

The Effect of Procrastination and Goal Orientation on Academic Dishonesty Moderated by Self-Efficacy in Postgraduate

Isna Mutmainah

TPQ Al-Gufron, Indonesia
isnamutmainah30@gmail.com

Abstract

This unethical behavior occurs because of the mindset of each individual, if the individual thinks everyone is cheating, then they will tend to cheat. This study aims to see the effect of procrastination and goal orientation on academic dishonesty in post-graduate moderated by self-efficacy. The scale used for the data collection is the academic dishonesty scale by Bashir & Bala, the self-efficacy scale by Schwarzer & Jerusalem, the procrastination scale by Chun Chu & Choi, and the goal orientation scale by Button et al. The sampling technique used is nonprobability sampling with accidental sampling, which uses a Google form with a sample of 212. The construct validity test in this study is confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), while the hypothesis test uses moderated regression analysis (MRA). The results show a significant effect of self-efficacy, procrastination, and goal orientation (learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation) on academic dishonesty, and there is a significant effect of procrastination and goal orientation (learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation) on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy. There is a significant effect of procrastination on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy, there is an insignificant effect of learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy, and there is an insignificant effect of performance goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy. Further research can examine other variables impacting academic dishonesty, such as self-esteem, religiosity, and social support.

Keywords: academic dishonesty, goal orientation, postgraduate, procrastination, self-efficacy

Abstrak

Perilaku tidak etis ini terjadi karena pola pikir setiap individu, jika individu menganggap semua orang curang, maka mereka akan cenderung untuk berbuat curang. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat pengaruh prokrastinasi dan orientasi tujuan terhadap academic dishonesty pada mahasiswa pascasarjana yang dimoderatori oleh self-efficacy. Skala yang digunakan untuk pengumpulan data adalah skala ketidakjujuran akademik oleh Bashir & Bala, skala efikasi diri oleh Schwarzer & Jerusalem, skala prokrastinasi oleh Chun Chu & Choi, dan skala orientasi tujuan oleh Button et al. Teknik pengambilan sampel yang digunakan adalah nonprobability sampling dengan accidental sampling yaitu menggunakan Google form dengan jumlah sampel 212. Uji validitas konstruk dalam penelitian ini adalah confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), sedangkan uji hipotesis menggunakan moderated regression analysis (MRA). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan ada pengaruh yang signifikan efikasi diri, prokrastinasi, dan orientasi tujuan (learning goal orientation dan performance goal orientation) terhadap academic dishonesty, dan terdapat pengaruh yang signifikan prokrastinasi dan orientasi tujuan (learning goal orientation dan performance goal orientation) terhadap ketidakjujuran akademik dimoderatori oleh self-efficacy. Terdapat pengaruh yang signifikan prokrastinasi terhadap academic dishonesty yang dimoderatori oleh self-efficacy, terdapat pengaruh yang tidak signifikan orientasi tujuan belajar terhadap academic dishonesty yang dimoderatori oleh self-efficacy, dan terdapat pengaruh yang tidak signifikan orientasi tujuan kinerja terhadap academic dishonesty yang dimoderatori oleh self-efficacy. Penelitian lebih lanjut dapat meneliti variabel lain yang mempengaruhi ketidakjujuran akademik, seperti harga diri, religiusitas, dan dukungan sosial.

Kata kunci: ketidakjujuran akademik, orientasi tujuan, pascasarjana, penundaan, self-efficacy

Introduction

Academic dishonesty is a problem that needs to be considered in the world of education. Academic dishonesty is one of the problems that need to be considered in the world of education so that it becomes a topic that is widely used as a research theme (Arifah et al., 2018; Eastman et al., 2008; Herdian & Astorini, 2017; Incecam et al., 2017; Pantu et al., 2020; Utami & Agustina, 2019; Wideman, 2008). As in research, Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce, (2009) revealed that there were 68.1% of students did academic dishonesty at least once for fifteen weeks. In addition, there were 79.7% of graduate students who did academic dishonesty at least once during lectures (Witherspoon et al., 2012).

