BISMA
The Journal of Counseling

Religiosity and Anti-Corruption Perceptions of Students

Adi Heryadi[1*)], Egi Prawita[2], Alvira Laylhi Shoma Hikma Wirandha[3]
[123]Universitas Jenderal Achmad Yani Yogyakarta
*Corresponding author, e-mail: adiheryadi16@gmail.com

Conflict of Interest Disclosures:

The authors declare that they have no significant competing financial, professional or personal interests that might have influenced the performance or presentation of the work described in this manuscript.

Abstract: Students are the future cadres of the nation, but not infrequently students behave dishonestly in academic life on campus. Continuous efforts are needed to build students' anti-corruption perceptions so that in the future they will not behave in corruption. religiosity is religiosity that includes various dimensions that not only occur when a person performs ritual behavior (worship), but also performs other activities. This study aims to see the relationship between Religiosity and Anti-Corruption Perceptions of Students, this correlational study uses a religiosity scale and an anti-corruption perception scale as a data collection tool. Respondents of this study were students of the Faculty of Economics and Social Unjaya who were selected by purposive sampling technique and 132 respondents were collected. The results showed that there was a positive relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption perception, the higher the student's religiosity, the higher the anti-corruption perception. The religiosity variable contributed 43% to the anti-corruption perception variable.

Keywords: Anti-Corruption Perception, Religiosity, Students, Psychology of Corruption.

Introduction

In early February 2022, the public was shocked by the news that 400 students in Aceh were suspected of corruption in scholarship funds, where they actually knew that they did not qualify as scholarship recipients but did so. Many other facts have also been revealed how student activists are also entangled in corruption cases and what is suspected by the KPK as seeds of future corruption that is often carried out by students such as cheating, leaving absenteeism and other dishonest behavior (Lindsey, 2020).

The research report of Heryadi and Yuliasari (2019) at the Faculty of Economics and Social Unjaya obtained an index of anti-corruption behavior for FES Unjaya students of 3.33 out of a scale of 5. The results of this study indicate that FES students tend to behave anti-corruption, but other data from the study it was found that 43% of respondents already had adequate knowledge about corrupt behavior and there were still 57% of respondents who still needed to improve their knowledge and understanding of anti-

corruption behavior. The closer to number 5 the anti-corruption behavior index score shows that students are increasingly anti-corruption behavior.

The results of research by Heryadi and Jayanti (2021) at the Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs Unjaya also found data that there was a positive correlation between students' academic honesty and students' anti-corruption perceptions.

The results of research by Mumtazah, Rahman, and Sarbini (2020) show a positive relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption intentions. The direction of this relationship is positive, which means that a person's high religiosity is associated with a high intention to carry out anti-corruption behavior. This study also shows that gratitude can increase the relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption intentions, while Yahya's research (2015) shows that religiosity affects a person's attitudes and behavior, including attitudes and behavior of corruption within the organization.

Rokhmah & Putri (2018) which examined 440 students from nine universities in East Java who departed from the concern that society had so much hope in students as the nation's next generation showed that the religiosity variable could not moderate the independence and dependence variables. However, the role model has a significant effect in predicting anti-corruption behavior by 12.7%. Of the four role models, the teacher/lecturer has the largest contribution of 12.7% to the anti-corruption behavior of students.

In language there are three terms, each of which has a different meaning, namely religion, religiosity and religious (Abdullah, 2020). Religiosity comes from the word religiosity which means piety, great devotion to religion (A Del Castillo, 2021). Religiosity comes from religious which is related to religion or the nature of religion that is attached to a person (La Ferle, 2019).

According to Zuckerman, Silberman, and Hall (2013) religiosity is the level of individual involvement in religious aspects. Religious teachings contain rules regarding what should be done and what should not be done with consideration of sin and reward. Religious people involve themselves thoroughly to their religion. Ancok and Suroso (2001) state that religiosity is religiosity that includes various dimensions that do not occur when a person performs ritual behavior (worship), but also performs other activities driven by supernatural powers. This means, in individual behavior, everything relates to beliefs in the religion he adheres to (Jumriani, 2022). Religion can also include the term ethics, as it serves as a reminder of what is considered good and evil (Sommer et al., 2013).

