Perception on Plagiarism among Faculty Members and Research Scholars in Higher Educational Institutions of Dindigul District: A Study

Sadagopan Dhanavandan*

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

These papers surveyed the respondents' Awareness and perception of Plagiarism among the Faculty members and research scholars of higher educational institutions in Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu. The 500 questionnaires were distributed among the participants, 456 questionnaires were filled and returned for usable by the respondents and remaining not replied. The responses rate is 91.2%. Further among 222 Male respondents, 11.18% of them are having Aware, 10.75% of them in Learning, 10.53% are with Fair and 76(16.23%) of them are Expert. Similarly out of 234 Female respondents, 16.45% of them has No Idea, 7.02% of them have Aware, 10.09% of them in Learning, 8.99% are with Fair and 8.77% of them are Expert.

1. 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 life of a modern library System. In the good old day s librarian are treated as resource supply people who are sharing the knowledge to the needy people. But today the librarian is developing the digital library in their own organization for their own people and for others. They have developed the digital library of their own and collect the different resources through the digital format and store it in their digital library. Today this is one of the most important and primary job of a librarian. To develop this programming knowledge and computer skill is highly required and today the librarians are now they upgraded themselves.

2. Plagiarism

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 has made it easier to plagiarize 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. The act of taking someone else s ideas and passing them off as your own defines the concept of plagiarism . As it is shown by the growing educational concerns, Plagiarism has now become an integral part of our digital lives as technology, with the billions of information it gives us access to, led to the exacerbation of this phenomenon. Plagiarism is the representation of another author s language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions as one s own original work. In educational contexts, there are differing definitions of plagiarism depending on the institution. Plagiarism is considered a violation of academic integrity and a breach of journalistic ethics. It is subject to sanctions such as penalties, suspension, expulsion from school or work, substantial fines.

3. Review of Literature

Moyo (2004) explored new services and delivery modes incorporating: electronic collections, such as e-books, e-journals and databases; virtual reference services, and other online services. Innovation of new services that are peculiar to the online/web environment is the trend in modern electronic libraries. Libraries continue to harness new technologies to offer services in innovative ways to meet the changing needs of their patrons. Dhanavandan, Mohamed Esmail and Sivaraj (2008) are found that the respondents from staff 40.82 percent use the digital resources to collect general knowledge The majority of staff 40.81 per cent learned digital resources training provided by the Librarian. Saini et al. (2016) found that detect Plagiarism as people rephrase the text do not copy it directly. To detect plagiarism apache lucene have been used. Firstly indexing of the original document is done and then used cosine similarity to compare the plagiarized document with set of documents which are there saved previously. Elmunsyah et al. (2018) studied the result of software experts were 91.67% (which had the criteria categorized very feasible to use), small group 91.17% (very suitable to use), a large group 90.39% (very feasible to use). Plagiarism Checker software is very worthy used to test the similarity of scientific papers, because the results obtained above 85%. Jereb et al. (2018) studied awareness of plagiarism and possible gender differences in this awareness are presented. Gender differences in plagiarism awareness were analysed both generally and within several socio-economic contexts. The study was conducted at the University of Maribor in Slovenia. The findings have revealed statistically significant gender differences in students' plagiarism awareness; specifically, women have a much more negative attitude towards plagiarism than men.

Saputro et al. (2020) States the implementation of plagiarism checker in the LMS E-PBL obtain an average unique increase of 8.30%. Thus, the LMS E-PBL based on scientific communication skills and plagiarism checker is feasible to be implemented in learning. This research can contribute

the findings of a website-based-learning LMS platform that is adaptive to problem-based learning and plagiarism checker, so that students can learn in groups independently under the teacher s guidance without doing Plagiarism. Bairmani, Shreeb and Dehham (2021) studied and discovered whether Iraqi EFL College Students are aware of research plagiarism or they are not. The results show that they are unaware of plagiarism because they are not acquainted with the right way of avoiding plagiarism. A t-test has been use to show whether there are differences between males and females, and the result shows no statistical difference. Moreover, a set of conclusions such as students are not acquainted with the right way of documentation because the textbook is relatively old, they don't have enough practical training in writing research paper.

4. Objectives of the Study

1. *To identify Awareness about Plagiarism tools*
2. *To identify the preferred search engines by the respondents*
3. *To assess ways to known about the Plagiarism*
4. *To know the level of experiences in using plagiarism checker*
5. *To find out Awareness about the legal issues about Plagiarism*
6. *To know the present status of Plagiarism among the respondents*

5. Methodology

The survey method was used to investigate the perception and about Plagiarism from faculty members and research scholars in the higher educational institutions in Dindigul District. The questionnaires were constructed and distributed to the higher educational institutions which consist of faculty members and research scholars. The 500 questionnaires were distributed among the participants, 456 questionnaires were filled and returned for usable by the respondents and the remaining did not reply. The responses rate is 91.2%. Based on the collected data, some statistical tools like simple percentage and WAM were used.

6. Analysis of Data and Interpretation

6.1 Distribution of the Questionnaires

This attempt is to find out the Awareness and opinion about Plagiarism among the respondents in their academic and research publications. The distribution sample questionnaires to the respondents are working and pursuing research in the higher educational institutions in Dindigul District, which is shown in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Distribution of the Questionnaires

Sl. No.	Questionnaires Distributed	%	Questionnaires Replied	%
1	500	100.00	456	91.2

The **Table 1** shows the distribution of the questionnaires among respondents, 500 questionnaires were distributed. Among 500, 456 (51.70%) respondents were returned duly filled and the response rate is 91.2%.

6.2 Demographic Details

The demographic details of the respondents were analysed and same has been shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2. Demographical Details of Respondents

Sl. No.	Descriptions	Frequency	Percentage
Type of the Respondents			
1	Faculty	230	50.44
2	Research Scholars	226	49.56
User Domicile			
1	Rural	269	58.99
2	Urban	187	41.01
Gender			
1	Male	222	48.70
2	Female	234	52.30
Age			
1	30 and below	153	33.55
2	31-40	221	48.46
3	41 -50	54	11.84
4	Above 50	28	6.14

The demographic details of the respondents were shown in **Table 2**. Out of 456 respondents, 230 (50.44%) of them Faculty members and 226 (49.56%) of them were Research Scholars. Based on their residing domicile, 269 (58.99%) of them from Rural and 187 (41.01%) of them fromUrban. Out of 456 respondents, 222 (48.70%) were male and 227 (52.30%) were female. Similarly, out of 456 respondents, 153 (33.55%) were 30 and below years age group, followed by 221 (48.46%) were 31-40 years age group, 54 (11.84%) respondents were 41-50 years age group and 28 (6.14%) were above 50 years age group.