The result of Hadjar's research (2017) conducted at UIN Walisongo found that 98% of the sample had cheated in one form or another, as for academic dishonesty behavior carried out, namely cheating in class, writing paper assignments, and improper citations. Meanwhile, the research of Arifah et al. (2018) revealed that there were 54.630% of Unnes students who carried out academic dishonesty in the deficient category, 38.889% in the low category, 4.629% in the high category, and 1.852% in the high category, as for the behavior carried out was academic dishonesty behavior when working on individual assignments, academic dishonesty behavior when working on group assignments, academic dishonesty behavior when working on midterm exams, academic dishonesty during the final semester exam.

This problem does not only occur in Indonesia but has become an epidemic in many countries (Stephens, 2019). Yang et al. (2013), academic dishonesty does not help individuals in learning and poses a severe potential threat to society, such as several events related to moral collapse that affect the global economy, including the accounting scandal at Enron Corporation and the financial turmoil of Wall Street, caused by highly educated people. In addition, an example in Indonesia of social assistance corruption cases committed by the former Minister of Social Affairs in the Greater Jakarta area for the 2020 fiscal year (Restu, 2021). Sajid Nazir & Shakeel Aslam's (2010) research on graduate students in Pakistan found that many students who commit academic dishonesty and want light punishment or no punishment for individuals who commit academic dishonesty in the low category. However, it has substantial implications for the development of morality and ethics owned by students. This unethical behavior occurs because of the mindset of each individual, and according to McCabe and Trevino (2001), if individuals think everyone is cheating, then they will tend to cheat (Eastman et al., 2008). The problem of violations of academic ethics is a serious challenge that is found in the world of education among students (Yang et al., 2013; Bachore, 2016), Especially in graduate students where graduate students tend to be more tolerant of academic dishonesty behavior (Nazir et al., 2011).

In the case found by Kanat-Maymon et al. (2015) of graduate students in Israel, the cause of students doing academic dishonesty is frustration, while students who feel satisfied or happy have a minimal tendency to do academic dishonesty. Research by Peled et al. (2019) on graduate students in Israel showed that more students practice academic dishonesty when learning face-to-face than e-learning. According to Stephens (2019), academic dishonesty is considered a natural thing, and it is done for survival and success.

In addition, according to Daumiller and Janke (2020), academic misconduct behavior is one of the efforts to improve performance. Conversely, individuals will not commit academic dishonesty if they feel they will be caught red-handed (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 2009). The academic dishonesty behavior carried out by graduate students based on the research of Witherspoon et al. (2012) consists of two types, namely traditional cheating methods: cheating in the classroom, cheating outside the classroom, and plagiarism, and contemporary cheating methods: using computers, the internet and using mobile phones.

Nazir et al. (2011) revealed several academic dishonesty behaviors carried out by graduate students, such as cheating through cheat sheets, using other people's assignments in their names, and stealing exam materials. In addition, cheating behavior is often done without thinking, such as helping friends to copy exams or assignments, copying from the internet without including sources, receiving and helping others on assignments or projects, allowing friends to use their reports as preparation, etc. Academic dishonesty behavior not only causes negative things for the individual himself, but also for his environment. Krou et

al. (2021) revealed that this behavior resulted in a deterioration in the achievement of educational goals, where although individuals were educated, intellectual, civic, and psychosocial development was not as expected.

Yang et al. (2013) argue that the reason individuals do academic dishonesty depends on the major taken, such as students in business and science majors see that doing academic dishonesty is more beneficial than getting the risk of doing dishonesty, such as wanting to succeed, getting scholarships and getting jobs, because by doing academic dishonesty individuals do not need to make a strenuous effort to get the desired results despite their competence. Low owned. The Center for Academic Integrity cited Wideman (2008), defines academic dishonesty as dishonest behavior associated with academic achievement including cheating, plagiarism, lies, fraud, and any other form of advantage unfairly obtained by individuals.

