

# The Influence of Academic Pressure, Academic Procrastination and Ability with Self Efficacy as a Moderating Variable on Student Academic Fraud Behavior

*by Zainul Kisman*

---

**Submission date:** 11-Apr-2023 11:09PM (UTC+0800)

**Submission ID:** 2061616297

**File name:** as\_a\_Moderating\_Variable\_on\_Student\_Academic\_Fraud\_Behavior.pdf (297.89K)

**Word count:** 6253

**Character count:** 34527

## THE INFLUENCE OF ACADEMIC PRESSURE, ACADEMIC PROCRASTINATION AND ABILITY WITH SELF EFFICACY AS A MODERATING VARIABLE ON STUDENT ACADEMIC FRAUD BEHAVIOR

**Murdiana**

Prodi Akuntansi, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Trilogi  
Email: murdiaanaa4@gmail.com

**Efendri**

Prodi Akuntansi, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Trilogi  
Email: efendri@trilogi.ac.id

**Zainul Kisman**

Prodi Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Trilogi  
Email: zainulkisman@trilogi.ac.id

**Dwi Sunu Kanto**

Prodi Magister Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Trilogi  
Email: dwisunukunto@trilogi.ac.id

### **Abstract**

*This study aims to analyze the effect of academic pressure, academic procrastination, and ability with self-efficacy as a moderating variable on student academic cheating. The population used in this study were Trilogi University students. The sample was determined using a purposive sampling method. The data analysis technique uses Partial Least Square (PLS) with the SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) method or the Structural Equation Model with the PLS Warp program. The data source used is primary data obtained by distributing questionnaires. The results of this study indicate that academic pressure, academic procrastination, and ability to have a positive and significant effect on academic cheating and self-efficacy do not moderate the impact of the three independent variables above on academic cheating.*

**Keywords:** *Academic Cheating; Academic Pressure; Academic Procrastination; Ability; Self Efficacy*

### **Abstrak**

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh tekanan akademik, prokrastinasi akademik, dan kemampuan dengan efikasi diri sebagai variabel moderating terhadap kecurangan akademik siswa. Populasi yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa Trilogi University. Sampel ditentukan dengan menggunakan metode purposive sampling. Teknik analisis data menggunakan Partial Least Square (PLS) dengan metode SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) atau Structural Equation Model dengan program PLS Warp. Sumber data yang digunakan adalah data primer yang diperoleh dengan menyebarkan kuesioner. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa tekanan akademik, prokrastinasi akademik, dan kemampuan

berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kecurangan akademik dan efikasi diri tidak memoderasi pengaruh ketiga variabel independen di atas terhadap kecurangan akademik.

**Kata Kunci:** *Kecurangan Akademik; Tekanan Akademik; Penundaan Akademik; Kemampuan; Efikasi Diri*

### **Introduction**

Education is the central pillar of the nation's progress. The higher the education a person gets, the better his life is expected to be in the future. The role of education is to equip not only intellectual intelligence but also emotional and spiritual intelligence. According to Law No. 12 of 2012 concerning higher education, article 1 paragraph (1) explains education is essentially developing students' self-potential based on religious and spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character and skills. Education aims not only to develop students' academic brilliance but also to form students who have a feeling by prioritizing honesty as the foundation of every activity they undertake.

However, the implementation could be smoother than its purpose. Research (Nursani & Irianto, 2013) states that the facts in the field are that there are still many results-oriented students, which has led to various fraudulent practices committed by students or what is known as *academic fraud*. In the case of cheating that occurred at the National University of Singapore (UNS) when holding college entrance exams online, many students were caught cheating during exams. They copied a friend's answer (source: news. id, March 19 2020). Another case occurred in Indonesia in 2016 at the Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta; as many as 4,937 out of 24,493 students had taken a thesis, but only some students could not finish writing their thesis on time due to procrastination (source: nu.or.id, October 13 2019).

Academic cheating is dishonest behaviour carried out by a student or students in the learning process to gain an unfair advantage in obtaining academic success (Purnamasari, 2013). Academic cheating occurs because of triggering factors; internal and external factors can happen because not all students have the same ability to digest the knowledge they gain in lectures, so some of them cannot compete with others and each student's potential. Differ according to their respective fields.

