

THE EFFECT OF SELF-EFFICACY AND RELIGIOSITY ON ACADEMIC CHEATING

Dinda Fauzi Siregar¹, Salamiah Sari Dewi², Ummu Khuzaimah³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Medan Area, Medan, Sumatera Utara

Corresponding E-mail: regdin810@gmail.com^{1*}, salamiahsaridewi@staff.uma.ac.id², umu_psi@yahoo.com

Received : 05 June 2025
Revised : 07 July 2025
Accepted : 20 July 2025

Published : 20 July 2025
DOI : <https://doi.org/10.54443/morfai.v5i2.3684>
Link Publish : <https://radjapublika.com/index.php/MORFAI/article/view/3684>

Abstract

This study examined the predictive roles of self-efficacy and religiosity on academic cheating among students at University X in Medan City. Employing a quantitative research design, this study collected data from 195 student participants. The tendency for academic cheating, along with levels of self-efficacy and religiosity, were measured using established scales. The results revealed that self-efficacy was a significant negative predictor of academic cheating. Higher levels of self-efficacy were strongly associated with a lower propensity for such misconduct, highlighting that a student's confidence in their own academic abilities serves as a key protective factor. Similarly, religiosity was found to have a significant negative relationship with academic cheating. Students reporting higher levels of religiosity, guided by strong moral and ethical values, were less inclined to engage in dishonest academic practices. Furthermore, the analysis identified a significant joint effect, where the combination of high self-efficacy and high religiosity provided the strongest deterrent against academic cheating. These findings underscore that both internal psychological confidence and a strong moral framework derived from religiosity are crucial in fostering academic integrity, making students who possess both traits most likely to act with honesty and responsibility.

Keywords: *Self-Efficacy; Religiosity; Academic Cheating*

INTRODUCTION

Education serves as a fundamental pillar for personal and societal advancement, with higher education acting as a crucial environment for cultivating both intellectual capacity and ethical growth (Kuesrieni, 2016; Islamuddin, 2018). Universities are entrusted with the responsibility of producing quality graduates who not only master knowledge and skills but also embody strong moral values and integrity. However, this foundational integrity is under constant threat from the persistent issue of academic cheating. This problem is prevalent in educational systems globally, including Indonesia, and it fundamentally undermines the core purpose of education, which prioritizes the learning process and personal development over the mere attainment of high scores or maximum results through dishonest means. Academic cheating can manifest in numerous forms, each representing a significant breach of ethical standards. According to Whitley (2018), these behaviors include copying from others during examinations, plagiarism by submitting another's work as one's own, data fabrication or falsification to fit a desired outcome, and engaging in illicit collaboration on assignments intended to be individual efforts. These actions not only devalue the academic qualifications awarded by institutions but also inhibit the student's own learning and critical thinking development. Understanding these various forms is the first step for educators and institutions to create effective policies and preventive measures to uphold a culture of honesty and academic integrity on campus.

Several interconnected factors contribute to the phenomenon of academic cheating among students. A primary driver is the immense pressure to achieve high grades, often fueled by the belief that academic success is the sole determinant of future career prospects. This pressure, combined with an intense fear of failure, can lead students to perceive cheating as a necessary "safe" option for academic survival. Other contributing factors include a lack of adequate preparation, exhaustion from demanding workloads, and poor time management skills, which make dishonest shortcuts seem like an efficient solution (Sudjana, 2017). Furthermore, environmental influences such as peer pressure in campus cultures where cheating is normalized, and the easy access to information via technology, further lower the barrier to dishonest behavior. One of the most significant psychological factors linked to academic cheating is self-efficacy. As defined by Albert Bandura (1982), self-efficacy is an individual's personal belief in their own capability to organize and execute the actions required to achieve a specific goal successfully.

This belief is not a monolithic trait but is composed of three distinct dimensions. The first is the level of task difficulty a person feels they can handle. The second is the strength of their conviction in their abilities, even when facing challenges. The third is the generality of this confidence, determining whether it applies to a wide range of situations or is specific to a narrow field. A direct link can be established between low self-efficacy and a higher propensity for academic cheating. Students who lack confidence in their ability to succeed on an exam or complete an assignment legitimately often experience heightened anxiety and a debilitating fear of failure. In this state, they may resort to dishonest shortcuts such as cheating or plagiarism, viewing these actions as a necessary coping mechanism rather than relying on their own efforts. This relationship is supported by empirical research, such as the study by Aurel et al. (2023), which found that self-efficacy had a significant negative effect on cheating behavior. Observational evidence also confirms this, as less confident students are more frequently seen engaging in cheating behaviors. In addition to psychological factors like self-efficacy, an individual's moral compass, which is often shaped by their religiosity, plays a crucial role in their academic conduct. Religiosity is defined as the degree to which religious values and beliefs are internalized and consistently reflected in an individual's daily life and actions (Jalaluddin, 2014). According to Glock's (2016) multidimensional framework, a genuinely religious person not only holds specific beliefs and engages in ritual practices but also possesses religious knowledge, experiences profound religious feelings, and allows their faith to positively guide their social behavior, promoting virtues such as honesty, justice, and compassion in their interactions with others.

