

10-30-2023

Internal Factor Difference That Affects University Students' Academic Dishonesty Inside and Outside of JABODETABEK

Hasna Hafizhah Salma
Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia, hasna.h.salma@gmail.com

Gary Collins Brata Winardy
Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia, colinsgary@gmail.com

Eva Septiana
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia, evaseptiana.septiana@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/proust>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Educational Psychology Commons](#), [Humane Education Commons](#), and the [Online and Distance Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salma, Hasna Hafizhah; Brata Winardy, Gary Collins; and Septiana, Eva (2023) "Internal Factor Difference That Affects University Students' Academic Dishonesty Inside and Outside of JABODETABEK," *Psychological Research on Urban Society*. Vol. 6: No. 2, Article 4.
DOI: 10.7454/proust.v6i2.1132
Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/proust/vol6/iss2/4>

This Original Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Psychology at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychological Research on Urban Society by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Internal Factor Difference That Affects University Students' Academic Dishonesty Inside and Outside of JABODETABEK

Psychological Research
on Urban Society
2023, Vol. 6(2): 41-51
© The Author(s) 2023
DOI: [10.7454/proust.v6i2.1132](https://doi.org/10.7454/proust.v6i2.1132)
proust.ui.ac.id

Hasna Hafizhah Salma^{1*}, Gary Collins Brata Winardy¹ and Eva Septiana²

¹ Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

² Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Received: January 16th, 2023

Revision Accepted: September 25th, 2023

Abstract

Urban society shown a more heterogenous personal quality compared to rural society such as greater diversity in social status and religious pluralism. Unfortunately, structure of urban society tends to put achievement above morality in academic practices. This can be seen in academic phenomenon such as cheating, and plagiarism. Such practices are only made easier through technology. Since the emergence of Covid-19 pandemic the use of technology is increasing substantially in learning process. In urban region such as Jakarta metropolitan area, Indonesia, the use of internet and technology in university become one of many factors that facilitate academic dishonesty behaviors. This research is quantitative research with samples of 187 university students currently taking courses on associate degree, bachelor, and master's degree from public and private universities inside and outside of Jakarta metropolitan area (JABODETABEK). The result showed differences in proportion of internal factor variance that includes religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring. Participants in Jakarta metropolitan area are controlled more by internal factors to abstain from academic dishonesty, compared to students outside of Jakarta metropolitan area. These findings can give consideration for universities stakeholders to enact an academic climate that supports integrity with character development, especially in urban universities.

Keywords

academic dishonesty, religious commitment, self-efficacy, self-monitoring, Jakarta metropolitan area

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Indonesia experienced a significant development in the field of education and technology. The pandemic has forced the government and educational institutions to enact a long-distance learning policy facilitated by online learning technology (Kurniawati et al., 2022). The rapid change into a new system was met with multiple hurdles that magnify the differences between urban and rural societies. Although urban society met the change and managed to adapt faster with high

levels of preparedness due to the frequent use of technology in daily life, rural society fell short in comparison. These differences only widen the gap of the teaching process in academic sectors between urban and rural societies.

The gap between both societies in technology proficiency only serves to widen academic disparity. This variation results in different forms of academic dishonesty (Wang, 2021). In distance learning, academic dishonesty is a complex psychological and social phenomenon that can demolish the credibility of academic institutions during the learning process and in the evaluation of the validity of learning results

Corresponding Author:

Hasna Hafizhah Salma

Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

Email: hasna.h.salma@gmail.com

(Chiang, Zhu, & Yu, 2022). Daniels et al. (2021) found that academic dishonesty is reported to be four times more likely to occur during distance learning compared with regular learning. Raja dan Case (2014) in Daniels et al. (2021) indicated that 75% of students feels that cheating during online, compared with regular, exams is easy. Additionally, Gaungul et al. (2020) expressed that a different evaluation method or an entirely new strategy for conducting exams is required in distance, online learning compared with regular learning to reduce academic dishonesty. Thus, this study infers that technology use on the one hand is a boon but may facilitate ethics problems, such as academic dishonesty, on the other hand.

