CHAPTER-1
INTRODUCTION

Education has been acknowledged as the most influential and essential tool for the progress of any country. Numerous researches both at national and international levels have provided evidences that education contributes a lot in social and economical growth of a country. It is an indicator for a community’s social well-being, standard of living and social justice. In view of the realization of the worthy goals of education to national development, educational institutions were introduced for the training of the learners. Examinations and Continuous comprehensive evaluation were equally implemented to assess learners’ level of understanding. According to Hassan and Ogunmakin (2010) “whatever action that undermines examination, will definitely pose a great threat to the validity and reliability of examination results and certification.” Academic cheating remains one of the most serious threats to the validity and reliability of examination results in this country. It is one of the major problems facing today by educational system in India. It shows the level of moral decadence in this country.

Huge cheating scandals have rocked our schools and colleges in India. Evidence abounds of growing incidents of academic cheating by students at schools and colleges; which clashes with the chief aim of education. One vivid example is the case uncovered at Bihar 2015 board examination where images of parents and friends scaling walls and clinging to windows to help Bihar students taking their Class X exams are still fresh.
These scenes might not have surprised many, highlight the condition of education in that region, but this aberration has become a national phenomenon with at least 12 major question paper leaks in as many months affecting lakhs of students across states - be it CBSE AIMPT 2015, or UPPSC or UP combined pre-medical test or the Tamil Nadu Board Class XII Maths paper or Haryan Board Class XII English paper or Jamia Millia's engineering and BDS entrance test paper leaks (PTI, 2015).

People, who are working in our educational institutions, are the safe guard of academic integrity. The pervasiveness of academic cheating is not concealed from them, but they ignore it; cheating during examination, whispering during exams, use of mobile phones, blue-tooth devices, buying papers etc. On the other hand, non-cheaters remain silent and do not blow the whistle against cheaters because they don’t want to be labeled as “snitches” and “jerks”. The enormous dishonesty in academic context represents an irony of our education system in India. Teachers, who are role model to the students and implant honesty among students, instead directed them to get engage in cheating. Apart from the extensive moral degradation, academic cheating raises a deep question about teachers’ and students’ doubts about facing the national examinations. These cheating scandals, together with various hidden cheating cases in this country, propose that academic integrity is fading. However, it is not safe to avoid the prevalence of academic cheating, because it emphasizes the lack of effective and efficient education, which has always been the source of human growth and enlightenment.

1.1. ACADEMIC CHEATING

The problem of academic cheating is so enveloping among students at schools and colleges that majority of them get involved in cheating behaviour in one form or another. High school students often involve in behaviors and practices that come under the umbrella term academic dishonest (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006: McCabe, 1999; Strom & Strom, 2007). It is a growing concern. Bushweller (1999) studied about growing concern of academic dishonesty among students for better grades and to get ahead in the world. This problem crop up in all levels of education i.e. elementary, middle, high, college and even at doctorate level.
Researches indicate that cheating occurs among elementary school children (Kanfer & Duerfeldt, 1968; Cizek, 1999), in middle and high school by adolescents (Evans & Craig, 1990; Anderman, Griessinger & Westerfield, 1998; Mudock, Hole & Weber, 2001; McCabe, 2001) and as later on college (Newstead, Franklyn, Stokes & Armstead, 1996; McCabe & Trevini, 1997). Researches also indicate that not only students but educators also involved in cheating in order to booster their students’ scores in high stake assessment system (Kane & Staiger, 2002). The crisis of academic cheating is not restricted to the boundaries of our educational institutions. Students who assume that academic dishonesty is an adequate and acceptable practice might borrow the same behaviors to higher education and even into their workplace.

**Academic Dishonesty: Concept and Contours**

Academic dishonesty can take numerous behavioural types and its definition varies according to the scope of the behaviour to which a researcher attends. The major issue in discussing academic cheating has been the deficiency of clear understanding and/or the diverse meanings of academic dishonesty. According to the literature, the term takes on many different meanings, some familiar to all; others less obvious. The terms academic dishonesty, academic misconduct and cheating appear to be used interchangeably throughout the literature. The Centre for Academic Integrity (1999) defines academic dishonesty as “dishonest behaviour related to academic achievement including cheating, plagiarism, lying, deception and any other form of advantage unfairly obtained by one student over others”. However, the Oxford English Reference Dictionary (Pearsall and Trumble, 1996) defines cheating as “to deceive or trick, deprive of or to gain unfair advantage by deception or breaking rules, especially in a game or examination.” “Academic misconduct continues beyond the classroom to include forging or altering university documents, writing a paper for a student, and damaging or hiding library resources (Christensen Hughes & McCabe, 2006).” Academic cheating is perceived as behaviour rather than a description of a particular student act. It involves a recognized ends and a restricted means (Rozycki, 2006). Kibler, et al. (1988) defines academic dishonesty as “forms
of cheating and plagiarism which result in students giving or receiving unauthorized assistance in an academic exercise or receiving credit for work which is not their own”. Michaels and Miethe (1989) point out cheating as “the fraudulent means of achieving scarce valued resources”. Academic cheating has been demonstrated as a broad diversity of behaviors that were perceived as unethical (Barnett & Dalton, 1981). Brown (1993) defines “cheating as getting unauthorized aid, plagiarizing or relying on any other form of assistance that is not allowed under the honor code.” Finn and Frone (2004) states, “Cheating represents the extent to which students engaged in academic dishonesty during the past year.” (cited by Kalia, 2006). Cizek (2003) defines “academic cheating as any action that violates the established rules governing the administration of a test or completion of an assignment; a behavior that gives one student an unfair advantage over other students on a test or assignment; or an action that decreases the accuracy of the intended inferences arising from a students’ performance on a test or assignment.”

