ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN FINLAND: RELIGIOUS AND DEMOGRAPHIC DIFFERENCES

Christa Tigerstedt, Arcada University of Applied Sciences, Finland
Linn Hongell, Arcada University of Applied Sciences, Finland
Marty Ludlum, University of Central Oklahoma, United States
Victoria McKee, University of Central Oklahoma, United States

ABSTRACT

We examined Finnish business majors' behaviors and attitudes towards academic dishonesty (AD) and how religion affects their views. Finland is unique because of a national religion and historically a heavy church involvement in public education. In the current project, we surveyed undergraduates (n=136). We used two scales, one for AD attitudes, one for AD behaviors, both of which had high reliability. With factor analysis, we reduced the scales to three variables and found religion impacted academic ethics by three facets: denomination, intensity, and level of participation. In addition, we found significant differences based on gender, age, First Generation status, military experience, and employment.

Key words: *Survey, Academic dishonesty, Finland, religion*

INTRODUCTION

Cheating. No one word causes such consternation among academics as cheating. The conventional wisdom is that cheating is both pervasive and world-wide (Grenness, 2022). Sadly, evidence abounds of students violating the most basic ethics. Does religion make a difference in students' behaviors towards academic dishonesty? The conventional wisdom would be in the affirmative. A religious person is a more ethical person, at least the assumption would claim (Xygalatas, 2017). Atheists, those without religion, would be assumed to be less ethical. We decided to test these assumptions in the current project.

Religious people describe themselves as being more ethical, honest, and empathetic. However, in actual behaviors, differences were not found (Xygalatas, 2017). When examining religious versus non-religious people researchers provide evidence that while there were differences in individuals stated views, religious versus non-religious individuals did not differ in their actions. Moral behaviors and immoral behaviors were equally as common among religious and non-religious persons (Hofmann et al., 2014). Perhaps the conventional wisdom is incorrect.

This study will examine an under-studied population, Finnish students, and their views toward academic ethics. The current project adds to the knowledge of the discipline by examining this understudied group of future Scandinavian leaders. Finland's ethical climate is

exceptional. Finland is tied for first place as the least corrupt country in the world, according to Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (2022) Finland tied with Denmark and New Zealand for the top spot. Finland's excellent status is longstanding. When comparing many nations through the 1980's and 1990's research provides evidence that Finland one of the least corrupt nations (Treisman, 2000).

Furthermore, The Nordic Business Ethics Survey (NBES), annually since 2019, measures ethical views of business workers from Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Estonia (Romberg & Ratsula, 2023). The NBES demonstrates that Finland (and the other countries included) have strong ethical mindsets in the workplace, and these guide the economy of these nations. Finland has been a leader in corporate criminal liability to address business wrongdoing, and not surprisingly Finland had almost perfectly clean politics (Tolvanen, 2009; Zook, 2009). This comes from their core values and educational background. Finnish students and found they had strong ethical orientations for employees, the environment, and their community (Ludlum, et al., 2013).

How does Finland achieve such consistent high ethical evaluations? National religion is part of the answer. Finland had incorporated Lutheran religious curricula into basic education (Zilliacus & Holm, 2013). Students formerly were required to take religious instruction as part of their program for all students, ages 7-16. The national curriculum used to include approximately one hour per week for religious education in every grade (Fin. katsomusaineiden opetus) but currently, 14 non-Lutheran options are offered as secular ethics including Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, and Catholicism (Fin. elämänkatsomustieto) (Lipiainen, et al., 2020).

The Lutheran Church, intertwined with the welfare state, dominates Finland's religious culture. The Lutheran Church accounts for sixty-nine percent of the population (Expat-Finland, 2022; Lipiainen et al., 2020), down eight percent in less than a decade (Markkola, 2014; Vogelaar, 2013). The second largest religion in Finland is being non-religious at twenty-seven percent (Lipiainen, et al., 2020). Even with a national religion, fifty-four percent of Finns describe themselves as "neither religious or spiritual," and fifty-eight percent claim to seldom or never attend Lutheran religious services (Lipiainen et al., 2020).

Since most ethical views are framed by religious influences, Finland provides a unique example with a national religion. We surveyed Finnish college students in the spring of 2019 on academic ethics. To support this analysis, we will first review the relevant literature. Next, we will examine the survey methods. Then, we will discuss the findings. We conclude by suggesting further research in this area.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Academic dishonesty is a hot topic and most of the news is not flattering. With the rise of artificial intelligence, cheating is becoming even easier and more concerning in academics and the workplace. The most examined population is American college students. McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino (2006) surveyed graduate business students from fifty-four schools in the USA and Canada on thirteen specific unethical behaviors. They found fifty-three percent of business students admitted one or more cheating incidents.

Not all nations are equal when it comes to academic dishonesty. When examining business and economics students across forty-two universities in twenty-one countries researchers found that Scandinavian students (Sweden and Denmark) have a lower probability of cheating compared to students from Eastern Europe (Teixeira & Rocha, 2010). Teixeira (2013) studied undergraduate students from twenty-one countries (not including Finland) and found that countries with higher levels of corruption showed higher rates of cheating on exams.

For business programs, the news is especially bad. In a sample of American universities, business students were significantly more likely to cheat than non-business students (McCabe, 1997). When examining undergraduate students on seventeen specific cheating behaviors researcher found that eighty-three percent of students cheated at least once in college, and fifty-five percent had done serious cheating (exam or plagiarism) during college (Rettinger, et al., 2004). However, not every student has the same propensity or likelihood to cheat. Males were much more likely to cheat across all seventeen behaviors. (Rettinger, et al., 2004).

