Indian Journal of Information Sources and Services
ISSN: 2231-6094 (P) Vol.12, No.1, 2022, pp.1-8

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51983/ijiss-2022.12.1.3037

Impact of Plagiarism Checking on Research Scholars with Reference to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu

S. P. Mariaselvi[1] and P. Balasubramanian[2]
[1]Research Scholar, [2]University Librarian and Head,
Department of Library and Information Science, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tamil Nadu, India
E-mail: selvipaul92@gmail.com, bala_phd2010@yahoo.com

(Received 27 December 2021; Revised 25 January 2022; Accepted 5 March 2022; Available online 27 April 2022)

Abstract **- This paper surveyed the awareness of plagiarism among the respondents from the higher educational institutions in Tirunelveli District. It discusses the awareness about plagiarism and its experiences in their academic purposes. Among the 410 participants, 132(32.2%) are Ph.D. Scholars, including 96(23.41%), are 'Male', and 36(8.78%) are 'Female'. And 59(14.39%) LIS Professionals, which includes 30(7.32%) of them are 'Male' and 29(7.07%) of them are 'Female'. It is highlighted that the majority of the respondents are Faculty members. And also, 82.2 per cent of the respondents preferred the "Google" search engine, followed by the "Yahoo" search engine with 7.56%.**

Keywords: **Plagiarism, Impact, Awareness, Search Engines, Experiences**

I. INTRODUCTION

The developments in information and communication technologies and their subsequent absorption in library and information science (LIS) have forced information professionals to change the way they are functioning at present. Because of their popularity with the users, overwhelming attention is being given to the web-based information services in libraries. Web technology is part and parcel of the life of a modern library system. In the good old days, librarians were treated as resource supply people who shared knowledge with needy people. But today, the librarian is developing the digital library in their organisation for their people and others. They have created a digital library of their own, collected the different resources through the digital format and stored it in their digital library. Today this is one of the most important and primary jobs of a librarian. To develop this programming knowledge and computer skill is highly required and today the librarians are now they upgraded themselves.

II. PLAGIARISM DETECTION

Plagiarism detection is the process of locating instances of plagiarism within a work or document. The widespread use of computers and the advent of the Internet have made it easier to plagiarise the work of others. Most cases of plagiarism are found in academia, where documents are typically essays or reports. However, plagiarism can be found in virtually any field, including scientific papers, art designs, and source code.

A. Detection of Plagiarism

1. Manual Detection

It requires substantial effort and excellent memory and is impractical in cases where too many documents must be compared, or original documents are not available for comparison.

2. Software-Assisted Detection

The software allows vast collections of documents to be compared, making successful detection much more likely. The act of taking someone else's ideas and passing them off as your own defines the concept of "plagiarism". As the growing educational concerns show, plagiarism has become an integral part of our digital lives as technology, with the billions of information it gives us access to, led to the worsening of this phenomenon.

III. MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY (MSU)

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University (MSU) is a dynamic institution of higher learning, set in a rural milieu of southern Tamil Nadu, with a campus spread of 550 acres. The university was established by the Government of Tamil Nadu as a teaching-cum-affiliating University on September 7 1990, to cater to the long-felt needs of the people of the four southernmost districts of Tamil Nadu viz., Tenkasi, Tirunelveli, Tuticorin, and Kanyakumari.

It is named after the renowned Tamil Poet scholar, Professor P. Sundaram Pillai (1855-1897), the famous verse drama Manonmaniam. His poem has become "Tamil Thaai Vazhthu", the official invocation song sung in all functions in Tamil Nadu. University plays a pivotal role in providing education to the masses, leading from darkness to light. The library at Manonmaniam Sundaranar University was established in the year 1990. It has been upgraded to a more digitalised version to synchronise with current trends of e-content. The library was shifted to this New Building in July 2016.

IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nisha *et al.,* 2015. Provided an overview of plagiarism-plagiarism in studies, and numerous commercial and free plagiarism detection equipment accessible. Auxiliary, the thesis offered the modern plagiarism cases mentioned from India and abroad and projects developed by academic and studies institutes in India.

