Lecturers Perceptions of the Use of Anti-Plagiarism Check Software in Federal University of Technology Minna. Implications for Sustainable National Development in the 21st Century.

Bello, M. R., (PhD)
Morenikeji, O., (PhD)
Wushishi, D. I. (PhD)

[1]*Dept. of Science Education,*
, Federal University of Technology, Minna
[2]*Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning,*
Federal University of Technology, Minna
e-mails drrabiu@futminna.edu.ng; oluwole@futminna.edu,ng;
deewushishi@yahoo.com,
GSM No's: +234 803 592 7009; +234 081 781 4820; +234 806 253 7882

Abstract

The study investigated the perceptions of the use of anti-plagiarism Check Software (APCS) amongst lecturers in Federal University of Technology, Minna. Survey research design was used by the researchers for the study which was convenient for the purpose of determining their perceptions of the use anti-plagiarism check software (APCS) in the University. The population of the study was all lecturers in FUTMINNA. Multistage sampling technique (stratified & simple sampling techniques) were utilized in arriving at 79 lecturers picked from across the eight schools (faculties) in the University. Likert-type questionnaire entitled 'Questionnaire for Perception of anti-plagiarism Check Software (QLPAPCS) was designed for the study and was validated by experts with a reliability index of 0.82 using Cronbach alpha. The method of data collection was distribution of QLPAPCS directly by the research assistants identified in each of the schools (faculties) in the University. Data collected was analyzed using simple frequency counts percentages while descriptive charts were used to illustrate the data analyzed. The study revealed that lecturers have very high perception of the use of anti-plagiarism (89.79%) in FUTMINNA which has implications on lecturers insisting on originality in students' projects and thesis works while laziness was perceived to be the major factor responsible for plagiarism. It is recommended that the usage of Turnitinas anti-plagiarism check software (APCS) should be encouraged to sustain the success recorded in the University. It was concluded that academic staff have positive perceptions APCS it should not be adopted to avoid been tagged for punitive measures for administrative convenience.

Keywords: Perception, Anti-plagiarism check software (APCS), Turnitin, Lecturers'

Introduction

The 21ˢᵗ century tools of Internet (using World Wide Web) and Information Communication Technologies (ICT) has brought the prevalence of easy access to library and open online resources. This advancement which broken the barriers to information resources has been abused, thus has become inimical to academic integrity and breach of intellectual property rights. Jerome, Christopher and Ifeakachukwu (2016) reported Gow (2013) whose assertion was that, the prevalence of plagiarism is traceable to the introduction of ICT's in education and the plethora of online resources. Similarly, Patrick and David (2002) also argued that, the universal access to the Internet has been cited as a reason for the perceived decline in academic integrity. This is because conducting research and the process of writing a reportis a complex and difficult exercise requiring knowledge, truthfulness, honesty, clarity, accuracy, conciseness and most importantly ethical concerns (Roig, 2013). What is aptly describes that act is plagiarism? And plagiarism is the 'wrongful appropriation' and 'purloining' publications of another author's language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions and the representation of them as person's original work. It is also an act of using some one's else work or ideas without proper acknowledgement or permission from the author (Younmans, 2011). Furthermore, Howard (1995) in Jenny (2009) described plagiarism to include outright cheating and fabrication of laboratory data to non-attribution and "patch-writing," where several pieces of purloined materials is patched together. There is a growing concern among academics, policy makers and

administrators of dimensions and the forms plagiarism has taken and its consequences on national development. Intellectual theft of ideas erodes integrity which is gradually eroding originality, authorship and confidence in academics in the University system. Therefore plagiarism could be considered as academic dishonesty or unethical conduct and copyright infringements which perpetrators are liable to expulsion or suspension in a University anywhere in the world.

