Awareness and Understanding about Plagiarism among Higher Education Teachers in India

Gaurav Singh*

Abstract

Plagiarism is one of the most debatable topics among academicians these days. People are debating about its ethical viz-a-viz legal consequences. Many incidents of plagiarism have been reported in the recent past among teachers in higher education institutions. Media reports on these cases of plagiarism have developed anxiety and tension among Indian academicians. In this backdrop, the researcher has tried to study the awareness and understanding of plagiarism among higher education teachers in India. A mixed item self-reporting tool was administered on 232 teachers teaching in various affiliated colleges or university departments. Data was collected through both offline and online mode. Analysis of the data reflects that teachers have a basic understanding of only a few common types of plagiarism but not all. Teachers are in support to avoid plagiarism, but many of them are still not aware of a proper plagiarism detection mechanism. The study suggests that along with training and awareness programmes, plagiarism and its consequences should be a part of the research curriculum. The comprehensive guidelines are also required to promote academic honesty among teachers in colleges as well as in universities.

INTRODUCTION

Plagiarism is one of the most discussed academic issue. Many incidents of plagiarism in journals and research papers have been reported around the globe, and India is not an exception. Though it is not a new concept, in India people have started talking more about plagiarism after a historic letter written by a

* *Assistant Professor*, School of Education, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi (India) −110068

few Stanford University professors to Hon'ble President of India in the year 2002.

Seven professors of Physics from Stanford University including three Nobel Laureates wrote a letter to Hon'ble President of India Late Dr A. P.J. Abdul Kalam on October 11, 2002, about an issue of plagiarism. This letter came as a shocking allegation against a member of the Indian academic community, and the country at large started thinking about plagiarism seriously. It had till then been an alien term to many of the teacher. There are many instances in the past where Indian teachers have faced allegations of plagiarism. Similarly, Clegg and Flint (2006) have also reported that plagiarism is spreading a moral panic in the United Kingdom. Singh et al., (2014) reported through the analysis of various news articles that most common types of plagiarism are ideas or thoughts, plagiarism of old published research work as new and plagiarism of data or process from a research paper. In India the debate is still going on whether plagiarism is an ethical issue or a legal issue. University Grants Commission (UGC) has proposed some measures to curb plagiarism in Indian Universities through some draft guidelines in 2017, but no final notification has been released till date.

Conceptual Understanding and Need for the Study

There appears to be no universal definition of plagiarism, but different authors or researchers have used the term depending on the context. American Association of University Professors (1989) defined plagiarism as, 'taking over the ideas, methods, or written words of another without acknowledgement and with the intention that they may be taken as the work of the deceiver' University of Essex (2007) also defines plagiarism as, 'using or copying the work of others (whether written, printed or in any other form) without proper acknowledgement in any coursework'.

Carroll (2007) defined it as' 'passing off someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally as your own for your benefit.' Many researchers used different explanations for plagiarism like Young (2013) considered it as 'academic cheating'. It is commonly accepted as a deliberate act of taking someone's thoughts, work, data, and ideas or quote without acknowledging the original contributor and presenting as one's original work. the increasing access to the Internet has made this issue more common as students or researchers have a greater access to other's work. Faulty policies like the introduction of Academic Performance Indicator (API) system in India has also contributed a lot. The focus of teachers had shifted from teaching only to publish and perish. It is a common evil in

teachers as well as students work. There are researches who have identified reasons behind plagiarism like Carroll (2007) suggested that students who are not confident about their writing abilities in English, sometimes 'borrow' a few words from original authors. Burke (1986) also identified that challenges faced by international students in language contribute to plagiarism. Razera (2010) found that students expressed the need for extra information to feel more comfortable for dealing with plagiarism. Some researchers have pointed out the reasons, such as lack of motivation, lack of training, badly worded examinations and lack of time for plagiarism. Baty (2007) and Erlenawati (2005) reported that despite being aware of plagiarism, due to lack of English language skills required to read information, extract the relevant points and then put it into their words, students end up doing acts which come under plagiarism. Sivell (2013) found that plagiarism by English as Foreign Language (EFL) students may be unintended, and the cause may go beyond deliberate dishonesty.

Williams (2002) also revealed that purchasing papers from Internet sources are a very modern form of plagiarism. Songsriwittaya et al. (2009) discovered that students plagiarised because they wanted to achieve the goal of getting good grades. Charubusp (2015) highlighted that if students found some piece of work most suitable and sufficient,

they do not try to work more and use it as it serves their purpose. Razera (2011) is of the view that when Internet was pervasive, plagiarism was not so easy as copying was done by hand from various sources like books, encyclopedia or newspapers, but Internet has made their work easy because they used elementary commands on computer famous as 'copy and paste'.

