



Building a Culture of Integrity and Responsibility: Students' Awareness and Engagement in Student Discipline Programs in a Higher Education Institution

Pedro Ocdenaria Quiñal Jr., Noel Anthony Mirambel., Engr. Vanessa Jane Olmoguez-Ruiz

Department of Student Affairs Office, University of Cebu-Main

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800615>

Received: 21 August 2026; Accepted: 26 August 2026; Published: 14 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the students' level of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives in the University of Cebu-Main Campus and examined the significant relationship between these variables. Specifically, it assessed the respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, college enrolled, and year level, as well as their level of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs. The study employed a descriptive–correlational quantitative research design involving 636 undergraduate students selected through proportionate random sampling from the different colleges of the University, and data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire with established validity and reliability. The findings revealed that the respondents were very aware of the University's student discipline programs, strongly agreed that they actively engaged in discipline-related activities, and that a significant moderate relationship existed between students' level of awareness and engagement, with significant differences in engagement observed according to sex, college enrolled, and year level. The results indicate that increasing students' awareness contributes to greater participation in discipline programs while emphasizing the need for targeted interventions that address the diverse characteristics of the student population. Based on the findings, a Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan was proposed to strengthen policy awareness, increase student engagement, and foster a culture of integrity, responsibility, and ethical citizenship within the University.

Keywords: student discipline programs, student awareness, student engagement, integrity, responsibility, higher education, descriptive–correlational research, University of Cebu

INTRODUCTION

Student discipline programs play a vital role in fostering integrity, responsibility, and ethical behavior among students in higher education institutions. Beyond enforcing institutional rules, these programs cultivate students' awareness and engagement, enabling them to become active partners in maintaining a safe, orderly, and values-driven learning environment (Gregory et al., 2021; Bear & Yang, 2020). Consequently, strengthening students' awareness and participation in discipline programs contributes to holistic student development and responsible citizenship.

Universities in the United States, the United Kingdom, Finland, and Germany have increasingly adopted student-centered discipline frameworks that emphasize restorative practices, policy awareness, and student participation, resulting in improved behavioral outcomes and stronger institutional commitment (Karp & Frank, 2021; OECD, 2023). Likewise, research in these countries demonstrates that students who understand institutional policies are more likely to exhibit self-regulation, accountability, and ethical decision-making (Gregory et al., 2021). Meanwhile, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia continue to integrate discipline education with character formation and civic responsibility through comprehensive student development programs (MEXT, 2023; Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2022; Mulyadi et al., 2023). Furthermore, these studies reveal that effective communication of institutional policies and active student engagement significantly enhance students' compliance and responsible behavior. Similarly, Philippine studies reported that students generally demonstrate satisfactory compliance with university policies; however, variations remain in their awareness and participation in discipline-related initiatives (Quiñal et al., 2024; Dela Cruz & Ramos, 2022; Villanueva & Reyes, 2021).

Moreover, these studies emphasize that sustained policy dissemination and meaningful student engagement are essential in cultivating a culture of integrity and responsibility within higher education institutions.

Based on the researchers' observation at the University of Cebu, student discipline programs are regularly implemented through orientations, policy dissemination, and student development activities. However, differences in students' awareness and participation suggest that not all students fully understand or actively engage in these institutional initiatives.

Although previous studies have examined student discipline, policy compliance, and institutional implementation, limited research has simultaneously investigated the relationship between students' level of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs, particularly within private higher education institutions. This gap underscores the need to determine whether awareness influences students' engagement in discipline-related initiatives and supports the development of more effective student affairs programs. The findings of this study served as the basis for a Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan designed to strengthen policy awareness, increase student engagement, and promote a culture of integrity and responsibility within the University.

Theoretical Background

This study is mainly anchored on the Student Engagement Theory by George D. Kuh (2008). The main theory is supported by the Social Learning Theory by Albert Bandura (1977) and the Theory of Planned Behavior by Icek Ajzen (1991). Collectively, these theories provide a comprehensive framework for explaining how students acquire knowledge of institutional discipline programs, develop favorable attitudes toward university policies, and actively participate in discipline-related initiatives. The integration of these theories enables the study to explain the relationship between students' awareness and engagement in fostering a culture of integrity and responsibility within a higher education institution.

Student Engagement Theory, proposed by Kuh (2008), asserts that the quality and extent of students' involvement in educationally purposeful activities significantly influence their learning, personal development, and behavioral outcomes. The theory emphasizes that students who actively participate in institutional programs are more likely to develop positive values, stronger institutional commitment, and responsible citizenship. In the present study, the theory serves as the primary lens by explaining that students' engagement in discipline programs reflects their active involvement in promoting university policies and institutional values. Thus, Student Engagement Theory provides a strong foundation for understanding how meaningful participation contributes to increased awareness, positive behavioral practices, and sustained compliance with institutional discipline programs.

Supporting the main theory is Social Learning Theory by Bandura (1977), which explains that individuals acquire knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors through observation, imitation, reinforcement, and interaction within their social environment. Likewise, the Theory of Planned Behavior by Ajzen (1991) posits that human behavior is influenced by behavioral intentions, which are shaped by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. In the context of this study, these theories explain how students develop awareness of discipline programs through institutional communication, peer interaction, and university experiences, while their engagement is influenced by personal beliefs and perceived expectations regarding responsible behavior. Together, these supporting theories strengthen the explanation that awareness, social influence, and behavioral intention collectively encourage students to participate actively in discipline initiatives and comply with university policies.