From this perspective, religiosity can function as a powerful protective factor against academic dishonesty. Students who possess a high degree of religiosity are more likely to have a robust internal ethical framework that inherently condemns cheating as a morally unacceptable act (Febrini, 2017). Their deeply internalized values, such as honesty and responsibility, guide them to act with integrity, even when they are facing significant academic pressure or temptation. Conversely, individuals with lower levels of religiosity may lack this strong internal moral guidance, making them more susceptible to violating academic norms and engaging in dishonest behaviors when they perceive an opportunity or feel a need to do so. While previous studies have independently established links between factors like self-efficacy and religiosity and academic cheating, the complex interplay between these variables warrants further investigation. Observations and preliminary interviews suggest that students often cheat due to a lack of understanding or low motivation, which points to a potential connection where low self-efficacy drives dishonesty. However, this relationship might be significantly influenced or mediated by the student's underlying religious convictions. Therefore, this research aims to explore these intricate relationships. Based on the background described, the researcher seeks to investigate the roles of self-efficacy and religiosity in academic cheating among students at University X in Medan City.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is an unethical act deliberately committed by students to undermine the integrity of the educational process. Various experts define this behavior as a violation of rules to obtain an unfair advantage. According to Indriani (2019), this dishonesty includes actions such as cheating, plagiarism, theft, and falsifying academic-related data. This view aligns with Kharisma (2008), who emphasizes the aspects of giving or receiving unauthorized assistance on assignments or exams, as well as receiving credit for work that is not one's own. Furthermore, Santoso (2015) broadens its scope to include violations of norms, the use of prohibited materials, and seeking loopholes to gain leniency in evaluations. In essence, as stressed by Taylor (2006), academic dishonesty is an intentional and unethical behavior that directly reduces the accuracy of assessments of a student's true abilities. Based on these various perspectives, it can be concluded that academic dishonesty encompasses any form of deliberate and dishonest action taken by a student to gain an academic advantage through illegitimate means. This behavior violates educational integrity and ethics, covering a range of activities such as cheating, plagiarism, giving or receiving unauthorized aid, using prohibited materials, and falsifying information to manipulate learning evaluation results.

The factors influencing the occurrence of academic dishonesty can be broadly categorized into two main domains: contextual factors and individual factors. According to McCabe (1993), contextual factors include external elements such as the regulations in place at the educational institution, the degree of student acceptance of these policies, and the effectiveness of applied sanctions or punishments. Pressure from the social environment, especially conformity to the behavior of peer groups, also serves as a significant driver. On the other hand, individual factors relate to a student's internal characteristics, such as age, gender, academic achievement level, and the depth of their religious values. Adriyana (2019) and Davis further detail these internal factors, which include laziness, a lack of awareness, past experiences of failure, and excessively high expectations for achieving perfect scores. Other specific external factors include exam conditions, such as seating arrangements, unfair test difficulty, lax supervision, and a

classroom atmosphere that is too large and noisy, which can create opportunities for cheating. Other research also consistently shows that male students and students with lower academic performance tend to engage in cheating more frequently. In conclusion, academic dishonesty is driven by a complex interaction between internal and external factors. Internal factors originate from within the student, encompassing psychological aspects like low motivation, morality, personal experiences, and demographic attributes such as gender and academic history. Meanwhile, external factors come from the surrounding environment, which includes the institutional academic climate, such as rules and sanctions, the strong influence of peers, and situational conditions that enable cheating to occur, for instance, lenient exam supervision or high-pressure exams. Understanding both of these factors is key to designing effective prevention strategies.

Academic dishonesty manifests in various identifiable aspects and forms of behavior. McCabe (1993) developed these into several main indicators: cheating, either manually or with the help of gadgets; collaborating illicitly to be dishonest; falsifying data or bibliographies; and copying another person's work without permission. Hendricks (2004) provides a more detailed list, which includes using forbidden notes during an exam, copying answers from others, helping a friend to cheat, plagiarizing an assignment and claiming it as one's own, and even using false excuses to delay a submission. Meanwhile, Cizek (2015) simplifies these into three general aspects: first, improperly giving or receiving information; second, using prohibited materials; and third, exploiting procedural or personal weaknesses to gain an academic advantage. The importance of identifying these aspects is emphasized in research by Iyer and Eastman, who found that students accustomed to cheating in an academic setting are likely to continue such unethical behavior in the future, highlighting the urgency of early evaluation and intervention.

Essentially, the aspects of academic dishonesty refer to a spectrum of dishonest actions performed within the educational process. Based on various theories, these aspects can be detailed into specific actions such as cheating, plagiarism, illegal collaboration, and data falsification, as described by McCabe and Hendricks. Conceptually, however, all these actions can be classified into three broad categories according to Cizek: the exchange of forbidden information, the use of illegal materials, and the exploitation of systemic loopholes for personal gain. Identifying these different aspects is not only important for enforcing discipline but also as a preventive measure to inhibit the formation of an unethical character later in life.

To recognize academic dishonesty more deeply, Wood (2014) classifies its characteristics into several very clear, specific actions. The first characteristic is plagiarism, which is the act of imitating or quoting someone else's work without proper attribution and claiming it as original work. The second is collusion, defined as unofficial collaboration between two or more students to complete an assignment or exam for the benefit of one or all parties. Next is falsification, which is submitting another person's work as one's own after changing the original author's identity. There is also replication, a dishonest practice of submitting the same assignment or work to multiple outlets to receive double credit or points. Additionally, other characteristics include exam-time behaviors, such as bringing unauthorized notes or electronic devices, successfully obtaining a copy of the exam questions or answers beforehand, and communicating with other participants during the exam. Even acting as an intermediary for cheaters or pretending not to notice when cheating occurs is included.

