Chapter 6

Findings, Conclusion and Suggestions

6.1 Preamble

In Chapter 5 a detailed discussion on the analysis of data collected from the universities in Chennai with regard to the awareness about plagiarism among research scholars has been presented. In this chapter, the findings, observations and suggestions based on the outcome of Chapter 5 have been outlined.

6.2 Findings and Observations

The findings and observations are broadly classified under appropriate headings along with referencing table and figure numbers.

6.2.1 Demographic Details of the Respondents

a. Gender

- Out of 419 respondents, 58.7% of the respondents are male and 41.3% of the respondents are female (Table 5.1).

b. Category of the Researcher

- Out of 419 respondents, 68.3% of the respondents are part time research scholars and 31.7% of the respondents are full time research scholars (Table 5.1).

c. Age Group

- Out of 419 respondents, 41.1% of respondents are in the age group of 31 to 40 years. 31.0% of the respondents are in the age group of 21 to 30 years.
27.0% of respondents are in the age group of 41 to 50 years and very few respondents (1.0%) are in the age group of 51 to 60 years (Table 5.1).

d. Universities

- Out of 419 respondents, 56.8% of the respondents are from deemed universities and 43.2% of the respondents are from state universities (Table 5.1).

6.2.2 Research Status of the Respondents

6.2.2.1 Disciplines in which Respondents are Doing Research

- The majority (23.4%) of the respondents are doing research in Engineering. 20.3%, 17.2%, 15.5%, 12.4%, 3.1%, 2.4% and 2.1% are the percentage of respondents doing research in Science, Commerce, Arts, Computer Science, Law, Library & Information Science and Medical respectively. It is also clear that a minimum percentage of the respondents are 1.0%, who is doing research in Education (Table 5.2 and Figure 5.1).

- More (16.2%) part time respondents are doing research in Engineering and there is no respondent in deemed universities in Education, Law, Medical, Physical Education and Veterinary and Animal Sciences (Table 5.3).

6.2.2.2 Year of Registration for Ph.D.

- The majority (31.7%) of the respondents registered in Ph. D programme in 2013 and 30.1% of the respondents registered in Ph. D programme in 2012. It is also observed from the table that 2% of respondents registered in 2009, which is the minimum percentage (Table 5.4 and Figure 5.2).
In 2013, a majority (20.5%) of respondents registered for Ph.D. put on programme in deemed universities and in 2009, only one male respondent registered as a part time scholar in a state university (Table 5.5).

6.2.2.3 Progress of Research Work

- Out of 419 respondents, 40.6% of the respondents are in the middle stage of their research work, 30.3% of the respondents are in the earlier stages and 29.1% of the respondents are in the final stage of their research work (Table 5.6 and Figure 5.3).

- The majority (25.8%) of the male is in the middle stage of their research work and minority only 9.5% of the full time researchers are in the earlier stage of their research work (Table 5.7).

6.2.2.4 Publications in National Journals

- Out of 419 respondents, 35.1% of respondents published two papers each in national level journals and 30.5% of the respondents published only one paper each. It is also observed that 7.4% of the respondents have not published even a single paper in a national level journal (Table 5.8 & Figure 5.4).

- The majority (26.5%) of part time respondents published two papers each in national journals and 2.4% full time respondents have not published even a single paper in national journals (Table 5.9.)

6.2.2.5 Publications in International Journals

- Out of 419 respondents, 43.4% of the respondents published one paper in international journals, 16.9% of the respondents published two papers each,
3.8% of respondents published three papers each and very few respondents (0.5%) published more than three papers in international journals. It is also observed that 35.3% of the respondents have not published even a single paper in international journal (Table 5.10 & Figure 5.5).

- The majority (30.3) of the respondents, who are part time scholars, published one paper each in international journal and no female published more than three papers each in international journals (Table 5.11).

6.2.3 **Information Sources Used for Writing Thesis/Research Papers**

1. **Types of Information Sources for Writing a Thesis**

   a. **Textbooks**

   - Out of 419 respondents, 41.5% of the respondents opine that they used to get help from textbooks for writing a theses/research papers and 58.5% of the respondents replied that they do not take help from text books for writing a theses/research papers (Table 5.12).

   b. **Journals / Periodicals**

   - Out of 419 respondents, 37.0% of respondents used to take help from journals / periodicals for writing a theses/research and 63.0% of the respondents replied that they were not taking help from journals / periodicals for writing a theses/research papers (Table 5.12).

   c. **Internet /E-resources**

   - Out of 419 respondents, a majority (62.8%) of the respondents used to take help from Internet/E-resources for writing a theses/research papers and
37.2% of the respondents not used to take help from Internet/E-resources for writing a theses/research paper (Table 5.12).

d. Other’s Dissertations/ Theses

- Out of 419 respondents, 58.7% of the respondents admit that they used to take help from other’s dissertations/ theses for writing a theses/research and 41.3% of the respondents do not take help from other’s dissertations/ theses for writing their thesis/research papers (Table 5.12).

e. Conference /Seminar Proceedings

- Out of 419 respondents, 28.2% of the respondents used to take help from the conference/ seminar proceedings for writing a theses/research papers and 71.8% of the respondents do not take help from the conference/ seminar proceedings for writing a theses/research paper (Table 5.12).

