses of MA and PhD students were examined, the findings of both research tools demonstrated that most of the Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors have a high perception of plagiarism. This finding corroborates with the study of Alimorad (2018), in which Iranian EFL University Instructors were found to have a high perception of plagiarism. However, the finding is contrasting with Rets & Ilya's study (2018), in which it was identified that ELT students were not equipped with a high perception of plagiarism by their ELT Instructors. Moreover, concerning the different types of plagiarism, the Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors hold divergent levels. While these university instructors possessed a high level of perception regarding direct plagiarism, illicit plagiarism, other plagiarism, and purloining, they have low perceptions in the cases of sham paraphrasing and secondary citation. In a similar manner, the study of Hu & Lei (2016) found out that Chinese EFL University Instructors had low perception of sham paraphrasing, paraphrasing, and appropriate referencing. Arguably then, in general EFL Instructors do not have high perception to each type of plagiarism.

Also, the findings of this study made it obvious that Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors hold a moderate level of perception of paraphrasing. This finding is different from that of Liao & Tseng (2010) who displayed that EFL Chinese students have a low perception of properly paraphrasing as a result of their own university instructors' perception. Similarly, the study of McDonough et al. (2014) identified that EFL Thai students had extremely less perception of paraphrasing. Obviously, EFL University Instructors do not possess high perception in terms of paraphrasing. When it comes to the concept of plagiarism, the Turkish University Instructors demonstrated to have a quite sufficient perception. In contrast, they failed to perceive the difficulty of the concept of plagiarism for the students. This can have implication for students such as pretending to perceive the concept of

plagiarism, feeling the need to shut down as it is already difficult to perceive, or feeling ignored by the university instructor. For university instructors the concept of plagiarism might be a black and white issue, but for students this is definitely not the case. Instead of assuming or expecting that EFL/ELT students can acquire the concept of plagiarism easily or directly without any problem, university instructors need to be in the perception that it is foreign, even an abstract notion for students. Specifically, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors have to be enhancing their student's perception of responsibility to plagiarism. In fact, EFL/ELT master's, and doctoral students need to be provided with the perception that plagiarism is a shared responsibility. Otherwise, they will regard and attribute the responsibility directly to their university instructors.

Secondly, both qualitative and quantitative analysis revealed that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors hold a negative attitude towards plagiarism. With respect to Turkish EFL University Instructors, the finding was consistent with the study by Hu & Lei (2016). Also, in terms of Turkish ELT University Instructors, the obtained data was identical with the study of Amin & Mohammadkarimi (2019). Although these Turkish University Instructor hold a negative stance towards plagiarism, they did not have a strong negative attitude towards self-plagiarism and other plagiarism. This is different from that of Sun & Hu (2020) who have found that Chinese EFL University Instructors possessed a low negative attitude towards direct plagiarism and paraphrasing as it was seen by the university instructor as a learning opportunity. This in particular can have serious implications for the MA and PhD students such as perceiving to commit plagiarism in these types of plagiarism as not wrong or demonstrating a tolerate attitude toward these types of plagiarism. In this sense, Ahmadi (2014) highlighted that the lacking negative attitude towards the different types of plagiarism can cause students to have misperception about the types of plagiarism, to adopt an incorrect attitude towards the types of plagiarism, and to be engaged in plagiarism behaviours. Naturally, students can be exposed to wrong messages about plagiarism and its types, in cases where students are not displayed and reflected with serious and strong negative attitude towards plagiarism and its types of plagiarism.

The findings obtained from the data collection tools also showed worth results regarding the impact of Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors attitude on their students' plagiarism behaviours. Clearly, it could be understood that the Turkish University Instructors modelled attitude towards plagiarism directly affected their student's behaviour to plagiarism negatively. This result is supported by Husain et al. (2017) who expressed that EFL University Instructors negative stance towards plagiarism directly and indirectly resulted in undertaking negative behaviours to plagiarism. Given that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors can affect their students' attitudes and behaviours to plagiarism, students' perception to plagiarism can be again reinforced. Therefore, it is crucial of these Turkish University Instructors fundamental to ensure that students are consistently modelled with the necessary attitudes and behaviours towards plagiarism.

Regarding awareness of plagiarism, the data analysis informed that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors generally have sufficient awareness. However, sufficient awareness of plagiarism might be a potential hinder for these university instructors to determine problematic areas for students in relation to plagiarism and taking effective actions against plagiarism. In Farahian's et al. study (2020) it was pointed out that lacking awareness of university instructors does not enable to review and improve prevention strategies to plagiarism. Moreover, Nabee's et al. study (2020) demonstrated that university instructors' ineffective awareness of plagiarism can result in poor identification for the causes of plagiarism and insufficient measurements against plagiarism. Then it is likely that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors might not be utilizing or implementing powerful strategies regarding plagiarism. In order to deal with plagiarism and to curb plagiarism among students, these university instructors need to improve and develop their awareness level of plagiarism.

Even though these Turkish University Instructors awareness level of plagiarism was sufficient, they demonstrated to have different awareness levels to the consequences of plagiarism, institutions plagiarism policy, intentional plagiarism, and unintentional plagiarism. Especially, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors have a high level of awareness of intentional and unintentional plagiarism. Not only is it crucial to have a high level of awareness about plagiarism, but it is also important to pass this awareness on to students. For example, the study of Doro (2014) displayed that even though university instructors possessed high awareness of plagiarism, the students did not have a high awareness of unintentional plagiarism.

As for the domain of awareness of the consequences of plagiarism, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors possessed an appropriate level of awareness. However, they displayed to have a moderate level of awareness regarding the institution's plagiarism policy. On the other hand, Halupa & Bolliger (2013) found that many university instructors have low awareness regarding their own higher education institutions plagiarism policy. Specifically, having moderate or low awareness about the institution's plagiarism policy for the Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors can result in not being able to properly respond to plagiarism misconducts and being insufficient in undertaking serious punishments against the plagiarism incidents of the students. To make it clear to students that plagiarism is a serious offence or even an academic crime and to deter students from committing plagiarism, a high degree of conscious awareness to the institution's plagiarism policy and consequences of plagiarism by university instructors are critical factors.

It was also significant to find out to what extent Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors were aware of artificial intelligence on plagiarism. In this sense, the data demonstrated that the Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors have adequate awareness of artificial intelligence regarding plagiarism. Moreover, these university instructors are widely aware that artificial intelligence tools can exacerbated the plagiarism problem in the higher education and the academia.

From this perspective, the study of Francke & Bennett (2019) illustrated that artificial intelligence tools pose a plagiarism threat for the universities. By being conscious of the danger that artificial intelligence can pose, university instructors can enlighten students about the potential risks about using artificial intelligence tools in relation to plagiarism. In particular, from the obtained data, it becomes clear that Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors have provided clarified their students about artificial intelligence tools related to plagiarism. It could also be seen that these university instructors have equipped their students with high awareness that the usage of artificial intelligence requires to be acknowledged within the paper and reference part. In addition, these instructors have passed a high awareness to their EFL/ELT students about any case within the artificial intelligence tools constitutes plagiarism.

