

Moral Reasoning and Academic Dishonesty: A Qualitative Study of Undergraduate Students in Malaysia

Ahmad Azmi Abdel Hamid Esmaeil, Ismail Maakip, Peter Voo*, Yu Long

Faculty of Psychology and Education, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia

Email Address:

ahmad_azmi_bp21@iluv.ums.edu.my (Ahmad Azmi), daeng@ums.edu.my (Ismail Maakip), peter@ums.edu.my (Peter Voo), longyu_bp21@iluv.ums.edu.my (Yu Long)

*Corresponding e-mail: peter@ums.edu.my

To Cite This Article:

Abdel Hamid Esmaeil, A. A., Maakip, I., Voo, P., & Yu Long. (2024). Moral Reasoning and Academic Dishonesty: A Qualitative Study of Undergraduate Students in Malaysia. *ICCCM Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 26–33. <https://doi.org/10.53797/icccmjssh.v3i4.5.2024>

Abstract: Academic dishonesty represents a pervasive issue within educational settings, and understanding the moral reasoning behind such behaviors is crucial for effective intervention. The primary objective of this research is to explore and assess the moral reasoning frameworks of undergraduate students attending the University of Malaysia Sabah, a public institution. Employing a qualitative methodology, we conducted in-depth interviews with 13 students to gain nuanced insights into their moral perspectives. Data analysis was carried out using an Interpretive Phenomenological Approach (IPA), enabling us to deeply understand the lived experiences and thought processes surrounding moral reasoning among these students. Our findings reveal that students predominantly subscribe to one of three distinct moral viewpoints. The first approach, termed as the 'subjective/contextual' perspective, posits that moral decisions are largely influenced by personal feelings and specific situational factors. The second approach is rooted in consequentialism, where the morality of an action is determined by its outcomes. The third approach regards morality as an objective entity, often grounded in religious or legal tenets. Based on our results, we advocate for a multifaceted educational strategy that addresses academic dishonesty. Universities should actively educate students on both the individual and societal repercussions of engaging in academically dishonest behaviors. Additionally, encouraging students to further develop their religious affiliations could serve as a complementary approach to mitigating academic dishonesty.

Keyword: Moral Reasoning, Understanding, Students, Case Study, Undergraduate, Malaysia

1. Introduction

Academic dishonesty is a pervasive phenomenon among students in Malaysia. A study shows that 47% of students have committed academic dishonesty in 2014 compare 51% in 2015 and 49 percent in 2016(Mustapha et al., 2017), another study found that more than half of students in a Malaysian university have engaged in cheating (Yussof & Ismail, 2018).

Recent comprehensive studies point to the widespread Academic dishonesty among students, especially during the pandemic, where all exams have been conducted online. Based on a study among students in Singapore, almost all students have committed one form of cheating (Lim & See, 2001). the study also notes that 77.1% of the respondents witnessed their friends cheating. Moreover, only 1.7% are willing to report. Other studies found 95% (Ives et al., 2017), and another one 75% (Chapman et al., 2004). We understand that the pervasiveness of academic dishonesty is a complex phenomenon with many facets. Nevertheless, moral judgment is indeed one of them.

While developing individual morality is one of the primary roles of higher education. Universities must teach students how to be critical individuals who can also use their skills for the good of society. It is a mix between good men and good citizens (Keohane, 1998; Tompkins, 1945). This study aims to understand how Malaysian public university students rationalize their moral behavior.

Theoretical Background

It is crucial to underscore the influential theories put forth by Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg in the realm of moral psychology. Jean Piaget posited that children typically approach morality from a dichotomous perspective,

categorizing actions as either right or wrong based on parental guidance. As individuals gain more life experience, their ability to reason morally matures, making them more cognizant of the necessity and advantages of adhering to specific rules and ethical guidelines.

Expanding on Piaget's foundational ideas, Lawrence Kohlberg developed a tripartite framework to articulate the stages of moral development. At the pre-conventional level, individuals primarily determine ethical behavior according to the anticipated outcomes, specifically rewards and punishments. The conventional level features moral reasoning that is chiefly influenced by the internalization of societal norms and expectations. At the post-conventional level, the individual engages in more advanced moral reasoning, developing an understanding of broader ethical principles and abstract concepts (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977).

