



**EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka):
Culture, Language, and Teaching of English**

Journal homepage: <http://jurnal.unmer.ac.id/index.php/enjourme/index>

Academic dishonesty in online English as a Foreign Language classroom

Wahyu Indah Mala Rohmana, Shofia Kamal, Nailatul Amani, Tazkia Adiba As-Samawi

English Education Departments, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim, Jl. Gajayana No.50,

Malang 65144, Indonesia

Corresponding author: malaindah@uin-malang.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Received 21 October 2022
Accepted 09 December 2022
Available online 31 December 2022

Keywords:

Academic dishonesty; EFL classroom; online learning

DOI: 10.26905/enjourme.v7i2.8827

How to cite this article (APA Style):

Rohmana, W. I., Kamal, S., Amani, N., & As-Samawi, T. A. (2022). Academic dishonesty in online English as a Foreign Language classroom. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, 7(2) 230-240, doi: <https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v7i2.8827>

ABSTRACT

In spite of studies about academic dishonesty that have been conducted by many researchers, only a small number of studies have investigated academic integrity in online EFL classrooms at university level. The aim of this research is to seek about the occurrence and types of academic dishonesty as well as strategies that could be used by English teachers to overcome the problem. This research investigated the reason why EFL students tend to carry out academic dishonesty in online learning. Researchers used open-ended questions to gain the students opinion and responses. Results of this research shows that 55.6% of the respondents understood what was considered to be academic dishonesty and in the same percentage they also sometimes conducted academic dishonesty. In exam related violations, 61.1% of them sometimes looked up information on the web to get helps or answers. In assignment related violation, 38.9% responded that they sometimes shared answers of the task and collaborated with others on individually assigned work. In online session related violations, 38.9% showed that sometimes they participated in a live session from one device and did other activities at the same time. Then, reasons why they did academic dishonesty was because the assignment was too difficult and they did not learn about the material well. All in all, most of the respondents understood about academic integrity, but they still tend to cheat. Thus, this study would help EFL students and teachers to maintain the academy integrity.

©2022 The Authors. Published by University of Merdeka Malang
This is an open access article distributed under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Academic honesty is a part of academic integrity which was created by academic institutions. A number of studies have investigated academic integrity in offline class (Rodriguez & Lewellyn, 2015; Williams & Aremu, 2019; Winardi et al., 2017). Also, other studies have been conducted in higher education by Akakandelwa et al., (2013) and Bachore (2016), but those were participated by random participants who were from English education department students. Furthermore, some studies about academic honesty have been conducted in an online learning environment, which include studies from Thornock (2013) and Chen et al. (2020). Moreover, Thornock (2013) states there are solutions that can be used for diminishing academic disintegrity in higher educational levels such as providing

students with an accessible plagiarism checker online. Additionally, faculty's technique to prevent it such as making students aware of their university code of conduct (Paulet, et al, 2016). Furthermore, Chen et al., (2020) provide explanation about its own novelty as a research paper, the types, solution, and limitation of academic dishonesty from previous research were also demonstrated on the paper clearly. Hence, none of those studies investigated academic dishonesty which is focused on online English as a foreign language classroom. This is the limitation of the previous studies which require further research from this study specifically.

Langa (2013) investigated students' attitudes toward academic honesty. The research was conducted on 60 university students in the field of education. The results of the study indicate that there is still a need for student awareness of the importance of academic honesty to obtain the competence of the study program being followed. The study only focuses on students' attitudes about the acceptance of dishonesty behavior between bi-annual exams, homework, and license papers, and has not yet described what forms of academic dishonesty may be. In addition, this research has not investigated the scope of online learning and EFL students in English courses.

The forms of academic dishonesty have been listed in the research on 43 college students majoring in English education who took theology courses. Habiburrahim et al., (2021) found the four most common cheating acts (above 50%), including collaborating with friends in completing individual tasks, copying text from books and sending it as their assignment, copying text from the internet and sending it as their assignment, and asking friends for answer during the exam. This study has not shown the frequency of each form of academic dishonesty because the researchers only provide a yes or no type of response. The research was also not carried out in the scope of online learning and EFL English course.