Sicak and Arslan (2016) argue that academic dishonesty is an act that is contrary to academic ethics. Jones (2011) revealed that along with the development of technology, academic dishonesty behavior is getting easier to do, such as getting answers through the internet, cheating in a simple way, namely cut and paste, and following cheating video instructions online. Based on this opinion, it can be concluded that academic dishonesty is a violation of academic ethics in the form of cheating, plagiarism, and everything obtained by unfair means.

Several factors can affect academic dishonesty, namely procrastination. Procrastination has a relationship with academic dishonesty. Jones (2011) states the reason someone does academic dishonesty is procrastination, if individuals often delay their work until they lack or run out of time to do tasks, then to fulfill the, task individuals tend to do academic dishonesty. Procrastination individuals prioritize feeling comfortable in their mood in the short term over prioritizing the long-term goal of working on a task (Gagnon et al., 2016).

Research by Incecam et al. (2017) shows a positive relationship between academic procrastination and academic dishonesty. In addition, research by Arifah et al. (2018) found that procrastination significantly influences academic dishonesty in Unnes students. Prasetyo and Handayani (2019) found a significant and positive relationship between academic procrastination and academic dishonesty in students who study while working.

The next factor is goal orientation. According to Dweck, quoted by Payne et al. (2007), individuals with high goal orientation are confident that effort can improve achievement. Having a goal orientation is essential for every individual, and it makes individuals want to hone their abilities in various desired fields both related to academic and non-academic, besides that having a goal will make it easier for individuals to achieve their goals. Goal orientation is a multidimensional variable consisting of mastery goal orientation and performance-approach goal orientation (Midgley et al., 1998).

Bell and Kozlowski (2002) revealed that self-efficacy and learning orientation have a positive relationship. According to Dweck and Leggett quoted by Yang et al. (2013), individuals who adopt mastery goals tend to believe that individual efforts and internal factors can be controlled and that this results in individual success or failure, therefore individuals who have mastery goals devote more effort and time to learning. This opinion is also reinforced by Krou et al. (2021) that individuals with high mastery goals when performing tasks will try to achieve their goals well and avoid academic dishonesty. While individuals with low mastery goals tend to commit academic dishonesty, it can be characterized by neglecting responsibility and a lack of diligence in doing tasks.

Individuals who pursue performance goals tend to believe that uncontrollable abilities and factors lead to success or failure and are more likely to despair in the face of challenges or difficulties (Yang et al., 2013). Individuals who have performance goals when doing tasks will be more likely to do academic dishonesty to get high scores, such as cheating and collaborating on tests (Budinarsih & Widyaningsih, 2016).

Research by Yang et al. (2013) shows that mastery goals negatively affect academic dishonesty, while performance goals do not significantly affect academic dishonesty. This research is in accordance with Santosa' research (2019), conducted at the University of Malang, showing a negative relationship between mastery goals and academic dishonesty, and performance goals do not correlate with academic dishonesty. The research results by Krou et al. (2021) showed a significant influence of mastery goals on academic dishonesty, while performance goals did not significantly affect academic dishonesty.

In addition, high and low academic dishonesty can be influenced by self-efficacy, where the prevention of academic dishonesty behavior that can be done and owned by individuals, among others, with self-efficacy that individuals believe in their ability to do assignments or answer questions during exams well, without any doubt and believe in what is done without cheating. Conversely, if the individual has low self-efficacy, he tends to commit academic dishonesty (Yang et al., 2013). According to Bandura quoted by Mukhid (2009), the term self-efficacy refers to beliefs about the ability of individuals to organize and perform an action to achieve the results to be achieved. Based on this, self-efficacy is the belief in self-assessment based on the competencies individuals have to complete their tasks. Individuals who believe they can perform academic tasks use more cognitive and metacognitive strategies, regardless of previous achievements or abilities (Pajares, 2002).

Prat-Sala and Redford, as quoted by Cerino and Eric (2014), revealed that individuals with high levels of self-efficacy when doing reading and writing tasks, he learned to use a strategic style that refers to the amount of time and consideration when working on tasks, learning, and time management for optimal results and individuals with low levels of self-efficacy neglect in doing tasks. Based on Baran and Jonason, 2020; and Küçüktepe's research (2010), there is a significant negative relationship between academic dishonesty behavior and self-efficacy in graduate students.