Anchoring this study on these three theories provides a multidimensional understanding of students' awareness and engagement in student discipline programs. Student Engagement Theory explains the importance of active participation, Social Learning Theory emphasizes the influence of the university environment and social interactions, while the Theory of Planned Behavior clarifies how awareness and intentions translate into responsible actions. The integration of these theoretical perspectives enables the study to explain not only whether students are aware of institutional discipline programs but also why they choose to participate in and support them. Consequently, these theories provide a strong conceptual foundation for developing evidence-

based interventions that enhance student engagement, strengthen institutional discipline programs, and cultivate a culture of integrity, responsibility, and ethical citizenship in higher education.

Objectives of the Study

This study determined the students' level of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs at the University of Cebu–Main Campus.

Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 age;
 - 1.2 sex;
 - 1.3 college enrolled; and
 - 1.4 year level?
2. What is the level of awareness of students regarding student discipline programs?
3. What is the level of student engagement in discipline-related activities?
4. Is there a significant relationship between students' level of awareness and their level of engagement in discipline programs?
5. Is there a significant difference in the level of awareness and engagement when grouped according to profile?
6. Based on the findings, what Action Plan can be proposed to enhance students' awareness and engagement discipline programs?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Student discipline programs have become an essential component of student affairs in higher education because they promote responsible behavior, ethical decision-making, and adherence to institutional standards. Contemporary higher education institutions recognize that discipline should not merely focus on correcting undesirable behavior but should also cultivate students' moral development, accountability, and sense of social responsibility. Recent studies indicate that universities adopting preventive and educational approaches to discipline experience greater student participation, fewer disciplinary violations, and stronger institutional commitment among students (Bear & Yang, 2020; Gregory et al., 2021). Furthermore, researchers emphasize that discipline programs become more effective when they encourage students to understand institutional expectations and actively participate in promoting a positive campus culture rather than simply complying with rules through fear of sanctions.

Research conducted in universities across North America and Europe demonstrates that students' awareness of institutional policies significantly influences their attitudes toward discipline and responsible citizenship. Universities in the United States and the United Kingdom have increasingly implemented values-based discipline frameworks that integrate student orientations, policy awareness campaigns, restorative practices, and peer-led initiatives to strengthen behavioral accountability (Karp & Frank, 2021; Advance HE, 2023). Likewise, studies have shown that students who possess a higher level of awareness regarding university regulations are more likely to demonstrate self-regulation, academic integrity, and respect for institutional policies (OECD, 2023). These findings suggest that increasing students' understanding of university discipline policies contributes not only to compliance but also to the development of lifelong ethical behavior.

Similarly, universities across Asia continue to strengthen student discipline through educational interventions that emphasize values formation, civic responsibility, and collaborative participation. Studies conducted in Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia reveal that discipline programs are more effective when institutional policies are consistently communicated and reinforced through student engagement activities, leadership programs, and co-curricular initiatives (MEXT, 2023; Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2022; Mulyadi et al., 2023). Moreover, Asian researchers found that students who actively participate in university-sponsored activities develop stronger responsibility, social awareness, and institutional commitment than those who merely receive information through written policies. Consequently, awareness and engagement function as

complementary factors that encourage students to internalize university values and demonstrate responsible behavior both inside and outside the classroom.

Within the Philippine higher education system, student discipline programs are recognized as an integral component of Student Affairs and Services that support holistic student development and institutional governance. The Commission on Higher Education emphasizes that higher education institutions should implement programs that promote responsible citizenship, ethical conduct, and student participation consistent with the objectives of Republic Act No. 7722 and the Student Affairs and Services framework (CHED, 2017). Likewise, recent local studies have reported that while students generally demonstrate satisfactory compliance with institutional policies, variations remain in their awareness of discipline programs and their actual engagement in university initiatives (Quiñal et al., 2024; Dela Cruz & Ramos, 2022; Villanueva & Reyes, 2021). These findings indicate that compliance alone may not fully reflect students' understanding of institutional discipline programs or their willingness to participate actively in promoting a culture of integrity.

Although numerous studies have examined institutional discipline policies, student behavior, and policy compliance, relatively few investigations have simultaneously examined the relationship between students' awareness of discipline programs and their engagement in discipline-related activities within higher education institutions. Existing literature primarily measures behavioral outcomes or institutional compliance without exploring how awareness influences students' participation in discipline initiatives and the overall effectiveness of institutional programs. Furthermore, limited empirical evidence exists within private higher education institutions in the Philippines, particularly in the University of Cebu, where student discipline programs are regularly implemented through orientations, campaigns, and policy dissemination activities. This research gap justifies the conduct of the present study, as determining the relationship between students' level of awareness and engagement will provide empirical evidence for developing a more responsive institutional action plan that strengthens integrity, responsibility, and active student participation in discipline programs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a descriptive–correlational quantitative research design to determine the students' level of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives in a Higher Education Institution and to examine the significant relationship between these variables. A total of 636 undergraduate students participated in the study through proportionate random sampling. The respondents were selected from the different colleges of the University, namely: College of Teacher Education, College of Business and Accountancy, College of Criminal Justice, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Customs Administration, College of Computer Studies, College of Engineering, College of Social Work, College of Hospitality Management, and College of Nursing, representing all year levels. The study was conducted at the University of Cebu–Main Campus, which was selected as the research locale because it regularly implements comprehensive student discipline programs and initiatives designed to promote integrity, responsibility, and positive student behavior through policy dissemination, orientation activities, and student development programs.