Religiosity needs to be distinguished from religion, because the connotation of religion usually refers to institutions that are engaged in juridical aspects, rules and punishments, while religiosity is more about the 'deep heart' and personalization aspects of these institutions (Abdullah & Karim, 1986).

In general, religiosity is something that is felt very deeply and in touch with one's desires, requires obedience and rewards or binds a person in a society (Nashori & Mucharam, 2002).

According to Glock & Stark (Ancok & Suroso 1995) defines religion as a symbol system, belief system, value system and symbolized behavior system, all of which are centered on issues that are internalized as the most meaningful. Hawari (Ancok & Suroso, 1995) states that religiosity is a religious appreciation or depth of belief that is expressed by performing daily worship, praying and reading scriptures. Religiosity is manifested in various aspects of life in the form of visible and visible activities, as well as invisible activities that occur in one's heart (Winkelman, 2022).

From the description above and the direct finding of research that looks at the relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption perceptions makes researchers challenged to see the relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption perceptions of students at the Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs, Unjaya, this research is important to obtain further data on how interventions can be implemented. do to contribute to the prevention of corruption, especially among students.Anti-corruption perceptions are individual perspectives or further processing of anti-corruption values obtained through experience so that we can realize something that is right, good and constructive not to support efforts that harm the state (Triana & Heryadi 2020).

Method

This research is a quantitative research with a correlation approach, the researchers see how the relationship between the two variables, namely religiosity as an independent variable and anti-corruption perception as a dependent variable. Anti-corruption perception is defined as the way an individual sees or further processing of anti-corruption values that he has obtained through experience so that he can realize something that is right, good and constructive not to support efforts that harm the state or others. (Triana & Heryadi 2020).

The measuring instrument used in this study is the Religiosity Scale and Anti-Corruption Perception. The researcher uses the Anti-Corruption Perception Scale which modifies the Triana and Heryadi (2020) scale and has been tested in previous studies with a correlation coefficient value of 0.814 with 28 valid items from a total of 42 items. the religiosity scale that modifies from the Rifqi scale (2011) there are 24 valid items out of a total of 35 items with a correlation coefficient value of 0.837. The population in this study were FES Unjaya students consisting of 4 study programs in Accounting, Law, Management, and Psychology class 2018 to 2021 and from data collection using purposive sampling technique, 132 respondents were obtained.

While the try out or testing of measuring instruments is carried out on a religiosity scale that modifies from the Rifqi scale (2011) there are 24 valid items out of a total of 35 items with a correlation coefficient value of 0.837. The population in this study were FES Unjaya students consisting of 4 study programs in Accounting, Law, Management, and Psychology class 2018 to 2021 and from data collection using purposive sampling technique, 132 respondents were obtained. While the try out or testing of measuring instruments is carried out on a religiosity scale that modifies from the Rifqi scale (2011) there are 24 valid items out of a total of 35 items with a correlation coefficient value of 0.837. The population in this study were FES Unjaya students consisting of 4 study programs in Accounting, Law, Management, and Psychology class 2018 to 2021 and from data collection using purposive sampling technique, 132 respondents were obtained.

Results and Discussion

The respondents of this study were 132 students of FES Unjani Yogyakarta. Around 79.5% of respondents are female. The remaining 20.5% of respondents are male.

Table 1. Percentage of Subjects by Gender

Gender	Percentage
Man	20.5%
Woman	79.5%

Most of the respondents came from the Psychology study program, which was 56.8%. Other study programs, namely Law 18.2%, Management 15.2%, and Accounting 9.8%.

Table 2. Percentage of Subjects by Study Program

Faculty of Economics and Social	Percentage
Accounting	9.8%
Management	15.2%
Law	18.2%
Psychology	56.8%

Respondents aged 18 years by 2.3%, 19 years by 26.5%, 20 years by 43.9%, and over 20 years by 27.3%.