6.3 Preferred Search Engines

The search engines preferred by the respondents were analysed. The percentile analysis of major search engines such as Google, Yahoo, MSN, AltaVista and others and the same has been shown in **Table 3**.

Table 3. Preferred Search Engines

Sl. No.	Search Engines	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	Google	372	81.58	1
2	Yahoo	39	8.55	2
3	MSN	17	3.73	4
4	AltaVista	7	1.54	5
5	Others	21	4.61	3
	Total	456	100.00	

Table 3 describes that preferred search engine to access the plagiarism checker tools like both free and commercials, 372 (81.58%) respondents preferred Google search engine, followed by Yahoo search engine with 39 (8.55%), MSN 17 (3.73%), AltaVista 7 (1.54%) and 21 (4.61%) respondents were preferred other search engines like DuckDuckGo, OneSearch, Bing etc. It clearly shows that most of the respondents were preferred Google search engine and lowest number of respondents preferred Alta Vista search engine.

6.4 Preferred Search Engine Vs Demographic Details

The study has further been extended to Institution, User category, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on institution, user category, gender and age were shown in **Table 4**.

Table 4. Preferred Search Engine Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demogr-arphic Details	Google	Yahoo	MSN	Alta Vista	Others	Total	Mean	SD	Sig.
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	211 (46.27)	12 (2.63)	2 (0.44)	1 (0.22)	4 (0.88)	230 (50.44)	1.1522	.61875	0.000
2	Research Scholars	161 (35.31)	27 (5.92)	15 (3.29)	6 (1.32)	17 (3.73)	226 (49.56)	1.6327	1.19725	
Gender										
1	Male	191 (41.89)	10 (2.19)	7 (1.54)	0	14 (3.07)	222 (48.68)	1.3604	1.02717	0.001
2	Female	181 (39.69)	29 (6.36)	10 (2.19)	7 (1.54)	7 (1.54)	234 (51.32)	1.4188	.93331	

Age

No		Google	Yahoo	MSN	Alta Vista	Others	Total	Mean	SD	p
1	Below 30	133 (29.17)	11 (2.41)	3 (0.66)	1 (0.22)	5 (1.1)	153 (33.55)	1.2614	.81734	
2	31-40	194 (42.54)	11 (2.41)	6 (1.32)	1 (0.22)	9 (1.97)	221 (48.46)	1.2805	.88062	0.000
3	41-50	27 (5.92)	11 (2.41)	7 (1.54)	4 (0.88)	5 (1.1)	54 (11.84)	2.0556	1.33765	
4	Above 50	18 (3.95)	6 (1.32)	1 (0.22)	1 (0.22)	2 (0.44)	28 (6.14)	1.6786	1.18801	
Domicile										
1	Rural	232 (50.88)	15 (3.29)	7 (1.54)	2 (0.44)	13 (2.85)	269 (58.99)	1.3234	.94802	0.001
2	Urban	140 (30.7)	24 (5.26)	10 (2.19)	5(1.1)	8 (1.75)	187 (41.01)	1.4866	1.01790	
Total		372 (81.58)	39 (8.55)	39 (8.55)	7 (1.54)	21 (4.61)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

Google becomes a preferred search engine irrespective of User category, Users Domicile, gender and age which is shown in **Table 4**. Among the 230 Faculty members, 211 (46.27%) of them preferred Google followed by Yahoo search engine with 12 (2.63%), MSN 2 (0.44%), Alta Vista 1 (0.88%) and 21 (4.61%) respondents were preferred other search engines. Similarly, 226 research Scholars, 161 (35.31%) of them prefered Google followed by Yahoo search engine with 27 (5.92%), MSN 15 (1.32%), Alta Vista 6 (1.32%) and 17 (3.73%) respondents were preferred other search engines.

Out 222 Male respondents, 191 (41.89%) of them preferred Google followed by Yahoo search engine with 10 (2.19%), MSN 7 (1.54%), and 14 (3.07%) respondents were preferred other search engines. Similarly, the female respondents also preferred Google search engine but when comparing male, they preferred Yahoo search engine.

In the case of age group, the majority of the respondents are in the age group of 31-40 which includes preference of 194 (42.54%) of them preferred Google followed by Yahoo search engine with 11 (2.41%), MSN 6 (1.32%), and 9 (1.97%) respondents were preferred other search engines. It shows almost all the age group of respondents is preferred Google search engine.

In residing domicile wise analysis, 232 (50.88%) of the rural respondents preferred Google followed by Yahoo search engine with 15 (3.29%), but respondents from Urban, they preferred Yahoo search engine.

6.5 Awareness about Plagiarism among Respondents

The study has been analyses the Awareness about plagiarism checking tools among the respondents. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 5**.

Table 5. Awareness about Plagiarism among Respondents

Sl. No.	Level of Awareness	Respondents	Percent	WAM	Std.Dev
1	No idea	75	16.45		
2	Aware	83	18.20		
3	Learning	95	20.83	3.1842	1.41618
4	Fair	89	19.52		
5	Expert	114	25.00		
	Total	456	100.00		

The **Table 5** shows that awareness plagiarism among the respondents. Among 456, 75 (16.45%) of them has No Idea, 83 (18.20%) of them has Aware, 95 (20.83%) of them in Learning, 89 (19.52%) are with Fair and 114 (25.00%) of them are Expert. It clearly shows that the majority of respondents has Awareness about Plagiarism. The overall mean value 3.1842 and deviation of opinion is 1.41618. It can be inferred that the variables lies between Learning and Fair.

6.6 Awareness about Plagiarism Vs Demographic Details

The study has further been extended preferred Awareness about Plagiarism Vs User category, domicile, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 6**.