Few studies like Henriksson (2008) have pointed out the uncertainty among teachers and students about what plagiarism is, and where the line between acceptable and unacceptable conduct is traced. Razera (2010) suggested that students should have a better knowledge about academic writing and they should learn what is allowed and not allowed. Lack of knowledge about copyright issues among students is also an essential reason according to Kokkinaki et al. (2015). William (2002) cautions about the limited role of plagiarism detection tools, which can be used only for detection but not suggesting how to avoid plagiarism. Razara (2010) has also hinted about the disagreement between teachers and students about the detection tools. He pointed out that the students found these tools more helpful as compared to teachers. Wilkinson (2009) reported that in his study, 49% of the teaching staff and 39% learners thought that cheating on assessment tasks was common with 'copying a few paragraphs and not citing the source' the most common

form. He also reported that the staff feels that due to lack of understanding of rules, cheating occurs among students, whereas students are of the opinion that wanting a better grade and having too many assessment items are the strong motivators for cheating. Students also want the 'lighter sentences' (disciplinary actions) against plagiarism.

There are some studies like Ireland and English (2011) supporting plagiarism. They proposed a 'safe environment' where students are allowed to 'plagiarize'. Some cultural issues are also associated with this narrative. Angelil-Carter (2000); and Brennan and Durovic (2005) reported that, 'copying may be called plagiarism in western countries, but it is not considered as a problem in many other cultures.' There are many cultures which believe it is a free expansion, sharing and distribution of knowledge without any restriction as knowledge is for the benefit all. 'In some cases, it is considered humble than boldly advocating your own opinions about something (Bell, 1999)'. Yang and Lin (2009) reported that the student did not think it was correct to rewrite an author's words since the author was well known and respected. Hence, they included it in his their her text. Ballard and Clanchy (1988; 1991) reported that in Eastern culture, the respect of written knowledge and authority is the norm, and critical analysis is not required or encouraged.

The above discussion highlights the conceptual understanding of plagiarism, its causes identified and reported by various researchers, cultural issues associated with plagiarism and the level of understanding among teachers and students worldwide, which have given an exceptional understanding about the issue worldwide. It has also been found that as compared to rest of the world, there are negligible studies about plagiarism in Indian academic community. Thus, these reasons triggered the researcher to undertake a comprehensive study.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The research study aims to study the awareness and understanding of plagiarism among higher education teachers teaching in affiliated colleges and university departments of Indian universities.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

- **Awareness:** Awareness about plagiarism includes creating awareness among teachers about the incidents, reports, related acts, plagiarism viz-a-viz copyright and citation, detection tools, various ways to avoid it, etc.
- **Understanding:** Understanding about plagiarism includes statements related to different types of plagiarism as well as related issues.
- **Plagiarism:** In the present study, plagiarism is not taken as any one definition.

A widely accepted explanation of plagiarism is given by American University's Academic Integrity Code (Section II A): to plagiarise is to use the work, ideas, or words of someone else without attribution. Plagiarism may involve using someone else's wording without using quotation marks — a distinctive name, a phrase, a sentence, or an entire passage or essay. It may also involve misrepresenting the sources that were used.

The Graduate School of Michigan State University, (2014, p.2) found plagiarism as handing in a paper written by a friend, buying a paper on the Internet, paying someone to write a paper and handing it in as [one's] own, copying and pasting information from the Internet or another source without correctly citing the author, and inadequate paraphrasing of a source so that [the] wording is too close to the original.

Various researchers have given its various dimensions, operationally, all activities and dimensions of plagiarism have been considered under the umbrella term plagiarism for the present study.

- **Higher Education Teachers:** Higher education teachers refer to the faculty members teaching in affiliated colleges or university departments at the undergraduate, postgraduate or doctoral level and designated as assistant professors, associate professors and professors.
- **Affiliated Colleges:** Affiliated colleges refer to the undergraduate and postgraduate colleges affiliated to a university and recognised by University Grants Commission.
- **Indian Universities:** Indian universities refer to the central, state, deemed-to-be and private universities recognised by University Grants Commission.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Primary objectives of the study are
- to study the awareness about plagiarism among higher education teachers teaching in Indian universities or affiliated colleges.
- to study the understanding of various issues related to plagiarism among higher education teachers teaching in Indian universities or affiliated colleges.
- to compare the awareness and understanding of teachers through their place of work (colleges or universities).

HYPOTHESES

In order to achieve the third objective; following two (02) null hypotheses are framed.