Table 3.Percentage of Subject Age Distribution

Age	Percentage
18 years	2.3%
19 years old	26.5%
20 years	43.9%
Over 20 Years	27.3%

Categorization of Research Respondents

The distribution of research data hypothetically and empirically is illustrated in the following table.

Table 4. Description of Research Data

Variable	Hypothetical Data				Empirical Data			
	Min Score	Max Score	mean	SD	Min Score	Max Score	mean	SD
religiosity	24	120	72	16	69	120	104.37	9.91
Anti-Corruption Perception	28	140	84	14	88	138	110.53	9.71

Hypothetical data describes data before data collection and empirical data is research data. The table above shows that hypothetically, the religiosity scale has a minimum score of 24 and a maximum score of 120. Because the scale consists of 24 items with each score moving from 1-5, so the minimum and maximum ranges are 24 x 1 = 24 to 24 x 5 = 120. The hypothetical mean (μ) is (120 + 24): 2 = 72 and the distribution distance is 120 – 24 = 96. Each standard deviation (σ) is 96: 6 = 16. While empirically, the anti-corruption perception scale has a minimum score of 64 and a maximum score of 112, the empirical mean (μ) is 90.66 and the standard deviation (σ) is 7.92.

The table above also explains that hypothetically, the anti-corruption perception scale has a minimum score of 28 and a maximum score of 140. The anti-corruption perception scale consists of 28 items with each score moving from 1–5, so the minimum and maximum ranges are 28 x 1 = 28 to 28 x 5 = 140. The hypothetical mean (μ) is (140 + 28): 2 = 84 and the distribution distance is 140 – 28 = 112. Each standard deviation (σ) is 112 : 6 = 18.67. While empirically, the religiosity scale has a minimum score of 88 and a maximum score of 138, the empirical mean (μ) is 110.53 and the standard deviation (σ) is 19.49.

On that basis, the research respondent's data was made into high, medium and low categorizations as follows.

1. Religiosity

The measurement categories of research subjects are divided into three categories, namely high, medium and low categories. To find the category score obtained by the following division:

1) Tall   =X > (μ + 1σ)

= X > (104.37 + 1 x 9.91)

= X > 114.28

2) Currently   =(-1σ) X (μ + 1σ)

= (104.37 - 1 x 9.91) X (104.37 + 1 x 9.91)

= 94.46 X 114.28

3) Low =X (μ-1σ)

= X (104.37 - 1 x 9.91)

= X 94.46

Information:

μ: Empirical Mean

σ: Standard Deviation (Azwar, 2011)

X : Subject Score

After knowing the value of the high, medium and low categories, the percentage will be known by using the formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Thus, the criteria for anti-corruption perceptions can be obtained as follows:

Table 5. Category Religiosity

Category	Norm	Score	□	%
Tall	X > + 1σ	X > 114.28	23	17.4%
Currently	-1σ X + 1σ	94.46 X 114.28	86	65.2%
Low	X≤ -1σ	X 94.46	23	17.4%
TOTAL			132	100%

From the table above, it can be illustrated that 17.4% of students have a high religiosity score, 65.2% of students have a moderate score and 17.4% of students have a low religiosity score.

2. Anti-Corruption Perception

The category of measuring anti-corruption perceptions on research subjects is divided into three, namely high, medium and low categories. To find the category score obtained by the following division:

1) Tall   =X > (μ + 1σ)

= X > (110.53+ 1 x 9.71)

= X > 120.24

2) Currently=(-1σ) X (μ + 1σ)

= (110.53 - 1 x 9.71) X (110.53 + 1 x 9.71)

= 100.82 X 120.24

3) Low   =X (μ-1σ)

= X (110.53 - 1 x 9.71)

= X 100.82

Information:

: Empirical Mean

: Standard Deviation (Azwar, 2011)