Academic Cheating is defined as “fraud, deceit or dishonesty in an examination or in an assignment or in the class by using or attempting to use method which are prohibited or inappropriate (Report of the academic dishonesty and plagiarism subcommittee chaired by Maslach, 2004).”
Many researchers are of the view that cheating is a cognitive process i.e. decision to cheat includes some form of planning (Mixon, 1996; Gruvalva & Nowell, 2006). But, Bunn et al. (1992) suggested that students’ dishonest behaviour can be classified in two categories: planned cheating and panic cheating. Planned cheating includes creating and using crib notes for examination, copying assignments or plagiarizes a paper. Panic cheating includes cheating behaviour during examination where an individual finds himself at the lost for an answer that enforces him to take such decision. Being knowledge of cheating behaviour before, planned cheating is viewed as more dishonest than panic cheating.

Cheating in academic context covers verity of deceitful actions e.g. cheating by using unauthorized material, fabrication of information, references or results, contract cheating, plagiarizing, helping others to involve in cheating, creating interference during instruction, procedure to gain advantage (Lambert et al. 2003, Cizek, 2003, Maslach, 2004). Kalia (2005) delineates two areas i.e. Active cheating to improve own grade and Passive cheating to help others in improving their grades. Keeping in view the prevalence of academic cheating in India, Kalia & Kirandeep (2011) constructed and standardized a scale to assess academic cheating among adolescents in Indian context. The scale outline five major dimensions that contain cheating behaviour: 1) Cheating during exams; 2) Plagiarism; 3) Lying about academic assignments; 4) Interference during instruction; and 5) Damaging intellectual property.

1.2. PREVALENCE OF ACADEMIC CHEATING

While highlighting the fact that the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty among students differs from study to study, there is a common conformity that this problem is prevalent in secondary as well as in post secondary education. Accordingly, this prevalent issue has been discussed and studied in various educational and psychological papers. Croucher (1997) called this problem as an ‘epidemic’ in educational field. This problem has been widespread at such a large scale in educational institutions that majority of students admitted to engage it to some degree at least at one or the other point of their academic carriers (Becker and
McGregor, 1992; Eskridge & Ames, 1993). Putka (1992) affirmed that “some of the nation’s brightest students regard academic dishonesty as a way of life.” McCabe (2005) highlighted that the problem of academic dishonesty has become a habit for growing number of students. Number of studies published in recent decade’s revealed prevalence of academic cheating in higher education, whereas few studies have examined this phenomenon in secondary education, which is the focus of the present study.

The problem of academic cheating, from school level through to college level, has been a matter of serious concern for teachers and educators across the world and they have been trying to uncover its root causes and to cure this problem (Sherill et al., 1971). Literature on academic dishonesty explores assorted views regarding prevalence of academic cheating (McCabe and Drinn, 1999). Several studies revealed prevalence of academic cheating in higher education (Bowers, 1964; Kibler, 1994; McCabe, 1997; McCabe et al., 2001; McCabe and Trevino, 1994, 1996; Center for academic Integrity, 2007). These studies reported that an average of 65-85% of undergraduate students from colleges and university campuses admitted to some form of academic cheating. For example, Drake (1941) revealed that 23% of students in different colleges admitted to cheat. Goldsen (1960) found that rates of academic cheating among college students increases from 38% in “1952” to 49% in “1960”. Jendrek (1989) found the usual rate of academic dishonesty between 40% and 60%. By 1992 the rate of academic cheating among college students gets increases as 74%. Even more recently, researchers have reported rates as high as 90% (Graham et al., 1994). Bowers (1964) surveyed more than 5,000 students from 99 United States colleges and universities and found that three fourth of the students admitted to involved in one or more incidents of academic cheating. McCabe and Trevino (1997) replicated Bowers’ 1964 study after 30 years and revealed moderate overall increases in academic dishonesty. Cheating on examination was the one area where were most significant increases were found. McCabe (2005) surveyed more than 18,000 students from colleges in United States and Canada; results revealed that academic cheating and plagiarizing are extensive with rate as elevated as 71% and
70%. These studies revealed prevalence of academic dishonesty among college students only.

Academic dishonesty, on the other hand, seems to be even more widespread among high school students (Davis et al., 1995). Estimates of US students who get engaged in academic dishonesty vary from 50 per cent to 90 per cent (McCabe et al. 2001). In a 1998, survey of 3,000 high achieving 16 to 18 year old students found who planned to attend college revealed that 80% of United States best students admitted to cheat to get the top position in the class, including 40% who cheated on a quiz or a test, 67% copied someone else work. But the most shocking findings were that more than half of the students said that they did not think cheating was a big deal and about 95% of cheaters said they were not caught. In the same year other researchers found that 70% for students from high schools and 54% of students from middle schools admitted to cheat at least on one examination during past year (Educational Testing Service Research Center, 1999). Considering the fact that data collected in above studies was self-reported, it is safe to believe that above findings are the misjudgments of actual findings. A nationwide survey conducted by Josephson Institute of Ethics in 1996, among 20,000 students from middle and high school revealed that 64% of them admitted to cheat and that number jumped to 70% in 1998. In addition, 60% of 36,000 secondary school students in 2006 survey reported to involve in cheating during examination and assignments for their classes.

