

**Academic Integrity: Students' Awareness and Instructors' Promoting Strategies in English  
Lessons**

Anastassiya Nesterova

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Education and Humanities  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

SDU University

Department of Language Teacher Education

June, 2025

Thesis Advisor:

Associate Professor, PhD., Kymbat Smakova

SDU University

Faculty of Education and Humanities  
Department of Language Teacher Education

This is to certify that the Master's Thesis of

Anastassiya Nesterova

has met the thesis requirements of  
SDU University

Kaskelen, 2025

Approved by:

PhD., Associate Professor, Kymbat  
SMAKOVA,  
Professor, Thesis supervisor

PhD., Doctor Gulzhaina  
KASSYMOVA  
Committee Chair

PhD., Assistant Professor  
Akmarzhan NOGAIBAYEVA  
Department Chair



PhD., Associate Professor Zhainagul DUISEBEKOVA  
Dean, Faculty of Education and Humanities

**AUTHOR AGREEMENT**

The Author, I, Anastasiya Nesterova, hereby grants SDU University full and exclusive rights to reproduce the manuscript, make revisions, and reproduction. SDU rights include but are not limited to the following: (1) to reproduce, publish, sell, and distribute copies of the thesis, selections of the thesis, and translations and other derivative works based upon the thesis, in print, audio-visual, electronic, or by any and all media now or hereafter known or devised; (2) to license reprints of the thesis to third persons for educational photocopying; (3) to license others to create abstracts of the thesis and to index the thesis; (4) to license secondary publishers to reproduce the thesis in print or digital form, including electronic on-line databases; and (5) to license the thesis for document delivery. These exclusive rights run the full term of the copyright, and all renewals and extensions thereof.

hereby accept the terms of the above Author Agreement<sup>1</sup> and I sign.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Author signature

20.06.2025  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

---

This page is to be separately printed, then signed and dated by the author, after that scanned and finally copy-  
asted in this page.

**DECLARATION**

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that this submission is entirely my own work, in my own words, and that all sources used in researching it are fully acknowledged and all quotations properly identified to my best extent. It has not been submitted, in whole or in part, by me or another person, for the purpose of obtaining any other credit, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis. I understand the ethical implications of my research, and this work meets the requirements of the Faculty of Education and Humanities Research Ethics Policy.

Anastasiya Nesterova

Name



Signature

20.06.2025

Date

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Writing my master's dissertation has not been an easy journey. Over the past two years, I have experienced many changes, both academic and personal. There were times when I was sitting late at night, preparing for my upcoming conferences or editing articles. I was very inspired and motivated to accomplish these goals, despite being absolutely exhausted after a 10-hour workday. Sometimes, I felt desperate, and let things take their course. Surprisingly, though, there were many instances when the last variant worked as intended.

Now, as I am about to graduate, I would like to express my immense gratitude to all the people who helped me in this journey. Firstly, to my dear supervisor, Kymbat Smakova, who always provided thorough feedback on my work and pushed me towards the limit. You always challenged me and never let me choose the easiest part. Although it was sometimes stressful, now I see that it was definitely worth the effort. Secondly, to my beloved friends, Dasha, Rabiya, and Bagdaulet, thank you for your unwavering support and belief in me. Your kind words always helped me to stay on track and never give up, even though certain events had a profound impact on me. Last but not least, I am grateful for my family's support. I chose to keep my academic and family life separate since I did not want them to interfere with each other. Thank you for accepting my choice, but at the same time, being always there for me!

I believe I have reached even more goals than I planned. Hopefully, this promising start will lead to even better results in the future!

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	ix
Abstract .....	1
Андатпа .....	2
Аннотация .....	3
CHAPTER 1 Introduction .....	4
1.1 Background Information .....	5
1.1 Problem Statement .....	6
1.2 Purpose .....	7
1.3 Significance .....	7
1.4 Research Questions .....	8
1.5 The Structure of Thesis .....	9
CHAPTER 2 Literature Review .....	10
2.1 The Theoretical Framework and Definitions of the Key Terms .....	10
2.2 Students' Perceptions of Academic Integrity .....	13
2.2.1 Factors Influencing the Adherence to Academic Integrity .....	14
2.2.2 Main Types of Academic Dishonesty .....	15
2.2.3 The Use of Chat GPT .....	16
2.2.4 Reasons for Violating Academic Integrity .....	19
2.3 The Instructors' Roles in Maintaining Academic Integrity .....	20
2.4 The Instructors' Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity .....	21
2.4.1 The Use of Online Applications .....	21
2.4.2 The Use of Turnitin .....	23

2.4.3 The Use of Honor Codes .....	23
2.4.4 The Use of Authentic Assessment as an Alternative to tests .....	24
2.4.5 The Use of Online Proctoring Applications .....	25
2.5 Conclusion .....	26
CHAPTER 3 Methodology .....	27
3.1 Research Design .....	27
3.2 Participants and Sampling Plan .....	28
3.3 Data Collection .....	29
3.4 Data Analysis .....	31
3.5 Reliability and Validity .....	32
3.6 Significance .....	33
3.7 Limitations and Recommendations .....	33
3.8 Ethical Concerns .....	33
CHAPTER 4 Results and Findings .....	35
4.1 Background Information about the Participants .....	35
4.2 The Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity .....	36
4.2.1 Definitions of Academic Integrity .....	37
4.2.2 The Students' Attitudes towards Academic Integrity .....	38
4.2.3 Perceived Seriousness and Self-Reported Engagement in Academic Dishonesty .....	42
4.2.4 Correlation Analysis of Key Variables .....	47
4.3 The Instructors' Perceptions of Academic Integrity .....	48
4.3.1 The Instructors' Roles in Teaching about Academic Integrity .....	49
4.3.2 The Use of Online Applications .....	51

4.3.3 The Use of Turnitin .....	52
4.3.4 The Use of Honor Codes .....	53
4.3.5 The Use of Authentic Assessment .....	54
4.3.6 The Use of Online Proctoring Applications .....	55
CHAPTER 5 Discussion .....	57
5.1 The Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity .....	57
5.2 The Instructors' Roles and Promoting Strategies .....	58
CHAPTER 6 Conclusion .....	64
References .....	66
Appendix A .....	77
Appendix B .....	78
Appendix C .....	82
Appendix D .....	84
Appendix E .....	87

**List of Tables**

Table 1. Demographic Information about the Respondents .....	35
Table 2. Demographic Information about the Participants .....	36
Table 3. Students' Definitions of Academic Integrity .....	37
Table 4. Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity Policies .....	39
Table 5. Assessment of Policies .....	40
Table 6. Frequency of Instruction on Academic Integrity Topics .....	41
Table 7. Perceived Seriousness and Self-Reported Engagement in Academic Dishonesty .....	44
Table 8. Reasons for Violating Academic Integrity .....	45
Table 9. Spearman's Rank Correlations Between Variables .....	48

## **Academic Integrity: Students' Awareness and Instructors' Promoting Strategies in English**

### **Lessons**

### **Abstract**

With the emergence of artificial intelligence, maintaining academic integrity has become one of the most discussed topics. Thus, universities make attempts to decrease academic dishonesty. The aim of this research is doublefold: first, it seeks to identify students' awareness of academic integrity. Second, it describes the instructors' roles and strategies they use to maintain academic integrity. To achieve these aims, the adapted version of M-AIS was distributed among 187 students, majoring in the specialty "6B1702: Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages" at one private university in Kazakhstan. As for instructors, 12 of them participated in semi-structured interviews. The research followed a mixed method design, in which the quantitative part was analyzed based on mean, standard deviation, and Spearman's rank correlation. Overall, it was found that the students were fairly familiar with academic integrity and held positive attitudes towards it. However, they still perceived plagiarizing home assignments, getting unpermitted help, and mispresenting sources as trivial plagiarism and admitted to being engaged in them. In addition, there was a correlation between the student's year of study, GPA, perceived severity of academic dishonesty, and self-reported engagement in it. The findings were interpreted using Hatch's (2002) framework of typological analysis. As regards the instructors, their roles in promoting academic integrity were moderately active (ambassador). They taught different techniques to avoid plagiarism, assigned authentic assignments, or developed their own materials. The other part was determined to be passive (casual and detached) because they believed in students' responsibility to learn about academic integrity. As for strategies, the instructors considered the Turnitin application and authentic assessment as effective ways of maintaining academic integrity. In addition, they made presentations to teach about academic integrity. On the other hand, they did not believe in the usefulness of honor codes and online proctoring applications.

*Keywords:* academic integrity, academic dishonesty, self-reported engagement, perceived seriousness.

## Академиялық Адалдық: Студенттердің Академиялық Адалдық Туралы Білімі және Оқытушылардың Ағылшын Тілі Сабақтарында Академиялық Адалдық Стратегияларын Дамытуы

### Аңдатпа

Жасанды интеллекттің пайда болуымен академиялық адалдықты сақтау ең көп талқыланатын тақырыптардың біріне айналды. Сондықтан, университеттер академиялық адалдықты сақтауға тырысады. Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты екі еселенген: ол студенттердің академиялық адалдық туралы хабардарлығын анықтауға тырысады. Ол оқытушылардың рөлдері мен академиялық адалдықты сақтау үшін қолданатын стратегияларын сипаттайды. M-AIS бейімделген нұсқасы Қазақстанның бір жеке университетінде «6B1702: Шет тілі: екі шет тілі» мамандығы бойынша оқитын 187 студентке таратылды. Оқытушылар келетін болсақ, олардың 14-і жартылай құрылымдық сұхбатқа қатысты. Зерттеу аралас әдіс дизайны бойынша жүргізілді, онда сандық бөлік орташа, стандартты ауытқу және Спирмен дәрежесінің корреляциясы негізінде талданды. Жалпы алғанда, студенттердің академиялық адалдықты жақсы білетіндігі және оған деген оң көзқарастары анықталды. Дегенмен, олар үй тапсырмаларын плагиат жасауды, рұқсат етілмеген көмек алуды және дереккөздерді бұрмалауды тривиальды плагиат ретінде қабылдап, олармен айналысатынын мойындады. Сонымен қатар, студенттің оқу жылы, GPA, қабылданған академиялық адалдықтың ауырлығы және оған өз бетінше қатысуы арасында корреляция болды. Нәтижелер Хэтчтің (2002) типологиялық талдау шеңбері арқылы түсіндірілді. Оқытушыларға келетін болсақ, олардың академиялық адалдықты арттырудағы рөлі орташа белсенді. Олар плагиатқа жол бермеу үшін әртүрлі әдістерді үйретті, шынайы тапсырмалар берді немесе өз материалдарын әзірледі. Басқа бөлігі пассивті болды, өйткені олар студенттердің академиялық адалдық туралы білу жауапкершілігіне сенді. Стратегияларға келетін болсақ, оқытушылар Turnitin қолданбасы мен шынайы бағалауды академиялық адалдықты сақтаудың тиімді жолдары ретінде қарастырды. Сонымен қатар, олар академиялық адалдық туралы оқыту үшін презентациялар жасады. Олар ар-намыс кодекстері мен онлайн-прокторинг қосымшаларының пайдалылығына сенбеді.