Lastly, the insights gained from the data collection tools revealed significant results regarding offering clear and consistent messages about plagiarism. In particular, Turkish EFL and ELT University Instructors demonstrated to offer clear and consistent messages regarding plagiarism, however these clear messages were not carried out consistently by these university instructors. Moreover, these university instructors convey clear messages about plagiarism to EFL/ELT master's and doctoral students at the beginning of the course or term. A similar finding has been made by Pritchett (2010). However, the finding considerably contracts with the study of Granitz & Loewy (2007) in which university instructors did neither expose students to clear messages nor to consistent messages about plagiarism. Also, it could be deduced that the Turkish EFL and ELT Instructors expect from their students to internalize the clear messages regarding plagiarism without hesitation. Rather than looking forward that students directly adopt and internalize the messages about plagiarism, it should be seen as a process that requires effective interaction and time. This can have a great impact on their perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism. While it is important to convey clear and consistent messages to students, it is also crucial to be clear about how these messages need to be offered to the students.

As a master student and practitioner of this research, I would like to express my comments and honest feelings towards the results of the study. In fact, this study originated from my experiences that I made toward plagiarism during my master education process. The results of the study indicated that it was not only me who found the concept of plagiarism difficult, there also other EFL/ELT master students who consider it as complex and even as challenging. Apart from this fact, it was remarkable to perceive that university instructors can inspire students to comprehensively acquire the subject of plagiarism. Moreover, thanks to the university instructors, students' prior incorrect perception, attitudes, and awareness to plagiarism can completely be modified and shaped. Also, it was valuable to recognize that university instructors tried to ensure that their EFL/ELT students are offered with clear and consistent messages about plagiarism.

Finally, with respect to the results of the study, some recommendations can be made for potential future EFL and ELT University Instructor and higher education institutions. In particular, Turkish higher education institutions need to be providing their university instructors with professional development activities concerning the subject of plagiarism before and after each semester. For example, Turkish higher education institutions can make usage of workshops that can enable university instructors to develop their practices to plagiarism and plagiarism issues. Also, workshops by the Turkish higher education institutions can be useful and practical for reframing university instructors approaches to plagiarism. In addition, reviewing and improving the institutional plagiarism policies with the university instructors can be helpful in enhancing the plagiarism policies and procedures and in identifying the lacking areas of the policies and procedures. With respect to potential future EFL and ELT University Instructor, it can be suggested that they should not assume that they are sufficiently familiar with the topic of plagiarism. Instead, they should always consider themselves as novice and try to develop themselves in any regard to the concept of plagiarism, the subject of plagiarism and theories of plagiarism. Also, it is crucial of them to inform and educate themselves about plagiarism even though they are equipped with the effective perception, attitude, and awareness of plagiarism.

REFERENCES

- Abasi, A. R., & Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and plagiarism: Conversations with international graduate students and disciplinary professors. *Journal of English for Academic purposes*, 7(4), 221-233.
- Abou-Zeid, M. N. (2016). Academic integrity: a perspective from Egypt. T. Bretag içinde, *Handbook of academic integrity* (s. 135-145). Singapore: Springer.
- Adiningrum, T. S. (2015). Reviewing plagiarism: An input for Indonesian higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 13(1), 107-120.
- Adiningrum, T. S., Wihardini, D., & Warganegara, D. L. (2013). Awareness or Understanding? A Case Study of Assessing Indonesian Academic Staff Understanding of Plagiarism. *Education and Society*, 31(1), 69-81.
- Ahmadi, A. (2014). Plagiarism in the academic context: A study of Iranian EFL learners. *Research Ethics*, 10(3), 151-168.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the Attitude-Behavior Relation: Reasoned and Automatic Processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 11(1), 1-33.
- Ali, J. K. (2023). Benefits and challenges of using ChatGPT: An exploratory study on English language program. *University of Bisha Journal for Humanities*, 2(2), 629-641.
- Alimorad, Z. (2018). The Good, The Bad, or The Ugly: Examining Iranian EFL University Teachers' and Graduate Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *TEFLIN Journal: A Publication on the Teaching & Learning of English*, 29(1), 19-44.
- Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. C. Murchison içinde, *Handbook of Social Psychology* (s. 798-844). Worcester: Clark University Press.
- Amin, M. Y., & Mohammadkarimi, E. (2019). ELT students' attitudes toward the effectiveness the anti-plagiarism software, Turnitin. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 3(5), 63-75.
- Anders, B. A. (2023). Is using ChatGPT cheating, plagiarism, both, neither, or forward thinking? *Patterns*, 4(3), 1-2.
- Anderson, M. S., & Steneck, N. H. (2011). The problem of plagiarism. *Urologic oncology: Seminars and original investigations*, 29(1), 90-94.
- Angélil-Carter, S. (2014). *Stolen language?: Plagiarism in writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Ash, J. (1795). *New and Complete Dictionary of the English Language*. The New York Public Library .