Building on this body of work, James Rest articulated four key psychological processes that underpin our moral behavior in specific situations. These processes are as follows: ethical awareness, which involves recognizing and interpreting the moral components of a situation; moral judgment, wherein one determines the most ethically appropriate course of action; moral intention, which encompasses the act of choosing among competing ethical considerations; and moral behavior, representing the self-regulated mechanisms that translate these moral intentions into concrete actions (Rest, 1984).

In addition to the contributions of Kohlberg and Rest, other scholars have developed theoretical models that draw inspiration from Kohlberg's original framework, often referred to as "neo-Kohlbergian" theories. In these theories, moral development is conceptualized through schemas rather than stages. The first schema, known as the Personal Interest Schema, focuses on an individual's self-centered concerns, such as personal gains and losses, while largely ignoring broader societal implications. Here, society is not yet understood as an interconnected and organized system. The Maintaining Societal Norms schema emphasizes the importance of adhering to established social norms and regulations, viewed as essential for societal harmony and safety. Finally, the Postconventional Schemas are built on four foundational elements: the primacy of moral criteria, appeal to an ideal, the notion of shareable ideals, and full reciprocity. The primary distinction between the Maintaining Societal Norms and the Postconventional Schemas lies in the way they arrive at moral consensus: the former appeals to traditional practices and authoritative figures, whereas the latter relies on ideals and logical coherence to establish a moral framework (Rest et al., 2000).

Existing Literature on Moral Development in Higher Education

A considerable body of research indicates that higher education plays a pivotal role in fostering moral development among students. Several studies spanning multiple decades corroborate this notion (Cummings et al., 2001; Foster & Laforce, 1999; Gfeller, 1986; King & Kitchener, 1994; King & Mayhew, 2002; Kitchener et al., 1984; Malinowski & Smith, 1985; Paradise & Dejoie, 1991; Rodzalan & Saat, 2016; Shaver, 1987). A comprehensive review conducted by King & Mayhew (2005), which examined 45 separate studies, found that a staggering 90% of these investigations demonstrated a significant positive correlation between formal education and heightened moral reasoning.

The Impact of Institutional Contexts on Moral Development

However, it is crucial to note that the institutional setting itself may modulate this developmental trajectory. Studies have shown that differing educational environments can exert unique influences on moral development (Good & Cartwright, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1992; Steven P. McNeel, 1994). For instance, research conducted by Shaver (1987) revealed that students enrolled in Christian liberal arts programs displayed higher levels of moral reasoning compared to their counterparts in Bible colleges. This suggests that the philosophical underpinnings and educational frameworks of different institutions can have a marked impact on students' moral maturation.

Gender and Field-Specific Trends in Moral Development

In addition to institutional influences, the extant literature indicates that other variables, such as gender and field of study, can also affect moral development. One study, originating from the Faculty of Management at the University of Technology Malaysia, found distinct moral differences between male and female students (University of Technology Malaysia et al., 2016). Moreover, a study that specifically targeted senior chemical engineering students discovered that four out of five participants had achieved post-conventional stages of moral development, as outlined by Kohlberg's theory of moral development (Butler et al., 2019).

Methodological Considerations in Moral Development Research

It's also worth mentioning that most studies exploring moral reasoning, particularly those employing Malaysian samples, have predominantly utilized quantitative research methodologies. As of the time of this writing, there is a noticeable absence of qualitative studies in this realm. This gap in the literature highlights an opportunity for future research to delve deeper into the complexities of moral reasoning through qualitative approaches.

In sum, while higher education generally fosters moral development, this progression can be influenced by multiple factors, including the specific educational institution, gender, and academic discipline. As research in this area continues to evolve, there is a burgeoning need for more nuanced studies, particularly those employing qualitative methodologies, to enrich our understanding of moral development among students.

2. Methodology

Study Objectives and Methodological Approach

In the present study, our primary objective is to explore and assess the moral reasoning capacities of undergraduate students attending a public university in Malaysia. Recognizing the gaps in existing literature, particularly the dearth of qualitative studies focused on Malaysian contexts, we opted for a qualitative research methodology. This methodological choice is predicated on the belief that qualitative research provides a more nuanced and in-depth understanding of the complex issues surrounding moral reasoning.

Our decision to utilize a qualitative approach allows us to delve deeper into the intricacies of students' moral frameworks, capturing the subtleties and complexities often overlooked in quantitative studies. By using qualitative methods, we aim to uncover the rich, context-specific insights into how students interpret ethical dilemmas, make moral judgments, and navigate moral landscapes in an academic setting. This method not only permits us to grasp the 'how' and 'why' behind students' moral choices but also enables us to identify the underlying values, beliefs, and social influences that shape these decisions.