- The majority (36.0%) of the respondents who used to take help from the other’s theses are from deemed universities and 13.6% of the respondents from state universities used to take help from conference /seminar proceedings and a majority (37.0%) of the male respondents used to take help from the Internet /E-resources for writing thesis/research papers. It has been also seen from the table that a majority (42.0%) of the part time respondents taking help from the Internet /E-resources (Table 5.13.)

2. Respondent’s Dependency on the Internet for Writing Their Thesis/Research Paper

- Out of 419 respondents, 40.1 % of respondents frequently depended on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper, 29.6% of respondents highly
depended and 25.1% of respondents occasionally depended. It is also observed from the above mentioned table that only 5.3% of respondents rarely depended on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper (Table 5.14 and Figure 5.6).

- The majority (22.2%) of respondents frequently depended on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper in deemed universities and 2.1% of the respondent rarely depended on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper in state universities (Table 5.15).

- 24.6% of male frequently dependent on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper and only 2.1% of the full time scholars rarely dependent on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper (Table 5.16).

6.2.4 The Researcher’s Habit of Citing References

6.2.4.1 Researcher’s Habit of Giving References while They Reproduce Others’ Works or Ideas

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 27.4% of the respondents often were in the habit of giving the references while reproducing works or ideas of others, 19.3% of them were in the habit of giving references occasionally, 17.4% of respondents were in the habit of giving references rarely and only 16.7% of respondents always were in the habit of giving the references, while reproducing works or ideas of others. It is also clear from the table that out of 419 respondents, 19.1% of the respondents never used to give the references, while reproducing works or ideas of others (Table 5.17 and Figure 5.7.)
• 14.3% of the respondents from deemed universities *often* give the references while reproducing other’ works or ideas and 6.9% of the respondents from the state universities *always* give references (Table 5.18).

• 16.7% of the male respondents were seen *often* giving the references while reproducing other’s works or ideas and 7.2% of the female respondents *occasionally* giving references. It is also inferred from the table that 18.6 % of the part time respondents *often* give the references while reproducing other’s works or ideas and 6.7% of the full time respondents *never* giving references (Table 5.19).

6.2.4.2 Researcher’s Practice of Citing References while They Copied from the Internet

• A study of data in Table 5.20 and Figure 5.8 indicates practice of the citing references by the respondents if they copy from the Internet. It could be noted that out of the total 419 respondents, 30.3% of respondents never cited references if they copied from the Internet and 13.8 % of them always citing references if they copy from the Internet (Table 5.20 and Figure 5.8).

• 16.9% of the respondents, who are part time scholars *never* gave the references, while reproducing works or ideas of others and 5.5% of the respondents, who are full time scholars occasionally giving the references if reproducing works or ideas of others (Table 5.21).

6.2.4.3 Citation Styles Used by Researchers while Giving References

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 35.8% of respondents admit that they do not use any citation style while giving references whereas 28.2% of respondents use APA style. 25.1 % of respondents use MLA style. 6.2% of
respondents use Chicago style and 4.8% of respondents use Harvard style while giving the references (Table 5.22 & Figure 5.9).

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 25.8% of the respondents, who are part time scholars are found not using any citation style while giving references and 1% of the female respondents use Harvard style while giving references (Table 5.23).

6.2.4.4 Researcher’s Practice of Using Quotation Marks while They Copied Exact Sentences from Other Sources

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 51.8% of them admit that they never use quotation marks when copying exact sentences from the work of others, 32.9% of them use quotation marks sometimes and only 15.3% of the respondents always use quotation marks (Table 5.24 and Figure 5.10).

- 36.5% of the respondents, who are part time scholars never use the quotation marks when copy exact sentences from other sources and 2.9% of the respondents, who are from state universities always using the quotation marks when copy exact sentences from other sources (Table 5.25).

6.2.4.5 Researcher’s Practice of Giving Reference while Paraphrasing Contents of Others

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 48.2% of them admit that they never give the reference while paraphrasing contents of others. 34.4% of them sometimes give the reference, and only 17.4% of the respondents always give the reference when they paraphrase other’s contents (Table 5.26 and Figure 5.11).
• Out of the total 419 respondents, 32.0% of respondents, who are part time scholars, admit that they never give the references when they paraphrase other’s contents and 5.5% of the respondents, who are full time scholars, always use the quotation marks when they copy exact sentences from other sources (Table 5.27).

