Academic Integrity: Through the Lens of the Digital Natives

Florentina Del Mundo Canlas[1], Arianne Zapata Castro, Jolina Cel Laquindanum Cunanan, Justin Peter Celso Cunanan, Cherry Jane Mandap De Asis, Trixie Ann Dela Cruz Mandap, Pretty Abigail Gutierrez Sunga, Jovita G. Rivera[8], Reymond Q. Fajardo[9]

Department of Education, Don Honorio Ventura State University, Pampanga, Philippines
Email: canlasflorentinad@gmail.com[1], castroarianne8@gmail.com[2],cunananjolinacell@gmail.com[3], cunananjustinpeterc@gmail.com[4], deasischerryjane0@gmail.com[5], mandaptrixieann@gmail.com[6], Sungaprettyabigailg@gmail.com[7], jgrivera@dhvsu.edu.ph[8], rqfajardo@dhvsu.edu.ph[9]

Abstract: *Academic integrity is equated to educational quality; stakeholders must have the knowledge and experience necessary to act with integrity. This study intends to explore how digital natives uphold academic integrity, encompassing on the six core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. The researchers randomly selected a total of four hundred thirty-nine (439) respondents, who were categorized according to their profiles, and are currently enrolled in the second semester of A.Y. 2021–2022 at Don Honorio Ventura State University, Sto. Tomas-Extension Campus. The experience of respondents toward academic integrity was determined using a mixed-method research design, specifically, triangulation. Standardized questionnaires with structured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted to determine and validate the results. The findings inferred that digital natives are "very truthful" in academic honesty and "reliable" in academic trust. Academic fairness was marked "fair" for both informational and procedural fairness. Respondents were "highly courteous" in their respectful practices while "never harassed" in their disrespectful practices, referring to academic respect. In addition, respondents were "responsible" regarding academic responsibility and "brave" in dealing with academic courage. Significantly, age, sex, and position in a campus organization differed in honesty. Furthermore, age, gender, and year level were also significantly different in terms of trust. Year level affected both subdomains of fairness, while program enrollment affected informational fairness. Females and students with positions on campus were noticeably more respectful, responsible, and courageous. The wide dissemination and implementation of programs and activities regarding academic integrity should be observed to sustain the institutions' dignity.*

Keywords— *Academic Integrity, honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, courage*

1. INTRODUCTION

In academe, integrity is equated to excellence and quality. This is because it coincides with the peculiarity of the institution. Academic integrity issues among students are becoming a growing crisis around the world, according to Balbuena and Lamela, 2015. Academic integrity issues have a tremendous impact on the performance of students, as well as on the authenticity of excellence and the public trust in institutions. According to the International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI) (2020), academic integrity is a dedication to six guiding principles: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage in the face of difficulty. This implies that, aside from the common cheating and plagiarism acts of the students, there are still other matters hindering academic integrity.

Initially, academic dishonesty was in the form of fabrication and falsification of data. Northern Illinois University (NIU, n.d.) stated that, in an academic endeavor falsification or fabrication in academic contexts refers to the unauthorized invention, modification, or reporting of information, both of which are unethical. Yet, many students, especially researchers, are still committing. Research has been withdrawn from the Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin after the first author, a Columbian grad student, allegedly altered data in a way that "resulted in false and unreliable results". (Society for Personality, and Social Psychological, Inc., 2020). Moreover, many fraudsters begin their criminal careers with minor offenses that progressively get worse, especially when no one intervenes to stop those (Bos, 2020).

Secondly, favoritism practices in classrooms are implications of injustice in the academe. Having biases toward students may also affect the student-teacher relationship as well as the personal mindset development of the learners. In line with this, respondents agreed that the impacts of teacher favoritism on students include mutual trust, mutual respect between student and instructor, boldness, aiming for favoritism rather than hard work, and the impact on the entire educational system. Findings show that favoritism has a bearing on the grades of hardworking students (Global Social Science Review, n,d.). Furthermore, Harshman, (2021) mentioned that the students who are not given special treatment feel excluded and learn to hate the teacher or even despise the favored students. Due to favoritism, students may believe they might not be as good academically, socially, or physically as others.

Other types of academic dishonesty are cheating and plagiarism which are undeniably widespread over the world. As studied by McCabe (2015), UK and U.S surveys revealed that a high percentage of students, both graduates and undergraduates, surveyed admitted to cheating on tests and homework, or committing plagiarism. Between the years 2012 to 2015, The Times London discovered university students

were caught cheating (Schmidt, 2016). Not even the huge educational institutions in the world can be free from it. Every quarter, Stanford University publishes a report on cheating events, while Harvard authorities mustered the fortitude to confront plagiarism claims head-on (Unicheck, 2019).

In the Philippines, many news articles about alarming academic dishonesty issues have been reported, especially during distance learning. Nograles (2021), states that this is only a symptom of a larger issue. As such, Magsambol, (2021) claimed that the presence of an Online Kopyahan (cheating) Facebook page should be a serious source of concern for educators in the country since it reveals the limits of the current education set-up. In addition, according to an investigative story, some students hire others to do their homework. Some students are desperate to pass their classes and resort to academic dishonesty to meet class requirements, while some of the hired individuals, who are also students, admit to taking advantage of the current situation for entrepreneurial purposes for personal necessities. Nevertheless, there is some debate about whether such an act constitutes academic integrity. If ethical dilemmas surrounding academic integrity continue to plague students' capacity to make good decisions, the academic institution's integrity will be jeopardized. Graduate competency, curricular program quality, and school staff capability are all on the line (Balbuena & Lamela, 2015). Thus, faculty and administrators must reconsider how college policies and processes fulfill all students' interests, particularly international students, in terms of academic dishonesty, as the demographics of higher education change (Simpson, 2016).

Since respect is part of academic integrity, bullying is one manifestation of disrespect to others. Besides, a survey conducted by the Program for International Student Assessment in 2018 found that 6 out of 10 Filipinos claimed to have been bullied (PISA), which is higher compared to other countries. Conversely, although the main subject of bullying is usually among students, there are also some cases of students disrespecting teachers. Several teachers in Mindanao high school expressed their dismay that many of their learners have become so ill-mannered, arrogant, and nasty, to the point of launching assaults on their teachers on social media sites (MGSD, 2016). A significant change in students' attitudes about adults in recent years is undeniable, and numerous factors have been provided as to why this has occurred (Llego, n.d.). Unfortunately, most teachers who have been subjected to such abuse choose to remain silent, while others choose to turn a blind eye. What is more saddening is when parents tend to tolerate this kind of behavior.

As trust is part of the six core values, abuse of trust and power is an obstacle to maintaining academic integrity. These are often in form of sexual harassment. Oni, et.al. (2019) defined sexual harassment as repeated, undesired, and unsolicited sexual advances that might take the form of physical, verbal, nonverbal, or visual cues. It is viewed as one of the major pressures that endangers a person's performance in organizations or educational institutions, and illness in today's educational institutions. Moreover, Reysio-Cruz (2020) reported that a high-ranking official of the Department of Education became alarmed as more and more allegations of sexual harassment were made by students and graduates of some universities in Manila (DepEd n,d.).

At one college in Manila, a former student reported how her teacher in Grade 11 had admitted to having inappropriate desires for his students. At this point, other students and graduates from other schools were inspired by this act of bravery, which is one of the values of academic integrity, by coming out to share their experiences (Perez, 2020). Likewise, students from a university in Pampanga also showed courage, by reporting their concerns after receiving malicious messages from a teacher (Abad, 2021).

If perspectives on responsibility are vital, then, according to Ayish (2019), paying close attention to how students view this matter and how it affects their academic performance is significant. In accordance with DepEd Order No.42 2017, also known as National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), the school divisions' duties and obligations in schools and their districts fall within their competence. However, Usman (2016) claimed that the education system's lack of accountability and mediocre service delivery are influenced by the discrepancies in its policies.

In the local context, there is a recent study at DHVSU Sto. Tomas that talked about the academic dishonesty of the pre-service teachers' practices in E-assessment, where students admitted committing cheating. According to the findings, pre-service teachers' opinions of academic dishonesty are linked to their cheating activity. Despite their awareness of academic dishonesty, the respondents continued to participate. Furthermore, the students' motivation to cheat in class is linked to the students' cheating conduct. The participants cheated because of being motivated by a multitude of factors (Arubio, et al, 2021).

Hence, the researchers aimed to explore the experiences of the students with regard to observing academic integrity, particularly in the construct of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. This study would be beneficial to the campus as the researchers may suggest policies for the office to come up with preventive measures. This would also be advantageous in promoting university-wide transparency and credibility of the stakeholders which would make a good impression and help in gaining public trust.

.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study attempted to explore the level of academic integrity practices of the students on the campus. Also, this determined the significant difference in the respondents' level of academic integrity, in terms of the six core values; honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage, as well as the significant difference in the respondents' level of academic integrity in terms of their profiles. This study used a mixed-method research design, specifically a methodological triangulation research strategy, to determine

the students' level of academic integrity. Hence, this study is a combination of qualitative and quantitative. George (2021) states that mixed methods research encompasses the benefits of both quantitative and qualitative research approaches to address your research topic. It can also help researchers acquire a more complete picture than a single quantitative or qualitative study. For the quantitative phase of this study, randomly selected students were invited to complete an online survey. The seven open-ended questions and a focus group discussion, which provided the researchers with information that was used to validate the quantitative data collected, were utilized for the qualitative portion. The gathered data represented evidence for this study. Alternatively, the researchers compared the results of two distinct methodologies performed on the same people (for example, a semi-structured interview and a focus group), and if the conclusions made were roughly similar, this helped corroborate the data's dependability and validity (Indeed Editorial Team, 2021). Moreover, it verified the consistency of data obtained using several instruments and raised the chances of controlling, or at least assessing, some of the challenges or many reasons that influence the researchers' outcomes (Cohen, et.al n.d)

Population/Respondents of the study

The researchers randomly selected a total of 439 respondents consisting of students from the first year to the fourth-year college of Don Honorio Ventura State University-Sto.Tomas Campus. These were the students currently enrolled in the second semester of the academic year 2021-2022.

Table 1. The respondents and the respective numbers of respondents.

Respondents	Number of Respondents
Bachelor in Elementary Education Students	105
Bachelor of Business Administration Students	128
Bachelor of Hospitality Management Students	84
Bachelor of Information Technology Students	122
Total Respondents	439

Research Instruments

The researchers used different instruments with quantitative statements for the six (6) respective domains of academic integrity. To measure honesty, The Academic Integrity Survey developed by McCabe (2007) was used with

a Cronbach alpha reliability of (α = .94). Next, to measure trust, the researchers used the Student Trust in Faculty Scale developed by Adams et al. (2004), with a Cronbach alpha reliability of (α = .90). Third, to assess fairness, the researchers employed The Fairness Barometer, a questionnaire developed by Sonnleitner et al. (2018) with a Cronbach alpha reliability of (=.90). The fourth instrument titled Respect and Responsibility School Culture Survey was developed by Davidson et al. (2004) with the Cronbach alpha reliability of (α = .97) referring to respect, while (α = .98) referring to the responsibility domain. Lastly, the Choose Love Survey, which was developed by Delcourt et al. (2017), was used in measuring the courage domain with the Cronbach alpha reliability of (α = .91).

A survey-questionnaire was used for students. Open-ended questions were also included on the last part of the survey to collect the respondents' perception about academic integrity outreach to give this study more depth.

