

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AMONG STUDENTS IN INDONESIA

Herdian¹, & Fatin Rohmah Wahidah²

^{1,2}Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Indonesia

We suggest you to cite this article as:

Herdian, Wahidah, F.R.. 2020. Academic Dishonesty Among Students in Indonesia. *Junior Scientific Researcher*, Vol VI, No. 2, pp. 3-12.

Abstract

This study aimed to describe the current condition of academic dishonesty in college students in Indonesia. Participants in the study were students who are currently actively undergoing lectures at universities in Indonesia (n = 408). The research method used is a quantitative descriptive approach with data collection through an academic dishonesty scale that is built based on academic dishonesty measurements developed by McCabe and Trevino (1993) and Stone et al. (2010) and has been adapted in Indonesia by Ampuni et al (2019), that consisted of 14 items ($\alpha=0.86$). The results of this study describe the most academic dishonesty of students in the medium category (45.1%). The most academic dishonesty forms used by students is collaboration, while cheating is the least used method by students. Based on these results, it is hoped that educational institutions will pay more attention to how these behaviors can be prevented.

Keywords: *Academic Dishonesty, Students College, Cheating*

JEL Classification: I2

Introduction

Character education is very important to be applied at every level of education. Not only at the most basic levels of education, but even character education is also needed to be broadly applied at the tertiary level (Berkowitz & Fukula, 1999). Character education in tertiary institutions is considered vital because it has one of the objectives, namely to improve the quality of education implementation and outcomes that lead to the achievement of character building and noble character of students as a whole, integrated and balanced, in accordance with graduate competency standards (Hasanah, 2013). Besides, character education taught will continue to be extended throughout the entire education period (Williams, 2003). Other outcomes of character education are also expected to be able to encourage, solid, and continuously prepare leaders in the future (Agboola & Tsai, 2012).

One of the character values applied to universities is honesty (Devine & Chin, 2018). Where honesty is interpreted as following the agreed behavior to be accepted (Cherrington & Cherrington, 1993), besides is a form of conveying something true and in accordance with reality (Rusyan, 2006). Koellhoffer (2009) says that someone who is academically honest is not committing acts of plagiarism, which means not copying someone else's work or not using someone else's work without his permission. Vadi &

Jaakson (2006) said that Honesty is considered as an essential foundation for ethical behavior in many ways, even the value of honesty is the best policy (Cade, 1998).

Although the value of honesty is very important, many studies report that dishonesty occurs in universities in the world such as in Asia including Indonesia (Herdian, Na'imah, 2018), India (Babu, Joseph & Sharmila, 2011), Malaysia (Shariffuddin & Holmes, 2009), Thailand (Thomas, 2017), China (Rawwas, Al-Khatib & Vitell, 2004), in Europe including Italy (Macale, et al, 2017), Russia (Lupton & Chaqman, 2002), France (Hendy & Montargot, 2019), in America (Diekhoff, et al., 1999), Mexico (Ayala-Gaytán & Quintanilla-Domínguez, 2014), and Africa (Teferra, 2001).

Academic dishonesty means giving or receiving assistance in a way that is not permitted by the instructor in the creation of work to be submitted for academic evaluation including papers, projects, and examinations (cheating); and presenting, as a person, ideas or words of others or others for academic evaluation without proper recognition (plagiarism) (Hard, Conway, & Moran, 2006). Cizek (2003) says that dishonest behavior is divided into three categories: (1) giving or receiving information, (2), using prohibited materials, and (3) "utilizing the weaknesses of people, procedures, or processes to benefit from academic work.

Factors of academic dishonesty are very diverse, the various empirical literature on academic dishonesty has reported strong evidence of peer effects on student dishonesty (Herdian, 2018; Wahyuningtyas & Indrawati, 2018; OLeary and Pangemanan, 2007). However, Griebeler's (2017) findings show that only closer friendships are likely to increase cheating and that only happens to students with low grades.

Hetherington and Feldman (1964) classify four types of cheating behavior, namely 1) Social active is cheating done by asking, asking, taking answers from others actively. For example: during an exam, a student asks answers from other students, takes a friend's answer; 2) Social passive is cheating which is done by allowing or even providing voluntary answers. For example: letting others cheat, when the exam takes place students let other students cheat or even give a cheat sheet; 3) Individualistic Opportunistic is cheating done independently and suddenly without any planning for example: opening a book or using an internet mobile phone during an exam; 4) Independent Planned is self-reliant cheating to be done intentionally and planned at the time of the exam. For example: intentionally bringing materials or notes into the examination room.

