CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Major Findings

Concerning the objectives of the study, the following key findings have been discussed as follows:

Objective 1: "To study the level of awareness about plagiarism and use of anti-plagiarism methods among the faculty members, research scholars and PG students."

1. Table 5.15 shows the awareness of Faculty members, Research scholars and PG students regarding the concept of Plagiarism. It is inferred from the above table (5.14) that moreover 270 (80.36%) respondents select yes and 66 (19.64%) select no regarding the awareness of plagiarism. Thus it can be stated that that the Faculty members and Research scholars are more aware about the concept of plagiarism as compared to PG students

2. Table 5.16 shows that Means of familiarizing the term 'plagiarism' among the Faculty members, Research scholars and PG Students. It can be inferred from the table that 270 (80.36%) means of familiarizing the term 'Plagiarism' and 66 (19.64%) are not familiar with the term 'plagiarism'.

3. Table 5.20 states the Awareness of Commercial Anti-plagiarism Tools among the respondents. Moreover 213 (63.39%) respondents are aware of Commercial Anti-Plagiarism Tools and 123(36.61%) respondents are unaware of it.

4. Table no. 5.21 shows Awareness of freely available Plagiarism Detection Tools among faculty members, Research scholar and PG Students. Moreover, 209 (62.20%) respondents are aware of free Plagiarism Detection Tools and 127 (37.80%) respondents are unaware of it. Thus it is seen that Faculty members, Research scholars are more aware about freely available plagiarism detection tools like Quillbot, Plagiarism checker, SmallSEOtools, Viper, PaperRater and Dustball respectively as compared to PG Students.

Therefore, it can be concluded that in comparison to PG students, faculty members and research scientists are more familiar with the concept of plagiarism and anti-plagiarism techniques.

Objective 2: "To study the role of library authority in creating awareness about plagiarism through information literacy programmes."

5. Table 5.9 defines whether the Library authority host any information literacy programmes for the users to promote awareness about plagiarism within the Institution. It can be observed that all the institutions CU, GU, DU, AWU and MU promotes awareness about plagiarism through seminars, workshops and presentations in the classroom.

6. Table 5.10 discusses the frequency of Information Literacy Programmes host by the library authority. As seen from the table we can easily observe that though every university tries to host different literacy programmes yearly basis but CU and GU try to conduct different literacy programmes on frequently mode like Half-yearly and students request too.

Objective 3: "To identify the tools and techniques used by the faculty members, research scholars and PG students to avoid plagiarism."

7. Table 5.17 shows the awareness of Academic Writing Practices followed by the respondents to curb plagiarism. It is observed that 149 (44.35%) respondents are aware and 187 (55.65%) respondents are not aware of the availability of Ethical Academic Writing Practices.

8. Table 5.18 shows the awareness of Citation Format while providing references by the respondents. It is clear from the table that 253 (75.30%) respondents are use citation style and 83 (24.70%) respondents are not familiar with citation style while providing references.

9. Table 5.19 states the Awareness regarding the Reference Management Tools among the respondents. From the above table it is observed that 48 (51.06%) Faculty members are aware and 46 (48.94%) are unaware, 65(49.24%) Research scholars are aware and 67 (50.76%) Research scholars are unaware, again 48 (43.64%) PG Students are aware and 62 (56.36%) PG Students are unaware about Reference Management tools. Moreover it is seen that 161 (47.92%) respondents are aware and 175 (52.08%) respondents are unaware about Reference Management Tools.

Objective 4: "To study the role and efforts of University Libraries and Library Professionals to curb plagiarism."

10. Table 5.2 discusses the availability of the separate section/unit for plagiarism detection in the institutions. It is observed that there is no separate unit or technical person is involved to detect plagiarism in the institutions under study.

11. Table 5.3 tangibly highlights that CU, GU, DU and MU used Urkund (Ouriginal) as their Plagiarism detection software to detect plagiarism. It is evident from the table that only AWU does not use any plagiarism detection software.

