GOLDEN RATIO OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION
VOLUME 6, ISSUE. 1 (2026)
Website: https://goldenratio.id/index.php/grsse/index

GOLDEN RATIO
ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

SOCIAL SCIENCE AND EDUCATION | RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Peer Conformity in Relation to Cheating Behavior Among Ninth-Grade Students

Dentamara La Viera Brilliany[1], Fajar Kawuryan[2]

[1,2] Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Muria Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia.
Email: tamaralaviera@gmail.com[1], fajar.kawuryan.@umk.ac.id[2]

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: November 10, 2025
Revised: December 24, 2025
Accepted: January 15, 2026

DOI
https://doi.org/10.52970/grsse.v6i1.1844

ABSTRACT
Cheating cases remain a serious problem in the world of education in Indonesia. According to the 2024 Education Integrity Assessment Survey (SPI) published by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in April 2025, 78% of schools still engage in cheating behavior. This study aims to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity in relation to cheating behavior among grade IX students. This study used a quantitative method with a sampling technique, namely cluster random sampling, involving 100 respondents. Data were collected through paper questionnaires distributed directly, which utilized three Likert scales: the Cheating Behavior Scale (26 items), the Self-Efficacy Scale (15 items), and the Peer Conformity Scale (20 items). After testing the assumptions and hypotheses, the results revealed a highly significant relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity with cheating behavior among students, with a p-value of 0.000 ($p < 0.01$). The minor hypothesis indicates a highly significant relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior ($r = 0.887$, $p < 0.001$) and between peer conformity and cheating behavior ($r = 0.873$, $p < 0.001$). This research can contribute to the educational environment, as influenced by psychological factors. This study aims to empirically investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity in relation to cheating behavior among ninth-grade students. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to educational psychology by providing insight into factors related to cheating behavior.

Keywords: Cheating Behavior, Self-Efficacy, Peer Conformity.

I. Introduction

Education is an internal process that occurs within an individual, aiming to help students adapt to their environment and develop behaviors that can have a positive impact on society. In the school environment, students are expected to understand and articulate the material they have learned in class. However, in practice, student achievement often focuses more on academic achievement than on their natural learning process (Sanlie et al., 2020). Currently, the world of education is facing various challenges, one of which is the decline in academic integrity among students. The pressure to achieve high grades and meet academic standards often pushes students to take shortcuts, such as cheating on exams. One form of dishonest behavior is cheating on written exams. Cheating has become a common form of deviant behavior and is even considered normal by some students, thus continuing to be a problem in the world of education

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

(Meydiansyah, 2021). The 2024 Education Integrity Assessment Survey (SPI) published by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) found cheating cases in 78% of schools and 98% of universities in Indonesia. These findings suggest that academic dishonesty has become a pervasive and systemic issue in Indonesian education. This situation demonstrates the need to strengthen the education system and develop education through an awareness-based approach, values, compliance, and risk management (Admin, 2025). Cheating is one of the most common forms of academic dishonesty in educational settings. This practice involves copying someone else's work or answers through dishonest means to obtain a high grade on an exam (Wahyudiati, 2015). According to Kurniasih et al. (2019), cheating in Indonesia is considered commonplace and has become a habit that is no longer taboo. Furthermore, the absence of strict laws and methods to reduce cheating, along with a lack of understanding of the types of cheating, has made several negative impacts increasingly visible. Corruption, collusion, and nepotism ultimately arise from cheating.

According to Rupa et al. (2024), one factor contributing to cheating behavior is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a cognitive process that plays a crucial role in shaping an individual's belief in their own ability to complete academic tasks or face learning challenges to achieve desired results. High self-efficacy can develop through successful personal experiences, such as when students strive to understand learning materials and feel confident in their ability to complete test questions, according to Rupa et al. (2024). Self-efficacy is the foundation of an individual's confidence in their ability to accomplish a specific task or achieve a desired outcome. Students with high levels of self-efficacy tend to choose greater challenges, demonstrate persistence in facing new situations, and believe that their abilities will support success in achieving their goals. This belief motivates them to try harder and persist longer when working on complex tasks (Mawaddah, 2019). In a study conducted by Mufarrihah (2022), titled "The Correlation Between Self-Efficacy and Academic Dishonesty Among Students," a significant negative relationship was found between academic self-efficacy and academic dishonesty. This means that the higher a student's self-efficacy, the lower their likelihood of engaging in cheating or academic dishonesty behavior. Conversely, students with low self-efficacy are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty.