- Bennett, K. (2011). Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft: the geopolitics of academic plagiarism. The Geopolitics of Academic Plagiarism. T. Rommel içinde, *Plagiate-Gefahr für die Wissenschaft*. (s. 53-69). Berlin: LIT Publication.
- Bennett, K. K., Behrendt, L. S., & Boothby, J. L. (2011). Instructor perceptions of plagiarism: are we finding common ground? *Teaching of Psychology*, 38(1), 29-35.
- Bens, S. L. (2022). Helping students resolve the ambiguous expectations of academic integrity. S. E. Eaton, & J. C. Hughes içinde, *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge*. (s. 377-392). Canada: Springer.
- Bloch, J. (2007). Plagiarism across cultures: Is there a difference? *Indonesian JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 1-13.
- Blum, S. D. (2009). Academic integrity and student plagiarism: A question of education, not ethics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(24), 1-35.
- Blum, S. D. (2017). *My word! Plagiarism and college culture*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Borg, E. (2002). Northumbria University lecturers' experiences of plagiarism and collusion. *Proceeding of the Northumbria Conference: Education for the future*. Newcastle, UK: Educating for the future at Newcastle.
- Bowen, N. E., & Nanni, A. (2021). Piracy, playing the system, or poor policies? Perspectives on plagiarism in Thailand. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 51, 1-13.
- Bowers, N. (1994). A loss for words: Plagiarism and silence. *The American Scholar*, 63(4), 545-555.
- Bretag, T. (2005). Implementing plagiarism policy in the internationalised university. *University of Newcastle, (PhD Dissertation)*, 1-100.
- Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., . . . Haeringen, K. v. (2019). Contract cheating: A survey of Australian university students. *Studies in higher education*, 44(11), 1837-1856.
- Brimble, M., & Stevenson-Clarke, P. (2005). Perceptions of the prevalence and seriousness of academic dishonesty in Australian universities. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 32(3), 19-44.
- Brown, V. J., & Howell, M. E. (2001). The efficacy of policy statements on plagiarism: do they change students' views?. *Research in Higher Education*, 42, 103-118.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Bryman, A. (2008). The End of the Paradigm Wars? P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen içinde, *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods* (s. 13-25). Sage.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (4th Edition)*. (2013). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Cambridge Learner's Dictionary (4th Edition)*. (2012). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge University. (2023). University of Cambridge: <https://www.cam.ac.uk/topics/artificial-intelligence?page=10%2C4> adresinden alındı
- Chen, Y., & Chou, C. (2017). Are We on the Same Page? College Students' and Faculty's Perception of Student Plagiarism in Taiwan. *Ethics & Behavior*, 53-73.
- Choo, T. E., & Paull, M. (2013). Reducing the prevalence of plagiarism: A model for staff, students and universities. *Issues in Educational Research*, 23(2), 283-298.
- Chugh, R., Luck, J.-A. (., Turnbull, D., & Pember, E. R. (2021). Back to the classroom: educating sessional teaching staff about academic integrity. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19, 115-134.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins Dictionary of the English Language*. (2010). London: Harper Collins Pub .
- Collins English Dictionary (8th Edition)*. (2019). London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Collins English Dictionary*. (2010). London: Harper Collins Pub.
- Collins, M. E., & Amodeo, M. (2005). Responding to plagiarism in schools of social work: Considerations and recommendations. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 41(3), 527-543.
- Compton, J., & Pfau, M. (2008). Inoculating against pro-plagiarism justifications: Rational and affective strategies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 36(1), 98-119.
- Creswell, J. W. (1999). Mixed-Method Research: Introduction and Application. G. Cizek içinde, *Handbook of Educational Policy* (s. 455-472). New York: Academic Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publication.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. (Third Edition)*. California: Sage Publication.
- Crisp, G. T. (2007). Staff attitudes to dealing with plagiarism issues: Perspectives from one Australian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 3(1), 3-15.
- Davis, L. (2011). Arresting student plagiarism: are we investigators or educators? *Business Communication Quarterly*, 74(2), 160-163.
- Day, K. (2008). Time is not on our side: Plagiarism and workload in the community. R. Howard, & A. Robillard içinde, *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies*. (s. 43-61). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

- Dayyeh, I. A., & Skakiyya, I. (2018). Perspectives of Students and Faculty at Bethlehem University towards Plagiarism: Challenges and Solutions. *Bethlehem University Journal*, 35, 91-111.
- De. Maio, C., Dixon, K., & Yeo, S. (2019). Academic staff responses to student plagiarism in universities: A literature review from 1990 to 2019. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(4), 1131-1142.
- Deckert, G. D. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(2) , 131-148.
- Denney, V., Dixon, Z., Gupta, A., & Hulphers, E. (2021). Exploring the perceived spectrum of plagiarism: A case study of online learning. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19, 187-210.
- DeVoss, D., & Rosati, A. C. (2002). "It wasn't me, was it?" Plagiarism and the Web. *Computers and composition*, 19(2), 191-203.
- Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. (2002). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Djoub, Z. (2016). Mobile Technology and Learner Autonomy in Language Learning. I. R. Association içinde, *Human-Computer Interaction: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (s. 291-309). Los Angeles: IGI Global.
- Doro, K. (2014). Students' perception of cheating and plagiarism: An exploratory study among Hungarian EFL undergraduates. B. Fregan içinde, *Success and challenges in foreign language* (s. 43-47). Nemzeti Közzolgálati Egyetem.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dryden, L. M. (1999). No more copying? Plagiarism reconsidered, with a view to reducing it in student writing. *KOTESOL proceedings PAC2* (s. 27-34). Seoul, S. Korea: Korea TESOL.
- du Rocher, A. R. (2020). Active learning strategies and academic self-efficacy relate to both attentional control and attitudes towards plagiarism. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 21(3), 203-216.
- Duggan, F. (2006). Plagiarism: prevention, practice and policy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 151-154.
- East, J. (2006). The problem of plagiarism in academic culture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 2(2), 16-28.
- Eaton, S. E. (2021). *Plagiarism in higher education: Tackling tough topics in academic integrity*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Eckel, E. J. (2011). Textual appropriation in engineering Master's theses: A preliminary study. *Science and engineering ethics*, 17(3), 469-483.

- Ehrich, J., Howard, S. J., Mu, C., & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(2), 231-246.
- Eke, D. O. (2023). ChatGPT and the rise of generative AI: Threat to academic integrity? *Journal of Responsible Technology, 13*(100060), 1-4.
- Eldin, Y. K., & Ela, L. A. (2016). Implementing plagiarism awareness workshop to nursing faculty members, Damanhour University. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice, 7*(1), 124-132.
- Elliott, T. L., Marquis, L. M., & Neal, C. S. (2013). Business ethics perspectives: Faculty plagiarism and fraud. *Journal of business ethics, 112*, 91-99.
- Eret, E., & Gokmenoglu, T. (2010). Plagiarism in higher education: A case study with prospective academicians. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*(2), 3303-3307.
- Eriksson, E. J., & Sullivan, K. P. (2008). Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions. T. S. Roberts içinde, *Controlling Plagiarism: A Study of Lecturer Attitudes* (s. 23-37).
- Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African journal of emergency medicine, 7*(3), 93-99.
- Etymology Dictionary.* (n.d). Etymonline: [https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=awareness adresinden alındı](https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=awareness+adresinden+alındı)
- Evans-Tokaryk, T. (2014). Academic integrity, remix culture, globalization: A Canadian case study of student and faculty perceptions of plagiarism. *Across the disciplines, 11*(2), 1-40.
- Evering, L. C., & Moorman, G. (2012). Rethinking plagiarism in the digital age. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 56*(1), 35-44.
- Farahian, M., Parhamnia, F., & Avarzamani, F. (2020). Plagiarism in theses: A nationwide concern from the perspective of university instructors. *Cogent Social Sciences, 6*(1), 1-17.
- Fazio, R. H. (2007). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations of varying strength. *Social Cognition, 25*(5), 603–637.
- Fish, R., & Hura, G. (2013). Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(5), 33-45.
- Flint, A., Clegg, S., & Macdonald, R. (2006). Exploring staff perceptions of student plagiarism. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 14*5-156.
- Franke, A. H. (1993). Legal Watch: What Punishment Befits the Plagiarist? *Academe, 79*(5), 64-64.

