

## Fraud hexagon and fraud: Love of money as moderation

Aisyah Afifah, Eddy Suranta, Anita Anggraini

Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Bengkulu University

\*Corresponding author: [aisyahafifah1234@gmail.com](mailto:aisyahafifah1234@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

This research aims to provide empirical evidence regarding the influence of the fraud hexagon on fraud which is moderated by love of money. This research uses a quantitative approach with distributing questionnaires. This research has been tested using SMART-PLS version 3.2.9. The sample in the study was selected using a purposive sampling method with a total of 89 samples of Bengkulu bank employees in Bengkulu province. The results of this research show that the variables of opportunity, capability, arrogance, collusion and arrogance which are moderated by love of money have a positive effect on fraud in banking. Pressure and rationalization have effect on fraud in banking. Meanwhile, pressure, rationalization, capability, and collusion moderated by love of money have no effect on fraud in banking. But opportunity moderated by love of money have negative effect on fraud in banking. It is hoped that this research can provide additional information and understanding regarding what influences fraud in banking. The limitations of this research lie in the small number of samples so it is felt that it does not accurately represent the total number of Bengkulu bank employees in Bengkulu Province. The fraud hexagon model studied is still relatively new, so there are still minimal comparison references, and it is difficult for respondents to answer honestly because the questionnaire statements are an average of sentences negative meaning.

Keywords: Fraud hexagon, love of money

---

### INTRODUCTION

Fraud is a behavior carried out by one party intentionally and consciously that causes harm to another party. (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners Indonesia, 2019), fraud is defined as a form of abuse of position in order to achieve individual benefits by misusing resources or assets in the organization that can be done by all layers, so that almost no institution or institution can be separated from fraud. In 2018, the majority of fraud cases occurred in Indonesia in the form of misuse of state and company assets as much as 89%, corruption as much as 38%, and financial statement fraud as much as 10%. This result is different from 2019, namely corruption with 64.4% occupying the first position and followed by misuse of state assets/wealth 28.9% and financial statement fraud 6.7% (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners Indonesia, 2019). This is due to the increase in corruption cases in Indonesia accompanied by the declining performance of The KPK (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, English: Corruption Eradication Commission) in cracking down on existing cases (Alamsyah et al., 2018).

In addition, banks are also businesses that have a fairly high risk (Pradnyawati & Et.all, 2017).. As stated in the Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 18/POJK.03/2016 concerning the Application of Risk Management for Commercial Banks, it is stated that banks have various risks that must be faced such as credit risk, market risk, liquidity risk, operational risk, compliance risk, legal risk, reputation risk, and strategic risk. In the case in Bengkulu province, especially at Bengkulu bank on September 4, 2019, there has been an arrest of a former employee of Bank Bengkulu for a case of breaking into Bank Bengkulu at the Curup branch worth Rp 1 billion (Juhriyadi, 2019). On August 4, 2021, there were reports of former employees of Bengkulu Bank with the initials IC who committed banking crimes by receiving fees or taking customer benefits during loan disbursement (Imran, 2021). On July 6, 2021, there were allegations of rewarding the regional device organization treasurer as much as 1 percent of the total civil servants loan by Bank Bengkulu and paid every month from 2015 to 2019 estimated at around IDR 15 billion (Raflesia, 2021).

Love of money is one of the supporting indicators of fraud. (Sugiantari & Widanaputra, 2016) define love of money as a personality who loves money, both in material form, which can also be implemented in the form of objects or other material goods using the money they have. Individuals who have a love of money behavior, then he seems obsessed with money. The purpose is solely to earn money. If not immediately followed up, fraud can threaten the growth of a company. Therefore, many theories have emerged that discuss the indicators of the causes of fraud, one of which is fraud hexagon theory. Fraud hexagon theory was initiated by Georgios L. Vousinas in 2019 which is a development of fraud triangle theory by (Cressey, 1953), fraud diamond theory by (Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004), and fraud pentagon theory proposed by (Horwath, 2011).

This research was conducted because there is still a research gap, which is different from the results of previous research from (Baz et al., 2016), (Susandra & Hartina, 2017), (Said et al., 2017), (Muhsin, Kardoyo, & Nurkhin, 2018), (Budiartini et al., 2019), (Omukaga, 2020), (Apriani, 2020), (Suryandari & Pratama, 2021b), (Gede et al., 2022). In the variable love of money (Ningsih et al., 2022) and (Husnurrosyidah, 2019) revealed that love of money has a positive influence on fraud. Tripermata (2016) revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship in love of money relationships to cheating tendencies. That led researchers to want to reexamine the study. Related to love of money as explained above that this variable has an influence on fraud. In this study, researchers want to retest by putting the love of money variable as a moderation variable.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPHOTESIS DEVELOPMENT

### Literature Review

#### *Fraud hexagon theory*

In 2019 Georgios L. Vousinas developed a pentagon fraud theory by adding an element of collusion called fraud hexagon theory. So that this fraud theory contains 6 elements that cause fraud including pressure, opportunity, rationalization, and capability, arrogance, and collusion called the S.C.C.O.R.E model. (Vousinas, 2019) explained that the term collusion refers to the actions of two or more people where they agree to deceive third parties by taking their rights.

#### **GONE Theory**

According to Jack Bologne in (Tirto S, 2011) elaborated that there are 4 factors that cause fraud, namely greed, opportunities, needs and exposures called GONE Theory. Greed is a greedy behavior that can continue to develop in every human being. Opportunities or opportunities have a relationship with events in an organization/institution or community that opens opportunities for every individual to commit fraud. Needs refer to the indicators that everyone needs to live a normal and proper life. Exposure or disclosure is behavior that refers to perpetrators who must receive the impact if found guilty of fraud.

#### **Attribution Theory**

The theory was created by (Heider, 1967), developed by Jones and Davis (1965) and Kelly (1967). This theory examined how humans analyze, interpret, and draw conclusions from the information around them and how to perceive and think about others, both about their attitudes, intentions, feelings and actions and relationships with each other (Heider, 1967). (Ross, 1977) explained that every behavior or action of a person is caused by internal or external factors. In short, this theory studied what is behind a person in doing an action caused by internal and external factors.

#### *Fraud*

Fraud is a planned activity that is deliberately carried out by someone to harm others which will certainly have a negative impact on the community, as well as the environment where he works. (ACFE, 2022)

grouped fraud into three parts, namely Corruption, Asset Misappropriation, and Financial Statement Fraud.

### ***Love of money***

This theory was put forward by (Tang, 1992) who published the Love of money theory as reading material about human psychology. This theory is applied to assess a person's subjective feelings about money. In the next study, (Tang & Chiu, 2003) explained that there is a love of money scale that contains 4 special indicators, namely motivators, success, importance, and rich. This scale reflects the combined idea of money as a motivator, money symbolizes success, money is important, and I want to be rich.

### **Hyphotesis Development**

#### **The effect of pressure on fraud**

Pressure is the desire to carry out something deviant caused by pressure originating from within and outside the individual itself (Suryandari & Pratama, 2021). The pressure faced can be in the form of financial or non-financial pressure. In the GONE theory, when someone has greed followed by a great need that puts him under pressure, of course, the greater his urge to cheat. As explained in attribution theory, when someone commits an unethical act or commits fraud, it is certainly due to the attribute of cause. In this case, the attribute that causes someone to commit fraud is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon explained that when someone is under pressure, of course, the greater the urge to cheat. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Said et al., 2017), (Omukaga, 2020), dan (Suryandari & Pratama, 2021a) which states that pressure has a positive influence on fraud.

H1 : Pressure has a significant positive effect on fraud

#### **The Effect of opportunity on fraud**

Cressey (1953) explains that fraudsters perceive opportunities when they observe how to use their entrusted position to settle financial matters, and believe that they are unlikely to be punished. That is, if an employee is in a work environment, they occupy a qualified position, with weak internal supervision then they are likely to launch their cheating. The reason is because the employee sees an opportunity from his environment. This is supported by the GONE theory which states that opportunity is a factor in cheating. Explained in attribution theory, there is always a causal attribute in every action of a person. In this case, the attribute of the cause is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon states that when someone gets a high chance, it will certainly increase their chances of cheating. This is reinforced by research conducted by Schuchter & Levi (2016), U. Apriani (2020), and Omukaga (2020) which revealed that opportunity has a positive influence on fraud.

H2 : Opportunity has a significant positive effect on fraud

#### **The Effects of rationalization on fraud**

Rationalization is defined as a form of justification for fraud that has been committed by fraudsters with their own feelings or beliefs (Akomea-Frimpong et al., 2019). In the GONE theory, it could stem from wide-open opportunities and greed that drives someone to cheat. According to attribution theory, there is always a causal attribute when someone commits cheating. In this case, the causative attribute is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon explains that a high level of rationalization leads to a higher chance of someone cheating. This is reinforced by research conducted by Said et al., (2017), U. Apriani (2020), Omukaga (2020), and Suryandari & Pratama (2021) which revealed that rationalization has a positive effect on fraud. In short, the higher the rationalization that exists in the individual, the more likely he will cheat.

H3: Rationalization has a significant positive effect on fraud

#### **The Effect of capability on fraud**

(Wolfe & Hermanson, 2004) state that although a person has been pressured internally and externally, opportunities are wide open with weak supervision, and the person can rationalize his behavior is not necessarily the person can do it if it is not accompanied by ability. In attribution theory, when individuals perform an action there must be attributes of cause. The attribute of the cause of ability is fraud hexagon.

Explained in fraud hexagon, when someone has the ability it will certainly smooth out their cheating tactics. Plus if the person has great needs and ingrained greed as stated in the GONE theory, then of course these two factors will make someone carry out his cheating. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Amin, 2018), (Muhsin, Kardoyo, Arief, et al., 2018), (Muhsin, Kardoyo, & Nurkhin, 2018) and (Apriani, 2020) who stated that capability has a positive influence on fraud.

H4 : Capability has a significant positive effect on fraud

### **The Effect of arrogance influence on fraud**

Howarth (2011) states that arrogance is selfish behavior over rights owned and ignores control, regulations, and internal practices in a company. As explained in attribution theory, there is a causal attribute in every action of a person. The attribute of arrogance is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon states that when humans have a great arrogant nature. In GONE, the theory also explained that weak exposure will make fraudsters not afraid of the law. As explained above with the arrogant nature that someone has, coupled with weak exposure will make someone not afraid to cheat, they will feel, if caught they will immediately get out of the bondage of the law. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Susandra & Hartina, 2017), (Desviana et al., 2020), (Kalau & Leksair, 2020), and (Gede et al., 2022) who stated that capability has a positive influence on fraud.

H5 : Arrogance has a significant positive effect on fraud

### **The Effect of collusion influence on fraud**

Vousinas (2019) explains that the term collusion refers to the actions of two or more people where they agree to deceive third parties by taking their rights. It is explained in the GONE theory that greed makes a person never satisfied and feel enough for what they have. In attribution theory, it is explained that the attribute of the cause of collusion is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon states that collusion is an act of fraud. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Susandra & Hartina, 2017), (Desviana et al., 2020), (Kalau & Leksair, 2020), dan (Gede et al., 2022) who stated that capability has a positive influence on fraud.

H6 : Collusion has a significant positive effect on fraud

### **The role of love of money in moderating pressure variables**

On average, everyone who cheats is caused by money. Someone who has pressure in his life such as an example of installments that are due, desires that are greater than needs will certainly be driven to commit these fraudulent acts. Plus if he has the nature of love of money or love for money then he will be more motivated in carrying out these unethical actions. In line with the GONE theory, people who have the nature of love of money are greedy people and will not feel satisfied. In attribution theory it is stated the same thing, that there is a causal attribute in every event. The causative attribute in this case is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon states that pressure is a contributing factor to fraud. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Wilujeng & Nurlita, 2019), (Ningsih et al., 2022), and (Erdawati et al., 2022) which explains that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H7: Love of money moderates the relationship between pressure variables and fraud variables

### **The role of love of money in moderating opportunity variables**

Wide-open opportunities caused by weak internal oversight cause fraudsters to easily launch their actions. Opportunities can arise anytime and anywhere. In line with attribution theory, hexagon fraud is an attribute of the cause. Fraud hexagon explains that opportunity is a contributing factor to cheating. In the GONE theory, it is explained that someone who has a greedy nature will certainly never feel enough

of what he has. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Muhaimin, 2021), (Paradila et al., 2022), and (Erdawati et al., 2022) which explains that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H8: Love of money moderates the relationship between the opportunity variable and the fraud variable

### **The role of love of money in moderating rationalization variables**

The rationalized mind will assume that the nature of love of money is only to meet its needs and does not feel that it is excessive. In line with the GONE theory, greed is a trait possessed by humans that makes them feel that they will never be enough of what they have. In attribution theory, it is explained that there is always a causal attribute in every event. In this case, the causal attribute of rationalization is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon states that rationalization is a contributing factor to fraud. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Wilujeng & Nurlita, 2019), (Muhaimin, 2021), and (Ningsih et al., 2022) which states that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H9: Love of money moderates the relationship between rationalization variables and fraud variables

### **The role of love of money in moderating capability variables**

Perpetrators who have the ability will certainly be more neat and organized in carrying out their actions. In the theory of GONE it is explained that greed and necessity are factors that cause cheating. Coupled with the nature of love of money that exists in the individual, it will certainly make the person more motivated to cheat. In attribution theory, it is explained that there is a cause attribute in every event. The causative attribute in this case is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon explains that ability is a factor in cheating. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Wilujeng & Nurlita, 2019), (Muhaimin, 2021), and (Ningsih et al., 2022) which states that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H10: Love of money moderates the relationship between ability variables and fraud variables

### **The role of love of money in moderating arrogance variables**

A cheater who has an arrogant nature and a high ego will certainly not be afraid of anything. They have high confidence in the success of their actions. If the nature of love of money is embedded in the perpetrator, it will make him a free and unlimited person in carrying out his actions. In line with the GONE theory, disclosure of cases accompanied by low sentences will make perpetrators underestimate the impact of the fraud they commit. Attribution theory explains that there is always a causal attribute in every deed. In this case, the causative attribute is fraud hexagon. Fraud hexagon explains that arrogance is a contributing factor to fraud. This is reinforced by research conducted by (Wilujeng & Nurlita, 2019), (Ningsih et al., 2022), and (Erdawati et al., 2022) which explains that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H11: Love of money moderates the relationship between the arrogance variable and the fraud variable

### **The role of love of money in moderating collusion variables**

An individual can persuade a friend to commit his fraudulent act and it is called collusion. In the theory of GONE it is stated that greed will make a person make all efforts to obtain his desires. Someone who is greedy and accompanied by the nature of love of money will certainly make the group more collusive. Weak disclosure and punishment make them take the existing law even further. In line with attribution theory, where hexagon fraud is attributed, explains that collusion is one of the factors in fraud. Usually collusion groups consist of various structures within the organization or in different levels of office. This research is reinforced by research conducted by (Muhaimin, 2021), (Paradila et al., 2022), and (Erdawati et al., 2022) which explains that love of money has a significant positive influence on fraud.

H12: Love of money moderates the relationship between collusion variables and fraud variables

This research is a type of survey research that uses quantitative methods. The type of data needed in this study is primary data. Data collection techniques in the form of distributing questionnaires or questionnaires. Researchers distributed questionnaires containing pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, collusion, and love of money and fraud through google forms to all employees of Bank Bengkulu who were included in the sample criteria. The population of this study is all employees of Bank Bengkulu with a total of 787 employees spread across each district of Bengkulu Province such as Bengkulu City, Central Bengkulu, North Bengkulu, Mukomuko, Kepahiang, Rejang Lebong, Lebong, Seluma, South Bengkulu, Kaur and one branch located in the capital city of Indonesia, namely Jakarta. Researchers will only limit the sample of employees working in Bengkulu province, so that 771 employees will be obtained with a sample error percentage of 10%. From the calculation results, 89 respondents were sampled in this study.

Research instruments

Fraud

The measurement on this variable adopted from (ACFE, 2022) with 9 question items.

Pressure

The Measurements on this variable adopted from (Albrecht et al., 2008) with 6 questions items.

Opportunity

The Measurements on this variable adopted from (Albrecht et al., 2012) with 5 questions items.

Rationalization

The Measurements on this variable adopted from (Albrecht et al., 2012) with 4 questions items.

Capability

The measurement on this variable is adopted from Wolfe & Hermanson (2004) with 5 questions items.

Arrogance

The measurement on this variable is adopted from Howarth (2011) with 5 questions items.

Collusion

The measurement on this variable adopts from Tang & Chiu (2003) with 5 questions items.

Love of money

Measurements on this variable adopted from Tang et al., (1997) with 18 questions items.

**Analysis Methods**

According to (Sugiyono, 2018), data analysis is an action taken after collecting data from all respondents. In this study, researchers used the help of Smart PLS 3.2.9 software.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Inner Model**

After the estimated model meets the discriminant validity criteria, the structural model (inner model) is tested. The inner model is to see the relationship between the latent construct and the result of R-Square on the estimation of the path parameter coefficient and the level of significance. Here is table showing the value of R-Square in the study.

**Table 1.** R-Square

Variable	R-Square
<i>Fraud</i> (F)	0,527

Source: SmartPLS Data Processing 3.2.9 (2023)

Testing of structural models is carried out by looking at R-Square which is a goodness-fit test of the model. The pressure, opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, collusion model, with the variable moderation love of money against fraud gives an R-Square value of 0.527 which can be interpreted that the variability of fraud constructs is influenced by 6 independent variables pressure,

opportunity, rationalization, capability, arrogance, collusion and one variable moderation love of money of 52.7%. While 47.2% was influenced by other variables outside the variables studied in this study.

**Table 2.** Path Coefficient

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T-Statistics (O/STDEV)	P- Values
Pressure -> Fraud	-0.104	-0.065	0.134	0.781	0.218
Opportunity -> Fraud	0.203	0.177	0.102	1.991	0.023
Rationalization -> Fraud	0.085	0.075	0.107	0.796	0.213
Capability -> Fraud	0.202	0.201	0.083	2.438	0.008
Arrogance_ -> Fraud	0.161	0.151	0.123	1.313	0.095
Collusion -> Fraud	0.263	0.261	0.114	2.312	0.011
LOM -> Fraud	0.125	0.093	0.125	1.005	0.158
Pressure*LOM (MO1)	-0.132	-0.143	0.14	0.943	0.173
Opportunity*LOM (MO2)	-0.204	-0.172	0.12	1.699	0.045
Rationalization*LOM (MO3)	-0.08	-0.036	0.148	0.539	0.295
Capability*LOM (MO4)	-0.107	-0.102	0.084	1.277	0.101
Arrogance*LOM (MO5)	0.277	0.259	0.155	1.787	0.037
Collusion*LOM (MO6)	0.018	0.061	0.201	0.09	0.464

Source: SmartPLS Data Processing 3.2.9 (2023)

## Discussion

### The Effect of Pressure on Fraud

The effect of pressure on fraud has a negative direction. Which means, pressure has no effect on fraud, which means that pressure has no influence on the fraud that occurs. Research conducted by (Putra & Rahayu, 2019) also shows that pressure has no effect on fraud.

### The Effect of Opportunity on Fraud

The effect of opportunity on fraud has a positive direction. This means that the higher the opportunity someone has, the higher the possibility of fraud that occurs. Research conducted by (Asmah et al., 2019) also showed that opportunity has a positive and significant effect on fraud. Because there are very clear opportunities taken advantage of by employees involved in fraudulent acts. (Schuchter & Levi, 2016) stated that opportunity has a positive and significant effect on fraud.

### The Effect of *Rationalization* on Fraud

The effect of rationalization on fraud has a positive direction. That is, rationalization has no effect on fraud. (Cressey, 1953) explained that often fraudsters issue morally acceptable ideas that justify them in behaving unethically. Research conducted by (Asmah et al., 2019) also showed that rationalization does not have a significant effect on fraud. (Schuchter & Levi, 2016) stated that rationalization has no significant effect on fraud.

### The Effect of Capability on Fraud

The effect of capability on fraud has a positive direction. This means that the higher the capability a person has, the higher the possibility of fraud that occurs. Research conducted by (Asmah et al., 2019) also showed that the ability has a positive and significant effect on fraud. Because there are very clear opportunities taken advantage of by employees involved in fraudulent acts. (Schuchter & Levi, 2016) stated that ability has a positive and significant effect on fraud.

**The Effect of Arrogance on Fraud**

The influence of arrogance on fraud has a positive direction. This means that the higher the arrogance that someone has, the higher the possibility of fraud that occurs. Research conducted by (Susandra & Hartina, 2017) also showed that arrogant has a positive and significant effect on fraud. Because of this arrogant nature, it must be owned by every employee who engages in cheating. (Gede et al., 2022) stated that arrogance has a positive and significant effect on fraud.

**The Effect of Collusion on Fraud**

The table above shows that the effect of collusion on fraud has a positive direction. This means that the higher the collusion a person has, the higher the possibility of fraud that occurs. Research conducted by (Susandra & Hartina, 2017) also showed that collusion has a positive and significant effect on fraud. Because the average perpetrator of fraud always colludes with his other coworkers in committing fraudulent acts. (Kalau & Leksair, 2020) stated that collusion has a positive and significant effect on its existence.

**The effect of Love of money in moderating pressure on fraud**

The effect of pressure on fraud moderated by the nature of love of money has a negative direction. Which means, the nature of love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of pressure on fraud, in other words love of money does not affect pressure on fraud. Although the average respondent answered in the affirmative to questions that referred to budget, crime, justice, success, power in control, happiness, wealth, and motivation for money, the average respondent answered less agree to questions related to self-expression and social influence. They do not agree that money makes him have freedom, money provides opportunities to be what he wants, and money helps in improving the image in society. So that makes the variable love of money unable to strengthen the influence of pressure on fraud. Having a high level of love of money does not necessarily strengthen the occurrence of fraud. This means that with the high nature of love of money in Bengkulu bank employees, it is not certain that they will commit fraud. This is because some measurements in the love of money variable are not relevant to the respondents' circumstances, so they disagree less with the question.

**The effect of Love of money in moderating opportunities on fraud**

The effect of opportunity on fraud moderated by the nature of love of money has a negative and significant direction. That is, the nature of love of money can weaken the influence of opportunity on fraud. Although the average respondent answered in the affirmative of questions referring to budget, crime, justice, success, power in control, happiness, wealth, and motivation for money, the average respondent answered less agree with questions related to self-expression and social influence. They do not agree that money makes him have freedom, money provides opportunities to be what he wants, and money helps in improving the image in society. So that makes the variable love of money weaken the influence of opportunity on fraud. Being employees of Bengkulu bank, they are certainly required to apply company values. So of course there will be employees who take advantage of the nature of love of money on the positive side. In another sense, they do have opportunities and love for money, but it does not necessarily make them cheat, instead they will take advantage of the opportunities that exist by working harder to get bonuses and promotions. This is in accordance with one of the company's values, namely innovation and integrity, namely utilizing abilities and competencies to generate new ideas and creativity towards perfection for the progress of the company and building trust with honesty, responsibility, and carrying out duties with high dedication, as well as upholding and obeying the banker's code of ethics.

**The effect of Love of money in moderating rationalization of fraud**

The effect of rationalization on fraud moderated by the nature of love of money has a negative direction. Which means, the nature of love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of rationalization on fraud, in other words love of money does not affect rationalization of fraud. Although the average respondent answered in the affirmative of questions referring to budget, crime, justice, success, power in



control, happiness, wealth, and motivation for money, the average respondent answered less agree with questions related to self-expression and social influence. They do not agree that money makes him have freedom, money provides opportunities to be what he wants, and money helps in improving the image in society. So that makes the variable love of money has no effect on rationalization of fraud. However, the results of the study stated different results, stating that love of money was not able to strengthen the influence of rationalization on fraud. Having a high level of love of money may not necessarily encourage someone to cheat. Which means, with the high nature of love of money in Bengkulu bank employees, it is not certain that they will commit fraud. Based on theory and also research results that have been presented that love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of rationalization on fraud.

#### **The effect of Love of money in moderating capability of fraud**

That the effect of capability on fraud moderated by the nature of love of money has a negative direction. Which means, the nature of love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of capability on fraud, in other words love of money does not affect the capability to fraud. Although the average respondent answered in the affirmative of questions referring to budget, crime, justice, success, power in control, happiness, wealth, and motivation for money, the average respondent answered less agree with questions related to self-expression and social influence. They do not agree that money makes him have freedom, money provides opportunities to be what he wants, and money helps in improving the image in society. However, there are still many employees who do not agree that their abilities are used to commit fraud. This can be evidenced by the large number of respondents who answered less agree with questions related to self-expression and social influence. So because of this, love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of ability on fraud.

#### **The influence of Love of money in moderating arrogance of fraud**

Based on the results of the study shows a positive and significant direction, which means love of money is able to strengthen the influence of arrogant on fraud. So that having a high level of love of money can certainly encourage fraud based on arrogance. The moderation effect given by the love of money variable on the influence of arrogance on the fraud variable is pure moderator. An employee can be said to have the nature of Love of money when he never feels satisfied with something he has, so to fulfill his desire for money, then he will do everything possible so that his desire is fulfilled. According to (Husnurrosyidah, 2019), love of money is a human act of money, his understanding of money accompanied by his ambitions and aspirations to money. When a person's nature has the nature of acting at will without thinking about others accompanied by ambitions and aspirations for money, then that person will certainly commit fraud. This means that fraudulent acts can be driven by the nature of love of money owned by Bengkulu bank employees.

#### **The effect of Love of money in moderating collusion of fraud**

The table above shows that the effect of collusion on fraud moderated by the nature of love of money has a negative direction. Which means, the nature of love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of collusion on fraud, in other words love of money does not affect the collusion to fraud. Although the average respondent answered in the affirmative of questions referring to budget, crime, justice, success, power in control, happiness, wealth, and motivation for money, the average respondent answered less agree with questions related to self-expression and social influence. They do not agree that money makes him have freedom, money provides opportunities to be what he wants, and money helps in improving the image in society. So that makes the variable love of money unable to strengthen the influence of collusion on fraud. Based on the theory and research results that have been described, love of money is not able to strengthen the influence of collusion on fraud. However, there are still many employees who do not agree that they colluded to commit fraudulent acts. This can be evidenced by the large number of respondents who still answer disapproval of questions that refer to self-expression and social influence. So, because of this, love of money is unable to strengthen the influence of collusion on fraud.

## CONCLUSION

This study aims to prove the influence of pressure, opportunity, rationalization, ability, arrogance, and collusion moderated by love of money on fraud at Bank Bengkulu in Bengkulu Province. Based on the results of testing and analysis in this study, it is known that the variables opportunity, capability, arrogance, and collusion have a positive effect on fraud at Bengkulu bank. Pressure and rationalization have no effect on fraud at Bengkulu banks. In the moderation variable, love of money has a positive effect to arrogance its influence on fraud at Bengkulu banks. While in the opportunity variable, love of money has a negative effect/weakens the influence of opportunity on fraud. Meanwhile, love of money has no effect in moderating the effect of pressure, rationalization, capability, and collusion variables on fraud. It is hoped that this research can provide additional information and understanding related to what are the effects of fraud in Bengkulu banks. So it is expected that the company's managers and directors can anticipate this by improving internal control and conducting regular internal quality audits so that no employee can commit fraud. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to the development of theories about hexagon fraud, GONE theory, and attribution theory. The limitation of this study lies in the small number of samples so that it is felt that it does not accurately represent the total number of Bengkulu bank employees in Bengkulu Province. The hexagon fraud model studied is still relatively new, so there are still minimal comparison references, and it is difficult for respondents to answer honestly because the average sentence questionnaire statement has a negative meaning. The next researcher is expected to increase the number of research samples so that the sample can really represent and make questionnaire statements that have positive meanings or use sentences that will not make respondents feel cornered so that respondents answer honestly.

## REFERENCES

- ACFE. (2022). Occupational Fraud 2022: A Report to the nations. *Association of Certified Fraud Examiners*, 1–96.
- Akomea-Frimpong, I., Andoh, C., Akomea-Frimpong, A., & Dwomoh-Okudzeto, Y. (2019). Control of fraud on mobile money services in Ghana: an exploratory study. *Journal of Money Laundering Control*, 22(2), 300–317.
- Alamsyah, W., Abid, L., & Sunaryanto, A. (2018). Laporan Kegiatan Trend Penindakan Kasus Korupsi. *Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW)*, 1–33.
- Albrecht, W. S., Albrecht, C., & Albrecht, C. C. (2008). Current trends in fraud and its detection. *Information Security Journal*, 17(1), 2–12.
- Albrecht, W. S., Albrecht, C. O., Albrecht, C. C., & Zimbelman, M. F. (2012). *Fraud Examination*.
- Amin, S. N. (2018). Fraud detection of financial statement by using fraud diamond perspective. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 7(3), 878–891.
- Apriani, U. (2020). Pengaruh Komponen-Komponen Fraud Star Terhadap Korupsi Dengan Sistem Pengendalian Intern Pemerintah (Spip) Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *Jurnal Magister Akuntansi Trisakti*, 7(1), 1–24.
- Asmah, A. E., Atuilik, W. A., & Ofori, D. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of staff-related fraud in the Ghanaian banking industry. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 26(3), 669–682.
- Association of Certified Fraud Examiners Indonesia. (2019). Survei Fraud Indonesia 2019. *Indonesia Chapter #111*, 53(9), 1–76.
- Baz, R., Samsudin, R. S., Che-Ahmad, A. B., & Popoola, O. M. J. (2016). Capability component of fraud and fraud prevention in the Saudi Arabian banking sector. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(4), 68–71.
- Budiartini, K., Dewi, G. A. R. S., & Herawati, N. T. (2019). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Terjadinya Kecurangan Akuntansi Dalam Perspektif Fraud Diamond (Studi Empiris pada Bank Perkreditan Rakyat (BPR) Kabupaten Buleleng). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Akuntansi Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, 10(2), 113–123.
- Cressey, D. R. (1953). Other people's money; a study of the social psychology of embezzlement. In *Other people's money; a study of the social psychology of embezzlement*. Free Press.

- Desviana, D., Basri, Y. M., & Nasrizal, N. (2020). Analisis Kecurangan pada Pengelolaan Dana Desa dalam Perspektif Fraud Hexagon. *Studi Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 3(1), 50–73.
- Erdawati, L., Mikrad, & Febrianto, H. G. (2022). Analisis Faktor-faktor Kecenderungan Fraud Accounting Persepsi Pegawai Organisasi Perangkat Daerah Kabupaten Tangerang. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Keuangan*, 11(1), 55–72.
- Gede, I. M., Putra, D., Ayu, N., & Trisna, W. (2022). Pengaruh Elemen Fraud Hexagon terhadap Kecurangan Akuntansi Pada Badan Usaha Milik Desa di Kabupaten Buleleng. 12(2), 339–353.
- Heider, F. (1967). On social cognition. *The American Psychologist*, 22(1), 25–31.
- Horwath, C. (2011). The Mind Behind the Fraudsters Crime: Key Behavioral and Environmental Elements. *United States of America: Crowe Horwath LLP*, 1–62.
- Husnurrosyidah, H. (2019). Pengendalian Internal, Love Of Money Terhadap Kecenderungan Kecurangan Akuntansi di BMT Kabupaten Kudus. *Ekonika : Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Kadiri*, 4(2), 140.
- Imran, T. Y. (2021). Diduga tarik fee dengan nasabah, mantan karyawan Bank Bengkulu dipolisikan. *RMOL Bengkulu*.
- Juhriyadi. (2019, September 4). Buronan mantan pegawai bank BPD Bengkulu ditangkap. *Independensi*.
- Kalau, A. A., & Leksair, S. (2020). Pengaruh Efektivitas Pengendalian Internal, Ketaatan Aturan Akuntansi dan Perilaku Tidak Etis terhadap Kecenderungan Kecurangan Akuntansi (Studi pada Perusahaan Badan Usaha Milik Negara di Ambon). *Cita Ekonomika*, 14(2), 99–110.
- Muhaimin. (2021). Pengaruh Love Of Money dan Religiusitas terhadap Fraud Accounting Anggaran Dana Desa pada Kecamatan Sinjai Tengah. *Journal of Management*, 4(2), 121–133.
- Muhsin, Kardoyo, & Nurkhin, A. (2018). What Determinants of Academic Fraud Behavior? From Fraud Triangle to Fraud Pentagon Perspective. *KnE Social Sciences*, 3(10), 154.
- Muhsin, M., Kardoyo, M., Arief, S., Nurkhin, A., & Pramusinto, H. (2018). *An Analysis of Student's Academic Fraud Behavior*. 164(Iclic 2017), 34–38.
- Ningsih, K. R. R., Budiarta, K., Sujana, I. K., & ... (2022). Budaya Catur Purusa Artha Memoderasi Love of Money dan Sifat Machiavellian, Terhadap Indikasi Fraud. In *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*. ojs.unud.ac.id.
- Omukaga, K. O. (2020). Is the fraud diamond perspective valid in Kenya? *Journal of Financial Crime*, 28(3), 810–840.
- Paradila, I. M. P., Sujana, I. K., Agung, A., Putu, G., & Rasmini, N. K. (2022). *The Influence of Love of Money and Machiavellian Towards Fraud with Faith of Karma Phala as Moderation*. 7(December), 241–253.
- Pradnyawati, S. O., & Et.all. (2017). Risiko Perbankan Dan Profitabilitas. *Jurnal Buletin Studi Ekonomi*, 22(1), 53–64.
- Putra, M. A., & Rahayu, T. (2019). Analisis Fraud Diamond Theory Dalam Pengelolaan Dana Desa di Kecamatan Guntur Kabupaten Demak. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Unimus (Volume 2, 2019)*, 240–248.
- Rafflesia, B. (2021). Kasus dugaan korupsi Rp 15 Miliar Bank Bengkulu terus bergulir. *Berita Rafflesia.Com*.
- Ross, L. (1977). Ross\_Intuitive\_Psychologist\_in\_Adv\_Experiment\_Soc\_Psych\_vol10\_p173.pdf. In *Advances in Experimental Psychology Volume 10* (pp. 173–220).
- Said, J., Alam, M. M., Ramli, M., & Rafidi, M. (2017). Integrating ethical values into fraud triangle theory in assessing employee fraud: Evidence from the Malaysian banking industry. *Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 170–184.
- Schuchter, A., & Levi, M. (2016). The Fraud Triangle revisited. *Security Journal*, 29(2), 107–121.
- Sugiantari, N., & Widanaputra, A. (2016). Pengaruh Idealisme, Relativisme, Dan Love of Money Pada Persepsi Mahasiswa Akuntansi Tentang Krisis Etika Akuntan. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*, 17(3), 2474–2502.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Bisnis: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, kombinasi, dan R&D* (S. Y. Suryandari, Ed.). Alfabeta.
- Suryandari, E., & Pratama, L. V. (2021a). Determinan fraud dana desa: Pengujian elemen fraud hexagon, Machiavellian, dan love of money. In *Reviue Akuntansi dan Bisnis .... scholar.archive.org*.
- Suryandari, E., & Pratama, L. V. (2021b). *Determinan Fraud Dana Desa: Pengujian Elemen Fraud Hexagon, Machiavellian, dan Love of Money*. *Reviu Akuntansi Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 5 (1), 55 ....
- Susandra, F., & Hartina, S. (2017). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kecenderungan Fraud Pada Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (Skpd) Di Kota Bogor. *Jurnal Akumida*, 3(2), 35.

- Tang, T. L. (1992). The meaning of money revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 197–202.
- Tang, T. L., & Chiu, R. K. (2003). *Tang-Chiu2003 Article Income Money Ethic Pay Satisfactio*. 13–30.
- Tirto S, D. (2011). *Implementasi kewaspadaan nasional terhadap bahaya korupsi di lingkungan aparatur pemerintahan guna menumbuhkan kesadaran hukum dalam rangka ketahanan nasional*.
- Vousinas, G. L. (2019). Advancing theory of fraud: the S.C.O.R.E. model. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 26(1), 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2017-0128>
- Wilujeng, R., & Nurlita, N. (2019). Pengaruh Love Of Money Dan Perilaku Tidak Etis Terhadap Kecenderungan Kecurangan (Studi Kasus Karyawan Bagian Keuangan Universitas Brawijaya Malang). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa FEB Universitas Brawijaya*, 7(2), 4.
- Wolfe, D. T., & Hermanson, D. R. (2004). The FWolfe, D. T. and Hermanson, D. R. (2004) 'The Fraud Diamond: Considering the Four Elements of Fraud: Certified Public Accountant', *The CPA Journal*, 74(12), pp. 38–42. doi: DOI:raud Diamond : Considering the Four ElemWolfe, D. T. and Hermanson, D. R. *The CPA Journal*, 74(12), 38–42.