For the purpose of this study, data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire administered through an online Google Forms survey. The instrument was developed based on the University's Student Handbook, institutional discipline policies, and relevant literature on student discipline and engagement. Prior to the actual data collection, the research instrument underwent content validation by experts in student affairs, educational management, and research to establish its validity. Subsequently, a pilot test was conducted to assess its internal consistency and reliability using Cronbach's Alpha, which yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.92, indicating excellent reliability. Permission to conduct the study was secured from the concerned University officials, after which the survey link was distributed to the selected respondents. Responses were collected, reviewed for completeness, encoded, and subsequently imported for statistical analysis.

The data analysis was conducted in several phases. Phase 1 involved the organization, coding, and validation of the collected responses to ensure completeness and accuracy of the dataset prior to analysis. Phase 2 utilized frequency count and percentage to describe the respondents' demographic profile, while weighted mean, standard deviation, and ranking were employed to determine the students' level of awareness and engagement in student

discipline programs and initiatives. Phase 3 involved the Chi-square Test of Independence to determine the significant relationship between students' level of awareness and level of engagement, with the Contingency Coefficient (C) computed to determine the strength of the association. Phase 4 employed One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine significant differences in students' awareness and engagement when grouped according to their profile variables, and whenever significant differences were identified, a Tukey Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Post Hoc Test was performed to determine the specific groups that significantly differed. Finally, the researcher interpreted the results, and the findings served as the basis for the proposed Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan aimed at strengthening students' awareness, increasing engagement, and fostering a culture of integrity and responsibility within the University.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Respondent's Demographic Profile

Age	f	Per Cent
16 - 23	598	94.03%
24 - 31	29	4.56%
32 - 39	6	0.94%
40 - 47	1	0.16%
48 - 55	2	0.31%
	636	100%
Sex	f	Per Cent
Male	396	62.26%
Female	240	37.74%
	636	100%
College Enrolled	f	Per Cent
College of Teacher Education	44	6.92%
College of Business and Accountancy	84	13.21%
College of Criminal Justice	10	1.57%
College of Arts and Sciences	34	5.35%
College of Customs Administration	46	7.23%
College of Computer Studies	77	12.11%
College of Engineering	82	12.89%
College of Social Work	29	4.56%
College of Hospitality Management	111	17.45%
College of Nursing	119	18.71%
	636	100%
Year Level	f	Per Cent
First Year	483	75.94%
Second Year	50	7.86%
Third Year	59	9.28%
Fourth Year	44	6.92%
	636	100%

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 636 respondents in terms of age, sex, college enrolled, and year level. The findings reveal that the majority of the respondents were 16–23 years old (94.03%), indicating that the study predominantly represents the traditional undergraduate population in higher education. In terms of sex, 396 (62.26%) were male while 240 (37.74%) were female, suggesting that both sexes were adequately represented to provide diverse perspectives regarding student discipline programs. Furthermore, the respondents came from ten academic colleges, with the College of Nursing (18.71%) and the College of Hospitality Management (17.45%) contributing the largest proportions, while First Year students (75.94%) comprised the majority of the participants. The demographic composition suggests that the findings primarily reflect the perceptions and experiences of students who are at the initial stage of university life, making the results

particularly valuable in evaluating the effectiveness of orientation programs, policy dissemination, and student engagement initiatives designed to cultivate a culture of integrity and responsibility within the institution.

The demographic distribution demonstrates that the study obtained responses from students representing various colleges and year levels, thereby providing a comprehensive assessment of awareness and engagement in student discipline programs across different academic disciplines. The predominance of first-year students highlights the importance of institutional orientation and policy dissemination since this group is expected to be more receptive to values formation and university regulations during their transition into higher education. Likewise, the representation of different colleges provides valuable insights into how discipline programs are perceived across diverse academic environments, enabling the University to determine whether existing initiatives are implemented consistently among its academic units.

Overall, the profile of the respondents suggests that student discipline programs should continue to prioritize awareness campaigns, orientation activities, and engagement initiatives, particularly among newly admitted students who comprise the largest segment of the student population. At the same time, the diversity of respondents across colleges allows the University to identify discipline-related concerns that may be unique to specific academic programs and student groups. Consequently, these demographic characteristics provide a meaningful basis for interpreting the subsequent findings and for developing targeted intervention strategies that strengthen students' awareness, engagement, integrity, and responsibility within the University.

