Plagiarism Awareness Among Post Graduate Students of Select Universities of Haryana

Kavita*, Manoj Kumar Joshi

Department of Library and Information Science, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Abstract

The study was conducted on plagiarism awareness among the post graduate students of select universities of Haryana. There are 700 total population and 259 respondents were response out of 290. The study was empirical and used survey methods. Questionnaire tool was used for data collection. The present study describes various aspects of plagiarism such as plagiarism awareness among respondents, understanding the concept of plagiarism, awareness of anti-plagiarism software, reason for plagiarism and awareness of punishment. The study was founded that majority of respondents did not know any anti-plagiarism software and punishment for plagiarism. Only 28.18% students knew how to cite a book/journal.

Keywords: Plagiarism, anti-plagiarism software, post graduate, physics, political science

***Author for Correspondence** Email: kavitabaliana11@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Every human being undergoes the process of education throughout his/her life. In the initial stage, formal education plays a vital role in child's shaping as a future citizen. In the formal education, the child learns new things which have been documented in a large number of books and other documents.

Everything recorded in the form of a document, is the property or product of the person responsible for its creation. When we need/use the document written by someone, we must acknowledge this fact and whenever, we write something which we have taken from someone else's document, we need to acknowledge the source in the form of citation of the original source. When we fail to acknowledge properly, we enter the sphere of plagiarism.

In a simple language, plagiarism is when we use other persons' words, ideas, views our work and do not give proper credit to the author of original work.

DEFINITION

According to Hannabuss (2001) plagiarism is "the unauthorized use or close imitation of the ideas and language/expression of someone else and involves representing their work as your own" [2].

According to Webster's Online Dictionary [3], plagiarism means "Steal and pass of (the ideas or words of another) as one's own: use another's production without crediting the source; to commit literary theft: present as new and original an idea or product derived form an existing source."

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Deepak Kumar and Joginder Singh [4] reported a study on awareness and attitude towards plagiarism among research scholars in Kurukshetra University. The study shows that 98% respondents were aware about the plagiarism and 84% respondents were not aware about the anti-plagiarism software. The majority of the respondents said that laziness is the most frequent reason of plagiarism followed by lack of knowledge on how to write scientifically.

Prasantha Kumara and Lakshmi [5] conducted a study on awareness of plagiarism among research scholars of Sri Venkateshwara University. The results show that 98.37% respondents were aware of anti-plagiarism tools and 52.84% respondents were facing the problems of language skills, and 26.61% of writing skills.

Scanlon and Neumann [6] reported a study based on internet plagiarism among college

students. The study found that majority of respondents reported copying some text and using it without citation, 19% did this sometimes and 9.6% often or very frequently. 24.5% of these respondents reported plagiarizing online sometimes to very frequently.

Idiegbeyan-ose, Nikiko and Osinulu [7] studied post graduate students of selected universities of Ogun State, Nigeria. They found that 38.8% respondents were highly aware of plagiarism followed by 46.4% average and 14.8% had low level of awareness. 1/3 of respondents blamed the prevalence of plagiarism on pressure followed by writing skills and lack of knowledge. Training on proper citation and referencing is regarded as having the propensity to reduce plagiarism.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
The study was undertaken to identify the plagiarism awareness among post graduate students of select Universities of Haryana. The participants of this study include post graduate Students of Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (KUK, Maharishi Dayanand University (MDU), Rohtak, and Central University (CU) of Haryana.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
1. To know students' acquaintance with the word plagiarism.
2. To know the students understanding of plagiarism.
3. To know the sources of information used by post graduate students.
4. To know the students' understanding of citation.
5. To understand students' views on reasons of student plagiarism.
6. To know students' views on methods of reducing student plagiarism.

METHODOLOGY
The present study being empirical in nature, survey method was adopted to collect data from the population. The study was conducted on 290 post graduate students from Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Maharishi Dayanand University, Rohtak, and Central University of Haryana. The Total

population of students in three universities was 700 out of them sample was taken 290 students and response obtained of 259 students filled in questionnaires were received back with a response rate of 89.31 percent.