Table 1: Respondents' details

Respondent's details	Faculty	Gender
Student 1	Foundation	Male
Student 2	Foundation	Female
Student 3	Foundation	Female
Student 4	Software Engineering	Male
Student 5	Science and Natural Resources	Female
Student 6	Psychology and Education	Female
Student 7	Psychology and Education	Male
Student 8	Psychology and Education	Female
Student 9	Civil engineering	Male
Student 10	Foundation	Male
Student 11	Education and psychology	Male
Student 12	Business, Economy, and Accountancy	Female
Student 13	Business, Economy, and Accountancy	Male

For the selection of participants, we employed a purposive sampling strategy, a targeted approach aimed at identifying individuals with comprehensive knowledge of the research topic. This methodological choice was deliberate and designed to optimize the use of limited research resources by focusing on participants who could offer in-depth insights into the subject matter under investigation (Palinkas et al., 2015).

In line with this, students were selected based on two main criteria: their familiarity with the research topics and their proficiency in the English language. These criteria were established to ensure that the participants could both comprehend the research materials and articulate their thoughts coherently during the study.

Our research sample was composed of thirteen students, offering a diverse cross-section of academic disciplines and stages of educational advancement. Four of these students were in their foundation year, still at the early stages of their academic journey. The remaining nine were in various phases of their degree programs. The sample was drawn from multiple faculties to enrich the scope of the study: four participants were enrolled in the Faculty of Psychology and Education, two were from the Engineering faculty, and the remaining two represented the Accounting and Business faculty.

The demographic breakdown of our sample included both genders, consisting of five females and seven males, thereby offering a balanced gender perspective on the research topic (See Table 1 for further details).

Table 2: Themes from the study

Themes
subjective/contextual
Consequential
objective

For data collection, our study employed the use of semi-structured interviews as the primary research instrument. This interviewing approach was chosen for its flexibility, enabling participants to articulate their viewpoints in an unrestricted yet focused manner. Semi-structured interviews strike a balance by allowing participants the freedom to express themselves openly while also enabling the researcher to steer the conversation

toward specific themes or issues. This ensures a rich, detailed exploration of the topics under investigation (Doody & Noonan, 2013).

The design of our interview protocol was informed by guidelines set forth by (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). These guidelines provided a robust framework for crafting questions that were both open-ended and targeted, ensuring that the interviews would yield substantive, analyzable data.

Among the primary questions posed during these interviews were: "How do you define 'right' and 'wrong'?" and "What are the moral standards that underlie your actions?"

In our study, we utilized an Interpretive Phenomenological Approach (IPA), as developed by Smith et al. in 2021, as the methodological framework for analyzing the interview data. This approach is particularly geared towards exploring the subjective experiences and perspectives of the participants. Our aim was to understand the issues through the lens of the individuals being studied, thereby providing an authentic account of their viewpoints.

Simultaneously, we maintained an awareness of our own perspectives and potential biases as researchers. This reflexivity was crucial for mitigating the influence of our own viewpoints on the interpretive process. By acknowledging our own preconceptions, we took deliberate steps to minimize their impact on the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Given that the primary focus of our article is to delve into the moral reasoning and ethical perspectives of students, we determined that the Interpretive Phenomenological Approach was exceptionally well-suited for our research objectives.

For the data analysis phase, we employed ATLAS.ti 23, a specialized qualitative data analysis software that facilitates the organization, coding, and interpretation of complex datasets. Utilizing this software enabled us to systematically dissect the interview responses to identify recurring patterns, themes, and concepts.

The thematic development process unfolded in several structured steps, ensuring a rigorous and transparent approach to data analysis:

1. **Familiarization Phase:** Initially, we immersed ourselves in the data by reviewing the interview transcripts multiple times. This repetitive engagement with the data served as a foundation for the subsequent analytical stages, allowing us to gain an intuitive understanding of its depth and nuances.
2. **Independent Coding:** At this juncture, two researchers independently undertook the task of coding the data. The aim here was not only to categorize the data but also to delve into the psychological motivations of the respondents. Any discrepancies between the researchers' codings were duly noted and resolved through discussion and consensus. This collaborative process bolstered the reliability and validity of our coding strategy.
3. **Thematic Development:** In the final stage, we consolidated the codes into broader themes, organizing them in a manner that would illuminate the core aspects of the participants' moral viewpoints. By clustering related codes together under overarching themes, we were able to distill the essence of how the participants conceptualize and engage with issues of morality.

