

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

---

4-2020

## MEASURING THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS PLAGIARISM: A STUDY

Sankar P Dr

Sree Narayana Guru College, [amulsankar@gmail.com](mailto:amulsankar@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

P, Sankar Dr, "MEASURING THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS PLAGIARISM: A STUDY" (2020). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 4121.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4121>

# MEASURING THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS PLAGIARISM: A STUDY

**Dr. P. SANKAR,**  
*Librarian,*  
*Sree Narayana Guru College,*  
*KG Chavadi, Coimbatore 641 105*

---

## ABSTRACT

*Good scientific writing must be characterized by clear expression, conciseness, accuracy, and perhaps most importantly, honesty. Unfortunately, modern scientific research often takes place within all sorts of constraints and competing pressures. As a result, a portion of the scientific literature, whether generated by students of science or by seasoned professionals, is likely to be deficient in one or more of the above components. The present study attempted to present the positive and negative attitudes towards Plagiarism and examine the Subjective norms on plagiarism activities. Attitudes toward Plagiarism questionnaire was developed, with good psychometric characteristics. TPB is a relevant predictive model of academic dishonesty that explains behavior as a final act anticipated by logical thinking. Simple random sampling adopted for the study to collect data from the students, research scholars and faculty members of Arts and Science colleges in Coimbatore. The present study results show positive, negative and subjectivity norms attitudes of PG students. Research Scholars and faculty members towards plagiarism. Faculty members were relatively better informed and against plagiarism compared to post graduates. There by highlighting the need to address the issue of plagiarism among students. If the carry out of plagiarism is not in use care of, scientific research turns into a mere repetition of previous papers and lacks uniqueness*

**Keywords:** *Plagiarism, Attitude, Faculty members, Coimbatore*

---

## Introduction

Scientific writing can be a cognitively demanding and arduous process, for it simultaneously demands exceptional degrees of clarity and conciseness, two elements that often clash with each other. In addition, accuracy and transparency, fundamental aspects of the scientific enterprise are also critical components of scientific writing. Good scientific writing must be characterized by clear expression, conciseness, accuracy, and perhaps most importantly, honesty. Unfortunately, modern scientific research often takes place within all sorts of constraints and competing pressures. As a result, a portion of the scientific literature, whether generated by students of science or by seasoned professionals, is likely to be deficient in one or more of the above components.

A general principle underlying ethical writing is the notion that the written work of an author, be it a manuscript for a magazine or scientific journal, a research paper submitted for a course, or a grant proposal submitted to a funding agency, represents an implicit contract between the author of that work and his/her readers.

Accordingly, the reader assumes that the author is the sole originator of the written work and that any material, text, data, or ideas borrowed from others is clearly identified as such by established scholarly conventions, such as footnotes, block-indented text, and quotations marks. The reader also assumes that all information conveyed therein is accurately represented to the best of the author's abilities.

Plagiarism is the unauthorized or unacknowledged use of another person's academic or scholarly work. Done on purpose, it is cheating. Done accidentally, it is no less serious. Regardless of how it occurs, plagiarism is a theft of intellectual property and a violation of an ironclad rule demanding "credit be given where credit is due". Quite often, carelessness, procrastination and inexperience are contributing factors behind a charge of plagiarism. Developing good research habits and learning how to properly cite and document your sources will keep you above suspicion and protect you from such charges. If you intend on pursuing an academic career, your scholarship will undergo constant examination by your peers and colleagues. Your reputation will be earned when you earn their respect; how you will be judged will be based, in part, on how you treat the intellectual property of others.

Acknowledging those from whom you have learned assigns credibility to your work and creates a record that other researchers can refer to and build upon. More importantly, your own skill and talent as a scholar will begin to take shape. As respect for your scholarship grows, so too will your inclusion in the ongoing conversation among experts, past and present, within your specific field of study. Your own body of intellectual property will not be far behind.

