

Counterproductive Behaviors Among Indonesian Students

Ahmad Muhammad Diponegoro^{1*}, Erita Yuliasesti Diah Sari² and Khoiruddin Bashori³

Faculty of Psychology, Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

¹ahmad.diponegoro@psy.uad.ac.id, ²erita.sari@psy.uad.ac.id,

³khoiruddin.bashori@psy.uad.ac.id

Abstract

Counterproductive behaviors have predominantly been investigated at work and in Western countries. This study took a broader perspective with respect to counterproductive academic behavior among Indonesian students. CAB is a major problem in educational institutions throughout the worlds. One of the reasons students do CAB is because it can enhance their happiness or pleasure and please certain parties. But unfortunately it does more harms to more parties. CAB consist of different kinds of behavior, (i.e., cheating, plagiarism, play truant, absenteeism, plagiarism, deception), breaking rules, breach / break of rules, low in effort, and misuse of resources) misusing resources. A sample of 453 Indonesian students from several academic institutions reported on their frequencies of their counterproductive academic behavior (CAB). The measurement of CAB using a scale of 20 questions with two responses: Yes and No. Descriptive analyses was administered to understand the data. Result showed that from 453 participants just 26 students wrote never practice counterproductive academic behavior. Conclusion: the religious values and moral values that are taught in universities and schools has not been internalized properly.

Keywords: *students, counterproductive academic behavior, moral values, religion*

1. Introduction

The word counterproductive in the study of behavior in general is widely discussed in psychology research [1], but the most widely used of this term is the study of organizational psychology [2-6]. While, educational psychologists are still rarely utilized the term. Educational experts who use this term in educational psychology labelled the counterproductive behavior in academic atmosphere as counterproductive academic behavior (CAB) [7].

One of the reasons students do CAB is because it can increase their happiness or pleasure and please certain parties [8]. The goal that should have been attained with the hard work, was often achieved by low effort that was a cheating. Achieving goals through CAB often makes individual happy. Without adequate effort students can get good grade, top ten in the university, obtain scholarships, and high achievements. Of course this kind of happiness is often considered pseudo, even often only applies in a short time and because do more harm to others. They are practicing, committed CAB.

CAB is a major problem in educational institutions throughout the world. For this reason, conducting a comprehensive study of CAB is very relevant. To learn what values affect individuals doing CAB. Also whether with the moral and religious culture that underlies a country's CAB behavior will decrease or rarely occur. CAB consist of different kinds of unhealthy behavior, (i.e., cheating, plagiarism, play truant, absenteeism, plagiarism, deception), breaking rules, breach / break of rules, low in effort, low effort, and misuse of resources) misusing resources, this studies will report the description of causes and types of CAB in Indonesia. Research that has been running for decades shows CAB is a behavior that is not expected by everyone. Fraudulent behavior is often carried

out in a group, and is a widespread problem that affects academic institutions throughout the world [9].

The consequences of unproductive behavior weaken slowly or erode the educational process, which has a negative impact on students and academy administration [7]. Some researchers refer to CAB as dishonest behavior [10]. CAB has emerged as an area of concern among social science researchers (e.g., psychology, education, and ethics), leaders of educational institutions, political decision makers, and other stakeholders (such as potential workers, committees ethics,). It is a critical relevance to conduct research in order to explain this phenomenon and to develop effective strategies to control and reduce the repeatability of CAB.

Furthermore, CAB threatens the main purpose of universities to foster ethical standards of students and to build good universities. Dishonesty is also related to personality [11]. A number of students expressed dangerous jokes by saying that giving answers to friends during exams is a charity, [12]. Cheating in academics is seen as unethical behavior, aversive behavior both by philosophers and psychologists [13], indeed many experts find it difficult to be honest in daily interactions [14]. CAB also occurs in developed countries and leading universities, such as Harvard. Even those who cheat are far more than those who do not [12].

CAB according to a number of studies occurred in developed countries and leading universities, such as Harvard. There are even more frauds than not. As one of 130 Harvard seniors faced accusations of cheating. The incident shows that there are three main problems in education. First, student counterproductive behavior is defined as dishonest behavior that is used to get illicit profit. Research conducted by involving more than 39,000 students on more than 65 U.S. campuses and Canada revealed that more than 50% of students claimed to have cheated. Other research conducted at the University level shows that between 52% and 66% of students were committed CAB. Second, cheating can take many forms and is not always an individual activity. A number of cheating scandals involved students involved in collaborative dishonesty. Third, because academic group work is often encouraged to be completed in the classroom [12].

