Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature is crucial aspect of the planning the study and time spent in such a survey, invariably is a wide investment. Wertheimer (2010) is of the view that “Review of related literature may serve to avoid unnecessary duplication of any kind to make progress towards the solution of new problem for study, one has to conduct a thorough survey of the material already available in the given field to determine whether his chosen problem has been partly or completely investigated before.”

Best (2010) opined that “practically all human knowledge can be found in books and libraries. Thus the survey of related literature implies locating, studying, evaluating reports of relevant researches, study of published articles, going through related portions of encyclopedias and research abstracts, study of pertinent pages out of comprehensive books on the subject and going through related manuscripts if any.” A review of literature must precede any well planned research study. It promotes greater understanding of the problem and its crucial aspect, calls for deep insight and clear perspective of the field. The review of related literature is an essential and important part of research work. Keeping in view the importance of reviewing the old literature, certain national and international related studies were reviewed and presented here under the four sections:-

2.1 Studies pertaining to academic cheating.
2.2 Studies pertaining to self control and academic cheating.
2.3 Studies pertaining to impulsiveness and academic cheating.
2.4 Studies pertaining to socio-economic status and academic cheating.

2.1 STUDIES PERTAINING TO ACADEMIC CHEATING

A large and growing body of research on academic cheating is available from many disciplines. Research on student dishonesty in academic context has associate and examine many psychological and social factors including personality factors (Kelly & Worrell, 1978; Jackson et al., 2002; Christine & James, 2008), motivation
(Angell, 2006), age/gender (Newstead et al., 1996; Crown & Spiller, 1998; Noel & Carry, 2008), situational factors (Eisenberg, 2004; Kalia, 2006), and several other factors related to academic dishonesty. Most scholars agree that the occurrence of academic cheating has been amplified over the past three decades (Cleark, Whitley, 1996, Butterfield, 2001; Lambert, Hogan, Barton, 2003). Reports are indicating that academic cheating is cropping (Bushweller, 1999), has become a global phenomena (Noha & Eckstein, 2001) and becoming more and more knotty. “Some go so far as to propose that academic cheating is at an epidemic level (Niels, 1996).” Evidences are mounting that students come to college prepared to cheat (Anderman, Griesinger, & Westerfield, 1998; McCabe, 1999). Researchers at the Josephson Institute of Ethics (2004) reported that 83% of high school students copy someone else’s homework. McCabe (1999) reported that cheating is a commonplace activity for high school students. “Cheating, plagiarism, and other forms of academic misconduct are a significant problem in high schools (Josephson Institute of Ethics, 2006) and colleges and universities (Davis, Grover, Becker, & McGregor, 1992; McCabe & Trevino, 1993, 1997).” The literature on academic dishonesty among high school and college students has shown that problem of cheating is growing and a widespread phenomenon. Brief review of the studies related to academic cheating is given as under:-

Bowers (1966) attempted to examine academic cheating among college students. A sample of 5000 students studying in colleges of United States participated in the study. The results of this investigation revealed that about half of the students participated in the study admitted to engage in one or more form of academic cheating behaviour. Moreover, half of the students who were admitted to have done cheating also revealed that they had involved in more than one form of cheating. Majority of students also admitted that they were never caught and their perception of punishment about academic misconduct was lenient.

Johnson et al. (1972) examined behaviorally measured cheating among 5th graders in relation to personality and situational variables. Results of the study exposed that the unobtrusive measure was associated with a higher incidence of
cheating. It was also demonstrated that the previously reported relationship between academic ability and cheating was largely attributable to the obviousness of the assessment measure. Several interactions between sex and cheating indicated that females cheated in response to consistently unfavorable self-perceptions, while males were influenced by immediate situational factors.

**McCabe (1992)** examined the influential role of situational ethics on academic dishonesty among college students. The results of present study both harmonized and clashed with the findings of LaBeff, et.al. (1990). Responses from 6,096 students at 31 diverse schools were collected. The analysis of responses suggested that violation of institutional norms on academic honesty was justified by neutralization. Results also explored that students identify many situations in which they feel cheating is acceptable. Variety of neutralization techniques were used by students (randomization, rejection, diverting-blames to others, accusing the litigants) to enlighten their cheating behaviour.

**McCabe and Trevino (1993)** attempted to examine academic cheating among school students in relation to honor code. It was suggested in the study that level of academic honesty may be lower by honor code because they clarify exception and definition of cheating behaviour. This study highlights the importance of honor code in modifying the moral behaviour of an individual. The reason behind that is, students in honor code environment are given responsibilities for to spot those who break the rules, identify their guilt and to assign punishments. Although, a positive relationship is established between honor code and academic dishonesty through data surveyed, yet the data could confirm the reason for academic dishonesty. Further, the data highlighted the role of honor code in explaining lowest level and highest level of academic cheating. The reason behind occurrence of academic cheating in its lowest level schools that lack honor code is because administrators communicated their exceptions regarding higher standards of academic integrity among students and motivate them to follow the rules of appropriate demeanor. On the other side peak level of academic dishonesty take place at a school that had a long standing honor code but administrators failed to
correspond appropriately about the importance of institutional honor code to students. These findings give an important insight that merely presence of honor code is not enough to prevent academic cheating among students. A true effectual and proficient honor code must be implemented and strongly rooted in student culture.

Diekhoff et al. (1996) found that the time spent in hours for work was inversely related to academic cheating. These finding seems to be counterintuitive to the time pressure excuse preferred by students in studies of college cheating. Researchers also found that unmarried students were more likely to cheat than married students.

Newstead et al. (1996) investigated academic cheating among 943 college students. Finding of the study revealed that cheating was common among male students. In addition, male students were involved more in academic dishonesty than their female counterparts. It was also found in the study that cheating was also common among students with lower academic abilities, younger students and science students. An interactional analysis between gender and academic achievement was also found. It was revealed that male students having low academic achievement reported more their involvement in academic dishonesty than female counterparts having low academic achievement. Further, as the academic achievement increases this gender gap decreases. There exist significant and inverse relationship between abilities and academic cheating.

McCabe and Trevino (1997) investigated the influential role of individual and contextual factors in predicting cheating behaviour. A survey was conducted in United State on 1800 students of state universities in the year 1993-94. The results highlighted that cheating behaviour was influenced by the institutional context. It was suggested that academic cheating behaviour of individuals is influenced by number of their characteristics including grade-point average, gender and age. Moreover cheating was also influenced by number of contextual factors i.e. peer disapproval of cheating, level of cheating among peers, alliance membership and the perceptible harshness of punishments for academic cheating. Among all these
influential factor peer disapproval was the strongest factor to influence cheating behaviour. Moreover contextual factors were significantly more influential than individual factors.

**Anderman et al. (1998)** examined academic dishonesty and beliefs in science among early adolescents in relation to motivational variables. Results showed that adolescents who were more involved in dishonest activities in science did not consider their classroom as essential and consider that their schools’ center of attention is only performance and ability. Students who believed in the acceptability of cheating also reported personal extrinsic goals and a perceived emphasis on extrinsic factors in class. Students showing deceitful behaviour were worried about their school. It was also explored that use of self-handicapping approaches were related positively and the use of deep cognitive tactics were negatively related to dishonest beliefs and behaviors.

**Godfrey and Waugh (1998)** studied literature on academic cheating and found that majority of students repotted their acceptance to cheating behaviour at different school levels. Academic cheating incidents in upper primary schools were reported 40% and this percentage rose to 80% in secondary schools. It was also highlighted that students studying in religious schools also had knowledge about cheating and their involvement in cheating practices was less serious. Moreover secondary school students reported their engagement in various forms of dishonest behaviour during their schooling.