Plagiarism is using someone else's work or ideas without attributing proper credit and presenting the work or ideas as your own. It is considered an academic violation, though it is not illegal in a criminal or civil sense. When someone commits plagiarism, the act is against the author of the work.

Inspired by the five key characteristics of plagiarism according to Fishman, we define plagiarism to encompass: The use of ideas, concepts, words, or structures without appropriately acknowledging the source to benefit in a setting where originality is expected. Other researchers commonly define academic plagiarism as literary theft, i.e. stealing words or ideas from other authors. Theft describes the deliberate appropriation of foreign property without the consent of the rightful owner. The definition used in this thesis does not necessarily characterize academic plagiarism as theft for the following reasons. Authors may inadvertently fail to properly acknowledge a source, e.g., by forgetting to insert a citation, or citing a wrong source; thereby committing plagiarism unintentionally. Additionally, a psychological memory bias called cryptomnesia can cause humans to unconsciously attribute foreign ideas to them. Second, academic plagiarists may act in consent with another author, but still commit plagiarism by not properly acknowledging the

original source. The term collusion describes the behavior of authors, who write collaboratively, or copy from one another, although they are required to work independently.

### **Review of Literature**

**Dias, Paulo C (2014)** indicated that both teacher and students know that plagiarism is illegal and their attributes on plagiarism to the easiness on contents access on Internet but while teachers tend to attribute causes to students' lack of skills, students highlight the pressure to get good grades, laziness and poor management as well as the expectation that won't be caught. **Fish, Reva (2013)** revealed that students believed other students are far more likely than them to commit each type of plagiarism and they recognized that some types of plagiarism are more serious than others. The opportunity to reduce incidents of plagiarism by providing students with accurate information about plagiarism at their schools is discussed in the context of social norms theory. **Ibegbulam, Ijeoma J. (2015)** showed that the knowledge of plagiarism among the students prior to their being taught the subject was very low. However, after being exposed to the subject through teaching, their knowledge increased significantly. The attitude of respondents to strategies for curbing plagiarism showed that respondents favored corrective measures over punitive measures. The study concluded that university administrations should pay close attention to this problem by developing strategies that can help resolve it.

**Idiegbeyan-ose, Jerome (2016)** revealed average level of awareness of plagiarism among postgraduate students, level of training influenced their level of awareness; pressure to meet deadlines, inadequate writing skills and lack of knowledge of what constitutes plagiarism were found to be responsible for the malaise. It recommended the intensification of awareness and sensitization programmes on plagiarism by various institutions and to enforce the use of Turnitin in all Nigerian Universities. **James, Mark X. (2019)** suggested that students who believe that imitation of experts is important to learning are more likely to self-report plagiarism, and that business students are more likely to self-report than non-business students. The other factors noted about ability to express one's self in English writing and their language skills. These results pointed that key insight into the English writing plagiarism behaviors of Chinese students studying in Western higher education. **Khairnar, Mahesh Ravindra (2019)** explored attitude toward plagiarism (ATP) measured using a self-administered questionnaire and PG students showed more positive attitude and less negative ATP as compared to faculty members. The study showed negligence of PG students toward plagiarism which calls for improvement in awareness regarding plagiarism and research education.

**Kim, Aaron (2009)** measured the impact of using anti-plagiarism tools (APT's) on students' behavior and attitudes toward plagiarism. It is noticed that correlations between APT perception and plagiarism behavior, moral judgment and

neutralization. **Oyewole, Olawale (2018)** revealed that most of the respondents had a high level of awareness of the various acts that constitute plagiarism and majority of the distance learners had a negative perception of plagiarism as they viewed it as a crime who indicated that they will ensure that they duly acknowledge their sources of information. The study suggested to develop a plagiarism policy that will be given to all the students. **Ramzan, Muhammad (2012)** revealed that there was a low level of awareness about plagiarism and university plagiarism policies and processes amongst the students. A significant number of students have fairly admitted that they have intentionally plagiarized written materials. It recommended that creating awareness amongst the students regarding plagiarism, plagiarism policies and provides statistical evidences for formulation of policies and guidelines to combat plagiarism in institutions of higher learning in Pakistan. **Strangfeld, Jennifer A. (2019)** highlighted that students plagiarize primarily because they are concerned that not only are their vocabulary and writing skills subpar, but that they do not fit into the college student role. Consequently, students' plagiarism experiences are contextualized within their broader educational histories rather than limited to the immediate circumstances surrounding their academic dishonesty.