In reviewing American universities, it is important to examine universities that consider themselves to have a "religious component" built into their core educational system. When examining undergraduate students at a religious school in the United States on multiple cheating behaviors, researchers found that students described cheating as "disturbingly common" (Rettinger & Kramer, 2009). Almost seventy-five percent of students engaged in at least one behavior, and over thirty-five percent reported serious cheating (plagiarism or exam cheating) (Rettinger & Kramer, 2009). Additionally, when comparing business and leadership students from the United States researchers found that business students cheated more often than non-business students and had more tolerant views of cheating than other students (Simha, et al., 2012). Therefore, it is imperative to examine different cultures and areas to see if the problem is inherent among all students or if there are some factors that could be changed to help decrease rampant cheating.

Although there has not been much research about the academics in Finland, Finland is known to have had their workplace and their ethical views have been extensively examined in the literature (Huhtala, Kangas, Lamsa, et al., 2008; Lamsa & Takala, 2000; Kujala, 2001& 2010; Kujala et al., 2011; Riivari & Lamsa, 2014; and Vuontisjarvi, 2006). However, once the graduates are in industry, higher education will have little if any impact. Löfström et al., (2015) interviewed fifty-six professors in Finland and New Zealand on academic integrity. The professors summarized, "university teachers at our institutions are united in respecting the importance of academic integrity, but not of one mind about what it is, how it should be taught and whose responsibility it is to teach it" (p. 446).

Research on academic ethics (cheating) with a Finnish undergraduate sample is sparse. Finnish business students were asked questions about unethical behaviors and found that sixty percent of Finnish college students claimed to have not seen a student cheat on an exam (Ludlum et al., 2017). The number dropped to thirty-nine percent when asked about taking credit for another student's work on any assignment. As students progressed (year in school), the number who witnessed cheating increased. Interestingly, students were hesitant to report another student cheating. Less than half would always report the offending student and a small portion, less than ten percent, would never report the unethical behaviors of another student.

Another project examined Finnish business students and their views on academic cheating and found Finnish students were highly motivated to do his/her own work, but at the same time were uncomfortable with being obligated to report academic dishonesty of other students (Ludlum et al., 2021). When comparisons were made, they found female and more experienced students were more ethical. They summarized that the rate of cheating in Finland was far below similar studies in the United States.

For comparison, we will use the extensively examined USA college student population. Surveys of student cheating in the United States are shockingly candid about the widespread academic dishonesty on campus. Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, and Passow (2004) surveyed technical students and found seventy-nine percent cheated at least once per term. Furthermore, in another study of undergraduate students and found ninety percent admitted to an academically dishonest act at least once (Hard et al, 2006).

Results of student cheating are not always consistent. This is caused by the difficulty in finding and exact definition for "cheating." There is not one operationalized definition of cheating. Teixeira & Rocha (2006) defined cheating in their study as copying the work of others. Not even scholars in academic ethics can agree on a single definition of cheating.

The wide array of results was influenced by the definition of cheating used in each survey. When surveying college students from three small colleges researchers found different rates of cheating based on the individual act. Plagiarizing a complete paper was rare while over fifty percent of students reported copying answers on an exam and eighty-four percent witnessed others copying answers on an exam (Qualls, 2014). Similarly, Rakovski and Levy (2007) surveyed business students and found more than sixty percent cheated on homework but less than four percent cheated on exams.

Cheating is a global problem. When examining the next few studies, there are a multitude of reasons and justifications for cheating, but the problem is that students across the world are cheating, and we do not have a model or cultural blueprint to reduce cheating at the university level. Egyptian students indicated "*pressure to achieve"* was a major factor to their decision to engage in academic dishonesty (Click, 2014). Comparing American and Japanese college students, Japanese students reported more instances of cheating on exams as well as a greater tendency to justify it (Diekhoff et al., 1999). Also, Dubljević, Sattler, and Racine (2014) surveyed four German Universities and found the use of cognitive enhancers (drugs or devices designed to aide or improve thinking) had low student acceptance. Taiwanese students were surveyed by grouping them by job status (Hsiao, 2015) and found the propensity to cheat varied between part-time and full-time employees (full-time workers were more likely to cheat).

Additionally, researchers examined students in Taiwan and found cheating is common on exams. Fifty-nine percent of students would never report exam cheating to the instructor (Ludlum & Gwinner, 2016). Murtaza et.al. (2013) surveyed student's perceptions of plagiarism via a survey of thirty-five Pakistani universities in which they researcher found evidence that ninety-four percent of respondents were unaware of their university's integrity policy. Adding to this list of cheating at a global level, almost seventy-five percent of medical students in Turkey had cheated during multiple-choice tests (Semerci, 2006). When examining graduates of management studies in Israel, researchers provided evidence that native-born Israeli students

cheated more than the non-natives and the older students cheated less than younger students (Siniver, 2013). Teixeria and Rocha (2008) Another study examined the difference of Portuguese students and Spanish students finding more Spanish students admitted to cheating than Portuguese (Teixeria & Rocha, 2008).

We should be cautious to assume the same results from one culture to another. Hofstede (1983, 1991, 1993) argued cultural differences impact conduct in business and decision-making. Socialization and training also influence personal values (Hofstede, 1991).