Birte *et al.,* 2012 focused on a prominent plagiarism case involving the former Minister of Science and Education's dissertation in Germany. The authors investigated the communication strategies of the Düsseldorf University as it circumnavigated the complex tasks of the crisis condition. By looking at the findings of the campus crisis by way of specialising in legitimating the felony and organisational procedure, it was evaluated from Schavan; dissertation that the diploma is revoked. On the flip, this cognisance left out restoring the threatened recognition of graduate education and of scholarship itself. Ultimately, the tragic conversation of the college worked to demoralise the properties and dreams of technology communication.

Wager 2011 discussed all the factors and suggested possible descriptions of significant and minor plagiarism relative to learned publications. The author mentioned that anti-plagiarism software could not detect plagiarised tables or figures, ideas, or plagiarism in translation. This software only detects the extent of text copied. So a proper definition of major and minor plagiarism in scholarly publications can help formulate anti-plagiarism policies along with resources such as COPE flowcharts. The author also provided some suggestions to handle plagiarism.

Pandey *et al.,* 2002 highlighted the threat of plagiarism with some case research and the method to shrink plagiarism efficiently with the assistance of tutorial seminars for particularly young researchers. The authors also mentioned the consequences of surveys carried out after organising the workshops for plagiarism awareness. According to the survey results, most scholars had been now not even aware of plagiarism in advance; however, after the discussion, their understanding of plagiarism troubles was more significant, and they felt pretty encouraged against it.

V. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To identify Awareness about Plagiarism tools.
2. To know the search techniques used to see the plagiarism.
3. To know the level of using Plagiarism checking tools.
4. To find out awareness about the legal issues about copyrights and anti-plagiarism.

VI. METHODOLOGY

The survey method investigated plagiarism among the respondents from higher educational institutions in Tirunelveli District. The questionnaires were used to collect the data among the respondents, which consists of four groups Faculty, Library Professionals, Ph.D. Scholars and M. Phil Scholars.

The 450 questionnaires were distributed, 410 questionnaires were filled returned for usable by the participant, and the remaining was not replied to. The responses rate is 91.00%. Statistical tools like simple percentages, WAM, and Chi-square tests were used based on the collected data.

VII. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND INTERPRETATION

A. Distribution of Questionnaires

This attempt is to find out the An Assessment of Awareness plagiarism among the respondents from higher educational institutions in Tirunelveli District, shown in table I.

TABLE I DISTRIBUTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES TO THE RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Gender	Questionnaires Distributed	%	Questionnaires Replied	%
1	Male	250	55.55	231	51.33
2	Female	200	44.45	179	39.77
	Total	450	100.00	410	91.00

Table I shows the distribution of the questionnaires among respondents. 450 questionnaires were distributed. Among the 250 (55.55%) questionnaires were distributed to the Male and 200 (39.77%) questionnaires to the female respondents.

Among 450, 231(51.33%) of the Male respondents were replied, and 179 (39.77%) of the Female Participants were answered. It is concluded that out of 450 questionnaires, the respondents responded to 410 (91.00%).

B. Demographic Details of the Respondents

The respondents' demographic details from higher educational institutions in Tirunelveli District were categorised based on type, domicile, gender, and age, shown in table I. The demographic details of the respondents are shown in table II. Out of 410 respondents, 132 (32.2%) were from Ph.D. Scholars, followed by 59 (14.39%), were from Library Professionals, 52 (12.68%) were from M.Phil. Scholars, 167 (40.73%) of the Faculty Members.

TABLE II DEMOGRAPHICAL DETAILS OF RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Descriptions	Frequency	Percentage
Category of the Respondents			
1	Ph.D. Scholars	132	32.2
2	M.Phil. Scholars	52	12.68
3	LIS Professionals	59	14.39
4	Faculty Members	167	40.73
User Domicile			
5	Rural	269	65.61
6	Urban	141	34.39
Gender			
6	Male	231	56.34
7	Female	179	43.66
Age			
8	Less than 30	151	36.83
9	31-40	203	49.51
10	41 -50	40	9.76
11	Above 50	16	3.90

Out of 410 respondents, 231(56.34) were male, and 179 (43.66%) were female. Similarly, out of 410 respondents, 151 (36.83) were less than 30 years age group, followed by 203 (49.51%) were 31-40 years age group, 40 (9.76) respondents were 41-50 years age group, and 16 (3.90%) were above 50 years age group.

