

# Attitudes and Perceptions of the Research Scholars towards the Use of Anti-Plagiarism Software for Quality Research Output: A Study

*Khaiser Nikam* \*, *Mahadevaswamy M*

Department of Library and Information Science, University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka, India

## **Abstract**

*Present study is an attempt to identify the attitudes and perceptions of the research scholars towards the use of anti plagiarism software for quality research output. Research is a process of conducting enquiry to create new knowledge. In the process of writing research papers and books, authors tend to copy existing content from other subjects without paying due acknowledgement to the original work. This results in violating copyright law and plagiarism. The best way to maintain quality in research is to pay gratification and acknowledge to the original work. All scholars are not aware that there are free and propriety anti plagiarism software to check similar content and rectify the error in quality research. The sample was selected from six life science departments such as Botany, Biotechnology, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Sericulture, Zoology and Genetics scoring 105 research scholars. The results of the study show that many researchers are aware of the use of anti plagiarism software and only few are not aware of its use. A large number of respondents with a mean value of 0.61; and SD being 0.11; use plagiarism software 'to improve the quality of research papers'. The reason for publication of papers is that it is as part of submission of thesis. 66 (62.9%) respondents are aware of UGC notification regarding repercussions of plagiarism. Respondents seem to prefer citation to avoid plagiarism 'Whenever you use quotes' with a mean of 0.84 and SD being 0.36. 62 (59.0%) respondents are of the opinion that 'Using another person's exact words without including quotation marks and citation' is a type of plagiarism. Nearly, 44 (41.9%) respondents feel that plagiarism is highly wrong. The study is useful in improving research paper writing by using anti plagiarism software.*

**Keywords:** *Attitude, perception, research scholars, plagiarism, anti plagiarism software, life sciences, copyright violation*

**\*Author for Correspondence** E-mail: khaiser.nikam6@gmail.com

## **Introduction**

Research is a process of conducting an inquiry to create new knowledge. Generally conventional research is based on primary and secondary sources and the original data is collected using "instruments" (such as surveys, interviews, questionnaires, "focus groups," etc.) to produce new knowledge on a particular topic. Universities are temples of higher learning, research and publication activities. Among many institutions, universities play a major role in creating and disseminating new knowledge. In India research in almost in all disciplines is gaining momentum. Apex bodies like the University Grants Commission; Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Department of Science and Technology (DST) are investing crores of

rupees to encourage research among young scientists. But how far the research is original; is a problem, which is being faced by the administrators and the academia. To check this, there are both free and commercial anti-plagiarism software which will help the researchers to know how much original is their work, what is the percentage of similar content. Information Library Network (INFLIBNET) is conducting awareness programs on anti plagiarism software via university libraries to spread the awareness of plagiarism in research. However, academic misconduct is not a new phenomenon. After the emergence of internet, plagiarism is rampant and prevalent at higher education level. Several studies have been reported on how information is being cut-and-paste to

write articles. In fact internet is the tempting factor to conduct plagiarism. Selwyn has carried out a study on online plagiarism and found that, 3/5th of under graduate students are reported of 'plagiarizing online material over a 12 month period' [1].

### Background Study

Conducting literature review as background study is necessary to know the research already carried out in the field. The other purpose is to keep oneself up-to-date with current literature on the topic. Plagiarism is part and parcel of the problem of writing and publication. Recently many studies have been carried out to examine the effect and repercussion of plagiarism. Further there are many free and proprietary softwares on plagiarism which help us to know the extent of similar content in one's research? Bolkan has conducted an analysis on 'avoid the plague: tips and tricks for preventing and detecting plagiarism' [2]. Razera *et al.* studied to know the attitudes of students and teachers towards plagiarism [3]. Ledwith and Risquez have presented variety of free and commercial software applications especially designed to detect plagiarism [4]. Curtis also studied the levels of awareness of plagiarism among students [5]. Deckert has also carried out a study in Hong Kong to discover how well students perusing higher education can recognize plagiaristic writing [6]. The present study is also carried out on the lines of the previous studies.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the demographic profile of researchers.
2. To assess the attitudes of researchers towards using anti plagiarism software.
3. To find out their familiarity with citing methods and reference styles.
4. To study the reasons for publication work and the repercussions of plagiarism.
5. To examine the extent of use of free and institution based anti plagiarism software with the help of librarian and by one's own self.

