Academic Integrity of Senior High School Students at St. Paul University Surigao

Marc Juveil R. Lasala[1], Erika Rose B. Gorillo[2], Nikko T. Ederio[3]

[1][2] BEEd Student, College of Education, Culture and Arts, St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City

[3] Faculty, College of Education, Culture and Arts, Director, Quality Assurance and Management, St. Paul University Surigao, Surigao City

ABSTRACT: This study examined the academic integrity of the Senior High School Students at St. Paul University Surigao in the new normal. The main instruments used to solicit information were researcher-made questionnaires for the 26 Senior High School teachers and 413 students of St. Paul University Surigao during the school year 2020-2021. Simple random sampling was employed to determine the participants. Data gathered were analyzed using means, standard deviation, t-test, and ANoVa. The teachers perceived that the students under study have high level of academic integrity in the new normal. The students on the other hand perceived that they have very high level of integrity. It was then revealed that there's a significant difference between the students and teachers' perceptions on the students' level of Academic Integrity except for trust behavior. Also, there is a significant degree of variance in the students' perceptions of their demonstrated respect and responsibility behaviors when considering sex. Despite these differences, it was still concluded that the Senior High School students have demonstrated good academic practices and high level of integrity as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. Also, the Paulinian Remote Flexible Learning Scheme of the University is effective in promoting core values in the new normal allowing the learners to still embody and demonstrate the six fundamental values of academic integrity. It is generally recommended that school administrators determine efficient measures to instill to both students and teachers how essential is academic integrity even challenged by the changing times.

KEYWORDS: Academic Integrity, Academic Misconduct, Academic Dishonesty, Core Values, Senior High School.

INTRODUCTION

The CoViD-19 pandemic, which began in 2019 and continues to this day, has produced extensive changes in higher education, with many schools embracing online learning modalities. Faculty and administrators are faced with the difficulty of establishing techniques to appropriately assess student learning in an online environment while ensuring academic integrity, as the expansion of totally online courses is projected to continue.

However, when CoViD-19 peaked in March–April 2020, continuing education for students was one of the top goals for a substantial number of countries. With almost 1.6 billion children out of school going to government lock downs, many countries hurried to relocate curriculum and evaluations online to assist students complete their education (UNESCO, 2020). In the Philippines, most universities including St Paul University Surigao have resorted to distance flexible learning. St Paul University Surigao implemented the ReFLEx or the Remote Flexible Learning Experience in order to facilitate the online learning and with the goal of maintaining academic excellence in these challenging times. Moreover, since the CoViD-19 outbreak, one of the problems of educations in new normal is that the variety of technological possibilities facilitates non-ethical behavior, such as sharing information on the Internet, consulting with friends and copying contents easily (Peytcheva-Forsyth and Sarwar, 2018).

However, Miller & Young- Jones (2012) stated in their research article entitled Academic integrity: online classes compared to face-to-face classes, that a third of academic leaders believe online classes are inferior to regular classes, and that faculty members have reservations about them. Lack of course comparability, more opportunities to cheat in online classes, and a greater attraction to students who want to cheat (Bailey & Bailey, 2011). According to Youngberg's (2012) commentary in the Chronicle of Higher Education, "it's too easy to cheat." The majority of faculty (64 percent) and students (57 percent) believe it is easier to cheat in online classes Kennedy (2000) Institutions that do not have academic integrity policies in place, as well as those that do not prioritize character development, face ethical issues. Ludeman (2005) stated that due to an increase in various forms of

student cheating, effective methods that create awareness of the campus environment are required at all educational institutions. Instead, institutions offer a limited number of, often inadequate, treatments and sanctions for dishonesty.

Nevertheless, In the case of private catholic institutions they have establish the correct values to students as they pursue their schooling at St. Paul University, in the case of St. Paul University school five core values are being impose to the Paulinian students such as: of Christ Centeredness, Commission, Community, Charism and Charity, These core values are universally instituted among all senior high school and universities of St. Paul Systems in the Philippines. These five core values drive students at this institution to have a personal ethics or principles that govern decision making, relationship building and problem solving (Ederio et al., 2021). The vision of St. Paul University Surigao is to become a community of learners and believers impelled by the Charism of Sisters of St Paul of Chartres, form-Christ centered, competent and responsible persons in the service of the church and society. On the other hand the mission of St. Paul University Surigao are striving Paulinians to become the preferred educational community marked by the commitments to zealously proclaim Jesus Christ as the good news to all, consistently provide integral catholic formation academic excellence research and community service, pro-actively respond to the challenging time in a spirit of collaboration and resource sharing , resolutely build a gospel –filled community and lastly would be responsibly manage resources in a spirit of Christian stewardship and good governance .

The researchers examined the academic integrity of the Senior High School Paulinians at St Paul University Surigao during the school year 2021-2022, whether they have demonstrated the good academic values, behaviors, and practices in the new normal education at St. Paul University Surigao. This study would also give an implication whether the Paulinian Remote Flexible learning scheme of St. Paul University Surigao is effective or not in promoting Paulinian core values in the new normal hence, embodied or demonstrated academic integrity.

This study is anchored on the definition of the Academic Integrity as underscored by the International Center for Academic Integrity, a US-based consortium of colleges, universities, and other institutions devoted to the cultivation integrity in educational spaces and endeavors since 1992. According to ICAI (2021), Academic integrity is the expectation that teachers, students, researchers, and all members of the academic community act with honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, respect, and courage.

The International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) emphasized its definition and behavioral descriptions of the depicted fundamental values comprising academic integrity. First is that Honesty is a fundamental value that forms the indispensable foundation of integrity and is prerequisite for full realization of trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. Honesty begins with individuals and extends out into the larger community. As students and faculty seek knowledge, they must be honest with themselves and with each other. In study halls and laboratories, in libraries, playing fields, and classrooms, cultivating and practicing honesty lays a foundation for lifelong integrity.

Trust on the other hand is reciprocal: being worthy of others' trust and allowing oneself to trust others go hand-in-hand. Students promote trust by preparing work that is honest, thoughtful, and genuine. Faculty promote trust by setting clear guidelines for assignments and for evaluating student work in an equitable, timely, and forthright manner. Trust is developed by schools that set clear and consistent academic standards, that apply their standards unfailingly and fairly, and that support honest and impartial research.

Students engage in fairness by doing their own original work, acknowledging borrowed work appropriately, respecting and upholding academic integrity policies, and by maintaining the good reputation of the institution. Administrators and staff are fair to their communities when they provide clear, useful, and just policies that help establish and nurture communities of integrity, and that treat students, faculty, staff, alumni, and institutions with respect.

Students show respect when they value and take advantage of opportunities to gain new knowledge by taking an active role in their own education, contributing to discussions, actively listening to other points of view, and performing to the best of their ability. Faculty show respect by taking students' ideas seriously, by recognizing them as individuals, helping them develop their ideas, providing full and honest feedback on their work, and valuing their perspectives and their goals.

Being responsible means standing up against wrongdoing, resisting negative peer pressure, and serving as a positive example. Responsible individuals hold themselves accountable for their own actions and work to discourage and prevent misconduct by others. Responsible faculty not only create and enforce classroom and institutional policy, but they also clearly communicate expectations around these policies. They keep their word and adhere to their own and their institution's policies. Likewise,

responsible students seek to obtain and understand information about classroom and institutional policy. They follow these policies and ask questions when they do not understand or disagree with them.

Courage often is interpreted as a lack of fear. In reality, courage is the capacity to act in accordance with one's values despite fear. Being courageous means acting in accordance with one's convictions. Like intellectual capacity, courage can only develop in environments where it is tested. Academic communities of integrity, therefore, necessarily include opportunities to make choices, learn from them, and grow. Through this interactive process, courage and the five additional values of academic integrity can develop as interwoven and mutually dependent characteristics. Students who exhibit courage hold themselves and their fellow learners to the highest standards of academic integrity even when doing so involves risk of negative consequences, such as a bad grade, or reprisal from their peers or others.

METHODS

In this study, the researcher used a quantitative research design employing a descriptive research survey approach. This design allowed the researcher to gather more precise and quantifiable information needed to quantify response that may lead to expected research outcomes with the identified appropriate indicators. Surendran (2019) believes that Quantitative research design is a systematic investigation of phenomena through gathering quantifiable data and performing statistical and computational techniques.

The said design was also employed to determine the extent of academic integrity values exhibited by the students as perceived by both the teachers and students and then determine the significant difference of the academic integrity exhibited by the participants when they are grouped According to the students' profile. Moreover, the design also helped the researchers determine the significant difference between the participant's perceptions on the academic integrity which then led the researchers to propose appropriate recommendations.

The participants of this study were the Senior High School teachers and students at St. Paul University Surigao during the academic year 2021-2022. Simple random sampling was used in determining the participants of the study which composed of senior high school students and teachers. The total number of the Senior High School students enrolled was 810. The 466 of which are from Grade 11 level and 345 are from Grade 12 level. There were also a total of 26 Senior High School Teachers who participated in the study. In a simple random sampling technique employed on the 810 student population, 413 were all randomly selected coming from all the different tracks, strands, and grade level.

The primary tool for gathering data is the researcher-made questionnaires. A unified set of questionnaires for teachers and the students were utilized in that order. Moreover, the teachers and senior high school students' questionnaires contain questions or indicators that inquired mostly about their perceptions of senior high school students' academic integrity. Furthermore, the researcher-made questionnaires underwent a validity check with experts and reliability testing by Cronbach's alpha in St. Paul University at Surigao City, before the actual data gathering. Cronbach's alpha determines the internal consistency or average correlation of items in a survey instrument to gauge the questionnaire's reliability to be crafted.

