



## Generating Factors of Students' Engagement in Street Corruption: Gender, Attitude, Cheating, And Religiosity

Umul Baroroh<sup>1</sup>, Ibnu Hadjar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor in Islamic Law, UIN (State Islamic University) Walisongo, Semarang Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup>Proffesor in Religious Education, UIN (State Islamic University) Walisongo, Semarang Indonesia.

**ABSTRACT:** Corruption is an acute problem in Indonesian public affairs. It has involved almost all relevant parties concerned in any public affair. This study investigated students' engagement in street corruption when applying for a driver's license and when ticketed for violation of traffic rules. It involves gender, attitude towards corruption, academic cheating, religious belief, and behavior as factors predicting a student's probability to engage in street corruption. Using a questionnaire developed for this study, data were collected from 566 students, selected by using cluster sampling from a state Islamic university and a state Islamic institute in Central Java, Indonesia. Data were analyzed by using a logistic regression technique, both separately for each factor and simultaneously in four different models. The study found that gender, attitude towards corruption, and religious behavior are significant factors in predicting the likelihood of a student's engagement in street corruption or bribery to police traffic officers, both separately and simultaneously. However, academic cheating and religious beliefs are not significant, neither separately nor simultaneously. It indicates that behavioral factors are accurate predictors, while value ones are not.

**Corresponding Author:**  
Ibnu Hadjar

**KEYWORDS:**

Engagement in street corruption, attitude towards corruption, cheating, religiosity.

### INTRODUCTION

Over the last decades, corruption has attracted the general public and researchers' attention because of its dramatic effects to a country's development and all of the social and economic aspects of its people (Ortega, Casquero, & Sanjuán, 2016). It is one of the greatest threats to the development of social, economic, political, and security worldwide (Popescu, 2016). It becomes an acute and serious problem faced by both developing and developed countries (Thompson & Medina, 2012; Fatchuri, 2017) although the intensity varies from one country to another. It can only be minimized, but never be eliminated anywhere (United States Institute of Peace, 2010). Even in the most developed economically and the cleanest region, e.g., European countries, corruption is increasing overtime (MacDonald & Majeed, 2014).

Although found in all countries, corruption is more widespread in developing countries since their conditions are more conducive for the growth of corruption than that in developed countries (Myint, 2000). Basically, corruption refers to "acts in which the power of public office is used for personal gain in manner that contravenes the rules of game" (Jain 2001:73). As such, corruption always involves those having power in public affairs at any level, such as politicians, government officials, and policemen. It can take various forms and a wide array of illicit behaviors, such as bribery, extortion, and graft involving public power.

There are two types of corrupt behavior in terms of parties involved (Myint, 2000). First, action that can be undertaken by an official alone, such as fraud and embezzlement. Second, action that can only be undertaken by involving two parties, the giver and taker in a corrupt deal, such as bribery and extortion. It is the latter that widely involves the public and occurs in people day-to-day lives (Ackerman, 2010). Although it is believed that there is no sector in the government body freed from the latter, police corruption is one of the most attention from the public, since it is involving the people widely and easily found everywhere in their day-to-day live.

Police corruption is a global phenomenon since it is widespread and one of the greatest obstacles to good governance (Kumssa 2015). It is endemic to police culture across the globe (Punch 2000). Although it is an international phenomenon, police corruption is rampant and more prevalent in developing countries (Olken & Pande, 2012; Andvig & Fjeldstad, 2008; Svensson, 2005). Even in many Asian countries, it is a serious problem since police is perceived to be the most corrupt government agencies (Quah, 2006). In Rusia (Oleinik, 2015) and Indonesia alike (Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia, 2001), the traffic police are consistently perceived by public to be the most corrupt government body.

Studies on police corruption have attracted significant attention in the literature in recent years. However, most of the studies focus on determinants of corruption by police officers as bribe-takers (Andvig & Fjeldstad, 2008). There is still a lack of substantial empirical evidence about the determinants of bribe-giver. Even the existing limited evidence about bribe-giver are adults (e.g. businessmen, general public). It seems no study focuses on new generation, especially students engaging in corruption. Indeed, there are some studies on students' engagement in corruption (e.g. Heyneman, 2004; Osipian, 2008; Shaw, 2009), but mostly focus on specific educational corruption, both academic (student-faculty exchange for academic activities) and service (student-administrator exchange for services) (Rumyantseva 2005), all of which happen on campuses. It seems that study on corruption involving students outside the campus has not been given enough attention in the research literature.

The current study is to investigate empirically the engagement of students in street corruption. It focuses on Muslim students' engagement in street corruption in Indonesia, especially giving bribes to traffic police officers when they are in a condition that enables to do so. Specifically, it tests the relation of the students' engagement in street corruption with gender, academic cheating, attitude towards street corruption and religiosity. It is expected that the study contributes for findings of the likelihood of a student's engagement in the corruption explained by such factors.

### **Street corruption and students' engagement: A theoretical review and hypothesis**

Most studies on corruption refer to UNDP's definition, that is, it is "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain" (UNDP, 2008). This definition has been used by Transparency International in its annual surveys on corruption index in public area globally (Transparency International, 2020). It is "an abuse of trust, power or position for improper gain... includes e.g. offering and receiving bribes – including bribery of foreign public officials–embezzlement, conflict of interest and nepotism" (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency/SIDA, 2015). It can take many forms, including bribery, fraud, money laundering and embezzlement (Bond Society, 2016). With such definition, corruption is only done by those who have power in public affairs, such as officials. However, it does not mean that those who are outside government bureaucracy may not engage in corruption. The most common of the engagement of non-bureaucracy is in the form of bribe-givers.