Self-efficacy is a source of motivation that individuals have that can influence the individual's degree of procrastination. Where if the individual has confidence that he can complete the task well, then he does not delay his work. Corkin et al. (2011) The reasons individuals actively procrastinate are lack of attention to the subject matter and feeling inferior, and this can be overcome by increasing self-efficacy.

In previous studies, self-efficacy moderated the effect of procrastination on academic fraud behavior (Murdiana et al., 2023). In addition, in academic-efficacy has a role as a moderator and mediator of academic competence and academic achievement. According to Arias-Chávez et al. (2020), Academic procrastination has a dynamic nature, and its presence affects educational factors such as completion of work, exams, direction, or interaction with teachers. Procrastination itself is known as a phenomenon that has a negative effect on individual performance and well-being (Klingsieck, 2013). While Self-efficacy is described as a source of motivation that individuals have that can influence the level of individual procrastination (Arias-Chávez et al., 2020; Cerino & Eric, 2014), where if individuals have confidence that they can complete tasks well, then they do not delay their work so that the tendency to do academic dishonesty is reduced.

In addition to procrastination, goal orientation also has a relationship with self-efficacy, where self-efficacy will make it easier for students to achieve their goals. Payne et al. (2007) found that goal orientation positively correlates with self-efficacy. According to Prat-Sala and Redford, quoted by Cerino and Eric (2014), Individuals with a high level of self-efficacy have high goal achievement to achieve. Individuals with a goal orientation will easily set goals and focus on what they will achieve (Geitz, 2015). Although goal orientation affects academic dishonesty without a moderator, it also has a relationship with self-efficacy. Therefore, in this study researchers tried to test self-efficacy as a moderator of procrastination and goal orientation as factors that influence academic dishonesty.

Based on the phenomenon that the author has described, the problem of academic dishonesty carried out by the academic community, especially for postgraduate students, needs to be followed up, where at that level students should have high integrity and a tendency to violate the code of ethics is low, besides that graduate students are expected to have high intellectual abilities following the chosen major. The way to measure academic dishonesty behavior in graduate students is based on factors that influence

academic dishonesty behavior. Therefore, the author wants to examine further the effect of procrastination and goal orientation on the academic dishonesty of graduate students, with self-efficacy as a moderator.

Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach, and the sampling design in this study is non-probability sampling, where the population in this study does not have the same opportunity to be used as a research sample. The sampling technique uses purposive sampling, where the sample is a graduate student of the State Islamic University of Jakarta with active status who gets a Google form. This sampling technique makes it easier for researchers to find samples.

Data collection in this study was done by distributing questionnaires online using Google Forms. The population in this study is postgraduate students studying at Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta who has active status and has attended at least one semester of lectures. The sample to be taken in this study is as many as 212 graduate students of UIN Jakarta.

The scale used in this study is academic dishonesty, which uses a scale developed by Bashir and Bala (2018), which consists of cheating in examinations, plagiarism, outside help, and lying about academic assignments. The procrastination scale was created by Chun Chu and Choi (2005) and developed by Choi and Moran (2009), which consists of four dimension items: preference for pressure, intentional procrastination, ability to meet deadlines, and outcome satisfaction. The Goal Orientation measurement tool was developed by Button et al. (1996). It consists of performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation. The self-efficacy scale created by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995), An individual's confidence in performing a new task or difficult task in various consists of two dimensions: optimistic resource beliefs and optimistic action beliefs. Construct validity was then tested using construct validity using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using Mplus.

Table 1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Test

Instrument	Dimension	Chi square	Df	P-Value	RMSEA
Academic Dishonesty	Academic Dishonesty	37.540	25	.0513	.049
Procrastination	Procrastination	71.741	49	.0188	.047
Goal Orientation	Performance Goal Orientation	31.101	22	.0941	.044
	Learning Goal Orientation	37.980	26	.0608	.047
Self Efficacy	Self Efficacy	43.633	32	.0824	.041

Table 1. shows that the CFA test of all variables shows that the model is a fit because the P-value is more than .05 and the RMSEA value is less than .05, indicating that all items on the scale measure unidimensional.