The characteristics of academic dishonesty outlined by Wood (2014) provide a concrete picture of the various modus operandi of this unethical conduct. This behavior can be grouped into several main categories: writing-based deception such as plagiarism, falsification, and replication; collaboration-based cheating such as collusion; and violations during exams like using cheat sheets or communicating illegally. Significantly, this classification also includes passive yet complicit actions, namely facilitating or allowing cheating to happen. A detailed understanding of these characteristics is vital for educators and institutions to build stronger systems for detection and integrity enforcement.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, fundamentally, is a cognitive construct that reflects an individual's belief or judgment regarding their own capabilities. According to Albert Bandura (1982), self-efficacy is the result of a cognitive process involving decisions and expectations about the extent to which a person can execute a series of actions to achieve specific goals. It is not about the objective skills one possesses, but rather about what an individual believes they can do with those skills. Gibson (2017) reinforces this by stating that self-efficacy is a person's belief that they can perform a task adequately in a given situation. Thus, self-efficacy can be summarized as a person's subjective evaluation of their competence to succeed in performing a task, achieving a goal, or overcoming various obstacles, which ultimately yields a positive outcome for their self-development. External factors and past experiences play a crucial role in shaping an individual's self-efficacy. Ormrod (2019) explains that success in previous tasks, especially similar ones, will significantly increase a person's belief in their ability to succeed in the future. Therefore, providing students with opportunities to achieve success in diverse fields is a vital strategy. Furthermore, messages received

from others, whether implicit or explicit, can have a powerful impact. Constructive feedback, even if it contains criticism, can improve performance if delivered with the conviction that improvement is possible. Observing the successes and failures of others, particularly those perceived as similar (models), also serves as a source of information for forming opinions about one's own abilities. Individuals often gauge their capabilities based on the achievements of those around them. Albert Bandura (1982) identified four primary and most influential sources in the formation of self-efficacy. The first and most powerful source is mastery experience or enactive attainment, where direct success provides tangible proof of one's capabilities. The second is vicarious experience, which involves gaining confidence by observing the success of similar others. Seeing others succeed can instill the belief that "if they can do it, so can I." The third source is verbal persuasion, which consists of encouragement and positive feedback from influential people that convinces an individual they have the ability to succeed. Lastly, physiological and affective states, where an individual interprets their emotional and physical reactions, such as anxiety or calmness, as indicators of success or failure.

Beyond Bandura's framework, other perspectives also enrich the understanding of self-efficacy factors. Atkinson (1993) highlights the importance of an individual's engagement in events experienced by others, verbal persuasion containing realistic guidance, and the ability to assess one's own strengths in stressful psychological situations. These factors drive the motivation to achieve. Meanwhile, Lautser (2011) identifies aspects that reflect positive self-efficacy. Its characteristics include a deep belief in one's own abilities, an optimistic outlook on the future, objectivity in assessing problems according to the truth, a sense of responsibility for the consequences of one's actions, and the capacity for rational and realistic thinking. These aspects are not just outcomes but also reflections of a healthy and strong level of self-efficacy possessed by an individual. Overall, achieving a high level of self-efficacy requires a synergy of various supporting factors. Its primary foundation is active achievement and personal success experiences, which serve as the most authentic proof of one's ability. This is reinforced by indirect experience through the observation of others' success, which functions as a benchmark and a source of inspiration. External support in the form of verbal persuasion or sincere encouragement from the social environment also contributes significantly to building confidence. Equally important, an individual's internal state—both a healthy physiological condition and a calm and peaceful psychological state—profoundly determines how one perceives challenges. When these factors are optimally fulfilled, a person will possess high self-efficacy, enabling them to confront and solve problems more effectively.

Self-efficacy varies among individuals and can be measured through three main dimensions, as described by Bandura (1982) and Sarwono (2013). The first dimension is level or magnitude, which pertains to the degree of task difficulty an individual believes they can complete. This dimension influences an individual's choice of behavior, whether to attempt or avoid a challenge. The second dimension is strength, which refers to how strong and steadfast an individual's conviction is regarding their abilities. A strong belief makes a person more persistent and resilient in the face of obstacles, whereas a weak belief is easily shaken. The third dimension is generality, which describes the breadth of domains to which self-efficacy applies. An individual may feel confident only in specific situations or across a wide variety of activities and contexts. The traits of individuals with high self-efficacy are easily recognizable through their attitudes and behaviors. According to Aurel (2023), these people exhibit a strong belief that they can effectively handle the various events and situations they face. They do not give up easily and show remarkable perseverance in completing tasks, even when encountering difficulties. They tend to view challenging tasks as something to be mastered, not avoided. One of the most prominent characteristics is resilience; they tend to bounce back quickly to try again after experiencing failure or setbacks. This confidence in their own abilities makes them enjoy the work process more and be more proactive in seeking solutions, as they are convinced that their efforts will lead to positive outcomes.