C. Distribution of the Respondents Vs Gender and Age

The category of the respondents was from higher educational institutions in Tirunelveli District were categorised based on gender and age, shown in table III.

TABLE III DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS VS GENDER AND AGE

Sl. No.	Description	Gender		Age Frequency				Total
		Male	Female	Less than 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
1	Ph.D. Scholars	96(23.41)	36(8.78)	56(13.66)	56(13.66)	15(3.66)	5(1.22)	132(32.2)
2	M.Phil. Scholars	23(5.61)	29(7.07)	25(6.1)	24(5.85)	3(0.73)	0(0)	52(12.68)
3	LIS Professionals	30(7.32)	29(7.07)	8(1.95)	28(6.83)	14(3.41)	9(2.2)	59(14.39)
4	Faculty Members	82(20)	85(20.73)	62(15.12)	95(23.17)	8(1.95)	2(0.49)	167(40.73)
Total		231(56.34)	179(43.66)	151(36.83)	203(49.51)	40(9.76)	16(3.9)	410(100)

Table III shows the distribution of the respondents from the higher educational institutions in the Tirunelveli District. Among 410 respondents, 132(32.2%) of them are Ph.D Scholars, which includes 96(23.41%) of them are 'Male', and 36(8.78%) of them are 'Female'. Followed by among the 52 (12.68%) M.Phil. Scholars, 23(5.61%) are 'Male', and 29(7.07%) are 'Female'. And 59(14.39%) LIS Professionals, 30(7.32%) of them are 'Male', and 29(7.07%) of them are 'Female'. And 167 (40.73%) of them are from Faculty members, which include 82(20%) of them are 'Male' and 85(20.73%) of them are 'Female'. It is highlighted that the majority of the respondents are Faculty members.

Further, among 410 respondents, 132(32.2%) are Ph.D. Scholars which includes age category, 56(13.66%) of them are in the age 'Less than 30', 56(13.66%) of them are in the age' 30-40 years', 15(3.66%) of them are in the period' 41-50 years' and 5(1.22%) of them are 'Above 50 years. Similarly, Further, among 167 faculty members, 62(15.12%) of them are in the age 'Less than 30', 95(23.17%) of them are in the age' 30-40 years', 8(1.95%) of them are in the period' 41-50 years' and 2(0.49%) of them are 'Above 50 years. It is highlighted that most of the respondents are between 31-40 years.

D. Preferred Search Engines by the Respondents

The search engines preferred by the respondents were analyzed. The percentile analysis of major search engines such as Google, Yahoo, MSN, Alta Vista, and others have been shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV PREFERRED SEARCH ENGINES BY THE RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Search Engines	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	Google	337	82.2	1
2	Yahoo	31	7.56	2
3	MSN	14	3.41	4
4	Alta Vista	7	1.71	5
5	Others	21	5.12	3
	Total	410	100.00	

Table IV describes that preferred search engine to access the plagiarism checking tools which are both free and commercial, 337 (82.2%) respondents preferred "Google" search engine, followed by "Yahoo" search engine with 31 (7.56%), "MSN" 14 (3.41%), "Alta Vista" 7 (1.71%) and 21 (5.12%) respondents were preferred "other search engines" like "Duck Duck Go", One Search", "Bing" etc. It is highlighted that most of the respondents preferred the Google search engine, and the lowest number of respondents, 7 (1.71%) respondents, preferred the "Alta Vista' search engine.

E. Preferred Search Engines Vs Respondents

The study has further been extended to the respondent's opinions based on their preferences, shown in Table V.

