

PAPER NAME

**8. Proseding Atlantic Press-Analysis of Student Morality and Learning Achievement at Universitas Neg**

AUTHOR

**Sirajuddin Saleh**

WORD COUNT

**3479 Words**

CHARACTER COUNT

**19388 Characters**

PAGE COUNT

**5 Pages**

FILE SIZE

**145.9KB**

SUBMISSION DATE

**Jul 20, 2022 5:38 PM GMT+8**

REPORT DATE

**Jul 20, 2022 5:39 PM GMT+8**

### ● 12% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

- 5% Internet database
- Crossref database
- 10% Submitted Works database
- 7% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

### ● Excluded from Similarity Report

- Bibliographic material
- Small Matches (Less than 8 words)
- Manually excluded text blocks
- Cited material
- Manually excluded sources

# Analysis of Student Morality and Learning Achievement at Universitas Negeri Makassar

Sitti Hardiyanti Arhas<sup>1,\*</sup>, Suprianto Suprianto<sup>2</sup>, Sirajuddin Saleh<sup>1</sup>,  
Risma Niswaty<sup>1</sup>, Jamaluddin Jamaluddin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Office Administration Education, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar 92222, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Guidance and Counseling, Universitas Borneo Tarakan, Tarakan, 77125, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author. Email: [hardiyantiarhas@unm.ac.id](mailto:hardiyantiarhas@unm.ac.id)

## ABSTRACT

Students tend to be a little unstable and quickly effect when there is news of unclear validity. Quickly effect when there is confusing news. Society expects students to become agents of change, capable of making appropriate criticisms of the government. Students often carry out activities that deviate from the community and conduct demonstrations that are often detrimental to society or institutions. This can be effect by several aspects such as the family environment, campus environment, organizational environment, and community environment. This research was conducted at Universitas Negeri Makassar with 37,594 students; because of the large population, the sample selected was 100 people who were chosen randomly. The data collection technique was carried out using questionnaires and interviews.

**Keywords:** Learning Achievement; Morality; Environment.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Age 4.0 can make everyday life easier and more comfortable because of the rapid development of information and communication technology. Society can achieve high-level goals compared to previous times. However, the development trend considers moral development unimportant [1]. Finally, they fail in their life achievements. As agents of change, students must have high mortality, which all groups expect, both the community and the campus, especially for families.

Students tend to be a little unstable, quickly effect when there is news that is not clear and confusing. Society expects students to be agents of change, able to make appropriate criticisms of the government. Students often carry out activities that deviate from society and conduct demonstrations that are often detrimental to society or institutions.

According to Lickona [2], ten symptoms indicate the direction of the destruction of a nation, namely increasing violence among teenagers, dishonesty that is entrenched, increasing disrespect for parents, teachers, and leaders, the effect of groups on acts of violence, increasing suspicion and hatred, use of language worsening, decreased work ethic, decreased sense of responsibility for individuals and citizens, high levels of self-destructive behavior and increasingly blurred moral guidelines.

This can be effect by several aspects such as the family environment, campus environment, community environment, and organizational environment.

Universities as educational institutions must pay more attention to the moral development of students. Students who only get an academic burden without moral and ethical cultivation will lead to intolerant behavior, bullying, and brawls.

Avoiding behavior that is contrary to morals is the responsibility of the family [3]–[6], College [7], [8], organization [9]–[11], and society [12]–[14]. The family is the primary school for students, who receive essential moral guidance from parents, siblings, or elders from childhood. Universities are required to create alumni who have strong ethics and morals. Organizational life acts as a second source of learning after academic college life. At the same time, a community environment is an important place for students to be able to behave well or badly.

Based on the research results of Christenson et al. [15], there is a convergence in family factors critical to student success. Then the research results of Wood et al. [16] found that the campus environment affects individuals in very different ways; students need good habits to make the right changes that might lead to a marked increase in achievement. Furthermore, the results showed that the organizational dimension was significantly related to student achievement even when the school's socioeconomic status was controlled for.

Furthermore, previous researchers, namely Bidwell & Kasarda [17], that the environmental conditions of non-white communities significantly impact the consistency of the level of student achievement. Finally, the research results of Seider et al. [18] showed that student behavior was significantly predicted by grade level, grade point average, gender, race/ethnicity, and commitment to integrity. Performance and moral character strength are unique predictors of primary student outcomes.

