

A Study on the Prevalence and Correlates of Academic Dishonesty in Four Undergraduate Degree Programs

Mark Anthony Mujer Quintos

University of the Philippines Los Baños, Laguna, Philippines

Abstract - *With college students from four different disciplines representing the humanities as well as the natural, mathematical, and social sciences as respondents, this study determined the degree of prevalence and correlates of academic dishonesty among students. A survey questionnaire about the respondents' personal characteristics and their frequency of engagement in academic dishonesty during one whole academic year (two semesters) was used as the research instrument. A Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test was used to determine which between cheating on examinations, quizzes and/or exercises and cheating on papers and/or projects was committed more often. Spearman's Rank Correlation tests were conducted to determine significant correlations between the students' characteristics and academic dishonesty.*

The study found that within an academic year, nine out of ten students have engaged in at least one act of academic dishonesty. Furthermore, students engaged in more types of academic cheating on papers/projects than on exams/quizzes/exercises. The most prevalent form of academic dishonesty was connivance through the sharing between students of answers and questions to an exam/quiz/exercise that a student has taken before and the others are just about to take. Cheating on papers/projects was committed more often than on exams/quizzes/exercises for all degree programs except for mathematical science students. Only two variables, (1) perception of one's classmates' and peers' frequency of academic cheating and (2) frequency of academic cheating during high school, have moderately strong positive correlations with academic dishonesty. The attitude that academic cheating is never justified, on the other hand, was found to have a moderately strong negative correlation with academic dishonesty **Keywords:** *Academic Dishonesty, Cheating, Academe, Academic Integrity, Education*

INTRODUCTION

Cheating seems to be everywhere. It seems to be present in every facet of life, be it the household, in school, in sports, in politics, and even in the professional world. In recent years, Philippine society was shaken by a barrage of cheating scandals that stained the reputation not only of its people but also of its institutions. These scandals include the PRC Nursing Board Exam leakage scandal of 2006 [1]-[2]; the allegations of cheating in the 2007 PRC Civil Engineering Board Exam [3]; the reportedly widespread cheating in the National Police Commission's PNP exam in 2009 [4]; the alleged leakage scandal in the US National Physical Therapy Exam which barred Filipino physical therapists from practicing in the United States in 2010 [5]-[6]; and what was regarded as "the most widespread case of cheating" in the country's bar exam for law – the latest of a string of cheating scandals – in

the early 1930s, in 1979, in 1982, and 1999 - that has been associated with the century-old exam [7].

In addition to the exam-based cheating scandals, public outcry brought about by allegations of plagiarism have graced the headlines of Philippine news in recent years. In 2013, University of the Philippines student Mark Joseph Solis was put under public scrutiny for submitting photos taken by Gregory John Smith to a Chilean Embassy-sponsored "Smiles for the World" contest and claiming them as his own. The student has subsequently apologized and has surrendered his claim to the rewards from the contest [8]-[9]. Senator Vicente "Tito" Sotto III was also embroiled in a plagiarism scandal in 2012 after he was reported to have "flagrantly and deceptively plagiarized" from Robert Kennedy's 1966 Day of Affirmation speech during the senator's speech delivered to the Philippine Senate in September 5, 2012 [10]. The judicial branch of government was also marred in controversy in 2010 when 23 counts of

plagiarism were found in a published decision penned by one of the associate justices of the Supreme Court. While the incident was regarded by the spokesperson of the Supreme Court as unintentional and merely “a bad case of footnoting”, the spokesperson of the University of the Philippines’ College of Law Faculty (UPCLF) argued that while two or three counts of footnoting may be considered as a bad case of footnoting, the same cannot be said when the number of counts amount to 23, especially when the footnotes in the original documents were also included in the notes copied [11].

While these examples of cheating in Philippine society are fairly recent, it does not mean that the prevalence of cheating is just a recent issue. Cheating has existed since the early times. There have been reports of examinees taking the civil service exam engaging in acts of cheating in order to get an edge over the others and pass the examination as far back as Ancient China. Acts of cheating in order to pass the civil service exam back then were so prevalent that the examinees were systematically searched everywhere for cheating devices such as notes stitched into their garments. These examinees were then locked inside cubicles for days in order to ensure that they would have no chance to prepare cheating instruments before the examination. However, even though the Chinese authorities tried to curb the cheating behavior of examinees, their efforts were not enough to completely wipe out cheating in the exams. This was because every time that they tried to prevent the occurrence of cheating by developing preventative measures to combat each specific method, the examinees were able to come up with new and cleverer ways to outsmart the system [12].

One particular setting of cheating that is a cause for concern today is cheating within the academe, or academic dishonesty. Academic dishonesty is a social problem that pervades the educational institutions from the primary level up to the institutions of higher education.

What is academic dishonesty? As stated by Palazzo [12], there is no single definition of academic dishonesty that is universally accepted by the academic community. Lambert, Hogan and Barton [13] reported that while some researchers maintain that academic dishonesty is limited only to unethical behavior that is committed intentionally, other researchers define academic dishonesty simply by providing a list of behavior that they consider to be acts of academic dishonesty, there are also researchers who define academic dishonesty as any behaviour committed by a member of the academe that is in violation of the educational institution’s prescribed rules or standard conditions on honesty. For

the purposes of this study, academic dishonesty shall be defined in this paper as:

Any deliberate act of violation of an educational institution’s prescribed rules or standard conditions on honesty that involves either the (1) passing off or declaring of something – be it data, information, answer, or product – as generated from one’s own sincere effort or work, when, it is not or (2) engaging in activities that will directly or indirectly put the purpose and integrity of any academic exercise into jeopardy.

Why is it important for society to pay attention to the social problem of academic dishonesty? First, the integrity of the academic community is at stake. Academic dishonesty scandals that put the academic community in the middle of controversies weaken the morale of the academe and destroy its reputation. This causes the studies conducted by the academic community to lose their credibility in a society that is already skeptical of the objectivity and veracity of scientists, thereby making the educational institution’s purpose as a research-oriented institution aimed at helping the community a very difficult endeavour to achieve. Second, the results of studies and undertakings committed by academically dishonest individuals could put elements of society in serious peril. For example, research in the field of medicine that contain fraudulent data may put the health of the members of the population at risk, while the undertakings of engineers, who are not actually qualified but only passed by cheating, may inadvertently come up with ill-designed structures that could topple any minute and take the lives of several innocent people in the process. Third, the results of empirical studies, such as Frei, Peterson, Isaacson and Griffith’s study [14], indicate that academically dishonest students are usually also those who have a high tolerance for other deviant behaviors, such as lying, theft, infidelity, betrayal and violence. While it is not prudent to generalize that all those who have engaged in academic dishonesty will be problematic members of the society, the above-cited findings are a cause for concern. And fourth, several empirical studies have discovered a positive relationship between a student’s engagement in acts of academic dishonesty and his or her future unethical behaviour in the workplace, or what the Carnegie Council Report dubbed as “ethical deterioration” [15]. For example, on matters which concern their professional lives, such as their job applications and the personality assessments conducted in the workplace, those who were frequent cheaters in high school and/or

college are more prone to lie. Furthermore, in an empirical study conducted by Graves in 2008, students who were habitual cheaters during their stint in the academe are more prone to engage in unethical or unprofessional behavior in the workplace. Those who cheated when they were in high school and/or college were found to be likely to commit acts of deviance. These acts of deviance are classified into two subgroups. On one hand, there is what the researchers call “property deviance”, which is defined as deviant behavior that deals with the “theft of property belonging to the company, fellow workers or outsiders”. On the other hand, there is also what Hollinger and Clark (1983, as cited in Graves, [16]) called the production deviance, which is defined as deviant behavior that deals with “counterproductive behavior regarding the use of time and the amount or quality of work produced by the employee”.