In practice, academic dishonesty is highly connected to the moral concept of an individual. McKenzie (2018) found that globalization and modernization affect moral reasoning and perception. This stance is more amplified in urban, large-city environments compared with rural societies. Thus, a difference exists between moral concepts in urban and rural societies, which is also reflected in academic dishonesty in the two environments. Typically, urban students are found to be more prone to academic dishonesty compared with their rural peers. In addition, Sutton (1991) revealed that urban students conduct more academic dishonesty compared with that of rural students. The homogeneity of rural society, coupled with social punishment in rural environments that pushes for conformity, exert more influence on academic dishonesty compared with rural environments that exhibit heterogeneity, which leaves moral concept a prerogative for each individual.

Academic dishonesty remains a global problem. Fisch (1996) revealed that in the United States, 90% of students conducted academic dishonesty, which includes cheating through notes or peers during their college years. Gedes (2011) also found that 75% of students in high school (ages 14 to 18 years) in acceleration classes committed academic dishonesty during tests and school assignments. Furthermore, Panjaitan (2017) discovered that academic dishonesty in Indonesia can be clearly witnessed during the national exam in all grades (elementary to senior high school). The rate of the likelihood of academic dishonesty increases according to grade.

However, Panjaitan lacked an explanation of how academic dishonesty behavior exactly occurred.

In line with the findings of Panjaitan (2017), Jamaluddin et al. (2020) found that academic dishonesty is more common in higher education grades, include diploma student, undergraduate student, and postgraduate student. In Indonesia, scholars cited that academic dishonesty occurs systematically. Jamaluddin et al. further explained that the collectivism culture in Indonesia support academic dishonesty through the context of collaboration as its rationalization. However, the authors did not mention the dynamics of internal factors involved, such as individual values and beliefs, that motivate an individual to conduct academic dishonesty.

This study conducted a pilot survey in January 21–28, 2021, through Google Forms to examine the forms of academic dishonesty among college students in Indonesia. The results demonstrated that in distance learning, students in urban areas conduct more academic dishonesty compared with those in rural areas. According to the survey, the most prevalent dishonest behaviors is asking questions among peers during online tests with 50% of the students falling under this category. The second most common behavior that was conducted by 20% of students is plagiarism of the work of another. Under the last category, 17% of students open textbooks or notes during tests when such behaviors are not allowed. Furthermore, a clear difference exists in the percentage composition on the methods of cheating employed by students in urban and rural areas. This difference further underlines the position of previous studies about the differences between urban and rural areas in terms of academic dishonesty.

There is a different pattern in the reasoning given by students on how they conduct academic dishonesty. In the Jabodetabek area, the reason that motivate students to commit academic dishonesty are related to internal factors such as the feeling of being cornered, lack of self-efficacy, and being unsupervised. Conversely, for rural students (outside Jabodetabek), the reasons are related to opportunities for collaboration with classmates. This aspect demonstrates that peer pressure and social obligation are more

meaningful for students in rural areas. Robinson et al. (2004) confirmed this result and cited that university students in rural areas conduct academic dishonesty through collaboration in accordance with the social climate of the university. However, this finding should be explored further due to the changing state of education, especially in the last two decades.

Ampuni (2020) explained the statement of students, that is, they are feeling cornered during an exam and, thus, conduct academic dishonesty, as a result of the lack of active self-regulation in moral development. This deactivation was related to low levels of self-monitoring (Carter, McCullough, & Carver, 2012). Furthermore, the force to act or not to act is highly related to personal values. Individuals tend to be committed to the value they hold, which can be related to supernatural powers (Alexander, 2017 & Atap, 1979; in Onu, Onyedibe, Ugwu, & Nche, 2021). This commitment is typically religious (Worthington et al., 2003).

The pilot survey conducted for this study revealed the significant role of internal factors, such as self-monitoring, self-efficacy, and religious commitment, which scholars proposed could prevent academic dishonesty. Currently, studies on academic dishonesty were conducted from the macro perspective and on external factors such as educational policy, economy level, laws against academic dishonesty, communication, and technology, among others. Jamaluddin et al. (2020) expressed that, ultimately, conducting academic dishonesty is an individual choice. Unfortunately, studies on internal and human factors are less robust compared with macro factors. In addition, the current study entertains the notion that internal factors, such as commitment to personal values in a collectivist society, is linked with self-monitoring and the perception that one can solve problems without resorting to unethical behavior in distance learning situation. The literature lacks an in-depth exploration of these assertions; thus, the current study aims to fill this research gap.