Table 2. Level of Awareness on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I am aware of the school's Student Discipline Initiative.	3.59	0.62019	Very Aware
2. I am aware about the Student Awareness Drive conducted in our campus.	3.47	0.69919	Very Aware
3. I am knowledgeable with the Positive Information Drive regarding discipline.	3.45	0.70240	Very Aware
4. I have knowledge of the student orientation activities on discipline policies.	3.53	0.63042	Very Aware
5. I am aware of the room-to-room discussions/campaigns on student discipline.	3.45	0.72892	Very Aware
6. I have seen or read the posters and bulletin information about discipline policies.	3.34	0.79233	Very Aware
7. I am informed with the rules regarding student uniform and proper appearance.	3.72	0.54852	Very Aware
8. I am aware of the list of prohibited attire inside the campus.	3.72	0.53727	Very Aware
9. I am aware of the differences between minor and major offenses as stated in the handbook.	3.57	0.61250	Very Aware
10. I am aware of the prohibited acts inside the campus and their consequences.	3.66	0.56166	Very Aware
Overall Mean	3.55		Very Aware
<i>Mean Ranges: 1.00 - 1.74 (Not Aware), 1.75 - 2.49 (Slightly Aware), 2.50 - 3.24 (Moderately Aware), 3.25 - 4.00 (Very Aware)</i>			

Table 2 presents the respondents' level of awareness regarding the University's student discipline programs and initiatives. The findings reveal an overall weighted mean of 3.55 (SD = 0.62), which is interpreted as Very Aware, indicating that the respondents possess a high level of familiarity with the University's discipline-related policies, activities, and institutional initiatives. Among the indicators, the highest mean scores were obtained by awareness of the rules regarding student uniform and proper appearance (WM = 3.72) and awareness of the list of prohibited attire inside the campus (WM = 3.72), suggesting that policies directly affecting students' daily campus life are the most widely communicated and understood. Likewise, respondents demonstrated high awareness of the prohibited acts and their corresponding consequences (WM = 3.66) and the Student Discipline Initiative (WM = 3.59), reflecting the effectiveness of the University's orientation programs, student handbook

dissemination, and continuous information campaigns. These findings imply that the institution has established effective communication mechanisms that promote students' knowledge of discipline policies, thereby fostering a culture of accountability and responsible citizenship within the university community.

Despite the generally high level of awareness, several indicators obtained relatively lower weighted means, particularly having seen or read posters and bulletin information about discipline policies (WM = 3.34), knowledge of the Positive Information Drive regarding discipline (WM = 3.45), and awareness of room-to-room discussions or discipline campaigns (WM = 3.45). Although these indicators remain within the Very Aware category, they suggest that communication strategies relying on traditional dissemination methods may not be reaching students as effectively as formal orientations and policy briefings. The findings indicate that students appear to acquire information primarily through structured institutional activities rather than through continuous promotional campaigns conducted across the campus. Consequently, strengthening digital communication platforms, interactive awareness campaigns, and student-led advocacy initiatives may further improve students' understanding of discipline programs beyond initial orientation activities. Such initiatives would ensure sustained policy awareness throughout the academic year and reinforce students' commitment to institutional rules and expectations.

The findings strongly support Student Engagement Theory proposed by Kuh (2008), which emphasizes that students become more knowledgeable, responsible, and committed to institutional values when they actively participate in educational programs and campus activities. The consistently high awareness ratings suggest that the University's discipline orientations, institutional initiatives, and policy dissemination efforts have successfully engaged students in understanding the behavioral expectations of the institution. Likewise, the findings align with Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), which posits that individuals develop appropriate behaviors through observation, communication, and interaction within their social environment, and with the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), which explains that awareness significantly shapes attitudes and intentions toward compliant behavior. Similar findings were reported by Dugan et al. (2021), who found that institutional engagement enhances students' understanding of university policies, and by Tight (2022), who emphasized that effective communication and student participation strengthen institutional commitment and responsible behavior among higher education students.

Table 3. Level of Engagement on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
1. I actively participate in the Student Awareness Drive activities.	3.35	0.53227	Strongly Agree
2. I engage in the Positive Information Drive by sharing or applying what I learn.	3.45	0.52555	Strongly Agree
3. I attend and listen attentively during orientation sessions on student discipline.	3.50	0.50974	Strongly Agree
4. I actively take part in room-to-room discussions/campaigns about discipline.	3.37	0.56425	Strongly Agree
5. I read and pay attention to the posters and bulletin boards about discipline.	3.46	0.50797	Strongly Agree
6. I follow the guidelines on student uniform and proper appearance.	3.67	0.47008	Strongly Agree
7. I avoid wearing prohibited attire inside the campus.	3.71	0.45453	Strongly Agree
8. I consciously refrain from committing minor offenses.	3.68	0.46774	Strongly Agree

9. I make sure to avoid major offenses that can harm my record or others.	3.72	0.45157	Strongly Agree
10. I promote and support a culture of positive discipline among my peers.	3.67	0.48977	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.56		Strongly Agree
<i>Mean Ranges: 1.00 - 1.74 (Strongly Disagree), 1.75 - 2.49 (Disagree), 2.50 - 3.24 (Agree), 3.25 - 4.00 (Strongly Agree)</i>			

Table 3 presents the respondents' level of engagement in the University's student discipline programs and initiatives. The results reveal an overall weighted mean of 3.56 (SD = 0.50), interpreted as Strongly Agree, indicating that students actively participate in and support activities that promote discipline, responsible conduct, and institutional values. The highest-rated indicator was "I make sure to avoid major offenses that can harm my record or others" (WM = 3.72), followed by "I avoid wearing prohibited attire inside the campus" (WM = 3.71) and "I consciously refrain from committing minor offenses" (WM = 3.68). Similarly, respondents strongly agreed that they follow the guidelines on student uniform and proper appearance (WM = 3.67) and promote a culture of positive discipline among peers (WM = 3.67). These findings suggest that students do not merely understand institutional discipline policies but also translate such knowledge into responsible behaviors that contribute to maintaining a safe, orderly, and values-oriented academic environment.