Now is the time for college is the right time for students to design their work-life carefully, based on morality, so that they can advance their career path well.

This research is vital to carry out considering that currently, students often carry out demonstration actions that (considered) lack respect for the leadership of the University and the Faculty.

## 2. METHODS

This research is quantitative research that uses and develops a mathematical model with the measurement process as a crucial thing that aims to test theories and build facts. The variables used in this study include learning achievement, morality, family environment, school environment, and community environment. The data used in this study were obtained from questionnaires distributed to 100 Universitas Negeri Makassar students from various faculties considered representative to measure the morality and learning achievement of students at Universitas Negeri Makassar.

Hypothesis testing is intended to determine whether there is a significant effect between exogenous variables on endogenous variables. In testing this hypothesis, the test uses a significant test to determine the null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha). This test is

carried out simultaneously (F test) or partially (t-test) using the SPSS and AMOS Programs.

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A simple linear regression analysis was carried out simultaneously to estimate the magnitude of the direct or indirect effect to analyze student morality and achievement.

Based on simultaneous linear regression analysis, the value of R-Square  $Y_1$  ( $R_2Y_1$ ) is 0.851, meaning that 85.1 percent of the variation in changes in morality variables can be explained simultaneously by variations in changes in the variables of the family environment, school environment, organizational environment, community environment. The remaining 14.9 percent is determined by other variables or factors outside the model.

The value of R-Square  $Y_2$  ( $R_2Y_2$ ) is 0.959, meaning that 95.9 percent of the variation in changes in learning achievement variables can be explained simultaneously by variations in changes in the variables of the family environment, school environment, organizational environment, and community environment, as well as student morality. The remaining 4.1 percent is determined by variables or other factors outside the model. Then the observation of the results of the estimation of the function of morality and learning achievement showed a significant effect on = 1 percent and 5 percent.

A detailed explanation of the form and magnitude of each variable's direct effect, indirect effect, and the total effect is based on the estimated coefficient values contained in the results of data processing.

**Table 1.** Regression Coefficient Direct, Indirect, and Total Correlation Variables

Direction of intervariable effect	Constant	Regression Coefficient (Direct Effect)	t-statistics	Probability	Regression Coefficient (indirect Effect)	Regression Coefficient (Total Effect)
X1→Y1	17.210	0.209	2.662	0.000**	-	-
X2→Y1		0.306	2.688	0.008**	-	-
X3→Y1		0.112	2.075	0.007**	-	-
X4→Y1		0.034	0.672	0.501	-	-
X1→Y2	3.763	0.000	0.050	0.960	-	-
X2→Y2		0.000	0.072	0.943	-	-
X3→Y2		-0.010	-2.106	0.035*	-	-
X4→Y2		0.001	0.335	0.737	-	-
Y1→Y2		0.196	5.320	0.000**	-	-
X1→Y1→Y2	-	-	-	-	0.041	0.041
X2→Y1→Y2	-	-	-	-	0.059	0.059
X3→Y1→Y2	-	-	-	-	0.022	0.012
X4→Y1→Y2	-	-	-	-	0.007	0.007

\*Sig = 5 percent; \*\*Sig = 1 percent;  $R_2Y_1 = 0.851$ ;  $R_2Y_2 = 0.959$

**3.1. The Effect of Family Environment on Student Morality and Learning Achievement**

The direct effect of the family environment on student learning achievement shows an insignificant effect. This means that any changes in the family environment will not affect student achievement.

The effect of the family environment on student morality shows a positive and significant effect, with a t statistic of 2.662 (greater than t-table = 1.984) and a coefficient of 0.209. This means that every one percent increase in the family environment will increase student morality by 0.209 percent.

The indirect effect of the family environment on student achievement through morality shows a positive effect. The positive effect comes from the positive and significant effect (t-value of 2.662 and coefficient value of 0.209) of family environment on morality. It then continues with a positive and significant effect (t-value of 5.320 and coefficient value of 0.196) on morality on student achievement.

This means that every one percent increase in the family environment will increase 0.209 percent of morality. The increase in morality will then increase student achievement by 0.041 (0.209 x 0.196).

The total effect of the family environment on learning achievement, either directly or indirectly, is 0.041. This shows that the existence of morality that comes from the family environment can increase student learning achievement.