Bribery is giving something to government officials in exchange of their powers for the benefit of the giver. Thompson and Medina (2012:126) define bribery as "*the practice of giving gifts of monetary value to a client or potential customer to persuade their decision.*" Corruption in this form may engage any one, including students, dealing with bureaucrats or officers. This study focuses on bribery to traffic police officers that engages students. It is because the police is the most visible government agent of social control and violation of rules by police will affect public perception of its morality (Jackson, et al., 2012). Since the transaction of this bribery generally takes place in the street, it is reasonable to call it "street corruption," which is very visible feature in Indonesia (Olken & Barron, 2009). The students' engagement is of interest because their behavior stands out as strong determinant for their future conduct (Shaw, 2009). Although it involves students, the focus of this study is not educational corruption since it is not in an educational context.

Why students gives bribery to the police officers? According to Abbink, Irlenbusch, and Renner (2002), basically bribery occurs because of mutual benefits between bribe-giver and bribe-taker. This conclusion is based on their experimental game on bribery situation, involving players functioning as public officers and users of public services (potential bribers). They found that reciprocity relationships between bribe-giver and bribe-taker is essential characteristics of bribery by establishing exchange of benefits. In term of street corruption, the students (as bribe-givers) will gain the benefit of being released from the punishment for the violation of the traffic law, while police officers (as bribe-takers) will have additional material benefits beyond what they should earn.

Since corruption involving students outside the campus has not been given enough attention in the research literature, it is difficult to understand factors affecting decision making by potential bribers, especially students, to give bribe to traffic police officers. However, it is found that many researchers have reported their findings on such factors as gender, attitude, cheating and religiosity which are the concerns of this study. Although most of the literature focuses of bribe-takers, the results can be used as a basis to understand factors of bribe-givers.

Basically, corruption is genderless (Goetz, 2007). However, many studies (e.g. Rivas, 2013; Togler & Valev, 2010; Swamy et al. 2001) have found that gender is one of factors determining corruption. With respect to gender differences, Rivas' study (2013) reveals that men are more likely than women to bribe public officials and both men and women tend to give higher bribes to male officials. Swamy et al. (2001) also find gender difference regarding the involvement in bribery in Georgia, in which, a higher share of women's participation leads to a decrease in corruption. Using data from the World Values Survey and the European Values Survey, Togler and Valev (2010) find significantly greater aversion to corruption and tax evasion among women in eight Western European countries, across time, and across numerous empirical specifications. Furthermore, as males tend to be more likely to take risk (Byrnes, Miller, & Schafer, 1999) and less obedient to the rules than females do (Hadjar, 1991), they are more likely to break the rule in order to satisfy themselves to achieve their goals. As consequence, they are more likely than females to engage in corruption, by giving bribe to the officers when they have an opportunity to do so in order to smooth out their affairs. These findings indicate that gender differences will be reflected in corrupt behavior differences.

Furthermore, attitude is "a positive or negative evaluation of people, activities, ideas, objects, event, or just about anything in the environment" (Al-Nasser, et.al 2014:58). It is a tendency for a person to response favorably or unfavorably to a stimulus

(Fishbein, 1967). This tendency encourages a person to act in accordance with his attitude (Jain, 2014). A positive attitude encourages him/her to do to the object of such attitude. While there seems no specific study on the effect of attitude toward corruption on corrupt behavior, many research in other field may give indication to understand the relationship. In order to test the attitude–behavior relation, for example, Bagozi (1981) used causal modeling research design on blood donation. He found significant effect of the attitude on the behavior indirectly through intention. This finding was confirmed by Hommer and Kahle (1988) in their research on the issue in the context of natural food shopping. They found that attitude towards nutrition influence shopping behavior of the subjects, that is, the more favorable towards nutrition and natural food, the more frequently to visit natural food store. Based on this literature, therefore, it is reasonable that attitude towards corruption can increase the probability of a student to engage in corruption when he/she has an opportunity to do so to launch his/her affairs.

Like corruption, cheating is a form of dishonesty and lack of integrity. Integrity functions as a form of social contract, in which the individual has a duty to follow the rules and norms to insure their peers also follow such rules and norms (John 2011). Cheating is an unfair act encouraged by moral (Wideman 2008). Students who are more frequently to cheat in their study tend to be more tolerant to corruption than those are less frequently. Since street corruption is very visible feature in Indonesia (Olken and Barron (2007), those who are used to cheat in academics will be easily to accept and conform to the practice in the road. Consequently, they will be more tolerant to such practice. Therefore, it is expected that experience to cheat in doing academic task will increase the probability of a student to engage in corruption.

Moreover, as religion is still of importance for most people, it is believed that it affects their behavior and actions. Researchers have been investigated the effect of religion on corruption. The results of the studies show that the effects are mix, positive and negative effect on corruption. Using macro data of 174 countries, Shadabi (2013) found that when various variables are controlled, Islam and Christianity have no significant effect on corruption. Another study by Paldam (2001) revealed that the effect of religion on the corruption index can be explained either directly in addition to the economy or indirectly through the economy. In micro study, McGee, Benk, and Yüzbaşı (2015) find significant correlation between religiosity and accepting bribes. They concluded that the higher scores in God's importance, the stronger opposition to accepting bribes and the more frequently attending religious services, the more opposed to accepting bribes. Lekewise, Sommer, Bloom, and Arikan (2012) found that religion related to level of corruption because of its relation to ethical behavior. Therefore, it is expected that the level of religiosity will be contrary to engagement in corruption.