Some studies (as reported in Educational Testing Service Research Center, 1999) revealed that academic dishonesty has increased throughout the past 20 to 50 years. Empirical research reports that 72% of high school students reported to get involved in cheating on written assignments while 98% let someone else copy their work. Moreover, the percentage of students who report using a cheat sheet doubled from 34% in 1969 to 68% in 1989 (Center for Academic Integrity, 2007). Other research revealed that 75% of high school participants confess to cheat, and at least 50%, and perhaps as high as 80% of students have admitted to engage in other forms of academic cheating (Edgren & Walters, 2006). Use of technology in education has revolutionized the education world. Various electronic devices and high tech gadgets
changed the way people communicate, work and study (Myrick, 2005). The pervasiveness of digital assets provides an environment where academic cheating such as cut and paste plagiarism can be very simple (Center for Academic Integrity, 2005). This finding has been hold up by study in the year 2003 which revealed that 94% of students were adequately practiced with the Internet to utilize it for cut and paste job. Students were confessing of Internet cheating with 50% saying they would use it for cheating purpose to avoid a failing grade (Underwood & Szabo, 2004). It was found that the most of students were adequately capable of cheating with the help of Internet, with 32% confessing to plagiarize through Internet and about 8% admitted to cheat the same more than once per week. Kennedy et al. (2000) explored students and teachers’ vision pertaining to academic cheating, both indicted that it would be easier to cheat in web-based distance learning class. Though the statistics for the prevalence of academic cheating might varies from one study to another study, the body of research examined summarized that the problem of academic cheating is extensive problem and need keen attention on the part of stake holders of education.

The problem of academic cheating among students has been investigated and conferred in the western context and this area remained unattended in India. Nearly all of India's competitive entrance examination have been stolen and sold to students at least once during the past five years. With the rates of academic cheating growing in our country and others, one may be anxious about the root causes for its occurrence.

1.3. METHODS USED TO CHEAT

Numerous methods have been adopted by cheaters. The most reported ways that students used for academic cheating include copy someone else’s exam, copy homework, using crib notes, writing on body parts & clothing, helping other cheat, plagiarizing, falsifying information, keeping silent about those who were cheating, communicating in codes or faking an illness, sharing assignments, test information and test answers (Graham et al., 1994; Franklin-Stokes and Newstead, 1995; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Bramucci, 2003). It is interesting to spotlight on the
question that why some students gets involved in dishonest act during examination even though they know that the penalty of board are getting so harsh. Keeping in view the prevalence of academic cheating in Indian context, Kirandeep, Sahu and Kalia (2008) have given following list of some discernible trends in cheating:

- Use of crib notes in examination.
- Copying from the answer sheets of other students during examination.
- Use of handkerchiefs/clothes etc. for writing hints of questions.
- Writing answers on table or walls before the commencement of examination.
- Taking help from the invigilators in the form of hints in the examination hall.
- Asking or telling other fellow students the answers through gestures or code language.
- Exchanging answer sheets with other fellow students.
- Taking the help of low paid staff on duty bribing them to bring answer to the questions from outside.
- Use of cell phones, pagers, iPods or other such hi-tech medium to receive the massages/answers to the questions.
- Use of calculators or other electronic devices for calculation even though it is prohibited.
- Changing seats in the examination room to sit near window or near to a fellow with the intention of cheating.
- Bribing concerned persons to get the question paper well in advance before the commencement of examination.
- Attempt the same question twice with the intention of duping the evaluator.
- Attaching currency notes in the answer sheets to bribe evaluators to give extra marks.
- Using wrong means to obtain information about exams/marks in advance of its declaration officially.
- Writing one’s name on another student’s exam or assignment.
- Giving false excuses to extend the time prescribed to appear in an exam or submitting assignment.
• Impersonation i.e. appearing in exam for someone else or allowing someone else to appear in one’s exam.
• Tracking the answer sheets to approach the evaluator to give more marks.
• Getting fake degrees or detailed marks card (DMC).
• Changing marks in detailed marks card (DMC).
• Changing original data in research work for obtaining pre-requisite results.
• Tearing or damaging pages from Library books so that other students cannot get the required material.
• Proxy attendance to fulfil the requirement of compulsory number of attendance in the class.
• Secretly altering previously evaluated work with the intention of getting higher grades.
• Collaborating with others on assignments even when doing so is prohibited.
• Copying from the writings or works of others into ones academic assignment without proper attribution or submitting such work as if it were one’s own.
• Paraphrasing the characteristic or original phraseology, metaphor or other creative artistic or literary device of another without proper attribution.
• Without proper attribution using ideas, views or insight of another.
• Fabricating references or a bibliography.

1.4. **REASONS FOR ACADEMIC CHEATING**

Academic dishonesty has been associated with a number of personal characteristics, demographics and situational factors that foster students to involve in academic dishonesty (Harding et al., 2001). Several studies have highlighted the reasons for students’ decision to engage in academic dishonesty. Students perceive the need to cheat to get ahead in the world (McMillan, 1989). Once in a program, students want better grades and fear failure could be the reason (Monica et al., 2010). Students get involved in academic cheating because they believe that it is an effortless means to achieve what they desire for a minimum amount of effort (Greene and Saxe, 1992). Peer influence also has significant influence on prevalence of academic cheating among students. Students often get involved in cheating who
identify that their friends are cheating and there is no punishment for their immoral act (McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Today’s student believes that many cheaters caught and pay a small price for their crime (Collison, 1990a; Josephson Institute, 2008). In fact, “90% of college students consider that cheaters never pay the price” (Kleiner & Lord, 1999). Rather the majority agree that “Successful people do what they have to do to win, even if others consider it cheating,” and a substantial minority believe that “People who are willing to lie, cheat, or break the rules are more likely to succeed than people who do not” (Collison, 1990a; Collision, 1990b; Josephson Institute, 2008). In fact, college students who cheat have every intention of pursuing success by continuing to ignore ethics and norms after graduation (Lovett-Hooper, Komarraju, Weston, & Dollinger, 2007).

Academic and grades have significant influence on the students’ post secondary plans (Taylor et al., 2002). Pressure from their parents, from their peers and society to perform up to the mark could be the reason for adolescents to involve in academic cheating. For adolescents pressure of parents is significantly higher at this age and when they find themselves unable to meet the expectation, they turn towards cheating (Strom, 2007). Parents also raise pressure on their children when they compare them to their siblings and other. To please their parents and to score higher than their siblings or peers adolescents sometimes takes such risk. To reduce some of the stress of examination is another reason that adolescents may turn to cheat (Strom & Strom, 2007). According to Vencat (2006), the driving force for academic cheating is hyper-competition—first and foremost, for entrance into universities and schools. In present times, emphasis on learning has been shifted to getting higher and higher grades. Students does not bother about learning, their main attention is to get grades (The Science Daily, 2010). Pressure to achieve higher grades and also to secure the most desire position in the job market emerges as one of the reason for involvement of students in cheating act.