Table 1. Researcher-made Questionnaire Internal Consistency and validity of the researcher-made questionnaire

Components	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Honesty	10	0.975	Excellent
Trust	10	0.975	Excellent
Respect	10	0.975	Excellent
Responsibility	10	0.975	Excellent
Fairness	10	0.975	Excellent
Courage	10	0.975	Excellent

Reliability Test Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	*Interpretation*
$0.9 \leq \alpha$	*Excellent*
$0.8 \leq \alpha \leq 0.9$	*Good*
$0.7 \leq \alpha \leq 0.8$	*Acceptable*

Corresponding Author: Nikko T. Ederio

$0.6 \leq \alpha \leq 0.7$	*Questionable*
$0.5 \leq \alpha \leq 0.6$	*Poor*
$\alpha < 0.5$	*Unacceptable*

As to the honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage components of the researcher-made questionnaire with 10 indicators or items, the Cronbach's alpha is 0.975, which is interpreted as excellent, hence, all valid and reliable for data gathering.

The researchers employed survey questionnaires, which were personally distributed to the study's participants. Prior to the gathering of data, a letter was addressed to the University's Basic Education Principal, requesting permission to conduct the study with teachers and students in the Senior High School. The researchers then gave the researcher-made questionnaires to the actual participants after receiving approval. Lastly, the data gathered were tallied, treated and analyzed, and interpreted.

In fulfilling the desire to have the most reliable and appropriate results and findings on examining the Academic Integrity of the Senior High School students at St. Paul University Surigao, the researchers used the following statistical tools to analyze the data:

Frequency count and percentage. This statistical tool was used to describe the profile of the participants quantitatively.

Means and Standard Deviation. This statistical tool was used to measure the level of academic integrity of the Senior High School students at St. Paul University Surigao.

The following is a 4-point frequency and extensiveness Likert scale used as the basis for interpreting data yielded from the participants' responses:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Very True of me Very True of them	Very High Integrity (Very Honest) (Very Trustworthy) (Very Respectful) (Very Responsible) (Very Fair) (Very Courageous)
3	2.50-3.24	True of me True of them	High Integrity (Honest) (Trustworthy) (Respectful) (Responsible) (Fair) (Courageous)
2	1.75-2.49	Untrue of me Untrue of them	Low Integrity (Dishonest) (Untrustworthy) (Disrespectful) (Irresponsible) (Unfair) (Uncourageous)
1	1.00-1.74	Very Untrue of me Very Untrue of them	Very Low Integrity (Very Dishonest) (Very Untrustworthy) (Very Disrespectful) (Very Irresponsible) (Very Unfair) (Very Uncourageous)

Upon statistical treatment, the interpreted data was discussed to infer and elicit proper conclusions and supporting ideas that suited to answer problems number 3 and 4, specifically on the level of academic integrity behaviors exhibited by the students a perceived by themselves and their teachers. Participants responded to each indicator in the questionnaires based on their best and honest evaluation, signifying their perceptions on the academic integrity of students under study. Average responses within 1.00 – 1.74 were described as *Very Untrue of me* frequent and meant *Very Low integrity;* 1.75 – 2.49 as *Untrue of me* frequent and meant *with Low Integrity;* 2.50 – 3.24 as *True of me* frequent and meant *with High integrity;* and 3.25- 4.00 as *Very true of me* frequent and meant *to Very High Integrity.*

t-test. This tool was used to determine the significant degree between the teachers and the students' perception of the level of academic integrity among the senior high school students themselves level of academic integrity. The difference between the participants' perceptions is considered significant if $p<0.05$. Otherwise, the null hypothesis is accepted, stating no significant difference between the participants' perceptions.

Moreover, *Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)* was also employed to determine the significant difference in the level of academic integrity with respect to the profile of the student participants.

In this study, the researchers strictly observed research ethics wherein confidentiality, privacy rights, and safety of the participants and the researcher's ethical practices were strongly observed. The researcher primarily adhered to specific provisions applicable under the DPA Act of 2012 to protect the study participants and the researcher. The questionnaires of the study integrated Data Privacy consent and waivers for the security assurance for both researcher and the participants. The researchers also respected the involved persons' feelings and opinions.

Informed-consent – the researchers ensured that individuals voluntarily participated in the research with full knowledge of relevant risks and benefits.

Maintenance of Privacy. The researchers in this study respected the feelings and personal information property rights of the informants. Hence, the confidentiality of information was ensured.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
Profile of the Participants
Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the student's participants as to age, sex, grade level, and strand/track.

Table 2. Profile of the student participants

Profile Variables	f (n=413)	%
Age		
16 years old	15	3.63
17 years old	172	41.65
18 years old	35	8.47
19 years old	171	41.40
20 years old	20	4.84
Sex		
Male	214	51.82
Female	199	48.18
Grade Level		
Grade 11	214	51.82
Grade 12	199	48.18
Strand / Track		
Technical Vocational Livelihood	34	8.23
Humanities and Social Science	95	23.00
Science, Technology Engineering, and Mathematics	176	42.62
Accountancy, Business, and Management	108	26.15

As seen from Table 2, out of the 413 students under study, 15 or 3.63% are 16 years old, 172 or 41.65% are 17 years old, 35 or 8.47% are 18 years old, 171 or 41.40% are 19 years old, and 20 or 4.84% are 20 years old. In terms of sex, 214, or 51.82%, were males and 199, or 48.18%, were females. In terms of grade level, 214 or 51.82% are in Grade 11 and 199 or 48.18% are in Grade 12.

Lastly, in terms of Strand/Track, 34 or 8.23% were Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL), 95 or 23.00% were Humanities and Social Science (HUMSS), 176 or 42.62% were Science, Technology Engineering, and Mathematics. (STEM), 108 or 26.15% were Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM) students.

Level of Academic Integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants

Table 3. Level of honesty behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
HONESTY											
1. acknowledge the source of the information used.	3.51	0.56	VTM	VH	3	1.04	TT	H	2.42	Reject	Significant
2. submit original work and complete individual assessments independently.	3.54	0.55	VTM	VH	2.92	0.86	TT	H	5.06	Reject	Significant
3. answer exams and assessments honestly based on the instructions given.	3.58	0.55	VTM	VH	3.04	0.84	TT	H	2.83	Reject	Significant
4. do not use any other unauthorized electronic devices as an aid during exam.	3.52	0.51	VTM	VH	2.84	0.8	TT	H	5.63	Reject	Significant
5. do not let other students copy or replicate my answers during exams	3.55	0.54	VTM	VH	3.08	0.76	TT	H	3.46	Reject	Significant
6. relay exact information and instructions from my teachers to my classmates or the other way around	3.53	0.55	VTM	VH	3.16	0.9	TT	H	2.3	Reject	Significant
7. am honest about my own feelings and refuse to stretch the truth for attention of sympathy	3.58	0.55	VTM	VH	3.2	0.76	TT	H	0.49	Accept	Insignificant
8. do not cheat during exams, quizzes and assessments	3.58	0.54	VTM	VH	2.8	0.76	TT	H	3.84	Reject	Significant
9. do not give false information about missing classes or exams.	3.42	0.58	VTM	VH	3.24	0.78	TT	H	-1.04	Accept	Insignificant

10. do not use other person's ideas as my own.	3.48	0.57	VTM	VH	3.24	0.78	TT	H	1.06	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	3.53	0.55	VTM	VH	3.05	0.83	TT	H	2.60	Reject	Significant

Legend:

	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	*Very true of me (VTM)* *Very True of them (VTT)*	*Very High Integrity (VHI)* */Very Honest (VH)*
3	2.50-3.24	*True of me (TM)* *True of them (TT)*	*High Integrity (HI)* */Honest (H)*
2	1.75-2.49	*Untrue of me (UTM)* *Untrue of them (UT)*	*Low Integrity (LI)* */Dishonest (DH)*
1	1.00-1.74	*Very untrue of me (VUM)* *Very untrue of them (VUT)*	*Very Low Integrity (VLI)* */Very Dishonest (VDH)*

Paired t-test significance : Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 3 shows the Academic Integrity indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *honest* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.05 and SD=0.83.* On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *very honest* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.53 and SD=0.55.* The Department of Education (2021) stressed that academic honesty is a "foundational element of learning and fundamental principle of all academic institutions."

In terms of the specific traits under Honesty with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *do not give false information about missing classes or exams (Mean=3.24; SD=0.78; VI=True of Them; QD=Honest) and do not use other person's ideas as their own (Mean=3.24; SD=0.78; VI=True of Them; QD=Honest) as they engaged in their flexible learning classes.* However, the students' believed quite differently. For them, they are most *honest about their own feelings and refuse to stretch the truth for attention of sympathy (Mean=3.58; SD=0.55; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Honest) and they answer exams and assessments honestly based on the instructions given sympathy (Mean=3.58; SD=0.55; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Honest) as they engaged in their flexible learning classes.* These findings are supported by how the International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) described the value of honesty as an academic integrity indicator. According to ICAI (2021), honesty is a fundamental value that forms the indispensable foundation of integrity and is prerequisite for full realization of trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.

Therefore, it is implied that *not giving false information about missing classes or exams and not using another person's ideas as their own* is a behaviors of honesty because *not giving false information about missing classes or exams and not using other person's ideas as their own* is showing fairness and respect.

 But for the students they *are more honest about their feelings and refuse to stretch the truth for attention of sympathy* and *they answer exams and assessments honestly based on the instructions given sympathy*   but this does not mean that they *give false information about missing classes or exams* and *use other person's ideas as their own* despite the differences in both results for the teachers, the students are *honest* and for the students, they believed that they are *very honest,* It also shown that despite of the differences, the teachers agreed and acknowledged the honesty of the students as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

And in terms of the lowest results, the teachers least believed that their students *do not cheat during exams, quizzes and assessments in* their classes *(Mean=2.8; SD=0.76; VI=True of Them; QD=Honest).* Relative to the teachers' perception, the students also least believed that *they do not give false information about missing classes or exams. (Mean=2.8; SD=0.76 VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Honest).* This is the lowest result among other behaviors as they engaged in their flexible learning classes.

