

THE EFFECT OF ATTITUDE TOWARD BEHAVIOR, SUBJECTIVE NORM, AND PERCEIVED BEHAVIORAL CONTROL ON THE INTENTION TO CONDUCT ACADEMIC CHEATING ON EMPLOYEE CLASS STUDENTS AT X UNIVERSITY

Sari Wulandari Haryoto Putri¹, Lamtiurma Anastasya Y. Simanjuntak² & Ulfa khoiriyah³
email : sariwulandarihp@gmail.com¹, anastasyasimanjuntak.as@gmail.com² & ulfaazzahra180@gmail.com³
Faculty of Psychology
Program Study Masters of Psychology Profession
Persada Indonesia University Y.A.I. Street Jakarta INDONESIA

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the effect of attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control on the intention to conduct academic cheating. This study used an inferential statistic approach. The subjects in this study were students of X University employees with a sampling technique used accidental sampling. The number of samples in this study were 157 people. Measurements in this study used the Attitude Toward Misconduct, Subjective Norms, Perceived Behavioral Control, & Intention Measure Measures (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2009). Cronbach Alpha value for Attitude Toward Behavior was 0.746, Subjective Norm was 0.948, Perceived Behavioral Control was 0.769, and Intention was 0.844. Data analysis techniques used descriptive test, classic assumption test, regression test, and comparative test. The results showed that there was a simultaneous influence of attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control on the intention to conduct academic cheating.

Keywords: Intention to Conduct Academic Cheating, Attitude Toward Behavior, Subjective Norm, Perceived Behavioral Control.

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the main things in building a quality nation because education plays an important role in forming a person's character, knowledge and skills. Quality education will of course produce quality and highly competitive human resources. However, ironically, the stigma of measuring success at the educational level is still centered on grades or Achievement Index. As if putting aside the process and only focusing on the final results obtained, this often results in deviant actions and justifies various ways for some people to get satisfactory grades by cheating.

According to Bower, cheating is an act that uses various illegal means to achieve legitimate or honorable goals, namely achieving academic success (Kushartanti, 2009). Cheating in academic matters is an immoral act and is related to other immoral acts in the world of work (Stone, Jawahar, Kisamore, 2009).

A fraud that is committed can be predicted by the intention to do so. Intentions related to fraud can materialize into actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Intention is an important factor that can determine the form and level of deviation committed. Several forms of fraudulent intentions that can be easily recognized are in deciding the level of deviation committed, such as the behavior of purchasing written works, manipulating written works without including reference sources, and other forms of fraud which are evidence that there is an intention to commit fraud

(Ministry of Research, Technology, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, 2019).

Cases of academic cheating are often found both in high schools and universities. Based on research conducted in the city of Semarang at a Senior High School (SMA), the results showed that 31.03% of respondents admitted that they often cheated when completing homework, while 68.97% admitted that they sometimes cheated when completing homework (Sudibyo, 2005). One case of academic cheating at the tertiary level in Indonesia occurred at a state university in Semarang. The most common fraud committed by 50% of respondents in the medium category was collaborating when taking the exam, such as working together during the exam and sharing answers with other exam participants. There were 47% of respondents who falsified assignments and research reports (Kurniawan, 2011).

Apart from that, researchers also carried out observations and collected pre-eliminary data in the University X Jatisampurna environment. Based on the results of the initial study, it shows that the forms of cheating carried out were: bringing notes or photocopies of material during the exam (38.7%), cheating on friends' answers during the exam (51.6%), using gadgets to look for answers during the exam (61.3%). %), doing copy-paste in making assignments, papers, and/or e-learning (54.8%), asking friends to do assignments, papers, and/or e-learning (16.1%), not contributing to doing assignments group (25.8%), and did not include references or bibliography in the paper or assignment (19.4%).

A fraudulent behavior can be predicted by the intention to do so. The greater a person's intention for a behavior, the greater the possibility that the behavior can be realized. According to Ajzen (1991), intention is a factor that can influence a person's behavior regarding how far they will try to make it happen or how hard they will try to plan a behavior. There are 3 determining factors that can independently or jointly influence intentions, namely attitude toward behavior, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control.

