CHAPTER-I

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In the present scenario of competitive world, where everybody lives, breathes and eats competition, school students are under constant pressure of fulfilling expectations of the teachers and parents. The all-pervading competitive environment, social and academic, encourages adolescents to compare themselves with their peer groups which makes their self-image in a regular state of redefinition. When they cannot grow up to their expectations or are in process of pursuing it, adolescents suffer resentment, stress, aggression, undesirable complexes, depression and indulge in various cheating behaviours. Cheating is a complex issue. Cheating is an unsocial behaviour which adolescents attempts to follow to make them happy and sustain their successful image. They do not care for ethical means, do not hesitate to adopt unfair means and short cut methods to achieve the ends at the cost of others. The role of muscle power, money power and political power plays a vital role to activate the academic cheating that ultimately leads to guilty conscience and harmful to the society. “Each student is responsible for his or her learning, therefore any act of academic dishonesty is a serious concern because its occurrence diminishes the quality of education and undermines the integrity of the institution. Complex issues associated with academic dishonesty arise when students pass out without the skills and knowledge that are associated with the awarded qualification. Moreover, academic dishonesty can threaten the development of leaders, good citizens and ethical professionals” (Brent & Atkisson, 2011).

1.1 MEANING AND AREAS OF ACADEMIC CHEATING

“The issue of academic dishonesty or cheating is no longer an isolated issue but has developed into a global occurrence because everyone is doing it” (Fawkner & Keremidchieva, 2004). “Academic dishonesty includes cheating on a quiz or test, plagiarizing, obtaining advanced information about a quiz or test, fabricating information or submitting the same academic work for multiple courses, helping or attempting to help another commit an act of academic dishonesty, and academic misuse of computer software” (Waithaka & Gitimu, 2012). Academic dishonesty is a major problem that continues to plague higher education (Miller, Shoptaugh, & Wooldridge, 2011; Rettinger & Kramer, 2009; Wotring & Bol, 2011). The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2013) defines
cheating, “As an act to deprive of something valuable by the use of deceit or fraud.” Another definition include the submission of work that is not one’s own (Burrus, McGoldrick, & Schuhmann, 2007). Hard, Conway and Moran (2006) defines cheating as, “Providing or receiving assistance in a manner not authorized by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for academic evaluation.” Oxford advanced learner’s dictionary (1994) defines cheating as, “To act dishonestly or unfairly in order to win an advantage or profit.” Cheating in school is defined as a violation of prescribed rules or some standards for completing school assignments, presentations and tests (Cizek, 1999). Kalia (2005) has classified cheating in two types i.e. (i) active cheating to improve one’s own grade (ii) passive cheating to assist others in improving their grades. Cheating may be defined as, “Fraudulent behaviour involving some form of deception in which one's own efforts or the efforts of others are misrepresented” (Prescot, 1989). Academic cheating can be using crib notes in Examination or using other’s work in assignments and it may be as using unauthorized techniques for examination purpose or hire professional persons to write papers and also to organize reports. Review of the literature suggests that many different forms of academic dishonesty are prevailing at international level (Caruana, Ramaseshan, & Ewing, 2000; Coston & Jenks, 1998; Kibler, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Roig & DeTommaso, 1995; Stern & Havlicek, 1986). According to Pavela (1978), there are four general areas that comprise academic dishonesty: i) cheating by using unauthorized materials on any academic activity such as an assignment, test, etc.; ii) lying of information, references, or results; iii) plagiarism; and iv) facilitating other students engage in academic dishonesty such as allowing other students to copy their work, maintaining test banks, memorizing questions on a quiz, etc.

Student academic dishonesty includes lying, cheating on exams, copying or using other people’s work without permission, altering or forging documents, buying papers, plagiarism, purposely not following the rules, altering research results, providing false excuses for missed tests and assignments, making up sources, and so on. (Arent, 1991; Moore, 1988; Packer, 1990; Pratt & McLaughlin, 1989). Perry (2010) devised a typology of academic misconduct and it represents a model of academic improper behaviour in two dimensions in which one dimension is measuring the level of rules to be understood whereas clearly the rules followed are measured in other dimension. Only those who perceive the rules but fail to follow, are cheaters according to this typology. Cheating can be in the form of plagiarized works, look over at the time of examination or sharing of prohibited information among students during exams. Over the
past years, various detailed and complicated cheating methods have been evolved. Since the information revolution began, students have reported about books hided in washrooms and storing of data in scientific calculators and mobiles. Strategies for signaling correct answer to classmates are increasing and level can be varied from coded signals or tapping of pens on benches to some voices in such a manner that cannot reach the range of invigilators. Cheating is different from various forms of academic dishonesty in which people involvethemselves without having any academic benefit for them, like, telegraphing answers to others during an exam could be cheating. If any student in the previous class period make aware to any other student about administration of an exam or some test by the teacher in the next class period, that is also treated as academic dishonesty even the first student haven’t receive any advantage. This type of cheating though disapproved might be considered altruistic.

1.1.1 PREVALENCE OF ACADEMIC CHEATING

The pervasiveness of academic cheating among students is of worldwide global concern and is prevalent in all types of Schools at all levels of Educational Boards and Universities. It is one of the complicated and challenging task for educators, instructors, administrators. Incidents of Academic cheating reported in the leading newspapers and educational literature collectively present a serious problem that is complex and multifaceted. Practices of academic cheating exist almost at each grade in Schools, Colleges and Universities but its degree and the type of specific groups of students engaged in academic cheating, is very difficult to measure. Cheating has been viewed by many students as a best way to get benefit, a way to gain higher marks so that he/she can secure admission in one of the top Universities. The students who indulge in cheating are not just at loss, but may be seen as not smart enough for not going with the flow of system. Academic dishonesty includes cheating in quizzes, tests, assignments; taking credit for work of others; interfere with the academic record of others; misrepresenting qualifications whether it is academic or professional and misrepresentation while filling applications and other official records. Academic cheating has been documented in each and every type of educational setup from elementary to higher level.