Data Analysis

The analysis technique in this study is Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) using the help of SPSS 26, where MRA is an interaction test, a particular application of multiple linear regression where the regression equation contains elements of interaction (multiplication of two or more independent variables). This analysis technique tests to strengthen or weaken the direct relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Moderating variables influence the nature or direction of the relationship between variables. The nature or direction of the relationship between independent and

dependent variables is likely to be positive or negative depending on the moderating variable therefore, the moderating variable is also called the contingency variable (Liana, 2009).

To assess a regression model obtained is a model that produces minimum errors, so several analysis tests are carried out including the value of the coefficient of multiple determination or R Square (R²), where R² is used to determine how much the influence of IV affects DV. The F test is performed to see if the effect of IV on DV is significant (Sig. < .05). The t-test is used to see the effect of significance given by each independent variable on the dependent variable (Sig. < .05).

Results and Discussion

After being analyzed using CFA and valid items were used to test all hypotheses using multiple linear regression. The following is the effect of IV, namely self-efficacy, procrastination, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation on DV, namely academic dishonesty, as follows:

Table 2. Model Summary of All IV to DV

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.483	.233	.218	4.85996

Based on **Table 2.** the amount R Square = .233 (23.3%) is obtained. This means that the variation in academic dishonesty is influenced by the variation in self-efficacy involvement, procrastination, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation together by 23.3%, while the rest is influenced by other variables outside this study.

Table 3. Result F-Test

Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1486.730	4	371.682	15.736	.000
Residual	4889.181	207	23.619		
Total	14430.450	153			

Based on **Table 3.** shows that there is a significant effect of self-efficacy, procrastination, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty with a significance value of .000 (sig < .05), and an F value of 15.736. This means that there is a significant effect together on procrastination, performance goal orientation, learning goal orientation and self-efficacy on academic dishonesty.

Based on **Table 4.** a regression coefficient of -.304 was obtained with a significance value of .001 (sig < .05). This means that self-efficacy has a significant influence on academic dishonesty, in a negative direction. A regression coefficient of .084 was obtained with a significance value of .198 (sig > .05). This means that procrastination does not have a significant effect on academic dishonesty, in a positive direction. A regression coefficient of .118 was obtained with The significance value is .095 (GIS < .05). This means that performance goal orientation does not have a significant influence on academic dishonesty by self-efficacy, with a positive direction. A regression coefficient of -.227 was obtained with a significance value of .017 (GIS > .05). This means that learning goal orientation does not have a significant effect on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy in a negative direction.

Table 4. Regression Coefficient of Research Variables All IV to DV

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std.Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	51.217	10.835		4.727	.000
<i>Self-Efficacy</i>	-.310	.095	-.304	-3.256	.001
Procrastination	.095	.073	.084	1.291	.198
<i>Performance Goal Orientation</i>	.405	.242	.118	1.677	.095
<i>Learning Goal Orientation</i>	-.214	.089	-.227	-2.397	.017

Based on **Table 5**. R Square .252 (25.2%) means that the variation of academic dishonesty is influenced by variations in procrastination involvement, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation moderated by self-efficacy together by 25.2% while 74.8% is influenced by other variables outside this study. Based on this, after self-efficacy acts as a moderator.

Table 5. Model Summary IV Against DV Moderated by Self Efficacy

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.526 ^a	.277	.252	4.75467	.526

Based on **Tabel 6**. in model 1 shows that there is a significant influence of procrastination, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy with a significance value of .000 (sig < .05), and an F value of 11,148. This means that self-efficacy acts as a moderator on the influence of procrastination, performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty.

