



Cultivating Honest Character in Social Context: The Basis for Realizing Academic Integrity

I Gusti Agung Ayu Wulandari^{1*}, Ni Ketut Desia Trisiantari², Ni Luh Putu Agetania³ 

^{1,2,3} Ganesha University of Education, Singaraja, Indonesia

*Corresponding author ayu.wulandari@undiksha.ac.id

Abstrak

Kemajuan teknologi memberikan dampak yang besar disetiap lini kehidupan, diantaranya Pendidikan. Setiap orang dalam dunia Pendidikan dapat dengan mudah mengakses informasi dari berbagai sumber diinternet, hal ini membuat banyak terjadi kecurangan akademik diantaranya tindak plagiat. GONE Theory yang ditemukan oleh Jack Bologne pada Tahun 1993 menjelaskan sebuah teori tentang factor-faktor yang mendasari seseorang melakukan perilaku curang atau penipuan. GONE adalah singkatan dari Greed (keserakahan), Opportunity (kesempatan), Need (kebutuhan) dan Exposure (pengungkapan). Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh yang dominan antara 4 faktor kecurangan tersebut. Jenis penelitian menggunakan *expost facto* dengan populasi adalah mahasiswa aktif di Provinsi Bali pada Tahun 2023 yang berkuliah dibawah naungan Kementerian Pendidikan, Riset dan Teknologi yaitu dari Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Universitas Udayana, Politeknik Negeri Bali, dan Institut Seni Indonesia. Berdasarkan data yang diperoleh dari Badan Pusat Statistik sebanyak 58.588 mahasiswa (BPS, 2023). Sesuai tabel dari Krejcie dan Morgan, jumlah sampel untuk populasi 50.000-75.000 adalah 382 (diambil dari $N = 50.000-75.000$ pada tabel Morgan) dengan tingkat ketelitian (d_2) 95% dan taraf signifikansi (z_2) 5%. Hasil penelitian menunjukan variable pengungkapan paling besar mempengaruhi kecurangan akademik yaitu sebesar 39%. Berdasarkan hasil tersebut maka karakter jujur menjadi Solusi paling baik agar tercipta integritas akademik di kalangan mahasiswa.

Kata Kunci: GONE Theory, Jujur, Integritas Akademik

Abstract

Technological advances have a big impact on every line of life, including education. Everyone in the world of education can easily access information from various sources on the internet, this causes a lot of academic fraud to occur, including acts of plagiarism. GONE Theory, discovered by Jack Bologne in 1993, explains a theory about the factors that underlie someone's fraudulent or deceptive behavior. GONE is an abbreviation of Greed (greed), Opportunity (opportunity), Need (need and Exposure). The aim of this research is to determine the dominant influence between the 4 cheating factors. This type of research uses *ex post facto* with the population being active students in the Province Bali in 2023 who are studying under the auspices of the Ministry of Education, Research and Technology, namely from Ganesha Education University, Udayana University, Bali State Polytechnic, and the Indonesian Institute of Arts, based on data obtained from the Central Statistics Agency, there are 58,588 students (BPS, 2023). table from Krejcie and Morgan, the number of samples for a population of 50,000-75,000 is 382 (taken from $N = 50,000-75,000$ in Morgan's table) with an accuracy level (d_2) of 95% and a significance level (z_2) of 5%. The research results show that the disclosure variable has the greatest influence on academic cheating, namely 39%. Based on these results, honest character is the best solution to create academic integrity among students.

Keywords: GONE Theory, Honest, Academic Integrity

1. INTRODUCTION

Technological advancements have had a significant impact on various aspects of life, including education. In the realm of education, individuals can easily access information from various sources on the internet, which has led to an increase in academic dishonesty, particularly plagiarism (Haldorai et al., 2021; Halili, 2019). This issue is commonly encountered at different levels of education, especially in higher education institutions. Furthermore, it is explained that students believe online cheating frequently occurs due to weak supervision by educators (Dendir & Maxwell, 2020; Shbail et al., 2022). This is often based on the difficulty educators' face in monitoring students while they are taking tests.