“The 2012 nationally televised cheating scandal at Harvard University involving as many as 125 students in a 279 student class could be used as a testament to this claim” (Pennington, 2012).

In Duck University, Academic Integrity center (2005) published the study that showed 87% of students had involved in cheating on written academic work and 70% on exams.
According to *Educational testing service* (1999), academic cheating has been raised dramatically during the last 50 years among high school and college students. *Who's Who among American High School Students Poll* (1998) came out with findings that (i) To get higher position in their class, 80 percent of the best students cheated. (ii) More than 50 percent of the students think that cheating is not a big issue. (iii) 95 percent were not caught in cheating. (iv) 40 percent cheated in quiz or in exam. (v) 67 percent involved in copying someone’s homework. In Josephson Institute of Ethics, according to *Josephson* (1998), “70% of high school and 54% of middle school students had cheated on an exam in the last 12 months.” Also *Connecticut Department of Public Health survey* (1997) concluded about 63% students of 11th grade and 62% students of 9th grade reported cheating in exams in last 12 months.

According to *Stephen Davis* (1998), "about 20% of college students from across the nation admitted to cheating in high school during the 1940's. That percentage has since soared, with no fewer than 75% and as many as 98% of 8,000 college students surveyed each year now reporting cheating in high school – and the majority admitting doing it on several occasions". According to the most recent incident report issued by the Academic Integrity Initiative in the Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, the 2011-12 academic year showed a 35% increase in reported incidents of academic dishonesty (*Brenda Quaye, Miami University’s new Coordinator for Academic Integrity*, 2012).

*McCabe* (2005) has been dedicated to extensive research on academic cheating for more than 20 years, published a report in the U.S. to conclude about extremely common occurrence of academic cheating in high schools and colleges. During the tenure of 2001 to 2005, around 20,000 high school students and about 100,000 students in the colleges and Universities of U.S. and Canada were surveyed and concluded that 74 percent reported about cheating on a test, 72 percent on a written work and 97 percent had copied on someone’s test or homework.

Cheating among students have been reported by a number of investigators (*Davis et al., 1992; Dickoff et al., 1996; McCabe.1992; Michaels and Miethe, 1989*). Several variables have been found to be associated with cheating which includes low level of commitment to ideals of higher education, classroom environment, objective type examinations, poor monitoring of exams and administration of old tests (*Maramark and Maline, 1993; Pulvers, 1997 quoted by Dickhoff et al., 1999*). The research reports collectively show that cheating has become common phenomena among students especially in higher classes. *Cizek* (1999) has reported that at elementary level approximately one third students admit to
cheating. The prevalence of cheating is at its top level during years of high school. A national survey shows that at high school level, 74% students admit to cheating on tests, whereas, 72% of students admitted to have cheated on written assignments. Davis and Ludvigson (1995) has reported that those students who involve in cheating during their studies at University level are also have involved in any sort of cheating earlier in their studies. In the U. S. some studies showed that 20 percent of students started cheating in their 1st grade (Bushway and Nash, 2002). Similarly, some other studies reported that 56 percent of middle school and 70 percent of high school students involvement in cheating (Bushway and Nash, 2002).

In the survey done by Ramirez (2008), almost more than 8 out of 10 students have told untruth to their parents related to something important and significant. Also the survey reveals that dishonest behaviour is pervasive at Public as well as at Private Schools. Boys are more involved in cheating behaviour than girls, but virtually, there exists no difference in case of cheating. Students who have engaged in the acts of cheating have a positive view about their own. 93% of them were satisfied with their morals and values and 77% stated that they are doing better when it comes for doing right thing. Asked if they agreed with the statement that "In the real world, successful people do what they have to do to win, even if others consider it cheating," 59% answered in the affirmative.

1.1.2 POTENTIAL INDICATORS, MODERATORS AND OTHER VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH CHEATING BEHAVIOUR

In some of the studies done in each decade over the last thirty years, fear of failure and parents demanding good grades were scored by students among the top five reasons for cheating. Educators have hypothesized four general reasons why students cheat: competition for recognition and advancement, lack of academic preparation, ignorance of what cheating and thrill seeking. “Several policies that cause increased competition or make students feel they are less prepared could increase rates of cheating, while interventions that reduce competition, increase academic confidence, or educate students about cheating may reduce these rates” (Finn & Frone, 2004). Students who were more likely to cheat are above averaged college going students. Cheating has increased among college going students than some other groups. To get into a selective college of their choice, they are ready to do all whatever they
can be. They want to do their best in all fields like perform best to get top grades, to be part of best sports, involve them in social services etc. This can lead most of the students to engage in cheating (Josephson, 1998). “Students who feel increased pressure and workload in school, they tend to be more exhausted, less engaged and have more health related problems” (Pope, 2010/2011). Among gifted adolescents, increase in academic cheating on homework and examination is related with increase in academic workload and to maintain success (Geddes, 2011). Academic pressures to succeed and to remain in very competitive and scholastic programs causing adolescents to utilize academically deceitful means (Taylor et al., 2002).