Another factor influencing cheating behavior is peer conformity. Individual perceptions and the influence of the immediate environment can shape a person's character, such as peer conformity within their friendship group (Ganta & Soetjiningsih, 2022). Peer conformity is a significant factor influencing adolescent behavior. The drive to conform often stems from the social rules that govern a group, both written and unwritten, which direct individuals to act in accordance with the group's expectations or norms (Mulindra & Ariani, 2023). Conformity to peers can have both positive and negative impacts. In specific contexts, individuals tend to follow the decisions and views of their peer group, even if these conflict with generally accepted values of justice or norms (Mulindra & Ariani, 2023), in research conducted by Sahin et al. (2024) entitled "Peer Conformity and Academic Cheating: The Moderating Role of Goal Orientation and Self-Efficacy" shows a positive relationship between peer conformity and academic cheating behavior, where the higher the level of peer conformity, the higher the possibility of an individual committing academic cheating.

II. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Cheating Behavior

Samiroh & Muslimin (2015) explains that cheating is a form of unethical behavior and is contrary to the values of honesty, where someone tries to get good grades in a deviant way, this action can be in the form of plagiarizing, imitating, copying other people's work either with or without the owner's permission or deliberately making special notes before the exam takes place, according to Amelia et al. (2016) Cheating is a form of dishonesty committed by individuals in completing assignments or exams, whether in schools, universities, or other contexts. This action reflects dishonest behavior and contains elements of deception, intended to achieve desired results. Cheating behavior refers to the act of cheating during the implementation of tests or exams, which can be carried out in various ways, such as asking friends, copying other people's

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

work, bringing notes into the exam, exchanging work results, or seeking leaked questions. This action aims to achieve academic success in a way that is not in accordance with the rules and principles of honesty (Hamidayati & Hidayat, 2020). Based on various expert opinions, the author concludes that cheating behavior is a form of conduct that is contrary to the value of honesty in an academic context, which is carried out to obtain high marks in a manner that deviates from the rules, for example, by asking friends, copying other people's work, or exchanging work results. According to Hartosujono & Sari (2015), cheating behavior can be influenced by two main factors: internal and external. Internal factors include feelings of insecurity, incompetence, and doubts about the ability to answer questions independently. Meanwhile, external factors, such as peer influence, particularly regarding cooperation in exam preparation, also play a role. In some situations, this behavior is considered normal and is not followed by strict sanctions from the school. According to Cizek (in Anderman & Murdock, 2007), cheating behavior is divided into three aspects:

a. Giving, taking, or receiving information
   This refers to the exchange of information, encompassing the giving, receiving, and taking of information. This refers to concrete forms of cheating, such as copying, plagiarizing, or other direct actions to obtain answers.
b. Using any prohibited materials
   This involves the use of prohibited facilities during tests, such as hidden notes, illegal electronic devices, or written cheat sheets.
c. Capitalizing on the weaknesses of persons, procedures, or processes to gain an advantage
   This includes exploiting loopholes or inconsistent weaknesses in the academic environment, such as lax supervision, leaked questions, or other opportunities that allow cheating.

The aspects of cheating behavior that the author will use as a guide in compiling the scale are the aspects that have been put forward by Cizek (in Anderman & Murdock, 2007), namely giving, taking, or receiving information, using any prohibited materials, and capitalizing on the weaknesses of persons, procedures, or processes to gain an advantage.

2.2. Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to achieve a specific level of performance, which is shaped by training experiences and influential life events. This belief encompasses self-assessment of one's ability to act rightly or wrongly, as well as their ability to meet demands or complete existing tasks (Wahyudiati, 2015). Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to carry out a series of activities to achieve a specific goal. This concept plays a crucial role as a driving factor influencing a person's motivation to undergo processes and take actions aimed at achieving success, including optimal learning outcomes (Silaban & Harahap, 2024). Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their own abilities, including their potential, in estimating the extent to which they can carry out actions and complete tasks necessary to achieve specific goals (Triyono & Rifai, 2018). This is also supported by Kibtiyah (2025). Self-efficacy refers to a person's belief in their ability to complete academic tasks and achieve predetermined academic goals. Based on various definitions proposed by experts, it can be concluded that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to plan, organize, and execute the actions necessary to achieve specific goals, including those in an academic context. Self-efficacy not only reflects confidence in internal potential but also plays a crucial role in influencing an individual's motivation, persistence, and success in completing tasks and facing challenges, particularly in the learning process. According to Bandura (in Triyono & Rifai, 2018), self-efficacy consists of three main aspects: level, generality, and strength.