Based on the reviews, it is concluded that the act of corruption correlated to variables concerned in this study. Although none of the studies focuses on bribe-giver, it is reasonable to apply the findings about the relationships to explain the likelihood of students' engagement in street corruption based on the variation of gender, attitude towards corruption, academic cheating, and religiosity. Therefore, it is hypothesized that: *Gender, attitude towards corruption, academic cheating, religious belief and behavior are significant factors predicting the likelihood of a student's to engage in street corruption, both separately and simultaneously.*

## **METHODS**

### **Participants**

This study involved 566 undergraduate students at a state Islamic university and a state Islamic institute in Central Java, Indonesia, which is exclusively for Muslims. The participants were selected by using cluster sampling technique, based on faculty, department, and class. All students having opportunity to engage in street corruption (i.e. those who had driving license and/or had been ever ticketed by traffic police officers due to violating traffic rules) in the selected classes were voluntarily involved in the study. Moreover, only students having opportunity to bribe the officers were selected. Those who had no opportunity to do so (having no driver license and having being ticketed for violating traffic rules) were eliminated from data alysis. The average age of them was 20.3 years (with standard deviation of 1.4 years). Most of them (60.1 percent) are female, reflecting the composition of the students' body. About one out of three participants were campus activists, mostly involved in student government at different levels in the university/institute.

### **Measures**

Data for this study were collected by using a questionnaire, which was especially designed for this study. Participants completed the questionnaire anonymously, to guarantee that their identities were not recognized. The questionnaire was designed in accordance with the characteristics of each variable as following.

#### *Engagement in street corruption*

Street corruption is bribery in the form of the payment of money given by traffic offenders to traffic police officers in return for making easier to get driving license or protection from law enforcement. The dependent variable in this study is engagement in street corruption, that is, whether students have been experiencing to bribe the police officer when he/she has an opportunity to do so. The participants were asked whether they do honestly in obtaining driving license and in resolving their problems when they were ticketed by the police due to violation of traffic rules. In these two conditions, they had the likelihood to give a bribe to the police officer. They were asked whether they had ever experienced to give payment illegally to the officer in order to facilitate their businesses. It is a binary variable so that score 1 was given to those doing such payment and score 0 to those never doing so. With

these scores, it is possible to estimate the level of probability of any student to engage in corruption based on known scores of the independent variables.

#### *Gender*

Participants were categorized based on their gender. Data on gender was obtained through the questionnaire on the identity of the participants. Score 0 was assigned for female participants (as a base) and 1 for male ones.

#### *Attitude towards corruption*

It is a student's tendency to respond favorably or unfavorably to statements about various aspects of corruption. It was measured by a questionnaire of 30-item Likert-type scale (Likert 1932). Each item consists of a statement (either positive [favorable] or negative [unfavorable]) about one aspect of corruption, followed by four response choices: *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree*, and *strongly disagree*. The scale was refined to become 20 items, based on the results of a pilot study (with sample of 141 subjects) conducted to specially refine the item scale. The reliability of the refined scale was  $\alpha = 0.734$ , indicating acceptable (DeVellis 1991) and moderate reliability of the scale (Muller, 1986). The total score of the scale may vary from 20 (very negative [intolerant] towards corruption) to 80 (very positive [tolerant] towards corruption), with theoretical mean of 50.

#### *Academic cheating*

It is defined as cheating behavior of students while studying at the university. It was measured by a 10-item scale, asking the intense of subjects in doing various cheating behavior during their study at the university. The items of the scales asked whether the participants do cheat in class testing, doing task, writing academic paper, doing improper citing, etc. Each item was followed by five alternative responses: *never*, *rarely*, *sometimes*, *often*, and *always* doing so. Consecutively, the response of a participant was scored 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. The total score of the scale (ranging from 0 to 40, theoretical mean of 20), indicated the students' intense in doing cheating (the higher the score, the more intensive).

#### *Religiosity scale*

The instrument of religiosity was designed to measure two dimensions of religiosity: religious belief and religious behavior, which are considered to be the most distinct indicator of religious person especially for Muslim (Al-Menayes, 2016). Both dimensions were treated as separate variables, represented behavioral and psychological aspects of religion. *Religious belief* was measured by a 6-scale item, indicating the level of belief strength, ranging from very weak (score 1) to very strong (score 7). Each item contained a statement about one fundamental principle of the Islamic belief (*rukun iman*). The total score of the scale may range from 6 (very weak belief) to 42 (very strong belief), with theoretical mean of 23.5. *Religious behavior* scale contained 14 items, asking the intensity of the subject in doing the most essential aspects of Islamic ritual (daily prayers and other worship). The score of each item ranges from 0 (never doing the stated ritual) to 4 (always doing the stated one). Therefore, the total score may range from 0 (never doing any religious ritual) to 56 (always doing all kind of the ritual). Its theoretical mean is 28.

#### *Data analysis*

Data collected were analyzed statistically by using logistic regression (Askar, Usuel, and Mumcu 2006; Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll 2002). This technique of analysis was used to test the model for probability of event of the binary dependent variable (engaging or not engaging in street corruption) based on the score of the independent variables (gender, attitude towards corruption, academic cheating, religious belief, and religious behavior). In this study, four logistic regression models were used to uncover the effects of the independent variables in four steps of analysis. The analysis was performed by using SPSS 16.0 program (SPSS Inc. 2007).

In order to give an idea on the tendencies of scores of the variables, firstly data of each variable are analyzed descriptively to measure the tendency of frequency (for binary variable) and centrality and variability (for continuous variables). The analytic techniques used are percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation (Hadjar 2014). The entire statistical calculation was done with the help of W-Stats program (Hadjar 2016).

## **RESULTS**

Before proceeding to report the results of logistic regression models, several noteworthy features from descriptive data shown in Table 1 merit brief attention. As mentioned before, 556 participants of this study have experienced a condition that enables them to be involved or not in street corruption (if they want to, they can bribe police officers when they are getting a driver's license and ticketed for violating traffic rules). The results of the analysis, as presented in Table 1, show that 204 (36 percent) of them have never engaged in corruption by bribing police officers to facilitate their businesses or to free themselves from punishment, although they have the opportunity to do so. These participants are reluctant to engage in corruption. However, the other 362 (64 percent) participants do engage in corruption, by bribing the police officers. This indicates that if they have opportunity to facilitate their businesses, they choose not to comply with regulations.