History:

Received : January 21, 2024

Accepted : March 02, 2024

Published : April 25, 2024

Publisher: Undiksha Press

Licensed: This work is licensed under

a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License



Current forms of supervision include setting time limits for assignments, using surveillance cameras, and other similar methods. Another study shows that assessments during online learning are a "survival mode" for students (Smaldino & Lowther, 2017). The term survival is used by learners considering the large number of assignments they receive during online learning, which leads them to take shortcuts by committing academic violations. Common academic violations include plagiarism without citing the original source, copying and pasting friends' assignments, and seeking help from online assignment services (Roe, 2022; Wijayanto et al., 2023).

According to previous study, academic dishonesty includes: (1) assignments completed by someone else but claimed as one's own work, (2) citing from various print and non-print sources without crediting the original sources, (3) obtaining leaked questions or answers from others, (4) receiving assistance from various parties while working on assignments, (5) falsifying research data, (6) using various excuses to delay submitting assignments, (7) falsifying bibliographies, (8) helping friends complete their assignments or tests, (9) bringing cheat sheets to exams, (10) being a parasitic member in group assignments (Cheng et al., 2021).

Various factors can influence someone to commit fraud, one of which is the GONE Theory. The GONE Theory, explains the underlying factors that drive individuals to engage in fraudulent behavior or deceit (Munirah & Nurkhin, 2018). GONE is an acronym for Greed, Opportunity, Need, and Exposure. Greed is a factor related to the internal drive within an individual to obtain greater benefits, even if the methods used are inappropriate, unethical, or dishonest (Astra et al., 2020; Budiman, 2018). For example, a student whose ability is only deemed worthy of a B grade might, due to greed and ambition to achieve an A, resort to various methods to reach this goal. This could include cheating on a friend's work, using a task proxy, and other similar actions, which clearly violate academic integrity. Some indicators that can be used to measure greed include: (1) being overly ambitious to the extent of justifying any means, (2) awareness of academic integrity as an academician, (3) non-compliance with rules, such as the level of plagiarism in assignments, (4) inadequate understanding of the material, leading to justifying any means to complete it, (5) pressure from the surrounding environment, such as parents who want the student to achieve high grades (Dendir & Maxwell, 2020).

Opportunity is a condition where someone can do something according to their goals due to the presence of a chance. Opportunities can arise because of gaps or weaknesses, enabling students to commit acts of fraud. Needs are a state where someone requires something to fill a deficiency or emptiness within themselves. These needs can vary, being either physical or psychological. These needs are considered an internal drive that compels someone to find various ways to fulfill them (Shbail et al., 2022; Widianingsih, 2013). If these needs are not met, it can result in stress, frustration, dissatisfaction, and other negative outcomes. Disclosure becomes a factor causing academic dishonesty. Why is that so? Because if someone cheats but doesn't get caught, they might repeat the behavior (Hashed & Almaqtari, 2021; Whale et al., 2018). This means that disclosure becomes one of the factors causing academic dishonesty. If a lecturer is disciplined when they catch a student cheating and immediately discloses the act and imposes harsh sanctions, then other students will certainly be deterred from repeating the behavior. Disclosure can occur in various ways, such as through strict supervision by lecturers, plagiarism checks on student assignments, reports from other students, and so on (Hatane & Kurniawan, 2022; Mouakket & Sun, 2020).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the factors influencing students to commit academic dishonesty include: (1) greed, which relates to the desire to achieve better grades despite the reality that their abilities do not match, (2) opportunity, which relates to the chance to commit academic dishonesty, such as when a lecturer does not strictly monitor the