The existence of morality instilled in the family environment will impact their achievements; with good morals, a student is easy to work with and liked by other students, lecturers, and staff at the university. The family is the first place of education for students, which teaches about good and avoiding or not committing evil. The social and psychological development of healthy children is based on shared conceptual knowledge about right and wrong, which is the inculcation of values from the environment called family [3], [19]–[21].

Morals from the family environment are actions that cannot be separated from other human judgments. The moral is an element that can make humans better than other creatures. If humans are immoral, they will only reduce the degree of humans from the aspect of behavior and actions.

**3.2. The Effect of Campus Environment on Student Morality and Learning Achievement**

The direct effect of the campus environment on student achievement shows an insignificant effect. This means that any changes to the campus environment will not affect student achievement.

The effect of the campus environment on student morality shows a positive and significant effect, with a t

statistic of 2.668 (greater than t-table = 1.984) and a coefficient of 0.306. This means that every one percent increase in the campus environment will increase student morality by 0.306 percent.

The indirect effect of the campus environment on student achievement through morality shows a positive effect. The positive effect comes from a positive and significant effect (t-value of 2.668 and coefficient value of 0.306). The campus environment on morality then continues with a positive and significant effect (t-value of 5.320 and coefficient value of 0.196) on morality on student learning achievement.

This means that every one percent increase in the campus environment will increase 0.306 percent of morality. The increase in morality will then increase student achievement by 0.059 (0.306 x 0.196).

The total effect of the campus environment on student achievement, either directly or indirectly, is 0.059. This shows that the existence of morality that comes from the campus environment can improve student learning achievement.

Educational Institutions are a forum for modern education developed to assist families and communities in fulfilling education. Schools are expected to be able to provide educational services that families and communities cannot. Families and communities put their hopes in schools so that their young generation can have the abilities needed in living life as citizens, including moral guidance.

Moral strength is needed to control reason and help so that humans can interpret their lives correctly. This is in line with the research results of Gingo et al. [19] that as children develop, there is a construction of different conceptual understandings of morals and other social norms through reciprocal interactions with the environment.

The nation's moral problems also contributed to the education process developed in schools. Education that leads to purely cognitive aspects will create intelligent and competitive individuals who lack values and personality.

**3.3. The Effect of Community Environment on Student Morality and Learning Achievement**

The direct effect of the community environment on student learning achievement shows a negative and significant effect. This means that any changes in the community environment will have a negative effect on student achievement.

The effect of the community environment on student morality shows a positive and significant effect, with a t statistic of 2.075 (greater than t-table = 1.984) and a coefficient of 0.112. This means that every one percent increase in the community environment will increase student morality by 0.112 percent.

The indirect effect of the community environment on student achievement through morality shows a positive effect. The positive effect comes from a positive and significant effect (t-value of 2.075 and coefficient value of 0.12) on the community environment on morality, then continues with a positive and significant effect (t-value of 5.320 and coefficient value of 0.196) on morality on student learning achievement.

This means that every one percent increase in the community environment will increase 0.112 percent of morality. The increase in morality will then increase student achievement by 0.022 (0.112 x 0.196).

The total effect of the community environment on student achievement, either directly or indirectly, is 0.012. This shows that the existence of morality that comes from the community environment can improve student learning achievement. However, the community environment has a negative impact on student morality.

The loss of the moral aspect will lead to uncontrolled lust that can undermine the human condition. The moral is the capital to make human life better and create a social order that is harmonious, balanced, harmonious, and peaceful. Such a situation never materializes when morals are not the primary concern during the order of people's lives.

Based on the opinion of Santrock J [22], moral development has an intrapersonal dimension that regulates individual activities when he is not involved in social interaction and an interpersonal dimension that regulates social interaction and conflict resolution.

### 3.4. The Effect of Community Environment on Student Morality and Learning Achievement

The direct effect of the organizational environment on student achievement shows an insignificant effect. This means that any changes in the organizational environment will not affect student achievement.

The effect of the organizational environment on student morality shows an insignificant effect. This means that changes in the organizational environment will not affect student morality.

The indirect effect of the organizational environment on student achievement through morality shows a positive effect. The positive effect comes from a positive and insignificant effect (t-value of 0.335 and a coefficient value of 0.001) on the organizational environment on morality. It then continues with a positive and significant effect (t-value of 5.320 and coefficient value of 0.196) of morality on student achievement.