- Frye, B. L. (2022). Should Using an AI Text Generator to Produce Academic Writing Be Plagiarism? *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal*, 4(33), 947-969.
- Fuchs, T. (2020). Delusion, reality and intersubjectivity: a phenomenological and enactive analysis. *Phenomenology and Mind*, (18), 120-143.
- Gilmore, J., Strickland, D., Timmerman, B., Maher, M., & Feldon, D. (2010). Weeds in the Flower Garden: An Exploration of Plagiarism in Graduate Students' Research Proposals and its Connection to Enculturation, ESL, and Contextual Factors. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 6(1), 13-28.
- Glendinning, I. (2014). Responses to student plagiarism in higher education across Europe. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 10(1), 4-10.
- Glendinning, I. (2016). European perspectives of academic integrity. T. Bretag içinde, *Handbook of academic integrity* (s. 55-74). Singapore: Springer.
- Gottardello, D., & Karabag, S. F. (2022). Ideal and actual roles of university professors in academic integrity management: a comparative study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(3), 526-544.
- Gottardello, D., Pàmies, M., & Valverde, M. (2017). Professors' perceptions of university students' plagiarism: A literature review. *BID: Textos universitaris de biblioteconomia i documentació*, 39(diciembre), 1-13.
- Granitz, N., & Loewy, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of business ethics*, 72, 292-306.
- Greenberger, S., Holbeck, R., Steele, J., & Dyer, T. (2016). Plagiarism Due to Misunderstanding: Online Instructor Perceptions. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(6), 72-84.
- Griethuijsen, R. A., Eijck, M. W., Haste, H., Brok, P. J., Skinner, N. C., Mansour, N., . . . BouJaoude, S. (2015). Global Patterns in Students' Views of Science and Interest in Science. *Research in science education*, 45, 581-603.
- Groom, N. M. (2000). The fine art of making it by faking it. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 7, 7-8.
- Gu, Q., & Brooks, J. (2008). Beyond the accusation of plagiarism. *System*, 337-352.
- Gullifer, J., & Tyson, G. A. (2010). Exploring university students' perceptions of plagiarism: a focus group study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(4), 463-481.
- Ha, P. L. (2006). Plagiarism and overseas students: Stereotypes again? *ELT journal*, 60(1), 76-78.
- Halupa, C., & Bolliger, D. U. (2013). Faculty perceptions of student self plagiarism: An exploratory multi-university study. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11, 297-310.

- Handa, N., & Power, C. (2005). Land and discover! A case study investigating the cultural context of plagiarism. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2(3) , 74-95.
- Harris, R. A. (2001). *The Plagiarism Handbook: Strategies for Preventing, Detecting, and Dealing With Plagiarism*. Los Angeles: CA: Pyczak Publishing.
- Hasanah, U., & Dewantara, A. H. (2022). The Faculty Awareness on Plagiarism Issue. *1st World Conference on Social and Humanities Research* (s. 38-42). Atlantis Press.
- Hayes, N., & Introna, L. (2005). The implications arising from the use of plagiarism detection systems in UK universities for Asian learners. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 3 , 55-73.
- Heberling, M. (2002). Maintaining academic integrity in online education. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 12(2), 87-98.
- Hochstein, D. D., Brewer, J., Steinke, M. D., & Taylor, J. D. (2008). Examining the issue of academic plagiarism: What do students at Wright State University Lake Campus know about plagiarism. *Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio Journal*, 14, 59-82.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). Empirical models of cultural differences. P. J. Nico Ed Bleichrodt içinde, *Contemporary issues in cross-cultural psychology* (s. 4-20). Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806.
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2016). Plagiarism in English academic writing: A comparison of Chinese university teachers' and students' understandings and stances. *System*, 56, 107-118.
- Hu, G., & Sun, X. (2016). Hu, G., & Sun, X. (2016). Chinese university EFL teachers' knowledge of and stance on plagiarism. *Comunicar. Media Education Research Journal*, 24 (2), 29-37.
- Huang, T., Loerts, H., & Steinkrauss, R. (2020). The impact of second- and third-language learning on language aptitude and working memory. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 1-17.
- Husain, F. M., Al-Shaibani, G. K., & Mahfoodh, O. H. (2017). Perceptions of and attitudes toward plagiarism and factors contributing to plagiarism: A review of studies. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 15(2), 167-195.
- Inc., M.-W. (1989). *Webster's Word Histories*. Springfield.

- Introna, L., Hayes, N., Blair, L., & Wood, E. (2005). Cultural values, plagiarism, and fairness: When plagiarism gets in the way of learning. *Ethics & Behavior*, 15(3), 213-231.
- Ison, D. C. (2018). An empirical analysis of differences in plagiarism among world cultures. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(4), 291-304.
- Jager, K. d., & Brown, C. (2010). The tangled web: investigating academics' views of plagiarism at the University of Cape Town. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(5), 513-528.
- James, M. X., Miller, G. J., & Wyckoff, T. W. (2019). Comprehending the cultural causes of English writing plagiarism in Chinese students at a Western-style university. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154, 631-642.
- Jereb, E., Ur, M., J. J., & Šprajc, P. (2018). Gender differences and the awareness of plagiarism in higher education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 21(2), 409-426.
- Kasler, J., Zysberg, L., & Gal, R. (2021). Culture, collectivism-individualism and college student plagiarism. *Ethics & Behavior*, 31(7), 488-497.
- Kayaoğlu, M. N., Erbay, Ş., Flitner, C., & Saltaş, D. (2016). Examining students' perceptions of plagiarism: A cross-cultural study at tertiary level. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 40(5), 682-705.
- Kezar, A., & Bernstein-Sierra, S. (2016). Commercialization of Higher Education. T. Bretag içinde, *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (s. 325-346). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Khathhayut, P., & Walker-Gleaves, C. (2021). Academic faculty conceptualisation and understanding of plagiarism—a Thai university exploratory study. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(4), 558-572.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2018). Development and Assessment of a Foreign Language Curriculum for Primary Education in Turkey. V. Wang içinde, *Handbook of Research on Program Development and Assessment Methodologies in K-20 Education* (s. 321-337). London: IGI Global.
- Krishan, K., Kanchan, T., Baryah, N., & Mukhra, R. (2017). Plagiarism in student research: responsibility of the supervisors and suggestions to ensure plagiarism free research. *Science and engineering ethics*, 23, 1243-1246.
- Kutieleh, S., & Adiningrum, T. S. (2011). How different are we? Understanding and managing plagiarism between East and West. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 5(2), 88-98.
- Laforest, J. (2009). Guide to Organizing Semi-structured Interviews with Key Informant: Safety Diagnosis Tool Kit for Local Communities. *Institut National de Sante*, 11, 1-33.