**Table 1: Descriptive statistics Means (M) and standard deviation (SD) or percentage of each variable**

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Percentage
<b>Dependent variable</b>				
Engagement in corruption				
<i>Never</i> (=0)	204	–	–	36
<i>Yes</i> (=1)	362	–	–	64
<b>Independent variables</b>				
Gender				
<i>Female</i> (=0)	340	–	–	60.1
<i>Male</i> (=1)	226	–	–	39.9
Attitude towards Corruption	566	39.54	6.24	–
Academic Cheating Behavior	566	7.04	4.30	–
Religiosity				
Religious Belief	566	37.63	3.22	–
Religious Behavior	566	28.11	7.97	–

The table also shows that the participants engaged in street corruption are much more than those not engaged (64 percent and 36 percent respectively). Among the participants, 60.1 percent are female and the other 39.9% are male. However, the percentage of females engaging in corruption is less than that of males (61.1 percent vs 68.1 percent). It indicates that females are more law-abiding than males.

It also shows that participants' attitude towards corruption tends to be negative. This is because their empirical score mean is almost two standard deviations ( $s = 6.24$ ) below the theoretical one (consecutively 39.54 and 50). However, their variation of the level of engagement is small (less than one sixth of possible score range, 20 – 80). This indicates that their attitude tends to be negative (neither positive/favorable towards corruption nor negative/unfavorable towards corruption) and homogenous.

The table also shows that the tendency of Muslim students to cheat in exams or other evaluation processes during their study at the university is low ( $M = 7.04$ ;  $s = 4.3$ ), in the sense that the mean score of cheating behavior is far from the theoretical mean (almost two standard deviations below the mean, 16). However, further analysis of the data reveals that almost all students (about 96.3 percent of the sample) have experienced cheating in one form or another.

Moreover, the tendency of religiosity scores are varied. Their religious belief tends to be very strong, the mean ( $M=37.63$ ) is far above theoretical one and close to the highest possible score (in a possible score range of 6 – 42), as well as very homogeneous ( $SD = 3.22$ , one twelfth of the possible score range). Unlike their belief, religious behavior (involvement in private and congregation prayers) tends to be moderate (the mean is slightly above the theoretical one, 28.11 and 28 respectively), with moderate dispersion of their scores ( $SD = 7.97$ ). The findings indicate that the participants are very strong in their belief, but moderate in their ritual intensity.

As preliminary step of data analysis in the main logistic regression models, data are analyzed to compare the probability of participants in engaging or not engaging in street corruption. This step of analysis is called the null model (Peng & So, 2003) because there is no predictor. The result of the analysis reveals that the probability of the participants (students) to follow the rules is lower than that to break the rules, especially in bribing the police officers to smooth their affairs. This is because the value of odds ratio is .574,  $odd = 1.775$ , significant at  $p < 0.001$  (Wald  $\chi^2 = 42.917$ ) and initial -2 Log Likelihood is 739.945. It indicates that the odd of the students to engage in corruption (bribing the police officers to smooth their affairs or to free themselves from punishment) is 28 percent higher than that of those not to engage.

In accordance with the main purpose of the study, data were analyzed by using simple logistic regression (Peng & So, 2003) to uncover the effect of each independent variable on the probability of a student to engage in street corruption. The analysis was done in isolation of the other independent variables. The results of the analysis are following.

**Table 2: Odds ratio and odds for logistic regression for predicting a student's engagement in corruption (each independent variable is treated in isolation [uncontrolled by the others])**

Dependent variable	B (odd ratio)	O (odds)	Wald $\chi^2$
Gender	.306	1.357	2,849*
Attitude towards Corruption	.036	1.037	6.678
Academic Cheating Behavior	.039	1.040	3.349*
Religious Belief	-.006	.994	.045
Religious Behavior	-.034	.967	9.096***

\* $p < .10$ ; \*\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*\* $p < .001$  (2-tailed test)

The table shows that only gender, academic cheating behavior, and religious behavior are significant ( $p < .10$ ) to be predictors of students' engagement in street corruption. This indicates that the likelihood of male is higher (1.357 times or 35.7 percent) than that of female to bribe the traffic police officers when they are in a condition to decide to do or not to do. The likelihood to bribe the police officers in such condition is also significantly affected by their cheating behavior. This means that increasing one point of a student's score on cheating behavior significantly improves .093 in the logit (ratio odds) of his/her probability to engage in bribing the traffic police officers. Unlike both variable, the effect of religious is negative. It mean that the higher the score on the variable, the less likely is a student to engage in street corruption. Unlike the above independent variables, attitude towards corruption and religious belief are not significant factors to predict ( $p > .10$ ) the engagement. In other words, whenever not controlled by other independent variables, the probability of a student to engage in street corruption by bribing the police officers is affected by gender and academic cheating behavior, but not by the attitude and religiosity.

Is the likelihood of students to engage in street corruption by giving bribery to the police officers significantly predicted simultaneously by all the independent variables (gender, attitude towards corruption, academic cheating behavior, and religiosity (belief and behavior)? Further multiple logistic regression analysis was employed to predict the likelihood of a participant to engage in the corruption. Table 3 presents results of data analysis in four steps of multiple logistic regression models (Peng & So 2003) to predict such probabilities. Each model presents values of coefficient or odds ratio and odds for each factor (independent variable) and the constant involved in the model, as well as model goodness of fit statistics.