These findings are in unison with Foster's (2016) notion that students perceived that they have the ability to cheat without being caught when they see others cheat or are given answers from other students. This perception can arise, for example, when

International Journal of Current Science Research and Review

ISSN: 2581-8341

Volume 05 Issue 11 November 2022

DOI: 10.47191/ijcsrr/V5-i11-27, Impact Factor: 5.995

IJCSRR @ 2022

www.ijcsrr.org

instructors and administrators are thought to be overlooking obvious cheating or when students see others cheat or are given answers from other students. Therefore, for both teachers and students, the students under study are indeed likely to *cheat during exams, quizzes and assessments.*

Considering all these findings shown in Table 3, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on indicators *1 acknowledge the source of the information used (t=2.42), 2 submit original work and complete individual assessments independently (t=5.06), 3 answer exams and assessments honestly based on the instructions given (t=2.83), 4 do not use any other unauthorized electronic devices as an aid during exam (t=5.63), 5 do not let other students copy or replicate my answers during exams(t=3.46), 6 relay exact information and instructions from my teachers to my classmates or the other way around (t=2.3), 7 do not cheat during exams, quizzes and assessments (t=3.84) and* it also shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 7 *am honest about my own feelings and refuse to stretch the truth for attention of sympathy (t=0.627), 9 do not give false information about missing classes or exams (t=0.307)* and *10 do not use other person's ideas as my own (t=0.298)* under the level of honesty achieved by the students under study.

However, looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of honesty academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=2.60.* Again, for the teachers, the students are *honest* but for the students, they believed that they are *very honest* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

Table 4. Level of trust behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
TRUST											
1. ensure my teachers and classmates of my academic works prepared genuinely and thoughtfully.	3.47	0.59	VTM	VT	3.28	0.84	VTT	T	0.72	Accept	Insignificant
2. maintain myself as a reliable student in and out of the class.	3.54	0.54	VTM	VT	3.32	0.8	VTT	T	2.91	Reject	Significant
3. ensure worthiness of other's trust and allow myself to trust others as well.	3.56	0.58	VTM	VT	3.28	0.79	VTT	T	1.06	Accept	Insignificant
4. participate in all activities and projects in class even if with lesser supervision from the teachers	3.53	0.51	VTM	VT	3.04	0.93	TT	T	3.27	Reject	Significant
5. demonstrate habits that promote reliability and credibility among the teachers and students in the learning environments	3.55	0.55	VTM	VT	3.36	0.76	VTT	T	3.44	Reject	Significant
6. work in my task independently strongly believe in my personal capabilities	3.53	0.52	VTM	VT	3.16	0.75	TT	T	2.49	Reject	Significant
7. share my resources and knowledge openly and generously to my classmates and teachers at the service to my class	3.56	0.58	VTM	VT	3.2	0.71	TT	T	0	Accept	Insignificant
8. consistently communicate the same message or information to my classmates and teachers by not changing what we have agreed	3.58	0.54	VTM	VT	3.2	0.91	TT	T	1.74	Accept	Insignificant

9. build trust among teachers and classmates by showing respect regardless of each other's status or power.	3.41	0.59	VTM	VT	3.36	0.76	VTT	T	1.98	Accept	Insignificant
10. consistently do and act what I say that others can rely on me.	3.47	0.58	VTM	VT	3.16	0.9	TT	T	1.06	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	**3.52**	**0.56**	**VTM**	**VT**	**3.24**	**0.81**	**TT**	**T**	**1.86**	**Accept**	**Insignificant**

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Very true of me (VTM) Very True of them (VTT)	Very High Integrity (VHI) /Very Trustworthy (VT)
3	2.50-3.24	True of me (TM) True of them (TT)	High Integrity (HI) /Trustworthy (T)
2	1.75-2.49	Untrue of me (UTM) Untrue of them (UT)	Low Integrity (LI) /Untrustworthy (UT)
1	1.00-1.74	Very untrue of me (VUM) Very untrue of them (VUT)	Very Low Integrity (VLI) /Very Untrustworthy (VUT)

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 4 shows the Academic Integrity indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *trustworthy* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.24 and SD=0.81*. On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *very trustworthy* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.52 and SD=0.56.*

In terms of the specific traits under Trust with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *demonstrate habits that promote reliability and credibility among the teachers and students in the learning environments (Mean=3.36; SD=0.76; VI=Very True of Them; QD=Very Trustworthy) and build trust among teachers and classmates by showing respect regardless of each other's status or power (Mean=3.36; SD=0.76; VI=Very True of Them; QD=Very Trustworthy)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. However, the students' believed quite differently. For them, they *consistently communicate the same message or information to their classmates and teachers by not changing what we have agreed (Mean=3.58; SD=0.54; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Trustworthy)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

These findings are supported by American Psychological Association's (2020) notion that teachers who foster positive relationships with their students create classroom environments more conducive to learning and meet student's developmental, emotional and academic needs. In addition, a student who feels a strong personal connection to their teacher, talks with their teacher frequently, and receives more constructive guidance and praise rather than just criticism from their teacher "is likely to trust their teacher more, show more engagement in learning, behave better in class and achieve at higher levels academically.

And in terms of the lowest results, the teachers believed that the students *share their resources and knowledge openly and generously to their classmates and teachers at the service class. (Mean=3.2; average SD=0.71) (Mean=3.2; SD=0.71; VI=True of Them; QD=Trustworthy)* Relative to the teachers' perception, the students believed that they *build trust among teachers and classmates by showing respect regardless of each other's status or power.(Mean=3.41; SD=0.59; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Trustworthy)* The lowest compared to other behaviors as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to Mitchell and Spady (1998) and Gregory and Ripski (2008), Trust is vital to student learning and behavior. In an environment of trust, students are more likely to risk being vulnerable by asking questions needed to clarify learning and to engage in help-seeking behavior key to achievement. Trusting students are more likely to adopt the goals of the teacher and the institution both in terms of behavior and achievement. Behaviorally, when students trust they are more likely to voluntarily comply

with teacher requests, less likely to exhibit defiance or other behavior issues, and the need for strategies for compliance are diminished.

Considering all these findings shown in Table 4, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on indicators *2 maintain myself as a reliable student in and out of the class (t=2.91), 4 participate in all activities and projects in class even if with lesser supervision from the teachers (t=3.27), 5 demonstrate habits that promote reliability and credibility among the teachers and students in the learning environments (t=3.44), 6 work in my task independently strongly believe in my personal capabilities (t=2.49) and* it also shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *1 ensure my teachers and classmates of my academic works prepared genuinely and thoughtfully (t=0.72), 3 ensure worthiness of other's trust and allow myself to trust others as well (t=1.06), 7 share my resources and knowledge openly and generously to my classmates and teachers at the service to my class (t=0), 8 consistently communicate the same message or information to my classmates and teachers by not changing what we have agreed (t=1.74), 9 build trust among teachers and classmates by showing respect regardless of each other's status or power (t=1.98), 10 consistently do and act what I say that others can rely on me (t=1.06)* under the level of trust achieved by the students under study.

However, looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of trust academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=1.86*. Again, for the teachers, the students are *trustworthy* but for the students, they believed that they are *very trustworthy* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to Adams & Forsyth (2008), Forsyth (2008), and Lee (2007), because students spend a large percentage of their school hours interacting with teachers, it is reasonable to think that the relationship between the student and teacher is important and may be critical to the success of students. When students view their teachers as legitimate and trustworthy authority figures, teachers are more likely to earn the respect and cooperation of their students, potentially increasing their capacity to achieve. The student-teacher relationship is thought to be grounded in trust and is based on the interactions of students and teachers. In this study, student perceptions of trust in teachers and teacher perceptions of trust in clients are thought to serve as the foundation for productive relationships to develop between students and teachers that provide an impetus for academic achievement to develop. The trusting relationship between students and teachers is theorized as where the "rubber meets the road" when attempting to create academic achievement for students.

Table 5. Level of respect behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
RESPECT											
1. open the camera while the instructors and classmates are discussing if internet connections are stable.	3.38	0.73	VTM	VR	3.16	0.75	TT	R	1.37	Accept	Insignificant
2. respond or unmute immediately whenever asked to answer a query.	3.61	0.64	VTM	VR	3.08	1	TT	R	3.84	Reject	Significant
3. keep instructors' intellectual property private (e.g., class slides, assignments, test, etc.) and so do not share these without the instructor's permission.	3.42	0.63	VTM	VR	3.24	0.88	TT	R	1.81	Accept	Insignificant
4. inform or notify instructors whenever I experience difficulties in attending to the online/modular class.	3.62	0.55	VTM	VR	3.12	1.01	TT	R	2.98	Reject	Significant
5. follow the instructors' guidelines and expectations as the class fulfill assignments and assessments.	3.64	0.55	VTM	VR	2.96	1.06	TT	R	3.44	Reject	Significant

6. follow the instructors' directions and set deadlines.	3.54	0.56	VTM	VR	2.88	1.13	TT	R	3.08	Reject	Significant
7. follow the class rules.	3.36	0.63	VTM	VR	3.24	0.93	TT	R	0.53	Accept	Insignificant
8. enter class meetings prepared and confident.	3.56	0.61	VTM	VR	2.92	1.04	TT	R	2.78	Reject	Significant
9. listen attentively to someone who is speaking.	3.38	0.64	VTM	VR	3.08	1.19	TT	R	0.34	Accept	Insignificant
10. respect everyone regardless of faith and culture differences.	3.52	0.66	VTM	VR	3.08	1.04	TT	R	1.25	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	*3.5*	*0.62*	*VTM*	*VR*	*3.08*	*1*	*TT*	*R*	2.14	Reject	Significant

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	*Very true of me (VTM)* *Very True of them (VTT)*	*Very High Integrity (VHI)* */Very Respectful (VR)*
3	2.50-3.24	*True of me (TM)* *True of them (TT)*	*High Integrity (HI)* */Respectful (R)*
2	1.75-2.49	*Untrue of me (UTM)* *Untrue of them (UT)*	*Low Integrity (LI)* */Disrespectful (DR)*
1	1.00-1.74	*Very untrue of me (VUM)* *Very untrue of them (VUT)*	*Very Low Integrity (VLI)* */Very Disrespectful (VDR)*

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 5 shows the respect behavioral indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *Respectful* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average mean=3.80 and SD=1. On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *Very Respectful* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average mean=3.5 and SD=0.62.