Religion is a significant factor, as faith is often the foundation for a person's ethical beliefs. Several studies have found religion impacted academic dishonesty. Etter, Cramer, and Finn (2006) surveyed students at a private church affiliated college and at a major research university and discovered the students at the religious school rated cheating as more offensive than did students at a non-religious affiliated school. Also, when undergraduates at a private religious university observed others cheating, that strongly influenced one's own cheating behaviors (Rettinger & Kramer, 2009).

Smyth, Davis & Kroncke (2009) surveyed students' perceptions of business ethics by comparing religious and (state) non-religious institutions. They found students at a Baptist college had more reaction to unethical behavior than state school students. Additionally, the state school students had a greater reaction than students at the Catholic school. It is certainly premature to claim one religion is more ethical than another, but it does support the idea that religion does have an effect, but the effect on ethics might not be uniform.

Religion should have significant importance in a Finnish sample, with one religion (Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland) being so dominant. However, the dominance of church membership may not indicate agreement with those beliefs. Pauha et al., (2020) noted that half of the atheists in Finland are members of the Lutheran Church. Based on these arguments, we hypothesize the following:

> *Hypothesis 1: The religious denomination of Finnish business majors significantly influences their attitudes toward academic dishonesty.*

Cheating is also influenced by age. When surveying college students' researchers found that those who cheated were less mature (younger, financially dependent on parents, less likely to be married) (Diekhoff et al., 1996). Similar findings came from Harding, Carpenter, and Finelli (2012) who surveyed engineering undergraduates from three different universities and discovered first-year students were more likely to cheat than seniors. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

> *Hypothesis 2: The age of Finnish business majors significantly influences their attitudes toward academic dishonesty.*

Gender has been found to be a significant indicator of who cheats. When examining a Midwestern university researchers found male students displayed more overall instances of cheating than did female students (Miller, et al., 2011). Similarly, Niiya, Ballantyne, North, and Crocker (2008) found males were more likely to cheat than females. Specifically, when

surveying business students, males were more academically dishonest than females (Rakovski & Levy, 2007). Gender differences exist even when considering the students' major and the time spent working on the course, as females consistently ranked cheating as less acceptable (Becker & Ulstad, 2007).

Hypothesis 3: Finnish female business majors will cheat less than their male counterparts.

METHOD FOR THE SURVEY

Participants

The participants are from a university of applied sciences in Helsinki, Finland, affiliated with the authors. The two divisions of higher education in Finland are universities (research-based) and polytechnics (applied science) which train for labor market needs (Jääskelä & Nissilä, 2015). Finland has 13 universities and 23 universities of applied sciences (Fulbright Finland Foundation, 2022). The school we examined represents the second part of this division. Both types of institutions reflect Finland's higher education system as heavily rooted in the welfare state principal of equal opportunity (Välimaa, 2012). However, because of the different educational missions, the students might not be similar.

Finland has a generous social program for students, and free tuition for students inside the European Union. Previous studies on Finland's students are limited because of the small population, about five and a half million (Statistics Finland, 2022). Finland's culture is guided by the Nordic Welfare model, which includes generous comprehensive and universal social entitlements (Keskinen, 2016) which handles retirement, child benefits, unemployment, health insurance, and student financial support (Kela.fi, 2022). The welfare state is a cornerstone of Finland's national identity (Kettunen, 2011). The Nordic welfare model, high taxes free and equal access to a broad scale of social services (health care, training, pensions, and education, to name a few) is provided without concern of income or economic need (Frelle-Petersen, Hein, & Christiansen, 2020). Finland's higher education system supports students with no tuition, a variety of grants for housing, and very low interest loans, even subsidies for meals on campus (Frelle-Petersen, Hein, & Christiansen, 2020; and Bridgestock, 2021). As a result, Finnish higher education is often without out-of-pocket expenses. In fact, Finnish students do not typically buy a textbook, rather they use online texts or borrow books from the library (Fulbright Finland Foundation, 2022).

All the participants were business majors. The respondents were in the following academic years: first, 81%; second, 8%; third, 7%; and fourth, 4%. Upperclassmen were underrepresented in our sample. Males outnumbered females 53% to 47%. Our group consisted of primarily traditional students (76% were aged 18-22). Only 6 students (4.7% of the respondents) were married, and only 3 students had children. Most students worked while attending school (64%), predominantly part-time work.

In religion, Lutheran/Christian was the dominant group with 47%, while 45% identified as non-religious. Other students were spread among all other faiths. To our surprise, students

were not very active in religion. Few students (13%) attended church once a month or more, and only one student identified with being "strongly religious."

Military experience was much higher in the Finland sample (35.4%) than in other student groups. In Finland, military service is required for all men and this obligation is usually completed while they are 18-20 years old (Laukkala, Partonen, Marttunen, & Henriksson, 2014). Military service by women is voluntary.

Procedures

The current project involved a self-assessment/self-reporting of students' views and ethical behaviors. A convenience sample was taken from large classes at Arcada University of Applied Sciences (2023) in Helsinki, Finland in the spring of 2019. The survey was conducted in English. The students at Arcada are multilingual (Finnish, Swedish, and English), with several programs taught in English to benefit their international student exchange programs. Finland has always been a multilingual country, becoming independent in 1917 with two official languages and several official minority languages, such as Sami (Kotimaisten Kielten Keskus, 2022; and Anckar, 2000).

Students were asked to complete the questionnaire during class time. The survey instrument was voluntary and anonymous. No inducements were offered to the students to participate. A total of 136 surveys resulted. However, some questions had fewer than 136 responses. The text of the questions is in the appendix.

