

# ***THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT***

## **Envisaging Business Ethics in Future Workplaces based on the Sources of Ethical Norms among University Students (Prospective Employees) in Tanzania: An Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis**

**Kafigi Jeje**

Assistant Lecturer, Department of Business Management, Institute of Accountancy Arusha, Arusha, Tanzania

**Abstract:**

*Business ethics can be envisaged by the conducts of higher learning students (potential employees). This study envisages business ethics in future workplaces based on both internal and external sources of ethical norms among university students in Tanzania. Our case study: The Institute of Accountancy Arusha (IAA), in Tanzania, paved way for students (bachelor degree level) to participate in this study after filling in, and returning 1350 questionnaires. An ordinal logistic regression analysis is used to ascertain various internal and external sources of ethical norms among university students (prospective employees). Tanzania's higher learning institutions are encouraged to develop mechanisms that will positively contribute to their students' moral developments, and be able to foster ethical climate in their surroundings. Likewise, potential employers (future workplaces) are encouraged to consider the ethical backgrounds of their potential employees in order to foster their respective ethical entities.*

**Keywords:** Higher learning/university students; Business ethics, Ethical norms, Ordinallogistic regression, Tanzania

### **1. Introduction**

Business ethics studies are crucial in identifying aspects that compel individuals to act ethically or unethically (Özbek, Alniaçık, Akkılıç, & Koç, 2013). Studies that seek to understand higher learning students' ethical orientations are important sources of key information to employers. Once informed about this, employers will be in good position to understand how their prospective employees will act, and therefore, make strategic decisions as well as ethical decisions at workplace (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). It is very important to note that ethical entities are interested in potential employees who can fit in respective corporate values (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). This is because; students are regarded as potential employees after acquiring knowledge and other skills needed at workplace (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). In this regard, studies have confirmed the apparent link between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014; Simkin & McLeod, 2009). This link stimulates universities to prepare ethical potential employees. This is because, ethical behaviours internalized at the university, will be portrayed in future employments (Simkin & McLeod, 2009). That is why, there is a great chance that the behaviours depicted by students during their college or university life are likely to be repeated at workplace (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014). Today, university administrators are designing academic programmes that will prepare their students to make ethical decisions not only at college but at workplace as well (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). Business schools for example, are busy designing mechanisms that will stimulate student engagement in ethics projects such as social responsibility, and environmental management so that they will practise the same while at workplace. The aim is to develop active citizens. Academics in higher learning institutions and the personal lives of students can act as drivers in shaping potential employees and ultimately develop ethical entities (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). Although most studies predict ethics at workplace based on students conduct while at college, little is known about the sources of their ethical norms. This study therefore seeks to envisage business ethics in future workplaces based on sources of ethical norms among university students (prospective employees) in Tanzania. These sources are categorised as internal and external sources. We therefore seek to specifically find the following;

1. Envisaged business ethics in future workplaces based on the internal sources of ethical norms among university students (prospective employees) in Tanzania
2. Envisaged business ethics in future workplaces based on the external sources of ethical norms among university students (prospective employees) in Tanzania

Sources of ethical norms among university students act as yardstick in understanding the sources of ethical norms at workplace and eventually pave way to define business ethics in prospective employees' working environments. This study assists policy makers, and practitioners from both public and private sectors to understand the nature of business ethics based on ethical norms among future business leaders (students), and therefore develop necessary laws, policies, rules, and regulations that can create current and future ethical climates at workplaces. We also argue that this study acts as a benchmark for researchers and academicians to develop various

ethical frameworks that will assist universities, and potential employers to influence students' and employees' positive behaviours respectively.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. *Understanding Business Ethics*

Ethics is related to good course of action. It entails fairness and placing great emphasis on the impacts of individual actions. It also entails the consideration of the welfare of others (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). When these practices take place in business, we get business ethics (Salehi, Saeidinia, & Aghaei, 2012). Business ethics entails moral principles for a business. It comprises of governance issues and decision making process in business (Goel & Ramanathan, 2014). It also entails business codes of conduct (Goel & Ramanathan, 2014). Importantly, companies seek to dwell more on the situation driving decisions rather than identifying good or bad practices (McFarlane, 2013). Business ethics tells us what is right and wrong (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014). It can also be defined in terms of an ethical path companies adopt. It entails equality, caring for society, fairness, and mechanisms to foster ethical climate in business (Salehi, Saeidinia, & Aghaei, 2012). Business ethics is related to relativism that judges ethics as a subject that depends upon the occasion and environment, and subjectivism that draws a conclusion that values are defined by personal taste and preferences. Also, business ethics is related to objectivism. This concept claims that some of the values are not defined by time and environment, or personal taste and preferences. These may include truth telling, fairness, and honouring promises (Donaldson & Fafaliou, 2003). It is therefore argued that at workplace, principles and values that drive personal and professional development are crucial in developing ethical working environments and entities (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014). Consequently, understanding what is right or wrong can be established by the standards guiding individual conduct. Therefore, it is crucial for businesses to define business ethics. Ethical entities are created by ethical employees and managers. That is why; an ethical manager will put all efforts in ensuring that his or her company makes decisions and develops policies based on the values, and the interests of the company's stakeholders (McFarlane, 2013). Both managers and employees are required to promote ethical behaviours and values at workplace (Burcea & Croitoru, 2014).

Business organizations need business ethics to survive (McFarlane, 2013). Values drive business (Donaldson & Fafaliou, 2003). Business ethics can be driven by the values that are expected by the members of a particular community (McFarlane, 2013). These behaviours are likely to yield encouraging outcomes at workplace and in the society at large (Khan, 2012). Ethics fosters company's credibility and trust. Companies should also abide by the law (McFarlane, 2013). The law is an important aspect of business ethics. However, it does not cover everything. That is why; companies develop and execute codes of practice (Donaldson & Fafaliou, 2003). All laws enacted by the local communities or countries intend to foster both law abiding, and ethical entities. Abiding by the laws will influence business reputation. That is why; law abiding companies are also regarded as ethical entities. Companies are governed by ethical principles, and conduct that ultimately shape employees and managers, and their interaction with one another at workplace, and their interaction with the society (McFarlane, 2013). Therefore, pleasant ethical behaviours of potential employees play a vital role in the development of business ethics at workplace (Khan, 2012).

### 2.2. *Sources of Ethical Norms among Students (Future Employees)*

Evidence shows that students who misbehave while in universities are likely to do the same at workplace (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014). This is why; today, most employers employ a lot of efforts to ensure that they employ a candidate who possesses the desired ethical standards. For them, it is important to understand how the potential employee will be able to confront ethical dilemmas. It has been noticed that students are ready to learn about ethics, and acquire, and utilize that knowledge at workplace as future employees (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). Ethical norms can emanate from cultural norms (McFarlane, 2013). It is well known that culture and socialization process are key in shaping someone's behaviour (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). Culture is regarded as a factor that significantly contributes to individual moral development (Khan, 2012). Culture includes values. Values guide action (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). These actions can be influenced by the family background. Within the family, an individual is likely to imitate what his or her close family members such as parents or siblings regularly do and eventually develop behaviours. It is also possible that an individual can also interact mostly with family members other than parents or siblings who can ultimately influence his or her behaviours. That is why; it is argued that leaders act as examples for their followers (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). Most of the university students are still dependent on their families. We therefore argue that the family members can be one of the sources of ethical norms for these young people; whereby parents and siblings are regarded as internal sources, whereas other family members are regarded as external sources of ethical norms among university students.

Values can also be demonstrated in terms of fairness, honesty, and ability to abide by the laws (Donaldson & Fafaliou, 2003). Likewise, the law can originate from cultural norms. Laws, rules, and regulations foster ethical behaviours (McFarlane, 2013). That is why; good citizens are those who abide by the law (McFarlane, 2013). University students are expected to be law abiding citizens. These laws include the university rules, and regulations, local community laws, and the state laws. Since the student interacts most with the university laws, rules, and regulations, we consider these rules as internal sources of ethical norms that can shape his or her behaviour. The university rules and regulations such as codes of conduct are an important factor in stimulating students' behaviours (Nadelson, 2007). That is why; it is revealed that a student shows a sense of responsibility after taking and signing the codes of honour and in this regard, academic integrity is preserved. Ethical values may lose their meaning if students assume that there is nothing wrong with academic dishonesty; such as cheating during exams, and plagiarism (Rujoiu & Rujoiu, 2014). Other laws such as local community laws and state laws are regarded as external sources of ethical norms.

