



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

Journal homepage: <http://www.journalijar.com>

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL  
OF ADVANCED RESEARCH

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

**Attitudes Towards Plagiarism among Post-Graduate Students and Faculty Members of  
A Teaching Health Care Institution In Telangana  
- A cross-sectional questionnaire based study.**

**Dr. P. Bhavani Kirthi<sup>1</sup>, Dr. KVN R Pratap<sup>2</sup>, Dr. T. Madhavi Padma<sup>3</sup>, Dr. V. Siva Kalyan<sup>4</sup>**

1. Post Graduate Student, Department Of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, Telangana State, India.
2. Professor and Head, Department Of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, Telangana State, India.
3. Professor, Department Of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, Telangana State, India.
4. Reader, Department Of Public Health Dentistry, Mamata Dental College, Khammam, Telangana State, India.

### Manuscript Info

#### Manuscript History:

Received: 15 June 2015  
Final Accepted: 26 July 2015  
Published Online: August 2015

#### Key words:

attitude, ethics, health care institution, plagiarism, scientific misconduct, attitude towards plagiarism questionnaire

#### \*Corresponding Author

**Dr. P. Bhavani Kirthi**

### Abstract

**Aims:** The aim of the study is to determine the attitudes towards plagiarism among post-graduate students and faculty members in a teaching health care institution in Telangana.

**Methods and Material:** Post-graduate students and faculty members completed the Attitude Towards Plagiarism Questionnaire which consists of 29 statements measuring three attitudinal factors: Positive attitude, Negative attitude and Subjective norms towards plagiarism. The statements are marked on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree(1), disagree(2), neither agree nor disagree(3), agree(4) to strongly agree(5).

**Results:** A total of 162 individuals participated in the study. Results revealed moderate positive attitude, negative attitude and subjective norms towards plagiarism, both among post-graduate students and faculty members. The mean scores for questions under positive attitude, negative attitude and subjective norms towards plagiarism among post graduates were 36.31, 21.84, 29.60; and 34.51, 23.65, 27.41 among faculty members respectively.

**Conclusions:** The moderate attitudes of post-graduate students and faculty members towards plagiarism reflect the lack of its awareness which may have detrimental repercussions in the health care field. There is a need for highlighting the issue of plagiarism among students and the provision of training programs in scientific ethical writing.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2015,. All rights reserved

## INTRODUCTION

Plagiarism is to make use of someone else's work, ideas or information without giving proper attribution to the author (Diana R, 2011). Barnhart (1988) traces the etymology of the word 'plagiarism', derived from the Latin word 'plagarius' which means kidnapper, seducer, plunderer or literary thief (Chris Park, 2003). In the past, journals, newspapers, magazines, etc were the major sources for plagiarism. But now, researchers no longer have to visit libraries for referring textbooks and journals. They are easily accessible over the internet with just one mouse click using powerful search engines. The two simple computer commands i.e. Ctrl + C (copy) and Ctrl + V (paste), makes plagiarism even more easier. This has led to the emergence of digital plagiarism wherein a large amount of information is available free of cost. Downloading music, movies, photographs, seminars and even scientific articles

from the internet, has become so common that plagiarism may be considered by many as an acceptable behaviour. This poses a question as to whether scientific research is a mere copying of previous research papers or does originality still exist.

Moreover, scientific research in the medical and dental fields requires great responsibility. Scientific misconduct can seriously damage people's health and even life (Vanja Pupovac et al., 2010). After finishing graduation, medical and dental students may be interested in pursuing higher education. Doing research and publishing articles is mandatory in the post-graduate curriculum of many universities all over the world. According to both the Medical and the Dental Council of India, the minimum qualification required for job promotion is to have a certain number of publications in scientific journals (MCI, 1998; DCI 2007). This along with the advent of desktop publishing by means of personal computers has contributed to the proliferation of new journals (David NW, 2003). Since postgraduate students and faculty members are often under the pressure to publish articles, they may be tempted to copy and paste from the internet, where a huge amount of information is easily available. In India, there has been only little effort to educate students on ethical issues involved in the practice of science, on proper citation practices and a clear definition of what constitutes plagiarism (P. Balaram, 2005). Thus there is an urgent need to identify the attitudes of researchers towards plagiarism and scientific misconduct. Hence a study was undertaken to determine the attitudes of post-graduate students and faculty members towards plagiarism.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

This is a cross-sectional questionnaire based study. The study subjects were medical and dental, post-graduate students and faculty members of a teaching health care institution in Telangana. Those who were willing to participate in the study and those who had submitted at least one scientific article for publication were given the questionnaire. Those who were not willing to participate in the study were excluded. Informed consent was taken from each participant and ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethical Research Committee.