Academic Dishonesty

McCabe and Trevino (1993) developed the construct of academic dishonesty, which is still used today. The trend of academic dishonesty has existed along with the development of infor-

mation sources and methods for accessing information (Perkins, Gezgin, & Roe, 2020). Academic dishonesty is defined as deviant behavior in learning such as cheating, copying, and opening notes on a test (Ampuni et al., 2020).

The act of academic dishonesty can be displayed differently among individuals according to personal characteristics (McCabe & Trevino, 1997). These characteristics can include demographic variables such as age, gender, education, socio-economic status, and cultural differences. In prior studies, these individualized characteristics exhibited a significant effect on academic dishonesty. As such, McCabe and Trevino (1997) convey the importance of involving demographic variables in examining academic dishonesty as a form of basic quality differentials. Furthermore, Harris et al. (2019) proposed the possibility that academic dishonesty may change during a distance learning period compared with regular learning. Differences in these behaviors require further studies.

Intervariable Dynamics (Religious Commitment, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Efficacy)

Academic dishonesty is a variable caused by multiple factors. Prior studies lack an explanation on the interaction between factors. McCabe and Trevino (1993) elaborated that academic dishonesty is caused by two major factors, namely, internal factors (those derived from the self; McCabe & Trevino, 1997) and external factors (those derived from the environment such as rule enforcement, and social group; McCabe & Trevino, 1993). The current study focuses on internal factors that influence academic dishonesty.

Religious commitment is a sociopsychological variable that refers to beliefs and individual behaviors in relation to supernatural values (Onu et al., 2021). Religious commitment explains individual quality that is evident in self-evaluation and reverence toward God in decision making according to one's applicable moral values. Furthermore, religious commitment can be gauged through involvement in religious organizations, degrees of participation in religious activities (e.g., the frequency of participation in Quranic reading at mosques for Muslims or attendance in weekly worship at churches for Christians). This aspect is accompanied by attitudes and behaviors in religious tenets and be-

liefs (Worthington et al., 2003). Ridwan and Di-antimala (2021) found that religious education (in religious commitment) is the major predictor for addressing academic dishonesty among university students majoring in accounting and medicine in Universitas Syiah Kuala Indonesia.

Self-monitoring is defined as the observation of the current conditions from the perspective of one's conscious actions according to established standards and norms along with the impact on individual feelings after committing such actions (Carter et al., 2012). For example, Onu et al. (2021) revealed that religious commitment is linked to academic dishonesty through self-monitoring. Religious commitment and self-monitoring can become a safeguard against academic dishonesty due to the feeling of being watched by higher beings (Qudsyi et al., 2018).

Self-efficacy can be explained as individual conviction toward the mastery of a skill, which may include challenging situation or given tasks (Chen et al., 2001). Ali and Syeda (2015) found that religious commitment is positively correlated with self-efficacy in samples of young adults in Pakistan. An increase in religious commitment is also observed with an increase in self-efficacy. Moreover, self-efficacy is linked to self-development and positive executive function (Krou, 2020), whereas low levels of self-efficacy are associated with academic dishonesty due to the lack of self-control.

Research Objectives and Hypotheses

The current study aims to examine the role of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring in academic dishonesty among university students within and outside Jabodetabek.

The first hypothesis aims to prove the significant influence of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring on academic dishonesty. The second hypothesis intends to confirm the existence of an interaction effect in the high-low ordinal category of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring with academic dishonesty.

Method

This study is a quantitative non-experimental one with a comparative design.

The objective of these methods is to compare between variables in two samples. The statistical methods used are Pearson's correlation, multiple linear regression, and two-way ANOVA via SPSS v.21. The variables under assessment are religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring in relation to academic dishonesty. The participants are students in universities inside and outside of the Jakarta metropolitan area.

Participants

The study used convenience sampling to recruit the participants with a minimum sample size of 107, which was calculated using G*Power 3.1.9.7 (effect size: $f = 0,5$; α err prob = 0,05; power ($1 - \beta$ err prob) = 0.95). Data were collected

Table 1. Characteristics of the participants

	<i>Sample size</i>
Gender	
Male	48
Female	139
Level of education	
Associate degree (D3)	3
Undergraduate degree (D4/S1)	44
Postgraduate degree (S2)	
Institution	
Private	87
Public	100
City	
Jakarta metropolitan area	87
Outside Jakarta metropolitan area	100
TOTAL	187

through Google Forms across 7 days. The inclusion criteria are university students of all degrees (i.e., associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctoral) aged 18–40 years and currently studying.