Academic dishonesty behavior committed by students as a small "experience" in the course of education that will have an impact for students to conduct such behavior in the future, therefore academic dishonesty is fundamental to be prevented early so that it does not have a sustainable impact (Royal et al.2016). Based on the above background, the purpose of this study is to describe the current condition of academic dishonesty in students

Method

The variable in this research is Academic Dishonesty. While the research method uses a quantitative descriptive approach. Where this method is considered suitable for describing academic dishonesty with relatively many participants. Participants in the study were 408 students who are currently actively undergoing lectures at universities in Indonesia. Data collection tools use an academic dishonesty scale that is built based on academic dishonesty measurements developed by McCabe and Trevino (1993) and Stone et al. (2010) and has been adapted in Indonesia by Ampuni et al (2019). The academic dishonesty scale is based on three forms of academic dishonesty namely cheating, illegal collaboration, and plagiarism with a number of 14. Participants are asked to respond to statements such as: "Using tools that are not allowed to complete assignments" using a scale of 0-4 that has an explanation of 0 (never) up to 4 (very often). All items showed good factor loading and were therefore included for hypothesis testing. Based on statistical analysis, the scale shows high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.86$), and each subscale shows a high Cronbach alpha coefficient up to 0.83 (cheating), 0.71 (illegitimate collaboration), and 0, 64 (plagiarism). Data analysis uses quantitative analysis by categorizing and making percentage percentages. The statistical analysis using the help of the SPSS statistical program.

Results and Discussion

Before describing the academic dishonesty in students, we first explain the profile of participants in this study:

Table 1. Frequencies For Sex

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
male	95	23.3	23.3	23.3
female	313	76.7	76.7	100.0
Total	408	100.0		

Based on table 1, the total participants in this study totaled 408 people. The categorization of participants by sex in this study was dominated by 313 people with a percentage of 76.7%. While the male gender participants amounted to 95 people with a percentage of 23.3%.

Table 2. Frequencies For GPA

GPA	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2,00 - 2,75	9	2.2	2.2	2.2
2,76 - 3,50	228	55.9	55.9	58.1
3,51 - 4,00	170	41.7	41.7	99.8
<2,00	1	0.2	0.2	100.0

Table 2. Frequencies For GPA

GPA	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total	408	100.0		

Based on table 2. Researcher divides four ranges for GPA. The highest GPA range is 3.51 - 4.00 while the lowest range is <2.00. This study was dominated by participants who had a range of GPA of 2.76 - 3.50, amounting to 228 people or 55.9%. Participants with a GPA range of 3.51 - 4.00, amounting to 170 people or 41.7%. Participants with a GPA range of 2.00 - 2.75, amounting to 9 people or 2.2%, and participants at least in the range <2.00 with a number of 1 people or 0.2%.

Table 3. Frequencies For Semester

semester	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2	79	19.4	19.4	19.4
4	140	34.3	34.3	53.7
6	113	27.7	27.7	81.4
8	72	17.6	17.6	99.0
>8	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	408	100.0		

Based on table 3. participant profiles by semester are divided into five categories. The fourth-semester participants were the most participants with 140 people or 34.4%. Participants in semester 6 were 113 people or 27.7%, semester 2 were 79 people or 19.4%, semester 8 were 72 people or 17.6% and participants were at least > 8 semesters with four people or 1%.

Academic Dishonesty

Violation of academic integrity among students is an issue that concerns all stakeholders of higher education, including institutions, faculties, university administration, students, alumni, employers, and the wider community. Academic integrity can be seen as a system of values and the accompanying behaviors and actions that occur in accordance with generally related academic integrity values. The International Center for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as covering six basic values of honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage (Fishman 2014).

Table. 4 Frequencies for category

category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very High	22	5.4	5.4	82.6
High	71	17.4	17.4	100.0
Medium	184	45.1	45.1	74.3
Low	119	29.2	29.2	29.2

Table. 4 Frequencies for category

category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
very Low	12	2.9	2.9	77.2
Missing	0	0.0		
Total	408	100.0		

Based on table 4. It can be seen that the most academic dishonesty of students in the medium category is 45.1% with a total frequency of 184 students. While in the category of academic dishonesty in the high and very high categories it was 22.8%. The rest are in the low category 29.2% and very low at 2.9%. Based on these data overall academic dishonesty of 408 students studied there are still 22.8% or 93 students still commit academic dishonesty with high intensity and very high. Based on the categories of forms of academic dishonesty behavior, academic dishonesty forms of collaboration are the forms most used by students. The number of percentages can be seen in table 5.