### **Objectives:**

The study aimed to presents

- ❖ To analysis the positive and negative attitudes towards Plagiarism
- ❖ To examine the Subjective norms on plagiarism activities.

### **Methodology**

To obtain the above objectives a structured questionnaire used. Attitudes toward Plagiarism questionnaire was developed, with good psychometric characteristics. In questionnaire development, Ajzen's theory of planned behavior (TPB) was chosen as a model to predict the intention to plagiarize. TPB is a relevant predictive model of academic dishonesty that explains behavior as a final act anticipated by logical thinking. Simple random sampling adopted for the study to collect data from the students, research scholars and faculty members of Arts and Science colleges in Coimbatore. 140 questionnaires disturbed among the various respondents and 130 received which consider for the study analysis. The response rate for the questionnaire was 92.85%.

### **Social Demographic Profile:**

It is noticed that 37% of the respondents was male and 63% of the respondents was female. Among the age group, 39% of the respondents were above 40 years and 23% of the respondents were 36-40 years age. 18% of the respondents was belonged to 31-35 age, 12% of the respondents were 26-30 age and 8% of the respondents was aged below 25. 45% of the respondents was faculty members, 37% of the respondents were research scholars and 18% of the respondents was PG students. Among the discipline wise distribution, 44% of the respondents was represented from Science,

34% of the respondents were from Arts background and 22% of the respondents were from Humanities subjects. Among the educational qualification distribution, 58% of the respondents had PG with NET and 12% of the respondents were had PG with M.Phil as educational qualification. 30% of the respondents had Ph.D degree. Among the experience distribution, 42% of the respondents had below 3 years of experience and 25% of the respondents had 3-5 years of experience. 22% of the respondents had 6-9 years of experience and 11% of the respondents had above 10 years of experience.

**Table No:1**  
**Positive attitude towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	Sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something.	N	48	32	37	9	4	130
		%	36.9	24.6	28.5	6.9	3.1	100
2	It is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same.	N	20	19	29	33	29	130
		%	15.4	14.6	22.3	25.4	22.3	100
3	Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful (one cannot steal from oneself).	N	24	47	39	18	2	130
		%	18.5	36.2	30	13.8	1.5	100
4	Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value.	N	24	38	41	20	7	130
		%	18.5	29.2	31.5	15.4	5.4	100
5	Self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism is.	N	17	37	38	23	15	130
		%	13.1	28.5	29.2	17.7	11.5	100
6	Young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism.	N	31	34	40	17	8	130
		%	23.8	26.2	30.8	13.1	6.2	100
7	If one cannot write well in a foreign language (eg, English), it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language.	N	40	45	27	13	5	130
		%	30.8	34.6	20.8	10	3.8	100
8	I could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing.	N	25	41	39	15	10	130
		%	19.2	31.5	30	11.5	7.7	100
9	Short deadlines give me the right to plagiarize a bit.	N	52	35	32	7	4	130
		%	40	26.9	24.6	5.4	3.1	100

10	When I do not know what to write, I translate a part of a paper from a foreign language.	N	22	41	41	17	9	130
		%	16.9	31.5	31.5	13.1	6.9	100
11	It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work.	N	34	32	41	16	7	130
		%	26.2	24.6	31.5	12.3	5.4	100
12	If a colleague of mine allows me to copy from her/his paper, I'm NOT doing anything bad, because I have his/her permission.	N	22	21	49	28	10	130
		%	16.9	16.2	37.7	21.5	7.7	100