The study recruited 187 participants students. Table 1 presents their characteristics.

Materials, Measures, and Apparatus

This study uses three measurement tools, namely, Religious Commitment Inventory-10 (RCI; Worthington et al., 2003), New General Self-Efficacy (NGSE; Chen et al., 2001), and Monitoring by Self, Others, and God (MSOG;

Carter et al., 2012), which were adapted and translated to Bahasa Indonesia. The Scale of Academic Dishonesty (AD), which was developed by Ampuni et al. (2020), was modified to fit the context of distance learning.

RCI. The scale comprises 10 items that explain individual qualities through personal view and respect for God in decision making related to moral values. This instrument also measures participation in religious groups, degree of participation and attitudes in following religious rules, and religious conviction in general (Hill & Hood, 1999; in Worthington et al., 2003). The reliability of the adapted instrument is 0.88 with validity ranging from 0.85 to 0.86 for each item.

NGSE. This instrument is composed of eight items that measure individual assessment of one ability to complete a task (Chen et al., 2001). The reliability of adapted instrument is 0.87. The validity of the items ranges from 0.84 to 0.86.

MSOG. This instrument comprises nine items that explain individual assessment of the perception that they are currently monitored by other people, themselves, and God. Such a perception plays a role in self-evaluation to increase self-awareness, which, in turn, encourages individuals to compare their actions to relevant standards (Carver & Scheier, 1978, 1998; in Carter et al., 2012).

AD. The instrument features 15 items that exhibit non-standard behaviors in the educational process such as cheating, copying, and opening notes during a test (McCabe & Trevino 1993; in Ampuni et al., 2020). The reliability of the modi-

fied instrument is 0.91 with the validity of each item ranging from 0.91 to 0.92.

Procedure

First, the study translated and adapted the instruments from August to September 2021. They were then tested to determine reliability and validity. The results demonstrated that the instruments are statistically valid and reliable. After statistical testing, the questionnaire was disseminated through Google Forms from October to December 2021. Finally, data were analyzed using the abovementioned statistical methods.

Ethical Considerations

To ensure research ethics and academic rigor, this study obtained permission from Ampuni et al. (2020) to use the AD through email. Furthermore, RCI, NGSE, and MSOG are widely available in public domain websites. The participants provided informed written consent, and the researchers ensured their anonymity. Data were analyzed aggregately and, thus, does not single out a participant.

Results

This study conducted a correlation statistical calculation to determine the correlations among variables (Table 2).

Table 2 indicates that academic dishonesty exerts a significant negative correlation with religious commitment ($r = 0.153$, $p < 0.05$), self-efficacy ($r = 0.204$, $p < 0.05$), and self-monitoring ($r = 0.195$, $p < 0.05$). This result indicates that

Table 2. Correlation among variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Academic Dishonesty	1					
2 Religious Commitment	-0.153*	1				
3 Self-Efficacy	-0.204*	0.388**	1			
4 Monitoring by Self	-0.195**	0.390**	0.429**	1		
5 Monitoring by Others	0.147*	0.259**	0.125	0.165*	1	
6 Monitoring by God	0.080	0.481**	0.249**	0.326**	0.383**	1

Pearson's correlation test with the assumption that data are normally distributed.

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3. Results of multiple linear regression for religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring in relation to academic dishonesty

	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance (p-value)</i>
General	0.32	0.102	4.123	0.001
Jakarta metropolitan area (Jabodetabek)	0.39	0.155	2.969	0.016
Outside the Jabodetabek	0.34	0.115	2.449	0.039

DV: Academic Dishonesty, *sig<0.5.

high levels of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring are correlated with low levels of academic dishonesty. Conversely, academic dishonesty exerts a positive significant correlation with self-monitoring by others ($r = 0.147$, $p < 0.05$); high levels of the perception of being observed by others can be linked with academic dishonesty. This result demonstrates that academic dishonesty in university students is systemic and communal in nature, in which they influence one another to conduct acts of academic dishonesty.

