University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Awareness and Attitude towards Plagiarism among Post Graduate Students and Research Scholars of Select Social Sciences Departments of Kurukshetra University and Panjab University, Chandigarh

Neha Garg Ms.
Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, nehabajajmgh@gmail.com

Manoj Kumar Joshi Prof.(Dr.)
Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, manojkj01@yahoo.com

Jivesh Bansal Dr.
Panjab University, Chandigarh, India, jivesh@pu.ac.in

Garg, Neha Ms.; Joshi, Manoj Kumar Prof.(Dr.); and Bansal, Jivesh Dr., "Awareness and Attitude towards Plagiarism among Post Graduate Students and Research Scholars of Select Social Sciences Departments of Kurukshetra University and Panjab University, Chandigarh" (2021). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 6682.
https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6682

Awareness and Attitude towards Plagiarism among Post Graduate Students and Research Scholars of Select Social Sciences Departments of Kurukshetra University and Panjab University, Chandigarh

Neha Garg
(JRF) Research Scholar
Department of Library & Information Science
Kurukshetra University
Email id: nehabajajmgh@gmail.com
ORDID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9055-2727

Prof. (Dr.) Manoj Kumar Joshi
Department of Library & Information Science,
Kurukshetra University
Email id: manojkj01@yahoo.com

Dr. Jivesh Bansal
University Librarian
A C Joshi Library (Central Library),
Panjab University
Email id: jivesh@pu.ac.in

Abstract
This study explores the awareness and attitude towards plagiarism among postgraduate students and research scholars of Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (KU) and Panjab University, Chandigarh (PU). The findings of the questionnaire based study reveal that 53.64% of KU and 79.9% respondents of PU were acquainted with the term plagiarism. More than 41% respondents became aware of this term in their present university and more than half of the total respondents came to know about this concept during last one year. Only 23.97% had attended plagiarism awareness programmes. The understanding and attitude towards plagiarism needs greater attention. Maximum 88.35% respondents considered 'Using someone's ideas/words without acknowledging his/her' as plagiarism while 48.63% did not consider 'Helping your friend/classmate write a paper that must be submitted by him/her as an assignment' as plagiarism. The main reason of plagiarism was lack of proper understanding of the concept and therefore it is suggested that awareness programmes on plagiarism and training programmes on methods of citation should be conducted.

Introduction

The term plagiarism is getting considerable attention these days as cases of its incidence are increasing rapidly. With the advent of internet, information has become very easy to identify access, extract and use elsewhere. But this ease of handling information has positive as well as negative manifestations. Unacknowledged use of information created by others is leading to ethical issues particularly plagiarism. Although, there is near unanimity in academic community regarding what constitutes plagiarism, but their expression as stated definition differs. The UGC regulations on 'Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions (2018) define plagiarism as "the practice of taking someone else's work or idea and passing them as one's own." Virginia Tech Constitution (2021, pp.2) defines plagiarism "as the copying of the language, structure, idea, and/or thoughts of another and claiming or attempting to imply that it is one's own original work". The concept of "plagiarism" has been in use for millenniums. Bailey, in his website Plagiarism Today (https://www.plagiarismtoday.com/2011/10/04/the-world%E2%80%99s-first-plagiarism-case/) states that the first century poet "Martial, like many poets in the era, found that his work was being copied and recited wholesale by other poets without attribution". According to Moss (2005), "Plagiarism is a very ancient art. Shakespeare stole most of his historical plots directly from Holinshed. Laurence Sterne and Samuel Taylor Coleridge were both accused of plagiarism". Plagiarism and unauthorized printing of works gradually acquired increased dimensions particularly after European renaissance. Such concerns led to enactment of copyright laws in the English world. These laws helped in protection of the rights of the authors and publishers; but the issue of plagiarism has other dimensions also, particularly concerning students, teachers, researchers, etc. As the availability of information is increasing; there are increasing number of cases of plagiarism. In order to counter this menace, different higher education and research institutions as well as publishers of journals and books, started formulating policies. In Indian context, the UGC regulations on 'Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions' (2018) have given a clear direction with respect to avoiding and handling of plagiarism complaints. Prior to these regulations individual institutions had their own policies that had wide variations. Although, nearly all academic institutions have now enacted guidelines for M. Phil. dissertations and doctoral theses, but policies on student assignments are still lacking in many institutions. However Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay (2015) (http://www.iitb.ac.in/newacadhome/punishments201521July.pdf), provides that "A student found copying in an assignment/laboratory project is given a zero in the assignment/project and is further given a one grade penalty" and the same penalty will be inflicted on both the students-one who copies and the other whose assignment/laboratory work is copied; unless it is proven that the act was done without information of the latter.