- Lancaster, T., & Clarke, R. (2008). The phenomena of contract cheating. T. S. Roberts içinde, *Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions* (s. 144-159). Hershey: IGI Publishing.
- Leask, B. (2006). Plagiarism, cultural diversity and metaphor - implications for academic staff development. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 183-199.
- LeClercq, T. (1999). Confusion and conflict about plagiarism in law schools and law practice. L. Buranen, & A. M. Roy içinde, *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world*. (s. 195-203). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2014). Chinese ESOL lecturers' stance on plagiarism: Does knowledge matter? *ELT Journal*, 41-51.
- Lei, J., & Hu, G. (2015). Chinese university EFL teachers' perceptions of plagiarism. *Higher Education*, 70(3), 551-565.
- Leonard, S. M., Teagarden, A., & Samuels, B. (2018). Issues about part-time and contingent faculty. *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 45(4), 1-24.
- Li, Y., & Casanave, C. P. (2012). Two first-year students' strategies for writing from sources: Patchwriting or plagiarism? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 195-180.
- Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2018). What really is the relationship between plagiarism and culture?: Some thoughts from the Chinese context. P. S. Diane Pecorari içinde, *Student plagiarism in higher education*. (s. 140-156). London: Routledge.
- Liao, M. T., & Tseng, C. Y. (2010). Students Behaviors and Views of Paraphrasing and Plagiarism in an EFL Academic Setting. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics (Journal of PAAL)*, 14(1) , 171-193.
- Liddell, J., & Fong, V. (2005). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism. *Journal of College and Character*, 6(2), 1-8.
- Lindahl, J. F., & Grace, D. (2018). Students' and supervisors' knowledge and attitudes regarding plagiarism and referencing. *Research integrity and peer review*, 3, 1-10.
- Loewenstein, J. (2003). Martial, Jonson and the assertion of plagiarism. K. Sharpe, & S. Zwicker içinde, *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (s. 275-294). Cambridge.
- Longhurst, R. (2003). Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups. N. Clifford, S. French, & G. Valentine içinde, *Key Methods in Geography*. (s. 143-156). Glasgow: Sage Publications.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (6th Edition)* . (2014). Los Angeles: Pearson Education.
- Louw, D. A. (1998). *Human development*. Cape Town: Pearson South Africa.
- Lund, J. R. (2004). Plagiarism: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, 6(3-4), 93-101.

- Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism—a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 233-245.
- Mahmud, S., Bretag, T., & Foltýnek, T. (2019). Students' perceptions of plagiarism policy in higher education: A comparison of the United Kingdom, Czechia, Poland and Romania. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17(3), 271-289.
- Maio, G. R., & Haddock, G. (2007). Attitude Change. A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins içinde, *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles (Second Edition)* (s. 565-586). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mallon, T. (1989). *Stolen words: Forays into the origins and ravages of plagiarism*. London: Ticknor & Fields.
- Marcus, S., & Beck, S. (2011). Faculty perceptions of plagiarism at Queensborough community college. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 17(2) , 63-73.
- Maria, G. R., & Liliana, M. (2019). University Teachers Plagiarism-A Preliminary Review of Research. *BRAIN: Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence & Neuroscience*, 10, 22-32.
- Marshall, S., & Garry, M. (2006). NESB and ESB students' attitudes and perceptions of plagiarism. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 2(1), 26-37.
- Martin, B. (1994). Plagiarism: A Misplaced Emphasis. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 3(2), 36-47.
- Mathrani, A., Han, B., Mathrani, S., Jha, M., & Scogings, C. (2021). Interpreting academic integrity transgressions among learning communities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 17(1) , 1-16.
- McCabe, D. L. (2005). It Takes a Village: Academic Dishonesty & Educational Opportunity. *Liberal education*, 91(3), 26-31.
- McCabe, D., & Pavela, G. (2000). Some good news about academic integrity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 32(5), 32-38.
- McDonough, K., Crawford, W. J., & Vleeschauwer, J. D. (2014). Summary writing in a Thai EFL university context. *Journal of second language writing*, 24, 20-32.
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d). Merriam-Webster Dictionary: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perception#:~:text=Medical%20Definition-,perception,of%20environment%20through%20physical%20sensation> adresinden alındı
- Michalska, A. (2012). Student plagiarism and national differences across Europe. *5th International Integrity and Plagiarism Conference Proceedings*. (s. 1-14). Newcastle, UK: Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to Qualitative-Quantitative Methodological Triangulation. *Nursing research*, 40(2), 120-123.

- Mostofa, S. M., Tabassum, M., & Ahmed, S. Z. (2021). Researchers' awareness about plagiarism and impact of plagiarism detection tools—does awareness effect the actions towards preventing plagiarism? *Digital Library Perspectives*, 37(3), 257-274.
- Nabee, S. G., Mageto, J., & Pisa, N. (2020). Investigating predictors of academic plagiarism among university students. *International Journal of Learning. Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(12), 264-280.
- Nash, J. (2018). Plagiarism, culture, the Middle East and Westernization: a mixed methods study. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 15(1), 54-67.
- Nawaz, S. (2017). English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Academic Integrity and Classroom Behaviour of Culturally Diverse Adult English Language Learners (ELLS) in Canada: A Critical Perspective. *University of Exeter (PhD Dissertation)*, 1-264.
- Newton, M. H., & Kinskey, M. (2021). The Association Between Course Context and Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of SSI Instruction. W. A. Powell içinde, *Socioscientific Issues-Based Instruction for Scientific Literacy Development* (s. 192-222). London: IGI Global.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1966). *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. New York: Basic Books.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (7th Edition)*. (2005). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford Learner's Dictionary For Academic English*. (2014). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Park, C. (2003). In Other (People's) Words: Plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471-488.
- Patak, A. A., Wirawan, H., Abduh, A., Hidayat, R., Iskandar, I., & Dirawan, G. D. (2021). Teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia: University lecturers' views on plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19, 571-587.
- Paterson, B., Taylor, L., & Usick, B. (2003). The construction of plagiarism in a school of nursing. *Learning in health and social care*, 2(3), 147-158.
- Pears, R., & Shields, G. J. (2010). *Cite Them Right: The essential referencing guide (Palgrave Study Skills)*. Bingley, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317-345.
- Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic Writing and Plagiarism: A Linguistic Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Pecorari, D. (2013). *Teaching To Avoid Plagiarism: How To Promote Good Source Use*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pecorari, D. (2016). Intertextuality and plagiarism. K. Hyland, & P. Shaw içinde, *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (s. 230-242). London: Routledge.
- Pecorari, D., & Petric, B. (2014). Plagiarism in Second-Language Writing. *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 269-302.
- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2010). University teachers discussing plagiarism: divided perspectives on teaching writing and shaping a culture of honesty. *4th Plagiarism Conference* (s. 21-23). Newcastle, UK: Newcastle Upon Tyne.
- Pecorari, D., & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 149-164.
- Pecorari, D., & Sutherland-Smith, W. (2021). Perspectives on Positive Academic Ethics: an Introduction. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19 , 305-308.
- Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL quarterly*, 30(2), 201-230.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical re-introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Pickard, J. (2006). Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 215-232.
- PlanoClark, V. L., & Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Understanding Research: A Consumer's Guide*. New York: Pearson.
- Polio, C., & Shi, L. (2012). Perceptions and beliefs about textual appropriation and source use in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 95-101.
- Pourghasemian, H., & Afzali, M. (2018). Intertextuality and Plagiarism in EFL Writing: An Analysis of University Professors' Attitudes towards MA Theses. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 8(4), 55-68.
- Powell, L. (2012). Understanding plagiarism: developing a model of plagiarising behaviour. *5th International Plagiarism Conference* (s. 1-18). Newcastle: The Sage Gateshead.
- Power, L. G. (2009). University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(6), 643-662.
- Prescott, P. A., & Soeken, K. L. (1988). The potential uses of pilot work. *Nursing Research*, 38(1), 60-62.
- Price, M. (2002). Situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, 88-115.
- Pritchett, S. (2010). Perceptions about plagiarism between faculty and undergraduate students. *Alliant International University (PhD Dissertation)*, 1-94.