McGee (2013) reported the reasons that cause students to commit academic dishonesty, forms of dishonesty in the online environment, and tactics to reduce mistakes. The reasons why students engage in unethical behavior include reluctance to fail to arise from themselves or pressure from their parents, ambiguous instructional outcomes, less chance of getting caught, and the belief that others are also cheating (Chiesl, 2007). In addition, the pressure to get high scores, avoid punishment, and not be skilled in certain skills. Second, there are five forms of student dishonesty behavior during online lectures, namely misrepresentation, technological manipulation, fraud, plagiarism, collusion, and manipulation (Faucher & Caves, 2009). Third, five strategies can be used to minimize students' deceptive behavior. This includes creating transparent expectations of academic integrity, focusing on how to build valid online assessments and how to deliver them with anticipation, making clever use of technology, and using pedagogical solutions for strategy. This research has conducted research in the scope of online learning but has not researched in the scope of EFL English course. In addition, this research only classifies acts of academic dishonesty into several outlines but has not classified them according to their needs (exams, assignments, and online sessions).

The development of educational world within the integrity of technology and the spread of Covid-19 cause discussion about academic honesty in online courses need to be investigated. There are reasons why students decide to conduct academic dishonesty. Also, there are many kinds of academic dishonesty forms. Besides, strategies and methods in overcoming problems about e-cheating are ample. Those involve the construction of online assessment as well as proficient techniques that

are worth to be implemented. In this research the researcher want to perceive how academic dishonesty committed in online class and why the students carry out academic dishonesty. In addition, the researcher investigated what are the effective strategies used by teachers to control students dishonesty in online class.

This research has been conducted on academic dishonesty which occurred in online EFL classroom in university level. This study will be carried out in order to know the types of academic dishonesty which are conducted by EFL students from higher education level in online learning environment. Also, this study will investigate the reasons why EFL students from higher education level in online course tend to carry out some forms of academic dishonesty.

2. Method

This research used mixed method to describe the way to commit academic dishonesty in online EFL classroom. The reason why researchers used mix-method is because it helped the data from the research contained of quantitative and qualitative data. those data provide adequate explanation about the findings. Besides, mix-method also a newest development in research method and it is a suitable research design to strengthen both quantitative and qualitative data from study (Creswell, 2012). This study uses a closed-ended questionnaire as a quantitative approach method and use qualitative descriptive research to describe the way to commit academic dishonesty in online EFL Classroom, reasons of committing academic dishonesty in online EFL classroom and strategies to deal and prevent it. The questionnaire was distributed via Google form with 6 parts. The first part asks about institution, study program, semester, and gender. The second part contains close-ended questions that ask their general knowledge about academic dishonesty. The third until fifth sections contain closed-ended questions in the order of exam, assignment, and online session related violations with the options of never to always. Then closed with open-ended questions in the last section to dig deeper into respondents' answers regarding forms, reasons, solutions, etc.. Participants in this research were 35 EFL university students who have experienced online learning in EFL classroom. All respondents identities were kept anonymous in line with ethical guidelines.

3. Results and discussion

Each questions uses a five-point Likert's scale which is Never (coded as 1), Rarely (coded as 2), Sometimes (coded 3), Often (coded 4), and Always (coded 5).

3.1. Exam Related Violation

The researchers found that 25% students are always and often surfing the internet to find out the answers of the questions while online exam. Only 13.9% students never use WhatsApp to get helps/answers from their friend. Meanwhile, 61,1% students sometimes looking up information on the web to get helps/answers during online exam. Likewise, almost half of participants (41,7%) students rarely use notes/book to answer the question during online exam or finishing assignment. Tabel 1 shows that the students sometimes cheating during exam.