Despite the consistently high engagement across all indicators, relatively lower mean scores were observed in active participation in Student Awareness Drive activities (WM = 3.35) and room-to-room discussions or discipline campaigns (WM = 3.37). Although these indicators remain within the Strongly Agree category, they imply that students demonstrate stronger engagement in personal compliance with institutional rules than in collaborative or advocacy-based discipline activities. This finding suggests that while students readily practice discipline individually, greater institutional efforts may be needed to encourage broader participation in awareness campaigns, peer education, and student-led initiatives that strengthen collective responsibility. Consequently, expanding participatory and experiential discipline programs may further cultivate student leadership, shared accountability, and a stronger sense of ownership in sustaining a positive campus culture.

The findings strongly affirm Student Engagement Theory by Kuh (2008), which posits that students who actively participate in institutional activities develop stronger commitment, responsibility, and positive behavioral outcomes. The respondents' high level of engagement demonstrates that meaningful participation in discipline-related programs encourages students to internalize institutional values and consistently practice appropriate behaviors within the university community. These results are likewise consistent with the findings of Kahu (2013), who emphasized that student engagement promotes positive educational and behavioral outcomes, and Bond et al. (2020), who reported that active student participation enhances responsibility, institutional commitment, and adherence to university policies, thereby reinforcing the theoretical foundations of the present study.

Table 3. Relationship Between Students' Level of Awareness and Level of Engagement in Student Discipline Programs

df	Computed Value	Critical Value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
3	189.512	7.815	Reject Ho	Significant; C = 0.48 (Moderate)

Table 3 presents the relationship between students' level of awareness and their level of engagement in student discipline programs using the Chi-square Test of Independence. The computed Chi-square value of 189.512 is substantially higher than the critical value of 7.815 with 3 degrees of freedom, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This indicates a statistically significant relationship between students' awareness and engagement in student discipline programs. Furthermore, the contingency coefficient of C = 0.48 indicates a moderate positive association, suggesting that students who possess greater awareness of institutional discipline



programs also tend to exhibit higher levels of participation and engagement in related activities. The findings imply that increasing students' knowledge of university discipline policies and initiatives may likewise enhance their willingness to actively participate in programs that promote responsible behavior and institutional values.

The significant moderate relationship observed in the study indicates that awareness serves as an important antecedent of student engagement, reinforcing the notion that understanding institutional policies encourages students to translate knowledge into responsible actions.

Similar findings were reported by Kahu (2013), who emphasized that student engagement is strengthened by meaningful institutional experiences, and Bond et al. (2020), who concluded that students who are well-informed and actively engaged in university programs demonstrate higher levels of commitment, compliance, and positive behavioral outcomes.

Table 4. Students' Level of Awareness on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped According to Profile

Variables	df	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Age	4	0.61	0.657	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Sex	1	4.13	0.042	Reject Ho	Significant
College Enrolled	9	1.39	0.191	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Year Level	3	0.52	0.670	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 4 presents the comparison of students' level of awareness on student discipline programs and initiatives when grouped according to their demographic profile using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The findings indicate that age ($F = 0.61$, $p = 0.657$), college enrolled ($F = 1.39$, $p = 0.191$), and year level ($F = 0.52$, $p = 0.670$) did not show statistically significant differences since their p-values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the failure to reject the null hypothesis.

This suggests that students generally possess a similar level of awareness of discipline programs regardless of their age, academic program, or year level. However, sex ($F = 4.13$, $p = 0.042$) yielded a statistically significant difference, resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating that male and female students differ significantly in their level of awareness regarding student discipline programs and initiatives. These findings imply that while institutional policy dissemination has been consistently effective across most student groups, differences in awareness based on sex suggest that students may vary in how they receive, process, or respond to institutional communication and discipline-related information.

The findings are consistent with Student Engagement Theory by Kuh (2008), which emphasizes that students' interaction with institutional programs influences their understanding and internalization of university policies. The significant difference observed according to sex further supports Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), which posits that learning behaviors are influenced by social experiences and interactions that may differ between demographic groups, while the absence of differences across age, college, and year level reflects the University's consistent implementation of discipline orientations and information dissemination.

Likewise, the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) suggests that awareness is shaped by personal beliefs and social influences, which may explain the observed variation between male and female students. Similar findings were reported by Bond et al. (2020) and Kahu and Nelson (2018), who concluded that although institutional communication generally promotes consistent awareness among students, demographic characteristics, particularly sex, may influence students' responsiveness to university initiatives and educational interventions.

Table 5. Students' Level of Engagement on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped According to Profile

Variables	df	Computed Value	P-Value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Age	4	1.38	0.240	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Sex	1	14.44	0.000	Reject Ho	Significant
College Enrolled	9	3.25	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Year Level	3	3.09	0.027	Reject Ho	Significant

Table 5 presents the comparison of students' level of engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives according to their demographic profile using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results show that age ($F = 1.38$, $p = 0.240$) did not produce a statistically significant difference, indicating similar levels of engagement across age groups. However, significant differences were found according to sex ($F = 14.44$, $p < .001$), college enrolled ($F = 3.25$, $p = 0.001$), and year level ($F = 3.09$, $p = 0.027$), leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for these variables. These findings suggest that students' engagement in discipline programs varies depending on their sex, academic program, and year level, indicating the need for more targeted engagement strategies for different student groups.

