



The state of self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty of undergraduate students during online learning

Anggita Nurindah Kusuma¹

¹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta;
Jl. Colombo No 1, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia
anggita.nurindahk@gmail.com

Article Info

Manuscript Received
May 10th 2022

Revision Accepted
October 17th 2022

Accepted for Publication
October 18th 2022

doi:
[https://doi.org/
10.21831/pri.v5i1.49441](https://doi.org/10.21831/pri.v5i1.49441)

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the condition of academic problems in the form of self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty in students during online learning and to examine the effect of self-regulated learning on academic dishonesty. This type of research is a correlational of quantitative approach. The study was conducted on 410 students in Special Region of Yogyakarta using online self-regulated learning scale and academic dishonesty scale. The results of this study indicate that student's self-regulated learning is mostly in the medium category with percentage of 52%. The aspect of self-regulated learning that has the highest average score is environment structuring, while the lowest aspect is time management. For academic dishonesty, most students are in the moderate category with percentage of 45.6%. this study also shows the F_{count} value of 24.471, a significance value of .00, and the regression equation $Y=23.816-.090$ which means that self-regulated learning has a negative effect on academic dishonesty. Self-regulated learning contributes 5.7% to academic dishonesty while 94.3% is influenced by other factors.

Keywords: *academic dishonesty; online learning; self-regulated learning*

Suggested citation

Kusuma, A.N. (2022). The state of self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty of undergraduate students during online learning. *Psychological Research and Intervention*, 5(1), 19-27. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21831/pri.v5i1.49441>

Introduction

In formal education, college is the highest level of education. The implementation of education in college has different characteristics from the level of education below it. The learning system and culture in college is very different when compared to school. Undergraduate students have greater personal responsibilities than when they were students. Compared to school where students still need demands in various ways, universities places students as the center of their own learning management (Aji, 2016). Undergraduate students are required to learn more independently and stop relying only on what they get from the lecturer. One of the goals of learning in higher education is to build individuals into independent learners (Huwae, Neve, Mariana, Jelita, & Gina, 2019) with the hope that students will be able to compete in the job market.

In times of pandemic like this, students are increasingly faced with new challenges in learning. Students are required to immediately adapt to the existing conditions because learning system that originally took place offline has now turned into online. The current study shows that most students experience difficulties in online learning because they tend to have lack self-regulation skills in learning. (Peverly, Brobst, Graham, & Shaw, 2003; Anthonysamy & Hew, 2020)

Self-regulation is a form of learning about their ability to engage in appropriate thoughts, feelings, and behaviors so that they can pursue valuable academic goals, while unifying and reflecting themselves (Zimmerman, 2000). Ludwig, Haindl, Laufs, & Rauch (2016) said that self-regulation is a self-adapting ability to regulate emotions, cognition, and behavior to respond effectively to internal and environmental issues. In education context, self-regulation is referred to self-regulated learning (SRL). Barnard, Lan, To, Paton, & Lai (2009) state that self-regulation in learning consists of six aspects, including environmental management, goal setting, time management, seeking help, task strategies, and self-evaluation.

In Indonesia, most students' self-regulated learning (SRL) during the Covid-19 period is known to be in the medium and low categories with a percentage of 71.7% and 10.8% (Harahap & Harahap, 2020). This shows that students still need to adapt in learning and they need to learn regulate themselves during pandemic period.

Through the results of Puspitawati's research (2021), it is known that the lower self-regulated learning will lead to higher levels of academic dishonesty in students. Academic dishonesty is defined as behavior that violates the ethical code of honesty values in the learning process, such as cheating and plagiarism (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Maramark & Maline (1993) stated that academic dishonesty includes cheating in the form of giving or receiving unauthorized assistance, receiving awards for work that is not original, and claiming other people's academic work as one's own, such as cheating on exams, imitating other people's work, or trace.

Nuss (1998) reveals that academic dishonesty is defined into two main categories, namely academic fraud and plagiarism. Academic fraud is a behavior of forming or doing false works in order to obtain an undue advantage, while plagiarism is the presentation of thoughts or the work of others without acknowledging the original source. Iyer & Eastman (2008) also explained that academic dishonesty includes four things, namely cheating behavior, outside help, plagiarism, and cheating using gadgets during tests (electronic cheating).