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part contains demographic data and the second part contains the Attitude towards Plagiarism (ATP) questionnaire measuring three attitudinal factors: positive attitude, negative attitude and subjective norms, developed by Mavrinac et al. (2010). It is a self-administered questionnaire and the time taken to fill the questionnaire was approximately 15-20 minutes. The ATP questionnaire consists of 29 statements which are marked on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree(1), disagree(2), neither agree nor disagree(3), agree(4) to strongly agree(5). Scores for each attitudinal factor were calculated by summing. The ranges for each factor were divided into three equal parts representing low, moderate and high score scales (Table 1).

Positive attitude is measured by 12 statements which measure the extent of acceptance of plagiarism and procedures which the individuals do by themselves. Hence a low score (12-28) is favourable. Negative attitude is measured by 7 statements which measure the extent of condemnation of acts of Plagiarism as done by others. Hence a high negative attitudinal score (27-35) is favourable. Subjective norms toward plagiarism are measured by 10 statements which represent the personal perception about the extent and acceptance of plagiarism in the society. Low subjective norms toward plagiarism reflect that such behaviours are considered unacceptable in the society. Hence a low score (10-23) is favourable. In order to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire in English language, it was pilot tested on a group of 30 postgraduate students, who were not included in the main study (cronbachs alpha=0.8).

Out of the total study population, 176 individuals fulfilled our inclusion criteria. The final questionnaire was administered to study subjects during clinical hours in the month of November 2014. The participants completed the questionnaire anonymously and independently. The returned questionnaires with missing data were excluded from the study. Data was entered into Excel sheet and data analyses were performed using SPSS 18 software. P value <0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. Overall scores were calculated for each attitudinal factor. Comparisons were made for attitudinal scores among post graduate students and faculty members using Chi square test. Distribution of answers to each question was also calculated.

## **RESULTS:**

Out of a total of 176 individuals to whom questionnaires were distributed, 171 participants returned the questionnaires, out of which 9 questionnaires were excluded due to missing data, Thus, a total of 162 responses were included for analysis, obtaining a response rate of 92%. 61% (N=99) of the participants were postgraduates and 39% (N=63) were faculty members. Results revealed moderate attitude towards plagiarism both among post graduates and faculty members for all three attitudinal factors. The mean scores for questions under positive attitude, negative attitude and subjective norms towards plagiarism among post graduates were 36.31, 21.84 and 29.60 respectively.

Among faculty members, the mean scores were 34.51, 23.65 and 27.41 for positive attitude, negative attitude and subjective norms respectively (Table 2). In comparison with postgraduates, faculty members had lower positive attitude and subjective norms score and higher negative attitude towards plagiarism though it was not found to be statistically significant.

#### Statements describing positive attitude:

Both postgraduates (51%) and faculty members (43%) agreed that self-plagiarism is not punishable since it is not harmful (Statement 3). 44% of post graduates and 60% of faculty members agreed that self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism (Statement 5). Majority of postgraduates (38%) and faculty members (37%) agreed that plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value (Statement 4). There was ambiguity (agreed, disagreed and neither agreed nor disagreed in almost equal proportions) as to whether young researchers should receive milder punishment or not for plagiarism (Statement 6). Only 11% of faculty members compared to 38% of post graduates agreed that they could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing (Statement 8) and this was found to be statistically significant ( $p=0.001$ ) (Table 3).

#### Statements describing negative attitude:

Majority of post graduates (35%) and faculty members (48%) agreed that the names of the authors who plagiarize must be disclosed (Statement 14) which was found to be statistically significant ( $p=0.023$ ). More than half of all the study subjects felt that it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism (Statement 15). Most of the post graduates (35%) and faculty members (51%) agreed that plagiarizing is as bad as stealing/cheating in an exam (Statement 16) ( $p=0.008$ ). A large proportion of the study subjects (40% postgraduates, 46% faculty members) disagreed that a plagiarized paper does no harm to science (Statement 18) (Table 3).

