PERCEPTION OF PLAGIARISM AND PLAGIARISM CHECKS SOFTWARE (PCS) AMONGST LECTURERS AND STUDENTS OF FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, MINNA, NIGERIA

[1]Bello M. R., [2]Morenikeji, O. O. & [1]Wushishi, D. I.
[1]Dept. of Science Education, School of Science &Technology Education,
Federal University of Technology, Minna
[2]Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning,
School of Environmental Technology,
Federal University of Technology, Minna
E-mail: drrabiu@futminna.edu.ng Tel: +234 803 592 7009

Abstract
The study investigated the perception of Plagiarism and plagiarism Check Software (PCS) amongst lecturers and students of Federal University of Technology, Minna, Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted for the study. The purpose of the study was to determine the perception of plagiarism and PCS amongst lecturers and students of the University. The population of the study are lecturers and students of Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTMINNA). Multistage sampling technique was used i.e. stratified and simple sampling techniques were used to select the samples of the study. The sample consisted of 79 lecturers and 378 students drawn from across the eight schools (faculties) in the University. Likert-type questionnaire titled 'Questionnaire for Perception of Plagiarism and Plagiarism Check Software (QPPCS) was used for data collection. It was validated by two experts and a reliability coefficient of 0.82 was obtained using Cronbach alpha. The QPPCS was distributed by research assistants identified by the researcher in the eight schools in the University. They adopted face to face method in getting the questionnaire filled and returned by respondents. The data collected was analyzed using frequency count and simple percentages. Descriptive charts were used in describing the data analyzed. The study revealed amongst others; that lecturers and students have very high (89.79%) percentage of awareness of plagiarism and PCS. Lecturers insist on originality when assessing projects and thesis works and laziness was found to be the major factor responsible for plagiarism. It is recommended that the usage of Turnitin PCS should be sustained and more studies should be carried out to determine the mechanisms and forms of tactics used to prevent detection of plagiarism even with PCS usage. It was concluded that though there is awareness of plagiarism and PCS amongst lecturers and students in the University there is the need to sustain the tempo in mitigating and determining other criminal measures adopted especially by students' to evade detecting plagiarism acts.

Keywords: Perception, Plagiarism check software (PCS), Turnitin, Lecturers', Students'

Introduction
The advent of internet has brought limitless access to written materials which makes it easy for researchers to represent other researchers' work as their efforts. According to Patrick and David (2002) universal access to the Internet has been cited as a reason for the perceived decline in academic integrity particularly regarding plagiarism. This is because conducting research and the process of writing a report is a complex and difficult exercise requiring knowledge, truthfulness, honesty, clarity, accuracy, conciseness and most importantly ethical concerns (Roig, 2013). There is a growing concern about academic integrity (plagiarism) among lecturers and students which is gradually eroding originality, authorship and confidence in academics within and outside the University system globally. 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 acknowledgment 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. Therefore, from this perspective plagiarism could be considered as academic dishonesty orunethical conduct and copyright infringement, which are liable to sanctions such as expulsion or suspension in the academia and industry.

Academic dishonesty (plagiarism) ranges from falsification to failure to acknowledge sources of resources, or information used. This 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).

It is certainly not arguable that plagiarism has become so rife since the emergence of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) which has madeit easier for students and lecturers to have access to learning resources beyond the traditional classroom and library, thus, removing the barrier of time, geographical location and instructors' (Oliver, 2002). However, plagiarism is not a new phenomenon, though, now worsened by ICT availability which gave students and lecturers the erroneous impression that anything on World Wide Web (WWW) is free (Clayton, 1997).

Available literature hasshown that over 70% of students mostly use online databases, e-books, e-journals, and e-libraries to complete their essays and reports (Khan & Subramanian, 2012). It seems that most institutions have no clear-cut academic code of conduct that guides and regulate research crime committed either intentionally or unconsciously as it concerns plagiarism in Nigeria. Such code of conduct is morally essential for true representation of facts and data. This code of conduct abhors plagiarism and promotes standard, fairness, honesty and academic integrity in a learning environment (Oliver, 2002).

There will be no excuse for breach of ethical conduct, but it has been understood that lecturers and students plagiarize as a result of fear of failure; poor time management skills; the consequences of cheating as unimportant; assigning topics by lecturers that are generic and vague as assignment/project; instructors or institutions failure to enact policy against plagiarism or report cheating (Council of writing Program Administrators, 2003). Plagiarism or cheating in academics could be effectively prevented or minimized. Khan and Subramanian (2012) identified strategies that can help prevent plagiarism which includes amongst others:

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.