Another source of ethical norms is the interaction between students and lecturers (Nadelson, 2007). Lecturers have the role to play in shaping the behaviours of their students. It has been revealed that their influence on students' behaviours is apparent. This is because, they have an opportunity to impart ethics knowledge through training and stimulate them to abide by the rules and regulations, as well as ethical standards (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). Research has revealed that students do regard their lecturers as role models. For example, research has indicated that students consider their lecturers as ethical individuals. Therefore, faculty members who are regarded as honest can stimulate their students to behave ethically. However, faculty members cannot influence their students to act ethically, unless they themselves behave positively (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). Due to close and frequent interactions with their lecturers, we regard this source of ethical norms as internal. On the other hand, the university student's behaviour can be shaped by former teachers/instructors who had interacted with him or her when he or she was attending primary schools, secondary schools, or colleges other than the current university. Research confirms the role of student-teacher relationship in shaping student's behaviour (Fredriksen & Rhodes, 2004).

It is also argued that the intention to act ethically or unethically is influenced by values, and societal variables (Elango, Paul, Kundu, & Paudel, 2010). Being ethical is about playing fair, thinking about welfare of others and thinking about consequences of one's actions (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). The other people whose welfare is thought of could be friends. Friendships are an important element of social networks. Friendship is also enhanced by the level of commitment and interactions among friends (Fortlouis-Wood, 2008). University students have friends. These are either fellow students, or non-university students. Since they are likely to interact mostly with their fellow university students, we refer to campus friends as internal source of ethical norms, while friends outside the campus can be regarded as external sources of ethical norms. This is because; friendship fosters social behaviour (Fortlouis-Wood, 2008).

The behaviours of a human being keep changing as he or she grows up. Mainly, his or her behaviours are influenced by the behaviours of others in the respective societies (Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010). The university student is surrounded by various internal and external environments. One of the internal environments that can also be regarded as internal sources of ethical norms is the university surroundings. At campus, the student meets various people including the university employees and administrators, lecturers, service providers, and fellow students to mention a few. All these people can make up the general behaviours at the campus and ultimately affect the student's behaviour. Research confirms that ethical climate on campus is of paramount importance in developing future employees (Lau, Caracciolo, Roddenberry, & Scroggins, 2012). On the other hand, the student is also surrounded by external environments such as the local community, and the society at large (country) in which his or her university is situated. In these societies, various types of players such as the government, institutions, and people with different backgrounds are found. All these are used to make up a particular general behaviour of that particular society that can ultimately affect the moral development of the student. Research confirms that one of the factors influencing the student conduct is the student's personal moral development (Nadelson, 2007). Again, moral development can be associated with one's religious beliefs. That is why; religion can be linked to morality (Burcea & Croitoru, 2014). To develop future ethical employees, moral values among higher learning institutions are essential. Our argument is that, most of the university students have their own religious beliefs. Moral values can be internalized by students who abide by what their religions teach. In this regard, religion can be considered as an internal source of ethical norms. This is because; one of the factors contributing to individual moral development is religion (Khan, 2012).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Study Area and Design

Our study took place in Tanzania at the Institute of Accountancy Arusha (IAA). IAA is one of the leading higher learning institutions in Tanzania. It runs various programmes from certificate to master degree. IAA was chosen as our case study because the researcher works at this higher learning institution where he has been involved in teaching business ethics for the past three years.

#### 3.2. Population, Sampling Procedure, and Sample Size

In this study, we decided to exclude certificate, ordinary diploma, postgraduate diploma, and master degree students. This is because; we wanted to have respondents who are likely to become employees soon after graduation. This group comprised of all bachelor degree students. We also argue that most of the certificate, and ordinary diploma holders, after graduation, are likely to continue with further studies where they will be pursuing ordinary diploma, and bachelor degree respectively. Most of the postgraduate students (postgraduate diploma, and master degree) are employed. Therefore, based on the existing records at the Registrar's office during the time of study (March to June 2015), we realized that there were 1668 bachelor degree students (N). Due to the importance of the theme (business ethics) under study, and due to the availability of data (easy accessibility of respondents), we decided to set the margin of error (e) as zero (0). Therefore, based on Yamane's (1967) formula (see equation 1), we remained with 1668 bachelor degree students (n) as our sample.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e^2)} \quad (1)$$

#### 3.3. Data Collection and Analysis

We distributed 1668 questionnaires to all bachelor degree students in all programmes such as; information technology; computer science; accountancy; economics and finance; procurement and logistics management; finance and banking; and business management. Questions attracted categorical responses in the form of; strongly disagree=1; disagree=2; disagree somewhat=3; undecided=4; agree somewhat=5; agree=6; strongly agree=7. All questionnaires were distributed and collected by seventeen (17)

bachelor degree students in information technology (BIT II) under the close supervision of the researcher who was also, teaching them *Statistical and Accounting applications (ITU 07425)* module. A total of 1350 well filled in questionnaires were returned. Data were analysed using Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis.

### 3.4. Variables

We asked students to rate the extent to which their behaviours have been contributed significantly by various environmental factors (WCS). This became our dependent variable that would be influenced by various independent variables under the categories of internal sources of ethical norms, and external sources of ethical norms. Under the internal sources of ethical norms, we had; whether friends (fellow university students) were regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (FSI); whether family members (parents, siblings) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (FMI); whether mentors (university lecturers) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (MLI); whether the laws (university regulations, rules, student bylaws) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (LRI); whether the general behaviours in the student's local community (university campus) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (GBI); and whether the student's religious belief is regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (RBI).

Under the external sources of ethical norms, we had several independent variables such as; whether friends (non-university students) were regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a university student behaves (FFE); whether family members (other than parents, siblings) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a student behaves (FME); whether mentors (former primary/secondary school teachers/college lecturers other than the student's current university lecturers) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a student behaves (FLE); whether the laws (local community laws, country laws) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a student behaves (LLE); whether the general behaviours in the university student's local community (local community such as towns/municipals/cities in which his or her university is found) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a student behaves (GBL); and whether the general behaviours in the student's society at large (i.e. Tanzania) are regarded as a factor contributing significantly to the way a student behaves (GBT)

### 3.5. Assumptions

We tested various assumptions with regard to the ordinal logistic regression analysis as follows:

#### 3.5.1. Multicollinearity

Based on the internal sources of ethical norms, and as shown in Table 1, we find that all Tolerance values are greater than 0.1 and VIF values are all less than 10 indicating that we do not have a problem with collinearity.

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	FSI1	.587	1.704
	FSI2	.580	1.724
	FSI3	.818	1.222
	FSI4	.716	1.396
	FSI5	.548	1.826
	FSI6	.511	1.956
	FMI1	.621	1.611
	FMI2	.854	1.170
	FMI3	.885	1.129
	FMI4	.772	1.296
	FMI5	.821	1.217
	FMI6	.751	1.332
	MLI1	.541	1.848
	MLI2	.454	2.204
	MLI3	.766	1.306
	MLI4	.562	1.780
	MLI5	.429	2.332
	MLI6	.388	2.576
	LRI1	.582	1.719
	LRI2	.482	2.076
	LRI3	.798	1.253
	LRI4	.533	1.877
	LRI5	.421	2.376
	LRI6	.415	2.407
GBI1	.596	1.677	

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
	GBI2	.462	2.165
	GBI3	.693	1.444
	GBI4	.561	1.783
	GBI5	.392	2.548
	GBI6	.386	2.593
	RBI1	.704	1.420
	RBI2	.852	1.173
	RBI3	.861	1.162
	RBI4	.882	1.133
	RBI5	.886	1.129
	RBI6	.801	1.249

a. Dependent Variable: WCS

Table 1: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(Internal Sources)

On the other hand, based on the external sources of ethical norms, as shown in Table 2, we find that all Tolerance values are greater than 0.1 and VIF values are all less than 10 indicating that we do not have a problem with collinearity.

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	FFE1	.531	1.883
	FFE2	.500	2.001
	FFE3	.754	1.326
	FFE4	.600	1.667
	FFE5	.472	2.118
	FFE6	.387	2.585
	FME1	.594	1.683
	FME2	.723	1.383
	FME3	.871	1.149
	FME4	.648	1.544
	FME5	.635	1.574
	FME6	.582	1.719
	FLE1	.553	1.808
	FLE2	.615	1.626
	FLE3	.862	1.160
	FLE4	.629	1.590
	FLE5	.539	1.856
	FLE6	.511	1.959
	LLE1	.535	1.868
	LLE2	.508	1.967
	LLE3	.761	1.314
	LLE4	.537	1.864
	LLE5	.413	2.423
	LLE6	.404	2.478
	GBL1	.487	2.053
	GBL2	.380	2.634
	GBL3	.618	1.619
	GBL4	.473	2.112
	GBL5	.319	3.131
	GBL6	.316	3.165
GBT1	.617	1.621	
GBT2	.579	1.727	
GBT3	.749	1.335	
GBT4	.599	1.669	
GBT5	.494	2.024	
GBT6	.460	2.173	

a. Dependent Variable: WCS

Table 2: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>(External Sources)

3.5.2. Proportional Odds

Based on the internal sources of ethical norms, with regard to the full likelihood ratio test, we realize that  $p < .05$  as shown in Table 3. The case is similar when considering the external sources of ethical norms as shown in Table 4.