The results of research conducted on students at a Midwestern University show that the intention to cheat in completing assignments or quizzes is commensurate with the ease of successfully cheating in completing the assignment (Lonsdale, 2016). Apart from that, other factors such as attitude (attitude toward behavior) can also be used as a basis for predicting academic cheating. Another consideration for committing academic cheating is when the opportunity to do so is available, such as the exam supervisor often leaving the room or just being a little alert when supervising the exam, especially in a busy class (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2009). Subjective norms and perceived behavioral control do have a positive role in shaping a person's intentions in academic fraud. The subjective norms of friends who cheat are considered to have a greater role than the subjective norms of parents in shaping a person's intentions. The amount of opportunity and ease of controlling behavior has an influence on a person's intention to commit fraud (Lonsdale, 2016).

The influence of attitude toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control on intentions to commit academic fraud shows that intention is a predictor that can be used to predict the occurrence of cheating. Using measurements of a person's intention to commit fraud aims to find out what factors most influence that intention so that steps can be taken to prevent it from happening. The respondents of this research are employee class students where they have to divide their time between studying and working. According to pre-eliminary data, there is still a lot of cheating committed by employee class students, so by looking at a person's intentions it is hoped that it can reduce the occurrence of academic cheating.

RESEARCH PURPOSES

This research aims to find out whether attitude toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control have an influence on the intention to commit academic fraud in employee class students at University X.

Academic Fraud Intention

According to Ajzen (1991), an individual's intentions or intentions precede engaging in actual behavior. Intention is a central factor in the theory of planned behavior. Individuals make a rational decision to carry out a certain behavior based on their beliefs about the behavior and their expectations regarding the positive results they will get.

Academic cheating intention is how likely someone is to consider various types of violations of academic integrity (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2010). Individuals who have a high tolerance for academic cheating behavior tend to have a higher intention to cheat (Mensah, Azila-Gbettor, & Appietu, 2016). Intention is a strong predictor in predicting someone's behavior (Lonsdale, 2016). Intention in involvement in realizing a behavior occurs is influenced by three components, namely: attitude (attitude toward behavior), subjective norm (subjective norm), and ease of controlling behavior (perceived behavioral control). These three components have functions independently or jointly on behavior (Ajzen, 1991).

Forms of Academic Cheating

Mullens (2000) defines academic cheating as any action that gives students an advantage over other students. According to Storch, Storch, & Clark (2002) academic cheating is the act of giving or receiving assistance without permission in academic assignments. Hughes & McCabe (2006) added that academic cheating can also include changing documents such as transcripts, writing papers for other students, and hiding or not including reference sources.

According to Mullens (2000), what constitutes a form of academic cheating is buying answers from people; plagiarize part of the text or all of it; impersonating someone else to take a test or exam; peek at other students' answers; smuggling notes during exams; working together on individual tasks or recognizing the results of group work as individual results. Kimberly (2011) added that other forms of academic cheating include exchanging answers during tests directly or using electronic devices; copying other people's assignments or answers.

Factors Causing Academic Cheating

There are several factors that underlie someone's cheating, especially in the academic field. According to Hughes & McCabe (2006), the factors that cause academic cheating are divided into two, namely: individual factors (internal) and situational factors (external). These two factors have their respective roles in forming academic cheating behavior.

Internal factors that cause academic cheating are personal factors that are caused from within a person (Hughes & McCabe, 2006), namely: demographics, notes or reports regarding personal behavior, and attitudes. Meanwhile, external factors are factors originating from outside the individual which can determine the occurrence of academic fraud. There are several external factors that can be described (Hughes & McCabe, 2006) as follows: perception of risk, perception of friends' behavior, and perception of the academic or university environment.

Attitude Toward Behavior

Attitude toward behavior or attitude towards behavior is an evaluation carried out by an individual, whether a positive or favorable evaluation or a negative or unfavorable evaluation

for himself regarding a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). A person's attitude towards academic cheating is a moral belief that they have whether it is a mistake or something that is acceptable (Stone, Jawahar, Kisamore, 2009). A person's positive attitude towards something can be seen from his confidence in evaluating whether something is useful or not for him. If this brings benefits to him, this belief will further improve his attitude towards the behavior (Ramdhani, 2011).

Attitudes are formed from 2 components (Ajzen, 2006), namely:

1. Behavioral beliefs are a person's beliefs regarding the consequences that will arise when carrying out a behavior.
2. Evaluation outcome is an evaluation of whether the consequences are positive or negative.