It is believed that the quality of education cannot be ensured if academic dishonesty is being committed in educational setting (Mulisa, 2015). The dishonest behavior carried out by the learner is caused by the lack of self-awareness about the importance of the task (Djamarah, 2002). Learners also have not been able to adapt to the current conditions of online learning. Students who are unable to regulate themselves their studies and then have a lazy attitude or do not want to work hard in learning will not understand the material and cause dishonest behavior such as cheating to appear (Palupi, Hasyim, & Yanzi, 2013). Therefore, students need to adapt to this kind of learning condition in order to be able to regulate themselves so they will have a sense of understanding about matter because this has a negative correlation with deceptive behavior (David, 2015).

This research was conducted in the Special Region of Yogyakarta where 22 of the 30 best universities in Indonesia (Webometrics Ranking Web of Universities, 2021) are located on Java Island and 23% of these universities are in the Province of the Special Region of Yogyakarta which is famous for its educational culture as well as known as the City of Education. It would be interesting and useful to investigate academic dishonesty that occurs in areas with such backgrounds. In addition, the results of a survey conducted by Husnan and Pudjiastuti (2015) in six major cities in Indonesia, one of which is Yogyakarta, shows that the majority of students in schools and universities commit academic fraud.

This is consistent with the results of an interview with 15 undergraduate students from various universities in Special Region of Yogyakarta in May 2021, most respondents felt that there were quite a lot of changes during this online learning compared to face-to-face learning. Students feels that their self-regulated learning is getting lower for some reason, among which there is distraction from the digital technology used and distraction from people around. As a result, students become less able to fully focus their attention on their college courses and are unable to conduct self-regulated learning well according to the plan that has been made.

As a result of the interview, students acknowledge that the intensity of plagiarism behavior is increasing in some daring tasks due to lack of motivation. In fact, the students also admit that during the online exams, students work together and exchange answers with their friends because during the online learning process, the students can't regulate themselves. With this condition of online learning, student's chance of being able to do something unfair is increasing. This can have an impact on student's learning success and the characters building.

Based on the above analysis, the purpose of this research is to know the state of the academic problem which is self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty in undergraduate students during online learning and to test the impact of self-regulated learning on academic dishonesty. The use of this research is enriching knowledge about self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty in students, both for universities, lecturer, students, other researchers, and readers.

Method

This study was used quantitative approach with a type of correlation research and conducted online at several universities in Special Region of Yogyakarta. The quantitative approach is a research that emphasizes testing theories through measuring research variables with numbers and analyzing data with statistical procedures, so the solving problems involves calculating numbers and the data obtained will be informed in the form of numbers and then analyzed in order to obtain conclusions from the object that being studied or researched. This study refers to the type of ex post facto research, research that aims to find the causes that allow changes in behavior, symptoms or phenomena caused by an event, behavior or things that cause changes in the independent variables which as a whole have occurred (Widarto, 2013:3).

Participants

The population in this study were students of a diploma and a degree in Special Region of Yogyakarta. Sampling technique used was accidental-sampling or convenience-sampling, which means that samples were obtained from anyone who met or by chance filled out a research questionnaire. Total number of samples collected from this survey were 410 people. Characteristics of the participants can be seen on Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Data

Sample Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	151	36.8%
Female	259	63.2%
<i>Education Program and Semester Level</i>		
D4	124	30,2%
S1	286	69,8%
<i>Learning Type</i>		
Online learning	394	96.1%
Blended learning	16	3.9%
Total	410	100%

Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

The data collection technique used in this study was questionnaire and through Google Forms. The research data were obtained directly through two instruments which were distributed to 410 students in Special Region of Yogyakarta. The instruments used were online self-regulated learning questionnaire which consists of 24 items with 5 likert points, e.g., I set standards for my assignments in online courses ($r = 0.908$) and academic dishonesty scale which consists of 7 items with 4 points of frequency level, e.g., During exam I tried to cheat on friend's work ($r = 0.817$).

