

## How do Middle School Student Trusts Predicted Moral Disengagement and Incivility?

Imam Setyo Nugroho<sup>1✉</sup>, Anwar Sutoyo<sup>2</sup> & Sunawan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas PGRI Madiun, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Professional Counselor Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup> Guidance and Counseling, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

### Article Info

History Articles

Received:

20 November 2019

Accepted:

5 March 2020

Published:

21 April 2020

Keywords:

academic integrity,

trust,

moral disengagement

### Abstract

Trust becomes one of the important characters and part of the integrity character that must be possessed by students. The importance of trust can be seen from the many academic cheating behaviors committed by students such as plagiarism and cheating and their future behavior. This study uses a correlational design with cluster sampling data collection techniques by selecting 636 students (49.5% male, 50.5% female) junior high school in Semarang and Temanggung. Data retrieval is done with students filling the scale of academic integrity, moral disengagement and incivility. The results confirmed that moral disengagement and incivility negatively predicted student trust ( $R = 0.26$ ,  $F_{(13,622)} = 3.54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This finding confirms that moral disengagement and incivility predict students' trust. Specifically the results of this study confirm that the type of moral disengagement is euphemistic labeling and the type of incivility is intentional incivility to predict student trust. Further discussion is discussed in this study.

✉ Correspondence address:

Setiabudi No.85, Kanigoro, Kartoharjo,

Madiun, Jawa Timur, 63118

E-mail: [imamsetyo84@students.unnes.ac.id](mailto:imamsetyo84@students.unnes.ac.id)

## INTRODUCTION

Character is the operative value which is the basis for someone to act and behave in various important contexts to be examined (Lickona, 2012; Lapsley & Narvaez, 2016; Suryabrata, 2013; Reksiana, 2018). One of the important characters to develop is trust which is related to trust in oneself and others.

Considering the importance of developing the character of trust the government emphasizes that character education is part of the national movement of the mental revolution in the education unit including trust (Dewayani, 2018; Rohanim et al, 2018). Trust is an important part of the learning process that will affect students' learning and personal environments (Boehm, et al 2009; Stephens, 2018). With the trust, communication in the school environment will run well and everyone carries out their duties and responsibilities with full responsibility.

Trust, namely the emergence of trust in oneself and others in their abilities, so that they dare to convey ideas and ideas to others in achieving common goals both at school and in the community (ICAI, 2014; Keohane, 1999; Bretag, 2016). In the academic world at the school of trust is an important foundation for students not to commit academic cheating such as plagiarism, cheating during exams, sharing homework and other academic cheating which in turn will also shape dishonesty and cheating behavior in the future and in various fields of life especially in work (Biswas, 2014; Lawson, 2004; Barnard, et al, 2008; Pfannenstiel, 2010; Jones, 2016; Ba, et al 2017; Krueger, 2014; Christiana, 2018; Sari, Marjohan, Neviyarni, 2013; Masada, Dacmiati, 2016) such as being late for coming to the office and teamwork in working. Thus it is important to know how trust can be predicted, so that academic cheating behavior can be prevented and reduced to realize students with integrity

The low level of student trust can be seen from the high rates of academic cheating committed by students. Academic cheating of students continues to increase every year, a

survey of 20,000 students admitted 80% had cheated on school work, 70% had cheated on tests and 90% had cheated on homework (Strom & Strom, 2008; Seider et al, 2013). The results of this study also indicate the low level of student trust. Because students who have trust will not commit academic cheating.

Several previous studies have shown that moral disengagement has a relationship with academic cheating behavior by students such as cheating, taking a friend's homework, not participating in a group survey (Stephnes, 2018; Jordan 2001; Christiana, 2018; Vincent, 2016; Mayhew et al, 2009). However, how the relationship between moral disengagement with trust as a form of resistance to academic fraud is not known with certainty, so that further research is needed to reinforce the moral relationship between disengagement and student trust.