$H_0 1$: There is no significant difference between awareness scores of higher education teachers teaching in university departments and affiliated colleges.

$H_0 2$: There is no significant difference in understanding of higher education teachers teaching in university departments and affiliated colleges.

SAMPLING AND SAMPLE FOR THE STUDY

This study is about awareness and understanding of plagiarism among higher education teachers. Nature of the population is almost homogeneous based on their level of teaching. The researcher used a convenient sampling method to reach out to subjects for the sample. The researcher collected data from 109 teachers in a face-to-face situation. The researcher also developed the online tool using online application Qualtrics and collected data from 123 teachers through Gmail, WhatsApp and Facebook. The total sample size is 232 including 109 offline and 123 online tools. Details are given in the following table:

is an ethical issue, its relation to copyright, falsification and fabrication, the role of citation and paraphrasing, etc.

- **Section B** had twelve (12) statements related to different types of plagiarism. The objective of this section is to test the understanding of participants about various dimensions of plagiarism.

- **Section C** had ten (10) statements, which need to be rated on a 5 points scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. These statements are meant to test the understanding of participants about the detection and avoidance of plagiarism.

Table 1
Sample Distribution

Nature of Data Collection	University Teachers	College Teachers	Total
Offline	35	74	109
Online	68	55	123
Total	103	129	232

RESEARCH TOOL

The objective of the study is to achieve and develop a survey tool *Awareness and Understanding about Plagiarism among Higher Education Teachers.* The tool has three sections.

- **Section A** had eleven (11) Yes/No type items to test the awareness about the issue of plagiarism among teachers. These items focus on topics like if plagiarism

Reliability and Validity of the Tool

Expert validity was established for the tool by sharing the tool with 16 experts in education research teaching research methodology course in different universities. Initial tool had 15, 14, 15 items, respectively, in section A, B and C. Based on inputs from experts, the second draft was prepared with 11,

12 and 10 items. In section A, 4 items were dropped, in section B, 2 items dropped, and 3 items reformulated, in Section C, 5 items dropped, two were reformulated, and one added. The revised tool was administered on a sample of 35 teachers in online mode with a gap of 45 days. The test-retest reliability coefficient is found to be 0.68.

Method of Data Collection

The researcher collected data from 109 teachers participating in various refreshers and orientation programmes organised in academic staff colleges in a face-to-face situation. The researcher also developed the online tool using online application Qualtrics and shares with hundreds of teachers through Gmail, WhatsApp and Facebook. Despite repeated reminders and requests, the researcher got a date on online forms from 142 teachers in online mode and considered only 123 in the final sample as rest have not responded to all the sections or submitted incomplete information. So, for final scoring and analysis, responses of 232 teachers including 109 through offline and 123 through online was considered.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The collected data was organised and tabulated to test the objectives of the study. To study the first objective, i.e., 'Awareness about Plagiarism' among teachers, the data was collected and tabulated as follows:

Table 2
Awareness about Plagiarism

S. No.	Statement	Yes		No		Undecided	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1.	Do you agreew that plagiarism is an area of concern in academic world?	173	74.57	54	23.28	5	2.16
2.	Have you ever heard about any incident of plagiarism in your university or discipline?	72	31.03	148	63.79	12	5.17
3.	Do you think that infringement of copyright and plagiarism are the same?	39	16.81	104	44.83	89	38.36

4.	Are you aware of the techniques to detect plagiarism in the academic world?	120	51.72	73	31.47	39	16.81
5.	Do you know that there are techniques to avoid Plagiarism?	107	46.12	81	34.91	44	18.97
6.	Are Falsification and Fabrication part of plagiarism?	65	28.02	109	46.98	58	25.00
7.	Is plagiarism only an ethical issue?	66	28.45	134	57.76	32	13.79
8.	Do you think that citation is a solution for plagiarism?	126	54.31	72	31.03	34	14.66
9.	Do you think that paraphrasing skills are a solution for plagiarism?	91	39.22	64	27.59	77	33.19
10.	Do you agree that plagiarism has become an area of concern only after the Internet era?	159	68.53	42	18.10	31	13.36
11.	Do you think that plagiarism can be avoided completely by using plagiarism detection tools?	80	34.48	89	38.36	63	27.16

Table 2 shows the awareness about various aspects related to plagiarism among higher education teachers. On item-wise analysis of Table 2, it was observed that there is a high variation in the awareness of teachers about various dimensions of plagiarism.