- Pupovac, V., Bilic-Zulle, L., & Petroveckı, M. (2008). On academic plagiarism in Europe. An analytical approach based on four studies. *Digitum*, 10, 13-18.
- Purdy, J. P. (2009). Anxiety and the archive: Understanding plagiarism detection services as digital archives. *Computers and Composition*, 26(2), 65-77.
- Queensland University. (2023). The University of Queensland: <https://ai.uq.edu.au/article/2022/11/ai-impact-education> adresinden alındı
- Radunovich, H., Baugh, E., & Turner, E. (2009). An examination of students' knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism. *NACTA Journal*, 1, 30-35.
- Ramzan, M., Munir, M. A., Siddique, N., & Asif, M. (2012). Awareness about plagiarism amongst university students in Pakistan. *Higher education*, 64(1), 73-84.
- Randall, M. (2001). *Pragmatic Plagiarism: Authorship, Profit, and Power*. University of Toronto Press.
- Rathore, F. A., Waqas, A., Zia, A. M., Mavrinac, M., & Farooq, F. (2015). Exploring the attitudes of medical faculty members and students in Pakistan towards plagiarism: a cross sectional survey. *PeerJ*, 3, 1-12.
- Ravari, Z. K., Qamar Ul Islam, F. K., & Zarvijani, S. B. (2022). Factors that hinder the thesis writing process of non-native MA students in ELT: supervisors' perspectives. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 15(5), 1325-1336.
- Razera, D., Verhagen, H., Pargman, T. C., & Ramberg, R. (2010). Plagiarism awareness, perception, and attitudes among students and teachers in Swedish higher education—a case study. *4th International Plagiarism Conference-Towards an authentic future* (s. 1-13). Newcastle: UK Press.
- Rets, İ., & Ilya, A. (2018). Eliciting ELT Students' Understanding of Plagiarism in Academic Writing. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 193-211.
- Robinson-Zañartu, C., Peña, E. D., Cook-Morales, V., Peña, A. M., Afshani, R., & Nguyen, L. (2005). Academic crime and punishment: Faculty members' perceptions of and responses to plagiarism. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 20(3), 318–337.
- Roig, M. (2001). Plagiarism and paraphrasing criteria of college and university professors. *Ethics & behavior*, 11(3), 307-323.
- Schmitz, G. (2009). The effects of acquisition and transaction shopping value perceptions on retail format usage intentions: an illustration from discount stores. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 19(2), 81-101.
- Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: Identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society*, 24(1), 1-28.
- Serviss, T. (2016). Creating faculty development programming to prevent plagiarism: Three approaches. T. Bretag içinde, *Handbook of academic integrity* (s. 551-567). Singapore: Springer.

- Silfiani, S. (2018). Plagiarism in English Academic Writing: Students' Perceptions. *English Education Journal*, 9(1), 102-123.
- Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT journal*, 59(3), 226-233.
- Sterling, E. W., & Farr, D. (2018). Mix (ed/ing) messages: Online teaching, student success, and academic integrity in sociology. *The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology*, 10(1), 1-21.
- Stout, D. (2013). Teaching students about plagiarism: What it looks like and how it is measured. *Western Michigan University (PhD Dissertation)*, 1-200.
- Sun, X., & Hu, G. (2020). What do academics know and do about plagiarism? An interview study with Chinese university teachers of English. *Ethics & Behavior*, 30(6), 459-479.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2005). Pandora's box: Academic perceptions of student plagiarism in writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 4(1), 83-95.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet, and Student Learning: Improving Academic Integrity*. New York: Routledge.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies. *Semiotica*, 187(4), 127-139.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Terry, R. (2010). *The Plagiarism Allegation in English Literature from Butler to Sterne*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tremayne, K., & Curtis, G. J. (2021). Attitudes and understanding are only part of the story: self-control, age and self-imposed pressure predict plagiarism over and above perceptions of seriousness and understanding. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(2), 208-219.
- Vassileva, I., & Mariya Chankova. (2019). Attitudes toward Plagiarism in Academia. *English Studies at NBU*, 5(1), 135-163.
- Vincent-Robinson, C. (2016). Faculty Perceptions of Self-Plagiarism and Other Forms of Academic Dishonesty Among University Students. *Florida International University, (PhD Dissertation)*, 1-444.
- Vivacqua, A. S., Oliveira, J., & Souza, J. M. (2009). i-ProSE: Inferring User Profiles in a Scientific Context. *The Computer Journal*, Volume 52(7), 789-798.
- Volpe, R., Davidson, L., & Bell, M. C. (2008). Faculty attitudes and behaviors concerning student cheating. *College Student Journal*, 42, 164-175.

- Walker, C., & White, M. (2014). Police, design, plan and manage: Developing a framework for integrating staff roles and institutional policies into a plagiarism prevention strategy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 36(6), 674-687.
- Walker, J. (2010). Measuring plagiarism: Researching what students do, not what they say they do. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(1), 41-59.
- Wheeler, G. (2009). Plagiarism in the Japanese universities: Truly a cultural matter? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 17-29.
- Whitley, B. E., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2001). Academic integrity as an institutional issue. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 325-342.
- Wickelgren, B. F., & Holm, T. T. (2008). The Role of the Coach and the Organization in Addressing Plagiarism. *Forensic*, 93(1), 3-17.
- Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 20(2), 98-105.
- Wlodkowski, R. (1985). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism?: Analyses of 10 North-American college websites. *System*, 31(2), 247-258.
- Yarbrough, M. V. (1995). Do As I Say, Not As I Do: Mixed Messages for Law Students. *Dickinson Law Review*, 100(3), 677-684.
- Yusof, D. S. (2009). A different perspective on plagiarism. *The Asian Conference on Education/ACE 2020* (s. 61-65). Tokyo: IAFOR Publication.
- Zamani, B. E., Azimi, S. A., & Soleymani, N. (2023). Identifying and prioritizing the effective factors affecting the students' plagiarism in Isfahan University. *Research and Planning in Higher Education*, 19(1), 91-110.
- Zemack-Rugar, Y., Bettman, J. R., & Fitzsimons, G. J. (2007). The effects of nonconsciously priming emotion concepts on behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 93(6), 927-939.
- Zheng, M., Pan, X., & Lillis, D. (2018). CodEX: Source Code Plagiarism Detection. *AICS*, 1-12.
- Zobel, J., & Hamilton, M. (2002). Managing student plagiarism in large academic departments. . *Australian Universities' Review*, 45(2), 23-30.



APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear participant,

The aim of this study is to explore the perception, attitudes, and awareness toward plagiarism among Turkish Master and Doctorate Students in social science. There are no correct or wrong answers to the questions. Your responses will be kept strictly anonymous and confidential. Therefore, select the appropriate items that you feel are correct. Thank you very much for participating in this study.