The instrument was divided into five (8) parts; part I was the demographics of the respondents. Part II was the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of honesty. The scale consisted of 26 items. The respondents rated 1–never, 2–once, 3–more than once, and 4–not relevant. Part III was the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of trust. The scale consisted of 13 items. The respondents rated them as 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – agree, and 4 – strongly agree. Part IV was the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of fairness. The scale consisted of 15 items; 6 for informational fairness and 9 for procedural fairness. The respondents rated 1–strongly disagree, 2–disagree, 3–agree, and 4—strongly agree. For Part V, it was the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of respect. The scale consisted of 20 items; 13 for respectful practices and 7 for disrespectful experiences. For the respectful practices, the respondents rated 1–strongly disagree, 2—somewhat disagree, 3—somewhat agree, and 4—strongly agree. For the disrespectful experience, the respondents rated 1–never, 2–once or twice a year, 3–about every other month, 4–about once a month, and 5, two or three times a month. Part VI was the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of responsibility. The scale consisted of 8 items. The respondents rated 1–strongly disagree, 2–somewhat disagree, 3–somewhat agree, and 4—strongly agree. Part VII was about the respondent's level of academic integrity in terms of courage. The scale consisted of 13 items. The respondents rated them as 1–not at all like me; 2–not much like me; 3–somewhat like me; and 4—almost always like me.

Lastly, Part VIII of the questionnaire was the qualitative part created by the researchers. It consisted of seven open-ended questions about the academic integrity of students on the campus. These were validated by a team of experts that included a linguist, a lawyer, a psychologist, and a theology seminarian.

Table 2. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Honesty Domain)*

Range	*Interpretation of mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Very truthful
1.51 – 2.5	Truthful
2.51 – 3.5	Somewhat Truthful
3.51 – 4.0	Not Truthful

Table 3. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Trust Domain)*

Range	*Interpretation Of Mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Untrustworthy
1.51 – 2.5	Slightly Trustworthy
2.51 – 3.5	Trustworthy
3.51 – 4.0	Highly Trustworthy

Table 4. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Fairness Domain)*

Range	*Interpretation of mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Unfair
1.51 – 2.5	Moderately Fair
2.51 – 3.5	Fair
3.51 – 4.0	Very Much Fair

Table 5. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Respect Domain; Sub-Category Respectful Practices)*

Range	*Interpretation of mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Discourteous
1.51 – 2.5	Somehow courteous
2.51 – 3.5	Courteous
3.51 – 4.0	Highly Courteous

Table 6. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Respect Domain; Sub-Category Disrespectful Practices)*

Range	*Interpretation Of Mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Never Harassed
1.51 – 2.5	Barely Harassed
2.51 – 3.5	Moderately Harassed
3.51 – 4.5	Harassed
4.51– 5.0	Always Harassed

Table 7. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Responsibility Domain)*

Range	*Interpretation Of Mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Irresponsible
1.51 – 2.5	Fairly Responsible
2.51 – 3.5	Responsible
3.51 – 4.0	Completely Responsible

Table 8. *Interpretation Table (Level of Academic Integrity as regards to Courage Domain)*

Range	*Interpretation of mean*
1.0 – 1.5	Not Brave at All
1.51 – 2.5	Seldom Brave
2.51 – 3.5	Brave
3.51 – 4.0	Consistently Brave

Statistical Treatment

The researchers compiled raw survey data and provided the information. Statistical approaches such as tally, frequencies, percent, weighted mean, standard deviation, T-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were utilized to analyze data obtained on surveys about academic integrity. A statistical test called a t-test is used to compare the means of two groups. It is widely employed in hypothesis testing to determine whether a technique or treatment has an impact on the population of interest or whether two groups differ, such as for sex, former school and position in school (Bevans, 2020). Moreover, the The ANOVA test is used to evaluate multiple groups simultaneously to determine whether there is a relationship between them. The ANOVA formula's F statistic, commonly known as the F-ratio, enables the analysis of several data sets to evaluate the variability between and within samples for instance age, year level, and program (Kenton, 2022).

Ethical Considerations

A letter was sent to the director of Don Honorio Ventura State University Sto. Tomas Campus to grant permission to conduct the academic integrity survey. Following the approval, the researchers approached the teachers and requested permission to administer the questionnaire among the students during class. The

researchers observed ethical norms governing the care of study participants, recognizing that they were more than just a data-gathering tool. Rest assured that the information obtained was kept totally confidential, ensuring that none of the respondents was compromised or humiliated.

Table 9. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Age*

Age (in Years)	Frequency	Percent
18 and below	16	3.6
19-21	277	63.1
22-25	131	29.8
26 and Above	15	3.4
Total	**439**	**100.00**

Table 9 displays the profile of the respondents in terms of age. The respondents' ages ranged from 18 and below, 19–21, 22–25, and 26 and above years old. 3.6% of the respondents were 18 and below, consisting of 16 students. On the other hand, 63.1% of respondents, or 277 students were between the ages of 19 and 21, and 29.8 people were between the ages of 22 and 25, including 131 students. Lastly, the remaining 3.4% were ages 26 and above, comprised of 15 students. This result showed that almost half of the respondents were aged 19–21 years old.

Table 10. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Sex*

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	165	37.6
Female	262	59.7
Prefer not to say	12	2.7
Total	**439**	**100.00**

Table 10 displays the profile of the respondents in terms of sex. 165 students were male, which consisted of 37.6 % of the total sample population. Moreover, 262 students were female containing 59.7 % of the total sample population. Lastly, 12 students did not mention their sex, which was equivalent to 2.7%.

Table 11. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Program*

Program	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEED)	105	23.9
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA)	128	29.2
Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management (BSHM)	84	19.1
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (BSIT)	122	27.8
Total	**439**	**100.00**

Table 11 presents the four programs the campus offers to see the respondents' programs. There were 105 respondents, 23.9% of whom were Bachelor of Elementary Education students. On the other hand, 29.2% of the respondents were Bachelor of Science in Business Administration students, totaling 128 students. Moreover, 19.1% were Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management, comprised of 84 students. Lastly, the remaining 27.8% were Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, consisting of 122 students.

Table 12. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Year Level*

Year Level	Frequency	Percent
First Year Students	120	27.3
Second Year Students	99	22.6
Third Year Students	105	23.9
Fourth Year Students	115	26.2
Total	**439**	**100.00**

Table 12 shows the four-year levels of the respondents' programs on campus. There were 120 respondents, with 27.3 percent being first-year students. 99 second-year students comprised 22.6 percent of responses. Furthermore, 23.9 percent, or 105 students were in their third year. Finally, the remaining 26.2 percent, or 115 students were in their fourth year.

Table 13. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Former School*

Former School	Frequency	Percent
Public School	301	68.56
Private School	138	31.44
Total	**439**	**100.00**

Table 13 illustrates the respondents' former schools before enrolling at DHVSU Sto. Tomas. There were 301 respondents who attended public school, accounting for 68.56%. The remaining 138 students, representing 31.44%, attended private schools.

Table 14. *Descriptions of the Respondents according to their Position*

Position	Frequency	Percent
No	*378*	*86.1*
Yes	*61*	*13.9*
Auditor	*3*	*0.68*
BEED Society Officer	*1*	*0.23*
BSBA Representative	*1*	*0.23*
Business Affair	*1*	*0.23*
Chairman for Information	*1*	*0.23*
Chief Executive Officer	*2*	*0.46*
GAD Representative	*11*	*2.51*
IT Department Officer	*1*	*0.23*
IT Representative	*1*	*0.23*
Mayor	*8*	*1.82*
Monitor	*2*	*0.46*
PIO	*2*	*0.46*
President	*4*	*0.91*
Secretary	*6*	*1.37*
SBO	*1*	*0.23h*
Student Service	*2*	*0.46*
Student Affair	*1*	*0.23*
Treasurer	*4*	*0.91*
Vice Mayor	*5*	*1.14*
Vice President	*4*	*0.91*
Total	*439*	*100.00*

Table 14 depicts the respondents based on their position at DHVSU Sto. Tomas. There were 378 respondents who had no position, accounting for 86.1 percent of the total. Additionally, 61 students were engaged in positions, making up 13.9 percent of the total. BEED Society Officer, BSBA Representative, Business Affair, Chairman for Information, IT Department Officer, IT Representative, SBO, and Student Affair each had 1 respondent out of 61. Meanwhile, each of the following positions received 2 responses: Chief Executive Officer, Monitor, PIO, and Student Service. Three of the respondents work as class auditors. 4 Four people applied for the posts of President, Treasurer, and Vice President. Five of the respondents were class vice mayors. Six of the responses came from class secretaries. 8 of them are class mayors. Finally, 11 of the respondents were committed as Gad Representatives.

Table 15. *Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity as regard to Honesty*

Indicators	Mean	sd	Verbal Interpretation
1. Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography.	1.608	.795	Truthful
2. Working on an assignment with others (in person) when the instructor asked for individual work	1.886	.858	Truthful
3. Working on an assignment with others (via email or Instant Messaging) when the instructor	1.872	.834	Truthful
4. Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test.	1.622	.781	Truthful
5. In a course requiring computer work, copying another student's program rather than writing your own.	1.506	.785	Very Truthful
6. Helping someone else cheat on a test.	1.431	.743	Very Truthful
7. Fabricating or falsifying lab data.	1.374	.713	Very Truthful
8. Fabricating or falsifying research data.	1.449	.783	Very Truthful
9. Copying from another student during a test WITH his or her knowledge.	1.469	.717	Very Truthful
10. Copying from another student during a test or examination WITHOUT his or her knowledge	1.330	.701	Very Truthful
11. Using digital technology (such as text messaging) to get unpermitted help from someone during a test or examination.	1.406	.718	Very Truthful
12. Receiving unpermitted help on an assignment.	1.424	.742	Very Truthful
13. Copying (by hand or in person) another student's homework.	1.476	.711	Very Truthful
14. Copying (using digital means such as Instant Messaging or email) another student's homework.	1.449	.706	Very Truthful

15. Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences from a book, magazine, or journal (not electronic or Web-based) without footnoting them in a paper you submitted	1.813	.783	Truthful
16. Turning in a paper from a "paper mill" (a paper written and previously submitted by another student) and claiming it as your own work.	1.353	.725	Very Truthful
17. Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences of material from an electronic source - e.g., the Internet - without footnoting them in a paper you submitted.	1.736	.810	Truthful
18. Submitting a paper you purchased or obtained from a Web site (such as www.schoolsucks.com) and claimed it as your own work.	1.349	.711	Very Truthful
19. Using unpermitted handwritten crib notes (or cheat sheets) during a test or exam.	1.339	.713	Very Truthful
20. Using electronic crib notes (stored in PDA, phone, or calculator) to cheat on a test or exam.	1.373	.710	Very Truthful
21. Copying material, almost word for word, from any written source and turning it in as your own work.	1.371	.706	Very Truthful
22. Turning in a paper copied, at least in part, from another student's paper, whether or not the student is currently taking the same course.	1.378	.711	Very Truthful
23. Using a false or forged excuse to obtain an extension on a due date or delay taking an exam.	1.362	.695	Very Truthful
24. Turning in work done by someone else	1.339	.700	Very Truthful
25. Cheating on a test in any other way	1.485	.715	Very Truthful
Total	**1.484**	**0.741**	**Very** Truthful

Table 15 shows the level of academic integrity when it comes to honesty. The mean values were ranging from 1.330 to 1.886. Item number 10 "Copying from another student during a test or examination WITHOUT his or her knowledge" had the lowest mean which was 1.330. This indicated that students were more likely to copy from classmates during an exam with their permission. To validate the result of the quantitative phase, here are some of the responses of the participants from the open-ended questions and FGD. Students were "very truthful" about their behavior as academic honesty.

As indicated by Balbuena et al. (2015), students work together to improve their test scores; they share answers on objective tests and support one another when one of them is unsure about the proper response to a test item. Furthermore, inefficient instruction may have contributed to pupils' lack of subject-matter knowledge and comprehension, which may have inadvertently encouraged misbehavior.