*Түйін сөздер:* академиялық адалдық, академиялық адалдық, өзін-өзі хабарлаған қатысу, қабылданатын байыптылық.

## **Академическая Честность: Осведомленность Студентов и Стратегии Ее Продвижения Преподавателями на Занятиях Английского Языка**

### **Аннотация**

С появлением искусственного интеллекта, соблюдение академической честности стало одной из самых обсуждаемых тем. Поэтому университеты предпринимают меры для снижения академической нечестности. Цель исследования состоит из двух частей: во-первых, оно исследует осведомленность студентов об академической честности. Во-вторых, оно определяет роли преподавателей и их стратегии для ее поддержания. Для достижения этих целей, адаптированная версия M-AIS была распространена среди 187 студентов специальности “6В1702: Иностранный Язык: Два Иностранных Языка” в одном частном университете в Казахстане. Также 12 преподавателей приняли участие в полуструктурированных интервью. Был использован смешанный тип исследования, в котором количественная часть была анализирована с помощью среднего значения, стандартного отклонения и корреляции Спирмена. Было обнаружено, что студенты знакомы с академической честностью и имеют положительное отношение к ней. Однако они воспринимали плагиат в домашних заданиях, получение неразрешенной помощи и искажение источников, как незначительный плагиат. Была выявлена корреляция между годом обучения студентов, средним баллом, воспринимаемой серьезностью академической нечестности и самооценкой вовлеченности в нее. Результаты интервью были интерпретированы по модели типологического анализа Хатча (2002). Роль преподавателей в поддержании академической честности была довольно активной. Часть из них обучала различным техникам избежания плагиата, задавала креативные задания и разрабатывала собственные материалы. Другая часть была более пассивной и считала соблюдение академической честности ответственностью студентов. Касаясь стратегий, преподаватели считали использование Turnitin и аутентичных заданий эффективными стратегиями. Также они делали презентации об академической честности. С другой стороны, преподаватели не верили в эффективность кодов чести и онлайн приложения для прокторинга.

*Ключевые слова:* академическая честность, академическая нечестность, списывание, самооценка вовлеченности, воспринимаемая серьезность.

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction

Currently, educational institutions worldwide value the strict maintenance of academic integrity since it leads to obtaining in-depth knowledge in the chosen area. Hence, academic integrity is defined as the application of “honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility even in the face of adversity” (McCabe & Pavela, 2004, p.6). The commitment to these values is a cornerstone that should be upheld by the academic community to ensure the credibility of the anticipated outcomes of university programs. Even though much attention is paid to maintaining academic integrity, this idea is frequently blurred, resulting from the impact of rapid globalization, the emergence of technological innovations, and ambiguous university policies. Consequently, these reasons cause academic dishonesty, which takes multiple types, such as bribery, cheating, data fabrication, improper citations, falsification, and others (*Types of Academic Misconduct*, 2024). In addition, the emergence and use of artificial intelligence (AI) powered tools have also posed a significant challenge to the preservation of academic integrity. Therefore, there are a lot of acts of academic dishonesty which Chow et al. (2021) refer to as “any deceitful or unfair act intended to produce a more desirable outcome on an exam, paper, homework assignment, or other assessment of learning” (p.17).

Any academic misconduct results in the loss of academic integrity, which challenges the concept of fair education and the credibility of obtained degrees. In addition to this, academic integrity is not only limited to the educational context, but it also has a direct relationship with the person’s decision-making in the future workplace, as they can also be tempted by finding an easier way of overcoming arising problems. Carpenter (2004) concluded that those students who committed academic misconduct during their studies had more inclination towards being

dishonest at their workplace. Opposite findings were made by Guerrero-Dib et al. (2023), who revealed a direct positive relationship between students' adherence to academic integrity at the university level and their moral behavior and ethics at the workplace. Thus, it is possible to say that adherence to academic integrity at university has an impact on being honest in the workplace.

### **1.1 Background Information**

Despite the widely spread agreement on the need to promote academic integrity, 60% of students still admit violating it, primarily in the form of cheating, every year (McCabe, 2004). This trend is increasing each year, and almost every student engaged in violating academic integrity throughout their studies (Anitha & Sundaram, 2021). The authors concluded that the most common violations included seeking help from different sources, plagiarizing, and cheating in exam conditions. In addition, after the breakout of the COVID-2019 pandemic, the situation has worsened, particularly in terms of cheating on assignments and exams, as there is a lack of control, and students are given “an unprecedented and extremely tempting choice to cheat” (Khan et al., 2021, p. 20). As regards the reasons for violations of academic integrity, it usually happens due to reasons such as being afraid of failure, having questions unrelated to the course material, lacking severe consequences, or aiming to get higher results in exams (Bylieva et al., 2020). Additionally, the use of artificial intelligence poses another challenge to academic integrity today. One of the most commonly used applications is Chat GPT, which “has revolutionized natural language processing by generating human-like text with context and coherence” (Roumeliotis & Tselikas, 2023, p.192). The advantages of this application are evident in its ability to quickly generate answers, cost efficiency, provision of relevant feedback, and

effective asynchronous communication (Haleem et al., 2022; Kala & Smith, 2023.). Therefore, nowadays, there is a clear need to maintain academic integrity.

Thus, Kazakhstani universities have also recognized the importance of upholding academic integrity and have taken significant steps to promote it. One of the initial measures was the establishment of the Academic Integrity League on August 28, 2018. Currently, there are 17 higher education institutions in this association, the aim of which is to promote the implementation of the ten fundamental principles of academic integrity. Based on the report provided by the Academic Integrity League (2023), the instructors are responsible for ensuring academic honesty so that students are aware of the consequences of their violations; thus, decreasing the likelihood of academic dishonesty. In addition, the universities are obliged to guarantee that their graduates have received a high-quality education that is compatible with the needs and requirements of their future employers. The next step is the submission of quality assurance reports of Kazakhstani universities compiled on the basis of the effectiveness of their programs. Also, beginning from 2019, similarity detection softwares, such as Turnitin and StrikePlagiarism, have become obligatory to be used in checking students' written works.

Despite an ongoing discussion of the need to maintain academic integrity, it remains disputable who should be the main person to familiarize students with these values. However, mostly, the instructors are seen as the key figures in this process (Adhikari, 2018; Löfström et al., 2014). Likewise, they should be knowledgeable of its standards and teach their students about them as well.

## **1.2 Problem statement**

In general, students are unaware of what academic integrity is, and frequent violations of it are common (Bergström et al., 2020). That is why the instructors are given a leading role in

educating students about this, since they regularly interact with students, assign homework, and conduct examinations, which is in turn their responsibility to ensure the outcomes of education. This study focuses particularly on the maintenance of academic integrity in EFL lessons, which are conducted for future teachers of English. In the case of teaching specialties, academic integrity should be given due attention as these majors prepare teachers for their future careers in education. Thus, it is obligatory for them to become professionals in their sphere.

### **1.3 Purpose**

The aim of this study is twofold: first, it seeks to identify the students' perceptions of maintaining academic integrity in English lessons. Second, this research will investigate the instructors' roles and strategies in promoting academic integrity in higher education. Thus, the following objectives will be achieved:

- To analyze the theoretical and methodological background that explains students' awareness and perceptions of academic integrity as well as the instructors' promoting strategies;
- To identify how students perceive academic integrity;
- To determine the main types of violations of academic integrity and reasons for breaching it;
- To determine the strategies instructors use to uphold academic integrity, including the role they play in it.

### **1.4 Significance**

Concerning the theoretical significance of the study, it will provide an in-depth analysis of students' attitudes toward academic integrity and the instructors' perceptions of their role in the promotion of academic integrity and working strategies. This is necessary to help determine

the current state of academic integrity in English lessons. As regards practical significance, since this research aims to collect strategies that promote academic integrity from the instructors' viewpoint, they can be collected and serve as a guide for future implementation. In addition, the novelty of this research is that Kazakhstani scholars mainly focused on the identification of students' perceptions of academic dishonesty (Bazylkhanova et al., 2022; Makhmutova, 2021; Sarsenbayeva, 2020). However, teachers' roles and their strategies have not been investigated in detail (Altaibekova, 2020). Therefore, this research will provide some insights into these issues to close gaps in knowledge.

### **1.5 Research Questions**

1) To what extent are students aware of the need to adhere to academic integrity in higher education?

2) In what ways are the standards of academic integrity maintained by instructors in English lessons?

