# Academic Dishonesty among College Students: Perspectives on academic Year, Living Arrangement, and Lecturer Supervision

*Damajanti* Kusuma Dewi[1*] and *Elvyand* Oktavianus[1]

[1]Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Psychology, Indonesia

**Abstract.** Academic dishonesty is an ongoing concern in higher education because it undermines the values of academic integrity. This study examined whether demographic factors, including academic year, residence, and perceptions of lecturer supervision, are related to academic dishonesty. A total of 705 undergraduate psychology students participated, selected using a total sampling technique. Data were collected through a Google Form questionnaire using the Academic Dishonesty scale, adapted from Pradia & Dewi, and analyzed with three-way ANOVA and independent samples t-tests. The results showed that student year significantly affected dishonesty scores, with first-year students reporting higher levels than second-year students, although the effect size was small. Residence and lecturer supervision did not show significant effects, and no interactions were observed. These findings suggest that academic dishonesty is more influenced by students' stage of study rather than their living arrangements or perceptions of supervision. The study also introduces residence as a novel variable in this context. The results highlight the need for higher education institutions to design more intensive integrity education for new students and to anticipate future challenges, including digital integrity and the responsible use of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools.

## 1 Introduction

Academic dishonesty or academic fraud is an issue that continues to be a focal point in higher education due to its potential to threaten the integrity and credibility of higher education. Behaviors commonly exhibited among students include various actions such as cheating, plagiarism, data fabrication, and other forms aimed at obtaining the desired academic results unlawfully. Academic dishonesty reflects the moral values, academic pressure, and social environment surrounding them. A study conducted by [1] found that more than 50% of students admitted to having been involved in academic dishonesty at least once during their studies. This reflects that academic dishonesty is not merely an individual deviant act, but has become part of the systematic dynamics within the higher education environment.

Academic dishonesty is conceptually defined as unethical behavior conducted in an academic context with the aim of obtaining results that are expected unlawfully [2].

* Corresponding author: damajantikusuma@unesa.ac.id

© The Authors, published by EDP Sciences. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Furthermore, there are six main aspects of academic dishonesty, namely cheating (copying in exams or assignments), plagiarism (copying someone else's work without attribution), outside help (receiving unauthorized assistance), prior cheating (using questions or assignments from previous students), falsification (fabricating data or information), and lying for academic reasons. It can be seen that these actions aim to gain personal benefits that not only violate academic values but also have the potential to affect the ethics and professionalism of students in the future [3]

A number of previous literatures have identified various factors that contribute to the tendency of academic dishonesty. These factors can be classified into psychological aspects, including achievement motivation [5], as well as situational factors, such as academic pressure [4], peer group norms [5], and perceptions of punishment consequences [6,7]. In the context of demographic factors, studies examining the contribution of students' years show varied results. Some studies show a significant relationship between the year of study or cohort and academic dishonesty [8,9] while other studies report no significant relationship [9,10]. The inconsistency in these findings indicates that the influence of demographic factors highly depends on the specific context of each institution or population studied, making it often non-universal.

Based on previous studies that have been conducted, gaps in research are evident in the limited contextual studies on academic dishonesty, particularly regarding the role of students' living status and their perception of faculty supervision. The limited research considering this variable, even though the living status, which includes living with family that instills moral values in individuals [5], or living in dormitories or boarding houses, can indirectly influence students' vulnerability to cheating. The rigidity of lecturers in handling cheating also becomes an important factor that influences students' moral tolerance toward cheating in an academic context [11]. This indicates that there is a need for in-depth exploration of these variables to observe the interaction of these factors with students' cheating behavior.

Previous research generally also used two-way or one-way analysis approaches, such as linear regression or two-sample t-tests, which have not yet allowed for a thorough exploration of interactions between variables. It is important to conduct analytical research with a model that can simultaneously evaluate both main and interaction effects, such as three-way ANOVA. This approach provides an in-depth picture of how the combination of cohort, residence, and lecturer supervision perception variables shapes patterns of student academic dishonesty behavior. Exploring these three variables in a single interactional model aims to achieve a more comprehensive and profound understanding of student academic behavior. The objective of this research is to determine whether there are differences in academic dishonesty scores based on the year of enrollment.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Participants

A total of 705 active undergraduate students from the Faculty of Psychology at a state university were involved in this study. Participants were selected using the total sampling technique, which included the entire population of active students who met the criteria to be included in the sample. Demographic information, such as cohort, age, and residence status, was collected to provide a comprehensive overview of the characteristics of the studied sample.