Literature Review

Plagiarism awareness, understanding, attitude, and incidence are quite extensively being investigated in professional literature. Although, the topic is contemporary for higher education and research in all disciplines, the review is mainly restricted to the higher education scenario only.

Raj et al. (2021) conducted a multicentric and cross sectional study to know the extent of awareness and attitudes on plagiarism among 786 postgraduate resident doctors of government medical colleges (GMCs) and junior medical faculty from across 11 teaching Institutions across south India. In this study, respondents have lacked adequate knowledge on how to avoid plagiarism suggesting a need for a revamp in medical education curriculum by incorporating research and publication ethics and extent of knowledge on plagiarism among junior medical professionals is far-off from satisfactory. Tsekea, Bindura & Madziko (2021) conducted a study on attitude towards plagiarism of Bindura University of Science Education among undergraduate students has both low as well as limited awareness of plagiarism and also found reasons of plagiarism that is external pressure, lack of referencing convention skills, poor academic writing skills and lack of plagiarism awareness. In a study of dental professionals of Maharashtra, India Khairnar *et al.* (2019) found that 68.3% respondents responded in agreement on "self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful" while a little less number of faculty members i.e. 61.1% agreed to it and this difference in the response was not statistically significant. Interestingly, the statement "Plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible assets. it should not be considered as a serious offense" was agreed upon by 38.9% postgraduate students and 32.2% faculty members. Javaeed et al. (2019) reported a study of undergraduate medical students in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. Interestingly, 86.19% respondents did not know about plagiarism. Only 14.45% respondents were aware of the legal consequences of plagiarism and only 35.36% respondents considered plagiarism to be unprofessional or unethical. Uplaonker (2018) found that 97.18% postgraduate students and 84.31% research scholars were aware about plagiarism in University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad. All the respondents disagreed with the statement "cutting and pasting the paragraph word for word, there is no need to make any acknowledgment" while 61.97% postgraduate students and 30.39% research scholars faced problems due to lack of language skill. Oyewole et al. (2018) reported a study of distance learners in University of Ibadan, Nigeria. The study found that 50% respondents highly agreed with the statement "copying from the internet" was an act of plagiarism. 53% respondents strongly agreed with the statement "plagiarism is an academic crime" while 52.50% respondents strongly agreed with the statement "plagiarism is an act of lack of integrity". The study further explored that 56.9% respondents strongly agreed with the statement "I will not plagiarize because it is an academic crime" whereas 51% strongly agreed with the statement "I will make sure I give acknowledgment which is due at all times". Iloh et al. (2018) in a study of post-graduate medical college in south-east Nigeria found that all the respondents were aware of plagiarism; among them 23.8% respondents were involved in committing plagiarism. A majority of 73.5% respondents said that plagiarism arose mostly during the writing of undergraduate projects. All the respondents said that enabling factors and punitive measures for plagiarism were ignorance of what constitutes plagiarism, and loss of promotion and demotion. Mahmud et al. (2018) conducted a comparative study of students from the United Kingdom (UK), Czechia, Poland and Romania and found that 93.3% respondents in UK agreed with the statement "the institution where I now study has policies and procedures for dealing the plagiarism" whereas only 40% Romanian respondents agreed with it. The study concludes that students of the UK had the highest level of awareness of plagiarism as compared to other three countries. Madaan and Chakravarty (2017) highlighted a study to assess the awareness towards plagiarism among post graduate students of DAV College sector-10, Chandigarh. In this study Majority of the students use quotation marks but they do not quote the original author. Flood of information available on Internet in every domain is major reason which makes students plagiarise, thus

saving the time and effort of the students. There is another reason behind plagiarism which has emerged from the study i.e. disliking the topic, lack of confidence and quoting the citation in standard format involves time and effort. Most of the students consider copying and pasting as an unethical practice and also have basic knowledge about plagiarism.