Being afraid of failure in examination is one of the most significant causes for students to engage in cheating behaviour. They consider examination as the ultimate aim for their future and give due importance to examination (Khan, 2004).
Moreover, students often believe that if they fail in examination, their parents will criticize them for their poor grades; their friends will look down to them and make fun. Lack of self-confidence is another reason that causes some students cheating. They find examination as difficult task and sometimes quit examination. Some of them unreasonably judge themselves that they are not smart enough to pass the examination. Anderman et al. (2010) gives impulsivity as reason for academic cheating. Risk taking behaviour of the students, encourage them to involve in academic dishonesty. Often students perform these kinds of acts just to show-off to their friends. These students perhaps believe that cheating the examination is challenging and makes them popular in the classroom. Besides, they will acquire extraordinarily score with minimum efforts if they succeed their cheating plans too. Therefore, to dare the punishments, some students cheat in examination for their pleasures.

Deterioration of moral values is one of the causes to arise in academic dishonesty, as documented over the past decade by the Josephson Institute (Kolanko et al., 2006). Schropshire (1997) believe that students’ values led to the justification of cheating behavior. He asserted that students made value-laden decisions about when to cheat through a process of “cost-benefit analysis.” Students want good grades to get into the right school or to get the right job. As pointed out by Hall and Kuh (1998), “acts of academic dishonesty do not occur in a vacuum but in environments marked by competing and sometimes conflicting values and desires.”

Dowd (1992) some of the reasons behind involvement of students in cheating include personality of the students, desire or pressure for grades, immaturity, poor college policy and the lack of role models. Nuss (1984) reported that “faculty members are likely to take less sever action when the incidents of academic dishonesty are among those they consider less serious.” Lenient attitude of faculty towards cheaters fail to discourage cheating or may even make it possible (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). If teachers want to improve the ethical behaviour of the students, they first need to address the unethical behaviour that occurs in the classroom. “What kind of expectation for ethical behaviour is communicated when teachers ignore
cheating?” (Copeland, 2005). Students are liable to take advantage of such situations. During examination often cheaters go unreported and unpunished non cheaters also begin to cheat (McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield, 2001). Roughly half of American instructors admit to ignoring evident cheating at times because of the hassles that reporting it entails for them (McCabe, 2005; Nadelson, 2007). Their institutions, too, underplay and under-report the problem (Bok, 2006; Haney & Clarke, 2007). In India, however, someone on the inside often leaks exam questions, probably for a handsome price, and the prime suspects are faculty and administrators (Montlake, 2006). Attitude of teachers as well as societal and social norms have clearly influence the decision about academic cheating (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). If any teacher pays little attention to academic cheating most of the students consider it foolish not to cheat. Graham et al. revealed after investigating reasons behind students’ decision to cheat and not to cheat that student view classroom as a reciprocal process and that “when faculty are unfair students see this as a violation of the rules and thus feel free to cheat.” McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield (2001) also reported that some students blame inappropriate study material, lack in quality teaching and lack of association between assignments and study material as another reasons for students to take decisions about academic cheating.

Studies on academic cheating has revealed that students justify their cheating behaviour by giving reasons like examination was tough or lesson was not taught properly by the teacher or other also cheat etc. The most common excuses given by students is “everybody else is doing it” or “other cheat more than they do” etc (Greene & Saxe, 1992). High school is convenient place where students often blame other such as school, teacher, parents or society (Anderman, Griesinger & Westerfield, 1988).

1.5. **HIGH-TECH ACADEMIC CHEATING DURING EXAMINATION**

Methods of using crib notes are out dated. How can we forget the character of Munnabhai in a movie “Munnabhai MBBS”, where he uses mobile phone to cheat during examination? But now Munnabhais (Cheaters) are going more hi-tech when trying to perform cheating act. News related to cheating during different exams in
India put light on use of various types of high tech devices during examination. Cheating case of MBBS examination, 2013 at Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences (RGUHS) where invigilators were stumped by the novel cheating technique used by MBBS student during examination. The student was equipped with device like a lapel mike and an electronic circuit inside the collar of his shirt. Through this device his answers were being transmitted from Hyderabad.

During Bihar Combined Entrance Competitive Examination Board (BCECEB) 2015, 13 candidates were arrested from different centers in Patna, who were using high-tech gadgets for cheating. The combined examinations were being held for getting admission to different engineering and medical colleges. The police said that all the candidates were caught for using Bluetooth-enabled devices while taking their examination (India Today News-May 19, 2015). The popular All-India Pre-Medical Test (AIPMT), 2015 paper leak case where four persons, including two dental surgeons and an MBBS student were arrested by Rohtak police. Rohtak IGP Shrikant Jadhav said an answer key of 90 questions, mobile chips, micro earphones, blue-tooth devices and digital watches had been seized from the possession of those arrested. The accused had planned to stitch the gadgets to the candidates’ undergarments through which the answer key was to be passed on to them. The answer key was found in the WhatsApp inbox of a mobile phone seized from the possession of those arrested (Times if India, May4, 2015). Former CBSE chairman Ashok Ganguly says the reason for the growth of this menace is because technology isn't used effectively and the sloppiness of the exam-conducting bodies. "The bodies conducting examinations are living in the 19th century, but those behind this mischief are using 21st century technology. Those behind the AIPMT 2015 leaks used blue-tooth and other communication devices. This speaks a lot about how we are being outwitted."
1.6. ACADEMIC CHEATING AND SELF CONTROL

Self control is vital to success in life and regarded as one of the most important part of self (Baumeister, 1998; Higgins; 1996). It entails the prospect that human behaviour is flexible and able to adopt in different problems of life (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). This flexible behaviour enables individuals to adapt in social and situational demands that they faces in their daily life. Particularly, self control direct people to emphasis on social consciousness rather than selfish impulses and enable them to take decisions regarding what is wrong and what is right (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). When two motivations or standards compete against one another, self control is needed to restrain the unwanted impulse from manifesting itself into behaviour. In addition it prevents impulses that could be costly to the individual in the long run; even there are short term benefits (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007).