In terms of the specific traits under Respect with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *follow the class rules. (Mean=3.24; SD=0.93; VI=True of Them; QD=Respectful)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. However, the students' believed differently. For them, they *follow the instructors' guidelines and expectations as the class fulfill assignments and assessments (Mean=3.64; SD=0.55; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Respectful)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

These findings are supported by how the International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) described the value of respect as an academic integrity indicator. According to ICAI (2021), Students show respect when they value and take advantage of opportunities to gain new knowledge by taking an active role in their own education, contributing to discussions, actively listening to other points of view, and performing to the best of their ability. Faculty show respect by taking students' ideas seriously, by recognizing them as individuals, helping them develop their ideas, providing full and honest feedback on their work, and valuing their perspectives and their goals.

Looking closely to the lowest results under the Respect category, the teachers believed that the students follow *the instructors' directions and set deadlines (Mean=2.88; SD=1.13; VI=True of Them; QD=Respectful)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. Relative to the teachers' perception, the students believed that they *follow the class rules (Mean=3.36; SD=0.63; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Respectful)* the lowest compared to other behaviors as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to Gul Celkan et al. / Procedia (2015) this is a unique expectation usually implied in terms of "respect." Students and teachers may have very different definitions of respect. The concept of "respect" isn't mutual; students expect to be respected yet do not give any respect to an instructor. In short, this concept may come to mean: "I expect the instructor to validate me as a person regardless of my attitudes, effort, and treatment of the professor." Needless to say anticipations of instructors and students

may not always converge. However, one side should not ignore the expectations of the other. As long as there is mutual respect, the student success rate will rise and student attitudes toward class and faculty would be very different

The teachers and the students believed quite differently in the concept of *"following the class rules"*. Teachers, believed the students demonstrate respect best they *follow the class rules with the highest result (Mean=3.24; SD=0.93; VI=Very True of Them; QD=Respectful).* For students they least *follow the class rules (Mean=2.88; SD=1.13; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Respectful)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

These findings are supported by Pettitt's (2021) notion that if the teacher is fully aware of these differences and tries to empower himself/herself in learning how to understand students with different orientations, students would build respect toward their teacher, too. If instructors fail to understand and respect the differences their student's exhibit in class, it is completely due to their own lack of understanding.

Considering all these findings shown in Table 5, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *2 respond or unmute immediately whenever asked to answer a query (t=3.84), 4 inform or notify instructors whenever I experience difficulties in attending to the online/modular class (t=2.98), 5 follow the instructors' guidelines and expectations as the class fulfil assignments and assessments (t-test=3.44), 6 follow the instructors' directions and set deadlines (t=3.08), 8 enter class meetings prepared and confident (t=2.78)* and it also shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1 *open the camera while the instructors and classmates are discussing if internet connections are stable (t=1.37), 3 keep instructors' intellectual property private (e.g., class slides, assignments, test, etc.) and so do not share these without the instructor's permission (t=1.81), 7 follow the class rules (t=0.53), 9 listen attentively to someone who is speaking (t=0.34)* and *10 respect everyone regardless of faith and culture differences (t=1.25) under* the level of respect achieved by the students under study.

However, looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of respect academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=2.14*. Again, for the teachers, the students are *respectful* but for the students, they believed that they are *very respectful* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to ICAI (2021), respect in academic communities is reciprocal and requires showing respect for oneself as well as others. Respect for self means tackling challenges without compromising your own values. Respect for others means valuing the diversity of opinions and appreciating the need to challenge, test, and refine ideas. Students demonstrate trust by consistently and accurately citing the work of others in their assignments, keeping academic materials and instructor's intellectual property private (e.g., class slides, assignments, tests, etc.), and not sharing these without the instructor's permission.

Table 6. Level of responsibility behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	**SD**	**VI**	**QD**	**M**	**SD**	**VI**	**QD**			
RESPONSIBILITY											
1. work on improving myself after receiving feed backs from teachers and classmates.	3.39	0.77	VTM	VR	3.04	1.14	TT	R	1.55	Accept	Insignificant
2. speak good words and guard myself against wrong doings and bad or evil acts in our class.	3.52	0.72	VTM	VR	3.08	1.04	TT	R	3.7	Reject	Significant
3. write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class.	3.4	0.72	VTM	VR	2.88	1.05	TT	R	2.7	Reject	Significant
4. participate during class and activities actively	3.56	0.57	VTM	VR	2.92	1.19	TT	R	3.36	Reject	Significant

5. communicate with classmates and instructors actively.	3.66	0.49	VTM	VR	3.04	0.98	TT	R	3.13	Reject	Significant
6. complete the assigned individual and group tasks to the best of my abilities.	3.43	0.66	VTM	VR	3.12	0.93	TT	R	2.49	Reject	Significant
7. comply with and attend to my class requirements and attendances actively and promptly.	3.36	0.59	VTM	VR	3.08	1.04	TT	R	0.19	Accept	Insignificant
8. notify my classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems	3.45	0.61	VTM	VR	3.16	0.94	TT	R	1.85	Accept	Insignificant
9. share time, resources, and energy willingly for the accomplishment of a particular task.	3.34	0.55	VTM	VR	3.04	1.06	TT	R	0.17	Accept	Insignificant
10. perform excellently in studies, projects, and task.	3.42	0.67	VTM	VR	3.04	0.89	TT	R	1.52	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	**3.46**	**0.64**	**VTM**	**VR**	**3.04**	**1.02**	**TT**	**R**	2.06	Reject	Significant

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Very true of me (VTM) Very True of them (VTT)	Very High Integrity (VHI) /Very Responsible (VR)
3	2.50-3.24	True of me (TM) True of them (TT)	High Integrity (HI) /Responsible (R)
2	1.75-2.49	Untrue of me (UTM) Untrue of them (UT)	Low Integrity (LI) /Irresponsible (IR)
1	1.00-1.74	Very untrue of me (VUM) Very untrue of them (VUT)	Very Low Integrity (VLL) /Very Irresponsible (VIR)

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 6. shows the Academic Integrity indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *very responsible* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.4 and SD=1.02.* On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *responsible* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average *mean=3.46 and SD=0.64.*

In terms of the specific traits under Responsibility with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *notify their classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems (Mean=3.16; SD=0.94; VI=True of Them; QD=Responsible)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. However, the students' believed differently. For them, they *communicate with classmates and instructors actively. (Mean=3.66; SD=0.49; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Responsible)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

Therefore, it is implied that the students *notify their classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems* and *communicate with classmates and instructors actively* is a behaviors of responsibility because *notify their classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems* and *communicate with classmates and instructors actively* is showing fairness, and responsibility.

These findings are supported by how the International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) described the value of responsibility as an academic integrity indicator. According to ICAI (2021), responsible means standing up against wrongdoing, resisting negative peer pressure, and serving as a positive example. Responsible individuals hold themselves accountable for their own actions and work to discourage and prevent misconduct by others. Responsible faculty not only create and enforce classroom and institutional policy, but they also clearly communicate expectations around these policies. They keep their word and adhere to their own and their institution's policies. Likewise, responsible students seek to obtain and understand information about classroom and institutional policy. They follow these policies and ask questions when they do not understand or disagree with them.

Looking closely to the lowest results under the Responsibility category, the teachers believed that the students *write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class (Mean=3.4; SD=1.05; VI=True of Them; QD=Responsible)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. Relative to the teachers' perception, the students also believed that they *write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class (Mean=3.4; SD=0.72; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Responsible)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

Therefore for both teachers and students, the students under study are indeed likely to have difficulty to *write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class.*

As observed and experienced by the researchers, the note taking is so hard not just because handwriting is slower than live speech, but because the mental processes that allow students to take effective notes are so demanding and because of the distractions in the classroom, students are having difficulty taking notes.

Considering all these findings shown in Table 6, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *2 speak good words and guard myself against wrong doings and bad or evil acts in our class (t=3.7), 3 write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class (t=2.7), 4 participate during class and activities actively (t=3.36), 5 communicate with classmates and instructors actively (t=3.13), 6 complete the assigned individual and group tasks to the best of my abilities (t=2.49)* and it also shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *1 work on improving myself after receiving feed backs from teachers and classmates (t=1.55), 7 comply with and attend to my class requirements and attendances actively and promptly (t=0.19), 8 notify my classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems (t=1.85), 9 share time, resources, and energy willingly for the accomplishment of a particular task (t=0.17), 10 perform excellently in studies, projects, and task (t=1.52)* under the level of responsibility achieved by the students under study.

However, looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of responsibility academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=2.06.* Again, for the teachers, the students are *responsible* but for the students, they believed they are *very responsible* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to Deveci & Ayish (2017) many students readily acknowledge that they are responsible for their own learning and that such responsibility can lead to success in many aspects of their lives. Taking responsibility for your own learning can lead to fast development and a sense of pride in your hard work and newly acquired skills. To become an independent learner who takes responsibility for their own work you can set goals, identify strengths and weaknesses in your skills and discover and develop you own personal learning style. Students demonstrated responsibility by attending classes on time and regularly, being prepared for classes, taking good care of school property, completing their individual and group work to the best of their abilities and being accountable to themselves their instructors, their classmates, and the University, seeking help If they are struggling or are not sure of expectations.

