



Assessing Online Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University

Jason V. Chavez*

Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University, Zamboanga City, 7000 Philippines

Article info

Article history:

Received: 4 May 2022

Revised: 30 November 2022

Accepted: 19 December 2022

Keywords:

Academic integrity, Humanized teaching

Abstract

This study investigates how to effectively engage students in academic honesty and allow them to learn through the essence of humanized teaching. A total of 250 teachers and students were surveyed, and in-depth analyses were carried out to assess the practices of academic integrity mechanism and the experiences of humanized teaching among teachers and students. The findings suggest that the institution has the role to introduce new strategies to implement policies on academic integrity to increase the honesty of the students. The institution must control the learning setting to encourage students to remain honest. Clearly, social, cognitive, and teaching presences are highly prevalent in educational systems. Cognitive presence is the most remarkable component of humanized teaching. It is statistically different from computer literacy, indigent status, and course types. Organizational and institutional contexts are also relevant to academic integrity. For learners to be encouraged in continuing a productive academic experience, the degree of personal connection, competence, autonomy, or independence should be included in humanized teaching. The study is significant for Higher Education to elaborate and formulate their goals for humanized teaching and learning while upholding academic integrity.

Introduction

As learners have more access to information, learning environments should create an atmosphere where teachers and students may seek knowledge together (Demir-Yildiz & Tatik, 2019) and engage learning with less problematic concepts in academic integrity and humanized teaching (Joan, 2013). Because of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the integrity of academic output has been called into question, and teaching to susceptible sectors of learners looks to be a challenging

assignment for our educators including the culture of cheating (Holden, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic has prompted broad changes in higher education as of this writing, with many schools adopting online learning modalities. As the development of fully online courses is expected to continue to expand (e.g., Allen and Seaman, 2017), faculty and administrators are faced with the challenge of developing methods to adequately assess student learning in an online environment while maintaining academic honesty.

* Corresponding Author
email: jasonsight@yahoo.com

The purpose of this study is to investigate how academic integrity is preserved in higher education and how humanized teaching is maintained in the face of a flexible learning environment. These two characteristics are significant in academic engagements because they help stakeholders understand how stakeholders will deal with educational difficulties such as honesty in schools and persuading students to continue their education through liberal and accommodating teaching styles. School administrators are under pressure to change their methods in order to interact with modern students (Joan, 2013) and adapt to the current education system, which is transitioning to online and modular access and affects over 28 million students across the country.

Over the last two decades, academic dishonesty has become a concerning issue on college campuses. While the school administration appears to be unaware of the issue, the primary problems demonstrate how education is now delivered in a flexible learning environment. When it comes to academic integrity difficulties in online learning, Razek (2014) argues that cheating is more likely to occur in online classrooms than in face-to-face classes, with 57.2 percent feeling that cheating is easier over the internet.

It is vital for institutions to emphasize and enforce academic integrity throughout higher education, while college administrators must raise their students' ethical duty to reduce the incidence of academic dishonesty among students (Morris, 2018). According to Razek (2014), academic articulation, fostering students as they acquire academic excellence, professional development assurance in applying policies for academic integrity, enhancing the curriculum, and aligning the curriculum are examples of such approaches.

However, in the context of humanized teaching, one must be 'people-centered' in values orientation, primarily in the principles of people development, psychology, and behavioral conditions, to further build loyalty, unity, integrity, and passion for education and learning (Morri, 2018; Wang, 2016). As a consequence, the research to analyze the level of academic integrity among college students is supported, because it covers the concept in humanized teaching for guideline extraction and policy-making that is concentrated on the "humane" component while still adhering to a methodical point of view (Wang, 2011; Roorda, 2011).

Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University (ZPPSU) has made its curriculum apparent as one of the largest state colleges in Western Mindanao

(Philippines). The university develops techniques to control flexible learning across virtual media while encouraging student academic honesty.