**Brown (1999)** reported that students were much more likely to be academically dishonest in home assignments than in-class exam and the participants who received a questionnaire on a one-on-one situation tended to appear more academically honest than those who received questionnaire in group. Nearly three quarters of the students were willing to cheat in a situation where they had pressure to finish an assignment in fixed time for a major grade.

**George et al. (1999)** investigated the neutralization i.e. justification of academic cheating among college students in relation to academic cheating and class
room environment. A sample of 280 college students studying in arts colleges from Midwest was participated in this investigation. Results revealed that students who were more involved in cheating behaviour describe their classes as significantly less personalized, less satisfying and less task oriented that those who were less involved in academic cheating. The seven scales of College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI) explained 4% of variance in academic cheating and 14% of variance in neutralization. Six out of seven College and University Classroom Environment scales were able to establish significant correlation with different assess of dishonest neutralization. It was further highlighted that neutralization increases with decrease in the perceived classroom personalization, involvement, student cohesiveness, satisfaction, task orientation and individualization. It was concluded that overall classroom environment is a significant factor to predict academic cheating.

**Hendershott et al. (1999)** conducted a study that focused on gender difference in cheating. The study attempted to explore reasons behind students’ decisions regarding involvement in cheating. Also, reasons behind why students don’t cheat were also explored. It was suggested that unlike neutralization theory, “which hypothesizes that individuals convince themselves that cheating behavior can be justified, deterrence theory holds that people refrain from engaging in deviant behavior like cheating primarily because they fear the punitive consequences of their deviance.” The study indicated the difference in thinking about cheating among male and female students. The results also indicated that academic integrity policies have much stronger deterrent effect on the behaviour of female students than male students to refrain from cheating. Moreover male students were more likely to exercises neutralization techniques than female students. The findings revealed that female students were less likely to exercise neutralization techniques in comparison with male students because have less opportunity to find circumstances that justify their dishonest behaviour.

**LaBeff, Shinohara and Yasukawa (1999)** compared American and Japanese students concerning the prevalence of cheating, their attitudes towards it,
issues concerning neutralization, their reactions to cheating and the effectiveness of different deterents. Their results showed that Japanese students appraised social stigma and fear of punishment as least successful forms of deterrence in comparison with their American peers. Moreover cheaters and non-cheaters think similarly about punishments in both cultures: according to non-cheaters guilt is the best deterrent, while cheaters ranked fear of punishment as the best form of deterrence. This study showed that fear of punishment and guilt was perceived dissimilarly effective deterents of cheating according to cheaters and non-cheaters. Furthermore, in general, as we have seen fear of punishment was seen as a better deterrent among Americans, than among Japanese students. On the basis of these studies, we can conclude that among Japanese students in general, and especially among Japanese non-cheaters, fear of punishment is an even stronger deterrent than among American students.

McCabe, Trevino and Butterfield (1999) recommended that dishonest behaviour can be efficiently handled in the classroom. A deep analysis of this research suggested that faculty members of the institution can follow several strategies which includes communication expectation about dishonest behaviour clearly, to set up policies concerning suitable behavior and encourage students to stand by those policies, being supportive in dealing with students, reducing pressure on students, providing harsh penalties to cheaters, developing fare and consistent grading policies, and removing opportunities to cheat. The study emphasized implementation of code of conduct because students following code of conduct feel their importance being a member of special community. This special community demands agreements with certain standard of academic integrity in exchange for the many privileges related to honor codes. Many privileges like self-scheduled examination, the strapping judicial role performed by pupils, unproctored examination, etc. enable to generate a proper environment where students and faculty members can trust each other. The research also recognized various factors that influence dishonest behaviour like pressure to get high grades, pressure from the parents, a strong wish to shine in the world, pressure to get appropriate occupation,
lacking accountability, a lack of character, bad self image, sluggishness, lacking satisfaction in job and lacking personal integrity.

**Bjorklund and Wenestam (1999)** examined prevalence of academic cheating among students in Swedish-Finnish University. The present study aimed at exploring: - occurrence of academic cheating, different methods used to cheat, reasons behind academic cheating and not cheating in Finish context. 160 university students from three departments i.e. teacher education (77), theology (52) and economic (31) participated in this study completing a questionnaire regarding academic cheating behaviour. Results of the study revealed that 75 percent of the students reported to involve in at least one of the dishonest behaviour as listed in questionnaire. However, 63.5 percent of students admitted to cheat in overall cheating behaviour. It was also implicated in the study that academic cheating among Finnish students was a common phenomenon and is conceived as an ethical problem.

**Jensen et al. (2001)** investigated acceptance of academic cheating among students in 19 different circumstances where individual motives differ for transgresses. The participants in this study were 490 students of age between 14 to 23 years studying in schools and colleges. Evaluations performed by students were correlated with their cheating behaviour, gender, school grades and psychological variables. The results revealed that students studying in high schools and colleges keep motives in their minds while evaluating the acceptability of academic dishonesty. Male Students who evaluate cheating leniently, perceive cheating behaviour as common phenomenon. Similar results were found among high school students also. In addition, there was a significant negative relation between acceptance of cheating & cheating behaviour and self restraint. However, there was significant positive relationship between acceptance of cheating & cheating behaviour and tolerance of deviance.

**Penelope et al. (2001)** examined the perceptions of students regarding academic cheating in relation to university’s policy on academic cheating. A web survey was organized where students from 14 universities participated and submitted their responses. The findings of the study revealed that students perceive academic
cheating as a common phenomenon. Also, different characteristics of academic dishonesty policy associated with perception of students towards cheating. It was reported that two characteristics i.e. commitment of students and specificity of the policy established inverse relationship with students perception about academic cheating.

Hofmann and Sherman (2002) examined cheating among high school students within a context of competitive goal structures. Results explored that students show a general lack of approval for rationalizing cheating but do not approve intolerance for cheating. The above findings were conferred within a context of a competitive goal structure. It was concluded that attitude and tolerance for cheating (on homework as well as on tests) was socially constructed and is not associated with general honesty or dishonesty – rather it is moderated by goal structure.

Ellis et al. (2003) designed a study focused on academic cheating during adolescence. The researchers examined a novel aspect of academic cheating by taking cues from cognitive and attribution theory. Keeping in view these theories four related aspects of the academic cheating were examined with emphasis on various concepts and conditions of cheating. Results reported that ratings of cheating problem seriousness were highest for the high school level. It was highlighted that knowledge of defining attributes of cheating increased significantly by grade but plagiarism variations were poorly understood. Also precollege students and high achieving student more strongly identify teacher behaviors as causal factors in cheating. In spite of achievement level, student personality characteristics were recognized more as causes of academic cheating by younger students. Ratings of cheating prevention strategy efficacy increased by grade but were generally weak. However, no gender differences were revealed.

Lambert et al. (2003) examined academic dishonesty among university students. This study revealed that participation of students in extracurricular activities has been linked to increasing academic dishonesty. Students who involved in sports reported to have average and high level of academic dishonesty than those
who do not involved in varsity sports. The reason behind that was their participation in extracurricular activities do not provide ample time for their academic and hence less time devoted to their studies.

**Arvidson (2004)** attempted to investigate academic dishonesty among college students. The study focused on the relationships between academic dishonesty and different independent variables i.e. cognitive development, use of neutralization techniques, self-concept as a multifaceted cognitive construct, attitude toward cheating and the reasons behind college student academic cheating behaviors. Results explored that there exist a significant and negative relation between academic dishonesty and self-concept. Also, attitude of students towards academic cheating exhibited significant inverse relationship with academic cheating. Moreover neutralization techniques used by students exhibited significant positive relationship with academic cheating. The position of cognitive development and self-concept in academic cheating represents chief results.