Table 7. Level of fairness behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
FAIRNESS											
1. relate to all warmly and graciously without biases.	3.39	0.77	VTM	VF	3.08	1.04	TT	F	1.47	Accept	Insignificant
2. contribute ideas and skills in group performance tasks fairly	3.5	0.75	VTM	VF	3.12	0.93	TT	F	3.76	Reject	Significant
3. give fair treatment to every individual during classes.	3.4	0.73	VTM	VF	3.08	1.04	TT	F	2.32	Reject	Significant
4. treat all subjects, teachers, and academic works with no biases	3.57	0.57	VTM	VF	3.2	0.87	TT	F	2.91	Reject	Significant
5. take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how I wanted to be heard and reached out.	3.67	0.49	VTM	VF	3.12	1.01	TT	F	3.53	Reject	Significant
6. treat others equally without self-interest and prejudice.	3.43	0.66	VTM	VF	3.2	0.82	TT	F	2.19	Reject	Significant
7. follow the university's rules and to not gain unfair advantages in assessments or assignments.	3.37	0.59	VTM	VF	3.2	0.87	TT	F	0.00	Accept	Insignificant
8. help and guide my classmates willingly if they are struggling, to the best of my abilities.	3.46	0.58	VTM	VF	3.2	0.82	TT	F	1.98	Accept	Insignificant
9. exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors.	3.34	0.55	VTM	VF	3.16	0.9	TT	F	-0.78	Accept	Insignificant
10. serve in every assigned task willingly for the common good of every and not of only a few.	3.42	0.67	VTM	VF	3.12	0.93	TT	F	1.19	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	**3.45**	**0.64**	**VTM**	**VF**	**3.15**	**0.92**	**TT**	**F**	1.85	Reject	Significant

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Very true of me (VTM) Very True of them (VTT)	Very High Integrity (VHI) /Very Fair (VF)
3	2.50-3.24	True of me (TM) True of them (TT)	High Integrity (HI) /Fair (F)
2	1.75-2.49	Untrue of me (UTM) Untrue of them (UT)	Low Integrity (LI) /Unfair (UF)
1	1.00-1.74	Very untrue of me (VUM) Very untrue of them (VUT)	Very Low Integrity (VLI) /Very Unfair (VUF)

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 7. shows the fairness behavioral indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *Fair* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average mean=*3.15* and SD=*0.92*. On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *Very Fair* given the average

mean=*3.45* and SD=0.64 as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average mean=*3.45* and SD=0.64.

According to the DepEd Memorandum (2021), the department recognizes the limitation of managing assessments in the current learning set-up; however, teachers, parents, and school heads are highly encouraged to seek out opportunities to teach, academic integrity among learners and discourage them from feeding on laziness and instant gratification, as this will generate devastating effects on their values . Nonetheless, when dealing with academic dishonesty, teachers, parents, and school heads should use cautions, exercise good judgement and treat learners with respect and fairness

In terms of the specific traits under Fairness with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructor*s *Mean=3.16; SD=0.9; VI=True of Them; QD=Fair)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. However, the students' believed differently. For them, they *take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how they wanted to be heard and reached out. (Mean=3.67; SD=0.49; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Fair)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

These findings are supported by how the International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) described the value of fairness as an academic integrity indicator. According to ICAI (2021), described the quality or state of being fair, especially fair or impartial treatment, lack of favoritism toward one side or another. Therefore, it is implied that *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructor*s and *take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how they wanted to be heard and reached out.* is a behavior of fairness because *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructor*s and *take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how they wanted to be heard and reached out'*s showing fairness and respect.

And in terms of the lowest results under the fairness category, the teachers believed that the students *treat all subjects, teachers, and academic works with no biases (Mean=3.2; SD=0.82; VI=True of Them; QD=Fair) and treat others equally without self-interest and prejudice (Mean=3.2; SD=0.82; VI=True of Them; QD=Fair)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. Relative to the teachers' perception, the students believed that they *give fair treatment to every individual during classes (Mean=3.4; SD=0.73; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Fair)* the lowest compared to other behaviors as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to ICAI (2020) notion that students engage in fairness by doing their own original work, acknowledging borrowed work appropriately, respecting and upholding academic integrity policies, and by maintaining the good reputation of the institution. Administrators and staff are fair to their communities when they provide clear, useful, and just policies that help establish and nurture communities of integrity, and that treat students, faculty, staff, alumni, and institutions with respect.

The teachers and the students differently believed in the concept of "*exhibiting generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors* " Teachers, believed the students demonstrate fairness best they *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors (Mean=3.16; SD=0.9; VI=True of Them; QD=Fair).* For students they believed they *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors (Mean=3.34; SD=0.55; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Fair)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

Considering all these findings shown in Table 7, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *2 contribute ideas and skills in group performance tasks fairly (t=3.76), 3 give fair treatment to every individual during classes (t=2.32), 4 treat all subjects, teachers, and academic works with no biases (t=2.91), 5 take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how I wanted to be heard and reached out (t=3.53), 6 treat others equally without self-interest and prejudice (t=2.19).* However, it is found out that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1 *relate to all warmly and graciously without biases (t=1.47),7 follow the university's rules and to not gain unfair advantages in assessments or assignments (t=0.00),* 8 *help and guide my classmates willingly if they are struggling, to the best of my abilities (t=1.98),* 9 *exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors (t=0.78),* 10 *serve in every assigned task willingly for the common good of every and not of only a few (t=1.19).* Under the level of fairness achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of fairness academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=1.85*. Again, for the teachers, the students are *fair* but for the students, they believed that they are *very fair* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to ICAI (2021), Promoting fairness in the classroom not only gives the teacher respect but also gives the students a sense of safeness and trust within the classroom. Creating an environment that revolves around fairness, trust and respect will be beneficial to all of the children in the class. The terms respect and trust are pretty straightforward. There doesn't need to be a debate on what those two mean, but the same cannot be said for fairness. When one usually hears the word "fair" it is often looked at as synonymous to the term "equal" but the two are not the same, especially in a classroom setting. Students demonstrate fairness by treating others equally without self-interest or prejudice following the University's rules and not trying to gain unfair advantages in assessments, mid-terms or tests (e.g., copying someone else's answers, using their phone to look up information during an exam etc.)

Table 8. Level of courage behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
COURAGE											
1. ask permission humbly for the extension of activities whenever tasks are foreseen to be impossible to be completed on or before the set deadline.	3.39	0.73	VTM	VC	3	1.08	TT	C	2.35	Reject	Significant
2. take risks in answering instructors' queries and academic tasks even if it is technologically and cognitively challenging.	3.49	0.67	VTM	VC	2.96	0.98	TT	C	2.79	Reject	Significant
3. acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to myself and to others.	3.42	0.68	VTM	VC	3.16	0.94	TT	C	2.68	Reject	Significant
4. demonstrate optimism in accomplishing tasks amidst difficulties in online or modular classes.	3.51	0.6	VTM	VC	3	0.91	TT	C	2.83	Reject	Significant
5. alert the instructor, dean, or a staff member immediately whenever one has caught committing an academic offense or has violated a rule.	3.65	0.5	VTM	VC	3	0.91	TT	C	2.79	Reject	Significant
6. make ethical and practical decisions and strategies even faced with difficult situations.	3.43	0.64	VTM	VC	3	1.04	TT	C	2.52	Reject	Significant
7. stand for the truth regardless of criticisms from classmates, teachers, and others.	3.41	0.61	VTM	VC	3.08	0.95	TT	C	2.32	Reject	Significant
8. consider mistakes as opportunities for self -improvement and learning.	3.47	0.56	VTM	VC	3.12	0.97	TT	C	2.42	Reject	Significant
9. take responsibility in thoughts and actions objectively.	3.49	0.52	VTM	VC	3	0.96	TT	C	2.19	Reject	Significant
10. exert effort to promote unity and collaboration in doing group tasks.	3.53	0.62	VTM	VC	3.12	0.88	TT	C	1.81	Accept	Insignificant
Average:	*3.48*	*0.61*	*VTM*	*VC*	*3.04*	*0.96*	*TT*	*C*	2.47	Reject	Significant

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
4	3.25-4.00	Very true of me (VTM)	Very High Integrity

International Journal of Current Science Research and Review

ISSN: 2581-8341

Volume 05 Issue 11 November 2022

DOI: 10.47191/ijcsrr/V5-i11-27, Impact Factor: 5.995

IJCSRR @ 2022

www.ijcsrr.org

		Very True of them (VTT)	(VHI)
			/Very Courageous (VC)
3	2.50-3.24	True of me (TM)	High Integrity (HI)
		True of them (TT)	/Courageous (C)
2	1.75-2.49	Untrue of me (UTM)	Low Integrity (LI)
		Untrue of them (UT)	/Uncourageous (UC)
1	1.00-1.74	Very untrue of me (VUM)	Very Low Integrity (VLI)
		Very untrue of them (VUT)	/Very Uncourageous (VUC)

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 8. shows the courage behavioral indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by their teachers and the students themselves. For the teachers, the students are *Courageous* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average m*ean=3.08 and SD=0.93*. On the other hand, for the students, they believed that they are *Very Courageous* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal given the average m*ean=3.48 and SD=0.61*.

In terms of the specific traits under Courage with the highest results, it can be inferred that for teachers, their students *acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to themselves and to others. Mean=3.16; SD=0.9; VI=True of Them; QD=Courageous)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. However, the students' believed differently. For them, they *exert effort to promote unity and collaboration in doing group tasks. (Mean=3.53; SD=0.62; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Courageous)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

These findings are supported by how the International Center for Academic Integrity (2021) described the value of respect as an academic integrity indicator. According to ICAI (2021), described one of the most effective ways for teachers to ensure that their students have obtained the specified learning outcomes is to provide them with constructive feedback. If students are not given the optimal feedback and are not asked to re-do the work, teachers will not know whether the educational goals have been met.