In Graves’ study [16], frequent cheaters in High School and/or College are more prone in their later lives to become professionals who would commit property deviance, such as abusing employee discount privileges, stealing store merchandise, overstating the number of hours they worked, purposefully underrating merchandise, overstating expenses for reimbursement, and stealing company tools or equipment. They are also more likely to commit acts of production deviance such as surfing the web for personal use during work hours, playing computer games on company time, using an employer’s long-distance phone line for personal use, calling in sick to keep from going to work, taking unnecessarily long lunch breaks without approval, doing slow or sloppy work, working under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, and going to work late and leaving the office early.

This paper endeavours to gain a deeper understanding of academic dishonesty with the hope that more insight into the subject of academic dishonesty may help in developing countermeasures that could curb the prevalence of academic dishonesty.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Engaging college students from four degree programs, this study endeavoured to accomplish three objectives:

1. Assess the degree of prevalence of academic dishonesty among the students by:
 - a. Determining the proportion of students from each of the four degree programs under study who engaged in academically dishonest behavior within one whole academic year;
 - b. Determining the number of types of academically dishonest behavior that the students from each of the four degree programs under study have committed within one whole academic year;

- c. Determining the proportion of students from each of the four degree programs under study who have engaged in each type of academically dishonest behaviour within one whole academic year; and

- d. Determining which types of academically dishonest behavior are most prevalent within each of the student bodies of the four degree programs under study within one whole academic year.

2. Determine which between cheating on exams/quizzes/exercises and cheating on papers/projects is more often committed among the students of each of the four degree programs within one whole academic year.

3. Determine which characteristics of students are correlated with academic dishonesty and determine the strength and direction of these relationships.

METHODS

A total of 237 undergraduate students from four degree programs served as the random sample of respondents for the study. The four degree programs were chosen to represent the humanities and the three branches of the sciences – social science, natural science, and mathematical science. These respondents were tasked to report on their engagement in academic dishonesty within the duration of one academic year – to be precise, the preceding academic year. This ensured that the students, despite being of different year levels, would have a uniform timeframe with which to anchor their self-reporting of academic dishonesty.

Only those who were classified as Sophomore, Junior, or Senior students were engaged to participate in the study while those who were classified as Freshman were excluded. The exclusion of registered students under the classifications of Freshman was under the assumption that these students were not yet students of the university during the preceding academic year. All participants were determined through a stratified random sampling design. They were also briefed on the nature of the study and given the freedom to refrain from participating if they did not feel comfortable with the nature of the research. To increase the respondents’ perception of anonymity and confidentiality, each respondent was given an envelope within which the accomplished questionnaire could be enclosed. The researcher also installed secured drop-off points for the accomplished questionnaire within and outside the campus to facilitate the convenient return of accomplished questionnaires for the respondents.

In addition to the classification filter, the subjects of the study were filtered to exclude those students who fell under any of the two following categories: First, registered students who have filed for a

Leave of Absence (LOA) or who have been Absent Without Leave (AWOL) during either the first or second semester of the preceding academic year. Second, registered students who have shifted from another degree program during either the first or second semesters of the preceding academic year. The rationale for excluding those students who fell under the first category was that these students would have had less or even no opportunity to engage in acts of academic dishonesty than the other students in the population. Meanwhile, the rationale for excluding those students who fell under the second category was that these students could report acts of academic dishonesty they may have committed while not yet under the degree program they are currently on, which will consequently result in inaccuracies in the data.

A survey questionnaire asking about the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, educational characteristics, organizational affiliations, perceptions on the cheating climate at the campus, hours spent on various extra-curricular activities, academic habits, and attitudes about cheating was used as the research instrument. The survey questionnaire also asked the respondents about their frequency of engagement in 32 types of academically dishonest behaviours during the preceding academic year. These behaviours were obtained from informal interviews with students prior to the study as well as the existing literature on academic cheating. The list of cheating behaviours was comprised of 16 acts that could take place during exams, quizzes, and exercises, while the remaining 16 acts were those which could be committed in papers or projects.

A Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to determine which between cheating on exams, quizzes and/or exercises and cheating on papers and/or projects was more often committed by the students. Spearman Rho Correlation tests were conducted to determine significant correlations between students' characteristics and their engagement in acts of academic dishonesty.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Background Characteristics of Student Respondents

The personal characteristics of the respondents, particularly their socio-demographic characteristics, educational characteristics, organizational affiliations, perceptions on the cheating climate at the campus, hours spent on various extra-curricular activities, academic habits, and attitudes about cheating, were obtained from the survey. The results are provided in Tables 1 to 7 (see Appendix). In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, the student respondents had ages ranging from 16 to 23 years old with the highest

proportion being 19 years old. These respondents were more often female, lived in urban areas, and relatively economically well-off with an annual gross family income of PHP100,000.00 to PHP249,999.00. When asked about the importance of religion in their lives, the majority indicated that religion is important to them.

In terms of educational characteristics, these respondents ranged from having studied in college for 2 to 10 semesters, with the highest proportion reporting that they have studied in college for 4 semesters. Historically, the majority of the respondents studied in a private institution during high school, oftentimes in private religious institutions. In addition, the majority of these respondents reported to have engaged in cheating at least once during their high school lives, with the largest proportion having cheated 1 to 3 times during High School. Though most respondents had never failed a course prior to the survey and though almost half had Grade Weighted Averages ranging from 2.00 to 1.49 (which is considered high enough to qualify for inclusion in the honor roll), 4 out of every 5 respondents indicated that they were not running for honors nor were they beneficiaries of any scholarship program. The survey results further showed that the majority of the respondents had skipped classes 1 to 3 times during the academic year under study.

In terms of organizational affiliations, the majority of the respondents reported being a member of a student organization, with the largest proportion being affiliated with 1 student organization. Typology-wise, the most subscribed type of organization among the respondents was academic organizations. As far as perceptions on the cheating climate in the campus under study was concerned, the majority of the respondents believed that their classmates/peers cheat. The majority of respondents also believed that professors rarely catch students who cheat, and almost half believe that professors rarely punish those who are caught cheating. However, the respondents also believed that professors view cheating very negatively, and when the professors punish the cheating students, the punishment is moderate to very severe. Finally, the respondents believed that the student body in general has a negative perception of cheating, but more respondents believed that cheating was prevalent in the campus.

When it comes to time allocation among the students, the respondents in general reportedly allocated around 1 to 5 hours per week each on studying and doing homework, watching television, partying and drinking, and browsing social networking sites. Some respondents also allocated 1 to 5 hours of their week in helping in student clubs or groups and playing computer games. The student respondents were generally full-time students, with only 1 out of every 5 reporting that they allocated some hours of their week to work for pay.

Aside from the hours per week allocated to studying, the academic ethics of the respondents were further explored. The majority of the respondents reported that they usually end up cramming to prepare for exams and/or finish their assignments. Almost half of the respondents simply cram before exams and do some studying during most weeks. This was despite the majority indicating that they view academic life and social life as either equally important or academic life as more important than their social lives. However, this may be because they also generally believed that learning is more important than getting a high GWA. Finally, the respondents were asked about their attitudes toward cheating where the general sentiment was that cheating is not justifiable, albeit their stance was observably weaker when a friend asks or when the situation is a matter of passing the course rather than simply getting high grades.