Data Analysis and Discussion
Table 1 shows that 52.89% respondents were aware of the word plagiarism and 47.10% respondents were not aware. Majority of the students of MDU (55%) and KUK (54.34%) were aware of the word plagiarism and 52.30% respondents in CUH were unaware of the word plagiarism.

Table 1: *Plagiarism Awareness among Respondents.*

University	Yes Y (%age)	No N (%age)	Total
KUK	50 (54.34)	42 (45.65)	92
MDU	55 (55)	45 (45)	100
CUH	32 (47.35)	35 (52.23)	67
Total	137 (52.89)	122 (47.10)	259

Table 2: *Understanding of the Concept of Plagiarism: Total.*

Statement	Yes	No	Unsure
A N=203	97 (47.78%)	51 (25.12%)	55 (27.09%)
B N=208	98 (47.11%)	72 (34.61%)	38 (18.26%)
C N=197	91 (46.19%)	50 (25.38%)	56 (28.42%)
D N=201	64 (31.84%)	78 (38.80%)	59 (29.35%)
E N=156	53 (33.97%)	65 (41.66%)	38 (24.35%)
F N=202	68 (33.66%)	92 (45.54%)	42 (20.79%)
G N=188	62 (32.97%)	76 (40.42%)	50 (26.59%)
H N=147	52 (35.37%)	57 (38.77%)	38 (25.85%)
I N=143	51 (35.66%)	53 (37.06%)	39 (27.27%)
J N=208	66 (31.37%)	71 (34.13%)	71 (34.13%)
K N=136	28 (20.58%)	48 (35.29%)	60 (44.11%)
Total N=1989	730 (36.70%)	713 (35.84%)	546 (27.45%)

Table 3: Frequency of Use of Information Source: Total.

University	Journal articles	General books	Textbook	Encyclopedia	Dictionary	Internet	Newspaper
KUK	2.47	2.97	2.89	2.20	2.5	2.47	1.94
MDU	1.77	3.06	3.16	1.52	2.37	2.89	2.79
CUH	2.50	2.88	2.78	2.08	2.64	2.84	2.76
Total	2.30	2.90	2.89	1.91	2.47	2.75	2.47

Table 4: Essential Information for Citing a Book.

University	Author N (%age)	Author Pub.+title N (%age)	Author Pub., title, year N(%age)	Author, Year N (%age)	Pub. N (%age)	Title, Pub. N (%age)	Year N (%age)	Total
KUK	24 (26.08%)	26 (28.26%)	26 (28.26%)	07 (07.60%)	06 (06.52%)	03 (03.26%)	00 (00%)	92
MDU	18 (18%)	13 (13%)	40 (40%)	08 (08%)	00 (00.00)	12 (12%)	09 (09%)	100
CUH	30 (44.67%)	03 (04.47%)	09 (13.43)	03 (04.47%)	08 (11.94%)	05 (05.74%)	11 (16.41%)	67
Total	72 (27.79%)	42 (16.21%)	75 (28.95%)	18 (06.94%)	14 (05.40%)	20 (07.72%)	20 (07.72%)	259

The respondents were given 11 statement covering various facts of plagiarism and they had to tick the appropriate column whether in their opinion the statement showed plagiarism or, not they were not sure the response shows that only about 36% of the total number of respondent answered in yes and a large majority of the respondent either considered the statement did not Conway plagiarism or were unsure about it out of 11 only in three statement A, B and C more than 45% respondent sure that this statement showed plagiarism (Table 2).

The respondents were asked to specify the frequently of various information sources they concerned for writing class assignment. They are response was received on 0.5 scale of always, frequently, sometime, rarely and never. For always purpose the response was given weight from 0 to 4(never = 0, rarely = 1, sometime = 2, frequently = 3, always = 4 and then mean score was calculated. Table 3 show the mean score of use of various information sources by respondents of KUK, MDU and CUH the post graduate students mostly use general books (M.S. 2.90) and text book (M.S. 2.89) the respondents also used internet (M.S. 2.75) frequently all these sources were used by MDU respondents more frequently than these of other University.