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	2236.069			
General	1894.956 <sup>b</sup>	341.112 <sup>c</sup>	144	.000
The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.				
a. Link function: Logit.				
b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.				
c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.				

Table 3: Test of Parallel Lines<sup>a</sup>(Internal Sources)

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	2281.288			
General	1591.158 <sup>b</sup>	690.130 <sup>c</sup>	144	.000
The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.				
a. Link function: Logit.				
b. The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after maximum number of step-halving.				
c. The Chi-Square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.				

Table 4: Test of Parallel Lines<sup>a</sup>(External Sources)

We also realize that, based on the internal sources of ethical norms, as shown in Table 5, for FSI2, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .784, .726, .721, .654, .834, and .933). Also, for FSI6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .888, .840, .752, .797, .923, and 1.011). The case is similar for FMI1, whereby the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .867, 1.004, .952, 1.145, 1.136, and 1.003). Similarly, for FMI5, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., 1.034, .970, 1.017, .932, 1.086, and 1.225). Also, for FMI6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., 1.391, 1.621, 1.318, 1.435, 1.200, and 1.248). Also, for RBI6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .822, .770, .803, 1.032, 1.073, and .899). However, the assumption of similar odds for other variables might not be tenable.

Independent variable	B						Exp(B)					
	WCS1	WCS2	WCS3	WCS4	WCS5	WCS6	WCS1	WCS2	WCS3	WCS4	WCS5	WCS6
FSI												
FSI(1)	-1.921	-1.600	-.604	-.578	-.437	-.372	.146	.202	.547	.561	.646	.689
FSI(2)	-.243	-.320	-.327	-.424	-.181	-.069	.784	.726	.721	.654	.834	.933
FSI(3)	.130	.222	.262	.150	-.456	-.155	1.138	1.248	1.300	1.162	.634	.856
FSI(4)	-1.194	-.838	-.803	-.271	-.279	-.139	.303	.433	.448	.763	.757	.870
FSI(5)	.013	-.145	-.034	-.039	-.390	.094	1.013	.865	.966	.962	.677	1.098
FSI(6)	-.119	-.174	-.285	-.227	-.080	.011	.888	.840	.752	.797	.923	1.011
FMI												
FMI(1)	-.142	.004	-.049	.136	.128	.003	.867	1.004	.952	1.145	1.136	1.003
FMI(2)	.139	-.043	.423	-.129	-.431	-.564	1.149	.958	1.527	.879	.650	.569
FMI(3)	-18.632	-.658	-.130	-.280	.380	.107	.000	.518	.878	.755	1.462	1.113
FMI(4)	-17.889	-.892	-.693	-.444	-.191	-.152	.000	.410	.500	.641	.826	.859
FMI(5)	.033	-.030	.017	-.070	.082	.203	1.034	.970	1.017	.932	1.086	1.225
FMI(6)	.330	.483	.276	.361	.182	.222	1.391	1.621	1.318	1.435	1.200	1.248
MLI												
MLI(1)	1.659	1.762	.720	.206	.693	.916	5.253	5.825	2.054	1.229	2.000	2.500
MLI(2)	.459	.719	.059	.078	.123	.734	1.583	2.053	1.061	1.082	1.131	2.084
MLI(3)	1.371	.663	.230	-.062	.052	.382	3.940	1.941	1.259	.940	1.054	1.466
MLI(4)	.269	.820	-.043	-.407	.100	-.020	1.309	2.270	.958	.666	1.106	.980
MLI(5)	.356	.612	.094	-.106	.262	.349	1.428	1.845	1.098	.899	1.299	1.417

	B						Exp(B)					
MLI(6)	.644	.498	.010	-.131	.231	.223	1.904	1.646	1.011	.877	1.260	1.250
LRI												
LRI(1)	.133	-.600	-.206	-.104	-.397	-1.025	1.142	.549	.814	.901	.673	.359
LRI(2)	-.522	-.207	-.008	.130	.207	-.401	.593	.813	.992	1.139	1.230	.669
LRI(3)	1.438	.526	.491	.239	-.039	-.469	4.213	1.692	1.635	1.270	.962	.626
LRI(4)	.306	-.103	-.066	.145	-.086	-.696	1.358	.902	.936	1.155	.918	.499
LRI(5)	.466	-.080	.107	.011	.091	-.590	1.594	.923	1.113	1.011	1.095	.554
LRI(6)	.257	-.107	-.015	.070	.048	-.380	1.293	.898	.985	1.072	1.049	.684
GBI												
GBI(1)	.681	.855	.356	.420	-.032	-.163	1.976	2.352	1.428	1.523	.968	.850
GBI(2)	1.095	.893	.514	.758	.215	-.161	2.988	2.443	1.672	2.133	1.239	.851
GBI(3)	-1.003	-.021	-.150	-.041	-.284	-.471	.367	.979	.860	.960	.753	.624
GBI(4)	.594	.295	.481	.432	.145	.119	1.812	1.343	1.618	1.540	1.156	1.126
GBI(5)	.916	.745	.548	.597	-.116	-.458	2.500	2.106	1.730	1.817	.891	.632
GBI(6)	.965	.700	.365	.169	-.231	-.160	2.624	2.013	1.440	1.185	.794	.852
RBI												
RBI(1)	.164	.204	-.214	-.063	-.044	-.257	1.179	1.226	.807	.939	.957	.774
RBI(2)	-.638	-.451	-.779	-.566	.153	-.164	.528	.637	.459	.568	1.165	.849
RBI(3)	.910	1.010	.794	.554	.611	.337	2.484	2.747	2.211	1.740	1.842	1.401
RBI(4)	-.975	-.470	-.602	.276	.466	.049	.377	.625	.548	1.318	1.594	1.051
RBI(5)	-.381	-.581	-.609	-.119	-.110	.234	.683	.559	.544	.888	.895	1.263
RBI(6)	-.196	-.261	-.219	.031	.071	-.106	.822	.770	.803	1.032	1.073	.899
Constant	-4.253	-3.169	-1.866	-1.265	-.296	1.271	.014	.042	.155	.282	.743	3.566

Table 5: Parameter estimates and odd ratios for the dichotomized cumulative categories of WCS(Internal Sources)

On the other hand, we also realize that, based on the external sources of ethical norms, as shown in Table 6, for FFE2, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., 1.466, 1.387, 1.093, 1.040, 1.253, and 1.065). Again, for FFE4, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .613, .791, .596, .808, .941, and .799). Also, for FME2, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are similar (i.e., .963, .752, .982, 1.144, .754, and .905). Similarly, for FME4, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .813, .669, .877, .714, .956, and .914). Likewise, for FME6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .613, .555, .663, .843, .747, and .818). Again, for FLE5, the odd ratios for the five different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., 1.384, 1.216, 1.318, 1.416, and 1.242). However, only the odd ratio for WCS1 (.862) is different from others. We therefore conclude that, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. For FLE6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .917, 1.096, 1.063, 1.361, 1.309, and 1.117). Also, for GBT5, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .937, 1.116, 1.150, 1.096, 1.000, and .854). Finally, for GBT6, the assumption of proportional odds appears tenable. This is because;the odd ratios for the six different binomial logistic regressions are comparable (i.e., .824, .831, .724, .648, .719, and .697). However, the assumption of similar odds for other variables might not be tenable.