Today the issue of plagiarism in our higher institutions in Nigeria was discussed in the Committee of Vice Chancellors meeting organized in 2012 which culminated in the commissioning of a United Kingdom (UK) integrity software company (TURNITIN) for technical collaboration towards checking academic submissions in Nigerian Universities (The International School of Management, 2015). Academic dishonesty (plagiarism) is perceived differently by researchers; while some scholars are aware of it as academic dishonesty others do not necessarily perceive that acts or quantum is too insignificant to be adjudged to be plagiarism. Some plagiarism behavior such as collusion is intentional and unethical whereas others are either accidental or unintentional which is referred to poor practice (Jerome, Christopher & Ifeakachukwu, 2016). Plagiarism is gradually assuming a phenomenal dimension in the 21ˢᵗ century academic community particularly in the developing world. Plagiarism is now refined or modeled to include among others; cloning (act of submitting another researchers' work, word-for-word, as one's original work); remix (act of paraphrasing from other sources and making the content fit together seamlessly); recycling (act of borrowing generously from one's own previous work without citation); 404 error (written piece that includes citations to non-existent or inaccurate information about sources); re-tweet (includes proper citation, but relies too closely on the text's original wording and/or structure); mashup (paper that represents a mix of copied material from several different sources without proper citation); and ctrl-C (written piece that contains significant portions of text from a single source without alterations (Turnitin, 2012).

There will be no excuse for breach of ethical conduct by lecturers even though various reasons have advanced for their engagement which include amongst others; poor time management skills; the consequences of cheating as unimportant; institutional failure to enact policy against plagiarism or report cheating(administrators, 2003).While Khan and Subramanian (2012) have identified anti-plagiarism strategies to include:

    a. Raising awareness on academic dishonesty and plagiarism.
    b. Highlighting the various types of plagiarism.
    c. Introducing policies that encourage adherence to ethical codes of conduct.
    d. Open communication between students and lecturers on the expectations in reporting essays and projects.

Michael Huemers' theory on perception lays credence that, 'perception is directed awareness of external reality which accounts for non-inferential acknowledgement of such reality. The theory explains that, "for one to be aware of something and there is no object present then there cannot be actual awareness as in the case of hallucination". Huemer (2015) identified three major components of perception:

    1. Internal mental state which refers to perceptual experience
    2. Object of perception which is external and roughly satisfies the content of experience
    3. Absence of relationship between the two disqualifies the event from been perceived.

Perception becomes relevant when it establishes the relationship between realism and object which actually constitute plagiarism. Therefore, the theory explains the function of attitudinal disposition of culprit to plagiarize could be due to environmental influence. Universities should promote policies that enhances scholars respect intellectual property and honesty in recognition of the contribution of knowledge to sustainable national development.

Frey (2001) reported that there are several anti-plagiarism detection soft are used for maintaining ethical standards in research reporting or authorship. They include: Ferret, Copy Catch Gold, and Turnitin. The University has adopted Turnitin programme for checking undergraduate Students Projects and also postgraduate thesis. Youmans, (2011) stated that, Turnitin.com search engine has created a database of peer-reviewed articles, text-books, online pages that compares and highlights copied texts to see whether they are plagiarized. The fear of being detected in institutions where plagiarism software programs are

used for assessment of published articles and students final projects has help promote ethical standards in such environments. Anti-plagiaristic measures are now been appraised and adopted in the processes of appointments and promotion of academics in Nigerian institutions of higher learning. The anti-plagiarism checks software (APCS) called Turnitin was introduced in Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTMINNA) Nigeria in 2012/2013 academic session. The Turnitin anti-plagiarism check software package has screened over10, 000 undergraduate and postgraduate students' projects and theses. 15% and 10% was set as acceptable level of plagiarism for Masters and PhD postgraduate theses respectively while 20% was set for undergraduate students' projects. It is expected that screening will obviously keep lecturers and students in check towards guiding against plagiarism. Nevertheless, perception is all about the way individuals and people see and understand or rather interpret something. The desire to determine how lecturers and students have perceived the adoption of anti-plagiarism measures and specifically APCS (Turnitin) in FUTMINNA prompted this research study.