The above studies show that although undergraduate students have very less awareness of plagiarism, the postgraduates, research scholars and faculty are significantly more aware of the concept. However, the understanding and attitude towards the concept and practice of plagiarism varies among respondents of different subjects and in different institutions.

Objectives of the Study

The study was conducted to know the awareness and attitude of postgraduate students and research scholars of KU and PU. The specific objectives of the study with respect to postgraduate students and researchers of KU and PU were to know:

1. The awareness and understanding of plagiarism;
2. The attitude towards plagiarism;
3. The reasons of plagiarism; and
4. The methods of reducing plagiarism.

Research methodology

The study was conducted by surveying the respondents in both the universities with a structured questionnaire. Total 220 questionnaires were personally distributed in KU and PU and the same numbers of questionnaires were received back from both the universities. However, only those questionnaires were subjected to further analysis which responded positively to the question of awareness of the concept of plagiarism.

Scope and limitation of the study

The study was undertaken to identify awareness and attitude towards plagiarism among post graduate students and research scholars of selected social science departments (History, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology and Public Administration) of Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra and Panjab University, Chandigarh. Besides subject limitation, the study was also limited to the teaching departments in the main campus of these universities. Regional centres of the universities were not included in the study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1. Respondents by Category

University	Post Graduate students		Research scholars		Total
	1ST Year N(%age)	2ND Year N(%age)	M.Phil. N(%age)	Ph.D N(%age)	

KU	44 (40.00)	36 (32.72)	16 (14.54)	14 (12.72)	110
PU	40 (36.36)	29 (26.36)	19 (17.27)	22 (20.00)	110
Total	84 (38.18)	65 (29.54)	35 (15.90)	36 (16.36)	220
	149(67.72)		**71(32.27)**		

Table 1 shows that out of total 220 respondents, 84(38.18%) were first year students, 65(29.54%) second year students, 35(15.90%) M.Phil. students and 36(16.36%) Ph.D scholars. Overall, 149(67.72%) respondents were postgraduate students and 71(32.27%) were research scholars. The higher participation of PG students is broadly in proportion of their population in the universities.

Table 2. Plagiarism Awareness

University	Yes (%age)	No (%age)	Total
KU	59 (53.64)	51 (46.36)	110
PU	87 (79.09)	23 (20.90)	110
Total	146 (66.36)	74 (33.63)	220

Table 2 shows that 53.64% respondents of Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra (KU) were aware of the word 'plagiarism' whereas 79.09% respondents of Panjab University (PU) were in this category. This response is mainly due to already existing plagiarism policy and similarity check software in PU (policy since 2015 and Turnitin since 2012), while KU (policy since 2019 and Turnitin since 2018) adopted it late.

Table 3. Sources of Plagiarism Awareness

University	Present university N(%age)	Classroom by teachers N(%age)	During reading N(%age)	Discussion with friends/ classmates N(%age)	Seminar/ workshop N(%age)	Mass media such as radio, T.V. N(%age)	Total
KU	20 (33.89)	19 (32.20)	07(11.86)	08 (13.55)	03(5.08)	02 (3.38)	59
PU	40 (45.97)	26 (29.88)	17(19.54)	02 (2.29)	01 (1.14)	01(1.14)	87
Total	60 (41.09)	45 (30.82)	24(16.43)	10 (6.84)	04 (2.73)	03(2.05)	146

Table 3 show that maximum 45.97% respondents of PU and 33.89% respondents of KU came to know about the word 'plagiarism' in the present university. In PU 29.88% respondents and in KU 32.20% respondents came to know about the word 'plagiarism' in the classroom by teachers. A relatively smaller percentage i.e. 19.54% respondents of PU and 11.86% respondents of KU came to know

about plagiarism during professional reading. Other quite less used sources of plagiarism awareness were: discussion with friends/classmates (2.29% respondents of PU and 13.55% respondents of KU); seminar/workshops (1.14% respondents of PU and 5.08% respondents of KU); and mass media such as radio, T.V., etc. (1.14% respondents of PU and 3.38% respondents of KU). The response makes it clear that main source of plagiarism awareness in both the universities was various university channels and the second most important source was the teachers. These two sources formed two thirds of the total response.