**Eisenberg (2004)** attempted to study the effect of moral orientation and of three situational variables i.e. importance of examination, level of supervision and peer norms on students attitude towards academic dishonesty in school examination. Two types of academic cheating i.e. active cheating (copying from others) and passive cheating (letting others copy) were taken for the study. Data regarding different variables used in the study was collected from 196 male and female participants in the middle schools of Israel. Results revealed that a-moral students reported more cheating behaviour than moral students. Out of three situational variables, importance of examination had marginally significant effect on active cheating. However, on rest of the two variable i.e. supervision during examination and peer norms had significant effect on both types of academic cheating attitudes.

**Jeffrey (2004)** investigated relation of cheating with personality characteristics, behaviour of parents and gender of subject. Results showed that male cheaters were significantly higher in aggression, exhibition, social recognition, and harm avoidance but lower in autonomy and ACT (American College testing) scores. Female transgressors were reliably lower in harm avoidance and higher in
Impulsivity than non-cheaters. Among males, no parent scales differentiated transgressors and resisters. Among females, parent scales reflecting reports of lower father warmth and fewer maternal equalitarian interactions but higher Hostile Control significantly differentiated cheaters from non-cheaters. These findings were discussed, particularly in terms of the sex differences which suggest that males and females may cheat for different reasons.

Kalia (2005) studied the influence of gender on knowledge, perceptions, tendencies and belief towards cheating. Cheating is believed to be of two types i.e. active cheating done to improve one’s own grade and passive cheating done to assist another student in improving his grade. Female students have more knowledge about cheating and have high tendencies of cheating than their male counterparts. But for preparing home assignments/project work, male students have high percentage of cheating than female students.

Sangeeta (2005) designed a study that examined academic dishonesty in relation to student personal responsibility. Result showed that there exist a significant and negative relation between academic cheating and personal responsibility. It was also reported that female students with high academic dishonesty exhibited lowest sense of responsibility while the female students with high integrity in academic context exhibited high sense of personal responsibility. However, results are not alike for male students for association personal responsibilities and academic cheating. Half of the students surveyed in the study admitted to some form of academic dishonesty while the majority professors were found to underestimate the pervasiveness of academic cheating.

Alutu and Aluede (2006) attempted to study perceptions of examination malpractices and examination ethics among secondary school students in Nigeria. The findings of the study revealed that majority of students participated in the study assumed that their involvement in the examination misconduct was a common happening and it is difficult to get rid of this problem. Majority of students had a very wrong notion about examination ethics. They believed that examination ethics require among others sittings next to someone so that they can cheat during paper in
examination hall. It was also revealed that parents, teachers and school principals were involved in encouraging cheating during examination.

**Bruin and Rudnick (2006)** examined frequency of premeditated cheating in tests and exams in relation to their personality traits of conscientiousness and excitement seeking among students studying in university. The study revealed that the two traits of personality i.e. conscientiousness and excitement seeking combine to account for a statistically and practically significant proportion of variance in academic cheating. It is also reported that need for high excitement seeking and lack of efforts may serve as influential traits with regard to academic dishonesty.

**Tate et al. (2006)** designed an exploratory study on academic dishonesty among MBA students at an institute of management in India. Responses on academic dishonesty were collected from 62 participants in that institution. Findings of the study revealed that level of participants in academic dishonesty range from a low 6.5 percentage for having unauthorized information programmed into calculator during an exam to a high 80.6 percentage for, “Working with other on an individual paper or project”. Twelve of the sixteen practices in the questionnaire had been practiced by more than 20 percentages of the respondents. The overall level of academic dishonesty as measured by the percentage of the respondents who had participated in at least one of the practices was 95.2 percentage. In addition, reasons for participation in academic dishonesty were also explored. The most likely reason for participation was, “the student want or need a high grade” followed by the students feel that there is low risk of getting caught or punished.

**Therese et al. (2006)** studied the prevalence of academic dishonesty in online classes and traditional classes. It was reported in the study that academic cheating was prevalent more in the traditional classes than online classes. This finding suggested that an online class leads to reduction in academic cheating in the classrooms, the reason behind that was the way in which online courses were designed. A typical form of cheating known as panic cheating was found more in traditional classroom conditions, reported less likely to perform in online classroom conditions.
Scott (2007) examined academic cheating behaviour of college students in relation to moral identities and social anxiety. Results of the study revealed that social anxiety was positively related with academic cheating i.e. higher the social anxiety higher will be the recall of academic cheating. Further it was also found that college student were less lightly show cheating behaviour on their academic work when their maximum emphasizes was on the moral identity.

Stephens and Gehlbach (2007) attempted to examine academic cheating among high school students in relation to personal goals and perceived classroom goal structures. It was reported that personal mastery goals negatively predicted neutralization of responsibility for cheating and engagement in cheating behaviors. However, there exist a positive relationship between students’ perceptions of a classroom performance goal structure and engagement in cheating behaviors and observations of others engaged in cheating.

Abdulrazaq and Salmanl (2008) examined reasons and solutions to examination misconduct among female students. It was reported in the study that societal preference for paper qualification, insufficient preparation for exams, lack of good study habits, lack in self confidence, poorly equipped schools and host of others were considered as the causes of examination malpractice among female students.

Carrell (2008) studied peer effects in academic cheating. Responses from participants using self reported academic cheating were collected. The participants in this study were class of students enrolled from 1959 through 2002 at the three major United States military service academies (Air Force, Army and Navy). Peer influence on academic dishonesty was measured. It was reported that higher levels of involvement of peer cheating activities will increase the possibility that an individual will also perform cheating. It was also highlighted that students will drive this academic dishonest behaviour from school to college.

Carter (2008) designed a study focused on beliefs, level of understanding and reported actions of faculty regarding academic integrity. The participants were
faculty members at private and public institutions in Southeastern United States. Self reported questionnaire were given to faculty members teaching to undergraduate classes at three universities in Southeastern. The findings of the study uncovered that a few notable differences in faculty beliefs, level of understanding and reported actions regarding academic integrity between institutions with honor code and institutional policies. Overall results regarding type of institutions revealed that very few notable differences in faculty perception and understanding about academic integrity were observed (private verses public). No matter faculty belongs to private or public institution or an institute with honor code or academic integrity policy, faculty generally shares some common beliefs:- (a) academic integrity is a serious concern for faculty who, for the most part, have a general understanding and support for institutional academic integrity policies; (b) faculty reported a desire to be informed of how serious the problem of student cheating is and the frequency of occurrence on campus; (c) faculty could take a more proactive role in educating their colleagues and students about academic integrity; (d) faculty could become more vigilant and committed to following through on addressing cheating behaviors; (e) students could be actively involved in supporting and promoting academic integrity; and (f) administrative support of faculty who report academic integrity violations is critical given this is one of the reasons faculty tend not to report and/ or ignore student cheating.

Eastman et al. (2008) designed a study that focus on the impact of unethical reasoning on different types of cheating behaviour. It was explored that unethical reasoning had significant impact on the academic cheating. The results revealed that academic dishonesty was more among students having feeling that they had strong unethical reasons behind committing cheating than those who had feeling regarding weak reasons for academic dishonest behaviour. Four kinds of academic dishonest behaviour i.e. cheating on test, seeking help from outside, plagiarism (on papers) and E-cheating (electronic cheating on test) were take for the study and the relationship help for all the four categories. It was suggested that pupils were rationalizing their cheating behaviors and those pupils who were having feeling regarding strong
reasons for committing cheating were more involved in academically dishonest activities.