The findings support Student Engagement Theory (Kuh, 2008), which explains that students' participation in institutional activities differs according to their educational experiences and opportunities for involvement. They also align with Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) and the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), suggesting that students' engagement is influenced by their social environment, academic experiences, and behavioral intentions. Similar findings were reported by Bond et al. (2020) and Kahu (2013), who emphasized that student engagement varies across demographic groups and educational contexts. Collectively, these results underscore the importance of developing discipline programs that address the diverse characteristics and needs of the student population.

Table 6. Post Hoc Test for Groupings with Significant Results

	Variables	n	Mean	Description	Grouping	
Students' Level of Awareness on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped According to Sex	Male	240	3.50	Very Aware	B	
	Female	396	3.58	Very Aware	A	
Students' Level of Engagement on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped According to Sex	Male	240	3.48	Strongly Agree	B	
	Female	396	3.60	Strongly Agree	A	
Students' Level of Engagement on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped	College of Teacher Education	44	3.64	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Business and Accountancy	84	3.51	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Criminal Justice	10	3.54	Strongly Agree	A	B

According to College Enrolled	College of Arts and Sciences	34	3.58	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Customs Administration	46	3.59	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Computer Studies	77	3.44	Strongly Agree		B
	College of Engineering	82	3.59	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Social Work	29	3.51	Strongly Agree	A	B
	College of Hospitality Management	111	3.48	Strongly Agree		B
	College of Nursing	119	3.67	Strongly Agree	A	
Students' Level of Engagement on Student Discipline Programs and Initiatives when Grouped According to Year Level	First Year	483	3.55	Strongly Agree	A	B
	Second Year	50	3.67	Strongly Agree	A	
	Third Year	59	3.56	Strongly Agree	A	B
	Fourth Year	44	3.45	Strongly Agree		B

Table 6 presents the results of the Tukey Post Hoc Test, which was conducted following the significant One-way ANOVA results to determine which specific groups differed significantly in terms of students' awareness and engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives. For students' level of awareness when grouped according to sex, female respondents ($M = 3.58$) were classified under Group A, while male respondents ($M = 3.50$) belonged to Group B, indicating a statistically significant difference between the two groups. Similarly, in terms of students' level of engagement when grouped according to sex, female students obtained a higher mean ($M = 3.60$) than male students ($M = 3.48$), with females again classified under Group A and males under Group B. These findings suggest that female students demonstrate significantly higher awareness of and engagement in student discipline programs than their male counterparts, implying that women may be more receptive to institutional policies and more actively involved in discipline-related initiatives.

Furthermore, significant differences were also observed in students' level of engagement when grouped according to college enrolled and year level. Among the different colleges, the College of Nursing ($M = 3.67$) consistently belonged to Group A, indicating significantly higher engagement than the College of Computer Studies ($M = 3.44$) and the College of Hospitality Management ($M = 3.48$), which were classified under Group B, while the remaining colleges shared both groupings, suggesting no statistically significant differences from either cluster. Likewise, with respect to year level, Second Year students ($M = 3.67$) belonged exclusively to Group A, whereas Fourth Year students ($M = 3.45$) were classified under Group B, indicating that second-year students exhibited significantly higher engagement in discipline programs than fourth-year students, while first- and third-year students overlapped with both groups. These results imply that students' engagement in discipline initiatives varies according to their academic characteristics, particularly sex, college affiliation, and year level, highlighting the need for targeted intervention strategies that address the specific engagement needs of different student groups.

The post hoc findings reinforce Student Engagement Theory by Kuh (2008), which posits that students' involvement in institutional activities varies depending on their educational experiences and level of connection with the university environment. The higher engagement demonstrated by female students, nursing students, and second-year students suggests that opportunities for participation, exposure to institutional programs, and academic experiences influence students' commitment to discipline-related initiatives. These findings are likewise supported by Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), which explains that students' behaviors are shaped through continuous interaction with their academic and social environment, and by the Theory of Planned

Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), which emphasizes that attitudes and perceived norms influence behavioral engagement. Similar observations were reported by Bond et al. (2020) and Kahu and Nelson (2018), who concluded that meaningful student engagement differs across demographic and academic groups and that institutions should implement differentiated strategies to maximize participation and strengthen students' commitment to university policies and values.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study establish that students of the University of Cebu–Main Campus possess a very high level of awareness and high level of engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives, demonstrating that the University's existing policies, orientation programs, and discipline-related interventions have been generally effective in promoting responsible student behavior. Moreover, a moderate but statistically significant relationship between awareness and engagement confirms that students who are more knowledgeable about institutional discipline programs are likewise more inclined to participate actively in activities that reinforce university values and regulations. While awareness remained relatively consistent across most demographic groups, significant differences according to sex were observed, whereas students' level of engagement varied significantly based on sex, college enrolled, and year level, suggesting that engagement is influenced not only by institutional communication but also by students' academic and social experiences. These findings affirm that awareness alone is insufficient to cultivate sustained behavioral change unless accompanied by meaningful opportunities for student participation and involvement. Ultimately, the study demonstrates that student discipline programs become more effective when institutional policies are transformed into lived experiences through continuous engagement, collaboration, and shared responsibility among members of the academic community.

