SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

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

MEANING AND AREAS OF ACADEMIC CHEATING

“The issue of academic dishonesty or cheating is no longer an isolated issue but has developed into a global occurrence because everyone is doing it” (Fawkner & Keremidchieva, 2004). “Academic dishonesty includes cheating on a quiz or test, plagiarizing, obtaining advanced information about a quiz or test, fabricating information or submitting the same academic work for multiple courses, helping or attempting to help another commit an act of academic dishonesty, and academic misuse of computer software” (Waithaka & Gitimu, 2012).
Academic dishonesty is a major problem that continues to plague higher education (Miller, Shoptaugh, & Wooldridge, 2011; Rettinger & Kramer, 2009; Wotring & Bol, 2011). The Merriam-Webster dictionary (2013) defines cheating, “As an act to deprive of something valuable by the use of deceit or fraud.” Another definition include the submission of work that is not one’s own (Burrus, McGoldrick, & Schuhmann, 2007). Hard, Conway and Moran (2006) defines cheating as, “Providing or receiving assistance in a manner not authorized by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for academic evaluation.” Oxford advanced learner’s dictionary (1994) defines cheating as, “To act dishonestly or unfairly in order to win an advantage or profit.” Cheating in school is defined as a violation of prescribed rules or some standards for completing school assignments, presentations and tests (Cizek, 1999). Kalia (2005) has classified cheating in two types i.e. (i) active cheating to improve one’s own grade (ii) passive cheating to assist others in improving their grades. Cheating may be defined as, “Fraudulent behaviour involving some form of deception in which one's own efforts or the efforts of others are misrepresented” (Prescot, 1989). Academic cheating can be using crib notes in Examination or using other’s work in assignments and it may be as using unauthorized techniques for examination purpose or hire professional persons to write papers and also to organize reports.

Review of the literature suggests that many different forms of academic dishonesty are prevailing at international level (Caruana, Ramaseshan, & Ewing, 2000; Coston & Jenks, 1998; Kibler, 1993; McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Roig & DeTommaso, 1995; Stern & Havlicek, 1986). According to Pavela (1978), there are four general areas that comprise academic dishonesty: i) cheating by using unauthorized materials on any academic activity such as an assignment, test, etc.; ii) lying of information, references, or results; iii) plagiarism; and iv) facilitating other students engage in academic dishonesty such as allowing other students to copy their work, maintaining test banks, memorizing questions on a quiz, etc.

Student academic dishonesty includes lying, cheating on exams, copying or using other people’s work without permission, altering or forging documents, buying papers, plagiarism, purposely not following the rules, altering research results, providing false excuses for missed tests and assignments, making up sources, and so on. (Arent, 1991; Moore, 1988; Packer, 1990; Pratt & McLaughlin, 1989).
PREVALENCE OF ACADEMIC CHEATING

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

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

According to Stephen Davis (1998), "about 20% of college students from across the nation admitted to cheating in high school during the 1940's. That percentage has since soared, with no fewer than 75% and as many as 98% of 8,000 college students surveyed each year now reporting cheating in high school – and the majority admitting doing it on several occasions”.

According to the most recent incident report issued by the Academic Integrity Initiative in the Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, the 2011-12 academic year showed a 35% increase in reported incidents of academic dishonesty (Brenda Quaye, Miami University’s new Coordinator for Academic Integrity, 2012).

McCabe (2005) has been dedicated to extensive research on academic cheating for more than 20 years, published a report in the U.S. to conclude about extremely common occurrence of academic cheating in high schools and colleges. During the tenure of 2001 to 2005, around 20,000 high school students and about 100,000 students in the colleges and Universities of U.S. and Canada were surveyed and concluded that 74 percent reported about cheating on a test, 72 percent on a written work and 97 percent had copied on someone's test or homework. Cheating among students have been reported by a number of investigators (Davis et al., 1992; Dickoff et al., 1996; McCabe.1992; Michaels and
Several variables have been found to be associated with cheating which includes low level of commitment to ideals of higher education, classroom environment, objective type examinations, poor monitoring of exams and administration of old tests (Maramark and Maline, 1993; Pulvers, 1997 quoted by Dickhoff et al., 1999). The research reports collectively show that cheating has become common phenomena among students especially in higher classes. Cizek (1999) has reported that at elementary level approximately one third students admit to cheating. The prevalence of cheating is at its top level during years of high school. A national survey shows that at high school level, 74% students admit to cheating on tests, whereas, 72% of students admitted to have cheated on written assignments. Davis and Ludvigson (1995) has reported that those students who involve in cheating during their studies at University level are also have involved in any sort of cheating earlier in their studies. In the U. S. some studies showed that 20 percent of students started cheating in their 1st grade (Bushway and Nash, 2002).

Similarly, some other studies reported that 56 percent of middle school and 70 percent of high school students involvement in cheating (Bushway and Nash, 2002).

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

POTENTIAL INDICATORS, MODERATORS AND OTHER VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH CHEATING BEHAVIOUR

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

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

According to Educational Testing Service (1999), “Research about cheating among college students has shown the following to be the primary reasons for cheating: Campus norm; No honor code; Penalties not severe; Faculty support of academic integrity policies is low; Little chance of being caught; Incidence is higher at larger, less selective institutions. Additional influencers include: Others doing it; Faculty member doesn't seem to care; required course; No stated rules or rules are unclear; Heavy workload.”

Duke University study (2005) found that 75 percent students of high level school engage in cheating and that number climbs to 90 percent in case of copying another person's homework. It was done by the weaker students who were not capable of getting good marks. In the present
scenario, students think it necessary part of school life and also be done by the highly capable
good students who can get good marks without cheating because they are under severe pressure
to maintain their high grades to get admission in topmost colleges. They are who are smart
enough to make out how to cheat without getting caught.
As the expected motivation becomes high, the rate of cheating also becomes higher (Whitley,
1998). Some other factors/causes were the want of getting best marks(McCabe, 1992; Singhal,
1982) or the desire to get good scholarships (Diekhoff et al., 1996). Engagement in Academic
dishonesty was linked with the need to get high grades (Coston & Jenks, 1998; Genereux &
McLeod, 1995; Robinson, & Kuin, 1999; Whitley, 1998).Less social disapproval combined
with increased competition for admission into Universities and Schools has made students more
desiring to do whatever to get the grade A. Grades rather than education have become the main
focus of many students. Students feel like justified in cheating and as they see others involved in
cheating, they do it. The cheaters may get 100% in their exam, while the non-cheaters may get
marks only in 90's. In most of the cases, cheaters do not get caught and if caught, they are rarely
punished severely (Educational testing service, 1999).
Apart from attaining grades, cheating is motivated by following factors: pressure to maintain
high good grades, to avoid failure; perception of school as unfair, lack of time spent on class
work or homework and Non condemnatory perception towards cheating. Those motives have
two concepts in common; the fear of not being able to maintain success and disassociation from
school rules and norms (Finn and Frone, 2004). Similar results are concluded from several
more researches, where the academic workload is an important determinant (Lipson &
MacGavern, 1993). Pressure for good grades in higher education, academic stress, attitude of
teachers are important determinants of cheating (Davis et al, 1992). Baird (1980) reported that
35% of the students had very little time for preparation of the exams and 26% students reasoned
their workload compel them to cheat. Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes, and Armstead (1996) found
that 21 percent of the cheaters regarded lack of time for study, as one of the reason which
indulge them to cheat and 20 percent cheated to get better grades. 16% reasoned for cheating that
was "everybody else does it", which reflects their cheating attitude effectively. This attitude was
followed by 14% cheaters to help some friend and 10% cheat because of their laziness. Maramark and Maline (1993) studied various causes of cheating and reported that
stress to compete for jobs, to maintain scholarships and also to get admission to postgraduate programs were most important determinants of cheating.

THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN CHEATING

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

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

Many students think cheating is not universally wrong under certain circumstances, some felt that it can be justified (LaBeff et al., 1990). This can be explained by why most of the cheaters try to justify their misconduct behaviour (Haines et al., 1986; Roig & Ballew, 1994; Whitley, 1998). This justification about cheating is based upon the concept of neutralization proposed by Sykes and Matza (1959). It does not matter whether the demographic, situational or contextual influencers are with students that engage them in various forms of cheating behaviour, they must overcome their own conscience before they cheat. Such type of behaviour depends both on how strongly and practically someone disapproves it and what different types of justifications, students use to get escaped from a sense of guilty. Those students who individually have not any ethical problem, cheat guilt-free. Students engage in cheating because they see other students doing it and think they are being unfairly disadvantaged and feel justified in what they are doing. Some students think that this is the only way out, they can stay in the race and get admission into the selective school (Educational testing service, 1999).

FACULTY ISSUES IN DETERRING ACADEMIC CHEATING

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

EFFORTS TO STOP CHEATING

Results of a survey underscore the pervasiveness of academic cheating, even as schools employ more sophisticated methods to catch cheaters and take a tougher steps to stop and discourage unethical behaviour. U.S. News (2008) explored the efforts to stop cheating in higher education. The students’ responses raise several questions about why cheating is on the increasing mode and whether schools should emphasize character/value education in their curriculum.
UNM Policy on Academic Dishonesty (2008) suggests that each student is expected to follow and maintain the highest norms and standards of honesty and integrity in academic and professional front. The University reserves the right to take disciplinary action and also including dismissal against any student who is found guilty of such misconduct behaviour or fails to fulfil the standards. Any student found to have engaged in academic dishonest behaviour in course work, may get failing marks for the course.

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

ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

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

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

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

ACADEMIC CHEATING AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

A number of demographic characteristics including age, gender and grade point average has been identified that are important influencers on cheating (McCabe and Trevino, 1997). Students engaged in so many extra-curricular activities are more likely to cheat whereas females, students with higher grade point and older students are less likely to cheat (Carroll, 2002). Academic achievement affects cheating behaviour as those students who perform poorly are more involved in cheating than those performing well academically (McCabe and Trevino, 2000). High levels of cheating have a correlation with low grades. Also, educational qualification of parents shows a weak but positive correlation with cheating; students whose parents did not attend college are less likely to cheat than those students whose parents received college degrees (Carroll, 2002, A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education, the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning).

Urban schools which are performing high have several factors in common like strong leadership quality, supportive school culture and a positive environment and also good teaching. Students’ engagement is also identified as an important factor which is directly related to academic success (Alpern, 2008).

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

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

**ACADEMIC CHEATING AND ACADEMIC STRESS**

Academic cheating is the by-product of Academic stress. Selye first introduced the concept of stress. Any external or internal drive which threatens the organismic equilibrium is stress (**Selye, 1956**). Stress in today’s scenario has become a hot topic in educational setting. Stress is the consequence of the failure to adapt to change. Stress develops from the very beginning of the school education as in our educational system marks have intimately become the root cause of all troubles (**Dered, 2007**). A marked-based system is really stressful. Former HRD Minister Kapil Sibal has pointed out that our Indian Education System which is marked based and examination centered is a trauma for both parents and students. In the present era, stress has become more for students. Students undergo stress at assignments, mid-term exams etc. and is driving many students to frustration and lead them in the direction of cheating. Academic stress has become more with the increasing awareness of education. Some students explained that they become stressed because they have been assigned so many needless assignments that requires long hours without actual learning. They do not mind in completing tasks if actual learning happens and also, they hate wasting valuable time on such home or class assignments that is not valuable for teachers. Sometimes, the pointless homework takes an eternity to complete and has a less educational value that makes them less motivated and more stressful. These students have very high GPAs but they become stressed by tedious assignments which have little meaning for them. Because of the pressure to get high grades and scores, many
admit to cheating, in fact about 95% of the 11th and 12th grade students report at least one instance of cheating including copying homework from someone and cheating on tests, exams and quizzes. Even when the schoolwork or homework is meaningful, the academic stress of an excessive workload combined with a busy schedule of different activities becomes so much hectic for many and becomes difficult to complete. Academics and schoolwork are major stressors for the youth. (Conner, Pope, and Galloway, 2009)

There are varieties of stressors in academic context indulging adolescents in Academic Cheating that have identified by the several researchers such as academic burden, high expectations, unrealistic ambitions, limited opportunities, high competitiveness are some of the major sources of academic stress (Sinha, 2000). Increasing number of assignments, competition with others, failure (Fair brother and Warn, 2003), interpersonal difficulties with teachers and other subjects, family problems, college level stressors, overcrowded lecture rooms (Ongori, 2007), semester wise system (Erkutla and Chafra, 2006), the pressure to perform well at the examination etc. Different Tests and schoolwork were identified as main sources of stressful youths (Kouzma & Kennedy, 2004; Kouzma & Kennedy, 2002).