Factors that cause cheating, namely demands or pressure from close people such as parents, relatives/relatives, and friends, trigger a student to commit dishonest behaviour to achieve the desired goal, namely, getting good grades. Academic pressure is the encouragement or motivation faced by students who have academic problems in their daily lives, causing them to choose intense pressure to get the best academic results in any way (Kusaeri, 2017). The level of pressure experienced by students can influence student behaviour in acting. When students are under pressure, they tend to cheat to achieve the goal to be completed, which is to get good grades.

The following academic cheating factor comes from within a person, namely procrastination or delaying work. Academic procrastination is a delay that is carried out intentionally and repeatedly by setting aside the assignments given and carrying out other activities that are not needed in carrying out assignments (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2016). Academic procrastination occurs due to several things, including the tasks or jobs given that are too difficult for students, so that students have difficulty starting work on assignments, other activities that cause students to be unable to divide their time, and so on.

The following internal factor is ability. Ability is a personal trait or a person's ability to take advantage of opportunities in existing situations. Academic cheating will only occur if someone has the right abilities. Opportunities open the door for cheating, and pressure and rationalization can attract students to commit fraud. But students must be able to explore these opportunities to take advantage so they can commit fraud repeatedly (Wolfe and Hermanson in Nursani & Irianto, 2013).

Self-efficacy is a person's belief in the ability to succeed in certain social situations, and self-efficacy is essential in achieving goals, tasks and challenges (Suharsono & Istiqomah, 2014). High self-efficacy will encourage a person to increase his ability to get through the difficulties encountered to achieve his goals in attaining higher achievements in good ways. This can have a positive influence on student actions in determining something.

## **Literature Review**

### **1. Academic Cheating**

Academic cheating is an act that is contrary to ethics. Fraud can be carried out in various ways, such as intentional, dishonest or deceptive actions, which cause differences in understanding in assessing or interpreting something (Yudiana & Lastanti, 2016). Cheating can occur in any environment, including in an academic setting.

In an academic environment, academic cheating can have a destructive impact on students because, to achieve success, they forget the true purpose of education. According to (Purnamasari, 2013), academic cheating is dishonest behaviour carried out by a student or students in the learning process to gain an unfair advantage in achieving academic success. Research (Santoso & Yanti, 2015) also states that academic cheating can affect the quality of education in the future and make a person lack good integrity.

## **2. Theory of Fraud Diamond**

Fraud diamond Theory is a new view of the phenomenon of fraud (fraud) put forward by (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004) which perfects the fraud triangle put forward by (Donald R. Cressey, 1953). If the fraud triangle has three elements, namely pressure, opportunity, and rationalization, then the fraud diamond has one additional element that is significant in influencing someone to commit fraud, namely capability.

According to (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), many studies show that *fraud* is more likely to occur when a person has pressure to commit fraud. Weak supervision allows someone to commit fraud, and then that person can justify fraudulent behaviour. Thus, the fraud triangle is used to improve both detection and prevention by considering the fourth element, namely capability.

The elements of a fraud diamond include:

- a. Pressure, namely the encouragement or motivation that someone wants to achieve but is limited by the inability to complete it, can cause someone to commit fraud. Pressure can be in the form of financial factors, bad habits that a person has, pressure from external parties, and other pressures (Albrecht, Albrecht, Albrecht, & Zimbelman, 2012).
- b. Opportunity *is* a situation that allows someone to commit fraud and is considered safe to commit fraud. Opportunities can be in the form of weak

controls in detecting fraud, inability to assess the quality of performance, failure to discipline perpetrators, ignorance or apathy, and lack of access to information (Albrecht, Albrecht, Albrecht, & Zimbelman, 2012).

- c. Rationalization, namely self-justification for wrong behaviour, as an attempt to justify fraudulent behaviour (Albrecht, Albrecht, Albrecht, & Zimbelman, 2012).
- d. Capability, namely personal traits and abilities that play a significant role in committing academic fraud (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004).

### **3. Academic Pressure**

Research (Albrecht, Albrecht, Albrecht, & Zimbelman, 2012) explains that pressure is a situation where someone needs to cheat. The main reason that causes fraud is the pressure to meet needs and earn a profit. According to (Kusaeri, 2017), pressure in the context of cheating is the encouragement or motivation faced by students who have academic problems in their daily lives, causing them to choose intense pressure to get the best academic results in any way.