Flexible learning enhances learning by combining engaging current materials, assessment procedures, and learner communities into the learning process (Cassidy, 2016). This promotes humanized teaching, in which students learn with compassion, as well as academic honesty, in which students understand the value of academic institutions. This conduct should be viewed as completely unethical by the governing institution because it prevents the normalization of cheating in college (Morris, 2018). This can be accomplished through the use of internet-based tools such as Virtual Learning Environments or Learning Management Systems, discussion boards, or chat rooms; or through a "blended" approach, with content available electronically and ready in addition to "face-to-face" classroom tutorials and lectures (Joan, 2013).

This study offers a strategic mechanism for implementing academic integrity checkers or mechanisms while not focusing on the vulnerable profiles of the learners who should potentially be recipients of humanized teaching.

Objectives

This study focuses on assessing the practices of academic integrity mechanisms and the experiences of humanized teaching among teachers and students of Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. Furthermore, the study compares the findings through the lens of the demographic traits of the respondents.

Conceptual Framework

As presented in the Figure 1, this study aimed to assess the academic integrity of students based on institutional context, integrity checker, organizational context, and Darwinism. The study also determined the categories under humanized teaching that include teaching presence, cognitive presence, social presence, and humanized teaching for integrity. These + variables were presumed to be mediated by the variables under the demographics of the participants.

Literature Review

In different counties in Asia, there were different studies conducted regarding the incidence of academic dishonesty, plagiarism and intervention strategies. For instance, the incidence of academic dishonesty became




Figure 1. Conceptual Framework

common among universities in Muslim countries like Indonesia and India (Akbar, 2020). One main cause for this is the pressure that the students experienced in developing academic writeups. In the Philippines, it has been described that students view academic dishonesty as “normal” in schools and is product of the teacher’s incompetence or student’s inability to learn (Roman, 2018). In fact, Roman (2018), stressed that plagiarism in state colleges and universities became controversial especially in the context of academic writing and research.

An academic integrity mechanism is supposed to protect the quality of output of learners and improve the goals of standards of the educational institution. Additionally, institution-based context was significant to the development of policies that lessen the incidence off academic dishonesty among universities (Akbar, 2020). This becomes relevantly if this is aligned with the concept of humanized teaching. Humanized teaching accommodates learners to practice better and more credible academic engagements based on their profile as learners.

Academic Integrity and the Cheating Culture. Individual students are part of a wider university culture that either undermines or protects credibility. According to some, the prevalence of a “cheating culture” is a major factor to academic dishonesty (Tolman, 2017). Students may be tolerant of cheating, feel that cheating is required for success, and believe that all students are cheating if a university has an established culture of cheating, or at least the perception of a culture of cheating (Crittenden et al., 2009). Students form cheating culture directly, and hence subgroups of students in a

university community may have their own cheating cultures (Tolman, 2017). It is therefore possible for online students to have a different cheating culture than the rest of the student population. However, if this subgroup of students is recognized as being at risk for academic dishonesty, the institution has a chance to address academic integrity in that student group in a proactive manner (Tolman, 2017).

McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2003) investigated codes of conduct in early academic integrity research, defining them as “a community’s endeavor to express its expectations and standards of ethical actions.” He went on to say that college was a “time of significant change and moral development for many college students.” This gives educators a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to positively impact moral formation, which may subsequently influence ethical actions throughout a person's lifetime. McCabe's (2003) findings show that self-reported ethical professional activities are related to collegiate honor code experiences, lending credence to this notion. Later research validated the importance of codes of conduct while also providing insight into implementation concerns (McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino, 2003, 2012).

Integrity in the Digital Age. Holden (2021) proposed that while investigating academic integrity in the online environment, more study should be conducted on the cheating culture as well as the form of and motivation for cheating on various sorts of assessments. Furthermore, as demonstrated, previous research has yielded mixed results in terms of whether academic dishonesty is prevalent in the online environment and has called for additional research that examines assessment type, the field of study, and student demographics such as age and reason for enrolling in the course.