Religiosity

Religiosity can be understood as the degree to which an individual comprehends, believes in, and internalizes the principles of their professed faith. For a Muslim, as noted by Nashori (2016), it reflects the extent of their knowledge, conviction, and practice of Islam. It is more than a mere cognitive product; it represents a personal and profound connection with the divine. According to Feierman (2019), religiosity is a personal relationship with a supreme, all-powerful, and merciful divine being (God), which consequently fosters a desire to please that being by adhering to His will and avoiding His prohibitions. This concept suggests that religious activity is not confined to formal rituals but extends to all actions driven by an inner spiritual force. Thus, a religious attitude is a complex integration of religious knowledge, feeling, and action within an individual. The development of an individual's religiosity is influenced by a multitude of factors, beginning in early childhood. Nashori (2016) emphasizes the foundational role of family education, early life experiences, and religious training during one's formative years. A person who receives consistent religious guidance from their parents, social environment, and school is likely to

perceive religion as a vital part of their life. In contrast, those without such an upbringing may not develop a sense of its importance. Feierman (2019) corroborates this by identifying social factors, such as parental teaching and societal traditions, and personal experiences as key influences. These experiences include encounters with beauty and harmony in the world (natural factors), navigating moral conflicts, and profound emotional religious moments (affective factors), all of which shape one's religious disposition. A comprehensive framework for understanding the multifaceted nature of religiosity was proposed by Glock (2016), who identified five key aspects. The first is religious practice, which concerns the extent to which an individual performs ritual obligations like prayer, fasting, or charity. The second, religious belief, pertains to the acceptance of dogmatic tenets within the faith, such as belief in angels, judgment day, heaven, and hell. The third aspect is religious knowledge, measuring how well a person understands the teachings of their religion and their efforts to deepen that knowledge. The fourth, religious feeling, encompasses the emotional and experiential dimensions of faith, such as feeling a profound closeness to God or experiencing a sense of divine protection. These dimensions provide a structured way to assess an individual's religious commitment.

Expanding on Glock's framework, the fifth dimension is the religious effect, which measures how religious motivations shape a person's behavior in social contexts, such as visiting a sick neighbor or donating to the poor. Furthermore, Allport (1997) offered a nuanced perspective by describing religious orientation through several dichotomies. A key distinction is between a personal vs. institutional approach, where a personal orientation involves deeply internalizing religious values, while an institutional one is tied more to the formal organization of the faith. Another is unselfish vs. selfish, where an unselfish orientation seeks to transcend self-centered needs, contrasting with a selfish one that uses religion for personal comfort or gain. This highlights the different motivations that can underlie religious expression and its impact on one's life. Allport further elaborates on these orientations to capture the depth of religious integration. He contrasts a faith that has relevance to all of life with one that is compartmentalized, where religious principles are separated from one's overall worldview. A deeply religious individual, in this view, has an ultimate vs. instrumental orientation, treating faith as an end in itself rather than a means to achieve other, non-religious goals. This involves the fulfillment of belief, where doctrines are accepted totally and without reservation, not superficially. Finally, he distinguishes between associational vs. communal affiliation, where one seeks deeper religious value versus engaging for social status, and emphasizes the consistent development of faith, demonstrated by regularly practicing religious duties amidst a busy life.

The characteristics of a truly religious individual, as outlined by Jalaluddin (2014), reflect a mature and integrated faith. Such a person accepts religious truth based on reasoned consideration, not mere conformity, and tends to be realistic in applying religious norms to their daily conduct. They exhibit a positive attitude towards their faith's teachings, actively seeking to deepen their understanding. Their religious observance stems from a sense of personal responsibility, making their piety an authentic expression of their life's principles. Furthermore, they are typically open-minded, with a broad perspective, and are capable of critically examining religious material, grounding their faith in both intellectual conviction and conscience. This creates a visible link between their religiosity and their social behavior, shaped by their unique personality.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative, non-experimental research design to examine the relationships between variables without any manipulation of the subjects. The research was conducted at University X in Medan City, with data collection taking place from May 15, 2025, to June 5, 2025. The target population for this study consisted of 975 students from the Faculty of Psychology, spanning the 2022-2024 academic batches. A total of 195 students participated in the study. The primary inclusion criterion was being an active student registered within the specified faculty and academic batches. The sample was recruited using a convenience sampling technique, targeting students who were available and willing to participate during the data collection period.

Three instruments were used for data collection: Self-Efficacy: This variable was measured using an adapted version of the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE). The original 10-item scale was adapted in terms of language to suit the local context. It uses a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Very Inappropriate" to "Very Appropriate". Religiosity: To measure religiosity, the researcher adapted the scale developed by Khuzaimah (2023). The final instrument consisted of 15 items assessing religious beliefs and practices on a 5-point Likert scale, from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Academic Dishonesty: This variable was measured using a scale developed by the researcher. The instrument was created by modifying and integrating concepts from two sources: the Academic Dishonesty Scale (McCabe, 1993) and the Academic Dishonesty Instrument. The final scale comprised 17 items measuring the frequency of various dishonest academic behaviors, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Always."