The respondents were asked, what the essential information items to cite a book are? The response shows that the largest number of respondents in CUH (44.67%) ticked the option author only. About 40 percent of MDU ticked the option author, title, publisher and year. About 28.26 percent respondents of KUK ticked the option author, title and publisher; thus the largest number of respondents (44.67%) in CUH ticked only author option (Table 4).

Table 5 shows that only 25.88% students knew the standard style of citation of work and 74.13% respondents did not know any standard style of citation. 31% students of MDU and 27.17% of KUK knew the standard style of citation.

Table 5: Awareness of Standard Citation System.

University	Yes N (%age)	No N (%age)	Total
KUK	25 (27.17%)	67 (72.82%)	92
MDU	31 (31%)	69 (69%)	100
CUH	11 (16.41%)	56 (83.58%)	67
Total	67 (25.88%)	192 (74.13%)	259

Table 6: Anti-plagiarism Software Awareness among Respondents.

University	Yes N (%age)	No N (%age)	Total
KUK	14 (15.21%)	78 (84.78%)	92
MDU	25 (25%)	75 (75%)	100
CUH	09 (13.43%)	58 (86.75%)	67
Total	48 (18.53%)	211 (81.46%)	259

Table 7: Reasons for Plagiarism.

University	Time Pressure N (%age)	Everyone N (%age)	Help a friend N (%age)	Excess work Load N(%age)	Lacking research skills N(%age)	External pressure N (%age)	In Ability N (%age)	No fear N (%age)	Time wastage N (%age)	Unaware Ness N(%age)	Others N (%age)	Total
KUK	68 (22.44)	26 (08.58)	16 (05.28)	18 (05.94)	39 (12.87)	30 (09.90)	17 (05.61)	28 (09.24)	21 (06.93)	36 (11.88)	04 (01.32)	303
MDU	45 (11.90)	45 (11.90)	31 (08.20)	52 (13.75)	46 (12.16)	28 (07.40)	39 (10.31)	38 (10.05)	31 (08.20)	23 (06.08)	00 (00.00)	378
CUH	34 (17.98)	24 (12.69)	21 (11.11)	14 (07.40)	19 (10.05)	17 (08.99)	19 (10.05)	14 (07.40)	15 (07.93)	12 (06.34)	00 (00.00)	189
Total	147 (16.89)	95 (10.91)	68 (07.81)	64 (07.35)	104 (11.95)	75 (08.62)	75 (08.62)	80 (09.19)	67 (07.70)	71 (08.16)	04 (00.45)	870

Table 8: Suggestions to Reduce Student Plagiarism.

University	Awareness Program N (%age)	Training & education N (%age)	Introduce About Software N (%age)	University Policy N (%age)	Other N (%age)	Total
KUK	70 (36.84)	44 (23.15)	39 (20.52)	31 (16.31)	06 (03.15)	190
MDU	57 (26.88)	46 (21.69)	58 (27.35)	51 (24.05)	00 (00.00)	212
CU H	42 (33.07)	42 (33.07)	31 (24.40)	12 (09.44)	00 (00.00)	127
Total	169 (31.94)	132 (24.95)	128 (24.19)	94 (17.76)	06 (01.13)	529

Table 6 shows that only 18.53% students knew about the anti-plagiarism software and 81.46% students did not know any anti-plagiarism software. Relatively more students of MDU (25%) were aware of any anti plagiarism software than the students of KUK (15.21%) and CHU (13.43%).

Table 7 presents response on the reasons of plagiarism. The largest number of respondents particularly in KUK (22.44%), CUH (17.98%) and MDU (11.90%) felt that students resorted to plagiarism due to time pressure. A little less number of respondents (11.95%) opined that students resort to plagiarism because they lack research skills. 95 respondents (10.91%) stated that students resort to plagiarism because everyone does it.