Subjective Norm

Subjective norm or subjective norm is a social pressure that a person feels whether he should do something or not do it in accordance with the norms that apply in the social environment (Ajzen, 1991). Subjective norms are an individual's perception regarding the expectations of people who have an important role in their life regarding a behavior. In individual life there are vertical and horizontal subjective norm relationships. Vertical relationships are like relationships between superiors and subordinates, while horizontal relationships are like relationships with equal positions (Ramdhani, 2011).

Subjective norms that apply in the social environment that are adhered to by people closest to them or people who have an important meaning in a person's life have an influence on a person's intentions. Friends' subjective norms and parents' subjective norms have a significant influence in forming intentions, although friends' subjective norms have a greater impact than parents' subjective norms (Lonsdale, 2016). Subjective norms play a role in encouraging a person's intention to do something or not in accordance with his perception of his social environment. Someone will commit academic cheating if friends in their environment also do the same thing. The perception that friends and family think cheating is a normal thing to do can increase a person's intention to do this (Wijayanti & Putri, 2016).

Subjective norms are influenced by 2 components (Ajzen, 2006), namely:

1. Normative belief is an individual's belief in the views of other people who play an important role in their life (significant others) regarding whether a particular behavior should be carried out or not at all.
2. Motivation to comply is a person's motivation or desire to fulfill or not fulfill the expectations of significant others regarding a certain behavior.

Perceived Behavioral Control

Perceived behavioral control or ease of behavioral control is a perception regarding how easy or difficult something can be done. Past experience also plays a role in whether the behavior can be easily carried out or not and can be used as a reference to anticipate obstacles that may occur (Ajzen, 1991). Individuals who have high confidence in their abilities and the opportunities that exist regarding a behavior will have a stronger perception of behavioral control (Ramdhani, 2011).

A person's perception of the severity or lightness of the consequences they will receive regarding their academic cheating behavior can determine whether they will carry out this behavior or not. If he feels that the benefits obtained are greater than the consequences or punishment he will receive, then he will continue to commit the fraud (Stone, Jawahar, Kisamore, 2009).

Perceived behavioral control is influenced by 2 components (Ajzen, 2006), namely:

1. Control belief is a person's perception or belief about how difficult a behavior is to carry out

- based on his or her perception of the risks, difficulties and challenges of realizing that behavior.
2. Percieve power is a person's perception of his or her ability whether or not he is able to produce a behavior by considering the risks, difficulties and challenges that exist related to that behavior.

METHODOLOGY

This research uses an explanatory research design using inferential statistics. Explanatory research is used to test whether there is a relationship or influence between hypothesized variables (Mulyadi, 2011).

RESEARCH VARIABLE

There are four variables in this research, namely 3 independent variables and 1 dependent variable as follows:

1. Independent variable (X1) = attitude toward behavior
2. Independent variable (X2) = subjective norm
3. Independent variable (X3) = perceived behavioral control
4. Dependent variable (Y) = academic cheating intention

The operational definition of academic cheating intention is the total individual score obtained from the items of how likely they are to consider various types of academic cheating.

The operational definition of attitude toward behavior is the total individual score obtained from the individual's moral belief items regarding cheating, willingness to report fraud committed by others, and helping others in cheating.

The operational definition of subjective norm is the total individual score obtained from perception and suspicion items regarding the frequency of various forms of academic fraud committed by other people.

The operational definition of perceived behavioral control is the total individual score obtained from the individual's perception items regarding the ease or difficulty of successfully cheating.

POPULATION, SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

The population in this study were students at University X. The sampling technique used in this research is non-probability sampling where not all of the research population will have the same opportunity to become the research sample. The type of non-probability sampling technique used is accidental sampling where the sample unit used is based on chance, that is, anyone who meets the researcher by chance can be used as a sample if it is deemed that the person they happen to meet is suitable as a data source.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The measuring instruments used in this research are separated into 4 measuring instruments for each variable. This measuring instrument was adapted from Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore (2009). There are 8 items in the intention measuring tool, there are 7 items in the attitude toward behavior measuring tool, there are 7 items in the subjective norm measuring tool, and there are 4 items in the perceived behavioral control measuring tool. The scale used to measure intention, attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control uses a Likert scale with 5 answer choices as follows: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. For scoring favorable items, the answer Strongly Agree is given a score of 5 (Five),

Agree is given a score of 4 (Four), Neutral is given a score of 3 (Three), Disagree is given a score of 2 (Two), and Strongly Disagree is given a score of 1 (One). Meanwhile, for scoring unfavorable items, the answer Strongly Agree is given a score of 1 (One), Agree is given a score of 2 (two), Neutral is given a score of 3 (Three), Disagree is given a score of 4 (Four) and Strongly Disagree is given a score of 5 (Five).