Frey (2001) reported that there is several availableanti-plagiarism detection software that lecturers and students can use to maintain ethical standard in research reporting or authorship. They include: Ferret, CopyCatch Gold, Turnitin and plagiarism catcher that uses search engines to compare and identify sources that are not acknowledged. Similarly, Youmans, (2011) suggested the use of Turnitin. com search engine which 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 can help promote ethical standards in such environments. There are however several factors influencing academic misconduct: failure to understand what is expected or confusion over differing expectations, increasing work overload, deliberate attempt to deceive markers, the desire to help a friend, not understanding referencing conventions, difficulty of assessment tasks, and peer pressure (Jenny, 2009)
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 plagiarism checks software (PCS) called Turnitin was introduced in Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTMIN) Nigeria in 2012/2013 academic session.The Turnitin antiplagiarism 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 studentsin 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 antiplagiarism measures and specifically PCS (Turnitin) in FUTMIN 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
This research investigated the perception of lecturers and students on plagiarism and plagiarism check software (PCS) which is Turnitin that is used in the Federal University of Technology, Minna Nigeria. This is because the Turnitin programme as PCS has been introduced in the University and it is been used by lecturers and students in the last four years. To this effect, not much is known about lecturers and students perception of this act of academic dishonesty (plagiarism) in FUTMIN. There is also perceived apathy, resentment and fear of victimization in the processes of promotion and appointment exercises of lecturers and vetting of students projects/dissertation/thesis after completion of study using the Turnitin software programme. There has been complaints going round the University that the use of Turnitin is targeted at stalling the progress of lecturers (especially to deny them promotion) and really unnecessary for students project reports. These reasons have prompted the need to carry out this research study on the perception of lecturers and students on plagiarism and PCS in the University.

Objectives of the study
The underlying goal of undertaking this study was to determine how lecturers and students perceive the use of PCS (Turnitin) package in the University to check cases of plagiarism that degrades and prevent quality research outputs. Therefore, the research attempted to achieve the following objectives:
1. To determine whether lecturers and students are aware of plagiarism and plagiarism check software package (Turnitin) used in Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTMIN).
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 the proportion of students that engaged in Plagiarism in FUTMIN.
5. To determine how rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMIN.
6. To determine whether publishers return manuscripts with missing references?
7. To determine the factors influencing plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMIN.

Research Questions
The following research questions were formulated to be answered for the purpose of the research:
1. Are lecturers and students aware of plagiarism and plagiarism check software package in FUTMIN?
2. Do lecturers 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 FUTMIN?
5. How rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMIN?
6. How often do publishers return manuscripts with missing references?
7. What are the factorsresponsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers' and student's in FUTMIN?

Research Methodology
The study adopted descriptive research design particularly the survey method. Survey method is used to collect data using a questionnaire from a representative sample size of individuals or subjects that are of interest to the researcher in order to make predictions on the entire population of the study (Sambo, 2005).

The population of the study was 800 and 10,500 students' as at 2014/2015 academic session in Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTMIN). The lecturers and students 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 has 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 sampling technique was used to select the sample of the study from the eight schools in the University. The students were also stratified and selected based on their academic levels of study (100L to 500L) using simple random sampling technique. The instrument for data collection was developed by the researcher and was named 'Questionnaire on Perception of Plagiarism and Plagiarism Check Software Package (QPPCS) amongst Lecturers and Students in FUTMIN'. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A contained bio-data information while section B has items on perceptions of plagiarism and PCS amongst lecturers and students. The QPPCS was distributed to lecturers' and students' while only 79 lecturers and 378 students filled the questionnaires and returned them across the eight schools in the University. The QPPCS instrument was validated by two experts and a reliability coefficient of 0.82 using Cronbach's alphawas obtained. The questionnaires was distributed by eight research assistants from the various schools in the University. Research assistants were used to distribute the questionnaires to lecturers and students. Lecturers were given the QPPCS in their respective offices and were given few days to complete them. While the QPPCS administered to students were collected immediately at the point of administration. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequency counts & simple percentages).

Results

1. Analysis of Demographic Data

Table 1:
Analysis of Demographic Data of Lecturers' and Students' in FUTMIN.

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%)
	Ph.D 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 are24.30%. 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.

Table2:
Distribution of Students' Levels of Study and Mode of Entry in FUTMIN

Variable	Category	Frequency
Level of Study	Undergraduate	312 (82.5%)
	Postgraduate	66 (17.5%)
Mode of Entry	Pre-Degree	38 (10%)
	UTME	239 (62.9%)
	Direct Entry 200L	26 (6.8%)
	Direct Entry 300L	8 (2.1%)
	PG Minna	67 (17.7%)

Table 2 also shows students' distribution based on their levels and mode of study in the University. Undergraduate students' are 312 which represents 82.5% while postgraduate students' are only 66 which is 17.5%. Their mode of entry shows that 239 which also represent 62.9% are UTME students'. While Pre-degree, direct entry 200L and 300L had 38%, 26% and 8% respectively. Only 66 are postgraduate programme students' which also represents about 17.7%.

