

Self-Efficacy and Academic Cheating in Nursing Faculty Students

Clarita Eka Putri Mendrofa¹, Dinda Rensi Novalinda², Prista Yuniar³, Adventina Delima Hutapea^{4*}, Peggy Sara Tahulending⁵

^{1,2,3} *Siloam Hospital, Jakarta*

^{4,5} *Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang*

Email:adventina.hutapea@uph.edu

ABSTRACT

Several studies have found that the types of academic fraud that often occur are cheating, plagiarism, stealing exam materials, and handing over other people's assignments on their behalf. One of the reasons that causes academic cheating to occur is disbelief in one's capabilities which is called self-efficacy. Previous research has shown that low self-efficacy will give up faster and avoid difficulties because they are not sure of their abilities. Cheating behavior in the nursing profession is very bad because it will have a bad effect on patients like medication errors. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in nursing students. The research design used descriptive correlational. The sample in this study was nursing students at the University of Western Indonesia with a total of 183 respondents. The sampling technique used simple random sampling because the population was homogenous. Data was collected online by Google Forms. The data were analyzed using the chi-square test. It was found that the majority of self-efficacy was in the moderate category of 123 (67.2%), and academic cheating was in the low category of 165 (90.2%). The Chi-Square test showed a p-value of 0.002. There is a relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in nursing students. High self-efficacy will create a calm feeling to face difficult tasks, increase optimism, and reduce anxiety. Recommendations for nursing educational institutions can motivate students and modify learning methods so that students have the confidence not to commit academic fraud.

Keywords: self efficacy, plagiarism, fraud, student, nursing

INTRODUCTION

Dishonesty is a social disease problem that occurs among children to adults. This is also observed in the world of education, especially among students, dishonesty often occurs such as lying, cheating, fraud, and plagiarism (Faisauddin & Itsna, 2016). Academic dishonesty, commonly called academic cheating, is a pervasive issue where students engage in dishonest activity to obtain unfair or improper academic advantages contrary to stated assessment criteria and institutional norms, impacting the education sector. One study found that 70.4% of cheating is prevalent in every tertiary institution (Lue et al., 2022; Saana et al., 2016). Academic cheating is another immoral practice that encourages students to use deceptive methods to get good scores while concealing their true identities so that it can have consequences after students graduate from college (Kusnoor & Falik, 2013; Quraishi & Aziz, 2017). Several studies

discovered types of academic cheating/fraud, such as using friends' answers as one's own during exams., copying friends' assignments, opening the internet to find answers and sending them to friends, copying and pasting from the internet, and opening books during exams (Cardina et al., 2021; Herdian et al., 2021; Nursalam et al., 2016).

The results of previous research around the globe, anywhere between 40% and 80% of college students have engaged in academic dishonesty at least once (Saana et al., 2016). A study conducted at an institution in Korea found that students in the second academic year exams committed a lot of serious cheating and light cheating in several faculties. Serious fraud was 26.2% in the Faculty of Business, 28.7% in the Faculty of Engineering, 17.6% in the Faculty of Education, and 27.6% in the Faculty of Medicine. 50% of students committed minor fraud at least once in the business faculty, 68.9% in the engineering faculty, 42.6% in the education faculty, and 42.6% in the medical faculty (Park, 2020). One research conducted by Kessler International found that 86% of students cheated online, 76% copied answers, 79% plagiarism, 72% used other people's mobile phones to commit fraud, and 42% bought papers (Burgason et al., 2019; Cardina et al., 2021)

Previous research conducted that cheating was carried out in clinical settings such as falsifying history or physical and laboratory data and reporting normal physical findings, while these were not examined. Based on the findings, 87.6% of students cheated once in college, and 58.2% of students cheated at least once in a clinic (Kusnoor & Falik, 2013). Some of the academic fraud committed such as cheating when taking exams, doing assignments, falsifying signatures and data, and plagiarism. Based on findings of previous research, discovered that 57.3% of students copied answers from friends during exams, 54% of students took and copied assignments from classmates, 53.4% of students forged the signatures of friends who were not present, 52.7% of students used material from books without writing the resource, and 53.4% of students entered non-existent data results into the database (Quraishi & Aziz, 2017).