Michel (1981) pointed out that when the delay is self imposed it is known as “self control”. Thus self-control refers to behaviour in which a person monitors his or her own action in the absence of or in contradiction to the presence in the
immediate environment (Liebert, Poulous and Marmor, 1979). In the words of Berk (1991), self-control is the ability to inhibit the expression of spontaneous impulses. Vohs et al. (2004), reported self-control is “an individual’s capacity to consciously (intentionally) override and inhibit socially undesirable and unacceptable impulses and to alter and regulate one’s behaviors, thoughts and emotions”. Monikers for self-control vary widely and include delay of gratification, effortful control, willpower, executive control, time preference, self-discipline, self-regulation and ego strength.

Singh and Gupta (1996) have categorized self control into following three dimensions:-

I. Degree and adequacy of self-regulation (i.e. delay of gratification)
II. Freedom from impulsivity (i.e. resistance to temptation)
III. Freedom from self-centredness

The literature on self control recognizes four main dimensions of self control, namely controls of thoughts, emotions, impulses and performance (Baumeister et al, 1994; Tangney et al, 2004). Also resistance to temptation and delay of gratification are the two most important aspects of self-control (Liebert, Poulous and Marmer, 1979; Mischel, 1981; Berk, 1991). Former refers to refraining from opportunity to engage in socially inhibited but otherwise tempting act, such as stealing one’s property and cheating in various examinations. Latter refers to the people postponing immediate gratification for the sake of more valued object. In other words, people are expected to control immediate impulses and to work towards distant goals, such as educational and vocational achievements. The term self-control is generally reserved for circumstances in which people employ in behaviours designed to thwart or prevail a proponent response. In other words, when an individual exercise self-control, he alter his response tendencies in a manner that includes restraining one goal so as to pursue another one that is evaluated to have maximum and long-term utility. Self-control is not merely conceived as a process; rather it is property of system that has efficient self-control capabilities. In other words, most human beings have self-control in the sense that they can chase one goal that conflicts with another, proponent one, but in as much as people differ in the efficiency with which the
mechanisms governing self-control operate, they also differ in self-control. The term self-control is generally used in latter sense, it refer to “the internal resources available to inhibit, override or alter responses that may arise as a result of physiological processes, habit, learning or the press of the situation”.

Empirical research in the field of self control has shown that high self control individuals have ability to manage their thoughts, control their emotions and restrain their impulses than those who have low self control (Baumeister et al., 1998). “They enjoy greater psychological well-being, more academic success and better interpersonal relations (Mischel, Shoda, & Peake, 1988; Shoda, Mischel, & Peake, 1990; Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004).” Individual with high self-control identify behaviour that is appropriate to almost all types of behavior, favorable to a flourishing and healthy life. “Also, high self control predicts good adjustment, better grades and interpersonal success (June et al. 2004).” On the other hand individuals with low self-control are assumed to be suffering from various communal problems including “obesity, substance abuse, criminality, impulsive buying, and procrastination (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Patton, Stanford, & Barratt, 1995; Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Wikstrom and Treiber, 2007; Vohs & Faber, 2007).”

Despite the deviation in the conceptualization of self-control, the term “self control” is used to explain the underlying dynamics of deviant and criminal behaviour in both psychological and criminological research and theory development or validation. “Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) General Theory of Crime, now known as self-control theory, is one of the most popular crime theories. This theory hinges upon the notion that ‘human conduct can be understood as the self-interested pursuit of pleasure or the avoidance of pain’ and that acts of crime are no different from any other acts in this respect.” They define crime as “acts of force or fraud undertaken in the pursuit of self-interest.” The theory applies not only to acts that are legally defined as crime, but also to what Gottfredson and Hirschi call ‘analogous acts’, such as accidents (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) or truancy from school or work. The key component of the theory is low self-control. This theory mainly
claims that the term low self control is for “primary individual characteristics causing criminal behaviour”. Low self-control is perceived as a trait, or a buildup of individual traits including impulsiveness, selfishness, ability to take risk and lack of forethought that have ‘a substantial tendency to arrive jointly in the same individual, persevere through life’ and which are ‘established very early in life’ (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990). Individuals with low self control appear to attracted towards criminal acts because crime shares many of the characteristics of self control. Deviant behaviour is the product of lack of self control (Bruin & Rudnick, 2007). Further, it can be concluded that crimes are risky, immediately gratifying, easy and simple to perform (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990).

Self control can be conceived as an individual trait as well as a situational trait. It might vary across different tasks according to the level of difficulty of the tasks alter in term of restraining one’s urges and as the chronological sequence of tasks require repeated use of self-control. Several studies have been explored highlighting the impact of self control on academic cheating. It is reported that low self control for short term is correlated with academic dishonesty and lying (Mead et al., 2009). “Low self control and high susceptibility to social influence explored as predictors of past behaviour of academic dishonesty (Coskan, 2010).” “Also high scores on self control predict good adjustment, better grades and interpersonal success (June, 2004).” Adolescence period found to be a period of emotional extreme, self centeredness, free from rules and regulation and show impulsive behavior. An important question regarding adolescent to show such behaviour is that whether adolescents have the ability to manage such emotions and drives. Thus, self-control should have a link with academic cheating.

