



The Influence of Medan State University Students Academic Fraud Behavior Through the Pentagon Fraud Dimensions

Dila Anjiani¹, Lidia², Restika Yenni³

^{1,2} Faculty of Economics, Medan State University

e-mail : dilayani26@gmail.com¹,

permatalidia342@gmail.com²,

restikayenni276@gmail.com³

Penulis Korespondensi: Dila Anjiani

e-mail: dilayani26@gmail.com

ARTIKEL INFO

Artikel History:

Menerima: 20 Mei 2023

Diterima: 29 Mei 2023

Tersedia Online: 31 Mei 2023

Kata kunci:

Pentagon Fraud, Tekanan,
Kecurangan Akademik

Artikel History:

Received: 20 May 2023

Accepted: 29 May 2023

Available Online: 31 May 2023

Keywords:

Pentagon Fraud, Pressure,
Academic Fraud

ABSTRAK

Permasalahan dalam kasus ini adalah kami peneliti termotivasi untuk menguji dimensi Fraud Pentagon, apakah dengan menggunakan dimensi tersebut memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap kecurangan akademik mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Medan dari berbagai fakultas. Sehingga dari keberadaan berbagai fakultas tersebut peneliti akan dapat menganalisis perbandingan kecurangan akademik di berbagai fakultas dengan menggunakan dimensi Fraud Pentagon. Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif, dengan menggunakan kuesioner sebagai instrumen penelitian. Populasi yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah dari berbagai fakultas Universitas Negeri Medan, jumlah sampel dalam penelitian ini adalah 32 mahasiswa. Diharapkan penelitian ini dapat menjadi penelitian yang mampu menggali informasi terkait tekanan dan perilaku terhadap kecurangan akademik. Selanjutnya hasil penelitian ini diharapkan dapat mengurangi perilaku kecurangan akademik.

The problem in this case is that we, researchers, are motivated to test the dimensions of the Fraud Pentagon, whether using it has a significant influence on the academic fraud of Medan State University students from various faculties. So that from the existence of various faculties, researchers will be able to analyze the comparison of academic fraud in various faculties using the dimensions of the fraud pentagon. This type of research is quantitative research, using a questionnaire as the research instrument. The population used in this research was from various faculties of Medan State University, the number of samples in this research was 32 students. It is hoped that this research can become research that is able to explore information related to pressure and behavior towards academic cheating. Furthermore, the results of this research are expected to reduce academic cheating behavior

1. INTRODUCTION

Cheating is an act or action that reflects the absence of justice values and ignores the value of honesty as well as violations of rules carried out by students to gain benefits for themselves in the form of academic success. So academic cheating is cheating or dishonest behavior carried out in the academic environment by using all means to gain advantage for oneself. Academic cheating is not a new problem but a phenomenon that has become ingrained among students. Eriskawati & Januarti (2016) reveal that academic cheating is a form of violation that is still often committed by students. According to Albrecht et al. (2012) fraud is a general term that includes all the ways in which cunning is used by someone to do something to gain an advantage over others from wrong judgment. Academic cheating can also be defined as behavior carried out by students intentionally, including several forms of behavior such as violating rules in completing assignments and exams, giving advantages to other students in doing assignments or exams in a dishonest way and reducing the expected accuracy of student performance (Cizek, 2000).

This phenomenon of academic cheating has become a problem in most countries in the world. Academic cheating has become a common thing that is done by everyone, not only among students in Indonesia, but academic cheating occurs throughout the world. As reported by Detik News (2013), 125 Harvard University students were caught cheating during the final exam. Harvard University, located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is known as one of the most prestigious universities in the world. Every student who studies at this university is not an ordinary student. They even have to pay tuition fees of US\$ 63 thousand (Rp. 611 million) per year. With high tuition fees, students should study well without committing academic fraud so as not to waste expensive tuition fees. Meanwhile, quoted from Arena Lte (2016), in 2016 students at Rangsit University in Bangkok, Thailand, were caught cheating on exams by using gadgets and collaborating with other students.

In Indonesia, academic cheating often occurs, this is proven by a survey conducted by Rangkuti and Deasyanti in 2010 of 298 education students at one of the LPTKs (Educational Personnel Educational Institutions) in Indonesia, showing that there was academic fraud committed by students. The survey results show that academic cheating was carried out by students during exams and was classified as frequent (more than twice) during the last year, including copying answers from students who were positioned nearby during the exam without other students realizing it, bringing and using materials that were not permitted/cheats to in the exam room and planned collusion between two or more students to communicate their answers during the exam. Meanwhile, academic fraud is committed when carrying out assignments, such as presenting false data, allowing other people to plagiarize their work, copying material for written work from books or other publications without stating the source and also changing/manipulating research data (Rangkuti & Deasyanti in Rangkuti (2011) .