In Indonesia, academic cheating is still common, particularly in online learning. Several studies that had been previously conducted at a university in Indonesia showed that in 2011 there were 43% of students used prohibited material during assessment, 22% plagiarism, and 13% misrepresentation (Purnamasari, 2013). During online learning, students have many ways to cheat, such as downloading assignments from friends by logging into their accounts and using the answers as their own (Cardina et al., 2021; Herdian et al., 2021). Based on our survey conducted among nursing students at One University of Western Indonesia, it was found that 70.6% of students committed academic fraud such as cheating, plagiarism, and falsifying data.

One of the things that influence the occurrence of academic cheating is the lack of self-efficacy in students.

Self-efficacy is influenced and determined by one's thoughts, emotions, interpretations of previous events, feelings, and behaviors. When people have high confidence in their abilities, when facing a difficult problem or task, it is a challenge that must be faced and mastered, not considered a threat that must be avoided. People who doubt their abilities mean they have low support and commitment to a goal to be achieved. Therefore, self-efficacy is a predictive value of academic dishonesty and cheating. Academic cheating and self-efficacy are related such as plagiarism. The higher the level of student self-efficacy, the less likely it is to commit plagiarism (Ewen, 2014; Lue et al., 2022). Therefore, self-efficacy is greatly influenced by many aspects of life such as education which can improve academic achievement.

According to Bandura's theory, self-efficacy is influenced by three aspects, namely: level, strength, and generality. The level aspect includes the stage of difficulty of the assignment, where the assignment acted by individuals is sorted by difficulty, so individual self-efficacy disparities might only apply to activities that are grouped by difficulty. Aspects of strength include the high stability of the individual to his belief in doing the task. The generality includes the mastery of individual abilities in various fields (Syahrina & Ester, 2016).

A study conducted on students when taking exams found that 43% of respondents felt they could get a good grade, but compared to their fear of not getting the correct answer, 47% of respondents had doubts they could able to solve the exam questions (Quraishi & Aziz, 2017). The researcher's survey results showed that 47 respondents felt unsure about getting satisfactory achievements in class, then 48 respondents felt nervous and forgot about exams, 45 respondents felt weaker than other students in certain courses, 36 respondents felt pessimistic and did not try to finish a difficult task and with the same number, and 36 respondents admitted that they were easily influenced in committing fraud such as cheating. However, there are different research results at a University in Bali where self-efficacy does not affect academic cheating. This is influenced by other factors.

Based on the phenomena and problems described, there is still a lot of academic fraud occurring in several faculties. This can be caused by low student self-efficacy. This research is still little explained in nursing faculties. It is very important to identify students' self-efficacy so that when students face the clinic they do not commit fraud that impacts the patient and family. Therefore, this study was conducted related to self-efficacy with academic cheating in nursing

students. This study aimed to determine self-efficacy, academic cheating, and the relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in nursing students.

METHODS

Study Design and Setting

This study used a descriptive correlational with a cross-sectional approach to examine subjects at one point in time. This study was conducted between February 2021 and March 2021 in the Faculty of Nursing at a Western Private University.

Samples

This research was conducted on nursing students stage 2019 at one of the Faculty Nursing at the Western Private University. The sampling technique used is simple random sampling. The most basic type of probability sampling is simple random sampling. The researcher constructs a sampling frame, or collection of population elements, for simple random sampling. Simple random sampling is where sample members are taken from a population randomly and are considered homogeneous (Pakpahan et al., 2019; Polit & Beck, 2018). The sample is part of the target population element, which is the most basic unit of data collected (Polit & Beck, 2018). The sample is part of the target population element, which is the most basic unit of data collected. The total population of this study was 338 students. The sample size for this study uses the Slovin formula. The Slovin formula is used when research uses simple random sampling techniques. The error rate for research in the nursing scope is usually 5% (Pakpahan et al., 2019; Santoso, 2023). The number of samples in this study was 183 students.

Instruments

The instrument this study used was a questionnaire consisting of self-efficacy and academic cheating questionnaires. The self-efficacy questionnaire was modified from a research questionnaire (Damri et al., 2017) and have permission which aims to measure the level of respondents' self-efficacy based on aspects that influence self-efficacy, namely: Level (A1), Strength (A2), and Generality (A3) consisting of 34 statements. This questionnaire used a Likert scale with responses between strongly disagree, disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. The Academic Cheating Questionnaire is grouped into four forms of academic fraud behavior, including Cheating (B1), Plagiarism (B2), Fabrication/Falsification (B3), and Sabotage (B4) which consists of 23 statements, each of which has a behavioral indicator. This questionnaire uses a Likert scale with responses between never, rarely, sometimes, often, and always.