Empirical literature reviewed have shown varying respondents views on plagiarism. In a study conducted by Jenny (2009) in Charles Sturt University Australia shows that, there was no statistical significant difference between the proportion of staff and students who thought that cheating on assessment tasks was correlated with the number of years as an academic ($p = 0.048$, $r = 0.169$) and the that the most common reasons for plagiarism was thought to be lack of understanding about the rules of referencing and laziness or bad time management. A look at result of analysis of Jenny's study showed the percentages factors responsible for plagiarism: 73% of the students wanting a better grade, 65% too many assignments, unconscious that students are not aware they were doing anything wrong and 63% thought they were unlikely to be caught. Patrick and David (2002) reported that most students in the study agreed that plagiarism of any kind like cutting and pasting text from the Internet is wrong whether done conventionally or online. A t-test comparing of the groups who neither agreed nor disagreed or strongly disagreed revealed that those who believed plagiarism is wrong were significantly less likely to plagiarize ($t = -3.64$, $p < 0.01$).

Statement of the Problem
Academic dishonesty has become so rife that it is a source of discountenance between lecturers and managements of ivory towers in Nigeria. The issue of plagiarism is germane but the motive is viewed with a lot of cynicism amongst lecturers in Universities. There are lecturers with the notion that, plagiarism check is targeted at stalling lecturers' progression (promotion) which is usually accompanied with financial benefits. In FUTMINNA, Turnitinanti-plagiarism check software is currently used in checking undergraduate and postgraduate projects and thesis for similarities. And whether it would be used for comparing lecturers' articles before promotions is a contentious matter that may threaten industrial peace in Nigerian Universities. This study is therefore aimed at determining what type of perception lecturers have on the use of anti-plagiarism check software (Turnitin) in Federal University of Technology, Minna Nigeria.

Objectives of the study
The underlying aim of undertaking this study was to determine lecturers' perception of the use of anti-plagiarism (APCS) in Federal University of Technology Minna and its implication for sustainable national development in the 21st century. Specifically, the objectives of the study was to determine lecturers' perception of the use of Turnitin anti-plagiarism check software in FUTMINNA:

1) To determine whether lecturers are aware of the use of Anti-plagiarism Check Software (APCS) programme in FUTMININA.
2) To determine whether lecturers insist on originality of sources of materials used in writing papers, assignments and projects.
3) To find out the point at which the lecturers begin to suspect plagiarism in a students' term paper, assignment and project.
4) To determine how rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMININ.
5) To determine whether publishers return manuscripts with missing references?
6) To determine the factors influencing plagiarism amongst lecturers and in FUTMININA.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. Are lecturers aware of the use of Anti-plagiarism Check Software (APCS) programme in FUTMINNA?
2. Do lecturers in FUTMINNA insist on originality when assessing student's term papers, assignments and projects?
3. When do lecturers begin to suspect plagiarism in a student's term papers, assignments project?
4. What is the proportion of students that engaged in plagiarism in FUTMINNA?
5. How rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMINNA?
6. How often do publishers return manuscripts with missing references?
7. What are the factors responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers' and student's in FUTMINNA?

Research Methodology

Descriptive research design particularly the survey method was used for the study. Questionnaires was developed and given to sampled size of lecturer' that filled the items and returned to research assistant. The population of the study were about 800 lecturers in University in the 2014/2015 academic session. The lecturers are spread across the various schools (Faculties) in the University. FUTMIN operates two campuses and presently has eight schools which constitutes the population of the study. Bosso campus with three schools; School of Science and Technology Education (SSTE), School of Life Science (SLS) and School of Physical Science (SPS) while the Gidan Kwano (GK) campus has five schools; School of Engineering and Engineering Technology (SEET), School of Environmental Technology (SET), School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology (SAAT), School of Information and Communication Technology (SICT) and School of Entrepreneurship and Management Technology (SEMT). Stratified and random sampling techniques were used in selecting75 lecturers from the eight schools in the University. The instrument for data collection was a researcher developed questionnaire entitled 'Questionnaire on Lecturers Perception of the Use of Anti-Plagiarism Check Software Package (QLPAPCS) in FUTMINNA'. The questionnaire was segmented into two sections. Section (A) contained demographic information while section B had items on lecturers' perceptions of the use of anti-plagiarism (APCS)check software (Turnitin). The QLPAPCS was distributed to lecturers, while only 75 lecturers completed and return the questionnaires. The QLPAPCS was validated by two experts and a reliability coefficient of 0.82 using Cronbach's alpha was obtained. Research assistants were used for data collection in the eight schools in the University. Lecturers were visited in the respective departments and given the QLPAPCS to fill and the assistant return at a later date to collect them. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency counts & simple percentages).