Measures

The first scale (Attitudes) examined students' views on academic bad behaviors and was a replication of the 19 questions used by Simha, Armstong, & Albert (2012). The Attitudes first scale used a Likert type rating of: 0=Not Cheating, 1 = Trivial Cheating, 2 = Serious Cheating. The full text of the Attitudes scale is reported in Table 1.

The second scale (Behaviors) was based on the first scale but modified to put the general statements into a first-person format ("I have done…") to measure behaviors rather than attitudes. The Behaviors scale used a Likert type ranking about his/her own behavior, 1. Never, 2. Rarely, 3. Sometimes, 4. Many times, and 5. Always. The full text of the Behaviors scale is reported in Table 2.

We reported the means and standard deviations on all questions. In addition, when comparing demographic sub-groups, we used Chi-Squared tests. We used SPSS version 24 for analysis. The complete text of demographic questions is in the appendix.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Surveying students about academic ethics is a challenge as many would not be candid about their own wrongdoing. We were best able to minimize the socially appropriate response bias by using a large group survey, anonymous results, and confidential submissions. The overall findings on Attitudes are displayed below.

Table 1. Means on Attitudes toward Cheating

0=Not Cheating, 1 = Trivial Cheating, 2 = Serious Cheating	Mean	Stnd. Dev.
ATC1 Copying homework assignments from others.	.90	.556
ATC2 Allowing others to copy homework assignments from you.	.81	.565
ATC3 Collaborating with others on assignments meant to be completed alone.	.60	.670
ATC4 Collaborating with others on tests meant to be completed alone.	1.38	.760
ATC5 Using unauthorized cheat-sheets on an exam.	1.64	.729
ATC6 Looking at or copying from other's exam copies.	1.61	.670
ATC7 Allowing others to look at or copy from an exam copy.	1.26	.733
ATC8 Obtaining exam questions illicitly beforehand.	1.47	.677
ATC9 Telling another student what is on the exam before he/she takes it.	.87	.678
ATC10 Using authorizing electronic equipment for use in exams	1.23	.825
ATC11 Fabricating bibliographies on assignments/papers.	1.25	.727
ATC12 Copying from a source without citing source	1.17	.697
ATC13 Obtaining papers from the web and turning them as your own work.	1.63	.686
ATC14 Making other write your papers for you, and then turning them in as your own work.	1.48	.740
ATC15 Referencing materials without reading them.	.96	.679
ATC16 Falsifying grades scores.	1.63	.679
ATC17 Changing one's answers after getting the grade in order to increase one's score.	1.47	.713
ATC18 Making false and fraudulent excuses to postpone assignments and/or tests.	1.04	.719
ATC19 Falsifying school documents (i.e., doctor notes, parking permits, or certificates).	1.48	.769

The lower the mean, the less serious students considered the offense. The higher the mean, the more serious students viewed the offense. To no one's surprise, students viewed copying homework (out of class assignment) as low-level cheating, even when the assignment was meant to be completed alone. Moderate cheating includes collaborating on tests and small instances of plagiarism. Serious cheating includes wholesale cheating on exams and completely plagiarized projects, as well as trying to falsify one's scores.

FREQUENCY OF CHEATING

The second scale, Frequency of Cheating (FOC) used a self-reporting scheme on a student's personal behaviors. These statements were put into the first person (I have done ___). Since we relied on self-reporting, we cannot confirm the reported behaviors match actual behaviors, but this is the only possibility when using an anonymous survey. As a result, these findings represent unconfirmed bad behaviors. The complete results are shown below.

Table 2. Frequency of Cheating and Means.

How would you describe your own behavior? For the following questions, use this scale: 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Many times 5. Always	**Mean**	**Stnd. Dev.**
FOC1 I have copied homework assignments from other students.	2.38	.951
FOC2 I have allowed students to copy homework assignments from me.	2.77	.966
FOC3 I have collaborated with others on assignments I was supposed to do alone.	2.92	1.009
FOC4 I have collaborated with others on take-home exams I was supposed to do alone.	2.30	1.118
FOC5 I have used an unauthorized cheat sheet on an exam.	1.35	.621
FOC6 I have looked at or copied from someone else's exam during a test.	1.62	.739
FOC7 I have allowed others to look at or copy from my exam during a test.	1.84	.955
FOC8 I have obtained the test question beforehand illegally.	1.41	.711
FOC9 I have told another student what is on an exam before he/she took it.	2.59	1.125
FOC10 I have used unauthorized electronic equipment for help on an exam.	1.36	.673
FOC11 I have fabricated a bibliography.	1.22	.518
FOC12 I have copied information from a source for a paper without citing the source.	1.91	.857
FOC13 I have obtained a research paper from the web and handed the paper in as my own.	1.36	.737
FOC14 I have had others write my research paper for me, and then handed the paper as my own.	1.25	.613
FOC15 I have referenced materials without truly reading them.	2.10	.951
FOC16 I have falsified grade scores.	1.22	.588
FOC17 I have changed test or assignments answers after getting my grade score.	1.22	.515
FOC18 I have made fraudulent excuses to postpone exams or assignments.	1.58	.757
FOC19 I have falsified school documents (i.e., parking, permit, certificate, doctor notes etc.)	1.31	.789

The lower the mean, the less frequent the behavior was reported. The higher the mean, the more frequent the behavior was reported.