#### Statements describing subjective norms:

Post graduates (30%) and faculty members (38%) did not agree that they are sometimes tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it (Statement 22). Majority of post graduates (54%) and faculty members (57%) disagreed that they keep plagiarizing because they haven't been caught yet (Statement 23). Only 28% of post graduates and 10% of faculty members felt that it is justified to plagiarize if they currently have more important obligations/tasks to do (Statement 28) ( $p=0.014$ ). 40% of post graduates agreed and 40% of faculty members disagreed that sometimes it is necessary to plagiarize (Statement 29), which was found to be statistically significant ( $p=0.001$ ) (Table 3).

**Table 1:** Mean scores for three attitudinal factors with ranges for low, moderate and high attitude for each factor.

Attitudinal factor	Score	Reference range
Positive attitude	Low*	12-28
	Moderate	29-45
	High	46-60
Negative attitude	Low	7-16
	Moderate	17-26
	High*	27-35
Subjective norms	Low*	10-23
	Moderate	24-37
	High	38-50
* Favourable attitude from the academic integrity point of view.		

Source: Vanja Pupovac et al. (2010).

**Table 2:** Mean scores for three attitudinal factors among Post Graduates and Faculty Members.

Attitudinal Factor	Post Graduates	Faculty Members
Positive Attitude	36.31	34.51
Negative Attitude	21.84	23.65
Subjective Norms	29.60	27.41

**Table 3:** Distribution of answers (in % for N=162 participants) to the Attitude towards Plagiarism questionnaire

STATEMENTS		Designation	Strongly Disagree N(%)	Disagree N(%)	Neither agree nor disagree N(%)	Agree N(%)	Strongly Agree N(%)	P value
1	Sometimes one cannot avoid using other people's words without citing the source, because there are only so many ways to describe something	PG	10(10.1)	16(16.2)	6(6.1)	61(61.6)	6(6.1)	0.124
		F	1(1.6)	13(20.6)	7(11.1)	35(55.6)	7(11.1)	
2	It is justified to use previous description of a method, because the method itself remains the same	PG	0(0)	17(17.2)	26(26.3)	48(48.5)	8(8.1)	0.003*
		F	0(0)	5(7.9)	6(9.5)	39(61.9)	13(20.6)	
3	Self-plagiarism is not punishable because it is not harmful ( <i>one cannot steal from oneself</i> )	PG	10(10.1)	15(15.2)	13(13.1)	50(50.5)	11(11.1)	0.289
		F	2(3.2)	12(19.0)	13(20.6)	27(42.9)	9(14.3)	
4	Plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value	PG	19(19.2)	27(27.3)	15(15.2)	38(38.4)	0(0)	0.370
		F	13(20.6)	19(30.2)	6(9.5)	23(36.5)	2(3.2)	
5	Self-plagiarism should not be punishable in the same way as plagiarism	PG	5(5.1)	20(20.2)	24(24.2)	44(44.4)	6(6.1)	0.128
		F	4(6.3)	7(11.1)	8(12.7)	38(60.3)	6(9.5)	
6	Young researchers who are just learning the ropes( <i>beginners</i> ) should receive milder punishment for plagiarism	PG	8(8.1)	35(35.4)	23(23.2)	27(27.3)	6(6.1)	0.449
		F	10(15.9)	17(27)	16(25.4)	18(28.6)	2(3.2)	
7	If one cannot write well in a foreign language, it is justified to copy parts of a similar paper already published in that language	PG	10(10.1)	35(35.4)	13(13.1)	34(34.3)	7(7.1)	0.014*
		F	14(22.2)	29(46.0)	8(12.7)	12(19.0)	0(0)	
8	I could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing	PG	12(12.1)	30(30.3)	18(18.2)	38(38.4)	1(1.0)	0.001*
		F	18(28.6)	29(46.0)	8(12.7)	7(11.1)	1(1.6)	
9	Short deadlines give me the right to plagiarize a bit	PG	16(16.2)	27(27.3)	24(24.2)	28(28.3)	4(4.0)	0.356
		F	15(23.8)	22(34.9)	9(14.3)	14(22.2)	3(4.8)	
10	When I do not know what to write, I translate a part of a paper from a foreign language	PG	8(8.1)	30(30.3)	18(18.2)	39(39.4)	4(4.0)	0.010*
		F	15(23.8)	22(34.9)	13(20.6)	11(17.5)	2(3.2)	
11	It is justified to use one's own previously published work without providing citation in order to complete the current work	PG	9(9.1)	39(39.4)	23(23.2)	23(23.2)	5(5.1)	0.016*
		F	16(25.4)	18(28.6)	11(17.5)	18(28.6)	0(0)	
12	If a colleague of mine allows me to copy from his/her paper, I'm NOT doing anything bad, because I have his/her permission	PG	19(19.2)	21(21.2)	19(19.2)	31(31.3)	9(9.1)	0.639
		F	14(22.2)	12(19.0)	17(27.0)	17(27.0)	3(4.8)	
13.	Plagiarists do not belong in the scientific community	PG	10(10.1)	32(32.3)	28(28.3)	26(26.3)	3(3.0)	0.013*
		F	4(6.3)	11(17.5)	13(20.6)	28(44.4)	7(11.1)	
14	The name of the authors who plagiarize should be disclosed to the scientific community	PG	5(5.1)	22(22.2)	28(28.3)	35(35.4)	9(9.1)	0.023*
		F	1(1.6)	15(23.8)	6(9.5)	30(47.6)	11(17.5)	