Table 6. Awareness about Plagiarism Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	No Idea	Aware	Learning	Fair	Expert	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	26 (5.7)	52 (11.4)	57 (12.5)	38 (8.33)	57 (12.5)	230 (50.44)	3.20	1.34	0.000
2	Research Scholars	49 (10.75)	31 (6.8)	38 (8.33)	51 (11.18)	57 (12.5)	226 (49.56)	3.15	1.49	
Gender										
1	Male	0	51 (11.18)	49 (10.75)	48 (10.53)	76 (16.23)	222 (48.68)	3.65	1.16	0.000
2	Female	75 (16.45)	32 (7.02)	46 (10.09)	41 (8.99)	40 (8.77)	234 (51.32)	2.73	1.48	
Age										
1	Below 30	16 (3.51)	28 (6.14)	25 (5.48)	38 (8.33)	46 (10.09)	153 (33.55)	3.45	1.62	
2	31-40	38 (8.33)	35 (7.68)	57 (12.5)	36 (7.89)	55 (12.06)	221 (48.46)	3.15	1.41	0.005

							Total	Mean	SD	
3	41-50	12 (2.63)	11 (2.41)	8 (1.75)	13 (2.85)	10 (2.19)	54 (11.84)	2.96	1.45	
4	Above 50	9 (1.97)	9 (1.97)	5 (1.1)	2 (0.44)	3 (0.66)	28 (6.14)	2.32	1.30	
Domicile										
1	Rural	22 (4.82)	55 (12.06)	60 (13.16)	60 (13.16)	72 (15.79)	269 (58.99)	3.30	1.29	0.000
2	Urban	53 (11.62)	28 (6.14)	35 (7.68)	29 (6.36)	42 (9.21)	187 (41.01)	2.88	1.52	
Total		75 (16.45)	83 (18.2)	95 (20.83)	89 (19.52)	114 (25)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

The **Table 6** shows that awareness plagiarism among the respondents analysis with user category, domicile, gender and age. Among 230 faculty members, 26 (5.7%) of them has No Idea, 52 (11.4%) of them are having Aware, 57 (12.5%) of them in Learning, 38 (8.33%) are with Fair and 57 (12.5%) of them are Expert. Similarly out of 226 research scholars, 49 (10.75%) of them has No Idea, 31 (6.8%) of them are having Aware, 38 (8.33%) of them in Learning, 51 (11.18%) are with Fair and 57 (12.5%) of them are Expert. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.15 and 3.20. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between Learning and Fair. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.34 and 1.49. Further it extended the chi-square test and the values shows the variables are significant.

Further among 222 Male respondents, 51 (11.18%) of them are having Aware, 49 (10.75%) of them in Learning, 48 (10.53%) are with Fair and 76 (16.23%) of them are Expert. Similarly out of 234 Female respondents, 75 (16.45%) of them has No Idea, 32 (7.02%) of them are having Aware, 46 (10.09%) of them in Learning, 41 (8.99%) are with Fair and 40 (8.77%) of them are Expert. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 2.73 and 3.65. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between Aware and Fair. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.16 and 1.48. Further it extended the chi-squre test and the values shows the variables are significant.

In the case age frequency wise analysis, the 221 (49.51%) respondents are from 31-40 Years, which includes 38 (8.33%) of them has No Idea, 35 (7.68%) of them are having Aware, 57 (12.5%) of them in Learning, 36 (7.89%) are with Fair and 55 (12.06%) of them are Expert. It is clearly shows that the lowest of the respondents are under age category of Above 50 years. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 2.96 and 3.45. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between Learning and Fair. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.30 and 1.62. Further it extended the chi-squre test and the values shows the variables are significant.

In the case residing domicile wise analysis, the 269 (49.51%) respondents are from Rural which includes 22 (4.82%) of them has No Idea, 55 (12.06%) of them are having Aware, 60 (13.16%) of them in Learning, 60 (13.16%) are with Fair and 72 (15.79%) of them are Expert. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 2.88 and 3.30. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between Learning and Fair. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.29 and 1.52. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows the variables are significant.

6.7 Experience in using Plagiarism Checking Tools

The respondents' experience in using Plagiarism checking tools was analysed based on the number of years they are using Plagiarism checking tools, 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 plagiarism checking tools and the same has been shown in **Table 7**.

Table 7. Experiences in Using plagiarism checking tools

Sl. No.	Experience	Frequency	Percent	Rank
1	Below one year	59	12.94	3
2	1 and 2 years	55	12.06	4
3	2 and 3 years	80	17.54	2
4	3 and 4 years	35	7.68	5
5	Above four years	227	49.78	1
	Total	456	100.0	

The **Table 7** reveals the experiences in using plagiarism checking tools by the respondents. Out of 456 respondents, 227 (49.78%) respondents have over four years of experience using Plagiarism checking tools for his/her academic work. Followed by 80 (17.54%) respondents are 2 and 3 years, 59 (12.94%) of respondents below one year, 55 (12.06%) of respondents 1 and 2 years, and 35 (7.68%) of respondents are 3 and 4 years experience in using electronics resources.

6.8 Experiences in Using

The study has further been extended to User category, Domicile, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on institution, user category, gender and age were shown in **Table 8**.

Table 8. Experiences in Using Plagiarism checking tools Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	Below one year	1 and 2 years	2 and 3 years	3 and 4 years	Above four years	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	11 (2.41)	6 (1.32)	75 (16.45)	7 (1.54)	131 (28.73)	230 (50.44)	4.04	1.19	0.001
2	Research Scholars	48 (10.53)	49 (10.75)	5 (1.1)	28 (6.14)	96 (21.05)	226 (49.56)	3.33	1.67	
Gender										
1	Male	37 (8.11)	26 (5.7)	35 (7.68)	17 (3.73)	107 (23.46)	222 (48.68)	3.59	1.56	0.024
2	Female	22	29	45	18	120	234	3.79	1.41	

								Mean	SD	Sig.
		(4.82)	(6.36)	(9.87)	(3.95)	(26.32)	(51.32)			
Age										
1	Below 30	27 (5.92)	24 (5.26)	34 (7.46)	9 (1.97)	59 (12.94)	153 (33.55)	3.32	1.54	
2	31-40	23 (5.04)	20 (4.39)	40 (8.77)	11 (2.41)	127 (27.85)	221 (48.46)	3.90	1.43	0.000
3	41-50	7 (1.54)	6 (1.32)	5 (1.1)	12 (2.63)	24 (5.26)	54 (11.84)	3.74	1.45	
4	Above	2 (0.44)	5 (1.1)	1 (0.22)	3 (0.66)	17 (3.73)	28 (6.14)	4.00	1.44	
Domicile										
1	Rural	25 (5.48)	35 (7.68)	61 (13.38)	17 (3.73)	131 (28.73)	269 (58.99)	3.72	1.41	0.001
2	Urban	34 (7.46)	20 (4.39)	19 (4.17)	18 (3.95)	96 (21.05)	187 (41.01)	3.65	1.60	
Total		59 (12.94)	55 (12.06)	80 (17.54)	35 (7.68)	227 (49.78)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

In the case of experience in using electronic resources, it can be seen from **Table 8** that nearly fifty percent of respondents were using Plagiarism checking tools more than four years respondents irrespective of User category, domicile, gender and age.