This means that every one percent increase in the organizational environment has no significant effect on mortality. The increase in morality will then increase student achievement by 0.007 (0.001 x 0.196).

The total effect of the community environment on student achievement, either directly or indirectly, is

0.008. This shows that the existence of morality that comes from the organizational environment can improve student learning achievement. However, the organizational environment does not significantly impact student morality.

Each student as part of a student organization will have different characteristics in every respect, so these differences must be appropriately managed so as not to cause conflict. When in an organizational environment, humans as individuals will bring personal beliefs and past experiences as individual characteristics. Individual beliefs and past experiences can come from the family, school environment, and community.

Individual behavior will be different in terms of the formation of human behavior and nature because their abilities are also different. Learning occurs over time and is relatively permanent because of experience. There are only a few people who are aware of the learning process from an organizational perspective, while most of the others are persistent and tend to force themselves to be accepted, so the development of morality tends to stagnate

## 4. CONCLUSION

Based on data processing and data analysis results, the family environment does not directly affect student learning achievement. The family environment has a positive and significant effect on student morality. The indirect effect of the family environment on student learning achievement through morality shows that the family environment has a positive effect on student learning achievement.

The school environment does not directly affect student learning achievement. The school environment has a positive and significant effect on student morality. The indirect effect of the school environment on student learning achievement through morality shows that the school environment has a positive effect on student learning achievement.

The community environment has a negative and significant effect on student learning achievement directly. The community environment has a positive and significant effect on student morality. The indirect effect of the community environment on student learning achievement through morality shows that the community environment has a positive effect on student learning achievement.

The organizational environment does not have a significant effect on student achievement directly. The organizational environment has no significant effect on student morality. The indirect effect of the community environment on student learning achievement through morality shows that the community environment has a positive effect on student learning achievement.



**REFERENCES**

- [1] K. Chamnongthai, "Striving to Be an Engineer of Achievement and Morality [Young Professionals]," *IEEE Consum. Electron. Mag.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 28–33, 2016.
- [2] T. Lickona, *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam, 2009.
- [3] V. Kechriotis, "Family, clergy, conviviality and morality among the Greek-Orthodox in Izmir at the end of the Empire," *Hist. Fam.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 88–97, 2011, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hisfam.2011.03.003>.
- [4] L. Earner-Byrne, "Reinforcing the family: The role of gender, morality and sexuality in Irish welfare policy, 1922–1944," *Hist. Fam.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 360–369, 2008, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hisfam.2008.09.004>.
- [5] A. Dahl, "Chapter One - The Science of Early Moral Development: on Defining, Constructing, and Studying Morality from Birth," vol. 56, J. B. B. T.-A. in C. D. and B. Benson, Ed. JAI, 2019, pp. 1–35.
- [6] J. K. O'Hara, C. Canfield, and K. Aase, "Patient and family perspectives in resilient healthcare studies: A question of morality or logic?," *Saf. Sci.*, vol. 120, pp. 99–106, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.06.024>.
- [7] S. Hampshire, "Morality and conflict," 1983.
- [8] S. Hampshire, "Public and private morality," 1978.
- [9] M. J. Fox and A. Reece, "Which ethics? Whose morality?: an analysis of ethical standards for information organization," *KO Knowl. Organ.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 377–383, 2012.
- [10] K. Menger, *Morality, decision and social organization: toward a logic of ethics*, no. 6. Springer Science & Business Media, 1974.
- [11] J. Ladd, "Morality and the ideal of rationality in formal organizations," *Monist*, pp. 488–516, 1970.
- [12] M. Fisk, "Community and morality," *Rev. Polit.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 593–616, 1993.
- [13] D. M. Smith, "Geography, community, and morality," *Environ. Plan. A*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 19–35, 1999.
- [14] F. Inglis, "Nation and community: A landscape and its morality," *Sociol. Rev.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 489–514, 1977.
- [15] S. L. Christenson, T. Rounds, and D. Gorney, "Family factors and student achievement: An avenue to increase students' success," *Sch. Psychol. Q.*, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 178, 1992.
- [16] N. B. Wood, F. Lawrenz, D. Huffman, and M. Schultz, "Viewing the school environment through multiple lenses: In search of school-level variables tied to student achievement," *J. Res. Sci. Teach. Off. J. Natl. Assoc. Res. Sci. Teach.*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 237–254, 2006.
- [17] C. E. Bidwell and J. D. Kasarda, "School district organization and student achievement," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, pp. 55–70, 1975.
- [18] S. Seider, J. Gilbert, S. Novick, and J. Gomez, "The role of moral and performance character strengths in predicting achievement and conduct among urban middle school students," *Teach. Coll. Rec.*, vol. 115, no. 8, pp. 1–34, 2013.
- [19] M. B. T.-R. M. in B. S. Gingo, "Morality and Prosocial Behavior," Elsevier, 2021.
- [20] A. R. Pearson, C. G. Tsai, and S. Clayton, "Ethics, morality, and the psychology of climate justice," *Curr. Opin. Psychol.*, vol. 42, pp. 36–42, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.03.001>.
- [21] K. De Keere, "Finding the moral space: Rethinking morality, social class and worldviews," *Poetics*, vol. 79, p. 101415, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2019.101415>.
- [22] J. W. Santrock and J. W. Santrock, "Psikologi Pendidikan edisi kedua." Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2007.