Assessments' credibility. Despite the fact that Lanier (2006) discovered increased reporting of cheating in online courses, the study did not differentiate between assessments and instead focused on cheating across all assignments in classes. However, Watson and Sottile (2010), noted that students were significantly more likely to cheat by obtaining answers from others during an online quiz or test than during an in-person quiz or test, implying that students in an online course tended to cheat more in an online exam, whereas students in an in-person course tended to cheat through other assignments. When comparing dishonesty in online versus on-campus courses, the differences in evaluations

that allow for plagiarism such as essays that may be finished “open book” over a prolonged period, maybe negligible (Watson & Sottile, 2010).

Gender, Indigent Students, Type of Course, and Integrity. While both men and females are reluctant to report cases of academic dishonesty that they see, the findings revealed that there are substantial gender variations in student motives to act honestly and refrain from cheating (Hendershott, 1999). Moral character is defined as the attributes related to aiming for ethical behavior in academic surroundings and activities, as well as one’s interactions with other persons and communities, among destitute students from high poverty medium urban schools (Seider, 2013). The issues of academic integrity have grown increasingly pressing as the education world has widely adopted an e-learning method in the form of MOOCs or SPOCs on courses that involve a large number of machines (Dyumin, 2018).

Humanized Teaching. Humanizing pedagogy is required for the development of academic and social resilience in learners (Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Freire, 1970). In addition to adopting the CCSS for reading and math, Iowa Core (2010) developed a list of skills known as universal constructs. A group of educators and business executives combed through several kinds of literature to develop these ideas about what it means to be a 21st-century learner. Universal constructs include critical thinking, complex communication, creativity, teamwork, flexibility, adaptation, productivity, and responsibility (Iowa Core, 2010). Districts and instructors are given local autonomy over the integration of these structures via materials and/or teaching methodologies. There is no advice that a program or curriculum be followed in order to meet these criteria. This makes a huge contribution to humanizing a decontextualized and mechanical educational system.

Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching. Supervisor traits can have an impact on students and aid them in developing their professional identities. A role model is characterized in this context as a professional whose good attributes are likely to be copied by students since they displayed abilities and personal characteristics that impressed and inspired them even intense and stressful situations. Positive role models display professional knowledge, strong communication and relationships with patients towards students, good teaching abilities, and most significantly, personal attributes such as honesty, compassion, and excitement. This adaptive instructional modeling leads to academic

honesty since student’s value output based on the modeled outcome. Teachers and preceptors that students believe to be good role models because of their humanized teaching features are, unexpectedly, oblivious of their effect, but have similar opinions about the favorable attributes of a role model as students. Given the significance of role models in student personal and professional development, schools must take efforts to ensure that good role models predominate among their staff (Silva, 2019).

Flexible Learning, Humanizing Learning, and Academic Honesty. According to Shurville et al., (2008). Flexible Learning is a set of educational ideas and approaches concerned with giving learners more choice, ease, and customization to match the learner. Because the digital world, where flexible learning flourishes, can accommodate a wide range of students, there is potentially good scope to humanize learning in a flexible learning arrangement. Learning methods are typically developed utilizing a range of teaching and learning theories, philosophies, and techniques to provide students with access to knowledge and expertise, as well as to contribute thoughts and opinions and engage with other students and mentors. Because of the fluid and ever-changing character of flexible learning, academic honesty can be difficult to maintain. The manner in which instructors discuss plagiarism and academic integrity in the digital era provides new difficulties to the profession that have never been experienced before (Elizabeth, 2016). While some teachers welcome the proliferation of portable technologies and easy wireless internet access and seek ways to integrate digital literacy and writing into their classrooms, many teachers are concerned about the possibility of more academic dishonesty in students’ work due to the ease with which it can be done.

Method

1. Population and Samples

This study specifically chose convenience sampling technique because the researcher selected subjects based on the expectation that each participant will provide credible information and value to the study based on the readily accessible respondents. The study extracted responses from voluntary participants constituted by the college teachers and students from Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University who were teaching and enrolled for the academic year 2020-2021. The sample consisted of 150 students and 100 teachers from the university

2. Research Instruments

The study is quantitative research that follows the descriptive survey. Two Likert Scale questionnaires were developed with 4-levels of agreement namely strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The first instrument is Academic Integrity Survey with four categories (Institutional Context, Integrity Checkers, Organizational Context, and Darwinism) and 20 statements. The second instrument is the Humanized Teaching Survey with four categories (Teaching Presence, Cognitive Presence, Social Presence, and Humanized Teaching for Integrity) and 20 statements. Before conducting the survey with population participants, the researchers conducted a pilot test obtaining a score of 0.965 on Cronbach's Alpha.