The test results of 4 measuring instruments carried out on 53 respondents as a whole can be said to be reliable. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the Attitude Toward Behavior measuring tool is 0.746. For the Subjective Norm measuring instrument, the Cronbach value was 0.948. Then for the Perceived Behavioral Control measuring instrument, the Cronbach value was 0.769 and for the Academic Cheating Intention measuring instrument, the Cronbach value was 0.844. Validity testing is carried out using content and construct validity tests.

DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

There are several data analysis techniques used, namely:

1. The classical assumption test is carried out as a condition for being able to carry out hypothesis testing. Classic assumption tests used: data normality test, linearity test, and multicollinearity test.
2. Hypothesis testing is carried out using multiple regression to see the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. It is said to have influence if the sig value < 0.05 and F count $> F$ table. Then to see how much influence the independent variable has on the dependent variable by looking at the value of R square.
3. Additional tests were carried out to see differences based on demographic data. This test uses the t-test to see differences between two groups and anova to see differences between more than 2 groups. It is said that there is a difference between groups if the significance value is < 0.05 .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The number of respondents in this study was 157 people, of which there were 94 female respondents and 63 male respondents. Respondents from the Faculty of Engineering numbered 24 people, from the Faculty of Economics and Business there were 38 people, from the Faculty of Psychology there were 71 people, from the Faculty of Computer Science and Communication Science there were 9 people each, and from the Faculty of Arts and Creative there were 6 people. Then for semester level data, there were 1 respondents in semester 1, 3 people in semester 2, 2 people in semester 3, 15 people in semester 4, 5 people in semester 5, 46 people in semester 6, 24 in semester 7. people, in semester 8 there were 42 people, in semester 9 there were 7 people and in semester 10 there were 12 people.

Researchers used a normality test with Kolmogorov Smirnov. The results obtained show that the data is normally distributed by looking at the sig value. each variable > 0.05 (attitude toward behavior 0.178; subjective norm 0.084; perceived behavioral control 0.072; academic fraud intention 0.213). Next, the linearity test used is by looking at the anova table. The results of the linearity test show that the data is linear by looking at the sig value. deviation from linearity > 0.05 (attitude toward behavior 0.151; subjective norm 0.072; perceived behavioral control 0.716). Then the results of the multicollinearity test show that there is no multicollinearity by looking at the Tolerance value > 0.10 and the VIF value < 10 .

Table 1 Multicollinearity Test Results

	<i>Tolerance</i>	VIF	Information
<i>Attitude Toward</i>	0.96	1.042	Multicollinearity does not occur
<i>Behavior Subjective Norm</i>	0.797	1.254	Multicollinearity does not occur
<i>Perceived Behavioral Control</i>	0.776	1.289	Multicollinearity does not occur

The results of the hypothesis test can be seen in the following table:

Table 2 Simultaneous Test Results and Determination Coefficient

R Square	F hitung	Sig	Conclusion
0.173	10.684	0.00	Simultaneous influence

Based on the table above, the results show that the sig value is $0.00 < 0.05$ and the calculated F value is 10.684, where the calculated F value is greater than the F table value ($10.684 > 2.66$). So it can be concluded that Attitude toward behavior, Subjective norm, and Perceived behavioral control simultaneously have an influence on the intention to commit academic fraud. The magnitude of the influence on intentions was 17.3%, while the remainder was influenced by other factors outside the factors studied in this study.

The results of this research are in accordance with research conducted by Stone, Jawahar, and Kisamore (2010) which states that attitudes, subjective norms, and perceptions of behavioral control have an influence on intentions. Attitudes that approve of cheating, an environment that supports cheating, and the ease of committing fraud can increase a person's intention to commit fraud. Intention and perceived behavioral control have an influence on fraudulent behavior.