6.2.5 Awareness about Plagiarism

6.1.5.1 Familiarity of the Term ‘Plagiarism’

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 51.6% of respondents got first time feminization with the term ‘plagiarism’ only at the time of responding the questionnaire. It is also observed that 24.3% of the respondents came to know about the term ‘plagiarism’ one year back. 20.8% of respondents become aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ one to two years ago and very few respondents (15.8%) had come to know about the term ‘plagiarism’ two to three years back (Table 5.28 and Figure 5.12.)

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 26.5% of respondents, who are from state universities, got first time feminization with the term ‘plagiarism’ only at the time of responding the questionnaire and 3.1% of the respondents, who are from state universities, came to know about the term ‘plagiarism’ two to three years back (Table 5.29).

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 29.6% of the male respondents got first time feminization with the term ‘plagiarism’ only at the time of responding the questionnaire and 3.8% of the female respondents first aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ two to three years back. It is also inferred from the table that 36.3% part time respondents got first time feminization with the term ‘plagiarism’ only at the time of responding to the questionnaire and only
3.1% of the full-time respondents first time aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ two to three years back (Table 5.30).

6.1.5.2 Means of Familiarizing the Term ‘Plagiarism’ First Time

- Out of the total 419 respondents, a majority (51.6%) of the respondents got first time feminization with the term ‘plagiarism’ through the questionnaire whereas 13.1% of respondents came to know about plagiarism through a conference. It is also clear from the above table that very few (1.7%) of respondents became aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ for the first time through university regulations and 1.2% of respondents first time became aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ through regulations of the University Grants Commission (UGC) (Table 5.31 and Figure 5.13).

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 28.2% of respondents, who are from deemed universities, the term plagiarism got familiarized for the first time through the questionnaire whereas only 1% of respondents from state universities came to know about plagiarism through the University regulations. It is also inferred from the table that 30.3% of the male respondents and 35.1% part time respondents were first time familiar with the term plagiarism through the questionnaire (Table 5.32).

6.1.5.3 Awareness about Plagiarism in General (Table 5.33. -5.34)

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 64.9% of the respondents accept that the statement “Copying from a book/online sources without crediting the source constitutes plagiarism” is true while 35.1% express that it is false.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 44.6% of the respondents agree with the statement “If taking consent for copying the work of the authors of the
original source, but not giving references constitutes plagiarism” is true and 55.4% of the respondents opine it is false. It shows that only 44.6% of the respondents are aware of the fact that there is a difference between copyright infringement and plagiarism.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 52.5% of respondents claim that the statement “Translating from another language and presenting as one’s own work constitutes plagiarism.” is true but 47.5% of respondents express that this statement is false. It shows that only 52.5% of respondents are aware the fact that translating from another language is also considered as plagiarism.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 70.2% of respondents accept that the statement “Copied from the Internet but not citing the source constitutes plagiarism” is true whereas 56.3% of respondents express that this statement is false.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 63.2% of the respondents are aware that the University Grants Commissions (UGC) insists on universities to use anti-plagiarism software for checking plagiarism in thesis whereas 36.8% of the respondents express that this statement is false.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 45.1% part time respondents agree with the statement “Copying from a book/online sources without crediting the source constitutes plagiarism” and only 13.1% full time respondents agree with the statement, “Copied from the Internet but not cite the source constitutes plagiarism” which is minimum percentage.
6.1.5.4 Awareness about Types of Plagiarism

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 43.7% of was aware of self-plagiarism and 56.3% of the respondents were not aware of it. Out of the total 419 respondents, 32.9% of the respondents seemed to be aware of direct plagiarism and 67.1% of the respondents were not aware of it. Out of the total 419 respondents, 12.6% of them were aware about unintentional plagiarism and 87.4% of the respondents not aware of it and out of the total 419 respondents, 28.2% of them were aware of complete plagiarism and 47.5% of the respondents not aware of it (Table 5.35).

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 30.5% of respondents, who are part time research scholars, were aware of self-plagiarism whereas only 1.7% of respondents who are full time research scholars were aware of unintentional plagiarism (Table 5.36).

1.2.5.5 Awareness about Tools Available for Detection of Plagiarism

1.2.5.5.1 Awareness about Commercial Tools

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 40.1% of them were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely “Turnitin” whereas 59.9% of them were not aware of this software. 15.5% of them were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely “EduTie.Com” whereas 84.5% of them are not aware of this software. It is also observed from the table that 9.8 % of the respondents were aware of anti-plagiarism software namely “Urkund” whereas 90.2 % of them were not aware of this software (Table 5.37).

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 25.5% of part time respondents, were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Turnitin’ whereas only 1.7% of
6.2.5.5.2 Awareness of Freely Available Tools

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 18.1% of them were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Viper’ whereas 81.9% of them were not aware of this software. 17.2% of them were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Plagiarism detector’ whereas 82.8% of them were not aware of this software. It is also observed from the table that 8.6% of them aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Small SEO tools’ whereas 91.4% of them are not aware of this software (Table 5.39).