Fig. 1. *"Sharing answer activity, quizzes exams etc.. I believe it is wrong but I just want to help"R86.*

Fig. 2. *"I remember when I am on grade 10, our top 1 spread around his papers to let us copy and make sure that all of us are getting high grades on one of our subject."R164.*

Fig. 3. *"Sending answers to my classmates"R76*

Fig. 4. *"Nag-e-exam kami non tapos yung teacher kolektahan yung mga tapos na, at ako yung nautusan na mangolekta. Tapos yung kaklase ko nakita ko sabi niya "sabihin mo yung sagot saken". Habang hindi nakatingin yung teacher, tinulungan ko siyang magsagot.* (We were having an exam and our teacher asked me to collect the papers of the students who were already finished answering the test. Then one of my classmates asked me about the answer and I saw that his paper didn't have any answer yet. Our teacher gave time to those who were not yet done, while my teacher was not looking, I gave him all the answers that I know.) P5 FGD Session 2

Fig. 5. *"I was involved on a Cheating once way back 2019 with for spreading answer sheet for the 2nd batch but I apologize even I did not do it."R49.*

Fig. 6. *"Opo, na-experience ko na po at nagawa ko din po yun. Bali nag-final exam kami at yung katabi ko po hindi siya nakapag-review. Kaya pinagsagot ko siya"* (Yes, I experienced and I was the one who cheated. When we had our final exam in one subject, my seatmate didn't have an answer so I took his paper to answer it by myself.) P3 FGD Session 2.

Fig. 7. *"Nagkokopyahan? Para yatang kami yan ah, pero syempre di mo naman maiiwasan sa student na may magkokopyahan may gumagawa ng cheat tsaka kapag sinumbong mo yung isang student na yon magagalit at*

magagalit siya sayo."(Cheating? It seems like us, because of course as a student, you cannot avoid cheating or copying others' work, and if you report that student who cheats, she/he will be angry with you.) P5 FGD Session 1.

Fig. 8.

On the other hand, the recorded mean of 1.886. was the highest for item number 2 "Working on an assignment with others (in person) when the instructor asked for individual work". This means that respondents' level of academic honesty is "Truthful" working on individual homework with others as the highest item for academic honesty. Therefore, cheating is regarded to be one of the most prevalent types of academic misconduct in educational institutions' worries (Wilkinson, 2009).

Fig. 9. *"There are times where students tend to answer a certain exam by group even if an exam is individual." R374*

Fig. 10. *"Yes nag-cheat na kami halos then may naganap na consequences yun. I remember nung first year kami.* (Yes, when I was in my first year, my classmates and I cheated and got caught, and then we received consequences) R67.

Fig. 11. *"They use a group video call to cheat in an online exam." R414*

Fig. 12. *Back nung face to face, I think finals yata yon or midterm exam. It is a written exam and a faculty member yata someone that facilitating the exam that time and ayon nagshare share na kami nang sagot. Everytime na may exam.* (Back when classes were face to face, I think that was our final or midterm examination. It was a written exam and a faculty member facilitated the exam that time and we shared answers without the professor knowing.) P2 FGD Session 2

In general, with a total mean of 1.484 and a standard deviation of 0.741, respondents were "Very Truthful" in their level of academic integrity in terms of honesty. This specified that respondents perceived full honesty on campus.

Fig. 13. *I think hindi ko po magagawa yan.* (I think, I can never do that.) R84

Fig. 14. *None, as long as I can I don't want to cheat in any ways. R130*

Fig. 15. *Ah nothing. If you study hard you will learn and know no more cheating will do. R174*

Fig. 16. *Wala, dahil hindi ko pa nasubukan.* (None, because I never tried it.) R15

Fig. 17. *I haven't done it before cause I'm afraid to get caught. R320*

However, some respondents admitted their involvement or experience in academic dishonesty.

Fig. 18. *"Opo, naexperience ko na po at ako po mismo ang gumawa.* (Yes, I experienced cheating and I was the one who cheated.) P3 FGD Session 2)

Fig. 19. *"Share ko lang nung nangyari to 1st year or 2nd year ako, so tapos may nakita kame isa sa mga kaklase namen na puro sulat yung kamay niya at ginawa niyang kodigo iyon. So pagkatapos ng exam naghingi siya ng alcohol para burahin yung nakasulat sa kamay niya so hindi na kame nagsumbong hinayaan na lang namin siya.* (I will share my experience. It happened in my first or second year when I saw one of my classmates whose hand was full of handwriting, so I doubted it, and then while taking the exam, he/she peeked at his/her hand, according to what I saw. It turns out that the lectures and important exam information were written there. So, when he/she asked for alcohol after the exam, I wasn't sure where he/she was going to use it. He/she erased what was written on his/her hand. We didn't report and just let him/her.) P1 FGD Session 1

Fig. 20. *"As a student di naman maiwasan ang magpakopya at mangopya in the end meron kang mararamdamang konsensya at sa susunod sisikapin mong mag review upang may maisagot.* (As a student, it is unavoidable to cheat and copy others' work but in the end, you feel guilty and next time you will do your best to review so that you can answer the exam.) P2 FGD Session 1

Fig. 21. *Oo madami na kong nakitang nagkokopyahan kasama na din ako don syempre hindi mo naman maiiwasan yon kapag di ka nakapag-review.*

Fig. 22. *Yung naramdaman ko pero ngayon manhid parang natural ko ng ginagawa yon.* (Yes, I've noticed a lot of students copying other people's work; in fact, I'm one of them, but if you aren't reviewing the lessons, you obviously can't avoid to cheat. Yet now that I'm numb, it seems like I'm doing it naturally.) P3 FGD Session 1

Fig. 23. *Online class you can search on google you can see your ppt's just like that but not all the times R18*

Fig. 24. *Kapag mayroong recitation o may tinatanong ang teacher minsan gumagamit ako ng Google.* (When there is a recitation or when our teacher asks us a question, sometimes I use Google.) R20

Fig. 25. *Oo nakakatulong ito minsan sa akin, dahil minsan diko nagagawa ang gawain na ibinigay sa amin sa kadahilanang work students, pero minsan nakaka konsensiya dahil sa maling gawain.* (Yes, it helps me sometimes,

because there were times that I couldn't do the task assigned to us because I am a working student, However, I feel guilty because of this wrongdoing.) R37

Indicators	Mean	sd	Verbal Interpretation
1. Teachers are always ready to help at this school.	3.321	.626	Trustworthy
2. Teachers at this school are easy to talk to.	3.196	.661	Trustworthy
3. Students are well cared for at this school.	3.314	.594	Trustworthy
4. Teachers at this school always do what they are supposed to.	3.294	.636	Trustworthy
5. Teachers at this school really listen to students	3.244	.636	Trustworthy
6. Teachers at this school are always honest with me.	3.330	.610	Trustworthy
7. Teachers at this school do a terrific job.	3.132	.725	Trustworthy
8. Teachers at this school are good at teaching.	3.369	.627	Trustworthy
9. Teachers at this school have high expectations for all students.	3.212	.647	Trustworthy
10. Teachers at this school DO NOT care about students.	2.242	.998	Slightly Trustworthy
11. Students at this school can believe what teachers tell them.	3.091	.666	Trustworthy
12. Students learn a lot from teachers at this school.	3.337	.608	Trustworthy
13. Students at this school can depend on teachers for help.	3.039	.686	Trustworthy
Total	**3.163**	**0.671**	**Trustworthy**

The mean values for academic integrity when it comes to trust, as shown in Table 16, ranged from 2.242 to 3.369.

The lowest mean was 3.039 for item number 10, "Teachers at this school DO NOT care about students." This confirmed that students perceived teachers at the campus as "Slightly Trustworthy". As mentioned by Lei, H. et.al (2018) reveals in their study the two definitions of teacher support which include self-determination and social support. According to the self-determination view, pupils will feel cognitive, emotional, or autonomy-oriented support from a teacher when they are learning something new. Moreover, individuals undertake work and complete tasks in accordance with their values, interests, and hobbies, but those in their immediate circle might affect the emotions and motives that underlie those actions. When teachers give pupils a choice, something relevant to them, or respect, autonomy is supported. Here are a few of the participants' responses to the structured interview and FGD to help validate the outcome of the quantitative phase.

"I trust those staff and students in campus like they are giving consideration to us when we need an adjustment in this online class and also my classmates helping each other to pursue this course so that someday all of us can graduate and achieve are dreams together. R38

"Trusting a person inside the campus affects my studies by reviewing what the Teacher has said prior to the exam. R56

"Teachers need to show that they trust their students; because when students feel his trust they can be more willing, more confident and more successful. R86

"For teachers, a bit shaky because I know how they sometimes good at sugar coating to get the heart of the students but some are bluntly honest, which I kind a like(?) because it helps me to improve a lot. For Students/classmates, they're so - so, but it doesn't affect my studies that much. R166

"Teachers who develop strong bonds with their learners make their classrooms more conducive to learning and get to know their students." R177

"They don't affect my studies actually my teachers and classmates help me to be more productive in school. R253

"I will feel appreciated and be more comfortable in expressing my opinions and be more assertive. R439

"It has a good effect for me since you have someone who can help me R407

It builds my self-esteem. R395

The highest reported mean, however, for item number 8, "Teachers at this school are good at teaching," was 3.369. Students stating that the faculty at the campus teach very well as the highest item on the academic trust test demonstrated respondents a "Trustworthy" level of academic trust. Leblanc, (2010) indicates that both emotion and rationality are important components of effective teaching. It is important to inspire children to study, but it's also important to educate them how to do so in a way that is interesting, valuable, and memorable. It involves taking pride in your work, being passionate about it, and expressing that enthusiasm with everyone.

"It is important because, for example yung teacher pinagkakatiwalaan mo parang mare-reassure mo na very informative ang mga tinuturo."(It is important to trust someone because in some instances like if you trust your teacher, you will be guaranteed that the lesson he/she teaches is very informative.) P2 FGD Session 2.

Strong bonds between students and their other students, professors, and staff can increase students' levels of motivation and hence facilitate learning. R316

Mas nakakatulong para makakuha ng mas magandang grades. (This is helpful to get higher grades) R184

Trusting a person especially teachers is important because students cannot learn from teachers in whom they have no trust. R16

Trusting other people helps me to grow more. For example, trusting the teachers about what they are teaching and also trusting them that they will give quality education to us. R25

Teachers need to show that they trust their students; because when students feel his trust they can be more willing, more confident and more successful. R86

They're always there to motivate and i-lift up lalo na pag nafefeel ko na parang hindi ko kaya. (They're always there to motivate and cheer me up whenever I feel that I can no longer handle it.) R99

Tiwala ako sa lahat ng aking classmate or lalu na sa mga teachers kaya ako nakakapag focus pa lalu sa every session ng virtual class. (I have trust in my classmates, most especially in my teachers, that is why I can focus even more in every virtual session) R111

In general, respondents have a "**Trustworthy**" level of academic integrity in terms of trust, with a total mean of 3.163 and a standard deviation of 0.671. A student is more likely to believe in their teacher more, demonstrate more enthusiasm in learning, act better in class, and accomplish at higher levels academically and gain further helpful compliments from them than just criticism. (Trauma Learning Policy Initiative, 2020)

Syempre sobrang importante non, bilang isang tao we need someone na talagang pagkakatiwalaan naten. Personally, ako meron naman meron akong pinagkakatiwalaang mga friends ko then nakakatulong sila para lalo kang ma encourage mag-aral at pumasok. (Yes, it is very important that we need someone to trust. Personally, I also have friends that I can trust who encourages me to study and learn.) R1 FGD Session 2

Ayan so yes po ma'am no is very important that you have someone that you can rely on

(That's it, so yes, ma'am, it's very important that you have someone you can rely on when you're on campus. You can have someone willing to listen to you when you're struggling with your studies so that you will not overthink when you are able to share what you're feeling with others. You feel better when you're able to express what's inside you.) R1 FGD Session 1

It helps so much because someone trust into you. Because it can help you to lean, to be heard by someone else, that you given trust. R10

It affects how you deal and how they treat you too. If they treat you properly, it has a good affects on your studies because I am motivated and inspired that someone's trust me. R15

It has a big effect especially on how they treating me in a right or good way. R19
" To trust someone is to know them and know the values under decisions" R160

Indicators	Mean	Sd	Verbal Interpretation
Informational Fairness			
1. The content of the exam is announced on time.	3.292	.628	Fair
2. Students know what criteria are used to assess oral exams.	3.310	.585	Fair
3. Students understand their own grades on oral exams	3.293	.599	Fair
4. Students know what criteria are used to assess written exams.	3.284	.588	Fair
5. Students understand their own grades on written exams.	3.314	.575	Fair
6. When I ask, teachers explain my grade.	3.280	.620	Fair
Total	**3.296**	**0.599**	**Fair**

kapag nasa campus ka. Nagkakaroon ka kase ng sandalan sa mga difficult moments na pinagdadaanan mo at meron willing na makinig sayo when you are struggling sa studies mo so nakakawala kase ng iniisip diba when you are able to share yung nararamdaman mo so gumagaan yung pakiramdam mo kapag na labas mo kung ano yung nasa loob mo.