The teachers and the students differently believed in the concept of *"acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to myself and to others."* Teachers, believed the students demonstrate courage best they *acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to themselves and to others (Mean=3.16; SD=0.9; VI=True of Them; QD=Courageous)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. For students they believed they *acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to myself and to others (Mean=3.42; SD=0.68; VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Courageous)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

And in terms of the lowest results, the teachers believed that their students *take risks in answering instructors' queries and academic tasks even if it is technologically and cognitively challenging (Mean=2.96; SD=0.98; VI=True of Them; QD=Courageous)* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes. Relative to the teachers' perception, the students believed that they *ask permission humbly for the extension of activities whenever tasks are foreseen to be impossible to be completed on or before the set deadline (Mean=3.39; SD=0.73 VI=Very True of Me; QD=Very Courageous)* the lowest compared to other behaviors as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

As observed and experienced by the researchers, that providing constructive written feedback to students is essential to encouraging deep learning and help meet the intended goals. Constructive feedback is the single most beneficial support teachers can provide for their students. Teachers have a major role in improving teaching and learning processes and outcomes through providing constructive feedback. Good teaching practice involves checking students' progress regularly and adjusting their teaching strategies accordingly. Feedback is said to help teachers recheck the effectiveness of their teaching and identify areas that need improvement.

Considering all these findings shown in Table 8, it is now revealed that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators *1 ask permission humbly for the extension of activities whenever tasks are foreseen to be impossible to be completed on or before the set deadline (t=2.35), 2 take risks in answering instructors' queries and academic tasks even if it is technologically and cognitively challenging (t=2.79), 3 acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to myself and to others (t=2.68), 4 demonstrate optimism in accomplishing tasks amidst difficulties in online or*

modular classes (t=2.83), 5 alert the instructor, dean, or a staff member immediately whenever one has caught committing an academic offense or has violated a rule (t=2.79), 6 make ethical and practical decisions and strategies even faced with difficult situations(t=2.52), 7 stand for the truth regardless of criticisms from classmates, teachers, and others (t=2.32), 8 consider mistakes as opportunities for self-improvement and learning (t=2.42), 9 take responsibility in thoughts and actions objectively (t=2.19).

However, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicator *10 exert effort to promote unity and collaboration in doing group tasks (t=1.81) under the level of courage achieved by the students under study.*

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of courage behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with *t=2.47*. Again, for the teachers, the students are *courageous* but for the students, they believed that they are *very courageous* as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal.

According to ICAI (2021) In reality, courage is the capacity to act in accordance with one's values despite fear. Being courageous means acting in accordance with one's convictions. Like intellectual capacity, courage can only develop in environments where it is tested. Academic communities of integrity, therefore, necessarily include opportunities to make choices, learn from them, and grow. Through this interactive process, courage and the five additional values of academic integrity can develop as interwoven and mutually dependent characteristics. Students demonstrate courage by being brave and standing up for what is right, even in challenging situations. If they think someone has committed an academic offense or is violating a rule - they alert their instructor, Associate Dean, or a staff member.

Table 9. The overall level of academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students as perceived by the participants.

Indicators	STUDENTS' RESPONSES				TEACHERS' RESPONSES				t	Decision	Difference
	M	SD	VI	QD	M	SD	VI	QD			
HONESTY	3.53	0.55	VTM	VH	3.05	0.83	TT	H	2.60	Reject	Significant
TRUST	3.52	0.56	VTM	VT	3.24	0.81	TT	T	1.86	Accept	Insignificant
RESPECT	3.5	0.62	VTM	VR	3.08	1	TT	R	2.14	Reject	Significant
RESPONSIBILITY	3.46	0.64	VTM	VR	3.04	1.02	TT	R	2.06	Reject	Significant
FAIRNESS	3.45	0.64	VTM	VF	3.15	0.92	TT	F	1.85	Reject	Significant
COURAGE	3.48	0.61	VTM	VC	3.04	0.96	TT	C	2.47	Reject	Significant
Overall Academic Integrity	**3.49**	**0.6**	**VTM**	**VHI**	**3.08**	**0.93**	**TT**	**HI**	**2.16**	**Reject**	**Significant**

Legend:

Scale	*Range*	*Verbal Interpretation*	*Qualitative Description*
4	*3.25-4.00*	*Very true of me (VTM)* *Very True of them (VTT)*	*Very High Integrity (VHL)* *(Very Honest (VH)* *(Very Trustworthy (VTT)* *(Very Respectful (VR)* *(Very Responsibility (VR)* *(Very Fair (VF)* *(Very Courage (VC)*

3	2.50-3.24	*True of me (TM)* *True of them (TT)*	***High Integrity (HL)*** *(Honest (H)* *(Trustworthy (T)* *(Respectful* *(Responsible (R)* *(Fair (F)* *(Courageous (C)*
2	1.75-2.49	*Untrue of me (UTM)* *Untrue of them (UT)*	***Low Integrity (LL)*** *(Dishonest (VDR)* *(Untrustworthy (UT)* *(Disrespectful (DR)* *(Irresponsible (IR)* *(Unfair (UF)* *(Uncourageous (UC)*
1	1.00-1.74	*Very untrue of me (VUM)* *Very untrue of them (VUT)*	***Very Low Integrity (VLL)*** *(Very Dishonest (VDR)* *(Very Untrustworthy (VUT)* *(Very Disrespectful (VDR)* *(Very Irresponsible V(IR)* *(VeryUnfair (VUF)* *(Very Uncourageous (VUC)*

Paired t-test significance: Reject if /t/> associated critical value at df (1.983)

Table 9 shows the overall academic integrity indicators demonstrated by the students as perceived by the teachers and the students themselves. It can be inferred from the data shown that for teachers, the students demonstrated *high level of academic integrity* given the average mean=3.08 and average SD=0.93. For the students, they believed that they have *very high level of academic integrity* given the average mean=3.49 and average SD=0.6. The overall t=2.16 implying that there's a significant difference between the perceptions of the students and teachers on the overall level of academic integrity.

Furthermore, the "Trust" Academic Integrity category obtained the highest mean among other indicators according to the teachers with the mean=3.24, SD=0.81 and verbally interpreted as very true of them. This signifies that the Senior High School teachers perceived that their students have high level of "Trust" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes. However, it is the "Honesty" Academic Integrity behavior that obtained the highest mean among other indicators according to the students with the mean=3.53, SD=0.55, and verbally interpreted as very true of me. This implies that the Senior High School students perceived that they have very high level of "Honesty" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes.

As students and faculty seek knowledge, they must be honest with themselves and with each other. In study halls and laboratories, in libraries, playing fields, and classrooms, cultivating and practicing honesty lays a foundation for lifelong integrity. Institutions also must commit to being honest with students, faculty, staff, supporters, and their broader communities, for honesty at the organizational level sets the tone for the overall academic endeavor.

Trust is developed by schools that set clear and consistent academic standards, that apply their standards unfailingly and fairly, and that support honest and impartial research. Outside the academic community, trust enables communities to value and rely on scholarly research, teaching, and degrees. Communities of trust engender cooperation by creating environments in which participants expect to treat others and be treated with fairness and respect.

Students engage in fairness by doing their own original work, acknowledging borrowed work appropriately, respecting and upholding academic integrity policies, and by maintaining the good reputation of the institution.

Students show respect when they value and take advantage of opportunities to gain new knowledge by taking an active role in their own education, contributing to discussions, actively listening to other points of view, and performing to the best of their

ability. Faculty show respect by taking students' ideas seriously, by recognizing them as individuals, helping them develop their ideas, providing full and honest feedback on their work, and valuing their perspectives and their goals.

Likewise, responsible students seek to obtain and understand information about classroom and institutional policy, they follow these policies and ask questions when they do not understand or disagree with them.

Students who exhibit courage hold themselves and their fellow learners to the highest standards of academic integrity even when doing so involves risk of negative consequences, such as a bad grade, or reprisal from their peers or others. They also must then display the courage necessary to act on those decisions. Only by exercising courage is it possible to create communities that are responsible, respectful, trustworthy, fair, and honest and strong enough to endure regardless of the circumstances they face. ICAI (2021)

Looking closely to the lowest results, it can be inferred from the Table 9 that for the teachers, The "Courage" Academic Integrity category obtained the lowest mean among other indicators according to the teachers responses with the mean=3.04, SD=0.96, and verbally interpreted to true of them. This signifies that the Senior High School teachers perceived that their students have high level of "Courage" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes. For the students on the other hand, "Respect" obtained the lowest mean among other indicators with the mean=3.50, SD=0.62, and verbally interpreted to very true of me. This implies that the Senior High School students perceived that they have a very high level of "Respect" as they engaged themselves in their flexible learning classes.

Table 10. Degree of variance in the student's responses when grouped According to their profile

Profile Variables	Academic Integrity	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value	Decision
Age	Honesty	0.13	4	0.03	0.42	0.793	Accept
	Trust	0.32	4	0.08	0.94	0.441	Accept
	Respect	0.16	4	0.04	0.41	0.802	Accept
	Responsibility	0.02	4	0.00	0.05	0.995	Accept
	Fairness	0.06	4	0.02	0.16	0.960	Accept
	Courage	0.14	4	0.04	0.42	0.798	Accept
Sex	Honesty	0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.964	Accept
	Trust	0.24	1	0.24	2.85	0.092	Accept
	Respect	0.52	1	0.52	5.47	0.020	Reject
	Responsibility	0.37	1	0.37	3.93	0.048	Reject
	Fairness	0.33	1	0.33	3.46	0.063	Accept
	Courage	0.04	1	0.04	0.45	0.505	Accept
Grade Level	Honesty	0.03	1	0.03	0.34	0.562	Accept
	Trust	0.06	1	0.06	0.70	0.405	Accept
	Respect	0.01	1	0.01	0.09	0.759	Accept
	Responsibility	0.01	1	0.01	0.08	0.772	Accept
	Fairness	0.01	1	0.01	0.09	0.761	Accept
	Courage	0.15	1	0.15	1.71	0.191	Accept
Strand/ Track	Honesty	0.17	3	0.06	0.74	0.528	Accept
	Trust	0.04	3	0.01	0.15	0.931	Accept
	Respect	0.44	3	0.15	1.54	0.205	Accept
	Responsibility	0.09	3	0.03	0.32	0.809	Accept
	Fairness	0.16	3	0.05	0.54	0.658	Accept
	Courage	0.37	3	0.12	1.44	0.231	Accept

Reject if p<0.05

Table 10 first outcome shows that there is no significant degree of variance in all academic integrity indicators of the students when they are grouped according to their age given all p-values that are greater than the significance level, 0.05. Therefore,

regardless of the age, the students believed similarly of their academic integrity in terms of honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness and courage.