***** **

Karadeniz Technical University
Department of Western Languages and Literature
Master's Degree in Applied Linguistics
Email: *****

A. Demographic Information

Age	☐ 20 - 24 ☐ 25 - 29 ☐ 30 - 34 ☐ 35 or over
Gender	☐ Male ☐ Female
University	
Current Academic Status	☐ First-year M.A student ☐ Second-year M.A student ☐ First-year PhD student ☐ Second-year PhD student ☐ Third-year PhD student ☐ Fourth-year PhD student ☐ Other (please specify): _____
Program	☐ English Language and Literature ☐ English Culture and Literature ☐ English Literature ☐ English Language Teaching ☐ Other (please specify): _____
Master Thesis / Doctoral Thesis	☐ in English ☐ in Turkish

Appendix 1: (Continue)

B. Initial Information for the Questionnaire

Please choose the appropriate item.

1. Have you received any information regarding plagiarism by the instructors?	☐ Yes ☐ No
2. If yes, through which means were you made familiar with plagiarism? (select by crossing all that apply to you)	☐ Via Instructor ☐ Via Institution ☐ Via Articles / Books ☐ Via Discussions ☐ Via Online Resources
3. Have you been informed about <u>your</u> university's plagiarism policy?	☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Do you have access to anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate, and etc?	☐ Yes ☐ No
5. If yes, before submitting your paper, do you check it with an anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate, and etc?	☐ Never ☐ Seldom ☐ Sometimes ☐ Often ☐ Always
6. If no, would you prefer to utilize an anti-plagiarism program such as Turnitin, iThenticate and etc for your paper?	☐ Never ☐ Seldom ☐ Sometimes ☐ Often ☐ Always
7. Before submitting your written papers, do you seek the advice of your teachers to prevent plagiarism?	☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Were you informed during the Master/Doctoral program that students' paper would be checked for plagiarism?	☐ Yes ☐ No
9. Have you witnessed a plagiarism occurrence during the Master/Doctoral program?	☐ Yes ☐ No
10. If yes, what action was taken by the instructor?	☐ Received verbal warning ☐ Received a lower grade ☐ Resubmitted the paper/assignment ☐ Suspended from the course ☐ Took no action ☐ Others.....

Appendix 1: (Continue)

11. Have you been informed about the consequences of committing plagiarism?	☐ Yes ☐ No
12. If yes, how were you informed? (select by crossing all that apply to you)	☐ Via Instructor ☐ Via Institution ☐ Via Course Syllabus ☐ Via Online Sources ☐ Others.....
13. Master courses/Doctoral courses have high demands such as completing multiple assignments in a short time or competition to receive high grades. Does this cause you to ignore plagiarism to some extent?	☐ Not at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Much ☐ Very Much
14. When you need to submit papers to the instructors, how much pressure do you put upon yourself?	☐ Not at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Much ☐ Very Much
15. How much pressure do you feel on you due to your classmates for writing successful papers?	☐ Not at all ☐ Slightly ☐ Much ☐ Very Much

C. Perception Statements

Please choose the appropriate item.

1. Students are assigned to present their research proposals in the course. During the presentation, Student A thinks that Student B's ideas are interesting. Student A then starts to write down some sentences of Student B's paper. Student A put those sentences in his/her own paper without any modification.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

2. Student A has to write a paper for a M.A./ PhD course. Student A asks Student B for help in terms of writing the paper scientifically. Student B agrees and offers some suggestions. Student B also writes two paragraphs for Student A's paper. Student A submits the paper as one's original paper.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Appendix 1: (Continue)

3.The student takes a sentence word by word from a book and changes two or three words of the sentence to demonstrate that the sentence has been paraphrased. The student then acknowledges where the information was taken.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

4.As part of a research methods course, Student A is required to write an academic paper. In the previous semester Student B had written an academic paper for this course. Student A has access to this information. Student A asks Student B whether it is possible to make use of the written paper. Student B lends the paper over, and Student A submits the whole academic paper as his/her own paper.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

5.The student takes a paragraph from a scientific paper. The student changes the language and the structure of the paragraph. The student also utilizes different examples than in the original paragraph. The student provides references to the origin of the source.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

6.The student has to write a specific academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course in a week. The student finds a professional writer who writes papers in return for money. The student receives the paper soon and submits it as his/her original paper.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

7.Student A and Student B have to write a general academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course. Student A has not done anything regarding the paper. However, Student B has already written his/her paper. Student A is aware that Student B has accomplished his/her paper. Without taking permission Student A takes Student B's written paper. Student A then writes the same paper up and submits it.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Not Sure
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

Appendix 1: (Continue)

8.The student reads an academic article. The student then utilizes the secondary citations and refers to the secondary citations in his/her paper.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	() Yes	() No	() Not Sure
-------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------

*secondary citation: means making use of a book/academic paper/conference paper etc. that you have not read first hand but have read it from another source

9.The student uses common knowledge information as an introduction sentence. The student does not give any reference to common knowledge.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	() Yes	() No	() Not Sure
-------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------

10.The student takes word for word information from an academic article. The student takes and puts these words into his/her own paper without acknowledging where the information was taken.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	() Yes	() No	() Not Sure
-------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------

11.The student has to write a paper on a specific subject. The student finds and reads information in different academic articles. The student then takes and compose the information by paraphrasing it on the paper without mentioning the source of the information.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	() Yes	() No	() Not Sure
-------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------

12. The student has to write a general academic paper for a M.A./ PhD course. Last semester, the student wrote a general academic paper for another M.A./ PhD course. The student chooses to make use of this paper and submits his/her previously written paper.

Do you consider this as plagiarism?	() Yes	() No	() Not Sure
-------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------

Appendix 1: (Continue)

13-14. For the following questions, please read the original source and the student version. Then identify whether the student's version is an example of plagiarism or not.

13. Original Source Material:	Student Version:
“Other than genetic research, there is no consensus on the cause of dyslexia. Research suggests that, because dyslexia is more common among males than females, the dyslexic's left hemisphere may have been overexposed to testosterone during fetal development. Another view holds that the left hemisphere develops slower. Other researchers suggest that dyslexia is caused by trauma during fetal development or childbirth” (Dowson, 2003, 19).	To date, there is no agreement on what causes dyslexia. Since dyslexia is more common among males than females, some researchers believe that the dyslexic's left hemisphere may have received too much testosterone during fetal development. Another view holds that the same hemisphere may develop slower. Finally, some researchers suggest that the dyslexic child may have experienced some form of trauma during fetal development or during childbirth. (Dowson, 2003, 19)

13. Do you consider student's version as plagiarism? Yes () No ()

14. Original Source Material:	Student Version:
“The Coca-Cola Co. is testing a new vending machine that lets thirsty consumers buy a Coke by dialing a phone number located on the machine near the coin slot. Dial the number and out pops your pop. The wireless phone account is charged for the soda. Students and staff at the Institute of Technology in Helsinki are using the prototype. Coke says it is waiting to see how the phone-ready vending machine fares there before possibly rolling it out elsewhere, maybe even in the U.S.” (Pappas, 1999, p. 45).	The Coca-Cola Company has developed a prototype vending machine that allows people to use their cell phone to order a soft drink. Customers can charge their desired beverage to their wireless phone account by simply calling the telephone number posted on the machine. Coca-Cola is currently testing their invention in Finland with students and staff at the Institute of Technology in Helsinki. If the trials are successful, Coca-Cola is considering introducing its invention into American and international markets. (Pappas, 1999, p. 45)

14. Do you consider student's version as plagiarism? Yes () No ()

Appendix 1: (Continue)

D. Attitude Statements

Please choose the appropriate item.