### 2.2 Research Instruments

Research Instruments Research data were collected using a questionnaire distributed via Google Form. The main instrument used is the Academic Dishonesty scale, which has been modified from the scale developed by [12] based on the adaptation of the Academic Dishonesty Scale by [2]. This instrument consists of a series of statements designed to measure students' tendencies toward academically dishonest behavior, including demographic-related questions such as cohort, residency status, and perceptions of faculty supervision. The tryout of the scale was conducted on 124 students from the 2023 and 2024 batches of the Faculty of Psychology at University X and showed a reliability score of 0.873 and a validity score ranging from 0.327 to 0.664.

### 2.3 Data Analysis Technique

This research uses a non-experimental quantitative approach. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using inferential statistical techniques. To test the influence of cohort, residence status, and lecturer supervision perception on academic dishonesty, as well as the interactions among the three, a three-way ANOVA analysis was used. Additionally, an independent sample t-test was also used to compare the differences in academic dishonesty scores between two specific data groups, such as the comparison between the 2024 and 2023 cohorts. All statistical analyses, including three-way ANOVA and independent samples t-tests, were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26.

## 3 Result

This research involves 705 Psychology Faculty students from the 2023 and 2024 batches at University X. The following is a descriptive overview of the subjects in this study:

**Tabel 1.** Demographic

| Batch | Residence | | Perception of Lecturer Supervision | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Out of Town | Home | Less Strict | More Strict | |
| 2023 | 222 | 117 | 216 | 123 | 339 |
| 2024 | 217 | 149 | 44 | 322 | 366 |
| Jumlah | | | | | 705 |

The homogeneity test was conducted in this study with the aim of determining whether the data variation in the population has the same variance or not. The basis for decision-making for this homogeneity test is if the significance value (Sig.) < 0.05, the variances of the two population groups are declared non-homogeneous (different), whereas if the significance value (Sig.) > 0.05, the variances of the two population groups are declared homogeneous (the same).

Table 2. Homogenity

| Levene Statistic | DF1 | DF2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Batch | 7 | 667 | 0.155 |

Based on the homogeneity test results, the significance value (Sig.) of the academic dishonesty variable was found to be 0.155. Because this Sig. value is greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the variances of the tested population groups are equal or homogeneous. With the assumption of homogeneity of variances met, researchers can use the between-subjects effects test, known as the three-way ANOVA (F-test), to test the hypothesis. This three-way ANOVA aims to determine whether there are significant differences in the average

scores of academic dishonesty based on the factors of cohort, residence status, lecturer supervision perception, and the interactions among the three.

**Table 3.** Results of test of between-subjects effects

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial $\eta^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 1196.661[a] | 7 | 170.952 | 1.443 | .185 | - |
| Intercept | 1117011.721 | 1 | 1117011.721 | 9426.014 | .000 | - |
| Cohort | 657.453 | 1 | 657.453 | 5.548 | .019 | .008 |
| Residence | 181.887 | 1 | 181.887 | 1.535 | .216 | .002 |
| Perception | 137.915 | 1 | 137.915 | 1.164 | .281 | .002 |
| Cohort * Recidence | 58.935 | 1 | 58.935 | .497 | .481 | <.001 |
| Cohort * Perception | 113.009 | 1 | 113.009 | .954 | .329 | <.001 |
| Residence * Perception | .029 | 1 | .029 | .000 | .988 | <.001 |
| Cohort * Residence * Perception | 24.082 | 1 | 24.082 | .203 | .652 | |
| Error | 82596.653 | 697 | 118.503 | | | |
| Total | 1353335.000 | 705 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 83793.313 | 704 | | | | |

Based on the results of the three-way ANOVA (see Table 3), a significant difference was found for the cohort variable, $F = 5.55$, $p = .019$, with a partial $\eta^2$ of .008, indicating a small effect size. This suggests that academic dishonesty scores differ between student cohorts. In contrast, residence status did not show a significant effect, $F = 1.53$, $p = .216$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$, nor did lecturer supervision, $F = 1.16$, $p = .281$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$, both of which reflected negligible effect sizes. Furthermore, none of the two-way or three-way interactions were significant (all $p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 < .001$), indicating that the combined influence of these demographic factors did not meaningfully predict students' academic dishonesty scores. Because each independent variable consisted of only two groups, post-hoc tests were not strictly necessary.