The respondents were asked to suggest measures to reduce student plagiarism. The response shows that the largest number of respondents in KUK (36.84 %) and CUH (33.07%) felt that student plagiarism can be reduced by conducting plagiarism awareness programs. However in CUH, 33.07 percent respondents also ticked the option training and education on methods of citation. Among Haryana Universities maximum 27.35 percent

respondents of MDU felt that plagiarism can be controlled by introducing the plagiarism detection software and similar mechanisms (Table 8).

Table 9 shows that only 23.93% students knew the punishment for plagiarism and 76.06% students were not aware of any punishment for plagiarism. 34.32% students of CUH followed by KUK (28.26%) and MDU (13%) were aware of punishment for plagiarism.

Table 9: Awareness of Punishment for Plagiarism among Respondents.

University	Yes N (%age)	No N (%age)	Total
KUK	26 (28.26%)	66 (71.73%)	92
MDU	13 (13%)	87 (87%)	100
CUH	23 (34.32%)	44 (65.67%)	67
Total	62 (23.93%)	197 (76.06%)	259

SUGGESTIONS

On the basis of response of the study, available literature and discussion with respondents the following suggestion are given for making students aware of plagiarism and avoidance of its incidence:

1. Universities should organize workshop, seminars and direct meeting with students on the issue of plagiarism.
2. Universities and colleges should make specific academic policy for preventing plagiarism.
3. The teachers should make the students aware of plagiarism and how to write their own ideas or views.
4. Faculty should make the students aware about the citation and how to cite the original work.
5. The supervisors should keep attention on the research work, project and assignment of the students.
6. Librarian should organize training program on preventing plagiarism.
7. Use of anti-plagiarism software should be increased and not only Ph.D. theses and M Phil. Dissertation but assignment should also be checked on it.

CONCLUSIONS

Among three universities included in the study the highest percentage of respondents in MDU (55%) followed by KUK (54.34%) and CUH (47.35%) were aware of the word plagiarism. The study was founded that the students are generally not understand of the concept of plagiarism. The post graduate students most frequently use general books (M.S. 2.90) and text book (M.S. 2.89) the respondents also used internet (M.S. 2.75) frequently. Only 28.18% students knew how to cite a book/journal and 71.81% did not know. It can be concluded that the respondents of select Universities of Haryana are not aware of any standard style of citation. Only 18.53% students knew about the anti-plagiarism software and 81.46% students did not know any anti-plagiarism software. The study was founded that time pressure, lacking research skills and everyone does it are the main reasons of students plagiarism. Only 23.93% students knew there was punishment for plagiarism and 76.06% students were not aware of any punishment for plagiarism.

REFERENCES

1. Hannabus S. Contested texts: issues of plagiarism. *Library Management*. 2001; 22(6/7): 311–318p.
2. Clough, Paul. Old and new challenges in automatic plagiarism detection. *Plagiarism Advisory Service*. 2003; 1–14p.
3. Webster's Online Dictionary. 2014. [Online] available from https://www.merriam-webster.com/ [accessed on January 2018].
4. Deepak K, Singh J. Awareness and attitude towards Plagiarism among research scholars: A case study of Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra. *Journal of Indian Library Association.* 2014; 50(4): 19–27.
5. Prasantha K, Lakshmi S. Awareness on plagiarism among research scholars of Sri Venkateshwara University: A study. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science.* 2015; 20(3): 55–59p.
6. Scanlon Patrick M, David R. Neumann. Internet plagiarism among college students. *Journal of college students Development.* 2002; 43(3): 375–85.
7. Idiegbeyan-ose J, Nikiko Christopher, Osinulu Ifeakachuku. Awareness and Perception of plagiarism of postgraduate students in selected universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy Practice.* 2016; 1322p.

Cite this Article
Kavita, Manoj Kumar Joshi. Plagiarism Awareness Among Post Graduate Students of Select Universities of Haryana. *Journal of Advancements in Library Sciences*. 2018; 5(1): 80–84p.