Around 74.57% teachers in this study are considering plagiarism as an area of concern among academicians. About 63.79 % teachers teaching at higher education level still do not have any knowledge of incidents of plagiarism in their discipline or institute. This reflects that a significant number of teachers are still not aware of the incidents of plagiarism. Only 16.81% of teachers are of the opinion that the infringement of copyright and plagiarism are the same whereas a significant number i.e., 44.83% do not agree with it. An interesting observation is that 38.36% are not able to decide that the infringement of copyright and plagiarism are the same or different. This finding indicates that a large number of teachers are still confused between issues like copyright and plagiarism and their interrelationship. This opinion suggests that more clarity is required on the issue related to copyright and plagiarism.

In this study, only 51.72% of teachers teaching in higher education institutions are aware of the techniques available to detect plagiarism, and only 46.12% are aware of the ways to avoid plagiarism in academic writings.

Fabrication means generating false data without doing any experiment or filling questionnaires or by false participants, whereas falsification refers to manipulate research materials, equipment, or processes, or change or omit/suppress data or results without scientific or statistical justification, such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. These terms are often misunderstood as plagiarism. When teachers were asked about terms like falsification and fabrication, which also come under academic misconduct, only 28.02% agreed with the statement. Interestingly about 46.98% are undecided about it.

In the light of debates around plagiarism as an ethical issue or a legal issue, participants were asked to respond on the item. According to 28.45% teachers, plagiarism is only an ethical issue, whereas a significant number i.e., 57.76% are undecided on it. Around 54.31% teachers thought that citation may be a solution to avoid plagiarism, whereas only 39.32% considered paraphrasing skills as a solution to it. These findings indicate that a large section of teachers who are still not aware of the ways to avoid it. It reflects that thorough training is essential for teachers in higher education on this issue. The study also reveals that teachers at large feel that the issue of plagiarism is due to the Internet. Around 68.53% agree with the statement in this study, but only 34.48% have faith in tools like Turnitin.

The analysis in Table 2 hints towards the need for continuous efforts for developing awareness and understanding about plagiarism among higher education teachers.

After studying about the awareness on plagiarism, some

specific statements related to various types of plagiarism were given to participants to know the level of understanding of teachers towards various acts, which often come under plagiarism. Twelve (12) statements related to various acts under plagiarism were given to respondents, and they were asked to tick, the act which they consider as plagiarism. Table 3 depicts their responses.

Table 3
Understanding about Various Aspects of Plagiarism

S. No.	Aspect of Plagiarism	Agree with Statement	Percentage
1.	If one copies someone else's work and puts their own name on it.	212	91.38
2.	When one borrows the 'phrases and clauses' from the source and weaves them into his writing.	89	38.36
3.	When one paraphrases or summarises another's work by changing the words a little or using synonyms without citing the source.	176	75.86
4.	If one incorrectly quotes and incorrectly cites a source they are using, like Facebook, etc.	75	32.33
5.	The use of another's exact words without citing the author	154	66.38
6.	Paraphrasing another's words by changing sentence construction or word choice without citation	149	64.22
7.	Submitting a paper without citing or by iwncorrectly citing another's ideas	167	71.98
8.	Submitting a paper that you got off the internet or from a friend for discussion as your own	132	56.90
9.	The use of your previous work for a separate assignment	138	59.48
10.	Using photographs, video/audio from online resources without permission or acknowledgement	152	65.52
11.	Quoting some text from an ancient book (for example, 500 years old)	69	29.74
12.	Using some knowledge, which you heard in any lecture or an academic meeting	61	26.29

On analysing Table 2, it can be said that there is not a single act which comes under plagiarism, which is known to all respondents. There are few statements or acts with which more than 50% of teachers have agreed with statements like copying someone else's work and putting their name on it (91.38%), paraphrasing or summarising other's work by changing the words a little or using synonyms without citing the source (75.86%), using another's exact words without citing the author (66.38%), paraphrasing by changing sentence construction or word choice without citation (64.22%), submitting a paper without citing or with wrong citation of other's ideas (71.98%), submitting a paper that one got from the Internet or from a friend for discussion as their own (56.90%), using one's own previous work for a separate assignment (59.48%), and using photographs, video/audio from online resources without permission or acknowledgement (65.52%).

Whereas the acts like borrowing the 'phrases and clauses' from the original source and weaving them into his own writing (38.36%), incorrectly quoting and/or incorrectly citing a source they are is using, like Facebook, etc., (32.33%), quoting some text from an ancient book (29.74%), and using some knowledge, which someone heard in any lecture or an academic meeting (26.29%), are the lesser known forms of plagiarism to participants.