**Table 3: Logistic regression models predicting the effects of the independent variables on the probability of a student to engage or not in street corruption–Coefficients of odd ratio (Odds)**

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Gender				
Female (ref.)				
Male	.307* (1.357)	.311* (1.365)	.264* (1.302)	.328* (1.338)
Attitude towards Corruption	–	.037*** (1.037)	.034** (1.035)	.037** (1.037)
Cheating Behavior	–	–	.023 (1.023)	.005 (1.005)
Religiosity				
Religious Belief	–	–	–	.008 (1.008)
Religious Behavior	–	–	–	-.035*** (.966)
Constant	.455****(1.576)	-.995*(.370)	-1.025*(.359)	-.340 (.712)
Model goodness-of-fit statistics				
Wald $\chi^2$	2.877*	9.683***	10.726**	19.627***
Degrees of freedom	1	2	3	5
-2 Log Likelihood	737.068	730.262	729.219	720.318
Cox & Snell $R^2$	.005	.017	.019	.034
Nagelkerke $R^2$	.007	.023	.026	.047
N	566	566	566	566

\* $p < .10$ ; \*\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*\* $p < .001$  (2-tailed test). Initial -2 Log Likelihood = 739.945.

Model 1 involves gender (female as reference) as the predictor of a student's probability to engage in street corruption by bribing the police officers. The results of data analysis show that coefficients of odds ratio for male students is  $B = .307$ , odds = 1.357, and  $p < .10$ . The odd indicates that probability for male students to engage in street corruption is 1.357 times or 28.9 percent higher than that for female. It means that female students are more obedient to the law than male ones. A test of the model versus the null model (intercept only) indicates a significant result,  $\chi^2(1;566) = 2.877$ ;  $p < .10$ . Therefore, by using gender as predictor (female = 0; male = 1), the probability of engagement of a student in street corruption can be predicted with this model:  $\text{Logit}(y=1) = .455 + .307(\text{gender})$ . Based on the model, the likelihood of a student to engage in the street corruption is .682 for male and .612 for female.

Model 2 shows the logistic regression coefficient and odd ratio for gender and attitude towards corruption. As in model 1, gender has significant partial effect ( $B = .311$ ;  $O = 1.365$ ;  $p < .10$ ). The odd ratio of gender indicates that when holding the attitude towards corruption constant, a male student is about 1.365 time more likely to engage in street corruption than female one. Employing .10 criterion of statistical significance, attitude towards corruption has no significant partial effect ( $B = .037$ ;  $p > .01$ ). In other words, when gender is held constant, increasing a student's score on the attitude has significant effect to predict his/her probability to engage in street corruption. Model 2 also meets the statistical test of goodness of fit ( $\chi^2 = 9.683$ ;  $p < .01$ ). It indicates that model 2 is

better than model 1 to predict the likelihood of a student to engage in street corruption, since the attitude towards corruption has no additional effect when added to gender as predictor.

In model 3, in which cheating behavior is added to, gender still has significant partial effect ( $B=.264$ ;  $O=1.302$ ;  $p<.10$ ). Attitude towards corruption is also a significant effect ( $B=.034$ ;  $O=1.035$ ;  $p>.05$ ), when other predictors in the model is held constant. Unlike both variables, when gender and attitude towards corruption hold constant, cheating behavior has no effect on students' engagement in corruption ( $B=.023$ ;  $O=1.023$ ;  $p>.10$ ). It indicates that when gender and attitude towards corruption are held constant, increasing a point of a student's score on cheating behavior does not significantly improves his/her odd ratio of the probability to engage in street corruption. In the overall, this model meets the statistical test of goodness of fit ( $\chi^2 = 10.726$ ;  $p<.05$ ). It means that model 3 is significantly different from the null model, that is, the probability of a student engagement in street corruption is predictable with the model.

In addition to involving the variables used in model 3, model 4 adds religiosity (religious belief and behavior) to be predictors for the probability for a student to engage in street corruption. As in model 3, gender and cheating behavior are significant predictors for a student's probability to engage in street corruption, but attitude towards corruption is not significant. The added predictor variables have different effects. As in previous models, when other variables in the model are held constant, gender is a significant factor for predicting the probability of being engaged in street corruption ( $B=.328$ ;  $O=1.338$ ;  $p<.10$ ). The odds indicate that male student has 1.338 times more likely to engage in street corruption than female when they have opportunity to do so. Cheating behavior has no significant effect in predicting a student's probability to engage in street corruption. The table also shows that religious belief has no significant partial effect ( $p>.10$ ), when other predictors in the model is held constant. On the contrary, religious behavior has negative significant effect ( $B=-.035$ ;  $O=.966$ ;  $p<.01$ ). The negative value of the coefficient indicates that a student's probability to engage in street corruption decreases as his/her score on religious behavior scale increases. That is, each increasing 1 point of the score will be followed by  $-.035$  of value of odd ratio.

Finally, the model goodness-of-fit tests indicate that all models are significantly different from the null model (Alison, 2014). The evaluation of the overall model demonstrate the improvement over the null model (the intercept only model. That is the value of *Wald*  $\chi^2$  for each model (initial -2LL minus the model -2LL, consecutively 2.877; 9.683; 10.726; and 19.627) is significant at  $p<.10$ . It means that the four logistic regression models fit the data. In other words, the four models can be used to predict the likelihood of students to engage in street corruption. However, the proportion of the variation in the dependent variable (engagement in street corruption), as explained by independent variables in each of the models, is small (ranging from .5 to 3.4 percent for *Cox & Snell*  $R^2$  and from .7 to 4.7 percent for *Nagelkerke*  $R^2$ ). It indicates that the variance of the students' engagement in street corruption is mostly explained or affected by other variables not included in this study.

