



Received: 08-10-2025
Accepted: 18-11-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Determinants of Academic Program Choice Among Criminology Students

¹ Filven L Cagulada, ² Divina G Torralba

^{1,2} College of Arts and Sciences, Holy Name University, Tagbilaran City, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Divina G Torralba

Abstract

This study examined the factors influencing program preference among Bachelor of Science in Criminology students in Tagbilaran City, Philippines. A quantitative descriptive design was employed, and data were collected from 150 criminology students across three higher education institutions offering the program. Results showed that childhood aspiration was the most influential factor in

choosing the criminology program, followed by personal reasons and influence from family members or relatives. Financial constraints and availability of scholarship grants emerged as significant perceived challenges, while mental ability and school location were not considered major obstacles. ANOVA results revealed significant differences in perceived challenges among groups of respondents.

Keywords: Criminology Students, Program Preference, Childhood Aspiration, Family Influence, Personal Reasons, Financial Constraints, Tagbilaran City

Introduction

Career choice is a complex developmental task shaped by personal aspirations, social influences, and structural realities. Early ambitions often begin in childhood and evolve as individuals interact with family, school, and society. As noted in developmental literature, societal norms, socioeconomic conditions, educational exposure, and cultural expectations significantly shape career trajectories. Students frequently make program decisions while navigating personal interests and external pressures, including financial capacity, job market considerations, and family expectations. In the Philippines, the BS Criminology program has seen a consistent rise in enrollment, partly influenced by increased demand for law enforcement professionals and improved salary structures for uniformed personnel. In Tagbilaran City, where three tertiary institutions offer criminology programs, understanding why students choose this field is essential for improving academic support and aligning institutional programs with student motivations. Research Gap Despite the popularity of criminology as a program, no prior study has examined the specific factors influencing criminology students' program preference in Tagbilaran City or the province of Bohol. This gap limits the understanding of how personal, socioeconomic, and contextual influences shape criminology-related career decisions in this local setting.

Research Methodology

Research Design

A **quantitative descriptive research design** was used to gather and analyze data on the factors influencing criminology students' program preferences. The researchers utilized a structured, researcher-made questionnaire.

Participants and Sampling

The study involved **150 BS Criminology students**, with **50 participants from each of the three institutions** offering the program in Tagbilaran City:

- Holy Name University (HNU)
- University of Bohol (UB)
- Bohol Institute of Technology–International College (BIT-IC)

Participants were selected using **simple random sampling**. Eligibility criteria included:

- Enrolled in the 2nd semester of A.Y. 2022–2023
- Enrolled in the BS Criminology program

Students not meeting these criteria were excluded.

Research Setting

The study was conducted across the three higher education institutions in Tagbilaran City offering BS Criminology. These institutions represent the primary criminology education providers in the city.

Instruments

Data were collected using a **validated researcher-made questionnaire** consisting of four parts:

1. Sociodemographic profile
2. Factors influencing program preference
3. Perceived challenges in choosing the program
4. Checklist-type responses and a 4-point Likert scale

The instrument was reviewed and approved by the thesis adviser, statistician, and research panel.

Procedures

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the program heads of the three schools. Participants received a consent form assuring confidentiality and voluntary participation.

Questionnaires were distributed in person and took approximately 10–15 minutes to complete. Completed questionnaires were immediately collected, tallied, encoded, and processed for analysis.

Data Analysis

The following statistical tools were used:

- **Frequency and percentage:** to describe family profile and influencing factors
- **Weighted mean:** to determine perceived challenges
- **ANOVA:** to test for significant differences in perceived challenges among groups

Interpretation Scale

Scale	Range	Interpretation
4	3.51–4.00	Strongly Agree
3	2.51–3.50	Agree
2	1.51–2.50	Disagree
1	1.00–1.50	Strongly Disagree

Results

Table 1.1: Respondents' Family Annual Income

Income (PHP)	Frequency	Percentage
10,000–100,000	71	47%
100,000–250,000	42	28%
250,000–500,000	24	16%
500,000–1,000,000	14	9%
Total	150	100%

Interpretation

Almost half (47%) of respondents belong to families earning **PHP 10,000–100,000 annually**, indicating that most criminology students come from lower-income households.

Table 1.2: Parents' Educational Attainment

Education Level	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary	23	15%
High School	57	38%
College	67	45%
Post-Graduate	2	1%
Total	150	100%

Interpretation

Most respondents' parents reached **college level (45%)**, followed by high school (38%).

Table 1.3: Parents' Employment Status

Status	Frequency	Percentage
Employed	127	85%
Unemployed	23	15%
Total	150	100%

Interpretation

Most parents of criminology students are employed.

Table 2: Factors Influencing Choice of BS Criminology

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
Economic	42	28.00%
Peers	14	9.33%
Family Influence	67	44.67%
Childhood Aspiration	74	49.33%
Personal Reasons	70	46.67%
Job Availability	16	10.67%
Job Security	24	16.00%

Interpretation

Childhood aspiration (49.33%) emerged as the strongest influence, followed by **personal reasons (46.67%)** and **family influence (44.67%)**. Peers had the least influence.

Table 3: Perceived Challenges in Choosing BS Criminology

Challenge	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Financial	2.49	Agree
Mental Ability	2.61	Disagree
School Location	2.53	Disagree
Availability of Scholarship Grants	2.43	Agree
Overall Mean	2.52	Agree

Interpretation

Financial constraints and limited scholarship availability are significant challenges. Mental ability and school location are not perceived as major barriers.