TABLE V PREFERRED SEARCH ENGINES VS RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Respondents	Preferred Search Engine					Total
		Google	Yahoo	MSN	Alta Vista	Others	
1	Ph.D. Scholars	105(25.61)	8(1.95)	7(1.71)	2(0.49)	10(2.44)	132(32.2)
2	M.Phil. Scholars	42(10.24)	5(1.22)	2(0.49)	1(0.24)	2(0.49)	52(12.68)
3	LIS Professionals	49(11.95)	3(0.73)	3(0.73)	1(0.24)	3(0.73)	59(14.39)
4	Faculty Members	141(34.39)	15(3.66)	2(0.49)	3(0.73)	6(1.46)	167(40.73)
Total		337(82.2)	31(7.56)	14(3.41)	7(1.71)	21(5.12)	410(100)

Table V states that preferred search engines to access the plagiarism checking tools, both free and commercial. Out of 410, 337 (81.58%) respondents preferred the "Google" search engine, which consists of 105(25.61%) of them Ph.D. Scholars, 42(10.24%) of them M.Phil. Scholars, 49(11.95%) of them from LIS Professionals and 141(34.39%) of them from Faculty members. Followed by "Alta Vista" search engine were used by 7 (1.54%) respondents, which consists of 2(0.49%) of them Ph.D Scholars, 1(0.24%) of them M.Phil Scholars & LIS Professionals and 3(0.73%) of them from Faculty members. It shows that the majority of the respondents used the "Google" search engine to know the plagiarism checking tools.

F. Preferred Search Engine Vs Gender & Age Frequency

The study has been extended to preferred search engines Vs Gender and Age. The respondent's opinion is based on their preferences shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI PREFERRED SEARCH ENGINE VS GENDER & AGE FREQUENCY

Sl. No.	Profile	Google	Yahoo	MSN	Alta Vista	Others	Total	Chi-square
Gender								
1	Male	197(48.05)	9(2.2)	7(1.71)	1(0.24)	17(4.15)	231(56.34)	Chi-square: 20.445, df :4, Sig.: 000
2	Female	140(34.15)	22(5.37)	7(1.71)	6(1.46)	4(0.98)	179(43.66)	
Age Frequency								
3	Below 30	131(31.95)	11(2.68)	3(0.73)	1(0.24)	5(1.22)	151(36.83)	Chi-square: 56.300, df :12, Sig.: 000
4	31-40	176(42.93)	11(2.68)	6(1.46)	1(0.24)	9(2.2)	203(49.51)	
5	41-50	18(4.39)	8(1.95)	5(1.22)	4(0.98)	5(1.22)	40(9.76)	
6	Above 50	12(2.93)	1(0.24)	0(0)	1(0.24)	2(0.49)	16(3.9)	
Total		337(82.2)	31(7.56)	14(3.41)	7(1.71)	21(5.12)	410(100)	

Table VI describes that preferred search engine to access the plagiarism checking tools both free and commercial, 337 (82.2%) respondents preferred "Google" search engine, which consists of 197(48.05%) of them from "Male" and 140(34.15%) of the "Female". Followed by "Yahoo" search engine with 31 (7.56%), which includes 9(2.2%) of them from "Male" and 22(5.37%) of the "Female". Similarly, the frequency analysis shows 337 (82.2%) respondents preferred "Google" search engine, which includes 131(31.95%) of them from "Below 30", 176(42.93%) of the "31-40 years", 18(4.39%) of them from "41-50years" and 12(2.93%) of them in "Above 50 years". It is highlighted that most of the respondents were from age frequency of "31-40years".

Further, a Chi-square test has been administered to identify the signs. The calculated value is shown in Table VI. For the gender-wise analysis, the table value is 9.488 at a 5% significance level. The computed value for most of the deals was higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are highly significant in their opinion about the preference search engines used. Further, for the age frequency analysis, the table value is 21.026 at a 5% significance level. The calculated value for most of the values is higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are significant in their opinion about the preference search engines used.