**James et al. (2008)** designed a study that focused on the ethics instructions, religiosity, intelligence and its influence on cheating behaviour. Results of the study revealed that academic cheating was reported less among those students who attended worship services more frequently than those who attended worship services less frequently. Also those students who have taken a course in business ethics were no less likely to cheat than students who had not taken such a course. Moreover results also revealed that religiosity and intelligence of the individual student had moderate influence on cheating behaviour. In particular, students who were not highly religious exhibit a lesser amount of dishonest behaviour if they taken a business ethics course. On the other hand students who were highly religious were not likely to show cheating behaviour whether or not they had taken a business ethics course. In addition, highly intelligent students were less involved in cheating if they had taken a course in business ethics. Similarly students with higher level of intelligence and religiosity exhibited significant less cheating. The implications of these findings were discussed.

**Lori (2008)** examined academic cheating level among athletes in relation to religiosity. Participants in this study were athletes at a Private Christian college and a State University. Students were compared at both institutions on the level of academic dishonesty and religiosity. Results revealed that there was significant difference in the religiosity levels among athletes in the two institutions. In addition, there was no significant difference in the level of academic cheating among athletes in the two institutions. Religiosity predicts academic cheating moderately at Christian college. However, religiosity was not a predictor of academic cheating at State University.

**Murdock et al. (2008)** examined influences of classroom and individual on students’ attributes of blame for cheating. Data was collected from high school students and relationship was examined between subsequent cheating behaviour and students’ attributes of blame for cheating. Participants were 444 high school students
studying in 48 mathematics and science classes. Results of the study revealed that student-level and aggregate views of teacher characteristics were related to concurrent and subsequent attribution of cheating blame to teachers and to subsequent cheating behaviors, over and above the influence of moral emotion dispositions. Stronger links between the classroom environment and attributions may have been ascertained if measures of classroom context had been more specifically related to the outcomes of interest.

Olabisi (2008) reported a survey of staff and students’ expression of preference for and willingness to engage in three approaches to lessening the threat of academic cheating in the University of Ilorin, Nigeria. Results of the study revealed the possible connections between gender and the respondents’ responses. The sample comprised 87 staff and 232 final year undergraduate students, randomly drawn from five faculties in the university. Researcher designed questionnaire on academic cheating was used for data collection. Findings of the study showed that as the ‘Police’ approach was most chosen by staff members, the students expressed preference mostly for the ‘Virtues’ approach; significant differences existed between the staff and students in the degrees of their expressed willingness to engage in the ‘Police’ and ‘Virtues’ approaches; however, gender had no significant influence on respondents’ first choice for or readiness to involve in any of the three approaches. The implications of the findings for integrated approach to decrease academic dishonesty and for instituting academic integrity policy in Nigerian universities were highlighted.

Widwman (2008) reviewed literature on academic cheating in post secondary institutions. The research demonstrated that academic cheating is prevalent at post secondary level. It mainly highlights academic dishonesty in relation to some selected variable i.e. “peer influence, moral reasoning, motivation, neutralization as well as western society and what some describe as its culture of cheating.” The stream of research revealed that factors such as peer influence, to improve grades, procrastination, need to get good job and cheating culture are the major reasons behind cheating behaviour. This research suggested that different
various selected in the research show their relevance in predicting academic dishonesty among students at post secondary institution through research conducted by numerous researchers in this context.

**Elias (2009)** examined potential determinants of cheating perceptions among business students. Data was collected from 666 business students in three universities. Two variables i.e. anti-intellectualism and academic self-efficacy were used to predict potential determinants of cheating. Anti-intellectualism refers to a student’s negative view of the value and importance of intellectual pursuits and critical thinking whereas academic self-efficacy refers to a student’s belief in one’s ability to accomplish an academic task. Results indicated that students who are high in anti-intellectualism perceive college cheating as unethical. However, those students who are low in academic self-efficacy likely to perceive college cheating as unethical. Keeping in mind that college has been found as a predictor of workplace cheating, results of the presents study suggested business instructor to reduce the level of anti-intellectualism among students and motivate them to put forth their best efforts. The results also serve employers by focusing attention on these two psychological variables during the hiring and promotion processes.

**Fezatte (2009)** designed a study focused on academic dishonesty in relation to personality traits, while controlling the effects of self-efficacy, attitudes and academic motives. Data were collected from 344 university students. A confidential online questionnaire was used to assess personality traits, academic motives, attitudes towards academic dishonesty, academic self-efficacy, self and peer reports of academic cheating. The results revealed that there was a significant relationship between reports of academic dishonesty and personality variables and this effect was mediated by attitudes of students regarding towards cheating behaviour. In addition, there exists significant relationship of self efficacy & gender with students reported academic cheating before and during university. Two components related with academic i.e. grade point average and program were the strong factors in predicting cheating behaviour during university. However, no significant relationship exists between types of motivation and reports of academic cheating. Finally, reports of
peers regarding academic cheating were significantly elevated than academic cheating reported by self.

Kenneth (2009) investigated cheating behaviors among business students at three public business schools. Results supported the differentiation of the theoretical constructs within the specified process model. Tests of the theoretical model supported most of the hypothesized relations, most notably significant positive relations between a motivational orientation and both prior cheating and future cheating liking, as well as neutralization tendency.

McKibban (2009) examined the relationship between student perceptions of teacher effectiveness and academic misconduct. Participants in the study were 3,115 students from 128 classes. Data were collected from the participants regarding perception of students towards teacher effectiveness and academic dishonesty. The results indicated that there was no significant relationship between perception of students regarding teacher effectiveness and academic dishonesty. Findings of the study do suggest that students were more likely to report academic dishonesty (i.e. cheating during examination, claiming other work as their own, using falsely excuses and creatively padding others work) as they perceive that difficulty and work load of course work is lower.

Bens (2010) examined understandings of senior education students’ about academic honest and dishonesty. Participants in this study were senior education degree program students from two western Canadian universities. Students were exposed to verbalism discussion in five groups and accordingly data were collected in naturalistic settings. Findings of the study were focused on sustentative, structural and future applicability in students understanding. Important elements regarding academic cheating appealing students understanding were existence of rules, intent to break those rules and resulting unearned grade advantages. Many situational considerations were volunteered by students that describe and believe about likelihood associated with academic honesty and dishonesty. The findings of the study suggested students’ visualization of a system regarding academic integrity that
abides resemblance to moral system. Also there was a lack of monitoring behaviour of students’ and professor’s related to academic honesty and dishonesty.

**Monika et al. (2010)** investigated attitudes towards seriousness of cheating behaviour among undergraduate dental students in India. The researcher also examined the rate of academic malpractices among these students. Data were collected from 300 undergraduate students in a dental institute. A self prepared questionnaire was used to assess academic malpractices among these students and to rate the seriousness of six dishonest behaviours. The results revealed that response rate was 100%. At least 61% of the students surveyed in this study considered two of the six cheating behaviour as serious. About, 70% of the participants reported to admit their involvement in malpractice in exams at least once. Also majority of them were of the view that if they cheat during examination it will not have significant effect on their future. The present research highlighted the prevalence of academic dishonesty in Indian context and suggested that cheating is a vital issue, which needs to be addressed for the benefit of the society at large.

**Stone (2010)** attempted to examine academic misconduct behaviour and its intentions by using theory of planned behaviour and personality. A sample of 241 business undergraduates was participated in the study. Mediated structural equation models of the theory of planned behavior, with personality constructs, adjustment, and prudence, as antecedents were studied in this research. The theory of planned behavior model explained that there was 21% of the variance in cheating intentions and 36% of cheating behavior. Findings of this research were in favor of theory of planned behaviour model and a partially mediated model. In mediated model prudence, but not adjustment showed significant relationship with model components, attitudes, norms, control and behaviour but not related with intention to cheat. These findings revealed that the theory of planned behavior model may stingily integrate and advance academic misconduct research.