The existence of pressure from the educational environment and one's internal environment requires him to commit acts of academic fraud. Besides that, the limitations possessed by a student or students can also encourage them to achieve academic fraud. The more pressure students experience, the more likely academic fraud behaviour occurs. Pressure is a situation where someone feels the need to cheat. The main reason that causes fraud is the pressure to meet needs and earn a profit.

### **4. Academic Procrastination**

According to (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2016), academic procrastination is a delay carried out intentionally and repeatedly by putting aside the assignments given and carrying out other activities that are not needed in carrying out the assignment.

Procrastination is the most common symptom found in students who cheat or plagiarism. This happens because students who have a habit of procrastinating work have low readiness in facing exams or tests. Procrastinating work can harm the activities being carried out so that the results are not optimal.

## **5. Ability**

According to (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), abilities are defined as personal traits and abilities that a person plays in academic cheating. Academic cheating will not occur if someone does not have the right abilities. Opportunities open the door for fraud. Pressure and rationalization can attract students to commit fraud. Still, students must be able to explore these opportunities to take advantage so they can commit fraud repeatedly (Wolfe and Hermanson in Nursani & Irianto, 2013). Only people who have a high ability to cheat will be able to understand existing internal controls, identify weaknesses and use them in plans to implement fraud (Albrecht, Albrecht, Albrecht, & Zimelman, 2012).

## **6. Self-Efficacy**

According to Albert Bandura (Pudjiastuti, 2012), Self Efficacy is a person's belief in his ability to organize and carry out various actions needed to achieve his desires. According to (Suharsono & Istiqomah, 2014), Self-efficacy is a person's belief in the ability to succeed in certain social situations, and self-efficacy plays an essential role in a person achieving goals, tasks and challenges.

Self is one of the most influential aspects of self-knowledge in everyday life because the self-efficacy possessed by each individual is very significant in determining the actions to achieve a goal, including sharing thoughts about events that will be faced (Kusrini, 2014).


Based on the above understanding, it can be concluded that Self-Efficacy is a person's belief or belief in his ability to either complete the tasks given or when carrying out the Mid Semester Examination or Final Examination so that he can overcome the difficulties encountered when conducting them in the hope of getting satisfactory result.

When a person has a strong appreciation of self-efficacy, it will encourage the person to improve his ability to get through the difficulties faced to achieve his goals achieving higher achievements in good ways. On the contrary, the appreciation of self-efficacy will lead a person to a low perception of himself so that he can solve an

obstacle the wrong way because of his ingrained disbelief in himself.

**Hypothesis Development**

Figure 1. Research Thinking Framework



Karyono (2013) in (Apriani, Sujana, & Sulindawati, 2017) states that there are impulses that cause someone to commit fraud, including; financial factors, such as lifestyles that exceed financial capabilities, arrears or debts, and non-financial factors such as experienced failures, bad habits, and pressure from the surrounding environment such as achievements that are not appreciated or appreciated.

**H1:** Academic Pressure Has a Positive Effect on Student Academic Cheating.

Delays in work or learning activities due to less useful activities will hinder student performance. According to (Ursia, Siaputra, & Sutanto, 2013) (Prasetyo & Handayani, 2019), academic procrastination occurs because a person has many activities, both academic and non-academic, so he cannot manage his time properly and does not make assignments a priority. (Prasetyo & Handayani, 2019) It also said that students' unpreparedness in completing tasks within a set time limit caused them to commit plagiarism or cheating.

**H2:** Academic Procrastination Has a Positive Effect on Student Academic Cheating.

Academic fraud committed by students is inseparable from the ability of students to be able to commit fraud. Research results (Nursani & Irianto, 2013) on 292 students



majoring in accounting at Brawijaya University stated that the higher the student's ability to act fraud, the higher the possibility of committing fraud. This is in line with research (Yudiana & Lastanti, 2016), which states that academic fraud occurs due to several characteristics and abilities possessed by students where they can be calm after committing fraud, understand the lecturer's assessment criteria so that they can find loopholes in committing fraud and can think of ways to commit fraud. Cheating is based on the opportunities that exist.