Table 5. The percentage for Academic dishonesty form

form of dishonesty	Percent
Cheating	24.63
Collaboration	41.78
Plagiarism	33.59
Total	100.00

Based on table 6. dishonesty behavior is elaborated based on self-report results items by 408 students. "Copying lots of sentences from published sources without giving credit to the author" by 20% (sometimes) and 7% (often). Other items related to plagiarism are "Allow friends to copy my answers during the test" by 20% (sometimes), 7% (often), and 1% (Almost Always). Plagiarism is an unethical activity in scientific renewal. Something agreed upon is given to essential deviations from the thoughts received from the relevant scientific community consciously and deliberately and must be proven with substantial evidence. Plagiarism can take many forms: ideas are taken and parts of the text are taken. Self-plagiarism occurs in a compilation of writers using his work which was previously published without acknowledging it (Dellavalle et al, 2007). Plagiarism behavior is not a new thing happening in academic activities. One of the universities in China uses the application of plagiarism to filter out article are submissions and more than a third of articles rejected because of plagiarism (Rezanejad & Rezaei, 2013).

In other aspects such as Unauthorized Collaboration in the form of the statement "Working together on a task that should be an individual task" reported 33% (sometimes), 13% (Often), and 1% (Almost Always). Unauthorized Collaboration Behavior is behavior related to the bond between an individual and his friend. So that academic dishonesty behavior is very likely to occur in individuals who have a certain attachment to their friends to cooperate in college assignments.

This result has strengthened the results of previous studies which said that of the three forms of academic dishonesty, students most often participated in collaborations without permission. This is possible because Indonesia is a collectivist country (Oyserman et al, 2002; Ampuni, 2019), saying this is possible because of Indonesia's collectivist culture. Collectivism behavior emphasizes group goals above personal goals, and emphasizes the desires and interests of groups above personal interests. Even people who embrace collectivist values avoid conflict or negotiation (Wishnuwardhani & Mangundjaya, 2008). This can explain why academic dishonesty behavior in students occurs in their friendship groups.

Table 6. Students' of engagement in dishonest behaviors

<i>Behavior</i>	Prevalence (%), n = 408				
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
Copying the material and acknowledge it as a result of my own work.	29	38	26	5	2
Use dishonest methods to learn what is on the exam before the exam.	51	38	10	1	0
Copying multiple sentences from published sources without giving credit to the author.	29	43	20	7	0
Helping others to cheat on tests.	47	37	13	2	1
Working together on a task that should be an individual task.	14	39	33	13	1
Copying friends' answers during a test.	58	32	7	2	0
Collecting the work done by others.	77	18	3	1	0
Receive help on individual assignments without the permission of the teacher.	45	38	14	2	0
Cheating on the test in any way.	50	42	7	0	0
Looking at the text books or notes during a test without the permission of the teacher/supervisor.	67	27	5	1	0
Using tools that are not allowed to complete the task.	67	26	5	1	0
Not contributing to group assignments where my name is written as a member.	79	16	4	0	0
Allow friends to copy my answers during tests.	28	44	20	7	1

Doing partial or total plagiarism using internet.	29	48	17	5	1
---	----	----	----	---	---

Note: marked values mean that corresponding behavior is prevalent

Collaboration

In table 5. It can be seen that the least form of academic dishonesty behavior done by students is cheating. In Contrast, the form of academic dishonesty behavior plagiarism is in the middle position between forms of cheating and collaboration. In development theory, Hurlock (2002) states that the family has less influence compared to the influence of friends on individual development. One of them is behavior. McCabe & Trevino (1997) make it clear that deviant behavior is learned from close associations with people involved in deviations. This reinforces the results of this study that the collaboration done with friends is part of the influence of friends who are around. The results of this study reinforce the results of previous studies conducted by Is, Tafsir & Tanjung (2017) which say that the low honesty factor is influenced by friends. Friendship does not always have a positive impact, but it is not uncommon for close friends to have a negative impact. The results of this study prove that one of the negative effects of friendship is affecting academic behavior such as dishonesty. In the case of collaboration in particular, academic dishonesty in the form of collaboration between friends is a form of chain dishonesty. Which will not rule out the possibility that this will still happen in the next friendship. So there needs to be a selective attitude in choosing friends in this case, especially academic friends.