Table 4: Period of Plagiarism Awareness

University	First time in questionnaire N(%age)	During last one-year N(%age)	Two/ three years N(%age)	Four/ five years N(%age)	More than five years N(%age)	Total (N)
KU	19 (32.20)	22 (37.28)	14 (23.72)	01 (1.69)	03 (5.08)	59
PU	11 (12.64)	36(41.37)	19 (21.83)	13 (14.94)	08 (9.19)	87
Total	33 (22.60)	55 (37.67)	33(22.60)	14 (9.58)	11 (7.53)	146

The concept of plagiarism has become actively debated topic in higher education and research circles. But still, a student becomes aware of it once he/she reaches the college/university. Table 4 shows that 41.37% respondents of PU became aware about plagiarism during last one year and 37.28% respondents of KU responded in this category. Total 32.20% respondents of KU and 12.64% respondents of PU had come to know about plagiarism first time through this questionnaire, which means some respondents had heard about plagiarism but were not completely aware about what constitutes 'Plagiarism'. A sizeable number of 23.72% respondents of KU and 21.83% respondents of PU were aware about plagiarism for the last two/three years.

Table 5: Participation in Plagiarism Awareness Programmes

University	Yes N(%age)	No N(%age)	Total (N)
KU	03 (5.08)	56 (94.91)	59
PU	32 (36.78)	55 (63.21)	87
Total	35 (23.97)	111(76.02)	146

As presented above at Table 2, every one out of three respondents was not aware of the concept of plagiarism; in such a situation attending awareness workshops, training programmes, etc. become very important. Table 5 shows that only 5.08% respondents of KU had attended plagiarism awareness programmes and the remaining 94.91% respondents did not attend any plagiarism awareness programme. On the other hand, 36.78% respondents of PU had attended plagiarism awareness programmes which is relatively quite large number.

Table 6: Understanding of the Concept of Plagiarism

Sr. No.	Statement	KU			PU			Total		
		Yes N(%age)	No N(%age)	Not sure N(%age)	Yes N(%age)	No N(%age)	Not sure N(%age)	Yes N(%age)	No N(%age)	Not sure N(%age)
	Using someone's ideas/words without acknowledging him/her.	47 (79.66)	6 (10.16)	6 (10.16)	82 (94.25)	5 (5.74)	0	129 (88.35)	11 (7.53)	6 (4.10)
	Submitting a paper that has been cut and pasted in small part or full from a website.	42 (71.18)	14 (23.72)	3 (5.08)	78 (89.65)	1 (1.14)	8 (9.19)	120 (82.19)	15 (10.27)	11 (7.53)
	Copying from the internet and not crediting the source.	43 (72.88)	10 (16.94)	6 (10.16)	73 (83.90)	9 (10.34)	5 (5.74)	116 (79.45)	19 (13.01)	11 (7.53)
	Copy and pasting a paragraph from the internet with small changes.	21 (35.59)	30 (50.84)	8 (13.55)	51 (58.62)	20 (22.98)	16 (18.39)	72 (49.31)	50 (34.24)	24 (16.43)
	Translating a document from other language and submitting as your own.	23 (38.98)	21 (35.59)	15 (25.42)	45 (51.72)	33 (37.93)	9 (10.34)	68 (46.57)	54 (36.98)	24 (16.43)
	Helping your friend/classmate write a paper that must be submitted by him/her as an assignment.	16 (27.11)	25 (42.37)	18 (30.50)	28 (32.18)	46 (52.87)	13 (14.94)	44 (30.13)	71 (48.63)	31 (21.23)