Independent variable	B						Exp(B)					
	WCS1	WCS2	WCS3	WCS4	WCS5	WCS6	WCS1	WCS2	WCS3	WCS4	WCS5	WCS6
FFE												
FFE(1)	-.993	-.759	-.625	.329	.107	-.337	.370	.468	.535	1.390	1.113	.714
FFE(2)	.383	.327	.089	.040	.226	.063	1.466	1.387	1.093	1.040	1.253	1.065
FFE(3)	-.826	.304	.270	-.047	-.272	-.395	.438	1.356	1.309	.954	.762	.674
FFE(4)	-.489	-.235	-.518	-.213	-.061	-.224	.613	.791	.596	.808	.941	.799
FFE(5)	.702	.321	.322	.146	.166	.303	2.018	1.378	1.380	1.157	1.180	1.354
FFE(6)	.774	.384	.228	.378	.171	-.064	2.168	1.468	1.256	1.460	1.186	.938
FME												
FME(1)	-1.543	-.479	-.458	-.792	-.037	-.053	.214	.619	.633	.453	.963	.949
FME(2)	-.037	-.285	-.018	.135	-.282	-.100	.963	.752	.982	1.144	.754	.905
FME(3)	-.046	-.882	-1.305	-.246	.527	.426	.955	.414	.271	.782	1.693	1.531
FME(4)	-.207	-.402	-.131	-.337	-.044	-.090	.813	.669	.877	.714	.956	.914

	B						Exp(B)					
FME(5)	.369	.049	-.018	.148	-.229	-.046	1.446	1.050	.982	1.160	.796	.955
FME(6)	-.489	-.589	-.411	-.171	-.292	-.200	.613	.555	.663	.843	.747	.818
FLE												
FLE(1)	.780	.514	-.032	.085	.419	.346	2.182	1.672	.969	1.089	1.520	1.414
FLE(2)	-.967	.030	-.048	.023	.356	.539	.380	1.031	.953	1.023	1.428	1.714
FLE(3)	.922	.690	.906	.550	.082	-.357	2.513	1.993	2.476	1.734	1.086	.700
FLE(4)	-1.681	-.432	-.848	-.213	-.321	-.233	.186	.649	.428	.808	.725	.792
FLE(5)	-.148	.325	.195	.276	.348	.217	.862	1.384	1.216	1.318	1.416	1.242
FLE(6)	-.087	.092	.062	.308	.269	.111	.917	1.096	1.063	1.361	1.309	1.117
LLE												
LLE(1)	1.158	1.419	.832	.290	-.078	-.164	3.183	4.134	2.298	1.336	.925	.848
LLE(2)	1.269	1.003	.609	.243	.227	-.526	3.558	2.726	1.838	1.274	1.255	.591
LLE(3)	1.900	.667	-.076	-.268	.425	.045	6.689	1.949	.927	.765	1.530	1.046
LLE(4)	1.768	.798	.484	.269	.416	-.013	5.861	2.221	1.623	1.309	1.516	.987
LLE(5)	1.051	.450	-.077	-.368	-.236	-.677	2.861	1.568	.926	.692	.790	.508
LLE(6)	1.101	.500	.112	-.099	-.073	-.334	3.008	1.648	1.119	.906	.930	.716
GBL												
GBL(1)	-.291	-.985	-.733	-.414	-.343	-.310	.748	.374	.480	.661	.710	.734
GBL(2)	-.061	.252	.437	.789	.221	.611	.941	1.286	1.548	2.200	1.247	1.842
GBL(3)	-.771	-.295	-.203	.358	.257	.281	.462	.744	.817	1.431	1.293	1.324
GBL(4)	-.906	-.636	-.594	-.107	-.170	.290	.404	.529	.552	.899	.843	1.336
GBL(5)	-.909	-.592	-.143	.136	.160	.289	.403	.553	.866	1.146	1.173	1.335
GBL(6)	-.569	-.378	-.288	.022	.192	.374	.566	.685	.750	1.022	1.211	1.453
GBT												
GBT(1)	.095	-.054	-.270	-.202	.090	.228	1.100	.947	.763	.817	1.094	1.257
GBT(2)	-1.761	-1.971	-1.985	-1.386	-.427	-.589	.172	.139	.137	.250	.653	.555
GBT(3)	-.463	.427	.222	-.183	-.286	-.161	.629	1.533	1.249	.833	.751	.851
GBT(4)	-.392	-.785	-.965	-.419	-.191	-.175	.675	.456	.381	.658	.826	.839
GBT(5)	-.065	.110	.140	.091	.000	-.158	.937	1.116	1.150	1.096	1.000	.854
GBT(6)	-.194	-.186	-.323	-.434	-.329	-.360	.824	.831	.724	.648	.719	.697
Constant	-3.201	-2.208	-1.221	-.993	-.288	1.243	.041	.110	.295	.370	.750	3.467

Table 6: Parameter estimates and odd ratios for the dichotomized cumulative categories of WCS(External Sources)

3.6. Covariate Patterns and Cell Patterns

Based on the internal sources of ethical norms, we realize that there are 905 covariate patterns in our ordinal regression analysis. We also realize that there are 1020 cell patterns in this dataset. As shown in Table 7, this means that 905X6=5430. Out of 5430 cells, 1020 cells do not have zero frequencies. Therefore, there are 4410 (5430-1020) cells with zero frequencies that gives 81.21547% (4410/5430) as shown in Table 7.

There are 4410 (81.2%) cells (i.e., dependent variable levels by observed combinations of predictor variable values) with zero frequencies.

Table 7: Covariate Patterns and Cell Patterns (Internal Sources)

On the other hand, based on the external sources of ethical norms, we realize that there are 960 covariate patterns in our ordinal regression analysis. We also realize that there are 1055 cell patterns in this dataset. As shown in Table 8, this means that 960X6=5760, and out of 5760 cells, 1055 cells do not have zero frequencies. Therefore, there are 4705 (5760-1055) cells with zero frequencies, giving 81.684028% (4705/5760) as shown in Table 8.

There are 4705 (81.7%) cells (i.e., dependent variable levels by observed combinations of predictor variable values) with zero frequencies.

Table 8: Covariate Patterns and Cell Patterns (External Sources)

3.7. Overall Model Fit

Based on the internal sources of ethical norms, we realize that, the deviance goodness-of-fit test indicated that the model was a good fit to the observed data,  $\chi^2(4484) = 2032.502, p = 1.000$ . Again, the Pearson goodness-of-fit test indicated,  $\chi^2(4484) = 4786.594, p < .05$  as shown in Table 9.



	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	4786.594	4484	.001
Deviance	2032.502	4484	1.000
Link function: Logit.			

Table 9: Goodness-of-Fit (Internal Sources)

On the other hand, based on the external sources of ethical norms, we realize that the deviance goodness-of-fit test indicated that the model was a good fit to the observed data,  $\chi^2(4759) = 2110.881, p = 1.000$ . Similarly, the Pearson goodness-of-fit test indicated that the model was a good fit to the observed data,  $\chi^2(4759) = 4006.022, p > .05$  as shown in Table 10.

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	4006.022	4759	1.000
Deviance	2110.881	4759	1.000
Link function: Logit.			

Table 10: Goodness-of-Fit (External Sources)

3.8. Likelihood-ratio Test

Based on the internal sources of ethical norms, we realize that the final model statistically significantly predicted the dependent variable over and above the intercept-only model,  $\chi^2(36) = 258.693, p < .001$  as shown in Table 11.

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	2494.761			
Final	2236.069	258.693	36	.000
Link function: Logit.				

Table 11: Model Fitting Information (Internal Sources)

On the other hand, based on the external sources of ethical norms, we realize that the final model statistically significantly predicted the dependent variable over and above the intercept-only model,  $\chi^2(36) = 241.111, p < .001$  as shown in Table 12.

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	2522.399			
Final	2281.288	241.111	36	.000
Link function: Logit.				

Table 12: Model Fitting Information (External Sources)

4. Findings

Our findings are categorised into two main parts. The internal sources of ethical norms among university students are analysed first and thereafter external sources follow.

4.1. Internal Sources of Ethical Norms among University Students

We analysed the internal sources of ethical norms based on tests of model effects (see Table 13), and the overview of parameter estimates using the GENLIN procedure (see Table 14). The results indicate that the interaction between a university student and his/her fellow students has a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 29.459, p = .000$ . It is also revealed that the interaction between a university student and his/her family members (parents, siblings) does not have a statistically significant effect on the way such a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 4.824, p = .567$ . On the other hand, results show that the interaction between a university student and his/her mentors (university lecturers) has a statistically significant effect on the way such a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 73.775, p = .000$ . Again, the laws (university regulations, rules, student by laws) have a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 17.420, p = .008$ . We have also realized that the general behaviours in his/her local community (university campus) have a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 35.026, p = .000$ . On the other hand, it has been revealed that the higher learning student's religious belief has a statistically significant effect on the way he/she behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 13.101, p = .041$ .