Table 6. Result F-Test All IV Against DV

Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	1764.114	7	252.016	11.148	.000
	Residual	4611.796	204	22.607		
	Total	6375.911	211			

Table 7. Regression coefficient of variable IV to DV moderated by Self Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std.Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	165.691	75.886		2.183	.030
Procrastination	1.750	.572	1.548	3.062	.002
Performance Goal Orientation	-3.330	1.936	-.965	-1.720	.087
Learning Goal Orientation	-.510	.360	-.541	-1.419	.157
Self-Efficacy	-2.518	1.501	-2.470	-1.678	.095
Procrastination X SE	-.032	.011	-1.890	-2.859	.005
Performance GO X SE	.071	.038	3.903	1.881	.061
Learning GO X SE	.006	.008	.573	.847	.398

Based on **Table 7**, a regression coefficient of -1.890 was obtained with a significance value of .005 (sig < .05). This means that procrastination has a significant influence on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy, in a negative direction. A regression coefficient of 3.903 was obtained with a significance value of .061 (sig > .05). This means that performance goal orientation has a significant influence on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy with a positive direction. A regression coefficient of .573 was obtained with a significance value of .398 (sig > .05). This means that learning goal orientation does not have a significant effect on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy with a positive direction.

There is a negative and significant influence of procrastination on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy. This means that self-efficacy acts as a moderator, where the self-efficacy variable can weaken the influence of procrastination on academic dishonesty. Based on Jones' research, (2011) the reason someone commits academic dishonesty is procrastination, if individuals often postpone their work until they lack or run out of time in doing tasks. The reasons individuals actively procrastinate are inattention to the subject matter and feeling inferior, this can be overcome by increasing self-efficacy (Corkin et al., 2011). Self-efficacy is described as a source of motivation that the individual has that can influence the degree of procrastination of the individual (Arias-Chávez et al., 2020; Cerino & Eric, 2014), Where if the individual has confidence that he can complete the task well then he does not delay his work.

There is a positive and insignificant influence of performance goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy. This means that self-efficacy does not act as a moderator where the higher the self-efficacy and performance goal orientation, the higher the academic dishonesty. This is because self-efficacy is not strong enough to weaken the influence of performance goal orientation on academic dishonesty. This finding needs further investigation, because it does not fit the existing theory.

There is a positive and insignificant influence of learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy. This means that self-efficacy does not act as a moderator where the higher the self-efficacy and learning goal orientation, the higher the academic dishonesty. This is because self-efficacy is not strong enough to weaken the effect of learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty. This finding needs further investigation, because it does not fit the existing theory.

Conclusion

Hypothesis testing tests the effect of IV on DV in the presence of moderator variables, the conclusion of the research results is as follows:

1. There is a significant influence of procrastination, performance goal orientation, learning goal orientation and self efficacy on academic dishonesty. There is a significant effect of procrastination, performance goal orientation, learning goal orientation and self efficacy on academic dishonesty moderated by self efficacy. There is a significant effect of procrastination on academic dishonesty moderated by negative self-efficacy. There is an insignificant effect of performance goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy in a positive direction. There is an insignificant effect of learning goal orientation on academic dishonesty moderated by self-efficacy with a positive direction.
2. The small number of respondents, namely 212 students, made the data less than optimal, so in the next study it was advisable to find more respondents. In addition, the variables LGO and PGO have a positive and insignificant direction, the results of the study need to be studied more deeply because the theory is different from the existing theory.
3. This research can be of special concern to the agencies, universities and lecturers concerned in order to prevent academic dishonesty carried out by graduate students by providing notices, warnings or sanctions in accordance with the academic deviant behavior committed. Universities or institutions need to conduct workshops, seminars or discussions on how to improve self-efficacy and goal orientation.