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

a. Level
   Refers to the extent to which a person feels confident in their ability to complete tasks of varying difficulty. Individuals with high self-efficacy will choose challenges that match their abilities and will not give up easily on complex tasks.
b. Generality
   Related to the extent to which a person has mastered various task areas. Individuals with broad self-efficacy can demonstrate their competence across various contexts, whereas those with low self-efficacy tend to be limited to specific situations.
c. Strength
   Emphasizes the extent to which an individual's belief in their abilities is strong and consistent. Someone with strong self-efficacy will continue to strive because they believe that their actions will lead to desired results. This belief serves as a crucial foundation for individuals to maintain intense effort, especially when faced with obstacles or challenges.

The aspects of self-efficacy that the author will use as a guide in compiling the scale are those proposed by Bandura (in Triyono & Rifai, 2018), namely level, generality, and strength.

2.3. Peer Conformity

Conformity refers to the tendency to adjust one's behavior to conform to group standards (Taylor et al., 2009). Meanwhile, according to Baron & Byrne (2005), Peer conformity is a social influence in which individuals change or adjust their behavior and attitudes to conform to existing social norms. According to Safitri (2018), Peer conformity refers to the tendency of individuals to adjust their attitudes, behavior, or values to align with the norms adopted by their peer group, as an effort to gain acceptance, recognition, and avoid rejection within their social environment. Peer conformity is a change in individual behavior that is directed at adjusting to the group through the imitation of attitudes, cooperation, solidarity, and competition, to gain social acceptance and avoid exclusion. This conformity can have both positive and negative impacts; however, among adolescents in the school environment, the negative impact tends to be more dominant, both on the school environment and on themselves (Dayanti et al., 2019). Thus, based on the explanations provided in the figures above, it can be concluded that peer conformity is an individual's tendency to adjust their attitudes, behavior, and personal values to align with the norms adopted by the peer group, to gain social acceptance and avoid rejection or exclusion. Sears (in Mardison, 2016) explains explicitly that there are aspects of peer conformity, namely, as follows:

a. Cohesiveness
   Conformity is influenced by a person's close relationship with their group. Cohesiveness has the power to attract and encourage a person to remain in the group. The more a group member likes another, the stronger the cohesiveness and loyalty.
b. Agreement
   The group's opinion has been established, so loyal group members must conform to it.
c. Obedience
   Obedience is a person's loyalty to a particular authority. Group pressure or demands on a person can lead them to engage in undesirable behavior.

Based on the explanation above, the author drew on aspects of peer conformity from Sears (in Mardison, 2016), specifically cohesiveness, agreement, and obedience, which will serve as a reference in creating the scale.

2.4. Research Hypothesis

In a study conducted by Wahyudiati (2015), titled "The Relationship between Self-Efficacy Levels and Cheating Behavior among Students at Muhammadiyah University of Gresik," the researcher aimed to examine the relationship between self-efficacy levels and cheating behavior. The results of the study indicate a

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior. This means that the higher a person's self-efficacy level, the lower the tendency to cheat, and vice versa, in a study conducted by Sherly Dkk. (2021) The study, "Cheating Behavior Is Viewed from Conformity to High School Students of Gadjah Mada Medan," presents the results of a positive relationship between conformity and cheating behavior in Gadjah Mada High School students in Medan. These findings suggest that peer conformity influences cheating behavior, as individuals tend to cheat due to peer pressure. These hypotheses are derived from previous empirical studies and will be tested using empirical data analysis. This study proposes one central hypothesis and two minor hypotheses, as follows:

1. Major Hypothesis
   Here is a relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity with cheating behavior in grade IX students.
2. Minor Hypothesis

a. There is a negative relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior in ninth-grade students. In other words, the higher the self-efficacy, the lower the cheating behavior in students, and vice versa, the lower the self-efficacy, the higher the cheating behavior in students.
b. There is a positive relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior in ninth-grade students. In other words, the higher the peer conformity, the higher the cheating behavior among students, and vice versa: the lower the peer conformity, the lower the cheating behavior among students.

III. Research Method

This study employed a quantitative research method, utilizing a scale-based instrument for data collection. Quantitative research methods are based on the philosophy of positivism, which involves studying populations or samples, collecting data using research instruments, and testing predetermined hypotheses. (Sugiyono, 2013). Data were collected by directly distributing questionnaires that contained scales measuring cheating behavior, self-efficacy, and peer conformity. The scales on the questionnaires used a Likert scale, according to Sugiyono (2013) In research, it is used to assess the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a group or individual regarding a phenomenon. Using a Likert scale, variables are measured and translated into indicators. These indicators are organized into items consisting of statements and questions. This research was conducted in Kudus City, with a population of 267 ninth-grade students at SMPN X Kudus. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling. Sugiyono (2013) The area sampling technique is used to determine the sample that will serve as the data source when the object being studied is very large, such as a region, area, or large group that needs to be divided into several parts/groups (clusters). Determining the number of samples is based on the Slovin formula. Dewi dkk. (2023) get minimum sample results:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+Ne^2}$$