3. Collection of Data

The researcher secured permission and clearance from the academic head before conducting the survey. All participants were given a copy of the approved letter that stated the research purpose, ethical standards, and voluntary statements to be signed. Upon the agreement between the authorities and researcher, online survey forms were used to facilitate the administration and collection of information. The entire study lasted from December 2020 to June 2021. Questionnaires were administered to the respondents and retrieved two weeks later in March 2021. The retrieval rate was 100%. The entire survey took place online, and no face-to-face interaction was conducted to follow the guidelines of the Department of Health.

4. Data Analysis

The data that was collected was analyzed using frequency distribution, and weighted mean for all descriptive results. Independent t-Test was used for the significant differences of the responses according on the respondents' profile as groups.

Results

Question 1: What is the profile of the respondents?

Table 1 Demographics of the Respondents

Demographics		Frequency (n)	Percent
Gender	Male	85	34.0%
	Female	165	60.0%
Course Type	Social Sciences	138	55.2%
	Science and Technology	112	44.8%
Indigent Status	Indigent	148	59.2%
	Non-indigent	102	40.8%
Computer Literacy	Beginner	112	44.8%
	Average-Advanced	138	55.2%

Table 1 shows that 250 individuals responded to the survey. These responses were divided into several groups based on their gender, course type, computer knowledge levels, learning platforms and their indigent status.

Gender consisted of 85 males (34%) and 165 females (66%). Science and Technology course type had 112 (44.8%) respondents and Social Sciences had 138 respondents (55.2%). At least 112 (44.8%) responded as beginners in computer literacy while 138 (55.2%) answered as being average or advanced in computer skill level. The learning platforms of the respondents consisted of 128 (51.2%) full online learning, 98 (39.2%) as blended learning and 24 (9.6%) respondents were self-directed module. Indigent was 148 (59.2%) and not indigent respondents were 102 (40.8%).

Question 2: What are the levels of Academic Integrity?

Table 2 Levels of Academic Integrity

Category	St. Dev.	Overall Mean	Remark
Institutional Context	0.277	3.00	High
Integrity Checker	0.067	3.06	High
Organizational Context	0.226	3.17	High
Darwinism	0.196	2.57	Moderate

Range: 1.0-1.60 very low, 1.61-2.20 low, 2.21-2.80 moderate, 2.81-3.40 high, 3.40-4.00 very h

Table 3 presents the results for levels of humanized teaching. Social Presence and Cognitive Presence yielded a very high humanized teaching with the mean of 3.46 and 3.45, respectively. Teaching Presence yielded a high overall mean of 3.25. Humanized teaching for integrity yielded a high mean of 3.24.

Question 4: Is there a significant difference on the levels of Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching when grouped based on the profile of the respondents?

Table 4 Demographic Profile Responses (significant at 0.05)

Demographics	Category	F-stat	t	Sig.	Remark
Gender	Social Presence	3.25	1.38	0.014	Significant
Computer Literacy	Cognitive Presence	4.45	-2.13	0.036	Significant
	Humanized Integrity	4.49	-1.94	0.035	Significant
Indigent Status	Cognitive Presence	0.68	-0.480	0.005	Significant
	Social Presence	0.64	-0.314	0.019	Significant
Course Type	Cognitive Presence	4.600	0.462	0.033	Significant

Only gender was significant in social presence with the 0.014 level of significance. Computer literacy was significant to both Cognitive Presence (0.036) and

Humanized Integrity (0.035). There was also significant difference in Social Presence (0.005) and Cognitive Presence (0.019) based on the Indigent Status of the respondents. Course type was also significant for Cognitive Presence yielding a 0.033 level of significance.