**H3:** Ability Has a Positive Influence on Student Academic Cheating.

The results of research by Blachnio and Weremko (2011) in (Syahrina & Ester, 2016) show that someone with low self-confidence does not believe in their abilities, so they tend to see other people's work/writing, besides that there is encouragement that arises, causing students to commit fraud and vice versa. In contrast, research (Artani & Wetra, 2017) states that self-efficacy does not influence academic fraud behaviour, meaning that the level of self-efficacy does not reflect academic fraud behaviour.

**H4:** Self-Efficacy Has a Negative Effect on Student Academic Cheating.

Pressure in the context of cheating is the encouragement or motivation faced by students who have academic problems in their daily lives, causing them to choose intense pressure to get the best academic results in any way (Kusaeri, 2017). When students receive positive support and motivation from those closest to them, they will be able to position themselves on positive things and believe in their abilities so that they are less likely to commit fraud.

**H5:** Self-Efficacy Moderates the Effect of Academic Pressure on Student Academic Cheating.

Research (Mih & Mih, 2016) states that self-control and the perception that when the effort is carried out optimally, the results obtained will also be maximum to encourage students to be able to work honestly. That is, when students can change their mindset to be more positive, they will be able to complete their assignments without delay, so they don't have to cheat to get maximum results.

**H6:** Self-Efficacy Moderates the Effect of Academic Procrastination on Student Academic Cheating

When students have a high appreciation of self-efficacy, it will encourage students to improve their abilities in positive things. As well as self-identification of the actions they will take. The results of research (Artani & Wetra, 2017) and (Nurkhin, 2018) state that students with more abilities tend not to commit acts of fraud. Students who can control themselves better will avoid fraudulent acts, both when doing assignments and during exams.

**H7:** Self-Efficacy Moderates the Effect of Ability on Student Academic Cheating.

**Research Method**

This type of research is a quantitative research using primary data obtained by distributing questionnaires to Trilogy University students using Google Forms. The sample was determined using the purposive sampling method. The sample size was calculated using the Slovin formula with an error rate of 5% and resulted in a sample of 300 student respondents.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Descriptive Analysis**

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min		Max	
			Total Score	Score Average	Total Score	Score Average
Academic Cheating	5,689535	2,725543	1,132	4,387597	1,657	6,422481
Academic Pressure	6,374677	2,811313	1,246	4,829457	2,118	8,209302
Academic Procrastination	6,901647	2,316565	1,645	6,375969	1,920	7,441860
Ability	6,062016	2,521536	1,457	5,647287	1,723	6,678295
Self-Efficacy	8,286822	1,710522	1,889	7,321705	2,273	8,810078

Table 1 shows the average score (mean) of the academic fraud variable of 5.689535 is greater than the standard deviation value of 2.725543. Thus, the deviation of the data on the academic fraud variable can be said to be good in representing the data. Based on the distribution of 10 items, a minimum score of 1,132 was obtained with an average score of 4.387597 obtained from the Y22 statement indicating that students' perceptions of academic fraud in carrying out the act of falsifying sick

certificates to correct attendance were included in the low category. The maximum score of 1,657 with an average score of 6.422481 obtained from the Y31 statement indicates that students' perceptions of academic cheating in terms of working on group assignments only completed by a few people are included in the high category.

Table 1 shows the average score (*mean*) of the academic pressure variable of 6.374677, which is greater than the standard deviation value of 2.811313. Thus, the deviation of the data on the academic pressure variable can be said to be good in representing the data. Based on the distribution of 6 items, a minimum score of 1,246 was obtained with an average score of 4.829457 from statement X113, indicating that students' perceptions of academic cheating due to demands not to repeat courses are included in the low category. The maximum score of 2,118 with an average score of 8.209302 obtained from statement X111 indicates that students' perceptions of academic fraud in receiving student scholarships must achieve high scores, including in the high category.

Table 1 shows the average score (*mean*) of the academic procrastination variable of 6.901647, which is greater than the standard deviation value of 2.316565. Thus the deviation of the data on the academic procrastination variable can be said to be good in representing the data. Based on the distribution of 8 statements, a minimum score of 1,645 was obtained with an average score of 6.375969 obtained from statement X223, indicating that students' perceptions of academic cheating in terms of ease of internet access make students underestimate the assignments given, which are included in the low category. The maximum value is 1,920, with an average score of 7.441860 obtained from statement X212, indicating that students' perceptions of academic fraud when students do not understand the material being studied are included in the high category.