Table 1. Item Kuesioner

Variable	Subvariable	Indicator
Self-Efficacy	A1. Level dimension	a. Confidence in the ability to overcome difficulties in creating tasks b. Confidence in the ability to complete the task c. Confidence in the ability to learn
	A2. Strength dimension	a. Belief in one's resilience to the task b. Strength in the face of unfavorable experiences c. Confidence in getting good learning outcomes
	A3. Generality dimension	a. Study-following strategy b. Managing study time
Academic Cheating	B1. Cheating	a. View exam materials at the time of the exam b. Cooperate in taking the exam
	B2. Plagiarism	a. Collecting assignment papers submitted by others and recognizing them as one's work b. Copying another colleague's assignment work c. Paraphrasing when using sources in assignments
	B3. Fabrication/ Falsification	a. Falsifying quotations in assignments or papers b. Falsifying data in writing assignment reports and papers
	B4. Sabotage	a. Interfering with another colleague's research process or assessment report b. Removing other peers' assignments or exam results

Validity and reliability tests have been conducted on the research questionnaire. Both questionnaires were validity tested on 39 respondents. The Self-efficacy questionnaire consists of 39 statement items of which 34 items are valid with a range of r count 0.318-0.701 ($r_{table} = 0.316$), while the academic cheating questionnaire consisted of 25 items, of which 23 were declared valid with a range of r count 0.320-0.760 ($r_{table} = 0.316$). Reliability focuses on the consistency of measurement methods. Regarding each of these reliability indicators, the stronger the evidence for good reliability is when the value is near to 1.00. Although opinions on the minimum acceptable value vary, a value of 0.80 or higher is usually considered good. Researchers try to choose a measure with a high level of reliability, but if they use a multi-item scale, they usually calculate the alpha coefficient with their data as well (Polit & Beck, 2018). The results of the Cronbach's Alpha value after the reliability test were 0.911 on the self-efficacy questionnaire and 0.906 on the academic cheating questionnaire, the instrument was said to be reliable.

Data Collection

Researchers who will conduct data collection. Research data was collected after approval by the faculty. The researcher collected data online by sharing a link to a Google form that consisted of a brief explanation of the study, the purpose of the study, informed consent, and

the contents of the questionnaire. The link also included the phone number and email of one of the researchers who could be contacted, in case the respondent had any questions. Online data collection is easy to reach, accessible, can be filled in anywhere, and can be arranged so that all statements must be filled in, so that no statements are left behind. Through online questionnaires, researchers can immediately evaluate, how many have collected it. This questionnaire does not use names, so the ethical principle of confidentiality is still carried out.

Data Analysis

The research results obtained will be analyzed by using computer software like SPSS 21.0. Analysis of the chi-square test was used in this study. The independence chi-square test can be performed with nominal or ordinal data to assess whether the two variables are independent or related (Grove & Gray, 2019). The chi-square test is used to determine the relationship between categorical variables and categorical variables. Chi-Square is as follows: a). If there is an Expected value of less than 5 in 2x2, then Fisher's Exact Test is used. b). If the table is 2 x 2, and there is no E value < 5, then the test used should be "Continuity Correction (a)", c). If the table is more than 2 x 2, for example, 3 x 2, 3 x 3, etc., then the test used is "Pearson Chi-Square (Pakpahan et al., 2019).

Ethical Consideration

Before the research was conducted, this study had passed the ethical test from the ethical commission of the faculty of nursing (048R/RCTC-EC/R/I/2021). In this study, informed consent was provided in the questionnaire link. If the respondent agreed to be involved in this study, then the informed consent was accepted, and continued to fill out the questionnaire. If the respondent is not willing, the informed consent is rejected and the questionnaire link will be submitted. This study used four ethical principles, namely respect for human dignity, confidentiality, justice, and beneficence. In the principles of confidentiality and anonymity, the researcher did not put the respondent's name on the questionnaire, so the respondent did not need to write his name. Then the results of this study were only accessed by the researcher.