Discussion

What are the levels of Academic Integrity?

Results suggest that the institution has the role to introduce new strategies in order to implement policies on academic integrity. There is an important aspect to academic integrity that needs to be added to increase the honesty of the students. For organizational context, the institution must control the “organization” or the classroom setting to engage their students to remain honest with their homework. This, therefore, supports the study to assess the condition of academic integrity among college students while covering the principle in humanized teaching for guideline extraction and policy-making that are centralizing to the ‘humane’ dimension but still following a systematic point (Wang, 2011; Roorda, 2011).

Conceptual definitions for integrity suggest this as a behavior according to shared values, moral difference, and a determinant for individual social interaction (Crittenden, 2009). This explains for moderate Darwinism because of the differences that students have in moral and ethical contexts.

It is described that the institution has the utmost responsibility to manage academic dishonesty. It is integral for the institution to emphasize and ‘re-assert’ academic integrity (Morris, 2018) while the college executives must boost the ethical responsibility of their learners to reduce the frequency of academic dishonesty among them (Razek, 2014). It is shown that the policies are believed to have a direct impact on the ability of students to remain honest and credible in their works. The setting of learning could help in having effective management of academic dishonesty.

Additionally, adding an integrity checker could help students see the value of being honest. It has been proposed that the institution could reform integrity checkers which introduce a new edge to performances and skills that students have. This is a firm guide for educators as this provides the teachers with a unique opportunity to favorably affect moral development, which can then influence ethical behaviors throughout a person’s life. McCabe, (2003) affirmed this by saying that self-reported ethical actions in the workplace are

associated to collegiate honor code experiences providing credibility to this theory. This is how the academic tenure of the parents resonates even beyond the four corners of the classroom. The value of codes of conduct was reaffirmed in a subsequent study, which also provided insight into implementation considerations (McCabe, Butterfield, and Trevino, 2003, 2012).

Similarly, Institutional Context was found to have relevance to the policymaking strategies and guidance. Academic articulation is nurturing students as they develop academic excellence; professional development assurance in applying policy for academic integrity, strengthening the curriculum, and aligning the approach to the institutional policies for academic dishonesty (Morris, 2018). The role of the administration is centralized to academic honesty which signifies their strength to remodel their curriculum. Because it also shows that dishonesty was the result of an incapable curriculum, the institution needs to reconsider approaches geared to academic honesty.

What are the levels of Humanized Teaching?

Clearly, social, cognitive, and teaching presences are highly prevalent in educational systems. Social Presence has its purpose in distance learning. Social factors (e. g., delivery, connection) could affect the overall performances of the students as well as their relationship with their teachers. For students to be encouraged, the degree of personal connection, competence, autonomy, or independence need to be well thought out (Roorda, 2011). It has been reflected that the teachers must be goal-oriented and congenial to influence their students to participate and collaborate. Social factors deliver responses to students which trigger their sense of participation in activities and classwork. Teachers can hereby relieve these demands by demonstrating involvement (i.e., caring for and communicating to the student), providing rules and regulations, securing freedom of choice, and encouraging social involvement. With that, if student’s basic needs are fulfilled, their engagement in learning activities and performances will certainly increase (Roorda, 2011).

This means learning process based on the preference and flexibility of the activities and instructions could facilitate engagement to academic honesty. Students are given their type of learning, quality of lessons, and teaching styles which could be used for them to be credible enough in their works. Students would be honest to their performance as their teachers have humanistic qualities.

In a related concept, higher education purposively integrates its curriculum through effective course delivery and content, logistics and directions, time bounds, location and proximity, pedagogical activities, performance assessment, and learning outcomes (Joan, 2013).

Connectivity shows effective learning through giving clear instructions and guidance. Engagement to critical thinking is shown to be an effective quality for productive learning. This teaching style is most likely be from the teachers, but the delivery of these styles depends on the execution. There is also a need for renewed styles to be used to have the humanized aspect of learning in the new normal.