\* statistically significant, PG=postgraduate, F=faculty

**Table 3:** Cont'd

STATEMENTS		Designation	Strongly Disagree N(%)	Disagree N(%)	Neither agree nor disagree N(%)	Agree N(%)	Strongly Agree N(%)	P value
15	In times of moral and ethical decline, it is important to discuss issues like plagiarism and self-plagiarism	PG	1(1.0)	12(12.1)	16(16.2)	53(53.5)	17(17.2)	0.197
		F	0(0)	2(3.2)	7(11.1)	41(65.1)	13(20.6)	
16	Plagiarizing is as bad as stealing/cheating in an exam	PG	9(9.1)	24(24.2)	15(15.2)	35(35.4)	16(16.2)	0.008*
		F	0(0)	8(12.7)	6(9.5)	32(50.8)	17(27.0)	
17	Plagiarism impoverishes( <i>makes poor</i> ) the investigative spirit	PG	5(5.1)	14(14.1)	19(19.2)	47(47.5)	14(14.1)	0.188
		F	0(0)	5(7.9)	11(17.5)	33(52.4)	14(22.2)	
18	A plagiarized paper does no harm to science	PG	11(11.1)	40(40.4)	23(23.2)	19(19.2)	6(6.1)	0.328
		F	12(19.0)	29(46.0)	12(19.0)	9(14.3)	1(1.6)	
19	Since plagiarism is taking other people's words rather than tangible( <i>real</i> ) assets, it should NOT be considered as a serious offense	PG	14(14.1)	33(33.3)	26(26.3)	26(26.3)	0(0)	0.096
		F	12(19.0)	22(34.9)	9(14.3)	17(27.0)	3(4.8)	
20	Authors say they do NOT plagiarize, when in fact they do	PG	1(1.0)	15(15.2)	29(29.3)	43(43.4)	11(11.1)	0.774
		F	2(3.2)	9(14.3)	15(23.8)	31(49.2)	6(9.5)	
21	Those who say they have never plagiarized are lying	PG	5(5.1)	18(18.2)	32(32.3)	26(26.3)	18(18.2)	0.437
		F	4(6.3)	11(17.5)	13(20.6)	24(38.1)	11(17.5)	
22	Sometimes I'm tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it	PG	17(17.2)	30(30.3)	18(18.2)	31(31.3)	3(3.0)	0.755
		F	11(17.5)	24(38.1)	10(15.9)	15(23.8)	3(4.8)	
23	I keep plagiarizing because I haven't been caught yet	PG	13(13.1)	53(53.5)	20(20.2)	12(12.1)	1(1.0)	0.064
		F	17(27.0)	36(57.1)	7(11.1)	3(4.8)	0(0)	
24	I work in a plagiarism-free environment	PG	13(13.1)	42(42.4)	28(28.3)	12(12.1)	4(4.0)	0.519
		F	7(11.1)	25(39.7)	14(22.2)	14(22.2)	3(4.8)	
25	Plagiarism is not a big deal	PG	18(18.2)	24(24.2)	18(18.2)	38(38.4)	1(1.0)	0.014*
		F	15(23.8)	25(39.7)	10(15.9)	10(15.9)	3(4.8)	
26	Sometimes I copy a sentence or two just to become inspired for further writing	PG	6(6.1)	19(19.2)	18(18.2)	47(47.5)	9(9.1)	0.245
		F	4(6.3)	21(33.3)	13(20.6)	21(33.3)	4(6.3)	
27	I don't feel guilty for copying verbatim( <i>exactly the same words as were used originally</i> ) a sentence or two from my previous papers	PG	4(4.0)	38(38.4)	11(11.1)	44(44.4)	2(2.0)	0.056
		F	7(11.1)	15(23.8)	12(19.0)	25(39.7)	4(6.3)	
28	Plagiarism is justified if I currently have more important obligations or tasks to do	PG	15(15.2)	33(33.3)	22(22.2)	28(28.3)	1(1.0)	0.014*
		F	13(20.6)	31(49.2)	10(15.9)	6(9.5)	3(4.8)	
29	Sometimes it is necessary to plagiarize	PG	6(6.1)	21(21.2)	18(18.2)	40(40.4)	14(14.1)	0.001*
		F	12(19.0)	25(39.7)	11(17.5)	10(15.9)	5(7.9)	