Table 3 illustrates the role of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring in academic dishonesty using multiple linear regression.

Table 3 indicates that religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring can explain a significant proportion of variance in academic dishonesty ($R^2 = 0.102$, $F = 4.123$). This result indicates that religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring can predict 10.2% of variance in academic dishonesty, while other variables can predict the remaining 89.8%.

Among students within the Jakarta metropolitan area ($R^2 = 0.155$, $F = 2.969$), the proportion of internal factor variance that is statistically significant in influencing academic dishonesty is predicted to be 15.5%, whereas 84.5% are due to other variables. Meanwhile, students outside of the Jakarta metropolitan area exhibit different results ($R^2 = 0.115$, $F = 2.449$) with a predicted internal factor variance of 11.5%.

Table 4 proposes that monitoring by others significantly predicts academic dishonesty for both groups of students ($\beta = 0.119$, $\beta = 0.135$, $\beta = 0.115$, $p < 0.05$). Self-monitoring also predicts academic dishonesty in students inside Jabodetabek ($\beta = -0.194$, $p < 0.05$). The regres-

sion coefficients demonstrate that the feeling of being monitored by others can influence the increase in academic dishonesty among university students, whereas being monitored by the self can decrease academic dishonesty.

This study also observed the interaction between the internal factors of academic dishonesty using factorial ANOVA. This statistical test was conducted to examine the differences among university students inside and outside Jabodetabek. According to the descriptive analysis, the average score of academic dishonesty is 2.16. Scores <2.16 are categorized as low academic dishonesty and scores of 2.16 and higher are categorized as high academic dishonesty. The study followed the same statistical steps for the other internal factor variables of religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring. Table 5 presents the results.

According to Table 6, an interaction effect exists between religious commitment and gender, which indicates that a difference exist between religious commitment between men and women, which influences academic dishonesty in distance learning inside Jabodetabek. Furthermore, the study observed an interaction between monitoring by God and gender. In other words, a difference exists between the feeling of being watched by God between the male and female students, which influences academic dishonesty. A positive interaction is also found between monitoring by the self and others, which suggests that high levels of self-control are linked to feelings of being watched by others, which also contributes to academic dishonesty. Lastly, the study noted a positive interaction among religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring. This finding implies that high levels of religious commitment are also linked with

Table 4. Multiple linear regression coefficients of religious commitment, self-efficacy and self-monitoring in relation to academic dishonesty

<i>Model</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficient Beta</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
General			
(Constant)	3.307	-	0.000*
Religious Commitment	-0.102	-0.087	0.315
Self-Efficacy	-0.160	-0.133	0.103
Monitoring by Self	-0.081	-0.125	0.129
Monitoring by Others	0.119	0.040	0.003*
Monitoring by God	-0.038	-0.051	0.551
Jabodetabek			
(Constant)	2.925	-	0.000*
Religious Commitment	-0.093	-0.069	0.561
Self-Efficacy	-0.135	-0.104	0.344
Monitoring by Self	-0.194	-0.259	0.022*
Monitoring by Others	0.135	0.248	0.023*
Monitoring by God	0.071	0.079	0.490
Outside Jabodetabek			
(Constant)	3.576	-	0.000*
Religious Commitment	-0.080	-0.078	0.543
Self-Efficacy	-0.214	-0.189	0.118
Monitoring by Self	0.015	0.071	0.833
Monitoring by Others	0.115	0.226	0.043*
Monitoring by God	-0.134	-0.205	0.113

*Significance: $p < 0.05$

high levels of self-efficacy and self-monitoring, which influences academic dishonesty.

Discussion

The results indicate that internal factors, including religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring, can predict academic dishonesty in distance learning. Chiang et al. (2022) explained that universities should focus more on the prevention of academic dishonesty in distance learning by conveying consequences and potential punishments for students who conduct academic dishonesty in the beginning of the learning process. Disclosing the consequences of academic dishonesty to the study will provide them with the opportunity for internalizing such consequences. The findings further reinforce the

results of previous studies on the significance of internal factors in predicting academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; Ampuni et al., 2020). The current study offers new insights on how the proportions of variance in religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring are larger and predict academic dishonesty among students inside Jabodetabek compared with those outside with a difference of 4%. This result is in-line with that of a previous study on differences in moral concept among individuals in urban and rural areas (McKenzie, 2018). Thus, the results supports the first hypothesis.