According to Lanier (2006) in younger age, they have their own code of ethics to behave in society but as they grow up, they show moralities in their behaviors and become more philosophical. Lanier (2006) found that older students were less likely to cheat while Hutton (2006) determined that younger students were more likely to cheat.

The second result depicted in table 10 shows that there is a significant degree of variance in two of the academic integrity behaviors of the students particularly in terms of respect and responsibility when they are grouped according to their sex *(p-value for respect when grouped according to sex=0.020; p-value for responsibility when grouped according to sex =0.048).*

According to Witmer & Johansson (2015) found that female students are certainly less prevalent in disciplinary matters regarding academic dishonesty among students. Simon et al. (2004) found that 'women are significantly more likely to report academic dishonesty than are men. However, in a study by Kisamore et al (2007) no convincing support was found for a hypothesis that men suspect cheating more often and report misconduct less than women. In several other studies no significant gender differences were found either (e.g., Horbach et al, 2020).

According to Malone (2006), attitude of male and female students differs on some dishonest acts but for most of the issues of dishonesty, they behave in same way Some other studies reported that male students are more frequently engaged in dishonest acts than females especially when it comes to academic responsibilities (Whitley et al, 1999).

The third outcome shows that there is no significant degree of variance in all academic integrity behaviors and attitudes of the students when they are grouped according to their grade levels given all p-values that are greater than the significance level, 0.05. Therefore, regardless of the grade level, the students believed similarly of their academic integrity in terms of honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage.

Lastly, the fourth outcome depicted in table 10 shows that there is no significant degree of variance in the academic integrity behaviors of the students when they are grouped according to their strand or track given all p-values that are greater than the significance level, 0.05. Therefore, regardless of the strand/track, the students believed similarly of their academic integrity in terms of honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is examined the academic integrity of the Senior High School Students at St. Paul University Surigao. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following queries: (I) profile of the participants in terms of age, sex, strand/track and grade level, (II) the level of the academic integrity behaviors demonstrated or exhibited by the students as perceived by themselves and their teachers, (III) significant degree of variance on the academic integrity exhibited by the students when they are grouped according to profile, and (IV) significant difference between the students' and teachers' perceptions on the students' Academic Integrity.

Based on the analysis done on the data gathered, the findings revealed in this study are summarized as follows:

1. The majority of the participants were 17 years old, 172, or 41.65%. Most of them were males (214 or 51.82%), and as for grade level, the majority were from Grade 11 (214 or 51.82%). Most of the participants were from the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) strand, 176 or 42.62%.
2. The students' level of academic integrity behaviors, as perceived by themselves and their teachers, in terms of honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage. For the teachers, the students demonstrated a high level of academic integrity given the general average of mean= 3.08 and SD= 0.93. For the students, they believed that they achieved a very high level of academic integrity given the general average mean=3.49 and SD= 0.60.
3. There is a significant degree of variance in two of the academic integrity behaviors of the students particularly in terms of respect and responsibility when they are grouped according to their sex (p-value for respect when grouped according to sex= 0.020; p-value for responsibility when grouped according to sex =0.048).
4. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on indicators 1. acknowledge the source of the information used (t=2.42), 2. submit original work and complete individual assessments independently (t=5.06), 3. answer exams and assessments honestly based on the instructions given (t=2.83), 4. do not use any other unauthorized electronic devices as an aid during exam (t=5.63), 5. do not let other students copy or replicate my answers during exams (t=3.46), 6.

relay exact information and instructions from my teachers to my classmates or the other way around (t=2.3), 7. do not cheat during exams, quizzes and assessments (t=3.84).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 7. am honest about my own feelings and refuse to stretch the truth for attention of sympathy (t=0.627), 9. do not give false information about missing classes or exams (t=0.307) and 10. do not use other person's ideas as my own (t=0.298) under the level of honesty achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of honesty academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=2.60.

5. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 2. maintain myself as a reliable student in and out of the class (t=2.91), 4. participate in all activities and projects in class even if with lesser supervision from the teachers (t=3.27), 5. demonstrate habits that promote reliability and credibility among the teachers and students in the learning environments (t=3.44), 6. work in my task independently strongly believe in my personal capabilities (t=2.49).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1. ensure my teachers and classmates of my academic works prepared genuinely and thoughtfully (t=0.72), 3. ensure worthiness of other's trust and allow myself to trust others as well (t=1.06), 7. share my resources and knowledge openly and generously to my classmates and teachers at the service to my class (t=0), 8. consistently communicate the same message or information to my classmates and teachers by not changing what we have agreed (t=1.74), 9. build trust among teachers and classmates by showing respect regardless of each other's status or power (t=1.98), 10. consistently do and act what I say that others can rely on me (t=1.06) under the level of trust achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of trust academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=1.86.

6. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 2. respond or unmute immediately whenever asked to answer a query (t=3.84), 4. inform or notify instructors whenever I experience difficulties in attending to the online/modular class (t=2.98), 5. follow the instructors' guidelines and expectations as the class fulfill assignments and assessments (t =3.44), 6. follow the instructors' directions and set deadlines (t=3.08), 8 enter class meetings prepared and confident (t=2.78).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1 open the camera while the instructors and classmates are discussing if internet connections are stable (t=1.37), 3 keep instructors' intellectual property private (e.g., class slides, assignments, test, etc.) and so do not share these without the instructor's permission (t=1.81), 7 follow the class rules (t=0.53), 9 listen attentively to someone who is speaking (t=0.34) and 10 respect everyone regardless of faith and culture differences (t=1.25) under the level of respect achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of respect academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=2.14.

7. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 2. speak good words and guard myself against wrong doings and bad or evil acts in our class (t =3.7), 3. write notes or record while discussion is on-going and then study on it after the class (t=2.7), 4. participate during class and activities actively (t=3.36), 5 communicate with classmates and instructors actively (t=3.13), 6. complete the assigned individual and group tasks to the best of my abilities (t=2.49).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1. work on improving myself after receiving feed backs from teachers and classmates (t=1.55), 7. comply with and attend to my class requirements and attendances actively and promptly (t=0.19), 8. notify my classmates and instructors whenever unable to attend to classes or submit requirements on time due to connectivity or electricity problems (t=1.85),

9. share time, resources, and energy willingly for the accomplishment of a particular task (t=0.17), 10. perform excellently in studies, projects, and task (t=1.52) under the level of responsibility achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of responsibility academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=2.06.

8. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 2. contribute ideas and skills in group performance tasks fairly (t=3.76), 3. give fair treatment to every individual during classes (t=2.32), 4. treat all subjects, teachers, and academic works with no biases (t=2.91), 5. take time to listen or reach out to others similarly as how I wanted to be heard and reached out (t=3.53), 6. treat others equally without self-interest and prejudice (t=2.19).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1 relate to all warmly and graciously without biases (t=1.47), 7 follow the university's rules and to not gain unfair advantages in assessments or assignments (t=0.00), 8. help and guide my classmates willingly if they are struggling, to the best of my abilities (t=1.98), 9. exhibit generosity in fulfilling tasks with classmates and instructors (t=0.78), 10. serve in every assigned task willingly for the common good of every and not of only a few (t=1.19). Under the level of fairness achieved by the students under study.

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of fairness academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=1.85.

9. There is a significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicators 1. ask permission humbly for the extension of activities whenever tasks are foreseen to be impossible to be completed on or before the set deadline (t=2.35), 2. take risks in answering instructors' queries and academic tasks even if it is technologically and cognitively challenging (t=2.79), 3. acknowledge constructive criticism bravely without bearing negative emotions to myself and to others (t=2.68), 4. demonstrate optimism in accomplishing tasks amidst difficulties in online or modular classes (t=2.83), 5. alert the instructor, dean, or a staff member immediately whenever one has caught committing an academic offense or has violated a rule (t=2.79), 6. make ethical and practical decisions and strategies even faced with difficult situations(t=2.52), 7. stand for the truth regardless of criticisms from classmates, teachers, and others (t=2.32), 8. consider mistakes as opportunities for self -improvement and learning (t=2.42), 9. take responsibility in thoughts and actions objectively (t=2.19).

On the other hand, it was shown that there is no significant difference between the teachers and students' perceptions on indicator 10 exert effort to promote unity and collaboration in doing group tasks (t-test=1.81).

Looking into the overall results, it can be inferred that there is a significant difference between the teachers and students perceptions on the overall level of courage academic integrity behaviors demonstrated by the students under study with t=2.47.

10. The "Trust" Academic Integrity category obtained the highest mean among other indicators according to the teachers with the mean=3.24, SD=0.81 and verbally interpreted as very true of them. This signified that the Senior High School teachers perceived that their students have high level of "Trust" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes. However, it is the "Honesty" Academic Integrity behavior that obtained the highest mean among other indicators according to the students with the mean=3.53, SD=0.55, and verbally interpreted as very true of me. This implies that the Senior High School students perceived that they have very high level of "Honesty" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes.