\* statistically significant, PG=postgraduate, F=faculty

**DISCUSSION:**

Plagiarism is the usage of ideas, text, data, etc. without acknowledgment of the owner of the intellectual property (K. Satyanarayana, 2010). The term plagiarism is usually used to refer to the theft of words or ideas, beyond what would normally be regarded as general knowledge (Chris Park, 2003). The common types of plagiarism include: (i) use of data from an earlier publication, (ii) reproduction of Tables or Figures from an earlier article, (iii) publish similar articles with subgroups of data previously analyzed, discussed and published as a larger group, (iv) publish same/similar data repeatedly, (v) publish same/similar article in a local and also in an international journal with



same/different authorship, etc (K. Satyanarayana, 2010). Studies of academic dishonesty amongst students have often focused on the types of behaviours and practices they are likely to engage in, including cheating on tests and assignments, falsification of data, plagiarism, inappropriate use of resources, taking credit for work done by others (Chris Park, 2003). Though many studies on plagiarism have already been published abroad, in India, research on this topic has been meagre.

In the present study, moderate scores were obtained in all three categories among both postgraduates and faculty members, consistent with the results of the study by Vanja Pupovac et al (2010), Mary Shimi et al (2014) and Shubham Jain et al (2015). This could be because of the lack of adequate awareness about plagiarism. Postgraduates (35%) and faculty members (51%) agreed that plagiarizing is as bad as stealing/cheating in an exam. As post graduates are still in the learning stage they may not consider plagiarism to be an important issue and few may even be ignorant about this concept.

In the present study, faculty members (46%) and postgraduates (30%) disagreed that they could not write a scientific paper without plagiarizing. As per Vanja Pupovac et al (2010), 64% of university students, as per Mary Shimi et al (2014), 42.8% of dental postgraduates and 52.9% faculty members; and as per Shubham Jain et al (2015), 39% of dental postgraduates and 45% of medical postgraduates, disagreed for the same statement. The difference may be because postgraduates lack experience and training in writing scientific papers which may compel them to resort to plagiarism. Tshepo Batane (2010) and Diana R (2011) found the overall plagiarism rate to be 20.5% and 41% among university students respectively. The prevalence of plagiarism was 53.5% among medical professionals and 87% among dental professionals as reported by Harkanwal Singh et al. (2014) and Dhulika Dhingra et al. (2014) respectively. This reveals a higher level of plagiarism in our country.

Majority of postgraduates (38%) and faculty members (37%) agreed that plagiarized parts of a paper may be ignored if the paper is of great scientific value. Majority of medical students (52.5%) and faculty members (53.9%) disagreed for the same as reported by Farooq Rathore et al (2015). Whereas in studies conducted by Mary Shimi et al (2014) and Vanja Pupovac et al (2010) there was no clear attitude. It might be understood that they justify and support plagiarism even though they know that it is wrong. A large proportion of the study subjects agreed that self-plagiarism should not be punishable and if it is punishable, it should not be in the same way as plagiarism. This reveals that the study subjects did not consider self-plagiarism to be as offensive as plagiarism since it involves copying from their own previous articles.

In the present study both post graduates and faculty members were inconclusive (almost equal proportions for all five options) regarding the penalties for plagiarism in contrast to a study by Paul E. Teplitsky (2002), where the students gave equal, or more lenient penalties than faculty members for the same offense. This may be because they did not consider plagiarism to be a punishable offence. Giving penalties for plagiarism could result in instilling fear of punishment, which may help in preventing plagiarism. About 31% of post graduates and 27% faculty members agreed that it is justified to copy from a friend's paper after taking his/her permission which is similar to a study by Mary Shimi et al (2014) and it was 9% in a study by Diana R (2011). Majority of post graduates (35%) and faculty members (48%) agreed that the names of the authors who plagiarize must be disclosed, which is similar in a study conducted by Mary Shimi et al (2014). Disclosing the names of the authors may help to keep plagiarism under control. These findings show that they justify plagiarism when done by themselves, but would be more strict if done by others.