2. Analysis Of Research Questions

Research Question 1: Are lecturers and students aware of Plagiarismand Plagiarism Check Software (PCS) package in FUTMIN?

Table3:
Responses on Lecturers awareness of Plagiarism and Plagiarism Check software (PCS) package in FUTMIN

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 fo r using antiplagiarism software	71(11.70%)	4(0.66%)	75
	GRAND TOTAL AND PERCENTAGES	**545 (89.79%)**	**62 (10.21%)**	**607**

Table 3 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.

Table 4:
Responses on Students Awareness of Plagiarism and PCS

Statement	Frequency	Percentages (%)
YES	307	80.4%
NO	75	19.6%
Total	382	100%

Table 4 also shows students awareness of that plagiarism and PCS. They are the ones who consented to knowing that plagiarism is a criminal offence in the University. 307 students responded in affirmation which is 80.4%. While only 75 students which represent less than 20% responded negatively that they are not aware of plagiarism and PCS, and that it is a criminal offence respectively.

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

Table 5:
Lecturers' Responses on Originality Check

S/NO	Items	Frequency	Percentages (%)
1.	Term Papers Only	3	3.9%
2.	Assignments	30	39.5%
3.	Project/Thesis	43	56.6%
	Total	**76**	**100%**

Table 5 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.

Table 5:
Responses on whether Students' are cautioned when given written assignments

S/NO	Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	YES	263	70.5%
2.	NO	110	29.5%
	Total	**373**	**100%**

Table 5 shows the result of whether students are cautioned on plagiarism on written assignments. The result showed that 263 students' were affirmative with a very high percentage of 70.5% while 110 respondents with 29.5% were reluctant with 29.5% respectively.

Research Question 3: When do you suspect plagiarism in a student's project work?

Table 6:
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 6 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 FUTMIN?

Table 7:
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 7 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 FUTMIN are engaged in plagiarism.

Research Question 5: How rampant is plagiarism amongst lecturers in FUTMIN?

Table 8:
Responses of Lecturers' on Rampant Level of Plagiarism in FUTMIN

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 8 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 FUTMIN.

Research Question 6: How often do publishers return manuscripts with missing references?

Table 9:
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 9 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 and students in FUTMIN?

Table 10:
Responses of Lecturers' on Factors Responsible for Plagiarism amongst Lecturers and students in FUTMIN

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 10 shows that six (6) factors are responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMIN. 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 antiplagiarism 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 FUTMIN.

The following are the summary of findings for the study:
1.   Lecturers and students are aware of plagiarism and PCS.
2.   Lecturers insist on originality when assessing particularly students' projects/theses.
3.   Lecturers suspect plagiarism in a students' work when facts not in public domain are not referenced.
4.   The population of students engaged in plagiarism in FUTMIN are fairly large.
5.   Plagiarism is not rampant among lecturers in FUTMIN.
6.   Publishers do not normally return manuscripts with missing references.
7.   The factors responsible for plagiarism among lecturers and students in FUTMIN are in these order:
      a)   Laziness.
      b)   Mass information on the internet.
      c)   No enforcement of plagiarism law.
      d)   Too many assignments and time management.
      e)   Publish or perish syndrome.

Discussion
The results of data analyzed on the perception of plagiarism and use of PCS in the FUTMIN showed that both lecturers and students 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 that lecturers and students 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 in checking the sources and acknowledgement of other authors work in students' assignments and term papers to ensure proper representation of facts. And how the lecturer does suspects plagiarism in students' work is when facts that are not public domain is 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 FUTMIN 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 antiplagiarism check software has raised the awareness level which helped to reduce rampant cases of plagiarism (TURNITIN, 2012). Therefore, plagiarism is not rampant amongst lecturers in FUTMIN. 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 used. And therefore, their article papers are often returned for missing references.

The findings of the study also revealed that several factors are responsible for plagiarism amongst lecturers and students in FUTMIN. The result of analysis showed that, laziness was highest contributor amongst others 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 only had 15.8%, 13.2%, 18.4%, and 10.5% respectively. So, the major factors responsible for plagiarism in FUTMIN is laziness and then followed by too many assignments and time management amongst lecturers and students. 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 FUTMIN 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.

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 and students in FUTMIN. 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 students are laziness, mass availability of information on the Internet and lack of enforcement antiplagiarism laws. In addition to these ones, among lecturers you have 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 and students.
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 PCS 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

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 27th 2013 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 Practices: 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