Table 1 shows the average score (*mean*) of the ability variable of 6.062016, which is greater than the standard deviation value of 2.521536. Thus, the deviation of the data on the ability variable can be said to be good in representing the data. Based on the distribution of 6 items, a minimum score of 1,457 was obtained with an average score of 5.647287 from statement X321, indicating students' perceptions of academic cheating in terms of diverting the situation during exams were included in the low category. The maximum score is 1,723, with an average score of 6.678295 obtained from statement

X312, indicating that students' perceptions of academic fraud when lack of supervision during exams is used by students to find answers on the internet are included in the high category.

Table 1 shows the average score (mean) of self-efficacy of 8.286822, which is greater than the standard deviation value of 1.710522. Thus, the deviation of the data on self-efficacy can be said to be good at representing data. Based on the distribution of 9 items, a minimum score of 1,889 was obtained with an average score of 7.321705 obtained from statement Z14 indicating that students' perceptions of academic cheating in terms of repeating the material given are included in the low category. The maximum value is 2,273, with an average score of 8.810078 obtained from statement Z31, indicating that students' perceptions of academic fraud regarding the level of satisfaction with the grades obtained by hard work are included in the high category.

Average Variance Extracted (AVE)  
Table 2. Value of *Cross Loading*

Variable	Average Variable Extract (AVE)
Academic Pressure (X1)	0.716
Academic Procrastination (X2)	0.661
Ability (X3)	0.732
Self-Efficacy (Z)	0.568
Academic Cheating (Y)	0.524

Source: primary data processed, 2021

Based on testing the AVE value in table 2, it is known that all AVE values are > 0.5, which means that the *variance* of the indicators has been absorbed by the latent variable > 50%, in other words, academic cheating, academic pressure, academic procrastination, abilities, and self-efficacy is quite good in terms of representing the indicators.

**Discriminant Validity**

Figure 2. Fornell-Lacker Discriminant Test

Correlations among I.vs. with sq. rts. of AVEs								
	X1	X2	X3	Z	Y	Z*X1	Z*X2	Z*X3
X1	(0.846)	0.400	0.614	-0.145	0.698	0.255	0.037	0.185
X2	0.400	(0.813)	0.615	0.116	0.486	0.046	0.120	0.082
X3	0.614	0.615	(0.856)	0.030	0.590	0.204	0.071	0.264
Z	-0.145	0.116	0.030	(0.754)	-0.081	-0.106	-0.301	-0.220
Y	0.698	0.486	0.590	-0.081	(0.724)	0.142	0.051	0.099
Z*X1	0.255	0.046	0.204	-0.106	0.142	(1.000)	0.627	0.690
Z*X2	0.037	0.120	0.071	-0.301	0.051	0.627	(1.000)	0.818
Z*X3	0.185	0.082	0.264	-0.220	0.099	0.690	0.818	(1.000)

Note: Square roots of average variances extracted (AVEs) shown on diagonal.

Source: primary data processed, 2021.

Figure 2 shows that the square root value of AVE (0.846; 0.813; 0.856; 0.754; 0.724; 1.000; 1.000; 1.000) is greater than the correlation value between other latent variables, as shown in Figure 4. There are 4 variables X2. The AVE square root value of the latent variable X2 is 0.813, which is greater than the correlation value of the latent variable X2 with other latent variables, which is 0.400; 0.615; 0.116; 0.486; 0.046; 0.120; 0.082.

**Reliability**

Table 3. Composite Reliability Value Reliability

Variable	Composite	Cronbach's Alpha
Academic Pressure (X1)	0.881	0.791
Academic Procrastination (X2)	0.921	0.897
Ability (X3)	0.926	0.942
Self-Efficacy (Z)	0.922	0.904
Academic Cheating (Y)	0.897	0.86

Source: primary data processed, 2021

The results of composite reliability in table 3 show that the academic cheating instrument is 0.897, academic pressure is 0.881, academic procrastination is 0.921, ability is 0.942, and self-efficacy 0.922. This means that each research instrument designed is reliable.

### R<sup>2</sup> or R-Square Test

Structural Model Evaluation can be seen from the significant R-Square. Table.