Table 2. Blueprint of Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Dishonesty Scales

No	Dimensions	Item Numbers	Total Items
<i>Self-Regulated Learning</i>			
1	Goal setting	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	5
2	Environment structuring	6, 7, 8, 9	4
3	Task strategies	10, 11, 12, 13	4
4	Time management	14, 15, 16	3
5	Help-seeking	17, 18, 19, 20	4
6	Self-evaluation	21, 22, 23, 24	4
<i>Academic dishonesty</i>			
1	Cheating manually or with the help of gadgets	1, 2, 5, 7	4
2	Working together to commit dishonesty	3, 4, 6	3

Self-regulated learning is an individual effort to self-regulate in the learning process by using metacognitive abilities, motivational regulation, and behavioral direction whereas academic dishonesty is a variety of deviant actions that are not permitted and cannot be accepted in the work of academic matters.

Result and Discussion

Result

Based on the hypothesis test, the results obtained are a constant value of 23.816 and a coefficient value of -0.090 so that the regression equation is $Y = 23.816 - 0.090X$. This equation means that when there is no self-regulated learning value (X), then the value of academic dishonesty (Y) is 23.816 then every time there is an additional 1 value of self-regulated learning (X), then the value of academic dishonesty (Y) will decrease by 0.090. In addition, it is also known that between the variable of self-regulated learning and academic dishonesty, there are p significance value of .000 which is smaller than .05. So it can be concluded that H₀ is rejected and H_a is accepted. That means there is a negative effect on self-regulated learning (X) on academic dishonesty (Y). These results support research from Puspitawati (2021) which states that self-regulated learning has a negative effect on academic dishonesty.

Consistent with the hypothesis of this study, self-regulated learning (X) simultaneously affects academic dishonesty, $F = 24.471$, $p < .001$. Thus, this regression model can be used to predict the dependent variable which in this study is academic dishonesty. The magnitude of the effect of the research variables can be seen from the results of the R² value of .057 which means that the contribution of self-regulated learning to academic dishonesty is 5.7% while the remaining 94.3% is influenced by other variables that are not examined.

The results of this study also found that the value of student's self-regulated learning was mostly in the medium category with a percentage of 52% or a total of 213 respondents. In addition, 46.8% of the total respondents are also known to have a good level of self-regulated learning. This shows that the majority of students in this study can manage themselves quite well in learning even though learning is carried out online or blend of online and offline.

Discussion

Based on the subject's entire response data on six aspects of self-regulated learning, it is known that aspects with the highest average value are environment structuring. This means that students already have a good environmental structure for learning. Students are also able to understand their respective needs so that they can study comfortably. Environmental comfort in learning has a positive influence on a fun and efficient learning process (Febriani, 2021). Therefore, with a supportive learning environment, students can achieve optimal learning outcomes.

But on the other hand, data obtained from respondents also shows that students tend to be less able to manage their time in learning. This is known from the average value of the lowest aspect, which is time management. The existence of non-face-to-face learning makes students have a greater chance of doing activities outside academic interest. There are many temptations that can distract when they want to learn, for example accessing entertainment media from the digital technologies they use. Time management has an impact on the learning process and can be one of the determinants of achieving the set learning target (Sunarya, Ladjamuddin, & Dewanto, 2017).

In addition to self-regulated learning, this study also reveals that there are still many students in this study who make academic dishonesty during online or blended learning. Although the frequency of academic dishonesty committed is not high, this behavior must still be considered because if it continues, it can have a greater negative impact in the future.

Based on this study, self-regulated learning with academic dishonesty have a negative and significant correlation. This is in line with the results of previous research by Puspitawati (2021) which stated that self-regulated learning has a negative effect on students' academic dishonesty. The higher level of student's self-regulated learning, the lower academic dishonesty. These results are also in accordance with the hypothesis proposed in this study, that there is a negative effect of

self-regulated learning on students' academic dishonesty during online learning in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The role of self-regulated learning against academic dishonesty is said to have negative effect because if students are able to carry out a good self-regulation process in dealing with learning situations, then these students are able to face demands and carry out their roles well.