exam, allowing students to cheat, (3) necessity, which relates to the students' need for appreciation and satisfaction, leading them to justify any means to meet these needs, (4) disclosure, which relates to the exposure of the academic dishonesty perpetrator (Cheng et al., 2021; Dendir & Maxwell, 2020; Mustapha et al., 2017). If a perpetrator is announced and sanctioned, such incidents can be minimized in the future, but conversely, if the perpetrators are never revealed, it will certainly foster a culture of academic dishonesty. In formal education, academic dishonesty is often encountered due to the dishonesty of participants in completing assignments and exams. An intellectual should possess appropriate academic integrity to reflect the education they have received (Cheng et al., 2021; Isnaini et al., 2020). Academic integrity is a behavior within oneself in the academic environment that prioritizes truth by not lying, cheating, and acting in accordance with the rules established in the school environment (Dewanti et al., 2020; Roe, 2022). In line with this, academic integrity is a commitment to uphold six basic ethical principles as an academic: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage (Miller & Young-Jones, 2012).

The research was conducted to analyze which of the four factors, as outlined by the GONE Theory, is the most dominant cause of someone committing fraud. Once the most dominant factor is identified, further research can be carried out to address this predominant cause. The novelty of this research uses GONE theory by integrating four factors and their indicators. It is hoped that by conducting this research, students, particularly prospective teachers, can be academically well-prepared, thereby minimizing the occurrence of academic dishonesty in the future.

2. METHODS

This research essentially aims to determine the influence of greed, opportunity, need, and disclosure on academic fraud among active students in Bali Province. Therefore, this study is classified as an ex post facto research. Ex post facto research is conducted where the independent variables are already present when the researcher observes the dependent variables in a study (Bunari et al., 2023). The population in this study consists of active students in Bali Province in 2023 who are studying under the auspices of the Ministry of Education, Research, and Technology, namely from Ganesha University of Education, Udayana University, Bali State Polytechnic, and the Indonesian Institute of the Arts. According to data obtained from the Central Bureau of Statistics, there are 58,588 students. A sample is a portion of the entire population that can be selected based on sampling techniques, where the predetermined sample must be a reflection of the population's condition (Etikan et al., 2016). Research sample is a portion of the population taken and can be representative of or represent the entire population. The number of samples for a population of 50,000-75,000 is 382 (taken from $N = 50,000-75,000$ on the Morgan table) with an accuracy level (d_2) of 95% and a significance level (z_2) of 5%.

The data collection used in this research is through a non-test method by distributing questionnaires. A questionnaire is a data collection technique employed by researchers by providing several written questions/statements to the respondents (Nemoto & Beglar, 2014). The questionnaire used has been previously tested for validity and reliability with good results, thus making the instrument suitable for use. The data analysis was conducted by first performing prerequisite tests, namely the normality test of data distribution using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with the help of SPSS 16.00 for Windows. The testing criterion is that the data is normally distributed if the significance value (sig) > 0.05 . This was followed by the linearity test to determine whether the data has a significant linear relationship. The linearity test was performed using the F-test.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Prerequisite Test

The purpose of the requirement analysis test is to determine whether the collected data meets the criteria for analysis. Therefore, before conducting hypothesis testing, data normality testing is performed first. The normality test of the data distribution is conducted to ensure that the data generated in the study truly comes from a normally distributed population, allowing for hypothesis testing to be carried out. The normality test of the data distribution is conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with the assistance of the SPSS 16.00 for Windows program. The testing criterion is that the data is normally distributed if the significance level (sig) > 0.05. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, using the SPSS for Windows version 16.00 program, are shown in [Table 1](#).

Table 1. Recapitulation of Normality Test Results for Distribution of Research Data

Variable	Kolmogorov-smirnov		Conclusion
	Statistic	Sig	
a. Greed	0.079	0.080	Normal
b. Chance	0.128	0.102	Normal
c. Need	0.109	0.075	Normal
d. Disclosure	0.119	0.114	Normal
e. Academic Cheating	0.093	0.073	Normal

Based on [Table 1](#), it is evident that for all variables, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic obtained is greater than 0.05. This means that the scores of students' greed, opportunity, necessity, disclosure, and academic dishonesty are normally distributed. The linearity test is used to determine whether data has a significant linear relationship or not. The results of the Linearity Test using SPSS for Windows version 16.00 are obtained as shown in [Table 2](#).