R square generated using WarpPLS 7.0:

Table 4. R-Square Value R

R-squared	Adj. R-squared
0.617	0.606

Source: primary data processed, 2021

Table 4 shows the *R-square* for the academic fraud variable (Y) of 0.617 or 61.7%. So, the variables of academic pressure (X1), academic procrastination (X2), ability (X3) and *self-efficacy* (Z) have been able to explain the variation in the academic cheating variable (Y) of 61.7%. The remaining 38.3% is explained by other variables not used in this study.

### Hypothesis Testing

Table 5. Path Coefficient

Path	Path Coefficient	p-value	t-statistic
X1 -> Y	0.523	0.001	9.151
X2 -> Y	0.156	0.008	2.435
X3 -> Y	0.201	0.002	2.928
Z -> Y	-0.002	0.482	-0.046
Z* X1 -> Y	-0.004	0.468	-0.081

Z*X2 -> Y	0.010	0.449	0.128
Z*X3 -> Y	0.054	0.252	0.668

Source: primary data processed, 2021

### First hypothesis

The results of testing the first hypothesis are the direct relationship between academic pressure and academic cheating, showing a path coefficient value of 0.523 with a t-statistic 9.51 greater than the t-table 1.960 ( $p\text{-value} = 0.001 < 0.05$ ). So, it can be concluded that the results of testing the academic pressure hypothesis have a positive and significant effect on academic cheating. These results are consistent with the first hypothesis, which states that academic pressure has a positive and significant impact on academic fraud, so the results of the first hypothesis are accepted.

This is due to the pressures experienced by students, among others, the desire to get high scores to be able to compete academically, the desire to win scholarships, the desire to get recognition from both lecturers and other students, the demands experienced by students not to repeat courses, as well as an unsupportive friendship environment. All of this causes academic pressure to have a positive effect on increasing academic cheating. The results of this study are in line with Karyono's research (2013).

### Second Hypothesis

The results of testing the second hypothesis are the relationship between academic procrastination and academic cheating, showing a path coefficient value of 0.156 with a t-statistic 2.435 greater than the t-table 1.960 ( $p\text{-value} = 0.008 < 0.05$ ). So, it can be concluded that the results of testing the hypothesis of academic procrastination have a positive and significant effect on academic cheating.

These results are consistent with the second hypothesis, which states that academic procrastination has a positive and significant effect on academic cheating, so the results of the second hypothesis are accepted. The higher the level of student academic procrastination, the higher the level of academic fraud. Academic procrastination occurs due to several factors, namely lousy time management and not

making the lecture agenda a priority; this is because students are more preoccupied with activities that are not related to lectures, such as playing with gadgets, hanging out, etc. Another factor that causes procrastination is that students underestimate the assignments given, so when the collection of assignments gets closer, students tend to commit fraud in completing the assignments given. The results of this study are in line with the results of a survey by Ursia et al. (2013)

### Third Hypothesis

The results of testing the third hypothesis are the relationship between the ability to academic fraud, showing a path coefficient value of 0.201 with a *t-statistic* of 2.928, which is greater than the *t-table* 1.960 (p-value= 0.002<0.05). So it can be concluded that the results of testing the ability hypothesis have a positive and significant effect on academic cheating. These results follow the third hypothesis, which states that the ability to have a positive and significant impact on academic fraud, and then the results of the third hypothesis are accepted. The higher the respondent's ability to commit fraud and the opportunity for it to exist, the higher the level of academic fraud.

Academic cheating that occurs is inseparable from the abilities of these students. Students can think of ways or strategies for committing fraud, especially during exams, such as adjusting seating positions, taking small notes, using communication tools, and cooperating in answering exam questions.

### Fourth Hypothesis

The results of testing the fourth hypothesis are the relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating, showing a path coefficient value of -0.002 with a *t-statistic* -0.046, which is smaller than the *t-table* 1.960 (p-value = 0.482 > 0.05). Hypothesis self-efficacy has a negative but not significant effect on academic cheating. This result is not following the fourth hypothesis, which states that self-efficacy has a negative and significant impact on academic cheating, so the results of the fourth hypothesis are rejected.