Leading to cognitive presence indicated that the ability to convince the students to think critically is crucial to distance learning. The critical thinking and learning patterns coincide with their productivity. This somehow influences their learning and goal orientation because of how visible the managing approaches are. This is corroborated by Fránquiz & Salazar (2004) and Freire (1970) as their findings revealed that the development of academic and social resiliency in learners requires a humanizing pedagogy. This pertains to the dynamics of the learners 'vulnerabilities and abilities in situations that must accommodate humanized concepts given that they may belong to disenfranchising and difficult set-ups.

Is there a significant difference on the levels of Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching when grouped based on the profile of the respondents? Cognitive presence is the most remarkable component of humanized teaching. It is different from computer literacy, indigent status, and course types. This category shows that the most effective way to have humanized teaching is to establish the use of cognitive presence. It is highly observable that this approach enables the students to think critically and interact with their skills. It shows that technical understanding to the topic develops their minds in solving problems and applying what they learn.

These differences mean that when it comes to gender and status, it is remarkable that the social presence aspect is relevant for humanized teaching. It shows that the communication- wise component of a well-established education is most likely fundamental. Furthermore, this enables the students to learn and study their activities based on how their teachers deliver their lessons.

Similarly, cognitive presence is crucial for course types of students because this allows their critical thinking skills challenged towards learning possibilities. Data suggested that humanized integrity is a crucial matter for computer literacy because of how the students can collate information across vast virtual media which is the main cause of dishonesty among them.

This is similar with social presence, the delivery of further knowledge to the students will be effective. Gender and indigent status differ in social presence. One shall be 'people- centered' in values orientation primarily in the principle of people development, psychology, and behavioral conditions to further build loyalty, unity, integrity, and passion for education and learning (Wang, 2016). The social approach is a fundamental aspect for flexible learning to be effective; this approach will further engage the students in communicating among their classmates when motivated..

Interestingly, there is corroboration to the findings on gender for academic integrity as according to Hendershott (1999), while both men and women are hesitant to report incidences of academic dishonesty that they see, the data demonstrated that there are significant gender differences in student motivations to act honestly and refrain from cheating.

In terms of digital literacy level, there is a distinct variation in responses. According to Holden (2021), more research on the cheating culture, as well as the form of, and motivation for, cheating on various types of assessments, can be conducted; however, the findings may have yielded mixed results in terms of whether academic dishonesty is prevalent in the online environment, and has called for additional research that examines assessment type, the field of study, and student demographics such as age and why they enroll in the course. This can transition further as it is relevant for computer literacy to be humanized especially for academic integrity as it showed that computer skills could influence the academic honesty of a student.

The findings on destitute students are consistent with those of Seider (2013), who defined moral character as the attributes related to aiming for ethical behavior in academic surroundings and activities, as well as one's interactions with other people and communities, among destitute students from high poverty medium urban schools. When it comes to the type of course, there is a wide range of responses. According to Dyumin (2018), academic integrity concerns have become increasingly important since the education industry has

largely adopted an e-learning technique in the form of MOOCs or SPOCs on courses that include a significant number of computers. Similarly, it has been determined that even prior to online teaching, students choose to cheat to attain higher scores in exams or in academic writing (Roman, 2018) but the implementation on online learning provided gateway to more advanced cheating attitudes.

These considerations, therefore, supports the study to assess the condition of academic integrity among college students while covering the principle of humanized teaching for guideline extraction and policy-making that are centralizing to the 'humane' dimension but still following a systematic point (Wang, 2011; Roorda, 2011). Categories under academic integrity were found to be less likely relevant for the honesty of the students.

As a whole, there is a leeway to accommodate the learners' diverse abilities from complex to basic traits in learning or using their capabilities. Iowa Core (2016) believes that critical thinking, complex communication, creativity, and teamwork are all great attributes of a 21st-century learner. At the same time, these high-level learning traits should not be limited but rather expand accommodating students with their skills such as flexibility, adaptability, productivity, and accountability as universal constructs. There is no suggestion that a program or curriculum should be followed to satisfy these requirements in the strict sense. Given that there are adaptive mechanisms needed during a health crisis, it is important to associate teaching and learning engagements by humanizing academic activities because it should welcome diverse students.