We divided the behaviors into three categories: low frequency behaviors, which included exam cheating, fabrication/plagiarism, and altering scores; moderate frequency behaviors, which included copying an answer during an exam and false excuses to avoid assignments; and frequent cheating which included copying or sharing homework answers or collaborating on projects meant to be completed alone.

The survey had face validity. As a test for internal consistency, we conducted Cronbach's alpha for the two scales. The first scale, Attitudes, was a replication of the 19 questions from Simha, Armstrong, & Albert (2012) and the Cronbach's alpha was .910. The second scale of 19 questions (Behaviors) had a Cronbach's alpha of .902. Both scales were well above the 0.70 threshold for research.

We determined overall cheating levels for Finnish business students based on our sample. We found that 83.09% admitted to minor cheating on exams (FOC8-9); 83.83% admitted to

serious cheating on exams (FOC4-5-6-7-10); 94.86% admitted to cheating on homework (FOC1-2-3); 80.15% admitted to minor plagiarism (FOC11-12-15); 30.89% admitted to serious plagiarism (FOC13-14); 51% admitted to falsifying scores (FOC16-18-19); and 21% admitted to false excuses (FOC17). These results, while high, include doing these behaviors at any time in higher education. In addition, these results are not dissimilar to the behaviors in other nations.

To make further comparisons, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed using principal component analysis and varimax rotation. The minimum factor loading criteria was set to 0.50. The communality of the scale, which indicates the amount of variance in each dimension, was also assessed to ensure acceptable levels of explanation. The results show that all communalities were over 0.50.

An important step involved weighing the overall significance of the correlation matrix through Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which provides a measure of the statistical probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlations among some of its components. The results were significant, approximate chi-square (n=115) = 2794.21, df=703, ($p < 0.001$), which indicates its suitability for factor analysis. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (MSA), which indicates the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, was 0.794. In this regard, data with MSA values above 0.800 are considered appropriate for factor analysis. Finally, the factor solution derived from this analysis yielded three factors for the scale, which accounted for 48.49% of the variation in the data.

In this EFA, 12 items (ATC1-2-3, ATC9, ATC12, ATC15, ATC18, FOC6-7-8, FOC10, & FOC12) failed to load on any of the three factors significantly. Hence, these 12 items were removed from further analysis.

The three factors identified as part of this EFA aligned with the theoretical proposition in this research. Factor 1 included 12 items (ATC 4-8, ACT 10-11, ATC 13-14, ATC 16-17, and ATC19), referring to *CHEAT_ATTITUDES (CA*). Factor 2 included 8 items (FOC5, FOC11, FOC 13-14, and FOC 16-19, which represents *CHEAT_SIGNIF (CS*). Factor 3 included 6 items (FOC 1-4, FOC9, and FOC15 referring to *CHEAT_MINOR (CM).* Factor Loadings are presented in the table below.

Table 3. Factor Loading, PCA with varimax rotation.

Item	Factor 1 (CA)	Factor 2 (CS)	Factor 3 (CM)
ATC13	.889		
ATC5	.860		
ATC6	.860		
ATC16	.852		
ATC14	.785		
ATC19	.783		
ATC8	.770		
ATC17	.704		
ATC4	.665		
ATC7	.631		
ATC11	.605		
ATC10	.551		
FOC17		.889	
FOC16		.851	
FOC19		.748	
FOC14		.708	
FOC11		.703	
FOC13		.603	
FOC5		.569	
FOC18		.526	
FOC3			.797
FOC1			.765
FOC2			.701
FOC4			.698
FOC9			.568
FOC15			.516
Variance	22.049	19.517	6.931
Cumulative	22.049	41.566	48.496

For each factor an internal reliability test was done. Factor 1 (12-items) had a Cronbach's alpha of .926. Factor 2 (8-items) had a Cronbach alpha of .887. Factor 3 (6-items) had a Cronbach alpha of .836, all of which exceeded the .700 level used for social science research.

Differences between students

To do comparisons based on individual characteristics of the three facets of religion (Denomination, Frequency, and Intensity), we used analysis of variance (ANOVA). For simplicity, we report only the statistically significant ANOVAs in the table below. A complete statistical report is available from the authors.

Table 4. ANOVA results, statistically significant in BOLD.

	Factor	Mean Square	F	df	Sig.
Religious Denomination	***CHEAT_SIGNIF***	**2.539**	**2.628**	**4**	**.039 ****
Religious Denomination	*CHEAT_ATTITUDES*	1.738	1.738	4	.142
Religious Denomination	*CHEAT_MINOR*	.453	.456	4	.768
Religious Frequency	***CHEAT_ATTITUDES***	**7.485**	**7.843**	**1**	**.006 ****
Religious Frequency	*CHEAT_SIGNIF*	.001	.001	1	.976
Religious Frequency	*CHEAT_MINOR*	.077	.078	1	.781
Religious Intensity	*CHEAT_SIGNIF*	.243	.233	6	.965
Religious Intensity	*CHEAT_MINOR*	1.013	1.038	6	.405
Religious Intensity	***CHEAT_ATTITUDES***	**4.921**	**6.219**	**6**	**<.001 ****

How should we interpret this result? Simply identifying with a religion (choosing a denomination from a list) had some effect on cheating behavior. However, those who had strong support for a religion (intensity) and those who actively participate in a religion (religious frequency) were higher in academic honesty attitudes, but not higher in behavior. These findings support the different effects of religion from previous studies.