Failing to cite sources of reference completely and accurately.	28 (47.45)	11 (18.64)	20 (33.89)	52 (59.77)	20 (22.98)	15 (17.24)	80 (54.79)	31 (21.23)	35 (23.97)
Submitting an assignment /paper with passage copied from print /internet without acknowledgment or citation.	44 (74.57)	9 (15.25)	6 (10.16)	78 (89.65)	6 (6.89)	3 (3.44)	122 (83.56)	15 (10.27)	09 (6.16)
Submitting an essay bought from internet sites.	30 (50.84)	16 (27.11)	13 (22.03)	56 (64.36)	18 (20.68)	13 (14.94)	86 (58.90)	34 (23.28)	26 (17.80)
Deliberately using other people's words as one's own.	35 (59.32)	11 (18.64)	13 (22.03)	67 (77.01)	8 (9.19)	12 (13.79)	102 (69.86)	19 (13.01)	25 (17.12)
Copying words/sentences without quotation mark ("...") and providing references but no in-text citations.	13 (22.03)	16 (27.11)	30 (50.84)	33 (37.93)	18 (20.68)	36 (41.37)	46 (31.50)	34 (23.28)	66 (45.20)
Copying words/sentences without quotation mark ("...") but providing references and in-	12 (20.33)	20 (33.89)	27 (45.76)	17 (19.54)	33 (37.93)	37 (42.52)	29 (19.86)	53 (36.30)	64 (43.83)

text citations.									
Collectively preparing assignment/papers to be submitted by one person.	27 (45.76)	12 (20.33)	20 (33.89)	22 (25.28)	25 (28.73)	40 (45.97)	49 (33.56)	37 (25.34)	60 (41.09)
Paraphrasing someone else's words with no in-text citation but giving the source in the reference list.	15 (25.42)	18 (30.50)	26 (44.06)	49 (56.32)	21 (24.13)	17 (19.54)	64 (43.83)	39 (26.71)	43 (29.45)

Table 6 shows the understanding of the concept of plagiarism by the respondents of both universities. In this table data shows that 88.35% respondents of both the universities agreed with the statement A i.e., "using someone's idea/words without acknowledging him/her" was an act of plagiarism and 83.56% respondents agreed with the statement H i.e., "submitting an assignment/paper with passage copied from print/ internet without acknowledgement or citation" was an act of plagiarism whereas 82.19% respondents agreed with the statement B i.e., "submitting a paper that has been cut and pasted in small part or full from a website" was an act of plagiarism. A slightly less percentage i.e. 79.45% respondents agreed with statement C i.e., "copying from internet and not crediting the source" was an act of plagiarism. The data of this table further shows that most of the respondents i.e., more than 50% respondents of both universities agreed that the statements A, B, C, H, I and J were the acts of plagiarism. The understanding of the concept of plagiarism by the respondents of Kurukshetra University (KU), shows that 79.66% respondents agreed with the statement A i.e., "using someone's idea/words without acknowledging him/her" was an act of plagiarism whereas 10.16% respondents each did not agree or were not sure with this statement. The data also shows that 74.57% respondents agreed with the statement H i.e., "submitting an assignment/paper with passage copied from print/internet without acknowledgment or citation" was an act of plagiarism whereas 15.25% respondents did not agree and 10.16% respondents were not sure about it. It is also revealed that 72.88% respondents agreed with the statement C i.e., "copying from the internet and not crediting the source" was an act of plagiarism whereas 16.94% respondents did not agree and 10.16% respondents were not sure about this statement. As much as 71.18% respondents agreed with the statement B i.e., "submitting a paper that has been cut and pasted in small part or full from a website" was an act of plagiarism, 23.72% respondents did not agree with this statement and 5.08% respondents were not sure about this statement. Out of 14 statements, only 4 statements i.e., A, B, C, H were agreed upon by more than 70% respondents that these statements represented the acts of plagiarism. The understanding of the concept of plagiarism by the respondents of Panjab University (PU) shows that 94.25%

respondents agreed to the Statement A: "Using someone's ideas/words without acknowledging him/her". was an act of plagiarism whereas 5.74% respondents did not agree with this statement. Further, 89.65% respondents agreed with the statement B i.e. "submitting a paper that has been cut and pasted in small part or full of a website" was an act of plagiarism. The study also finds that 89.65% respondents agreed with the statement H i.e., "submitting an assignment/paper with passage copied from print/internet without acknowledgement or citation" was an act of plagiarism, 6.89% respondents did not agree with this statement and 3.44% respondents were not sure about it. Large majority of 83.90% respondents agreed with the statement C i.e., "copying from the internet and not crediting the source" was an act of plagiarism, 10.34% respondents did not agree with the given statement and 5.74% respondents were not sure about it. Another 77.01% respondents agreed with the statement J i.e., "deliberately using other people's words as one's own" was an act of plagiarism, 9.19% respondents did not agree with this statement and 13.79% respondents were not sure about it. Out of 14 statements only 5 statements i.e., A, B, C, H and J were accepted to be the acts of plagiarism, by more than 75% respondents.