The table no 1 shows the positive attitude towards plagiarism. It is noticed that 36.9% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 24.6% of the respondents were agreed that sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something. Around 28.5% of the respondents were neutral about this stand. 6.9% of the respondents were disagreed and 3.1% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something. It is clear that 15.4% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 14.6% of the respondents were agreed that it is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same. Around 22.3% of the respondents were neutral about this stand. 25.4% of the respondents were disagreed and 22.3% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that it is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same. It is noticed that 18.5% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 36.2% of the respondents were agreed that self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful. Around 30% of the respondents were in neutral stand. 13.8% of the respondents were disagreed and 1.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful. It is clear that 18.5% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 29.2% of the respondents were agreed that plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value. Around 31.5% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 15.4% of the respondents were disagreed and 5.4% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value. It is clear that 13.1% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 28.5% of the respondents were agreed that self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism is. Around 29.2% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 17.7% of the respondents were disagreed and 11.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism is. It is noticed that 23.8% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 26.2% of the respondents were agreed that young researchers who are just learning

the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism. Around 30.8% of the respondents were neutral about the statement. 13.1% of the respondents were disagreed and 6.2% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism. It is noticed that 30.8% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 34.6% of the respondents were agreed that if one cannot write well in a foreign language, it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language. Around 20.8% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 10% of the respondents were disagreed and 3.8% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that if one cannot write well in a foreign language, it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language. It is clear that 19.2% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 31.5% of the respondents were agreed that they could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing. Around 30% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 11.5% of the respondents were disagreed and 7.7% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that they could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing. It is clear that 40% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 26.9% of the respondents were agreed that short deadlines give them the right to plagiarize a bit. Around 24.6% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 5.4% of the respondents were disagreed and 3.1% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that short deadlines give them the right to plagiarize a bit. It is noticed that 16.9% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 31.5% of the respondents were agreed that when they do not know what to write, they translate a part of a paper from a foreign language. Around 31.5% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 13.1% of the respondents were disagreed and 6.9% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that when they do not know what to write, they translate a part of a paper from a foreign language. It is clear that 26.2% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 24.6% of the respondents were agreed that it is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work. Around 31.5% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 12.3% of the respondents were disagreed and 5.4% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work. It is clear that 16.9% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 16.2% of the respondents were agreed that if a colleague of mine allows them to copy from their paper, they were not doing anything bad, because they have their permission. Around 37.7% of the respondents were neutral about their statement. 21.5% of the respondents were disagreed and 7.7% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that if a colleague of mine allows them to copy from their paper, they were not doing anything bad, because they have their permission.



**Table No: 2**  
**Ranking of respondents opinion on Positive attitude towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something.	2.15	1.093	2
2	It is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same.	3.25	1.364	12
3	Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful (one cannot steal from oneself).	2.44	0.996	4
4	Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value.	2.6	1.118	8
5	Self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism is.	2.86	1.199	10
6	Young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism.	2.52	1.17	6
7	If one cannot write well in a foreign language, it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language.	2.22	1.107	3
8	I could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing.	2.57	1.154	7
9	Short deadlines give me the right to plagiarize a bit.	2.05	1.07	1
10	When I do not know what to write, I translate a part of a paper from a foreign language.	2.62	1.123	9
11	It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work.	2.46	1.162	5
12	If a colleague of mine allows me to copy from her/his paper I am doing anything bad, because I have his/her permission.	2.87	1.164	11