Source	Type III		
	Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
FSI	29.459	6	.000
FMI	4.824	6	.567
MLI	73.775	6	.000
LRI	17.420	6	.008
GBI	35.026	6	.000
RBI	13.101	6	.041
Dependent Variable: WCS			
Model: (Threshold), FSI, FMI, MLI, LRI, GBI, RBI			

Table 13: Tests of Model Effects (Internal Sources)

The results also indicate that the odds of FSI1 considering WCS was 0.640 (95% CI, 0.356 to 1.151), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.219, p = .136$ ; indicating that FSI1 and FSI7 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the odds of FSI2 considering WCS was 2.287 (95% CI, 1.518 to 3.446) times that of FSI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 15.635, p = .000$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider FSI2 than if we consider FSI7. The findings have also revealed that the odds of FSI3 considering WCS was 0.712 (95% CI, 0.346 to 1.463), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.855, p = .355$ ; indicating that FSI3 and FSI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Again, the odds of FSI4 considering WCS was 1.136 (95% CI, 0.636 to 2.029), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.184, p = .668$ ; showing that FSI4 and FSI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Also, the odds of FSI5 considering WCS was 1.023 (95% CI, 0.689 to 1.518), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.012, p = .912$ ; alarming that FSI5 and FSI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. This is the same when finding the effect of FSI6 compared to FSI7 on WCS. It is revealed that the odds of FSI6 considering WCS was 1.151 (95% CI, 0.836 to 1.584), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.745, p = .388$ ; indicating that FSI6 and FSI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

We also find that the odds of MLI1 considering WCS was 1.200 (95% CI, 0.631 to 2.283), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.309, p = .579$ ; indicating that MLI1 and MLI7 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. On the other hand, it has been revealed that the odds of MLI2 considering WCS was 3.477 (95% CI, 2.102 to 5.754) times that of MLI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 23.528, p = .000$ ; revealing that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider MLI2 than if we consider MLI7. On the other hand, results have revealed that the odds of MLI3 considering WCS was 1.180 (95% CI, 0.526 to 2.650), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.161, p = .688$ ; indicating that MLI3 and MLI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. This is the same when finding the effect of MLI4 compared to MLI7 on WCS. The results have found that the odds of MLI4 considering WCS was 1.609 (95% CI, 0.860 to 3.011), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.214, p = .137$ ; indicating that MLI4 and MLI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Likewise, the odds of MLI5 considering WCS was 1.025 (95% CI, 0.643 to 1.634), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = .011, p = .918$ ; revealing that MLI5 and MLI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the odds of MLI6 considering WCS was 0.657 (95% CI, 0.450 to 0.959) times that of MLI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 4.746, p = .029$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider MLI6 than if we consider MLI7.

Results have also revealed that the odds of LRI1 considering WCS was .562 (95% CI, 0.310 to 1.022), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 3.568, p = .059$ ; alarming that LRI1 and LRI7 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, it has been revealed that the odds of LRI2 considering WCS was 0.392 (95% CI, 0.237 to 0.649) times that of LRI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 13.270, p = .000$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider LRI2 than if we consider LRI7. On the other hand, we find that the odds of LRI3 considering WCS was 0.511 (95% CI, 0.236 to 1.107), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.896, p = .089$ ; revealing that LRI3 and LRI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. This is the same case when finding the effect of LRI4 compared to LRI7 on WCS. It has also been revealed that the odds of LRI4 considering WCS was 0.751 (95% CI, 0.445 to 1.268), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 1.145, p = .285$ ; signalling that LRI4 and LRI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Also, the odds of LRI5 considering WCS was 0.732 (95% CI, 0.494 to 1.083), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.433, p = .119$ ; indicating that LRI5 and LRI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the case is different when the effect of LRI6 compared to LRI7 on WCS is analysed. We find that the odds of LRI6 considering WCS was 0.589 (95% CI, 0.415 to 0.837) times that of LRI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 8.701, p = .003$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider LRI6 than if we consider LRI7.

The findings also reveal that the odds of GB11 considering WCS was 0.568 (95% CI, 0.308 to 1.047), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 3.284, p = .070$ ; indicating that GB11 and GB17 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, it is found that the odds of GB12 considering WCS was 0.382 (95% CI, 0.238 to 0.613) times that of GB17, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 15.922, p = .000$ ; telling that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GB12 than if we consider GB17. Similarly, the odds of GB13 considering WCS was 0.505 (95% CI, 0.259 to 0.984) times that of GB17, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 4.035, p = .045$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GB13 than if we consider GB17. However, the odds of GB14 considering WCS was 0.653 (95% CI, 0.391 to 1.093), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.631, p = .105$ ; indicating that GB14 and GB17 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Similarly, the odds of GB15 considering WCS was 0.712 (95% CI, 0.477 to 1.064), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.748, p = .097$ ; indicating that GB15 and GB17 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. This is the same case when the effect of GB16 compared to GB17 on WCS is analysed. We have found that the odds of GB16 considering WCS was 1.171 (95% CI, 0.812 to 1.689), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = .713, p = .399$ ; indicating that GB16 and GB17 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

We also find that the odds of RBI1 considering WCS was 0.828 (95% CI, 0.441 to 1.553), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.346, p = .557$ ; indicating that RBI1 and RBI7 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the odds of RBI2 considering WCS was 2.444 (95% CI, 1.185 to 5.042) times that of RBI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 5.848, p = .016$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider RBI2 than if we consider RBI7. On the other hand, it has been revealed that the odds of RBI3 considering WCS was 2.002 (95% CI, 0.854 to 4.695), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.548, p = .110$ ; indicating that RBI3 and RBI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Similarly, the odds of RBI4 considering WCS was 1.135 (95% CI, 0.596 to 2.159), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) =$

0.148,  $p = .700$ ; indicating that RBI4 and RBI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the odds of RBI5 considering WCS was 1.681 (95% CI, 1.034 to 2.733) times that of RBI7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 4.387, p = .036$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider RBI5 than if we consider RBI7. However, the odds of RBI6 considering WCS was 0.982 (95% CI, 0.744 to 1.297), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.016, p = .899$ ; indicating that RBI6 and RBI7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test			Exp(B)	95% Wald Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
			Lower	Upper	Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.		Lower	Upper	
Threshold	[WCS=2.00]	-7.766	1.0200	-9.765	-5.767	57.969	1	.000	.000	5.743E-5	.003
	[WCS=3.00]	-.689	.2177	-1.116	-.263	10.027	1	.002	.502	.328	.769
	[WCS=4.00]	-.569	.2174	-.995	-.143	6.848	1	.009	.566	.370	.867
	[WCS=5.00]	-.551	.2173	-.977	-.125	6.435	1	.011	.576	.376	.882
	[WCS=6.00]	-.058	.2168	-.482	.367	.070	1	.791	.944	.617	1.444
[FSI=1.00]	-.446	.2994	-1.033	.141	2.219	1	.136	.640	.356	1.151	
[FSI=2.00]	.827	.2092	.417	1.237	15.635	1	.000	2.287	1.518	3.446	
[FSI=3.00]	-.340	.3677	-1.061	.381	.855	1	.355	.712	.346	1.463	
[FSI=4.00]	.127	.2962	-.453	.708	.184	1	.668	1.136	.636	2.029	
[FSI=5.00]	.022	.2015	-.373	.417	.012	1	.912	1.023	.689	1.518	
[FSI=6.00]	.141	.1628	-.179	.460	.745	1	.388	1.151	.836	1.584	
[FSI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
[FMI=1.00]	-.014	.2828	-.569	.540	.003	1	.959	.986	.566	1.716	
[FMI=2.00]	.121	.3258	-.518	.760	.138	1	.710	1.129	.596	2.138	
[FMI=3.00]	-.214	.4705	-1.136	.708	.207	1	.649	.807	.321	2.030	
[FMI=4.00]	.519	.3095	-.088	1.125	2.811	1	.094	1.680	.916	3.082	
[FMI=5.00]	.311	.2344	-.148	.771	1.766	1	.184	1.365	.863	2.162	
[FMI=6.00]	.119	.1364	-.148	.386	.762	1	.383	1.126	.862	1.472	
[FMI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
[MLI=1.00]	.182	.3282	-.461	.826	.309	1	.579	1.200	.631	2.283	
[MLI=2.00]	1.246	.2569	.743	1.750	23.528	1	.000	3.477	2.102	5.754	
[MLI=3.00]	.166	.4127	-.643	.974	.161	1	.688	1.180	.526	2.650	
[MLI=4.00]	.476	.3197	-.151	1.102	2.214	1	.137	1.609	.860	3.011	
[MLI=5.00]	.025	.2379	-.442	.491	.011	1	.918	1.025	.643	1.634	
[MLI=6.00]	-.421	.1931	-.799	-.042	4.746	1	.029	.657	.450	.959	
[MLI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
[LRI=1.00]	-.575	.3046	-1.172	.022	3.568	1	.059	.562	.310	1.022	
[LRI=2.00]	-.937	.2571	-1.441	-.433	13.270	1	.000	.392	.237	.649	
[LRI=3.00]	-.671	.3943	-1.444	.102	2.896	1	.089	.511	.236	1.107	
[LRI=4.00]	-.286	.2670	-.809	.238	1.145	1	.285	.751	.445	1.268	
[LRI=5.00]	-.312	.2001	-.704	.080	2.433	1	.119	.732	.494	1.083	
[LRI=6.00]	-.529	.1793	-.880	-.177	8.701	1	.003	.589	.415	.837	
[LRI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
[GBI=1.00]	-.566	.3121	-1.177	.046	3.284	1	.070	.568	.308	1.047	
[GBI=2.00]	-.963	.2413	-1.436	-.490	15.922	1	.000	.382	.238	.613	
[GBI=3.00]	-.683	.3401	-1.350	-.017	4.035	1	.045	.505	.259	.984	
[GBI=4.00]	-.426	.2624	-.940	.089	2.631	1	.105	.653	.391	1.093	
[GBI=5.00]	-.339	.2046	-.740	.062	2.748	1	.097	.712	.477	1.064	
[GBI=6.00]	.158	.1869	-.209	.524	.713	1	.399	1.171	.812	1.689	
[GBI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
[RBI=1.00]	-.189	.3211	-.818	.440	.346	1	.557	.828	.441	1.553	
[RBI=2.00]	.894	.3695	.169	1.618	5.848	1	.016	2.444	1.185	5.042	
[RBI=3.00]	.694	.4349	-.158	1.547	2.548	1	.110	2.002	.854	4.695	
[RBI=4.00]	.126	.3281	-.517	.769	.148	1	.700	1.135	.596	2.159	
[RBI=5.00]	.519	.2480	.033	1.006	4.387	1	.036	1.681	1.034	2.733	
[RBI=6.00]	-.018	.1417	-.296	.260	.016	1	.899	.982	.744	1.297	
[RBI=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	
(Scale)	1 <sup>b</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	