It is not only students who commit academic fraud but also their teaching staff. A major case occurred in 2010 and there were at least four major cases of academic fraud. The first relates to the revocation of a teaching staff's title of professor because he was caught plagiarizing someone else's work. The other two cases involved plagiarizing theses by two different lecturers to get credit for their professorship appointments. The fourth case is the plagiarism of the work of an Austrian literary scientist by a university professor in Bandung (<http://www.umy.ac.id/>).

As one of the educational institutions in Indonesia, Medan State University (abbreviated as UNIMED) is one of the state universities in North Sumatra, Indonesia which is located on Jalan Willem Iskandar, Pasar V Medan Estate, Percut Sei Tuan, Deli Serdang (near the Medan City border) . Medan State University must always uphold conservation values so that this vision can

be achieved well. Every student needs to pay attention to ethics by behaving and acting honestly and not cheating.

Academic cheating that often occurs is eliminating sources of quotations made in writing final projects, working together during midterm or final exams (when they are asked to do it independently), cheating during exams and no involvement in completing group assignments (Muhsin et al., 2018). This phenomenon shows that there are still acts of fraud committed by students. Therefore, there is a need for research to investigate what factors influence someone to commit academic fraud.

According to Hartanto (2012:44) there are two factors that influence academic cheating, namely internal factors and external factors. These internal factors include a lack of understanding of academic cheating behavior, the desire to get good grades, considering cheating as normal or procrastinating on assignments. Meanwhile, external factors such as pressure from other people, unclear school regulations or less firm attitudes from teachers when they see students committing academic fraud. Martindas (2010) states that academic cheating arises as an interaction of various factors, both internal (within oneself) and external (coming from the environment). Internal factors related to academic cheating include academic self-efficacy, academic achievement index, work ethic, self-esteem, ability or competence, academic motivation (need for approval belief), attitude, level of education, study techniques (study skills) and morality. Apart from that, external factors include supervision by teachers, implementation of regulations, bureaucrats' responses to cheating, the behavior of other students and the environmental conditions of cheaters. Based on the opinion above, it can be seen that academic cheating behavior occurs not only because of individual factors but also because of environmental factors.

One theory related to fraud is the fraud pentagon theory. The fraud pentagon theory is a development of the fraud triangle theory and the fraud diamond theory. This theory was introduced in the literature in Crowe Horwath (2011) entitled "Why the Fraud Triangle is No Longer Enough" which was developed by Jonathan Marks. This theory adds competence and arrogance to the three factors contained in the fraud triangle theory, known as the fraud pentagon. There are five elements in this theory, namely pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability and arrogance. Crowe (2011) revealed that a person's competence can be used to commit fraud. Competence has the same meaning as capability contained in the fraud diamond theory. The fraud triangle theory is the basic theory of preventing and detecting fraud.

This theory was first introduced by Donald R. Cressey in 1953 (Tuanakotta, 2010:205). There are three elements in this theory, namely pressure, opportunity and rationalization. Kusumantoro et al. (2016) stated that a person's motivation for committing fraud is the incentive or pressure to commit fraud itself, the opportunity to commit fraud and the attitude or rationalization to justify the act of fraud. Furthermore, the fraud triangle theory was developed by Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) by adding capability to the three factors contained in the fraud triangle theory, which is known as the fraud diamond theory. According to Wolfe & Hermanson (2004), apart from pressure, opportunity and rationalization, capability must also be considered, namely personal traits and abilities that play a major role in fraud. Wolfe and Hermanson (2004) stated that opportunities open the door to cheating, pressure and rationalization can attract students to cheat. But students must have the ability to recognize these opportunities to take advantage. In other words, fraud will not occur if the individual does not have the skills and abilities to commit fraudulent acts (Abdullahi & Mansor, 2015).