By adhering to this systematic approach, we endeavored to capture the intricate layers of our participants' moral reasoning and ethical beliefs in a coherent and meaningful way.

3. Findings

In general, we found that students' reasoning is characterized by whether they think morality is subjective and contextually dependent. Alternatively, they believe morality to be something objective. In other words, it is something that goes beyond what we think or what we feel. However, it is essential to note that students have not been classified under one specific theme.

Subjective/contextual

The majority of the students in our study articulated the notion that morality is a construct deeply influenced by subjective feelings and contextual factors. To provide a nuanced understanding of this perspective, let's delve deeper into the insights shared by the participants.

According to Student 1, the demarcation between right and wrong is contingent upon a person's gut feelings as well as the underlying rationale for their actions. For example, while the act of killing is often morally condemned, Student 1 suggests that it can be ethically justifiable in certain contexts, such as self-defense or a utilitarian calculus where the death of one individual could save numerous others.

"I think for me it is more of a gut feeling. Or more of how you feel about it when you think about it empathetically. For example, like killing someone." (Student 1)

"That could be right or wrong depending on your feelings at the moment, or the reason that you put behind it to justify it. Let's say, kill one to save thousands. That would probably, for me, align with my moral compass. I would probably opt for the more logical decision." (Student 1)

"It actually depends on the reason for killing this person. Maybe you want to defend yourself. And you do not have any other choice but to kill this person." (Student 1)

Other participants, including Students 3 and 5, concurred with the notion that the distinction between right and wrong is individual-specific. Student 3 emphasized that moral categories such as 'good' and 'bad' are subjective, depending on individual definitions. Similarly, Student 5 suggested that judgments about right and wrong could vary from person to person, particularly in complex situations.

"I think, like what I said, okay back to my answer. I think everybody has a definition of good and bad." (Student 3)

"I think this depends on different people. Because, if I say this is right but you think this is wrong. So, I think it depends on the individual, especially in complicated scenarios." (Student 5)

Student 13 added a temporal dimension to the discussion, suggesting that perceptions of morality can evolve over time.

"No, for me, it is no. I am sure it is not. It is not a good thing to do. And well, maybe someday I will change my mind about that." (Student 13)

Consequential

Another emergent theme was the consequentialist perspective on morality, exemplified by Student 4. According to this viewpoint, the moral quality of an action is determined by its outcomes, particularly whether it causes harm or benefit to others or oneself.

"For me, something is wrong if it harms other people." (Student 4)

"Something wrong could also mean where you harm yourself. For example, engaging in activities like drug abuse, drinking, and smoking are harmful actions." (Student 4)

Student 4 further elaborated that even well-intentioned actions could lead to negative consequences. For instance, excessive generosity could inadvertently foster entitlement or greed in recipients.

"If you donate too much to people, they will become entitled, they will become greedy. And they will want more; they will become lazy." (Student 4)

Student 6 shared similar consequentialist views, stating that actions that do not induce guilt or discomfort are generally right, while those that do are wrong.

"For me, the right thing is when you do something without feeling guilty because when you do something wrong, you feel uncomfortable and guilty." (Student 6)

Objective

A contrasting perspective emerged from participants like Student 9, who argued for a more objective or transcendental basis for morality, rooted in religious principles. This viewpoint holds that morality should not be left to individual interpretation as it could lead to conflict.

"So, for me, it has to be religion. Because if you think right and wrong are based on your understanding, it is not valid." (Student 9)

Other participants, including Students 2 and 7, echoed this sentiment, suggesting that morality should be guided by religious teachings or societal norms.

"I think, by the guide that I have from my religious affiliation, I can discern what is right or wrong." (Student 2)

"In my point of view, whatever my religion says is bad is bad. Whatever society tells me is bad, then it is bad." (Student 7)

Student 13 mentioned the importance of legal frameworks in determining moral actions, suggesting that laws exist to regulate human behavior in cases where morality is not straightforward.

"So, I think that it is hard to define what is right and what is wrong, but that is where the law comes into play. The law exists to restrict the actions of every human being." (Student 13)

4. Discussion

In the current investigation, we identified three overarching perspectives on morality that shape students' beliefs and actions: the subjective/contextual, consequentialist, and objective viewpoints. Each of these moral frameworks has distinct implications for how students perceive and engage in academic dishonesty.