ACADEMIC CHEATING AND EGO STRENGTH

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

Baughman et al. (1962) considering ego as “a complex construct that subsumes a group of integrated constructions.” “Kohlberg (1966) expressed that an immoral act such as cheating
existed in all of us and not a good indicator of immoral character until a person developed a set of moral principles. Thus, cheating would only indicate the existence of an ego strength deficit once a student was old enough to distinguish right from wrong” (Blanchard, Robert Burns Jr., 2012). “Ego strength represents individuals that are expected to resist impulses and follow their convictions more than individuals with low ego strength” (Trevino, 1986). “When an individual is ego involved, the goal is to maximize the establishment and demonstration of high ability and to avoid the demonstration of low ability” (Nicholls, 1984). “For ego involved individuals, low effort is often a way to avoid ego threat and the implications of failure” (Miller, 1985, 1986). Similarly, cheating is accompanied by dismissing the value of the activity, is a mechanism by which the experience of ego deflating failure can be avoided by students as well. For ego involved individuals, however, cheating, like low effort (Covington & Omelich, 1979) is like a double edged sword. As cheating may avoid the demonstration of low ability, similarly it also undermines the capacity to maintain higher ability. That is the reason, there was no clear basis to predict reasons for not cheating on the basis of ego involvement from an achievement perceptive and as opposed to a value perspective. Kohlberg (1976) made a similar observation with respect to recognizing that reprehensible moral conduct by world leaders cannot be explained as being a function of preconventional moral reasoning. Ego strength involves issues of self-esteem, self-control, the ability to resist impulses and delay gratification. For students who refer to punishment as a reason not to cheat, it is likely that either moral reasoning was not activated or that these students lack the ego strength to defer their own self-interest to a moral obligation at a higher level. Ego strength is related to conviction strength and self-regulation ability (Trevino, 1986). Individuals with high ego strength are expected to follow their convictions and to resist impulses more than those with low ego strength. Trevino (1986) proposed ego strength as a moderator of the relationship between moral development stages and ethical behaviour. Individual responses to ethical decision-making depend on certain individual characteristics namely ego strength. Specifically, those persons who have low ego strength may be easily influenced by others and revealed more significant peer reporting intentions, although they have no such decisions or intentions at the first place. On the other side, those who have high ego strength may not be convinced by other persons as their decisions and intentions mostly results from their own convictions regardless of any external forces. While ego strength was proposed as an important moderator for explaining ethical decision-making (Krebs, 1967; Mischel, 1974;
Rest, 1980; Trevino, 1986). Banerjee, Cronan, and Jones (1998) conducted an exploratory analysis that disconfirmed the moderating role of ego strength on the process of ethical decision-making a clear ethical climate, high ego strength will be the dominant variable, significantly moderating each model path. The clear implication is that it is unrealistic for organizations to rely entirely on individual variables such as ego strength to guide behaviour (Boling, 1978), while ignoring the influence of external ethical climate. The results appears to have no significant correlation between the strength of a students’ superego and cheating (Whitley, 1998). Results expressed by Martin (2001) and Neil (2005) that ego strength was not affected by the sex of the individual. Kumar (2010) found no significant difference in ego strength of boys and girls. Research by Nejedlo; Giordano; Schork and Edward (1994) revealed the role of ego strength in the production of academic cheating behaviour.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Our education system has 10+2+3 pattern under which a student at secondary stage opts for specialized education. Various students who are studying in schools when analyzed for their behaviour were found to have disturbed behaviour resulting in academic cheating in one form or the other. Behind this kind of behaviour there are many reasons viz; social, economic, mental and educational. As it is evident that mental imbalance, disturbed environment and emotional immaturity affect the efficiency of an individual by producing ill effects, the mental state of a person is reflected in his behaviour in some form or the other. Students who indulged in cheating often think it justified. As they see others involved in cheating, they cheat and they feel that they will be unfairly disadvantaged. Nevertheless, we strongly feel that it is of the utmost importance that this area of research is further developed in the near future, not the least since students believe to see cheating as a normal part of their academic life which is illustrated as, Students believes that everyone cheats (Houston, 1976), and that cheating is a normal part of life (Baird, 1980), encourage cheating. The adage ‘cheaters never win’ may not apply in the case of academic cheating. With cheating rates as high as 75% to 87% (Baird, 1980; Jendreck, 1989) and its detection rates as low as 1.30% (Haines et al., 1986), academic cheating seems to be reinforced, not punished (Davis, Grover, Becker & McGregor, 1992).
According to Educational Testing Service (1999), “In most cases cheaters don't get caught. If caught, they seldom are punished severely, if at all. Cheating increases due to pressure for high grades. Math and Science are the courses in which cheating most often occurs. Computers can make cheating easier than ever before. For example, students can download term papers from the World Wide Web.” Thirty years ago, males were admitted significantly more academic dishonest than females. Today, this difference has decreased substantially and some recent studies show no differences in cheating between men and women in colleges.

Furthermore, previous studies related to students’ cheating have revealed that there is a tendency to take a general side of the problem and its educative measures and techniques undertaken to address this problem do not focus on the perception, attitudes and related behaviours that are shown by a specific group and are not as effective as they could be. During the last decade of technology, access to the online information technology facilitating use of internet search engines, mobiles, pagers, fax machines and various other technological systems etc. has equipped the students with new techniques for cheating and provide a perception that the various problems of academic cheating in all type of institutions are increasing. The gravity of academic cheating cannot be underestimated as it not only harms the academic environment, students and institutions but in most cases, it also harms the student who cheat and who avoid learning experiences and learning outcomes.

The book under review ‘Student Plagiarism in an Online World: Problems and Solutions’ provides a handy reference material on a problem about which not much discussion took place in academic world. In editor’s own admission “There is a growing evidence base that shows student plagiarism to be on the increase. Students cheat, deliberately, by coping words, phrases or even large chunks of text from other sources.” The book is a collection of 16 articles by different authors distributed over six sections. In this book, the second chapter entitled ‘a student perspective of plagiarism’ by Craig Zimitat presents result of a study of English-speaking, undergraduate students pertaining to plagiarism-related behaviours, their knowledge of plagiarism and their academic skills, conducted in six Australian Universities. The study reported that, 80% of the students claimed that they never plagiarized. However, perhaps students under the survey understood that direct coping of text or ideas without acknowledging the source, is only act of ‘plagiarism’. Though about 80% of the students expressed to have possessed the skills of note taking, paraphrasing, citing, referencing etc. barely 50% in each year
group reported confidence in these skills. These types of studies are significant for formulating guidelines to minimize plagiarism.

Academic Cheating is exclusively professional concern of teachers for educational welfare. Academic Cheating can be managed better when the feelings that caused it are taken into consideration. It is usually possible for the alert teacher to find out some of the reasons for his behaviour by studying the child’s records, talking with his previous teachers, visiting in his home, and watching him on the playground and in the lunchroom. Then the problem may be helped by seeing to it that some pressure is relieved, by seeking the cooperation of parents, or simply by giving the child more opportunities to get his feelings out in the open.

To revive the values of Education, it is necessary to find out answers to certain questions related to academic cheating. Various types of Cheating behaviours needs to be explored by deep analysis so that reasons behind that behaviour can come into light. Nevertheless, studies related to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength with academic cheating are largely absent from the academic cheating literature. Many studies have investigated the prevalence of academic cheating among undergraduate and graduate students; however, there have been very few studies carried out on School level Students. The incidence and prevalence of academic cheating has increased, nevertheless, information on cheating within school education is lacking in Indian set up. However, not a single extensive study was found till date in Indian context. Thus, there is a need to study academic cheating behaviour among adolescents dwelling in Indian Culture.