Plagiarism

The results of this study found that form of plagiarism is the second percentage after collaboration. Weber-Wulff (2016) says that Plagiarism is not just an exact copy of the text of another person, whether done intentionally or not, but can be one of various misuse of the work of others without attribution. The form of academic dishonesty behavior in plagiarism is a type of serious but widespread error, and is often neglected in developing countries. Despite its far-reaching implications, plagiarism is less well known and discussed in the academic environment, and insufficient evidence exists in Latin America and developing countries to inform the development of prevention strategies (Carnero, et al, 2017). The results of this study reinforce the results of previous studies conducted by Rohmanu (2016) that as many as 53% of respondents are accustomed to quoting words, phrases and sentences from reference sources even though they are not in the context of direct quotations (word for word plagiarism). Plagiarism behavior is not a new behavior in academic dishonesty. Even the behavior of plagiarism has been found in many previous studies. Plagiarism itself can be prevented through preliminary writing techniques. However writing with these techniques is not easy, so that plagiarism is one that is entrenched for students who do not have the skills in composing an academic sentence. Though writing articles is one thing that must be owned by every student. because the culmination of studies in college is related to the writing of scientific articles.

Cheating

Based on the results of this study Forms of cheating academic dishonesty behavior, the percentage is the least compared to the other two forms of dishonesty. Academic cheating is defined as academic behavior that is not in accordance with the requirements of assessment and other institutional policies; when students behave in ways that are intended to get an improper advantage about to their assessment (Guthrie, 2019). Actually cheating is defined as a form that is prohibited by violating the rules that have been made. Academic cheating in this study was measured by items of statements which included using dishonest methods before the test, copying friends' answers, cheating in various ways during the test, viewing textbooks without seizing supervisors and using tools that were not allowed

Conclusions

Academic dishonesty that occurs in students can be used as a basis for making prevention programs. This certainly should be able to be used as joint evaluation material for education stakeholders, not only teachers but people involved in educational institutions. This study states that collaboration is a method of dishonesty that is mostly done by students. While cheating is the least used method by students. Based on these results, it is hoped that educational institutions will pay more attention to how these behaviors can be prevented

Acknowledgment

The researcher would like to thank all college students who have agreed to be participants in this study.

References

1. Agboola, A., & Tsai, K. C. (2012). Bring Character Education into Classroom. *European journal of educational research*, 1(2), 163-170.
2. Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (Eds.). (2011). *Psychology of academic cheating*. Elsevier.
3. Ayala-Gaytán, E. A., & Quintanilla-Domínguez, C. M. (2014). Attitudes and causes of cheating among Mexican college students: an exploratory research. *Magis, Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 6(13), 17-30.
4. Babu, T. A., Joseph, N. M., & Sharmila, V. (2011). Academic dishonesty among undergraduates from private medical schools in India. Are we on the right track?. *Medical teacher*, 33(9), 759-761
5. Berkowitz, M. W., & Fekula, M. J. (1999). Educating for character. *About Campus*, 4(5), 17-22
6. Cade, B. (1998). Honesty is still the best policy. *Journal of family therapy*, 20(2), 143-152.
7. carnero, a. m., mayta-tristan, et al. (2017). plagiarism, cheating and research integrity: case studies from a masters program in peru. *Science And Engineering Ethics*, 23(4), 1183-1197.
8. Cherrington, D. J., & Cherrington, J. O. (1993). Understanding honesty. *Internal*