RESULTS
ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 1: Analysis of demographic data of Lecturers in FUTMINNA

Variable	Category	Frequency
Academic Status	Junior Academic Staff	55 (69.6%)
	Senior Academic Staff	24 (30.4%)
Highest Certificate	Degree.	2 (2.5%)
	Postgraduate	20 (25.3%)
	Doctorate	3 (3.8%)
	Masters in-view	31 (39.2%)
	PhD in-view	23 (29.1%)
Age	<30 years	5 (6.3%)
	31 – 40 years	30 (38.0%)
	41 – 50 years	35 (44.3%)
	>50 years	9 (11.4%)
Length of Years in Service	<1 year.	2 (2.5%)
	1 – 5 years	26 (32.9%)
	6 – 10 years	35 (44.3%)
	11 – 15 years	8 (10.1%)
	16 – 20 years	2 (2.5%)
	>20 years	6 (7.6%)

Table 1 shows the distribution of academic staff sampled for the study. Junior academic staff represents about 55.70% and senior academic staff are 24.30%. Therefore, Junior academic staff number was higher may be because they are more in population compared to the senior academic staff who are mostly senior lecturers and Professors. The age bracket of lecturers between 41 – 50 years involved in the study were 44.3% which is the highest with only 11.4% of lecturers over 50 years of age. While those whose length of service ranges between 6 -10 years (44.3%) were more in the study. Furthermore, only about 7.6% of lecturers who have worked in the University over 20 years were sampled in the study. This is believed to be the segment of the population who are professors and associate professors in the University.

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question 1: Are lecturers aware of the use Anti-plagiarism Check Software (APCS) programme in FUTMINNA?

Table 2: Responses on Lecturers awareness of the use of Anti-Plagiarism Check software (APCS) programme in FUTMINNA

S/NO	Items	YES	NO	TOTAL
1.	Aware Plagiarism is criminal	76 (12.52%)	1(0.16%)	77
2.	Aware of anti-plagiarism software	70(11.53%)	8(1.32%)	78
3.	Aware plagiarism is an offence during Thesis writing	71(11.70%)	8(1.32%)	78
4.	Instruct Students' about Plagiarism when given essay assignment	70(11.53%)	7(1.15%)	78
5.	Caution Students' about Plagiarism when given essay	67(11.04%)	8(1.32%)	75
6.	Care about Plagiarism when grading	64 (10.54%)	15(2.47%)	79
7.	Staff engage in Plagiarism	56 (9.23%)	11(1.81%)	67
8.	Is the University ripe for using anti-plagiarism software	71(11.70%)	4(0.66%)	75
	TOTAL	545 (89.79%)	62 (10.21%)	607

Table 2 shows 89.79% lecturers' affirmation on awareness and 10.21% of them been unaware of plagiarism and PCS. This result showed that lecturers are generally much aware of plagiarism and PCS for detection of copy and paste works. This represents 545 responses which is high as against 62 respondents who have awareness and those who are also unaware of plagiarism and PCS in the University.

Research Question 2: Do lecturers insist on originality when assessing students' term papers, assignments and projects?

Table 3: Lecturers' Responses on Originality Check

Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
Term Papers Only	3	3.9%
Assignments	30	39.5%
Project/Thesis	43	56.6%
TOTAL	76	100%

Table 3 shows the result of whether lecturers insist on originality when marking students' term papers, assignments and project/thesis work. It showed that lecturers check on originality recorded high percentage of 56.6% for projects/thesis work, 39.5% for assignments and 3.9% for term papers respectively.