“Students at nine medium to large state universities were surveyed for such comprehensive investigation of the influences of individual and contextual factors on self-reported academic dishonesty. Results of the studies suggested that cheating was influenced by a number of characteristics of individuals including age, gender, and grade-point average, as well as a number of contextual factors including the level of cheating among peers, peer disapproval of cheating, fraternity/sorority membership, and the perceived severity of penalties for cheating. Peer disapproval was the strongest influential factor” (McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Researchers have found the students at schools with other ways of academic integrity are more likely to cheat than the students who attend school with an honor code (McCabe and Trevino, 1993).

While research on academic dishonesty in other countries is minimal, anecdotal evidence suggests cheating could be even more common in countries like Japan (Dryden, 1999). A National Survey by Rutgers' Management Education Center of 4,500 high school students found that, “75 percent of them engage in serious cheating. More than half have plagiarized work they found on the Internet. Perhaps most disturbing, many of them don't see anything wrong with cheating: Some 50 percent of those responding to the survey said they don't think copying questions and answers from a test is even cheating. Students have very little sense of moral outrage about cheating. For many, the pressure to do well academically and compete for good colleges has made cheating a way to survive high school.”

According to Educational Testing Service (1999), “Research about cheating among college students has shown the following to be the primary reasons for cheating: Campus norm; No honor code; Penalties not severe; Faculty support of academic integrity policies is low; Little chance of being caught; Incidence is higher at larger, less selective institutions. Additional influencers include: Others doing it; Faculty member doesn't seem to care; required course; No stated rules or rules are unclear; Heavy workload.”
Duke University study (2005) found that 75 percent students of high level school engage in cheating and that number climbs to 90 percent in case of copying another person's homework. It was done by the weaker students who were not capable of getting good marks. In the present scenario, students think it necessary part of school life and also be done by the highly capable good students who can get good marks without cheating because they are under severe pressure to maintain their high grades to get admission in topmost colleges. They are who are smart enough to make out how to cheat without getting caught.

As the expected motivation becomes high, the rate of cheating also becomes higher (Whitley, 1998). Some other factors/causes were the want of getting best marks (McCabe, 1992; Singhal, 1982) or the desire to get good scholarships (Diekhoff et al., 1996). Engagement in Academic dishonesty was linked with the need to get high grades (Coston & Jenks, 1998; Genereux & McLeod, 1995; Robinson, & Kuin, 1999; Whitley, 1998). Less social disapproval combined with increased competition for admission into Universities and Schools has made students more desiring to do whatever to get the grade A. Grades rather than education have become the main focus of many students. Students feel like justified in cheating and as they see others involved in cheating, they do it. The cheaters may get 100% in their exam, while the non-cheaters may get marks only in 90's. In most of the cases, cheaters do not get caught and if caught, they are rarely punished severely (Educational testing service, 1999).

Apart from attaining grades, cheating is motivated by following factors: pressure to maintain high good grades, to avoid failure; perception of school as unfair, lack of time spent on class work or homework and Non condemnatory perception towards cheating. Those motives have two concepts in common; the fear of not being able to maintain success and disassociation from school rules and norms (Finn and Frone, 2004). Similar results are concluded from several more researches, where the academic workload is an important determinant (Lipson & MacGavern, 1993). Pressure for good grades in higher education, academic stress, attitude of teachers are important determinants of cheating (Davis et al, 1992). Baird (1980) reported that 35% of the students had very little time for preparation of the exams and 26% students reasoned their workload compel them to cheat. Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, and Armstead (1996) found that 21 percent of the cheaters regarded lack of time for study, as one of the reason which indulge them to cheat and 20 percent cheated to get better grades. 16% reasoned for cheating that was "everybody else does it", which reflects their cheating attitude effectively. This attitude was followed by 14% cheaters to help some friend and 10% cheat because of their laziness. Maramark and Maline (1993) studied various
causes of cheating and reported that stress to compete for jobs, to maintain scholarships and also to get admission to postgraduate programs were most important determinants of cheating.

1.1.3 THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN CHEATING

Technology has made cheating easier. Using information from the internet without proper attribution, downloading term papers from on-line paper mills and sharing answers through e-mail, are all high-tech cheating. Numerous websites are available for helping students to cheat. According to Educational testing service (1999), a website providing free term papers to students and averaged 80,000 hits per day. Boston University filed suit against eight such web companies for providing online term papers and such companies have to include disclaimers on their websites indicating papers are for research purposes only and are not to be submitted as original work.

In order to download research papers, articles etc. produced by others and present them as their own work, students use a new technique like the World Wide Web. It was illustrated from Swedish university report that students were using ‘not accepted means’ to get credits and among which mostly downloaded readymade course works from the web were used (Meddelar, 1998). Various forms of cheating are widely accessible to larger population of studentsthrough continuous growth of the Internet. Large multi institutional studies of attitudes of students toward cheating have established the criticizing role that situational factors, such as peer behaviour and peer disapproval have on student dispositions regarding cheating (Bowers, 1964; Leming, 1980; McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1997), yet the another newest environmental factor, the increasing use of information technology has escaped systematic study. A review of situational factors that facilitate different forms of academic dishonesty suggested that information technology has lowered obstacles to cheating. Researches have shown that cheating occurs when related opportunities are enhanced (Michaels & Miethe, 1989; Perry, Kane, Bernesser & Spicker, 1990), surveillance can be ignored (Concoran & Rotter, 1987; Covey, Saladin & Killen, 1989), chances for being successful have been improved (McCabe & Trevino, 1993), and risk of punishment has been lowered (Leming, 1980). All are related with evidence about how information technology has enabled students to deeply involve in academically dishonest behaviours.