Table 4: ANOVA - Differences in Perceived Challenges Among Groups

Group	Mean ± SD	F	p-value	F crit	Decision	Interpretation
A	2.50 ± 1.57	8.209	0.00041	3.057	Reject Ho	Significant difference
B	2.22 ± 1.69					
C	1.42 ± 0.64					

Post Hoc (Bonferroni)

- A vs B → Not Significant
- B vs C → **Significant**
- C vs A → Not Significant

Discussion

The findings reveal that criminology students in Tagbilaran City primarily choose the program due to personal motivations rooted in childhood aspirations, aligning with Holland's Career Choice Theory, which emphasizes personality-career fit. Many students appear driven by early interests related to law enforcement, public safety, or the justice system.

Family influence also plays a key role, consistent with literature showing the importance of parental expectations and familial role models in educational decisions.

Despite financial hardship being common—highlighted by low household income levels—students still pursue the program, although financial constraints and limited scholarships were significant challenges. This indicates a strong internal commitment to the field despite economic barriers.

Meanwhile, mental ability and school location were not considered major concerns, suggesting that students feel confident in their capacity to complete the program and have accessible educational institutions.

The ANOVA results show that perceived challenges differ significantly among student groups, particularly between Groups B and C. This may reflect differing socioeconomic contexts or institutional support mechanisms across schools.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that criminology students' program preference is primarily shaped by childhood aspiration, followed by personal reasons and family influence. Challenges related to financial constraints and scholarship accessibility were notable, while mental ability and school location were minimally impactful. Differences in perceived challenges among institutions suggest varying student experiences across schools.

Recommendations

1. Schools should strengthen program orientation and career guidance to help students make informed decisions.
2. Enhanced scholarship opportunities and financial assistance programs are recommended to reduce economic barriers.
3. Facilities and resources for criminology programs should be improved to increase student engagement and interest.
4. Early career education should be provided at the senior high school level.
5. Future researchers should replicate the study in other municipalities or provinces to compare findings.

Acknowledgment

The authors extend their sincere appreciation to all individuals and institutions who contributed to the completion of this study. We gratefully acknowledge Ms. Divina Torralba, our research adviser, for her expert guidance, constructive insights, and continuous support throughout all stages of the research process. Her commitment and mentorship were invaluable to the development of this work. We also express our gratitude to Prof. Ethel Nabor for her statistical expertise, patient assistance, and thoughtful feedback, as well as to Dr. Crisanto Pancito, whose professional guidance further strengthened the quality of this study. Our thanks are likewise extended to the panel members—Dr. Ramon Boloron, Atty. Cheryl Ann Villares, and Dr. Unilyn Solon—for generously sharing their time and providing valuable recommendations that significantly improved the manuscript. Finally, we acknowledge the support of our families, classmates, faculty members, and non-teaching personnel whose encouragement and assistance contributed to the successful conduct of this research.

References

1. Astin A. APA PsycNet. American Psychological Association, 1999. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-01418-006>
2. Berry J. How does society affect career development of young people? TimelessTime, May 4, 2023. <https://timelesstime.co.uk/knowledgebase/how-does-the-wider-social-context-affect-career-development-of-young-people/>
3. County Health Rankings & Roadmaps. Social and economic factors, n.d. Retrieved 2022, from <https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/explore-health-rankings/county-health-rankings-model/health-factors/social-economic-factors>
4. Dayao R, Almario O. Career and school preferences of senior high school students' academic year 2017-2018. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 2017; 5:1219-1222. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/5887>
5. Department of Budget and Management. President Duterte fulfills campaign promise, doubles salaries of cops, soldiers, January 10, 2018. <https://www.dbm.gov.ph/index.php/secretary-s-corner/press-releases/list-of-press-releases/425-president-duterte-fulfills-campaign-promise-doubles-salaries-of-cops-soldiers>
6. Erdogan A. Holland's theory of careers and vocational choice. ResearchGate, 2022. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358119611_HOLLAND'S_THEORY_OF_CAREERS_AND_VOCA_TIONAL_CHOIC
7. FindUniversity.ph. BS in Criminology in the Philippines, n.d. <https://www.finduniversity.ph/majors/bs-in-criminology-philippines/>
8. Hinkelman JM, Luzzo DA. Mental health and career development of college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 2007; 85(2):143-147. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00456.x>
9. Lizzio A, Wilson K, Simons R. University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: Implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*. 2002; 27(1):27-52. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120099359>
10. Okada H, Weller M, Weller M. Immunotherapy response assessment in neuro-oncology: A report of the RANO Working Group. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2015; 16(15):e534-e542. Doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(15\)00088-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00088-1)
11. Parpala A, Lindblom-Ylänne S, Komulainen E, Litmanen T, Hirsto L. Assessing students' experiences of teaching-learning environments and approaches to learning: Validation of a questionnaire in different countries and varying contexts. *Learning Environments Research*. 2013; 16(2):201-215. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-013-9128-8>
12. Reynolds E. Childhood aspirations are an important driver of achievement later in life. *BPS Research Digest*, 2022. <https://www.bps.org.uk/research-digest/childhood-aspirations-are-important-driver-achievement-later-life>
13. Ruiz DFA, Pioquinto PV, Amparado MP. Employment status of criminology graduates. *OSF Preprints*, 2020. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/r6e9b>

14. Santiago A. Factors affecting career choices of college students enrolled in agriculture, n.d. Academia.edu. Retrieved December 15, 2022, from https://www.academia.edu/29898403/Factors_Affecting_Career_Choices_of_College_Students_Enrolled_in_Agriculture