In the case of user category, among 230 (50.44%) faculty members, 131 (28.73%) respondents use the Plagiarism checking tools more than four years and followed by 2 and 3 years 75 (16.45%); 1 and 2 years 6 (1.32%); below one year 11 (2.41%) and 3 and 4 years 7 (1.54%). The research scholars 21.05 percent of respondents are using Plagiarism checking tools for more than four years and followed by below one year 48 (10.53%); 3 and 4 years 28 (6.14%); 1 and 2 years 49 (10.75%) and 2 and 3 years 5 (1.1%) respondents were used. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.33 and 4.04. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between 3-4 years and Above 4 years. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.19 and 1.67. Further it extended the chi-squre test and the value shows (0.001) the variables are significant.

In case of gender wise analysis, among 222 (48.68%) male respondents, 107 (23.46%) respondents are using the Plagiarism checking tools more than four years and followed by 2 and 3 years 35 (7.68%); 1 and 2 years 26 (5.7%); below one year 37 (8.11%) and 3 and 4 years 17 (3.73%). Similarly, The 234 (51.32%) female respondents are using Plagiarism checking tools for more than four years and followed by below one year 22 (4.82%); 3 and 4 years 18 (3.95%); 1 and 2 years 29 (6.36%) and 2 and 3 years 45 (9.87%) respondents are using. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.59 and 3.79. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between 2-3 years and 3-4 years. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.41 and 1.56. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.024) the variables are insignificant.

In case of age frequency wise analysis, Out of 456 respondents the majority of the respondents are comes under age frequency 31-40 year. Among respondents, 127 (27.85%) respondents are using the Plagiarism checking tools more than four years and followed by 2 and 3 years 40 (8.77%); 1 and 2 years 20 (4.39%); below one year 23 (5.04%) and 3 and 4 years 11 (2.41%). Similarly, majority of the respondents are using experiences in plagiarism checking tools with all the age groups. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.32 and 4.00. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between 2-3 years and 3-4 years. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.44 and 1.54. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

In case of residing domicile wise analysis, Out of 456 respondents more than 58 percent of the respondents are residing in Rural. Among respondents, 131 (28.73%) respondents are using the Plagiarism checking tools more than four years and followed by 2 and 3 years 61 (13.38%); 1and 2 years 35 (7.68%); below one year 25 (5.48%) and 3 and 4 years 17 (3.73%). Similarly, majority of the respondents from Urban using plagiarism checking tools with more than four years. The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.65 and 3.72. It can be inferred that all the variables lies between 2-3 years and 3-4 years. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.41 and 1.60. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.001) the variables are significant.

6.9 How to know about Plagiarism

The respondent's knowledge about Plagiarism was obtained using the variable such as website, seminar/conference/workshop, a professional forum, library professional, research supervisor and friends and colleagues. The same has been analysed. The frequency and percentile analysis were shown in **Table 9**.

Table 9. How to Know About Plagiarism

S.No.	Particulars	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1	Website	110	24.12	2
2	Seminar/Conference/Workshop	77	16.89	3
3	Professional forum	45	9.87	5
4	Library Professionals	130	28.51	1
5	Research Supervisor	37	8.11	6
6	Friends and Colleagues	57	12.50	4
	Total	456	100.00	

Above **table 9** shows that how the respondents known about Plagiarism. Out of 456 respondents, most of the respondents are know about Plagiarism through Library professionals, with 130 (28.51%), followed by 110 (24.12%) of respondents through Websites, 77 (16.89%) respondents through Seminars,

conferences and workshop. This table also revealed that 57 (12.50%) of respondents know about open access through His/her friends and colleagues, 45 (9.87%) of respondents from their Professional forum, and 37 (8.11%) of respondents are known about open access resources through their Research supervisor. It is pointed out that the majority of the respondents are known about the Plagiarism by Library professionals only.

6.10 How to Know About Plagiarism Vs Demographic Details

The study has further been extended to Institution, User category, Gender, and Age. The respondent known about open access resources based on institution, user category, gender, and age were shown in **Table 10**.

Table 10. Preferred Search Engine Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	Website	Seminar/ Conference/ Workshop	Professional Forum	Library Professionals	Research Supervisor	Friends & Colleagues	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents											
1	Faculty	60 (13.16)	45 (9.87)	8 (1.75)	80 (17.54)	8 (1.75)	29 (6.36)	230 (50.44)	3.07	1.69	
2	Research Scholars	50 (10.96)	32 (7.02)	37 (8.11)	50 (10.96)	29 (6.36)	28 (6.14)	226 (49.56)	3.26	1.67	0.001
Gender											
1	Male	45 (9.87)	46 (10.09)	28 (6.14)	51 (11.18)	19 (4.17)	33 (7.24)	222 (48.68)	3.23	1.69	
2	Female	65 (14.25)	31 (6.8)	17 (3.73)	79 (17.32)	18 (3.95)	24 (5.26)	234 (51.32)	3.11	1.67	0.006
Age											
1	Below 30	33 (7.24)	29 (6.36)	7 (1.54)	57 (12.5)	14 (3.07)	13 (2.85)	153 (33.55)	3.18	1.59	
2	31-40	58 (12.72)	35 (7.68)	25 (5.48)	57 (12.5)	14 (3.07)	32 (7.02)	221 (48.46)	3.13	1.73	
3	41-50	14 (3.07)	8 (1.75)	11 (2.41)	9 (1.97)	9 (1.97)	3 (0.66)	54 (11.84)	3.00	1.60	0.000
4	Above	5 (1.1)	5 (1.1)	2 (0.44)	7 (1.54)	0	9 (1.97)	28 (6.14)	3.67	1.92	
Domicile											
1	Rural	69 (15.13)	50 (10.96)	23 (5.04)	83 (18.2)	10 (2.19)	34 (7.46)	269 (58.99)	3.06	1.67	
2	Urban	41 (8.99)	27 (5.92)	22 (4.82)	47 (10.31)	27 (5.92)	23 (5.04)	187 (41.01)	3.32	1.69	0.001
Total		110 (24.12)	77 (16.89)	45 (9.87)	130 (28.51)	3 7(8.11)	57 (12.5)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

In the case of way to known the Plagiarism, it can be seen from **Table 10** that majority of the respondents known about Plagiarism through the library professionals by irrespective of, User category, Gender and Age.