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

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

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS USED

(i) ACADEMIC CHEATING

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

(ii) LOCUS OF CONTROL

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

(iii) ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

(iv) ACADEMIC STRESS

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

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

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study purports to realize the following objectives:

O₁  OBJECTIVES RELATED TO LOCUS OF CONTROL
O₁(a) To Study and Compare Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₁(b) To Study and Compare Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₁(c) To Study and Compare Female Externally Controlled Adolescents and Female Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₁(d) To Study and Compare Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₁(e) To Study and Compare Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O₂  OBJECTIVES RELATED TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
O₂(a) To Study and Compare High Achieving Adolescents and Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₂(b) To Study and Compare Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₂(c) To Study and Compare Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₂(d) To Study and Compare Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O₂(e) To Study and Compare Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O3 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO ACADEMIC STRESS
O3(a) To Study and Compare High Academic stress Adolescents and Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O3(b) To Study and Compare Male High Academic stress Adolescents and Male Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O3(c) To Study and Compare Female High Academic stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O3(d) To Study and Compare Urban High Academic stress Adolescents and Urban Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O3(e) To Study and Compare Rural High Academic stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O4 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO EGO STRENGTH
O4(a) To Study and Compare High Ego Strength Adolescents and Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O4(b) To Study and Compare Male high Ego Strength Adolescents and Male low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O4(c) To Study and Compare Female high Ego Strength Adolescents and Female low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O4(d) To Study and Compare Urban high Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
O4(e) To Study and Compare Rural high Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

O5 OBJECTIVES RELATED TO CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO STRENGTH
O5(a) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Locus of Control
   O5(a1) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
   O5(a2) To find correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control
O5(b) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement
To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress
To find correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY
The following null hypotheses have been framed in respect to academic cheating:

H₁  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO LOCUS OF CONTROL
H₁(a) There is no significant difference between Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₁(b) There is no significant difference between Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₁(c) There is no significant difference between Female Externally Controlled Adolescents and Female Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₁(d) There is no significant difference between Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₁(e) There is no significant difference between Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H₂  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
H₂(a) There is no significant difference between High Achieving Adolescents and Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₂(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₂(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₂(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H₂(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H3  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO ACADEMIC STRESS
H3(a) There is no significant difference between High Academic stress Adolescents and Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H3(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Academic stress Adolescents and Male Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H3(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Academic stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H3(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Academic stress Adolescents and Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H3(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Academic stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H4  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO EGO STRENGTH
H4(a) There is no significant difference between High Ego Strength Adolescents and Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H4(b) There is no significant difference between Male High Ego Strength Adolescents and Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H4(c) There is no significant difference between Female High Ego Strength Adolescents and Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H4(d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
H4(e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

H5  HYPOTHESES IN RESPECT TO CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO STRENGTH
H5(a) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Locus of Control
   H5(a1) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
   H5(a2) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control
**H5(b)** There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement

**H5(c)** There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress

**H5(d)** There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength

**DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

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

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

**DELIMITATIONS IN SAMPLING**

The Sample of 400 students of XIth class equally divided on the basis of Gender and locality (100 male urban, 100 male rural and 100 female urban, 100 female rural), was selected randomly from Haryana for making total sample of 400. The age range of the sample is 14±.

**DELIMITATIONS IN THE METHOD OF STUDY AND MEASURING TOOLS**

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

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

METHOD OF THE STUDY

The present study is conducted to find out the effect of four independent variables i.e. Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength on Academic Cheating. Keeping in view the objectives of the study the investigator has chosen descriptive survey method in the present study. Descriptive Survey method provides the opportunities in describing, studying and interpreting what exists today and is concerned with conditions, relationships, practices, beliefs, attitudes that provide the processes and the trends that are emerging. Descriptive research is not mere gathering of data and tabulate on data but goes beyond to interpret the meaning and significance of what is described. Besides describing, it often compares and contrasts the existing evidence thereby involving measurements, classifications and interpretations and evaluations.

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The present study is undertaken to study Academic Cheating in relation to Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength of adolescents. The methodology of the present study was planned after scanning the available literature and related sources of information on various variables. In order to achieve the objectives stated earlier and to test the corresponding hypotheses, a sample of 400 students studying in Sr. Sec. Schools of Haryana was planned.
POPULATION

“A population is any group of individuals that has one or more characteristics in common which distinguishes group from other individuals and that are of interest to the investigator.” (Best, 2008).

The accessible population of the present study consisted of male and female students studying in Senior Secondary Schools of Haryana State. The population being large in number and vastly distributed, it was very difficult to contact it within the limited resources of time and money. Moreover, it seemed a wasteful exercise to collect the data from whole population, when only small but representative sample could furnish the details.
SAMPLE

“A Sample is the small proportion of the population that is selected for observation and analysis. By observing the characteristics of the sample, certain inferences can be made about the characteristics of the population from which it drawn” (Best, 2008).

Keeping in view of expenses, time, utility and suitability, the sample comprised of 400 students of the age group of 14 to 17 years old studying in 11th standard in Haryana state. To meet the requirements of the study, multistage random sampling method was used in selecting the sample. The whole of Haryana divided into four zones i.e. East, West, North and South. From each zone, one district was picked up randomly i.e. Sonipat, Hisar, Yamunanagar and Faridabad. From each district, four schools (two rural + two urban) were selected using random sampling technique. A sample of 50 students (25 male and 25 female) from schools of rural residential area and 50 students (25 male and 25 female) from schools of urban residential area from each district were randomly selected making a total sample to 400 students. Thus the final sample consisted of 400 students equally divided into sex and residence (100 urban male +100 rural male +100 urban female +100 rural female adolescents) of 11th class.

Table 3.1
List of Sampled Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Schools Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sonipat</td>
<td>Govt. Sr. Secondary School, Model Town, Sonipat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swami Dayanand Sr. Sec. School, Sisana, Sonipat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baba Chhotu Nath Sr. Secondary School, Sisana, Sonipat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. Girls Sr. Secondary School, Murthal Adda, Sonipat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hisar</td>
<td>Sarvodaya Sr. Secondary School, Azad Nagar, Hisar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. D. Sr. Sec. School, Rishi Nagar, Hisar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. girls Sr. Secondary School, Narnaund, Hisar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. boys Sr. Secondary School, Narnaund, Hisar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A detailed description of the sample has been given below in figure 3.1

**Figure 3.1**
Figure 3.2
Split-up of Total Sample
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TOOLS USED FOR THE STUDY

Every Descriptive type of research employs some of relevant tools of research. Following tools were chosen for the collection of data in the present study.

1. Academic Cheating Scale (2011) constructed and standardized by Kalia and Kirandeep
4. Locus of Control Scale (1992) constructed and standardized by Hasnain and Joshi.
5. Marks obtained by the students in the Xth class examination conducted by Haryana Education Board were taken as indicator of Academic Achievement.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TOOLS USED

The brief description of all the tools used in the study is given below:

Academic Cheating Scale (ACS)

Academic Cheating Scale constructed and standardized by Kalia and Kirandeep (2011) was used to measure Academic Cheating. It measures Academic Cheating in five areas namely: Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignments, Interference during instructions and Damaging Intellectual Property. It also provides a Global academic cheating score.

A detailed description of areas along with items is given below:

The operational definitions of academic cheating and its six dimensions are adopted from a report of the academic dishonesty and plagiarism subcommittee chaired by Maslach (2004).