G. Awareness about Plagiarism among Respondents

The study has been analysed the awareness about plagiarism checking tools among the respondents. The respondent's opinion is based on their preferences shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII AWARENESS ABOUT PLAGIARISM AMONG RESPONDENTS

Sl. No.	Description	No Idea	Aware	Learning	Fair	Expert	Total	WAM	Std. Dev
1	Ph.D. Scholars	15(3.66)	20(4.88)	21(5.12)	39(9.51)	37(9.02)	132(32.2)	3.477	1.344
2	M.Phil. Scholars	4(0.98)	7(1.71)	25(6.1)	6(1.46)	10(2.44)	52(12.68)	3.211	1.143
3	LIS Professionals	14(3.41)	20(4.88)	15(3.66)	5(1.22)	5(1.22)	59(14.39)	2.44	1.192
4	Faculty Members	28(6.83)	26(6.34)	28(6.83)	35(8.54)	50(12.2)	167(40.73)	3.317	1.464
Total		61(14.88)	73(17.8)	89(21.71)	85(20.73)	102(24.88)	410(100)	3.229	1.388

Table VII shows the awareness of plagiarism among the respondents. Among 132 Ph.D. Scholars, 15(3.66%) have 'No Idea', 20(4.88%) have 'Aware', 21. (5.12%) of them in 'Learning', 39(9.51%) are with 'Fair', and 37(32.2%) of them are "Expert'. Similarly, out of 167 Faculty Members, 28(6.83%) of them has 'No Idea', 26(6.34%) of them have 'Aware', 28(6.83%) of them in 'Learning', 35(8.54%) are with 'Fair', and 50(12.2%) of them are "Expert'. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.21 and 3.47. It can be inferred that all the five variables lie between 'Learning' and 'Fair'. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.14338 and 1.46481.

H. Awareness about Plagiarism Vs Gender & Age Frequency

The study has further been extended preferred awareness about plagiarism Vs Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which are shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII AWARENESS ABOUT PLAGIARISM VS GENDER & AGE FREQUENCY

Sl. No.	Profile	No Idea	Aware	Learning	Fair	Expert	Total	Sig.
Gender								
1	Male	4(0.98)	46(11.22)	50(12.2)	56(13.66)	75(18.29)	231(56.34)	Chi-square: 78.181, df :4, Sig.: 000
2	Female	57(13.9)	27(6.59)	39(9.51)	29(7.07)	27(6.59)	179(43.66)	
Age Frequency								
3	Below 30	15(3.66)	28(6.83)	25(6.1)	38(9.27)	45(10.98)	151(36.83)	Chi-Squar: 26.302, df :12, Sig.: 010
4	31-40	31(7.56)	33(8.05)	52(12.68)	35(8.54)	52(12.68)	203(49.51)	
5	41-50	9(2.2)	8(1.95)	8(1.95)	11(2.68)	4(0.98)	40(9.76)	
6	Above 50	6(1.46)	4(0.98)	4(0.98)	1(0.24)	1(0.24)	16(3.9)	
Total		61(14.88)	73(17.8)	89(21.71)	85(20.73)	102(24.88)	410(100)	

Table VIII shows the awareness of plagiarism among the respondents. Among 231 'Male' respondents, 4(0.98%) of them has 'No Idea', 46(11.22%) of them have 'Aware', 50(12.2%) of them in 'Learning', 56(13.66%) are with 'Fair', and 75(18.29%) of them are "Expert'. Similarly, out of 179 'Female' respondents, 57(13.9%) of them has 'No Idea', 27(6.59%) of them are having 'Aware', 39(9.51%) of them in 'Learning', 29(7.07%) are with 'Fair', and 27(6.59%) of them are "Expert'.

In this case, age frequency among the 203(49.51%) are from' 31-40 Years, which includes 31(7.56%) of them has 'No Idea', 33(8.05%) of them are having 'Aware', 52(12.68%) of them in 'Learning', 35(8.54%) are with 'Fair' and 52(12.68%) of them are "Expert'. It is shown that the lowest of the respondents are under the age category of 'Above 50 years.

Further, a Chi-square test has been administered to identify the signs. The calculated value is shown in Table 8. For the gender-wise analysis, the table value is 9.488 at a 5% significance level. The computed value for most of the deals was higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are highly significant in their opinion about the awareness of plagiarism. The table value is 21.026 at a 5% significance level in the age frequency analysis. The calculated value for most of the values is higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are significant in their opinion about the awareness of plagiarism.