In the case of user category, among 230 (50.44%) faculty members, 80 (17.54%) respondents

use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 60 (13.16%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 45 (9.87%); Professionals Forum 8 (1.75%); Research Supervisor 8 (1.75%) and Friends & Colleagues 29 (6.36%). The research scholars 50 (10.96%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 50 (10.96%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 32 (7.02%); Professionals Forum 37 (8.11%); Research Supervisor 29 (6.36%) and Friends & Colleagues 28 (6.14%). The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.07 and 3.26. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known about Plagiarism by Library Professionals. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.67 and 1.69. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.001) the variables are significant.

In case of gender wise analysis, among 222 (48.68%) male respondents, 51 (11.18%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 45 (9.87%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 46 (10.09%); Professionals Forum 28 (6.14%); Research Supervisor 19 (4.17%) and Friends & Colleagues 33 (7.24%). The Female, 79 (17.32%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 65 (14.25%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 31 (6.8%); Professionals Forum 17 (3.73%); Research Supervisor 18 (3.95%) and Friends & Colleagues 24 (5.26%). The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.11 and 3.23. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known about Plagiarism by Library Professionals. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.67 and 1.69. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.006) the variables are significant.

In case of age frequency wise analysis, Out of 456 respondents the majority of the respondents are comes under age frequency 31-40 year. Among respondents, 57 (12.5%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 58 (12.72%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 35 (7.68%); Professionals Forum 25 (5.48%); Research Supervisor 14 (3.07%) and Friends & Colleagues 32 (7.02%). The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.00 and 3.67. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known about Plagiarism by Library Professionals. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.59 and 1.73. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

In case of residing domicile wise analysis, among 269 (58.99%) Rural respondents, 83 (18.2%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 69 (15.13%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 50 (10.96%); Professionals Forum 23 (5.04%); Research Supervisor 10 (2.19%) and Friends & Colleagues 34 (7.46%). The Urban respondents, 47 (10.31%) respondents use the plagiarism checking tools by Library Professionals and followed by Websites 41 (8.99%); Seminars/Conference/Workshop 27 (5.92%); Professionals Forum 22 (4.82%); Research Supervisor 10 (2.19%) and Friends & Colleagues 34 (7.46%). The mean value for all the variables ranges between 3.06 and 3.32. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known about Plagiarism by Library Professionals. The deviation of opinion ranges between 1.67 and 1.69. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.001) the variables are significant.

6.11 Level of Awareness on Legal Problems among Respondents

The study has been analyses the Level of Awareness on Legal Problems among the respondents.

S. Dhanavandan

The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 11**.

Table 11. Level of Awareness on Legal Problems among Respondents

Sl. No.	Level of Awareness on Legal Problems	Respondents	Percent	WAM	Std. Dev
1	Not aware	16	3.51		
2	Marginally	17	3.73		
3	Moderately	42	9.21	4.2061	0.99738
4	Substantially	163	35.75		
5	Completely	218	47.81		
	Total	456	100.00		

The **Table 11** shows that Level of Awareness on Legal Problems while using Plagiarism among the respondents. Among 456, 16 (3.515%) of them has Not aware, 17 (3.73%) of them has Marginally, 42 (9.21%) of them in Moderately, 163 (35.75%) are with Substantially and 218 (47.81%) of them are aware Completely. It clearly shows that the majority of respondents have Awareness on legal problems about Plagiarism. The overall mean value 4.2061 and deviation of opinion is 0.99738. It can be inferred that the variables lies between Substantially and Completely.

6.12 Level of Awareness on Legal Problems Vs Demographic Details

The study has further been extended level awareness on legal problems about Plagiarism Vs User category, domicile, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 12**.

Table 12. Level of Awareness on Legal Problems Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	Not aware	Marginally	Moderately	Substantially	Completely	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	10 (2.19)	14 (3.07)	11 (2.41)	70 (15.35)	125 (27.41)	230 (50.44)	4.24	1.084	0.000
2	Research Scholars	6 (1.32)	3 (0.66)	31 (6.8)	93 (20.39)	93 (20.39)	226 (49.56)	4.16	0.90	
Gender										
1	Male	12 (2.63)	16 (3.51)	22 (4.82)	60 (13.16)	112 (24.56)	222 (48.68)	4.09	1.17	0.000
2	Female	4 (0.88)	1 (0.22)	20 (4.39)	103 (22.59)	106 (23.25)	234 (51.32)	4.30	0.78	
Age										
1	Below 30	2 (0.44)	10 (2.19)	10 (2.19)	35 (7.68)	96 (21.05)	153 (33.55)	4.39	0.96	
2	31-40	8 (1.75)	4 (0.88)	17 (3.73)	99 (21.71)	93 (20.39)	221 (48.46)	4.19	0.92	

3	41-50	6 (1.32)	3 (0.66)	9 (1.97)	24 (5.26)	12 (2.63)	54 (11.84)	3.61	1.21	0.005
4	Above 50	0(0)	0	6 (1.32)	5 (1.1)	17 (3.73)	28 (6.14)	4.39	0.83	
Domicile									
1	Rural	10 (2.19)	15 (3.29)	17 (3.73)	90 (19.74)	137 (30.04)	269 (58.99)	4.22	1.04	0.000
2	Urban	6 (1.32)	2 (0.44)	25 (5.48)	73 (16.01)	81 (17.76)	187 (41.01)	4.18	0.93	
	Total	16 (3.51)	17 (3.73)	42 (9.21)	163 (35.75)	218 (47.81)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