Moral disengagement is a condition where individuals justify antisocial behavior by putting aside their moral values and making unethical moral decisions while maintaining their moral standards (Bandura, 2016; 2002; 1999; Hyde et al 2010; Feist, Feist & Robert, 2017: 165; Detert et al, 2008; Clemente, Espinosa & Padilla, 2019; Travlos et al, 2018; Caroli & Sagone, 2014; Proios, 2016; Aprilia & Solicha, 2019). Moral disengagement can be understood as justifying immoral actions and consciously violating rules for personal interests and benefits such as cheating, plagiarism and other academic fraud.

Other research results also show that incivility is one of the causes of students to commit academic cheating such as cheating and plagiarism (Masada, Dacmiati, 2016; Kolanko et al, 2006). Students who do not have discipline when learning in class, then tend to have difficulty in understanding the lesson and when the exam encourages these students to commit other academic cheating.

Incivility is one of the deviant behavior by disturbing other students when learning activities, so the learning atmosphere becomes harmonious and cooperative (ilies, 2019; Kolanko 2006; Berger, 2000; Jensen et al, 2002;

Knepp, 2012; Farrell et al, 2016) . Thus incivility can be understood as disruptive behavior by students and makes the school climate a less comfortable place to learn.

Based on the previous elaboration, the results of previous studies specifically have not confirmed how moral disengagement and incivility in predicting student trust, the purpose of this study is to understand the relationship between moral disengagement and incivility in predicting student trust. The findings of this study are expected to broaden the results of Stephnes's research (2018), Jordan (2001), Christiana (2018), Vincent et al (2016), Mayhew et al, (2009) in the context of trust, not just focusing on academic cheating. This research is expected to reinforce previous research related to the relationship between trust with the type of moral disengagement and the type of incivility. This is based on previous research not yet identifying the specific types of moral disengagement and what kind of incivility predicts trust.

## METHODS

This research uses a quantitative approach with a correlational research design involving 636 students based on gender, 49.5% male, 50.5% female; by class, VII 66.04% VIII 33.96%; based on age 11-12 years 29.72%; 13 - 14 years 69.97%; 15 - 16 years 0.31% of junior high schools in Semarang and Temanggung. The research sampling technique used cluster sampling technique.

The research data collection instrument uses an academic integrity scale ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ) Ramdani (2018) for the trust variable consisting of 5 items of the construct of the trust character. Assessment of academic integrity scale uses a Likert scale, with five answer choices (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) with statements worth favorable and unfavorable. The second data collection instrument is the moral disengagement scale ( $\alpha = 0.82$ ) Bandura (2016) which contains 32 items from eight moral disengagement constructs, namely moral judgment, language refinement, favorable

comparison, transfer of responsibility, transfer of responsibility, ignoring consequences, attributing blame . The assessment of moral disengagement scale uses a Likert scale, with four answer choices (1 = very inappropriate to 4 = very appropriate) and all statements are unfavorable.

The third data collection instrument is the Incivility scale ( $\alpha = 0.80$ ) Farrel et al (2016) which contains 10 items from the construct of Unintentional incivility, Intentional incivility. The incivility scale assessment uses a Likert scale, with four answer choices (1 = very inappropriate to 5 = very appropriate) and all statements are unfavorable. The research procedure is carried out by distributing the scale of research to respondents and asked to fill it directly. Data analysis techniques in this study used a regression test to determine the effect and relationship between the character of trust, moral disengagement, and incivility, seen from differences in gender, class level and age.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on table 2, the result of herarchy regression analysis shows that together variables of class, sex, age, moral disengagement and incivility significantly influence the character of trust ( $r = 0.26$ ,  $f(13,622) = 3.54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Other results show that in moral disengagement only euphemistic labeling indicators ( $t = -3.02$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) significantly influence trust. other than that incivility shows that only intentional incivility ( $t = -2.23$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) significantly influences trust. This study aims to identify the type of moral disengagement and types of incivility that predict negative trust.