This finding shows that more common acts under plagiarism are known to a considerable number of the respondents, but less common acts are still not known to many of them. This reveals that participants do not have a sound understanding of various issues and acts, which are covered under plagiarism. This also establishes the need for thorough training and awareness programmes to be conducted at the university as well as at college level.

It has also been observed there are some issues which are under debate among teachers. To know the opinion of teachers on such issues, a rating scale has been created (based on Likert's attitude scale method). Their responses were taken as strongly agree, agree, can't say, disagree and strongly disagree on the statements, which were focussing on the philosophical understanding of plagiarism, some lesser common types of plagiarism like avoiding plagiarism in oral presentations, ways to avoid it and how more awareness can be developed about plagiarism. Issues like keeping plagiarism in research methodology syllabus of colleges and universities; and providing plagiarism detection tools to all colleges and universities were also placed to know the opinion of the participants. Their responses are tabulated in Table 4 and have been analysed statement-wise afterwards.

Table 4
Opinion about Plagiarism Related Issues

S. No.	Plagiarism related Issues	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Can't Say		Agree		Strongly Agree	
1.	It is against the philosophy of spreading knowledge without boundaries.	35.78%	83	21.98%	51	17.24%	40	14.22%	33	10.78%	25
2.	It can also occur in your use of illustrations, maps and tables.	33.62%	78	25.00%	58	7.76%	18	23.28%	54	10.34%	24
3.	It needs to be avoided in an oral presentation.	5.17%	12	17.67%	41	11.21%	26	26.72%	62	39.22%	91
4.	It is about having subjective interpretations.	3.45%	8	13.79%	32	20.69%	48	39.22%	91	22.84%	53
5.	It has brought anxiety and tension among teachers in higher education.	5.17%	12	13.36%	31	17.67%	41	37.07%	86	26.72%	62
6.	It should be controlled under a universal law or international pact or agreement.	1.72%	4	1.29%	3	5.17%	12	48.28%	112	43.53%	101
7.	It can be avoided by organising continuous awareness programmes.	2.59%	6	3.45%	8	4.31%	10	46.98%	109	42.67%	99
8.	It should be a part of the curriculum of research methods courses in universities.	0.00%	0	0.43%	1	0.00%	0	29.74%w	69	69.83%	162

9.	The polgirism detection tools should be available for free or in-open access to individuals.	7.33%	17	5.17%	12	0.00%	0	40.09%	93	47.41%	110
10.	Is it an Internet generated threat among academicians?	9.91%	23	18.53%	43	15.52%	36	33.19%	77	22.84%	53

There is a strong belief in certain sections of academia that there should be no restriction in the dissemination of knowledge and it should be available for all without any restrictions, such as citation, etc. When higher education teachers were asked to give their opinion on this issue, their responses were quite different. As shown in Table 4, only 25% agree or strongly agree with the opinion that plagiarism is against the philosophy of spreading knowledge without boundaries and restrictions. About 35.78% strongly disagreed and 21.98% are disagreed with the statement, whereas a significant portion i.e., 57.76 % of respondents were against this opinion. It reflects that among higher education teachers, opinion is not the same and more awareness and collective understanding needs to be developed.

When respondents' opinion on plagiarism in the use of illustrations, maps, tables were taken, most of them agreed with the statement, as shown above in Table 4, around 33.72% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the opinion that plagiarism is also an issue in the case of illustrations, graphs, maps, tables, etc., but a large section did not agree, with it. It has been observed that teachers typically use quotes, statements, text, and data in classroom teaching or oral presentations without quoting the original contributors. When they were asked to give their opinion on this issue, responses were reflected that 26.72% agreed and 39.22% strongly agreed i.e., around 66% of teachers were of the opinion that plagiarism also needs to be avoided in oral presentations. Though it cannot be challenged easily, it is a matter of academic honesty and ethics. Teachers should develop a habit of quoting the original contributor during oral presentations also, and the same should be promoted among students too.

It is clear from Table 4 that 62.06% teachers support that plagiarism has a subjective interpretation. It has been observed that in some universities 25% similarity is allowed whereas in some cases the threshold limits up to 40%. UGC recommendations allowed 10%, but there is no universal interpretation. Sometimes, the use of different plagiarism detection tools give different results.

Nearly 1/3rd i.e., 63.79% teachers either agree or strongly agree with the statement that due to issues related to plagiarism, anxiety and tension among teachrers may develop. When they were asked about the need of an international/universal pact/ agreement or act to curb the issue of plagiarism, most of them i.e., 91.81% supported it as it affects academic community all over the world.