### Scope and Limitation

The scope of the present study is confined to research scholars from the disciplines of life sciences. Researchers from the seven life

science departments of University of Mysore such as Botany, Biotechnology, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Sericulture, Zoology and Genetics are chosen as the sample. Other scholars from physical sciences, humanities and social sciences are not covered in the present study. Faculty and students are not included. The reason for taking only research scholars is that now a days, university has made it mandatory to put the thesis for anti-plagiarism check before their submission to the university for evaluation. So research scholars make use of the software regularly.

### Research Design

A good research design provides a detailed outline of how to carry out investigation; how to collect data, what instruments to be used and how the data can be analyzed. In this study a well-structured questionnaire with Likert's scale is used to assess the attitudes, opinion and the perceptions of the respondents towards the use of anti plagiarism software to improve the quality of research. The data collected was analysed using SPSS package.

### Results and Discussion

The analysis and interpretation of data obtained from the survey is presented here, to meet the objectives listed above. Tables and the interpretation given below indicate a systematic study of the attitudes, opinion and the perceptions of the respondents towards the use of anti plagiarism software at the time of theses writing and publication of research papers among life scientists.

### Sample Population

The sample population of the present study is shown in Table 1. It may be seen from the table that majority of respondents are from the discipline of Microbiology representing 26 (24.81%) followed by Biotechnology 25 (23.81%); Botany 14 (13.3%); Zoology 13 (12.4%); Sericulture 11 (10.5%); and Genetics 1 (1.0%). Thus, a large number of respondents are from the discipline of Microbiology representing 26 (24.81%).

### Gender

The gender wise breakup of respondents is shown in Table 2. It is clear from table that out of 105 respondents 66 (66.9%) are male and the remaining 39 (37.1%) are female. Thus, of

the 105 respondents, majority of them are (66; 66.9%) male respondents.

### Age

Age wise distribution of respondents is shown in Table 3. It may be seen from the table that nearly 77 (73.3%) respondents fit into 26–

28 years of age; followed by 17 (16.2%) respondents who are in the age group of 29–31 years. About 9 (8.6%) respondents are in 23–25 years age group and 2 (1.9%) respondents fit into 20–22 years of age range. Thus, a large number of respondents, scoring 77 (73.3%) are in 26–28 years of age group.

**Table 1: Discipline/Departments.**

S/N	Department	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Microbiology	26	24.8%	24.8
2	Biotechnology	25	23.8%	48.6
3	Botany	14	13.3%	61.9
4	Zoology	13	12.4%	74.3
5	Sericulture	11	10.5%	84.8
6	Biochemistry	15	14.3%	99.0
7	Genetics	1	1.0%	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Table 2: Gender.**

S/N	Gender	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Male	66	62.9%	62.9%
2	Female	39	37.1%	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Table 3: Age.**

S/N	Age	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	20–22	2	1.9	1.9
2	23–25	9	8.6	10.5
3	26–28	77	73.3	83.8
4	29–31	17	16.2	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

### Educational Qualifications

The educational qualification of the respondents is shown in Table 4. It may be seen from the table that 90 (86%) respondents are M. Sc. qualified and 15 (14%) respondents are M. Tech. qualified. Thus majority; 90 (86%) respondents are M. Sc. qualified.

### Familiarity with Reference Systems

There are different types of reference systems used by the researchers to prepare citations.

They are APA, MLA, Chicago Style Manual, IEEE, Vancouver and Nature. An attempt is made here to know, to what extent the respondents are familiar with these reference systems. It may be seen from Table 5, that 92 (87.6%) respondents are familiar with reference systems, whereas 13 (12.4%) of them are not familiar. Thus, a majority of respondents scoring, 92 (87.6%) are familiar with reference systems.

**Table 4: Qualification.**

S/N	Qualifications	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	M. Sc.	90	86%	86%
2	M. Tech.	15	14%	100.0%
	Total	105		

**Table 5: Reference Systems-Familiarity.**

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	92	87.6%	87.6%
2	No	13	12.4%	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Reference Styles in Use**

The style of references used by respondents is shown in Table 6. Many respondents scoring 61 (58.1%) are using APA style of references (mean=0.58; SD=0.48), followed by Vancouver (Mean=0.35=SD=0.48); Nature (Mean=0.30; SD=0.46); IEEE (Mean=0.24; SD=0.43); Chicago Style Manual (Mean=0.22; SD=0.42); and MLA (Mean=0.21; SD=0.41). Thus, many respondents are using APA style of references (mean=0.58; SD=0.48).