**Table 4**. Results of Independent Samples t-test on Academic Dishonesty

| Comparison | t(df) | p | Cohen's d | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cohort 2023 vs 2024 | -2.42(703) | .019 | .18 | Small effect |
| Residence (Family vs Dorm) | -1.25(703) | .216 | .09 | Negligible |
| Lecturer Supervision (Low vs High) | 0.54(703) | .281 | .04 | Negligible |

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to further examine group differences in academic dishonesty (see Table 4). The results showed that students from the 2024 cohort reported significantly higher academic dishonesty scores than those from the 2023 cohort, $t(703) = -2.42$, $p = .019$, with Cohen's $d = .18$, indicating a small effect size. In contrast, no significant differences were found for residence status, $t(703) = -1.25$, $p = .216$, $d = .09$, or for perceptions of lecturer supervision, $t(703) = 0.54$, $p = .281$, $d = .04$. Both of these comparisons reflected negligible effect sizes. These findings further support the ANOVA results, confirming that cohort differences play a role, albeit with a small effect, while residence and lecturer supervision do not significantly predict academic dishonesty.

## 4 Discussion

The results of the statistical analysis clearly show that the cohort of students has a significant difference in academic dishonesty scores. However, the strength of this effect is small, indicating that although cohort matters, its influence is limited. In contrast, the status of residence and perception of faculty supervision do not show any significant differences, and both reflect negligible effects. These findings affirm that academic dishonesty behavior in this research sample is more influenced by factors related to the students' study period in college rather than their living environment or their perception of faculty supervision

The findings of this study indicate a significant difference in academic dishonesty scores based on cohorts and align with several previous studies that examined this factor. Research [8,9] showed a significant relationship between the year of study and the tendency of students to engage in academic dishonesty, directly affirming that the duration of study is a predictor that needs to be considered. This is also supported by research [8] which shows significant differences in cheating among groups of students from different semesters. These findings prove that the dynamics of academic cheating among students can change with the level of their education.

The differences in academic dishonesty among cohorts in this study's findings present an interesting contrast to several previous studies' results. In the context of this research, first-year students (class of 2024) tend to have higher scores of academic dishonesty, whereas the study by [8] shows that senior students have a greater tendency to cheat compared to other students. A similar difference was also found in the study by [13], which indicates that higher levels of cheating occur among senior students. This illustrates that new students face high pressure to adapt to a new academic environment that is different from their previous level of education. Individual factors such as higher expectations [4], heavy workload and intense competition [14] can be the main triggers for cheating. This situation can be further exacerbated by the lack of in-depth understanding among students regarding academic rules and the consequences of cheating [6,14]. Senior students, on the other hand, tend to face different types of pressure, such as the pressure to maintain good grades and complete their studies on time [5] fear of failure [4], and social expectations [13], which can also drive unethical behavior. This illustrates that patterns of academic dishonesty do not only occur at one stage of study, but rather at every level of education, which can also be triggered by different types of pressure.

There are other research findings that actually show contradictory results to this study. The research by [9] found that the year of study does not significantly affect students' tendency to engage in academic dishonesty. Similar results were also found in the study by [10], which showed that the year of study does not have an impact on the intensity of cheating among students. The inconsistency of these findings reaffirms that the cohort's differences regarding academic dishonesty highly depend on the specific context of each higher education institution, such as culture or educational dynamics.

This study also found an important finding that the status of students' residence does not have a significant difference in academic dishonesty. Although students who live far from family supervision (in dormitories or boarding houses) are intuitively said to be more vulnerable, the results of this study deny that assumption. This reflects that the more determining factor is the social dynamics in the digital era, such as peer group norms [5], which are more dominant than the role of physical supervision from family at home in influencing academic dishonesty behavior.

This study also found that the perception of lecturer supervision does not have a significant difference in academic dishonesty. The limited literature discussing the same variable, however, this finding contrasts with several studies that focus on the effectiveness of punishment. [6] found that students cheat because they feel there is only a small chance of

getting caught and there are no severe penalties for such behavior. [15] also explained that the faculty's role in enforcing penalties significantly improves students' attitudes toward academic dishonesty. This indicates that students are more likely to reduce cheating due to the presence of effective punishment rather than just mere supervision.

This study focused on traditional forms of dishonesty; however, the landscape of academic integrity is constantly evolving. It is also important to note that new forms of academic dishonesty have emerged with the advancement of technology, particularly the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT or other automated writing assistants. While this study did not specifically investigate AI-related dishonesty, future research should address how these tools may alter students' perceptions and practices of cheating, plagiarism, and academic integrity in general.