● **12% Overall Similarity**

Top sources found in the following databases:

- 5% Internet database
- Crossref database
- 10% Submitted Works database
- 7% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

TOP SOURCES

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	<b>Y. Nadia, S. R. Nurhayati, Y. S. Wibowo. "Do bullying effect on student a...</b>	1%
	Crossref	
2	<b>Troy State University (main campus) on 2011-12-05</b>	1%
	Submitted works	
3	<b>repository.ubaya.ac.id</b>	1%
	Internet	
4	<b>download.atlantis-press.com</b>	1%
	Internet	
5	<b>Laureate Higher Education Group on 2013-05-05</b>	<1%
	Submitted works	
6	<b>tcrecord.org</b>	<1%
	Internet	
7	<b>University of Warwick on 2012-11-26</b>	<1%
	Submitted works	
8	<b>Padjadjaran University on 2018-01-26</b>	<1%
	Submitted works	

- 9

**Ahmad Tohri, Abdul Rasyad, Muhammad Sururuddin, Lalu Muhammad ...** <1%

Crossref
- 10

**Desy Krisna, Gunarhadi Gunarhadi, Winarno Winarno. "Development of ...** <1%

Crossref
- 11

**ojs.uajy.ac.id** <1%

Internet
- 12

**University of Exeter on 2018-03-28** <1%

Submitted works
- 13

**University of Birmingham on 2021-04-25** <1%

Submitted works
- 14

**gmwpublic.studenttheses.ub.rug.nl** <1%

Internet
- 15

**researchgate.net** <1%

Internet
- 16

**"The Media Institute. Television Evening News Covers Nuclear Energy: ...** <1%

Crossref
- 17

**University of Central Florida on 2019-07-29** <1%

Submitted works
- 18

**mro.massey.ac.nz** <1%

Internet
- 19

**pubs.rsc.org** <1%

Internet



● Excluded from Similarity Report

- Bibliographic material
- Small Matches (Less than 8 words)
- Manually excluded text blocks
- Cited material
- Manually excluded sources

EXCLUDED SOURCES

<b>repository.unsoed.ac.id</b>	<b>4%</b>
Internet	
<b>Silvanus Chakra Puspita, . Supriyantoro, . Hasyim. "Analysis of Hospital Infor..."</b>	<b>3%</b>
Crossref	
<b>atlantis-press.com</b>	<b>3%</b>
Internet	
<b>conference.loupiasconference.org</b>	<b>2%</b>
Internet	
<b>Universitas Diponegoro on 2021-08-03</b>	<b>2%</b>
Submitted works	
<b>University of Central Oklahoma on 2022-05-01</b>	<b>2%</b>
Submitted works	
<b>repository.uin-malang.ac.id</b>	<b>2%</b>
Internet	
<b>eprints.unm.ac.id</b>	<b>2%</b>
Internet	
<b>Sriwijaya University on 2021-03-15</b>	<b>2%</b>
Submitted works	

**Universitas Negeri Malang on 2020-03-02**

**2%**

Submitted works

---

**psychologyandeducation.net**

**2%**

Internet

EXCLUDED TEXT BLOCKS

**Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume**

www.researchgate.net

---

**654**

repository.uin-malang.ac.id