Description :
n: Sample size
N : Population size
E: Percentage error set (10% or 0,1)

From this formula :

$$n = \frac{267}{1+ (267 \text{ x } 0{,}1^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{267}{3{,}67{,}5} = 72{,}7 \text{ rounded to } 73.$$

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

From these results, it is known that the minimum number of samples used in this study is 73. Sugiyono (2013) stated that the appropriate sample size in the study is between 30 and 500. Based on this understanding, the study sample consists of 100 students from SMPN X Kudus, specifically those in the 9th grade. The sample of 100 students was selected because the average class size is 30 students. The author took 3 classes, which added up to 100 students. Based on the Slovin formula, the minimum sample size required is 73 respondents. However, the sample size was 100 respondents to anticipate the possibility of unusable data, such as answer sheets that did not meet standards and had to be discarded or excluded from the analysis.

3.1. Research ethics

After obtaining permission from the school where the research was conducted, participants were junior high school students. The research procedures, including the purpose and role of the participants, were explained before data collection. All data collected will be kept confidential, and participant identities will be anonymized to ensure their privacy and confidentiality. The research was conducted in accordance with ethical standards for psychological research involving humans, particularly minors.

Periantalo (2016) explains that implementing research ethics can be done through several principles, including:

1. Guaranteeing data confidentiality, meaning the author needs to inform the subjects about the guarantee of data confidentiality and that the data is for research purposes only.
2. Explaining the purpose of the research, meaning the author needs to inform them of the purpose of the data collection.
3. Consent form, a form that informs participants of their willingness to participate in the research after receiving information about the research procedures.

3.2. Instrument validity

The validity of quantitative research refers to the extent to which the author measures what should be measured in a study (Budiastuti & Bandur, 2018). In this study, a previously unused tryout was used to measure and validate the scale; the measurement was then scored on a scale of 1 to 4. The research measuring instrument was formed by one figure for each variable whose aspects were considered. The cheating behavior measuring instrument was proposed by Cizek (in Anderman & Murdock, 2007) and consists of 30 questionnaire items. The self-efficacy measurement tool was proposed by Tiyono & Rifai (18) and consists of 30 questionnaire items. The peer conformity measurement tool was proposed by Sears (Mardison, 2016). The questionnaire consisted of 30 items. After the measuring instrument was developed, it was distributed to the subjects, and the validity of the scale was assessed. Validity testing was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 for Windows. This research instrument, with a coefficient value >0.30, was declared acceptable, while an inefficient value <0.30 was declared unacceptable or failed (Azwar, 2017). Based on the results of the validity test, the cheating behavior scale items obtained 26 valid items. The results of the self-efficacy validity test obtained 15 valid items. The results of the peer conformity validity test obtained 20 valid items.

3.3. Instrument Reliability

This study employs the Cronbach's Alpha method to assess the reliability of the instrument and analyzes it using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 for Windows. The results of the analysis indicate that all research instruments have an adequate level of reliability. Periantalo (2016) explains that a reliability coefficient is considered reliable if its value falls within the range of 0-1. If the reliability value is≥0.9, it is stated as highly recommended; if the reliability value is≥0.8, it is considered satisfactory. A reliability score of 0.7 is also considered satisfactory. So it is concluded that the closer to 1, the

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

more reliable. Based on the results of the reliability analysis, the cheating behavior scale has a reliability of 0.907. In contrast, the self-efficacy scale has a reliability of 0.749, and the peer conformity scale has a reliability of 0.844. Thus, all research instruments are declared reliable and suitable for use in data collection.

3.4. Data Analysis

Before conducting the hypothesis testing, the author conducted an assumption test to ensure the feasibility of the research. The assumption test consisted of normality and linearity tests. The normality test used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method to determine whether the research data used was normally distributed. Meanwhile, the linearity test was conducted by examining the results of the Test for Linearity in SPSS to ensure the independent and dependent variables were linear. After that, the testing will continue with hypothesis testing. The first hypothesis test, namely the primary hypothesis, was conducted using calculations from SPSS, which employed regression analysis techniques to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity in relation to cheating behavior. The second hypothesis, namely the minor hypothesis, was tested using product-moment correlation analysis between the independent and dependent variables.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1. Analysis Result

The author conducted several data tests before testing the hypothesis. The tests included categorizing the research data, a normality test to determine whether the data were normally distributed, and the results of the hypothesis testing. The study involved 100 junior high school students from Kudus, Central Java, as respondents. The following analysis was conducted to categorize the variables. The details of the cheating behavior categorization revealed that among the 100 respondents, there were 11 respondents (11%) with a very high categorization, 21 respondents (21%) with a high categorization, 35 respondents (35%) with a medium categorization, 24 respondents (24%) with a low categorization, and 9 respondents (9%) with a very low categorization. Therefore, the categorization of cheating behavior among the respondents in this study was dominated by the low-high category. The following is a table of the research data category test:

Table 1. Categorization of Cheating Behavior Data

Categorization	Total	%
Very High	11	11
High	21	21
Moderate	35	35
Low	24	24
Very Low	9	9
Total	100	100

In the self-efficacy variable, there were 7 respondents with a very high categorization, 22 respondents (22%) with a high categorization, 34 respondents (34%) with a moderate categorization, 31 respondents (31%) with a low categorization, and 6 respondents (6%) with a very low categorization. Therefore, the self-efficacy categorization of the respondents in this study was dominated by the low-high category.

Table 2. Categorization of Self-Efficacy Data

Categorization	Total	%
Very High	7	7
High	22	22
Moderate	34	34

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

Categorization	Total	%
Low	31	31%
Very Low	6	6%
Total	100	100%

In the peer conformity variable, there were 12 respondents (12%) with a very high categorization, 21 respondents (21%) with a high categorization, 29 respondents (29%) with a medium categorization, 23 respondents (23%) with a low categorization, and 15 respondents (15%) with a very low categorization. Thus, the peer conformity categorization of the respondents in this study was dominated by the medium-high category.

Table 3. Categorization of Peer Conformity Data

Categorization	Total	%
Very High	12	12
High	21	21
Moderate	29	29
Low	23	23
Very Low	15	15
Total	100	100

After conducting the categorization test, the author conducted an assumption test, namely a normality and linearity test. The following Table 4 shows the results of the normality test:

Table 4. Normality Test Results

No	Variabel	K-SZ	*P*(0.05)	Description
1.	Cheating Behavior	0,068	0,200	Normally Distributed
2.	Self-Efficacy	0,080	0,120	
3.	Peer Conformity	0,080	0,119	

Based on the results of the normality test on the cheating behavior variable, a significance level of p = 0.200 (p > 0.05) was obtained, with a K-ZR (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) value of 0.069. Therefore, the variable items for cheating behavior were found to be normally distributed. The results of the normality test on the self-efficacy variable yielded a significant p-value of 0.120 with a K-ZR (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z) of 0.080; therefore, the cheating behavior variable items were usually distributed. The same thing happened to the peer conformity variable data, which showed a significant p-value of 0.119 with a K-ZR (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z) of 0.080; therefore, the peer conformity variable items were usually distributed.

Table 5. Results of the Linearity Test between Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior

Variable	F	$^{Si}g^{(}P)$	Description
Self-Efficacy with Cheating Behavior	0,920	0,589	Linear

The results of the linearity test in Table 5 indicate a relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior. This can be seen from the linear F-value of 0.920 and P-value of 0.589 (p > 0.05). These figures indicate a linear relationship between the two variables.

Table 6. Results of the Linearity Test between Peer Conformity and Cheating Behavior

Variable	F	$^{Si}g^{(}P)$	Description
Peer Conformity with Cheating Behavior	0,803	0,778	Linear

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

The results of the linearity test in Table 6 indicate a relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior. This can be seen from the linear F-value of 0.803 and the P-value of 0.778 (p > 0.05). These figures indicate a linear relationship between the two variables.

Table 7. Major Hypothesis Test

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig(P)
1 Regression	0,924	0,853	0.850	8.799	281.895	0.000

Based on the results of the regression analysis test in the table above, a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.01) was obtained, with an R-squared value of 0.924. This indicates a significant relationship between Self-Efficacy (X1), Conformity (X2), nd Cheating Behavior (Y). Therefore, the hypothesis that states a relationship exists between self-efficacy and peer conformity regarding cheating behavior in this study can be accepted, with a practical contribution of 85.3%.

Table 8. Results of the Correlation Analysis of Product-Moment Self-Efficacy with Cheating Behavior

Variable	R	R Squared	Sig(P)
Self-Efficacy with Cheating Behavior	0,887	0,786	0,000

Based on the results of the correlation analysis test in the table above, the correlation coefficient between the two variables, rx_2 and y, is 0.887 with a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.01). This indicates a very significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior; therefore, the hypothesis stating a negative relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior is rejected, as the findings actually show the opposite direction of the relationship, namely a positive one with a practical contribution of 78.6%.

Table 9. Results of Product-Moment Correlation Analysis of Peer Conformity with Cheating Behavior

Variable	R	R Squared	Sig(P)
Peer Conformity with Cheating Behavior	0,873	0,762	0,000

Based on the results of the correlation analysis test in the table above, the correlation coefficient between the two variables, rx_2 and y, is 0.873 with a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.01). This indicates a very significant positive relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior, so that the hypothesis stating a positive relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior is declared accepted with a practical contribution of 76.2%.