Meanwhile, there are also other factors that influence a person's intention to commit academic fraud outside of attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioral control, namely justification (Stone, Jawahar, & Kisamore, 2009), personality aspects (Lonsdale, 2106), self-control factors, academic self-efficacy, academic achievement (Aulia, 2015), and moral obligation (Harding, Mayhew, Finelli, & Carpenter, 2007).

Next, a partial t test was carried out to find out whether each independent variable could partially influence the dependent variable. The results of the partial test can be seen in the following table:

Table 3 Partial Test Results

Variable	Coefficient	Beta	Correlation	R square	t count	sig.	Conclusion
Constant (a)	8.8				2.605	0.01	
<i>Attitude Toward Behavior (X1)</i>	0.365	0.28	0.331	0.092	3.735	0	Partially influential
<i>Subjective Norm (X2)</i>	-0.161	-0.122	-0.004	0.0004	-1.481	0.141	No effect
<i>Perceived Behavioral Control (X3)</i>	0.601	0.286	0.279	0.079	3.429	0.001	Partially influential

The research results show that attitude toward behavior has a $\text{sig} < 0.05$ and the calculated t value is $> t$ table, so it can be said that attitude toward behavior has a partial influence on the intention to commit academic fraud. Then, to see the magnitude of the influence of each variable on intentions, you can look at the R square value of each variable. The result is that attitude toward behavior has an influence of 9.2% on intentions. In line with the results of this research, Mensah, Azila-Gbettor, and Appietu (2016) also stated that students who develop a weak attitude towards academic cheating have a higher intention to commit academic fraud compared to students who cannot tolerate cheating. A person's attitude has an influence on the intention to commit academic fraud.

Then, if we look at perceived behavioral control which also has a $\text{sig} < 0.05$ and the calculated t value $> t$ table, it can be said that perceived behavioral control has a partial influence on the intention to commit academic fraud. The influence on intention is 7.9%. Other research that supports this was also conducted by Lonsdale (2016) who stated that perceived behavioral control has an influence on intentions to commit academic fraud. In line with this, according to Stone, Jawahar, and Kisamore (2010) stated that perceived behavioral control is a determining factor and has a significant influence in shaping a person's intention to commit fraud and cheat.

Meanwhile, the results obtained from subjective norms are $\text{sig} > 0.05$ and the calculated t value $< t$ table, so it can be said that subjective norms do not have a partial influence on the intention to commit academic fraud. If you look at the R square value, the influence that subjective norms have on intentions is only 0.04%. The high subjective norm in this study was not accompanied by an increase in a person's intention to commit fraud. In line with the opinion of Yogatama (2013) which states that if subjective norms are associated with two other factors that influence intentions, it can be said that the intention to do something is very dependent on the individual's thoughts and internal factors, where attitudes and behavioral control have a partial influence on intentions, while norms subjective originating from outside the individual has no partial influence.

Apart from that, McCabe (2006) also stated that a faculty's policy in responding to and following up on academic fraud is very important to be able to reduce the number of frauds that occur. Ignoring cheating and not giving strict sanctions to perpetrators keeps the rate of cheating high in the university environment.

Then additional tests based on semester level showed differences in the subjective norm and perceived behavioral control values possessed by each respondent at each semester level. In line with this, Mensah et.al (2016) stated that students in their first semester have a greater tendency to commit academic fraud.

CONCLUSION

Attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control together have an influence of 17.3% on the intention to commit academic fraud where attitude toward behavior partially has an influence of 9.2%, subjective norm partially only has an influence of 0.04% or it could be said to have no partial effect on the intention to commit academic fraud, and perceived behavioral control partially has an influence of 7.9% on the intention to commit academic fraud. It was also found that men had a higher intention to commit fraud than women. The faculty with the highest intention to commit fraud is the Faculty of Economics and Business. And the high intention to commit fraud occurred in semester 1 and semester 9.

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

This research was conducted when Indonesia was in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic, which affected all existing sectors, including the economy, health, education, and so on. The implementation of social distancing and PSBB (Large-Scale Social Restrictions) makes it difficult for researchers to carry out this research, especially when collecting data. Researchers cannot go directly to the field and can only distribute questionnaires online via Google Form, so the distribution of data based on faculty and semester level is not spread evenly. There were only 157 respondents to this study, this cannot describe the actual population.