The table no 2 shows the ranking of respondents' opinion on positive attitude towards plagiarism. Among the various factors, Short deadlines give me the right to plagiarize a bit (M: 2.05; SD: 1.07) ranked first, Sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something (M: 2.15; SD: 1.093) ranked second, if one cannot write well in a foreign language (eg, English), it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already

published in that language (M: 2.22; SD: 1.107) ranked third, Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful (one cannot steal from oneself) (M: 2.44; SD: 0.996) ranked fourth, It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work.(M: 2.46 ; SD: 1.162) ranked fifth, Young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism.(M: 2.52; SD: 1.17) ranked sixth, I could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing. (M: 2.57; SD: 1.154) ranked seventh, Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value. (M: 2.6; SD: 1.118) ranked eighth, When I do not know what to write, I translate a part of a paper from a foreign language (M: 2.62; SD: 1.123) ranked ninth, Self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism is, (M: 2.86; SD: 1.199) ranked tenth, If a colleague of mine allows me to copy from her/his paper, I'm NOT doing anything bad, because I have his/her permission, (M: 2.87; SD: 1.164) ranked eleventh and it is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same (M: 3.25; SD: 1.364) ranked twelfth.

**Table No: 3**  
**Relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and their positive attitude on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.465 <sup>a</sup>	.216	.136	1.121

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40.536	12	3.378	2.686	.003 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	147.156	117	1.258		
	Total	187.692	129			

The table no 3 shows the regression test results between educational qualification of the respondents and their positive attitude on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.003 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on educational qualification and their positive attitude on plagiarism.

**Table No: 4**  
**Relationship between experience of the respondents and their positive attitude on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.435 <sup>a</sup>	.190	.106	.643

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.318	12	.943	2.281	.002 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	48.374	117	.413		
	Total	59.692	129			

The table no 4 shows the regression test results between experience of the respondents and their positive attitude on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.002 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on experience and their positive attitude on plagiarism.

**Table No: 5**  
**Negative attitude towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	Plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community.	N	17	28	48	28	9	130
		%	13.1	21.5	36.9	21.5	6.9	100
2	The names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community.	N	18	27	47	21	17	130
		%	13.8	20.8	36.2	16.2	13.1	100
3	In times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism.	N	14	24	34	31	27	130
		%	10.8	18.5	26.2	23.8	20.8	100
4	Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam.	N	20	30	42	25	13	130
		%	15.4	23.1	32.3	19.2	10	100
5	Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit.	N	24	24	45	31	6	130
		%	18.5	18.5	34.6	23.8	4.6	100
6	A plagiarized paper does no harm science.	N	30	21	37	28	14	130
		%	23.1	16.2	28.5	21.5	10.8	100
7	Since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets; it should NOT be considered as a serious offense.	N	20	24	21	21	44	130
		%	15.4	18.5	16.2	16.2	33.8	100

The table no 5 shows the negative attitude towards plagiarism. It is noticed that 13.1% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 21.5% of the respondents were agreed that plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community. Around 36.9% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 21.5% of the respondents were disagreed and 6.9% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community. It is noticed that 13.8% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 20.8% of the respondents were agreed that names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community. Around 36.2% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 16.2% of the respondents were disagreed and 13.1% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community. It is clear that 10.8% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 18.5% of the respondents were agreed that in times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism. Around 26.2% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 23.8% of the respondents were disagreed and 20.8% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that in times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism. It is clear that 15.4% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 23.1%

of the respondents were agreed that Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam. Around 32.3% of the respondents were neutral about the statement. 19.2% of the respondents were disagreed and 10% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam. It is noticed that 18.5% of the respondents were strongly agreed and another 18.5% of the respondents were agreed that Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit. Around 34.6% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 23.8% of the respondents were disagreed and 4.6% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit. It is noticed that 23.1% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 16.2% of the respondents were agreed that plagiarized paper does no harm science. Around 28.5% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 21.5% of the respondents were disagreed and 10.8% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that plagiarized paper does no harm science. It is clear that 15.4% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 18.5% of the respondents were agreed that since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets; it should not be considered as a serious offense. Around 16.2% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 16.2% of the respondents were disagreed and 33.8% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets; it should not be considered as a serious offense.