Prevalence of Academic Dishonesty

It was found that academic dishonesty was very prevalent in the four degree programs. As shown in Table 8, roughly nine out of every ten students from the four degree programs had been academically dishonest at least once.

Table 8. Percentage of students per degree program who committed an act of academic dishonesty at least once (n=237).

	Exams, Quizzes, And/Or Exercises	Papers And/Or Projects	Overall
Humanities	94%	94%	98%
Social Science	95%	98%	98%
Natural Science	91%	94%	97%
Mathematical Science	88%	85%	95%
Overall	92%	93%	97%

The rate of prevalence of academic dishonesty was greater, albeit only by a little margin, on papers and/or projects than in exams, quizzes and/or exercises. This observation is true for all degree programs save for the mathematical science degree program where the opposite is true. Further observation on the data reveals that when the four degree programs under study are compared, the social science student body has the highest proportion of students who engaged in academically dishonest behaviours on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises and on papers and/or projects at least once, while those from the mathematical science degree program reported the least proportion of students who cheated on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises

and on papers and/or projects at least once. Nevertheless, even though the mathematical science degree program had the least proportion of students who cheated, it must be noted the difference is not large and that the proportion of students who cheated is still high.

Whitley (1999, cited in Klein, Levenburg, McKendall, and Mothersell, [17]) reviewed the studies on academic dishonesty conducted in the United States and stated that the rates of prevalence of academic dishonesty have an average of 70% which range from as low as 9% to as high as 95%, though a recent study by Taradi, Taradi, Knezevic, and Dogas [18] indicated that 99% of the students engaged in academically dishonest behavior. Cheating prevalence also appears to vary by country, as McCabe (2005) observed, academic dishonesty is less prevalent in Canada, and Davis et al. (1994, cited in Thorpe, Pittenger, and Reed [19]) also observed that cheating is less prevalent in Australia than in the U.S. The proportion of students who were found to have engaged in academic dishonesty at least once in this study are higher than the average rate of academic dishonesty found in the other studies. Though the percentages are much higher in this study, the pattern of more students engaging in academically dishonest behavior on papers and/or projects than on examination, quizzes, and/or exercises is similar to the findings revealed by Whitley's [20] review of literature on academic dishonesty studies.

It is also worth noting that the high percentage of cheating found in this study could be because this research made use of a much bigger list of cheating behaviours, thereby increasing the chances of students reporting academic dishonesty. Or it could also be because, as McCabe [21] Tang and Zuo (1997, cited in Jordan, [22]), Brown and Emmett (2001, cited in Bolin, [23]), and Thorpe et al. [19] observed, students at large state-supported institutions cheat more. There are various explanations on why this is the case, such as (1) educational qualifications being either too low or too high (while those with average educational requirements having less cheating prevalence), (2) large institutions relying on large classes where students find it easier to cheat, and (3) student-faculty relations in large institutions and large classes are not as close as student-faculty relations in small institutions and classes, therefore, students at large institutions and classes feel less guilt when they cheat.

It was also found that students under the four degree programs engaged in an average of four types of dishonest behaviours in examinations, quizzes and/or exercises. Meanwhile, they engaged in an average of five types of dishonest behaviours in papers and/or projects. This is shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Average number of types of academically dishonest behaviours committed by students per degree program (n=237).

	Exams, Quizzes, and/or Exercises	Papers and/or Projects	Overall
Humanities	3	4	8
Social Science	4	6	9
Natural Science	4	6	10
Mathematical Science	4	5	9
Overall	4	5	9

Overall, students from the four degree program engaged in an average of nine types of dishonest behavior. This is similar to the average number of types of academically dishonest behavior on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises reported by Rettinger and Kramer [24], wherein they reported that the American students under their study engaged in an average of one cheating behavior on papers and/or projects. Aside from the comparison with Rettinger and Kramer's study, it can also be observed from the results that Humanities students used slightly less number of types of cheating behavior on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises than the other degree programs. However, this difference is very minimal.

Meanwhile, on cheating behavior on papers and/or projects, those from the social science and natural science degree programs were observed to average the most number of types while those from the humanities degree program had the least average number of types practiced. A possible explanation for this is that social science and natural science students, given the nature of their disciplines as researchcentric, have a greater number of opportunities to cheat on papers and/or projects. These two disciplines, for example, conduct empirical studies almost every semester and therefore the kind of cheating that can take place on empirical studies, such as the alteration or fabrication of information, or the use of made-up or unread sources in

the bibliography, is more likely than on the two other degree programs.

All in all, however, even though these students cheated, what must be taken into account here is that they engaged in a very limited number of types of academically dishonest behavior. Overall, they engaged in an average of 4 types of cheating in examinations, quizzes and/or exercises, and this is in the lower end of the spectrum considering that the minimum number of types is zero and the maximum is 16. While slightly higher, the number of types of cheating they engaged in on papers and/or projects is still low, given that the maximum number is also 16. This means that while these students cheat, their repertoire of techniques was fairly limited.

On the question of which academically dishonest behavior was most prevalent, it was been observed that "Asking another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that he/she had previously taken and you are about to take." and "Giving another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that you had previously taken and he/she is about to take." were consistently the most prevalent forms of cheating as shown in Tables 10 and 11. This is in agreement with the observations of Stuber-McEwen Wiseley, Hoggatt [25] who reported that aiding and abetting methods are the most frequently used techniques of academic dishonesty. Furthermore, these two most prevalent forms of cheating are not done alone but in connivance with other students. This may be a done between a handful, a few, or between a pair of students, or even between the whole class. This finding is also in agreement with Chapman, Davis, Toy, and Wright's [26] report that when peers or friends were involved, students had a greater tendency to cheat. This appears to be the case here; a kind of social exchange, per se. Student A provided the questions or the answers to the test to Student B, and in another class, Student B provided the questions or the answers to the test to Student A.

Table 10. List of academically dishonest behavior committed on exams, quizzes, and/or exercises from most prevalent to least prevalent for the four degree programs under study (n=237).

BEHAVIORS	SOSCI	HUM	NAT SCI	MATH SCI	OVERALL
1. Asking another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that he/she had previously taken and you are about to take.	78%	77%	70%	83%	76%
2. Giving another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that you had previously taken and he/she is about to take.	75%	66%	70%	80%	72%
3. Copying from another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.	36%	30%	38%	27%	33%

4. Allowing another student to copy from you during an exam/exercise/quiz.	51%	33%	53%	54%	47%
5. Copying from a “cheat note” (kodigo) during an exam/exercise/quiz.	4%	5%	5%	7%	5%
6. Changing an answer after an exam/exercise/quiz was graded, and then reporting that there has been a mistake in grading.	4%	2%	4%	10%	4%
7. Taking an exam/exercise/quiz for another student.	4%	2%	1%	2%	2%
8. Having someone else take an exam/exercise/quiz for you.	5%	2%	1%	2%	3%
9. Noticing someone else cheating during exams/exercises/quizzes and not reporting it.	64%	67%	66%	61%	65%
10. Noticing that your teacher has mistakenly checked one of your incorrect answers in an exam/exercise/quiz and not reporting it.	27%	44%	36%	49%	38%
11. Using a mobile phone to transmit answers to another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.	7%	2%	1%	2%	3%
12. Using a mobile phone to ask someone for answers during an exam/exercise/quiz.	5%	5%	4%	2%	5%
13. Writing notes on your body parts or in other accessible places in preparation for an exam/exercise/quiz.	4%	6%	3%	7%	5%
14. Storing codes in a calculator to use for an exam/exercise/quiz.	5%	0%	8%	7%	5%
15. Opening your manual/notes/reference book during exams/exercises/quizzes whenever the teacher/proctor is across or out of the room.	13%	8%	10%	17%	11%
16. Excusing yourself during an exam/exercise/quiz in order to get the answers to the exam/exercise/quiz questions while outside.	2%	2%	6%	10%	5%