11. The "Courage" Academic Integrity category obtained the lowest mean among other indicators according to the teachers responses with the mean=3.04, SD=0.96, and verbally interpreted to true of them. This signifies that the Senior High School teachers perceived that their students have high level of "Courage" as they engaged in their flexible learning classes. For the students on the other hand, "Respect" obtained the lowest mean among other indicators with the mean=3.50, SD=0.62, and verbally interpreted to very true of me. This implies that the Senior High School students perceived that they have a very high level of "Respect" as they engaged themselves in their flexible learning classes.

Based on the findings revealed in this study, it was concluded that the Senior High School students have demonstrated good academic practices and high level of integrity as they engaged in their flexible learning classes in the new normal. Also, the

Paulinian Remote Flexible Learning Scheme of the University is effective in promoting core values in the new normal allowing the learners to still embody and demonstrate the six fundamental values of academic integrity. Furthermore, the Senior High School Students perceived differently as to the academic integrity behaviors of the students particularly in terms of respect and responsibility when they are grouped According to their sex. The teachers and the students perceived differently as to the demonstrated behaviors of the Paulinians particularly in terms of honesty, respect, responsibility, fairness, and courage. However, the teachers and the students both similarly believed that Paulinians are trustworthy.

Taking into consideration the findings and conclusions of the study, the researchers generally recommend that school administrators determine efficient measures to instill to both students and teachers how essential is academic integrity even challenged by the changing times. Also, this will help future researchers develop further studies related to pedagogical researchers focusing on values integration in the curriculum.

REFERENCES

1. Alla Anohina-Naumeca, Ilze Birzniece & Tatjana Odiņeca (2020). Students' awareness of the academic integrity policy at a Latvian university https://edintegrity.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1007/s40979-020-00064-4
2. Bretag, T. (2016). *Educational Integrity in Australia. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.*; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 23–38.
3. Brimble, M. (2015). *Why students cheat: An Exploration of the motivators of student academic dishonesty in higher education. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.;* Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 365–380.
4. Brown, M.; Haughwout (2014), A.; Lee, D.; Scally, J.; van der Klaauw, W. *Measuring Student Debt and Its Performance; Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports;* No. 668; FRBNY Staff Reports: New York, NY, USA, 2014.
5. Bloomfield, 2005, Hughes, Christian, Dayman, Kaufman and Schmidt (2002), https://home.schoolcraft.edu/cce/15.1.45-61.pdf
6. Bower, (1964); McCabe et al, (1997); Whitley et al, (1999); Crown and Spiller (1998); Cohen et al. (1998); Malone, (2006); Shaub, (1989); Sweeney, (1995), Thoma, (1986) https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066433.pdf
7. Cerimagic, S., and Hasan, M. R. (2019). *Online exam vigilantes at australian universities: student academic fraudulence and the role of universities to counteract.* ujer 7 (4), 929–936. doi:10.13189/ujer.2019.070403

8. Chen, S.; Macfarlane, B. (2015). *Academic integrity in China. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.;* Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 100–103.

9. Chin, M. (2020). *"The Ice Directive is Gone, But International Students Still Deportation," The Verge.* Available online: https://www.theverge.com/21365223/ice-international-students-college-coronavirus-CoVid-19-school-year (accessed on 10 September 2020).

10. Coman C., Laurent T., Meses L., Stanciu C., Bularca M. (2020). *Online Teaching and Learning in Higher Education during the Coronavirus Pandemic: Students' Perspective*

11. DepEd Memorandum (2021) https://www.freeeducationaltools.com/2021/09/deped-memo-promoting-academichonesty. html?m=1#:~:text=DepEd%20released%20the%20Memorandum%20DM,while%20upholding%20every%20learner%27 s%20integrity.

12. Epigeum (2020). Available online: www.epigeum.com/epigeum-insights/news/*academic-integrity-what-are-thechallenges-we-face-and-what-can-we-do-about-them/*

13. Ederio, N., Malillin, M.R., Andrin, G., N, Calaca, N, Watin, A.K., Palijo, H.S.T., Guilalas, A.V. (2021). *Characterizing Outcomes-Based Mathematics Teachers: Mark of Paulinian Education.* European Scholar Journal, Volume 2(No. 11),1-22. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5701558, https://scholarzest.com/index.php/esj/article/view/1379

14. Ederio, N., Calaca, N., Mallillin, Sr Marie Rosanne, SPC (2022). *Creative Mathematics Outcomes Achieved by the Junior High School Students as Characteristics of Mathematics Education at St. Paul University.* International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 5(1), 156-163. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V5-i1-18 https://ijcsrr.org/single-view/?id=4990&pid=4889

15. Ederio, N., Calaca, N., & Mallillin, M.R., (2021). *Extent of mathematics learning outcomes and competencies achieved by the junior high school students of St. Paul University Surigao.* Review of International Geographical Education Online, Volume 10(No.11), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5830884

16. Fishman, T. (2016). *Academic integrity as an educational concept, concern, and movement in US institutions of higher learning*. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 7–22.

17. Foster, G. (2015). *Grading standards in higher education: Trends, Context, and Prognosis. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed*.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 307–324.

18. Gilmore, J.; Maher, M.; Feldon, D. (2015). *Prevalence, prevention, and pedagogical techniques: Academic integrity and ethical professional practice among STEM students.* In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 730–743.

19. Holdren, O.L., Norris, M. E., and Kuhlmeier (2021). *Academic Integrity in Online Assessment: A Research Review.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.639814

20. Hylton, K., Levy, Y., and Dringus, L. P. (2016). *Utilizing Webcam-Based Proctoring to Deter Misconduct in Online Exams.* Comput. Edu. 92-93, 53–63. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2015.10.002

21. Haines et al., (1986); Graham et al., (1994); Diekhoff et al., (1996) Auerbach and Welsh, (1994); Barger et al., (1998). Lanier (2006) https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066433.pdf

22. International Center for Academic Integrity [ICAI]. (2021*). The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. (3rd ed.)* www.academicintegrity.org/the-fundamental-valuesof-academic-integrity

23. James, C. (2016). *Academic integrity in legal education. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed*.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 696–707.

24. Jaschik, S., and Lederman, D. (2018). *2018 Survey of Faculty Attitudes on Technology: A Study by inside Higher Ed and Gallup*. Washington, DC. Gallup, Inc. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/system/files/media/IHE_2018_Survey_Faculty_Technology.pdf

25. Khan, Z. R., Dyer, J., Bjelobaba, S., Gomes, S. F., Dlabolová, D. H., Sivasubramaniam, S., … Harish, P. (2021). Initiating count down - gamification of academic integrity. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00068-0

26. Ludeman, Roger & Osfield, Kenneth & Hidalgo, Enrique & Oste, Danja & Wang, Howard & UNESCO, & Services, International. (2009). *Student affairs and services in higher education: Global foundations, issues and best practices*. http://lst-iiep.iiep-unesco.org/cgi-bin/wwwi32.exe/[in=epidoc1.in]/?t2000=026816/(100).

27. Lofstrom, E. (2016). *Academic integrity in social sciences*. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 713–724.

28. Morris, E.J.; Carroll, J. (2015). *Developing a sustainable holistic institutional approach: Dealing with realities "on the ground" when implementing an academic integrity policy*. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 450–461.

29. Orim, S.M. (2016). *Perspectives of Academic integrity from Nigeria. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed*.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 148–159.

30. Pecorari, D. (2016). *Plagiarism, international students, and the second-language writer. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed*.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 538–548.

31. Peytcheva-Forsyth et al. (2018). *The impact of technology on cheating and plagiarism in the assessment – The teachers' and students' perspectives.* AIP Conference Proceedings. 2048. 020037. 10.1063/1.5082055. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329579299_The_impact_of_technology_on_cheating_and_plagiarism_in_the_assessment_-_The_teachers_and_students'_perspectives

32. Stenmark C.K., Winn N.A. (2015) *Ethics in the Humanities*. In: Bretag T. (eds) Handbook of Academic Integrity. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-079-7_43-1

33. Stephens, J.M. (2016) *Creating cultures of integrity: A multilevel intervention model for promoting academic. In Handbook of Academic Integrity*, 1st ed.; Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 996–1005.

34. Surendan, A. (2019). *Quantitative Research: Definition, Methods, Types and Examples, Retrieved from* www.google.com/amp/s/www.questionpro.com/blog/quantitative-research/amp/. Retrieved from November 6, 2019

35. S, Nowak, & R, Sundaram, & F, Thomas, (2000*). Academic dishonesty and distancelearning: Student and faculty views. College student journal. 34. 309-314*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236158886_Academic_dishonesty_and_distance_learning_Student_and_faculty_views/citation/download

36. Thomas, J.; Scott, J. (2020). *UK perspectives of academic integrity. In Handbook of Academic Integrity, 1st ed.;* Bretag, T., Ed.; Springer Science + Business Media Singapore Pte Ltd.: Singapore, 2016; pp. 39–54. 16. Quality Assurance Agency. Available online: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us/what-we-do/our-work (accessed on 17 June 2020).

37. Taylor, Glaister, Sutton & Yeo (2007). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276839670_Students'_Perception_And_Behavior_Of_Academic_Integrity_A_Case_Study_Of_A_Writing_Forum_Activity

38. UNESCO. Available online: www.en.unesco.org/CoVid-19/educationresponse (accessed on 9 June 2020).

39. Young-Jones, Adena & Miller, Arden. (2013). *Academic integrity: Online classes compared to face-to-face classes. Journal of Instructional Psychology*. 39. 138-145. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260969851_Academic_integrity_Online_classes_compared_to_face-to-face_classes/citation/download?fbclid=IwAR2oENgyQZu8FE5d1oAfdedpFu1B3rbK5BVS-R4Y-vsOdviQPgLbIPVjeYg

40. Youngberg. D (2012) *Why online Education won't replace college* https://www.chronicle.com/article/why-online-education-wont-replace-college-yet