Based on examinations on the scale-item content used to evaluate CAB and the descriptions provided by the literature on the topic, this study has broadened the CAB typology by including seven categories and providing definitions and examples of behavior included in these aspects. The seven aspects are: (a) deceptive; (b) voluntary attendance; (c) plagiarism; (d) fraud; (e) violation of rules; (f) low effort; and (g) misuse of resources. All these aspects will be related to the overall CAB factor [12].

Conversely, based on the previous CWB definitions, CAB could be defined as any intentional behavior performed by a student that is contrary to the legitimate interests of the academic institution, its members (e.g., faculty, academic administration, other students), and the institutional goals. CAB has been operationalized in the literature under different names. However, an inspection of the CAB measures across studies shows that they overlap behaviors. For instance, sometimes cheating and plagiarism are considered under the same category and sometimes they are considered as different but related categories. In other cases, researchers combine various negative academic behaviors into a compound of overall CAB.

An examination of the content and the correlations among the CAB categories supports the argument that, although related, they are substantively (i.e., different content) and empirically different (i.e., moderate correlations). As a result of CAB, among others, the occurrence of endemic corruption in the world. For example, various scandals such as The Enron accounting scandal, corruption at FIFA, the Petrobras and Odebrecht bribery cases in Brazil— these are just a few examples of widespread dishonesty and fraud worldwide.

According to Transparency International's annual global survey of corruption levels, over two thirds of the 176 countries and territories in the Corruption Perceptions Index, 2016 fell below the midpoint of the scale from 0 (highly corrupt) to 100 (very clean; Transparency International, 2017) [10].

We found that most psychological researches about Indonesia in the clinical psychology, and the counterproductive religious behaviors such as jihadists what their called as religious extremist behavior [15], the role of religious fundamentalism [16] and discrimination of race [17]. None of these research that focused on academic behavior. The academic behavior, either productive academic behavior or counterproductive academic behavior mostly conducted in western countries. Such as in United states and Canada.

To fill this gap, we will conduct research on CAB in Indonesia, a country that teaches its people to be honest with legal religious teachings, which requires all its adherents to act honestly. Cheating in Indonesian supposed to be rare, because the government encourage its citizen to act honestly as taught by their religious scholars and educators [18]. Meanwhile research on CAB is mostly done in the western world with an individualistic culture.

A group of Muslims and adolescents who are serious about their religion, there are those who highlight aspects of character, studying or seeking knowledge, to achieve ultimate happiness, which is heaven [16]. For Indonesia, it can be concluded that religion and noble values are the philosophical principles of the Indonesian country. As a result, dishonesty and fraud, which are immoral acts, should not arise. Because almost all religious teachings [19-20], especially Islam forbid it. Honesty should cultivate in this religious country [14].

But in reality, corruption, which is a dishonest act, is developing in the direction of the growth of corruption in almost all the world. Especially among students. Those who are corrupt are considered to have a dark personality or have a dark side to their personality [11]. In Pancasila the values of honesty and humanity are implied. It means that those who are dishonest and harming others, not act as a good Indonesian citizen [21].

2. Methodology

This research involved 453 undergraduate students in various universities in Indonesia. CAB measurement is carried out using a scale consisting of 20 questions with 2 response answers, namely Yes and No and plus 2 items of reasons for doing and not CAB. This scale modifies a similar scale that was used by Newstead, Stokes and Armstead. Measuring instruments are made in the form of forms through Google and distributed through groups of students under the control of researchers.

The analysis technique used is descriptive, by examining the demographic data of respondents, along with answers to the reasons for doing or not doing cheating activities. Demographic data is used as supplementary data which is qualitative in nature. This study also included a quantitative analysis to find differences in the reasons for doing and not cheating in terms of various aspects of respondent demographics.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Table cities of the respondents

City	Frequency
Banda Aceh	5
Bandar Lampung	5

Banjarmasin	13
Bogor	1
Bukittinggi	4
Jakarta	12
Kendari	2
Kota Ternate, Malut	13
Kupang	10
Makassar	17
Malang	11
Metro, Lampung	13
Padang	28
Palembang	20
Pekanbaru	117
Pematangsiantar	1
Purwokerto	13
Purworejo	8
Semarang	17
Surabaya	1
Surakarta	12
Tangerang	1
Yogyakarta	129
TOTAL	453