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 12.4% of part time respondents were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Viper’ whereas 2.6% of full time respondents were aware of anti-plagiarism software, namely ‘Small SEO tools EVE2’ (Table 5.38.)

6.2.5.6 Awareness about the Consequences of Plagiarism (Table 5.41-5.43)

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 60.6% of respondents were not aware of the consequences, “If anyone caught in plagiarism, she/he will be punished”. Only 39.4% of the respondents were aware about punishment if they indulge in plagiarism.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, only 30.5% of respondents were aware that plagiarism can spoil the career of anyone, whereas 69.5% of respondents were not aware about it.
• Out of the total 419 respondents, 57.0% of the respondents think that self-plagiarism is not punishable whereas 43% of the respondents think that self-plagiarism is also punishable.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, only 54.7% of respondents aware that a person can lose his/her job due to indulging in plagiarism whereas 45.3% of respondents were not aware about it 51.3% of the respondents were aware that a person can be sent to jail due to indulging in plagiarism, but 54.4% of the respondents were not aware about it.

• The majority (32.2%) of respondents from deemed universities aware about the statement “A person can lose his/her job due to indulging in plagiarism” and only 14.8% of the respondent from state universities aware of the statement “Plagiarism can spoil the career of anyone”, which is very less percentage.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 39.4% of respondents, who are part time research scholars, aware of the statement “A person can lose his/her job due to indulging in plagiarism” whereas 8.6% of respondents who are full time research scholars, aware the statement “Plagiarism can spoil the career of anyone”.

6.2.6 Attitude of the Respondents towards Plagiarism (Table 5.44-5.47)

• The mean value of all the variables ranges from 2.44 to 3.78. The deviation of the opinion ranges between 1.202 and 1.397. It indicates that there is not much deviation in their opinion. In the case of attitude towards plagiarism among respondents, the preference was given to the statement “Copying and pasting from the Internet is easier than creating one’s own sentences.” It is followed by the statement “No one will check and detect the copied
material”. However, least preference was given to the statement, “Plagiarism is justified due to work pressure” (Table 5.44).

- It has been seen from Table 5.45 that Preference was given to the statement “Copying and pasting from the Internet is easier than creating one’s own sentence.” by the respondents from state as well as deemed universities. In the case of state universities, the second preference is given for the statement, “Plagiarism is justified if some portion of the paper is plagiarized from a quality journal article since it has scientific value”, whereas it is given the fifth rank out of 10 by respondents from deemed universities. The third preference is given by all the universities to the statement “If anyone is copying one’s own data, it is not punishable because it is not harmful. However, the lowest rank was given to the statement, “Plagiarism is justified due to work pressure” by respondents from all the universities.

- It has been seen from Table 5.46 that Preference was given to the statement “Copying and pasting from the Internet is easier than creating one’s own sentence.” by the male and female respondents. In the case of male respondents, the second preference is given to the statement, “No one will check and detect the copied material”, whereas it is given the fourth rank out of ten by female respondents. The third preference is given by all the respondents to the statement “If anyone is coping one’s own data, it is not punishable because it is not harmful. However, the lowest rank was given to the statement, “Plagiarism is justified due to work pressure” by all the respondents.

- It has been seen from Table 5.47 that the preference was given to the statement “Copying and pasting from the Internet is easier than creating
one’s own sentence” by both full time and part time respondents. In the case of full time respondents, the second preference is given to the statement, “No one will check and detect the copied material”, whereas it is given the fourth rank out of ten by part time respondents. The third preference is given to the statement “Copying methodology from other thesis is justified because methodology, it remains same.” by full time respondents, whereas it is given the fifth rank out of ten by part time respondents. However, the least rank was given to the statement, “Plagiarism is justified due to work pressure” by both full time and part time respondents.

6.2.7 The Environment Which Made Respondents to Reproduce the Work of Others (Table 5.48- Table 5.51)

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 77.1% of respondents agreed that they reproduce works of others as they are not aware of the consequences of indulging in plagiarism.
- Out of the total 419 respondents, 75.7% of the respondents express that they reproduce works of others because it is hard to have original ideas.
- Out of the total 419 respondents, 73.0% of respondents said that they copied other’s works because the thesis/ article writing is too difficult.
- Out of the total 419 respondents, 72.8% of respondents accept that “Expressing thoughts in the English language is sometimes tougher than copying the words of others”.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 68% of respondent accepted that they copy from the internet as the required information are easily available on the internet.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 62.8 % of the respondents express that they reproduce works of others when they did not get any help in writing thesis/research paper.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 57.0% of the respondents accept that they reproduce works of others when they are under pressure to complete Ph.D. thesis or research papers.