The table also reveals that on most of the statements, respondents of PU were more assertive than those of KU.

Table 7: Attitude towards Plagiarism

Sr. No.	Statement	KU Mean score	PU Mean score	Total Mean score
	Using others' work with their permission is sufficient.	4.13	4.10	4.11
	Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the question paper of final exam and memorizing its answers.	3.67	4.34	4.07
	If a student violates the plagiarism policy he/she should face its consequences.	3.59	4.19	3.95
	Punishment for plagiarism in college should be light because we are just learning to write on our own.	3.49	3.86	3.71
	It is ok to use something you have written in the past to fulfill a new assignment because you cannot plagiarize yourself.	3.72	3.65	3.68
	Plagiarism is against my ethical values.	3.62	3.65	3.64
	It is justified to use previous descriptions of a method, because the method itself remains the same.	3.91	3.39	3.60
	If I lend a paper to a student to look at who plagiarizes I should not be punished.	3.42	3.68	3.58
	Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value.	3.67	3.41	3.52
.	Young researchers who are just learning the ropes should receive milder punishment for plagiarism.	3.38	3.35	3.36
.	Plagiarism is ok if professor gives you too much work.	3.40	3.31	3.34
.	It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to	3.45	3.20	3.30

	complete the current work.			
.	If one cannot write well in a foreign language (e.g., English), it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language.	2.83	3.42	3.18
.	If a student buys or downloads free a whole research paper and submits it as his/her own, he should be expelled from the university.	2.79	3.31	3.10
.	A plagiarist's behavior does no harm to the value of a university degree.	3.13	3.05	3.08

The respondents were given 15 statements to assess their attitude towards plagiarism. The response was sought on 5-point Likert's scale i.e. Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree, and correspondingly weights were assigned to each response such as strongly agree (5), agree (4), neutral (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1). The response of 9 statements out of 15 was in the category of "Agree" (M.S = 3.5- 4.5). The respondents opined the statement "Using others work with their permission is sufficient" most favorably with (M.S = 4.11). The second most agreed statement (M.S = 4.07) was "Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the question paper of final exam and memorizing its answers". The third most agreed (M.S =3.95) statement was "If a student violates the plagiarism policy he/she should face its consequences".

The responses of 6 statements were in the category of "Neutral" (M.S= 2.5-3.5).The least agreed (M.S=3.08) statement was "A plagiarist's behavior does no harm to the value of a university degree"; slightly up in the ladder was the statement "If a student buys or downloads free a whole research paper and submits it as his/her own, he should be expelled from the university" (M.S=3.10) and "If one cannot write well in a foreign language (e.g., English), it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language" (M.S=3.18).

The respondents of KU opined the statement "Using others' work with their permission is sufficient" most favorable with (M.S=4.13) in comparison of PU (M.S=4.10). The second most agreed statement "Plagiarism is as bad as stealing the question paper of final exam and memorizing its answers" found strong favor in the response of PU (M.S=4.34) in comparison of KU (M.S=3.67). The third most highly favorable statement "If a student violates the plagiarism policy he/she should face its consequences" was more favored by PU (M.S=4.19) than by KU (M.S=3.59).

The overall response shows that the respondents of both the universities did not have a clear and strong attitude towards some of the plagiarism related concepts. This is shown by their response on different statements.

Table 8: Reasons for Plagiarism

Reasons	KU (N=59) N(%age)	PU (N=87) N(%age)	Total (N=146) N(%age)
Lack of knowledge about what is allowed and what is not allowed	43 (72.88)	75(86.20)	118 (80.82)
Don't know how to write scientifically	42 (71.18)	69 (79.31)	111 (76.02)
Have lack of time	33 (55.93)	65 (74.71)	98 (67.12)