**Sykes (2010)** examined attitudes towards academic dishonesty among high school students in relation to their parental awareness. Participants in this study were parents of students in 9-12 grades in a high school. Researcher conducted a
quantitative survey and utilizes in both online and paper for to collect data from respondents. The findings of the study revealed that parents were of the view that dishonest behaviour is intolerable and are slightly aware of what specific techniques involved. Parents’ views regarding punishment for academic dishonesty were that students must be punished for their cheating behaviour.

Nora and Zhang (2010) investigated motives of cheating among secondary students. In addition, interrelationship among different variables of self-efficacy, peer influence and academic dishonesty were also examined. The findings revealed that students having lower level of self-efficacy were more likely to cheat than those who perceived themselves as effective. Moreover peer influence play significant role in discouraging academic cheating by showing their disapprover and informing teachers about dishonest behaviour.

Okorodudu (2010) examined delinquency among adolescents in relation to parenting style. A sample of 404 students participated in the study completing six research questions. The results revealed that two parenting style i.e. authoritarian and authoritative did not predicts delinquency among adolescents where as lassair-faire parenting style play significant role in predicting delinquency among adolescents. Similar results were observed irrespective of gender, location and age. It was also revealed that adolescents were socially competent and goal directed when parenting style was positively oriented i.e. demanding and responsive. In addition, parents who monitor activities of adolescents, exerted control and promote self-autonomy were having significant effects on the behaviour of adolescents. Parents who do not responding to the needs of adolescents had negative impact on the behaviour of adolescents.

Abiodun (2011) investigated prevalence of academic dishonesty among Nigerian students on internal and external exams. The results revealed that students show their acceptance to cheating behaviour at least once in their previous examinations. In addition, 53.44% of them admitted to cheat twice. Different forms of cheating in the examination were explored and signing the correct answer to classmate during examination was the topmost form of examination. Whereas,
contract cheating i.e. appointing others to write examination and creating disturbance in the classroom so that other may cheat were the least forms of academic cheating. In addition, there was no significant difference among male and female students on total academic cheating i.e. when all kinds of academic cheating were combined together. However, no significant difference among male and female adolescents when topmost form of prevent academic cheating was analyzed.

Arun (2011) examined the academic dishonesty practices among undergraduate students. Data from 166 medical students from private medical colleges in India were collected. Results of the study revealed that 75% students had given proxy for attendance, 49% had cheated from other record book. Results also highlight the prevalence of cheating in theory examination where 74% of students admitted that they had cheated from their peers, 2% had attempted to acquire papers before examination and 5% of students had influenced their professors by using unfair means to get more marks. In addition, during practical examination, 81% had taken technical help, 45% had earlier knowledge about the examination case and 54% of them have falsely documented clinical findings. Findings of the research suggested that prevalence of academic cheating is very high in medical profession.

Blachnio and Weremko (2011) investigated the determinants of academic dishonesty among students. The researcher examined the specific type of cheating behaviour which is usually there among students. A prediction was made by the researcher that “an agreement between each participant and the experimenter would induce participants to remain honest.” The study was preceded in the form of a laboratory experiment, where participants were observed in natural settings. The findings revealed the importance of experimenter’s partner presence to avoid cheating. The results revealed that the existence of the experimenter’s confederate was significant. Involvement of students in academic cheating was more often when they observe during test that other person is cheating than they did when writing the test individually. Hence, the argument had no significant influence on the behaviour of participant. In addition, influence of personality determinant on academic dishonesty was also examined. Disloyal behaviour was investigated in relation to
self-esteem and attitude towards dishonesty. Results revealed that participants who were having low self-esteem are more involved in cheating behaviour than those who having higher self-esteem. Likewise, attitude towards disloyalty, results revealed that loyalty have lower value for participant who were involved in cheating while loyalty valued is high for those who did not cheat.

**Bourassa (2011)** designed a study that focus on academic dishonesty among students at colleges and universities. The participants in this study were students studying in church related colleges and universities. Finding of the study revealed that students who were studying in church related institutions were involved in cheating behaviour. Twenty four cheating behaviour of respondent were analyzed and it was reported that self reported cheating rate was 77%. These behaviours were dishonest activities associated with plagiarism, examination cheating and sharing of assignments work. Range of these dishonest behaviours varies from less than 1% to 45%. Significant difference in perception and attitude towards academic cheating was observed among group of students that engaged in and that did not involve in dishonest behaviour. Students who were involved in academic dishonesty were more likely have observed real occurrence of cheating. Moreover, reports of cheating by cheaters were negligible. Also results revealed that there was no significant relationship between most of the individual difference factors and academic cheating. In addition, younger students were involved in cheating behaviour and more involved in intramural athletics.

**Brunell et al. (2011)** examined academic dishonesty among college students in relation to specific dimensions of narcissism. Data were collected from one hundred and ninety nine college students completed the self reported or reported other’s cheating behaviour and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The results revealed that the exhibitionism dimension of the NPI leads to maximum involvement in academic dishonesty and the reason behind that was lack of guilt as perceived by students. Findings suggested that the effect of exhibitionism for involvement of an individual in academic dishonesty hold only for self but not other-report conditions. Hence, it can ne concluded that self play
significant role in narcissism. Thus, the narcissists' emphasizes on self centered academic achievement lead to predict academic cheating among students in schools supported by a lacking of guilt factor for their unethical behavior.

Del et al. (2011) examined perception of students regarding academic cheating in laboratory classroom settings. The chief aims of the study were to compare academic dishonest in research laboratory and other academic class and to explore how perception towards academic dishonesty changes with age and/or research experience. Results explored four major ascertains for this work. The first is that students perceive work in laboratory and work in other academic class as same. The reason behind that was students do not believe what they learn in laboratory is science. Additionally, they make a clear dissimilarity between work done in class laboratory and work done in research or industrial lab. Hence, significant difference exists in students’ perception towards academic dishonesty in these two settings. Finally, the same difference was not marked among graduate students and is observed as a part of maturity. In the process of finding the above assertions, perceptions of students toward nature of science were exposed and were also conferred. These beliefs have direct relevance to students' perceptions of dishonesty in both lab atmospheres.

Koss (2011) studied the literature pertaining to academic dishonesty among adolescents in America. The chief aim of this study was to find out the appropriate reasons behind preference of adolescents to choose academic cheating over academic integrity. Further this study focused to determine the role that class room and school play in academic dishonesty, to explore the mean and ways that students used during cheating and to prevent academic dishonesty. Reasons behind academic cheating were explored as pressure from teachers, parents and peers. The classroom and school environment, self centered culture and changing technology also contributes in academic cheating. Also successful ways to cheat on examination, assignments and entrance exams by adolescents were also explored. Some of the ways adolescents cheat during examination include using crib notes, which they usually place them on the wall next to them. They also use their body parts like arms, legs or
hands to do the same. Numerous researches acknowledged effective prevention and interventions approaches to academic cheating.

**Jordan (2011)** examined academic dishonesty among college students in relation to motivation, perceived norms, attitudes and knowledge of institutional policy. Level of academic cheating among cheaters and non cheaters was assessed in relation to two types of motivations i.e. mastery and extrinsic, perceived social norms about academic cheating, on attitude towards academic cheating and on acquaintance of institutional policy about academic cheating. Results of the study revealed that all the variables taken for the study were significantly predictors of academic cheating. Students who exhibit academic cheating were found to be lower in mastery motivation and higher in extrinsic motivation than who did not exhibits academic cheating. There was also significant difference among cheaters and non cheaters on perceived norms regarding, knowledge of intuitional policy and attitudes towards cheating.