X : Subject Score

After knowing the value of the high, medium and low categories, the percentage will be known by using the formula:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Thus, the criteria for academic honesty can be obtained as follows:

Table 6. Anti-Corruption Perception Category

Category	Norm	Score	□	%
Tall	X > + 1σ	X > 120.24	18	13.6%
Currently	-1σ X + 1σ	100.82 X 120.24	98	74.2%
Low	X≤ -1σ	X 100.82	16	12.1%
TOTAL			132	100%

From the table above, it can be illustrated that 13.6% of respondents have a high anti-corruption perception score, 74.2% of respondents have a moderate anti-corruption perception score and 12.1% of respondents have a low anti-corruption perception score.

Hypothesis testing

Before testing the research hypothesis, a prerequisite test was held in the form of normality and linearity tests of the data as follows.

1. Normality test

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the confounding or residual variables have a normal distribution. Normality test is used to determine whether the data used is normally distributed or not. The normality test in this study used the one sample Kolmogrov-Smirnov (KS) test. The basis for decision making in this study is if the value of Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) is greater than 0.05 (p>0.05), it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed.

Based on data processing carried out by researchers using SPSS Version 25 Windows, the results of the normality test of this research data are as follows:

Table 7. Normality test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		Unstandardized Residual
N		132
Normal Parameters, b	mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	7.34120579
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.064
	Positive	.064
	negative	-.042
Test Statistics		.064
asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200c,d

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

From the table above, it can be seen that the normality test states the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) on the religiosity variable and anti-corruption perception of 0.20 (p > 0.05) so that the distribution of religiosity scores and anti-corruption perceptions is in a normal distribution.

2. Linearity Test

Linearity test is conducted to determine whether two variables have a linear or non-linear relationship. The basis for decision making in this study is if the Deviation from Linearity value is greater than 0.05 (p>0.05), it can be concluded that the two variables are linearly correlated.

Based on data processing carried out by researchers using SPSS Version 25 Windows, the results of the linearity test of this research data are as follows:

Table 8. Linearity Test

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
		ANOVA Table					
Anti-Corruption Perception * Religiosity	Between Groups	(Combined)	6483,692	36	180.103	2,905	.000
		linearity	5312.856	1	5312.856	85,703	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	1170.836	35	33,452	.540	.979
	Within Groups		5889.187	95	61,991		
	Total		12372.879	131			

From the table above, it can be seen that the linearity test shows that Deviation from Linearity is 0.979 greater than 0.05 or 0.979 > 0.05 so that the relationship between the two variables, namely religiosity and anti-corruption perception is linear with an F coefficient value of 0.540 and a significance of 0.979.

Because the prerequisite test meets, then to find out the correlation of the two variables, a hypothesis test is carried out using the Pearson Product Moment correlation technique. The analysis was carried out using SPSS for windows version 25. In this study, the requirement is that the correlation coefficient moves from 0 to -1. If the correlation coefficient moves from 0 to +1 then it is stated to be positively correlated, and if the correlation moves from 0 to -1 then it is stated to be negatively correlated (Pratisto, 2005).

Based on data processing that has been carried out by researchers, the results of hypothesis testing can be seen in the following table:

Table 9. Hypothesis testing

		Religiosity	Anti-Corruption Perception
	Correlations		
Religiosity	Pearson Correlation	1	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	132	132
Anti-Corruption Perception	Pearson Correlation	.655**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	132	132
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The results of the hypothesis test above show a correlation coefficient (pearson correlation) of 0.655 and a significance level of 0.000. The correlation coefficient is greater than 0.5 (p < 0.5) and the significance level (1-tailed) is less than 0.05 (p < 0.05) so it can be said that the correlation between religiosity and anti-corruption perceptions is strong.

The positive sign on the correlation coefficient indicates that the direction of the relationship between the two variables is positive. That is, the higher the religiosity, the higher the perception of anti-corruption in FES Unjaya students. On the other hand, the lower the religiosity, the lower the anti-corruption perception held by the students of FES Unjaya. From the hypothesis testing conducted, it can be said that the hypothesis proposed in this study is accepted.