• It is also observed from the table that out of the total 419 respondents, 35.8% of respondents express that “They reproduce others’ works due to lack of interest in the topic of study” and out of the total 419 respondents, 36.3% said that laziness is the reason for copying others.

• The majority (46.3%) of the male respondents admit that they reproduced works of others because they are not aware of the consequences of indulging in plagiarism and only 13.4% of the female respondent reproduced works of others because of lack of interest in the topic of study and laziness, which is a very low percentage.

• The majority (50.6%) of the part time respondents admit that they reproduced works of others because they are not aware of the consequences of indulging in plagiarism and only 11.0% of the full time respondent reproduced works of others because of lack of interest in the topic of study and laziness, which is a very low percentage.
6.2.8 The Respondent’s Interest in Avoiding Plagiarism

6.2.8.1 Researchers’ Response on “Plagiarism Should be Avoided.”

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 30.8% of them agree with the statement that “Plagiarism should be avoided” and 21.2% are strongly agreed with plagiarism should be avoided. 15.3% of the respondents disagree with the statement that “Plagiarism should be avoided” and 5.7% are strongly disagreed with this. Apart from this 27.0% of the respondents neither agrees nor disagree with the statement “Plagiarism should be avoided.” (Table 5.52 and Figure 5.14).

- The majority (17.7%) of respondents from deemed universities agreed with the statement that “Plagiarism should be avoided” and only 2.4% of the respondent from deemed universities strongly disagree with this (Table 5.53).

- The majority (21.2%) of respondents who are part time scholars agree with the statement that “Plagiarism should be avoided” and only 1.9% of the respondent who are full time scholars strongly disagree with this (Table 5.54).

6.2.8.2 Ways to Avoid Plagiarism Followed by Respondents

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 57.8% of them accepted to improve their writing skill and 57.0% of the respondents interested in using quotes, references and footnotes for avoiding plagiarism. It is also seen from the table that 52.5% of the respondents agree to develop one’s own ideas and 50.8% are interested to check with plagiarism software before submitting a thesis/article (Table 5.55).
• Out of the total 419 respondents, 37.7% part time respondents were interested in using quotes, references and footnotes to avoid plagiarism and 17.2% full time respondents interested to check with plagiarism software before submitting a thesis/article for avoiding plagiarism (Table 5.56).

6.2.8.3 Methods to Increase the Knowledge of Plagiarism Followed by Respondents (Table 5.57-5.58)

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 37.5% of respondents would like to enhance their knowledge about plagiarism by joining professional training courses.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 41.3% of the respondents would like to increase their knowledge about plagiarism by self-study (books, Internet).

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 73.0% of respondents would like to increase their knowledge about plagiarism by discussing with colleagues/other Research Scholars.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 72.8% of respondents would like to increase their knowledge about plagiarism by attending conferences/seminars/workshops.

• Out of the total 419 respondents, 31.3% part time respondents were interested to increase their knowledge by discuss with colleagues/other research scholars and 11.7% full time respondents interested to increase their knowledge by attending conferences/seminars/workshops.
6.2.8 Ways and Means of Helping the Research Scholars in Avoiding Plagiarism (Table 5.59-5.62)

- It is inferred from the table that out of the total 419 respondents, 82.6% of the respondents never checked their research papers with anti-plagiarism software earlier and 85.0% of the respondents want training for using plagiarism software.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 47.7% of the respondents feel that universities should conduct a seminar with examples of plagiarism whereas 37.0% of the respondents feel that universities should provide descriptive information about plagiarism and its consequences in the form of a handbook.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 77.1% of the respondents face problem in giving references/citation and 52.3% of the respondents feel that universities should provide training as how to cite the useful resources correctly.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 73.0% of respondents face difficulties in writing their thesis/research paper and 47.5% of respondents feel the universities should provide training for technical writing.

- Out of the total 419 respondents, 52.3% of respondents find difficulties in expressing their thoughts in English as English is not their first language and 77.1% of respondents feel the universities should conduct some training programs for improving English writing skills.

- The majority (56.1%) of respondents from deemed universities faced problem in giving references/citation and only 6.4% of the respondent from
state universities checked their research paper with anti-plagiarism software earlier which is very less percentage.

- It has been seen from the table that the majority (56.1%) of female respondents face problem in giving references/citation and only 7.9% of the female respondents checked their research paper with anti-plagiarism software earlier which is a low percentage.

- The majority (59.7%) of part time respondents need training for using plagiarism software and only 7.2% of full time respondent checked their research paper with anti-plagiarism software earlier which is a low percentage.

6.3 **Findings in Relation to Hypotheses**

- There is no significant difference in the researcher’s dependency on the Internet for writing thesis/research paper on the respective status of university.

- There is no significant difference in the researcher’s habit of citing references in respective university status.