The results of the research confirm that moral disengagement and incivility predicts trust negatively. The relationship between moral disengagement and trust is in line with Stephens's research, (2018) Christiana, (2018), Vincent et al. (2016) which states that moral disengagement is negatively related to academic cheating as a form of opposition to trust. Bandura (2016) also asserts that individuals who have high moral disengagement will tend to seek

justification for immoral or prohibited behavior such as cheating and plagiarism, thereby directly reducing trust. Whereas the relation between incivility and trust is in line with Knepp's (2012) study which states that incivility is also related to immoral behavior by students such as making

noise in class, checking friends who cannot answer and other disruptive behaviors. This shows incivility and moral disengagement jointly affect the character of students, especially trust.

**Table 1.** Intercorrelation Metrics, Mean and Standard Deviation

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
T	( $\alpha$ 0.72)										
MJ	-0.09	( $\alpha$ 0.59)									
EL	-0.20**	0.37**	( $\alpha$ 0.49)								
AC	-0.15**	0.35**	0.50**	( $\alpha$ 0.63)							
DR	-0.10**	0.30**	0.33**	0.36**	( $\alpha$ 0.65)						
DFR	-0.07**	0.25**	0.23**	0.27**	0.44**	( $\alpha$ 0.60)					
DC	-0.04**	0.30**	0.34**	0.28**	0.32**	0.32**	( $\alpha$ 0.53)				
AB	-0.10**	0.24**	0.28**	0.24**	0.39**	0.32**	0.31**	( $\alpha$ 0.49)			
DH	-0.07**	0.25**	0.31**	0.36**	0.23**	0.18**	0.26**	0.22**	( $\alpha$ 0.60)		
UI	-0.15**	0.24**	0.27**	0.15**	0.19**	0.15**	0.20**	0.25**	0.15**	( $\alpha$ 0.63)	
II	-0.18**	0.27**	0.35**	0.25**	0.21**	0.17**	0.26**	0.19**	0.30**	0.48**	( $\alpha$ 0.81)
M	19.09	8.03	7.12	6.72	8.87	9.29	8.98	9.61	6.87	10.50	8.34
SD	2.63	2.17	1.85	1.91	2.21	2.30	2.34	2.01	2.05	2.58	2.53

Information:

T = Trust; MJ = Moral Justification; EL = Euphemistic Labeling; AC = Advantageous Comparison; DR = Displacement Of Responsibility; DFR = Diffusion Of Responsibility; DC = Distortion Of Consequences; AB = Attribution Of Blame; DH = Dehumanization; UI = Unintentional Incivility; II = Intentional Incivility; ( ) = Coeficiance Alpha; \*\* = Signifikan  $p < 0.01$ .

Interestingly the results of this study reveal and confirm only euphemistic labeling of eight types of moral disengagement that predicts student trust. Whereas incivility only intentional incivility predicts student trust. The prediction of euphemistic labeling on student trust based on the results of this study can be understood because students actually know and realize that academic cheating behavior is carried out as a form of opposing trust such as cheating on exams, homework plagiarism and other academic cheating is wrong behavior and not according to the rules. However students continue to commit academic cheating on the grounds that academic cheating is something that is commonly done by other students so that it is not a bad thing besides cheating is part of making parents happy by getting good grades when the test is based on fear and lack of confidence in their abilities will get good results when doing the task independently without cheating. In line with this reason the results of research by Pujiatni & Lestari, 2010; Hartanto, 2012; Hartosujono & Sari, 2015; Fitri, Dahliana & Nurdin 2017 showed that fear with parents and wanting to be seen prominently is one of the

factors causing students to commit academic fraud or have low trust. Students who are afraid of parents to show their test results indicate that these students have low trust.

If it is generalized, the findings related to the prediction of euphemistic labeling of trust, it can be understood that students who commit cheating because they consider academic cheating is a natural thing and many other students do so resulting in low trust in their abilities (McCabe, 2001; Koesoema, 2010; Pujiatni & Lestari, 2010; Hartanto, 2012; Hartosujono & Sari, 2015; Fitri, Dahliana & Nurdin 2017). Thus the true results of this previous study also showed that euphemistic labeling predicted then. The high euphemistic labeling indicator of students is influenced by the environment which considers academic cheating to be reasonable and good test results are somehow proof that the student is smart and sincere in learning at school, resulting in students who will commit academic cheating making excuses in they are justifying academic cheating behavior by replacing the term academic cheating with a way to make parents and teachers happy.