**Table No: 6**  
**Ranking of respondents' opinion on Negative attitude towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community.	2.88	1.107	4
2	The names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community.	2.94	1.206	5
3	In times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism.	3.25	1.278	6
4	Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam.	2.85	1.195	3
5	Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit.	2.78	1.143	1
6	A plagiarized paper does no harm science.	2.81	1.306	2
7	Since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets; it should NOT be considered as a serious offense.	3.35	1.487	7

The table no 6 shows the ranking of respondents' opinion about negative attitude towards plagiarism. Plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit (M: 2.78; SD: 1.143) ranked first, A plagiarized paper does no harm science (M: 2.81; SD: 1.306) ranked second, Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam (M: 2.85; SD: 1.195) ranked third, Plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community (M: 2.88; SD: 1.107) ranked fourth, The names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community (M: 2.94; SD: 1.206) ranked fifth, In times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism. (M: 3.25; SD: 1.278) ranked sixth and since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets; it should NOT be considered as a serious offense (M: 3.35; SD: 1.487) ranked seventh.

**Table No: 7**

**Relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and their negative attitude on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.306 <sup>a</sup>	.094	.042	1.181

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	17.555	7	2.508	1.798	.003 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	170.137	122	1.395		
	Total	187.692	129			

The table no 7 shows the regression test results between educational qualification of the respondents and their negative attitude on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.003 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on educational qualification and their negative attitude on plagiarism.

**Table No: 8**  
**Relationship between experience of the respondents and their negative attitude on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.405 <sup>a</sup>	.164	.116	.639

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	9.806	7	1.401	3.426	.002 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	49.887	122	.409		
	Total	59.692	129			

The table no 8 shows the regression test results between experience of the respondents and their negative attitude on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.002 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on experience and their negative attitude on plagiarism.

**Table No: 9**  
**Subjective norms towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
1	Authors say they do not plagiarize, when in fact they do.	N	47	32	30	8	13	130
		%	36.2	24.6	23.1	6.2	10	100
2	Those who say they have never plagiarized are lying.	N	25	39	44	14	8	130
		%	19.2	30	33.8	10.8	6.2	100
3	Sometimes I'm tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it.	N	15	20	49	30	16	130
		%	11.5	15.4	37.7	23.1	12.3	100
4	I keep plagiarizing because I haven't been caught yet.	N	13	31	46	25	15	130
		%	10	23.8	35.4	19.2	11.5	100
5	I am working in a plagiarism-free environment	N	17	26	32	33	22	130
		%	13.1	20	24.6	25.4	16.9	100
6	Plagiarism is not a big deal.	N	21	15	33	29	32	130
		%	16.2	11.5	25.4	22.3	24.6	100
7	Sometimes I copy a sentence or two just to become inspired for further writing.	N	18	22	32	28	30	130
		%	13.8	16.9	24.6	21.5	23.1	100
8	I don't feel guilty for copying verbatim a sentence or two from my previous papers.	N	66	28	28	3	5	130
		%	50.8	21.5	21.5	2.3	3.8	100
9	Plagiarism is justified if I currently have more important obligations or tasks to do.	N	24	40	44	12	10	130
		%	18.5	30.8	33.8	9.2	7.7	100
10	Sometimes, it is necessary to plagiarize	N	23	27	42	22	16	130
		%	17.7	20.8	32.3	16.9	12.3	100

The table no 9 shows the subjective norms towards the plagiarism. It is noticed that 36.2% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 24.6% of the respondents were agreed that authors say they do not plagiarize, when in fact they do. Around 23.1% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 6.2% of the respondents were disagreed and 10% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that Authors say they do not plagiarize, when in fact they do. It is clear that 19.2% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 30% of the respondents were agreed that those who say they have never plagiarized are lying. Around 33.8% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 10.8% of the respondents were disagreed and 6.2% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that those who say they have never plagiarized are lying. It is noticed that 11.5% of the respondents were strongly