- There is a significant difference in the awareness of the term ‘plagiarism’ among research scholars on the respective status of university and state universities research scholars are found relatively less aware of the term ‘plagiarism’ than research scholars in deemed universities.

- There is no significant difference in the researchers’ awareness about the consequences of plagiarism on the respective status of university.

- There is a significance difference in the researchers’ attitude towards plagiarism on the respective university status.
• There is no significant difference in the reasons for reproducing the work of others by the researcher on the respective status of university.

• It is concluded that there is no significant difference in the researchers’ habit of citing references in respective status of university.

6.4 Summary

It was identified that respondents committed plagiarism utilizing Information resources namely, E-resources or internet were 62.8%, used other’s dissertations or theses were 58.7% and depended on textbooks were 41.5%.

The habit of citing references showed that 16.7% - Regular, objective and obliging rules, 30.3% - Never cited references from Internet, 19.1% - Never Used references, 51.8% - Never used quotation marks, 48.2% - Never give the reference while paraphrasing content.

Copying and pasting from the Internet was found easier than creating one’s own sentences.” that was the attitude of Researchers launching into plagiarism, thinking that “no one will check and detect the copied material”.

30.8% of researchers agreed for avoiding plagiarism.

Awareness about plagiarism in general, Familiarity, means of familiarization, types of plagiarism, tools available for the detection of plagiarism and the consequences of plagiarism could be proved and determined.

The study proved that awareness about plagiarism was not satisfactory and there was no difference in awareness about plagiarism among research scholars on the respective university status.
6.5 Suggestions Regarding Combating the Problem of Plagiarism

There are three steps of combating the problem of plagiarism as follows:

- Avoiding plagiarism
- Detection of plagiarism and
- Prevention of plagiarism and Enhance the awareness of plagiarism

6.5.1 Suggestions Regarding Avoiding Plagiarism

- The researcher should give citation for all material whatever he/she is using for his/her research work.
- The researcher should know how anti plagiarism tools work.
- If anyone takes away text from his/her own article for writing another article is known as self-plagiarism, therefore the researcher should not publish their own work second time.
- People sometimes change the word in the text and claim it as their own yet, then also falls under plagiarism, therefore the researcher should give references for the idea also which he/she is using for his/her research work even if he/she change the words.
- If the researcher uses someone else’s words as it is he/she should always use quotation marks.
- While citing the sources academic style sheet (like APA, MLA, Chicago) should be followed.
- After finishing all work a researcher should check through online plagiarism software before submit his//her research work in anywhere.
• The researcher should not use material from social media or Wikipedia without verifying its origin.

• The researcher should know about when citation is needed and when not. A few information have been mentioned below. This useful information has been collected from the website http://www.wsulibs.wsu.edu/library-instruction/plagiarism/what for the purpose of provide simple guideline.

a. What Doesn’t Need To Be Cited Or Attributed?

1. “Common knowledge (often determine by audience and context)

2. Things within the public domain. Such as:
   • Dictionary definitions
   • Information from common encyclopedias
   • Most Headline news
   • An art, music, science or invention that has an expired copyright or over which no one has ownership or current proprietary interest.
   • Work created before proprietary laws were created.
   • Mathematical formulas.

3. One’s own words and ideas in his/her own work.

4. Clip Art on Your computer.”150
b. When Citation and Attribution is Needed

- “Any facts taken from sources that are not common knowledge or are not in the public domain.
- Any quotations even if you are quoting something that would otherwise be common knowledge (such as quoting from a dictionary or encyclopedia).
- Using proprietary materials such as picture, sounds, and videos.”

6.5.2 Suggestions Regarding Detection of Plagiarism

It was seen that doing plagiarism is much easier than creating one’s own writing and now checking plagiarism is also very much easy. In the words of Alzahrani, et al., “Plagiarism detection is the process of featuring the document, analyzing its content, unveiling portions that might be plagiarized, and bringing similar source documents, if they are available.”

6.5.2.1. Plagiarism Detection Tools

Plagiarism detection tools are the similarity detection software that scan and compare the contents in electronic form submitted by individuals with an electronic database and find out the similar text available on the internet. In the words of Gotterbarn, et al., “using plagiarism detection tools would benefit the scholarly publication process by helping authors examine their own work and by allowing reviewers and editors to detect and deter plagiarism prior to publication.” These software should be used in detection of plagiarism.

6.5.2.2. Types of Plagiarism Detection Tools/software

There are two types of tools available for detecting Plagiarism in research/academic writing.
• Proprietary/Commercial anti-plagiarism software

• Free online anti-plagiarism software

6.5.2.2.1 Proprietary/Commercial Anti-plagiarism Software

According to linfo.org, “The term proprietary is derived from the Latin word ‘proprietas’ meaning property. Proprietary software is software that is owned by an individual or a company that developed it. There are almost always major restrictions on its use, and its source code is almost always kept secret.”\(^1\)\(^5\)\(^3\) The description of proprietary anti-plagiarism software has been presented in Appendix IV, Table A3.1.