The participant come from several islands and cities that scattered across Indonesian archipelago. Most of them come from Sumatera (Pakanbaru) island, and Java Island (Yogyakarta). There were several provinces joined this research. For examples, Aceh, South Sulawesi, Middle of Java, East Java, and Yogyakarta,

Table 2. Frequency of reasons for committing CAB

Reasons	f	%
Peer pressure	2	1,67
Time pressure	25	20,83
Laziness	12	10
To help a friend	33	27,5
Test is too hard	12	10
To evaluate grades	5	4,16
To get good grades	6	5
Afraid of failure	3	2,5
Imitate a friend who does it	14	11,67
Promise to a friend	1	0,83
Not have enough time to study	4	3,33
Other	13	10,83

Table 3. Frequency of reasons for not committing CAB

Reasons	f	%
Devalue the achievement	10	8,40
It is not a honest behavior	55	46,21
Feeling guilty	1	0,84
Feel scared	1	0,84
Embarrassing	16	13,44
Not show good quality	1	0,84

Did not want to hurt myself	1	0,84
Situation did not applicable	10	8,40
Would not impact anything	1	0,84
No benefit	22	18,49
Did not do it	1	0,84

Students commit dishonest actions due to various factors. The highest percentage is due to helping his friend. This action is usually carried out for paper assignment writing activities. Students put the name of a friend in the group even though they are not involved in making the assignment. It can also when entering class, helping his friend who is not present for attendance. Time is very urgent, so students do not think long and commit fraud.

A significant percentage is found because of seeing other people doing the same thing. Making mistakes together becomes less sensitive and is not considered a mistake. Furthermore, the reason is lazy and feels that exam questions are too difficult to make students commit fraud such as cheating on the exam.

Other reasons that are casuistic, for example, are forced by friends to make scientific work, are afraid that if they do not act fraudulently, they will not get good grades, or because they have promised their friends to make assignments.

The reason students do not commit fraud is dominated by the view that cheating is an act that shows dishonesty. Furthermore, the reason stated is the absence of benefits obtained by committing fraud. Students also voiced their shame when they did that. Some students also mentioned the reason that the situation was indeed not possible to act fraudulently and such actions would only reduce their academic achievement.

4. Conclusion

Plagiarism, cheating, absenteeism, substance abuse, stealing, or procrastination - is a list of CAB behaviors that are mostly done. Counterproductive behavior is negatively related to student academic achievement in terms of grades and inhibits the performance of other group members. Cheating, for example, prevents students from understanding important content, while absences reduce the possibility of learning from one student with another and other work groups. Likewise, undergraduate students are involved in counterproductive behavior to meet their needs so that the need for the function and role of universities to identify these mechanisms is to determine which academic behaviors that can be reduced.

Likewise, the function and reputation of the university will be disrupted if undergraduate students engage in counterproductive behavior so that what needs to be underlined needs to be identified to identify the mechanism to reduce erroneous academic behavior [22].

Table 2 shows that students commit dishonest actions due to various factors. The highest percentage is due to helping his friend. This action is usually done for the task writing activity.

Some experts point out that academic counterproductive behavior is driven by students' affective conditions such as anger, anxiety or fear. This condition connects attention to existing work on counterproductive behavior and the results show that attention is negatively related to counterproductive because of student behavior by helping other students to manage the affective state for the better. However other research conducted in the context of work shows the nature of positive and negative influences associated with counterproductive behavior. High positive influences are associated with high levels of

energy, full concentration, and pleasant involvement, while high negative influences are associated with subjective pressures and unpleasant involvement [22].

In addition, the results of the study indicate that counterproductive academic behavior occurs because students include the names of friends in the group even though they are not involved in making assignments. Can also when entering class, helping his friend who is not present for attendance. Time is very urgent, so students do not think long and commit fraud. According to education experts, students who are academically involved in counterproductive behavior have less attention to the impact on others and tend towards academic dishonesty [23].

In an academic context, a student who has a high aggressive nature can make hostile attributions related to lecturer policy (e.g., strict deadlines for assignments) and compliance with policies. Aggressive students can conclude that the professor's policy is intended to be dangerous, not functional. This attribution of hostility is discussed in the examination of current studies in both explicit hostility (open) aggression and implicit (secret) aggression [23].