DiVall & Schlesselman (2016) said that fear of failure was the reason for learners to behave dishonestly. A lazy and unprepared student in their learning process will feel anxious and worried while facing difficulties in education and fear of failure. It then makes some of the students prefer to take shortcuts by behaving dishonestly so that they can achieve their goals without being overwhelmed with doubt. Sujana & Wulan (1994) said that students with high intelligence but with unfair behavioural intensity could be overwhelmed by hopes, such as gaining higher values or succeeding in testing. Even if the test is very easy, still they are relying on their friends' answers for confirmation (Diego, 2017). They actually capable but fearful of failing because of pressure. For example, demands from parents or demands from within themselves, like wanting to understand the matter and get high value but too busy with other activities.

Students with the ability to regulate themselves in good learning will be able to focus on their learning goals, try learning strategies, regulate time and learning environments, and evaluate their understanding. Thus, students can understand the material and create confidence in themselves so when they faced with an academic problem, students will feel capable to solve it on their own. Then when a student fails or receives worse than their hopes, or those around, they will continue to do self-evaluation, then re-design the learning plan, realize it, and re-evaluate what they has achieved.

It is different from students with lower self-regulated learning. Students will have an irregular learning process and didn't understand the material. These misunderstandings makes students feel anxiety and tension when they faced with difficulties, such as testing. People experiencing anxiety tend to feel self-threatened and engage in unethical acts to restore confidence (Eshet, Steinberger, & Grinautsky, 2021), in academic context is such as cheating.

Not only that, when individuals with poor self-regulated learning get results that are not in line with expectations, individuals will feel unhappy about the failure but then still did not try to evaluate themselves or improve. The desire to avoid failure on the one hand and the lack of readiness to work hard on the other will lead the individual to conflict (Sujana & Wulan, 1994). Students with conditions like this are the ones who eventually decide to pass the test or just use the most possible strategy, which is to act unfairly.

Students need to have a high level of consciousness about the importance of the learning process in order not to get involved in impartial action. The right education process is not only about evaluating results, but also about learning and determining the value of the student's character itself. Expected through the learning process, competences and characteristics of students can be further developed so that they can become the capital in preparing for competition in the global era.

Conclusion

From the results of this study, it can be concluded that there is a negative effect of self-regulated learning on students' academic dishonesty during online learning in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. This shows that to minimize the occurrence of academic dishonesty, it can be done by seeking better self-regulated learning. If students are able to regulate themselves in learning in the form of goal setting, environment structuring, task strategies, time management, help seeking, and self-evaluation, dishonesty in academics will be lower.

Suggestion

Self-regulated learning in most students is good, but in terms of time management in this study, the student response value is the lowest average compared to other aspects. To maximize the ability or character of students, it would be better if students were able to manage their time. This can be done, for example, by creating a time-sharing plan and then specifying and implementing the schedule. Students can also ask for help from those closest to them to remind each other. The next researcher is expected to develop this research by taking factors that can influence academic dishonesty other than self-regulated learning. Because in this study, there were other unknown factors that are not examined in the study.