**Reference Styles - Familiarity**

Extent of familiarity in using reference systems by respondents is shown in Table 7. It may be seen from the table that nearly 50

(82.9%) respondents are highly familiar with reference styles formats. 48 (17.1%) respondents are moderately familiar in using reference style formats and 7 (6.6%) respondents are slightly familiar in using reference style formats. Thus, many respondents scoring 50 (82.9%) are highly familiar with reference style formats.

**Use of English**

It is seen from the Table 8, that 87 (82.9%) of respondents are good in English and 18 (17.1%) of them lack good English knowledge. Thus, many respondents scoring, 87 (82.9%) are good in English to write thesis and research papers.

**Table 6: Use of Reference Styles.**

S/N	Reference Styles	Mean	SD
1	APA	0.58	0.49
2	MLA	0.21	0.41
3	Chicago manual	0.22	0.42
4	IEEE	0.24	0.43
5	Vancouver	0.35	0.48
6	Nature	0.30	0.46

**Table 7: Extent of Familiarity with Reference Styles.**

S/N	Extent	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Highly	50	47.6	47.6
2	Moderately	48	45.7	93.3
3	Slightly	7	6.7	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Table 8: Use of English.**

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	87	82.9%	82.9%
2	No	18	17.1%	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Use of English to Write Thesis and Research Papers**

It may be seen from the Table 9, that nearly 36 (34.3%) respondents are highly good in

English, 67 (63.8%) respondents are moderately good in English and 1 (1.0%) respondents are slightly good.

### Publishing of Research Papers

It is seen from the Table 10, that of all the respondents 53 (50.5%) say ‘YES’ and 52 (49.5%) of respondents say “NO”.

### Reasons for Publishing on War Footings

The reasons for publishing research papers on war footings by the respondents are shown in Table 11. It is clear from the table that, nearly 59 (56.2%) of respondents say ‘As part of PhD work’, followed by 15 (14.3%) of respondents who say that it is ‘To become popular in the subject’; 9 (8.6%) each of respondents say ‘To

get recognitions’, and ‘To get fellowships’ respectively; and 22 (12.4%) of the respondents say ‘To get the appointments in future. Thus, the main reason for publishing research work is that it as part of the research work’.

### Plagiarism Detection Software-Familiarity

It seen from the Table 12 that of all the respondents, 81 (77.1%) say “YES” and 24 (22.9%) say “NO” to the idea of the extent of familiarly with plagiarism software.

**Table 9: Use of English to Write Thesis and Research Papers.**

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
1.	Highly	36	34.3	34.3
2.	Moderately	67	63.8	99.00
3.	Slightly	1	1.0	100.0%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Table 10: Publishing of Research Papers.**

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	53	50.5%	50.5
2	No	52	49.5%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Table 11: Reasons for Publishing.**

S/N	Reasons	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	To get the appointment	13	12.4	12.4
2	To get research fellowships	9	8.6	21.0
3	To get recognition	9	8.6	29.6
4	To become popular in the subject	15	14.3	43.9
5	As part of PhD Work	59	56.2	100%

**Table 12: Plagiarism Detection Software–Familiarity.**

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	81	77.1%	77.1
2	No	24	22.9%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0%	

### Plagiarism Software Used Most

The types of plagiarism software used by the respondents are shown in Table 13. It may be seen from the table that majority of the

respondents are using “iThenticate” (mean=0.43; SD=0.49); followed by ‘Viper’ (mean=0.43; SD=0.50); ‘Duplichecker’ (mean=0.23; SD=0.42).

**Table 13: Plagiarism Software Used Most.**

S/N	Soft ware	Mean	SD
1	Turnitin	0.43	0.49
2	iThenticate	0.56	0.11
3	Viper	0.45	0.50
4	DupliChecker	0.23	0.42

**Purpose of Use**

The purpose of using plagiarism software is shown in Table 14. It is clear from the table that, a large number of respondents with a mean value of 0.61 and SD being 0.11 use plagiarism software 'to improve the quality of research papers', the second most cited purpose for which the respondents use the plagiarism software is; 'To reduce the percentage of similar content' with a mean value of 0.48 and SD being 0.50, the third most cited purpose for which the respondents use the plagiarism software is; 'It is mandatory to get the thesis checked' before its submission, with a mean value of 0.37 and SD being 0.48. The fourth most cited purpose for which the respondents use the plagiarism software is; 'To know the original source and authors' with a mean value of 0.33 and SD being 0.47. And the fifth most cited purpose for which the respondents use the plagiarism software is; 'To overcome plagiarism' with a mean value of 0.32 and SD being 0.47.