12. Table 5.8 discusses the corrective services provided to the users in cases of excessive similarity found by the institutions during submission. As seen from the table Peer reviewing, proper referencing and citation is done by CU, GU, DU, AWU and MU before submission the subject content to the institution while Language editing is done by CU, GU, DU, MU except AWU.

Objective 5: "To give recommendations for creating awareness about plagiarism and preventing strategies."

13. Table 5.4 analyses whether the institutions or library provide information about plagiarism and copyright issues on the website. From the table, it is observed that CU, GU and DU only provide information about Research ethics on the website while AWU and MU didn't provide any information about plagiarism on the website.

14. The steps taken by university libraries to prevent plagiarism are listed in Table 5.5. As seen in the table, only the CU library tick 'yes' to every service listed under the table. The CU also gives unique IDs to the researchers for self-checking plagiarism detection software, which helps to reduce plagiarism. Again, GU, DU, AWU and MU adhere to the UGC norms for the promotion of academic integrity and prevention of plagiarism (2018) and exchange plagiarism reports with authors except AWU.

15. Table 5.11 states the suggestions offered by Faculty members/Librarians for creating awareness about plagiarism in the process of data collection. It is seen that CU has offered most of the features like offering personalised ID for self-checking Plagiarism, An appropriate review mechanism before submission and taking steps for the advancement of the academic integrity among the researchers. Like CU other Universities should also play an active role in terms of plagiarism which is quite slow and gradual.

6.2 Suggestions

After the thorough research on the awareness of Plagiarism among Faculty Members, Research Scholars and Post Graduate students, the following suggestions can be made:

1. **Provide personalised IDs:** Researchers and faculty members should be issued personalised IDs by universities so they can identify plagiarism on their own. If the Universities provide them with Personalised IDs, they might be more aware of plagiarism.

2. **Training and Support:** Universities must provide thorough training to Faculty members, Users and library personnel. Among these include educating users on the features of the Plagiarism Detection Software, copyright policies, and submission procedures through webinars, workshops, tutorials, and other activities of that nature.

3. **User- Friendly Interface:** Efficient algorithms and efficient coding techniques should be a priority. It should be simple to operate the user interface. The current systems tend to be quite slow; even a modest-sized class's analysis could take a day or longer to complete.

4. **Technical Development:** Software for detection employs many methods, but the majority of them rely on comparing a document with a huge number of possible sources. While creating the next generation of plagiarism detection software, numerous practical, ethical, and legal considerations should be made.

Moreover, Students should be taught the real meaning of plagiarism and what constitutes it, otherwise, they will fall into the academic dishonesty and violate the ethical code of conducting research.

6.3 Conclusion

Plagiarism is an extremely prevalent issue on numerous college and university campuses. There are Research Scholars and PG Students who are unaware of the extent of plagiarism. The study gives us an overview of the awareness of Plagiarism in Institutions of Higher Education of Assam. In the era of easily accessible information, one would assume that individual copyright infringement is a greater possibility. Some implications are related to increasing faculty members' awareness of new technologies and detecting software to combat plagiarism, which is negatively influencing academic knowledge generation and the authenticity of students' work. Teachers should be able to discuss plagiarism policies in their institutions, how they affect students' learning processes, and how much of an impact they have on knowledge and social development. They should also be able to defend anti-

plagiarism policies for students by demonstrating why they are best for everyone. To ensure that students produce legitimate work, educators should consider the factors that encourage plagiarism in the classroom, such as students' immaturity regarding ethical stealing on the internet, their disinterest in the assignments, or their lack of exposure to scientific writing. Students should be educated about plagiarism to prevent it, as well as to recognise and appreciate academic integrity, rather than only out of fear of punishment

Along with the major findings, it was observed that most Universities used Urkund (Ouriginal) software for the Plagiarism Detection. However, there are several types of defects in the system: theoretical, technical, and resulting from a disregard for ethical and social considerations. The faculty members need to be aware of these significant shortcomings. Software for detection employs many methods, but the majority of them rely on comparing a document with a huge number of possible sources. While creating the next generation of plagiarism detection software, numerous practical, ethical, and legal considerations should be made.