Dependent Variable: WCS  
 Model: (Threshold), FSI, FMI, MLI, LRI, GBI, RBI  
 a. Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.  
 b. Fixed at the displayed value.

Table 14: Parameter Estimates (Internal Sources)

#### 4.2. External Sources of Ethical Norms among University Students

We analysed the external sources of ethical norms based on tests of model effects (see Table 15), and the overview of parameter estimates using the GENLIN procedure (see Table 16). The findings reveal that the interaction between a university student and his/her friends (non-university students) does not have a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 6.682, p = .351$ . Likewise, it has been revealed that the interaction between a university student and his/her family members (other than parents, siblings) does not have a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 4.387, p = .625$ . However, it has been revealed that the interaction between a university student and his/her mentors (former primary/secondary school teachers/college lecturers other than his current university lecturers) has a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 40.310, p = .000$ . On the other hand, it has been revealed that the laws (local community laws, country laws) do not have a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 2.384, p = .881$ . On the contrary, it has been revealed that the general behaviours in the university student's local community (other than the university campus he/she spends much time with) has a statistically significant effect on the way a university student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 34.331, p = .000$ . Similarly, it was found that the general behaviours in the university student's society at large (i.e. his/her country) have a statistically significant effect on the way a higher learning student behaves, Wald  $\chi^2(6) = 28.953, p = .000$ .

Source	Type III		
	Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.
FFE	6.682	6	.351
FME	4.387	6	.625
FLE	40.310	6	.000
LLE	2.384	6	.881
GBL	34.331	6	.000
GBT	28.953	6	.000
Dependent Variable: WCS Model: (Threshold), FFE, FME, FLE, LLE, GBL, GBT			

Table 15: Tests of Model Effects (External Sources)

When finding the effect of FLE1 compared to FLE7 (reference) on WCS, we find that the odds of FLE1 considering WCS was 0.723 (95% CI, 0.359 to 1.456), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.823, p = .364$ ; revealing that FLE1 and FLE7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the odds of FLE2 considering WCS was 3.043 (95% CI, 1.880 to 4.925) times that of FLE7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 20.515, p = .000$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider FLE2 than if we consider FLE7. On the other hand, the findings show that the odds of FLE3 considering WCS was 0.962 (95% CI, 0.408 to 2.268), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.008, p = .929$ ; indicating that FLE3 and FLE7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Similarly, the odds of FLE4 considering WCS was 1.171 (95% CI, 0.646 to 2.125), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.271, p = .603$ ; indicating that FLE4 and FLE7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Again, it has been revealed that the odds of FLE5 considering WCS was 1.015 (95% CI, 0.691 to 1.490), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.006, p = .940$ ; indicating that FLE5 and FLE7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Also, the odds of FLE6 considering WCS was 0.786 (95% CI, 0.573 to 1.078), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 2.228, p = .135$ ; revealing that FLE6 and FLE7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

When analysing the effect of GBL1 compared to GBL7 (reference) on WCS, we find that the odds of GBL1 considering WCS was 0.300 (95% CI, 0.160 to 0.561) times that of GBL7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 14.166, p = .000$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GBL1 than if we consider GBL7. Similarly, the odds of GBL2 considering WCS was 0.364 (95% CI, 0.217 to 0.612) times that of GBL7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 14.572, p = .000$ ; telling that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GBL2 than if we consider GBL7. Again, the odds of GBL3 considering WCS was 0.362 (95% CI, 0.186 to 0.706) times that of GBL7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 8.896, p = .003$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GBL3 than if we consider GBL7. However, the odds of GBL4 considering WCS was 0.708 (95% CI, 0.404 to 1.242), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 1.450, p = .228$ ; indicating that GBL4 and GBL7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Similarly, the odds of GBL5 considering WCS was 0.874 (95% CI, 0.557 to 1.372), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.341, p = .559$ ; indicating that GBL5 and GBL7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Also, it has been revealed that the odds of GBL6 considering WCS was 0.781 (95% CI, 0.514 to 1.186), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 1.345, p = .246$ ; indicating that GBL6 and GBL7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

The findings have also revealed that the odds of GBT1 considering WCS was 1.007 (95% CI, 0.535 to 1.894), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = .000, p = .984$ ; signalling that GBT1 and GBT7 (reference) appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. However, the case is different when the effect of GBT2 compared to GBT7 on WCS is analysed. The findings have revealed that the odds of GBT2 considering WCS was 3.260 (95% CI, 2.009 to 5.289) times that of GBT7, a statistically significant effect, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 22.902, p = .000$ ; indicating that we are more likely to consider WCS if we consider GBT2 than if we consider GBT7. However, the odds of GBT3 considering WCS was 2.161 (95% CI, 0.935 to 4.994), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 3.249, p = .071$ ; revealing that GBT3 and GBT7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

Similarly, the odds of GBT4 considering WCS was 1.130 (95% CI, 0.648 to 1.972), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.186, p = .666$ ; indicating that GBT4 and GBT7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Also, the odds of GBT5 considering WCS was 1.137 (95% CI, 0.764 to 1.691), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 0.399, p = .528$ ; indicating that GBT5 and GBT7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS. Similarly, the results reveal that the odds of GBT6 considering WCS was 1.261 (95% CI, 0.897 to 1.774), which is not statistically significant, Wald  $\chi^2(1) = 1.778, p = .182$ ; telling that GBT6 and GBT7 appear to have the same opinion when it comes to WCS.