Academic Cheating: Academic Cheating is defined as fraud, deceit or dishonesty in an examination or in an assignment or in class by using or attempting to use methods which are prohibited or inappropriate.
(i) **Cheating in Examination**: Unfair means used before or during or in context of examinations by providing or receiving answers. (1 to 12 items)

(ii) **Plagiarism**: Claiming others’ creative work or intellectual material as own, without acknowledging its source in the submission of formal or informal academic assignment. (13 to 17 items)

(iii) **Creating an improper disadvantage to other students**: Cheating done by hiding or damaging library books for personal advantage or the disadvantage of others, or spoiling or changing lab samples in the laboratory.

(iv) **Lying about Academic Assignments**: Taking other’s help to complete assignments but furnishing false information of doing it himself/herself. (18 to 34 items)

(v) **Interference during instructions**: Failure to comply with the instructions of the instructor or disruption of classes or other academic activities. (35 to 38 items)

(vi) **Damaging intellectual property**: Sabotaging or stealing another student’s assignments, notes, files etc. or improperly accessing via computer for private purposes, other than studies. (39 to 40 items)

The Academic Cheating Scale contains 40 items in all. Each item is provided with five alternatives. Responses are obtained on the test booklet itself. It takes around 25 minutes for responding all the items.

**Reliability**

The final version of the scale was administered to 100 male and female students in the age group of 14 to 15 years old studying in X class. The odd items versus even items were correlated using Spearman Brown Split Half method and also Guttman’s Split Half method. The Spearman Brown coefficient was .87 and Guttman’s Split Half coefficient was .86 and the Cronbach’s alpha as .91 suggesting the high reliability of the scale.

**Validity**

The scale was validated against the criterion of content validity. All the 72 items were presented to twenty judges (recognized professors in the department of Education and Psychology) for their opinion and only 50 items were retained which had received 80% unanimity. All the items were found consistent with academic cheating. Therefore, on the basis
of face validity and content validity, it appears reasonable to assume that Academic Cheating scale measures academic cheating among adolescents.

**Scoring method**

Each item is followed by five alternatives ranging from ‘always’ to ‘never’ depicting degree of respondents’ involvement in different types of academic cheating. The options Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Hardly Ever and Never carries scores 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 respectively. The score of each respondent is obtained by adding the scores on all the individual items under each dimension of academic cheating. The possible maximum score of an individual is 160. Whichever option is encircled, its corresponding score is counted. The sum of all the scores of 40 items provides the Global academic cheating score of an individual. A high score on this scale indicates his high involvement in academic cheating; while a low score shows less involvement in academic cheating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Cheating Dimensions Score</th>
<th>Interpretation (Category)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82 and above</td>
<td>High academic cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-81</td>
<td>Above moderate academic cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-75</td>
<td>Moderate academic cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-63</td>
<td>Below Moderate academic cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 54</td>
<td>Low academic cheating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stress Inventory for School Students (SISS)**

The inventory is constructed and standardized by Rani and Singh (2008) and is devised to identify the academic stress among school students. It consists of 40 items.

**Reliability**

The inventory has both test-retest reliability and internal consistency reliability. For calculating Test-retest reliability, the inventory was administered twice with a gap of 14 days on a sample of 200 adolescents. Test-retest reliability was found to be 0.80 which was not only high but also statistically significant and internal consistency reliability by odd-even method was found to be
0.79 (corrected to full length) which was highly significant. Thus, inventory possessed a sufficient degree of reliability.

Validity

3. The face validity of questionnaire appeared to be fairly high.
4. The content validity is adequately assured as only those items are selected for the Questionnaire for which there is complete agreement amongst the experts.

Scoring

The scoring method of this inventory is very easy. There are 40 items in this inventory. Every question has 4 options. Option – Very worried is given 4 marks, Option – Worried is given 3 marks and little worried and Not worried are assigned a score of 2 and 1 respectively. A student can obtain maximum 160 score and minimum 40. All the 40 items selected are indicative of academic stress in the students. This indicates that higher the score, higher stress of the students and lower the score, lower stress of the students.

Qualitative Interpretation

The obtained score on inventory can also be qualitatively interpreted for knowing about the degree or magnitude of stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Score</th>
<th>Qualitative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121-160</td>
<td>High Level of Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-120</td>
<td>Moderate Level of Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-79</td>
<td>Low Level of Stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locus of Control Scale (LCS)

Locus of Control Scale (LCS) constructed and standardized by Hasnain and Joshi (1992) was used to study the locus of control. It was developed to measure internal and external continuum of the students. The test has been developed in Hindi language. The scale contains 36 items with 16 positive items reveal internal locus of control and 20 negative items reveal external locus of control.
Reliability and validity
Reliability of LCS was measured with Spearman Brown Method and Test-Retest Method were found to be 0.55 and 0.76 respectively. The criterion validity of this scale was measured with correlating Roma Pal’s Scale and was found to be 0.76.

Scoring
The three point scale was used to identify internal locus of control and external locus of control. Score 2, 1, 0 was assigned to always, sometimes and never for responses of Positive items and 0, 1, 2 score was assigned for negative responses.

Ego Strength Scale (E.S.S.)
Ego strength was measured by using Ego Strength Scale (ESS) by Hasan (2010). The Scale has 32 items.

Reliability
The odd-even reliability of the adapted scale having 32 items was found to be 0.78 (corrected) which is slightly higher than odd-even reliability (=0.76) reported by Barron for his 68 item scale. With the gaps of 2 and 5 weeks between subsequent administrations, the test-retest reliability co-efficient of the adopted scale were found to be 0.86 and 0.82 respectively.

Validity
The scale according to the author is highly valid and is fit to measure ego strength of adolescents.

Scoring
One mark is given for each of the ‘No’ (X) responses.

Academic Achievement
Marks obtained by the students in the X\(^{th}\) class examination conducted by Haryana Education Board were taken as indicator of Academic Achievement.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION OF SELECTED TOOLS
1. Introduce yourself to maintain friendly relationship
2. Ask the students to sit properly in a way that they cannot get influenced by other students’ responses.
3. Tell the students the purpose of the test and the importance of their true response for the study.
4. Assure them confidentiality of the responses and invoke honesty in responding.
5. Distribute the booklets of the selected tools to each student one by one.
6. Ask them to supply necessary introductory information by filling all the columns
7. Read the instructions clearly from the test booklet and invite any doubt before they start responding.
8. Ask them to respond independently, truly and honestly.
9. Supervise them by moving around in the room.
10. Clarify the meaning of certain items if needed.
11. Collect the test booklets back making sure that all the entries have been filled and all the items have been responded, and then count them.

**STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES USED**

The following statistical techniques were applied to analyze the data:

SPSS version 22 (latest version) were applied to measure various Statistical values/Parameters with maximum accuracy. Descriptive statistics such as means, SDs and SEMs were worked out on the scores of Academic Cheating, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress, Locus of Control and Ego Strength. To determine the significance of difference between means of different groups, t-test was applied. To test the significance of ‘t’ values, the following level of significance were established-

- 0.02 Level of Significance
- 0.06 Level of Significance

In order to measure the relationship between different variables i.e. Academic Cheating, Locus of Control, Academic Achievement, Academic Stress and Ego Strength, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied. Bar Diagrams were made to represent the data pictorially.
FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

FINDINGS RELATED TO ACADEMIC CHEATING IN RELATION TO LOCUS OF CONTROL

Objective  $O_1(a)$  To Study and Compare Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis $H_1(a)$  There is no significant difference between Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings: (i) Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to internally controlled Adolescents.

(ii) Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions in comparison to internally controlled Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Externally Controlled Adolescents and Internally controlled Adolescents on Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

Objective  $O_1(b)$  To Study and Compare Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis $H_1(b)$  There is no significant difference between Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings: (i) Male Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Male internally controlled Adolescents.

(ii) Male Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions in comparison to Male internally controlled Adolescents.
(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Male Externally Controlled Adolescents and Male Internally controlled Adolescents on Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

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

Findings: (i) Female Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Female internally controlled Adolescents.

(ii) Female Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly higher on cheating in Examination in comparison to Female internally controlled Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Female Externally Controlled Adolescents and Female Internally controlled Adolescents on Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

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

Findings (i) No Significant difference was observed among Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally controlled Adolescents on all the dimensions of Academic Cheating.
Objective  **O₁(e)**  To Study and Compare Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally Controlled Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

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

Findings:  
(i)  Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Rural internally controlled Adolescents.

(ii) Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions in comparison to Rural internally controlled Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents and Rural Internally controlled Adolescents on Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

**FINDINGS RELATED TO ACADEMIC CHEATING IN RELATION TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

Objective  **O₂(a)**  To Study and Compare High Achieving Adolescents and Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

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

Findings:  
(i)  High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Low Achieving Adolescents.

(ii) High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, and interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property i.e. on all the dimensions of Academic Cheating in comparison to Low Achieving Adolescents.
Objective **O₂(b)** To Study and Compare Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

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

Findings: (i) Male High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Male Low Achieving Adolescents.

(ii) Male High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, and interference during instructions in comparison to Male Low Achieving Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Male High Achieving Adolescents and Male Low Achieving Adolescents on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

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

Findings: (i) No significant difference between Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents on all the dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

Hypothesis **H₂(d)** There is no significant difference between Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.
Findings: (i) Urban High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Urban Low Achieving Adolescents.

(ii) Urban High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, and interference during instructions in comparison to Urban Low Achieving Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Urban High Achieving Adolescents and Urban Low Achieving Adolescents on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

Objective \( O_2(e) \) To Study and Compare Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis \( H_2(e) \) There is no significant difference between Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings: (i) Rural High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Rural Low Achieving Adolescents.

(ii) Rural High Achieving Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property in comparison to Rural Low Achieving Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Rural High Achieving Adolescents and Rural Low Achieving Adolescents on Plagiarism dimension of Academic Cheating.
FINDINGS RELATED TO ACADEMIC CHEATING IN RELATION TO ACADEMIC STRESS

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

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

Findings: (i) High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(ii) High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination and Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among High Academic Stress Adolescents and Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Plagiarism, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

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

Findings: (i) Male High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly higher on Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Male Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(ii) No Significant difference was observed among Male High Academic Stress Adolescents and Male Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating.
Objective O3(c) To Study and Compare Female High Academic stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

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

Findings: (i) Female High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly higher on Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Female Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(ii) No Significant difference was observed among Female High Academic Stress Adolescents and Female Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, and interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating.

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

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

Findings: (i) Urban High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(ii) Urban High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination in comparison to Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Urban High Academic Stress Adolescents and Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.
Objective O₃(e) To Study and Compare Rural High Academic stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic stress Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

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

Findings: (i) Rural High Academic Stress Adolescents were found significantly higher on Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Rural Low Academic Stress Adolescents.

(ii) No Significant difference was observed among Rural High Academic Stress Adolescents and Rural Low Academic Stress Adolescents on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating.

FINDINGS RELATED TO ACADEMIC CHEATING IN RELATION TO EGO-STRENGTH

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

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

Findings: (i) High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(ii) High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism and Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among High Ego Strength Adolescents and Low Ego Strength Adolescents on interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.
Objective \(O_4(b)\)  To Study and Compare Male High Ego Strength Adolescents and Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis \(H_4(b)\)  There is no significant difference between Male High Ego Strength Adolescents and Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings:  (i)  Male High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(ii)  Male High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly higher on Plagiarism and Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(iii)  No Significant difference was observed among Male High Ego Strength Adolescents and Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Cheating in Examination, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

Objective \(O_4(c)\)  To Study and Compare Female High Ego Strength Adolescents and Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis \(H_4(c)\)  There is no significant difference between Female High Ego Strength Adolescents and Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings:  (i)  Female High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(ii)  Female High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination and Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(iii)  No Significant difference was observed among Female High Ego Strength Adolescents and Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Plagiarism,
interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property
dimensions of Academic Cheating.

Objective \textbf{O}_4 (d) To Study and Compare Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis \textbf{H}_4 (d) There is no significant difference between Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings: (i) Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly higher on Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(ii) No Significant difference was observed among Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents and Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, on damaging intellectual property and on Global Academic cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating.

Objective \textbf{O}_4 (e) To Study and Compare Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Hypothesis \textbf{H}_4 (e) There is no significant difference between Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents on Academic Cheating.

Findings: (i) Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly more involved in Global Academic Cheating in comparison to Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(ii) Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents were found significantly higher on Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism and Lying about Academic Assignment in comparison to Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents.

(iii) No Significant difference was observed among Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents and Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents on interference
during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

FINDINGS RELATED TO CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO-STRENGTH

Objective O₅(a₁) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
Hypothesis H₅(a₁) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control
Findings: No Significant correlation was found between Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control

Objective O₅(a₂) To find correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control
Hypothesis H₅(a₂) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control
Findings: No Significant correlation was found between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control

Objective O₅(b) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement
Hypothesis H₅(b) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement
Findings: Significant positive correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Achievement

Objective O₅(c) To find correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress
Hypothesis H₅(c) There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress
Findings: There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Academic Stress

Objective $O_5(d)$ To find correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength
Hypothesis $H_5(d)$ There is no significant correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength
Findings: Significant positive correlation between Academic cheating and Ego Strength

CONCLUSIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

One of the major purposes of carrying out investigations is to draw conclusions. The conclusions are the essentials of the study, which tell about its outcomes. They are derived from the analysis of collected data and its interpretation. On the basis of analysis and interpretation of data, the following conclusions have been drawn. For the purpose of making the conclusions clear and perceptive, they have been divided into sub-sections namely,

1. Conclusions based on Locus of Control and academic cheating
2. Conclusions based on Academic Achievement and academic cheating
3. Conclusions based on Academic Stress and academic cheating
4. Conclusions based on Ego-Strength and academic cheating

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

(i) Externally Controlled Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than internally controlled Adolescents. However, on Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating, they are identical.
(ii) Male Externally Controlled Adolescents are involved in Global Academic Cheating more than Male internally controlled Adolescents. They are identical on Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.
(iii) Female Externally Controlled Adolescents are more involved in global academic cheating than Female Internally controlled Adolescents. They are identical on Plagiarism, Lying
about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

(iv) Urban Externally Controlled Adolescents and Urban Internally controlled Adolescents are similar on all the dimensions of Academic Cheating.