Research Question 3: When do Lecturers begin to suspect plagiarism in a student's term papers, assignments and project?

229

Table 4: Responses of Lecturers' suspicion of Plagiarism in a students' work

S/N	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	When facts not in public domain are not referenced	26	40%
2.	No reference in more than a quarter of a page	8	12.3&
3.	When Students' writing change to professionals writing	14	21.5%
4.	When a statement in a previous paragraph do not rhyme with the preceding paragraph	17	26.2%
	TOTAL	65	100 %

Table 4 shows that 40% of lecturers suspect plagiarism in students' work when facts not in public domain are presented. 12.3% of lecturers suspect plagiarism when a student does not reference more than a quarter of a page. 21.5% of lecturers suspect plagiarism when students' writing change to professionals' writing. And 26.2% are able to suspect plagiarism when a statement in previous paragraph does not rhyme with the preceding argument or opinion subsequently raised which may indicate a copy and paste text which is plagiarism.

Research Question 4: What are the proportion of students engaged in plagiarism in FUTMINNA?
Table 5: Responses of Lecturers' on Proportion of Students' Engaged in Plagiarism

SN	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Very Few	12	15.4%
2.	Few	26	33.3%
3.	Fairly Large	32	41.1%
4.	Very Large	8	10.3%
	TOTAL	78	100 %

Table 5 shows that very few proportion of students engage in plagiarism which is 15.4% while the few that engage in plagiarism represents 33.3%. Furthermore, fairly large proportion of students which represents 41.1% engages in plagiarism while 10.3% responses indicated that very large proportion of students in FUTMINNA are engaged in plagiarism.

Research Question 5: How rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA?
Table 6: Responses of Lecturers' on Rampant Level of Plagiarism in FUTMINNA

S/N	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Very Rampant	1	1.4%
2.	Rampant	19	26.4%
3.	Not Rampant	52	72.2%
	TOTAL	72	100 %

Table 6 shows that 1.4% and 26.4% respondents indicated that plagiarism is very rampant and rampant respectively while 72.2% of respondents indicated that plagiarism is not rampant amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA.

Research Question 6: How often do publishers return manuscripts with missing references?
Table 7: Responses of Lecturers' on return of Article Papers with missing References

S/N	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Once	12	15.8%
2.	Occasionally	11	14.4%
3.	Never	53	69.7%
	TOTAL	76	100 %

Table 7 shows that 69% of respondents never had their article papers returned for missing references. And those who had their papers retuned occasionally represented only 14.5% while 15.8% had theirs return once.

Research Question 7: What are the factors responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA?

Table 8: Responses of Lecturers' on Factors Responsible for Plagiarism amongst Lecturers in FUTMINNA

S/N	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Laziness	32	42.1%
2.	Mass information on the Internet	12	15.8%
3.	No enforcement of Plagiarism law	10	13.2%
4.	Too many assignments and time Management	14	18.4%
5.	Publish or Perish Syndrome	8	10.5%
	TOTAL	76	100 %

Table 8 shows that six (6) factors are responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMINNA. Laziness had the highest percentage of 42.1%. 15.8% of respondents are saying that mass information on the Internet is responsible. 13.2% indicated that is lack of enforcement of anti-plagiarism law. 18.4% indicated too many assignments and inadequate time management while 10.5% respondents attested that it is publish or perish syndrome that is responsible for plagiarism especially amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA.