Parameter	B	Std. Error	95% Wald Confidence Interval		Hypothesis Test			Exp(B)	95% Wald Confidence Interval for Exp(B)		
			Lower	Upper	Wald Chi-Square	df	Sig.		Lower	Upper	
Threshold	[WCS=2.00]	-7.907	1.0223	-9.910	-5.903	59.823	1	.000	.000	4.966E-5	.003
	[WCS=3.00]	-.892	.2403	-1.363	-.421	13.783	1	.000	.410	.256	.656
	[WCS=4.00]	-.774	.2400	-1.244	-.304	10.401	1	.001	.461	.288	.738
	[WCS=5.00]	-.757	.2400	-1.227	-.286	9.944	1	.002	.469	.293	.751
	[WCS=6.00]	-.267	.2392	-.736	.201	1.249	1	.264	.765	.479	1.223
	[FFE=1.00]	-.349	.2806	-.899	.201	1.547	1	.214	.705	.407	1.223
	[FFE=2.00]	-.456	.2272	-.901	-.011	4.029	1	.045	.634	.406	.989
	[FFE=3.00]	-.247	.3546	-.942	.448	.484	1	.487	.781	.390	1.566
	[FFE=4.00]	.025	.2964	-.556	.606	.007	1	.933	1.025	.574	1.833
	[FFE=5.00]	-.036	.2117	-.451	.379	.029	1	.866	.965	.637	1.461
	[FFE=6.00]	-.202	.1815	-.558	.154	1.238	1	.266	.817	.573	1.166
	[FFE=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	[FME=1.00]	-.128	.3405	-.795	.540	.141	1	.708	.880	.452	1.715
	[FME=2.00]	-.245	.2476	-.730	.241	.976	1	.323	.783	.482	1.272
	[FME=3.00]	-.367	.3851	-1.122	.387	.911	1	.340	.692	.326	1.473
	[FME=4.00]	.095	.2925	-.478	.669	.106	1	.745	1.100	.620	1.952
	[FME=5.00]	-.281	.1817	-.637	.075	2.396	1	.122	.755	.529	1.078
	[FME=6.00]	-.200	.1475	-.490	.089	1.846	1	.174	.818	.613	1.093
	[FME=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	[FLE=1.00]	-.324	.3571	-1.024	.376	.823	1	.364	.723	.359	1.456
	[FLE=2.00]	1.113	.2457	.631	1.594	20.515	1	.000	3.043	1.880	4.925
	[FLE=3.00]	-.039	.4377	-.897	.819	.008	1	.929	.962	.408	2.268
	[FLE=4.00]	.158	.3039	-.438	.754	.271	1	.603	1.171	.646	2.125
	[FLE=5.00]	.015	.1961	-.370	.399	.006	1	.940	1.015	.691	1.490
	[FLE=6.00]	-.241	.1612	-.556	.075	2.228	1	.135	.786	.573	1.078
	[FLE=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	[LLE=1.00]	-.008	.3140	-.623	.608	.001	1	.980	.992	.536	1.836
	[LLE=2.00]	-.275	.2608	-.786	.236	1.111	1	.292	.760	.456	1.267
	[LLE=3.00]	-.121	.4404	-.984	.742	.076	1	.783	.886	.374	2.100
	[LLE=4.00]	.012	.2656	-.509	.532	.002	1	.965	1.012	.601	1.702
	[LLE=5.00]	-.181	.2014	-.576	.214	.806	1	.369	.835	.562	1.239
	[LLE=6.00]	-.183	.1808	-.537	.172	1.023	1	.312	.833	.584	1.187
	[LLE=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	[GBL=1.00]	-1.205	.3201	-1.832	-.577	14.166	1	.000	.300	.160	.561
	[GBL=2.00]	-1.011	.2648	-1.530	-.492	14.572	1	.000	.364	.217	.612
	[GBL=3.00]	-1.015	.3404	-1.682	-.348	8.896	1	.003	.362	.186	.706
	[GBL=4.00]	-.345	.2867	-.907	.217	1.450	1	.228	.708	.404	1.242
	[GBL=5.00]	-.134	.2299	-.585	.316	.341	1	.559	.874	.557	1.372
	[GBL=6.00]	-.248	.2134	-.666	.171	1.345	1	.246	.781	.514	1.186
	[GBL=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	[GBT=1.00]	.007	.3226	-.626	.639	.000	1	.984	1.007	.535	1.894
	[GBT=2.00]	1.182	.2469	.698	1.666	22.902	1	.000	3.260	2.009	5.289
	[GBT=3.00]	.770	.4274	-.067	1.608	3.249	1	.071	2.161	.935	4.994
	[GBT=4.00]	.123	.2839	-.434	.679	.186	1	.666	1.130	.648	1.972
	[GBT=5.00]	.128	.2027	-.269	.525	.399	1	.528	1.137	.764	1.691
	[GBT=6.00]	.232	.1741	-.109	.573	1.778	1	.182	1.261	.897	1.774
	[GBT=7.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
	(Scale)	1 <sup>b</sup>	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: WCS  
 Model: (Threshold), FFE, FME, FLE, LLE, GBL, GBT

a. Set to zero because this parameter is redundant.

b. Fixed at the displayed value.

Table 16: Parameter Estimates (External Sources)

## 5. Discussion

Both internal and external sources of ethical norms among university students have been revealed. These sources are likely to become the yardstick for likelihood of business ethics at workplace. For example, results show that higher learning students influence the behaviours of their fellow students. This may be caused by the utmost interaction that exists between them. The assumption that our paper draws is that the interaction between students and their colleagues can result into either ethical behaviours or unethical conducts. Ethical behaviours or misbehaviour practices portrayed by a higher learning student are directly linked to the good or bad practices shown by his or her fellow students whom one interacts with most. As a potential employee, we argue that, he or she is likely to imitate the behaviours of his or her prospective fellow employees, and ultimately affect the ethical decision making process at workplace one is likely to make. On the other hand, other than their fellow college or campus friends, university students have friends outside the university premises that they interact with as well. However, the research results have revealed that the “outsiders” do not exert any influence on the behaviours of their friends (students). This may be caused by the little time students spend with their non-university friends. The case is likely to be similar when these students become employees. They will continue having friends other than their fellow employees. Therefore, their behaviours are less likely to be influenced by the conduct of friends who are not their fellow workplace colleagues. We also argue that, the weak influence will be the result of the little time spent whenever employees and their “outsiders” interact.

Results have revealed that the interaction between a higher learning student and his/her family members such as parents, and siblings does not influence such student’s behaviours. It is likely that the higher learning students, based on age, make independent ethical/unethical decisions. We also argue that these future employees will not be influenced by close family members in most of the corporate decisions they make. On the other hand, higher learning students have other family members apart from parents and siblings. Results have shown that the behaviours of university students are not influenced by these family members. This could be due to little time spent in their interactions. The case is likely to be similar at future workplaces. The prospective employees are expected to spend little time in interacting with their family members other than parents, and siblings. We therefore, argue that both universities, and future employers will not benefit from the good conducts influenced by their students’ or prospective employees’ family members other than parents, and siblings respectively. However, it is so beneficial to both universities, and employers, had these family members exerted unethical behaviours to the students, and prospective employees respectively.

Evidences show that university lecturers play a vital role in shaping their students’ behaviours. They can be a source of good conducts or unethical behaviours of their students. We also argue that the close interaction between students and their lecturers is likened to the close interaction between an employee and his or her supervisors. Future employees are therefore likely to behave in similar manner their prospective bosses will behave, and ultimately affect ethical decisions within their organizations. On the other hand, university students were also students in other institutions before being admitted by their respective higher learning institutions. They were once primary pupils. They also attended secondary schools, and colleges. During their stay at their former schools, students had time to interact with their mentors. We also argue that some students are still interacting with their former mentors who could be former lecturers or school teachers. Results have shown that these mentors exert or exerted an influence on their former students’ behaviours. We also argue that the same mentors’ behaviours, whether good or bad, are likely to influence the conduct of these future employees at workplace. Both universities, and future organizations, are likely to benefit from the former mentors’ ethical behaviours. On the contrary, they will not benefit from the former mentors’ bad practices.

Results have also revealed that university rules, and regulations have a significant role in the behaviours of students. This suggests that good characters can be influenced by strict university laws and regulations. It is also possible that weak rules and regulations can influence bad behaviours. This is likely to happen at workplace when these future employees will be behaving due to the strict company rules and regulations or misbehaving due to weak corporate rules, and regulations. Surprisingly, the laws such as the respective community and country laws do not exert any influence on the behaviours of the higher learning students. We argue that university students may have “little interaction” with laws governing their respective communities, as well as their countries. We argue that they place their efforts to abide by the laws that have “direct” impact on their stay at their respective universities as revealed earlier by the contribution of university rules, and regulations. We also argue that these future employees are likely to behave or misbehave at workplace irrespective of the existing community, and state laws.

The university campus comprises of many groups of people. Apart from students, we see the management, lecturers, administrative staff, supporting staff, and service providers to mention a few. The behaviours of these stakeholders make up the general behaviour of the campus. Students imitate it and are likely to misbehave or act ethically if the general behaviour within the campus is unethical or ethical respectively. We also argue that, students are likely to behave in similar way at workplace due to the influence of the general behaviour portrayed at future workplaces. On the other hand, every higher learning institution is found in a particular local community. Results have revealed the general behaviours within the local community surrounding a higher learning institution; have a significant contribution to the way the respective university students behave. This means that the good general behaviours within the local community are likely to influence the students’ ethical conducts. On the other hand, unethical behaviours from the local community are also likely to influence students’ bad practices. The reason behind this link may be the high interaction time spent between students and respective community members. This is likely to be a similar case between future employees and their respective local communities that surround their organizations.