1.7. ACADEMIC CHEATING AND IMPULSIVENESS

Impulsivity is an important psychological trait in personality theories and implicated in psychiatric disorders. There is a lack of a precise definition of impulsiveness and it has been recommended that impulsiveness is multidimensional trait (Evenden, 1999). Impulsiveness has been allied to variety of behaviors and characteristics, including intolerance, impatience, incentive seeking, acting without
thinking, and lack of ability to wait. Self-report measures have been developed to appraise impulsiveness, based on specific definitions, such as “a complete lack of looking ahead at the consequences of their actions (Eysenck et al., 1985)” and “the tendency to deliberate less than most people of equal ability before taking action (Dickman, 1990).” Impulsiveness is a personality trait characterized by the inclination of an individual to initiate behavior without adequate forethought as to the consequences of their actions, acting on the spur of the moment. “Eysenck and Eysenck (1978) related impulsivity to risk-taking, lack of planning, and making up one's mind quickly. It refers to the tendency to act without considering the logical consequences of one’s actions.” Wishnie (1976) address the “impulsive personality as a person with destructive character disorders and focused on certain types of criminals and additions.”

Impulsive children are carefree, excitement seekers, act hurriedly and without thinking, and take action towards dare and challenging tasks. Eysenck et al., (1985) defines impulsivity as “a complete lack of looking ahead at the consequences of their actions”. Rai et al. (1988) define “impulsiveness as a personality trait which includes quick behaviour, risk-taking activities, lack of emotional control, non-planning; liveliness and hyperactivity.”

Rai and Sharma (1988) identified following broad categories representing impulsiveness:-

- Narrow meaning of impulsiveness: This component of impulsiveness include action on the spur of the moment, not considering of future consequences, quick behaviour such as quick to move, quick to make up mind, quick to voice opinion, rapid decisions and actions, short reaction time, lack of reflectiveness and lack of self control.
- Risk taking and sensation seeking: This includes daring and risk taking behaviour, excitement and seeking sensation etc.
- Lack of planning: It comprises of lack of fore-thought, lack of planning, readiness to being work without a carefully constructed plan and need of lot of supervision etc.
Liveliness and care-freeness: It consists of care-freeness, taking life easily, happy go lucky and living in present etc.

Hyperactivity: It pertains to restlessness, over-activeness, excessive motor activity and low frustration tolerance etc.

In general, impulsive actions are mostly seen as depending on inhibitory control, that is, the ability to restrain unwanted response tendencies. Impulsivity means doing things suddenly without any planning and without considering the effects they may have or inclined to act on impulse rather than thought; the inability to curb one’s immediate reactions or think before one acts. As a result, people who are extremely impulsive may blurt out answers to questions, run into the street without looking, and find it hard to wait for things they want. From above discussion it can be concluded that impulsive behaviour comes out be problematic in nature.

Miller et al. (2007) are of the opinion that when an individual make decision on the basis of impulsive rather than reason, the individual may be tempted to cheat. Further, an individual who are high in need for sensation are more likely to cheat because of risky nature. Whitley’s (1998) reported a small positive relationship between academic dishonesty and impulsiveness among college students. In addition, results of a study by Williams et al. (2006) revealed that there exist significant and positive relationship between academic dishonesty and subclinical psychopathy (which includes impulsive thrill seeking). Anderman (2010) point out that level of impulsiveness predicts academic dishonesty among individuals who admitted their maximum involvement in academic dishonesty. Kalia and Dalal (2011) found that neurotic adolescents were significantly more involved in academic cheating in comparison to stable adolescents moreover significant positive correlation was observed between academic dishonesty and neuroticism. Angeles et al. (2011) asserted that impulsiveness and disruptive behaviour is significantly related with disruptive behaviour both inside and outside of the classroom. Although impulsivity is related to problematic behaviours, few researches have been conducted particularly on the relationship of impulsiveness with academic cheating. The present
investigation highlights this issue by examining the relationship of student’s impulsive behaviour and academic cheating.

1.8. **ACADEMIC CHEATING AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

Which social class is more likely provenance of unethical behaviour, the lower or the upper class? Investigating how social class is connected with immoral behaviour or actions that hurt others and prohibited or ethically offensive to one’s society is a difficult task. It would shade light on the behaviours such as, deception, dishonesty or breaching the laws that have significant consequences for the society. On the other hand, individuals belonging to low socio-economic status survive in environment defined by limited resources, great threat and more uncertainty. It leads to the explanation that individuals belonging to low socio-economic status may be provoked to act unethically to their resources or to conquer their disadvantages. A second line of reasoning however, suggested the opposite prediction; namely, that upper class may be more disposed to unethical behaviour. Better resources, freedom and independence from others among the upper class give rise to self-focused social cognitive tendencies, which seems to facilitate immoral behaviour. Religious teaching extols the poor and gives a warning to wealthy people with claims like, “it will be hard for a rich person to enter the kingdom of heaven”. Based upon previous findings, in the present research it is tested whether individuals belonging to high socio-economic status in comparison with low socio-economic status individuals are more likely to involve in dishonest behaviour and whether their attitudes towards greed might help them to explain this tendency.

Literature surfed on socio-economic status revealed that socio-economic background of the parent’s influences academic performance of their children to a great extent (Panday and Maikhuri, 2003; Devi et al., 2003; Panigrahi, 2005; Alam, 2009; Mohanty, 2009). “Socio-economic status is a position that an individual or family occupies with reference to prevailing average standard of culture possessions, effective income, material possessions, level of education, aspiration and participation in the group activity of community (Kalia & Sahu, 2012)”.” Student’s behaviour to cheating in the examination might be traceable to influence of parents
or home (Kyglo, 2001). Nzoka (2007) revealed that children belonging to high socio-economic status exhibits cheating behaviour less than those from those belonging to low socio-economic status. Reasons being that, children belonging to high socio-economic status have access more educational facilities/material than others. However, Aduloju and Obinne (2013) found that parent’s socio-economic status had no significant effect on students cheating behaviour. Orkorodudu (2013) also revealed that peer pressure and socio-economic status predicts student’s attitude to examination malpractice in Nigeria. Kalia and Kirandeep (2011) are of similar view that high socio-economic status adolescents are significantly more involved in academic cheating. The chief aim of this research is to study academic cheating among adolescents in relation to self control, impulsiveness and socio-economic status.