### **1.6 The Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis consists of six chapters. The first chapter, introduction, contains historical background, problem statement, aim, objectives, and research questions. The literature review presents the theoretical framework, definitions of key terms, and the main takeaways about students' awareness and instructors' promoting strategies. As for the methodology, it explicitly explains the steps and procedures involved in conducting this research. The results and findings chapter is divided into two parts: the first deals with describing the results of the questionnaire, while the second focuses on the identification of instructors' roles. After that, chapter five, discussion, provides a comparative analysis of the obtained results and findings with other

studies conducted in the same area. Finally, the conclusion gives a brief summary of this research.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

Nowadays, the instances of violating integrity are constantly rising. Primarily, the behaviors leading to academic dishonesty can be classified into several types: cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, and sabotage. Therefore, it is not surprising that almost every student has engaged in scholastic dishonesty at least once during their studies (Simmons, 2018). This happens due to various reasons such as a desire to get higher grades, maintain the scholarship, lack of knowledge of the subject matter, underdeveloped paraphrasing, citation, and referencing skills. More alarmingly, though, Luniachek et al. (2020) pointed out that students do not consider committing academic dishonesty as a serious problem since it is sometimes neglected by instructors, and this issue is not raised publicly. According to Bazylkhanova and Dalekhanova (2022a), students generally lack awareness of what academic integrity is and perceive plagiarism as the only form of academic misconduct. That is why this literature review will first focus on identifying students' perceptions related to academic integrity. It will include information regarding the types of academic dishonesty, students' awareness of academic integrity, and reasons leading to its violations. This part is based on the theories developed by Ajzen (1991), Bandura (1997), and Kohlberg (1958), which served as a basis for McCabe's (2010) Academic Integrity Survey (M-AIS). Secondly, the following literature review will provide insights into instructors' perceptions and promoting strategies because instructors are regarded as primary gatekeepers of academic integrity.

#### 2.1 The Theoretical Framework and Definitions of the Key Terms

Prior to discussing the students' awareness of academic integrity and instructors' promoting strategies, it is necessary to determine the theoretical background of academic

integrity. The theoretical foundation of this research lies in four theories: Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1997), Moral Development Theory (Kohlberg, 1958), and Academic Integrity Framework (Bretag et al., 2011). With the help of the Theory of Planned Behavior, which consists of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, it will be possible to understand how students perceive academic dishonesty and whether they engage in any type of it. Social learning theory emphasizes peer behavior and instructor modeling, which will show how external factors contribute to students' understanding and maintenance of academic integrity. Moral development theory explains how people react to others behavior: whether they take action or ignore it. In the case of students, it shows whether they will respond to academic dishonesty when they notice it. As for Bretag et al. (2011) framework, particularly the dimensions of academic integrity support and learning, teaching, and assessment, serve as a guide in investigating the instructors' roles and strategies in teaching about academic integrity. The abovementioned frameworks were also used in the studies conducted by Anitha and Sundaram (2021), Sarsenbayeva (2020), Di Paulo (2022), and Ivic and Sostaric (2022).

As regards the meaning of academic integrity, most instructors and students acknowledge that teaching, learning, and research can be conducted only in highly ethical environments. For this reason, based on the European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI) glossary, academic integrity is defined as “the compliance with ethical and professional principles, standards, practices, and consistent system of values, that serves as guidance for making decisions and taking actions in education, research, and scholarship” (p.10).

However, this definition is frequently narrowed only to prohibiting behaviors that contradict the idea of academic integrity and is mostly viewed negatively, while International

Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 2019) makes efforts to show it in positive and pragmatic ways. Another reason why it is difficult to decide on the all-encompassing definition of academic integrity is that this term is susceptible to multiple interpretations, as some refer it to values and behaviors whereas others relate it to plagiarism and cheating (Boehm et al., 2019). Also, these authors maintained that academic integrity takes the form of a social contract in which one “relinquishes certain rights – so that other members of the group also relinquish similar rights to create an equitable environment” (p.4). This means that every individual should take responsibility not only for themselves but for their surrounding peers as well. In addition, academic honesty is subdivided into three crucial principles: doing the work yourself, citing other authors, and fairly presenting research materials (Lipson, 2019). Thus, by following these simple principles, academic integrity can be ensured. Finally, Turner and Beemsterboer (2003) suggested that academic integrity also refers to the teaching and learning of skills, values, and the distribution of new knowledge. Consequently, these authors acknowledged the need to learn more about ethical values rather than simply avoiding cheating.

Concerning the violations of academic integrity, they are, in fact, not new. The earlier studies (Bowers, 1964; McCabe & Trevino, 1996) indicated that they trace back to the 20<sup>th</sup> century when cases of academic dishonesty became apparent, and researchers started to focus on the most common types and reasons for this. Also, nowadays, due to the shift in external and internal values, social changes, and the impact of modern technologies, instances of academic dishonesty have become rampant. What is more worrying is the fact that the main problem does not lie in students who violate the rules but in “the collegiate culture that supports cheating” (Alschuler & Blimling, 1995, p. 6). As a result, while academic institutions generally acknowledge the vitality of being honest, numerous cases of dishonesty are still neglected.

Academic dishonesty refers to the behavior breaching “the submission of work that has been produced by a student who will be awarded a grade” (Lambert et al., 2003, p. 98). This usually happens because of improper citations, group work on individual assignments, asking someone to check before submitting, and getting questions or answers for the upcoming test in advance (Kidwell et al., 2003).

## **2.2 Students’ Perceptions of Academic Integrity**

One of the most significant aspects that can influence the maintenance of academic integrity is seen in students’ perceptions of it. However, it can be observed that academic integrity is perceived differently when students represent different specialties. According to Woith et al. (2012), nursing students associated academic integrity with positive connotations, viewing its maintenance as essential for trustworthiness, honesty, and fairness. In addition, the students believed that academic integrity leads to professional outcomes, which “encompass concepts such as professionalism, success, and expertise” (p. 257). Elzubeir and Rizk (2003) also identified that medical students support an academically honest environment and view it positively, as the vast majority of them claimed to have never been engaged in any form of violations. On the contrary, Stone (2023) concluded that academic integrity was a frightening term for most of her research participants majoring in business, as they were scared of the consequences of breaching it. In addition, this study revealed that most academic misconducts were claimed to be unintentional due to the lack of awareness on behalf of students. Therefore, the majority of students defended themselves even though they disobeyed the rules.

As regards the teaching specialties, different perspectives have been identified. Di Paulo (2022) revealed that his participants (pre-service teachers) recognized the vitality of adhering to academic integrity, but still, the majority cheated on exams, provided improper citations for

writing assignments, or shared their homework with other students. Moreover, they justified their behavior by looking at their peers or observing the faculty's negligence. Eret and Ok (2014) investigated the perceptions of 386 students in Ankara who majored in teaching specialties. It was found that half of them used Internet sources to do assignments, asked friends to help, or self-plagiarized. Year of study and gender were also significant predictors of cheating: males and final-year students were more prone to disobeying the rules. However, those students who were frequently involved in writing research papers were found to be less likely to engage in scholastic dishonesty (Espinosa & Toquero, 2018). Based on the results of their study, students who possessed well-developed research skills rarely violated academic integrity and saw it as an integral component of their institution. Also, Calovic-Nenezic (2023) determined that, in general, students view academic integrity as a necessity; however, frequent violations of it are due to the lack of knowledge, absence of strict punishments, and inadequate control. As a result, it can be concluded that the perceptions of academic integrity vary based on the students' majors.

### ***2.2.1 Factors Influencing Adherence to Academic Integrity***

Adherence to academic integrity can be influenced by a lot of factors, both external and internal. One of the main internal factors contributing to the understanding and maintenance of academic integrity is the level of awareness (Thakkar & Weisfeld-Spolter, 2012). The authors concluded that the consequences of breaching academic integrity should be effectively communicated to students. Also, the students themselves agreed to become partners in the prevention of academic dishonesty; however, they wanted to be rewarded for their "help".

An example of external factors is the mode of delivery. Since some courses are conducted online and others - offline, this has a huge impact on academic integrity. In the online format, students show more violations as they have more possibilities to cheat, and instructors pay less

attention to instances of academic dishonesty (Lanier, 2006). Ivic and Sostaric (2022) also supported the claim that academic integrity suffers in online lessons, as they found out that students' grades significantly improved. Janke et al. (2021) elaborated further on this question and investigated exactly how academic integrity was breached in the online format. Based on the answers of 1608 students in Germany, it was concluded that the cases of cheating on online exams experienced a dramatic increase compared to offline ones. Easier access to unallowed materials and exchanging answers were the main reasons why cheating rates increased. However, the study revealed no significant differences in breaching academic integrity in other forms.

Another important role in the promotion of academic integrity is given to instructors. Peters et al. (2019) classified them into seven categories: ambassador, collaborator, cooperater, casual, referrer, and detached. These names are derived based on the degree of responsibility that the instructors take in teaching academic integrity. While ambassadors and collaborators play an active role in this process, referrers and detached believe in students' responsibility. Subsequent study conducted by Chirikov et al. (2020) focused on those instructors who explicitly taught about academic integrity, and it revealed that students are more likely to obey the rules when their instructor is strongly intolerant of their violations. Thus, the authors claimed that it is the instructor's responsibility to actively teach about academic integrity, not only when the acute need arises. However, Lofstrom (2014) and MacLeod (2020) revealed that in some educational institutions, instructors are unaware of academic integrity policies; as a result, they observed the deterioration of it every year. This negligence mainly happened because of excessive overwork and incomplete institutional policies. Thus, it is possible to say that there are many factors that play a role in students' perceptions of academic integrity.

### ***2.2.2 Main Types of Academic Dishonesty***

Academic integrity and academic dishonesty are the two notions that frequently come together, but their meanings are different. As such, academic dishonesty is defined as “any deceitful or unfair act intended to produce a more desirable outcome on an exam, paper, homework assignment, or other assessment of learning” (Chow et al., 2021, p.30). The types of academic dishonesty include plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, sabotage, outside help, and others.