RESULTS

The results of the study were explained according to the research objectives. The objective is to identify self-efficacy and academic cheating and to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in students of the Faculty of Nursing at the University of Western Indonesia. Based on the characteristics of the respondents, it was found that 112

(61,2%) were 19 years old, and 154 (84,2%) were female. Table 2 below shows the characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents' Characteristics

Respondents' Characteristic	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age (Year)		
17	1	0,5
18	11	6,0
19	112	61,2
20	50	27,3
21	8	4,4
22	1	0,5
Total	183	100,0
Sex		
Female	154	84,2
Male	29	15,8
Total	183	100,0

The results of nursing students' self-efficacy showed that 67,2% were categorized as moderate self-efficacy and 90,2% of nursing students who committed academic cheating were categorized as low. Table 3 below shows the distribution of self-efficacy and academic cheating.

Table 3. Distribution of Self-Efficacy and Academic Cheating of Nursing Students

Variable	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Self-Efficacy		
Moderate	123	67,2
High	60	32,8
Total	183	100
Academic Cheating		
Low	165	90,2
Moderate	18	9,8
Total	183	100,0

The data analysis used in this study was the chi-square test. The results of the analysis obtained a p-value of 0,004 (p-value <0.005) indicating that there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in nursing students stage of 2019 at One University of Western Indonesia (table 4). Based on Table 4 it can show that nursing students have moderate self-efficacy so the ability to commit academic cheating is low (85,4%).

Table 4. Chi-square test

Self-efficacy	Academic Cheating		Total	p-value
	Low	Moderate		
Moderate	105 (85,4%)	18 (14,6%)	123 (100%)	0,002
High	60 (100%)	0 (0%)	60 (100%)	
Total	165 (90,2%)	18 (9,8%)	183 (100%)	

DISCUSSION

Self-efficacy

The results found that the self-efficacy of nursing students is categorized as moderate (67.2%). The results of this study are the same as previous research that found 60.78% of students have a moderate level of self-efficacy. This is reviewed from how students can complete tasks and obstacles that arise, and also how to adjust to the environment and the problems faced (Mamesah & Kusumiati, 2019).

Self-efficacy is affected by two factors, namely internal and external factors. Internal factors or factors that arise from within the individual are interest, patience, resilience, or the ability to survive adversity and change, character, and motivation and action to learn. The existence of self-motivation will predict the results of a person's performance and succeed in achieving it so that it has satisfaction with the results. Meanwhile, external factors that affect self-efficacy include attachment style, warmth, goal focus, active mastery experience, and verbal persuasion (Haugan & Eriksson, 2021; Mukti & Tentama, 2019).

In contrast to a previous study, it was discovered that 18 (40.9%) of 44 students from the Faculty of Psychology, University of X had a poor degree of efficacy. The causes discovered in his research are students' lack of self-confidence in completing tasks and students' lack of awareness to increase their efforts in completing tasks when they encounter obstacles, implying that the level of effort aspect is extremely important in research on students at the Faculty of Psychology, University X (Pudjiastuti, 2012).

One way to improve self-efficacy is to develop an environment for learning that uses a mindfulness-based instruction approach that can raise the self-awareness and self-efficacy of nursing students. Students gain a thorough understanding of course material by being guided mindfully through a series of simple assignments that encourage focused reflection, encourage self-awareness, and encourage focused learning (Robb & Spadaro, 2020). High self-efficacy is

also influenced by assistance from supervisors or mentors, both academic and clinical, which greatly determines the achievement of learning outcomes. This is because there is a relationship between self-efficacy and academic results of nursing students (Rambod et al., 2018).

Academic Cheating

Based on analysis in this study 90.2% of nursing students were categorized as low in committing academic cheating. The most common types of cheating were copying other colleagues' answers, reading books, or viewing material during the exam, sharing answers with other colleagues, not paraphrasing, falsifying journal sources, and falsifying patient assessment data. In line with previous research, it was found that most of the items that were rated high for academic dishonesty had a low presentation. However, the results of previous studies state that what is rated high is the fact that cheating behavior has no negative consequences for others. This means that nursing students deny that there is a negative impact of academic dishonesty on their professionalism, institutional reputation, and patients. It can be due to their belief that cheating is not serious and harmless (Kiekkas et al., 2020). However, this study contradicts previous research that found 75 (51%) of 145 students to be high academic cheaters. Academic cheating is primarily committed by students, not just because of ineptitude, but also out of fear of not being able to compete with others (Ester, 2016).