6.5.2.2.2 Free Online Software/Tools

“Free software, which is generally the same as open source software, is available at no cost to everyone, and it can be used by anyone for any purpose and with only very minimal restrictions”\(^1\)\(^5\)\(^3\). These software divided into three categories for better understanding.

1. Software which are freely available online have been presented in Appendix IV, Table A3.2 and User can use it by simply open the link.

2. Software which are freely downloadable online have been presented in Appendix IV, Table A3.3 and the user can download the software by using the web address and use it.

3. Software which can be used free of cost with sign up requirement have been presented in Appendix IV, Table A3.4.

It is recommended that everyone should check one’s thesis or research paper with the help of one of these anti-plagiarism software before submission and realize the
level of originality in their work. This will definitely improve the quality of the thesis work of the research scholars and authors of journal article.

6.5.2.3. Benefits of Using Plagiarism Detection Tools

- With the help of plagiarism detection tools researchers can find out if any other person has copied their research writing.
- It helps to improve writing skills as some plagiarism tools check grammar also.
- It filters the duplicate content.
- These tools are useful to avoid intellectual property issues.
- It promotes effective and efficient research.
- These softwares are useful for research scholars, website creator, and publisher.
- Anti-plagiarism tools allow accessing multiple databases.
- It allows detecting any incidents of plagiarism and helps to take appropriate action.
- It helps the researcher to properly cite references.

Anti-plagiarism tools help faculty members and research scholars to have successful academic careers in the future by avoiding plagiarism.

6.5.2.3. Drawbacks of Anti-Plagiarism Tools

There are some drawbacks of detection tools:
Detection tools cannot distinguish correctly cited text from plagiarized text and if any one copied from the printed it will not possible to detect through these services.

These tools can detect copied words, but these tools can not check plagiarized thoughts or ideas.

These tools also not able to process textual images for similarity checks. In the words of Wager, “Text-matching software is a useful tool for measuring the extent of text copying, but it cannot detect plagiarized tables or figures, plagiarism of ideas, or plagiarism in translation”.

It shows that detection of plagiarism cannot give the proper solution of problem of plagiarism in academic world. But it can help to reduce the plagiarism.

6.5.3 Suggestions Regarding Prevention of Plagiarism and Enhancing the Awareness of Plagiarism

Prevention of plagiarism is as important as detection. Fallowing suggestions can be apply for preventing the plagiarism and Enhancing the Awareness of Plagiarism.

- **Universal Norm for Similarity Percentage in Theses.**

In this technological era, plagiarism detection is essential for protecting the originality written work but different universities having different criteria and norms for checking plagiarism through anti-plagiarism software. Moreover all software which are being used for the detection of plagiarism, they all are similarity text software, here it is compulsory to mention that all
similar text cannot be consider as plagiarism. There is a need to maintain universal norms for similarity percentage.

- **Anti-Plagiarism Policy**

  There should be an anti-plagiarism policy in each university and it should be in the university website. It is also recommended that there should be instructions and activities in the website which educate about the ethics and legal issues on plagiarism and copyright.

- **Awareness among Supervisors**

  Supervisors in each university must be instructed that they make the scholars aware of the consequences of plagiarism. For implementing this, there is also a need to create awareness among supervisors. If they are aware of plagiarism they would be able to give instruction to their research scholars for avoiding plagiarism.

- **Guidelines on Avoiding Plagiarism**

  Most of the research scholars are not aware of plagiarism policy, so it is recommended that there should be a set of guidelines on avoiding plagiarism and it should be mentioned in Ph.D. rules and regulation of the universities.

- **Awareness of the Consequences of Plagiarism**

  Punishment is not the solution to problem of plagiarism. It has been found from the study that a major reason for adopting plagiarism is the lack of awareness of the consequences of plagiarism. So there is a need to create awareness about plagiarism and its consequences.
• **Plagiarism Awareness Test Before Giving Admission in Ph. D. Programmes**

The person who is going to do research, he/she must have knowledge about plagiarism. So it is recommended that there should be plagiarism awareness test before giving admission in Ph. D. programmes in all Universities.

• **Proper Instruction to The Research Scholars**

There should be proper instruction to the research scholars that if they reproduce other’s work, it can be caught very easily and punishable too, so try to avoid this practice.

• **Organize Seminars For Creating Awareness**

There should be instruction for all universities that it is compulsory to organize seminars for creating awareness about plagiarism once in a year.

• **Workshop must be organized on avoiding plagiarism**

Workshop must be organized on avoiding plagiarism. In the words of Tsang and, Aaron “Continual efforts to educate our students about the ills and consequences of plagiarism are desirable”\(^\text{155}\) to reduce the problem of plagiarism.