Chance is also a factor that influences academic cheating. According to Albrecht et al. (2012:34) opportunity is a situation that allows someone to commit fraud, a situation that is considered safe by the perpetrator to cheat assuming that the fraudulent act is not detected. The greater the opportunity, the easier it is for students to commit academic fraud. Opportunities

usually arise due to less strict supervision and poor systems. So basically opportunity is the factor that is easiest to minimize and anticipate, when a good system has been created at the university, and strict supervision. Based on research conducted by Becker et al. (2006), Malgwi & Rakovski (2008), Fitriana & Baridwan (2012), Nursani & Irianto (2014), Yudiana & Lastanti (2016), Primasari et al. (2017), Murdiansyah et al. (2017) and Padmayanti et al. (2017) shows that opportunity influences academic cheating behavior. The results of this research are different from the results of research conducted by Widianingsih (2013), Zaini et al. (2015), Mufakkir & Listiadi (2016), Apriani et al. (2017) and Nurkhin & Fachrurrozie (2018) which show that opportunity has no effect on academic cheating behavior.

One of the factors that influences academic cheating is pressure. Pressure is the encouragement that students face in getting academic results as expected even though they use any means to achieve them, including committing acts of cheating (Albrecht et al., 2012: 34). This encouragement can come from lifestyle demands, parental demands, family economics and so on. The higher the pressure felt by someone, the greater the possibility that academic fraud will occur. This is in line with the research results of Becker et al. (2006), Malgwi & Rakovski (2008), Fitriana & Baridwan (2012), Widianingsih (2013), Zaini et al. (2015), Apriani et al. (2017), Murdiansyah et al. (2017), Padmayanti et al. (2017) and Nurkhin & Fachrurrozie (2018) show that pressure influences academic cheating behavior. The results of this research are different from the results of research conducted by Nursani & Irianto (2014), Yudiana & Lastanti (2016) and Primasari et al. (2017) which shows that pressure has no effect on academic cheating behavior.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Pentagon Fraud Theory

Fraud pentagon or also known as Crowe's fraud pentagon theory is a theory that examines in more depth the factors that cause fraud to occur. This theory was introduced in the literature in Crowe Horwath (2011) entitled "Why the Fraud Triangle is No Longer Enough" which was developed by Jonathan Marks. The fraud pentagon theory is an extension of the fraud triangle theory previously put forward by Cressey, this theory adds two other elements, namely competence and arrogance. The competency described in the fraud pentagon theory has a similar meaning to the capability previously explained in the fraud diamond theory by Wolfe and Hermason in 2004. The results of the research obtained one additional element where this situation describes the nature of the perpetrator, which is called arrogance. or arrogant.

Academic Fraudulent Behavior

Understanding Academic Fraudulent Behavior

Fraud is a general term that includes all ways in which cunning is used by someone to do something in order to gain an advantage over another from wrong judgment (Albrecht et al., 2012: 6). Meanwhile, according to Zimbelman et al. (2014:7) fraud is a general term and includes all kinds of methods that can be used with particular skill chosen by an individual to gain benefits from other parties by making false representations. Academic cheating can also be defined as behavior carried out by students intentionally, including several forms of behavior such as violating rules in completing assignments and exams, giving advantages to other students in doing assignments or exams in a dishonest way and reducing the expected accuracy of student performance. (Cizek, 2000:7). Based on these opinions, it can be concluded that academic cheating is dishonest behavior carried out by someone to achieve academic success by violating existing regulations.

Indicators of Academic Fraud Behavior

Cheating behavior that appears in various universities includes learning activities in class, learning evaluations, lecture assignments related to academics. According to Hendricks in Sagoro (2013: 59-60), several forms of student academic cheating behavior that occur in carrying out assignments and learning evaluations are preparing small notes for exams or quizzes, using notes/cheat sheets during exams or quizzes, copying other people's answers during exams. , using dishonest methods to find out what will be tested, copying exam answers from other people without that person's knowledge, helping other people to cheat, copying other people's scientific work assignments and admitting it as their own work (plagiarizing), falsifying lists library, collaborating with teachers to complete individual assignments, copying several sentences (including from the internet) without including the information in the bibliography (plagiarism), buying scientific works from other people, using various false reasons to prolong the submission of assignments, bribing, giving gifts, or threaten other people for their own benefit, ask for signatures of attendance, ask other people to replace themselves or replace other people to take exams, cooperate with other people during exams or quizzes orally, gestures, or use communication media such as cellphones , providing calculated answers or even answers to other people using paper media.

Pressure

Pressure, namely the existence of incentives/pressure/need to commit fraud. Pressure covers almost everything including lifestyle, economic demands, etc. including financial and non-financial things. These non-financial factors include position, personal failure, business failure, adversity in loneliness, bad habits and resentment or hatred (Tuanakotta, 2010:207). According to Wolfe & Hermanson (2004), many studies show that fraud is more likely to occur when someone is under pressure to commit fraud. Pressure is a situation where someone feels the need to commit fraud (Albrecht et al., 2012:36). According to Hartanto (2012:1) pressure can come from those closest to him such as other people, relatives or friends.