To promote academic integrity, first, the most common unethical behaviors should be identified. According to the earlier findings provided by Munir et al. (2011), whose participants were 200 BS and MS students majoring in science, sabotage, electronic cheating, and outside help are the top three behaviors leading to academic dishonesty. Also, Alleyne and Phillips (2011) study suggested that, on the other hand, lying and copying behaviors were the most frequent, and on the other hand, inventing data and using cheat sheets were much less common. The more recent research findings made by Anitha and Sundaram (2021) also agreed in terms of using external sources and cheating, and they added plagiarism and lying as other types of unethical behaviour. Moreover, the study revealed that students do not consider plagiarism as a severe form of academic misconduct, whereas cheating on exams is viewed negatively. Landa-Blanco et al. (2021) admitted that the most common forms of academic misconduct were plagiarism on assignments and exams and helping others do the same. In addition, students who frequently violated the rules did not consider it immoral and frequently justified their behavior as others also did the same. Most of them also reported cheating starting in school.

### ***2.2.3 The Use of ChatGPT and Academic Integrity***

Another area of concern nowadays is the use of ChatGPT. It has become pervasive among students who complete their written home assignments and pass final examinations with

the help of this tool. With the beginning of the widespread use of ChatGPT in November 2022, nowadays, around 180 million people are active users of this application, and more than 43% of students rely on it while completing their homework (Nerdynav, 2024). The popularity of Chat GPT has been achieved by its “greatly enhanced reasoning ability, understanding of complex issues, and code writing capability” (Yu, 2023, p.27). Shalevska (2023) describes several ways, in which students can implement Chat GPT in the educational sphere which are as follows: language learning, writing assistance, automated grading, and personalized learning. Language learning mainly refers to the simulation of real-life interactions and providing users with feedback on their errors. Writing assistance can correct students’ grammatical, punctuation, or spelling errors and also promote automated grading, which decreases teachers’ workload and gives immediate feedback. Finally, this application can be utilized to search for materials based on the users’ needs. Furthermore, such personalization of learning can improve “academic achievement, engagement, and self-efficacy” (Wu, 2017, p.57), which will result in better learning outcomes. Also, it was determined that Chat GPT has the potential to provide autodidactic learners with real-time feedback, increased accessibility, convenience, flexibility, self-assessment, and reflection (Firat, 2023; Oranga, 2023). Consequently, this application can become an indispensable component in self-studying.

Cotton et al. (2024) claimed that Chat GPT is potentially useful for instructors too as it helps to design multiple assessment tasks tailored to each student’s individual needs and levels which is not likely to be achievable without using artificial intelligence. Also, with the help of this application, it is possible to create a game-based assessment with immediate feedback. As regards the assessment of essays, this application can help by “automating assessment, plagiarism detection, administration, as well as feedback mechanisms” (p.351) if programmed

carefully (Sharma & Yadav, 2022). Another advantage of using Chat GPT is the creation of lesson plans and materials. Plessis (2023) explored the teachers' perceptions of a lesson plan designed by Chat GPT. Overall, it was found that it generally corresponded to the objectives and the level of students, and designed some exercises which in turn provided a kind of skeleton for teachers. However, it was suggested to be double-checked by the real teacher to make tasks more creative and think about smooth transitions between different stages of the lesson. Finally, according to Bonner (2023), Chat GPT can be helpful in simplifying texts for students, checking grammar and mechanics, generating speaking and writing prompts, and creating presentation notes. Thus, Chat GPT can significantly decrease teachers' workload.

On the other hand, the use of Chat GPT undoubtedly challenges the idea of academic integrity. Shalevska (2023) experimented with using Chat GPT in order to pass state exams in Macedonia. The results showed that Chat GPT could answer 80% of multiple-choice questions correctly and wrote an essay that fully corresponded to all the requirements. Therefore, she suggested paying careful attention in exam proctoring to eliminate cheating. Another difficulty lies in the identification of AI-generated content in written works. Webber Wulff et al. (2023) used both humans and plagiarism-checking software applications to identify whether there was AI in students' essays. The results revealed that among other plagiarism checkers, Turnitin was more accurate in identifying plagiarized content. As regards human evaluators, sometimes they appeared to be less "reliable" in this respect because advanced grammar and vocabulary frequently led them to categorizing this essay as AI-generated. In conclusion, the authors stated that neither applications, nor humans can guarantee 100% accuracy in detecting AI. Similar results were obtained by Hsu et al. (2023). In their study, Chat GPT had to write structured and unstructured abstracts for research papers. After that, they were distributed among human raters

and submitted to a plagiarism checker. It was revealed that only a minority of papers were identified to be AI-generated by humans. As regards the plagiarism checker, it revealed that unstructured abstracts were less likely to have been determined as plagiarized. Another threat to academic integrity is seen in the students' awareness of committing academic misconduct. Rosyanafi (2023) stated that students have become cautious about using Chat GPT which, however, does not mean they stopped relying on it in the completion of home assignments. Rather, students elaborated on other ways of using it: they started paraphrasing AI-generated output and checking its reliability before submitting their works.

Consequently, based on the abovementioned findings, nowadays, plagiarism, cheating on exams, and the use of Chat GPT are the most prevalent types of academic dishonesty.

#### ***2.2.4 Reasons for Violating Academic Integrity***

Academically dishonest behavior happens because of a number of reasons. However, one of the most important issues in violating academic integrity lies in the fact that students do not have awareness of what exactly constitutes cheating. As a result, according to Zangla (2023), as students lack knowledge in this respect, they cannot determine the severity of their actions. However, students are more likely to determine their peers' dishonest behavior rather than their own one. In addition, Bachore (2016) determined two areas of concern: cheating on exams and plagiarizing home assignments. As regards the first category, the main reasons for violating rules were the desire to get high grades, challenging and unrelated to the course material exam questions, and too limited time for completion. Plagiarism usually occurred due to contract cheating and improper use of published sources. This opinion was supported by Anitha and Sundaram (2021), who also added parental expectations and conformity as the main reasons for violations. Her participants, especially first- and second-year students, were heavily pressured by

parents in terms of academic success. Also, as they saw negative examples, shown by their peers, they were more likely to disobey the rules too. Furthermore, another interesting finding was proposed by Kennet and Shkodkina (2018) who conducted a comparative study between the USA and Ukraine. Based on their findings, Ukrainian students violated academic integrity twice more frequently than their American peers, and the authors attributed it to differences in culture and mindset. In addition, the researchers classified the reasons for violations into two groups: internal individual and external contextual factors with goal orientation to better grades and lack of awareness in the first category, and influencing peer behavior and lack of control in the second. To sum up, the reasons for violating academic integrity range from parents' expectations to lack of awareness.

### **2.3 The Instructors' Roles in Maintaining Academic Integrity**

As was previously mentioned, Peters et al. (2019) proposed a classification of roles instructors take in terms of promoting academic integrity. According to this classification, the roles are named based on the level of responsibility and involvement on behalf of instructors. They are as follows: ambassador, collaborator, cooperator, casual, referrer, delegator, and detached. This can be seen from the following explanation of some roles: while ambassadors are fully responsible, recognize, and teach their students a variety of skills, for example, paraphrasing and citation techniques, detached instructors either do not pay any attention to the maintenance of academic integrity or rely on students' conscience. Also, according to the findings, Peters et al. (2019) claimed ambassador and detached roles were the most popular ones. It was still evident that some instructors combined two or more roles, such as being a cooperator and a referrer.

Another classification was proposed by Löffström et al. (2014), considering those instructors, who took an active role in teaching about academic integrity. Thus, their suggestion was to divide them into five groups: teachers of rules and values, gatekeepers of the academy, teaching-oriented social reformers, academic integrity modelers who emphasize student responsibility, and academic integrity skill-builders. The resemblance of the first two categories can be seen with the ambassador, collaborator, and cooperator roles, proposed by Peters et al. (2019). However, Löffström et al. (2014) stated that roles vary not only in how extensively instructors teach the rules of academic integrity but also in how thoroughly they explain its values and highlight its significance. In general, Löffström et al. (2014) and Peter et al. (2019) concluded that the percentage of teachers who are active in terms of maintaining academic integrity in their lessons is moderately small; thus, more steps should be taken to uplift its significance.

## **2.4 The Instructors' Strategies to Promote Academic Integrity**

The previous subchapters presented the importance of academic integrity, students' perceptions, and instructors' roles. As it is evident from them, steps are taken to mitigate academic dishonesty. Therefore, the following part of the literature review will present an outline of strategies that instructors believe to be effective in higher education institutions.

### ***2.4.1 The Use of Online Applications***

After the outbreak of COVID-2019, online education has gained a lot of popularity. Therefore, students are likely to benefit from courses, devoted to academic integrity if they take them in this mode of delivery. Previous studies, conducted by Belter and Du Pré (2009) and Henslee et al. (2015), demonstrate successful implementation of such courses in practice. Belter and Du Pré (2009) believed that an integration of an online academic integrity course will result

in a sharp decline in the frequency of violations. Moreover, it should be made compulsory for all first-year students to yield the most efficient results. The authors emphasized the importance of this course and recommended restricting students from taking other subjects in case of failing it as was in their study. The designed online tutorial provided explicit information, concerning the types of academic dishonesty, it included a description of various forms of academic misconduct, ways to avoid it, and potential consequences. The results indicated that the frequency of cheating became four times lower after students completed the course. However, some works were still heavily plagiarized, and Belter and Du Pré attributed it to students' lack of knowledge, which caused an inability to complete assignments honestly. Later in 2015, Henslee et al. (2015) duplicated Belter and Du Pré's tutorial with an alteration in terms of its format – they introduced pre-recorded lectures and added revision tests to check comprehension. Both studies revealed almost equal effectiveness of online tutorials and pre-recorded lectures, but Henslee et al. (2015) determined that those students, who attempted the quiz more often, plagiarized more often as well. Therefore, the authors concluded that they lacked an understanding of how plagiarism can be avoided.

Another study conducted by Stoesz and Los (2019) determined the impact of using a similar application on the maintenance of academic integrity by high school students (grades 8-13) and undergraduates. The authors found out that prior to being introduced to the notion of academic integrity, nearly every student had violated it more than once. However, after the experiment, this application showed effectiveness, particularly with younger high school students and the 24-28 age group. Also, from a psychological point of view, it was revealed that individuals with higher levels of motivation and responsibility in studying were less likely to

cheat. Therefore, based on the previous research findings, it is believed that online applications and tutorials are a good strategy to be used in higher education.