Table 2. Récapitulation of Régression Line Linearity Test

Variable Pairs		F. Linearity		D. Dev. From Linearity		Category
Dependent	Independent	Count	Sig	Count	Sig	
X ₁	Y	158.680	0.000	0.787	0.742	Linier
X ₂	Y	235.726	0.000	1.787	0.054	Linier
X ₃	Y	1.233	0.007	0.964	0.501	Linier
X ₄	Y	286.629	0.000	0.597	0.070	Linier

The results of the linearity test analysis of the regression line in [Table 2](#), show that F Linearity F calculated with a significance of <0.05 and for F Deviation from Linearity F calculated with a significance of > 0.05. Thus it can be concluded that there is a linear relationship between greed, opportunity and need, and disclosure of student academic cheating. The multicollinearity test was applied to the independent variables, namely servant leadership scores, opportunities, work motivation, disclosure. For this test, product moment correlation between independent variables is used to predict the VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) value. If the VIF value ≤ 10 then the independent variables are not collinear ([Candiasa, 2010](#)). After conducting an analysis using SPSS, the VIF price between each independent variable was obtained as shown in [Table 3](#).

Table 3. Intercorrelation between Independent Variables

Variabel	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Greed	0.656	1.525
Chance	0.428	2.337
Need	0.941	1.063
Disclosure	0.535	1.869

From Table 3 it can be seen that the VIF value between the variables Greed and Academic Fraud is 1.525, Opportunity with Academic Fraud is 2.337, Need with Academic Fraud is 1.063, and Disclosure with Academic Fraud is 1.869. All VIF values are below 10. This means that the data is free from symptoms of multicollinearity and meets the prerequisite tests for analysis.

Hypothesis Test

To test the influence of greed, opportunity, need and disclosure on academic cheating, this was done using multiple regression techniques with the help of the SPSS for Windows version 16.00 program. A summary of the calculation results is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of Significance Test Calculations

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	18464.557	4	4616.139	99.439	0.000
Residual	17501.066	377	46.422		
Total	35965.623	381			

Based on the results of the analysis, shown in Table 4, the resulting multiple regression equation is $Y = 2.904 + 0.768X_1 + 0.460X_2 + -0.266X_3 + 0.750X_4$ with an F reg of 99.439 and a significance of 0.000. The correlation coefficient between the variables greed, opportunity, need and disclosure and student academic cheating is 0.717 with an influence of = 51.3%. This means that the null hypothesis which states that there is no influence of Greed, Opportunity, Need and Disclosure on student Academic Cheating, is rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an influence of Greed, Opportunity, Need and Disclosure on student Academic Cheating. Next, testing the hypothesis was carried out using a simple correlation technique with the help of the SPSS for Windows version 16.00 program. A summary of the regression analysis and multiple regression of the dependent variable on the independent variables can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Regression and Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Regression line equation	r_{xy}	r_{partial}	R_y	F hit	R_y^2	SE (%)	Category
$X_1 - Y$	$Y = 5.934 + 1.441 X_1$	0.545	0.320	-	-	-	15.8	Sig
$X_2 - Y$	$Y = 8.480 + 1.357 X_2$	0.609	0.190	-	-	-	12.6	Sig
$X_3 - Y$	$Y = 32.486 + 0.154 X_3$	0.057	-0.135	-	-	-	-0.6	Sig
$X_4 - Y$	$Y = 10.904 + 1.247X_4$	0.625	0.366	-	-	-	23.5	Sig
$X_1X_2X_3 - Y$	$Y = 2.904 + 0.768X_1 + 0.460X_2 + -0.266X_3 + 0.750X_4$	-	-	0.717	99.439	0.513	-	Sig