Pressure Indicator

According to Albrecht et al. (2012:36) pressure in fraud is divided into four types, namely financial pressure or pressure due to financial factors, bad habits that a person has, pressure that comes from external parties and other pressures.

Chance

Understanding Opportunity

Opportunity is a situation that provides an opportunity to allow fraud to occur. This occurs because the company's internal controls are weak, lack of supervision and abuse of authority (Tuanakotta, 2010:211). Opportunity is a situation where someone feels they have a combination of situations and conditions that make it possible to commit fraud and not be detected (Albrecht et al., 2012:39). According to Nurkhin & Fachrurrozie (2018) opportunities are opportunities that intentionally or unintentionally arise in situations in the classroom that force a student to carry out various fraudulent behaviors.

Opportunity Indicator

According to Albrecht et al. (2012:39) the causes of opportunity are as follows:

1. Lack of controls to prevent and detect violations. Controls to prevent and detect fraudulent behavior must be planned well in order to minimize fraudulent behavior. A system that is weak in detecting and preventing fraudulent behavior will create extensive opportunities for a student to commit fraud. Control systems that can be implemented include arranging sitting

positions during the exam, providing analytical assignments to enable students to work on assignments individually and implementing strict sanctions to prevent cheating.

2. Inability to assess the quality of a result

A lecturer must be able to assess the results of student work not only from whether the answers are correct or not, but also from the student's honesty in carrying out assignments. Lecturers must be able to distinguish between honest and not honest student work.

Rationalization

Understanding Rationalization

Rationalization is looking for justification before committing a crime, not after. Rationalization is needed to fight the law in order to maintain the identity of the perpetrator of fraud (Tuanakotta, 2010:212). Rationalization is self-justification or wrong reasons for wrong behavior (Albrecht et al., 2012: 49).

Rationalization Indicators

Albrecht et al. (2012: 50) stated that the rationalization for committing fraud that is often carried out by perpetrators of fraud is that the perpetrator feels that the organization owes the perpetrator, the perpetrator only does it because he is forced to do it, the perpetrator feels that no party is harmed, the perpetrator of the fraud feels that he has greater rights, this fraud is committed for good purposes, the perpetrator of fraud will stop cheating if his personal problem has been resolved and this fraud is carried out to maintain his reputation.

Ability

Understanding Ability

Individual abilities are the personal traits and abilities that play a major role in fraud. Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) stated that opportunities open the door to cheating, pressure and rationalization can attract students to cheat. but students must have the ability to recognize these opportunities to take advantage. In other words, fraud will not occur if the individual does not have the skills and abilities to commit fraudulent acts (Abdullahi & Mansor, 2015).

Capability Indicator

According to Wolfe & Hermanson (2004), there are traits related to abilities that are important in the person of a fraud perpetrator, namely:

1. Positioning

A person's position or function within an organization may provide the ability to create or exploit opportunities for fraud. A person in a position of authority has greater influence over a particular situation or environment.

2. Intelligence and Creativity

Perpetrators of this fraud have sufficient understanding and exploit weaknesses in internal controls and to use positions, functions, or access of authority for large profits.

3. Covidence/ego

The individual must have a strong ego and great confidence he will not be detected. Common personality types include someone who is driven to succeed at all costs, self-centered, self-confident and often self-loving (narcissism). According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, narcissistic personality disorder includes a need for admiration and a lack of empathy for others. Individuals with this disorder believe that they are superior and tend to want to show off their achievements and abilities.

Arrogance

Understanding Arrogance

Crowe (2011) argues that arrogance is an attitude of superiority and a sense of entitlement or greed as part of a person who believes that internal control does not apply to him. Meanwhile, according to Lano (2015), an arrogant attitude is an arrogant and arrogant attitude shown by someone who feels that he is the greatest, the smartest, the most powerful, the most influential compared to other people. Crowe (2011) revealed that many frauds are revealed not only for reasons of material gain, but fraud can be based on a person's selfishness, status and arrogance.