1.1.4 JUSTIFICATION ABOUT CHEATING GIVEN BY STUDENTS
Many students think cheating is not universally wrong under certain circumstances, some felt that it can be justified (LaBeff et al., 1990). This can be explained by why most of the cheaters try to justify their misconduct behaviour (Haines et al., 1986; Roig & Ballew, 1994; Whitley, 1998). This justification about cheating is based upon the concept of neutralization proposed by Sykes and Matza (1959).

It does not matter whether the demographic, situational or contextual influencers are with students that engage them in various forms of cheating behaviour, they must overcome their own conscience before they cheat. Such type of behaviour depends both on how strongly and practically someone disapproves it and what different types of justifications, students use to get escaped from a sense of guilty. Those students who individually have not any ethical problem, cheat guilt-free. Students engage in cheating because they see other students doing it and think they are being unfairly disadvantaged and feel justified in what they are doing. Some students think that this is the only way out, they can stay in the race and get admission into the selective school (Educational testing service, 1999).

1.1.5 FACULTY ISSUES IN DETERRING ACADEMIC CHEATING

There are limitations to rely on the faculty members to investigate academic dishonesty. One of the study found that up to 21% of professors have ignored at least one clear cut case of academic cheating (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel). Another study reported that 40% of professors never report cheating, 54% seldom report cheating and only 6% act on all cases of academic misconduct that confront them (Schneider). In another third survey, it was found that 79% professors had observed cheating, only 9% had penalized the student (McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino, 2003).

1.1.6 EFFORTS TO STOP CHEATING

Results of a survey underscore the pervasiveness of academic cheating, even as schools employ more sophisticated methods to catch cheaters and take a tougher steps to stop and discourage unethical behaviour. U.S. News (2008) explored the efforts to stop cheating in higher education. The students’ responses raise several questions about why cheating is on the increasing mode and whether schools should emphasize character/value education in their curriculum.

UNM Policy on Academic Dishonesty (2008) suggests that each student is expected to follow and maintain the highest norms and standards of honesty and integrity in academic and professional front. The University reserves the right to take disciplinary action and also
including dismissal against any student who is found guilty of such misconduct behaviour or fails to fulfil the standards. Any student found to have engaged in academic dishonest behaviour in course work, may get failing marks for the course.

Robinson-Zañartu; Peña; Cook-Morales; Peña; Afshani and Nguyen (2005) surveyed about 270 faculty members to determine whether they had been confronted with any situation of plagiarism and whether they had prepared to deal with it. They examined by using case studies, faculty characterizations of the severity of students’ use of another's work, by source, use, and amount of material and their suggestions, actions, reports, and sanctions.

1.2 ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

Some people tend to see all the things that happen to them as primarily under their control, such people are referred as internals. Their perceived locus of control is internal or within themselves. In contrast, other persons may tend to see their achievements as largely outside their own control. They believe that events are controlled by several other factors such as luck, chance, and help by teacher, friend or relatives. Such people have an external locus of control and referred as external.

Engaging in academic cheating or the deliberately use of someone’s work submitted for academic credit (Pavela, 1997), likely depends somewhat on one’s locus of control (Sierra & Hyman, 2006). Believing that successes or failures are out of one’s control may result in academic dishonesty. “Cheaters tend to consider their behavior acceptable when they can describe it as caused by external forces rather than their own dishonesty” (Rettinger & Kramer, 2009). Just like believing that an exam will be so difficult and impossible to pass may drag some students to involve in academically cheating behaviour rather than studying. The relationship between academic dishonesty and an external locus of control have found significant (Gallagher, 2010; Karabenick & Srull, 1978; Lefcourt, 1982; Pino & Smith, 2003). Alarape and Onakoya (2003) studied the cheating behaviours and locus of control of Nigerian students and found that students having external locus of control are more engaged in cheating behaviours. In addition to actual behavior, locus of control affects attitudes toward cheating and unethical behavior in the classroom. Trevino and Youngblood (1990) found American graduate students having internal locus of control were less likely to engage in unethical behavior. Coleman and Mahaffey (2000) in a study of American undergraduates found similar results that those having an external locus of control viewed cheating as more acceptable than those having an internal locus of control. On the contrary, Whitley (1998), in his meta-analysis of academic dishonesty among college students found
cheating was slightly correlated with an internal locus of control and revealed that students with an internal control are more likely to cheat on a task when they think the outcome is based on skill rather than chance, and the opposite is true of those with an external locus of control.

In the descriptive ethics literature, internal locus of control has been associated with higher level of cognitive moral development (Murk and Addleman, 1992), higher levels of moral responsibility (Johnson et al. 1968), helping behaviour and resistance to others expectations, requests, and other social pressures especially that violate their beliefs and principles (Lefcourt, 1982). In means that internals may react negatively to social influence which exhibits a shift in attitudes in the opposite direction of the influence (Biondo and Mac-Donald, 1971). Internal locus of control tends to be positively associated (Jones and Kavanagh, 1996; Reiss and Mitra, 1998; Cherry and Fraedrich, 2000; Key, 2002; Granitz, 2003), while external locus of control appears to be negatively associated with the ethical decision making process (Shapeero et al., 2003). It shows that externally controlled adolescents indulged more in unethical Intentions like academic cheating than internally controlled adolescents. Locus of control is negatively associated with ethics (McCuddy and Peery, 1996). Some other researchers reported no significant differences (Basset et al., 1999; Razzaque and Hwee, 2002). Ford and Richardson (1994) conducted three studies, in two out of three, there were no significant findings of these two studies and in his third study, external managers’ associated organizational politics as ethical. In two additional studies by Loe et al. (2000), the results obtained were mixed where one study reported no significant findings and the other was reported that locus of control directly or indirectly influences ethical decision-making through outcome expectancies. Several other studies report no significant differences in findings. Forsyth et al. (1985); Karabanick & Srull (1978) and Leming (1980) found that students with an external locus of control are more likely to cheat. Houston (1986b) found that the locus of control was not to be significantly correlated with cheating. The combination of literatures provides a broader base from which to generalize that individuals with an external locus of control are more likely to engage in unethical behaviours like cheating.