Table 17. *Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity as regard to Fairness*

As shown in Table 17, the mean values for academic integrity under informational fairness were ranging from 3.280 to 3.310. The lowest mean was 3.280 for item number 6, "When I ask, teachers explain my grade," which indicated that teachers at the campus are fair and transparent in presenting grades to students. In terms of their behavior as academic fairness under informational, students stated that teachers at the campus were "Fair". The results of the study

made by Caglar (2013) argued that establishing a more balanced learning environment would lessen the alienation felt by students. Students' sense of fairness in the learning environment may be improved by involving them in administrative decisions, planning activities to boost student-faculty engagement, and using several objective measuring and evaluation processes. One may argue that increasing students' sense of fairness has a favorable effect on how they feel about school. To help verify the results of the quantitative phase, below are a few of the participants' responses to the structured interview and FGD.

It doesn't really influence academic performance. But for other students it might pretty much help because they can easily talk to the instructors if they need help. R374
Yes. Favoritism is an unfair treatment. Hard work of every student wasn't recognized because of favoritism. R288
Yes, because other teachers are more focus on those students who they see that has so much potential. R187

However, the highest reported mean 3.310, was item number 2, "Students know what criteria are used to assess oral exams." This demonstrated the respondents' "Fair" level of academic fairness. This entails students being informed about the criteria for grading prior to the assessment orally. Gordon et. al (2010) shows students remarked how fair the grade they received was. According to regression analysis, exposure to teaching approaches rather than scoring techniques was the best predictor of grading fairness. The findings were explored in terms of the potential effects on grade inflation of these grading and teaching methods.

Fig. 26. *Yes, kasi yung teacher bago naman siya magbigay ng activity sinasabi nya yung criteria at rubrics para guided kami.* (Yes, our teacher disclosed his/her criteria and rubrics before he/she give us an activity for us to be guided.) R36

Procedural Fairness

1. My teacher is open for comments about his/her grading system.	3.344	.625	Fair
2. Grading criteria are applied equally to everyone in the class (unless there is a justified exception).	3.334	.611	Fair

3. My current achievements are graded independently of the grades I have had in the past.	3.273	.640	Fair
4. The oral exams in class include enough questions for students to show what they know and what they can do.	3.276	.596	Fair
5. The written exams in class include enough questions for students to show what they know and what they can do.	3.292	.602	Fair
6. During written exams I have enough time to complete the given questions/tasks.	3.255	.622	Fair
7. The questions/tasks included in exams are an accurate reflection of the material that has been taught in class.	3.285	.580	Fair
8. The difficulty of exam questions/tasks is appropriate.	3.214	.593	Fair
9. The exams only test material that has been taught in class.	3.230	.608	Fair
Total	3.278	0.605	Fair

The mean scores for procedural fairness under academic integrity are displayed in Table 18, with scores ranging from 3.214 to 3.344. In terms of their behavior as academic fairness under procedural, students stated that teachers at the campus were "Fair" which suggests that assessments given level of difficulty are appropriate for the students. The lowest mean was 3.214 for item number 8, "The difficulty of exam questions/tasks is appropriate." In terms of their behavior as academic fairness under procedural, which exposed students were guided with fairness. In line with this, the broad implications drawn from the study's findings were

that students were fully aware of fairness in the classroom and, more significantly, that fairness was a perception that was developed via communication (NCA, 2010). Here are a few of the participants' responses to the structured interview and FGD to aid in the validation of the quantitative phase's findings.

Fig. 27. *Teachers that have a biased or unfavorable attitude toward their students will instill mistrust in them.*R165

Fig. 28. *Yung ibang prof pag di masyadong marunong ung isang student is parang di nila ito tinutulungan.*(Those other faculty members seem to disregard students that are low performing.) R46

The item 1 with the highest reported mean, "My teacher is open for comments about his/her grading system." has a mean of 3.344, indicating a "Fair" level of respondents' perceptions of academic fairness. It implied that grade records are explained by teachers in an honest and open manner. As stated by Ozer et. al. (2010), the "partially" and "moderately" fair impression of education institutions' preparation of future teachers reveals a significant flaw, according to a study of the total findings. It is crucial to remember that educational institutions are not only in charge of providing prospective teachers with certain information sets, but are also expected to be the places where they provide them with professional teaching attitudes and behaviors.

Fig. 29. *No, there is no favoritism on campus, because they are all fair with the students.* R9

Fig. 30. *Base sa experience ko, samen kase hindi pako nakaka-experience ng favoritism sa class namen, kase yung dinidiscuss as a teacher dapat sa kanila magmula yung pagiging fair.* (Based on my case, I didn't experience favoritism in class because according to our teacher the initiation of fairness should come from them "teachers".) R1 FGD Session 2

However, some students perceived teachers on the campus having favoritism in class.

Fig. 31. *Back when face to face I was the only in favored and then it affects me, kapag may activities or schoolworks na pinapagawa yung professor, I felt confident na kahit na maliit or mababa yung score ko mataas pa rin yung lalagay niya na score.* (Back when face-to-face classes, I was the only one favored, and then it affected me. Every time there was a quiz or school work assigned by the professor, I felt confident even though I had a low score, I know that my teacher would give me a high score.) R2 FGD Session 2

Fig. 32. *Yes, kahit na sa tingin mo mataas ka dun sa student na iyon pero alam mong favorite sya wala kang magagawa.* (Yes, though you know you performed better than the favorite student, that student will still get higher, and you can do nothing about that.) R197

Fig. 33. *Yes, even if you do your best still not enough because of unequal treatment. R410*

Fig. 34. *Yes, because other teachers are more focus on those students who they see that has so much potential. R187*

In general, respondents had a high level of academic integrity in terms of fairness with a total mean of 3.278 and a standard deviation of 0.605, which indicated that respondents had a "Fair" perspective on campus. As presented by Cruz (2016), fairness is summarized as a social element, and some of the respondents' sight samples in household and educational settings as a result of this study. In terms of the family, there was no partiality and all family members received the same amount of love, care, and support. Giving grades equally, treating everyone similarly, and punishing those who are involved are all examples of being fair in the classroom. Fairness also encompasses morality and inner standards, as well as decision-making.

Table 18. *Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity as regard to Respect*

Indicators	Mean	sd	Verbal Interpretation
Respectful Practices			
1. **Students treat other students with respect, regardless of differences.**	3.485	.644	Courteous
2. **Students treat teachers with respect**	3.620	.576	Highly Courteous
3. **Students treat other adults at school with respect.**	3.592	.577	Highly Courteous
4. **Students respect others' property.**	3.583	.587	Highly Courteous
5. **Teachers treat students with respect.**	3.585	.578	Highly Courteous
6. **Other adults at school treat students with respect**	3.572	.580	Highly Courteous
7. **Teachers don't allow students to treat each**	3.519	.705	Highly Courteous

other disrespectfully.			
8. Teachers don't allow students to treat each other disrespectfully.	3.548	.677	Highly Courteous
9. People in this school are generally polite (say please, thank you, excuse me, hold the door).	3.540	.571	Highly Courteous
10. The school has clear rules against hurting other people physically (hitting, pushing, kicking, tripping) or threatening to hurt.	3.599	.568	Highly Courteous
11. The school has clear rules against hurting other people emotionally (name-calling, mean teasing, excluding others, spreading rumors).	3.595	.577	Highly Courteous
12. The school has effective disciplinary consequences for hurting people in any way (physically or emotionally)	3.574	.584	Highly Courteous
13. I feel respected at this school.	3.565	.612	Highly Courteous
Total	**3.568**	**0.603**	**Highly Courteous**

As can be seen in Table 18 showing the level of academic integrity when it comes to Respect, under Respectful Practices, the mean values were ranging from 3.485 to 3.620. Item number 1 "Students treat other students with respect, regardless of differences" had the lowest mean which is 3.485. This expresses that students were "Courteous" in their behavior with academic respect. It also indicates that students were treating other people on the campus with

respect despite being diverse. Wile (2020) reveals in his study that students treat each other properly when there is a climate of mutual respect. Students feel protected, inspired, and valued as a result, which promotes learning in the classroom. It takes both the teacher and the students to put forth a lot of effort to create this environment. But after the pleasant classroom climate is formed, kids typically work to keep it that way. To validate the result in the quantitative phase, here are some of the responses of the participants from the structured interview and FGD.

Fig. 35. *None, because I understand that nobody's perfect, we all commit mistakes if it happened nothing will change and it doesn't really mean that I will lower my respect, I will continue to respect them.* R24

Fig. 36. *Lahat sila worthy, kasi sila yung lagi mong kasama. Matututo ka sa mga kwento ng buhay nila tsaka yung knowledge na tinuturo nila satin.* (All of them (students) are worthy, because they are whom you are always with. You will also learn from their own life stories, as well as the knowledge they teach us.) R70

Fig. 37. *Wala po dahil lahat ng kapwa natin mapa bata man o matanda po ay kailangan natin mag respetuhan.* (Nothing, because everyone, whether young and adult needed to be respected.)R83

Fig. 38. *I think everyone need to gain respect, kahit ano man yung position inside the school.* (I think everyone need to gain respect, regardless of his/her position in school) R126

Fig. 39.
On the other hand, the recorded mean of 3.620 was the highest for item number 2 "Students treat teachers with respect". This means that respondents' level of academic respectful practices was "Highly Courteous". Learners are respectful to the faculty members of the campus.

Fig. 40. *I respect everyone. It doesn't matter if they are rude or what. R407*

Fig. 41. *All of them are worthy to respect even they don't deserve it because respect is given to everybody with no reason. R395*

Fig. 42. *Everyone on campus are worthy of my respect. But if a person is not respectful towards me. I will treat them the same way they treat me. R374*

Fig. 43. *Nothing, all people deserves to be respected. R340*

Fig. 44. *Anyone in school deserve to respect. R302*

Fig. 45.

Fig. 46.

Fig. 47. *For me it is worthy to respect those stuff, teacher or etc. because all us we need to respect each other. R29*

In general, respondents had a high level of academic integrity in terms of respectful practices with a total mean of 3.568 and a standard deviation of 0.603, which pertains that respondents observed politeness on campus.

Disrespectful Experiences			
1. How often have you been PHYSICALLY HURT (hit, pushed, etc.) or threatened by other students at school?	1.326	.774	Never Harassed
2. How often have you been EMOTIONALLY HURT (called names, excluded, been the victim of rumors, etc.) by other students at school?	1.538	.911	Barely Harassed
3. How often have you seen students PHYSICALLY HURTING OR THREATENING others at school?	1.431	.830	Never Harassed
4. How often have you seen students EMOTIONALLY HURTING others at school?	1.636	.999	Barely Harassed
5. How often have you been PUT DOWN OR DISRESPECTED in some way by a teacher or other adult in the school?	1.428	.807	Never Harassed
6. How often have you INTENTIONALLY HURT another student, either physically or emotionally, at school?	1.376	.809	Never Harassed
7. How often have you been the victim of CYBERBULLYING (mean behavior on Facebook, texting, e-mail, etc.)?	1.380	.807	Never Harassed
Total	**1.445**	**0.848**	**Never Harassed**

Based on Table 18, which displays the degree of academic integrity when it comes to respect, the mean values for disrespectful practices range from 1.326 to 1.636. The lowest mean was 1.326 for item number 1 "How often have you been PHYSICALLY HURT (hit, pushed, etc.) or threatened by other students at school?". Based on the results, expressing "Never Harassed" it shows that there was never any physical violence committed toward students on campus. Deutsch, et al. (2022) show in their study that when someone is being mistreated by someone they know or trust or has lived with abuse for a long time, it can be difficult. It is possible for people to incorrectly believe that it's their fault if they disobey their parents, breach the law, or fall short of someone's expectations. Here are a few of the participants' responses to the structured interview and FGD to help corroborate the outcome of the quantitative phase.