Discussion

The results of data analyzed on the perception of plagiarism and use of PCS in the FUTMINNA showed that lecturers have the awareness that plagiarism degrades and is an offence in the University. This is believed would improve the quality of research outputs from the University and entrench hard work and academic integrity which lecturers should strive for. On whether lecturers check on originality, the findings showed that, projects/thesis works of students have very high percentages of examination for plagiarism. Similarly, a lot of attention is dedicated to checking the sources and acknowledgement of other authors work in students' assignments and term papers to ensure proper representation of facts. And how do lecturers suspects plagiarism in students' work, is when facts that are not public domain are not acknowledged. Furthermore, when there is no coherence or there appears a contradiction between a paragraph and the preceding one, when language of reporting suddenly turns to a professionals writing and no reference in more than quarter of a page. This findings correlates with earlier work of Jenny (2002) on how to detect plagiarism in student work that, new students were less confident more likely to be confused and avoid plagiarism than older student (p = 0.011). Thus, the older or rather level of study of a student could likely trigger the tendency to plagiarize. On the analysis on the proportion of students that engaged in plagiarism in FUTMIN showed that fairly large percentage of students either copy or refuse to acknowledge sources of facts or deliberately distort facts with motive of taking credit. This finding also collaborates Khan and Subramanian (2012) that showed over 70% of students mostly use online databases, e-books, e-journals, and e-libraries to complete their essays and reports. This meant that lecturers would have to pay proper attention to works presented to them to avoid been deceived into accepting distorted facts by lazy and crafty students, because very large proportion of them are engaged in plagiarism.

The findings on how rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA revealed that, 72.2% of respondents in the study indicated that plagiarism is not rampant. This finding agrees with the earlier position of 89.79% of lecturers' awareness on plagiarism and use of PCS. University's adoption of anti-plagiarism check software (Turnitin) has raised awareness level which helped to reduce rampant cases of plagiarism (TURNITIN, 2012). Therefore, plagiarism is not rampant amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA. Furthermore, on whether publishers reject or return article papers written by lecturers for missing references, the result showed that 69.7% of respondents said never was their articles returned. While those whose article papers were return occasionally and once were 14.5% and 15.8% respectively. The result

showed that lecturers reference other peoples efforts in article papers they submit to publishers by correctly acknowledge the sources of materials. And so their articles' are often not returned for missing references.

The findings of the study also revealed that several factors are responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA. Laziness was found to be the leading contributor with 42.1%, while mass information on the Internet; lack of enforcement of plagiarism law; too many assignments and time management; publish or perish syndrome amongst academic staff recorded 15.8%, 13.2%, 18.4%, and 10.5% respectively. So, the major factor responsible for plagiarism in FUTMINNA is laziness and then followed by too many assignments and time management. Harko, Robert and Pargman (2016) posited that, the reason for plagiarizing is no single reason but rather the combination of several variables such as lack of training due to not having received enough training in scientific writing, and lack of time due to poorly designed assessment procedures and finally lack of motivation. Others factors highlighted do not pose serious problem as to influence or responsible for plagiarism in FUTMINNA was the 'you publish or perish syndrome 'that is given prominence as a condition for elevation of rank in the University which has endeared lecturers to plagiarism.

Implications Of Findings To Sustainable National Development
The following are the implications of findings of the study to sustainable national development in the 21st century:

1. That lecturers have awareness of anti-plagiarism Check Software (APCS) in the University which those implies they will be amenable for coping without proper acknowledgment or plagiarism because it will be detected and therefore academic dishonesty is not likely to thrive. As such, lecturers would uphold ethical conducts of honesty and hard work in the University.
2. That lecturers insist on originality when assessing particularly students' time papers, assignments and projects. When students are conscious that lecturers insist on originality, they will avoid the tendency of plagiarizing and imbibe the attitude of due diligence, originality, honesty and hard work in their conduct of assignments and other academic activities.
3. That when do lecturers suspect plagiarism in a students' work? Is when facts not in public domain are not referenced, when a statement in a previous paragraph do not rhyme with the preceding paragraph, were confirmed as possible indicators that a students has plagiarized. It does implies that, lecturers have to be vigilant and conversant with facts in public domain not to be deceived by clever and crafty students.
4. That the population of students engaged in plagiarism in FUTMINNA are fairly large. It therefore meant that, the factors influencing plagiarism (laziness, mass information on the Internet and too much assignments etc.) are having massive effects on students in the University
5. That plagiarism is not rampant among lecturers in FUTMINNA is plus on the University's academic which is commendable. It has shown that, lecturers are conversant with ethical rules and standard of academic literary acceptable for publishing.
6. That publishers do not normally return manuscripts with missing references also goes strengthen the earlier position of lecturers' awareness of universal standards of academic publishing which will soon see products of the University imbibing such threats and attitudes.
7. That the factors responsible for plagiarism among lecturers and students in FUTMINNA are in order; laziness, mass information on the internet, no enforcement of plagiarism law, too many assignments and time management, publish or perish syndrome.