Have lack of research skills	32 (54.23)	58 (66.66)	90 (61.64)
Lack of interest in topic of study	33 (55.93)	54 (62.06)	87 (59.58)
Do not want to spend time in assignments	30 (50.84)	56 (64.36)	86 (58.90)
Due to laziness	26 (44.06)	48 (55.17)	74 (50.68)
Have external pressure to succeed	26 (44.06)	48 (55.17)	74 (50.68)
Fear of scoring poorly in assignment	23 (38.98)	42 (48.27)	65 (44.52)
Plagiarism is not punished by the administration	21 (35.59)	21 (24.13)	42 (28.76)
Instant success without efforts	13 (22.03)	24 (27.58)	37 (25.34)
Business in curricular, co-/extracurricular activities resulting too much pressure	14 (23.72)	15 (17.24)	29 (19.86)

Table 8 shows the reasons for plagiarism. It reveals that 72.88% respondents of KU and 86.20% respondents of PU opined that "Lack of knowledge about what is allowed and what is not allowed" was the reason for plagiarism while 71.18% respondents of KU and 79.31% respondents of PU stated that people resorted to plagiarism because they did not know how to write scientifically. Total 55.93% respondents of KU and 74.71% respondents of PU opined that "Lack of time" was the reason behind plagiarism while 54.23% respondents of KU and 66.66% respondents of PU opined that "Lack of research skill" was the reason for plagiarism. The data also shows that 50.84% respondents of KU and 64.36% respondents of PU opined that they "Do not want to spend time in assignments" and 44.06% respondents of KU and 55.17% respondents of PU opined that "External pressure to succeed" and "Laziness" were the reason for plagiarism. 38.98% respondents of KU and 48.27 % respondents of PU opined that "Fear of scoring poorly in assignment" was the reason for plagiarism and 35.59% respondents of KU and 24.13 % respondents of PU opined that "Plagiarism is not punished by the administration" that was the reason of plagiarism. Only 22.03% respondents of KU and 27.58% respondents of PU opined that "Instant success without efforts" was the reason for plagiarism. The above analysis shows that lack of awareness; knowledge and skills regarding various aspects of plagiarism were the main reason for resorting to this practice.

Table 9: Awareness of Punishment to plagiarist

University	Yes N(%age)	No N(%age)
KU	36 (61.01)	23 (38.98)
PU	52 (59.77)	35 (40.22)
Total	88 (60.27)	58 (39.72)

Table 9 shows the awareness among respondents about punishment to plagiarist. The data shows that 61.01% respondents of KU and 59.77% respondents of PU were aware that punishment is given to plagiarists.

Table 10 Suggestions to Reduce Plagiarism

Suggestions	KU N(%age)	PU N(%age)	Total N(%age)
Conducting awareness programme on plagiarism	56 (94.91)	82(94.25)	138(94.52)
Student's course workload should be reduced	27(35.59)	59(67.81)	86 (58.90)
Training and education on methods of citation	46 (77.96)	84(96.55)	130 (89.04)
Introduce plagiarism detection software	41 (69.49)	74(85.05)	115(78.76)
Definite university policy on plagiarism	42 (71.18)	73(83.90)	115 (78.76)
Students should be informed that their work will be checked for plagiarism	39 (66.10)	78(89.65)	117 (80.13)

Table 10 shows suggestions to reduce plagiarism. The table reveals that large majority of respondents (KU 94.91% and PU 94.25%) opined conducting awareness programme on plagiarism can reduce its incidence. Significant number of 96.55% respondents of PU and 77.96% respondents of KU opined that training and education on method of citation can reduce plagiarism while 89.65% respondents of PU and 66.10% respondents of KU responded that plagiarism can be reduced if students are informed that their work will be checked for plagiarism. The table also shows that 85.05% respondents of PU and 69.49% respondents of KU were of the opinion that introduction of plagiarism detection software to the students can minimize plagiarism. 67.81% respondents of PU and 35.59% respondents of KU opined that to reduce plagiarism students course workload should be reduced.

Conclusion

The findings of the study have revealed some interesting facts. Two-thirds of the total respondents were aware of plagiarism while one-third were not aware. This indicates an alarming situation that needs immediate attention. Among the aware respondents, the main source of awareness was various university channels and their teachers. Most of the respondents became aware of plagiarism during the last one year. Very few respondents had attended plagiarism awareness workshops organized by their institution and library.