Religious commitment is gained through knowledge about religion. Ridwan and Diantiala (2021) found that a link between religious activity and religious knowledge in relation to

Table 5. Categorization of the scores of internal factors

	<i>Average</i>	<i>Categories</i>
<i>Religious Commitment</i>	3.92	High \geq 3.92 Low $<$ 3.92
<i>Self-Efficacy</i>	4.02	High \geq 4.02 Low $<$ 4.02
<i>Monitoring by Self</i>	5.09	High \geq 5.09 Low $<$ 5.09
<i>Monitoring by Others</i>	4.76	High \geq 4.76 Low $<$ 4.76
<i>Monitoring by God</i>	6.07	High \geq 6.07 Low $<$ 6.07

academic dishonesty with the locus of control as a moderator. Individuals who are committed to religious values, observe religious rites, and display high levels of understanding about their religion tend to exhibit low levels of academic dishonesty (Onu et al., 2021). Locus of control influences the ability of the individual to self-monitor and can predict future academic dishonesty (Carter, McCullough, & Carver, 2012). The more that people feel being monitored by themselves and by a deity, the more they tend to commit academic dishonesty. Moreover, in support of the findings of Ali dan Syeda (2015) and Krou (2020), the current study confirms that religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring can predict academic dishonesty. High levels of religious commitment leads to the high levels of self-confidence, which indicates better self-monitoring that, in turn, decreases the tendency to commit academic dishonesty.

This study also demonstrates that monitoring by the self and others consistently predict academic dishonesty. This pattern occurs for both groups of students. This result demon-

strates that in the Indonesian culture, which features collectivist aspects, the existence of other individuals will influence individual decisions to conduct academic dishonesty. If high rates of academic dishonesty are noted in a group in Indonesia, then the study infers that students collaborate to commit academic dishonesty. Jamaluddin et al. (2020) confirmed this finding, that is, academic dishonesty in Indonesia is mostly collaborative in nature. Robinson et al. (2004) propose that a collectivist culture tends to conduct academic dishonesty through collaboration. Collectivist cultures in urban or rural areas in Indonesia exhibit the same pattern.

Self-monitoring significantly predicts academic dishonesty among students in the urban areas of Jabodetabek. Conversely, self-monitoring among students outside of Jabodetabek significantly fails to predict academic dishonesty. This result indicates that in urban and suburban areas, the prevention of academic dishonesty can be encouraged with the application of personal principles and values. This finding reinforces the idea of McKenzie

Table 6. Intervariables effects interaction

<i>Variables</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Jabodetabek		
Religious Commitment	14.273	0.000*
Religious Commitment * Gender	5.062	0.029*
Monitoring by God * Gender	14.987	0.000*
Monitoring by the Self * Monitoring by Others	4.230	0.046*
Religious Commitment * Self Efficacy * Monitoring by Self	4.292	0.044*

Dependent Variable: Academic Dishonesty; *sig $<$ 0.5. Only a significant interaction was written; students outside Jabodetabek did not exhibit a significant interaction effect between variables.

(2018), that is, globalization and modernization in urban and suburban areas influence moral application to become more individualistic compared with rural areas that rely on social control and the value of a shared culture.

Furthermore, the study found that an interaction effect exists among religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring in relation to academic dishonesty among students inside Jabodetabek in the context of distance learning. This result indicated that individuals with high levels of religious commitment also exhibit high levels of self-efficacy and are more likely to monitor themselves, which leads to less academic dishonesty. However, no prior findings exist on this interaction. Nevertheless, the result supports the second hypothesis. In addition, the study further hypothesizes that this occurs because high levels of religious commitment encourage people to obey religious tenets, which can include managing one's conducts through self-monitoring. High levels of religious commitment can also lead to a feeling of assurance of one's effort, which increases self-efficacy. Taken together, the three variables lead to less academic dishonesty. Further studies for confirming the concrete form of this interaction are required, especially the factors that underlie the tendency of this interaction to only occur in urban areas.

