Analysis of Factors that Influence Interest in Buying *Counterfeit Products* among West Kalimantan Students through *Social Cognitive Theory*

Dominika Sujani[1,] Aloysius Day Kristianto[2]
[1-2] Management Study Program, Shanti Bhuana Bengkayang Institute, West Kalimantan

ARTICLEINFO

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine the influence of *self-efficacy* on interest in buying *counterfeit products, outcome expectancy* on interest in buying *counterfeit products* , *social influence* on interest in buying *counterfeit products.* The method used is quantitative with a survey approach. In this study, the population was students from West Kalimantan with a sample of 200 respondents. The data analysis method uses SEM. The results of this study indicate that *self-efficacy* has a positive but not significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products* . Meanwhile, *outcome expectancy* and *social influence* have a positive and significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products.* In conclusion, *outcome expectancy* and *social influence* influence students' buying interest in *counterfeit products.* In this case, students believe that *counterfeit products* can provide the same benefits as genuine products. Meanwhile, high *self-efficacy or confidence in one's ability to buy counterfeit products tends to show great interest in purchasing counterfeit products* . However, the influence of positive *self-efficacy on intention to purchase counterfeit products* is not always significant, indicating that other factors may be more dominant in influencing purchasing decisions such as perceived usefulness, price and quality of the product purchased.

Corresponding Author:

Dominika Sujani,
Management Study Program,
Shanti Bhuana Bengkayang Institute
Email: dominikasujani@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Product purchases among adults are no longer based on need but rather on personal desires to improve self-identity. In many cases, consumer purchasing decisions are no longer based on needs, but are often driven by personal desires and wishes to be accepted or recognized in their environment. Many consumers, especially the younger generation, buy branded products to improve their physical appearance and self-esteem. This is often influenced by factors that encourage someone to behave in this way, such as their psychology (Yanuardianto, 2019) . Consumer purchasing behavior is not only based on how consumers behave but also why they behave that way (Prasetyaningtyas, 2015) .

Consumer behavior is closely related to their needs because it is based on consumer needs and desires. According to Maslow, needs are desires that encourage someone to act or do something to fulfill needs (Heylighen, 1992) . These needs can encourage individuals to buy products that they think can meet their needs. This may trigger individuals to purchase *counterfeit products* . *Counterfeit* products are products that are intentionally sold without the permission of the brand owner or copyright. Counterfeit products are usually sold at a cheaper price than genuine products, but the

quality is usually lower and does not meet the standards set by the brand or copyright owner (Nasira, 2022) .

According to Maslow's theory, these needs are the core of human nature in living life. Basically, conscious actions or desires have many different motives, which means that each person is motivated to fulfill those desires. Thus it can be said that, as living creatures and social creatures, humans should fulfill their needs, whether driven from within themselves or from the encouragement of others. (Uspessy, 2018) . Based on research conducted (Debora, 2017) in an article about buying and hating counterfeit goods, Indonesia is a country with quite high consumers of counterfeit goods which resulted in Indonesia experiencing a loss of IDR 65.1 trillion in 2014 due to counterfeit goods. This is a big challenge for the government in overcoming this problem and also for industries that produce genuine goods in increasing company income.

Consumers play a very important role in identifying and avoiding counterfeit goods. In purchasing decisions, consumers can influence their decision to purchase a product through evaluation of quality and price, perception of counterfeit products, and self-confidence to differentiate between genuine and counterfeit products. On the other hand, self-efficacy can also influence consumers' decisions to buy counterfeit products. Self-efficacy is a person's belief about their ability to organize, carry out tasks, achieve goals, make things, and do certain things (Zagoto, 2019) . According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is the belief in doing something to overcome a situation so that the expected results can be achieved (Rustika, 2012) . Consumers who have high self-efficacy will be more resistant and focus on original products rather than *counterfeit products.* On the other hand, consumers who have low self-efficacy tend to increase their buying interest in *counterfeit products* to fulfill their needs and desires. Therefore, consumer self-efficacy plays an important role in forming attitudes and purchasing interest in *counterefit products* (Nasira, 2022) .