Arrogance Indicator

Crowe (2011) suggests that there are five perspective elements of arrogance, namely:

1. Big ego
2. They think internal control does not apply to them
3. Has characteristics of bully behavior (bullying attitude)

Has the habit of leading authoritarily 5. Has a fear of losing position or status.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method used is quantitative using secondary data. And to support the framework that will be prepared, relevant previous research results are presented as reinforcement in carrying out research. The following is previous research regarding academic cheating behavior:

NO	Researcher	Title	Results
1	Becker et al. (2006)	Using the Business Fraud Triangle to Predict Academic Dishonesty Among Business Students	The research results show that the pressure variable, opportunity and rationalization significant effect on academic cheating behavior
2	Malgwi & Rakovski (2008)	Behavioral Implications of Evaluating Determinants of Academic Fraud Risk Factors	The research results show that the pressure variable, opportunity and rationalization significant effect on academic cheating behavior
3	Malgwi & Rakovski (2009)	Combating Academic Fraud: Are Students Reticent about Uncovering the Covert?	The results of a survey of 740 students found that the most widely supported strategies were strong punishments, parental attention, information limits on unknown names and managing uniform policies.
4	Adeyemi & Adelaja (2011)	Deterrent Measures and Cheating Behavior of Accounting Undergraduates in Tertiary Institutions in Lagos Nigeria	Academic cheating behavior that occurs and is carried out tends to be high with the pressure factor being the dominant factor that influences academic cheating behavior
5	Fitriana & Baridwan (2012)	Accounting Students' Academic Fraud Behavior: Dimensions of the Fraud Triangle	The research results show that the variables of pressure, opportunity and rationalization have a significant effect on academic cheating behavior
6	Purnamasari & Irianto (2014)	Analysis of the Influence of the Fraud Triangle Dimensions on Students' Academic Fraudulent Behavior during Exams and Prevention Methods	The research results show that the variables of pressure, opportunity and rationalization have a significant effect on academic cheating behavior

7	Lewellyn & Rodriguez (2015)	Does Academic Dishonesty Relate to Fraud Theory? A Comparative Analysis	The research results show that the variables of pressure, opportunity and rationalization have a significant effect on academic cheating behavior
---	-----------------------------	---	---

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Influence of Pressure, Opportunity, Rationalization, Ability and Arrogance on Academic Cheating Behavior

Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) reveal that many studies show that fraud is more likely to occur when someone has pressure to commit fraud, control or supervision is weak and the perpetrator can rationalize his actions. Apart from pressure, opportunity and rationalization, Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) also added a fourth factor, namely ability. Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) argue that someone will not commit fraud if they do not have the skills and ability to do so. Ruankaew (2016) argues that opportunity opens the door to fraud, pressure and rationalization lead someone to commit fraud and the ability is needed to open the door to fraud and take advantage of the fraud. Research conducted by Harsanda & Setiyani (2016), Amalia & Mahmud (2017) and Wisnumurti & Yulianto (2017) shows that pressure, opportunity, rationalization and ability influence academic cheating behavior.

A person who has great pressure, wide open opportunities, high rationalization, ability and arrogance will tend to commit academic fraud. Meanwhile, if someone does not have many demands, there are limited opportunities, low rationalization, low ability and no inner arrogance, then that person will tend to obey existing regulations or not commit academic fraud.

Based on theoretical explanations and previous research results, the first hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H1: Pressure, opportunity, rationalization, ability and arrogance together have a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of Medan State University students.

The Effect of Pressure on Academic Cheating Behavior

Pressure is a situation where someone feels the need to commit fraud (Albrecht et al., 2012:34). Furthermore, Albrecht et al. (2012:34) stated that the pressure felt is encouragement or motivation or a goal that one wants to achieve but is limited by the inability to achieve it. This encouragement can come from lifestyle demands, parental demands, family economics and so on. Becker et al. (2006) revealed that the occurrence of fraud will be greater when there is greater pressure faced by the perpetrator of the fraud. Academic cheating behavior experienced by students can occur due to pressure such as demands to graduate, high grades, lots of assignments and little study time. Based on the theoretical explanation and results of previous research, the second hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H2: Pressure has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of Medan State University students.

The Influence of Opportunity on Academic Cheating Behavior

Opportunity is a situation where someone feels they have a combination of situations and conditions that make it possible to commit academic fraud and not be detected (Albrecht et al., 2012:34). According to Becker et al. (2006), opportunity is a driving factor in the occurrence of academic cheating. The greater the opportunity available for someone to commit fraud, the greater the possibility of that person committing fraud. Opportunities can be caused by weak supervision, giving perpetrators the opportunity to commit academic fraud. Students will be encouraged to

commit academic fraud when they see conditions that allow cheating. Based on the theoretical explanation and results of previous research, the third hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H3: Opportunity has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of Medan State University students.