Table 5. t-Test scores, statistically significant results only

	Factor	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.
Gender	*CHEAT_MINOR*	2.026	.157	1.439	109	.076
First Generation	*CHEAT_ATTITUDES*	5.454	.021	1.576	108	.059
Military	*CHEAT_MINOR*	.317	.575	2.329	110	.011
Age	*CHEAT_MINOR*	.080	.777	1.395	109	.082
Employed	*CHEAT_SIGNIF*	5.546	.020	-1.654	111	.050

When we examined individual demographic characteristics (gender, age, employment, military experience, and First-Generation status), we found that each of these characteristics were significant in one factor. It is important to note that no one individual characteristic

influenced all three factors. In fact, no individual characteristic influenced more than one factor. This supports the well held belief that all/most students cheat from time to time, and no group is immune to the temptation of cheating. Cheating Attitudes were affected only by First Generation status, and none of the other demographic characteristics. Minor cheating behaviors were affected by three demographic characteristics, gender, military experience, and age. Serious cheating behaviors were affected only by employment. Our sample had too few married students or students with children, making this comparison less robust than we would like.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this project provides evidence that Finnish students cheat just as frequently as other groups. When examining Hypothesis 1, regarding religious denomination of Finnish business majors and their attitudes toward academic dishonesty, we found a significant relationship between denomination and student's attitudes toward academic dishonesty. The results are as hypothesized and are most likely due to the Finnish student's religious beliefs and participation in religious organizations, which is reflected in their attitudes about cheating but not necessarily their behaviors. Although the research provides evidence that many students did not go to church, the strong culture around the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland could have some effect on the student attitudes.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that the age of Finnish students would significantly influence their attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Regarding Hypothesis 2, we did not find a significant relationship. We did see that age had a minor impact, along with military experience and gender. Which leads to Hypothesis 3, Finnish female business majors will cheat less than their male counterparts. As seen above, in hypothesis 2, gender was not a primary demographic of impact. This could be due to the smaller sample size or the use of self-measurement. Finnish students may feel comfortable admitting to small infractions, but conscious of the admonition of larger cheating instances.

In conclusion, religion's three factors, denomination, frequency of participation, and intensity of feeling all have significant effects on cheating behaviors. Other demographic characteristics impact the frequency of cheating, supporting the conclusion that cheating behaviors are common among all students.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTHER RESEARCH

One obvious problem with academic ethics research is we are examining the attitudes towards cheating, and self-reported incidents. We have no way to validate these with any objective measure. Students may perceive more cheating or believe they have witnessed cheating when none existed. In addition, students might be hesitant to self-report their own bad behaviors even if done anonymously. As a result, our findings about the pervasiveness of cheating, and all research on academic ethics deserve more scrutiny.

A limitation is the use of non-random sampling, which limits the generalizations that can be made from the findings. Another limitation is that we only examined one institution. This

school might not be representative of all Finnish applied science colleges and does not represent Finnish universities. Another limitation of this study is the sample size. A larger sample size could result in more detailed analysis of the sub-groups. For example, a larger sample size could divide business majors into discipline areas. The same distinctions can be made with religion, as the Finnish population is heavily dominated by the Lutheran Church. Smaller sub-groups (especially married students and students with children) have too few members to make any comparison. More research on academic dishonesty is certainly warranted as we strive to minimize the effects of unethical behaviors.

The authors wish to disclose that funding for this project was in part by the Office of High Impact Practices at the University of Central Oklahoma. The authors wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and insights. Any errors or omissions remain those of the authors. A previous version of this paper was presented to the Institute for Global Business Research Conference in San Antonio, Texas, October 19, 2023.

REFERENCES

Anckar, O. (2000). University education in a bilingual country: The case of Finland. *Higher Education in Europe 25.4*, 499-506.

Arcada University. (2023). About Arcada, available at http://www.arcada.fi/en/about-arcada/arcada-university-applied-sciences-0.

Becker, D. A. & Ulstad, I. (2007). Gender Differences in Student Ethics: Are Females Really More Ethical? *Plagiary: Cross-Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification*, 77-91.

Bridgestock, L. (2021). Five reasons to study in Finland. *TopUniversities.com*, available at https://www.topuniversities.com/blog/five-reasons-study-finland.

Click, A.B. (2014). 'Taking Something That Is Not Your Right': Egyptian Students' Perceptions of Academic Integrity. *Libri: International Journal of Libraries & Information Services, 64(2)*, 109-123.

Diekhoff, G. M., Labeff, E. E., Clark, R.E., Williams, L.E., Francis, B., and Haines V.J. (1996). College Cheating: Ten Years Later. *Research in Higher Education, 37*, 487-502.

Diekhoff, G.M., Labeff, E.E., Shinohara, K., & Yasukawa, H. (1999). College Cheating in Japan and the United States. *Research in Higher Education, 40(3)*, 343-353.

Dubljević, V., Sattler, S., & Racine, É. (2014). Cognitive Enhancement and Academic Misconduct: A Study Exploring Their Frequency and Relationship. *Ethics & Behavior, 24(5)*, 408-420.

Etter, S., Cramer, J.J., & Finn, S. (2006). Origins of Academic Dishonesty: Ethical Orientations and Personality Factors Associated with Attitudes about Cheating with Information Technology. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 39(2)*, 133-155.

Expat-Finland. (2022). *Religion in Finland and places of worship*. Available at https://www.expat-finland.com/living_in_finland/religion.html.