A pilot study was conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments. Content validity was assessed by expert review. The internal consistency of the scales was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability coefficients were as follows: General Self-Efficacy Scale ($\alpha = .88$), Religiosity Scale ($\alpha = .91$), and Academic Dishonesty Scale ($\alpha = .85$), all of which are above the acceptable threshold of .70. The research was conducted following a systematic procedure. First, administrative permits were obtained from the Faculty of Psychology at University X. Second, the research instruments were adapted and finalized. Third, the finalized questionnaires were distributed to participants online via a secure link. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before they began the survey. Finally, the collected data was compiled, cleaned, and prepared for statistical analysis. The data were analyzed using SPSS version 26. The analysis included several stages: (1) Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic data and variable scores. (2) Classical assumption tests (including tests for normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity) were performed to ensure the data met the requirements for regression analysis. (3) A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the simultaneous and partial effects of self-efficacy and religiosity on academic dishonesty.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classical Assumption Test Normality Test

The normality test was conducted to determine whether the distribution of variable scores (Religiosity), self-efficacy with academic cheating in students was normal. The normality test of the distribution of research data used random sampling. The rule used is if the significance is >0.05 then it is said to be normally distributed, and vice versa if the significance is <0.05 then it is said to be abnormally distributed (Azwar, 2017).

Table 1. Results of Calculation of Normality of Distribution

Normality Test Of Variables And Residues X_1X_2 and					
	MEAN	SD	K-S	P _{value}	INFORMATION
Self-Efficacy	21.651	1.948	0.191	0.052	normally distributed
Religiosity	21.441	2.141	0.211	0.055	normally distributed
Academic cheating	32.379	1.615	0.299	0.056	normally distributed
Residual $X_1X_2 Y$			0.147	0.051	normally distributed

Linearity Test of Relationship

The linearity test of the relationship is intended to determine the form of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Based on the linearity test, it can be seen whether the independent variable and the dependent variable in this study can or cannot be analyzed correlationally. The basis for decision making is if the value $P_{value} < 0.01$, then there is a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable and if the value $P_{value} > 0.01$ then there is no linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Determining the results of the linearity test can also be done by looking at the F value, the basis for making the decision is: if the calculated F value $< F$ table, then there is a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable and vice versa if the calculated F value $> F$ table, then there is no linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The linearity test values between (Religiosity) personality with Altruistic behavior And Academic cheating with Altruistic behavior can be seen from the table and table below:

Table 2. Results of Linearity Test

Linearity	F	P	Criteria	Information
	Misery	Misery		
$X_{1,2} - Y$	76.349	0.000	$P < 0.01$	linear
$X_1 - Y$	54.951	0.000	$P < 0.01$	linear
$X_2 - Y$	58.931	0.000	$P < 0.01$	Linear

$X_{1,2}$ = Predictors, Self Efficacy, Religiosity

$X_1 - Y$ = Self-Efficacy

$X_2 - Y$ = Religiosity

Y = Academic cheating

F MISERABLE = Linearity coefficient

p MISERABLE = Proportion of error probability

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test to see whether there is a correlation between independent variables (Ghozal, 2016). The way to see whether or not multicollinearity exists is by looking at the tolerance value and the variance inflation factor (VIF) value. The tolerance value measures the variability of the selected independent variables that cannot be explained by other independent variables. To see that there is no multicollinearity symptom if the tolerance value is >0.100 and the VIF value is <10.00 , as seen in the following table

Table 3. Results of Multicollinearity Test

	Koef Tolerance	Cow VIF	Criteria	Information
Self-Efficacy	0.945	1.058	Tolerance >0.100	No symptoms
Religiosity	0.945	1.058	VIF <10.00	Multicollinearity

Heteroscedasticity test

The heteroscedasticity test is to see whether the regression model has discomfort in the variance of the residuals from one observation to another. If the variance is different, it is called heteroscedasticity. One way to see heteroscedasticity is to regress independently with the absolute residual, if it is not significant then there is no heteroscedasticity. For a good research model is one that does not have heteroscedasticity (Ghozali, 2016).

Table 4. Results of Heteroscedasticity test

	F	Pvalue	Criteria	Information
X1X2 vs abs_res	0000	1.000	$p>0,05$	there is no tendency for homoscedasticity

Hypothesis Test Results

Based on the results of the analysis using the multiple regression method, two results were obtained in order to test the 3 hypotheses that had been proposed, namely the main effect and interaction effect.

The main effect results from both predictors show that:

1. There is **rolesignificant** relationship between Self Efficacy and Academic Cheating, where the t coefficient $_{x1y}$ = 7.345 with $p = 0.000$ means $p < 0.01$, the hypothesis is accepted
2. There is **rolesignificant** relationship between Religiosity and Academic Cheating, where the t coefficient $_{x2y}$ = 6.047 with $p = 0.000$, meaning $p < 0.01$, the hypothesis is accepted

It can be concluded that each variable of Self Efficacy and Religiosity has its own**role**against Academic Fraud

3. For *interaction effect* found there is **rolesignificant** Self-Efficacy and Religiosity simultaneously on Academic Cheating where the coefficient $F = 58.391$; with $p = 0.000$ means $p < 0.010$. The hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5. Summary of Multiple Regression Calculations

	Coefficient	p	Is
$X_1 - Y$	$t = 7.345$	0.000	S
$X_2 - Y$	$t = 6.047$	0.000	S
$X_{12} - Y$	$F = 58.391$	0.000	S