## DISCUSSION

The descriptive results of the study, as presented before, indicate an alarming behavior of students, especially related to their engagement in street corruption. More than four out of ten students involved in the study have engaged in bribery to traffic police officers. Each of them has experienced, at least once, giving bribe to the police officers when he/she applied for a driving license or was ticketed by the police for violation of the traffic rules. Although it is not uncommon for Indonesians in such circumstances (Indonesia Corruption Watch 2000; Pohan 2004), it is contradict to religious norm they had been studying at the university. According to Islamic teaching, bribery or *rushwah* (Arabic) is a serious crime since it is considered to be religious and criminal offense for both givers and takers (Chowdhury, Khan, & Akter 2013; Arafa 2012; Dawud 1952). Actually, giving bribe to public officials, including police officers, is not exclusive for Indonesians since it is widely practiced in Muslim-dominated countries, e.g. Pakistan (Javaid 2010), although further analysis reveals that Islam has no significant effect on corruption (Shadabi 2013). As other kind of corruption, the street corruption is also an acute problem found in many developing countries, e.g. Zimbabwe (Makono 2016) and India (Lamani & Venumadhava 2013).

The results of inferential statistics analysis also indicate that gender, cheating behavior, and religious behavior are significant factors to predict the probability of a student to engage in street corruption or bribery to traffic police officers when he/she is facing circumstances enabling him/her to do so. On the contrary, attitude towards corruption and religious beliefs are not significant ones.

First, gender is a significant factor of students' engagement in the bribery. This effect is consistent in all logistic regression models. It means that although engagement in corruption is common for both sexes, a male student is more likely to engage in street corruption. This finding is consistent with that of some previous studies. For example, Swamy, Knack, Lee, and Azfar (2001) found that men are more likely than woman to involve in bribery. Many theories have been developed by criminologists to explain the differences. Mocan's study (2004) investigating the determinants of corruption found that risk of exposure to bribery (having been asked for a bribe by a public official) contribute to explain the difference between female and male in engaging in corruption. The results of the study indicate that men are more likely to be asked for a bribe than women. Furthermore, in general female may be brought up to be more honest or more risk averse than men (Paternoster & Simpson 196). Even they feel that there is a greater probability for them of being caught. Males are more inclined than females to break the law or engage in deviant behavior (Harris, & Jenkins 2006) and tended to accept more law disobedience than female (Schulz & Gonzalez 2011). Girls are, generally, brought

up to have higher levels of self-control than boys which, in turn, affects their propensities to indulge in criminal behavior (Gottfredson, & Hirshi 190). Consequently, their probability to engage in street corruption is lower than that of male students.

As predicted, academic cheating significantly predict the students' probability to engage in street corruption. Experience to cheat in doing academic task increases the probability of a student to engage in corruption. It is understandable since both kinds of behavior are socially unacceptable, reflect moral offences, and lack of integrity, which function as forms of the "social contract" (John 2011), since both are forms of dishonesty and lack of integrity. The implication of this finding is that it may be lack of honesty that make both variables to correlates to each other. This suggests that future research controls honesty as the explanatory variable to explain the relationship of academic cheating and the engagement in the street corruption.

This study also shows an interesting finding, in which the students' attitude towards corruption is not significantly related to the probability of their engagement in street corruption. This differs from previous finding by McGee, Benk, and Yüzbaşı (2015), that attitude towards bribe correlates with accepting bribery. It may indicate that the students' behavior is affected by external motive, rather than by the internal one. It is also possible, according to Punch (2000), that the engagement in police corruption is due to group behavior rooted within established practices in the society where he/she lives. As it is not uncommon to see the practice in the street, students commit the practice although they are not favorable to it. In spite of all, they bribe the traffic police officer for expecting for personal gain, i.e. smoothness of getting driving license and free from the punishment.

The absence of relationship between religious belief and the probability of a student to engage in street corruption indicates that the psychological aspect of religiosity is not reflected in their behavior. It is expected that the stronger their belief, the more obedient to religious value, especially to avoid unaccepted deed (such as corruption) (Chowdhury, Khan, & Akter 2013). However, the result of the current study indicates that such relationship is not significant. One possible implication of the result may be due to the homogeneity of the subjects of the study. As presented before, their religious belief tends to be very strong and very homogeneous. As other things are equal, according to Glass and Hopkins (1984), the smaller the variability among the observations, the weaker the relation between the variables. Therefore, research in the future should involve more heterogeneous sample in term of religious belief.

In contrast to the belief, religious behavior is significantly correlated negatively to students' probability to engage in corruption. This result supports previous finding by Sommer, Bloom, and Arikan (2012) that religion related to level of corruption because of its relation to ethical behavior. It is the morality provided by religion that attenuates corruption. It means that religious behavior indicates the level of obedient to morally religious conduct, which in turn reflected in the compliance to the law. As a result, as level of religious behavior increases, the probability to engage in corruption decreases.

This study has some limitations. First, it involved only students from an Islamic university, in which they tend to be homogenous in term of religion, since the university is exclusively for Muslims. As a result, the generalization of the results of this study is limited to students studying in this type of college. It is suggested that future research involves students with heterogeneous backgrounds so that it enables to generalize to Indonesian students at general. Second, this study did not differentiate whether the transaction of the street corruption was initiated by the students or the police officers. This does not enable to assure that the students' behavior is internally motivated so that the results do not reflect the nature of students' characteristics. It is, therefore, suggested that future study compare the effect of the independent variables on internally-motivated and externally-motivated corrupt behavior. The results of such study enables the university to choose more appropriate student moral coaching strategies to prevent corruption involving them in the future.