The Influence of Rationalization on Academic Cheating Behavior

Rationalization is self-justification or wrong reasons for wrong behavior (Albrecht et al., 2012:34). Rationalization of cheating behavior is a student mindset that considers academic cheating behavior to be normal and has been done. A student who has a high level of rationalization for cheating or is used to making excuses will assume that the cheating behavior he is carrying out is correct (Pamungkas, 2015: 90). So it can be concluded that rationalization can encourage someone to commit academic fraud. Based on the theoretical explanation and results of previous research, the fourth hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H4: Rationalization has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University

The Influence of Ability on Academic Cheating Behavior

Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) stated that abilities are personal attitudes and abilities that play a major role in fraud. If someone has a high ability to commit academic fraud, the possibility of academic fraud occurring will be higher. Likewise, if someone has a low ability to commit academic fraud, the possibility of academic fraud occurring will be lower. Students who have the ability to commit academic fraud tend to commit academic fraud more often than those who do not have the ability to commit academic fraud. Based on the theoretical explanation and results of previous research, the fifth hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H5: Ability has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of Medan State University students

The Influence of Arrogance on Academic Cheating Behavior

Crowe (2011) argues that arrogance is an attitude of superiority and a sense of entitlement or greed as part of a person who believes that internal control does not apply to him. Meanwhile, according to Lano (2015), an arrogant attitude is an arrogant and arrogant attitude shown by someone who feels that he is the greatest, the smartest, the most powerful, the most influential compared to other people. Arrogance that is not supported by competence or the ability to commit fraud, then fraud will not occur. Likewise, on the other hand, even though someone has the ability to commit fraud, but there is no arrogance, the possibility of that person becoming a perpetrator of fraud is smaller. Research conducted by Tessa & Harto (2016) shows that arrogance influences fraudulent behavior. This means that arrogance influences students' academic cheating behavior. Based on the theoretical explanation and results of previous research, the sixth hypothesis in this research is as follows.

H6: Arrogance has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of Medan State University students

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Pressure, opportunity, rationalization, ability and arrogance simultaneously have a significant influence on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan

State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 55.7% and the remaining 44.3% is influenced by other variables not examined in this research.

2. Partial pressure has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 1.54%.
3. Partial opportunity has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 4.62%.
4. Partial rationalization has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 3.69%.
5. Partial ability has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 6.81%.

Arrogance partially has a significant effect on the academic cheating behavior of students at the Faculty of Economics, Medan State University in the class of 2021, amounting to 1.51%.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, R., & Mansor, N. (2015). Fraud Triangle Theory and Fraud Diamond Theory. Understanding the Convergent and Divergent for Future Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 5(4), 38–45.
- Adeyemi, S. B., & Adelaja, S. O. (2011). Deterrent Measures and Cheating Behavior of Accounting Undergraduates in Tertiary Institutions in Lagos Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(12), 195–204.
- Albrecht, W.S. (2012). *Fraud Examinaton (Fourth Edition)*. South-Western: Cengage Learning.
- Amalia, RN, & Mahmud, A. (2017). The Influence of Fraud Diamond on Academic Fraud of Undergraduate Students, Accounting Majors, State Universities in the City of Semarang. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(1), 1–15.
- Apriani, N., Sujana, E., & Sulindawati, IGE (2017). The Influence of Pressure, Opportunity, and Rationalization on Academic Cheating Behavior. *EJournal Undergraduate Ak*, 7(1).
- Arena Lte. (2016). Similar to the film, this student cheats with sophisticated gadgets. <https://arenalte.com/life/style/mirip-di-film-mahasiswa-inimenyontek-dengan-gadget-canggih/>. (Accessed 20 March 2018).
- Arikunto, S. (2014). *Research Procedures: A Practical Approach*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Artani, KTB, & Wetra, IW (2017). The Influence of Academic Self Efficacy and Fraud Diamond on the Academic Fraud Behavior of Accounting Students in Bali. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 7(2), 123–132.
- Becker, D., Janice Connolly, Paula U Lentz, & J Morrison. (2006). Using The Business Fraud Triangle to Predict Academic Dishonesty Among Business Students. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 10(1), 37–54.
- Bintoro, W., Purwanto, E., & Noviyani, DI (2013). The Relationship between Self Regulated Learning and Student Academic Cheating. *Educational Psychology Journal*, 2(1), 57–64.
- Boyle, D. M., Boyle, J. F., & Carpenter, B. W. (2016). Accounting Student Academic Dishonesty: What Accounting Faculty and Administrators Believe. *The Accounting Educators' Journal*, Special Ed(2016), 39–61. Boyle, D. M., Boyle, J. F., & Carpenter, B. W. (2016). Accounting Student Academic Dishonesty: What Accounting Faculty and Administrators Believe. *The Accounting Educators' Journal*, Special Ed(2016), 39–61.
- Cizek, G. C. (2000). *Cheating On Tests: How to Do It, Detect It, and Prevent It*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Publisher.