agreed and 15.4% of the respondents were agreed that sometimes they were tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it. Around 37.7% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 23.1% of the respondents were disagreed and 12.3% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that sometimes they were tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it. It is clear that 10% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 23.8% of the respondents were agreed that they kept plagiarizing because they haven't been caught yet. Around 35.4% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 19.2% of the respondents were disagreed and 11.5% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that they kept plagiarizing because they haven't been caught yet. It is noticed that 13.1% of the respondents were strongly agreed and 20% of the respondents were agreed that they were working in a plagiarism-free environment. Around 24.6% of the respondents were neutral about this statement. 25.4% of the respondents were disagreed and 16.9% of the respondents were strongly disagreed that they were working in a plagiarism-free environment

**Table No: 10**

**Ranking of respondents opinion about Subjective norms towards Plagiarism**

Sl. No	Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
1	Authors say they do NOT plagiarize, when in fact they do.	2.29	1.291	2
2	Those who say they have never plagiarized are lying.	2.55	1.107	3
3	Sometimes I'm tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it (students, researchers, physicians).	3.09	1.158	7
4	I keep plagiarizing because I haven't been caught yet.	2.98	1.141	6
5	I work (study) in a plagiarism-free environment	3.13	1.284	8
6	Plagiarism is not a big deal.	3.28	1.381	10
7	Sometimes I copy a sentence or two just to become inspired for further writing.	3.23	1.35	9
8	I don't feel guilty for copying verbatim a sentence or two from my previous papers.	1.87	1.074	1
9	Plagiarism is justified if I currently have more important obligations or tasks to do.	2.57	1.127	4
10	Sometimes, it is necessary to plagiarize	2.85	1.252	5

The table no 10 shows the ranking of respondents' opinion about the subjective norms towards plagiarism. Among the various factors, they don't feel guilty for

copying verbatim a sentence or two from my previous papers (M: 1.87; SD: 1.074) ranked first, Authors say they do NOT plagiarize, when in fact they do (M: 2.29; SD: 1.291) ranked second, those who say they have never plagiarized are lying. (M: 2.55 ; SD: 1.107) ranked third, Plagiarism is justified if I currently have more important obligations or tasks to do (M: 2.57; SD: 1.127) ranked fourth, Sometimes, it is necessary to plagiarize (M: 2.85; SD: 1.252) ranked fifth, they keep plagiarizing because they haven't been caught yet (M: 2.98; SD: 1.141) ranked sixth, Sometimes I'm tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it (students, researchers, physicians) (M: 3.09; SD: 1.158) ranked seventh, I work (study) in a plagiarism-free environment, (M: 3.13; SD: 1.284) ranked eighth, Sometimes I copy a sentence or two just to become inspired for further writing (M: 3.23; SD: 1.35) ranked ninth and Plagiarism is not a big deal (M: 3.28; SD: 1.381) ranked tenth.

**Table No: 11**  
**Relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and their subjective norms on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.326 <sup>a</sup>	.107	.032	.306

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.332	10	.133	1.420	.002 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	11.161	119	.094		
	Total	12.492	129			

The table no 11 shows the regression test results between educational qualification of the respondents and their subjective norms on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.002 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on educational qualification and their subjective norms on plagiarism.

**Table No: 12**  
**Relationship between experience of the respondents and their subjective norms on plagiarism**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.382 <sup>a</sup>	.146	.074	.654

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.722	10	.872	2.036	.003 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	50.970	119	.428		
	Total	59.692	129			

The table no shows the regression test results between experience of the respondents and their subjective norms on plagiarism. It is understand the significant value is 0.003 at the significance level of 95%. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The hypothesis mentioned that there is a significant relationship on experience and their subjective norms on plagiarism.

**Results and Discussions:**

- ❖ Most of respondents had positive altitude that due to short deadlines they had the right to plagiarize a bit, they believed that one cannot avoid using other peoples words without citing the source and language skill made justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language. People expressed that self-plagiarism is not punishable and justified to use one’s own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work.
  