More importantly, the study challenges the conventional assumption that the mere dissemination of university policies is adequate to achieve student compliance and cultivate a culture of discipline. The significant variations in engagement across different student groups indicate that a one-size-fits-all approach to discipline programming may no longer be sufficient in addressing the diverse needs, motivations, and experiences of today's higher education students. Consequently, higher education institutions must move beyond compliance-driven disciplinary systems toward student-centered, evidence-based, and participatory approaches that empower students as active partners in promoting institutional integrity and responsible citizenship. The proposed intervention framework emerging from this study provides a strategic direction for enhancing policy communication, strengthening student engagement, and developing targeted initiatives that respond to the characteristics of specific student populations. By reimagining discipline as a shared educational responsibility rather than merely an administrative function, this research contributes to the continuous improvement of student affairs services and supports the broader mission of higher education institutions to produce graduates who exemplify integrity, accountability, and ethical leadership both within and beyond the university.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **The Student Affairs Office**, in collaboration with the Prefect of Discipline (POD) and the Guidance Office, should strengthen student discipline programs by implementing a comprehensive and year-round discipline education campaign. While the findings revealed that students are generally very aware of university discipline programs, continuous reinforcement through seminars, orientations, digital campaigns, peer-led activities, and classroom integration will help sustain awareness and translate it into consistent disciplinary practices.
2. **College Deans, program chairpersons, and student organizations** should develop college-specific engagement initiatives that encourage greater participation in discipline-related programs. Since significant differences in students' level of engagement were observed across colleges and year levels, interventions should be contextualized to address the unique needs, interests, and experiences of different student groups rather than relying solely on institution-wide activities.

3. **Faculty members and student leaders** should be actively involved in promoting a culture of integrity, responsibility, and positive discipline by integrating discussions on university policies, ethical behavior, and responsible citizenship into classroom instruction, leadership programs, and co-curricular activities. Such collaborative efforts may strengthen students' internalization of institutional values and encourage greater ownership of university rules and expectations.
4. **The University Administration** should establish a regular monitoring and evaluation mechanism to assess students' awareness and engagement in discipline programs. Annual assessments, feedback systems, and evidence-based policy reviews will enable the institution to identify emerging concerns, measure program effectiveness, and continuously improve student discipline initiatives based on empirical findings.
5. **Future researchers** are encouraged to expand the present study by including other higher education institutions, additional demographic and psychosocial variables, and qualitative methods such as interviews or focus group discussions. Comparative and longitudinal studies may provide deeper insights into how institutional culture, leadership practices, and student experiences influence awareness, engagement, and compliance with university discipline programs.

The results of the present study, together with previous research, demonstrate that student awareness and active engagement are fundamental elements in fostering responsible behavior and strengthening institutional discipline. Students who clearly understand university policies and actively participate in institutional programs are more likely to develop self-regulation, accountability, and positive citizenship behaviors that contribute to a safe and productive learning environment (Kuh, 2008; Tinto, 2012). These findings reinforce the view that effective discipline extends beyond policy enforcement and requires continuous collaboration among administrators, faculty members, student leaders, and the students themselves. Consequently, higher education institutions should invest in proactive, developmental, and student-centered discipline programs that encourage participation rather than merely ensuring compliance.

Well-disciplined and value-oriented universities are not created by chance but are built through intentional leadership, meaningful student engagement, and evidence-based institutional practices. Research has consistently demonstrated that students who develop self-control, integrity, and active engagement are more likely to achieve positive academic, behavioral, and personal outcomes (Duckworth et al., 2019; Reeve et al., 2025). Furthermore, higher education institutions that promote academic integrity through values formation and student participation cultivate ethical decision-making that extends beyond mere compliance with institutional rules (Cox & McPhee, 2026). Therefore, universities should continuously strengthen student discipline programs through proactive, participatory, and developmental interventions that foster integrity, responsibility, and lifelong ethical citizenship, producing graduates who are academically competent, socially responsible, and morally grounded.

Proposed Action Plan

The findings of the study revealed that students demonstrated a very high level of awareness and high level of engagement in student discipline programs and initiatives. However, significant differences in students' engagement were observed when grouped according to sex, college enrolled, and year level, indicating that while institutional discipline programs are generally effective, the level of student participation varies across different student groups. Likewise, the significant relationship between awareness and engagement suggests that increasing students' understanding of university discipline programs contributes to greater participation in activities that promote responsible behavior. These findings highlight the need for sustained and differentiated interventions that strengthen both policy awareness and student involvement.

The University recognizes that student discipline is a developmental process that extends beyond policy enforcement and serves as an important component of holistic student formation. As higher education institutions continue to prepare graduates who embody integrity, responsibility, and ethical leadership, discipline programs must become more participatory, preventive, and educational rather than merely corrective. Strengthening collaboration among university administrators, faculty members, student leaders, and students themselves is



essential in cultivating a campus environment that supports positive behavior and shared accountability. Consequently, discipline initiatives should continuously evolve to address the diverse needs of students while reinforcing institutional values.