BEHAVIORS	SOSCI	HUM	NAT SCI	MATH SCI	OVERALL
17. Making up sources to put in a paper’s bibliography.	35%	42%	51%	37%	42%
18. Listing unread sources in a paper’s bibliography.	58%	52%	56%	37%	52%
19. Reading condensed/abridged versions of a novel/play/etc. or watching a movie based on the book rather than reading the assigned full-length version.	67%	73%	52%	66%	64%
20. Going to Wikipedia.com or some other site to read the summary of a book or a movie you are supposed to read/watch and make a review of.	75%	77%	56%	78%	70%
21. Fabricating the results of a laboratory experiment or a research that you are assigned to do.	36%	8%	45%	7%	27%
22. Altering the results of a laboratory experiment or project that you ran but for which the desired/correct results were not obtained.	31%	7%	52%	5%	27%
23. Copying a paper from the World Wide Web or a journal and presenting it as your own original work.	9%	3%	10%	17%	9%

24. Obtaining a purchased paper and presenting it as your own original work.	2%	0%	5%	2%	3%
25. Asking and/or taking ideas from others and using them without giving credit.	33%	28%	32%	41%	33%
26. Having another person write a paper, project, or academic output that you then present as your own.	7%	12%	9%	24%	12%
27. Writing a paper for another person that they then present as their own.	24%	25%	17%	17%	21%
28. Turning in the same paper in two different classes without making sure that it is alright with the teachers.	24%	17%	17%	41%	23%
29. Using „copy-pasted“ materials from the World Wide Web in writing a paper.	29%	28%	52%	41%	39%
30. Working with a group in a paper that was assigned as individual work.	36%	27%	40%	27%	33%
31. Taking someone else’s paper or copying a paper from a journal or the World Wide Web, then paraphrasing the contents and presenting it as your own.	35%	23%	35%	20%	29%
32. Intentionally quoting a part of a journal/reference out of its original context in order to use it in support of your argument in a paper.	60%	44%	49%	24%	46%

Table 11. List of academically dishonest behavior committed on papers and/or projects from most prevalent to least prevalent for the four degree programs under study (n=237).

Another observation that can be taken from the results is that the use of internet in order to cheat has also been consistently high, with the behavior, “*Going to Wikipedia.com or some other site to read the summary of a book or a movie you are supposed to read/watch and make a review of*” being consistently in the top ten most prevalent acts of academic dishonesty. In fact, whilst “*Asking another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that he/she had previously taken and you are about to take,*” and “*Giving another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that you had previously taken and he/she is about to take,*” were consistent top academically dishonest behaviors that can be done in examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises, “*Going to Wikipedia.com or some other site to read the summary of a book or a movie you are supposed to read/watch and make a review of,*” was consistently the most prevalent act of academic dishonesty that students do on papers and/or projects.

The same degree of prevalence, however, cannot be said for other technological gadgets, as the use of calculators and mobile phones in order to cheat are not as high on the list as the researcher initially expected. This observation is in agreement with the observation of

McCabe [21] who noticed that the rate of using various electronic devices in order to commit acts of academic dishonesty is modest. Another observation that is worthy of noting is that in the list of most prevalent to least prevalent academically dishonest behaviours, the academically dishonest behavior with the ten highest degrees of prevalence are the behaviours that might be considered „high risk“ are low in prevalence. The basis for classifying the risk is as follows: Low risk: very low chance of detection and punishment; High risk: high chance of detection and punishment. One final observation that must be brought to attention because it is important in the next part of the discussion is that when looking at the behaviours that have the ten highest degrees of prevalence, those acts of academic dishonesty which are done in papers and/or projects are consistently more numerous than those acts of academic dishonesty that are done in exams, quizzes, and/or exercises.

A cross-analysis of the proportion of students from each degree program engaging in each type of academic dishonesty included in the list reveals that Social Science students have the highest proportion of students who engaged at least once in seven of the 32 types of academic dishonesty on the list. These behaviours are:

1. Taking an exam/exercise/quiz for another student.

2. Having someone else take an exam/exercise/quiz for you.
3. Using a mobile phone to transmit answers to another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.
4. Using a mobile phone to ask someone for answers during an exam/exercise/quiz.
5. Listing unread sources in a paper's bibliography.
6. Taking someone else's paper or copying a paper from a journal or the World Wide Web, then paraphrasing the contents and presenting it as your own.
7. Intentionally quoting a part of a journal/reference out of its original context in order to use it in support of your argument in a paper.

Meanwhile they have the least proportion of students who engaged at least once in four of the behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. Copying from a "cheat note" (kodigo) during an exam/exercise/quiz.
2. Excusing yourself during an exam/exercise/quiz in order to get the answers to the exam/exercise/quiz questions while outside.
3. Making up sources to put in a paper's bibliography.
4. Having another person write a paper/project/academic output that you then present as your own.

All in all, the Social Science degree program under study was where four of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were most prevalent and it is also where three of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were most prevalent. Furthermore, this degree program was also where two of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were least prevalent and where two of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were least prevalent.

Humanities students, on the other hand, had the highest proportion of students who engaged in four of the behaviours at least once. These behaviours are:

1. Noticing someone else cheating during exams/exercises/quizzes and not reporting it.
2. Using a mobile phone to ask someone for answers during an exam/exercise/quiz.
3. Reading condensed/abridged versions of a novel/play/etc. or watching a movie based on the

book rather than reading the assigned full length version.

4. Writing a paper for another person that they then present as their own.

The last behaviour also has a curious case to it, as some of the Humanities students admitted that they wrote papers for other people as a source of income. Meanwhile, they had the least proportion of students who engaged in academic dishonesty at least once in 12 of the 32 behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. Giving another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that you had previously taken and he/she is about to take.
2. Allowing another student to copy from you during an exam/exercise/quiz.
3. Changing an answer after an exam/exercise/quiz was graded, and then reporting that there has been a mistake in grading.
4. Storing codes in a calculator to use for an exam/exercise/quiz.
5. Opening your manual/notes/reference book during exams, exercises and/or quizzes whenever the teacher/proctor is across or out of the room.
6. Excusing yourself during an exam/exercise/quiz in order to get the answers to the exam/exercise/quiz questions while outside.
7. Copying a paper from the World Wide Web or a journal and presenting it as your own original work.
8. Obtaining a purchased paper, and presenting it as your own original work..
9. Asking and/or taking ideas from others and using them without giving credit.
10. Turning in the same paper in two different classes without making sure that it is alright with the teachers.
11. Using "copy-pasted" materials from the World Wide Web in writing a paper.
12. Working with a group in a paper that was assigned as individual work.

It is worth noting that in two of these behaviours, specifically in "Storing codes in a calculator to use for an exam/exercise/quiz," and in "Obtaining a purchased paper, and presenting it as your own original work," the proportion of students who engaged in the respective acts at least once is zero. The former can be explained by the fact that Humanities degree program's curriculum does not have an abundance of courses which would require mathematical formula. Meanwhile, while the researcher can not offer a good explanation as

to why none of the Humanities students purchased papers and presented them as their own whereas students from the three other degree programs did, this would mean that in the earlier case mentioned - wherein some Humanities students write papers for other students in exchange for a fee -, the customers of these “ghostwriters” would not be from their own degree program but from the students under the other degree programs in the campus under study, or even students outside the university. All in all, the Humanities degree program under study was where two of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were most prevalent and it was also where two of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were most prevalent.