Frelle-Petersen, C., Hein, A., & Christiansen, M. (2020). *The Nordic social welfare model: Lessons for reform*. Available at https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/insights/us/articles/43149-the-nordic-social-welfare-model/DI_The-Nordic-social-welfare-model.pdf.

Fulbright Finland Foundation. (2022). *Higher Education in Finland*. Available at https://www.fulbright.fi/studies-and-research-finland/higher-education-finland.

Grenness, T. (2022). "If you don't cheat, you lose": An explorative study of business students' perceptions of cheating behaviors. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 1-15*. DOI: 10.1080/00313831.2022.2116479.

Hard, S. F., Conway, J. M., & Moran, A. C. (2006). Faculty and College Student Beliefs about the Frequency of Student Academic Misconduct. *Journal of Higher Education, 77(6)*, 1058-1080.

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., & Finelli, C. J. (2012). An Exploratory Investigation of the Ethical Behavior of Engineering Undergraduates. *Journal of Engineering Education, 101(2)*, 346-374.

Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J. & Passow, H.J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and Engineering Ethics 10,* 311-324.

Hofmann, W., Wisneski, D.C., Brandt, M.J., & Skitka, L.J. (2014). Morality in everyday life. *Science 345(6202),* 1340-1343.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive 7.1*, 81-94.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions. *International Studies of Management and Organization 13.1-2*, 46-74

Huhtala, M., Kangas, M., Lamsa, A.M., & Feldt, T. (2013). Ethical managers in ethical organizations? The leadership-culture connection among Finnish managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal 34.3*, 250-270.

Hsiao, C.H. (2015). Impact of ethical and affective variables on cheating: comparison of undergraduate students with and without jobs. *Higher Education, 69(1),* 55-77.

Jääskelä, P. and Nissilä, P. (2015). Identifying themes for research-based development of pedagogy and guidance in higher education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research 59.1,* 24-41.

Kela.fi. (2022). *About Kela*. Available at https://www.kela.fi/about-kela.

Keskinen, S. (2016). From welfare nationalism to welfare chauvinism: Economic rhetoric, the welfare state and changing asylum policies in Finland. *Critical Social Policy 36.3*, 352-370.

Kotimaisten Kielten Keskus (Institute for the Languages of Finland). (2022). *Languages of Finland*. Available at https://www.kotus.fi/en/on_language/languages_of_finland.

Kujala, J. (2001). A multidimensional approach to Finnish managers' moral decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics 34*, 231-254.

Kujala, J. (2010). Corporate responsibility perceptions in change: Finnish managers' views on stakeholder issues from 1994 to 2004. *Business Ethics: A European Journal 19.1,* 14-34.

Kujala, J., Lamsa, A.M., & Penttila, K. (2011). Managers' moral decision-making patterns over time: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Business Ethics 100*, 191-207.

Lamsa, A., & Takala, T. (2000). Downsizing and ethics of personnel dismissals – the case of Finnish managers. *Journal of Business Ethics 23*, 389-399.

Laukkala T, Partonen T, Marttunen M, & Henriksson M. (2014). Suicides among military conscripts between 1991 – 2007 in Finland - A descriptive replication study. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry 68*, 270–274.

Lipiainen, T., Halafoff, A., Mansouri, F., & Bouma, G. (2020). Diverse worldviews education and social inclusion: a comparison between Finnish and Australian approaches to build intercultural and interreligious understanding. *British Journal of Religious Education, 42.4*, 391-402.

Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., and Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education 69*, 435-448.

Ludlum, M., Gwinner, T. (2016). Academic Ethics of Taiwanese College Students. *Global Education Journal, 2016(4),* 2-18.

Ludlum, M., Steelman, B., Hongell, L., & Tigerstedt, C. (2021). Academic cheating and demographic differences: An examination of Finnish business students. *Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences, 33.1*, 77-93.

Ludlum, M., Hongell, L., and C. Tigerstedt. (2013). Finnish business students and business ethics: A preliminary survey. *International Journal of Business and Social Science 4.4*, 120-127.

Ludlum, M., Hongell, L., Tigerstedt, C., Teeman, J. (2017). Academic Ethics: A Pilot Study on the Attitudes of Finnish Students. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 15(4),* 307-320.

Ludlum, M., Hongell, L., Tigerstedt, C., Alsobrook, L. (2016). Gender, Indoctrination, and Religious Effects on Ethical Stakeholders: An Investigative Study of Finnish Business Students. *Journal of Business and Educational Leadership, 6(1),* 13-26.

Markkola, P. (2014). Focusing on the family: The Lutheran Church and the making of the Nordic welfare state in Finland, 1940s to 1960s. *Journal of Church and State 56.1*, 60-80.

McCabe, D.L. (1997). Classroom cheating among natural science and engineering majors. *Science & Engineering Ethics 3.4*, 433-445.

McCabe, D.L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5(3),* 294-30.

McCabe, D.L., & Trevino, L. K. (1995). Cheating among business students: A challenge for business leaders and educators. *The Journal of Management Education 19.2*, 205-218.

Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Wooldridge, J. (2011). Reasons Not to Cheat, Academic-Integrity Responsibility, and Frequency of Cheating. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *79.2*, 169-184.

Murtaza, G., Zafar, S., Bashir, I., & Hussain, I. (2013). Evaluation of student's perception and behavior towards plagiarism in Pakistani universities. *Acta Bioéthica*, *19.1*, 125-130.

Niiya, Y., Ballantyne, R., North, M.S., & Crocker, J. (2008) Gender, contingencies of self-worth and achievement goals as predictors of academic cheating in a controlled laboratory setting. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology 30*, 76-83.