(v) Rural Externally Controlled Adolescents are involved more in Global Academic Cheating than rural internally controlled Adolescents. On Plagiarism and damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are found similar.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

(i) High Achieving Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than Low Achieving Adolescents. They are higher on all the dimensions of Academic Cheating than Low Achieving Adolescents.

(ii) Male High Achieving Adolescents indulge more in Global Academic Cheating than Male Low Achieving Adolescents. Both the groups are similar on damaging intellectual property dimension of Academic Cheating.

(iii) Both the groups i.e. Female High Achieving Adolescents and Female Low Achieving Adolescents are identical on all the dimensions of academic cheating.

(iv) Urban High Achieving Adolescents are more indulged in Global Academic Cheating than Urban Low Achieving Adolescents. Both the groups are identical on damaging intellectual property dimension of Academic Cheating.

(v) Rural High Achieving Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than Rural Low Achieving Adolescents. On Plagiarism, both the groups are identical.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON ACADEMIC STRESS AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

(i) High Academic Stress Adolescents involve more in Global Academic Cheating than Low Academic Stress Adolescents. On Plagiarism, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are similar.

(ii) Male High Academic Stress Adolescents are higher on Lying about Academic than Male Low Academic Stress Adolescents. Both the groups have no difference in their
involvement on cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating.

(iii) Female High Academic Stress Adolescents are higher on Lying about Academic Assignment than Female Low Academic Stress Adolescents. On Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are similar.

(iv) Urban High Academic Stress Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than Urban Low Academic Stress Adolescents. Both the groups are equally involved on Plagiarism, Lying about Academic Assignment, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

(v) Rural High Academic Stress Adolescents are higher on Lying about Academic Assignment than Rural Low Academic Stress Adolescents. On Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, and interference during instructions, damaging intellectual property and also on Global Academic Cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are identical.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON EGO-STRENGTH AND ACADEMIC CHEATING

(i) High Ego Strength Adolescents indulge more in Global Academic cheating than Low Ego Strength Adolescents. Both the groups are similar on interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

(ii) Male High Ego Strength Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic cheating than Male Low Ego Strength Adolescents. On Cheating in Examination, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are similar.

(iii) Female High Ego Strength Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than Female Low Ego Strength Adolescents. Both the groups are equally involved on Plagiarism, interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.
(iv) Urban High Ego Strength Adolescents are higher on Lying about Academic Assignment than Urban Low Ego Strength Adolescents. On Cheating in Examination, Plagiarism, interference during instructions, on damaging intellectual property and on Global Academic cheating dimensions of Academic Cheating, both the groups are similar.

(v) Rural High Ego Strength Adolescents are more involved in Global Academic Cheating than Rural Low Ego Strength Adolescents. Both the groups are equally indulged on interference during instructions and on damaging intellectual property dimensions of Academic Cheating.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON CORRELATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC CHEATING AND LOCUS OF CONTROL, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ACADEMIC STRESS, EGO-STRENGTH

(i) Academic cheating and Internal Locus of Control are not related with each other.
(ii) There is no relationship between Academic cheating and External Locus of Control.
(iii) Academic cheating and Academic Achievement are positively correlated.
(iv) Academic cheating and Academic Stress are not related with each other
(v) Academic cheating is positively correlated with Ego Strength.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results presented in this study provide some insight into the cheating behaviour of adolescents. The movie ‘Wall Street’ provides a quintessential “the jig is up” moment when Bud Fox, a Wall Street broker, is led out of his office in handcuffs because his insider-trading scheme has been discovered. There is evidence coming to light that implies Bud Fox cheated in school. The problem with cheating in school shows that there is a correlation between those who cheat in school and those who are likely to be dishonest at work. The finding that Externally controlled Adolescents indulge more in cheating in comparison to Internally controlled Adolescents implies that we should devise preventive measures to control cheating practices used by adolescents especially keeping in mind Externally controlled Adolescents.

Educational administrators and planners need to develop and revise curriculum according to needs, interests and abilities of externally controlled students. Programs should be developed by
the school administrators to provide special guidance and counselling services about ill effects of cheating to externally controlled Adolescents. Counselling cell should be established in each school to facilitate students in adjustment while dealing with their personal, educational and social problems effectively. In class, special attention should be given to externally controlled students to involve them in various academic activities such as monitoring discipline, leading a group in collective project work, helping other students in studies etc. Cheating need to be discouraged by increasing their social participation, counseling them about their self-concept and by motivating them to increase their self-confidence. Poor self-control, dependency on others, lack of decision making ability and passive nature of Externally controlled Adolescents unable them to develop good study habits, so parents and teachers should encourage them to self-learning to distract them from dishonest behaviour.

The findings indicate that **High Achieving Adolescents** are indulge more in cheating in comparison to Low Achieving Adolescents. It implies that preventive measures to abolish cheating should be adopted especially keeping in mind High Achieving Adolescents.

Intervention programs that target students and subjective school experiences have been shown to improve achievement, lessen the achievement gap in a lasting way and also focus on telling students that they are valued and have efficacy in their scholastic environment (Yeager & Walton, in press). Teachers need to assign ideal amount of homework and check it regularly so that students remain busy in studies and side by side do not get overburdened with heavy workload. Effective learning techniques like PQRST (an acronym for Preview, Questions, Read, Summary and Test) should be suggested to students on the basis of various individual differences and capabilities of children for the improvement in their Academic Achievement. Various strategies should be adopted to improve the needs, interests and abilities of High Achieving Adolescents so that their focus should be clear irrespective of Cheating. Special attention should be given by school authorities on this group of adolescents to accelerate and maintain academic atmosphere with good academic routine. Their participation while building career related programs in schools must be encouraged. During social functions, society may use motivational techniques for students like rewarding the achievers from different schools in the area. Lecture series by educationists for good values should be organized.
The findings that **high academic stress adolescents** indulge more in cheating than low academic stress adolescents implies that we should devise measures to control cheating by keeping in mind high academic stress adolescents.