While the reason for seeing others do the same thing. Making mistakes together becomes less sensitive and is not considered a mistake. Furthermore, the reason is lazy and feels that exam questions are too difficult to make students commit fraud such as cheating on the exam. The academic rights model consists of two different dimensions. The extent of the responsibility for externalizing students who feel that they are responsible for their educational expenditure efforts to achieve the desired results (e.g., grades). Individuals who have external responsibilities feel that universities, lecturers, or especially classmates are responsible for exerting the effort needed in the education process to help them succeed. Another consideration is the extent to which students feel they should be freed from lecturer learning policies. Students who are entitled to have these hopes cause misunderstandings about the work of higher education, assuming that all efforts for learning must directly translate them into desired results [23].

Casuistic reasons such as being forced by friends to make scientific work, fearing that if they did not act fraudulently, would not get good grades, or the reason for having promised their friends to make assignments. Individuals like this have a high implicit aggression that tends to interpret the dangerous intentions of other people.

Some researchers comment that faculty often regret that some students have little responsibility for their academic success and yet expect high returns for little effort. The same student can also blame the lecturer for poor grades and various attempts are made to negotiate in obtaining higher grades. In addition, students have a tendency to have expectations of academic success without taking personal responsibility for achieving that success, also known as academic rights. Academic rights are associated with a variety of counterproductive behaviors in an academic environment. Consistent with theories that place individual differences as antecedents of counterproductive behavior [23].

The nature of higher education is often characterized by greater academic demands, thus setting higher standards and expectations. Due to the more challenging nature of tertiary education faced by students, their orientation changes and tends to take control to do something by cheating which, of course, if successful will experience success. On the other hand, the need for increased supervision of student cheating because indirectly has a strong influence on campus climate and ethics so as to prevent cheating behavior. In the academic context, direct supervision by the faculty is not always carried out but it is hoped that observations of students who wish to report dishonest actions can serve as a substitute for monitoring their behavior. Peer disapproval of cheating actions and reporting those actions can be a strong deterrent to behavior cheating, with some evidence

showing that students feel afraid if their actions are exposed by other students so this is one of the most effective fraud prevention measures [24].

Cultural perfectionism in East Asia such as Indonesia shows that students gather together to do the assignments given by the lecturers and they copy the answers between students. This action often occurs and is carried out without burden, even though the task is an individual task. This kind of action is not only done by students but also by middle-level students. They ask questions and exchange answers given by their teacher using their own smartphone. This will certainly be a problem if the task is individual. While lecturers or teachers have certain goals and objectives when giving assignments to students or students, both groups and individuals [1].

Indonesia is a country with a majority of followers of Islam whose followers are often referred to as following fundamentalism, but that does not mean they have extreme behavior. Fundamental can mean to be serious in following his religion so that dishonesty and cheating, which are immoral deeds, should not occur. Because almost all religious teachings, especially Islam forbid it. Honesty that should develop in this religious country. But in reality, corruption, which is a dishonest act, is developing in the direction of the development of corruption that is happening almost all over the world. Especially among students. Those who are corrupt are considered to have a dark personality or have a dark side to their personality [2].

Table 3 shows that the reason students did not commit fraud in certain aspects is dominated by the view that cheating is an act that shows dishonesty. Furthermore, the reason stated is the absence of benefits obtained by committing fraud. Students also voiced their shame when they did that. Some students also mentioned the reason that the situation was indeed not possible to act fraudulently and such actions would only reduce their academic achievement [24].

Acknowledgments

We thank to Ahmad Dahlan University for the financial support of this research, and also we thank to colleagues and lecturers from other universities, who help us to collect the data.

References

- [1] C. Mao, C. Chang, and R. E. Johnson, "Incivility and Employee Performance, Citizenship, and Counterproductive Behaviors: Implications of the Social Context," *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 24, no. 2, (2019), pp. 213–227.
- [2] C. R. Warren, S. E. Jané, S. Carlton, E. Kim, and M. S. Fiebert, "Validating the systematic observation of counterproductive work behaviors on social networking," *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, vol. 22, no. 1, (2019), pp. 24–36.
- [3] J. Schulte-braucks, A. Baethge, C. Dormann, J. G. Mainz, and T. Vahle-hinz, "Get Even and Feel Good? Moderating Effects of Justice Sensitivity and Counterproductive Work Behavior on the Relationship Between Illegitimate Tasks and Self-Esteem," *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, vol. 24, no. 2, (2019), pp. 241–255.
- [4] A. A. Grandey, & R. C. Melloy, "The state of the heart: Emotional labor as emotion regulation reviewed and revised," *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, (2017), pp. 407-422.
- [5] Y. Lee, C. M. Berry, and E. Gonzalez-mulé, "The Importance of Being Humble: A Meta-Analysis and Incremental Validity Analysis of the Relationship Between Honesty-Humility and Job Performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 104, no. 12, (2019), pp. 1535–1546.
- [6] Z. Yuan, C. MBarnes, & Y. Li, "Bad behavior keeps you up at night: Counterproductive work behaviors and insomnia," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 103, no. 4, (2018), pp. 383-398.
- [7] D. Cuadrado, J. F. Salgado, & S. Moscoso, "Personality, intelligence, and counterproductive academic behaviors: A meta-analysis". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 2020, (2020), pp. 1-34.