• **Hands-on Training Program on how to Use Anti-Plagiarism Software**

Research scholars are not aware of anti-plagiarism software so there is a need to give hands-on training program to learn the use of anti-plagiarism software.
• Knowledge of Citing References

Sometimes unintentional plagiarism occurs when a person has not given the references in proper manner. Therefore it is recommended to teach researchers how to properly cite references.

• Maintain The Database of All Published Books

Plagiarism software can check similarity with e-resources only, but it is not possible to check if any one copies from the text book so it is recommended to maintain the database of all published books.

• Maintained a Database of All Ph. D Theses

It has been seen in many cases that most of researcher not only copied from the internet, but also they used to copy from previous thesis for writing there thesis. So it is also recommended that a database of all Ph. D theses should be maintained.

• Responsibility of Librarians and Information Professionals

It is recommended that the librarians and information professionals should create awareness among researchers as well as faculty members regarding intellectual property issues. Apart from this intellectual property issues should be a part of the syllabus in all subjects. So that our student must have knowledge about these matters.

• Plagiarism Act in India

It is recommended to establish Plagiarism Act of India’s own.

• Encouraging Public Debate And Discussion
It is recommended to encourage public debate and discussion on plagiarism within the university.

6.6 Limitation of the study

The researcher did not try to go in depth a deeper psychological analysis behind the phenomenon called plagiarism. It may be having its roots, early education (wherein their teachers themselves encouraged students to indulge in malpractices in public examination, so that the percentage of the school concerned would go up in the eyes of public), the research scholar’s own world view (shortcut is better for success), the supervisor’s direct or indirect advice with silent permission, the candidate’s inherent carelessness, disinterestedness and so on…

Such incidents of academic malpractices need to be studied from psychological and sociological perspectives also, rather than pedagogical alone. No discipline, especially in humanities can be studied or researched in isolation, without relating it to the other disciplines with which it interacts constantly. This statement is applicable to Library and Information Science as well.

6.7 Conclusion

Plagiarism is not something new, nor of our age – a matter of ancient origin. In the past too, researchers used to go the library and copy something from the printed source. Now, is the era of information technology, and through Ctrl C (copy) and Ctrl V (paste), it is easier to copy anything from the Internet in a short time. It has been observed from the study that awareness about plagiarism is not satisfactory and there is no difference in awareness about plagiarism among research scholars on the respective university status.
There are many softwares available to detect plagiarism, some of them are commercial and others are freely available online, which can be used for detection of plagiarism. Moreover, in the Indian environment, the University Grants Commission (UGC), a statutory body of higher education has instructed all universities to check the theses before submission with anti-plagiarism software. Such software is also contributing towards decreasing the rate of plagiarism. But, no software can solve the problem of plagiarism completely until people are made aware about it.

Apart from this, punishment is not the solution to any problem. It has been found in the study that research scholars are following the ‘copy paste’ tendency, but they do not know that it is a misconduct and called as ‘plagiarism’ and most of them do not know that it is punishable too. Another thing is, plagiarism cannot be reduced until researcher are not aware the consequences of plagiarism. So, there is a need to create awareness about plagiarism and the consequences of plagiarism among research scholars by organizing seminars, conferences, and conducting educational programs. There is also a need to enlighten them that they should avoid plagiarism by themselves, not because of any university or University Grants Commission want them to avoid it, but they should avoid plagiarism because of saving their academic career, as one plagiarized material defame them, they may be fired from a job or something else. It is the time to take an active stand against plagiarism and by creating awareness, it will be possible to create a generation of research groups who will not indulge in plagiarism but exhibit their innovative ideas.

6.8 Future Direction

- The outcome of the study can be utilized by different institutions for combating plagiarism.
• Empowering Librarires and documentation centres free from the terror of plagiarism

• Plagiarism free Intellectual Property Management division can be fostered

• The outcome of the study can be utilized in making anti-plagiarism policy at national level.

• Can Keep the Publications in journals, Magazines, Books as an original

• Development of anti-plagiarism tools in different languages.

• Aptitude and Attitudes test can be conducted among faculty and students in different universities on plagiarism.

• Create awareness about plagiarism and the consequences of plagiarism among research scholars by organizing seminars, conferences, and conducting educational programs.

• The outcome of the study can be used to develop anti-plagiarism software

6.9 Area of further study

• Practical evaluation of plagiarism tools.

• Study of more cases in other fields like journalism, entertainment.

• Study of legal case histories of plagiarism cases, especially in India.

• Awareness of plagiarism among LIS professionals in India.

• Study of more cases in plagiarism in India and abroad.

• Development of anti-plagiarism tools in India and in different languages.
• Attitudes towards plagiarism among faculty and students in different universities in India.

• Activities of, and efforts taken by different institution for combating plagiarism.
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