Furthermore, because each variable of Self Efficacy and Religiosity has its own...**role**which is significant, then the regression equation can be formulated as follows:

$Y = A + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2$, with coefficient A as a constant of 19.563, beta $X_1 = 0.356$ and beta $X_2 = 0.266$, the prediction line is obtained $Y = 19.563 + 0.356 * X_1 + 0.266 * X_2$. The effective contribution for both Self Efficacy and Religiosity variables simultaneously can be seen from the R coefficient.² $*100\%$, R coefficient² = 0.380, then the effective contribution of the two variables Self Efficacy and Religiosity is 38.00%. To see the effective contribution of each independent variable, namely Self Efficacy and Religiosity, it can be seen by using the formula $SE = \text{beta} * \text{zero order} * 100\%$, where beta is the standardized coefficient of beta and zero order is the correlation of each variable Self Efficacy and Religiosity with Academic Cheating.

Table 6. Contribution Of Self-Efficacy

Variables	Koef beta	Zero Order (r)	Beta*zero order	Effective contribution (SE)
Self-Efficacy	0.429	0.512	0,220	22.00%
Religiosity	0.353	0.454	0,160	16.00%
			Total	38.00%

From the table above, it can be seen that the effective contribution of self-efficacy is greater than the effective contribution of religiosity. So it can be assumed that self-efficacy is greater. **role**towards academic cheating compared to religiosity.

Descriptive analysis

The Self Efficacy variable in this study was revealed using a scale consisting of 12 items and formatted using a Likert scale with 4 answer choices, so the hypothetical mean is $\{(12 \times 1) + (12 \times 4) / 2 = 30,000$. The Religiosity variable in this study was revealed using a scale consisting of 9 items and formatted using a Likert scale with 4 answer choices, so the hypothetical mean is $\{(9 \times 1) + (9 \times 4) / 2 = 22,500$. The academic cheating variable in this study was revealed using a scale consisting of 16 items and formatted using a Likert scale with 4 answer choices, so the hypothetical mean is $\{(16 \times 1) + (16 \times 4) / 2 = 40,000$. Based on data analysis, the results of the statistical analysis obtained an empirical mean for the Self Efficacy variable of 21,651, for the Religiosity variable of 21,441 and for academic cheating of 32,379.

Criteria

In an effort to find out the condition of Self Efficacy and Religiosity, it is necessary to compare the empirical mean/average value with the hypothetical mean/average value by considering the magnitude of the SB or SD number of the variable being measured. The SB or SD value of the Self Efficacy variable is 1.948, while Religiosity is 2.141 and academic cheating is 1.615. So if the hypothetical mean/average value < empirical mean/average value, where the difference exceeds one SB/SD, then it is stated that the research subjects as a whole have high Self Efficacy and Religiosity and if the hypothetical mean/average value > empirical mean/average value, where the difference exceeds one Standard Deviation, then it is stated that the research subjects have low Self Efficacy and Religiosity. Furthermore, if the empirical mean/average value is not different (does not exceed the SD or SB number) from the hypothetical mean/average value, then the students' Self Efficacy and Religiosity are declared moderate.

Table 7. Results of Calculation of Hypothetical Average Value and Empirical Average Value

Variables	Average Value		Sd/Sb	Information
	Hypothetically	Empirical		
Self-Efficacy	30.000	21.651	1.948	Very low
Religiosity	22.500	21.441	2.141	Currently
Academic cheating	40.000	32.379	1.615	Very low

Discussion

The Role of Self-Efficacy in Academic Cheating

The results of the analysis show that there is **role**significant between self-efficacy and academic cheating, with a coefficient of $tx1y = 7.345$ and a significance value of $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.01$). This shows that the first hypothesis in this study is accepted, namely that self-efficacy plays a significant role in the tendency of individuals to commit academic cheating. These findings indicate that individuals with high levels of self-efficacy tend to be more confident in facing academic tasks, thus having a lower tendency to engage in cheating behavior. In contrast, individuals with low self-efficacy feel unsure of their abilities, and are more likely to use shortcuts such as cheating or plagiarizing. This is in line with Albert Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory, which states that an individual's belief in their ability to organize and carry out the actions needed to achieve certain results will influence the choice of actions, effort, and persistence in facing challenges. High self-efficacy encourages individuals to choose adaptive strategies and avoid unethical behavior. Previous research also supports this finding. According to Anderman and Murdock (2007), students who have high academic self-efficacy are more likely to use honest learning strategies and rarely engage in cheating behavior. In another study by Schunk and Pajares (2002), self-efficacy was shown to play an important role in self-regulation and moral decision-making, including in academic contexts.

The Role of Religiosity in Academic Cheating

Further analysis shows that religiosity has a significant role in academic cheating, with a coefficient of $t_{x2y} = 6.047$ and a p value = 0.000 ($p < 0.01$). Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted. Individuals with high levels of religiosity tend to uphold moral and ethical values, thus avoiding cheating behavior in studies. Glock and Stark (1965) suggested that religiosity includes dimensions of belief, practice, experience, knowledge, and consequences, which can shape an individual's value system and attitude in everyday life. In an academic context, religious values such as honesty, responsibility, and integrity can be a moral basis for avoiding deviant behavior. This result is also supported by research from Rettinger and Kramer (2009), which found that students with high levels of religiosity have a lower tendency to commit academic fraud. Likewise, research by Błachnio and Weremko (2011), which showed a significant negative correlation between religiosity and dishonest academic behavior.