- [8] N. E. Ruedy, C. Moore, F. Gino, and M. E. Schweitzer, "The Cheater's High: The Unexpected Affective Benefits of Unethical Behavior," *Journal of Personality*, vol. 105, no. 4, (2013), pp. 531–548.
- [9] P. S. Pimentel, A. Arndorfer, and L. C. Malloy, "Taking the Blame for Someone Else's Wrongdoing: The Effects of Age and Reciprocity," *Law and Human Behavior*, vol. 39, no. 3, (2015), pp. 219–231.
- [10] P. Gerlach and R. Hertwig, "The Truth About Lies: A Meta-Analysis on Dishonest Behavior," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 145, no. 1, (2019), pp. 1–44.
- [11] M. Moshagen and B. E. Hilbig, "Measuring the Dark Core of Personality," *Psychological Assessment*, vol. 32, no. 2, (2020), pp. 182–196.
- [12] C. Pulfrey, K. Durussel, and F. Butera, "The Good Cheat: Benevolence and the Justification of Collective Cheating Values: A Way to Understand the Underlying," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 110, no. 6, (2018), pp. 764–784.
- [13] C. J. Bryan and G. S. Adams, "When Cheating Would Make You a Cheater: Implicating the Self Prevents Unethical Behavior," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, vol. 142, no. 4, (2013), pp. 1001–1005.
- [14] E. E. Levine, "You Can Handle the Truth: Mispredicting the Consequences of Honest Communication," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, vol. 147, no. 9, (2018), pp. 1400–1429.
- [15] M. N. Milla, I. E. Putra, and A. N. Umam, "Stories from Jihadists: Significance, identity, and radicalization through the call for Jihad," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, vol. 25, no. 2, (2019), pp. 111–121.
- [16] W. Yustisia, I. E. Putra, C. Kavanagh, H. Whitehouse, and A. Rufaedah, "The Role of Religious Fundamentalism and Tightness- Looseness in Promoting Collective Narcissism and Extreme Group Behavior," *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, vol. 12, no. 2, (2019), pp. 231–240.
- [17] I. E. Putra, "Representations and discourse about religion and Chinese descendants in 2012 Jakarta's election," *Qualitative Report*, vol. 21, no. 10, (2016), pp. 1799–1816.
- [18] M. Bong, A. Hwang, A. Noh, and S. Kim, "Perfectionism and Motivation of Adolescents in Academic Contexts," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 106, no. 3, (2014), pp. 711–729.
- [19] H. Xu, Y. Liu, and J. Liang, "How Religion Impacts Deception and Trust Behavior: Evidence from a Lab-in-the-Field Experiment in China," *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics*, vol. 11, no. 4, (2018), pp. 239–248.
- [20] S. J. Ward and L. A. King, "Moral self-regulation, moral identity, and religiosity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 115, no. 3, (2018), pp. 495–525.
- [21] C. Fatlolon, "Pancasila Democracy and the Play of the Good," *Filocracia*, vol. 3, no. 1, (2019), pp. 70–92.
- [22] I. T. L. Schwager, U. R. Hülshager, and J. W. B. Lang, "Be aware to be on the square: Mindfulness and counterproductive academic behavior," *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 93, (2016), pp. 74–79.
- [23] J. M. Taylor, S. F. Bailey, and L. K. Barber, "Academic entitlement and counterproductive research behavior," *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol. 85, (2015), pp. 13–18.
- [24] S. Islam, V. Permazdian, R. J. Choudhury, M. Johnston, and M. Anderson, "Proactive personality and the expanded criterion domain of performance: Predicting academic citizenship and counterproductive behaviors," *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 65, (2018), pp. 41–49.