This is because a high level of self-confidence cannot guarantee positive behaviour in every action taken. The existence of other factors can be an impetus for



students to take action, such as excessive ambition in achieving something so that students justify any means to get it, the role of an unsupportive environment, such as the many fraudulent practices carried out by other students also becomes a consideration for students in taking action. So the level of student confidence alone is not enough for the student not to commit academic fraud. If this is the case, it means that the students who are the sample are primarily students who are not confident or have low confidence. Because if the student has high self-confidence, the possibility of committing academic fraud is less likely. The results of this study are in line with the study of Artani & Wetra (2017).

#### **Fifth Hypothesis**

The results of testing the fifth hypothesis are the relationship between self-efficacy in moderating academic pressure (X1) on academic cheating (Y), indicating a path coefficient value of -0.004 with a t-statistic -0.081 smaller than a t-table 1.960 (p-value = 0.468 > 0.05). Hypothesis self-efficacy as a moderator of academic pressure has a negative but insignificant effect on academic cheating. These results are inconsistent with the fifth hypothesis, which states that self-efficacy can moderate the impact of academic pressure on academic cheating, so the results of the fifth hypothesis are rejected. The fifth hypothesis is also rejected because there is no direct effect of self-efficacy on academic cheating, as shown by the fourth hypothesis above. So, the results of the fifth hypothesis are consistent with the fourth hypothesis.

This happens because self-efficacy is not strong enough to weaken the relationship between academic pressure and cheating. A high level of self-confidence is not able to change the perspective of students when there is intense pressure from those closest to them causing students to do negative things even though they know that what they are doing is against the rules. This result also shows the low level of self-confidence of the respondents because when academic pressure increases, they take shortcuts by committing academic cheating.

#### **Sixth Hypothesis**

The results of testing the sixth hypothesis are the relationship of self-efficacy in moderating academic procrastination (X2) to academic cheating (Y), showing a path coefficient value of 0.010 with a t-statistic 0.128 which is smaller than the t-table 1.960 (p-value = 0.449 >0.05). Hypothesis self-efficacy as a moderator of academic procrastination has a positive and not significant effect on academic cheating. These results are inconsistent with the sixth hypothesis, which states that self-efficacy can moderate the impact of academic procrastination on academic cheating, so the results of the sixth hypothesis are rejected.

This happens because self-efficacy is not strong enough to weaken the relationship between academic procrastination and cheating. Good results will not be obtained if students do not want to change their bad habits, such as being lazy and not being disciplined with time. The results of this study are not in line with the study of Mih & Mih (2016).

#### **Seventh Hypothesis**

The results of testing the seventh hypothesis are the relationship of self-efficacy in moderating abilities (X3) to academic fraud (Y), showing a path coefficient value of 0.054 with a t-statistic 0.668 which is smaller than the t-table 1.960 (p-value = 0.252 > 0.05). So it can be concluded that the results of testing the hypothesis of self-efficacy as a moderator of academic procrastination have a positive and not significant effect on academic cheating. These results are inconsistent with the seventh hypothesis, which states that self-efficacy can moderate the impact of ability on academic cheating, so the results of the seventh hypothesis are rejected. The results of this study are not following the results of research by Artani & Wetra (2017) and (Nurkhin, 2018).

In this study, self-efficacy is not strong enough to weaken the relationship between ability and academic cheating. The level of one's self-confidence cannot affect one's abilities.

#### **Conclusion**

Based on the results of the study "The Effect of Academic Pressure, Academic Procrastination and Ability with Self-Efficacy as a Moderating Variable Against Student Academic Cheating", it can be concluded as follows:

1. Independent variable of academic pressure (X1) positively and significantly influences student academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the first hypothesis. The higher the pressure experienced by students, the more likely students choose to commit fraud as a shortcut.
2. The independent variable academic procrastination (X2) has a positive and significant effect on student academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the second hypothesis. The habit students do of delaying the completion of assignments makes them tend to commit fraud to submit assignments on time.
3. The independent variable ability (X3) has a positive and significant influence on student academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the third hypothesis. The higher the ability of students to take advantage of opportunities, the more likely they are to commit fraud.
4. The independent variable self-efficacy (X4) has a positive but not significant effect on student academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the fourth hypothesis. Self-confidence does not affect academic cheating because the respondents generally have low self-confidence.
5. The moderating effect of self-efficacy on academic pressure has a negative but insignificant impact on academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the fifth hypothesis. This hypothesis is rejected because self-efficacy does not have a direct effect on academic cheating (the fourth hypothesis).
6. The moderating effect of self-efficacy on academic procrastination has a negative and insignificant impact on academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the sixth hypothesis. This hypothesis is rejected because self-efficacy does not have a direct effect on academic cheating (the fourth hypothesis).