Fig. 48. *Every person in campus worth to respect even if they are your enemy.* R43

Fig. 49. *Respecting people demonstrates your concern for them. You can achieve this by being kind to everyone. Your parents, professors, and friends will respect you if you respect others.* R144

On the other hand, the recorded mean of 1.636 was the highest for item number 1 "How often have you been PHYSICALLY HURT (hit, pushed, etc.) or threatened by other students at school?" The results express that respondents' level of disrespectful practices was "Barely Harassed", which implied that a small number of respondents experience emotional harassment on campus. As studied by Hartney (2020), numerous emotions can cause psychological pain. Everyone has these feelings from time to time, but when they are intense and persistent, they can impair a person's ability to function and carry out normal daily activities. To substantiate the quantitative results, presented below are the responses from the structured interview and FGD.

Fig. 50. *If they insulting me and their words are below the belt resulting from to feel shy in my classmates.* R4

Fig. 51. *Kapag pinagsasalitaan ka ng masama na hindi naman dapat.* (When they talk inappropriately toward you.)R22

Fig. 52. *Kapag nasasaktan na nila yung feelings ko.* (When they hurt my feelings) R82

"Yes po ma'am nung face to face class pa so yung isa naming classmate na late siya ang then nagtuturo yung teacher namen sa harapan. Late siya hindi man lang kumatok ma'am dire-diretso lang siyang pumasok taoos pinagsabihan siya ng teacher namin tapos yung nakuhang sagot ng teacher namen dun sa classmate namin na yon is sinabihan lang siya ng Ediwow. So parang na disrespect yung teacher and then ayon naka abot sa taas." (Yes, during face-to-face classes, one of my classmates was late, and our teacher started her lesson in front of the class. He just entered the room without knocking on the door. Our teacher reprimanded him, and he just responded, "Edi wow." It seemed like our teacher was disrespected. That incident reached the admin office.) R1 FGD Session 2

In overall, respondents had a high level of academic integrity in terms of respectful practices with a total mean of 1.445 and a standard deviation of 0.848, which indicated that respondents were not involved in disrespectful behavior on campus. As Berkowicz, et al. (2018) stated in their study, respect for adults for one another sets an example for pupils in the healthiest of educational settings. However, we are all aware of the subtle ways that disrespect is displayed in schools, and the kids are even more perceptive than we are. It is noticeable when a teacher speaks negatively about a colleague, the administration, a pupil, or a parent while rolling their eyes. Whether or not children are present, speaking disparagingly about others in a group setting fosters an atmosphere where respect and the resulting trust are undermined. Here are some responses from the structural interview and focus group participants to help authenticate the quantitative phase's results.

Fig. 53. *Para sa akin wala naman kase lahat ng tao sa paaralan nirerespeto ng mga bawat estudyante, mag-aaral, trabahador, o guro man niyan kung ano man niyan ginawa nila mga kamalian nila yon.*

Fig. 54. (For me, everyone on campus is respected by students, workers, or teachers, no matter what mistake they commit.) R5 FGD Session 2

Fig. 55. *"About sa question na to ma'am I think no wala pang instances na kinonsider ko yung isang tao na hindi maging worth sa respect. Parang di pa ko naka encounter nang nag disrespect sa akin. So wala pang dahilan para mag disrespect ako ng ibang tao.* (About this question I think there are no instances where I consider someone not worthy of my respect. I've never had anyone treat me disrespectfully. So, I have no reason to be disrespectful to others.) R1 FGD Session 1

Contradicting the results, some respondents viewed academic disrespect towards their classmates and teachers.

Table 19. *Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity as regard to Responsibility*

Indicators	Mean	sd	Verbal Interpretation
1. Students are willing to help other students, even if they are not friends.	3.481	.592	Responsible
2. Students solve conflicts without insults or fighting.	3.417	.646	Responsible
3. The school encourages students to perform kind actions.	3.581	.542	Completely Responsible
4. When I see or hear about a student being bullied or hurt in any way, I	3.424	.576	Responsible

try to stop it or report it (to an adult or through an anonymous reporting system).			
5. When I see a student being bullied or treated unkindly in any way, I try to comfort them, be their friend, give them advice, or help them tell an adult.	3.431	.596	**Responsible**
6. If a student reports bullying or any kind of hurtful behavior, a teacher or the school does something right away to try to stop it.	3.510	.544	**Completely Responsible**
7. The school teaches students specific things they can do when they see someone bullying others	3.508	.565	**Responsible**
8. When students do something hurtful, they are required to do something positive to make up for it (apologize or do something nice to or for the person).	3.483	.592	**Responsible**
Total	3.479	0.582	**Responsible**

The mean values ranged from 3.417 to 3.581, as can be seen in Table 19, which displays the degree of academic integrity in relation to Responsibility. The lowest mean was 3.417 for item number 2, "Students solve conflicts without insults or fighting." This states that learners were "Responsible" for their actions in academe. Additionally, it shows that students were accountable for amicably settling their conflicts with

others. Here are a few of the participants' responses to the open-ended question and FGD to help validate the quantitative phase's results.

Fig. 56. *If they are responsible then they'll be like my role model and be just accountable like them.* R78

Fig. 57. *We can learn from one another and use it in different aspects in life.* R85

Fig. 58. *To encourage me to learn a lot and apply it to myself. Then I realized a lot when I take a learning from others.* R102

Fig. 59. *By helping me, by protecting me, by guiding etc. They have a big impact on my life that I can say that they helped me grow as a student and as an individual.* R114

Fig. 60. *It helps me when they give advice or cheering me up.* R127

On the other hand, item number 3 " The school encourages students to perform kind actions" had the highest recorded mean, which was 3.581. This indicates that respondents were "Completely Responsible" for academic behavior. This suggests that respondents were encouraged to behave responsibly by the campus. Here are some remarks given by the participants in the focus groups and structured interviews to help substantiate the findings of the quantitative phase.

Fig. 61. *They are doing very well. They have a lot of webinars that brings a lesson to us students.* R4

Fig. 62. *Lessons and webinars are being held in the school with regards to that.* R5

Fig. 63. *Ako kase sobrang dami kong nakikitang taong responsable talaga so, saken nakakatulong siya dun sa mentality, class performance, confidence, and life principle talagang malaking tulong yun saken para gawin ko rin na ako din maging responsible, ako din maging accountable sa mga ginagawa ko ako din parang encouragement sa akin yon and motivation saken yun para*

gawin ko rin o magiging model sila saken. Nagiging responsible ka once na sa ojt namen talagang nakita ko dun yung kung paano talaga maging responsible, kapag may binibigay na task yung cooperating teacher ko, before nung deadline sinasubmit at binibigyan ko talaga ng oras para gawin yung mga bagay na pinapagawa niya lalo na sa mga students. (I see a lot of people who are really responsible, and it helps my mentality, class performance, confidence, and life principle. That's really big help so that I can also be responsible, I can also be accountable for what I do. It's also like encouragement and motivation for me to do it too or they will be a model for me. You become responsible like for instance in our on-the-job training, I really saw there how to be responsible.

When my cooperating teacher gave me a task, before the deadline, activities were submitted and I really gave time to do the things she asked me to do especially for the students.) R1 FGD Session 1

With a mean of 3.479 and a standard deviation of 0.582, the majority of respondents had a "Responsible" level of academic integrity in terms of responsibility. As Aggabao et al. (2020) revealed in their study that due to their improved attitude toward their studies, pupils who were more responsible have higher academic accomplishments. Presented below are the responses from the structured interview and FGD, to verify the quantitative results.

Fig. 64. *Masarap pumasok ma'am. May nakikita or mamomotivate ka at lalo kang sisipagan kasi ginagawa niya yung responsibilities niya. And although tayong lahat may responsibilidad kasi college na tayo, may isip na bat hindi natin sila tularan sa kanilang ginagawa upang mas lalong lumago ang ating pakikisama.* (When someone is showing sense of responsibility, I am motivated to go to school, because I enjoy and it is good to come and study. We are in college years; we can also think that we can be like them so that many students might see us being responsible they will also be motivated by our simple gestures.) R4 FGD Session 1

Table 20. *Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity as regard to Courage*

Indicators	Mean	sd	Verbal Interpretation
1. When I am angry with someone, I know how to calm down.	3.460	.639	Brave
2. I try to tell the truth even when it is hard.	3.362	.654	Brave
3. I let people know that I appreciate their help	3.617	.552	Consistently Brave
4. I try to help when someone is in need.	3.585	.570	Consistently Brave
5. I do kind things for others, even when I don't get any reward.	3.626	.567	Consistently Brave

6. When someone says something mean to me, I know how to stop being upset.	3.339	.676	Brave
7. When no one is watching, I still try to do the right thing	3.560	.566	Consistently Brave
8. I try to do my best even when something is hard to do	3.588	.582	Consistently Brave
9. When somebody hurts my feelings, I can still get along with them.	3.280	.753	Brave
10. I keep trying even when something is difficult for me.	3.494	.644	Brave
11. I try to make good choices, even when others don't.	3.522	.600	Consistently Brave
12. When someone is mean to me, I try to get back at that person.	3.087	.897	Brave
13. When someone hurts my feelings, I	3.335	.695	Brave

try to let it go.

Total	**3.451**	**0.646**	Brave

As observed in Table 20, which compared the level of academic integrity to Courage the mean values ranged from 3.087 to 3.626. When someone is unpleasant to me, I try to get back at that person," item number 12 had the lowest mean (3.087), indicating that students were "Brave" for their activities in terms of academic courage. Additionally, it demonstrates that even when someone or something activates their emotions, students were still in control of them. Having future objectives is protective while someone is fighting, whether it be for self-defense, to win or preserve respect, or out of rage. (Rashmi Shetgiri, MD et al.) To help corroborate the findings of the quantitative phase, below are a few of the participants' responses to the open-ended question and FGD.

Fig. 65.   *Yes, there is someone in my class who's always there to protect our classmates in times of difficulty.* R16

Fig. 66.   *Yes, when I'm was in 8th grade, one of my classmate make an action when my teacher's back then my classmate stand to say to my teacher what my classmate did to her.* R32

Fig. 67.   *Yes, I saw in my previous school this student always bully her because of his appearance and those bullies always approach something on her looks, so her friends help and depend her to stop bullying this student.* R37

Fig. 68.   *Yes, when my boy classmate fighting with our prof, then my girl classmate speaks that he need to have some respect our prof.* R59

Fig. 69.   *Yes, my classmates before stand up for me when I was in high school about getting a false accusation by someone.* R162

Fig. 70.   *Some of our classmates, especially our top of our class and president are very courageous, they have the guts to tell the truth towards others on what's right or wrong.* R223

Fig. 71.   *Yes. Mga classmates ko is palaging pinipili yung tama at ipaglalaban nila yung bagay na alam nilang mas makakabuti sa lahat. (Yes, my classmates always choose what is right and they always fight for the things that are best for the group.)* R406

The highest recorded mean, which is 3.626, is found in item number 5, "I do kind things for others, even when I don't get any reward." This demonstrates that respondents exhibited "Consistently Brave" levels of academic courage. This indicates that respondents had the initiative to do right without asking anything in return. As stated by Batson

(1991). Altruistic actions are frequently discussed in terms of sacrifice and the potential costs and dangers involved. Since the altruistic performer must give his or her time and resources to others without expecting anything in return, altruism is frequently non-economic and even detrimental to existence at the individual level. To corroborate the statistical results, here are some of the respondents' answers from the structured interview and FGD.