Based on [Table 5](#), the regression equation for testing the hypothesis of greed on academic cheating of students is $Y = 5.934 + 1.441X_1$ with an F value of 160.657. The correlation coefficient is 0.545, the effect is 29.7%, and the effective contribution is 15.8%, thus the conclusion is significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation between greed and academic cheating among students. Next, the regression equation for testing the hypothesis of opportunity on academic cheating of students is $Y = 8.480 + 1.357X_2$ with an F value of 224.566. The correlation coefficient is 0.609, the effect is 37.1%, and the effective contribution is 12.6%, thus the conclusion is significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation between opportunity and academic cheating among students. Furthermore, the regression equation for testing the hypothesis of need on academic cheating of students is $Y = 32.486 + 0.154X_3$ with an F value of 1.235. The correlation coefficient is 0.057, the effect is 0.03%, and the effective contribution is -0.6%, thus the conclusion is not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant effect between need and academic cheating among students is accepted. Lastly, the regression equation for testing the hypothesis of disclosure on academic cheating of students is $Y = 10.904 + 1.247X_4$ with an F value of 243.387. The correlation coefficient is 0.625, the effect is 39%, and the effective contribution is 23.5%, thus the conclusion is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant effect between Disclosure and Academic Cheating among students is rejected. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant correlation between disclosure and academic cheating among students.

Discussion

Based on the analysis results, it is known that the multiple regression equation shows the influence of Greed, Opportunity, Need, and Disclosure on students' Academic Dishonesty. A contribution of 51.3% indicates that greed, opportunity, need, and disclosure significantly influence academic dishonesty. Therefore, it can be concluded that increased greed, presence of opportunity, needs to fulfill, and lack of disclosure greatly affect academic dishonesty among students. Reliance has a positive influence on academic dishonesty. This is because students often feel dissatisfied with their previous grades and do not want to lose in competition with their peers ([Chiang et al., 2022](#); [Heriyati & Ekasari, 2020](#); [Roe, 2022](#)). Opportunities indeed enable students to engage in dishonesty, such as during exams when students sit at the back and are not well supervised ([Cheng et al., 2021](#); [Isnaini et al., 2020](#)). The findings of this research also align with a study conducted by which stated that needs do not significantly influence academic dishonesty among students ([Janke et al., 2021](#)). This indicates that students do not necessarily need good grades, so they do not resort to academic dishonesty, or students already trust in their abilities and therefore do not feel the need to engage in academic dishonesty.

Based on the results of the conducted research, it can be concluded that disclosure variable has the greatest influence on the occurrence of academic dishonesty. This means that students who are accustomed to facing sanctions in the form of disclosure of their dishonesty are less likely to engage in academic dishonesty. The deterrent effect is obtained because students feel ashamed after their mistakes are revealed. Therefore, educational institutions play an important role in addressing academic dishonesty violations in the future ([Isnaini et al., 2020](#); [Patak et al., 2021](#)). So that honesty becomes one of the solutions for students to avoid academic dishonesty. Honesty is an honorable behavior that is important for every individual, including students, capable of behaving according to reality which serves as the foundation for one's actions, bringing about peace and motivating students to achieve success ([Aningsih et al., 2022](#); [SimanTov-Nachlieli & Moran, 2022](#)). If you are always honest in every action you take, then you will be well-trusted by people around you. So honesty is closely related to trust.