Table 1 - Students Perception About Exam Related Violation

Questions	Frequency				
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Do you as an online students taking the exam with a friend who is good at English?	2,8%	8,3%	27,8%	36,1%	25%
Do you as an online students give your e-learning account to a friend who has good English level to take the exam on behalf of them	0%	2,8%	5,6%	8,3%	83,3%
Do you as an online students using WhatsApp to get helps/answers from others?	2,8%	11,1%	33,3%	38,9%	13,9%
Do you as on online students surfing the internet to find out the answers of the questions	8,3%	16,7%	41,7%	25%	8,3%
Do you as an online students telling students in other classes the test questions and answer?	2,8%	2,8%	16,7%	41,7%	36,1%
Do you use notes/book to answer the question during online exam or finishing assignment.	0%	13,9%	33,3%	41,7%	11,1%
Do you as an online students looking up information on the web to get helps/answers?	2,8%	5,6%	61,1%	19,4%	11,1%

3.2. Assignment Related Violation

Based on Table 2, less than half participant (47.2%) stated that sometimes they write the homework in the native language and translating it into English using translation software. Almost all of the participants (83.3%) have ever shared the answers of the task as online students. Likewise, only 16.7% of participants never collaborate with other students on individually assigned work. Half of participants rarely copying and pasting information from WWW without citing/referencing it to finish your assignment. Furthermore, 61.1% of participants have ever use information from internet then translate it and submitting the translated work as your own without mentioning the source. Meanwhile, in the form of submitting an assignment previously submitted in another lesson by translating it into English, 58.3% of participants never do it.

Table 2 - University Students in Malang Perception about Assignment Related Violation

Questions	Frequency				
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Do you as an online students copying and pasting information from WWW without citing/referencing it to finish your assignment?	0%	2,8%	19,4%	50%	27,8%
Do you as an online students sharing answers of the task?	2,8%	8,3%	38,9%	41,7%	8,3%
Do you as an online students using paraphrase tool to finish the assignment without mentioning the resource?	8,3%	5,6%	16,7%	22,2%	47,2%
Do you as an online students collaborating with other students on individually assigned work?	0%	8,3%	38,9%	36,1%	16,7%
Do you as an online students use information from internet then translate it and submitting the translated work as your own without mentioning the source?	0%	13,9%	19,4%	27,8%	38,9%
Do you use information from the internet without modification and/or proper referencing, into your assignments?	0%	2,8%	16,7%	33,3%	47,2%
Taking a friend's homework and changing some parts of it	5,6%	2,8%	16,7%	19,4%	55,6%
Asking a person with good English to do homework	2,8%	5,6%	11,1%	27,8%	52,8%
Writing the homework in the native language and translating it into English using translation software	2,8%	16,7%	47,2%	11,1%	22,2%
Submitting an assignment previously submitted in another lesson by translating it into English	0%	5,6%	19,4%	16,7%	58,3%
Translating the homework created by compiling the sources in the native language and submitting it	2,8%	2,8%	22,2%	16,7%	55,6%

3.3. Online Session Related Violation

The researchers found that only 8.3% of students are never participating online learning with doing other activities (playing a game, surfing internet, going out, etc). On the other hand, 69.4% of participants never ask a friend or family member with a good level of English to attend the lesson on behalf of them. In addition, 33,3% students sometimes and rarely do not attending online meeting or leaving the session by pretexting technical problem while the 77.8% never. Likewise, 63% of students never answer the teacher’s question by using technical problem as excuses. Tabel 3 shows that students detached online learning.

Table 3 - Students’ at A University in Malang Perceptions about Online Session Related Violation

Questions	Frequency				
	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Participating in a live lesson from one device and doing other activities (playing a game, surfing internet etc, going out)	2,8%	16,7%	38,9%	33,3%	8,3
Asking a friend or family member with a good level of English to attend the lesson on behalf of them	2,8%	2,8%	16,7%	8.3%	69,4%
Not answering the teacher's questions by using technical problems as excuses	2,8%	2,8%	16,7%	13,9%	63,9%
Not attending the class or leaving the session by pretexting technical problems	0%	0%	11,1%	11,1%	77,8%

In the open ended question, when asked for examples of cheating in online classes, there were a variety of different responses. Eleven participants had the same answer, namely looking for answers in books or notes and browsing the internet while doing exams. Another response with the same 10 responses, students use social media platforms, where Whatsapp is the most frequently used, to request and provide answer sheets, discuss, and collaborate. In addition, participants stated that students can use more than one device, either during exams or online sessions to carry out other activities. There are also those who stated that they asked other people to do their work, copied a friend’s assignment without citing the source, and chatted during an online session.