4.2. Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity in relation to cheating behavior among ninth-grade students. Based on the results of the major regression test, it can be seen that there is a very significant relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity with cheating behavior in students, with a practical contribution of 85.3%. This means that self-efficacy and peer conformity influence cheating behavior. Thus, the central hypothesis in this study is accepted. Fitriah & Daliman (2022) explain that cheating involves looking at notebooks or collaborating with friends to complete assignments or exams. In his research, entitled "Self-Efficacy and Peer Conformity towards Cheating Behavior in Mathematics of Grade IX Students," the researcher noted that several factors contribute to students' cheating, including self-efficacy, peer conformity, self-control, parental social support, motivation, and interest in learning.

ISSN [Online]: 2797-5827

In research, Ghoni et al. (2025) entitled "The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Peer Conformity on Academic Dishonesty in Purbalingga 'X' Vocational High School Student" have presented the results of the hypothesis about the relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity with cheating behavior. Based on the results of the assumption test, the significance value of P is 0.00 <0.05, which indicates that self-efficacy and peer conformity have a significant influence on cheating behavior. This study found that the contribution of self-efficacy is smaller than that of peer conformity, suggesting that peer conformity has a greater influence on cheating behavior or academic dishonesty than self-efficacy. The results of the first minor hypothesis test revealed a highly significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and cheating behavior, thereby rejecting the hypothesis, with a correlation coefficient of 0.887 and a significance level of P = 0.000 (p < 0.01). The practical contribution of the self-efficacy variable to cheating behavior was 78.5%. These results indicate that the lower the self-efficacy, the lower the cheating behavior. Conversely, the higher the self-efficacy, the higher the level of cheating behavior. This result differs from previous self-efficacy findings, such as Fadillah (2019). In his research entitled "The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior in College Students," Fadillah (2019) found that self-efficacy plays a role in suppressing cheating behavior. The research yielded a correlation result of r = -0.406 with a significance value of P = 0.000, indicating that the higher the self-efficacy, the lower the tendency to cheat.

On the other hand, these results align with the research conducted by Nurjayanti et al. (2023). In their research entitled "The Relationship Between Academic Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior During the Online Period of Senior High School X", the results obtained showed that the lower the self-efficacy, the lower the cheating behavior. Conversely, the higher the self-efficacy, the higher the level of cheating behavior. However, this finding differs from the results of the correlation test, which shows a correlation coefficient value of -0.776 with a significance value smaller than the probability value, namely 0.000 ≤ 0.05. The correlation is negative because the two variables run in opposite directions. The difference in results between self-efficacy and cheating behavior may occur because self-efficacy is not always related to morality, but rather to an individual's belief in their abilities. Students with high self-efficacy may be able to control the situation during an exam and are confident in achieving a good grade. In this case, high self-efficacy, if not balanced with a strong sense of honesty, can encourage cheating as a strategy to achieve academic success. Furthermore, environmental factors such as academic pressure and peer influence can influence the direction of the relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior. Differences in subject characteristics, educational level, and school context can lead to variations in how students interpret and complete the questionnaire, thereby influencing the study's final results.

The results of the second minor hypothesis test revealed a highly significant positive relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior, with a correlation coefficient of 0.873 and a significance level of p = 0.000 (p < 0.01). The practical contribution of the peer conformity variable to cheating behavior was 76.5%. This suggests that lower peer conformity is associated with lower cheating behavior. Conversely, the higher the peer conformity, the higher the level of cheating behavior. Research conducted by Sando dkk supports this finding. (2025) in a journal entitled "The Influence of Peer Conformity on Cheating Behavior of Grade VII Students of UPTD SMP Negeri 10 Kupang in the 2023/2024 Academic Year," which shows a significant positive relationship between peer conformity and cheating behavior. With a significance value of 0.039 ≤ 0.05. According to Sando et al. (2025), peer conformity has a substantial impact on cheating behavior. Peer conformity can influence cheating behavior due to social pressure, which ultimately encourages students to conform to their group in order to be accepted and avoid being ostracized. Social pressure forces students to conform, even if it encourages dishonest behavior. Therefore, the higher the peer conformity, the greater the tendency to cheat as an adjustment to the peer environment within their group.