Subjective/Contextual Views of Morality

The subjective or contextual perspective posits that moral judgments are fundamentally individualistic and situation dependent. According to this viewpoint, the morality of academic dishonesty hinges on the unique beliefs and circumstances of each student. For example, a student may deem cheating permissible if they believe the action aligns with their personal ethical code, or if they find themselves in a situation where dishonesty appears justified, such as being under extreme pressure to perform well. This relativistic approach to morality can potentially provide students with the flexibility to rationalize academic dishonesty. Within an educational context, this can lead to serious consequences. Empirical research, such as the study conducted by Rawwas et al. (2004),

supports this by revealing that students with more tolerant, relativistic perspectives were more accepting of academic dishonesty.

Consequentialist Views of Morality

Conversely, adopting a consequentialist moral framework introduces a different set of considerations. This viewpoint suggests that the ethical value of an action is determined by its outcomes. However, this raises essential questions: what constitutes a 'good' or 'bad' outcome, and how should these outcomes be measured or scaled? For instance, a student might argue that cheating is justifiable if it leads to higher grades and academic success, especially when the likelihood of punishment is low, as was the case during the pandemic. On the other hand, students who evaluate the broader societal repercussions, or who are concerned with the long-term impact on the quality of their education, may be less inclined to engage in academic dishonesty.

Objective Views of Morality

Lastly, the objective moral standpoint argues that ethical principles should transcend individual interpretations and be anchored in religious beliefs or established legal systems. This suggests that students should not engage in academic dishonesty if it is proscribed by their religious doctrine or by educational policy. Supporting this notion, research indicates that higher levels of religious commitment are inversely correlated with academic dishonesty (Onu et al., 2021). Additionally, other studies show that greater religious knowledge can mitigate the inclination to commit academic dishonesty (Akko, 2018; Ridwan & Diantimala, 2021).

5. Conclusion

To summarize, this study illuminates the intricate and multifaceted nature of students' moral orientations and how these beliefs influence their stance on academic dishonesty. Whether scrutinized through a subjective, consequentialist, or objective lens, morality emerges as a complex construct, informed by a mosaic of individual experiences, societal norms, and philosophical underpinnings. Further research should delve into the complex relationship between these different moral worldviews and incidents of academic dishonesty.

Tackling the issue of academic dishonesty necessitates a collaborative effort involving students, educators, and policymakers. This is particularly crucial in the age of advanced AI technologies like ChatGPT, which have made academic dishonesty more accessible than ever. Educational institutions should focus on educating students about the far-reaching implications of dishonesty on both their prospects and broader society. Universities must also continually emphasize their foundational objective: to facilitate authentic learning experiences. One potential intervention could be to bolster students' religious affiliations, which evidence suggests may reduce the propensity to engage in dishonest academic behaviors.

Informed Consent Statement

None.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there exists no competing financial interest or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Ethics Statement

In the current study we follow the research ethics by asking students their permission to use their response in our study.

Author Contributions

All author contributed equally

Funding

The article was self-funded, we did not receive any external fund.

Acknowledgement

We do acknowledge all the people who help in this article.

Data Availability Statement

The data is available by request.