Teachers were also asked to give their opinion about some remedial issues. When they were asked to give their opinion about the need for continuous awareness programmes about plagiarism, 89.96% supported the role of such programmes in avoiding plagiarism. Around 99.57% i.e., almost all suggested that plagiarism should be an essential part of the curriculum of research methods in all disciplines. Researcher feels that this will deal with the issue of plagiarism in research work or research writing only. Much plagiarism is being detected in assignments, term papers, seminar

presentations, etc. It should also be avoided, and the mechanism of awareness is required to resolve this issue as well. About 87.50% teachers have suggested that the availability of plagiarism detection tools as free or open access tools should be ensured. It is a common observation that commercial tools like iThenticate or Turnitin are charging a lot and due to the high cost, these tools are not accessible to many students, teachers and institutions. In India, UGC has provided facility to use Urkund thorough INFLIBNET freely in libraries of Indian universities, but many universities and their faculty members are still not using it. It reflects the lack of awareness as well as the need to develop a habit among academicians. Almost 56.03% of teachers still considered plagiarism as an Internet generated threat.

To test the null hypotheses H01 and H02, the researcher compared the scores by using t-test. Table 5 is shows the dimension wise t-test scores.

Table 5
Comparison of Scores of College Teachers and University Teachers

S. No.	Dimension	University Teachers (103)		College Teachers (129)		t-test	
		Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	t-scores	Level of Significance
1.	Awareness about Plagiarism	12.54	47.68	10.82	46.40	1.90	N.S.
2.	Understanding of Plagiarism	8.02	15.92	5.79	18.42	4.05*	Significant at 0.05 level

The above analysis highlights that working in a university department or college or mode of data collection are not the factors associated with awareness of teachers regarding plagiarism. Efforts to make teachers aware about plagiarism are required at both the places. The significant difference between understanding of teachers about plagiarism between university and college teachers reflects that the understanding of teachers teaching in university departments is significantly better in various acts which come under plagiarism. To analyse it more, wise statement scores were also compared regarding understanding. Table 6 shows the outcomes:

Table 6
Comparison of Understanding about Various Aspects of Plagiarism

S. No.	Aspect of Plagiarism	University Teachers (103)		College Teachers (129)		t-test	
		Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance	t-scores	Level of Significance
1.	If one copies someone else's work and put their own name on it.	0.88	0.10	0.94	0.06	1.53	N.S.
2.	When one borrows the 'phrases and clauses' from the source and weaves them into own writing.	0.33	0.22	0.45	0.25	1.77	N.S.
3.	When one paraphrases or summarises another's work by changing the words a little or using synonyms without citing the source.	0.71	0.21	0.83	0.15	2.13	Significant at 0.05 level
4.	If one incorrectly quotes and incorrectly cites a source they have used, like Facebook, etc.	0.26	0.20	0.40	0.24	2.19	Significant at 0.05 level

5.	The use of another's exact words without citing the author	0.59	0.24	0.76	0.19	2.72	Significant at 0.05 level
6.	Paraphrasing another's words by changing sentence construction or word choice without citation	0.58	0.25	0.72	0.20	2.18	Significant at 0.05 level
7.	Submitting a paper without citing or by incorrectly citing another's ideas	0.63	0.24	0.83	0.14	3.57	Significant at 0.05 level
8.	Submitting a paper that you got from the internet or from a friend for discussion as your own	0.46	0.25	0.71	0.21	3.95	Significant at 0.05 level
9.	The use of your previous work for a separate assignment	0.42	0.25	0.82	0.15	6.65	Significant at 0.05 level
10.	Using photographs, video /audio from online resources without permission or acknowledgement	0.55	0.25	0.79	0.17	3.86	Significant at 0.05 level
11.	Quoting some wwt from an ancient book (for example, 500 years old)	0.22	0.17	0.40	0.24	3.04	Significant at 0.05 level
12.	Using some knowledge, which you have heard in any lecture or an academic meeting	0.16	0.14	0.39	0.24	3.99	Significant at 0.05 level

t-scores against various aspects of plagiarism in Table 6 indicate that on initial two aspects i.e., copying someone else's work and putting their own name on it and borrowing the 'phrases and clauses' from the source and weaves them into one's own writing, there is no significant difference between understanding of teachers from colleges and university department. These are the most common types of act which come under plagiarism. But on all other aspects like paraphrasing or summarising other's work by changing the words a little or using synonyms without citing the source, using another's exact words without citing the author, paraphrasing by changing sentence construction or word choice without citation, submitting a paper without citing or by incorrectly citing another's ideas, submitting a paper that one got from the Internet or from a friend for discussion as own, using their own previous work for a separate assignment, using photographs, video /audio from online resources without permission or acknowledgement,incorrectly quoting and/or incorrectly citing a source they are using, like Facebook, etc., quoting some text from an ancient book, and using some knowledge, which someone heard in any lecture or an academic meeting, the difference between understanding of teachers teaching in colleges and university department is significant. The tables also show a pattern in mean scores, i.e., mean scores of the teachers from university departments are higher as compared to teachers teaching in colleges. This reflects that understanding of teachers about various aspects of plagiarism in the university department is significantly better than their counterparts in affiliated colleges. In India, more students are learning in colleges and more teachers are teaching there, hence there is a need of an effective mechanism to train teachers on various aspects of plagiarism so that such mall practices can be curbed and good academic discipline can be developed.