Fig. 72. *Ako mismo naka-experience nung ako yung magsasabe ng totoo, for example meron kasing nagshishare saken na about sa kanyang sarili then nababalitaan ko sa iba na iba yung shinishare about sa kanya so ako naman kinausap ko kung sino yung nagsasalita ng fake news then ako yung nagspeak ng totoo sa kanya base dun sa pinag uusapan nila, example ikaw pinag uusapan ka nila then yung usapan nilang dalawa alam ko yung totoong nangyare then shinare ko sa kanila yung totoo na ikaw hindi ka ganyan o ganon. Sinabi ko sa kanila kung ano yung shinare mo saken.* (I, myself, experienced when I was the one to tell the truth. For example, someone just opened up to me about their self then I heard from others that what was being said about that person was different. So, I talked to the one who was speaking fake news then I was the one who spoke the truth based on what they were talking about. For example, others talked about you, but I know what really happened. I told them the truth that you are not that kind of person. I told them what you told me) P1 FGD Session 1

Nung IT ako, parehas yung sagot nila, then sabi ng teacher ko na nagkopyahan sila, kaya pinagtanggol ko siya, kasi magkalayo sila ng place. Paano sila magkokopyahan malayo sila sa isa't isa. Nakakakaba kasi syempre hindi mo naman papel yon, eh kaibigan ko yon eh. May karapatan ako na ipagtanggol siya kasi alam ko naman na malayo sila sa isa't isa. At alam ko naman yung kaibigan ko, napaka honest non. (When I was an IT student, we had a quiz and our teacher said that my two classmates had the same answer. But I stood up and told her how could they be able to have the same answer when in fact they were seated far away from each other. At first, it was very nerve-wracking but that's my friend and I know that they didn't cheat so I fought for him to avoid false accusations and I know my friend is really honest.) P3 FGD Session 1

Overall, respondents' academic integrity measured in terms of courage was at the "Brave" level, with a mean of 3.451 and a standard deviation of 0.646. According to

Sonnentag and Barnett (2016), moral courage in times of Adolescence can indicate a person's propensity to stand up to their peers on moral issues or to be a moral rebel. Even though it is unpopular, people should do what they believe to be right. Here are some of the answers given from the structured interview and FGD to support the statistical findings.

Fig. 73. *Bali yung classmates ko, nag-groupings kami then sabi ng teacher ko kung saan kami kampante dun kayo pumunta. Then, yung isang barkada namin, pumunta dun sa isang group ayaw ng ibang barkada ko na pumunta siya sa group na yon. Binully nila, kinuha nila yung Facebook, tapos nakita nilang yung conversation namin na ganon, na bakit kailangan pa nilang magalit ganyan-ganyan. Kaya kinausap namin sila kung bakit ganyan, bakit ganon, bakit Kailangan buksan yung Facebook niya, porke hindi kayo pinili bilang ka-group.* (During the class, our teacher said that the class would be divided into groups and we could pick who our members would be. Our circle of friends agreed that we can be grouped but one of my friends moved to another group. Some of our friends did not want him to join the said group, so they bullied him. Then they opened his Facebook account and read our conversation, used it, and made fun of us. Then we talked to them about their attitude.) P4 FGD Session 1

Table 21. *Summary of the Respondents' Level of Academic Integrity*

Academic Integrity	Mean	Sd	Verbal
1. Academic Honesty	1.484	0.741	Very Truthful
2.			
3. Academic Trust	3.163	0.671	Trustworthy
4. Academic Fairness			
a. Informational Fairness	3.296	0.599	Fair
b. Procedural Fairness	3.278	0.605	Fair
5. Academic Respect			
a. Respectful Practices	3.568	0.603	Highly Courteous

	Mean	Sd		
b. **Disrespectful Practices**	**1.445**	**0.848**		**Never Harassed**
6. **Academic Responsibility**	**3.479**	**0.582**		**Responsible**
7. **Academic Courage**	**3.451**	**0.646**		**Brave**

Table 21 shows the significant differences among respondents' profiles and their perception of academic integrity as regards honesty. The data reveals that there was a significant difference among respondents' age, sex, and position on campus. The age range of 26 and above (mean=1.1077, sd=0.17577) displayed the lowest mean, which proved that students in this age range were more honest than the younger ones.

As mentioned by Nazir, 2011, students who are younger and in their first year of college are more likely to be concerned about academic dishonesty. This supports the concept that younger learners have their own code of ethics for how to behave in society; yet, as people age, they display morality in their acts and gain more philosophical attitudes.

Moreover, in terms of sex, data shows that females (mean=1.4448, sd=0.52460) were more honest compared to males (mean=1.5420, sd=0.67036). Similarly, according to Nazir et al. (2011), male students were more prone than female students to engage in academic dishonesty. The table also shows that students with a position (mean=1.3474, sd=0.61515) on campus were more honest than those without a position (mean=.1.3474, sd=0.37900). Bedford (2012) argues that people will never trust a leader who they know to be dishonest.

Table 22. *Significant Difference on Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards to Honesty*

As shown in Table 22, according to respondents' profiles and

Profile		Mean	Sd	F	Sig.
Age	18 and Below	1.512	0.596		
	19-21	1.465	0.514	2.954	0.032*
	22-25	1.563	0.739		
	26 and Above	1.108	0.176		
Sex	Male	1.542	0.670	6.418	0.012*
	Female	1.445	0.525		
Program	BEED	1.483	0.574		
	BSBA	1.525	0.679	0.333	0.801
	BSHM	1.464	0.487		
	BSIT	1.455	0.573		
Year Level	First Year	1.472	0.549		
	Second Year	1.492	0.565	0.024	0.995
	Third Year	1.487	0.519		
	Fourth Year	1.487	0.710		
Former School	Public School	1.480	0.593	0.189	0.664
	Private School	1.493	0.587		
Position	No	1.506	0.615	10.202	0.002*
	Yes	1.347	0.379		

their perception of academic integrity in the domain of trust, there were noticeable disparities. The age, sex, and year level of education of respondents showed a substantial variation, according to the analysis. The data for students aged 26 and older (mean = 3.3282, sd = 0.44233) showed that these students were more reliable than the younger ones. In addition, research revealed that males were more trustworthy than females in terms of sex (mean=3.2452, sd=0. 0.45868 vs. mean=3.1169, sd=0.44604). The table additionally demonstrates that fourth-year students were more trustworthy than those in lower year levels (mean = 3.2562, sd = 0.49452). As mentioned by Li et al. (2012), across the 38 countries, there was a positive correlation between age and trust toward the four target groups. Contextual factors also affected age inequalities in trust toward friends, neighbors, and strangers (i.e., income inequality, developing status, and individualism).In addition, women were more trustworthy than men, and men trust more than women. Men were more likely to trust others when they expect a reward, which suggests that men approach interactions more strategically than women do. Women felt more pressure to be trustworthy and to show appreciation, but not all obligations had the same effects on behavior (Buchan et al., 2008).

However, according to Moran (2014), the degree to which the interrelationships of trust across different role groups in schools as well as faculty trust in principals, colleagues, and clients, parent trust in schools, and student trust in teachers

were examined. Also investigated was how well this group of related trust variables explains variation in student achievement at the elementary, middle, and high school levels both jointly and separately. The analysis findings showed that pupils' levels of trust in their principals and teachers varied greatly depending on their gender and grade level.

Table 23 *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Informational Fairness*

a. PROFILE		b. MEAN	c. MD	d. VALUE	e. SIG.	S
AGE	18 and Below	3.448	0.486			
	19-21	3.283	0.507	0.604	0.613	
	22-25	3.298	0.521			
	26 and Above	3.357	0.475			
SEX	Male	3.340	0.515	1.019	0.313	
	Female	3.278	0.509			
PROGRAM	BEED	3.414	0.512			
	BSBA	3.285	0.492	3.010	0.030*	
	BSHM	3.202	0.486			
	BSIT	3.296	0.527			
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	3.299	0.464			
	Second Year	3.423	0.531	4.285	0.005*	
	Third Year	3.170	0.504			
	Fourth Year	3.299	0.517			
FORMER SCHOOL	Public	3.316	0.514	0.180	0.671	
	Private School	3.252	0.497			
POSITION	No	3.280	0.515	0.014	0.906	
	Yes	3.393	0.465			

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

Table 23 shows the significant differences between respondents' profiles and perceptions of academic integrity in terms of fairness under the sub-category of informational fairness. The results of the analysis showed that there were considerable differences in the programs and academic year levels of the respondents. In terms of programs, data reveals that students majoring in Bachelor in Elementary Education (BEED) with the highest mean, (mean=3.4143, sd=0.51168) perceived fairness in the classroom as being more prevalent than students majoring in other programs. The table also demonstrates how second-year students on campus (mean = 3.4226, sd=0.53149) perceive fairness in comparison to students in other year levels. Based on a study, children were conscious of fairness in the classroom and respond to perceived injustice. Teaching staff at colleges should never stop trying to spread ideas that encourage beliefs in distributive, procedural, and interpersonal fairness. It is crucial to remember that, despite students' worries, what some may perceive as "unfair" may actually be in their best interests. We advise teachers to rethink their communication strategies in the classroom in light of their own objectives, standards, and personal views as well as students' concerns about fairness. Promoting justice in the classroom while upholding academic rigor requires a delicate balancing act for effective instruction. Instructors might be better able to accomplish both the relational and rhetorical objectives of training by doing this. (NCA, 2010)

Table 24. *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Procedural Fairness*

PROFILE		f. MEAN	g. MD	h. VALUE	i. SIG.	S
AGE	18 and Below	3.215	0.557			
	19-21	3.256	0.504	0.908	0.437	
	22-25	3.317	0.491			
	26 and	3.415	0.423			

		Mean	SD	F value	Sig.
SEX	Above Male	3.330	0.498	1.121	0.290
	Female	3.250	0.503		
PROGRAM	BEED	3.363	0.508	1.957	0.120
	BSBA	3.295	0.479		
	BSHM	3.202	0.487		
	BSIT	3.240	0.516		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	3.246	0.476	3.389	0.018*
	Second Year	3.380	0.548		
	Third Year	3.174	0.480		
	Fourth Year	3.319	0.483		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.299	0.510	2.100	0.148
	Private School	3.232	0.474		
POSITION	No	3.271	0.508	0.873	0.351
	Yes	3.320	0.450		

*significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed

Table 24 displays no significant difference between respondents' profiles and their Level of perception of academic integrity concerning the domain of fairness under the sub-category of procedural fairness, except at the year level. The analysis revealed that second-year students (mean = 3.3805, sd = 0.54781) on campus were more likely to view procedural fairness on campus compared to other year levels. Moreover, contextualized fairness in terms of social factors and some of the respondents' sight samples in personal and educational settings. There was no partiality in the family and everyone received the same amount of love, attention, and support. When it comes to grades, treatment, and punishment

PROFILE		MEAN	SD	F VALUE	SIG.
AGE	18 and Below	3.664	0.448	0.595	0.618
	19-21	3.550	0.493		
	22-25	3.579	0.492		
	26 and Above	3.677	0.487		
SEX	Male	3.528	0.526	4.121	0.043*
	Female	3.603	0.460		
PROGRAM	BEED	3.630	0.461	0.860	0.462
	BSBA	3.566	0.470		
	BSHM	3.534	0.525		
	BSIT	3.538	0.501		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	3.570	0.463	1.545	0.202
	Second Year	3.654	0.502		
	Third Year	3.521	0.488		
	Fourth Year	3.533	0.495		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.582	0.489	0.328	0.567
	Private School	3.535	0.483		
POSITION	No	3.561	0.499	3.873	0.050*
	Yes	3.605	0.409		

in the classroom, fairness means treating everyone equally. Fairness also entails making decisions and is based on morals and inner standards. It entails respecting one another, recognizing the rights of individuals, and treating everyone equally regardless of socioeconomic condition. Fairness, according to both genders, entails receiving what is due to you but also showing consideration for others (Giben et al., 2016)

Table 25 *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Fairness*

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

Table 25 demonstrates that, with the exception of the year level, there was no significant relationship between respondents' profiles and their view of academic integrity, which concentrated on general fairness. According to the analysis, second-year students on campus (mean = 3.3973, sd = 0.52059) provided a more favorable opinion of fairness than students in other year levels. This implied that the majority of second-year students apparently did not encounter favoritism on campus.