Previous research suggests that as many as 90% of respondents indicated that academic cheating is discouraged by the threat of severe punishment and three-quarters stated that at the time of the exam being given sign in a statement not to cheat because if you cheat you will be punished. This is very helpful so that students do not commit fraud (Birks et al., 2018). Academic cheating also does not only occur in academia but also in clinical practice, namely discussing patients in public places or with non-medical staff and giving inaccurate vital signs. The results of previous studies indicate that dishonest or cheating behavior is unethical behavior both in academics and clinical practice, and is influenced by student beliefs (Rafati et al., 2020).

In nursing, two things are important in identifying and preventing academic cheating. Because in the world of nursing, ethical issues are an integral part of nursing education. Nursing is an honest profession. Then, academic cheating is associated with unethical professional practice, due to academic cheating such as clinical data manipulation, such as not taking vital signs or not giving medication (Kiekkas et al., 2020). Cheating has many traits in common with other types of deviance, such as a preference for risk above gain and a propensity to be driven by

both internal and external pressures. As such, cheating may be punishable. Given the parallels, information from certain theories of deviance may be able to shed light on these findings and offer recommendations for reducing cheating (Burgason et al., 2019). Motivational factors are one of the important predictors of academic cheating, such as achievement goals, self-efficacy, and student expectations (Putarek, 2020).

The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Academic Cheating

Based on the chi-square test used in this study, it was found that self-efficacy and academic cheating were related in nursing students at one Faculty of Nursing in Western Indonesia (p-value 0.002). The findings are consistent with the research hypothesis. Previous research also obtained the same results as this study, namely that there was a significant relationship between self-efficacy and academic fraud in students at Putra Indonesia University, Padang, but in a negative direction. Students who commit academic cheating are those who have low self-efficacy. This is because high self-efficacy will create a calm feeling to face difficult tasks, increase optimism, and reduce anxiety. Conversely, students who have low self-efficacy will cause stress, depression, and narrow opinions to solve the problems (Syahrina & Ester, 2016).

Students who have higher levels of self-efficacy for self-regulation are more assured that they can plan their learning, set objectives, check to see whether they've been met, and alter cognitive and metacognitive strategies when goal achievement is in jeopardy. Mastery-approach Goals are based on achieving task-based or self-based competence and are connected to intrinsic motivation. As a result, engaging in dishonest behavior does not help one learn or perfect a task (Putarek, 2020).

The results of this study are different from one of the studies at the Faculty of Accounting in Bali that self-efficacy does not influence the behavior of committing academic cheating. The academic cheating found was influenced by the abilities possessed by students. It means that cheating will not occur if students cannot cheat (Artani & Wetra, 2017).

Integrity in academics plays an important role in the life of every student. Academic integrity is a behavior that is consistent in human beings to uphold the values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility, to maintain true values (Hidayat et al., 2020). In dealing with academic cheating, universities, and other educational institutions should also pay special attention to ethics training for students, and since teaching ethical issues does not change students' behavior, the implementation of ethical principles and worth by students should also

be monitored. Some issues such as cheating, violating morality, and dishonesty are declared more and more both in the workplace and in higher education centers (Fazli et al., 2018).

The results of the analysis of this study also explained that nursing students who have moderate self-efficacy, commit low academic cheating, and high self-efficacy (85.4%), commit low academic cheating (100%). Therefore, the way to deal with the occurrence of academic cheating is to develop a sense of self-confidence or self-efficacy, where students can do their duties independently and not depend on others. Another way is to have strict supervision and policies for all students who violate the rules, as well as by counseling students who commit academic cheating or who have low self-efficacy (Amelia et al., 2016).

Cheating harms self-esteem and mastery feelings. According to Murdock and Stephens (2006), the relationship between doing something wrong and self-esteem is more complex, and to maintain self-esteem, a person is prone to making more external and unstable attributions for the causes of his actions. Self-esteem will not suffer as a result. Only two of the twenty-two themes in a survey of motives to cheat reported by pharmacology students were internal attribution, the rest were entirely external (David, 2015). A feeling of mastery, on the other hand, is more distinct and directly tied to internal drive, self-involvement in the job, and the desire for comprehension. As a result, students with high levels of expertise are inconsistent with cheating.