Furthermore, many participants gave responses to changing the form of the exam, some answered that it could be changed into offline exams, oral exams, or live exams by using zoom/gmeet and turning on the camera during the exam. Meanwhile, other participants suggested that teachers have to increase their focus and attention on students during exams, as well as when teaching, teachers are expected to make sure their students understand the material being taught. In addition, teachers must give strong warnings to their students about the consequences of cheating. Other participants suggested that the questions given at random for each student or gave different questions, some

even suggested giving subjective questions rather than objective questions. Among the participants also responded to using more than one device where one device was for taking exams and the other for recording and monitoring students. Other participants did not know what solution they wanted to provide.

Additionally, the main reason why participants conditions conduct academic dishonesty are if they perceive an assignment is too difficult and if they did not learn about the material well. Another reason the participants conduct academic dishonesty is if they meet an urgent deadline, if they have a technical problem for example I could not connect to the assignment, but I have to finish it on time and if an assignment is too laborious.

In response to the researcher's question about the reason why participants conduct academic dishonesty, there were diverse answers from participants. Thus, 8 participants have a similar answer that they conduct academic dishonesty because the question is too difficult and they did not understand the word. participants have similar answer that the teacher only send the materials but they did not explain well and they did not understand the assignments. Others said that they did not understand the material well and afraid to get a bad score so they did academic dishonesty. Little response about the lecturer not consider the other students is cheating.

When asked about their response how would they react if their friends cheat, most of the students decided to give some advice to their friends who cheat, some of them chose to ignore the fact that their mates were cheating, for they thought it was not part of their business to handle. Moreover, there were quite shocking revelation that them blatantly stated that they did cheat and worked together with their friend during the time they were prohibited to.

The result of this study is dominated by females, with 62,9% of the participants were female and 37,1% were male. Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) mentions that gender did not play a role in academic misconduct. This study was designed to investigated EFL students from higher education perception towards academic dishonesty. The discussion are divided into several part, based on the tables above.

The first table related to students perceptions about exam violation in online learning. Harashchenko et al., (2019) implies that in online learning, students are given short time in online class, and big opportunity to cheat/dishonesty. Based on the result of the survey, three main strategies that participants used: (1) participants are always and often surfing the internet to find out the answers of the questions while exam during online learning, (2) students sometimes looking up information on the web to get helps/answers during online exam, and (3) students rarely use notes/book to answer the question during online exam or finishing assignment. Academic dishonesty is a serious issue. According to McGee (2013) reports reasons that cause students to conduct academic dishonesty, dishonesty's forms in online environment, tactics to diminish the misdoings, and proven institutional strategies to avoid the dishonesty.

According to Fadila (2022), academic dishonesty, including cheating and plagiarism, is not an uncommon thing amongst high schoolers in several cities in Indonesia. Furthermore, the development of technology in educational environment and the spread of Covid-19 pandemic have become the reason why distance learning is primarily utilized lately. The second tabel related to assignment-

related violation during online learning. Based on the form, half participants stated that sometimes they write the homework in the native language and translating it into English using translation software. Another participants have ever shared the answers of the task as online students. This behavior is acceptable as a kind of ‘helping friends’ type of relationship, even when students are on an examination where help from outside is not allowed, for it might either give them negative labelling by their peers or break their friendship (Bacha, 2017). The participants rarely copying and pasting information from WWW without citing/referencing it to finish their assignment. However, teacher can check students plagiarism using soft-wares such as SafeAssign and Turnitin.