Pauha, T., Renvik, T.A., Eskelinen, V., Jetten, J., van der Noll, J., Kunst, J.R., Rohmann, A., & Jasinskaja-

Qualls, R.C. (2014) The Relationship between disciplinary practices in childhood and academic dishonesty in college students 48.3 *College Student Journal* 362-374

Rakovski, C. C., & Levy, E. S. (2007). Academic dishonesty: Perceptions of business students. *College Student Journal, 41(2),* 466-481.

Rettinger, D. A., Jordan, A. E., & Peschiera, F. (2004). Evaluating the motivation of other students to cheat: A vignette experiment. *Research in Higher Education, 45(8)*, 873-890.

Rettinger, D.A., & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and Personal Causes of Student Cheating. *Research in Higher Education, 50(3)*, 293-313.

Riivari, E. & Lamsa, A.M. (2014). Does it pay to be ethical: Examining the relationship between organizations' ethical culture and innovativeness. *Journal of Business Ethics* 124, 1-17.

Romberg, A., & Ratsula, N. (2023). *Nordic Business Ethics Survey 2022*, available at https://www.nordicbusinessethics.com/nbes2022/.

Semerci, C. (2006). The opinions of medicine faculty students regarding cheating in relation to Kholberg's moral development concept, *Social Behavior and Personality 34.1*, 41-50.

Simha, A., Armstrong, J.P., & Albert, J.F. (2012). Who leads and who lags? A comparison of cheating attitudes and behaviors among leadership and business students. *Journal of Education for Business, 87*, 316-324.

Siniver, E. (2013). Cheating on Exams: The Case of Israeli Students. *College Student Journal, 47(4)*, 593-604.

Smyth, L. S., Davis, J. R., & Kroncke, C. O. (2009). Students' Perceptions of Business Ethics: Using Cheating as a Surrogate for Business Situations. *Journal of Education for Business, 84(4)*, 229-239.

Statistics Finland. (2022). Finland's preliminary population figure was 5,552,550 at the end of June 2022, available at https://www.stat.fi/en/publication/cktjpuaqg0yo20c55cj6ve0wp.

Teixeira, A.A.C., & Rocha, M.F. (2010). Cheating by economics and business undergraduate students: an exploratory international assessment. *Higher Education, 59(6)*, 663-701.

Teixeira, A.A.C., & Rocha, M. F. (2008). Academic cheating in Spain and Portugal: An empirical explanation. *International Journal of Iberian Studies, 21(1)*, 3-22.

Teixeira, A.A.C., & Rocha, M. F. (2006). College cheating in Austria, Portugal, Romania and Spain: A comparative analysis. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1(3), 198-209.

Teixeira, A.A.C. (2013), Sanding the wheels of growth: cheating by economics and business students and 'real world' corruption, *Journal of Academic Ethics, 11 (4)*, 269-274.

Tolvanen, M. (2009). Trust, business ethics and crime prevention – corporate criminal liability in Finland. *Jurisprudence* 1911(5), 335-358.

Transparency International. (2022). *Corruption Perceptions Index for 2021*. Available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2021/index/fin.

Treisman, D. (2000). The causes of corruption: A cross-national study. *Journal of Public* Economics *76.3*, 399-457.

Välimaa, J. (2012). The relationship between Finnish higher education and higher education research. In S. Ahola & D.M. Hoffman (eds.), *Higher education research in Finland* (p. 27-48). Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylä University Press.

Vogelaar, H. (2013). An intriguing ecumenical dialogue: Lutheran-Orthodox encounters in Finland. *Exchange 42*, 267-301.

Vuontisjarvi, T. (2006). Corporate social reporting in the European context and human resource disclosures: An analysis of Finnish companies. *Journal of Business Ethics 69*, 331-354.

Xygalatas, D. (2017). Are religious people more moral? *Anthropology* (Dec. 6), available at https://www.sapiens.org/culture/religious-people-moral/.

Zilliacus, H. and Holm, G. (2013). 'We have our own religion': A pupil perspective on minority religion and ethics instruction in Finland. *British Journal of Religious Education, 35.3*, 282-296.

Zook, D.S. (2009). The curious case of Finland's clean politics. 20.1 *Journal of Democracy* (Jan.) 157-168.

Appendix One. Demographic Survey Questions.

This is a voluntary research project on student views of academic ethics. The survey should take five to ten minutes to complete. There is no penalty for refusal to participate. You must be at least 18 years old to take this survey. DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME OR IDENTITY NUMBER ON THE SURVEY. ALL ANSWERS ARE ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL. If you do not wish to participate, you may hand in the survey form blank. Thank you for your input on this research project. All survey questions are ANONYMOUS.

What year in school are you presently?
Are you male or female?
What is your major/college?
1. Fine Arts 2. Math and Sciences 3. Education 4. Liberal Arts
5. Business 6. Nursing 7. Other
Are you currently employed (this semester)? 1. No 2. Part-time 3. Full-time
Are you married?
What is your age?
How many children do you have?
How would you describe your religious views?
1. Lutheran 2. Catholic 3. Christian 4. Hindu
5. Jewish 6. Buddhist 7. Muslim 8. Not Religious
How would you describe your religious views?
1. Strongly religious 2. Religious 3. Somewhat religious
4. Somewhat non-religious 5. Non-religious 6. Strongly non-religious
How often do you attend church or religious meetings in a month?
Have you served in the military or reserves?