The results of this study are important for nursing education and clinical practice, namely, to establish strategies for increasing self-efficacy by setting clear and definite goals, as well as providing appropriate and honest feedback through persuasion and verbal reinforcement, as well as providing examples of effective teaching both in the classroom and in the clinic, to reduce the incidence of academic cheating in the college environment. Another benefit is for nursing students to implement mentorship, so they can provide encouragement and motivation in the learning process. Furthermore, educational institutions might re-emphasize the legislation connected to cheating behavior, so that strong consequences are offered and clarified in the student handbook.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study found that nursing students had moderate self-efficacy and low academic cheating. The research hypothesis is accepted, where there is a relationship between self-efficacy and academic cheating in nursing students. What can encourage cheating and

dishonest behavior can come from individual factors such as fatigue, self-awareness, personal attitude, self-competence, and external factors such as internet facilities, and academic control. The level of cheating can be reduced among students should be reduced to build a culture of academic integrity at the institutional level, which involves reducing fatigue, focusing on learning, incorporating ethics into the curriculum, teaching peer review, and offering faculty development. Future research is expected to analyze dishonest behavior and self-efficacy in different respondents and places such as nursing students who are taking professional classes in the clinic.

LIMITATION

This study had limitations in that it was only to determine the relationship between the two variables, and was not area-specific. This research was academic.

REFERENCES

- Amelia, S. H., Tanjung, Z., Riyant, E., Azizi A.M, R., Novita, M. N. N., & Ranny. (2016). Perilaku menyontek dan upaya penanggulangannya. *JRTI (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 1(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29210/3003226000>
- Artani, K. T. B., & Wetra, I. W. (2017). Pengaruh academic self efficacy dan fraud diamond terhadap perilaku kecurangan Akademik Mahasiswa Akuntansi di Bali. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi*, 7(2), 123–132.
- Birks, M., Smithson, J., Antney, J., Zhao, L., & Burkot, C. (2018). Exploring the paradox: A cross-sectional study of academic dishonesty among Australian nursing students. *Nurse Education Today*, 65, 96–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.02.040>
- Burgason, K. A., Sefiha, O., & Briggs, L. (2019). Cheating is in the eye of the beholder: An evolving understanding of academic misconduct. *Innovative Higher Education*, 44(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-9457-3>
- Cardina, Y., Kristiani, & Sangka, K. B. (2021). Kecurangan akademik (Academic Fraud) pada pembelajaran daring. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 1(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.25134/prosidingsemnaspgsd.v1i1.8>
- Damri, Engkizar, & Anwar, F. (2017). Hubungan self-efficacy dan prokrastinasi akademik mahasiswa dalam menyelesaikan tugas perkuliahan. *Jurnal Edukasi: Jurnal Bimbingan Konseling*, 74–95.
- David, L. T. (2015). Academic cheating in college students: Relations among personal values, self-esteem and mastery. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 187, 88–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.017>
- Ester, I. A. S. (2016). Self Efficacy dengan academic dishonesty pada Mahasiswa Universitas Putra Indonesia “YPTK” Padang. *Jurnal RAP UNP*, 7(1), 24–35.
- Ewen, R. B. (2014). *An introduction to theories of personality*. Psychology Press: New York and London.
- Faisauddin, & Itsna, I. N. (2016). Hubungan self efficacy dengan perilaku menyontek mahasiswa. *Bhamada: Jurnal Ilmu Dan Teknologi KesehataFaisauddin, & Itsna, I. N. (2016). Hubungan Self Efficacy Dengan Perilaku Menyontek Mahasiswa. Bhamada:*