- Second. (2013). Mass Cheating Scandal, 60 Harvard Students Suspended. <https://news.detik.com/internasional/d-2159488/skandal-mencontek-massal60-mahasiswa-harvard-kena-skorsing>. (Accessed 17 February 2018).
- Dewi, KNA, Sulindawati, NLGE, & Sujana, E. (2017). The Influence of the Level of Academic Fraud Behavior on Accounting Students Majoring in Education and Non-Education at Ganesha University of Education with the Concept of "Fraud Triangle." *Ak Undergraduate E-Journal*, 1(2).
- Eriskawati, E., & Januarti, I. (2016). The Influence of Relativism, Idealism, and Gender on the Student's Academic Cheating Behavior. *Journal of Accounting Dynamics*, 8(1), 78–83.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2008). *Theories of Personality*. Yogyakarta: Student Heritage.
- Fitriana, A., & Baridwan, Z. (2012). Student Academic Deficiency Behavior: Dimensions of the Fraud Triangle. *Journal of Multiparadigm Accounting*, 3(2), 242–252.
- Fuadi, M. (2016). Determinants of Academic Fraud in Students at the Faculty of Economics, Semarang State University using the Fraud Triangle Concept. Thesis. Semarang: Semarang State University.
- Ghozali, I. (2016). Application of Multivariate Analysis with the IBM PSS 23 Program. Semarang: Diponegoro University.
- Harsanda, A., & Setiyani, R. (2016). The Influence of Fraud Diamond Dimensions on Student Academic Fraud Behavior. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(1), 1–13.
- Hartanto, D. (2012). *Cheating Guidance & Counseling: Uncovering the Root of the Problem and the Solution*. Jakarta: Index Publishers.
- Herlyana, M., Sujana, E., & Prayudi, MA (2017). The Influence of Religiosity and Spirituality on Student Academic Cheating. *Ak Undergraduate E-Journal*, 8(2).
- Horwath, C. (2011). What the Fraud Triangle is No Longer Enough.
- Kusumantoro, Nurkhin, A., Mukhibad, H., & Kiswanto. (2016). Determinants of Fraud Based on Islamic Paradigm: Case Study in Islamic Financial Services Cooperatives. *International Journal of the Computer, the Internet and Management*, 24(3), 68–71.
- Lano, P.F. (2015). Leadership Function to Reduce Employee Arrogance. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 4(1), 74–81.
- Lewellyn, P. G., & Rodriguez, L. C. (2015). Does Academic Dishonesty Relate to Fraud Theory? A Comparative Analysis. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5(3), 1–6.
- Malgwi, C. A., & Rakovski, C. (2008). Behavioral Implications of Evaluating Determinants of Academic Fraud Risk Factors. *Journal of Forensic & Investigative Accounting*, 1(2).
- Malgwi, C. A., & Rakovski, C. C. (2009). Combating Academic Fraud: Are Students Reticent about Uncovering the Covert? *J Acad Ethics*, 207–221.
- Martindas, R. (2010). Preventing Academic Fraud. <http://budimatindas.blogspot.com/2010/08/cepat-kecurangananakademik.html>. (Accessed 2 February 2018).
- Mubtadin, TYL, & Yanto, H. (2016). Factors that Influence Academic Fraud Practices. *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(1), 1–12.
- Mufakkir, MEF, & Listiadi, A. (2016). The Influence of Factors in the Fraud Triangle Dimensions on Academic Fraud Behavior. *Journal of Accounting Education*
- Muhsin, Kardoyo, Arief, S., Nurkhin, A., & Pramusinto, H. (2018). An Analysis of Student's Academic Fraud Behavior. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 164(March).
- Murdiansyah, I., Sudarma, M., & Nurkholis. (2017). The Influence of Fraud Diamond Dimensions on Academic Fraud Behavior. *Journal of Actual Accounting*, 4(2), 121–133.