1.9. **NEED OF THE STUDY**

“Cheating is a serious threat to the validity of learning . . . to begin to understanding cheating, we must first understand the source of the problem” (Cizek, 1999). The present study helps to explore such sources that will minimize the cheating epidemic. Rapidly growing evidences regarding academic dishonesty paying attention that students come to college prepared to cheat (Anderman, Griesinger & Westerfield, 1998; McCabe, 1999). McCabe (1999) reported that academic cheating is a commonplace activity for high school students. Further, high school students in his study remarked that “if cheating is going to get the grade, then that’s the way to do it” (McCabe, 1999, p.682). Researchers at Josephson Institute of Ethics (2004) revealed that 83% of students studying in high school copy someone else’s homework. High school students are likely to bring these attitudes and behaviors with them as they enter college. Also number of research consistently demonstrated that a significant number of students admitted to cheat in colleges also (Michaels and Miethe, 1989; Whitley, 1998; Brown and Emmett, 2001) and that academic dishonesty is enveloping across diverse culture (Magnus et al., 2002). The research also point out that students who are involved in academic dishonesty in high school and/or college are expected to involve in certain deviant behaviour at
workplace (Nonis and Swift, 2001). Academic cheating is a universal phenomenon which has increased drastically overtime and it is still growing (McCabe & Trevino, 1996; Schab, 1991). Cheating is prevalent to such an extent that “cheating on important exams occurs in every country of the world” (Noah & Eckstein, 2001).

Even in India academic cheating among school and college students is widespread. It acts as an epidemic to our education system and it is risky that we are not paying attention to this cheating epidemic as it reflects deficiency to achieve ultimate goal of education. Act of cheating is unfair to honest students, what honest students work hard for a cheater receives easily through cheating. It cheapens the legitimacy and value of a college or professional degree/certification. But more troubling is that act of cheating destroy the central mission of education. “A quality education requires a commitment to an ever deeper understanding of self and of one's place in the social and natural world; and when successful, it leads to a critical examination of the assumptions that guide one's life.” While cheating the cheater cheats himself. His actions imply that he either does not understand what a quality education is or does not care about getting one. But most terrible thing is that cheating contributes to an environment in which otherwise honest students learn to view education as merely the temporary acquisition of facts.

There is a strong need to explore more this type of cheating behaviour so that a deep analysis could be done in this context. The present study aims to explore the academic cheating behavior among adolescents, so that appropriate reasons for their cheating behavior can explored and accordingly decisions can be taken to avoid such kind of behavior. A very few studies have been conducted exploring the relationship of academic cheating with self control, impulsiveness and socioeconomic status especially in Indian setup.

The proposed study is needed by all those who are part of our education system and want to raise the level of education system. “Precaution is better than cure” is well known saying, so we should focus on the root cause of its occurrence rather than controlling it.
1.10. **JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY**

Life puts challenges and problems on the path to success and achievement. Throughout the course of everyday life people inevitable experiences myriad conflicting motivations. Peoples often feel temptation, urge or impulse to engage in behaviours that brings short term benefits and long term cost. In order to rise above from these conflicts, one has to act with perseverance and persistence. Self control is a sign of inner strength and control of oneself actions, reactions and abilities to take decision in difficult & stressful life situations, differentiating between right and wrong, ethical or unethical etc. Students often get opportunities to get benefits from a dishonest act which brings motivational conflicts among them. “When faced with temptation to cheat, students are confronted with an ethical decision: whether to comply with the academic norm not to cheat or to give into temptation and engage in academic cheating.” So to study if there is a significant relation of self control with academic dishonesty, self control is taken as one of the variable in the study. Researches point out that individual with good self control do better in work and in social life and they have fewer psychopathological problems other than people with relatively poor self control (Mischel et al., 1988; Shoda et al., 1990; Tangney et al., 2004; Duckworth & Seligman, 2005). On the other hand low self control seems to be one of the important causes of crime causation (Gotfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Pratt & Cullen, 2000) and has been implicated as major factor in other problematic behaviour (Muraven et al., 2005; Vohs & Faber, 2007). Hence, poor self control appears to be a risk factor for academic cheating.

Impulsiveness seems to be directly related with academic cheating. Acts of impulsiveness refers to the tendency to act without considering the future consequences, quick behaviour, risk taking and sensation seeking, lack of planning, care-freeness and hyperactivity (Rai and Sharma, 1988). The above mentioned characteristics highlight problematic nature of impulsive behaviour. An individual who are care-free and does not consider the future consequences will not bother about his study, will not be prepared well for home assignments or for examinations. They would find unfair alternatives to perform various academic activities and get
success through dishonesty. Impulsivity has been examined as a predictor of risky behaviors in a variety of domains (Donohew, Zimmerman, Novak, Feist Price, & Cupp, 2000). Quick, risky behaviour and sensation seeking among individuals may be more likely to cheat because of risky and challenging nature of cheating.

Literature have revealed that parents socio-economic status influences the academic performance of their children (Devi and Mayuri, 2003; Panday and Maikhuri, 2003; Panigrahi, 2005; Alam, 2009; Mohanty, 2009). Individuals having low socio-economic status live in environment having fewer resources, maximum threat & more insecurity and have less opportunities but high aspirations for their future. Moreover parents in families with low socio-economic status often have fewer years of education may feel unprepared to help their children in studies. On the other hand upper class may be more willing to indulge in various kinds of unethical acts. Maximum availability of resources, better freedom and independence from others among those who belongs to high socio-economic status increases self focused social cognitive tendencies, which appears to be the reason behind unethical behaviour.