The subjects in this study indicate that the type of moral disengagement, namely moral judgment, favorable comparisons, transfer of responsibility, distribution of responsibilities, ignoring consequences, attributions and dehumanization are not the reasons for students to commit academic cheating which shows a low level. This is in accordance with the opinion of Bandura (2016) related to the mechanism of moral disengagement, where individuals will

activate one of the mechanisms of moral disengagement when in certain situations that tend to blame it. In this study moral judgment is not a reason to commit academic fraud. This can be understood because students understand that then is a part of morals, so it is a matter that must continue to have and there is no moral reason for students not to be good to themselves or others.

**Table 2.** Trust Hierarchical Regression

Variabel	Model 1			Model 2		
	$\beta$	t	p	$\beta$	t	p
Class	-0.02	-0.51	>0.05	-0.03	-0.55	>0.05
Gender	-0.04	-0.94	>0.05	-0.02	-0.53	>0.05
Age	-0.03	-0.71	>0.05	0.01	0.12	>0.05
Moral disengagemt						
Moral justification				0.02	0.37	>0.05
Euphemistic labeling				-0.15	-3.02	<0.01
Advantageous comparison				-0.08	-1.64	>0.05
Displacement of responsibility				-0.00	-0.05	>0.05
Diffusion of responsibility				-0.01	-0.14	>0.05
Distortion of consequences				0.08	1.80	>0.05
Attribution of blame				-0.04	-0.89	>0.05
Dehumanization				0.02	0.57	>0.05
Incivility						
Unintentional incivility				-0.05	-1.15	>0.05
Intentional incivility				-0.11	-2.23	<0.05
R			0.06			0.26
R <sup>2</sup>			0.00			0.07
F			0.78			3.54
p			>0.05			<0.01

While the type of moral disengagement, which is a favorable comparison, transfer of responsibility, distribution of responsibility and attribution, is not a reason for students to commit academic fraud which shows the lack of students. This indicates that then it is a personal responsibility, so matters related to favorable comparisons, transfer of responsibilities, distribution of responsibilities and attributions are not reasons and do not have a relationship with academic cheating which shows the lack of students. Another thing in this research is that ignoring the consequences of being open is also a reason that makes students untrained to their abilities. This also indicates that students know consciously everything that is done including then will surely have consequences, both good and bad consequences. In addition, dehumanization also opens students' reasons for untrusion. It can be understood that students do not view others as people who are inferior to

themselves and can be treated arbitrarily because he himself sometimes still needs help from others to be able to complete tasks such as strengthening confidence in the exam questions being done is correct and will get good grades from teacher.

Interestingly this study also succeeded in emphasizing that the intentional incivility indicator has a significant negative relationship with trust. This shows that students who have a high level of intentional incivility will tend to have low and tend to do a lot of academic cheating.

The results of this study are in line with the opinion of Knepp (2012) which states that incivility is a part of immoral student behavior, for example, ignoring rules that have been established such as prohibiting making noise in class, prohibited from bullying and so on, so this shows that incivility and morals disengagement jointly affects students.

An interesting finding in this study is that differences in class level, sex and age have a negative relationship with moral disengagement and incivility. The results of this study differ from research conducted by Al Kandari (2011) which states that gender differences affect the level of individual incivility and male students tend to have higher incivility than female students. The results of this study can also be understood that the male and female sex subjects in this study have strong peer relationships. Peers are defined as children or adolescents who have more or less the same background, age, education, social status and maturity, which can influence the behavior and beliefs of each member and carry out daily activities together (Santrock, 2003). The results of this study are also strengthened by the opinion of Papalia, Old & Feldman (2008) which states that peers are a source of affection, sympathy, understanding and moral guidance. This explains that the sex in this study had no difference in the character of believers.

Another interesting finding in this study is that only intentional incivility indicators show a significant difference with the level of students. Thus it can be understood that students who intentionally do incivility are more likely to have low then. Incivility is actually a way for students to cover up their distrust of the abilities of themselves and others. students do incivility so that others pay attention and try to cover up their shortcomings.

## CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that moral disengagement and incivility negatively predict student trust. Besides that, only euphemistic labeling of the eight types of moral disengagement predicts student trust. Whereas incivility only intentional incivility predicts student trust. This research is limited to junior high school students and in grades VII and VIII further research is expected to expand research in junior high school students in class IX and high school students even in college students. In addition it is necessary to add other variables

that are likely to affect the level of student trust such as self-concept variables and self-efficacy.

## REFERENCES

- Al Kandari, N. (2011). The level of student incivility: the need of a policy to regulate college student civility. *College Student Journal*, 45, 257-268.
- Aprilia, Z., & Solicha, S. (2019). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi moral disengagement remaja. *Tazkiya Journal Of Psychology*, 1(1).
- Ba, Ba, Lam, Le, Nguyen, Nguyen & Pham .(2017). Student plagiarism in higher education in Vietnam: An empirical study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36:5, 934-946,
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193-209.
- Barnard, A., Schurink, W., & Beer, M.D. (2008). A conceptual framework of integrity. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34 (2), hlm. 40-49.
- Berger, B. A. (2000). Incivility. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 64(4). Retrieved from
- Biswas, A. E. (2014). Lessons in citizenship: using collaboration in the classroom to build community, foster academic integrity, and model civic responsibility. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25 (1), hlm. 9-25.
- Boehm, P.J., Justice, M., & Weeks, S. (2009). Promoting academic integrity higher education. *The Community Collage Enterprise*, hlm. 45-61. Retrieved from
- Bretag, T. (2016). *Handbook of academic integrity*. Singapore: Springer
- Caroli, M. E., & Sagone, E. (2014). Mechanisms of moral disengagement: An analysis from early adolescence to youth. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 140, 312-317. Retrieved from
- Clemente, M., Espinosa, P., & Padilla, D. (2019). Moral disengagement and

- willingness to behave unethically against ex-partner in a child custody dispute. *PLoS one*, 14(3), e0213662.
- Cristiana, R. (2018). Studi kasus regulasi diri afeksi moral pada siswa yang menyontek. *Jurnal Kependidikan* Vol 17, No 1.
- Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Sweitzer, V. L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 374.
- Dewayani. (2018). *Panduan praktis implementasi penguatan pendidikan karakter (PPK) berbasis kelas*. Jakarta: Pusat Analisis dan Sinkronisasi Kebijakan (PASKA) KEMENDIKBUD RI
- Farrell, A. H., Provenzano, D. A., Spadafora, N., Marini, Z. A., & Volk, A. A. (2016). Measuring adolescent attitudes toward classroom incivility: Exploring differences between intentional and unintentional incivility. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 34(6), 577-588.
- Feist, J, Feist, S & Robert. W (2017). *Teori kepribadian. Edisi 8 buku 2*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Feldmann, L. J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching*, 49(4), 137-140.
- Fitri, M., Dahliana, D., & Nurdin, S. (2017). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi perilaku menyontek pada siswa SMA Negeri dalam wilayah kota Takengon. *JIMBK: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Bimbingan & Konseling*, 2(1). Retrieved from
- Hartanto. (2012). *Menyontek mengungkap akar masalah dan solusinya*. Jakarta: Indeks
- Hartosujono & Sari, N. K. (2015). Perilaku menyontek pada remaja. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 20(2). Retrieved from
- Hyde, L. W., Shaw, D. S., & Moilanen, K. L. (2010). Developmental precursors of moral disengagement and the role of moral disengagement in the development of antisocial behavior. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 38(2), 197-209.
- Ilies, R., Guo, C. Y., Lim, S., Yam, K. C., & Li, X. (2019). Happy but uncivil? Examining when and why positive affect leads to incivility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-20
- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2014). *The fundamental values of academic integrity*. South Carolina: Clemson University
- Jensen, L. A., Arnett, J. J., Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (2002). It's wrong, but everybody does it: Academic dishonesty among high school and college students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27(2), 209-228. Retrieved from
- Jones, D. L. R. (2016). Academic dishonesty: are more students cheating?. *Business Communication Quarterly*. 74(2), 141–150.
- Jordan, A.E. (2001). College student cheating: the role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behavior*. 11(3), 233-247.
- Keohane, N. O. (1999). *The fundamental values of academic integrity*. New York: Duke University
- Koesoema, D. (2010). Pendidikan karakter, strategi mendidik anak bangsa di zaman global. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Knepp, K. (2012). Understanding student and faculty incivility in higher education. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 12(1), 32-45. Retrieved from
- Kolanko, K., Clark, C., Heinrich, K., Olive, D., Serembus, J., & Sifford, S. (2006). Academic dishonesty, bullying, incivility, and violence: Difficult challenges facing nurse educators. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 27, 34-43. Retrieved from
- Krueger, L. (2014). Academic dishonesty among nursing students. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 53(2):77-87.
- Lapsley, D., & Woodbury, R. (2016). Moral-character development for teacher education. *Action in teacher education*, 38(3), 194-206.
- Lawson, R. A. (2004). Is classroom cheating related to business students' propensity to cheat in the "real world"? *Journal of*