**Usefulness of Anti Plagiarism Software**

Usefulness of anti plagiarism software among respondents is shown in Table 15. It is clear from the table, that majority of respondents scoring 51 representing 48.6% find anti-plagiarism software highly useful; followed by 45 (42.9 %) respondents who find it moderately useful and lastly a very small percentage 9 (8.6%) say that the anti plagiarism software is slightly useful.

**Awareness about the Repercussion of Plagiarism Software**

Awareness about the repercussion of using plagiarism software on research among the respondents is shown in Table 16. It is clear from the table that a large number of research scholars representing (78; 74.3%) are aware of repercussion of plagiarism. Only very few respondents (27; 25.7%) are not aware of the repercussions of plagiarism.

**Table 14: Purpose of Use.**

S/N	Purpose	Mean	SD
1	To reduce the percentage of similar content	0.48	0.50
2	To overcome plagiarism	0.32	0.47
3	To know the original source and authors	0.33	0.47
4	To improve the quality of research papers	0.61	0.11
5	Its mandatory to get the thesis checked before its submission	0.37	0.48

**Table 15: Usefulness of Anti Plagiarism Software.**

S/N	Usefulness	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Highly	51	48.6%	48.6
2	Moderately	45	42.9%	91.4
3	Slightly	9	8.6%	100.0
	Total	105	100%	

**Table 16: Awareness about Repercussion of Plagiarism.**

S/N	Parameters	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	78	74.3%	90.5
2	No	27	25.7%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	

### Repercussions of Plagiarism

Awareness of repercussions of plagiarism among the respondents is shown in Table 17. It is clear from the table that, a large number of respondents feel that it 'Damages the reputation of the authors' with a mean value of 0.70 and SD being 0.45. The second, most respondents are of the view that it leads to 'Damaging the brand name of institution' with a mean value of 0.68 and SD being 0.11; the third, most number of respondents opine that it leads to 'Waste of time and resources when involved in enquiries' with a mean value of 0.44 and SD being 0.11. The last groups of respondents say that 'Budget allocation gets reduced' with a mean value of 0.30 and SD being 0.46.

### Awareness about UGC Notification regarding Repercussion

User responses on UGC notification regarding repercussion of plagiarism are shown in Table 18. It is clear from the table that, 66 (62.9%) respondents are aware of UGC notification regarding repercussion of plagiarism; remaining 39 (37.1%) respondents

are not aware of the UGC notification regarding repercussion of plagiarism.

### Orientation Program on Anti-Plagiarism

The responses to the orientation program on anti-plagiarism software organized by the library are shown in Table 19. It may be seen from the table that, a large number of respondents scoring 68 (63.8%) have not attended orientation/demo on anti-plagiarism. The remaining 37 (36.2%) respondents have attended orientation/demo on anti-plagiarism software arranged by the Mysore University Library.

### Reasons for not Attending Demo Program

Reasons for not attending/demo program regarding anti-plagiarism software by respondents are shown in Table 20. It is clear from the table that the main reason is the users did not come across any orientation program' on the use of anti-plagiarism software, with a mean value of 0.61 SD being 0.48. 'Lack of time to attend' is the second most cited reason by the respondents with a mean of 0.37 and SD being 0.50. 'Details are not available on the web' is also another reason with a mean value of 0.25 and SD being 0.43.

*Table 17: Repercussions of Plagiarism.*

S/N	Repercussion Types	Mean	SD
1	Damaging reputation of the authors	0.70	0.45
2	Damaging the brand name of institution	0.68	0.11
3	Budget allocation gets reduced	0.30	0.46
4	Waste of time and resources when involved in enquiries	0.44	0.11

*Table 18: Awareness about UGC Notification Regarding Repercussion.*

S/N	Opinion	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	66	62.9%	62.9
2	No	39	37.1%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0%	

*Table 19: Orientation Program on Plagiarism.*

S/N	Opinion	Response Type	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	37	36.2%	36.2%
2	No	68	63.8%	100.0
3	Total	105	100.0%	

*Table 20: Reasons for Not Attending Demo Program.*

S/N	Reasons	Mean	SD
1	Not come across any orientation program	0.61	0.48
2	Lack of time to attend	0.37	0.50
3	Details are not available on the web	0.25	0.43

### Usefulness of Orientation Program

The usefulness of orientation program on anti-plagiarism software arranged by the by the Mysore University Library is shown in Table 21. It is clear from the table that, 69 (65.7%) respondents find the orientation program on anti-plagiarism software arranged by the Mysore University Library highly useful; this is followed by 31 (29.5%) respondents finding the orientation program moderately useful; only 5 (4.8%) of them find the orientation program slightly useful.