The study on academic cheating among adolescents in relation to self control, impulsiveness and socio-economic status of adolescents will presents comprehensive and viable explanation towards understanding cheating behaviour.

1.11. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Academic Cheating among Adolescents in relation to Self Control, Impulsiveness and Socio-Economic Status

1.12. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED

1.12.1 Academic Cheating

The definition given by Maslach (2004) has been used as the operational definition of the term Academic Cheating which states, “Academic cheating is defined as fraud, deceit or dishonesty in an examination or in class by using or attempting to use methods which are prohibited or inappropriate.”
1.12.2 Self Control:

The definition given by Liebert et al (1979) is the operational definition of the term self control which states, “Self-control refers to behaviour in which a person monitors his or her own action in the absence of or in the contradiction to the pressure in the immediate environment.”

1.11.3. Impulsiveness:

The definition given by Rai et al. (1988) is the operational definition of the term impulsiveness which states, “Impulsiveness as a personality trait which includes quick behaviour, risk-taking activities, lack of emotional control, non-planning; liveliness and hyperactivity”.

1.11.4. Socio Economic Status:

The definition given by Kalia and Sahu (2012) has been adopted as an operational definition of the term Socio Economic Status which states, “Socio Economic Status as the position that an individual or family occupies with reference to prevailing average standards of cultural possessions, effective income, material possessions, level of education and aspiration and participation in group activity of community”.

1.11.5. Adolescents:

Encyclopedic Dictionary of Education (2010) defines adolescents as “the chronological years of individual growth and development beginning with the onset of puberty (about 11 years old) and lasting more or less until maturity (about 17 years old).

The adolescent is past childhood and not yet an adult so that the physical and psychological process of development may be erratic or confusing and lead to difficulty in adjustment or adolescent crisis”.
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1.13. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study aims at achieving the following objectives:

**O₁ Objectives Related to Academic Cheating and Self Control**

**O₁(a)** To study Academic Cheating among adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

**O₁(b)** To study Academic Cheating among male adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

**O₁(c)** To study Academic Cheating among female adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

**O₁(d)** To study Academic Cheating among urban adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

**O₁(e)** To study Academic Cheating among rural adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

**O₂ Objectives Related to Academic Cheating and Impulsiveness**

**O₂(a)** To study Academic Cheating among adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

**O₂(b)** To study academic cheating among male adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.
\(O_2(c)\) To study academic cheating among female adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

\(O_2(d)\) To study academic cheating among urban adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

\(O_2(e)\) To study academic cheating among rural adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

\(O_3\) Objectives Related to Academic Cheating and Socio Economic Status

\(O_3(a)\) To study academic cheating among adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

\(O_3(b)\) To study academic cheating among male adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

\(O_3(c)\) To study academic cheating among female adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

\(O_3(d)\) To study academic cheating among urban adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

\(O_3(e)\) To study academic cheating among rural adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

\(O_4\) Objectives Related to Correlation between Academic Cheating and Self control, Impulsiveness and Socio Economic Status
$O_4(a)$ To find correlation between Academic Cheating and Self Control.

$O_4(b)$ To find correlation between Academic Cheating and Impulsiveness.

$O_4(c)$ To find correlation between Academic Cheating and Socio-economic status.

1.14. HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Following null hypotheses were framed and explored with respect to academic cheating.

$H_1$ Hypotheses with respect to Academic Cheating and Self Control

$H_1(a)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

$H_1(b)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among male adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

$H_1(c)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among female adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

$H_1(d)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among urban adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

$H_1(e)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among rural adolescents having very low self control, low self control, medium self control, high self control and very high self control.

$H_2$ Hypotheses with respect to Academic Cheating and Impulsiveness
There is no significant difference in academic cheating among adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among male adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among female adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among urban adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among rural adolescents having very low impulsiveness, low impulsiveness, moderate impulsiveness, high impulsiveness and very high impulsiveness.

Hypotheses with respect to Academic Cheating and Socio Economic Status

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among male adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

There is no significant difference in academic cheating among female adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.
$H_3(d)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among urban adolescents having high socio-economic status, middles socio-economic status and low socio-economic status.

$H_3(e)$ There is no significant difference in academic cheating among rural adolescents having high socio-economic status, middle socio-economic status and high socio-economic status.

$H_4$ Hypotheses with respect to correlation between Academic Cheating and Independent variables i.e. Self control, Impulsiveness and Socio-economic status.

$H_4(a)$: – There is no significant relationship between Academic Cheating and Self Control of adolescents.

$H_4(b)$: – Academic Cheating and Impulsiveness of adolescents is not significantly related to each other.

$H_4(c)$: – There is no significant relationship between Academic Cheating and Socio-economic Status of adolescents.

1.15. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The present study deals with self control, impulsiveness and socio-economic status in relationship with academic cheating among adolescents. While it may not be quite possible to incorporate all the relevant issues in the present study as such an attempt would render it unmanageable. Therefore, this study will also have its limitations just as almost all the research works in social sciences have in consideration with maintaining the manageability of the study, 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 produced from the whole of the population rather than from its sample unless the sample is a true representative of the population, which is quite difficult to achieve.
Due to these along with the limitations of time and resources on the part of investigator, a sincere attempt has been made to delimit the study in terms of sample and method of the study and the measuring tools used in the study.

I. Delimitations in Sampling

The study was delimited to 300 students (150 Urban=75 Male + 75 Female; and 150 Rural=75 Male + 75 Female) of senior secondary level only.

II. Delimitations in Methods

The study adopted the psychological and sociological techniques of research and therefore, may contain some such infirmities which such techniques are normally infested with.