- Auditor, 50(6), 29-36.
9. Cizek, G. J. (2003). Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessment. Corwin Press.
 10. Dellavalle, R. P., Banks, M. A., & Ellis, J. I. (2007). Frequently asked questions regarding self-plagiarism: How to avoid recycling fraud. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 57(3), 527.
 11. Devine, C. A., & Chin, E. D. (2018). Integrity in nursing students: A concept analysis. *Nurse education today*, 60, 133-138.
 12. Diekhoff, G. M., LaBeff, E. E., Shinohara, K., & Yasukawa, H. (1999). College cheating in Japan and the United States. *Research in Higher education*, 40(3), 343-353.
 13. Fishman, T. (Ed.). (2014). Fundamental values project. In International Center for Academic Integrity (2nded.). Clemson University. http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/assets/Revised_FV_2014.pdf. Retrieved 26 Feb 2015.
 14. Griebeler, M. D. C. (2017). Friendship and in-class academic dishonesty. *Economics Letters*, 150, 1-3.
 15. Guthrie, c. I. (2009). plagiarism and cheating: a mixed methods study of student academic dishonesty . Thesis, master of social sciences, the university of waikato.
 16. Hard, S. F., Conway, J. M., & Moran, A. C. (2006). Faculty and college students' beliefs about the frequency of student academic misconduct. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1058-1080.
 17. Hasanah, H. (2013). Implementasi Nilai-nilai Karakter Inti Di Perguruan Tinggi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 3(2), 186-195.
 18. Hendy, N. T., & Montargot, N. (2019). Understanding Academic dishonesty among business school students in France using the theory of planned behavior. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 17(1), 85-93.
 19. Herdian & Na'Imah, T. (2018). Qualitative or quantitative which allows the case of academic dishonesty?. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis and Education*, 10(2), 41-48.
 20. Herdian, H., & Wulandari, D. A. (2018). Ketidakjujuran Akademik pada Calon Guru Agama. *Psikologia: Jurnal Psikologi*, 2(1), 1-16.
 21. Hetherington, E. M., & Feldman, S. E. (1964). College Cheating As A Function Of Subject And Situational Variables. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 55(4), 212.
 22. Hurlock, E.B. (2002). Psikologi perkembangan: Suatu pendekatan sepanjang rentang kehidupan. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
 23. Is, B., Tafsir, A., & Tanjung, H. (2017). Pendidikan Kejujuran dalam Kurikulum Pendidikan Agama Islam di Smk Kabupaten Labuhanbatu Sumatera Utara. *EduTech: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(1).
 24. Koellhoffer, T. (2009). *Being Fair And Honest*. New York: Chelsea House
 25. Lupton, R. A., & Chaqman, K. J. (2002). Russian and American college students' attitudes, perceptions and tendencies towards cheating. *Educational Research*, 44(1), 17-27.
 26. Macale, L., Ghezzi, V., Rocco, G., Fida, R., Vellone, E., & Alvaro, R. (2017). Academic dishonesty among Italian nursing students: A longitudinal study. *Nurse education today*, 50, 57-61.
 27. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and Contextual Influences on

- Academic Dishonesty: A Multicampus Investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 379-396.
28. Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kimmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological bulletin*, 128(1), 3.
 29. Rawwas, M. Y., Al-Khatib, J. A., & Vitell, S. J. (2004). Academic dishonesty: A cross-cultural comparison of US and Chinese marketing students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(1), 89-100.
 30. Rezanejad, A., & Rezaei, S. (2013). Academic dishonesty at universities: The case of plagiarism among Iranian language students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 11(4), 275-295
 31. Rohmanu, a. (2016). Tata Kelola Mahasiswa Terhadap Integritas Akademik Dan Plagiarisme. *Muslim Heritage*, 1(2), 331-352
 32. Royal, Kenneth D, Regina M Schoenfeld-tacher, and Keven Flammer. 2016. "Comparing Veterinary Student and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Misconduct." *International Research in Higher Education* (1):81–90. <https://doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v1n1p81>
 33. Rusyan, T. (2006). *Pendidikan Budi Pekerti*. Jakarta: Inti Media Cipta Nusantara.
 34. Shariffuddin, S. A., & Holmes, R. J. (2009). Cheating in examinations: A study of academic dishonesty in a Malaysian College. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 5 (2), 99-124
 35. Teferra, D. (2001). Academic dishonesty in African universities—trends, challenges, and repercussions: an Ethiopian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21(2), 163-178.
 36. Thomas, D. (2017). Factors that explain academic dishonesty among university students in Thailand. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27(2), 140-154.
 37. Vadi, M., & Jaakson, K. (2006). The Importance Of Value Honest: Determining Factors And Some Hints To Ethics. *University of Tartu Economics and Business Administration Working Paper*, (43).
 38. Wahyuningtyas, P. F., & Indrawati, E. S. (2018). Hubungan Antara Konformitas teman Sebaya dengan Intensi Menyontek pada Siswa SMA Kesatrian 2 Semarang. *Empati*, 7(2), 100-107.
 39. Weber-Wulff, D. (2016). Plagiarism detection software: Promises, pitfalls, and practices. *Handbook of academic integrity*, 625-638.
 40. Williams, D. D., Yanchar, S. C., Jensen, L. C., & Lewis, C. (2003). Character education in a public high school: A multi-year inquiry into Unified Studies. *Journal of Moral Education*, 32(1), 3- 33.
 41. Wishnuwardhani, P. D., & Mangundjaya, W. (2008). Hubungan nilai budaya individualisme-kolektivisme dan gaya penyelesaian konflik. *JPS*, 14(1), 1-10.