- Nurkhin, A., & Fachrurrozie. (2018). Analysis of the Influence of Diamond Fraud Dimensions on the Academic Fraud Behavior of UNNES Accounting Education Students. *Liabilities Journal of Accounting Education*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Nursani, R., & Irianto, G. (2014). Student Academic Fraud Behavior: Diamond Fraud Dimensions. *FEB Student Scientific Journal*, 2(2), 1–21.
- Padmayanti, KD, Sujana, E., & Kurniawan, PS (2017). Influence Analysis Fraud Diamond Dimensions of Student Academic Fraud Behavior. *Ak Undergraduate E-Journal*, 8(2), 1–12.
- Pamungkas, DD (2015). The Influence of Factors in the Fraud Triangle Dimension on the Academic Fraudulent Behavior of Class XI Accounting Students at SMK Negeri 1 Tempel in the 2014/2015 Academic Year. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Pamungkas, ID (2014). The Influence of Religiosity and Rationalization in Preventing and Detecting Accounting Fraud Tendencies. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 15(2), 48–59.
- Semarang State University Chancellor's Regulation Number 19 concerning Student Ethics and Rules.
- Primasari, DN, Suhendro, & Masitoh, E. (2017). Accounting Students' Academic Fraud Behavior Using Fraud Diamond Dimensions. *Journal of Accounting and Information Technology Systems*, 13, 118–126.
- Pudjiastuti, E. (2012). The Relationship between "Self Efficacy" and Cheating Behavior in Psychology Students. *Pulpit*, XXVIII(1), 103–112.
- Purnamasari, D., & Irianto, G. (2014). Analysis of the Influence of the Fraud Triangle Dimensions on Students' Academic Fraudulent Behavior during Exams and Prevention Methods. *FEB Student Scientific Journal*, 2(2).
- Rangkuti, AA (2011). Opportunity as a Threat to Academic Integrity. *Journal of Education*, 4(1), 31-36.
- Ruankaew, T. (2016). Beyond the Fraud Diamond. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 7(1), 474–476.
- Sagoro, E.M. (2013). Synergy between Students, Lecturers and Institutions in Preventing Academic Fraud in Accounting Students. *Indonesian Journal of Accounting Education*, XI(2), 54–67.
- Sari, DS, Rispanyo, & Kristianto, D. (2017). The Influence of Fraud Triangle Dimensions (Pressure, Opportunity and Rationalization) on Academic Fraud Behavior in Students. *Journal of Accounting and Information Technology Systems*, 13(4), 464–472.
- Sudjana. (2005). *Statistical Methods*. Bandung: Tarsito.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Educational Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, and R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tessa, C., & Harto, P. (2016). Fraudulent Financial Reporting: Testing the Pentagon Fraud Theory in the Financial and Banking Sector. In *Papers of the XIX National Accounting Symposium* (pp. 1–21). Lampung: University of Lampung.
- Tuanakotta, T.M. (2010). *Forensic Accounting and Investigative Auditing*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat Publishers.
- Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System.
- Wahyudin, A. (2015). *Research methods*. Semarang: Unnes Press.
- Widianingsih, LP (2013). Students Cheating Behaviors: The Influence of Fraud Triangle. *Integrative Business & Economics Research*, 2(2), 252–260.

- Widianto, A., & Sari, YP (2017). Detection of Academic Fraud in D III Accounting Students at Harapan Bersama Tegal Polytechnic using the Fraud Triangle Model. *AKSI Journal (Accounting and Information Systems)*, 1, 29–37.
- Wisnumurti, PA, & Yulianto, A. (2017). The Influence of Fraud Diamond Dimensions and Academic Procrastination on Academic Fraud in Class X and Economic Education Analysis Journal, 1–15.
- Wolfe, B.D.T., & Hermanson, D.R. (2004). The Fraud Diamond : Considering the Four Elements of Fraud. *The CPA Journal*, 2, 38–42.
- Yudiana, AP, & Lastanti, HS (2016). Analysis of the Influence of Diamond Fraud Dimensions on the Academic Fraud Behavior of Economics Faculty Students. In National Seminar and Call Paper, Faculty of Economics, UNIBA Surakarta, 412–422.
- Zaini, M., Carolina, A., & Setiawan, AR (2015). Analysis of the Influence of Fraud Diamond and Gone Theory on Academic Fraud. In XVIII National Accounting Symposium (Pp. 1–20). Medan: FEB University of North Sumatra.
- Zimbelman, M.F., Albrecht, C.C., Albrecht, W.S., & Albrecht, CO (2014). *Forensic Accounting (Fourth Edition)*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.