#### ***2.4.2 The Use of Turnitin***

With the invention of Turnitin in 1998, it has been widely used to detect plagiarism, based on the matches of text with that published on the Internet. Nowadays, it is used in more than 185 countries in 20000 institutions (Turnitin, 2024). Overall, Turnitin is viewed favorably by instructors, as it is an effective plagiarism detector, which helps to decrease cheating (Amin, 2019; Ismail & Jabri, 2023; Sutherland-Smith & Carr, 2005). This claim is supported by Ismail and Jabri (2023), whose study revealed that plagiarism rates decreased by a third when students knew their instructors checked their written assignments in Turnitin. However, apart from making students aware of using Turnitin, the authors added that it is necessary to teach them how to avoid plagiarism. Also, there was one drawback in this application: it did not always show an accurate percentage of plagiarism by counting common phrases as cheating. The same opinion was expressed by Amin (2019) and Sutherland-Smith and Carr (2005) whose participants were students. Even though they believed that Turnitin acts as a deterrent to plagiarism, they also noted its inaccuracy in calculating the percentage. Based on these comments, in both cases, it was suggested to doublecheck written assignments manually to see what was considered plagiarism. Abrahamson (2024) also determined that students view peer assessment as a beneficial function of this application because it promotes collaboration. In addition, more attention should be given to practicing paraphrasing techniques.

#### ***2.4.3 The Use of Honor Codes***

Another effective strategy that is popular in Western universities is the use of honor codes. As Tatum and Schwartz (2017) claimed, they act as a written and signed contract between

teachers and students, and it is likely to impede cheating and plagiarism. Also, a similar opinion was expressed by Scanlan (2006) who found out that universities with honor codes faced far fewer challenges with maintaining academic integrity than the universities without such practices. In addition, Gurung et al. (2012) gave some recommendations on how to write them. First, honor codes are to be written formally, and they should clearly describe the consequences students will face in case of any violations. Second, it is necessary for students to sign them to confirm that they have read and understood. Since some students might be unfamiliar with honor codes, Shu et al. (2012) suggested introducing them from the very beginning of the semester. Furthermore, to make the most of using honor codes, Scanlan (2006) recommended conducting training for students and encouraging instructors to be role models for them. The following passage is an excerpt from the honor code, published by the College of Arts and Science:

I shall perform honestly all my academic obligations. I will not represent the words, works, or ideas of others as my own, will not cheat, and will not seek to mislead faculty or other academic officers in their evaluation of my coursework or in any other academic affair.

#### ***2.4.4 The Use of Authentic Assessment as an Alternative to Tests***

Sotiriadou et al. (2019) proposed authentic assessment as an effective strategy to mitigate academic dishonesty. This type of assessment involves creating authentic assignments, which cannot be easily searched on the Internet; consequently, students will need to use their creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills to complete them. As such, the authors maintained that rather than assessing students' knowledge through standard multiple-choice tests, teachers should replace them with case studies, interviews, or video shootings to make assessment more meaningful for students. To ensure their depth of knowledge, it was suggested to have face-to-

face discussions with students. Also, implementing scaffolding techniques and regular progress checking would ensure successful completion of the assigned task. In addition, Sotiriadou et al. (2019) revealed that students' motivation grew when they were given authentic tasks because they simultaneously got practical knowledge and hands-on experience. Also, based on the results of their research, there were fewer violations of academic integrity. In Openo's (2023) opinion, authentic assessment is a contributor to the improvement of "the truly human skills of strategy, creativity, and compassion" (p.229), which will help to promote the culture of academic integrity. Evangelista (2025) also supported the idea of using authentic assessment in the form of case studies and shooting videos, as this form promotes creativity and application of knowledge. However, she suggested being cautious in assigning essays since they can be AI-generated or purchased.

However, authentic assessment can be difficult to conduct because of the evaluating criteria. To tackle this problem, the author developed a five-dimension framework for assessing students, which included task, physical, digital, social contexts, final product, and criteria and standards.

In order to develop tasks for authentic assessment, another framework was developed by Iverson et al. (2008). While designing authentic tasks, instructors should consider these factors: complexity, feed forward, fidelity, frequency, and impact. Ellis et al. (2019) also supported this idea because without meeting these criteria, the tasks will be poorly structured and will lead to cheating, destroying the meaning of this assessment.

#### ***2.4.5 The Use of Online Proctoring Applications***

During the COVID-2019 pandemic, a lot of universities switched to the online mode of conducting examinations. However, this has caused difficulties in terms of maintaining academic

integrity, as students could easily cheat. Based on the results, provided by Ivić and Šošćarić (2022), there was a significant improvement in students' results when they were not proctored in comparison with the previous years. That is why, the authors recommended using Moodle with installed proctoring. Also, they mentioned the necessity of including a random selection of questions from a large database, time limits, and the inability to switch between questions. The same view was shared by Shaushenova et al. (2021), who promoted online proctoring tools to decrease the likelihood of cheating in the online setting. This would ensure minimal deviation between the test results in the online and offline modes. Another application, similar to Moodle, is called Proctorio. Bergmans et al. (2021) determined that the students regarded it as a barrier to cheating and answered the questions honestly. Mutawa and Sruthi (2021) mentioned that blended proctoring was seen as the best version to conduct exams. Online proctoring, powered by AI, is convenient for instructors but limits students by not allowing them to ask questions. Consequently, in the blended format, the application monitors students while enabling instructors to provide any required help.

## **2.6 Conclusion**

This literature review aimed to provide an overview of students' perceptions of academic integrity and the instructors' roles in it. In addition, it tried to shed light on the most effective and precise strategies that are used. Also, the reviewed literature mainly focused on the experience of universities in other countries; however, there was a clear lack of studies related to the determination of the situation in Kazakhstan. In light of the fact that Kazakhstani students frequently violate the rules of academic integrity, the subsequent chapters will review what strategies instructors use and compare them with the abovementioned ones.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **Methodology**

This research has a dual focus: first, it aims to identify the students' awareness of the level of adherence to academic integrity in their educational institution, and second, it will reveal the strategies the instructors use to diminish the likelihood of academic misconduct. Therefore, this chapter will present an overview of the research design, a description of data collection tools, the procedures involved in conducting it, and an analysis of results and findings.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

To achieve the dual aim of the current study, mixed method research was selected as it involves the combination of elements peculiar to both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Since it utilizes their strengths in order to sufficiently address complex issues and reveal a deep understanding of research problems (Creswell, 2017), it is considered to be more effective in conducting research in the education sphere. As regards the quantitative part, the questionnaire, consisting of 17 predominantly multiple-choice questions, was distributed among 187 TFL first-third-year students. Therefore, this part followed a quantitative non-experimental research design, and its type was descriptive, as the aim was to assess students' current level of awareness, not to show causality. Creswell and Creswell (2018) claimed that descriptive quantitative research is capable of identifying common trends, patterns, and characteristics within a population which aligns with the aim of the current research to identify the students' awareness. Also, to make the research findings more generalizable, a large population took part which can only be achieved with the help of quantitative research methods (Groves et al., 2019).

Concerning the qualitative part, a phenomenological research design was chosen, as the instructors' number is significantly lower than the students. According to Gcu (2021), single,

objective reality does not exist; therefore, this type will be useful in providing deep insights into the instructors' perceived roles and strategies in teaching students about academic integrity. In addition, the frameworks for the instructors' classification of roles were adapted from the studies by Löfström et al. (2014) and Peters et al. (2019), which were also phenomenological. The framework, proposed by Peters et al. (2019), differentiated the roles based on the instructors' degrees of involvement in teaching about academic integrity, while Löfström et al. (2014) focused only on highly involved ones and subdivided them into distinct categories, taking into account the strategies they used.

### **3.2 Participants and Sampling Method**

The research participants were divided into two distinct categories: students and instructors. The research site was a private university in Almaty, Kazakhstan. Non-probability convenience sampling was employed to reach the students. According to Nikolopoulou (2022), this method is beneficial as “proximity, availability at a given time, or willingness to participate in the research are maintained” (p.5). Therefore, as the researcher had access to the target population, the choice was made towards the non-probability convenience sampling method. The only requirements for the students' participation were to be more than 18 years old and to study in the 1-3<sup>rd</sup> years, majoring in TFL (Two Foreign Languages). Senior students were not invited to participate in the questionnaire because they no longer had lessons related to learning English; therefore, their contribution could impact the reliability and validity of the current study, which was limited only to the maintenance of academic integrity in English lessons. Namely, the research involved diverse participants in terms of gender, year of study, and ethnicity which was done to increase the generalizability of findings.

The second group of participants were the instructors teaching these students, and a purposive non-probability method was chosen. To identify whether they corresponded to the predetermined criteria, background questions, related to their department at the university and subjects taught, were asked. In case the instructors taught any subject related to learning English in the language department, they were admitted to the study. This sampling technique is beneficial as it allows to choose the participants who were “especially knowledgeable about or experienced with a phenomenon of interest” (Creswell and Clark, 2017, p. 533). In addition, it prevented the interference of instructors from other faculties or departments whose views might be different and, therefore, can provide another picture.