I. Experiences in using Plagiarism Checking Tools

The respondents' experience in using electronic resources was analysed based on the number of years they are using the electronic resources, such as "Below one year", between "1 and 2 years", between "2 and 3 years", between "3 and 4 years", and "Above four years". The percentile analysis of experiences in using electronic resources and the same has been shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX EXPERIENCES IN USING PLAGIARISM CHECKING TOOLS

Sl. No.	Experience	Frequency	Percent	Ranking
1	Below one year	59	14.39	3
2	1 and 2 years	51	12.44	4
3	2 and 3 years	80	19.51	2
4	3 and 4 years	31	7.56	5
5	Above four years	189	46.10	1
	Total	410	100.00	

Table IX reveals the respondents' experiences in using plagiarism checking tools. Out of 410 respondents, 189 (46.10%) respondents have over four years of experience using plagiarism checking tools for their academic work.

Followed by 80(19.51%) respondents are 2 and 3 years, 59 (14.39%) of respondents below one year, 51 (12.44) of respondents 1 and 2 years, and 31 (7.56) of respondents are 3 and 4 years experience in using electronics resources.

J. Experiences in using Plagiarism Checking Tools

The study has analysed the respondents' experiences in using plagiarism checking tools. The respondent opinion based on opinions and responses is shown in Table X.

TABLE X EXPERIENCES IN USING PLAGIARISM CHECKING TOOLS

Sl. No	Profile	Below One Year	1-2 Years	2-3 Years	3-4 Years	Above Four Years	WAM	Std. Dev
1	Ph.D. Scholars	24(5.85)	27(6.59)	13(3.17)	16(3.9)	52(12.68)	3.34	1.59
2	M.Phil. Scholars	8(1.95)	8(1.95)	17(4.15)	2(0.49)	17(4.15)	3.23	1.45
3	LIS Professionals	8(1.95)	1(0.24)	10(2.44)	6(1.46)	34(8.29)	3.91	1.43
4	Faculty Members	19(4.63)	15(3.66)	40(9.76)	7(1.71)	86(20.98)	3.75	1.44
Total		59(14.39)	51(12.44)	80(19.51)	31(7.56)	189(46.1)	3.58	1.51

Table X shows the Experiences in Using Plagiarism Checking Tools among the respondents. Among 132 Ph.D Scholars, 24(5.85%) of them has 'Below 1 year', 27(6.59%) of them have '1-2 years', 13(3.17%) of them has '2-3 years', 16(3.9%) are having '3-4 years' and 52(12.68%) of them have "Above four years. Similarly, out of 167 Faculty Members, 19(4.63%) of them has 'Below 1 year', 15(3.66%) of them have '1-2 years', 40(9.76%) of them has '2-3 years', 7(1.71%) are having '3-4 years' and 86(20.98%) of them have "Above four years. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.23 and 3.96. It can be inferred that all the five variables lie between '2-3 years' and '3-4 years'. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.43 and 1.59.

K. Experiences in using Plagiarism Checking Tools Vs Gender & Age

The study has further been extended to Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on gender and age frequency is shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI EXPERIENCES IN USING PLAGIARISM VS GENDER & AGE

Sl. No.	Profile	Below One Year	1 and 2 Years	2 and 3 Years	3 and 4 Years	Above Four Years	Total	Sig.
Gender								
1	Male	39(9.51)	34 (8.29)	39(9.51)	17(4.15)	102(24.88)	231(56.34)	Chi-square: 6.831, df :4, Sig.: 0.145
2	Female	20(4.88)	17(4.15)	41(10)	14(3.41)	87(21.22)	179(43.66)	
Age Frequency								
3	Below 30	27(6.59)	24(5.85)	34(8.29)	9(2.2)	57(13.9)	151(36.83)	Chi-square: 28.920, df :12, Sig.: 004
4	31-40	23(5.61)	20(4.88)	40(9.76)	11(2.68)	109(26.59)	203(49.51)	
5	41-50	7(1.71)	5(1.22)	5(1.22)	9(2.2)	14(3.41)	40(9.76)	
6	Above 50	2(0.49)	2(0.49)	1(0.24)	2(0.49)	9(2.2)	16(3.9)	
Total		59(14.39)	51(12.44)	80(19.51)	31(7.56)	189(46.1)	410(100)	