Judging from *the life style* of students in West Kalimantan, they tend to be consumptive when buying a product, this is based on research conducted by (Basri, 2019) on PPAPK FKIP Economic Education students, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak. Also research conducted by (Syahrudin, 2013) on Economic Education students at FKIP, Tananjungpura University, Pontianak. These two studies show that students like to follow *trends* in their surroundings, they tend to buy products because of the discounts offered through social media. Apart from that, there are internal factors (personality), shopping activities are done to relieve stress, as well as external factors (cultural) they do impulsive buying where there are items that are trending, *they* will follow them and want to own these items. By following developments in *trends* , students think that they are able to improve their self-image which becomes their identity. The aim of this research is to analyze the influence of *self-efficacy, outcome expectancy* and *social influence* on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products* and to provide a better understanding of the factors that influence interest in purchasing *counterfeit products*, especially among students in West Kalimantan.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is located in West Kalimantan. This is due to the ease of researchers in selecting dynamic student samples who have fast responsiveness, and have sensitivity and speed in accessing new information. In this study the population was all students from West Kalimantan. This population was chosen because it is diverse and very dynamic, responsive and sensitive to changes and new things.

The sampling used was *purposive sampling.* A sample that is suitable for SEM (*Structural Equation Model*) analysis is a sample of 100-200 samples, a large sample will make it difficult to obtain a viable SEM model so it is necessary to determine a minimum sample count (Hair, *et al* 2010) . The minimum sample calculation in SEM analysis uses the formula (Hair, *et al* 2010) namely 5 to 10 x (number of latent variables + number of indicators). The minimum sample is 16 x 5 to 10 = 80 to 160 respondents and in this case it is considered sufficient to represent the population to be studied.

The data collection tool used was a questionnaire. The type of instrument used is an *online questionnaire* by asking respondents questions via Google form. The measurement scale used is a Likert scale with the following details: scale five strongly agree (SS), scale four agree (S), scale three neutral (N), scale two disagree (TS), scale one strongly disagree (STS) .

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Validity test

Validity test is a test that functions to see whether a measuring instrument used is valid or invalid. A questionnaire is said to be valid if the statements in the questionnaire can reveal something that is measured by the questionnaire (Janna, 2021) .

This validity test was carried out using SPSS (*Statistical Package for the Social Science*) software version 16.0 for Windows 10 based on the following criteria: if r count > r table, then the statement can be declared valid, if r count < r table, then the statement can be declared invalid . The results of this validity test can be seen from the statements given to respondents in the following table:

Table 1 . Validity test results

Variable	Indicator code	R count	R table	information
Self Efficacy	X1.1	0.801	0.278	Valid
	X1.2	0.777	0.278	Valid
	X1.3	0.566	0.278	Valid
	X1.4	0.748	0.278	Valid
	X1.5	0.781	0.278	Valid
Outcome Expectancy	X2.1	0.894	0.278	Valid
	X2.2	0.849	0.278	Valid
	X2.3	0.787	0.278	Valid
	X2.4	0.921	0.278	Valid
	X2.5	0.822	0.278	Valid
Social Influence	X3.1	0.932	0.278	Valid
	X3.2	0.901	0.278	Valid
	X3.3	0.914	0.278	Valid
	X3.4	0.935	0.278	Valid
	X3.5	0.959	0.278	Valid
counterfeit products	Y1	0.941	0.278	Valid
	Y2	0.926	0.278	Valid
	Y3	0.960	0.278	Valid
	Y4	0.959	0.278	Valid

Based on the table above, it can be explained that all indicators on the variables (*self efficacy, outcome expectancy, social influence* and interest in buying *counterfeit products*) show that all variables are declared valid because the calculated r value is greater than the table r value (0.278) for each indicator. The determination of the r table value is obtained from r table = df (N-2) with a two-way test significance level, so that the r table value obtained is 0.278 (50-2).