### **3.3 Data Collection**

The process of data collection consisted of several steps. Prior to distributing the questionnaire among students and conducting interviews with instructors, permission from the Research Ethics Committee was obtained (Appendix A). To design the questionnaire, the questions were adapted from the McCabe Academic Integrity Survey (M-AIS). This survey was developed by McCabe, the founder of the International Center for Academic Integrity, and has been tested on approximately 100000 students worldwide over 30 years. Canham (2011) claimed that the validity of this data collection tool is high – Cronbach’s alpha was 0.94. Therefore, this version (Appendix B) was chosen to be adapted and distributed among Kazakhstani participants. The survey is based on the three main theories: Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), Social Learning Theory (Bandura 1977), and Moral Development Theory (Kohlberg, 1958). Overall, the adapted version of this questionnaire contained five sections: the first related to background information questions, regarding the age, year of study, and gender. The second part related to estimating the awareness of academic integrity policies in this university; therefore,

open-ended and Likert-scale questions were asked. These questions focused on identifying how well the students were aware of the policies and the ways they were introduced to them. This part is connected with the Social Learning Theory, as it focuses on the institutional culture that shapes students' behavior. The third and fourth sections helped to determine the students' awareness of academic integrity and dishonesty as well as their self-reported cheating behaviors. Although the questions in both sections were similar, they were assessed on different scales and provided diverse insights. As for the students' awareness, the questions were based on the Theory of Planned Behavior which emphasizes people's attitudes towards a particular norm or rule. Concerning self-reported cheating, this part was supported by Moral Development Theory since it focuses on students' honesty and morality, as well as possible justifications of violations. Student's awareness was evaluated on a scale from 1 to 4 (where 1 was referred to as not cheating, 2 – trivial cheating, 3 – moderate cheating, and 4 – serious cheating, adapted from AIS) while self-reported behavior was from 1 to 3 (1 – never, 2 – once, 3 – more than once). The last section comprised open-ended questions asking students about their actions in case of violations at their current state and in the future. These questions probed to identify students' actions towards academic dishonesty and resemble the focus of Moral Development Theory and the Theory of Planned Behavior.

After the designing stage, the questionnaire was distributed among 20 students for a pilot-study. Having reviewed the questions, the participants provided feedback on them, and certain changes in terms of wording were made. Subsequently, the questionnaire (Appendix C) was distributed among 187 TFL students by means of Google Classroom and Gmail. Overall, there were 14 main questions, and it took around 30 minutes for students to answer them. This part of the research was conducted in January and February 2025.

The second phase of the data collection process was in the form of semi-structured interviews among 12 TFL instructors. Before participating, all instructors signed a consent form to confirm the voluntariness of their participation (Appendix D). In general, the interview questions (Appendix E) were structured to gain information about the instructors' roles in teaching about academic integrity and the strategies they used to achieve these objectives. To reveal the instructors' perceived roles, the questions and classifications were adapted from Peters et al. (2019) and Lofstrom et al. (2014) studies. While Peters et al. (2019) provided a general description of all roles, Lofstrom et al. (2014) explained from another point of view by explaining what actions they take to maintain academic integrity. Thus, these researchers provided a framework for the current study. To develop questions regarding the strategies, a substantial number of research articles devoted to the same topic were reviewed, and the questions were made based on the literature review.

After finishing writing the interview questions, they were reviewed by a scientific supervisor and two other professors who had the same research interests. Following this, 14 semi-structured interviews were conducted in face-to-face or online formats, depending on the availability and convenience of the research participants. All these interviews were held in March 2025. Each session began with a description of the purpose, benefits, and risks of participation, followed by signing a consent form and the interview itself which lasted for 25-40 minutes. The audios were recorded by using the Transcriptor application.

### **3.4 Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics analysis was used to analyze the quantitative part of this research. As the participants were the students of one private university, this method seems to be more appropriate as the results could not be generalized to the whole population (Bhandari, 2023).

Next, Amit's (2023) 4-step model was chosen to analyze the collected data. The description of the steps involved is as follows: data preparation (cleaning and organizing data), descriptive analysis (computation of means of central tendency), inferential analysis, and reporting the results. The results were calculated with the use of mean and standard deviation as they provided a moderately valid representation of information. As in the questionnaire the participants had to choose a verbal description of awareness regarding violations and the frequency of cheating, each of these categories was assigned a specific number, taken from McCabe's AIS (2010). As for correlation part, Spearman's rank correlation was used to calculate them, and the results were interpreted based on Cresswell (1986). SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was used to calculate the results.

The next step was to analyze the qualitative part - semi-structured interviews with instructors. Hatch's (2002) typological analysis was used to interpret the findings. After determining the typologies, the data was categorized into themes and coded as follows: instructors' roles (IR), academic integrity and violations (code AIV), online applications (code OA), honor codes (code HC), authentic assessment (code AA), and online proctoring applications (code APA).

### **3.5 Reliability and Validity**

To increase the reliability and validity, the available version of the AIS was taken and adapted to meet the aim of the research. In addition, the questions for semi-structured interviews were compiled after analyzing a number of articles (Lofstrom et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2014; Scanlan, 2006; Sotiriadou et al., 2020; Tatum & Schwartz., 2019). Both data collection tools were developed with the help of the research supervisor, underwent a pilot study, and were revised based on the provided feedback. Before uploading the raw data into the Excel

application, it was manually double-checked by the researcher, and all irrelevant or incomplete responses were eliminated.

### **3.6 Significance**

Regarding the practical significance, this research revealed the current state of adherence to academic integrity from the students' perspective. It showed their perceptions of this notion in terms of awareness of what constitutes academic integrity, frequency of violations, and attitude toward them. From the instructors' viewpoint, their perceived roles and working strategies were identified. Therefore, this information helped to determine how academic integrity is perceived and maintained in English lessons, which can further be used for the development of specific rules and regulations for university policies.

### **3.7 Limitations and Recommendations**

The research lacks generalizability, since it was conducted in one university and involved one major – TFL. The choice was made intentionally, as this specialty prepares future foreign language teachers, and it is a must for them to get high-quality knowledge. However, to mitigate this limitation further research can be conducted on a larger scale with the involvement of students and instructors from other majors.

### **3.8 Ethical Concerns**

As the topic of this research is highly discussed and multiple views are presented in the academic sphere, special attention was given to maintaining ethics. Therefore, prior to conducting the study, the research participants filled in the self-assessment form on the university's official website. Since this topic is sensitive and some potential risks were identified, there was a need to submit the research proposal. After that, the researcher followed the recommendations given by the Research Ethics Committee to keep risks to a minimum. In

addition, all participants were familiarized with the details of the interview and questionnaire and were given a consent form (Appendix D and E) to sign to confirm the voluntariness of their participation. The students could start answering the questionnaire after ticking the “I agree” option in Google Forms, and instructors had to sign the printed version. Also, everyone reserved the right to withdraw from the study at any point without further conflicts with the researcher or their academic institution.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results and Findings

This chapter of the dissertation is divided into two parts dedicated to presenting students' awareness of academic integrity and instructors' strategies to uphold it in English lessons. As such, the first part demonstrates the results from the questionnaire distributed among first-third-year students, and the second part reveals the instructors' responses.

#### 4.1 Background Information about the Participants

This section presents the background information about the participants of the study, who were divided into two groups: students and instructors. The questionnaire was conducted among 187 Two Foreign Languages (TFL) students. Based on the background questions, the majority of students were aged 18-20 (83,7%) and 21-23 (6,4%). In addition, 75 participants (40%) were first-year students, 56 (30%) – second-year, and 56 (30%)- third-year. Also, there were 158 females (85%), 24 males (13%), and 5 respondents (2%) did not reveal their gender. Their GPA was mostly between 2.67 and 3.66 (88%) while 36 students (19%) and 16 students (16%) had 3.67-4.0 and 1.67-2.66 respectively (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Demographic Information about the Respondents*

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	18-20	175	93.6
	21-23	12	6.4
Year of study	Year 1	75	40.1
	Year 2	56	29.9
	Year 3	56	29.9
Gender	Male	24	12.8
	Female	158	84.5
	Prefer not to say	2	1.1
Approximate GPA	3.67-4.0	36	19.3
	2.67-3.66	164	87.9
	1.67-2.66	16	8.6

Since the scope of this research was limited only to those instructors who taught English, the background information questions aimed to gather more information about their work experience (length and workplaces) as well as the subjects that they taught. It was found that all instructors had been working in higher education for 2-27 years with the majority having 4-7 years of experience there. Prior to coming to university, the majority reported having worked at schools, language centers, or as private tutors. At the university level, they taught the following subjects: Foreign Language (1-2) of B1 and B2 levels, Reading and Writing B1, Academic Writing (C1), and English for Specific Purposes (C1-C2 levels) (see Table 2).

**Table 2**

*Demographic Information about the Participants*

Code	Work Experience	Subjects Taught
Participant 1	3 years	Foreign Language (B1), Reading and Writing
Participant 2	28 years	Academic Writing, English for Academic Purposes (C1)
Participant 3	8 years	Reading and Writing, English for Specific Purposes
Participant 4	6 years	Foreign Language (B1), Academic Writing (C1)
Participant 5	2 years	Foreign Language (B1, B2), Reading and Writing
Participant 6	1 year	English for Specific Purposes (C1)
Participant 7	8 years	Foreign Language (B1, B2), Reading and Writing, Academic Writing C1
Participant 8	3 years	Academic Writing (C1), English for Specific Purposes (C1)
Participant 9	3 years	Foreign Language (B2), Public Speaking (C1)
Participant 10	2 years	Foreign Language (B1, B2), Reading and Writing
Participant 11	4 years	English for Specific Purposes (C1), Reading and Writing
Participant 12	4 years	Academic Writing (C1), Reading and Writing

#### **4.2 The Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity**

This part of the dissertation will focus on exploring the students' perceptions of academic integrity. As such, it is divided into the subchapters that describe the students' awareness, perceived severity of academic dishonesty, and self-reported engagement in it.

### 4.2.1 Definitions of Academic Integrity

To investigate students' awareness of academic integrity, they were asked to define this term in their own words and to explain their attitude towards it. The typology identified for these responses was called "The Students' Definitions of Academic Integrity" which was further divided into themes, and they were coded as follows: honesty (code H), cheating issues (code CI), trust and respect (code TR), and other definitions (code OD) (Table 3).