References

- Arias-Chávez, D., Ramos-Quispe, T., Villalba, K. O., & Cangalaya-Sevillano, L. M. (2020). Self-efficacy and academic procrastination: A study conducted in university students of metropolitan Lima. *International Journal of Innovation*, 11(10), 17.
- Arifah, Setiyani, & Arief. (2018). Pengaruh prokrastinasi, tekanan akademik, religiusitas, locus of control terhadap perilaku academic dishonesty mahasiswa pendidikan akuntansi. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 7(1). Unnes <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eeaj>
- Balkis, M. (2011). Academic efficacy as a mediator and moderator variable in the relationship between academic procrastination and academic achievement. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 45(45), 1–16.
- Baran, L., & Jonason, P. K. (2020). Academic dishonesty among university students: The roles of the psychopathy, motivation, and self-efficacy. *PLOS ONE*, 15(8), e0238141. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238141>
- Bashir, H., & Bala, R. (2018). Development and validation of academic dishonesty scale (ADS): Presenting a multidimensional scale. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1125a>
- Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, W. J. (2002). Goal orientation and ability: Interactive effects on self-efficacy, performance, and knowledge. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.497>
- Budiningsih, T. E., & Widyaningsih. (2016). Perbedaan academic self efficacy ditinjau dari jenis goal orientation. *Intuisi Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 8(2). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/INTUISI>
- Button, S. B., Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1996). Goal orientation in organizational research: A conceptual and empirical foundation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67(1), 26–48. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.0063>

- Cerino, & Eric. (2014). Relationships between academic motivation, self-efficacy, and academic procrastination. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, *19*, 156–163. <https://doi.org/10.24839/2164-8204.JN19.4.156>.
- Choi, J. N., & Moran, S. V. (2009). Why Not procrastinate? development and validation of a new active procrastination scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *149*(2), 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.149.2.195-212>
- Chun Chu, A. H., & Choi, J. N. (2005). Rethinking procrastination: positive effects of “active” procrastination behavior on attitudes and performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *145*(3), 245–264. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.3.245-264>
- Corkin, D. M., Yu, S. L., & Lindt, S. F. (2011). Comparing active delay and procrastination from a self-regulated learning perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *21*(5), 602–606. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.07.005>
- Daumiller, M., & Janke, S. (2020). Effects of performance goals and social norms on academic dishonesty in a test British. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *90*, 537–559.
- Eastman, J. K., Iyer, R., & Reisenwitz, T. H. (2008). The impact of unethical reasoning on different types of academic dishonesty: An exploratory study. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, *5*(12). <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v5i12.1211>
- Gagnon, J., Dionne, F., & Pychyl, T. A. (2016). Committed action: An initial study on its association to procrastination in academic settings. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, *5*(2), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2016.04.002>
- Gerry Geitz, Desirée Joosten-ten Brinke & Paul A. Kirschner (2015). Goal orientation, deep learning, and sustainable feedback in higher business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*. *26*:4, 273-292. [10.1080/08975930.2015.1128375](https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2015.1128375)
- Hadjar, I. (2017). The effect of religiosity and perception on academic cheating among muslim students in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *6*(2), 139–147.
- Herdian, & Astorini, D. (2017). Academic dishonesty pada calon pendidik agama islam di universitas x di purwokerto. *Psikologika*, *21*(1). <https://doi.org/10.21070/psikologia.v2i1.1073>, <http://ojs.umsida.ac.id/index.php/psikologia>.
- Hollinger, R. C., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2009). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures: An empirical survey of cheating at a major public university. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *46*(4). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1949-6605.5033>
- Incecam, B., Seren, N., & Ozden, M. (2017). Investigation of the relationship between academic procrastination and academic dishonesty tendency of pre-service teachers: The case of dumlupinar university. *Proceedings of ICERI2017 Conference*, 10.
- Jones, D. L. R. (2011). Academic dishonesty: Are more students cheating?. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *74*(2), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569911404059>
- Kanat-Maymon, Y., Benjamin, M., Stavsky, A., Shoshani, A., & Roth, G. (2015). The role of basic need fulfillment in academic dishonesty: A self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *43*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2015.08.002>
- Klingsieck, K., B. (2013). Procrastination: When good things don't come to those who wait. *European Psychologist*, *18*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000138>
- 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>