The study found an interaction between religious commitment and gender. Storch and Storch (2001) explained that a difference exists between men and women in terms of the influence of religiosity on academic dishonesty. Huelsman et al. (2006) found that religiosity as a factor that decreases academic dishonesty among women but not men.

Lastly, the study noted an interaction effect between monitoring by God and gender. Men and women display differences in terms of the influence of monitoring by God on academic dishonesty. Mangkualam et al. (2019) expressed that the feeling of being monitored by God is important to prevent students from committing academic dishonesty. Through the feeling of being watched by God, they are also encouraged to monitor themselves. Moreover, we found that a positive interaction between monitoring by the self and others. Individuals with high levels of

self-monitoring are also influenced by the feeling of being monitored by others.

This study focuses only on the dynamics of three internal factors, namely, religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring, in urban and rural areas of Indonesia in relation to academic dishonesty during distance learning. Thus, as a limitation, this study does not compare the differences between academic dishonesty in regular and distance learning in urban and rural areas.

Conclusions

Internal factors, such as religious commitment, self-efficacy, and self-monitoring, play a role in the academic dishonesty of students inside and outside of the Jakarta metropolitan area. The effects of the internal factors are greater for students inside the Jakarta metropolitan area. Alternatively, the study observed no significant influence of the interaction between internal factors that influence academic dishonesty for students outside of the Jakarta metropolitan area.

The findings bring value by contributing to the consideration of policy makers regarding the importance of creating a program that fosters religious commitment and self-monitoring as a part of character education. This aspect is especially important in metropolitan and suburban areas. As a citizen of Indonesia, observing religious principles is important for upholding character education according to Pancasila (the foundation of the Indonesian state). By adhering to the principles of religion, academic dishonesty can hopefully be reduced.

Given the limitation of this study, future studies may benefit in exploring other internal factors that may influence academic dishonesty. Moreover, further studies can examine the difference in academic dishonesty in distance and regular learning in urban and rural areas. Experimentation may also be concluded on how to increase self-efficacy and self-monitoring to reduce academic dishonesty in Indonesia.

Acknowledgements. Thank you to all parties who have helped so that this research can be carried out and published.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest. There is no conflicting interest to the authorship and/or the

publication of the manuscript.

Funding. There is no funding in this research. All costs from researchers.

References

- Ampuni, S., Kautsari, N., Maharani, M., Kuswardani, S., Buwono, S.B.S. (2022). Academic dishonesty in Indonesian college students: an investigation from a moral psychology perspective. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18(4), 395–417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09352-2>
- Carter, E.C., McCullough, M.E., & Carver, C.S. (2012). The mediating role of monitoring in the association of religion with self-control. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(6), 691–697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612438925>
- Chen, G., Gully, S.M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141004>
- Chiang, F., Zhu, D., & Yu, W. (2022). A systematic review of academic dishonesty in online learning environments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(4), 907–928. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12656>
- Daniels, L.M., Goegan, L.D., & Parker, P.C. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 triggered changes to instruction and assessment on university students' self-reported motivation, engagement and perceptions. *Social Psychology of Education*, 24(1), 299–318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-021-09612-3>
- Fisch, L. (Eds.). (1996). *Ethical dimensions of college and university teaching: understanding and honoring the special relationship between teachers and students*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Geddes, K.A. (2011). Academic dishonesty among gifted and high-achieving students. *Gifted Child Today*, 34(2), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107621751103400214>
- Guangul, F.M., Suhail, A.H., Khalit, M.I., & Khidhir, B.A. (2020). Challenges of remote assessment in higher education in the context of COVID-19: A case study of Middle East College. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 32(4), 519–535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-020-09340-w>
- Harris, L., Harrison, D., McNally, D., & Ford, C. (2020). Academic integrity in an online culture: do McCabe's findings hold true for online, adult learners?. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18(4), 419–434. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09335-3>
- Hendy, N.T., Montargot, N., & Papadimitriou, A. (2021). Cultural Differences in academic dishonesty: A social learning perspective. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(1), 49–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09391-8>
- Huelsman, M.A., Piroch, J., & Wasieleski, D. (2006). Relation of religiosity with academic dishonesty in A sample of college students. *Psychological Reports*, 99(739–742). <https://doi.org/10.2466/PRO.99.3.739-742>
- Hunsaker, A., Sarles, C.E., Rosen, D., Lingler, J.H., Johnson, M.B., Morrow, L., & Saxton, J. (2011). Exploring the reasons Urban and rural-dwelling older adults participate in memory research. *American Journal of Alzheimer's Disease and Other Dementias*, 26(3), 227–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1533317511399569>
- Ives, B. & Giukin, L. (2020). Patterns and predictors of academic dishonesty in Moldovan university students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 18(1), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09347-z>
- Jamaluddin, S.F., Adi, S.P., & Lufityanto, G. (2020). Social influences on cheating in collectivistic culture: collaboration but not competition. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 25(2), 174–189. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000122>
- Krou, M.R., Fong, C.J., & Hoff, M.A. (2021). Achievement motivation and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic investigation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 427–458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09557-7>
- Mangkualam, K., Salsabila, A., Sumadi, A., Septiyanza, C.T. & Rusydi, A. (2019). Efek mediiasi monitoring by self pada hubungan antara watching by god dan perilaku mencontek. *Psikologika: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Psikologi*, 24(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.20885/psikologi.vol24.iss1.art3>
- McCabe, D.L. & Trevino, L.K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: honor codes and other contextual influences, *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1993.11778446>