**Table 3**

#### *Student's Definitions of Academic Integrity*

Codes	Code Description	Examples
Honesty (Code H)	Emphasis on being honest towards academic community	"For me academic integrity is about ethical behavior in my university"
Cheating Issues (CI)	Implying that cheating should be avoided at all costs	"Unspoken rules that are a must for everyone: no cheating in any situation"
Trust and Respect (TR)	Building an environment of trust and respect within a group	"Fair collaboration and contribution in group work"

#### *Honesty (Code H)*

Overall, it can be seen that for a lot of respondents (n = 42), academic integrity primarily referred to showing honesty towards oneself and their academic progress. This is evident from the following responses:

*"Academic integrity is an honest and responsible manner of studying" (Respondent 7).*

*"It is being honest with yourself and your studies" (Respondent 100).*

#### *Cheating Issues (Code CI)*

Another widespread opinion was related to the cheating issues. The students (n = 30) believed that cheating discredits one's work and, therefore, should be avoided especially during

midterms or final exams. In this case, academic integrity was related to “unspoken rules, such as saying no to cheating”. Based on the frequency of mentioning, the importance of producing original work was ranked third, i.e., the participants acknowledged that plagiarism and unpermitted use of artificial intelligence can potentially be harmful to their academic reputation.

*“It involves completing assignments independently, giving proper credit to sources, avoiding cheating or plagiarism, and upholding ethical standards in research and learning. It ensures that knowledge is built on trust and respect” (Respondent 110).*

#### *Trust and Respect (Code TR)*

Based on the response, it is evident that many students (n = 30) also related academic integrity to showing trust and respect to other members of the academic community. It was particularly noticeable in the responses of third-year students who highlighted the need for fair role distribution and equal contribution to their final projects.

*“As part of the team, I am fully responsible for the grade my groupmates get; consequently, I try to do my best not to let them down” (Respondent 67).*

Other definitions of academic integrity involved adhering to rules and standards, commitment to learning, and constant reflection and self-improvement. Also, around 80% of students showed a positive attitude towards upholding academic integrity, stating its utmost importance in academic settings. As such, it can be deduced that students had a fairly clear understanding of what academic integrity is and vitality of its maintenance.

#### **4.2.2 The Students’ Attitudes towards Academic Integrity**

Around 80% of students showed a positive attitude towards upholding academic integrity, stating its utmost importance in academic settings. As such, it can be deduced that students had a fairly clear understanding of what academic integrity is and vitality of its maintenance.

Also, it was determined that 69% of students were aware of academic integrity prior to entering the university. In addition, a separate analysis revealed that schools started paying more attention to academic integrity as 75% of first-year students showed familiarity with this notion whereas only 66% of sophomores and juniors had prior knowledge regarding this notion. After becoming students, 91% of respondents reported being informed about the university's academic integrity policies. From their point of view, the main informants of academic integrity were faculty members and the first-year orientation program whereas the student handbook was considered the least effective. As such the results are presented in Table 4:

**Table 4**

*Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity Policies*

Question	Response Option	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Academic integrity policy at school	Yes	129	69
	No	58	31
Informed about the university' academic integrity policies	Yes	167	89.3
	No	20	10.7
Sources of information	First-year orientation program	94	50.3
	Campus website	43	23
	Student handbook	19	10.2
	Academic advisor	52	27.8
	Other students	51	27.3
	Faculty members	109	58.3

Since the majority of students reported being informed about academic integrity policies of their educational institution, it was important to investigate their effectiveness from the students' point of view. Overall, students believed that the faculty members' and their own understanding of academic integrity policies was quite high, the mean being at 4.14 and 4.05 in turn. This is also supported by the SD which was 0.96 in the first case and 0.92 – in the second,

showing internal consistency. Regarding the severity of penalties for cheating (mean = 3.78) and the effectiveness of policies (mean = 3.76), it is possible to say that they were moderate, and also SD at 1.1 and 1.03 showed the participants' mixed opinions concerning them. Finally, the year breakdown revealed that the Year 3 students considered all these items to be more severe than Year 1 or Year 2. Table 5 shows the comparison of students' perceptions by year:

**Table 5**

*Assessment of policies*

Item	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Years 1-3	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
The severity of penalties at university	3.79	1.11	3.68	1.06	3.88	1.13	3.78	1.1
Your own understanding of these policies	3.93	0.9	4.09	0.92	4.16	0.95	4.05	0.92
The faculty's understanding of these policies	4.12	1.02	4.21	0.87	4.11	0.97	4.14	0.96
The effectiveness of these policies	3.79	0.98	3.73	0.98	3.73	1.15	3.76	1.03

Apart from the policy's evaluation, it was necessary to determine which aspects of academic integrity instructors explained during their lessons. Based on the results presented in Table 6, it is clear that the most discussed item was plagiarism with a mean value of 4.13 and SD 1.04, demonstrating its high frequency. The second place was taken by the presentation of guidelines on group work and collaboration (mean – 3.91 and SD – 0.99). Proper citation and referencing of sources, as well as falsifying and fabricating research data scored 3.79 and 3.38, which means that they were sometimes explained, can be attributed to the fact that only 3<sup>rd</sup> year students typically had subjects requiring the abovementioned categories. Also, the breakdown of scores showed that the frequency of discussing aspects of academic integrity rose with the year

of study. It was evident that those students who came to study in 2024 were more informed about academic integrity than those who began in 2022.

**Table 6**

*Frequency of Instruction on Academic Integrity Topics*

Item	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Years 1-3	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD
In the past, how often did your instructors discuss:								
Plagiarism	3.83	1.06	4.29	1.02	4.39	0.95	4.13	1.04
Guidelines on group work and collaboration	3.71	1.03	3.91	0.94	4.18	0.92	3.91	0.99
Proper citation and referencing of sources	3.53	0.97	3.86	0.99	4.09	1.07	3.79	1.04
Falsifying/ fabricating research data	3.12	1.17	3.46	1.24	3.66	1.3	3.38	1.24

In addition to discussing academic integrity, it was found that instructors also used some strategies to prevent academic dishonesty. It was evident from the typological analysis from which the following strategies emerged: Turnitin, proper referencing, and clear guidelines in the syllabus, and creative assignments. In the first place was Turnitin, claimed to be used for checking every assignment. The students believed that it acted as a deterrent to cheating and decreased taking information from the Internet and Chat GPT. Also, they mentioned careful proctoring during exams and assignment of tasks to be done in class. This way, the likelihood of cheating was kept to a minimum. Following this, some instructors taught about proper referencing and citation skills, the aspects students considered problematic and therefore appreciated what was done for them. In addition, the majority of teachers had specific policies regarding academic integrity in their syllabi or the description of projects. Finally, the students noticed that they were sometimes given creative assignments which could not be completed with the help of artificial intelligence.

*“Firstly, they include academic integrity in their syllabuses. Then, they always ask to follow these policies when we submit assignments. Besides that, some of them connect lessons and topic to the topic academic integrity” (Respondent 10).*

*“They use Turnitin for every task, APA format of citations, timed and supervised assessments, paraphrasing and summarising sources are provided by teacher. Also, they give us 0 point if they detect AI or plagiarism, so we can understand that it really affects our grade” (Respondent 15).*

#### **4.2.3 Perceived Seriousness and Self-reported Engagement in Academic Dishonesty**

The previous sub-part revealed that the students have a fairly clear understanding of academic integrity. Thus, their perceptions of academic dishonesty and self-reported engagement in it were explored (Table 7). Based on the results, it is visible that students’ perceptions of violations of academic integrity differ according to their type. As such, all academically dishonest behaviours scored higher, implying that they are considered to be moderate cheating. For example, these behaviors are primarily represented by “using digital technology to get unpermitted help during the test” (mean = 3.61, SD = 0.68), “copying form another student during a test without his knowledge” (mean = 3.52, SD = 0.88), and “copying from another student during a test with his knowledge” (mean = 3.35, SD = 0.86). It is evident that the majority of students related it either to moderate or serious cheating. Surprisingly, though, students did not see a big problem in getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the test and called it “trivial cheating” as derived from Mean = 2.81 and SD = 1. Categories, connected to conducting research or working in groups, were mainly seen as trivial or insignificant cheating. Here, students believed that “fabricating or falsifying research data” (mean = 3.1, SD = 0.95) and “inappropriately sharing work in group assignments” (mean = 2.9,

SD = 0.96) are not that serious. As regards doing homework, it was seen as the least problematic category in terms of cheating. Therefore, items like “working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work” (mean = 2.54, SD = 0.97) and “paraphrasing and copying a few sentences from any source without citing them” (mean = 2.77, SD = 0.95) got the lowest indicators, implying that they also referred to trivial cheating.

Regarding self-reported engagement in academic dishonesty, different results were observed. Even though it was revealed that the mean scores ranged between 1.17 and 1.95 that generally describe the tendency to show academic dishonesty either never or once, there are some notable trends. As students did not perceive getting answers from someone who already took the test, many of them engaged in this kind of behavior most often (mean = 1.95, SD = 0.76). Also, they regarded “paraphrasing and copying a few sentences from any source without citing them” as trivial cheating, the participants were more likely to do this as well. Concerning the exams, since the violations were perceived to be serious, behaviors “copying from another student with his knowledge” (mean = 1.44, SD = 0.7) and “copying from another student without his knowledge” (mean = 1.3, SD = 0.61) were less common among students. Also, behaviors, such as “purchasing papers” (mean = 1.17, SD = 0.49) and “using a false or forged excuse to obtain an extension on a due date or delay taking an exam” (mean = 1.21, SD = 0.53) were the least common self-reported behaviors. Overall, it can be assumed that those behaviors which are hard to notice are more common than those that can be easily spotted. Consequently, more students engaged in these less noticeable behavior as they believed they would not be caught for violating academic integrity policies that are used in their educational institution. As such, Table 7 represents a comparison between the perceived severity of violations of academic integrity and self-reported engagement in these violations from the students’ point of view.