1.3 ACADEMIC CHEATING AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In Academic Context, Achievement in the school environment is called scholastic achievement and it is associated to a great extent with the development of knowledge, understanding, application and skills acquisition. But actually in our educational system,
more stress is laid down on the Intellectual ability and it is considered as an important factor in determining the academic achievement of the students. Although the uniform instructions were given to the students in classroom with similar intelligence level, but it has been observed by Educationists, Parents, and Teachers that extensive and wide range of differences could be seen in the academic achievement level of students. Therefore, it concluded that the intelligence ability is not an only factor in determining the low or high level of academic achievement of the students. Studies by Whitley and Keith-Spiegel have reported no clear correlation between academic dishonesty and academic success. One of the studies reported that students were given an unexpected opportunity to cheat but it did not significantly improve their scores from the control group. Other study reported that cheating did not improve the grades of students who were allowed to bring cheating sheets in a test. Only 13% of males and 46% of females think that cheating doesn’t help to improve grades, this may conflict with the common perception of cheating, it is often apparent to educationalists, professors and members of academic conduct committees when papers have been plagiarized by their inferior quality. In the USA, on average, one third of top grade students have cheated (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel,http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic_dishonesty#cite_ref-88)

Bowers (2009) asserts that academic dishonesty is a shortcut way-out that is why it might be attempted by even grade ‘A’ students. Students use the crib notes as alternatives rather than as complements to studying, and thus spent less time for the preparation of the examination.

A number of demographic characteristics including age, gender and grade point average has been identified that are important influencers on cheating (McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Students engaged in so many extra-curricular activities are more likely to cheat whereas females, students with higher grade point and older students are less likely to cheat (Carroll, 2002). Academic achievement affects cheating behaviour as those students who perform poorly are more involved in cheating than those performing well academically (McCabe and Trevino, 2000). High levels of cheating have a correlation with low grades. Also, educational qualification of parents shows a weak but positive correlation with cheating; students whose parents did not attend college are less likely to cheat than those students whose parents received college degrees (Carroll, 2002, A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education, the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning). Urban schools which are performing high have several factors in common like strong leadership quality, supportive school culture and a positive environment and also good teaching. Students’ engagement is
also identified as an important factor which is directly related to academic success (Alpern, 2008).

Academic dishonesty has been associated with Grade point average as students with lower grades are more involved in cheating than the students with high grades (Antion & Michael, 1983; Bunn, Caudill & Gropper, 1992; Diekhoff et al., 1996; Genereux & McLeod, 1995; Haines et al., 1986; McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Scheers & Dayton, 1987; Whitley, 1998), but it is not always happen (Jordan, 2001). Students having lower GPA have less to lose and more to gain by involvement in academic dishonesty, this is the rationale for this relationship (Leming, 1980; McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Also, it may be possible that students with lower GPA may have poor academic skills which makes them feel that they must have to cheat.

At a Symposium on cheating (“Symposium on cheating,” Today’s Education, 1980), educators and researchers analyzed why students cheat. Lack of confidence was seen as a common characteristic among cheaters, even among highly motivated and successful students. The high achiever often feels pressured by parents, teachers and his or her own internalized aspirations to attain ever-higher standards (and grades) while the low achieving student’s need to cheat often reflects a strategy for competing in a school environment where the student feels unsuccessful. Bushway and Nash (1977) reported about majority of studies that students who are having poor academic achievement may engage in cheating more frequently, other researches find a significant negative relationship between academic cheating and GPA (Antion and Michael, 1983; Baird, 1980; Bronzaft et al., 1973; Bunn et al., 1992; Fakouri, 1972; Haines et al., 1986; Michaels and Miethe, 1978; Singhal, 1982), grades (Gardner et al., 1988) and ability (Daniel et al., 1991). The only study reporting a non-significant relationship between grades/G.P.A. and cheating was reported by Houston (1986b).

Some other researches have shown a relationship between the occurrence of academic cheating and goal orientation. Students who perceive their classroom to emphasize performance goals are more engaged in cheating than those who perceive their classroom to have high mastery goals (Anderman & Midgley, 2004). That means those students who are motivated to learn for the need of learning, also who exhibit an intrinsic wish and value for education are less likely to cheat than those who perceive learning primarily by grades and by extrinsic rewards. Academic achievement has become an increasing complex high level competition. Katzman, president of Princeton review reported about an organization which prepares students to take standardized tests and believes that 10 years ago, students became
stressed as they wanted to be the winner but now they feel stressed because they do not want to be the loser. Cooper, Lindsay, & Greathouse (1998) reported that the amount and content of homework given to students does not an actual and useful predictor of student’s academic achievement. It can be meaningful for students when completed systematically and when the amount and content of homework is developmentally appropriate.