- Jurnal Ilmu Dan Teknologi Kesehatan (E-Journal)*, 7(1), 345–351.
[Http://Ojs.Stikesbhamadaslawi.Ac.Id/Index.Ph](http://Ojs.Stikesbhamadaslawi.Ac.Id/Index.Ph), 7(1), 345–351.
- Fazli, A., Imani, E., & Abedini, S. (2018). Faculty members' experience of student ethical problems: A qualitative research with a phenomenological approach. *Electronic Journal of General Medicine*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejgm/84952>
- Grove, S. K., & Gray, J. (2019). Understanding nursing research : Building an evidence-based practice. *Elsevier*, 472–574.
- Haugan, G., & Eriksson, M. (2021). Health promotion in health care - Vital theories and research. In *Health Promotion in Health Care - Vital Theories and Research*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63135-2>
- Herdian, H., Mildaeni, I. N., & Wahidah, F. R. (2021). “There are always ways to cheat” academic dishonesty strategies during online learning. *Journal of Learning Theory and Methodology*, 2(2), 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.17309/jltm.2021.2.02>
- Hidayat, M. N. A., Sumarwati, M., & Mulyono, W. A. (2020). Integritas akademik mahasiswa berhubungan dengan kemampuan dalam mengatur belajar secara mandiri. *Journal of Bionursing*, 2(2), 126–134. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.bion.2020.2.2.31>
- Kiekkas, P., Michalopoulos, E., Stefanopoulos, N., Samartzi, K., Krania, P., Giannikopoulou, M., & Igoumenidis, M. (2020). Reasons for academic dishonesty during examinations among nursing students: Cross-sectional survey. *Nurse Education Today*, 86(December 2019), 104314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104314>
- Kusnoor, A. V., & Falik, R. (2013). Cheating in medical school: The unacknowledged ailment. *Southern Medical Journal*, 106(8), 479–483. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SMJ.0b013e3182a14388>
- Lue, J. C., Stiles, B. L., & Vandehey, M. A. (2022). College cheating: The role of self-efficacy and neutralization theory. *College Student Journal*, 56(4), 358–371.
- Mamesah, T. S., & Kusumiati, R. Y. . (2019). Hubungan antara efikasi diri akademik dengan penyesuaian diri pada mahasiswa baru Provinsi NTT yang merantau di Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana Salatiga. *Psikologi Konseling*, 14(1), 317–329. <https://doi.org/10.24114/konseling.v14i1.13728>
- Mukti, B., & Tentama, F. (2019). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi efikasi diri akademik. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Magister Psikologi Universitas Ahmad Dahlan*, 0(0), 341–347.
- Nursalam, N., Bani, S., & Munirah, M. (2016). Bentuk kecurangan akademik (Academic Cheating) Mahasiswa PGMI Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan Uin Alauddin Makassar. *Lentera Pendidikan : Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah Dan Keguruan*, 16(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.24252/lp.2013v16n2a1>
- Pakpahan, M., Gusti, N., Eka, A., & Solely, G. (2019). *Buku Saku Metodologi Kuantitatif*. 1–31.
- Park, S. (2020). Goal contents as predictors of academic cheating in college students. *Ethics and Behavior*, 30(8), 628–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2019.1668275>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2018). Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice. In *Lippincott Williams & Wilkins: Philadelphia* (9th ed.).
- Pudjiastuti, E. (2012). Hubungan “Self Efficacy” dengan perilaku mencontek mahasiswa Psikologi. *MIMBAR, Jurnal Sosial dan Pembangunan*, 28(1), 103. <https://doi.org/10.29313/mimbar.v28i1.344>
- Purnamasari, D. (2013). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kecurangan akademik pada mahasiswa. *Educational Psychology Journal*, 2(1), 13–21.
- Putarek, V. (2020). The role of self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, achievement goals, and engagement in academic cheating. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 35(3), 647–671. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00443-7>

- Quraishi, U., & Aziz, F. (2017). Academic dishonesty at the higher education level in Punjab, Pakistan. *JRRE (Journal of Research and Reflection in Education)*, 11(1), 68–85.
- Rafati, F., Bagherian, B., Mangolian Shahrabaki, P., & Imani Goghary, Z. (2020). The relationship between clinical dishonesty and perceived clinical stress among nursing students in southeast of Iran. *BMC Nursing*, 19(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-00434-w>
- Rambod, M., Sharif, F., & Khademian, Z. (2018). The impact of the preceptorship program on self-efficacy and learning outcomes in nursing students. *Iranian Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Research*, 23(6), 444–449. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijnmr.IJNMR_67_17
- Robb, M., & Spadaro, K. C. (2020). A mindful approach to increase data analysis self-efficacy of DNP students. *Nurse Educator*, 45(4), 181. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000764>
- Saana, S. B. B. M., Ablordeppey, E., Mensah, N. J., & Karikari, T. K. (2016). Academic dishonesty in higher education: Students' perceptions and involvement in an African institution. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-016-2044-0>
- Santoso, A. (2023). Rumus slovin: Panacea masalah ukuran sampel? *Suksma: Jurnal Psikologi Universitas Sanata Dharma*, 4(2), 24–43.
- Syahrina, I. A., & Ester. (2016). Self Efficacy dengan academic dishonesty pada Mahasiswa Universitas Putra Indonesia “YPTK” Padang. *Jurnal RAP UNP*, 7(1), 24–35.