Furthermore, this degree program was also where six of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were least prevalent and where six of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were least prevalent.

As for the Natural Science student body, their students have the highest proportion of students who have engaged at least once in nine of the 32 behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. Copying from another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.
2. Storing codes in a calculator to use for an exam/exercise/quiz.
3. Making up sources to put in a paper’s bibliography.
4. Fabricating the results of a laboratory experiment or a research that you are assigned to do.
5. Altering the results of a laboratory experiment or project that you ran but for which the desired/correct results were not obtained.
6. Obtaining a purchased paper, and presenting it as your own original work.
7. Using „copy-pasted“ materials from the World Wide Web in writing a paper.
8. Working with a group in a paper that was assigned as individual work.
9. Taking someone else’s paper or copying a paper from a journal or the World Wide Web, then paraphrasing the contents and presenting it as your own.

Meanwhile, they have the least proportion of students who have engaged at least once in nine behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. 1. Asking another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that he/she had previously taken and you are about to take.
2. Taking an exam/exercise/quiz for another student.
3. Having someone else take an exam/exercise/quiz for you.
4. Using a mobile phone to transmit answers to another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.
5. Writing notes on your body parts or in other accessible places in preparation for an exam/exercise/quiz.
6. 6. Reading condensed/abridged versions of a novel/play/etc. or watching a movie based on the book rather than reading the assigned full length version.
7. 7. Going to Wikipedia.com or some other site to read the summary of a book or a movie you are supposed to read/watch and make a review of.
8. Writing a paper for another person that they then present as their own.
9. Turning in the same paper in two different classes without making sure that it is alright with the teachers.

All in all, the Natural Science degree program under study was where two of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were most prevalent and it was also where seven of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were most prevalent. Furthermore, this degree program was also where five of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were least prevalent and where four of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were least prevalent.

Finally, as for the Mathematical Science degree program under study, their student body had the highest proportion of students who engaged at least once in fourteen of the behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. Asking another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that he/she had previously taken and you are about to take.
2. Giving another student the questions and/or answers to an exam/exercise/quiz that you had previously taken and he/she is about to take.
3. Allowing another student to copy from you during an exam/exercise/quiz.
4. Copying from a “cheat note” (kodigo) during an exam/exercise/quiz.

5. Changing an answer after an exam/exercise/quiz was graded, and then reporting that there has been a mistake in grading.
6. Noticing that your teacher has mistakenly checked one of your incorrect answers in an exam/exercise/quiz and not reporting it.
7. Writing notes on your body parts or in other accessible places in preparation for an exam/exercise/quiz.
8. Opening your manual/notes/reference book during exams/ exercises/quizzes whenever the teacher/proctor is across or out of the room.
9. Excusing yourself during an exam/exercise/quiz in order to get the answers to the exam/exercise/quiz questions while outside.
10. Making up sources to put in a paper's bibliography.
11. Copying a paper from the World Wide Web or a journal and presenting it as your own original work.
12. Asking and/or taking ideas from others and using them without giving credit.
13. Having another person write a paper/project/academic output that you then present as your own.
14. Turning in the same paper in two different classes without making sure that it is alright with the teachers.

It can be observed that Mathematical Science students had the highest number of behaviors wherein they had the greatest proportion of students who engaged in the specific behaviour at least once. Even though the Mathematical Science student body had the highest number of types of behaviour wherein they had the highest proportion of students who engaged in the specific behaviour at least once, they also had the highest number of types of behaviour wherein they had the least proportion of students who engaged in the specific behaviour at least once. In total, they had the least proportion of students who engaged in at least once in ten behaviours. These behaviours are:

1. Copying from another student during an exam/exercise/quiz.
2. Noticing someone else cheating during exams/exercises/quizzes and not reporting it.
3. Using a mobile phone to ask someone for answers during an exam/exercise/quiz.
4. Listing unread sources in a paper's bibliography.
5. Fabricating the results of a laboratory experiment or a research that you are assigned to do.

6. Altering the results of a laboratory experiment or project that you ran but for which the desired/correct results were not obtained.
7. Writing a paper for another person that they then present as their own.
8. Working with a group in a paper that was assigned as individual work.
9. Taking someone else's paper or copying a paper from a journal or the World Wide Web, then paraphrasing the contents and presenting it as your own.
10. Intentionally quoting a part of a journal/reference out of its original context in order to use it in support of your argument in a paper.

All in all, the Mathematical Science degree program under study was where nine of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were most prevalent and it is also where five of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were most prevalent. Furthermore, this degree program was also where three of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises were least prevalent and where seven of the academically dishonest behaviours committed on papers and/or projects were least prevalent.

Another observation that can be made from the results are that the Natural Science students had the highest number of types of academically dishonest behaviours on papers and/or projects wherein they had the highest proportion of students who engaged in the act at least once, whereas the Mathematical Science students had the highest number of types of academically dishonest behaviours on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises wherein they had the highest proportion of students who engaged in the act at least once. A possible explanation for this is that the Natural Science curriculum under study, being research-centric in nature, has more paper and project requirements and therefore, its students have more opportunity to engage in academically dishonest behaviours that apply to papers and/or projects. Meanwhile, the Mathematical Science degree program under study deals more with equations and computations; hence they have more examinations, quizzes, and or exercises instead of papers and projects. Because of this, the students have more opportunities to cheat on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises than on papers and/or projects.

Comparison on the Frequency of Students' Cheating on Exams, Quizzes and/or Exercises and Cheating on Papers and/or Projects

At $\alpha = 5\%$, there is evidence that cheating in papers and/or projects was committed more often than cheating on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises by students in the humanities, the social science, and the natural science. Meanwhile, there is insufficient evidence to say that there was a significant difference in the frequency of cheating on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises and cheating on papers and/or projects within the mathematical science student body. Overall, however, there is sufficient evidence to say that cheating on papers and/or projects was committed more often than cheating on examinations, quizzes and/or exercises. This is shown in Table 12.

This finding is in agreement with the findings of other researchers such as Rettinger and Kramer [24],

Thorpe et. al. [19], McCabe, Butterfeld, and Trevino. [27], Comas-Forgas, Sureda-Negre, and Salva-Mut [28], and Bjorklund and Wenestam [29]. There are two possible explanations for why cheating on papers and/or projects was committed more often than cheating on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises. First, the line on what constitutes cheating behavior on papers and/or projects and what is not is more blurred than the line that defines what constitutes cheating on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises and what is not. Second, it is possible that students find it more difficult to cheat on the latter and get away with it since the chances of getting caught are higher.

Table 12. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test comparing which between cheating on examinations, quizzes, and/or exercises and cheating on papers and/or projects was committed more often among the four degree programs.