Based on the survey results represented in Table 2, it was found that two forms of academic dishonesty that have been and most often carried out are sharing answers from their assignments and collaborating with other students on individual projects. This is relevant to Habiburrahim et al., (2021) when a survey was distributed regarding the acceptability of the forms of cheating, collaborating with friends on individual assignments got the highest percentage of acceptance, namely 72.1%. This means that students judged that some forms of cheating are acceptable and others are not. Such as the form of academic dishonesty by submitting an assignment previously submitted in another lesson by translating it into English which has the highest “never” percentage, (58.3%), the level of unacceptable is also quite high, namely 69.8%.

Furthermore, in the context of the EFL class, more than half of the participants (66.7%) had and often wrote the homework in their native language and translated it into English using translation software. In addition, only 27.8% of participants never copied and pasted information from WWW without citing/referencing it to finish their assignment, the rest sometimes and several times. This is an act of plagiarism as mentions that copying all or almost all of the material from any source and then making our work is not plagiarism. Then another form of academic dishonesty that 61.1% of participants have done is using information from the internet, then translating it and submitting it as their own work. According to Correa (2011), one form of academic dishonesty that does not appear in other disciplines is to write assignments in the native language, original or from the web, then translate them into the target language.

Continuing with Table 3, the researchers found that the only form of academic dishonesty that most occurs in online sessions is participating in a live lesson from one device and doing other activities with a percentage of 91.7% of participants who have done so. The other 3 forms of academic dishonesty provided in the questionnaire have a “never” high percentage, above 63%. The researcher saw that the low percentage of the other three forms of academic dishonesty is related to the reason they did academic dishonesty in the sixth part of the form. 11.1% of the participants did academic dishonesty because they just felt lazy. This reason has a low percentage like the other three forms of academic dishonesty. This is in accordance with ÇeliK and Lancaster (2021), where students had a high level of attitude in online sessions compared to exam-realized violations and assignment-related violations. Threats that are a factor in academic dishonesty are online sessions that took a long time and are not monitored so that they feel they can leave their devices and do other activities.

The result of this study showed that there were several forms of academic dishonesty conducted by EFL students in online classes. It includes some activities during exams such as searching answers in books, using social media, collaborating with friends, using more than one device to ease cheating,

asking other people to finish their work, copying their mate's work, and chatting during the class. This finding is in line with Valizadeh (2022) about some methods of cheating in online exams. It proved that EFL students from university level had cheated in many kinds of forms during online classes.

Furthermore, most of the participants suggested the teacher change the form of the exam into an offline, oral, or live exam. Then, teachers should pay attention to their focus when conducting exams and when they are teaching. Also, students gave advice that the questions which were given by the teacher to students should be randomized. Furthermore, the question should be created as a subjective rather than objective question. Then, the participant should participate in class by using more than one device. Lastly, lecturers should warn students about honor code to avoid academic disintegrity. This advice is in line with a solution to avoid academic disintegrity which is to inform and educate students with policies about plagiarism (Thornock, 2013). It shows that there were ways to prevent academic disintegrity from students' perception.

In addition, students usually cheat in a specific condition, specifically when the assignment that they have to finish is too difficult and when they have not learned about the material yet. Also, they did it because they had technical problem during the class. Then, it also could be caused by their assignment's deadline being too close, it showed that they had poor time management. This cause is justified by Muluk et al. (2021). Also, the reasons why students cheated is because of their fear about getting a bad score. It is in line with the reason why students cheat is because of individual factors (Holden et al., 2021).

Moreover, the findings proved that most students understand what academic disintegrity means, for they have defined it and give examples of academic dishonesty. Thus, students have acknowledged the honor code about academic disintegrity (Bacha, 2017). Furthermore, many of the respondents decide to give their friends some advice when they know that their friends conduct academic dishonesty. It showed that they saw cheating as immoral action, it was justified by the study that has been conducted by. Thus, students mostly understand academic integrity and they tend to give advice to their cheating friends.