## 5 Conclusion

This study aims to explore the differences in academic dishonesty among students, focusing on the variables of cohort, residence status, and perception of faculty supervision. The results of the data analysis show that there are significant differences in academic dishonesty scores among different cohorts of students. These findings indicate that cheating behavior is more likely influenced by the stages of students' studies, such as the adaptation pressure for new students or the pressure to maintain performance for final-year students, rather than by factors such as the physical environment or perceptions of supervision. This study also yielded another important finding, namely that there is no significant difference between residence status and the perception of faculty supervision. This research emphasizes that academic dishonesty is a multifactorial phenomenon and that prevention strategies must be tailored to the types of pressures experienced by students at each level of study, focusing on the effectiveness of sanction enforcement rather than just supervision.

## 6 Implication

A key limitation of this study is that the participants were limited to psychology students. Therefore, the findings should not be generalized to all college students, and replication with diverse faculties and academic disciplines is recommended.

## References

1. S. Janke, S. C. Rudert, Ä. Petersen, T. M. Fritz, and M. Daumiller, Cheating in the wake of COVID-19: How dangerous is ad-hoc online testing for academic integrity?, Comput. Educ. Open **2**, 100055 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2021.100055
2. H. Bashir and R. Bala, Development and Validation of Academic Dishonesty Scale (ADS): Presenting a Multidimensional Scale, Int. J. Instr. **11**, 57 (2018) https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1125a
3. P. J. Miles, M. Campbell, and G. D. Ruxton, Why Students Cheat and How Understanding This Can Help Reduce the Frequency of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education: A Literature Review, J. Undergrad. Neurosci. Educ. **20**, A150 (2022) https://doi.org/10.59390/LXMJ2920
4. M. R. Krou, C. J. Fong, and M. A. Hoff, Achievement motivation and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic investigation, Educ. Psychol. Rev. **33**, 427 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09557-7
5. N. T. Hendy, N. Montargot, and A. Papadimitriou, Cultural Differences in Academic Dishonesty: A Social Learning Perspective, J. Acad. Ethics **19**, 49 (2021)

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09391-8
6. W. Dejene, Academic cheating in Ethiopian secondary schools: Prevalence, perceived severity, and justifications, Cogent Educ. **8**, 1866803 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1866803
7. S. Sattler, C. Wiegel, and F. van Veen, The use frequency of 10 different methods for preventing and detecting academic dishonesty and the factors influencing their use, Stud. High. Educ. **42**, 1126 (2017) https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1085007
8. I. L. Daneil, T. H. Eng, J. S. Rijeng, and S. F. Kamaruddin, Academic Dishonesty among University Students: Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors, Asian J. Res. Educ. Soc. Sci. **2**, 45 (n.d.) https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32950.65600
9. B. Đorić, M. Blagojević, and M. Papic, Cheating in Academic Context–Associations with Study Area, Study Year and Country, УЗДАНИЦА **17**, 195 (2020) https://doi.org/10.18485/uzdanica.2020.17.1.12
10. M. Salehi and S. Gholampour, Cheating on exams: Investigating Reasons, Attitudes, and the Role of Demographic Variables, Sage Open **11**, 21582440211004156 (2021) https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004156
11. Y. Zhang, H. Yin, and L. Zheng, Investigating academic dishonesty among Chinese undergraduate students: does gender matter?, Assess. Eval. High. Educ. **43**, 812 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1411467
12. F. R. Pradia and D. K. Dewi, Hubungan Antara Self-Efficacy Dengan Academic Dishonesty Pada Mahasiswa, Character J. Penelit. Psikol. **8**, 90 (2021) https://doi.org/10.26740/cjpp.v8i8.41680
13. H. Reihani, F. Zare, M. Moosavi, and M. Amini, The correlation between medical students' clinical dishonesty, psychological distress, and moral intelligence, BMC Med. Educ. **24**, 1217 (2024) https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06231-2
14. J. Mukasa, L. Stokes, and D. M. Mukona, Academic dishonesty by students of bioethics at a tertiary institution in Australia: an exploratory study, Int. J. Educ. Integr. **19**, 1 (2023) https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00124-5
15. I. Chirikov, E. Shmeleva, and P. Loyalka, The role of faculty in reducing academic dishonesty among engineering students, Stud. High. Educ. **45**, 2464 (2020) https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1616169