Table VIII shows awareness of plagiarism among the respondents. Among 231 'Male' respondents, 39(9.51%) of them has 'Below 1 year', 34(8.29%) of them have '1-2 years', 39(9.51%) of them has '2-3 years', 17(4.15%) are having '3-4 years' and 102(24.88%) of them have "Above four years. Among 179 'Female' respondents, 20(4.88%) of them has 'Below 1 year', 17(4.15%) of them have '1-2 years', 41(10%) of them has '2-3 years', 14(3.41%) are having '3-4 years' and 87(21.22%) of them have "Above four years'. In this case, age frequency among the 203(49.51%) are from 31-40 Years, which includes 23(5.61%) of them has 'Below 1 year', 20(4.88%) of them are having '1-2 years', 40(9.76) of them has '2-3 years', 11(2.68%) are having '3-4 years' and 109(26.59%) of them have "Above four years. It is shown that the minimum numbers of respondents have 'Above four years' experiences in the age group of 'Above 50 years.

Further, a Chi-square test has been administered to identify the signs. The calculated value is shown in Table XI. For the gender-wise analysis, the table value is 9.488 at a 5% level of importance. The computed value for most of the deals was less than the table value, which indicated the variables are highly insignificant in their opinion about the experiences in using plagiarism. Further, in the age frequency analysis, the table value is 21.026 at a 5% significance level. The calculated value for most of the values is higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are significant in their opinion about the experiences in using plagiarism. Further

L. Awareness on Legal Problems about Plagiarism

The respondents' Awareness of Legal Problems while using plagiarism was analysed based on opinions and surveys, such as "Not Aware", "Marginally", "Moderately", "Substantially", and "Completely". The percentile analysis of Awareness on Legal Problems while using plagiarism and the same has been shown in Table XII.

TABLE XII AWARENESS OF LEGAL PROBLEMS

Sl. No.	Awareness on Legal Problems	Not Aware	Marginally	Moderately	Substantially	Completely	WAM
1	Copy right issue and legal problems	0(0)	11(2.68)	4(0.98)	9(2.2)	3(0.73)	3.14
2	policies and guidelines of Copyrights	8(1.95)	4(0.98)	7(1.71)	30(7.32)	41(10)	4.02
3	Commercialized Plagiarism Software	2(0.49)	2(0.49)	14(3.41)	64(15.61)	124(30.24)	4.48
4	Awareness of Plagiarism Software available in Open Source	-	-	9(2.2)	18(4.39)	10(2.44)	4.02
5	Awareness of Intellectual Property Rights	-	-	5(1.22)	26(6.34)	19(4.63)	4.28
Total		10(2.43)	17(4.14)	39(9.51)	147(35.85)	197(48.04)	-

Table XII shows the Awareness of Legal Problems about Plagiarism among the respondents. Among 410 respondents, 10(2.43%) of them has 'Not Aware', 17(4.14%) of them have awareness 'Marginally', 39(9.51%) of them aware in 'Moderately', 147(35.85) are with 'Substantially' and 197(48.04%) of them are aware in "Completely'. Out of 410, 206(50.24%) of them has Awareness about the Commercialized Plagiarism Software. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.21 and 3.47. It can be inferred that significantly fewer respondents are aware of copyright issues and legal problems. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.14 and 1.46.