	Humanities	Social Science	Natural Science	Mathematical Science	Overall
CH.PAPER<CH.EXAM	19	13	20	19	71
CH.PAPER>CH.EXAM	38	35	48	17	139
CH.PAPER=CH.EXAM	7	7	9	5	28
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.008*	0.001*	0.001*	0.9	0.001

*significant at $\alpha = 5\%$

Correlates of Academic Dishonesty

Upon running the correlational tests of the characteristics of the respondents and cheating, it was discovered that 28 of the variables had positive associations – 21 of which were positively associated with cheating on exams and 25 were positively associated with cheating on papers (see Table 13 at Appendix). Out of the 21 variables positively associated with cheating on exams, 13 had negative or negligible associates and only eight had moderately strong associations. These variables were (1) the frequency of academic dishonesty during High

School, (2) the student’s perception on the frequency of their classmates’ and peers’ cheating, and the attitudes: (3) “Cheating is justified because it does not harm anyone”, (4) “Cheating is justified when friends ask”, (5) “Cheating is justified to keep scholarship or financial aid”, (6) “Cheating is justified to stay in school”, (7) “Cheating is justified to pass the course”, and (8) “Cheating is justified to graduate”. On the other hand, out of the 25 variables positively associated with cheating on paper, only two variables had moderately strong association while the rest had negligible strengths of association. These two variables are (1) the frequency of academic dishonesty during High School and (2) the student’s perception on the frequency of their classmates’ and peers’ cheating. This means that out of the 28 variables which had significant positive associations with academic cheating, the frequency of cheating during High School and the perception towards the frequency of classmates’ and peers’ cheating behavior were the strongest. Six other variables – all of which are attitudes – also had moderately strong associations with cheating on exams, however, their Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients for cheating on paper are weak, and therefore, their strengths of association were inconsistent unlike the other two which had moderately strong associations with both cheating on exams and cheating on paper.

Meanwhile, it was discovered that 10 of the variables had negative associations – seven of which were negatively associated with cheating on exams and six of which were negatively associated with cheating

on papers (see Table 14 at Appendix). Out of the seven variables that were negatively associated with cheating on exams, only the attitude that cheating is NEVER justified had moderately strong association while the others were weak. Similarly, out of the six variables that were negatively associated with cheating on paper, only the aforementioned attitude – Cheating is NEVER justified – had moderately strong association while the strengths of association of the other five variables were negligible.

Therefore, only the three variables shown in Table 15 had consistently achieved significant moderately strong associations with academic cheating. These three were (1) the frequency of cheating during High School, (2) perception on the frequency of classmates’ and peers’ cheating behaviour – both of which had positive association – and (3) the attitude that cheating is never justified – which had a negative association.

How were these three variables connected? It is possible that not all students who engaged in acts of academic dishonesty during their days as high school students engage in acts of academic dishonesty when they are in college. It may be that students who cheated during high school did so for two reasons: First, in order to have better grades, which they can utilize to get into their desired college or university, and second, in order to pass those high school subjects that did not spark their interest or they just found to be too difficult. They may have also believed that cheating in college is more serious and much more frowned upon in institutions of higher learning than it is in high school. Now that they are in college and have entered a degree program that is of personal interest to them, they may have resolved to no longer cheat – to start a new life so to speak. However, after seeing that the act of academic cheating is still committed by their classmates and peers, they came to the conclusion that it is still acceptable to cheat in college, and since their classmates and peers are doing it, why not join in the act? Their cheating history may then help them in two ways: First, having done such acts before, they are less nervous about the prospect of doing something illegal.

Table 15. Variables with moderately strong correlations ($\alpha = 5\%$) with Academic Dishonesty.

Variable	Correlation Coefficient	
	Cheating On Exams	Cheating On Papers
Frequency of cheating during High School	.352	.357
Student’s perception on frequency of classmates’ and peers’ cheating behavior	.306	.335
Attitude that “cheating is NEVER justified”	-.404	-.327

And second, having had prior experience in cheating, they know how to cheat and get away with it. Furthermore, they run less risk of cheating as their classmates and peers, being cheaters themselves, will be less likely to report them or condemn them for their illegal actions. However, if they decide to take the position that cheating is wrong whatever the circumstances, then they will refrain from engaging in acts of academic dishonesty despite their earlier cheating history, and despite the cheating behavior of their classmates and peers.

Looking back at the characteristics of the student respondents and the three variables found to be moderately correlated with academic cheating, the fact that roughly 4 out of every 5 respondents reported to have cheated in High School, and the perception subscribed to by 9 out of every 10 students that their classmates and peers also engage in cheating may help explain why there was a very high prevalence of cheating found in this study. However, cheating, despite being prevalent, was not committed with high frequency by the respondents because of the cognitive dissonance that the cheating behavior might cause given that roughly half of the respondents hold the view that there is no justifiable rationale for cheating.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study finds that academic dishonesty is very prevalent within the four degree programs. This is a cause for concern for the academic integrity of the university, especially when it comes to the papers and projects presented by the students. A trend is observed where it is in these kinds of academic exercises that academic cheating is more frequently committed. The fact that a slightly greater proportion of students engage in acts of academic dishonesty on papers and/or projects, and that students engage in more types of cheating behavior on papers and/or projects, and more frequently, is something that is cause for concern. Unlike examinations, quizzes, and exercises which usually measure and assess how much a student remembers and comprehends, school papers and projects deal more with how students use their capability to analyze, apply, synthesize and evaluate the lessons they have learned – the very same skill that students will be expected to demonstrate once they have graduated from the academe and moved on to take their place in the professional world and in general society. Cheating on these academic exercises now may give them the confidence and knowledge to cheat their way to the top in the workplace, or worse, to cheat at the tasks given to them in their jobs, and get away with it. This could cause problems not only for the individual, but also for other members of society, especially if the

cheating student becomes a professional in whose hands lay the welfare of hundreds, if not thousands, of people.

In order to curb or even totally eliminate the prevalence of academic dishonesty, the best course of action is to inculcate in the students the mentality that cheating is unacceptable no matter the circumstances. If the students are socialized to believe this notion of cheating from pre-elementary education onwards, then they will be less likely to cheat during the early stages of their schooling, which, in turn, would prevent them from having a history of cheating. This lack of history of cheating would deprive them of the confidence to cheat, and the knowledge and experience to effectively get away with it without being caught. Furthermore, if the majority of the students are oriented to view cheating as wrong and unjustifiable from the start, then the student will not get normative support for cheating from his or her peers and classmates, as they will also hold negative views on cheating. Instead of normative support, there would exist a powerful social stigma against the act.

REFERENCES

- [1] Filipino nurses' exam scandal. (2006). Asian Pacific Post. Retrieved September, 2010, from http://www.asianpacificpost.com/portal2/ff8080810d8f7410010da855d4d4006a_Filipino_nurses_exam_s_candal.do.html
- [2] Conde, C. (2006). Scandal over nurses' exam stirs unease in Philippines. New York Times. Retrieved September 2010, from http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/21/world/asia/21nurses.html?_r=1
- [3] Ortiz, M. (2007). Civil Engineering examinees protest board retake. Inquirer. Retrieved September 2010, from http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/breakingnews/nation/view/20071203104619/Civil_engineering_examinees_protest_board_retake.
- [4] Napolcom uncovers „massive“ cheating in PNP exams. (2009). Malaya. Retrieved September 2010, from <http://www.malaya.com.ph/apr29/metro1.htm>
- [5] Abella, J. (2010). Physical therapy grads from RP barred from taking US exams. GMA News.TV. Retrieved September 2010, from <https://goo.gl/Be0drs>
- [6] Villamor, A. (2010). Filipino PTs can't take US board exam. Varsitarian. Retrieved September 2010, from <https://goo.gl/ZGzG5U>
- [7] Bar leakage extends exam by one Sunday. (2003). Sunstar. Retrieved September, 12 2010, from <https://goo.gl/dbnOuj>
- [8] Bautista, R. N. (2013). Oh snap! UP student wins photography contest with plagiarized photo. GMA