Conclusion

Teaching and learning should be humane because the crisis slips into health and learning challenges. In the same manner, humanized teaching can afford to co-exist with academic integrity because it leads the learners to advocate credible learning as they have a well-assisted process of instruction. As these practices progress, they enable the students and instructors to collaborate in achieving the outcome of learnings with humane considerations and with integrity.

Recommendations

1. *Academic Integrity resources and guidebook*: Both the learners and the teachers must be aware through training or orientation and enjoined to implement and

conduct the academic integrity rules and regulations of the institution because these are the mantra for integrity and credibility as they are mandated to produce human resources and innovations that speak of honesty and respect for others property.

2. *Humanized Teaching strategy and conduct manual*: There is no more urgent time to use these manuals to serve the vulnerable profiles of our learners during a health crisis where almost all aspects of their daily activities are affected. This manual will be a reference or dictionary of what approach should be conducted for learners in a particular situation.

Reference

- Akbar, A., & Picard, M. (2020). Academic integrity in the Muslim world: A conceptual map of challenges of culture. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), 1-20.
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Digital learning compass: Distance education enrollment report 2017*. Babson Park, MA: Babson Survey Research Group, e-Literate, and WCET.
- Cassidy, A., Fu, G., Valley, W., Lomas, C., Jovel, E., & Riseman, A. (2016). Flexible learning strategies in first through fourth-year courses. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, 9, 83-94.
- Crittenden, V. L., Hanna, R. C., & Peterson, R. A. (2009). The cheating culture: A global societal phenomenon. *Business Horizons* 52, 337-346. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.02.004
- Demir-Yildiz, C., & Tatik, R. S. (2019). Impact of flexible and non-flexible classroom environments on learning of undergraduate students. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 8(4), 1159-1173.
- Dyumin, A. (2018). The academic integrity violations detection system for data science course on the MOOC-platform. In *2018 19th IEEE Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON)* (pp. 52-57). IEEE, Morocco: Marrakech.
- Elizabeth, E. (2016). An ethical dilemma: Talking about plagiarism and academic integrity in the digital age. *The English Journal*, 47-53.
- Fránquiz, M., & Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *High School Journal*, 87(4), 36-53.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

- Hendershott, A. (1999). Gender and academic integrity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(4), 345–354.
- Holden, O. (2021). Academic integrity in online assessment: *A research review. Frontiers in Education*. 6, 258-270.
- Iowa Core. (2010). 21st century skills. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <https://iowacore.gov/iowa-core/subject/21st-century-skills>
- Joan, D. R. (2013). Flexible learning as new learning design in classroom process to Promote quality education. *Journal on School Educational Technology*, 9(1), 37-42.
- Lanier, M. M. (2006). Academic integrity and distance learning. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 17(2), 244-261. doi:10.1080/10511250600866166
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Trevino, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and What Educators can do about it*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2003). Faculty and academic integrity: The influence of current honor codes and past honor code experiences. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(3), 367–385.
- Morris, E. (2018). Academic integrity matters: Five considerations for addressing contract cheating. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 14(1), 15.
- Razek, N. (2014). Academic integrity: A Saudi student perspective. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 18(1), 143.
- Roman, A. G. (2018). Minimizing plagiarism incidence in research writing in one state university in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(1), 27-33.
- Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students’ school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of educational research*, 81(4), 493-529.
- Shurville, S., O’Grady, T., & Mayall, P. (2008). Educational and institutional flexibility of Australian educational software. *Campus-wide information systems*, 25(2), 74–84.
- Tolman, S. (2017). Academic dishonesty in online courses: Considerations for graduate preparatory programs in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 51(4), 579-584.
- Watson, G. R., & Sottile, J. (2010). Cheating in the digital age: Do students cheat more in online courses?.
- Yang, T., Wang, Y., Deng, J., & Huang, C. (2021). Attitude, social norms, and perceived behavioral control influence the academic integrity-related behavioral intentions of graduate students. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 49(4), 1-12.