The opposite of honesty is dishonesty, academic dishonesty is any effort made by students to achieve their goals through dishonest means such as cheating, deceiving, stealing ideas, and so forth (M.Suud et al., 2019; Vlachopoulos, 2021). Generally, when someone behaves dishonestly, it will lead to feelings of restlessness, unease, and other things that cause worry about the eventual discovery of the lie. Someone who frequently lies will not be trusted by those around them, yet trust from others is an important factor in academic integrity (Adebisi, 2022; Roe, 2022). So that students who perform their academic tasks based on honest character already reflect academic integrity. Academic integrity is also referred to as the highest and absolute moral in completing academic activities. Of course, this moral cannot be seen by others, only you yourself will realize it. The higher someone's academic integrity, the higher the objectivity of the written work they produce. This research highlights the importance of developing honest character in the context of higher education. The implication is that educational institutions should prioritize programs that encourage the development of students' character to become honest individuals. Furthermore, this study can help raise awareness of the importance of academic integrity among students and educators. Thus, educational institutions can take steps to strengthen a culture of academic honesty. However, the findings of this research may be difficult to generalize to all higher education institutions due to the unique characteristics of each institution and different academic cultures.

4. CONCLUSION

The influence of opportunity, necessity, and rationalization has a positive effect on academic dishonesty, except for greed. Thus, the GONE Theory contributes to academic dishonesty among students in Bali. Preventive measures can be taken by educational institutions, including instilling the value of honesty and character.

5. REFERENCES

- Adebisi, Y. A. (2022). Undergraduate students' involvement in research: Values, benefits, barriers and recommendations. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, 81(August 2022), 104384.1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2022.104384>.
- Aningsih, Zulela, M. S., Neolaka, A., Iasha, V., & Setiawan, B. (2022). How is the Education Character Implemented? The Case Study in Indonesian Elementary School. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(1), 371–380. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0029>.
- Astra, I. M., Raihanati, R., & Mujayanah, N. (2020). Development of Electronic Module Using Creative Problem-Solving Model Equipped with Hots Problems on The Kinetic Theory of Gases Material. *Jurnal Penelitian & Pengembangan Pendidikan Fisika*, 6(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.21009/1.06205>.
- Budiman, N. A. (2018). Perilaku Kecurangan Akademik Mahasiswa : Dimensi Fraud Diamond dan Gone Theory. *Jurnal Ilmu Akuntansi*, 11(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.15408/akt.v11i1.8135>.
- Bunari, Fadli, M. R., Fikri, A., Setiawan, J., Fahri, A., & Izzati, I. M. (2023). Understanding history, historical thinking, and historical consciousness, in learning history: An ex post-facto correlation. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 12(1), 260–267. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i1.23633>.
- Cheng, Y. C., Hung, F. C., & Hsu, H. M. (2021). The relationship between academic dishonesty, ethical attitude and ethical climate: The evidence from Taiwan. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(21), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111615>.