Table 26. *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Respectful Practices*

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

As shown in Table 26 significant differences between respondents' profiles and their perception of academic integrity as regards the value of respect under its sub-part of respectful practice. The analysis reveals that there was a significant difference in respondents' sex and position on

PROFILE		MEAN	SD	FVALUE	SIG.
AGE	18 and Below	1.571	0.723		
	19-21	1.482	0.650	0.956	0.413
	22-25	1.485	0.825		
	26 and Above	1.200	0.400		
AGE	18 and Below				
	19-21	3.267	0.486		
	22-25	3.309	0.477		
	26 and Above	3.594	0.366		
SEX	Male	1.489	0.758	0.507	0.677
	Female	1.405	0.646	5.382	0.021*
SEX	Male	3.334	0.478	0.508	0.677
	Female	3.268	0.480	0.677	0.411
PROGRAM	BEED	1.473	0.781		
	BSBA	3.334	0.774		
	BSHM	1.498	0.638		
	BSIT	1.688			
PROGRAM	BEED	3.384	0.479		
	BSBA	1.411	0.603		
	BSHM	3.291	0.466		
	BSIT	3.202	0.456	2.560	0.055
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	1.429	0.721	0.260	0.854
	Second Year	3.251	0.494		
	Third Year	3.242	0.593		
	Fourth Year	3.397	0.521		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	1.488	0.794	4.027	0.008*
	Second Year	3.172	0.468		
	Third Year	3.311	0.466		
	Fourth Year	1.421	0.726		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.306	0.487	0.109	0.742
	Private School	1.498	0.649	1.417	0.235
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.240	0.456		
	Private School	1.461	0.717		
POSITION	No	3.247	0.601	3.018	0.083
	Yes	1.275			
POSITION	No			0.252	0.616
	Yes	3.350	0.433		

campus. In terms of the program, data showed that female students (mean=3.6025, sd=0.46003) perceive more respectful behavior on campus than male students (mean=3.5282, sd=0.52616). According to Arnot et al. (2018)

presented the development of both sexes and gender equality depend on the promotion of gender respect. This essay made the case for the significance of moral education in assisting girls' and women's struggles for respect under unfair and complicated gender power structures, particularly in conditions of poverty. Programs for moral education that promote respectful interactions between the sexes must address these highly contextualized sorts of "gender respect" conflicts. The table also shows that students with a position on campus (mean = 3.6053, sd = 0.40860) on campus were more likely to view respectful practice on campus compared to students who were not engaged in any position on campus. In connection, for students, showing respect entails "a basic recognition of your humanity. This includes things like remembering a student's name (and saying it correctly), not talking down to them or embarrassing them in front of their peers and showing an interest in their viewpoints. Both middle-schoolers and college-aged

students indicated they lost respect for teachers who used dismissive or punishing methods of discipline and that they were more inclined to act out in such a teacher's class. Students' willingness to work hard in class might also shift in response to how respected they feel.

Table 27. *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Disrespectful Experience*

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

Table 27 demonstrates that, with the exception of sex, there was no significant difference between respondents' profiles and how they view academic integrity in terms of the importance of respect and disrespectful behavior. According to the analysis, male students (mean = 1.4892, sd = 0.5760) perceived disrespectful behavior on campus differently from female respondents (mean = 1.4046, sd = 0.64585). This suggests that disrespectful behaviors toward female students were either non-existent or very rare. As indicated by Burczycka (2020), except for being belittled, harassed, Women were more likely than men to have experienced each of the discriminatory behaviors, including being ignored or excluded because they are or are considered to be transgender (reported by 1 percent of women and men, respectively).

Table 28 *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Respect*

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

Table 28 demonstrates that, aside from the respondents' position on the campus, there were no significant differences between respondents' profiles and their perceptions of academic integrity, specifically respect. Students without a position on campus sense academic respect on campus, according to the data (mean = 2.8261, sd = 0. 34714). This might also imply that college students without involvement in any school organization do not experience harassment as those who hold positions on campus. Furthermore, Ferlazzo (2019) revealed in his study that students respect professors who they perceive to respect them, it is a fact. The more students respect the teacher and feel that they have their best interests at heart, the simpler it is to create a learning atmosphere that is culturally sustainable.

Table 29. *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Responsibility*

PROFILE		MEAN	SD	F VALUE	SIG.
AGE	18 and Below	3.555	0.456	1.459	0.225
	19-21	3.445	0.470		
	22-25	3.531	0.447		
	26 and Above	3.583	0.371		
SEX	Male	3.495	0.480	5.783	0.017*
	Female	3.482	0.449		
PROGRAM	BEED	3.537	0.408	1.326	0.265
	BSBA	3.467	0.456		
	BSHM	3.509	0.476		
	BSIT	3.422	0.493		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	3.504	0.458	1.258	0.288
	Second Year	3.509	0.484		
	Third Year	3.404	0.444		
	Fourth Year	3.497	0.454		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.502	0.456	0.491	0.484
	Private School	3.430	0.466		
POSITION	No	3.460	0.464	-2.150	0.032*
	Yes	3.596	0.420		

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

As shown in Table 29, the profiles of the respondents and their level of perception of academic integrity in terms of responsibility were significantly different. According to the data, there was significant variation between respondents' positions on campus and sex. According to the results, female students were more responsible on campus than male students (mean=3.4947, sd=0.47984 vs. 3.4819, sd=0.44933). Likewise, it was mentioned that compared to men, women

PROFILE		MEAN	SD	VALUE	SIG.
AGE	18 and Below	2.931	0.194	0.944	0.419
	19-21	2.809	0.323		
	22-25	2.846	0.375		
	26 and Above	2.810	0.235		
SEX	Male	2.815	0.381	3.097	0.079
	Female	2.833	0.299		
PROGRAM	BEED	2.861	0.295	1.027	0.380
	BSBA	2.834	0.360		
	BSHM	2.821	0.334		
	BSIT	2.785	0.335		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	2.814	0.310	1.050	0.370
	Second Year	2.875	0.356		
	Third Year	2.797	0.292		
	Fourth Year	2.817	0.370		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	2.826	0.345	0.304	0.582
	Private School	2.822	0.308		
POSITION	No	2.826	0.347	5.502	0.019*
	Yes	2.815	0.233		

exhibit higher levels of internalized moral identity. Additionally, the study discovered that women held a more favorable view of firms' contributions to society than did males, which translates into higher levels of CSR. (Hatch et.al. 2015). The table also indicates that students who hold a position on campus (mean = 3.3963, sd = 0.41982) were more responsible than those who did not hold any positions. As deliberated by (Boettcher et.al., 2015), Participants were able to articulate the role of leaders in assisting others and maintaining the program. The results of this study offer insight into how student involvement influences the development of student leadership identity. Participants understood the role of positional leaders and that there were others who were able to lead without holding titles or positions. Contrastingly, Gonzalez et al. presented in their study that when it comes to ensuring that women fairly ascend to top positions in an academic system, the fact that men hold the majority of senior jobs while not experiencing the same disparity as women do may be crucial.

Table 30. *Significant Difference in Respondents' Profile and their Perception towards Academic Integrity as regards Courage*

PROFILE		MEAN	SD	F VALUE	SIG.

AGE	18 and Below	3.394	0.387		
	19-21	3.426	0.484	1.426	0.234
	22-25	3.487	0.453		
	26 and Above	3.641	0.469		
SEX	Male	3.412	0.505	4.788	0.029*
	Female	3.484	0.444		
PROGRAM	BEED	3.505	0.360		
	BSBA	3.412	0.493	1.576	0.194
	BSHM	3.508	0.480		
	BSIT	3.405	0.514		
YEAR LEVEL	First Year	3.487	0.421		
	Second Year	3.395	0.492	0.754	0.520
	Third Year	3.445	0.534.		
	Fourth Year	3. 466	0.434		
FORMER SCHOOL	Public School	3.477	0.488	2.492	0.115
	Private School	3.392	0.422		
POSITION	No	3.425	0.478	9.355	0.002*
	Yes	3.609	0.374		

significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

Table 30 shows a significant difference between respondents' profiles and their perception and level of academic courage. The analysis revealed that there was a significant difference in respondents' sex and position on campus. In terms of sex, data shows that female students (mean=3.4838, sd=0. 44442) are more courageous on campus compared to males (mean=3. 4117, sd=0. 50476). On the contrary, in relation to the study of Howard et.al. (2020), men are more courageous than women. The table also presents that students with a position on campus (mean = 3.6091, sd = 0. 37377) on campus were more courageous on campus compared to students who were not engaged in any position on campus. The importance of bravery and calling in influencing vulnerability, as well as how those constructs connect to position distinctiveness, While the findings did not establish a link between these variables and differentiation, they did emphasize the importance of courage and other-centered calling on an individual's willingness or capacity to be vulnerable (Lopez, 2018).

Recommendations
In light of the aforementioned findings, following recommendations were given.

1.Since there is a minimal portion of digital natives on campus who were committed or involved in cheating, it is suggested to implement differentiated assessments even during distance learning to avoid online cheating.

2.In terms of favoritism in the classroom, teachers should always be objective when assigning grades; criteria and rubrics should always be used; emotional biases should be eliminated in accordance with fairness.

3.Concerning the small number of cases of bullying and harassment, students are advised to step up and exercise complete freedom, but only based on events that occurred and not on speculation or emotions. Bullying and harassment policies should be reinforced and enforced.

4.It is also recommended to make programs and conduct seminars imposing academic trust, which can improve their integrity as well as their character, camaraderie, and the like.

5.Nonetheless, given the results of a high level of academic integrity on campus as seen by students, it is highly advised to enhance and enforce its overall academic integrity through student evaluation. Accumulate as many government awards and recognition as possible.
This would show students that the university supports moral principles in learning and has great integrity and dignity.

6.For future researchers, this is recommended as a reference to make in-depth questions and analysis for better results about academic integrity, even at the academic level, in other fields of profession and institution.