Attitude Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.I believe it is crucial in my country to cite the original writer.					
2.I believe I know what does and does not constitute plagiarism.					
3.I think plagiarism is a form of stealing.					
4.Sometimes I feel tempted to plagiarise because other students are doing it.					
5.If a student has difficulties in expressing oneself in the foreign language, it is appropriate that she/he commits plagiarism.					
6.I believe it is <u>acceptable</u> to reuse some sentences from one's pre-existing work for another work in my country.					
7.Plagiarism involves taking other person's word, not property; therefore, plagiarism is not a big deal for me.					
8.In the case of heavy workloads, I think plagiarism is inevitable.					
9.I think M.A./PhD students who utilize and submit downloaded paper as their own paper need to be suspended from the master program.					
10.For me plagiarism is imitating other scholars' work.					

Appendix 1: (Continue)

Attitude Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11.I think making use of other people's sentences or phrases is seen as a <u>learning opportunity</u> in my country.					
12.I believe I can use my own paper for another course because you cannot plagiarise from oneself.					
13.If another student allows me to submit his/her paper for another course, I think I'm not doing anything wrong.					
14.I believe that plagiarism needs to be punished lightly as plagiarism is a complex concept.					
15.I believe there is a direct relationship between insufficient writing skills in foreign language and plagiarism.					
16.I think plagiarism is considered as a <u>serious problem</u> in my country.					
17.I think I should not be punished for handing out a paper to another student who submits it as one's own paper.					
18.I believe to discourage students from plagiarism acts, students need to receive failing grades (such as FF).					
19.Plagiarism is against my ethical values.					
20.I believe it is <u>inappropriate</u> in my country to use a part of a previous work in a new written product.					

Appendix 1: (Continue)

E. Awareness Statements

Please choose the appropriate item.

Awareness Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.I believe I know the consequences of doing plagiarism.					
2.I think the plagiarism procedures of the institution is not clear.					
3.If my close friend volunteers to write some parts of my paper, I think it is appropriate.					
4.I believe unintentional plagiarism means failing to cite sources accurately.					
5.I believe it's acceptable if the paraphrased phrase is too close to the original phrase for which correct reference is provided.					
6.I think there is no strict punishment for plagiarism.					
7.I believe that institutions are able to catch students who commit plagiarism.					
8.I believe that <u>intentional plagiarism</u> can be seen as misquoting the origin of the source.					
9.If a student uses only two short sentences of another student's paper for his/her own paper, I think there is nothing wrong.					
10 I think that there is no need to take action against unintentional plagiarism.					
11 I believe my institution has zero tolerance toward plagiarism.					
12.I think that there is no difference between <u>intentional and unintentional plagiarism</u> .					

Appendix 1: (Continue)

Awareness Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13.If a student accurately refers to a work within the paper but not in the references part, I believe there is nothing wrong.					
14.I think that paraphrasing includes only modification of key words and rearrangement of the sentence structure.					
15.I think that <u>intentional plagiarism</u> needs to be punished.					
16.I believe that my institution has a lack of policies regarding dealing with each type of plagiarism.					
17.I think it is an unethical activity if a student sells one of his/her papers to another student.					
18.If only one sentence is <u>incorrectly paraphrased</u> in a student's paper, I think there is nothing wrong.					

F. Initial Information about Artificial Intelligence

Please choose the appropriate item.

*AI (ChatGPT) stands for "artificial intelligence." AI refers specifically to computer programs or system that can help students generate text for assignments, such as essay writing software or content creation tools.

Appendix 1: (Continue)

1.Are you familiar with ChatGPT?	☐ Yes ☐ No
2.Have you ever used AI-generated text in an academic assignment or paper?	☐ No, I have never used AI-generated text in an academic assignment or paper. ☐ Yes, but only for proofreading or correction purposes. ☐ Yes, but only to generate ideas or inspiration for my own writing. ☐ Yes, but I cited the source of the AI-generated text in my assignment or paper. ☐ Yes, without citation or permission from the instructor for any purpose. ☐ Other (please specify): _____
3.If you were caught using AI-generated text in an academic paper without attribution, what consequences do you think you should face?	☐ No consequences ☐ Warning from the instructor ☐ Lower grade on the assignment or paper ☐ Failing the assignment or paper ☐ Other (please specify): _____
4.How confident are you in your ability to distinguish between AI-generated text and human-written text?	☐ Not at all confident ☐ Slightly confident ☐ Moderately confident ☐ Very confident ☐ Extremely confident

G. Artificial Intelligence Statements

Please choose the appropriate item.

Artificial Intelligence Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.Using (ChatGPT) AI-generated text in an academic paper without attribution is a form of plagiarism.					

Appendix 1: (Continue)

Artificial Intelligence Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.Using text generated by AI tools without citation is ethical.					
3.Students should be required to disclose if they used AI-generated text in their assignments or papers.					
4.I think AI-generated text should be treated differently than other forms of plagiarism, such as copying and pasting from online sources.					
5.I believe using AI-generated text in an academic paper without permission from the instructor is acceptable.					
6.AI-generated text should be treated differently than other forms of plagiarism, such as copying and pasting from online sources.					
7.Schools and universities Should teach students about the potential ethical issues related to using AI to help write assignments.					
8.I think AI-generated text will become more common in the future.					
9.The use of AI-generated text is a growing concern in the academic world.					
10.I think AI-generated text can be utilized in unpublished papers, but not in dissertations.					

Appendix 1: (Continue)

Artificial Intelligence Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11.If ChatGPT is only utilized for editing writer's paper, then it can not be considered as unethical.					
12.Rewriting information that are created by ChatGPT can not be considered as plagiarism.					

Appendix 2: Interview Questions

1. What do you understand from the concept of plagiarism?
2. What do you think is your responsibility in terms of plagiarism?
3. What do you think is your instructor's responsibility in terms of plagiarism?
4. Do you think approaches toward plagiarism both in and out of class can have an influence on students' behaviour toward plagiarism? If yes, how? If no, why?
5. Do you think plagiarism can be minimized? If yes, how? If no, why?



CURRICULUM VITAE

She graduated from the Department of English language and literature, Karadeniz Technical University in 2016. After graduation, she started to work as an English Teacher at a private school in Trabzon. She started her master's degree in Applied Linguistics Program at Karadeniz Technical University in 2020. Currently, she works as an English teacher.

KÖSE is single and speaks English and German.