SUGGESTION

Attitude toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control together have an influence of 17.3% on the intention to commit academic fraud. There are other factors that influence intentions outside the factors studied by researchers. Other factors that can influence a person's intention to cheat academically are justification, personality factors, academic self-efficacy, and moral obligations. It is hoped that in further research other factors can be added to improve this research. The results of this research show that attitude toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control together have an influence on the intention to commit academic fraud. It is hoped that the University can form a culture of honesty in academic matters, create strict policies and rules for students who cheat, and provide strict supervision during exams and assignments to reduce the number of academic cheating. Students are expected to prioritize the value of honesty and uphold academic integrity in order to produce quality resources.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). *The Theory of Planned Behavior, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (2006). *Behavioral Interventions Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior*. January 2006. Downloaded from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235913732_Constructing_a_Theory_of_Planned_Behavior_Questionnaire on 1 August 2020. Accessed on 2 August 2020.
- Aulia, F. (2015). *Factors Associated with Academic Cheating in Students*. RAP UNP, Vol.6 No.1, 23-32.
- Harding, T. S., Mayhew, M. J., Finelli, C. J., & Carpenter, D. D. (2007). *The Theory of Planned Behavior as a Model of Academic Dishonesty in Engineering and*

- Humanities Undergraduates. Ethics & Behavior* 17(3), 255-279.
DOI:10.1080/10508420701519239.
- Hughes, J. M. C., McCabe, D. L. (2006). *Understanding Academic Misconduct*. Canadian Journal of Higher Education, Vol.36 No.1, 49-63.
<http://anjani.ristekbrin.go.id/intensi-kecurangan>. Accessed 11 August 2020.
- Kimberly, A. G. (2011). *Academic Dishonesty Among Gifted and High Achieving Students*. *Academic Dishonesty* 34(2), 50-56.
- Kurniawan, A. (2011). *Academic Cheating Behavior in Unnes Psychology Students*. Thesis.
- Kushartanti, A. (2009). *Cheating Behavior Judging from Self-Confidence*. *Indigenous Periodical Scientific Journal of Psychology* Vol. 11, no. 2, 38-46.
- Lonsdale, D. (2016). *Intentions to Cheat: Ajzen's Planned Behavior and Goal-Related Personality Facets*. *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol.0 No.0, 1-17. DOI: 10.1080/00223980.2016.1241737.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K. (1995). *Cheating Among Business Students: A Challenge for Business Leaders and Educators*. *Journal of Management Education*, Vol.19 No.2, 205-218.
- Mensah, C., Azila-Gbette, E. M., & Appietu, M. E. (2016). *Examination Cheating Attitudes and Intentions of Students in a Ghanaian Polytechnic*. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/15313220.2015.1110072.
- Mullens, A. (2000). *Cheat to Win*. *University Affairs*, 22-28.
- Mulyadi, M. (2011). *Quantitative and Qualitative Research and Basic Rationale for Combining Them*. *Journal of Communication and Media Studies*, Vol.15 No.1, 127-138.
- Ramdhani, N. (2011). *Preparation of Measuring Tools Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior*. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.19 No.2, 55-69.
- Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., Kisamore, J. L. (2009). *Using the Theory of Planned Behavior and Cheating Justifications to Predict Academic Misconduct*. *Career Development International*, Vol.14 Issue: 3, 221-241.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966415>.
- Stone, T. H., Jawahar, I. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2010). *Predicting Academic Misconduct Intentions and Behavior Using the Theory of Planned Behavior and Personality*. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32:1, 35-45.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539895>.
- Storch, J., Storch, E., & Clark, P. (2002). *Academic Dishonesty and Neutralization Theory: A Comparison of Intercollegiate Athletes and Non-Athletes*. *Journal of College Student Development*, 43(6), 921-930.
- Sudibyo. (2005). *The Habit of Cheating on Homework on the Achievements Achieved by a Student*. *Iswara Manggala Education Journal*, Vol.1 No.6.
- Wijayanti, A. W., Putri, G. A. (2016). *Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) Model to Predict Student Intentions to Commit Academic Cheating*. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, Vol.14 No.2, 189-197.
- Yogatama, L. A. M. (2013). *Analysis of the Influence of Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Perceived Behavioral Control on Intention to Use a Helmet When Riding a Motorbike among Adolescents and Young Adults in South Jakarta*. *Proceedings of PESAT (Psychology, Economics, Literature, Architecture & Civil Engineering)*, Vol.5, 1-10.