References

A. (2017, January 25). *How Students can Express Respect for Teachers and Education*. MyPrivateTutor Malaysia Blog. Retrieved from https://www.myprivatetutor.my/blog/how-students-can-express-respect-for-teachers-and-education

Abad, M. (2021, June 25). *This is how my school responded when my teacher harassed me*. RAPPLER. Retrieved from https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/investigative/ways-schools-respond-teachers-harassment-students/

Arnot, M. et.al. (2018). Gender respect: Empirical insights for (moral) educators about women's struggles for respect in the Global South 2022 Informa UK Limited https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03057240.2018.1433644?journalCode=cjme20

Ayish and Deveci (2019). *Student Perceptions of Responsibility for Their Own Learning and for Supporting Peers' Learning in a Project-based Learning Environment*. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1224347.pdf

Balbuena and Lamela (2015, May 4). *Prevalence, Motives, and Views of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education.* Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, Vol. 3, No. 2, May 2015. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED575015.pdf

Balbuena, S. E. (2014, May 8). *Prevalence, Motives, and Views of Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education*. Sherwin E Balbuena - Academia.Edu. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6996370/Prevalence_Motives_and_Views_of_Academic_Dishonesty_in_Higher_Education

Berkowicz, J. A. M. (2021, May 7). *Schools Must Continue to Teach and Practice Respect (Opinion)*. Education Week. Retrieved from https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-schools-must-continue-to-teach-and-practice respect/2018/05#:%7E:text=Respect%20is%20a%20very%20important,us%20and%20follow%20our%20lead

Birden, E. (2020, May 17). *Courage in the Classroom: The Impact of Social Emotional Learning on Student Perceptions of Courage*. Western Connecticut State University. Retrieved from https://westcollections.wcsu.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.12945/194/stamped.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y

Bos, J. (2020). *Fabrication and Cheating*. In: Research Ethics for Students in the Social Sciences. Springer, Cham. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48415-6_5

Buchan, N.R. et.al. (2008). Trust and Gender: An Examination of Behavior and Beliefs in the Investment Game ResearchGate https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222329553_Trust_and_Gender_An_Examination_of_Behavior_and_Beliefs_in_the_Investment_Game

Burczycka, M. (2020). Students' experiences of discrimination based on gender, gender identity or sexual orientation at postsecondary schools in the Canadian provinces, 2019 https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-005-x/2020001/article/00001-eng.htm

Caglar, C. (2013) *The Relationship between the Perceptions of Fairness of the Learning Environment and the Level of Alienation*. Egitim Arastirmalari – Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 50, 185-206.) Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1059929.pdf

Canham, A. (2008, May). *Evaluating Academic Integrity and Outreach Efforts: Changes in Perceptions Over A Three-Year Period*. Canham Andrew Diss. Retrieved from https://ttuir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2346/12496/Canham_Andrew_diss.pdf;sequence=1?fbclid=IwAR173ZQ2bwpbIO3fJjqHBwi-K9gwf1FWEBx10WRrj-gq3YWkxY-Ql0TgiHY

Cook-Sather, A. (September 2010). *Students as Learners and Teachers: Taking Responsibility, Transforming Education, and Redefining Accountability*. Curriculum Inquiry 40:4 (September 2010), 555-575. Bryn Mawr College Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work. Retrieved from https://repository.brynmawr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=edu_pubs

Danilyuk, J. (2020, April 27). *Academic Cheating Statistics Say There's Lots of Work to Do*. Unicheck Blog for Education Junkies. Retrieved from https://unicheck.com/blog/academic-cheating-statistics

Danilyuk, J. (2020b, April 27). *Academic Cheating Statistics Say There's Lots of Work to Do*. Unicheck Blog for Education Junkies. Retrieved from https://unicheck.com/blog/academic-cheating-statistics

Denisova-Schimdt, E. (n.a.) *The Global Challenge of Academic Integrity*. International Higher Education. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/9494/8459

Deutsch, MD and Allison, PhD (2020). *Abuse: What You Need to Know*. Nemours KidsHealth. Retrieved from https://kidshealth.org/en/teens/family abuse.html#:~:text=Need%20to%20Know,Abuse%3A%20What%20You%20Need%20to%20Know,-Reviewed%20by%3A

Dewanti and Wangi (n.a.). *Studi Deskriptif Nilai Karakter Respect and Responsibility di SMKN Kabupaten Bandung*. Retrieved from https://karyailmiah.unisba.ac.id/index.php/psikologi/article/view/28473/pdf?fbclid=IwAR3ipFGlzpiN4fAi2VCCTulY6SSkCeXSt3lFkSbBPQQY173OnkYEhGMLcwU

Droms Hatch, Courtney and Stephen, Sheryl-Ann, "Gender Effects on Perceptions of Individual and Corporate Social Responsibility" (2015). Scholarship and Professional Work - Business. 254. https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/cob_papers/254

Ferlazzo, L. (2019). Students Respect Teachers Who They Feel Respect Them https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-students-respect-teachers-who-they-feel-respect-them/2019/09

Fishman, T. et.al. (2020) (*The Second Edition of the The Fundamental Values is licensed by the International Center for Academic Integrity under Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International*) pp.16-27. Retrieved from https://www.chapman.edu/academics/academic-integrity/_files/the-fundamental-values-of-academic-integrity.pdf

García-González J, Forcén P, Jimenez-Sanchez M (2019) https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0225763

Hardie Gieben M. Cruz (April 2016) Retrieved from https://tojned.net/journals/tojned/articles/v06i02/v06i02-04.pdf

Hardie Gieben M. Cruz Marry O. Dela Torre Fatima D. Javier Ma. Eunice S. Papa April 2016 https://tojned.net/journals/tojned/articles/v06i02/v06i02-04.pdf

Harshman, E. (2021, December 3). *Favoritism shown by teachers can lead to an imbalanced and divided classroom*. The Central Trend. Retrieved from https://thecentraltrend.com/112658/opinion/favoritism-shown-by-teachers-can-lead-to-an-imbalanced-and-divided-classroom/

Hartney, E. (2020, July 7). *How Emotional Pain Addiction Causes Physical Issues*. Verywell Mind. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/physical-pain-and-emotional-pain-22421

Hosny and Fatima, (2014). *Attitude of Students Towards Cheating and Plagiarism: University Case Study*. Journal of

Applied Sciences, 14: 748-757. Retrieved from https://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=jas.2014.748.757#104643_b

Howard, M. C., & Fox, F. R. (2020). Does gender have a significant relationship with social courage? Test of dual sequentially mediated pathways. Personality and Individual Differences, 159, 109904. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0191886920300933

Hoy, W. (n.a.). *Student Trust*. Wayne K. Hoy. Retrieved from https://www.waynekhoy.com/student-trust/

Jordan, E. (2010, January 8). *College student cheating: the role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes and knowledge of institutional policy*. Taylor & Francis Online, Ethics and Behaviour, Vol. 11, Issue 3, 2001. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_3

Klaus, J. (2020, June 5). *Safety Rules for Classroom*. Classroom.Synonym. Retrieved from https://classroom.synonym.com/safety-rules-classroom-6544223.html

Leblanc, R. W., PhD. (2010, August 11). *Good Teaching: The Top 10 Requirements*. Faculty Focus | Higher Ed Teaching & Learning. Retrieved from https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/philosophy-of-teaching/good-teaching-the-top-10-requirements/

Lei, H. (2018). *The Relationship between Teacher Support and Students' Academic Emotions: A Meta-Analysis*. Frontiers. Retrieved from https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02288/full

Li, T. et.al. (2012). Age Differences in Trust: An Investigation Across 38 Countries Oxford Universe Press https://academic.oup.com/psychsocgerontology/article/68/3/347/557981

Llego, M. (n.a.). *Students and Parents Bullying Teachers: A Fast Spreading Disease*. Teacher PH. Retrieved from https://www.teacherph.com/students-parents-bullying-teachers-fast-spreading-disease/

Lopez, S. O. (2018). Vulnerability in Leadership: The Power of the Courage to Descend (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle Pacific University). https://www.proquest.com/openview/b95faa6263a8fc8f5ae8c23ff2aee0a4/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750

Magsambol, B. (2021, November 30). *In remote learning, some students pay someone else to do their classwork*. RAPPLER. Retrieved from https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/investigative/students-paying-someone-else-do-classwork-remote-learning-setup/

Michael E. Gordon and Charles H. Fay College Teaching Vol. 58, No. 3 (July-September 2010), pp. 93-98 (6 pages) Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/41305091

Michelle Lea Boettcher, Ann M. Gansemer April 2015 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1123/rsj.2014-0034

Mindanao Gold Start Daily (2016, October 29). *Ill-mannered, no discipline*. Mindanao Gold Standard Daily. Retrieved from https://mindanaogoldstardaily.com/archives/65953

Moran, M.T. (2014). The Interconnectivity of Trust in Schools ResearchGate https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265685753_The_Interconnectivity_of_Trust_in_Schools

National Communication Association (NCA), December 1, 2010 https://www.natcom.org/communication-currents/"and-justice-all"-fairness-college-classroom

Nazir, M. S., Aslam, M. S., & Nawaz, M. M. (2011). Can Demography Predict Academic Dishonest Behaviors of Students? A Case of Pakistan. International Education Studies, 4(2), 208-217. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1066433

Northern Illinois University (n.a.). *Fabrication of Falsification*. Northern Illinois university Academic Integrity Tutorials. Retrieved from https://www.niu.edu/academic-integrity/students/cheating/fabrication-or-falsification.shtml

Oni, H. T., Tshitangano, T. G., & Akinsola, H. A. (2019). *Sexual harassment and victimization of students*: A case study of a higher education institution in South Africa. African health sciences, 19(1), 1478–1485. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v19i1.21

Oransky, A. I. (2021, January 7). *Columbia grad student faked data in study of socioeconomics and life experiences, says retraction notice*. Retraction Watch. Retrieved from https://retractionwatch.com/2021/01/07/columbia-grad-student-faked-data-in-study-of-socioeconomics-and-life-experiences-says-retraction-notice/

Özer, N., & Demirtaş, H. (2010). *Students' perceptions regarding the fairness of learning environment in faculty of education.* Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 38, 126-145 Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257790069_Students'_Perceptions_Regarding_the_Fairness_of_Learning_Environment_in_Faculty_of_Education

Pampanga State Agricultural University (2015, May 06). *Duties and Responsibility of the Students*. Pampanga State Agricultural University. Retrieved from https://psau.edu.ph/citizen-engagement/36-ossd/238-duties-and-responsibilities-of-the-students

Perez, D. (2020, August 7). *Ending the Culture of Silence on Sexual Harassment and Assault*. Eco Warrior Princess. Retrieved from https://ecowarriorprincess.net/2020/08/filipino-schools-end-the-culture-of-silence-on-sexual-harassment-violence/

Reysio-Cruz, M. (2020, June 29). *More students raise cry vs harassment*. INQUIRER.Net. Retrieved from https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1298843/more-students-raise-cry-vs-harassment

Sheard, J. (2010, July 14). *Investigating differences in cheating behaviours of IT undergraduate and graduate students: The maturity and motivation factors*. Taylor & Francis Online, Higher Education Research & Development, Vol. 22, Issue 1, 2003. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0729436032000056526

Simpson, D. (2016) *"Academic Dishonesty: An International Student Perspective," Higher Education Politics &*

Economics: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 5. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1012&context=aphe

Sonnleitner and Kovacs (2020, February 28). *Differences Between Students' and Teachers' Fairness Perceptions: Exploring the Potential of a Self-Administered Questionnaire to Improve Teachers' Assessment Practices*. Frontiers in Education. Retrieved from https://www.readcube.com/articles/10.3389/feduc.2020.00017?fbclid=IwAR2YFjpAGOH6GR9CwVG19tLTGoWqZGhsUY5b-OAIEAs4dBlnwj3EYKkZ25Q

Sparks, S. D. (2016). How feeling respected transforms a student's relationship to school https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.pbs.org/newshour/amp/education/feeling-respected-transforms-student-school

Tariq, Abid, and Noreen (2019). *Educators' Favoritism: Evidenced based Opinions of Pupil Teachers*. Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ), Volume 10, Issue 1, March 2019. Retrieved from https://infonomics-society.org/wp-content/uploads/Educators-Favoritism-Evidenced-based-Opinions-of-Pupil-Teachers.pdf

Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative. (2020, November 25). *Teacher and Student Relationships: The Power of Trust*. Massachusetts Advocates for Children. Retrieved from https://www.massadvocates.org/news/teacher-and-student-relationships-the-power-of-trust

University of San Francisco (n.a.). *USF Academic Integrity Survey*. myUSF. Retrieved from https://myusf.usfca.edu/assessment/surveys/academicintegrity?fbclid=IwAR1JtxsmVTkDjWdUVtTFkC3ySJxWZwRpAHHVuMzaeFGAYbqU1Bm00KhSVk

Usman, Y. (n.a.). *Accountability in Education: An Imperative for Service Delivery in Nigerian School Systems.* Akwanga Journal of Education and Research (AJER). Vol.1 No.1, 2016. Pp.264-272. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED572007.pdf

Wilkinson, J. (2008, November 30). *Staff and Student Perceptions of Plagiarism and Cheating, International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 2009*. Eric. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ864328