### Tolerance Limit of Coping Similar Content

The tolerance limit of coping similar content by the respondents is shown in Table 22. It may be seen from the table that, many respondents have 0% tolerance limit of coping similar content with a mean value of 0.57 and SD being 0.23; followed by those who have 10% tolerance limits with a mean value of

0.24 and SD being 0.43; 20% tolerance limit of respondents has shown the mean value of 0.20 and SD is 0.40; those who have 25% (0.11; 0.31); 30% (0.11; 0.31) and 35% (0.27 ;0.44) tolerance limit comes next in the same order.

### Scanning of Content with Plagiarism Software and Generating the Report Oneself

The scanning of content with plagiarism software and generating the report oneself is shown in Table 23. It is clear from the table that, a large number of respondents scoring 87 (82.9%) say 'YES' to scanning of content with plagiarism software to generate report oneself and the remaining 18 (17.1%) respondents say that they cannot do the scanning of the content with plagiarism software and generating the report themselves.

**Table 21: Usefulness of Orientation Program.**

S/N	Usefulness	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Highly	69	65.7%	65.7
2	Moderately	31	29.5%	95.2
3	Slightly	5	4.8%	100
	Total	105	100%	

**Table 22: Tolerance Limit of Coping Similar Content.**

S/N	Tolerance	Mean	SD
1	0%	0.57	0.23
2	10%	0.24	0.43
3	20%	0.20	0.40
4	25%	0.14	0.35
5	30%	0.11	0.31
6	35%	0.27	0.44

**Table 23: Scanning of Content with Plagiarism Software and Generating the Report Oneself.**

S/N	Opinion	Response Type	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Yes	87	82.9%	82.9
2	No	18	17.1%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0%	

### Preference of Citation to Avoid Plagiarism

The responses of the users regarding the opinion about-Is citation preferred to avoid plagiarism is shown in Table 24. It may be seen from the table that the respondents seem to prefer citation to avoid plagiarism; followed by 'Whenever you use quotes' with a mean of 0.84 and SD being 0.36; followed by the parameter 'Whenever you paraphrase' with a

mean value of 0.69 and SD being 0.46; 'Whenever you use an idea that someone else has already expressed' with a mean value of 0.76 and SD being 0.42; 'Whenever you make specific reference to the work of another' with mean value of 0.73 and SD being 0.44; and lastly 'Whenever someone else's work has been critical in developing your own ideas' with a mean value of 0.65 and SD being 0.47.



**Table 24: Is Citation Preferred to Avoid Plagiarism.**

S/N	Parameters	Mean	SD
1	Whenever you use quotes	0.84	0.36
2	Whenever you paraphrase	0.69	0.46
3	Whenever you use an idea that someone else has already expressed	0.76	0.42
4	Whenever you make specific reference to the work of another	0.73	0.44
5	Whenever someone else's work has been critical in developing your own ideas	0.65	0.47

**Conditions in which Quotation is Preferred to Avoid Plagiarism**

The condition in which quotation is preferred to avoid plagiarism is shown in Table 25. It may be seen from the table that, 61 (58.1%) respondents feel that quotation is preferable 'Whenever the exact wording of a statement is crucial to its interpretation; followed by 7 (6.7%) respondents who feel quotation is preferable 'Whenever the statement or opinion in the paper based on a passage, in poem, short story novel, or play quote'; so also 17 (16.2%)

respondents feel quotation is preferable 'If your source states some idea or opinion in a particularly forceful or original or way that would be weaker by paraphrasing'; 4 (12.8%) respondents feel that quotation is preferable 'When you risk losing the essence of the author's ideas in the translation from her words to your own'; and 16 (5.7%) respondents feel quotation is preferable 'When you want to appeal to the authority of the author and using his or her words will emphasize that authority'.