**Oluwatayo (2011)** investigated level of academic dishonesty among senior secondary school students in relational to emotional intelligence. A sample of 180 students from three senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria was participated in the study. Self constructed emotional intelligence scale and Potential for academic cheating scale were used to collect data from respondent. Finding of the study revealed that emotional intelligence of secondary school students show significant and negative relationship with potential for academic dishonesty. Further, there exist significant relationship between sub scale of emotional intelligence and academic dishonesty. Emotional management highlights the most important role in declining academic cheating also emotional understanding followed by emotional perception play significant role in reducing academic cheating.

**Alt and Geiger (2012)** examined the phenomenon of academic cheating while focusing on the unique and interactive effects of socio-cultural variables on academic motivation, goal orientation and self efficacy perception of 221 Muslim and Jewish female students. A mixed quantitative and qualitative research design with Multivariate-Analysis of Covariance, Step-wise Discriminant Function
Analysis, Path Analysis and semi-structured interviews have been used to classify the data obtained in various scales. Path Analysis indicated that the main factor predicting the tendency to neutralize academic cheating was the performance goal of pleasing parents mediated by extrinsic motivation. Further analysis showed between-ethnic-groups differences with Muslim students being more extrinsically motivated by the performance goal of pleasing the parents. Content analysis of the interviews conducted with 22 students showed that, in contrast to the Jewish students’ individualistic perspective, Muslim students’ collective perspective put them under tremendous pressure to succeed due to the rippling effect of success on all spheres of life e.g., family’s honor, community standing, and future marriage prospects.

**Cornelius- Ukpepi and Enukoha (2012)** examined relationship of examination malpractice with academic performance. The participants in this study were students in primary science among sixth grade in cross river state, Nigeria. Finding of this study revealed that academic performance in science was significantly related with perception of students towards examination cheating. Further it was suggested that if pupils understand the effects of examination malpractice and study properly; it will help them to perform better in science and to reduce examination malpractice.

**Kbayashi and Fukushima (2012)** examine relation of academic cheating with gender and social bond. The chief aim of this study was to compare male and female students on academic cheating and to explore the role of social bonding in predicting cheating behaviour among students. Results revealed that female students were less likely to cheat than male students. In addition, social bonding among female students was stronger than male students and academic dishonesty was less among female students. Specifically, the stronger belief in legitimacy of social rules (a dimension of social bonding) among female students leads to less likeness in academic dishonesty.

**Tsai (2012)** attempted to investigate peer effects on academic dishonesty among students. This study was conducted in students studying in high schools of Taiwan. Results of present study revealed the effect of peer interaction highlighting
male-male and female-female interaction on academic cheating. It was explored that interaction effect among female were stronger than the male interaction effect. It implies that girls are more influenced by their female peers on academic cheating than male-male interaction. Findings do not support significant results for cross gender interaction i.e. male to female and female to male interactions. In addition, all the social interaction coefficients become insignificant when this model allows for school specific fixed effects.

**Walker and Townley (2012)** studied contract cheating as a novel and more fraudulent form of academic dishonesty. The term contract cheating includes students contracting out their coursework to writers in order to present the purchase assignments as their own work. This kind of work is usually done via the internet. It was highlighted that it is a major concern of educators because its detection is very difficult and is more fraudulent than other form of plagiarism. The present paper highlighted the literature reviewed available for this topic, problems related with this issue, its causal factor and some of the ways in which educators might respond.

**Ma et al. (2013)** conducted quantitative research regarding academic dishonesty among Chinese college. The present study investigated pervasiveness of different form of academic dishonesty among Chinese students. In addition different factors influencing cheating behaviour of students were also explored. A structural equation model was used to analyze the data. Results revealed that there was significant negative impact of organizational deterrence and individual performance on academic dishonesty. However, pressure of parents, peer dishonest behaviour and co-curricular activities have positive impact on academic dishonesty. Suggestions were given to diminish the level of academic dishonesty in China.

### 2.2 STUDIES PERTAINING TO SELF-CONTROL AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

“Self-control has been one of the major common point of interest of social sciences given that it is found to be a well known predictor of various kinds of deviant, criminal or disruptive in almost every research or study regardless of
disciplinary differentiations (Muraven, Pogarsky, & Shmueli, 2006; Pratt & Cullen, 2000).” Review of studies given below highlight the relation of self-control with academic cheating.

Cochran et al. (1998) investigated academic dishonesty behaviour in relation to an individual level of self control. Regression analysis, was use to find the relationship between self control and academic dishonesty. Results of this study revealed that there was significant and inverse effect of self control on academic dishonesty. Hence, individuals who were higher in self control were less likely to show cheating behaviour and those with lower level of self control were more involved in academic cheating. In addition, there was interactive significance between self control and opportunity on cheating. Finally, study strongly holds up for the direct and interactive effect of self control on academic cheating.

Reza (2000) designed a study that focused self control and social control in relation to ethnicity class, sex and delinquency. Findings of the study revealed that low self control was significantly related delinquency. The above findings strongly support the “General Theory Crime (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990), in this theory low self control was the strongest predictor of all types of delinquency.” In addition, different dimensions of self control were also examined. Students’ risk taking ability and impulsiveness among students were the strong predictors of delinquent behaviour than rest of the dimensions. Finally, even after controlling the effect of self and social control, rest of the variables i.e. sex, age and ethnicity had significant relationship with delinquency.

Gisela (2003) designed a study that focused on the conditional effects of low self control, opportunities, and frustration theories on explaining variation in cheating behaviour of students. The results indicated that measures of perceived opportunity and frustration exhibited differential effects on dishonest behaviour of students and it dependents on changing levels of low self-control of the students.

Bolin (2004) examined self control among college students in relation to their cheating attitudes and perceived opportunities. The study aimed at exploring self
control as a predictor of cheating behaviour. A sample comprised of 799 college students across United States participated in this study. Finding of the study revealed that attitude towards cheating mediate the relationship between self control and reported cheating behaviour. Hence there was not significant direct link between self control and academic cheating.

Jones and Quisenberry (2004) examined self control theory advocated by “Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory of crime” to predict several form of deviant behaviour. The research aimed at exploring the relationship of self control with possible limitations in deviant behaviour such as risky driving, risky sex and academic cheating. A sample of 254 college students participated in this study. Findings of the study revealed that there were significant results regarding self control and academic dishonesty.

June et al. (2004) investigated self control in relation to adjustment, grade and interpersonal success. This study aimed at exploring the relationship of high self control with good adjustment, better grade and interpersonal success. Individuals who score higher on self control were correlated to their high grade point average, better adjustment, better relationships and interpersonal skills, less binge eating and alcohol abuse, secure achievement and best possible emotional reply. Tests for curve-linearity failed to show any negative aspect of so called over control and the positive effects remained after controlling for social desirability. Low self-control was thus seems to be a key risk factor for a wide range of individual and interpersonal problems.

Higgins (2007) designed a study focused on exploring the link between low self control, rational choice, value and digital piracy. The results revealed that there has been a direct and indirect connection between low self control and intentions to digital piracy. It was highlighted that low self control had a direct connection with the intentions to digital piracy and had a direct positive effect on the values. Hence, individuals who are lower in self control are more involved in digital piracy and highly value the digital media. Further, indirect connection of low self control and intentions to digital piracy was also explored, revealing that low self control had a
indirect connection with digital piracy through value. Results of this study strongly support the “Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) view that individuals with low self-control are unlikely to see the consequences of their digital piracy.”

**Wikstrom and Treiber (2007)** attempted to study alternative concept of self control as advanced by “Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) in general theory of crime”. Role of self control in crime causation was explored by researchers. The chief aims of this study were to clarify the concepts of self control, executive capacity and mainly their role and relationship to enlighten the notion crime. The concept was based on the theoretical framework outlined in the situational action theory of crime causation. Situational concept to analyze self control was projected in this study rather than individual trait. It was highlighted that self control is best examined through an individual process of choice in different situations. Moreover, in crime causation the ability of an individual to work out self control is an appropriate factor only in different circumstances where he/she intentionally want to involve in criminal act or not. It was suggested that most peoples in different situations their decisions to involve in criminal act is not merely a question of their ability to experience self control but a question of morality.