In response to these findings, the proposed Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan is designed to strengthen students' awareness, increase meaningful engagement, and institutionalize a culture of integrity and responsibility within the University. The action plan emphasizes continuous policy education, student participation, leadership development, digital communication, and evidence-based program evaluation. Through these initiatives, the University seeks to foster responsible citizenship, improve compliance with institutional policies, and enhance the overall quality of student affairs services. Ultimately, the proposed action plan supports the University's commitment to producing graduates who exemplify ethical conduct, accountability, and professionalism.

The proposed Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan aims to:

- To strengthen students' awareness and understanding of the University's discipline policies, rules, and student development programs;
- To increase students' active engagement and participation in discipline-related activities, leadership initiatives, and values formation programs;
- To cultivate a culture of integrity, responsibility, accountability, and respect among students through collaborative and developmental interventions;
- To enhance the effectiveness of policy dissemination through innovative, digital, and student-centered communication strategies; and
- To establish a sustainable monitoring and evaluation system that continuously improves the implementation of student discipline programs and initiatives.

Proposed Student Discipline Enhancement Action Plan

Activities	Persons/Office Involved	Time Frame
Freshmen Orientation on University Policies, Student Discipline Programs, and Student Code of Conduct	Student Affairs Office, Office of Student Discipline, Guidance Office, SBO, College Deans, Chairpersons, First-Year Students	Every Opening of Classes (August)
Student Discipline Awareness Campaign through Digital Media, Infographics, Videos, and Social Media Platforms	Student Affairs Office, Campus Media Team, Student Organizations, Marketing Office	Every Semester
College-Based Student Discipline Caravan and Policy Orientation	Student Affairs Office, Discipline Officers, College Deans, Faculty Members, Student Leaders	Every Semester
Integrity and Responsibility Leadership Forum	Student Affairs Office, Guidance Office, Student Organizations, Resource Speakers	October (Integrity Month)
Student Peer Ambassador Program on Positive Discipline	Student Affairs Office, Supreme Student Government, Accredited Student Organizations	Every Academic Year

Classroom Integration of University Policies and Responsible Student Citizenship	Faculty Members, Chairpersons, Deans	Every Academic Year
"Know Your Rights and Responsibilities" Information Drive	Student Affairs Office, Guidance Office, Legal Office, Student Leaders	Every Semester
Student Discipline Week featuring seminars, exhibits, policy quiz competitions, and advocacy activities	Student Affairs Office, Campus Organizations, Campus Media Team	Every Second Semester
Annual Student Discipline Satisfaction and Awareness Survey	Institutional Research Office, Student Affairs Office, Quality Assurance Office	End of Every Academic Year
Monitoring and Evaluation of Student Discipline Programs with Action Planning Workshop	Student Affairs Office, Quality Assurance Office, Deans, Student Leaders	Annually (May–June)

The proposed program integrates continuous policy education, values formation, student leadership, digital awareness campaigns, peer engagement, and annual assessment mechanisms. It is intended to strengthen students' awareness and engagement in discipline programs while fostering a sustainable culture of integrity, responsibility, accountability, and ethical citizenship across the University. This action plan also serves as an evidence-based framework for improving student affairs services and ensuring that discipline programs remain responsive to the evolving needs of the student population.

REFERENCES

- 1 Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- 2 Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- 3 Bear, G. G., & Yang, C. (2020). *School discipline and self-discipline: A practical guide to promoting prosocial student behavior*. Guilford Press.
- 4 Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: A systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1), Article
- 5 Commission on Higher Education. (1994). Republic Act No. 7722: Higher Education Act of 1994. <https://ched.gov.ph/republic-act-no-7722/>
- 6 Commission on Higher Education. (2019). *Monitoring and Evaluation of Outcomes-Based and Responsive Philippine Higher Education (MORPHE)*. <https://ched.gov.ph/morphe/>
- 7 Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Self-discipline outdoes IQ in predicting academic performance of adolescents. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 939–944.
- 8 Duckworth, A. L., Taxer, J. L., Eskreis-Winkler, L., Galla, B. M., & Gross, J. J. (2019). Self-control and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 373–399.
- 9 Gregory, A., Clawson, K., Davis, A., & Gerewitz, J. (2021). The promise of restorative practices to transform teacher–student relationships and achieve equity in school discipline. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 31(2), 203–233.
- 10 Kahu, E. R. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(5), 758–773. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.598505>
- 11 Kahu, E. R., & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface: Understanding the mechanisms of student success. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(1), 58–71.
- 12 Karp, D. R., & Frank, O. (2021). *Restorative justice in higher education: A social justice approach to campus discipline*. Routledge.



- 13 Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- 14 Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. (2023). School education and student guidance policies. Government of Japan. <https://www.mext.go.jp>
- 15 Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia. (2022). Higher education strategic plan 2022–2025. Government of Malaysia. <https://www.mohe.gov.my>
- 16 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en>
- 17 Philippine Association of Practitioners of Student Affairs and Services. (n.d.). Official website.
- 18 Quiñal, P. O., Jr., Sumicad, R. P., & Geraldizo-Pabriga, M. G. (2024). Level of compliance with the university policies on appearance and discipline among college students of the University of Cebu–Main Campus.
- 19 Tinto, V. (2012). Completing college: Rethinking institutional action. University of Chicago Press.
- 20 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education. UNESCO.