M. Awareness on Legal Problems about Plagiarism Vs Gender and Age

The study has further been extended to Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on gender and age frequency is shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII AWARENESS ON LEGAL PROBLEMS ABOUT PLAGIARISM VS GENDER AND AGE

Sl. No.	Profile	1	2	3	4	5	Total	Sig.
Gender								
1	Male	7(1.71)	16(3.9)	24(5.85)	78(19.02)	106(25.85)	231(56.34)	Chi-square: 12.07, df :4, Sig.: 0.016
2	Female	3(0.73)	1(0.24)	15(3.66)	69(16.83)	91(22.2)	179(43.66)	
Age Frequency								
3	Below 30	2(0.49)	10(2.44)	10(2.44)	33(8.05)	96(23.41)	151(36.83)	Chi-square: 56.998, df :12, Sig.: 000
4	31-40	8(1.95)	4(0.98)	16(3.9)	93(22.68)	82(20)	203(49.51)	
5	41-50		3(0.73)	7(1.71)	18(4.39)	12(2.93)	40(9.76)	
6	Above 50		0(0)	6(1.46)	3(0.73)	7(1.71)	16(3.9)	
Total		10(2.44)	17(4.15)	39(9.51)	147(35.85)	197(48.05)	410(100)	

Table XIII shows the Awareness of Legal Problems about Plagiarism among the respondents. Among 231(56.34%) Male respondents, 7(1.71%) of them have 'Not Aware', 16(3.9%) of them are having awareness 'Marginally', 24(5.85%) of them aware in 'Moderately', 78(19.02%) are with 'Substantially' and 106(25.85%) of them are aware in 'Completely'. In the case of age frequency analysis, among 203(49.51%) respondents are in the age group of '31.-40years' which includes 8(1.95%) of them has 'Not Aware', 4(0.98%) of them are having awareness 'Marginally', 16(3.9%) of them aware in 'Moderately', 93(22.68%) are with 'Substantially' and 82(20%) of them are aware in "Completely'. It is highlighted that the respondents in the age group of' 41-50' and 'Above 50 years' are nobody in the 'Not Aware' category. It shows all respondents are aware of the legal problems while using plagiarism.

Further, a Chi-square test has been administered to identify the signs. The calculated value is shown in Table XVIII. For the gender-wise analysis, the table value is 9.488 at a 5% significance level. The computed value for most of the deals was higher than the table value, which indicated the variables are highly significant in their opinion about plagiarism's legal problems. Further, in the age frequency analysis, the table value is 21.026 at a 5% significance level. The calculated value for most of the values is higher than the table value, which indicates that the variables are significant about legal problems while plagiarism is used.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Plagiarism detection is the process of locating instances of plagiarism within a work or document. There is much software available to detect plagiarism, some of them are commercial, and others are freely available online, which can be used to detect plagiarism. Moreover, in the Indian environment, the University Grants Commission (UGC), a statutory body of higher education, has instructed all universities to check the theses before submission with anti-plagiarism software. Such software is also contributing towards decreasing the rate of plagiarism. But, no software can solve the problem of plagiarism completely until people are made aware of it. Apart from this, punishment is not the solution to any situation. It has been found in the study that research scholars are following the 'copy paste' tendency, but they do not know that it is misconduct and called 'plagiarism', and most of them do not know that it is punishable too.

REFERENCES

[1] Fähnrich, B., Janssen Daniy, C., & Nothhaft, H. (2015). The German plagiarism crisis: Defending and explaining the workings of scholarship on the front stage. *Journal of Communication Management, 19*(1), 20-38. DOI: 10.1108/JCOM-11-2013-0081.

[2] Nisha, F., Senthil, V., & Bakhshi, S. I., (2015, January 6-8). *Plagiarism in Research: Special Reference to Initiatives taken by Indian Organisations.* The report was presented at the 4th International Symposium on Emerging Trends and Technologies in Libraries and Information Services (ETTLIS), Noida, Accessed March 13, 2013. DOI: 10.1109/ETTLIS.2015.7048212.

[3] Ommani, A. R., & Chizari, M., (2007). Appropriateness of E-learning based Information Technology to Improve the Productivity of Crops. *Journal of Extension Systems, 23*(1), 70-80.

[4] Pandey, R. & Mehta, S. (2002). Awareness of Educational Technologies in Open Learning System by Target Group. *Indian Journal of Social Research, 43*(3), 183-189.

[5] Plagiarism. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plagiarism

[6] Wager Christina. Originality or Authenticity? Plagiarism' in Postmodern Times. (2011). Access (1204-0472). *Winter, 17*(1), 44-44.