- Küçüktepe, S. E. (2010). A study on preservice English teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and tendency towards academic dishonesty. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4985–4990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.807>
- Liana, L. (2009). Penggunaan MRA dengan spss untuk menguji pengaruh variabel moderating terhadap hubungan antara variabel independen dan variabel dependen. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi DINAMIK*, *XIV*(2).
- Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., Middleton, M., Maehr, M. L., Urdan, T., Anderman, L. H., Anderman, E., & Roeser, R. (1998). The development and validation of scales assessing students' achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *23*(2), 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1998.0965>
- Mukhid, A. (2009). Self-efficacy (Perspektif Teori kognitif sosial dan implikasinya terhadap pendidikan). *Tadrîs*, *4*(1).
- Murdiana, M., Efendri, E., Kisman, Z., & Kanto, D. S. (2023). The influence of academic pressure, academic procrastination and ability with self efficacy as a moderating variable on student academic fraud behavior. *Islamic Banking: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pengembangan Perbankan Syariah*, *8*(2), 375–394. <https://doi.org/10.36908/isbank.v8i2.698>
- Nazir, M. S., Aslam, M. S., & Nawaz, M. M. (2011). Can demography predict academic dishonest behaviors of students? A case of Pakistan. *International Education Studies*, *4*(2), p208. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n2p208>
- Pajares, F. (2002). Gender and perceived self-efficacy in self-regulated learning. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(2), 116–125. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_8
- Pantu, E. A., Karmiyati, D., & Winarsunu, T. (2020). Pengaruh tekanan teman sebaya dan kecemasan menghadapi ujian terhadap ketidakjujuran akademik pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, *8*(1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jipt.v8i1.9127>
- Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1), 128–150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.128>
- Peled, Y., Eshet, Y., Barczyk, C., & Grinautski, K. (2019). Predictors of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students in online and face-to-face courses. *Computers & Education*, *131*, 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.012>
- Prasetyo, I., & Handayani, N. S. (2019). Prokrastinasi akademik dan kecurangan akademik pada mahasiswa yang kuliah sambil bekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *12*(1), 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.35760/psi.2019.v12i1.1913>
- Restu, K. (2021, January 27). Babak kasus juliari p batubara diduga korupsi dana bansos covid-19, saksi baru dipanggil KPK [Berita]. *Potensi Bisnis*. <https://potensibisnis.pikiran-rakyat.com/news/pr-691238118/babak-kasus-juliari-p-batubara-diduga-korupsi-dana-bansos-covid-19-saksi-baru-dipanggil-kpk>
- Sajid Nazir, M., & Shakeel Aslam, M. (2010). Academic dishonesty and perceptions of Pakistani students. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *24*(7), 655–668. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541011080020>
- Santosa. (2019). *Takut gagal sebagai moderator hubungan antara orientasi tujuan dan academic dishonesty: Studi Pada Mahasiswa Di Malang Raya*. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang.

- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Optimistic self-beliefs as a resource factor in coping with stress. In S. E. Hobfoll & M. W. Vries (Eds.), *Extreme Stress and Communities: Impact and Intervention* (pp. 159–177). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8486-9_7
- Sıcak, A., & Arslan, A. (2016). The relation between prospective teachers' goal orientations and academic e-dishonesty. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 1660–1666. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040718>
- Stephens, J. M. (2019). Natural and normal, but unethical and evitable: The epidemic of academic dishonesty and how we end it. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 51(4), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2019.1618140>
- Utami, U. P., & Agustina, E. (2019). Hubungan Antara motivasi berprestasi dan relasi teman sebaya dengan academic dishonesty pada mahasiswa fakultas x unissula, prosiding, konferensi ilmiah mahasiswa unissula (Kimu). *Hubungan Antara Motivasi Berprestasi Dan Relasi Teman Sebaya Dengan Academic Dishonesty Pada Mahasiswa Fakultas X Unissula, Prosiding, Konferensi Ilmiah Mahasiswa Unissula (Kimu)*, 10. <http://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/kimuhum/article/view/8174>
- Wideman, M. A. (2008). Academic dishonesty in postsecondary education: A literature review. *Academic Dishonesty in Postsecondary Education*, 2(1), 13.
- Witherspoon, M., Maldonado, N., & Lacey, C. H. (2012). *Undergraduates and academic dishonesty*. 3(1), 11.
- Yang, S. C., Huang, C.-L., & Chen, A.-S. (2013). An investigation of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, reasons for dishonesty, achievement goals, and willingness to report dishonest behavior. *Ethics & Behavior*, 23(6), 501–522. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2013.802651>