**Table 25: Conditions in Which Quotation is Preferred to Avoid Plagiarism.**

S/N	Conditions	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Whenever the exact wording of a statement is crucial to its interpretation.	61	58.1%	58.1%
2	Whenever a statement or opinion in your paper is based on a passage in poem, short story, novel, or play, quote.	7	6.7%	64.8%
3	If your source states some idea or opinion in a particularly forceful or original or way that would be weaker by paraphrasing.	17	16.2%	81%
4	When you risk losing the essence of the author's ideas in the translation from her words to your own.	4	12.8%	93.8%
5	When you want to appeal to the authority of the author and using his or her words will emphasize that authority.	16	5.7%	100%
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Activities Leading to Plagiarism**

The activities leading to plagiarism are shown in Table 26. It may be seen from the table that, 62 (59.0%) respondents are of the opinion that 'Using another person's exact words without including quotation marks and citation' is a type of plagiarism; followed by 19 (11.4%) respondents who are of the opinion that 'Using another person's words but changing some of them or rearranging them with citation' is a

type of plagiarism activity; 9 (8.6%) respondents consider that 'Summarizing or paraphrasing another person's words without citation', is also plagiarism; 9 (8.6%) respondents feel 'Citing the source inaccurately' treat it as plagiarism; and 6 (11.7%) of them consider that 'Passing of one's own prewritten papers from the Internet or other sources' is also a type of plagiarism activity.

**Table 26: Activities Leading to Plagiarism.**

S/N	Activities	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Using another person's exact words without including quotation marks and citation	62	59.0%	59.0
2	Using another person's words, but changing some of them or rearranging them with citation	19	11.4%	70.4
3	Summarizing or paraphrasing another person's words without citation	9	8.6%	79
4	Citing the source inaccurately	9	8.6%	87.6
5	Passing off as one's own pre-written papers from the internet or others sources	6	11.7%	100.0
	Total	105	100.0%	

**Is plagiarism wrong?**

The Table 27 shows the data about: Is plagiarism wrong? It may be seen from the table that, 44 (41.9%) respondents feel that

plagiarism is highly wrong; followed by 38 (36.2%) feel that plagiarism is moderately wrong; and 23 (21.9%) respondents feel that plagiarism is slightly wrong.

**Table 27: Is Plagiarism Wrong?**

S/N	Extent	Responses	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
1	Highly	44	41.9%	41.9
2	Moderately	38	36.2%	78.1
3	Slightly	23	21.9%	100.0

**CONCLUSION**

This research is a dedicated work of an eminent scholar. It is wrong to copy another scholar's work without citations and acknowledgement. With the emergence of Internet, copying content of other authors has become very common. Therefore universities and publishers use anti plagiarism software like 'iThenticate', 'URKUND', 'Viper' etc. to solve the problem. After verification if similar content is found, the researchers are asked to change the content by using citations and quotations. However certain percentage of similar content is allowed in all subjects, but the percentage varies. In this study an attempt is made to find out the attitudes and perceptions of the life sciences research scholars.

This study turned out to be very fruitful. Many research scholars felt that they got insight in to the types of anti plagiarism software available and orientation program, UGC notification etc.

**REFERENCES**

1. Neil Selwyn. 'Not Necessarily a Bad Thing.' A Study of Online Plagiarism amongst Undergraduate Students. *Assess Eval High Educ.* 2008; 33: 5, 465-479p.
2. Bolkan JV. Avoid the Plague: Tips and Tricks for Preventing and Detecting Plagiarism. *Learning & Leading with Technology.* 2006; 33(6): 10-13p.
3. Razera D, Verhagen H, Pargman TC, *et al.* Plagiarism Awareness, Perception, and Attitudes among Students and Teachers in Swedish Higher Education-A Case Study. In *4th International Plagiarism Conference-Towards an Authentic Future*; Northumbria University in Newcastle Upon Tyne-UK. Jun 2010; 21-23p.
4. Ledwith, Risquez. Using Anti-Plagiarism Software to Promote Academic Honesty in the Context of Peer Reviewed Assignments. *Stud Hig Educ.* 2014; 33(4): 371-384p.

5. Curtis G, Gouldthorp B, Thomas EF, *et al.* Online Academic-Integrity Mastery Training may Improve Students' Awareness of, and Attitudes toward, Plagiarism. *Psychology Learning & Teaching (PLAT)*. 2013; 12(3): 282–289p.
6. Deckert GD. Perspectives on Plagiarism from ESL Students in Hong Kong. *J Second Lang Writ.* 1993; 2(2): 131–148p.

#### **Cite this Article**

Khaiser Nikam, Mahadevaswamy M. Attitudes and Perceptions of the Research Scholars towards the Use of Anti-Plagiarism Software for Quality Research Output: A Study. *Journal of Advancements in Library Sciences*. 2015; 2(3): 7–17p.