Reliability test

Reliability testing is a test used to determine whether the data produced from a questionnaire can be said to be reliable or not. This test is important in research to ensure the data obtained is stable and reliable. An instrument with only two answer choices is said to be reliable if the value of ri > rt, while an instrument with more than two answer choices is said to be reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient is > 0.70 (Yusup et al., 2018). A high level of reliability indicates that the instrument The measures used in research are reliable and consistent in measuring the constructs studied.

Table 2. Reliability test results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Information
Self-efficacy	0.789	Reliable
Outcome expectancy	0.908	Reliable
Social influence	0.959	Reliable
counterfeit products	0.961	Reliable

Based on the table above, the Cronbach's Alpha value for each research variable (*self efficacy, outcome expectancy, social influence* and interest in purchasing *counterfeit products*) shows a high level of reliability, namely > 0.7, meaning very reliable. The *self efficacy* variable has a value of 0.789

which shows that the variable is reliable. *The outcome expectancy* variable has a value of 0.908, indicating that the variable is reliable, the *social influence variable* has a value of 0.959, indicating that the variable is reliable, and the variable interest in buying *counterfeit* products has a value of 0.961, indicating that the variable is reliable. So it can be concluded that all variables in this study have met the reliability criteria, namely Cronbach's Alpha value > 0.70.

Sample adequacy test

The sample adequacy test using KMO and Barlett's Test aims to determine the suitability of a variable and to test the accuracy of factor analysis, whether pairs of statement items in the questionnaire can be explained by other variables. A large KMO value indicates that the data is suitable for factorial analysis, while significant results from Bartlett's test indicate that there is a relationship between the variables in factorial analysis.

Table 3. KMO and Bartlett's Test Results

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,814
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	739911
	df	6
	Sig.	,000

Based on the KMO and Barlett's table in table 3 above, the value of KMO (*Measure of Sampling Adequacy*) is 0.814 (>0.5). This shows that the sample adequacy test has met the sample adequacy criteria, meaning that the data taken is sufficient to carry out further data processing because a value of 0.814 explains that the sample is adequacy.

Normality test

According to Ghozali (2016) the normality test is carried out to test whether the distribution of the independent and dependent variables in the regression model is normal or not normal. In this research, the normality test was carried out using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test approach, namely with significance above 0.05, the data has a normal distribution. Meanwhile, if the results of the One Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov test produce a significance value below 0.05, then the data does not have a normal distribution.

Table 4 . Normality test results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Self-efficacy	Outcome expectancy	Socialinfluence	Interest in purchasing counterfeit products
N		200	200	200	200
Normal Parameters [a]	Mean	4.1770	3.7090	3.6870	3.6912
	Std. Deviation	.71317	1.05140	1.15312	1.14495
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.131	,164	,167	,166
	Positive	.124	,110	.127	.127
	Negative	-.131	-.164	-.167	-.166
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1,849	2,320	2,361	2,352
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,002	,000	,000	,000
a. Test distribution is Normal.					

Based on table 4. above, the normality test results show a significance value of less than 0.05 for 4 variables (*self efficacy, outcome expectancy, social influence on interest in buying counterfeit* products). This shows that the data in this study is not normally distributed. Even though the data in this study is not normally distributed, this research still uses this data for further analysis. This is

because the number of samples used is included in the large sample category, namely more than 100, so the problem of normality can be ignored (Hair, *et al 2018)* .

Multicollinearity Test
According to Ghozali (2016), the multicollinearity test was carried out to determine whether the regression model found contained a correlation between the independent variables. To determine whether there is multicollinearity in the regression model, it can be seen from the tolerance value and the value of *the Variance Inflation Factor* (VIF). In this case, if the tolerance value is more than 0.10 and the VIF value is less than 10 for all variables, then multicollinearity does not occur (Ghozali, 2013). The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen in table 4.5 below.

Table 5 . Multicollinearity test results

Variable	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Self Efficacy	0.722	1,386
Outcome Expectancy	0.251	3,982
Social Influence	0.266	3,762

Based on table 5 above, it shows that the independent variables in this research data are free from multicollinearity. This can be seen in the tolerance value in table 5 above, namely the value is more than 0.10 and the VIF value is less than 10. From the values obtained it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity between the variables in this study.

Model Accuracy Test
The model accuracy test is used to measure how far a regression model can explain variations in the dependent variable. The accuracy of the model in interpreting actual values can be measured through the coefficient of determination (R^2), the statistical value of the F data test and the statistical value of the t data test. In this research there is one dependent variable, namely Interest in Buying *Counterfeit Products.*

Table 6 . Regression Model Accuracy Test

Variable independent	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	Dependent variable is Interest in Buying *Counterfeit Products*		
				β	t	sig
Self Efficacy				0.021	0.621	0.535
Outcome Expectancy	0.842	0.840	348,216	0.266	4,700	0,000
Social Influence				0.668	12,139	0,000

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)
R^2 is the determinant coefficient (R^2) which is used to test the ability of the independent variable to predict the dependent variable with a coefficient between 0 and 1. The higher the R^2 value, the greater the power in explaining the regression equation and the better it is at predicting the dependent variable (Hair, 2010) . From table 6 above, it can be seen that the Adjusted R Square is 0.840 which explains that the ability of the independent variables (*self efficacy, outcome expectancy,* and *social influence*) to predict the dependent variable (interest in buying *counterfeit products*) is 84 percent of the variance while 16 percent is influenced. by other variables outside the model.

F test
The F test is an appropriate research model with the procedure chosen to see *the goodness of fit* (f test) of the research model used. The aim is to find out whether the regression model used can explain variations in the dependent variable well. The f test criteria are as follows:
    Ho: there is no significant effect simultaneously
    Ha: there is a significant influence simultaneously
    Ha: accepted if F count < F table,
    Ho: rejected if F count > F table.
Based on table 6 above, it explains that the F value of 348.216 shows a significance of 0.000, which can state that this research is able to describe the actual reality in the field.

t test

The t test is used to see whether or not there is a partial influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The t test criteria are if the t test is significant <0.05 then the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable, if the value is >0.05 it shows that it has no effect.

Based on table 6 above, the t test on each variable is as follows:

Self Efficacy t = 0.621, sig = 0.535 (>0.05), *Outcome Expectancy* t = 4,700, sig = 0.000 (<0.05) and *Social Influence* t = 12,139, sig = 0.000 (>0.05).

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the *self-efficacy variable* and the *social influence variable* have no effect on purchase interest in *counterfeit products* because the t and sig values show >0.05. Meanwhile, *the outcome expectancy* variable influences the interest in purchasing *counterfeit products* because the t and sig values are <0.05.

Hypothesis Testing Results

The results of hypothesis testing can be seen in the following table: .

Table.7 Hypothesis testing results

Variable	t	sig	Statement	Results
Self Efficacy	0.621	0.535	*Self Efficacy* has a positive but not significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products*	Not supported
Outcome Expectancy	4,700	0,000	*Outcome expectancy* has a positive and significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products*	Supported
Social Influence	12,139	0,000	*Social influence* has a positive and significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products.*	Supported

Discussion of hypothesis testing results

In this research, the results of IBM SPSS version 16 processing were obtained, namely that only the *outcome variables expectancy* and *social influence* had a positive and significant effect on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products.* Meanwhile, another variable, namely *self-efficacy,* has a positive but not significant effect on interest in buying *counterfeit products* . This means that consumers' *outcome expectancy* influences their decisions regarding price and risk. If consumers perceive *counterfeit products* to be of high quality without high risks, then their trust in *counterfeit products* will increase and consumers who do not believe that buying *counterfeit products* will provide the same benefits as original products at lower costs will also increase their trust in *counterfeit products.* . Likewise with the *social influence variable* , individuals feel strong social pressure or influence to buy *counterfeit products* , they are more likely to have a high interest in the product. So these two variables are very important factors in determining consumer interest in counterfeit products.

Another variable, namely *self-efficacy* , has a positive but not significant effect on interest in buying *counterfeit products* , meaning that an individual's *self-efficacy* (self-confidence) to buy *counterfeit products* is not always influenced by their self-confidence factor because the decision to buy *counterfeit products* does not only depend on *self-efficacy* (self-confidence) but is also influenced by perceptions of usefulness, price and quality of the product purchased.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that first, *self-efficacy* has a positive but not significant influence on interest in purchasing *Couterfeit products* . This happens because students who have high *self-efficacy* or confidence in their ability to buy *counterfeit products* tend to show great interest in purchasing *counterfeit products* . However, the influence of positive *self-efficacy on intention to purchase counterfeit products* is not always significant, indicating that other factors may be more dominant in influencing purchasing decisions. Second, *outcome expectancy* shows a positive and significant influence on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products.* This happens because *outcome expectancy* , namely beliefs about the expected consequences of purchasing *counterfeit products* , has a big influence on purchase intention. Students who believe that *counterfeit products* can provide benefits similar to genuine products without significant risks tend to have a

higher interest in purchasing *counterfeit products.* Third, *social influence* shows a positive and significant influence on interest in purchasing *counterfeit products* . This happens because the influence of friends, family and social media play an important role in students' decisions to buy *counterfeit products* . Students who feel high social pressure or encouragement to buy *counterfeit products tend to be more interested in buying counterfeit* products which is an important factor in influencing their interest in buying because of social norms and perceived acceptance of the surrounding environment. In this research, there are limitations where the distribution of questionnaires in this research is limited to those who know or have seen *counterfeit products* and students from West Kalimantan who can fill out the questionnaire. Distribution of the questionnaire was carried out indirectly, namely using Google Form. When collecting data, the information obtained from respondents is not all in accordance with the respondents' actual opinions, because each person's thoughts and understanding are different. With the findings obtained, manufacturers and sellers of original products are expected to collaborate between manufacturers and official sellers to provide special discounts or loyalty programs to students in order to encourage purchases of original products. Meanwhile, students themselves need to be aware of and control *their self-efficacy, outcome expectations* and *social influence* to avoid purchasing behavior *of counterfeit products.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Aisyah, IN, & Setiawan, M. (2014). Factors that Influence Consumer Attitudes and Interest in Purchasing Counterfeit Brand Handbag Products. *Journal of Management Applications* , *12* , 1–10.

Asnawi, A. (2015). The Influence of Social and Personal Factors on Consumer Attitudes and Intention to Buy Fake Fashion Goods. *Journal of Administrative Sciences* , *84* .

Bandura, A. (1989). *Human Agency in Social Cognitive Theory* . 1175–1184.

Basri, M., & Kuswanti, H. (2019). *Factors that Influence the Consumptive Behavior of PPAPK FKIP Economics Education Students, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak* . 1–10.

Collado, S., & Evans, G. W. (2019). Outcome expectancy : A key factor to understand childhood exposure to nature and children's pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* , *61* (March 2018), 30–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.12.001

Deborah, Y. (2017). *Buying and hating counterfeit goods* .

Febri Nurhandayani. (2021). THE INFLUENCE OF SELF-EFFICACY AND INSTAGRAM CONTENT ON INTEREST IN ACCESSING THE KEMDIKBUD'S HOME LEARNING PORTAL Febri Nurhandayani. *Journal of ICT in Education* , *8* (1).

Gangga Anuraga, Artanti Indrasetianingsih, MA (2021). Basic Statistical Hypothesis Testing Training Using R Software. *Budimas Journal* , *03* (02), 327–334.

Hair, JFH, Black, WC, Babin, BJ, Anderson, RE, Black, WC, & Anderson, RE (2018). *Multivariate Data Analysis.*

Hair, J.F.J. et al. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis. Prentice Hall, International,* Inc.

Heylighen, F. (1992). *A cognitive-systemic reconstruction of Maslow's theory of self-actualization* . *37* , 39–57.

Hsu, M., Ju, T.L., Yen, C., & Chang, C. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations $. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* , *65* , 153–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2006.09.003

Janna, N.M. (2021). The concept of validity and reliability testing using SPSS. *2021-01-21* , 1–12. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/v9j52

Kartika Prasetyaningtyas, ESI (2015). *Self-Esteem and Intention to Purchase Fashion Products* . *4* (4), 180–185.

Khairunnisa, A. (2023). *The Influence of Digital Marketing, Prices and Customer Expectations on Interest in Buying Make Over Products at the Palembang Icon Store* . Tridinanti University, Palembang.

Luc, PT (2020). Outcome Expectations and Social Entrepreneurial Intention: Integration of Planned Behavior and Social Cognitive Career Theory *. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* , *7* (6), 399–407. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no6.399

Moh. Toriqul Chaer. (2016). Moh. Toriqul Chaer, Self Efficacy and Education. *AL Murabbi Journal* , *3* , 106–122.

Nancy R. Lee, P. K. (2015). *Social Marketing: Changing Behaviors for Good* .

Nasira, W.E. (2022). Factors that Influence Purchase Interest and Their Impact on Actual Purchases of Counterfeit Products (Study of Students at the Faculty of Business and Economics, Islamic University of Indonesia). *Indonesian Journal of Economics, Business, Accounting, and Management* , *01* (01), 32–50.

Nico Rifanto Halim, DAI (2019). The influence of product quality, price and competition on purchasing interest. *Journal of Management and Business Research (JRMB) UNIAT Faculty of Economics Vol.4, No.3, October 2019: 415 - 424 P-ISSN 2527–7502 E-ISSN 2581-2165* , *4* (3), 415–424.

Noor, M., Azila, N., Aman, B.D., & Li, L. (2019). The Influences of moral judgment, social influence and attitude on non-deceptive behavior. *Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales* , *23* , 1–18.

Paananen, M., Aro, T., Viholainen, H., Koponen, T., Tolvanen, A., Westerholm, J., & Aro, M. (2019). Self-regulatory efficacy and sources of efficacy in elementary school pupils: Self-regulatory experiences in a population sample and pupils with attention and executive function difficulties. *Learning and Individual Differences* , *70* (January), 53–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.01.003

Pangestu, R. (2017). *The influence of price perception, perceived usefulness, ethical self-efficacy on online piracy, and perceived value on interest in buying music on digital applications* .

Pokhrel, P., Little, M.A., Fagan, P., Muranaka, N., & Herzog, T.A. (2014). Addictive Behaviors Electronic cigarette use outcome expectations among college students. *Addictive Behaviors* , *39* (6), 1062–1065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.02.014

Rustika, M. (2012). *Self-Efficacy: A Review of Albert Bandura's Theory* . *20* (1), 18–25.

Samaddar, S., Chatterjee, R., Misra, B., & Tatano, H. (2014). International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction Outcome-expectancy and self-efficacy : Reasons or results of flood preparedness intention? *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* , *8* , 91–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.02.002

Sari, SP (2020). *The Relationship between Purchase Interest and Consumer Purchase Decisions* . *8* (1), 147–155.

Satria Putra Utama, RKS, & M, AS (2019). Counterfeit cosmetic products: purchase intention based on the influence of social factors and personal factors. *Scientific Journal of Asian Business and Economics* , *15* , 1–9. https://doi.org/10.32812/jibeka.v15i2.377

Syahrudin, H. (2013). *Analysis of Changes in Consumptive Behavior among Migrant Students (Case Study of Economics Education Students at FKIP Untan)* . 1–8.

Uspessy, H.T. (2018). *Study of Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs on Fulfilling the Needs of the Elderly at the White Cross Nursing Home, Salatiga* .

William Stanza loyalist. (2018). *The Influence of Counterfeit Proneness on Counterfeit Purchase Intention for Counterfeit Clothing in Surabaya* . *7* (1), 1533–1547.

Yanuardianto, E. (2019). Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory. *Auladuna Journal* , *01* (02), 94–111.

Yusup, F., Studi, P., Biology, T., Islam, U., & Antasari, N. (2018). Validity and Reliability Test of Quantitative Research Instruments. *Tarbiyah Journal: Educational Scientific Journal* , *7* (1), 17–23.

Zagoto, L. (2019). *Self-Efficacy in the Process* . *2* , 386–391.