DISCUSSION ON THE FINDINGS

Findings of the study suggest that most teachers teaching at higher education level are still not aware about incidents of plagiarism in their discipline or institute, a large number of teachers are still confused between issues like copyright, plagiarism and other related issues and their interrelationship. This study suggests that more clarity is required on the issue related to copyright and plagiarism. For example, when teachers were asked about terms like falsification and fabrication, which also come under academic misconduct, only 28.02% agrees with the statement. Interestingly about 46.98% are undecided about it.

The biggest issue is that a large section of teachers are still not aware of the ways to avoid it. It reflects that thorough training is essential for teachers in higher education on

this issue. The study also reveals that teachers at large feel that issue of plagiarism is due to the Internet. The findings show that more common acts under plagiarism are known to a considerable number of the respondents, but less common acts are still not known to many of them. Study reveals that participants do not have a sound understanding of various issues and acts, which are covered under plagiarism. These findings are basically demanding for a conscious and dedicated efforts to make teachers aware about plagiarism, to train them with the skills required to check it as well as to avoid it. These training and awareness programmes can be conducted at the university as well as at college level. Use of available ICT platform like SYAWAM can be quite handy. A short-term online course can be developed and offered to all teachers across the country through online platforms like SWAYAM.

The study has revealed that teachers typically use quotes, statements, text and data in classroom teaching or oral presentations without quoting the original contributors. Though it cannot be challenged easily, but it is a matter of academic honesty and ethics. Teachers should develop a habit of quoting the original contributor during oral presentations also, and the same should be promoted among students too.

For a long time, there was no uniformity in rules to accept the degree of similarity of content among various universities or institutions, but after notification of UGC regulations, 2018, this issue has been resolved. As suggested by almost all, there is a need to include plagiarism as an essential part of the curriculum of research methods in all disciplines. The researcher feels that this will deal with the issue of plagiarism in research work or research writing only.

Conclusion

The study has shown that though there is general awareness of plagiarism among teachers in higher education, specific inputs are required to make them aware of this burning issue of academic activity. Though teachers understand the common types of plagiarism, they need to be sensitised about the many forms of plagiarism, which they do not consider as plagiarism. Many studies are indicate that no teacher supports plagiarism, but in the absence of proper tools and training they face many challenges. They are also of the opinion that apart from awareness programmes, plagiarism should be made part of the curriculum and academic honesty should be promoted by providing proper training to teachers in colleges and universities. Though University Grants Commission (UGC) has notified its regulations, but there is still a long way to go. There is no proper mechanism to check and control the plagiarism in Hindi and other Indian languages, in which most of the research work takes

place in state universities and regional institutions. It is also very difficult to ensure that the identified plagiarism by any software is actually plagiarism. We have seen a number of instances where plagiarism is being used as a tool for academic rivalry against persons sitting at higher positions either to demotivate them or to stop them for taking any higher position. In many such cases, complaints are found false at latter stage. This raises an alarm for all of us. It is our duty as academician to promote academic integrity as well as to curb mall-practices under the umbrella of plagiarism.

References

American Association of University Professors. 1989. As quoted in Plagiarism, ORI, the Office of Research integrity, Retrieved https://ori.hhs.gov/plagarism-3

Angelil-Carter, S. 2000. *Stolen Language? Plagiarism in Writing.* Harlow. England, Longman.

Ballard, B., and Clanchy, J. 1988. *Literacy in the University: An 'Anthropological' Approach.* Maidenhead. Open University Press, UK.

Ballard, B., and Clanchy, J. 1991. *Teaching Students from Overseas: a Brief Guide for Lecturers and Supervisors.* Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.

Baty, P. 2007. Immature' Students without Basic English Skills. Enrage Uclan Staff. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, March 30, 2007.