**Mead et al. (2009)** studied dishonesty in relation to self control. For this purpose researcher had conducted two experiments. It was hypothesized that “the act of dishonesty would increase when people’s self control were depleted by initial act of self control.” Results of experiment 1 revealed that for financial gain depleted participants misrepresented their performance to greater extent than non-depleted participants. However, results of experiment 2 was more troubling than the first one, it was revealed that depleted participants were more likely to explore themselves to temptation to cheat than the no depleted participants. Findings of this study suggested that as the people’s capability to exercise self control is weaken, there will be maximum increase in dishonesty.

**Coskan (2010)** designed a study that focused on effect of state self control and social influence on cheating among undergraduate students. The researcher also examined the role of the trait self control and conformity in prediction dishonest
behaviour among students. Results revealed that students having low self control predicts past behaviour of academic dishonesty. Students who were highly susceptible to social influence were reported their acceptance toward past cheating behaviour. Results of the hierarchical regressions showed that male students with low self control, a low cumulative GPA and highly disposed to social influence were major factors responsible for predicting past academic dishonesty. However, low trait self control was significant factor to predict academic dishonesty among undergraduate students.

**Gallagher (2010)** designed a study that focused on academic integrity among college students in relation to big five factors of personality, self esteem, anxiety, depression, locus of control, self control and social desirability. In this study 211 college students participated, performing academic integrity assessment questionnaire. Results of the study revealed that 80% of college students admitted that they had cheated at least once within the past year. Participants with lower in self control showed higher level of academic dishonesty. However, higher in neuroticism, openness, state anxiety and depression were more involved in academic dishonesty. A regression analysis revealed that higher levels of openness and lower levels of seriousness of cheating and self-control predicted academic dishonesty.

**Karim and Ghavam (2011)** examined tendency towards academic cheating among students of a university in Iran in relation to self control, self effectiveness and academic performance. Regression analysis was used to explore the relationship between these variables. Results revealed significant correlation between self control, self-effectiveness and academic performance with tendency to academic cheating. In addition, there was significant and negative correlation among different variables i.e. self control, self effectiveness and academic dishonesty.

**Williams and Williams (2012)** designed a study that focused on academic dishonesty, self control and general criminality among university students. The researcher attempted to investigate Gottferdson and Hirschi’s self control theory to explain academic dishonesty. 264 university students participated in this study. The researcher also examined relationship between general criminality and academic
dishonesty. Results of the study revealed the general criminality exhibited significant but small to moderate relation with academic cheating. Also significant relationship between academic dishonesty and subcategories of general criminality i.e. general dishonesty, violent crime and drug offending was present. It was suggested that general criminology theory may be used for explain academic dishonesty. However, another variable i.e. self control was not strong enough to predict academic dishonesty. Significant positive connection with academic cheating was only there for one of the six self control sub categories i.e. self centeredness. Moreover, there was also a strong relationship between perceptions of students regarding past and future academic cheating.

Masood and Mazahir (2015) investigated academic dishonesty among university students in relation to personality traits, self control. The results revealed that personality traits i.e. extroversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience were negatively related to academic cheating. Also there is a significant negative relation of self control with academic dishonesty. Moreover, self control also have negative link with academic plagiarism. The results also revealed that different personality traits and low self control were significant predictors of academic dishonesty.

2.3 STUDIES PERTAINING TO IMPULSIVENESS AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

Among big five models of personality: conscientiousness, extraversion (sensation seeking), neuroticism (Impulsivity), agreeableness and openness to experience have been found correlated with academic cheating (McCrae and Costa, 1985). Impulsivity is an important psychological trait in personality theories and implicated in psychiatric disorders. Impulsiveness as a personality trait includes quick behaviour, risk-taking activities, lack of emotional control, non-planning; liveliness and hyperactivity (Rai and Gupta, 1988). The available literature acknowledges that impulsive behaviour have been linked with various types of unethical behavior. In an attempt to show the relation of impulsiveness with academic dishonesty some of the studies are as under:-
Kelly and Worrell (1978) studied personality characteristics, parent behaviour and gender in relation to cheating. They found that in order to earn credit female college students who are high in impulsivity were more involved in cheating than female college students who are lower in impulsivity.

Sackett and Wanek (1996) reviewed the relationship between personality and integrity measure. Evidence from meta-analysis suggested that integrity test is related to conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness dimensions of personality. However the relationship between integrity and conscientiousness was almost zero when conscientiousness-performance relationship was accounted for.

Jackson et al. (2002) investigated 107 students from different academic disciplines to establish how personality, demographic, educational, attitudinal and climate i.e. both psychological and departmental variables predict self reported cheating behaviour at university. The results explained 50.05% of the variability in self reported cheating behaviour in terms of demographic (male, school, educational qualifications), departmental climate and individual differences (Lie and Neuroticism scales). The result also substantially supported the view that demographic (gender and school educational qualifications), individual differences (neuroticism and a low lie score) and departmental climate are significant predictors of dishonesty at university level. Men admitted to cheat more than did women. High neuroticism predicts cheating. Psychoticism was also significantly correlated with cheating behaviour.

Anderman et al. (2006) attempted to examine the academic cheating among adolescents in relation to impulsiveness. The participants in this study were high school adolescents studying health education. Results revealed that adolescents with higher level of impulsiveness show cheating behaviour for those who report highest participation in academic cheating. However, students who perceive mastery goal structure were less likely to show cheating behaviour. In addition, credibility of teacher play significant role in reducing cheating behaviour. Adolescents with moderate and extensive cheating behaviour were reported their least involvement in academic dishonesty they recognize their teacher as being credible.
**Angell (2006)** designed a study that focused on the interrelationship of frequency of cheating with impulsiveness, personal efficacy and academic motivation among college students. Results of the study revealed that correlations were slight and significant at 0.05 level of confidence. There exists negative relationship of pleasure/satisfaction with test assistance. However, pleasure/satisfaction was positively related to accomplishment. Further, plagiarism and future well being was positively related to each other. Academic cheating behaviour was slightly associated to impulsiveness. In addition, plagiarism and amotivation were positively associated to each other. Results were identical for accomplishment and intelligence.

**Bruin & Rudnick (2006)** attempted to examine relationship of two traits of personality i.e. conscientiousness and excitement seeking with self reported frequency of premeditated cheating in test and examinations. Participants were students studying in university. Results revealed that excitement seeking and conscientiousness combine to account for practically and statistically significant proportion of variance in academic cheating. In addition, it was highlighted in the study that higher level of excitement seeking and lack of effort appeared as predisposing traits for academic cheating. It was suggested that these two traits of personality plat significant role in explaining that cheating behaviour is presented.

**Nathanson et al. (2006)** attempted to examine predictors of behavioural measure of scholastic cheating. Two studies were conducted to access scholastic cheating among 291 participants in Study-I and 150 participants in Study-II. Results revealed that no significant difference in cheating was observed between the sexes, ethnicities and majors. Also individuals of dark triad (i.e. Narcissism, Machiavellianism and sub clinical psychopathy) of personality were best predictors of cheating. However, sub clinical psychopathy was strongest predictor of cheating among these three dark triad.