In the case of user category, among 230 (50.44%) faculty members, 10 (2.19%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 14 (3.07%) of them aware Marginally 11 (2.41%) of them aware Moderately 70 (15.35%) of them aware Substantially and 125 (27.41%) of them aware Completely. among 230 (50.44%) Research Scholars, 6 (1.32%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 3 (0.66%) of them aware Marginally 31 (6.8%) of them aware Moderately 93 (20.39%) of them aware Substantially and 93 (20.39%) of them aware Completely. The mean values lies between 4.09 to 4.30. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism with Substantially. The deviation of opinion ranges between 0.78 and 1.17. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

In the gender wise analysis among 222 (48.68%) Male respondents, 12 (2.63%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 16 (3.51%) of them aware Marginally 22 (4.82%) of them aware Moderately 60 (13.16%) of them aware Substantially and 112 (24.56%) of them aware Completely. among 234 (51.32%) Female, 4 (0.88%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 1 (0.22%) of them aware Marginally 20 (4.39%) of them aware Moderately 103 (22.59%) of them aware Substantially and 106 (23.25%) of them aware Completely. The mean values lies between 4.09 to 4.30. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism with Substantially. The deviation of opinion ranges between 0.78 and 1.17. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

In case of age frequency wise analysis, Out of 456 respondents the majority of the respondents are comes under age frequency 31-40 year. Among 221 (48.68%) respondents, 8 (1.75%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 4 (0.88%) of them aware Marginally 17 (3.73%) of them aware Moderately 99 (21.71%) of them aware Substantially and 93 (20.39%) of them aware Completely. The mean values lies between 3.61 to 4.39. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism with Substantially. The deviation of opinion ranges between 0.83 and 1.21. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.005) the variables are

significant.

In the residing domicile wise analysis among 269 (58.99%) Rural respondents, 10 (2.19%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 15 (3.29%) of them aware Marginally 17 (3.73%) of them aware Moderately 90 (19.74%) of them aware Substantially and 137 (30.04%) of them aware Completely. Among 187 (41.01%) respondents from Urban, 6 (1.32%) respondents level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism by Not Aware and followed by 2 (0.44%) of them aware Marginally 25 (5.48%) of them aware Moderately 73 (16.01%) of them aware Substantially and 81 (17.76%) of them aware Completely. The mean values lies between 4.18 to 4.22. It can be inferred that majority of respondents known level of Awareness on legal problems while using Plagiarism with Substantially. The deviation of opinion ranges between 0.93 and 1.04. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

6.13 Perception on Plagiarism among Respondents

The study has been analyses the perceptions on Plagiarism among the respondents. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 13**.

Table 13. Perception on Plagiarism among Respondents

Sl. No.	Perceptions	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total	WAM	Std. Dev
1	I have heard about it	1(0.22)	5(1.1)	0(0)	9(1.97)	13(2.85)	28(6.14)		
2	I am new to use	6(1.32)	24(5.26)	9(1.97)	50(10.96)	12(2.63)	101(22.15)		
3	I have used Plagiarism checker	5(1.1)	28(6.14)	32(7.02)	66(14.47)	97(21.27)	228(50)		
4	I know the level of similarity	0(0)	7(1.54)	16(3.51)	6(1.32)	15(3.29)	44(9.65)	2.9934	1.02387
5	I know the UGC guidelines	2(0.44)	17(3.73)	10(2.19)	19(4.17)	7(1.54)	55(12.06)		
	Total	14(3.07)	81(17.76)	67(14.69)	150(32.89)	144(31.58)	456(100)		

The **Table 13** shows that perceptions on Plagiarism among the respondents. Among 28 (6.14%) of them replied as I have heard about it, which includes 1 (0.22%) of them has Strongly Disagree, 5 (3.73%) of them has Disagree, 9 (1.97%) of them Agree, and 13 (2.85%) are Strongly Agree. Similarly the majority of the respondents, 228 (50%) of them replied as I have used Plagiarism checker which includes 5 (1.1%) of them has Strongly Disagree, 28 (6.14%) of them has Disagree, 32 (7.02%) of them states No Opinion, 66 (14.47%) of them Agree, and 97 (21.27%) are Strongly Agree. The mean value shows 2.9934 and the deviation is 1.02387. It clearly shows above the fifty percent of the respondents are agreed in their perception of Plagiarism.

6.14 Level of Awareness on Legal Problems Vs Demographic Details

The study has further been extended level awareness on legal problems about Plagiarism Vs

User category, domicile, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 14**.

Table 14. Level of Awareness on Legal Problems Vs Demographic Details

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	I have heard about it	I am new to access	I have used Plagiarism checker	I know the level of similarity	I know the UGC guidelines	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	17 (3.73)	48 (10.53)	123 (26.97)	20 (4.39)	22 (4.82)	230 (50.44)	2.40	1.16	0.120
2	Research Scholars	11 (2.41)	53 (11.62)	105 (23.03)	24 (5.26)	33 (7.24)	226 (49.56)	2.39	1.16	
Gender										
1	Male	19 (4.17)	55 (12.06)	105 (23.03)	20 (4.39)	23 (5.04)	222 (48.68)	2.32	1.16	0.241
2	Female	9 (1.97)	46 (10.09)	123 (26.97)	24 (5.26)	32 (7.02)	234 (51.32)	2.46	1.16	
Age										
1	Below 30	9 (1.97)	18 (3.95)	99 (21.71)	12 (2.63)	15 (3.29)	153 (33.55)	2.59	1.26	
2	31-40	16 (3.51)	61 (13.38)	96 (21.05)	17 (3.73)	31 (6.8)	221 (48.46)	2.39	1.06	0.000
3	41-50	3 (0.66)	14 (3.07)	22 (4.82)	12 (2.63)	3 (0.66)	54 (11.84)	1.75	.90	
4	Above 50	0	8 (1.75)	11 (2.41)	3 (0.66)	6 (1.32)	28 (6.14)	2.57	1.34	
Domicile										
1	Rural	18 (3.95)	67 (14.69)	139 (30.48)	21 (4.61)	24 (5.26)	269 (58.99)	2.43	1.12	0.031
2	Urban	10 (2.19)	34 (7.46)	89 (19.52)	23 (5.04)	31 (6.8)	187 (41.01)	2.39	1.21	
Total		28 (6.14)	101 (22.15)	228 (50)	44 9.65)	55 (12.06)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

In the case of user category, among 230 (50.44%) faculty members were responded towards the perception of Plagiarism, 17 (3.73%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 48 (10.53%) of them I am new to use, 123 (26.97%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 30 (4.39%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 22 (4.82%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. Among 226 (49.56%) Research Scholars, 11 (2.41%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 53 (11.62%) of them I am new to use, 105 (23.03%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 24 (5.26%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 33 (7.24%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. The mean values lies between 2.33 to 2.40 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 1.16 and 1.16. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.120) the variables are insignificant.