References

- Akko, B. T. (2018). Pengaruh Pendidikan Agama Islam Terhadap Akhlak (Perilaku Jujur). *IQRO: Journal of Islamic Education*, 1(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.24256/iqro.v1i1.313>
- Butler, B., Bodnar, C., Cooper, M., Burkey, D., & Anastasio, D. (2019). Towards understanding the moral reasoning process of senior chemical engineering students in process safety contexts. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 28, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ece.2019.03.004>
- Chapman, K. J., 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(3), 236–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475304268779>
- Cummings, R., Dyas, L., Maddux, C. D., & Kochman, A. (2001). Principled Moral Reasoning and Behavior of Preservice Teacher Education Students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038001143>
- Doody, O., & Noonan, M. (2013). Preparing and conducting interviews to collect data. *Nurse Researcher*, 20(5), 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2013.05.20.5.28.e327>
- Foster, J. D., & Laforce, B. (1999). A Longitudinal Study of Moral, Religious, and Identity Development in a Christian Liberal Arts Environment. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 27(1), 52–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164719902700105>
- Gfeller, B. M. (1986). Ego development and moral development in relation to age and grade level during adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 15(2), 147–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02141735>
- Good, J. L., & Cartwright, C. (1998). Development of moral judgement among undergraduate university students. *College Student Journal*, 32, 270–276.
- Ives, B., Alama, M., Mosora, L. C., Mosora, M., Grosu-Radulescu, L., Clinciu, A. I., Cazan, A.-M., Badescu, G., Tufis, C., Diaconu, M., & Dutu, A. (2017). Patterns and predictors of academic dishonesty in Romanian university students. *Higher Education*, 74(5), 815–831. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0079-8>
- Keohane, N. O. (1998). Moral Education in the Modern University. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 142(2), 244–257.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and Promoting Intellectual Growth and Critical Thinking in Adolescents and Adults. *Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series and Jossey-Bass Social and Behavioral Science Series*.
- King, P. M., & Mayhew, M. J. (2002). Moral Judgement Development in Higher Education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(3), 247–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724022000008106>
- King, P. M., & Mayhew, M. J. (2005). Theory and Research on the Development of Moral Reasoning Among College Students. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 19, pp. 375–440). Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-2456-8_9
- Kitchener, K. S., King, P. M., Davison, M. L., Parker, C. A., & Wood, P. K. (1984). A longitudinal study of moral and ego development in young adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 13(3), 197–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02089059>
- Kohlberg, L., & Hersh, R. H. (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory Into Practice*, 16(2), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405847709542675>
- Lim, V. K. G., & See, S. K. B. (2001). Attitudes Toward, and Intentions to Report, Academic Cheating Among Students in Singapore. *Ethics & Behavior*, 11(3), 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_5
- Malinowski, C., & Smith, C. P. (1985). Moral reasoning and moral conduct: An investigation prompted by Kohlberg's theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(4), 1016–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.4.1016>
- Mustapha, R., Hussin, Z., Siraj, S., & Darusalam, G. (2017). Academic Dishonesty Among Higher Education Students: The Malaysian Evidence (2014 To 2016). *KATHA- The Official Journal of the Centre for Civilisational Dialogue*, 13(1), Article 1 <https://doi.org/10.22452/KATHA.vol13no1.4>
- Onu, D. U., Onyedibe, M. C. C., Ugwu, L. E., & Nche, G. C. (2021). Relationship between religious commitment and academic dishonesty: Is self-efficacy a factor? *Ethics & Behavior*, 31(1), 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2019.1695618>
- Paradice, D. B., & Dejoie, R. (1991). The ethical decision-making processes of information systems workers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 10(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00383688>
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1992). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21(2), 222. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2075453>
- Rawwas, M. Y. A., Al-Khatib, J. A., & Vitell, S. J. (2004). Academic Dishonesty: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of U.S. and Chinese Marketing Students. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(1), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475303262354>

- Rest, J. R. (1984). Research on Moral Development: Implications for Training Counseling Psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12(3), 19–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000084123003>
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (2000). A Neo-Kohlbergian Approach to Morality Research. *Journal of Moral Education*, 29(4), 381–395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713679390>
- Ridwan, R., & Diantimala, Y. (2021). The positive role of religiosity in dealing with academic dishonesty. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1875541. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1875541>
- Rodzalan, S. A., & Saat, M. M. (2016). Ethics of undergraduate students: A study in Malaysian public universities. <https://doi.org/10.7763/ijiet.2016.v6.772>
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (2005). Qualitative Interviewing (2nd ed.): The Art of Hearing Data. *SAGE Publications, Inc.* <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452226651>
- Shaver, D. G. (1987). Moral Development of Students Attending a Christian, Liberal Arts College and a Bible College. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(3).
- Steven P. McNeel. (1994). College teaching and student moral development. The Faculty of Management, University of Technology Malaysia, 81310, Skudai, Johor, Malaysia, Rodzalan, S. A., Saat, M. M., & the Faculty of Management, University of Technology Malaysia, 81310, Skudai, Johor, Malaysia.
- (2016). Ethics of Undergraduate Students: A Study in Malaysian Public Universities. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 6(9), 672–678. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IJiet.2016.V6.772>
- Tompkins, E. (1945). General Education in a Free Society: A Report on the Harvard Report. *Journal of Education*, 128(7), 227–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205744512800711>
- Yussof, S. H., & Ismail, S. (2018). Academic dishonesty among accounting students in Malaysia / Salwa Hana Yussof and Suhaiza Ismail. *Management & Accounting Review (MAR)*, 17(1), Article 1.