Bell, K. 1999. *Plagiarism: Highway Robbery in the Classroom.* Retrieved http://www.camlang.com/sp005print.htm

Brennan, L., and Durovic, J. 2005. Plagiarism and the Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC) Student. Paper presented at the Educational Integrity: Values for Teaching, Learning and Research, 2nd Asia-Pacific Educational Integrity Conference. University of Newcastle. December 2–3, 2005.

Burke, B. 1989. Experiences of Overseas Undergraduate Students. *UNSW Bulletin.* T.q. No. 18.

Carroll, J. 2007. *A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education, 2nd edition. Oxford Brookes University.* Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development, Oxford.

Charubusp. S. 2015. Plagiarism in the Perception of Thai Students and Teachers. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles.* October 2015. Issue, 87.

Clegg, S., and Flint, A. 2006. More Heat than Light: Plagiarism in its Appearing. British *Journal of Sociology of Education.* Vol. 27, No. 3. pp.373–38.

Erlenawati, S. 2005. Language Difficulties of International Students in Australia: The Effects of Prior Learning Experience. *International Education Journal.* Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 567–580.

Henriksson, A-S. 2008. Att Förebygga Plagiat I Studentarbeten – en Pedagogisk Utvecklingsmöjlighet. Uppsala Universitet. Rapport 7 (in Swedish). Available online via http://www.uadm.uu.se/upi/arkiv/rapporter/7Attforebyggaplagiat.pdf.

IRELAND, C. AND ENGLISH, J. 2011. *Let them Plagiarise: Developing Academic Writing in a Safe Environment. Journal of Academic Writing.* Vol. 1, No. 1. pp.165–172.

KOKKINAKI, A. I., DEMOLIOU, C., AND IAKOVIDOU, M. 2015. Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism and Relevant Policies in Cyprus. *International Journal for Educational Integrity.* Vol. 11, No. 3. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-015-0001-7

RAZERA, D. 2011. Awareness, Attitude and Perception of Plagiarism among Students and Teachers at Stockholm University, Master of Science Thesis. Department of Computer and Systems Sciences. Stockholm University/KTH. Retrieved from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:432681/FULLTEXT01.pdf

RAZERA, D., VERHAGEN, H., PARGAMAN, T.C. AND RAMBERG, R. 2010. Plagiarism Awareness, Perception, and Attitudes among Students and Teachers in Swedish Higher Education — A Case Study. Proceedings of the 4th International Plagiarism Conference. Newcastle. UK. June 21–23. Available at: http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/documents/conference2010/papers/4IPC_0069_final.pdf

SINGH, G, BANARJEE, M, GOEL, M. AND KUMAR, M. 2015. Awareness and Understanding of Plagiarism among Higher Education Teachers. Unpublished term paper. 1st orientation programme. HRDC. JNU, New Delhi.

SIVELL, J. 2014. Phrase-Matching Software Can Draw Instructional Attention to a Neglected Aspect of Unintended Plagiarism. 6th International Integrity and Plagiarism Conference. CD ROM: ISBN 978-0-9573115-1-0.

SONGSRIWITTAYA, A., KONGSUWAN, S., JITKARUN, K., KAEWKUEKOOL, S., AND KOUL, R. 2009. Engineering Students' Attitude towards Plagiarism: A Survey Study. International Network for Engineering Education and Research. Retrieved October 25, 2014 from www.ineer.org/events/iceeiceer2009/full_papers/full_paper_212.pdf

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY. 2014. Avoiding Unintentional Plagiarism. Retrieved October 25, 2014, http://grad.msu.edu/researchintegrity/docs/plagiarism_avoiding_unintentional_plagiarism.pdf

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION. 2018. Promotion of Academic Integrity and Prevention of Plagiarism in Higher Educational Institutions Regulations. 2018. The Gazette of India. Extraordinary. Part III, Section 4, No. 287. July 31, 2018

WILKINSON, J. 2009. Staff and Student Perceptions of Plagiarism and Cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.* Vol. 20, No. 2. pp 98–105. Retrieved http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/

WILLIAMS, J.B. 2002. The Plagiarism Problem: Are Students Entirely to Blame? In Williamson, A., Gunn, C., Young, A., and Clear, T. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE).* December 8–11, 2002. Auckland, New Zealand.

YANG, M. AND LIN, J. 2009. The Perception of Referencing and Plagiarism amongst Students coming from Confucian Heritage Cultures. 4th Asia Pacific Conference on Educational Integrity (4APCEI). September 28–30, 2009. University of Wollongong, NSW Austral.

YOUNG, D. 2013. Perspectives on Cheating at a Thai University. Language Testing in Asia, Vol. 3, No. 6. Retrieved August 1, 2014, http://www.languagetestingasia.com/content/3/1/6