- News Online. Retrieved September 20, 2014 from <https://goo.gl/ltZX2W>.
- [9] Ramoran, C. (2013). UP student apologizes for plagiarism. Rappler. Retrieved September 20, 2014 from <https://goo.gl/0MfNu8>
- [10] Syjuco, Miguel. (2012). Kennedy to Sotto: "This is a clear case of Plagiarism". Rappler. Retrieved January 13, 2013 from <https://goo.gl/KMF0LG>.
- [11] Cite it right. (2010). The Manila Bulletin. Retrieved November 2010, from <http://mb.com.ph/print/289210>.
- [12] Palazzo, D. (2006). Detection, Patterns, Consequences, and Remediation of Electronic Homework Copying. United States Military Academy. Retrieved December 28, 2010, from <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/36817>.
- [13] Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2003). Collegiate academic dishonesty revisited: What have they done, how often have they done it, who does it, and why did they do it?. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, 7(4). Retrieved from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.4/lambert_eta1.html
- [14] Frei, R., Peterson, M., Isaacson, J., Griffith, R., & Jenkins, M. (2007). Exploring the relationship between academic dishonesty and applicant dishonesty. Paper presented at the 22nd annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New York, New York, 2007.
- [15] Jensen, L.A., Arnett, J.J., Feldman, S.S., & E. Cauffman. It's wrong but everybody does it: Academic Dishonesty among high School and College Students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, pp. 209-228.
- [16] Graves, S. (2008). Student cheating habits: A predictor of workplace deviance. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 3:15-22.
- [17] Klein, H., Levenburg, N., McKendall, M., & Mothersell, W. (2007). Cheating During the College Years: How do Business School Students Compare?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72, pp. 197-206.
- [18] Taradi, S., Taradi, M., Knezevic, T., & Dogas, Z. (2010). Students come to medical schools prepared to cheat: a multi-campus investigation. *J Med Ethics*, 36, pp. 666-670.
- [19] Thorpe, M., Pittenger, D., & Reed, B. (1999) Cheating The Researcher: A Study Of The Relation Between Personality Measures And Self-Reported Cheating – Statistical Data Included". *College Student Journal*. Retrieved January 3, 2011, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCR/is_1_33/ai_62894053/.
- [20] Whitley, B. E. (1998). Factors associated with cheating among college students: A review. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 235–274.
- [21] McCabe, D. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American Perspective. Retrieved January 3, 2011, from <http://www2.bc.edu/~peck/mccabe%20article.pdf>
- [22] Jordan, A. (2001). College Student Cheating: The Role of Motivation, Perceived Norms, Attitudes, and Knowledge of Institutional Policy. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11, pp. 233-247.
- [23] Bolin, A. (2004). Self-Control, Perceived Opportunity, and Attitudes as Predictors of Academic Dishonesty. *The Journal of Psychology*, 138, pp.101-114
- [24] Rettinger, D. & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student cheating. *Research in Higher Education*, 50, pp. 293-313.
- [25] Stuber-McEwen, D., Wiseley, P., & Hoggatt, S. (2009). Point, click, and cheat: Frequency and type of academic dishonesty in the virtual classroom. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 12 (3). Retrieved June 20, 2011 from www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall123/stuber123.html
- [26] Chapman, K., Davis, R., Toy, D., & Wright, L. (2004). Academic integrity in the business school environment: I'll get by with a little help from my Friends. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26, pp. 236-249
- [27] McCabe, D., Butterfield, K., & Trevino, L. (2006). Academic Dishonesty in Graduate Business Program: Prevalence, Causes, and Proposed Action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, pp.294-305
- [28] Comas-Forgas, R., Sureda-Negre, J., & Salva-Mut, F. (2010). Academic plagiarism prevalence among Spanish undergraduate students: an exploratory analysis. *Biochemia Medica*, 20, pp. 301-6
- [29] Bjorklund, M. & Wenestam, C. (1999). Academic cheating: frequency, methods, and causes. *European Conference on Educational Research*. Retrieved from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001364.htm>.

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).

A version of this article appeared in the [Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research](#).

APPENDIX

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Percentage (%) of the Sample	Socio-Demographic Characteristics	Percentage (%) of the Sample
Age		Location of Residence	
16 years old	0.9%	Rural	42.2%
17 years old	21.3%	Urban	57.8%
18 years old	22.1%	Annual Gross Family Income	
19 years old	25.5%	Under P40,000.00	6.3%
20 years old	17.4%	P40,000.00 to P59,999.00	2.8%
21 years old	8.9%	P60,000.00 to P99,999.00	14.2%
22 years old	2.9%	P100,000.00 to P249,999.00	30.7%
23 years old	0.9%	P250,000.00 and above	46%
Gender		Importance of Religion to Life	
Male	33%	Not Important at All	7.2%
Female	67%	Not Much Important	21.2%
		Fairly Important	38.1%
		Very Important	33.5%

Table 2. Educational Characteristics of the Respondents

Educational Characteristics	Percentage (%) of the Sample	Educational Characteristics	Percentage (%) of the Sample
No. of Semesters in College		Missed/Skipped Classes	
2 semesters	22%	Never	13.9%
3 semesters	4.3%	1 to 3 times	51.9%
4 semesters	27.6%	4 to 6 times	24.2%
5 semesters	2.6%	7 to 9 times	5.2%
6 semesters	23.3%	10+ times	4.8%
7 semesters	5.6%	Type of High School Attended	
8 semesters	12.1%	Public	37.8%
9 semesters	0.4%	Private Non-Sectarian	27.9%
10 semesters	2.2%	Private Sectarian	34.3%
Grade Weighted Average		Scholarship Program	
Less than 3.00	1.0%	Yes	14.7%
3.00 to 2.49	13.8%	No	85.3%
2.50 to 2.01	37.4%	English Proficiency	
2.00 to 1.49	45.1%	Not competent at all	1.3%
1.50 to 1.00	2.6%	A little bit competent	14.3%
Running for Honours		Fairly competent	68.4%
Yes	19.4%	Very competent	16%
No	80.6%	Cheating during HS	
No. of Failed Courses		Never	24.5%
0 courses	71.1%	1 to 3 times	38.8%
1 course	14.9%	4 to 6 times	12.2%
2 courses	9.4%	7 to 9 times	9.3%
3 courses	1.7%	10+ times	15.2%
4 courses	1.3%	Scholarship Program	
5 courses	4%	Yes	14.7%
6 courses	9%	No	85.3%

8 courses

4%

Workload

Mean Workload

38.10 units

Table 3. Number and Types of Organizational Affiliations of Respondents

Organizational Affiliations	Percentage (%) of the Sample
Number of organizational affiliations	
No organization	46.4%
1 organization	37.1%
2 organizations	13.9%
3 organizations	2.1%
4 organizations	0.4%
Type of Affiliations	
Student Council	0%
Religious Organizations	6.8%
Socio-civic Organizations	9.7%
Varsity	4.2%
Fraternities/Sororities	8.9%
Academic Organizations	27.8%
Cultural Organizations	4.2%
Varsitarian Organizations	5.1%
Political Organizations	1.7%
Others	3%