Interaction of Self-Efficacy and Religiosity on Academic Cheating

The results of the interaction test indicate that there is a significant role of self-efficacy and religiosity simultaneously on academic cheating, with a coefficient value of $F = 58.391$ and $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.01$). This means that the third hypothesis is accepted. This finding indicates that both variables, when combined, have greater power in influencing academic behavior than if they stand alone. The synergy between self-confidence in academic ability (self-efficacy) and moral values adopted (religiosity) can form individuals who are not only academically competent, but also morally integral. In this context, self-efficacy gives individuals a sense of being able to complete tasks without cheating, while religiosity strengthens the commitment not to violate norms and ethics. This is in line with the concept of moral self-regulation explained by Bandura (1991), that moral self-control is influenced by a combination of self-efficacy beliefs and internal moral standards. These two aspects work together to inhibit the urge to commit unethical acts. Research by Stone, Jawahar, and Kisamore (2010) also supports that individuals with high levels of religiosity and strong self-confidence in academic abilities are less likely to engage in deviant academic behavior.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the data analysis and discussion that has been carried out, the following conclusions can be drawn: There is a significant role between self-efficacy against academic cheating. The results of the analysis show that the higher self-efficacy owned by an individual, the lower the tendency to commit academic fraud. This shows that self-confidence in academic ability can be a protective factor against deviant behavior in the educational environment. There is a significant role between religiosity and academic cheating. Individuals with high levels of religiosity tend to have strong moral and ethical values, making them less likely to commit fraud in the academic process. There is a significant role simultaneously between self-efficacy and religiosity towards academic cheating. The combination of self-efficacy and religiosity provides a role which is stronger in reducing the tendency of academic cheating. This means that individuals who have self-confidence in completing academic tasks and are supported by high religious values are more likely to be honest and responsible. Thus, both self-efficacy and religiosity are two important factors that can be used as references in efforts to prevent academic cheating behavior in students.

REFERENCES

- Adriyana, R. (2019). The Influence of Ethical Orientation, Rationalization, and Self-Efficacy on Academic Cheating. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 22(1), 7-12.
- Allport, G. W. (1997). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. Holt.
- Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (2007). *Psychology of academic cheating*. Elsevier Academic Press.
- Atkinson. (1993). *Introduction to Psychology 8th Edition Volume Two* (translated by Ke-8 Volume Two .English: ISBN 978-0-0013-033-0 .
- Aulia, Y. H. (2002). The influence of self-efficacy, religiosity and internal locus of control on academic cheating behavior of accounting students with procrastination as a moderating variable. *JIAI (Indonesian Accounting Scientific Journal)*, 7(2), 230-252.
- Azra, A. (2016). *New Paradigm of National Education Reconstruction and Democratization*. English: English.
- Azwar, S. (2007). *Research methods*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.

- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development: Volume 1. Theory* (pp. 45–103). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. (1982). “Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency”. *American Psychologist*. Vol.37, pp.122-47
- Bandura, A. (2010). *Self Efficacy Mechanism in Psikological and Health Promoting Behavior*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Błachnio, A., & Weremko, M. (2011). Academic dishonesty and religiosity among Polish students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(10), 2575–2580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00831.x>
- Branson. (1999). *Learn “Civic Education” from America*. Yogyakarta: Institute for Islamic and Social Studies.
- Cizek, G. (2015). *Handbook of the Teaching of Psychology*. In Bukist & Davis (Eds.), *Preventing, Detecting, and Addressing Academic Dishonest*. Publisher.
- Dewi, I. G. (2020). Student Academic Cheating Behavior Student Academic Cheating Behavior .*Fraud Diamond Dimension*. JIA (Scientific Journal of Accounting), 5(2), .
- Dewi, S. Dalimunthe, HA. 2022. Differences in Teacher Self-Efficacy Reviewed by Gender at SMA X Medan.*Journal of Research, Psychology and Health (J-P3K)*. Vol (3-3).
- Dewi, S. Hardjo, S. (2023). The Influence of Learning Motivation and Self Efficacy on The Learning Independence of students at SMP Negeri 3 Pancur Batu. *Intrenational Journal of Social Science, Educational Ekonomi, Agriculture Research, and technology (IJSET)*. Vol 2 (258-266).
- Dewi, S. Madjid. Abd, F. (2020). The rose of religiosity in work life balance. *Budapest international research and critics institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol 3 (2363-2374).
- Dinda Natsya Aurel, A. F. (2023). The Influence of Self-Efficacy, Peers, and Student Integrity on Academic Cheating. *Journal of Educational Research and Teaching*, 156-175.\
- Faradiena. F. (2019) Validity of Academic Dishonesty Measurement Instrument. *JP31 (Indonesian Journal of Educational Psychology Measurement)*, 8(2).
- Febrini, D. (2017). *Psychology of Learning*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- Feierman, J.R. (2019). The Evolution of Religion, Religiosity and Theology. In *The Evolution of Religion, Religiosity and Theology*. Routledge.
- Fraud, A. o. (2016). “Indonesia Fraud Survey”.
- Gibson, J. L. (2017). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Process*. (Translation) Eighth Edition. Binarupa Script.
- Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1965). *Religion and society in tension*. Rand McNally.
- Glock, C. d. (2016). *Religion and Society in Tension*. USA: Rand.
- Glock, C. d. (2016). *Religion and Society in Tension*. USA: Rand.
- Hamdani. (2011). *Teaching Learning Strategies*. London: Library of Faith.
- Hartanto, W. (. (2016). Use of E-Learning as a Learning Medium. *Journal of Education and Da'wah*, Volume 2,(3), 194–203.
- Hawari, D. (2002). *Religious Dimensions in Psychiatric and Psychological Practice*. Jakarta: Publishing House of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Indonesia.
- Hendricks. (2004). Academic Dishonesty : A Study in The Magnitude of The Justification for Academic Dishonesty among College Undergraduate and Graduate Student. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 2012-260.
- Huber, S. &. (2012). The Centrality Of Religiosity Scale Religions. 3, 710-724.
- Khuzaimah, U. Hinduan, Z. Dkk. (2023). *Social Support, Religiosity, Wisdom and Well-Being Among Older Adults in Indonesia*. Faculty of Psychology, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia; 2Faculty of Psychology, Medan Area University, Medan, Indonesia.
- Indriani, D. T. (2019). *Forms of Academic Cheating Among Students*.
- Islamuddin, H. (2018). *Educational Psychology*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- Iyer, R., & Eastman, J. K. (2008). The Impact of Unethical Reasoning on Academic Dishonesty: Exploring The Moderating Effect of Social Desirability on Academic Dishonesty. *Marketing Education Review*. 18 (2), 21–33.
- Jalaluddin, A. I. (2014). *Philosophy of Education*. 1999. ISBN 978-0-0013-033-1 .
- Jalaluddin, A. I. (2014). *Philosophy of Education*. 1999. ISBN 978-0-0013-033-1 .
- Kharisma, T. W. (2008). “The Influence of Organizational Ethical Climate, Locus of Control, and Seriousness of Violation on Intention to Whistleblowing on Academic Fraud.(Empirical Study of Accounting Students, FEB UGM).