7. The moderating effect of self-efficacy on ability has a negative and insignificant impact on academic cheating. This can be proven by looking at the results of testing the seventh hypothesis. This hypothesis is rejected because self-efficacy does not have a direct effect on academic cheating (the fourth hypothesis).

## REFERENCES

- Albrecht, W., Albrecht, C., Albrecht, C., & Zimbelman, M. (2012). *Fraud Examination (Fourth Edition)*. South-Western: Cengage Learning.
- Apriani, N., Sujana, E., & Sulindawati, IE (2017). The Influence of Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization on Academic Fraudulent Behavior. *e-journal SI Ak Ganesha University of Education*.
- Artani, KB, & Wetra, I. (2017). The Effect of Academic Self-Efficacy and Fraud Diamond on Academic Fraud Behavior of Accounting Students in Bali. *JUARA Journal of Accounting Research*.
- Ghufron, N., & Risnawati, R. (2016). *Psychological Theories*. Yogyakarta: Arruzz Media.
- Kusaeri, K. (2017). Study of Cheating Behavior of Madrasah and Islamic School Students During the National Examination. *Eurasia: Journal of Islamic Education Research*, 331-54.
- Kusrieni, D. (2014). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Cheating. *Journal of Psychopedagogy*, 86-97.
- Mih, C., & Mih, V. (2016). Fear of Failure, Disaffection and Procrastination as Mediators Between Controlled Motivation and Academic Cheating. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 117-132.
- Durkin, A. (2018). Analysis of the Influence of Fraud Diamond Dimensions on Academic Fraud Behavior of UNNES Accounting Education Students. *Liabilities Journal of Accounting Education 1(1)*, 1-12.
- Nursani, R., & Irianto, G. (2013). Student Academic Fraudulent Behavior: The Fraud Diamond Dimension. *Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Brawijaya*.
- Prasetyo, I., & Handayani, NS (2019). Academic Procrastination and Academic Cheating in Students Studying While Working. *Journal of Psychology*.
- Pudjiastuti, E. (2012). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior of Psychology Students. *MIMBAR Vol. XXVIII*, 103-112.
- Purnamasari, D. (2013). Factors Influencing Academic Cheating on Students. *Educational Psychology Journal*.

- Sagita, DD, Daharnis, & Syahniar. (2017). The Relationship between Self Efficacy, Achievement Motivation, Academic Procrastination and Student Academic Stress. *Journal of Bicothetics*, 37-72.
- Santoso, D., & Yanti, HB (2015). The Effect of Dishonest Behavior and Moral Competence on Accounting Student Academic Cheating. *Accounting, Auditing & Information Research Media*, 1-16.
- Suharsono, Y., & Istiqomah. (2014). The Validity and Reliability of the Self-Efficacy Scale. *Scientific Journal of Applied Psychology*, 144-151.
- Syahrina , IA, & Esther. (2016). Self-Efficacy with Academic Dishonesty in Students of Putra Indonesia University (YPTK) Padang. *UNP RAP Journal*, 24-35.
- Ursia, NR, Siaputra, IB, & Sutanto, N. (2013). Academic Procrastination and Self-Control in University of Surabaya Faculty Students. *Makara Social Humanities Series*.
- Wolfe, D., & Hermanson, D. (2004). *Print The Fraud Diamond: Considering the Four Elements of Fraud. 12(Exhibit 1), 1-5*. Crowe Horwath. 2011: Article on Fraud.
- Yudiana, A., & Lastanti, H. (2016). Analysis of the Influence of Fraud Diamond Dimensions on Academic Fraud Behavior of Students of the Faculty of Economics. *National Seminar and Call Paper*, 412-422.

# The Influence of Academic Pressure, Academic Procrastination and Ability with Self Efficacy as a Moderating Variable on Student Academic Fraud Behavior

---

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

15%

SIMILARITY INDEX

11%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

---

## MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

---

1%

★ [www.gssrr.org](http://www.gssrr.org)

Internet Source

---

Exclude quotes    On

Exclude matches    Off

Exclude bibliography    On