The results of this study align with those of previous studies, which have found that peer conformity plays a role in encouraging cheating behavior. This suggests that peer pressure is an external factor influencing students to cheat, especially when the behavior is considered normal within their peer group. The research findings can contribute theoretically to understanding cheating behavior by examining the roles of self-efficacy and peer conformity. Self-efficacy is often associated with positive learning outcomes; however,

research findings suggest that high self-efficacy can also be linked to maladaptive academic behavior. In other words, students with high self-confidence in their academic abilities may engage in cheating as a strategy to maintain their academic performance. In addition to self-efficacy, peer conformity also contributes to the likelihood of cheating. The influence of peer conformity supports social influence theory, which emphasizes the role of peer groups in shaping individual behavior during adolescence.

The research findings also have important implications for schools and teachers. Pressure to achieve high grades can encourage students to cheat as a means of meeting academic demands. Therefore, efforts to prevent cheating should not focus solely on self-efficacy, as self-efficacy does not always align with academic behavior. In this context, self-efficacy can be directed toward achieving results rather than conforming to academic norms. Teachers are expected to create a learning environment that emphasizes the assignment of material and an honest learning process, not solely for the sake of grades.

V. Conclusion

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that there is a highly significant relationship between self-efficacy and peer conformity in relation to cheating behavior among ninth-grade students. Therefore, the central hypothesis in this study is declared accepted. In the first minor hypothesis test, it was found that there is a highly significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and cheating behavior. Meanwhile, in the second minor hypothesis, a highly significant positive relationship was found between peer conformity and cheating behavior. There are limitations to this study, such as the scale used to divide learning time in schools, which makes it less efficient, as it causes the subjects to be less focused on the task. There is the possibility of biased responses, and respondents may not fully reflect their actual circumstances, particularly on the cheating behavior scale, which is a personal and sensitive issue. These limitations can influence the findings. While this study has limitations, it can still serve as a reference. It is hoped that these findings provide important insights into the fact that cheating is an action that should be avoided and is a serious problem in educational settings. Future research could consider other factors that may influence cheating, such as academic anxiety, learning motivation, relationships with teachers, and parenting styles, to provide a more comprehensive and in-depth study. It is recommended to use the latest version of SPSS or a more up-to-date data processing program with more comprehensive features. Pay attention to the scoring method, including both dimension scores and total scores, so that the results can be closer to reality.

References

Admin. (2025). Findings from the 2024 Education SPI Results: Cheating and Plagiarism Still Rampant in Schools and Campuses. Corruption Eradication Commission. https://shorturl.at/8GeRN

Amelia, S. H., Tanjung, Z., Riyant, E., Azizi, R., Novita, M. N. N., & Ranny. (2016). Cheating Behavior and Efforts to Overcome It. 1(1), 1–6.

Anderman, E. M., & Murdock, T. B. (2007). Psychology of Academic Cheating (E. M. Anderman & T. B. Murdock (eds.)). Elsevier.

Azwar, S. (2017). Psychological Research Methods (ii). Student Library.

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2005). Social Psychology (W. C. Kristiaji & R. Medya (eds.)). Erlangga.

Budiastuti, D., & Bandur, A. (2018). Validity and Reliability of Research. In Mathematics Education Research Methods. Mitra Wacana Media.

Dayanti, E., Widyawati, F., & Setiawati, L. (2019). The Effect of Peer Conformity to Cheating Behavior with Self-Efficacy as a Mediator in Class XI Students at SMK Diponegoro 1, Rawamangun, East Jakarta. International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), 8(2), 662–666. https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v8i2/ART20195035.pdf

Dewi, N., Azhar, A. A., & Zuhriah. (2023). The Effect of TikTok Use on Self-Image Behavior of Communication Science Study Program Students at UIN Sumatera Utara. Journal of Social Sciences, 2(2). http://bajangjournal.com/index.php/JISOS

Fadillah, A. (2019). The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior in College Students. Psikoborneo: Scientific Journal of Psychology, 7(4), 657–664. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v7i4.4846

Fitriah, S. S., & Daliman. (2022). Self-Efficacy and Peer Conformity on the Behavior of Cheating in Mathematics in Grade IX Students. Journal Proceeding Series of Psychology, 1, 235–241.

Ganta, B. A., & Soetjiningsih, C. H. (2022). The Relationship between Peer Conformity and the Tendency of Delinquency in Adolescent Boys. Psikoborneo: Scientific Journal of Psychology, 10(2), 404. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v10i2.7984

Ghoni, F. A., Noveni, N. A., Nur'aeni, & Suwarti. (2025). The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Peer Conformity on Academic Dishonesty in Purbalingga 'X' Vocational High School Students. Journal of Psychology, Religion and Humanity, 7(1), 23–37. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32923/psc.v7i1

Hamidayati, H., & Hidayat, S. (2020). Character Education: The Phenomenon of Cheating Behavior in Elementary School Students. Pedadidaktika: Scientific Journal of Elementary School Teacher Education, 7(4), 175–185. https://doi.org/10.17509/pedadidaktika.v7i4.25403

Hartosujono, & Sari, N. K. (2015). Cheating Behavior in Adolescents. Journal of Psychology, 1, 12–19.