4. Conclusion

In higher education academic dishonesty has long been a major concern. Students doing academic dishonesty for some reason, either because the question was very difficult to understand, or the teacher only sent the materials but they did not explain well. Also, students usually conduct many forms of academic disintegrity during the class. Also, in this study researchers found that students do academic dishonesty in their assignment and exam while online learning. This research contains information about the reason why the participants conduct academic dishonesty during online classes. Researchers suppose teachers are more aware of academic dishonesty. In addition, teachers can use some tools to check the students plagiarism such as Turnitin. Also, students are already aware of academic integrity and they tend to give advice to their friends who cheat around them. The result of this research can be used for English teachers who teach in online classes to maintain the academy integrity. The researcher recommends the next researcher to study about academic disintegrity which is participated by other respondents despite EFL learners at university level.

5. References

- Akakandelwa, A., Jain, P., & Wamundila, S. (2013). Academic dishonesty: A comparative study of students of Library and Information Science in Botswana and Zambia. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 22(2), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.3172/JIE.22.2.137>
- Bacha, N. (2017). Research of EFL students' Writing at two Lebanese English Medium Universities. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 17, 129–135.
- Bachore, M. M. (2016). The nature, causes and practices of academic dishonesty/cheating in higher education: The case of Hawassa University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(19), 14–20.
- Çelik, Ö., & Lancaster, T. (2021). Violations of and threats to academic integrity in online English language teaching: Revealing the attitudes of students. *The Literacy Trek*. <https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.932316>
- Chen, C., Long, J., Liu, J., Wang, Z., Wang, L., & Zhang, J. (2020). *Online academic dishonesty of college students: A review*. 156–161. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200723.121>
- Chiesl, N. (2007). Pragmatic methods to reduce dishonesty in web-based courses. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8(3), 203–211.
- Correa, M. (2011). Academic dishonesty in the Second Language Classroom: Instructors' perspectives. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, 1(1), 65–79.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Pearson.
- Fadila, S. A. P. (2022). Students' perception on academic dishonesty in a Senior High School. *Journal of English and Education (JEE)*, 8(1), 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol8.iss1.art3>
- Faucher, D., & Caves, S. (2009). Academic dishonesty: Innovative cheating techniques and the detection and prevention of them. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 4(2), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2008.09.003>
- Habiburrahim, H., Trisnawati, I. K., Yuniarti, Y., Zainuddin, Z., Muluk, S., & Orrell, J. (2021). Scrutinizing cheating behavior among efl students at Islamic Higher Education Institutions in Indonesia. *The Qualitative Report*. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.4683>
- Harashchenko, L., Komarovska, O., İätviienko, O., Ovsiienko, L., Pet'ko, L., Shcholokova, O., & Sokolova, O. (2019). Models of corporate education in the United States of America. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 22.
- Holden, O. L., Norris, M. E., & Kuhlmeier, V. A. (2021). Academic integrity in online assessment: A research review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 639814. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.639814>
- Kerkvliet, J., & Sigmund, C. L. (1999). Can we control cheating in the classroom? *The Journal of Economic Education*, 30(4), 331–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220489909596090>
- Langa, C. (2013). Investigation of students' attitude to academic honesty—empirical study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 76, 426–430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.140>
- McGee, P. (2013). Supporting academic honesty in online courses. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO.2013.1.6>
- Muluk, S., Habiburrahim, H., & Safrul, M. S. (2021). EFL students' perception on plagiarism in higher education: triggering factors and avoiding strategies. *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika: Media Ilmiah Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 22(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v22i1.8944>

- Rodriguez, L., & Lewellyn, P. (2015). Does academic dishonesty relate to fraud theory? A comparative analysis. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5, 1.
- Thornock, S. B. (2013). Proactive solutions to academic dishonesty. *Open Journal of Nursing*, 03(08), 552–556. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojn.2013.38075>
- Valizadeh, M. (2022). Cheating in online learning programs: learners' perceptions and solutions. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 23(1), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1050394>
- Williams, T. M., & Aremu, O. A. (2019). Some correlates of academic dishonesty among serial-academically frustrated undergraduates in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Summa Psicológica*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.18774/0719-448x.2019.16.429>
- Winardi, R. D., Mustikarini, A., & Anggraeni, M. A. (2017). Academic dishonesty among Accounting students: Some Indonesian evidence. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 14(2), 142–164. <https://doi.org/10.21002/jaki.2017.08>