The main motivators for students’ involvement in cheating are heavy academic workload and shortage of time. “Teachers often emphasize the acquisition of knowledge, so they often neglect the emotional feelings of students during the teaching process, which can cause emotional stress and learning problems for students. Students may feel unfamiliar situations like nervousness, worry, frustration, abasement, depression, etc. The instability of these emotions easily initiates unusual behaviour, which then affects the learning achievements and adjustment ability of students if appropriate timely counselling is not given by the institutions, teachers and parents, or if they cannot obtain appropriate concern from their peers or siblings” (Chen et al, 2006). Academic stress at school level is associated with what and how students learn it. There is a lot of pressure for the present generation students to learn more and more as compared to past generations. Some students can experience stress from regular academic work that isn't difficult enough. When students feel desperate or having trouble in understanding the concept, students mostly cheat. The present study may be useful for the teachers, students, parents and teacher educators to help the students reduce their Academic stress and it is also useful to know the adverse effects of very high and low Academic stress on the students. The study can also be helpful to find the causes of very high and low stressed adolescents. So, focus should be on high academic stress adolescents to get away them from unfair means.

Teacher should involves thoughts, actions and strategies geared toward removing or diminishing a stressful event as well as its impact. It also involves thoughts, actions, and strategies directed toward the management and reduction of distressing emotions associated with a threatening events. Instructors should encourage their students to make a study plan, manage their time and use their study guide to facilitate greater motivation and performance. Schools should target upon those students who experience academic stress and its extent and also find out association with various factors. This will arise out of understanding and application of the nature of the problem, its sources, and its relationship in depth. This can help schools to diagnose problem areas specifically and also it helps to understand community problems. After that schools should implement specific strategies to reduce academic stress and increase well-being. “School programs targeting stress management or coping skills are effective in reducing stress
symptoms and enhancing coping skills for students” (Kraag et. al., 2006). Care should be taken to prepare the students in such a way as to have a balanced mind and not to be too stressed. Necessary actions should be taken to aware about the co-cognitive factors such as stress, self-confidence, locus of control, interest, ego-strength etc. which are responsible for the development of balanced personality. They should be properly guided to adjust to the environment and to have control over their psychological aspects. “Parental involvement has a positive influence on all youth, and peer support has a positive influence on high-risk youth in particular. Consistent discipline has been found to be both a promotive and protective factor for youth as well” (Gutman et al., 2002). The parents, teachers, elders and all the others in the society should take care of the adolescents’ conflicts and should give timely guidance in order to overcome these difficulties to reduce the extent of academic stress to the normal in case of high Academic stress.

The findings high ego-strength adolescents indulge more in cheating than low ego-strength adolescents implies that Schools, Educational Planners, Parents and Society need to find ways to combat cheating among high ego strength adolescents. High ego strength adolescents have high aspiration level, risk taking behaviour and manipulative powers which encourage them to involve highly in cheating behaviour. Parents should help their children to balance ego-strengths. This requires positive and conscious efforts to think and act differently to avoid the negativity and strengthen emotionally and socially healthy students to cope up with the problems, find new ways of dealing with struggles and also to handle whatever life throws at them without losing their sense of self.

Educational institutions, parents and the society are very eager to empower only the cognitive aspects of the children, at the same time they should remember that it is also very important to strengthen their emotional aspects for the development of balanced personality and to make them well equipped to face the challenges of competitive future. High ego strength adolescents have such a controlling mechanism within the personality as is capable of taking positive steps in the interest of person as a whole so special programmes like various exams for scholarships, competitions in co-curricular activities at school, state and national level should be organized to help them vent their high energy level positively. Such type of students have the aspiration/expectation about their study beyond their capacities and abilities. Students need
proper counselling while selecting their courses at intermediate level. The parents should consider the child's interest and aptitude and not impose on selecting the courses. The family environment should be congenial and the learning process should be made pleasurable and parents should avoid making it as a stressful event for adolescents. Finally supportive and stimulating atmosphere is very necessary for the students to progress in their academic life and for reaching their aim or goal. All these facilitates high ego strength adolescents to utilize their qualities in a positive manner.

**In general,** the current study implies that majority of students have engaged in academic cheating behaviour and admitted to have experienced one or other form of cheating. “Schools and parents must work together to help the problem of academic dishonesty. There needs to be a common ground with clear understanding of what academic dishonesty is and what the consequence will be for anyone who chooses academic dishonesty over academic integrity. The more academic dishonesty is talked about and the more awareness is turned towards it in the schools, the less it will occur” (Strom & Strom, 2007).

“Parents and schools need to collaborate and talk about academic dishonesty. The penalties should be the same across the board for all students. They should be clear and talked about with students and parents alike. Disciplining, for academic dishonesty should occur during a teachable moment” (Keiner & Lord, 1999). Teachers should prepare lessons to teach on academic integrity so that most of the students will believe in integrity not in dishonesty. Administrators, Counsellors and teachers in schools can devise with some creative techniques to control academic cheating and by using testing and non-testing approaches of counselling. The most important role in controlling academic dishonesty in the classroom is of teacher. Rather than placing importance on classroom achievement and marks, teachers should emphasize on overall understanding and mastering of the content. Teachers should work with school counsellors for inculcating values and ethics. Their focus must be around understanding and mastering versus performance while classroom teaching. Small group guidance can also implemented for students by school counsellors to concentrate more on concepts rather than competition, grades and pressure.

Schools should conduct training as well as orientation programs for faculty as well as for students to reduce academic cheating. Integrity policies and procedures should be reviewed so that incidents of cheating can be handled by using alternative methods. There must be some
position in schools for such a person who specifically can understand and handle the issues of academic cheating and also helps in developing an honor code system. Through orientation programmes, teachers need to be well equipped with effective strategies to detect cheating in various forms. Students have to be convinced about institution’s strong disapproval of cheating. “Traditional methods of commuting students through handbook and catalogues are no more effective in achieving the most desired goals of informing students about the gravity of academic dishonesty. It would be of great value if an ethos of promoting academic integrity is established by all forms of written and verbal communication” (Kibler, 1994). Academic integrity should be supported in school’s environment using a team approach. Giving such importance can make students best by being themselves. This approach might help to educate parents about their child and the effects of their competitive demands and stress on their child to be the best.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In India, studies on Academic Cheating have remained relatively unexplored. Studies on Academic Cheating need to go a long way to evaluate and repair the damage which Academic Cheating is causing to our Education System. Some of the suggestions based on the findings of the present study for the further research in the area of academic cheating are identified as follows:

- The present study has been conducted on adolescents. To confirm the findings and to generalize the conclusions, it is desirable to investigate the impact of different variables among different age groups on academic cheating.
- Academic cheating may be studied in relation to other variables such as personality, moral values, study habits and type of school etc.
- The Study can be extended on a larger and more representative sample.
- Using software to detect cheating will also reveal interpersonal dynamics behind active and passive cheaters.
- The Study may be conducted exploring other attributes of academic cheating.
- The research may be conducted in other states of India and comparison and validation of results may be drawn.
• Further research may focus on the role of teachers, parents, peer groups and academic Institutions affecting Academic cheating.

• The present study is based on academic cheating scale by Kalia and Kiran. Research can also be conducted using different scales of academic cheating to come at reliable conclusions.

• Study could be extended to students at other educational levels such as primary, secondary and higher education.