In the gender wise analysis, among 222 (50.44%) Male were responded towards the perception of Plagiarism, 19 (4.17%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 55 (12.06%) of them I am new to use, 105 (23.03%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 20 (4.39%) of them

stated I know the level of similarity, 23 (5.04%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. Among 226 (49.56%) Female, 9(1.97%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 46 (10.09%) of them I am new to use, 123 (26.97%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 24 (5.26%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 32 (7.02%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. The mean values lies between 2.32 to 2.46 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 1.16 and 1.16. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.241) the variables are insignificant.

In the age frequency wise analysis, majority of the respondents are in the age group of 31-40 year. Among 221 (48.46%) Male were responded towards the perception of Plagiarism, 16 (3.51%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 61 (13.38%) of them I am new to use, 96 (21.05%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 17 (3.73%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 31 (6.8%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. Among 153 (33.55%) in the age of Below 30 which includes 9 (1.97%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 18 (3.95%) of them I am new to use, 99 (21.71%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 12 (2.63%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 15 (3.29%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. The mean values lies between 1.75 to 2.59 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 0.90 and 1.34. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

In the residing domicile wise analysis, among 269 (58.99%) respondents from Rural were responded towards the perception of Plagiarism, 18 (3.95%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 67 (14.69%) of them I am new to use, 139 (30.48%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 21 (4.61%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 24 (5.26%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. Among 187 (41.01%) respondents from Urban, 10 (2.19%) of them stated I have heard about it and followed by 34 (7.46%) of them I am new to use, 89 (19.52%) stated I have used plagiarism checker, 23 (5.04%) of them stated I know the level of similarity, 31 (6.8%) stated I know the UGC guidelines. The mean values lies between 2.39 to 2.43 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 1.12 and 1.21. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.031) the variables are insignificant.

6.15 Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication

The study has been analyses the level of the confident of Plagiarism among the respondents. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 15**.

Table 15. Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication

Sl.No.	Status	Respondents	Percent	WAM	Std.Dev
1	Strongly Disagree	26	5.70		
2	Disagree	16	3.51		
3	Neutral	105	23.03	3.7500	1.02228
4	Agree	208	45.61		
5	Strongly agree	101	22.15		

Total	456	100.00

The **table 15** shows that the Plagiarism Checker always Ensure faster of Publications opinion and statement by the respondents. Out of 456, 26 (5.70%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 16 (3.51%) of them has Disagree, 105 (23.03%) of them in Neutral, 208 (45.61%) of them Agree, and 101 (22.15%) are Strongly Agree. The mean value shows 3.7500 and the deviation is 1.02228. It clearly shows nearly seventy percent of the respondents are agreed the plagiarism checker is ensure faster of Publications based on the opinion and statement by the respondents.

6.16 Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication

The study has further been extended level of the confident of plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication Vs User category, domicile, Gender and Age. The respondent opinion based on their preferences which is shown in **Table 16**.

Table 16. Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication

Sl. No.	Demographic Details	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	Mean	SD	Sig
Type of Respondents										
1	Faculty	14 (3.07)	10 (2.19)	61 (13.38)	87 (19.08)	58 (12.72)	230 (50.44)	3.71	1.07	0.020
2	Research Scholars	12 (2.63)	6 (1.32)	44 (9.65)	121 (26.54)	43 (9.43)	226 (49.56)	3.78	0.96	
Gender										
1	Male	18 (3.95)	10 (2.19)	37 (8.11)	105 (23.03)	52 (11.4)	222 (48.68)	3.73	1.11	
2	Female	8 (1.75)	6 (1.32)	68 (14.91)	103 (22.59)	49 (10.75)	234 (51.32)	3.76	0.92	0.010
Age Frequency										
1	Below 30	19 (4.17)	0	46 (10.09)	60 (13.16)	28 (6.14)	153 (33.55)	3.50	1.17	
2	31-40	0	16 (3.51)	47 (10.31)	105 (23.03)	53 (11.62)	221 (48.46)	3.88	0.85	0.000
3	41-50	6 (1.32)	0	5 (1.1)	29 (6.36)	14 (3.07)	54 (11.84)	3.83	1.16	
4	Above 50	1 (0.22)	0	7 (1.54)	14 (3.07)	6 (1.32)	28 (6.14)	3.85	0.89	
Domicile										
1	Rural	19 (4.17)	13 (2.85)	66 (14.47)	108 (23.68)	63 (13.82)	269 (58.99)	3.68	1.11	0.029
2	Urban	7 (1.54)	3 (0.66)	39 (8.55)	100 (21.93)	38 (8.33)	187 (41.01)	3.85	0.89	
Total		26 (5.7)	16 (3.51)	105 (23.03)	208 (45.61)	101 (22.15)	456 (100)			

(Figures in the parentheses denote percentage)

In the case of user category, among 230 (50.44%) faculty members were responded towards the Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication, 14 (3.07%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree,

10 (2.19%) of them has Disagree, 61 (13.38%) of them in Neutral, 87 (19.08%) of them Agree, and 58 (12.72%) are Strongly Agree. Among 226 (49.56%) research scholars responded, 12 (2.63%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 6 (1.32%) of them has Disagree, 44 (9.65%) of them in Neutral, 121 (26.54%) of them Agree, and 43 (9.43%) are Strongly Agree. The mean values lies between 3.71 to 3.78 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 0.96 and 1.07. It clearly shows nearly seventy percent of the respondents are agreed the plagiarism checker will ensure the faster of Publications based on the opinion and statement by the respondents. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.020) the variables are significant.