- Business Ethics*, 49 (2), 189–199. Retrieved from
- Lickona .(2012). *Pendidikan karakter* . Bantul: Kreasi Wacana
- Masada, C., & Dachmiati, S. (2016). Faktor pemengaruh perilaku siswa dan mahasiswa menyontek. *Sosio e-kons*, 8(3).
- Mayhew, M. J., S. M. Hubbard, C. J. Finelli and T. S. Harding. (2009). Using structural equation modeling to validate the theory of planned behavior as a model for predicting student cheating. *The Review of Higher Education*, 32 (4), 441–468.
- McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: a decade of research. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), hlm. 219-232. Retrieved from
- Papalia, D. E., Old, S. W., & Feldman, R. D. (2008). *Human development (psikologi perkembangan)*. Jakarta: kencana
- Pfannenstiel, A.N. (2010). Digital literacies and academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 6 (2), hlm. 41-49.
- Proios, M. (2016). An approach of the moral disengagement through the moral content judgment. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 26(5), 461-469.
- Pujiatni & Lestari. (2010). Studi kualitatif pengalaman menyontek pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora* Volume 11 No. 2, Agustus 2010. Retrieved from
- Ramdani, Z. (2018). Construction of academic integrity scale. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 7(1), 87-97.
- Reksiana. (2018). Kerancuan istilah karakter, akhlak, moral dan etika. *THAQAFIYYAT: Jurnal Bahasa, Peradaban dan Informasi Islam*, [S.l.], v. 19, n. 1, p. 1-30, ISSN 2550-0937. Retrieved from
- Rohanim dkk. (2018). *Praktik baik PPK jenjang sekolah menengah pertama*. Jakarta: Pusat Analisis dan Sinkronisasi Kebijakan (PASKA) KEMENDIKBUD RI
- Santrock, J. W. (2003). *Adolescence perkembangan remaja*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 422-4
- Sari, Marjohan, Neviyarni . (2013). Locus of control dan perilaku menyontek serta implikasinya terhadap bimbingan dan konseling (studi pada siswa sekolah menengah atas Padang Ganting). *Konselor*, 2(1).
- Seider, S., Novick, S., & Gomez J. (2013). Cultivating the academic integrity of urban adolescents with ethical philosophy programming. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 88(2), hlm. 142-158. Retrieved from
- Stephens, J. M. (2018). Bridging the divide: the role of motivation and self-regulation in explaining the judgment-action gap related to academic dishonesty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(MAR), 1–15.
- Strom, P., & Strom, R. (2008). Cheating in middle school and high school. *The Education Forum*, 71, 104–116.
- Suryabrata, S. (2013). *Psikologi kepribadian*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Travlos, A. K., Tsorbatzoudis, H., Barkoukis, V., & Douma, I. (2018). The effect of moral disengagement on bullying: testing the moderating role of personal and social factors. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 0886260518760012.
- Vincent, B. B. (2016). The moral economy of synthetic biology. *In Synthetic Biology* (pp. 87-100).