Majority of the subjects did not agree that they are sometimes tempted to plagiarize, because everyone else is doing it. They also disagreed that they keep plagiarizing because they haven't been caught yet. Usage of plagiarism detection softwares makes it easier to find cases of plagiarism. Almost half of the faculty members disagreed that it is justified to plagiarize if they currently have more important obligations/tasks to do whereas the postgraduates had mixed opinions. The work pressure of the postgraduate curriculum, in addition to lack of writing skills may force them to plagiarize.

## CONCLUSION:

The present study results show moderate attitudes of post graduate students and faculty members towards plagiarism. Faculty members were relatively better informed and against plagiarism compared to post graduates. Since post-graduate students are going to become the future professionals in the health care field, the lack of awareness about plagiarism among them may have serious consequences. There by highlighting the need to address the issue of plagiarism among students. If the practice of plagiarism is not taken care of, scientific research becomes a mere repetition of previous papers and lacks originality.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Providing academic training to improve the scientific ethical writing skills, emphasizing the consequences/punishment for plagiarism, encouraging original ideas through scholarships, giving less importance to accreditation points for job promotions, usage of plagiarism detection softwares, establishing institutional review boards and having a formal policy on plagiarism in all universities, are few of the recommended ways in which this problem can be tackled.

## REFERENCES:

- Chris Park. (2003): In Other (People's) Words: plagiarism by university students—literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28:471-88.
- David N. Wilson. (2003): The Future of Comparative and International Education in a Globalized World. *International Review of Education*, 49:15-33.
- Dental Council of India. (2007): Revised MDS course regulation. Available from: [accessed 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2015].
- Dhulika Dhingra, Devendra Mishra. (2014): Publication misconduct among medical professionals in India. *Indian Journal of Medical Ethics*, 11:104-7.
- Diana Razera. (2011): Awareness, Attitude and Perception of Plagiarism among students and teachers at Stockholm University. *Master of Science Thesis*. Stockholm University.
- Farooq Rathore, Ahmed Waqas, Ahmad Marjan Zia, Martina Mavrinac, Fareeha Farooq. (2015): Exploring the attitudes of medical faculty members and students in Pakistan towards plagiarism: a cross sectional survey. *PeerJ* 3:e1031; DOI 10.7717/peerj.1031.
- Harkanwal Singh, Namrata Gurram. (2014): Knowledge and Attitude of Dental Professionals of North India Toward Plagiarism. *N Am J Med Sci.*, 6:6–11.
- K. Satyanarayana. (2010): Plagiarism: a scourge afflicting the Indian science. *Indian J Med Res*, 131:373-6.
- Mary Shimi, S. Gomez, Nagesh L, Sujatha B.K. (2014): Assessment of the attitudes towards Plagiarism among dental postgraduate students and faculty members in Bapuji Dental College and Hospital, Davangere – A cross sectional survey. *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences*, 13:1-6.
- Mavrinac M, Brumini G, Bilic-Zulle L, Petroveck M. (2010). Construction and Validation of Attitudes Toward Plagiarism Questionnaire. *Croat Med J*, 51:195-201.
- Medical Council of India. (1998): Minimum Qualifications for Teachers in Medical Institutions. Available from: [accessed 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2015].
- Paul E. Teplitsky. (2002): Perceptions of Canadian Dental Faculty and Students About Appropriate Penalties for Academic Dishonesty. *Journal of Dental Education*, 66:485-506.
- P. Balaram. (2005): Plagiarism: A Spreading Infection. *Current Science*, 88:1353-4.
- Shubham Jain, Vrinda Saxena, Sudheer Hongal, Manish Jain, Nilesh Torwane, Vijayta Sharva. (2015): Comparison of Opinion Referendum of Medical and Dental Postgraduates Towards Plagiarism in Bhopal - Central India. *Journal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan*, 25:514-8.
- Tshepo Batane. (2010): Turning to Turnitin to Fight Plagiarism among University Students. *Educational Technology & Society*, 13:1-12.
- Vanja Pupovac, Lidija Bilic-Zulle, Martina Mavrinac, Mladen Petroveck. (2010): Attitudes toward plagiarism among pharmacy and medical biochemistry students – cross-sectional survey study. *Biochemia Medica*, 20:307-13.