The gender wise analysis among 222 (48.68%) Male respondents were responded towards the Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication, 18 (3.95%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 10 (2.19%) of them has Disagree, 37 (8.11%) of them in Neutral, 105 (23.03%) of them Agree, and 52 (11.4%) are Strongly Agree. Among 234 (50.44%) Female responded, 8 (1.75%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 6 (1.32%) of them has Disagree, 68 (14.91%) of them in Neutral, 103 (22.59%) of them Agree, and 49 (10.75%) are Strongly Agree. The mean values lies between 3.73 to 3.76 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 0.92 and 1.11. It clearly shows majority of the respondents are agreed the plagiarism checker will ensure the faster of Publications. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.010) the variables are significant.

In the age frequency wise analysis, majority of the respondents are in the age group of 31-40 year. Among 221 (48.46%) Male were responded towards the Plagiarism Checker Ensure the faster of Publication, 16 (3.51%) of them has Disagree, 47 (10.31%) of them in Neutral, 105 (23.03%) of them Agree, and 53 (11.62%) are Strongly Agree. Among 153 (33.55%) respondents in the age group Below 30year which includes, 19 (4.17%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 46 (10.09%) of them in Neutral, 60 (13.16%) of them Agree, and 28 (6.14%) are Strongly Agree. The mean values lies between 3.50 to 3.88 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 0.85 and 1.17. It clearly shows majority of the respondents are agreed the plagiarism checker will ensure the faster of Publications. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.000) the variables are significant.

The respondents domicile wise analysis, among 269 (58.99%) rural respondents were responded towards the Plagiarism Checker Ensure faster of Publication, 19 (4.17%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 13 (2.85%) of them has Disagree, 66 (14.47%) of them in Neutral, 108 (23.68%) of them Agree, and 63 (13.82%) are Strongly Agree. Among 234 (50.44%) respondents from Urban responded, 7 (1.54%) of them replied as Strongly Disagree, 3 (0.66%) of them has Disagree, 39 (8.55%) of them in Neutral, 100 (21.93%) of them Agree, and 38 (8.33%) are Strongly Agree. The mean values lies between 3.68 to 3.85 and the deviation of opinion ranges between 0.92 and 1.11. It clearly shows majority of the respondents are agreed the plagiarism checker will ensure the faster of Publications. Further it extended the chi-square test and the value shows (0.029) the variables are significant.

7. Conclusion

Nowadays the Plagiarism is major issue in the academic environment especially on research publications. Plagiarism allegations can cause a student to be suspended or expelled. Their academic record can reflect the ethics offense, possibly causing the student to be barred from higher educational institutions take plagiarism very seriously. It helps to improve the quality of the article as well as the research work. Presently many plagiarism tools are available in the form of commercialized and open access. Many higher educational institutions are more concentrating in this aspect to improve the citations of the institute. Currently, the plagiarism checker mostly used by the user communities and research scholars in academic institutions are before going submit their thesis or publishing the research output. The anti-plagiarism tools and services are very helpful to meet user needs and requirements in very faster manner. The library professionals are most key player to explore issues and consequences of Plagiarism. So, the Library professionals are must create the Awareness about copyrights and anti-plagiarism importance for the quality research output.

References

Bairmani, H. K., Shreeb, M. A., & Dehham, S. H. (2021). Iraqi EFL college students' awareness of plagiarism. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(4), 2123-2133. doi:10.52462/jlls.153

Dhanavandan, S., Mohamed Esmail, S., & Sivaraj, S. (2008). Use of digital resources among Engineering Professionals in Cuddalore District, Tamil Nadu. *Indian Journal of Information Science and Services, 3*(1), 36-41.

Elmunsyah, H., Suswanto, H., Asfani, K., & Hidayat, W. (2018). The effectiveness of plagiarism checker implementation in scientific writing for vocational high school. *International Conference on Indonesian Technical Vocational Education and Association, 201,* 192-196. doi:10.2991/aptekindo-18.2018.42

Jereb, E., Urh, M., Jerebic, J., & Šprajc, P. (2018). Gender differences and the awareness of plagiarism in higher education. *Soc Psychol Educ 21,* 409−426. doi:10.1007/s11218-017-9421-y

Moyo, L. M. (2004). Electronic libraries and the emergence of new service paradigms. *The Electronic Library, 22*(3), 220-230. doi:10.1108/02640470410541615

Saini, A., Bahl, A., Kumari, S., & Singh, M. (2016). Plagiarism checker: text mining. *International Journal of Computer Applications, 134*(3), 8-11. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.736.5088&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Saputro, B., Saerozi, M., Siswanta, J., Siswanto, J., & Susilowati, A. T. (2020). Validation of Learning Management System (LMS) of E-Problem-Based Learning Based on Scientific Communication Skill and Plagiarism Checker. *Technology Reports of Kansai University, 62*(6), 3097-3113. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Budiyono-Saputro/publication/343280787_Validation_of_Learning_Management_System_LMS_of_E-Problem-Based_Learning_Based_on_Scientific_Communication_Skill_and_Plagiarism_Checker/links/5f2128f9a6fdcc9626

bc99fa/Validation-of-Learning-Management-System-LMS-of-E-Problem-Based-Learning-Ba
sed-on-Scientific-Communication-Skill-and-Plagiarism-Checker.pdf

[About the authors]

Dr. S. Dhanavandan is working as Deputy Librarian, Central Library at Central University of Tamil Nadu, Thiruvarur-610005, Before joining in CUTN, he served as University Assistant Librarian at 'The Gandhigram Rural Institute – Deemed University', Gandhigram – 624 302, He has completed M.A. B.Ed., (Economics) DLL & AL., (Law), M.L.I.S, M.Phil, and Ph.D (LIS) in Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar. He is having more than twenty one years in the Library and Information Science profession. Six Ph.D degrees were awarded under his guidance. He has published more than 140 articles in National and International Journals and more than 155 papers presented and published in National and International Conferences. He authored more than 35 books in Library and Information Science and 60 Chapters in edited books. He has attended more than 60 Seminars/Workshops and training programmes.. He served as Chairperson and Resource Person in many workshops, conferences and also organized fourteen workshops and conferences. He has adjudicated Ten Ph.D theses.