Table 4. Perceptions of Respondents on the Campus' Cheating Climate

Perceptions on...	Percentage (%) of the Sample
... frequency of his or her classmates' and peers' cheating	
Never	9.3%
Rarely	33.3%
Occasionally	38.4%
Often	14.3%
Very Often	4.6%
... frequency of professors and instructors catching those who cheat	
Never	9.7%
Rarely	56.1%
Occasionally	21.5%
Often	11%
Very Often	1.7%
... frequency of professors and instructors punishing those caught cheating	
Never	5.1%
Rarely	40.3%
Occasionally	26.3%
Often	20.8%
Very Often	7.6%
... the severity of punishment dealt to those who are caught cheating	
Very Light	1.3%
Light	8.5%

Moderate	39%
Severe	34.7%
Very Severe	16.5%
... how the faculty views the act of cheating	
Very Negatively	51%
Negatively	38.6%
Neutral	3.4%
Positively	1.7%
Very Positively	0.8%

Table 4 (cont). Perceptions of Respondents on the Campus'' Cheating Climate

Perceptions on...	Percentage (%) of the Sample
... how the student body views the act of cheating	
Very Negatively	14%
Negatively	42.4%
Neutral	40.3%
Positively	1.7%
Very Positively	0.8%
... how prevalent the act of cheating is within the campus	
Very Rare	1.7%
Rare	11.8%
Undecided	41.8%
Fairly Prevalent	37.6%
Very Prevalent	7.2%

Table 5. Hours Spent by Respondents on Various Activities

ACTIVITY	Number of Hours Spent / Percentage (%) of the Sample							
	0	<1 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 15	16 to 20	21 to 25	26 to 30	31+
Studying and doing homework	0.9%	40.9%	27.8%	16%	5.1%	2.1%	3%	4.2%
Working for Pay	79.7%	8%	4.6%	4.2%	0.8%	0%	0.4%	2.1%
Helping in Student Clubs or Groups	43.8%	22.4%	17.3%	5.5%	6.8%	3%	0%	1.3%
Watching Television	17.7%	50.2%	19%	5.9%	2.1%	1.7%	1.3%	2.1%
Partying and Drinking	47.3%	35%	11.8%	2.5%	2.1%	0.4%	0.8%	0%
Browsing Social Networking Sites	1.7%	42.6%	30.8%	10.1%	7.2%	2.1%	2.1%	3.4%
Playing Computer Games	<u>42.6%</u>	<u>29.5%</u>	<u>14.8%</u>	<u>5.9%</u>	<u>1.3%</u>	<u>2.5%</u>	<u>1.3%</u>	<u>2.1%</u>

Table 6. Academic Ethic of Respondents

Academic Ethic	Percentage (%) of the Sample
Academic Discipline	
I can easily be talked out of studying	31.6%
I often end up daydreaming when I study	35.4%
I am easily distracted when I'm studying	52.7%
I am often bored in class	57.4%
I often end up daydreaming when I'm in class	38.8%

I usually rely on cramming to prepare for exams and for finishing assignments	74.7%
Study Pattern	
Never Study	1.3%
Cramming before Exams	9.3%
Cramming before Exams and some studying during most weeks	49.6%
Weekly study with reviews before exams	30.5%
Studying almost everyday	8.1%
Studying everyday, including weekends	1.7%
Attitude towards Social and Academic Lives	
Social life is the most important priority	0.4%
Social life is more important than academic life	6.3%
Social life and Academic life are equally important	46.4%
Academic life is more important than social life	42.2%
Academic life is the most important priority	4.6%

Table 6 (cont). Academic Ethic of Respondents

Academic Ethic	Percentage (%) of the Sample
Attitude towards GWA and learning	
Getting a high GWA is the most important priority	3.8%
Getting a high GWA is more important than learning	6.8%
Getting a high GWA and learning are equally important	43%
Learning is more important than getting a high GWA	40.9%
Learning is the most important priority	5.5%

Table 7. Attitudes on Cheating of Respondents

STATEMENT	ATTITUDE				
	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
Cheating is justified because it does not harm anyone.	41.4%	36.3%	16.9%	4.6%	0.8%
Cheating is justified for better grades.	51.9%	32.1%	11%	4.6%	0.4%
Cheating is justified when friends ask.	32.1%	30.4%	21.9%	14.3%	1.3%
Cheating is justified to keep scholarship or financial aid.	41.8%	30.8%	17.7%	8.4%	1.3%
Cheating is justified to stay in school.	40.1%	33.3%	18.1%	7.2%	1.3%
Cheating is justified to pass the course.	37.3%	34.7%	17.8%	9.7%	0.4%
Cheating is justified to graduate.	40.9%	29.1%	18.6%	9.7%	1.7%
Cheating is never justified.	3.8%	11.8%	21.9%	27.8%	34.6%

Table 13. Significant Positive Associations of Cheating on Exams and/or Cheating on Paper and their Strengths of Association

VARIABLE	STRENGTH	
	Cheating on Exams	Cheating on Paper
Age		Weak (.139)
Gender – Male		Weak (.167)
Number of Failed Courses		Weak (.141)
Missing and Skipping Classes	Weak (.249)	Weak (.229)
Frequency of Academic Dishonesty during High School	Moderate (.352)	Moderate (.357)

Affiliation with Fraternities or Sororities	Weak (.158)	Weak (.206)
Affiliation with Varsity Organizations		Weak (.135)
Student's Perception on Frequency of Classmates' and Peers' Cheating	Moderate (.306)	Moderate (.335)
Student's Perception on Student Body's view on Cheating	Weak (.181)	
Student's Perception on Prevalence of Cheating within the Campus	Weak (.215)	Weak (.258)
Hours Spent Working for Pay	Weak (.137)	Weak (.183)
Hours Spent Watching Television	Weak (.141)	
Hours Spent Partying and Drinking	Weak (.288)	Weak (.185)
Hours Spent Browsing Social Networking Sites (SNSs)		Weak (.185)
Hours Spent Playing Computer Games	Weak (.167)	Weak (.132)
I can easily be talked out of studying	Weak (.195)	Weak (.216)
I often end up daydreaming when I study		Weak (.214)
I am easily distracted when I'm studying	Weak (.197)	Weak (.186)
I am often bored in class	Weak (.237)	
I usually rely on cramming to prepare for exams and for finishing assignments		Weak (.201)
Never Study	Weak (.132)	Weak (.144)
Cheating is justified because it does not harm anyone	Moderate (.388)	Weak (.209)
Cheating is justified for better grades	Weak (.291)	Weak (.177)
Cheating is justified when friends ask	Moderate (.440)	Weak (.245)
Cheating is justified to keep scholarship or financial aid	Moderate (.340)	Weak (.185)
Cheating is justified to stay in school	Moderate (.372)	Weak (.209)
Cheating is justified to pass the course	Moderate (.418)	Weak (.199)
Cheating is justified to graduate	Moderate (.427)	Weak (.248)

Table 14. Significant Negative Associations of Cheating on Exams and/or Cheating on Paper and their Strengths of Association

VARIABLE	STRENGTH.	
	Cheating on Exams	Cheating on Papers
Gender – Female		Weak (-.167)
Grade Weighted Average (GWA)	Weak (-.143)	
Scholarship Program	Weak (-.210)	Weak (-.205)
Run for Honours	Weak (-.180)	Weak (-.179)
Affiliation with Socio-civic Organizations	Weak (-.144)	
Affiliation with Cultural Organizations		Weak (-.154)
Student's Perception on Frequency of Professors and Instructors Punishing Cheaters		Weak (-.125)
Studying almost everyday	Weak (-.217)	
Attitude towards Social and Academic Lives	Weak (-.149)	
Cheating is NEVER justified	Moderate (-.404)	Moderate (-.327)