Higher learning students have different religious beliefs. Research has shown that these beliefs have significant effect on their behaviours. They are likely to portray good behaviours if they comply with moral standards preached by their respective religious beliefs. We also argue that when his or her religious leaders or members within his or her religious circle are not walking in what their religious beliefs preach, the university students are likely to misbehave. Future employees are likely to act ethically at workplace due

to the influence exerted by their respective religious beliefs. They are also likely to misbehave if their religious leaders and members within their religions misbehave. Fellow employees who share the same religious belief with him or her are likely to influence his or her bad practices if they misbehave. Also, results have revealed that the university students' behaviours are influenced by the general behaviours in Tanzania. Pleasant general behaviours shown by the majority of citizens are likely to shape university students in behaving ethically. On the other hand, bad practices are likely to exert a negative influence. We also argue that future employees are likely to behave or misbehave due to the general ethical practices or unethical conducts going on in Tanzania.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has revealed the contributions of both internal and external sources of ethical norms among university students and ultimately paves way for the likelihood of business ethics at workplace. For example, based on the behaviours that are "transferred" from one another due to the interaction between students of the same higher learning institutions, we argue that future employers should strive to ensure that ethics at workplace is of paramount importance, and it acts as a fundamental criterion during recruitment in order to preserve ethical standards within the organization. On the other hand, we have seen how non-university friends exert no influence on the behaviours of their fellow friends who are students. This means that good behaviours or bad behaviours of non-university friends will have no impact to students' conduct. Students would misbehave if they would imitate unethical practices of their non-university students. This would be disadvantageous to the university. However, it would be disadvantageous, if their non-university friends would influence the students' bad practices. We argue that universities should encourage their students to imitate good behaviours from their non-university friends. Organizations should also be prepared to encourage their future employees to learn and imitate good behaviours from their friends who they do not work together.

We have also seen that the behaviours of higher learning students are not influenced by either their parents or siblings. This alarms that future employers should not place much efforts to link the business decisions that will be made by their prospective employees as having a foundation on the behaviours of an employee's parents or siblings. We argue that family background particularly that which is associated with parents and prospective employee's siblings should not be a factor during recruitment and selection. On the other hand, the results have alarmed that universities should strive to encourage their students to spend time with their ethically behaving family members other than the parents, and siblings in order to imitate good behaviours. On the other hand, we also argue that organizations should allow their future employees to interact with family members other than their parents, and siblings in order to imitate good practices and ultimately develop ethical working environments, as well as ethical entities.

Based on the behavioural influence the prospective supervisor will have on his or future subordinate, we argue that future employers (organizations) should carefully study the behaviours of their prospective employees and managers before they allow them to make workplace teams or work under one department. This is important for organizations that seek to prevent bad practices from being transferred to well behaving employees. However, after studying the respective behaviours, organizations are likely to change a misbehaving employee through a behaving manager and achieve corporate goals. On the other hand, the contribution of former mentors' behaviours is of paramount importance to both higher learning institutions, and future employers. We argue that background check is crucial in the admission process, and during recruitment and selection at workplace. We also argue that higher learning institutions should encourage their students to imitate good practices shown by their former mentors. We also recommend the same to the prospective employers after recruiting and selecting their future employees.

Since the rules, and regulations of a university influence the behaviours of students, and we have also seen that the company rules and regulations are likely to influence the conduct of employees, we argue that organizations should place their efforts in designing corporate laws, rules, and regulations that encourage ethics at workplace. Before recruitment, and soon after selection, prospective employees should be aware of these rules, and regulations, and be able to define their future employers as ethical entities. On the other hand, the failure to exert an influence on the behaviours of both students, and future employees, community, and state laws need to be reviewed to see the gaps if any. We also argue that Policymakers should strive to correct these gaps and advise effective execution of community, and state laws in order to have a "direct" impact to the wellbeing, and behaviours of the respective citizens including university students, and future employees.

Higher learning institutions should design and execute strict and friendly laws that will shape the behaviours of all stakeholders in their respective campuses. We also argue that, organizations should make develop and manage ethical working environments in order to attract the best employees but influence ethical conduct of their prospective employees during their stay in their respective organizations. This is possible if all stakeholders within their organizations abide by the ethical rules and standards. On the other hand, based on the influence exerted by local communities on the behaviours of respective university students, we argue that, universities should encourage their respective students to imitate good practices from their local community members. They can get better of their bad behaviours if interaction time is minimised. Higher learning institutions can reduce interaction between students and local community members if they decide to develop strategies that will accommodate a substantial number of their students in the university halls of residence or hostels. Likewise, we also argue that, future employers can opt for similar strategies if they accommodate their future fresh employees in "ethical" vicinities. However, we also argue that, future employers should encourage their prospective employees to imitate ethical conducts from well behaving local community members.

Higher learning institutions need to value the contribution of religion on the behaviour of a student. Universities should value religious liberty to their students and frequently encourage them to abide by what their religions preach. We also argue that this is a similar case when these students become employees. We argue that future employers need to consider this case seriously and be able to encourage their recruited and selected employees to abide by their respective religious beliefs in order to preserve ethical working environment. However, religious background should not be a criterion during recruitment and selection. We have also seen that the general

behaviours portrayed by most of the countrymen and countrywomen are likely to influence the behaviours of higher learning students, and future employees as well. Universities and organizations should place great emphasis on ethical trainings to their students, and future employees respectively. They should encourage their members to imitate good behaviours from behaving citizens.

### 7. Acknowledgements

I express my gratitude to Ms Eliakira Nnko, who, at the time of study, was an Acting Director of Undergraduate Studies at the Institute of Accountancy Arusha. Through her, the Institute of Accountancy Arusha, supported this study with regard to all printing and stationery services. I also express my gratitude to Mr Frank Sengati, who, at the time of this study, was the Head of Informatics Department, Institute of Accountancy Arusha. He assigned the researcher to teach *Statistical and Accounting applications (ITU 07425)* module and his decision propelled an interest to carry out this study. I heavily appreciate the support given to me by Mr Samwel Nyamanga from the Registrar's office. Mr Karisha Kavuta, who was the researcher's co-instructor, deserves thanks for his support. I exceptionally express my sincere gratitude to all second year bachelor degree students in information technology at the Institute of Accountancy Arusha (BIT II, Semester II, 2015) for their invaluable support in distributing and collecting questionnaires from their fellow bachelor degree students in all programmes.

### 8. References

- i. Burcea, N., & Croitoru, I. (2014). Business Ethics. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law* (6), 139-143.
- ii. Donaldson, J., & Fafaliou, I. (2003). Business Ethics, Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Governance: A Review and Summary Critique. *European Research Studies*, 6 (1-2), 90-110.
- iii. Elango, B., Paul, K., Kundu, S. K., & Paudel, S. K. (2010). Organizational Ethics, Individual Ethics, and Ethical Intentions in International Decision-Making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97 (4), 543-561.
- iv. Fortlouis-Wood, L. (2008). The Importance of Friendships for Social Identity Development: Research, Theory, and Practice: A Workshop. In A. Ross, & P. Cunningham (Eds.), *Reflecting on Identities: Research, Practice and Innovation* (pp. 739-748). London: CiCe.
- v. Fredriksen, K., & Rhodes, J. (2004). The Role of Teacher Relationships in the Lives of Students. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 103, pp. 45-54.
- vi. Goel, M., & Ramanathan, P. E. (2014). Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility – Is there a dividing line? *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 11, 49-59.
- vii. Khan, M. A. (2012). An Empirical Study of Students' Perception of Ethical Behaviour in Higher Education Institutions in Pakistan. *Актуальні проблеми економіки*, 6, 328-338.
- viii. Lau, L. K., Caracciolo, B., Roddenberry, S., & Scroggins, A. (2012). College Students' Perception of Ethics. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 5, 1-13.
- ix. McFarlane, D. A. (2013). The Importance of Business Ethics to Small Ventures. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management Journal*, 1 (1), 50-59.
- x. Mihelič, K. K., Lipičnik, B., & Tekavčič, M. (2010). Ethical Leadership. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems*, 14 (5), 31-42.
- xi. Nadelson, S. (2007). Academic Misconduct by University Students: Faculty Perceptions and Responses. *Plagiarism: Cross Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification*, 2 (2), 67-76.
- xii. Özbek, V., Alnıaçık, Ü., Akkılıç, M. E., & Koç, F. (2013). The Moderating Role of Locus of Control on the Links between Perceived Ethical Problem and Ethical Intentions of Marketing Managers in Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 265-273.
- xiii. Rujoiu, O., & Rujoiu, V. (2014). Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty. An Overview. *Proceedings of the 8th International Management Conference*, (pp. 928-938). Bucharest.
- xiv. Salehi, M., Saedinia, M., & Aghaei, M. (2012). Business Ethics. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 2 (1), 1-5.
- xv. Simkin, M. G., & McLeod, A. (2009). Why Do College Students Cheat? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94 (3), 441-453.
- xvi. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.