## CONCLUSION

This study hypothesizes that the students' engagement in street corruption in Indonesia is generated by factors of gender, academic cheating, attitude towards corruption, religious belief, and religious behavior. Based on the results and discussion of the findings, the research hypothesis is only partially confirmed. That is, not all independent variables are significant to predict the likelihood of a student's to engage in the street corruption by traffic police officers, both individually and simultaneously. Gender, academic cheating, and religious behavior are significant factors to predict the engagement in the street corruption. This indicates that the variation of these variables is consistently followed by the variation of probability of the engagement. Male students are more likely than female to engage in such corruption. While increase in the intense of students' cheating behavior is followed by increase in their likelihood to engage in street corruption, increase in the religious behavior is followed by decrease in the likelihood. Unlike these variables, the other two independent variables, attitude towards corruption and religious belief, are not significant to predict the likelihood of a student's engagement in the street corruption. Both variables do not explain consistently the variation of the likelihood of students' engagement in street corruption.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbink, K., Irlenbusch, B., & Renner, E. (2002). An experimental bribery game. *Journal of Law Economics and Organization*, 18(2), 428-454. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/18.2.428>



2. Ackerman, S. (2010). Corruption: Greed, Culture, and the State. *Yale Law Journal Online*, 120, 125-140. doi: <http://yalelawjournal.org/2010/11/10/roseackerman.html>
3. Agency/SIDA, S. I. (2015). Gender and corruption. Retrieved from <http://www.sida.se/contentassets/3a820dbd152f4fca98bacde8a8101e15/gender-and-corruption.pdf>
4. Al-Menayes, J. (2016). Measuring the Spiritual and Behavioral Dimensions of Religiosity in a Muslim Sample. *Asian Social Science*, 12(2). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n2p158>
5. Al-Nasser, R., Yusoff, R., Islam, R., & Al-Nasser, A. (2014). Effects of consumers' trust and attitude toward online shopping. 6 (2), . *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 6(2), 58-71.
6. Andvig, J., & Fjeldstad, O. (2008). Crime, Poverty and Police Corruption in Developing Countries. CMI Working Paper, WP 2008: 7. Retrieved from <https://www.cmi.no/publications/file/3076-crime-poverty-police-corruption-in-developing.pdf>.
7. Arafa, M. (2012). Corruption and bribery in Islamic law: Are Islamic ideals being met in practice? *Annual Survey of International & Comparative Law*, 18(1), 171-242.
8. Askar, P., Usluel, Y., & Mumcu, F. (2006). (2006). Logistic regression modeling for predicting task-related use in teaching 9(2),. *Educational Technology & Society*, 9(2), 141-151.
9. Bagozzi, R. (1981). Attitudes, intentions, and behavior: A test of some key hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(4), 607-627.
10. Bond Society. (2016). UK public attitudes towards corruption. London: Bond, Society Building. London: Bond Society Building.
11. Byrnes, J. P., Miller, D. C., & Schafer, W. D. (1999). Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 367-383.
12. Chowdhury, S., Khan, M., & Akter, S. (2013). Corruption in Islamic perspective and the roles of information and communication technology (ICT) to control it. *European Journal of Business and Management-Special Issue: Islamic Management and Business*, 5(1).
13. Dawud, A. (1952). Sunan Abi Dawud. Kairo: Maktabah Syarikah wa Mathba'ah al-Mushthofa.
14. DeVellis, R. (1991). Scale development. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.
15. Fatchuri, F. (2017). Korupsi Dalam Birokrasi dan Strategi Pencegahannya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Publik dan Kebijakan Sosial - Vol. 1 No. 2 Tahun 2017*, 1(2), 65-76.
16. Fishbein, M. (1967). Attitude and the prediction of behavior . In M. Fishbein, *Reading in attitude theory and measurement* (pp. 477-492). New York: John Wiley & Son.
17. Garson, G. (2014). Logistic regression: Binary and multinomial. Asheboro, N.C.: Statistical Associates Publishing.
18. Glass, G., & Hopkins, K. (1984). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*. Englewood: Prentice Hall.
19. Goetz, A. M. (2007). 2007. Political cleaners: Women as the new anti-corruption force?, , 38(1),. *Development and Change*, 38(1), 87-105.
20. Gottfredson, M., & Hirshi, T. (1990). *A General theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
21. Hadjar, I. (1991). An exploratory study of religious education and students' attitudes towards religion: A case study of Indonesian adolescents' viewpoints (Unpublished Master Thesis). Kingston Canada: Queens' University.
22. Hadjar, I. (1999). *Dasar-dasar metodologi penelitian kuantitatif dalam pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
23. Harris, C., & Jenkins, M. (2006). (2006). Gender Differences in Risk Assessment: Why do Women Take Fewer Risks than Men? *Judgment and Decision Making*, 1(1), 48-63.
24. Heyneman, S. (2004). Education and Corruption. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(Nopember), 637-648.
25. Hommer, P., & Kahle, L. (1988). A structural test of value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personalit and Social Pscychology*, 54(4), 638-646.
26. Inc., S. (2017). *SPSS 16.0 for Windows*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
27. Indonesia Corruption Watch. (2000). *Korupsi di pelayanan public: Studi kasus di lima kota: Jakarta, Palangkaraya, Samarinda, Mataram dan Kupang*. Jakarta: Departemen Riset dan Kajian Strategis ICW.
28. Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P., & Tyler, T. (2012). Why do People Comply with the Law?: Legitimacy and the Influence of Legal Institutions. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 52(6), 1051-1071. doi:DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bj>
29. Jain, A. (2001). Corruption: A review. *Journal of Economic Survey*, 15(1), 71-121.
30. Jain, V. (2014). 3D model of attitude. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 1-12.
31. Javaid, U. (2010). Corruption and its deep impact on good governance in Pakistan. , 48 (1),. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 48(1), 123-134.

32. John, L. (2011). Academic integrity & academic dishonesty: A handbook about cheating & plagiarism. Retrieved from <http://web2.fit.edu/current/documents/plagiarism.pdf>.
33. Kumssa, A. (2015). Police Corruption: A Perspective on its Nature and Control. *Donnish Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 1(1), 1-8.
34. Lamani, R., & Venumadhava, G. S. (2013). Police Corruption in India. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 6(4), 228-234.
35. Lee, C., Lee, K., & Ingersol, G. (2002). An introduction to logistic regression analysis and reporting. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 3-14.
36. Li, H. G., & Xiao, H. (2016). The perception of anti-corruption efficacy in China: An empirical analysis 125(3), . *Social Indicators Research*, 125(3), 885-903.
37. Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*.
38. MacDonald, R., & Majeed, M. (2014). Causes of corruption in European Countries: History, law, and political stability. *International Journal on Graft and Corruption Research*.
39. Makano, C. (2016). An Analysis of Causes of Corruption and Intervention Measures Being Employed to Curb It in the Zimbabwe Republic Police Traffic Branch: A Case Study of Harare Province: January to June 2015. *International Journal of Bussiness & Management*, 4(2), 380-403.
40. McGee, R., Benk, S., & Yüzbaşı, B. (2015). Religion and ethical attitudes toward accepting a bribe: a comparative study. *Religions*, 6, 1168–1181.
41. Mocan, N. (2014). What Determines Corruption? International Evidence from Micro Data. NBER Working Paper Series Nr. 10460 Cambridge, MA, April.
42. Mueller, D. (1986). *Measuring social attitudes: A handbook for researchers and practitioners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
43. Myint, U. (2000). Corruption: Causes, consequences and cures. *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*, 7(2), 33-50.
44. Oleinik, A. (2015). Corruption on the road: A case study of Russian traffic police. *IATSS Research*, 40(1), 1-25. doi:doi: 10.1016/j.iatssr.2015.12.001
45. Olken, B., & Barron, P. (2009). The simple economics of extortion: Evidence from trucking in Aceh. *Journal of Political Economy*. 117(3), 417-452.
46. Ortega, B., Casquero, A., & Sanjuán, J. (2016). Corruption and Convergence in Human Development: Evidence from 69 Countries During 1990–2012. *Social Indicators Research*, 127(2), 691–719. doi:DOI 10.1007/s11205-015-0968-8
47. Osipian, A. (2008). Corruption in Higher Education: Does it differ across the nations and why? *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(4), 345-365.
48. Paldam, M. (2001). Corruption and religion: Adding to the economic model. , 54(2/3),. *Kyklos*, 54(3/4), 383-414.
49. Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia . ( 2001). A national survey of corruption in Indonesia. . Jakarta: Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia .
50. Paternoster, R., & Simpson, S. (1996). Sanction, threats and appeals to morality: Testing a rational choice model of corporate crime. *Law and Society Review*, 30(3), 549-558.
51. Peng, C., & So, T. (2003). (2003). Logistic regression analysis and reporting: A primer. *Understanding Statistics*, 1(1), 31-70.
52. Pohan, A. (2004). Strategi penanggulangan korupsi di tubuh POLRI. *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia*, 3(3), 63-78.
53. Polinsky, A., & Shavell, S. (2001). Corruption and optimal law enforcement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 81, 1–24.
54. Popescu, A. (2016). Political process drivers of corruption in Eastern Europe. *CES Working Papers*, 8(4), 705-715.
55. Punch, M. (2000). Police corruption and its prevention. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 8, 301-324.
56. Quah, J. (2006). Preventing Police Corruption in Singapore: The Role of Recruitment, Training and Socialisation. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 28(1), 59-75.
57. Rivas, M. F. (2013). An experiment on corruption and gender. *Bulletin of Econom, ic Research*, 65(1), 10-42.
58. Schulz, W., & Gonzalez, E. (2011). Latin American Perspectives on Civic and Citizenship Education. Paper prepared for the Annual AERA Meeting in New Orleans, 8-12 April.
59. Shadabi, L. (2013). The Impact of Religion on Corruption. *The Journal of Business Inquiry*, 8, 102–117. Retrieved from <http://www.uvu.edu/woodbury/jbi/articles>
60. Shaw, P. (2009). The determinants of educational corruption: The case of Ukraine. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/search?q=student+briber+journal+pdf&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&client=firefox-b>.
61. Sommer, U., Bloom, P., & Arikan, G. (2012). Does faith limit immorality? The politics of religion and corruption. *Democratization*, 18(1), 25-51.
62. Svensson, J. (2005). Eight questions about corruption. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*(1), 1-42.

63. Swamy, A., Knack, S., Lee, Y., & Azfar, O. (2001). Gender and corruption. *Journal of Development Economics*, 64(1), 25–55.
64. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency/SIDA. (2015). Gender and corruption. Retrieved from <http://www.sida.se/contentassets/3a820dbd152f4fca98bacde8a8101e15/gender-and-corruption.pdf>
65. Thompson, K., & Medina, C. (2012). Bribery and controversy in the US and global market. *Undergraduate Review*, 8, 126-132. Retrieved from [http://vc.bridgew.edu/undergrad\\_rev/vol8/iss1/23](http://vc.bridgew.edu/undergrad_rev/vol8/iss1/23)
66. Togler, B. & Valev, N.T. (2010). Gender and public attitudes toward corruption and tax evasion. (2010). *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 28(4), 554-568.
67. Transparency International . (2016). How do you define corruption? Retrieved from <https://www.transparency.org/what-is-corruption/#define>.
68. UNDP. (2008). *Corruption and Development: Anti-corruption interventions for poverty reduction, realization of the MDGs and promoting sustainable development, primer on corruption and development*. New York: UNDP.
69. United States Institute of Peace. (2010). *Governance, corruption, and conflict*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace. Retrieved from <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/ETC-D/NPEC/480021.PDF>
70. Wideman, M. (2008). Academic dishonesty in postsecondary education: A literature review. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 2(1), 1-12.