- Khorido. 2020. The Relationship between Self Efficacy and Religiosity with Academic Cheating Behavior of FIP UNNES Students in 2020. Thesis. Guidance and Counseling Department, Faculty of Education, Semarang State University.
- Quesrieni. (2016). Learning Motivation from Teacher and Student Perspectives. Bandung: PT.
- Lautser. (2011). Self-efficacy, family social support and self-regulated learning in grade VIII students. Humanitas.
- Matindas, R. (2002). Human Resource Management, through concepts (ambition, reality and effort). Jakarta: Graffiti Main Library Publisher.
- McCabe, D. L. (1993). Academic Dishonesty : Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences. , . The Journal of Higher Education, 64 (5), 522–538.
- Naufal, M. D., Nur Aisyah, M., & Sc, M. (2019). The Effect of Fraud Triangle, Religiosity, and Self Efficacy on Academic Fraud Behavior. Indonesian Accounting Education Study Journal (KPAI).
- Nashori, F. d. (2016). Developing Creativity in the Perspective of Islamic Psychology. Yogyakarta: Kudus Tower.
- Novrianto, R. (2019). Construct Validity of the Indonesian Version of the General Self Efficacy Scale Instrument. Faculty of Psychology, Sultan Syarif Kasim State Islamic University, Riau.
- Nurmayasari, K. (2015). The Relationship Between Positive Thinking and Cheating Behavior in Grade X Students of SMK Koperasi Yogyakarta. Empathy Journal of the Faculty of Psychology, 3(1), 8-15.
- Ormrod, J. (2019). Educational Psychology Helps Students Grow and Develop. Jakarta: 6th ed Erlangga.
- Purnamasari, D. (. (2013). Factors Influencing Cheating in Students. . Educational Psychology Journal, University of Semarang.
- Rettinger, D. A., & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. Research in Higher Education, 50(3), 293–313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-008-9116-5>
- Santoso, D. d. (2015). “The Influence of Dishonest Behavior and Moral Competence on Academic Fraud in Students. Accounting, Auditing and Information Research Media, Vol.15(1). .
- Sarwono, S. W. (2013). Adolescent Psychology. English: Journal of the American Journal of Economics.
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), Development of achievement motivation (pp. 15–31). Academic Press.
- Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2010). Predicting academic misconduct intentions and behavior using the theory of planned behavior and personality. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 32(1), 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539895>
- Sudjana, H. N. (2017). Basics of the Teaching and Learning Process. Bandung: Algensindo New Light.
- Taylor, S. (2006). McGraw-hill companies: sixth Edition. New York: McGraw-hill companies: sixth Edition.
- Uyun, M. (2018). Goal Orientation and Academic Efficacy Against Academic Cheating in Students of the Faculty of Psychology, Uin Raden Fatah Palembang. Journal of Islamic Psychology, 4, 45–51.
- Whitley, B. E.-S. (2018). Academic dishonesty : an educator’s guide. Lawrence Associates.
- Wood. (2014). The Influence of Mobile Phones and Level of Learning Discipline on Cheating Behavior. Education for Life, 39-57.