- McCabe, D.L. & Trevino, L.K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(3), 379–396. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024954224675>
- McKenzie, J. (2018). Globalization and moral personhood: Dyadic perspectives of the moral Self in rural and Urban Thai communities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 33(2), 209–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558416670007>
- Onu, D.U., Onyedibe, M.C.C., Ugwu, L.E. & Nche, G.C. (2021). Relationship between religious commitment and academic dishonesty: is self-efficacy a factor?. *Ethics and Behavior*, 31(1), 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2019.1695618>
- Panjaitan, D.E. (2017). *Student cheating in national examinations: A case of Indonesia*. A Master's dissertation submitted to Osaka Jogakuin University Graduate School of International Collaboration and Coexistence in the 21st Century.
- Patall, E.A. & Leach, J.K. (2015). The role of choice provision in academic dishonesty. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 42, 97–110. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.06.004>
- Perkins, M., Gezgin, U.B., & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8>
- Portnoy, J., Legee, K., Raine, A., Choy, O., & Rudo-Hutt, A.S. (2019). Biosocial risk factors for academic dishonesty: testing a new mediation model in young adults. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 35(1), 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986218810590>
- Qudsyi, H., Sholeh, A., & Afsari, N. (2018). Upaya untuk mengurangi ketidakjujuran akademik pada mahasiswa melalui peer education. *Integritas*, 4(1), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v4i1.168>
- Ridwan, R. & Diantimala, Y. (2018). The positive role of religiosity in dealing with academic dishonesty. *Cogent Business and Management*, 8(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1875541>
- Robinson, E., Amburgey, R., Swank, E., & Faulkner, C. (2004). Test cheating in A rural college: Studying the importance of individual and situational factors. *College Student Journal*, 38(3), 380–395.
- Storch, E.A. & Storch, J.B. (2001). Organizational, nonorganizational, and intrinsic religiosity and academic dishonesty. *Psychological Reports*, 88(2), 548–552. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2001.88.2.548>
- Sutton, E.M. (1991). *Undergraduate student perceptions of academic dishonesty as a function of ethnicity and religious participation*. Retrospective Theses and Dissertations, 9780.
- Syeda, A. (2015). Religious faith, flourishing and self-efficacy in young adults: A correlational study. *Global Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 34–45.
- Wang, T. (2021). Urban schooling and social integration of ethnic migrant students in China. *Education and Urban Society*, 53(6), 708–733. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124520955161>
- Worthington, E.L., Wade, N.G., Hight, T.L., Ripley, J.S., McCullough, M.E., Berry, J.W., Schmitt, M.M., Berry, J.T., Bursley, K.H., & O'Connor, L. (2003). The religious commitment inventory – 10: Development, refinement, and validation of a brief Scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(1), 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.1.84>
- Yang, S.C., Huang, C., & Chen, A. (2013). An investigation of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, reasons for dishonesty, achievement goals, and willingness to report dishonest behavior. *Ethics and Behavior*, 23(6), 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2013.802651>.