The coefficient of determination, whose magnitude is the square of the correlation coefficient (r2). This coefficient is called the determinant coefficient, because the variance that occurs in the dependent variable can be explained through the variance that occurs in the independent variable (Sugiono,2017). The coefficient of determination = r2 = 0.6552 = 0.43. It shows that religiosity in explaining the variance of anti-corruption perceptions is 43%. It means that there is 57% (100% -43%) variance of anti-corruption perception which is explained by other factor.

This finding shows a strong relationship between religiosity and anti-corruption perceptions of FES Unjaya students and religiosity 43% of components on anti-corruption perceptions. This finding is also in line with the research of Ullah and Shah (2013) in Pakistan which showed that religious knowledge and the promotion of religious values in education were able to increase perceptions of corruption in Pakistani society with a religious approach. Ancok and Suroso (2001) mention religiosity is religiosity that includes various dimensions that do not occur when a person performs ritual behavior (worship), but also performs other activities supported by supernatural powers. This means that behavior is associated with belief in the religion they adhere to. The findings of this study indicate that only 17.4% of respondents have a high religiosity score, so intervention efforts are also needed to improve the behavior of religious students. Yahya's research (2015) shows that religious behavior affects attitudes and a person, including attitudes and behavior of corruption within the scope of the organization. While Manara (2016) in his research with the literature review method stated that from a study of psychological theories related to attitudes and behavior in groups, found the flow of the normalization process of corruption in an organizational group. The processes are cognitive dissonance, rationalization, moral disengagement, and normalization (divergent norm).

Likewise with the findings of anti-corruption perceptions, only 13.6% of respondents have a high anti-corruption perception score, meaning the student's perspective or further processing of anti-corruption values that he has obtained through experience so that he can realize something that is right, good and bad. development to not support efforts that are detrimental to the state or other people still needs to be improved with certain interventions.

Ludigdo and Afala (2021) say that corruption is a common phenomenon that occurs anywhere and involves anyone. So far, many discourses on corruption have been associated with the involvement of political elites, bureaucracies, businessmen, and political parties, but they rarely focus on millennials such as students and other youth groups. The millennial group is interesting to study because they are the nation's generation who will fill important posts in the country in the future. There are a number of studies that explain corrupt practices among millennials.

In their book Ludigdo and Afala (2021) say that the study conducted by Denisova-Schmidt et al.. on "Beg, borrow, or steal determinants of student academic misconduct in Ukraine higher education", shows the direct involvement of students in corrupt practices. at Ukrainian universities, (Denisova-Schmidt, Prytula and Rumyantseva, in 2019). In another study conducted by Denisova-Schmidt on corrupt practices among students in "Justification of Academic Corruption at Russian Universities: A Student Perspective" explains the different sides of corrupt practices in Russian universities (Denisova-Schmidt, 2013). In this study, Denisova-Schmidt found that there was an ambivalent attitude shown by students in corruption. Although they know that academic fraud and bribery are wrong and immoral, they have many reasons to justify these academic corrupt practices. Some of these justifications include reasons for saving time (time-saving), not realizing that it is a form of protest (protest), and people's attitudes that believe that a good future can only be obtained through an attitude to higher education. This study confirms that students are not only the object of corruption but also the subject of corruption in universities.

Conclusion

The results of the research by Heryadi and Jayanti (2021) at the Faculty of Economics and Social Affairs Unjaya found that there was a positive correlation between students' academic honesty and students' anti-corruption perceptions. The higher students' academic honesty, the higher their anti-corruption perception. There is a strong relationship between student religiosity and anti-corruption perceptions, so this initial research can be used as data to carry out further interventions on the variables of academic honesty and student religiosity to build anti-corruption perceptions.

Acknowledgment

have facilitated researchers so that this research can be realized. Hopefully this small step will contribute to efforts to prevent corruption, especially for students.