In order to know the respondents' understanding of the concept, 14 questions were asked about what constitutes plagiarism. Interestingly, the majority of the respondents of both universities agreed on only 6 of the 14 questions. This shows that there is still a need to develop a proper understanding of the concept among the respondents. Similar diversity of opinion is visible in the response on 15 statements of attitude towards plagiarism. Out of 15 statements, the overall response on 9 statements was in the range of "Agree" while the remaining 6 statements received an overall response in the category "Neutral". This response highlights the need for proper education and training on what constitutes plagiarism; and how to acknowledge the source in a correct way. The same views are also expressed by the respondents when they responded on reasons for plagiarism. Four-fifths of respondents considered the main reason for plagiarism as "Lack of knowledge about what is allowed and what is not allowed". Similarly, the two most cited suggestions to reduce plagiarism by nine out of ten respondents of the study were "Conducting awareness programs on plagiarism"

and "Training and education on methods of citation". Thus, a systematic drive to make the academic community aware of the correct meaning of plagiarism and methods of attribution is needed.

Acknowledgment

References

Goldgar, B. A. (2001). Imitation and Plagiarism: The Lauder Affair and Its Critical Aftermath. *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, *34*(1), 1–16.

Iloh, G., Amadi, A., Chukwuonye, M., & Godswill-Uko, E. (2018). Plagiarism in a resource-constrained context: A cross-sectional study of post-graduate medical college trainees and fellows in a tertiary health institution in South East Nigeria. *Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences*, *6*(2), 270–277. https://doi.org/10.4103/amhs.amhs_103_18

Javaeed, A., Khan, A. S., Khan, S. H., & Ghauri, S. K. (2019). Perceptions of plagiarism among undergraduate medical students in Rawalpindi, Pakistan. Pakistan journal of medical sciences, 35(2), 532.

Khairnar, M., Wadgave, U., Shah, S., Shah, S., Jain, V., &Kumbhar, S. (2019). Survey on attitude of dental professionals about plagiarism in Maharashtra, India. Perspectives in Clinical Research, 10(1), 9–14. https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.PICR_141_17

Mahmud, S., Bretag, T., & Foltýnek, T. (2018). Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism Policy in Higher Education: A Comparison of the United Kingdom, Czechia, Poland and Romania. Journal of Academic Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-018-9319-0

Madaan, D., & Chakravarty, R. (2017). Awareness towards plagiarism among post graduate students: A case study of Dav College sector-10, Chandigarh. Library Progress (International), 37(2), 202-212.

Moss, S. (2005, November 23). A History of Plagiarism (Not my own Work). The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2005/nov/23/comment.stephenmoss

Oyewole, O., Rasheed, A. A., & Ogunsina, S. T. (2018). Awareness, Perception and Attitude towards Plagiarism by Distance Learners in University of Ibadan, Nigeria. International Journal of Academic Library and Information Science, 6(4), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.14662/IJALIS2018.032

Raj, J. P., Venkatachalam, S., Amaravati, R. S., Siby, N., Oommen, A. M., Jose, J. E., ... & Manderwad, G. P. (2021). Extent of awareness and attitudes on plagiarism among post-graduate resident doctors and junior medical faculty in India: a cross-sectional, multicentric study. BMJ open, 11(6), 1-7, e046904.

Tsekea, S., Zivanai, J., & Madziko, I. (2021). The Attitude of Undergraduate Students Towards Plagiarism: The Case of Bindura University of Science Education. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6574.

University Grants Commission. (2018). University Grants Commission (Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulation, 2018. https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/7771545_academic-integrity-Regulation2018.pdf

Uplaonker, S. (2018). Awareness about Plagiarism amongst University of Agricultural Sciences students in Dharwad. International Journal of Library and Information Studies, 8(1), 248–253. Retrieved from http://www.ijlis.org/Jan-Mar_2018_Vol-8_No-1.html

Vinod, K.R., Sandhya.S, Satish Kumar D, Harani A, Banji David and Banji Otilia JF. (2011). Plagiarism-history, detection and prevention. Hygeia journal for drugs and medicines. 3(1), 1-4.

Virginia Tech. (2021). Constitution of the Graduate Honor System. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.https://graduateschool.vt.edu/content/dam/graduateschool_vt_edu/graduate-honor-system/Constitution2021.pdf

.