**Miller et al. (2007)** are of the opinion that when individuals have a high need for sensation, they need to experience novel, exciting experiences and sensation or impulsivity. Individual who are high impulsive tends to act without thinking and get
engaged in risky behaviour, particularly among adolescents. In the personality literature, impulsivity is categorized as part of Neuroticism where as sensation seeking is a part of extraversion-introversion. There is a reason to believe that individuals who are high in need for sensation (Extroverts) or in Impulsivity (Neurotics) would be more likely to cheat. From the perspective of impulsivity, when an individual makes decisions on the basis of impulsive rather than reason, the individual may be more tempted to cheat. An individual who are high in need for sensation are also more likely to cheat because of risky nature of cheating. Such individual may experience reinforcement from the rush associated with getting away with cheating on an examinations or assignments.

Christine and James (2008) studied level of academic dishonesty among adolescents in relation to big five personality traits. Finding of the study revealed that among big five personality traits, four traits i.e. extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and neuroticism have no significant impact on the level of academic dishonesty among students. However, single trait i.e. openness found to have moderate impact on the level of dishonest behaviour among adolescents.

Angeles et al (2011) examined relationship between impulsiveness and deviant behavior among adolescents in the classroom. The results revealed that adolescents who show impulsive and disruptive behaviour in the classroom were also show similar behaviour outside the classroom, significant relationship exist in the impulsive and disruptive behaviour of adolescents inside and outside the classroom. Age and sex explained the relationship between impulsiveness and behavior. In addition, younger participant and boys were more involved in disruptive behaviour than older adolescents and girls. Both age and sex showed an interactional effect on disruptive behaviour. Impulsivity and disruptive behaviour had significant relationship with number of sexual partners and the age at which sexual activities commenced. In addition disruptive and deviant behaviour have significant relationship with the impulsivity.

Aslam and Nazir (2011) examined academic dishonest behaviour of students in relation to their personality traits such as Extraversion, Agreeableness,
Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness. Data were collected from 932 graduate and undergraduate students studying in different Pakistani universities. A well structured questionnaire was used to collect responses of students. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant impact of students’ personality traits on attitude towards academic dishonesty. Also correlation between students’ personality traits and frequency of academic dishonesty explore mix results. Extroversion as dimension of personality had a significant and positive relation with frequency of academic cheating. However, agreeableness and neuroticism had negative and insignificant relationship with frequency of academic dishonesty. Also, Conscientiousness and Openness is highly significant and negative relation with the frequency of academic cheating.

Kalial and Dalal (2011) examined the relation of academic cheating with personality. Neurotic and stable adolescents were compared on academic cheating. Results explored that neurotic adolescents were significantly more involved in academic cheating in comparison to stable adolescents. Urban neurotic adolescents were more involve in academic cheating in comparison with urban stable adolescents, however no significant difference was found among rural neurotic and rural stable adolescents on academic cheating. Both Male and Female neurotic adolescents were significantly more involved in academic cheating in comparison with stable adolescents. Moreover significant positive correlation was found between academic cheating and neuroticism.

2.4 STUDIES PERTAINING TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

Kyglo (2001) was of opinion that students’ behaviors to cheating in examination might be traceable to the influence of parents or home. Ojerinde (2002) cited in Olabisi and Abiola (2014) revealed some causes of examination malpractices to include parental problems, defective supervision, improper home training, inadequate provision of necessary materials for learning which affect the students’ self-confidence, leading to low level of commitment to study. Thus the only choice for such students to pass in examination is cheating so that they can satisfy ambitions
of their parents. The investigator scanned the literature on academic cheating in relation to socio-economic status thoroughly, but only few studies could be traced. Here are studies exploring the relation of socio-economic status with academic cheating.

**Puett (1999)** examined students’ views about academic cheating in relation to socio-economic status. Researcher conducted a survey on 631 participants from two elementary schools. Results of the study revealed main effect for school and grade. Also it was explored in the study that students who were studying in low socio-economic school perceive scenarios of cheating in academic contexts as acceptable and ok. However, few students who were studying in higher socio-economic school perceive scenarios of cheating in academic contexts as acceptable and ok. In addition, with the exception of second grade students, it was revealed that as the students grew elder they were less likely perceive cheating behaviour as ok. The overall percentage of second grade students was higher than other grade at both schools. It was highlighted in the study that most students from third to sixth grade did not view cheating as being okay. Findings of the study indicated that certain cheating behaviour perceived by elementary school students as being okay.

**Akpan (2006) and Agapana and Nwachukwu (2007)** examined relationship between cheating behaviour and socio-economic status of students in tertiary institute. The findings of the study revealed that Students’ tendency to cheat in examination was significantly related to socio-economic status of parents. It was also highlighted that attitudes and behaviour of students has intensive impact of socio-economic status of their parents.

**Callahan (2006)** asserted that the broader socio-economic trends such as rising economic inequality and increasing middle class insecurity help fuel cheating. Likewise, our universities have limited influence over the broader socio economic trends that help fuel cheating.

**Passow et al. (2006)** conducted a survey on 643 engineering students about their decision to cheat by type of assessment. In this study, socio economic status as
independent variable was found having negative correlation with frequency of cheating in exam as well as frequency of cheating in homework.

**Hurrocks (1976) cited in Nnodum and Nzoka (2007)** investigated cheating behaviour of high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status children. It was concluded that children from high socio-economic status were involved in cheating behaviour more than those from low socio-economic status. It was highlighted that children from high socio-economic status have access to educational facilities/materials among other could be the reasons for their maximum involvement in dishonest act. On the other hand Nnodum and Nzoka (2007) also studied influence of socio-economic status of parents on cheating behaviour and results revealed that there was no significant relationship between socio-economic status of parents and academic dishonesty among students.

**Kalia and Dalal (2011)** examined relationship between socio-economic status of adolescents and academic cheating. The findings of the study revealed that adolescents having high socio-economic status were significantly higher on academic cheating than middle and low socio-economic status adolescents. However, no significant difference in academic cheating was observed among adolescents having middle socio-economic status and low socio-economic status. Moreover socio-economic status and academic cheating have significant positive correlation between them.

**Khan and Khan (2011)** investigated malpractices among secondary school students in certificate exam in relation to their socio-economic status. Participants were secondary school students in urban area of district of Pechawar in Pakistan. Results revealed that there was a significant relationship between academic cheating and students’ educational level and siblings. However, there was no relationship of students’ cheating with their age, education level of father, occupation parents’ income level, mother’s education and mothers status (working women or house women).
Okorodudu (2013) examined peer pressure and socioeconomic status as predictors of student’s attitude to examination malpractice in Nigeria. The findings of the study revealed that there was no significant relationship between socioeconomic status of students and their rate of involvement in academic cheating. Results suggested that children of low socioeconomic status as well as high socioeconomic status were involved in examination malpractice.

Aduloju and Obinne (2013) examined cheating behaviour among university students in relation to age, sex and parent socio-economic status. Results revealed that parents’ socio-economic status and gender had no significant impact on students cheating behaviour. In addition, it was suggested that as cheating is prevalent among university students, stake holder must find a way of curbing this problem. Also implication for measurement of intellectual functioning was highlighted.

A huge number of researches regarding prevalence of academic dishonesty are available from many disciplines. Above studies highlighted that academic cheating is prevalence of at all level of education and is a problem that is getting worse everywhere. Findings of various research revealed that there is a complete lack of academic integrity among students and it is a serious threat to the fundamental functioning of an educational institution (McCabe & Drinan, 1999, Miller, Murdock and Anderman, 2007). The increasing acknowledgement of academic cheating as a major cross-sectional problem insist educators and researchers to study more deeply about various aspects of academic cheating (Murdock & Anderman, 2006). The present research aimed at drawing the attentions of educators to find the possible ways to tackle with this problem. A review of literature reported above suggested that the studies on academic cheating are contrary and contradictory in nature. Therefore, the investigator has selected the topic to verify the above results.