Kibtiyah, A. (2025). Academic Self-Efficacy (A Model to Cultivate Students' Academic Self-Efficacy) (R. Utami (ed.)). CV. Amerta Media.

Kurniasih, P., Limbong, E. G., & Handayani, D. (2019). Infographics on Reasons for Cheating and Types of Cheating. Jurnal Desain, 06(02), 112–128. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/jurnaldesain.v6i2.2969

Mardison, S. (2016). Peer Conformity as a Shaper of Individual Behavior. Jurnal Al-Taujih, 2(1), 78–90. https://doi.org/10.15548/atj.v2i1.941

Mawaddah, H. (2019). Self-Efficacy Analysis in Psychology Students at Unimal. Journal of Applied Psychology (JPT), 2(2), 19. https://doi.org/10.29103/jpt.v2i2.3633

Meydiansyah, D. Y. (2021). The Phenomenon of Cheating Behavior Among Today's Students Reviewed from Self-Confidence, Self-Efficacy, and Procrastination: A Literature Study. Scientific Journal of BK, 4(3), 245–253. https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/j_consilia%0Asedangkan

Mufarrihah, F. (2022). The correlation between self-efficacy and academic dishonesty among students. Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences, 3(3), 95–100.

Mulindra, A. B., & Ariani, L. (2023). The Influence of Peer Conformity on Consumer Behavior in Adolescents. Journal of Educational, Psychological, and Health Research, 4(2), 54–60. https://doi.org/www.jurnalp3k.com/index.php/J-P3K/index

Nurjayanti, E. D., Widyarini, N., & Sari, A. S. (2023). The Relationship Between Academic Self-Efficacy and Cheating Behavior During the Online Period of Senior High School X Students. Journal of Psychology, 1(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.47134/pjp.v1i1.1940

Periantalo. (2016). Quantitative Research for Psychology. In Pustaka Pelajar (1st ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.

Rupa, N., Minarni, M., & Musawwir, M. (2024). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Learning Independence in College Students in Makassar City. Journal of Character Psychology, 4(2), 490–497. https://doi.org/10.56326/jpk.v4i2.3699

Safitri, A. D. (2018). The Influence of Religiosity and Peer Conformity on a Hedonistic Lifestyle. Psikoborneo: Scientific Journal of Psychology, 6(3), 327–333. https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v6i3.4644

Sahin, A., Sugiyo, & Sunawan. (2024). Peer Conformity and Academic Cheating: The Moderating Role of Goal Orientation and Self-Efficacy. Psikologika: Journal of Psychological Thought and Research, 29(1), 159–172. https://doi.org/10.20885/psikologika.vol29.iss1.art10

Samiroh, & Muslimin, Z. I. (2015). The Relationship Between Academic Self-Concept and Cheating Behavior Among Students of Mas Simbangkulon Buaran Pekalongan. 1(2), 67–77. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/267945701.pdf

Sando, M. V. W., Lio, S., & Nagul, W. (2025). The Influence of Peer Conformity on Cheating Behavior of Grade VII Students of UPTD SMP Negeri 10 Kupang (2023/2024 Academic Year). Indonesian Journal of Education, 5(2), 89–92. https://doi.org/10.59818/jpi.v5i2.1288

Sanlie, C., Marpaung, W., & Elvinawanty, R. (2020). Cheating Behavior Reviewed from the Perspective of Academic Procrastination in Yos Sudarso High School Students. Psyche, 165 (1), 121–125. https://doi.org/10.35134/jpsy165.v13i1.70

Sherly, E. R., & Manurung, Y. S. (2021). Cheating Behavior Viewed From Conformity in High School Students at Gajah Mada School, Medan. Psikologia: Jurnal Psikologi, 4(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.21070/psikologia.v4i1.705

Silaban, J., & Harahap, S. (2024). Self-Efficacy and Medication Compliance in Pulmonary Tuberculosis Patients (Nasrullah (ed.)). Selat Media Partners.

Sugiyono. (2013). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methodology. Alfabeta.

Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (2009). Social Psychology. Kencana Prenanda Media Group.

Triyono, & Rifai, M. E. (2018). Self-Efficacy and Emotion Regulation in Overcoming Academic Procrastination (K. Purnomo (ed.)). CV Sindunata.

Wahyudiati, N. P. (2015). The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Levels and Cheating Behavior in Students at Muhammadiyah University of Gresik. Journal of Psychoscience, 10(1), 54–66.