1.4 ACADEMIC CHEATING AND ACADEMIC STRESS

Academic cheating is the by-product of Academic stress. Selye first introduced the concept of stress. Any external or internal drive which threatens the organismic equilibrium is stress (Selye, 1956). Stress in today’s scenario has become a hot topic in educational setting. Stress is the consequence of the failure to adapt to change. Stress develops from the very beginning of the school education as in our educational system marks have intimately become the root cause of all troubles (Dered, 2007). A marked-based system is really stressful. Former HRD Minister Kapil Sibal has pointed out that our Indian Education System which is marked based and examination centered is a trauma for both parents and students. In the present era, stress has become more for students. Students undergo stress at assignments, mid-term exams etc. and is driving many students to frustration and lead them in the direction of cheating. Academic stress has become more with the increasing awareness of education. Some students explained that they become stressed because they have been assigned so many needless assignments that requires long hours without actual learning. They do not mind in completing tasks if actual learning happens and also, they hate wasting valuable time on such home or class assignments that is not valuable for teachers. Sometimes, the pointless homework takes an eternity to complete and has a less educational value that makes them less motivated and more stressful. These students have very high GPAs but they become stressed by tedious assignments which have little meaning for them. Because of the pressure to get high grades and scores, many admit to cheating, in fact about 95% of the 11th and 12th grade students report at least one instance of cheating including copying homework from someone and cheating on tests, exams and quizzes. Even when the schoolwork or homework is meaningful, the academic stress of an excessive workload combined with a busy schedule of different activities becomes so much hectic for many and becomes difficult to complete. Academics and schoolwork are major stressors for the youth. (Conner, Pope, and Galloway, 2009)
There are varieties of stressors in academic context indulging adolescents in Academic Cheating that have identified by the several researchers such as academic burden, high expectations, unrealistic ambitions, limited opportunities, high competitiveness are some of the major sources of academic stress (Sinha, 2000). Increasing number of assignments, competition with others, failure (Fair brother and Warn, 2003), interpersonal difficulties with teachers and other subjects, family problems, college level stressors, overcrowded lecture rooms (Ongori, 2007), semester wise system (Erkutla and Chafra, 2006), the pressure to perform well at the examination etc. Different Tests and schoolwork were identified as main sources of stressful youths (Kouzma & Kennedy, 2004; Kouzma & Kennedy, 2002).

1.5 ACADEMIC CHEATING AND EGO STRENGTH

The young age is the age of emotional outbursts, storm and strife and therefore they are relatively low in ego-strength. With the rise of ego-psychology, the position of ego was elevated to that of such a controlling mechanism within the personality as is capable of taking positive step in the interest of person as a whole. In classical psychoanalysis, the position of ego is that of meek mediator between id and superego. Freud (1933) used the analogy of rider and his horse to explain the relationship between the two components of personality. Fenichel (1945) is of the view that ego performs the following five functions: 1) Perception, 2) Motallity, 3) Binding tension, 4) Judgment, 5) Synthesizing. In Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytic theory of personality, “Ego strength is the ability of the ego to effectively deal with the demands of the id, the superego and reality. Those with little ego strength may feel torn between these competing demands, while those with too much ego strength can become too unyielding and rigid. Ego strength helps us maintain emotional stability and cope with internal and external stress”.

Baughman et al. (1962) considering ego as “a complex construct that subsumes a group of integrated constructions.” Kohlberg (1966) expressed that an immoral act such as cheating existed in all of us and not a good indicator of immoral character until a person developed a set of moral principles. Thus, cheating would only indicate the existence of an ego strength deficit once a student was old enough to distinguish right from wrong” (Blanchard, Robert Burns Jr., 2012). “Ego strength represents individuals that are expected to resist impulses and follow their convictions more than individuals with low ego strength” (Trevino, 1986). “When an individual is ego involved, the goal is to maximize the establishment and
demonstration of high ability and to avoid the demonstration of low ability” (Nicholls, 1984). “For ego involved individuals, low effort is often a way to avoid ego threat and the implications of failure” (Miller, 1985, 1986). Similarly, cheating is accompanied by dismissing the value of the activity, is a mechanism by which the experience of ego deflating failure can be avoided by students as well. For ego involved individuals, however, cheating, like low effort (Covington & Omelich, 1979) is like a double edged sword. As cheating may avoid the demonstration of low ability, similarly it also undermines the capacity to maintain higher ability. That is the reason, there was no clear basis to predict reasons for not cheating on the basis of ego involvement from an achievement perceptive and as opposed to a value perspective.

Kohlberg (1976) made a similar observation with respect to recognizing that reprehensible moral conduct by world leaders cannot be explained as being a function of preconventional moral reasoning. Ego strength involves issues of self-esteem, self-control, the ability to resist impulses and delay gratification. For students who refer to punishment as a reason not to cheat, it is likely that either moral reasoning was not activated or that these students lack the ego strength to defer their own self-interest to a moral obligation at a higher level. Ego strength is related to conviction strength and self-regulation ability (Trevino, 1986). Individuals with high ego strength are expected to follow their convictions and to resist impulses more than those with low ego strength. Trevino (1986) proposed ego strength as a moderator of the relationship between moral development stages and ethical behaviour. Individual responses to ethical decision-making depend on certain individual characteristics namely ego strength. Specifically, those persons who have low ego strength may be easily influenced by others and revealed more significant peer reporting intentions, although they have no such decisions or intentions at the first place. On the other side, those who have high ego strength may not be convinced by other persons as their decisions and intentions mostly results from their own convictions regardless of any external forces. While ego strength was proposed as an important moderator for explaining ethical decision-making (Krebs, 1967; Mischel, 1974; Rest, 1980; Trevino, 1986). Banerjee, Cronan, and Jones (1998) conducted an exploratory analysis that disconfirmed the moderating role of ego strength on the process of ethical decision-making a clear ethical climate, high ego strength will be the dominant variable, significantly moderating each model path. The clear implication is that it is unrealistic for organizations to rely entirely on individual variables such as ego strength to guide behaviour (Boling, 1978), while ignoring the influence of external ethical climate. The results appears to have no significant correlation between the strength of a students’ superego
and cheating (Whitley, 1998). Results expressed by Martin (2001) and Neil (2005) that ego strength was not affected by the sex of the individual. Kumar (2010) found no significant difference in ego strength of boys and girls. Research by Nejedlo; Giordano; Schork and Edward (1994) revealed the role of ego strength in the production of academic cheating behaviour.