References

A Del Castillo, F., Del Castillo, C. D., & Corpuz, J. C. (2021). Dungaw: Re-imagined religious expression in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of religion and health*, *60*(4), 2285-2305.

Abdullah, M. A. (2020). The Intersubjective Type of Religiosity: Theoretical Framework and Methodological Construction for Developing Human Sciences in a Progressive Muslim Perspective. Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies, 58(1), 63-102.

Abdullah, T., & Karim, M., R. 1989. *Metodelogi Penelitian Agama: Sebuah Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana

Ancok, D., Suroso, F., & Ardani, M. (2001). *Psikologi islami: Solusi islam atas problemproblem psikologi*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Azwar, S. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Edisi I Cetakan XII*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1965). *Religion and society in tension*. Rand McNally.

Heryadi, A., & Jayanti, A, M. 2021. Persepsi Anti Korupsi dan Kejujuran Akademik Mahasiswa. Peneltian: Fakultas Ekonomi dan Sosial Unjani Yogyakarta. Laporan Penelitian

Heryadi, A., & Yuliasari, H 2019. Indeks Perilaku Anti Korupsi Mahasiswa. Peneltian: Fakultas Ekonomi dan Sosial Unjani Yogyakarta. Laporan Penelitian.

Jumriani, J., Abbas, E. W., Isnaini, U., Mutiani, M., & Subiyakto, B. (2022). Pattern Of Religious Character Development at The Aisyiyah Orphanage In Banua Anyar Village Banjarmasin City. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(2), 2251-2260.

La Ferle, C., & Muralidharan, S. (2019). Religion in domestic violence prevention PSAs: The role of religiosity in motivating Christian bystanders to intervene. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *58*(4), 874-890.

Lindsey, T., & Pausacker, H. (2020). Crime and punishment in Indonesia. In *Crime and Punishment in Indonesia* (pp. 1-17). Routledge.

Ludigdo, U., & Afala, L. O. M. (2021). *Memotret Potensi Korupsi di Kalangan Mahasiswa*. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya Press.

Mumtazah, H., Rahman, A. A., Sarbini. 2020. Religiusitas dan Intensi Anti Korupsi: Peran Moderasi Kebersyukuran. *Jurnal An-Nafs: Kajian Penelitian Psikologi* 5 (1). Doi: 10.33367/psi.v5i1.1122

Nashori, F., & Mucharam, R, D. 2002. Mengembangkan Kreativitas Dalam Perspektif Psikologi Islam. Yogyakarta: Menara Kudus

Pratisto, A. (2005). *Cara Mudah Megatasi Masalah Statistik dan Rancangan Percobaan dengan SPSS 12*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo

Rokhmah, S, N., & Putri, J, T. 2018. Pengaruh *Role Model* dan Religiusitas Terhadap Perilaku Antikorupsi pada Mahasiswa Organisatoris di Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Psikologi dan Psikologi Islam (JPPI)*, 15(2), 26-33.

Sommer, U., Bloom, P. B.-N., & Arikan, G. (2013). Does faith limit immorality? The politics of religion and corruption. *Democratization*, *20*(2), 287–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2011.650914

Sugiono. 2017). *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta

Triana, N., & Heryadi, A. (2020). Kecintaan Pada Uang dan Persepsi Anti Korupsi. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 13 (1), 44-52

Ulah, A. & Shah, M. 2013. Does Pakistani Society Accept Corruption as a Changed Value with Reference to Religious Perspective?. *Global Disclosure of Economics and Business*, Vol. 2, No . DOI: 10.18034/GDEB.V2I1.191

Winkelman, M. J. (2022). An ethnological analogy and biogenetic model for interpretation of religion and ritual in the past. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, *29*(2), 335-389.

Yahya, K, K., Yean, T, F., johari, J., & Saad, N, A. 2015. The Perception of Gen Y on Organizational Culture, Religiosity and Corruption in Malaysian Public Organizations. *Procedia Economics and Finance* 31, 251 – 261. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01227-7

Article Information (Supplementary)

Word Count: