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Abstract

A number of studies have provided evidence of the increasing prevalence of academic dishonesty in academic institutions. Such development is contradictory to the essence of an academic institution’s existence. In this regard, this study was undertaken to identify the factors that significantly influence the likelihood of committing academic misconduct. The results should guide school administrators and faculty in strengthening their school’s academic integrity culture through appropriate policies and other relevant strategies. Guided by Bandura’s social cognitive theory of moral thought and action, data from students of a State-funded university in Southern Philippines were subjected to factor analysis and subsequently, ordinal logistic regression. The factor analysis revealed two distinct factors for academic misconduct – those committed inside and outside the classroom – bringing novelty to the study. In several earlier studies, this construct was studied as a single variable. Results indicate that trust, one of the values of academic integrity culture as well as faculty and peers exhibit significant influence to students’ likelihood of committing academic misconduct providing initial empirical evidence on the determinants to students’ likelihood to commit academic misconduct in the Philippines. No difference was found among business and non-business students in their likelihood of committing academic misconduct.
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Introduction

Every now and then, we come across anecdotal evidence of academic dishonesty of students. The irony of it all comes in the context in which these incidents happen – inside the school or while doing school work. Most institutions of higher learning, if not all, aim for academic excellence and produce moral and upright professionals. However, these anecdotal evidences seem to tell us a different story. In the U.S., academic integrity appears to be plagued with an increasing percentage of students who have committed at least one act of academic dishonesty (Mohr, Ingram, Fell & Mabey, 2011; Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar, 2007).
Academic integrity involves all acts upholding ethical values and maintaining a good moral character within the academic environ and context. Universities and schools often equate this construct with intellectual honesty. American University (2002), for instance, clearly manifests that honesty must permeate in a wide set of activities pertinent to the “pursuit of knowledge and understanding,” such as, using information and formulating arguments. Meanwhile, the International Center for Academic Integrity (2012) defines academic integrity as “a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.”

It must be noted that Presidential Decree No. 603 (1974) of the Philippines, otherwise known as the Child and Youth Welfare Act, provides that, “every child has the right to be brought up in an atmosphere of morality and rectitude for the enrichment and the strengthening of his character,” and that, “Every child has the right to live in a community and a society that can offer him an environment... conducive to the... cultivation of his desirable traits and attributes” (Art. 3). It is therefore imperative that students should be accorded the appropriate milieu in school for their moral development considering the huge amount of time he or she spends on school-related endeavors. This will prove to be a challenge when there is not enough information on the current status of academic integrity of a learning institution and not enough understanding of the dynamics between behaviors of academic dishonesty and its determinants.

As a research theme, academic dishonesty and misconduct has received much attention since the early half of the twentieth century (Hulsart & McCarthy, 2009). Among the reasons driving these research endeavors emanated from the notion that acts of academic dishonesty such as cheating and “unprofessional behavior while in school” will more likely result to unethical behavior in the workplace (Mohr, Ingram, Fell & Mabey, 2011). It is also believed that if an institution of higher learning shall be known for poor academic integrity, the community and other stakeholders may be more likely to lose trust on the degrees conferred on graduates and on the competence and moral character of the graduates themselves.

Meanwhile, several studies on academic dishonesty had focused on business schools. It is, indeed, worthy to mention that business students in the U.S. were generally more unethical in their behavior and attitudes than non-business majors (Smyth & Davis, 2004; Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar, 2007). The question is, “Are these findings true to Filipino business students as well?”

In the Philippines, much of the studies done on academic integrity primarily revolved around cheating on assignments and examinations (Mocorro, 2008; Baillo, 2000; Aliga, 1999; Reyes, 1998; Koo, 1990; Binuya, 1988; Roque, 1988; Abrantes, 1984; Bautista, 1980; Hernandez, 1977), more than half of these involved elementary and high school students while others covered college level students in general. There appears limited literature in the Philippines on determinants of behavioral manifestations of academic integrity.
Given these circumstances, this study aims to further our understanding of academic integrity and its determinants among students in a State–funded higher learning institution. Specifically, this study seeks to find answers to the following research questions.

- How does academic integrity culture influence students’ academic misconduct?
- How do faculty factors influence students’ academic misconduct?
- How do peers affect the students’ academic misconduct?
- Are business students more likely to commit academic misconduct than non-business students?

Indubitably, there had been earlier studies that had focused on individual and contextual factors as determinants of academic dishonesty. In fact, this study adopts the indicators focused on by Teodorescu and Andrei (2009) – faculty and peer influences. The combination of academic integrity culture, faculty influences and peer influences in the contextual or situational drivers block provides a more integrated dimension. This model takes into account not only the effects of teachers and peers on the likelihood of academic misconduct but the effects of institutional culture as well. This will hopefully offer better directions for policy formulation and implementation improvements pertaining to faculty development and academic integrity policy education to all concerned academic constituents.

Henceforth, the paper shall proceed as follows: first, it reviews the extant literature on academic integrity and the factors influencing behaviors of academic integrity or the contrary; second, it describes the methods and data analysis techniques employed in the study; third, the results of the study are discussed; and finally, the paper concludes with recommendations for school administrators and an agenda for future research.

Review Of Related Literature

There are several behavioral theories that shape the research directions of academic integrity conduct. This study particularly anchors its framework on the Social Cognitive Theory of Moral Thought and Action (Bandura, 1991). According to this theory, behavior, cognition and the environment interacts to create the total human experience in a dynamics of reciprocity. In the context of academic integrity, cognition includes moral development/thought, affective self-reaction and commitment to social norms among others. Environmental factors refer to social norms, possible sanctions, codes of conduct, classroom relationship with other students, peers and faculty and a caring college environment and other related aspects. Behavior pertains to actions that show academic integrity and professionalism.
As the theory suggests, all these factors work together such that behavior cannot be attributed to only one factor because it also impacts an individual’s thoughts and his surroundings. However, it is deemed an appropriate starting point in the understanding of these dynamic relationships by focusing on the effects of environmental factors to academic integrity conduct.

What Is Academic Misconduct?

Academic dishonesty is easily associated with cheating and plagiarism. As mentioned earlier, most studies in the Philippines have focused on these two acts of academic dishonesty. For this study, academic integrity conduct shall be construed based on the description of Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar (2007): a construct that encompasses multiple forms of academic deviance including but not limited to test cheating, plagiarism, and inappropriate collaboration (p.382).

Academic Integrity Culture And Academic Misconduct

Organizational culture has been defined as “a common perception held by the organization’s members; a system of shared meaning” (Robbins, 2005). It establishes an organization’s prescribed standards of behavior and acts as a regulatory mechanism (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996). In higher education institutions, integrity is among the core values that guides staff,
faculty and students alike in their actions (MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology, 2012). Specifically, academic integrity culture refers to “an institution’s values regarding promoting academic honesty as well as preventing and punishing academic misconduct” (Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar, 2007; p. 384).

The International Center for Academic Integrity, a consortium of 200 academic institutions, describes each of the fundamental values of an academic community of integrity as presented in Table 1 (ICAI, 1999).

Table 1. Fundamental values of academic integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>“...advances the quest for truth and knowledge by requiring intellectual and personal honesty in learning, teaching, research, and service. ...Campus policies uniformly deplore cheating, lying, fraud, theft, and other dishonest behaviors that jeopardize the rights and welfare of the community and diminish the worth of academic degrees” (p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>“...fosters a climate of mutual trust, encourages the free exchange of ideas, and enables all to reach their highest potential. ...Trust is also promoted by faculty who set clear guidelines for assignments and for evaluating student work; by students who prepare work that is honest and thoughtful; and by schools that set clear and consistent academic standards and that support honest and impartial research” (p. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>“...establishes clear standards, practices, and procedures and expects fairness in the interactions of students, faculty, and administrators... Fair and accurate evaluation is essential in the educational process. For students, important components of fairness are predictability, clear expectations, and a consistent and just response to dishonesty” (p. 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>“...recognizes the participatory nature of the learning process and honors and respects a wide range of opinions and ideas” (p. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>“...upholds personal accountability and depends upon action in the face of wrongdoing... Being responsible means taking action against wrongdoing, despite peer pressure, fear, loyalty, or compassion” (p. 9).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, student behaviors in school are both directly and indirectly affected by academic honesty policies (Imran & Ayobami, 2011). In several studies, the existence of honor codes largely frames the students’ attitudes towards academic integrity and academic dishonesty (McCabe & Pavela. 2004; McCabe, Butterfield & Treviño, 2003; McCabe & Pavela. 2000; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999). However, being aware of the need to deal with institutional culture issues before endeavors pertaining to the creation of a student honor code is vital (Hendershott, Drinan & Cross (2000). Von Dran, Callahan and Taylor (2001) observed that it is possible to improve students’ academic integrity by introducing interventions such as a conventional policy. Imran & Ayobami (2011) asserts, however, that “it is not enough to
formulate standard policies, translating the policy into a meaningful action via judicious implementation is equally more important” (p. 9) because if academic honesty policies are perceived to be ineffective, many students are more likely to engage in academic dishonesty (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999; Scanlan, 2006).

Thomas and Sassi (2011) asserted that “an open, in-depth discussion about academic dishonesty may help students (and teachers) develop ethical approaches to scholarship.” Meanwhile, Hulsart and McCarthy (2009) suggest the creation of an ethical classroom environment as compared to an institutional intervention. Boehm, Justice and Weeks (2009) found four initiatives to be significant in reducing scholastic dishonesty: faculty training, effective classroom management strategies, and clear definitions and examples of cheating. In the same study, significant differences were found between private institutions and community colleges in two initiatives – encouragement of more collaboration on homework and effective classroom management strategies. Scanlan (2006) posits that a “comprehensive institutional culture of academic integrity” involving deterring, detecting and imposing “rigorous” sanctions to errant can promote a climate of academic integrity and minimize plagiarism and cheating.

In the Philippines, there is a perceived prevalence of cheating among college students and that only few seem to be convinced of the effectiveness and usefulness of cheating policies (Mocorro, 2008).

As a factor to academic misconduct, academic integrity culture has been found to be a major determinant of students’ views towards cheating and other forms of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Trevino, 1997; McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 2002). This is confirmed by Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar (2007) who identified integrity culture as a significant influencer to various cheating perceptions.

In this study, this construct is largely defined by the fundamental values of academic integrity postulated by the International Center for Academic Integrity (2012).

**H1:** The likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as the strength of the academic integrity culture in terms of (a) honesty, (b) fairness; (c) responsibility; (d) trust; and (e) respect increases.

**Faculty Influences And Academic Misconduct**

In the study of academic integrity, it is quite easy to immediately attribute academic misconduct to the individual student. After all, they are the doers of these “offenses” despite academic moral codes. It must be reiterated, however, that in the context of reciprocal dynamism among the elements of the social cognitive theory, the faculty – as among the environmental factors – may cast some influence over a students’ likelihood to commit any form of misconduct in school and school-related work. Tippitt, Ard, Kline, Tilghman, Chamberlain & Meagher (2009) emphasize that
Creating environments that foster academic integrity will take the effort of all involved in the educational enterprise. Faculty need to reflect on how their practices – blatant or inadvertent – fail to reflect integrity. Faculty must also understand that they have significant power to help students learn about and adhere to principles of academic integrity (p.241).

Tippitt, Ard, Kline, Tilghman, Chamberlain & Meagher (2009) posited that the increasingly stringent higher education has posed pressure on students to succeed academically. It has been found that students are more likely to cheat because of more academic work required to pass a course and teachers’ unclear instructions (Kwong, Hing-Man, Kai-Pan and Wong, 2010). Although this can very well be within the control of faculty members, this study recognizes the curricular requirements prescribed unilaterally to all students in a program on top of the specific course requirements. Thus, this gives way to the following hypothesis.

**H2a:** The likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as the favorable perceptions on learning assessments increase.

To add ensure that the initial variables exhaustively identify the faculty factors, this study included faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies taken from the McCabe Academic Integrity Survey (MAIS) of 2010. The corresponding hypothesis is thus

**H2b:** The likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies increases.

**Peer Influences And Academic Misconduct**

Several studies have focused on identifying the situational factors that are likely to influence cheating. One block among these researches singles out the impact of peers on this dishonest behavior. For instance, found that students are more likely to cheat when friends are involved (Chapman, Davis, Toy & Wright, 2004; Teodorescu & Andrei, 2009). Baron and Crooks (2005), on the other hand, cited Roach (2001) who opined that “the prolific cheating in online environments is partly based on the conventional wisdom” that “when students are unknown face-to-face, they are believed more likely to have others sit in for them during exams and instructions and are also more likely to resort to plagiarism.”

In the Philippines, conventional level of moral reasoning appears to be common when students cheat by giving out answers (Mocorro, 2008). This means that students are more driven by their relationships with others when they share answers during examinations.

In this study, peer influences include peer’s engagement in academics from the study of Teodorescu and Andrei (2009); and peers’ attitude towards academic dishonesty and frequency of committing academic misconduct, both culled from the MAIS. The following hypothesis is tested.
H3a: The likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as peer disapproval of academic misconduct increases.

H3b: The likelihood of committing misconduct decreases as peer engagement in academics increases.

H3c: The likelihood of committing academic misconduct increases as peers’ academic misconduct increases.

Business Students And Academic Misconduct

Meanwhile, a number of empirical researches has centered on academic dishonesty among business students. Business students in the U.S. were generally found to be more unethical in their behavior and attitudes than non-business majors (Smyth & Davis, 2004; Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar, 2007). The question is, “Do these findings hold true to Filipino business students as well?” Accordingly, the following is hypothesized.

H4: Business students are more likely to cheat than non-business students.

The relationships to be tested as expressed in the foregoing hypotheses are illustrated in Figure 2.

Research Methods

Sampling

The study aimed to explore the determinants of academic misconduct among students from State-funded higher education institution in Southern Philippines. In particular, the target population for this study consisted of students from two campuses of a state university in southern Philippines during the First Semester of Academic Year 2012-2013. The unit of analysis is the individual student. A total of 530 questionnaires were given to students chosen using convenience sampling. During the administration of the survey, some students, however, were not around. Hence, only 430 questionnaires were returned and determined useful or a response rate of 81%. This particular sampling method was used as this was the only feasible option given the unique circumstances of the study. Given these circumstances, it must be noted that results of the study should be interpreted with caution due to the limited coverage of the sampling frame and the manner by which the respondents were chosen.

The sample was dominated by females with 68%. Business students accounted for 57% of the total number of respondents.

Data Collection

The instrument utilized in the study was initially pretested with a convenience sample of 121 students. The reliability of the scales was determined using Cronbach’s α. Data for the study was collected during the 3rd and 4th week of July using a combination of drop-off and
group-administered survey methods. An unmarked mail envelope was provided to the respondents where they can place their filled out questionnaires to further assure them that their responses shall be confidential and untraceable.

Figure 2. Conceptual framework of the study

Scale Development And Data Analysis

Factor analysis was used to develop factors from different items for each construct into their respective reliable scales.

The KMO measure of sampling adequacy test of the items for academic integrity culture yielded a value of 0.848 indicating that the data is adequate for a factor analysis. According to Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) values of KMO between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb. Meanwhile, Bartlett’s test of sphericity chi-square is 602.778 with p<0.001. This indicates that the correlation matrix for academic integrity culture is significantly different from the identity matrix thus the variables are not correlated. This implies that the variables are appropriate for factor analysis. The same can be said for faculty and peer influences as their KMO measure of sampling adequacy test result is 0.688 and 0.623,
respectively. Though these are relatively lower, these values still indicate acceptability for further analysis using principal components. This is further confirmed as the Bartlett’s test of sphericity chi-square of the variables faculty and peer influences are 131.572 and 504.759, respectively. Both values have p<0.001. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy for the construct, “Likelihood of committing academic misconduct,” produced the values 0.888 while the corresponding Bartlett’s test of sphericity is 640.677 with p<0.001. These results indicate satisfactory feasibility for a factor analysis.

Five factors were determined for academic integrity culture based on a priori criterion accounting for a cumulative percentage of variance explained of 85.1028%. The number of factors for faculty influences was determined to be 2 based on the eigenvalues criterion with a cumulative explained variance of 68.7895%. Meanwhile, the number of factors for peer influences was determined to be 3, based on the same criterion with a cumulative explained variance of 63.5684%. Perhaps, a notable novelty introduced in this study is the treatment of the outcome variable as two separate factors since the construct, “Likelihood of committing academic misconduct,” loaded to two factors using the latent root criterion. In earlier related studies, this behavioral outcome was studied only as a single variable (Kisamore, Stone & Jawahar, 2007) or operationally defined as referring to cheating only (Teodorescu & Andrei, 2009; Lanier, 2009; Imran & Ayobami, 2011). The two factors were correspondingly labeled as academic misconduct inside the classroom and outside the classroom and accounted for a cumulative explained variance of 64.65937%. All indicators with factor loadings greater than 0.50 were loaded to their corresponding factors.

All values of Cronbach’s α are well above 0.70 signifying relatively high reliability and internal consistency except for the factor “faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies” which got a Cronbach’s α of 0.686071023. Considering the exploratory nature of the study, such value is deemed acceptable.

Given the ordinal nature of the data and therefore the heteroscedasticity of the data, relationship between the dependent and independent variables was tested using ordinal logistic regression. To determine more specific determinants of academic misconduct than the general classifications of academic integrity culture, faculty influences and peer influences, all the factors of each construct were considered as predictors of committing academic misconduct (a) inside the classroom and (b) outside the classroom. Composite scores for every factor were computed by getting the average of the respondents’ answers across the items and were used in the analysis.

**Results And Discussion**

The ordinal logistic regression was applied to the data to determine the likelihood of a student reporting and committing an academic misconduct. The logs of the odds and the corresponding odds ratios are presented in Table 2.
Four factors were found to be significantly related with the likelihood of committing academic misconduct.

**Table 2. Ordinal logistic regression results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Likelihood of committing academic misconduct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log-odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>0.093205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>-0.0373922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.0935328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-0.3813865**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>0.2665323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning assessment used</td>
<td>-0.4385107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies</td>
<td>-0.5062821**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer’s engagement in academics</td>
<td>-0.1360104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer’s attitude towards academic dishonesty</td>
<td>-0.0461823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer’s frequency of committing academic dishonesty</td>
<td>.5860633***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Likelihood</td>
<td>-1158.5712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR chi² (10)</td>
<td>67.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi²</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at α = 0.05  ** Significant at α = 0.01  *** Significant at α = 0.001

Among the five values characterizing an academic integrity culture, only the odds for a stronger sense of trust among academic peers increasing the likelihood of committing academic misconduct was found to be significantly 0.60 times (α = 0.01) as likely as the odds for weaker sense of trust increasing the likelihood of committing academic misconduct. The result suggests that, holding all other variables constant, believing that others will not copy one’s work nor steal it prompts the students to reciprocate the act. Moreover, believing that others are truthful and honest in their academic works discourages students to be otherwise. Given these findings, only H1d of the hypotheses for academic integrity culture is supported.

Honesty, fairness, responsibility and respect of hypotheses H1a, b, c and e, respectively, were found to be insignificant predictors of academic misconduct. These results could have been due to the perspective by which students evaluated these values in the study. Responses to honesty, fairness, responsibility, and respect items could be highly variable depending on the respondents’ immersion and experience on students reporting acts of academic misconduct, respecting the opinions, ideas and academic works of others and the disciplinary process
imposed upon academic integrity violators. Responses to trust were based on their experience with fellow students which could be more static considering their proximity to their peers.

The likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as the favorable perceptions on learning assessments increase (H2a). The odds ratio of learning assessment used by faculty members are 0.64 for committing academic misconduct inside the classroom ($\alpha = 0.05$) and 0.55 for outside the classroom ($\alpha = 0.01$). These values connote, on one hand, that the odds for more favorable perceptions on the difficulty and effectiveness of a learning assessment increasing the likelihood to commit academic misconduct inside the classroom is only 0.64 as likely as the odds for less favorable perceptions. On the other hand, the odds for more favorable perceptions increasing the students’ likelihood to commit academic misconduct outside the classroom is only 0.55 as likely as the odds for less favorable perceptions. Most students aim for high marks (rewards) in school. Thus, when they sense that the examinations and quizzes are difficult for their level and not effective in measuring their understanding of the lessons, they are prone to feel some degree of procedural injustice. Procedural injustice is the perceived fairness of the process used to determine the distribution of rewards (Robbins, 2005; p. 172). Equity theory suggests that when there is a perceived inequity, individuals may attempt to restore equity (and fairness) by changing their inputs (Walster, Walster & Scott, 1978; Greenberg, 1989) - in this case, could be their answers to learning assessments by using cheat sheets or crib notes and other cheating means.

Meanwhile, the likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies increases (H2b). The odds for more faculty vigilance increasing the likelihood of committing academic misconduct is only 0.60 times ($\alpha = 0.01$) as likely as the odds for lesser faculty vigilance to do the same. Students are aware of the ethical issues and the disciplinary implications of cheating hence, when instructors are closely on their watch, they are deterred to engage in such. Constant reminders on academic integrity policies may invoke compliance to avoid punishment or to gain social conformity.

The likelihood of committing academic misconduct increases as peers’ academic misconduct increases (H3c) confirming the findings of Teodorescu & Andrei (2008). The odds for peers’ more frequent academic misconduct increasing the likelihood of students to commit academic misconduct – both inside and outside the classroom – is greater than the odds when the peers’ don’t engage in as much academic misconduct with odds ratios of 1.797 and 2.243, respectively. Both ratios are highly significant at $\alpha = 0.001$. These results highlight how the behaviors of peers can significantly influence students’ behaviors as well. In this context, students committing academic misconduct may be driven by the “psychological pressure that an individual feels to conform to social norms” (Ponnu, Naidu & Zamri, 2008; pp. 281-282). Referents or models are significant influencers of a person’s behaviors based on the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977).

Results, however, do not support the hypotheses that the likelihood of committing academic misconduct decreases as peer disapproval of academic misconduct increases (H3a) and that the likelihood of committing misconduct decreases as peer engagement in academics increases.
Peers’ engagement in academics negatively influences the likelihood of committing academic misconduct inside the classroom and positively influences the likelihood of committing academic misconduct outside the classroom albeit, the relationship is not significant. Peer influence is a real phenomenon that takes on varying roles across adolescent risk behaviors (Maxwell, 2000).

Utilizing one-way ANOVA and after ensuring that all assumptions are satisfied, result of the test for differences in the likelihood of committing academic misconduct among business and non-business students suggests no significant differences between the two groups as indicated by the Roy’s greatest root of 0.00382 with a p-value of 0.44283. This result prompts us to reject the hypothesis that business students are more likely to cheat than non-business students (H4).

Conclusion And Recommendations

Every academic institution of higher learning is called to uphold the ideals of academic integrity. As an institution that is vested with the noble aim to produce professionals with impeccable morals, it is important that schools, colleges and universities be free of any taint of academic dishonesty. To aid in the formulation of relevant strategies and initiatives to achieve this end, the study was undertaken to determine what factors influence the likelihood of reporting and committing academic misconduct. To the researcher’s knowledge, it is the first study to focus on a more integrative perspective, simultaneously exploring the effects of academic integrity culture, faculty influences and peer influences on the likelihood of committing academic misconduct. Furthermore, the study was able to derive two factors for academic misconduct – that is, inside and outside the classroom – when such construct was only similarly studied in the past as only one outcome variable.

Among the five values of the academic integrity culture construct, only trust was found to significantly influence the likelihood of students to commit academic misconduct such as cheating and plagiarism. All faculty factors were found to be significant predictors of students’ likelihood to commit academic misconduct such that the more favorable the perceptions are on faculty vigilance in implementing academic integrity policies and on the difficulty and effectiveness of learning assessments used, the odds are increased that students would not likely engage in academic misconduct. Peers’ frequency of committing academic misconduct proved to be a highly significant determinant to students’ likelihood to commit academic misconduct.

Against this backdrop, it is important for the school administration to intensify its efforts to foster the value of trust. This could be done by enjoining faculty members to be consistently vigilant in implementing academic integrity policies, accordingly dealing with violators. The academic institution could encourage trust by open dialogues with stakeholders regarding academic integrity issues and concerns. This could likely improve the impression of students on the commitment of the school in its thrust to uphold high academic ethical standards. A regular review of the learning assessment instruments must be undertaken to ensure that they appropriately measure learners’ progress relative to the established learning objectives.
Whenever possible, learning assessments must be formulated by a collective body to have a holistic view of students’ aptitude in specific courses.

It must be emphasized that the results of this study be construed with caution as it is constrained by the convenience sampling method and locale used. Given this limitation, it is recommended that the study be extended to a wider geographic scope. On the other hand, aspects of academic integrity culture other than values systems, such as leadership and practices, may be a worthwhile dimension to investigate. Moreover, results of the study raises the following questions which may guide future research.

- Do subjective norms, faculty fairness and faculty – student interaction also influence students’ likelihood of committing academic misconduct?
- Do perceptions on the severity of sanctions to academic misconduct affect the students’ likelihood of committing them?
- Do students from State-funded academic institutions have the same propensity to commit academic misconduct as students from private academic institutions?
- What individual factors affect Filipino students’ likelihood to commit academic misconduct?
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