- Chiang, F. K., 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>.
- Dendir, S., & Maxwell, R. S. (2020). Cheating in online courses: Evidence from online proctoring. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 2(October), 100033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100033>.
- Dewanti, P. W., Purnama, I. A., Siregar, M. N., & Sukirno, S. (2020). Cheating Intention of Students Based on Theory of Planned Behavior. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, 15(2), 268. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jiab.2020.v15.i02.p09>.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A. M., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>.
- Haldorai, A., Murugan, S., & Ramu, A. (2021). Evolution, challenges, and application of intelligent ICT education: An overview. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 29(3), 562–571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22217>.
- Halili, S. H. (2019). Technological Advancements in Education 4.0. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and E-Learning*, 7(1), 63–69. <https://tojdel.net/journals/tojdel/volumes/tojdel-volume07-i01.pdf#page=70>.
- Hashed, A. A., & Almaqtari, F. A. (2021). The Impact of Corporate Governance Mechanisms and IFRS on Earning Management in Saudi Arabia. *Accounting*, 7(1), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ac.2020.9.015>.
- Hatane, S. E., & Kurniawan, I. F. (2022). Intellectual Capital Disclosures Analysis of Indonesia and Thailand Tourism and Hospitality Industry: Comparison of Ownership Structure. *International Journal of Social Science and Business*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijssb.v6i1.40970>.
- Heriyati, D., & Ekasari, W. F. (2020). A Study on Academic Dishonesty and Moral Reasoning. *International Journal of Education*, 12(2), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v12i2.18653>.
- Isnaini, R. L., Hanum, F., & Prasajo, L. D. (2020). Developing Character Education Through Academic Culture in Indonesian Programmed Islamic High School. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 78(6), 948–966. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/20.78.948>.
- Janke, S., Rudert, S. C., Petersen, Ä., Fritz, T. M., & Daumiller, M. (2021). Cheating in the wake of COVID-19: How dangerous is ad-hoc online testing for academic integrity? *Computers and Education Open*, 2(September), 100055. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2021.100055>.
- M.Suud, F., Sutrisno, S., & Madjid, A. (2019). Educational Honesty: The Main Philosophical Value in School. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 6(2), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v6i2.11769>.
- Miller, A., & Young-Jones, A. D. (2012). Academic integrity: Online classes compared to face-to-face classes. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 39(3). <http://people.missouristate.edu/ardenmiller/swpa12.pdf>.
- Mouakket, S., & Sun, Y. (2020). Investigating the Impact of Personality Traits of Social Network Sites Users on Information Disclosure in China: the Moderating Role of Gender. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(6), 1305–1321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-019-09933-x>.
- Munirah, A., & Nurkhin, A. (2018). Pengaruh Faktor-Faktor Fraud Diamond dan Gone Theory Terhadap Kecurangan Akademik. *Economi Education Analysis Journal*, 3(1), 120–139. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eeaj/article/view/22862>.
- Mustapha, R., Hussin, Z., Siraj, S., & Darusalam, G. (2017). Academic Dishonesty Among

- Higher Education Students: The Malaysian Evidence (2014 To 2016). *Journal of KATHA*, 13(1), 73–93. <https://doi.org/10.22452/katha.vol13no1.4>.
- Nemoto, T., & Beglar, D. (2014). Likert-scale questionnaires. In *JALT 2013 Conference Proceedings*, 1–8. https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jalt2013_001.pdf.
- Patak, A. A., Wirawan, H., Abduh, A., Hidayat, R., Iskandar, I., & Dirawan, G. D. (2021). Teaching English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia: University Lecturers' Views on Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(4), 571–587. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09385-y>.
- Roe, J. (2022). Reconceptualizing academic dishonesty as a struggle for intersubjective recognition: a new theoretical model. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01182-9>.
- Shbail, M. O. Al, Alshurafat, H., Ananzeh, H., & Al-Msiedeen, J. M. (2022). Dataset of Factors affecting online cheating by accounting students: The relevance of social factors and the fraud triangle model factors. *Data in Brief*, 40, 107732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2021.107732>.
- SimanTov-Nachlieli, I., & Moran, S. (2022). The primacy of honest reputations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 46, 101398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2022.101398>.
- Smaldino, S. E., & Lowther, D. L. (2017). *Instructional Technology and Media for Learning*. 1–22.
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2021). Organizational change management in higher education through the lens of executive coaches. *Education Sciences*, 11(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060269>.
- Whale, K., Cramer, H., & Joinson, C. (2018). Left behind and left out: The impact of the school environment on young people with continence problems. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 23(2), 253–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12284>.
- Widianingsih, L. P. (2013). Students Cheating Behaviors: The Influence of Fraud Triangle. *Integrative Business & Economics Research*, 2(2), 252–260. http://www.sibresearch.org/uploads/2/7/9/9/2799227/riber_b13-134_252-260.pdf.
- Wijayanto, P. W., Thamrin, H., Haetami, A., Mustoip, S., & Oktiawati, U. Y. (2023). The Potential of Metaverse Technology in Education as a Transformation of Learning Media in Indonesia. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Dan Kajian Kepustakaan Di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran Dan Pembelajaran*, 9(2), 396. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v9i2.7395>.