Conclusion
From the empirical findings of this study, it was concluded that there is very high awareness of plagiarism and use of PCS amongst lecturers in FUTMINNA. Lecturers' carefully examine students' projects/thesis for plagiarism. Similarly, plagiarism is not rampant among lecturers and that is why articles submitted for publication are often returned for missing references. That the factors responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers are laziness, mass availability of information on the Internet and lack of enforcement anti-plagiarism laws. In addition, there is publish or perish syndrome as the major factor responsible for plagiarism.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made from the findings of the study:

1. More enlightenment campaigns should be carried out through workshops, sponsoring radio jungles using the University's 92.3 FM station to sustain current gains in awareness amongst lecturers.
2. Lecturers of research methodology must emphasize the need for proper referencing in text and bibliography of other authors work in students projects and thesis works. Group assignments that would help students demonstrate practical application of knowledge of referencing should be emphasized.
3. The University should subscribe to quality journals and commercial sites for download of reference materials to reduce the practice of plagiarism or cheating.
4. Lecturers should be encouraged to use APCS for every assignment and time papers.

References

Clayton, M. (1997). Term Paper at the click of a Mouse. The Christian Science Monitor (Online). Retrieved 20ᵗʰ. November, 2013 from http://www.csmonitor.com/durable/2013/11/20/feat/learning.1.html

Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003). Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices. Retrieved from http://www.wpacouncil.org

Frey, C. (2001). Chips and Cheating: Teachers are Looking Out for Tech Assisted Dishonesty, even Using Software to Detect Plagiarism. Los Angeles Times, Retrieved June 17ᵗʰ 2014, *from* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233894822_TurnitinR

Harko, V., Robert, R. &Pargman, T. C. (2016). Plagiarism Awareness, Perception and Attitudes among Students and Teachers in Swedish Higher Education: A Case Study. Retrieved May 16ᵗʰ 2016 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242738794

Huemer, M. (2015). Perception and Information Processing. Retrieved 19ᵗʰ August, 2016 from www.ifs.tuwien.ac.at/....infovis/..chapter3Humanperceptionandinform.accessedAugust19

Jerome, I., Christopher, N. &Ifeakachukwu, O. (2016). Awareness and Perception of Plagiarism of Postgraduate Students in Selected Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.* Retrieved 9ᵗʰ September, 2016 from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1322

Jenny, W. (2009). Staff and Student Perceptions of Plagiarism and Cheating. *International Journal of Technology and Learning in Higher Education,* 20(2), 98 - 105

Khan, Z. R. & Subramanian, B. (2012). Students go Click, Flick and Cheat …. E-Cheating, Technologies and more. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics, 6; 1-26*

Oliver, R. (2002). The Role of ICT in Higher Education for the 21ˢᵗ Century: ICT as a change agent for Education. Retrieved November 27ᵗʰ2013 from http://bhs-ict.pbworks.com/f/role%20of%20ict.pdf

Patrick, M. S. & David, R. N. (2002). Internet Plagiarism among College Student. *Journal of College Student Development, 43(3), 374 - 385*

Roig, M. (2013). Avoiding plagiarism, Self-plagiarism, and other Questionable Writing ractices: A Guide to Ethical Writing.

Turnitin (2012). White Paper on the Plagiarism Spectrum: Instructors Insight into 10 Types of Plagiarism. Retrieved December 9ᵗʰ, 2013 from www.turmitin.com Youmans, R. J. (2011). Does the adoption of plagiarism-detection software in higher education reduce plagiarism?. *Studies in Higher Education 36 (7); 749-761*