### 1.6 NEED OF THE STUDY

Our education system has 10+2+3 pattern under which a student at secondary stage opts for specialized education. Various students who are studying in schools when analyzed for their behaviour were found to have disturbed behaviour resulting in academic cheating in one form or the other. Behind this kind of behaviour there are many reasons viz; social, economic, mental and educational. As it is evident that mental imbalance, disturbed environment and emotional immaturity affect the efficiency of an individual by producing ill effects, the mental state of a person is reflected in his behaviour in some form or the other. Students who indulged in cheating often think it justified. As they see others involved in cheating, they cheat and they feel that they will be unfairly disadvantaged. Nevertheless, we strongly feel that it is of the utmost importance that this area of research is further developed in the near future, not the least since students believe to see cheating as a normal part of their academic life which is illustrated as, Students believes that everyone cheats (Houston, 1976), and that cheating is a normal part of life (Baird, 1980), encourage cheating. The adage ‘cheaters never win’ may not apply in the case of academic cheating. With cheating rates as high as 75% to 87% (Baird, 1980; Jendreck, 1989) and its detection rates as low as 1.30% (Haines et al., 1986), academic cheating seems to be reinforced, not punished (Davis, Grover, Becker & McGregor, 1992).

According to Educational Testing Service(1999), “In most cases cheaters don't get caught. If caught, they seldom are punished severely, if at all. Cheating increases due to pressure for high grades. Math and Science are the courses in which cheating most often occurs. Computers can make cheating easier than ever before. For example, students can download term papers from the World Wide Web.” Thirty years ago, males were admitted significantly more academic dishonest than females. Today, this difference has decreased substantially and some recent studies show no differences in cheating between men and women in colleges. Furthermore, previous studies related to students’ cheating have revealed that there is a tendency to take a general side of the problem and its educative measures and techniques
undertaken to address this problem do not focus on the perception, attitudes and related
behaviours that are shown by a specific group and are not as effective as they could be.
During the last decade of technology, access to the online information technology facilitating
use of internet search engines, mobiles, pagers, fax machines and various other technological
systems etc. has equipped the students with new techniques for cheating and provide a
perception that the various problems of academic cheating in all type of institutions are
increasing. The gravity of academic cheating cannot be underestimated as it not only harms
the academic environment, students and institutions but in most cases, it also harms the
student who cheat and who avoid learning experiences and learning outcomes.
The book under review ‘Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions’
provides a handy reference material on a problem about which not much discussion took
place in academic world. In editor’s own admission “There is a growing evidence base that
shows student plagiarism to be on the increase. Students cheat, deliberately, by coping words,
phrases or even large chunks of text from other sources.” The book is a collection of 16
articles by different authors distributed over six sections. In this book, the second chapter
entitled ‘a student perspective of plagiarism’ by Craig Zimitat presents result of a study of
English-speaking, undergraduate students pertaining to plagiarism-related behaviours, their
knowledge of plagiarism and their academic skills, conducted in six Australian Universities.
The study reported that, 80% of the students claimed that they never plagiarized. However,
perhaps students under the survey understood that direct coping of text or ideas without
acknowledging the source, is only act of ‘plagiarism’. Though about 80% of the students
expressed to have possessed the skills of note taking, paraphrasing, citing, referencing etc.
barely 50% in each year group reported confidence in these skills. These types of studies are
significant for formulating guidelines to minimize plagiarism.
Academic Cheating is exclusively professional concern of teachers for educational welfare.
Academic Cheating can be managed better when the feelings that caused it are taken into
consideration. It is usually possible for the alert teacher to find out some of the reasons for his
behaviour by studying the child’s records, talking with his previous teachers, visiting in his
home, and watching him on the playground and in the lunchroom. Then the problem may be
helped by seeing to it that some pressure is relieved, by seeking the cooperation of parents, or
simply by giving the child more opportunities to get his feelings out in the open.
To revive the values of Education, it is necessary to find out answers to certain questions
related to academic cheating. Various types of Cheating behaviours needs to be explored by
deep analysis so that reasons behind that behaviour can come into light. Nevertheless, studies
related to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength with academic cheating are largely absent from the academic cheating literature. Many studies have investigated the prevalence of academic cheating among undergraduate and graduate students; however, there have been very few studies carried out on School level Students. The incidence and prevalence of academic cheating has increased, nevertheless, information on cheating within school education is lacking in Indian set up. However, not a single extensive study was found till date in Indian context. Thus, there is a need to study academic cheating behaviour among adolescents dwelling in Indian Culture.

By all accounts the academic cheating remains largely undetected and it is the need of the hour to develop various strategies and techniques to more effectively address the problems within schools, colleges and universities by the educators and administrators and for which they require specific information about student’s understanding, perception, attitude and practices of cheating. In addition, they require to know moderators or indicators which motivates students to cheat and also, what discourages them from cheating. Furthermore, it is important to know whether there are differences in academic cheating among adolescents in relation to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength variables at different levels of study. So the Investigator decided to study Academic Cheating in relation to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength and to give suggestions to effectively address the problem.