References

- Aji, Grasinta. (2016). *Self-regulated learning pada mahasiswa tahun pertama* [Unpublished bachelor thesis]. Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Anthonyamy, L., Koo, AC., & Hew, SH. (2020). Self-regulated learning strategies and non-academic outcomes in higher education blended learning environments: A one decade review. *Educ Inf Technol*, 25, 3677-3704. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10134-2>
- Barnard, L., Lan, W. Y., To, Y. M., Paton, V. O., & Lai, S. (2009). Measuring self-regulation in online and blended learning environments. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12, 1-6.
- David, Laura T. (2015). Academic cheating in college students: Relations among personal values, self-esteem and mastery. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 187, 88 – 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.017>
- Diego, Leo Andrew B. (2017). Friends with benefits: causes and effects of learners' cheating practices during examination. *LAFOR Journal of Education*, 5(2).
- DiVall, MV, & Schlesselman, L. (2016). Academic dishonesty: whose fault is it anyway? *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 80(3): Article 35.
- Djamarah, Syaiful B. (2000). *Guru dan anak didik dalam interaksi edukatif*. Rineka Cipta.
- Eshet, Y., Steinberger, P., & Grinautsk, K. (2021). Relationship between statistics anxiety and academic dishonesty: A comparison between learning environments in social sciences. *Sustainability*, 13, 1564.
- Febriani, AlsaPutri. (2016). Pengaruh lingkungan belajar terhadap proses pembelajaran kelas XI di SMK Negeri 1 Cianjur. *JPPHK (Jurnal Pendidikan Politik, Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan)*, 11(1).
- Harahap, Ade C., & Harahap, Samsul R. (2020). Covid 19: Self regulated learning mahasiswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling*, 10(1).
- Husnan, S., & Pudjiastuti, E. (2015). *Dasar-dasar manajemen keuangan*, Edisi Ketujuh. UPP STIM YKPN.

- Huwae, Y., Neve, G., Mariana, M., Jelita, W., & Gina, A. (2019). Gambaran self-regulation pada mahasiswa baru [Unpublished bachelor thesis]. Universitas Pembangunan Jaya, Banten.
- Iyer, R., & Eastman, J. K. (2008). The impact of unethical reasoning on academic dishonesty: Exploring the moderating effect of social desirability on academic dishonesty. *Marketing Education Review*, 18(2), 21–33.
- Ludwig, K., Haindl, A., Laufs, R., & Rauch, W. A. (2016). Self-regulation in preschool children's everyday life: Exploring day-to-day variability and the within-and-between person structure. *Journal of Self Regulation and Regulation*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.11588/josar.2016.2.34357>
- Maramark, S., & Maline, M. B. (1993). Academic dishonesty among college students. *Issues in Education*.
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522–538.
- Mulisa, Feyisa. (2015). The prevalence of academic dishonesty and perceptions of students towards its practical habits: Implication for quality of education. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J.*, 4(2), 309-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/star.v4i2.43>
- Nuss, E. M. (1988). *Academic dishonesty a contemporary problem in higher education*. In Kibler, W. L., Nuss, E. M., Paterson, B. G., & Pavela, G. (Eds.), *Academic Integrity and Student Development: Legal Issues and Policy Perspectives*. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.
- Palupi, I. D., Hasyim, A., & Yanzi, H. (2013). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi budaya menyontek di kalangan siswa SMA Negeri 1 Seputih Raman Lampung Tengah. *Jurnal Kultur Demokrasi*, 1(5), 1-14.
- Peeverly, S. T., Brobst, K. E., Graham, M., & Shaw, R. (2003). College adults are not good at self-regulation: A study on the relationship of self-regulation, note taking, and test-taking. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.335>
- Puspitawati, Ira. (2021). Hubungan self regulated learning dengan kecurangan akademik pada mahasiswa. *Skrripsi*, not published, Universitas Gunadarma, Jakarta.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan r&d*. CV Alfabeta.
- Sujana, Y.E., & Wulan, R. (1994). Hubungan antara kecenderungan pusat kendali dengan intensi mencontek. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 21, 18.
- Sunarya, P. A., Ladjamuddin, Al-Bahra, & Dewanto, I. J. (2017). Hubungan antara manajemen waktu dengan prestasi belajar mahasiswa program studi DIII Komputerisasi Akuntansi Amik Raharja Informatika. *Cyberpreneurship Innovative and Creative Exact and Social Science (CICES)*, 3(2).
- Webometrics Ranking Web of Universities (2021). Indonesia. <https://www.webometrics.info/en/asia/indonesia%20>, diakses pada 6 Oktober 2021.

Widarto. (2013, June 27-28). *Penelitian ex post facto* [PowerPoint slides]. Pelatihan Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan. Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

Zimmerman. (2000). “*Attaining self-regulation: a social cognitive perspective*,” in Handbook of Self-Regulation, eds M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, and M. Zeidner (San Diego, CA: Academic Press), 13–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012109890-2/50031-7>