- ❖ Some respondents mentioned milder punishment to young researchers who are just learning the supports the plagiarism and argued that could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing. They reported that plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value and when they do not know what to write, they translate a part of a paper from a foreign language.

- ❖ Most of the respondents thought that plagiarism impoverishes the investigative spirit and plagiarized paper does no harm science. They also believed that plagiarizing is as bad as stealing an exam moreover plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community.
- ❖ Respondents reflected that names of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community and at the times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism
- ❖ Age of the academician cooperated much about the positive attitude towards plagiarism. The difference view of students, research scholars, faculty and match with negative attitude and subjective norms towards Plagiarism.
- ❖ Justification made that don't have feel guilty for copying verbatim a sentence or two from my previous papers, besides that authors said they do not plagiarize, when in fact they do. Moreover those who say they have never plagiarized are lying. and plagiarism was justified if have more important obligations or tasks to do.
- ❖ Sometimes, the respondents stated that they worked / studied in a plagiarism-free environment and Plagiarism is not a big deal.

### **Conclusion:**

Plagiarism performs appear to be smooth more frequent among the academic community. Growing the awareness of students about the seriousness of this practice is essential. Moreover, helping them by improving their language and writing skills and teaching proper referencing, quoting, paraphrasing and citation styles are also important to discourage this phenomenon. The present study results show positive, negative and subjectivity norms attitudes of PG students. Research Scholars and faculty members towards plagiarism. Faculty members were relatively better informed and against plagiarism compared to post graduates. There by highlighting the need to address the issue of plagiarism among students. If the carry out of plagiarism is not in use care of, scientific research turn into a mere repetition of previous papers and lacks uniqueness.

## References

1. Dias, Paulo C. and Bastos, Ana Sofia C (2014), Plagiarism phenomenon in European countries: Results from GENIUS project, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 116 ( 2014 ) 2526 – 2531
2. Fish, Reva and Hura, Gerri (2013) Students' perceptions of plagiarism, *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 13, No. 5, December 2013, pp. 33 – 45.
3. Ibegbulam, I. J., & Eze, J. U. (2015). Knowledge, perception and attitude of Nigerian students to plagiarism: A case study. *IFLA journal*, 41(2), 120-128.
4. Idiegbeyan-ose, Jerome; Nkiko, Christopher; and Osinulu, Ifeakachuku, "Awareness and Perception of Plagiarism of Postgraduate Students in Selected Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria." (2016). *Library Philosophy and Practice* (e-journal). 1322. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1322>
5. James, Mark X. (2019) Comprehending the Cultural Causes of English Writing Plagiarism in Chinese Students at a Western-Style University, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154 (3), 631–642
6. Khairnar, Mahesh Ravindra (2019) Survey on attitude of dental professionals about plagiarism in Maharashtra, India. *Perspect Clin Res* 2019;10:9-14.
7. Kim, A., & Wise, J. M. (2009). Measuring College Students' Perceptions and Attitudes toward Anti-Plagiarism Detection Tools and Their Behaviors, Beliefs, and Moral Judgment regarding Plagiarism. In *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology* (Vol. 1, pp. 256-264).
8. Oyewole, Olawale (2018) Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Plagiarism by Distance Learners in University of Ibadan, Nigeria, *International Journal of Academic Library and Information Science*, Vol. 6(4), pp. 101-113, June 201
9. Ramzan, M., Munir, M. A., Siddique, N., & Asif, M. (2012). Awareness about plagiarism amongst university students in Pakistan. *Higher education*, 64(1), 73-84.
10. Sankar P (2019), Perception of the faculty members and Research Scholars about Plagiarism: A study, *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 7(06), 148-158,
11. Strangfeld, Jennifer A. (2019) I Just Don't Want to Be Judged: Cultural Capital's Impact on Student Plagiarism, *SAGE Open*, January-March 2019: 1–14