1.7 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“A study of Academic Cheating among Adolescents in relation to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength”.

1.8 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED

(i) ACADEMIC CHEATING

The definition given by Maslach (2004) has been adopted in the present study which states, “Academic Cheating a fraud, deceit or dishonesty in an examination or in an assignment or in class by using or attempting to use methods which are prohibited or inappropriate.”

(ii) LOCUS OF CONTROL
Zimbardo (1985) defines Locus of Control as, “a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions are contingent on what we do (internal control orientation) or on events outside our personal control (external control orientation).”

(iii) ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Good’s Dictionary of Education (1973) defines Academic Achievement as, “knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, usually designated by test scores or marks assigned by teachers or by both.”

(iv) ACADEMIC STRESS

Baron (2002) defines Stress as, “the process that occurs in response to the situations or events (called stressors) that disrupt or threaten to disrupt our Physical or Psychological functioning.”

(v) EGO STRENGTH

Ali (1975) defines Ego Strength as, “an important factor in determining the capacity of an individual to perceive a challenging situation realistically and to execute the response effectively.”

1.9 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study purports to realize the following objectives:

O1 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO LOCUS OF CONTROL

O1(a) To Study and Compare Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O1(b) To Study and Compare Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O1(c) To Study and Compare Female Externally Controlled Adolescents and Female Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O1(d) To Study and Compare Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O1(e) To Study and Compare Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O2 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
O2(a) To Study and Compare High Achieving Adolescents and Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O2(b) To Study and Compare Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O2(c) To Study and Compare Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O2(d) To Study and Compare Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O2(e) To Study and Compare Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O3 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO ACADEMIC STRESS

O3(a) To Study and Compare High Academic stress Adolescents and Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O3(b) To Study and Compare Male High Academic stress Adolescents and Male Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O3(c) To Study and Compare Female High Academic stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O3(d) To Study and Compare Urban High Academic stress Adolescents and Urban Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O3(e) To Study and Compare Rural High Academic stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO EGO STRENGTH

O4(a) To Study and Compare High Ego Strength Adolescents and Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4(b) To Study and Compare Male high Ego Strength Adolescents and Male low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4(c) To Study and Compare Female high Ego Strength Adolescents and Female low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4(d) To Study and Compare Urban high Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4(e) To Study and Compare Rural high Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
OBJECTIVES RELATED TO CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO STRENGTH

O5(a) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Locus of Control
   O5(a1) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
   O5(a2) To find correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control

O5(b) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement

O5(c) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress

O5(d) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength

1.10 HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The following null hypotheses have been framed in respect to academic cheating:

H1 HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO LOCUS OF CONTROL

H1(a) There is no significant difference between Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H1(b) There is no significant difference between Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H1(c) There is no significant difference between Female Externally Controlled Adolescents and Female Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H1(d) There is no significant difference between Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H1(e) There is no significant difference between Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H2 HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

H2(a) There is no significant difference between High Achieving Adolescents and Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H2(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H2(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H2(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H2(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H3 HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO ACADEMIC STRESS

H3(a) There is no significant difference between High Academic stress Adolescents and Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H3(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Academic stress Adolescents and Male Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H3(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Academic stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H3(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Academic stress Adolescents and Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H3(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Academic stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4 HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO EGO STRENGTH

H4(a) There is no significant difference between High Ego Strength Adolescents and Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Ego Strength Adolescents and Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Ego Strength Adolescents and Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
Hs  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO STRENGTH

Hs(a) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Locus of Control
   Hs(a1) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
   Hs(a2) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control

Hs(b) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement

Hs(c) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress

Hs(d) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength

1.11  DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study of research deals with a study of Academic Cheating among adolescents in relation to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego-Strength. It is very difficult, rather impossible, to cover whole of it in a single study. However, the researches in social sciences have some limitations of their own such as:

1. The measuring tools and instruments are partially reliable and valid.
2. If the scope of study is made too wide, the depth is reduced.
3. More accurate results can be had from the whole of the population rather than from sample drawn from a population unless the sample is a true representative of the population, which is quite difficult to achieve. Due to these limitations and the limitations of time and resources on the part of investigator, an attempt has been made to delimit the study in terms of sample and method of study and measuring tools.

1.11.1  DELIMITATIONS IN SAMPLING

The Sample of 400 students of XIth class equally divided on the basis of Gender and locality (100 male urban, 100 male rural and 100 female urban, 100 female rural), was selected randomly from Haryana for making total sample of 400. The age range of the sample is 14+.
1.11.2 DELIMITATIONS IN THE METHOD OF STUDY AND MEASURING TOOLS

The study adopted the descriptive survey method of research and therefore, suffers from all those short comings, which are inherent in such techniques. The tools used to assess Academic Cheating by Kalia and Kirandeep (2011), Academic Stress for School Students by Rani and Singh (2008), Ego Strength by Hasan (2010) and Locus of Control Scale (LCS) by Hasnain and Joshi (1992) have been used for the collection of data which are partly reliable and valid.

1.11.3 DELIMITATIONS IN STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

Descriptive statistics such as means, SDs and SEMs were worked out on the scores of Academic Cheating, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress, Locus of Control and Ego Strength. To determine the significance of difference between means of different groups, t-test was applied. In order to measure the relationship between different variables i.e. Academic Cheating, Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied. SPSS version 22 was applied to calculate statistical measures with maximum accuracy and precision.