**Table 7**

*Perceived Seriousness of Academic Dishonesty and Self-Reported Engagement in it*

Item	Perceived Seriousness of Academic Dishonesty (4-point scale)		Self-Reported Engagement in Academic Dishonesty (3-point scale)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1) Fabricating or falsifying bibliography	2.96	1.02	1.26	0.53
2) Fabricating or falsifying research data	3.1	0.95	1.37	0.62
3) Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work	2.54	0.97	1.66	0.76
4) Inappropriately sharing work in group assignments	2.9	0.96	1.48	0.7
5) Copying another student's homework	3.37	0.86	1.59	0.79
6) Submitting the same paper in more than one course without specific permission	3.16	0.97	1.26	0.57
7) Purchasing papers	3.28	0.93	1.17	0.49
8) Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences from any source without citing them in a paper you submitted	2.77	0.95	1.94	0.8
9) Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test	2.81	1	1.95	0.76
10) Helping someone else cheat on a test	3.24	0.91	1.63	0.77
11) Copying from another student during a test with his knowledge	3.35	0.86	1.44	0.7
12) Copying from another student during a test without his knowledge	3.52	0.88	1.3	0.61
13) Using digital technology to get unpermitted help during a test	3.61	0.68	1.45	0.69
14) Using crib notes to cheat on an exam	3.23	0.96	1.32	0.63
15) Using a false or forged excuse to obtain an extension on a due date or delay taking an exam	3.22	0.93	1.21	0.53

As for the reasons for academic dishonesty, saving scholarship, and lack of knowledge of the subject matter were the most popular ones to justify the violations as mentioned by around half of the participants. In addition, 77 (41,2%) of students were burdened with other assignments which impeded them from being honest in their studies. Also, procrastination and

irrelevance of assignments were seen as the reasons for cheating by 51 (27,3%) and 38 (20,3%) students respectively. Finally, external factors, such as the desire to impress parents or friends and peer behavior, motivated 27 (14,4%) and 14 (7,5%) of participants to violate academic integrity (Table 8).

**Table 8**

*Reasons for Violating Academic Integrity*

<b>Item</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Saving scholarship	99	52,9%
Lack of knowledge of the subject matter	95	50,8%
Being burdened with other assignments	77	41,2%
Procrastination	51	27,3%
Irrelevance of assignments	38	20,3%
Desire to impress parents or friends	27	14,4%
Peer behavior	14	7,5%

Concerning the abovementioned reasons for violations, some students could provide justification for their unethical behavior. As a result, based on the responses, they were grouped into three categories. The first category, represented by 62 students, claimed that it was impossible to justify any violations as they were made consciously. However, 52 students believed that academic dishonesty could be justified provided that there are sound reasons. These reasons included being ill, feeling under constant pressure from parents, having limited knowledge, or wishing to save a scholarship. Finally, around a third of students could not provide any response for the given question.

*“I believe that no reason can truly justify violating academic integrity because dishonesty undermines personal growth, fairness, and trust” (Respondent 17).*

*“Because there’s just too much unnecessary data, I think it could justify cheating for 50%” (Respondent 30).*

Interestingly, although many students reported engagement in academic dishonesty, they also mentioned what they (in the role of students) would do if they noticed another student cheating was asked. Taking aside 27 respondents (14%) who could not give any answer, the rest were classified into those who would take action and those who would not. As such, 66 students (35%) reported that they would do the following things: talking to that student privately, reporting to the teacher or the dean's office, and gathering clear evidence of academic dishonesty. However, 94 participants (50%) claimed not doing anything because it is either not their responsibility to ensure the climate of academic integrity or they do not want to worsen their relationships with those students.

*“If I noticed a student cheating, I would consider the situation carefully before taking action. First, I would avoid making assumptions and ensure I have clear evidence of dishonesty. If I were a student, I might decide to speak to the person privately and remind them of the importance of academic integrity. Encouraging them to do their own work could help them understand the long-term benefits of learning honestly” (Respondent 16).*

*“Mostly, I just ignore it just because not to avoid getting into any trouble or conflicts with that student. If the teacher notices, the actions will be done by the teacher and the student will take responsibility. Even if I understand that the other student cheating will get the highest points than us, who are not cheating, I try to not pay attention, and just focus on my work” (Respondent 65).*

Also, in the future, around 85% of respondents mentioned that they would definitely do it and provided strategies such as using plagiarism checking applications, assigning creative tasks, teaching citation and referencing skills, and carefully monitoring students' behavior. In addition,

the participants acknowledged that the use of AI will be on the increase in the future; therefore, it would be their primary responsibility to promote academic integrity in their lessons.

*“Yes, as a future teacher, I will take action to promote academic integrity because it is essential for students’ personal and academic growth. To ensure honesty in learning, I will implement the following strategies: 1) Educate Students on Academic Integrity – I will clearly explain what academic dishonesty is and why it matters. 2) Teach Proper Research and Citation Skills – I will guide students in correctly citing sources and encourage them to develop original ideas” (Respondent 120).*

*“If I were a future teacher, I would definitely take action to promote academic integrity. I would do this by setting clear expectations, teaching proper citation methods, designing originality-based assignments, and fostering a culture of honesty and accountability” (Respondent 70).*

#### **4.2.4 Correlation Analysis of Key Variables**

Finally, the correlations between potential influencing factors—year of study, GPA, perceived severity, and self-reported engagement in academic dishonesty—were examined. The results are presented in Table 9. Spearman’s rank correlation was used to determine the possible correlation between variables, and the interpretation of the results was made based on Cohen (1988). As such, initially, the correlation between the year of study and the perceived seriousness of academic dishonesty was found. It was evident that there was a weak positive correlation, implying that the students tended to perceive academic dishonesty more seriously, as their year of study progressed ( $p = 0.123$ ).  $P\text{-value} = 0.09$  implies that the results were statistically insignificant. This can be attributed to the SD which was usually higher than 1 for these items which relates to the different opinions expressed by students.

Concerning the correlation between the year and self-reported engagement,  $\rho = 0.0056$  and  $p\text{-value} = 0.9395$  show no meaningful correlation between these items, and the correlation was statistically insignificant. However, there was a moderate positive correlation between the students' GPA and perceived severity of academic dishonesty which was also statistically significant ( $\rho = 0.499$  and  $p\text{-value} < 0.001$ ). This correlation means that the higher GPAs students have, the more intolerant they are to academic dishonesty. In addition, it was found that students with higher GPA were less likely to engage in academic dishonesty acts as shown by  $\rho = -0.103$  and  $p\text{-value} = 0.171$  which indicates a negative correlation according to which as GPA increases, self-reported cheating decreases. The SD for this part was also higher than 1, suggesting that the participants held diverse opinions. Finally, a moderate, statistically significant negative correlation was observed between students' perceived severity and self-reported engagement ( $\rho = -0.277$  and  $p\text{-value} < 0.001$ ) indicating that higher perceived severity means lower engagement.

**Table 9**

*Spearman's Rank Correlations Between Variables*

Variables	$\rho$	p-value
Year & Perceived Severity	0.123	0.09
Year & Self-Reported Engagement	0.0056	0.9395
GPA & Perceived Severity	0.499	<0.001
GPA & Self-Reported Engagement	-0.103	0.171
Perceived Severity & Self-Reported Engagement	-0.277	<0.001

### 4.3 The Instructors' Roles and Promoting Strategies

This part will focus on the representation of the findings derived from semi-structured interviews that were conducted with EFL instructors. In order to obtain these findings, typological analysis by Hatch (2002) framework was conducted. This typology was called "The Instructors' Roles and Promoting Strategies", and it was categorized into the following themes

with codes: Perceptions of Academic Integrity and Dishonesty (code PAID), the Use of Online Applications (code UOA), the Use of Turnitin (code UT), the Use of Honor Codes (UHC), the Use of Authentic Assessment (code UAA), and the Use of Online Proctoring Applications.

Overall, there were 12 participants who agreed to participate in the interviews.

#### ***4.3.1 Perceptions of Academic Integrity and Dishonesty (code PAID)***

Based on the responses, it was evident that all interviewees showed familiarity with the term “academic integrity” but they all perceived it in a different way. Some instructors limited this notion to cheating and plagiarism issues that frequently arose during their lessons. Others expanded it to showing honesty and respect in the professional sphere when it came to conducting lessons, participating in conferences, or publishing research articles. Also, the instructors agreed with being role models who shape students’ behavior and who promote fairness and equality.

*“In my opinion, it (academic integrity) is the main requirement for the whole academic community, starting from Bachelor’s degree students to experienced researchers” (Participant 4).*

*“For students, I think it mainly refers to cheating during the exam time or self-plagiarism when they repeatedly turn in the same work” (Participant 9).*

With the growing popularity of Chat GPT, the majority of respondents regarded it as the main challenge in preserving academic integrity because of the students’ frequent use of this chatbot for the completion of homework. Also, they highlighted problems with improper citations and self-plagiarism when students submit the same work to different teachers. Most of these problems were attributed to insufficient knowledge of English, poorly developed critical thinking skills, instructors’ limited understanding of academic integrity policies, and their

unwillingness to solve cases of academic dishonesty. Moreover, one instructor believed that falsified medical certificates submitted to retake an exam at a later time can also be an example of academic dishonesty.

*“Violations have become so frequent that I observe them in any assignment I give” (Participant 1).*

*“Frankly speaking, I didn’t pay enough attention to academic dishonesty. However, having participated in the Winter seminars, I realized that academic integrity is the most vital thing in education” (Participant 4).*

The next question probed to investigate the instructors’ roles in teaching about academic integrity. From their responses, it was evident that most of the instructors (67%) were active while the rest 33% either occupied a passive position and ignored academic dishonesty or threatened students. As for the active ones they fall into the category of ambassadors since they take action to teach about academic integrity. For example, these instructors showed paraphrasing and citation techniques, used various plagiarism detection applications, and clearly explained expected academic honesty in their syllabi. The other group, passive, which resembled casual and detached categories, did not consider teaching about academic integrity as their responsibility, rather they believed that it was their students’ obligation to stick to the rules set by the university. Also, some instructors, threateners, believed that only severe punishments would make sense; as such, they threatened students before giving them home assignments to decrease cheating levels.

*“I take a central role. We need to write everything clearly in our syllabus. It will make our teacher’s life easier” (Participant 3).*

*“I don’t believe it’s my responsibility as a teacher to explain to students that they ought to be honest” (Participant 7).*

*“Threatening is what I do to halt academic dishonesty and keep students motivated to show off their true knowledge” (Participant 9).*

#### **4.3.2 The Use of Online Applications (code UOA)**

After making a connection with the answers to the previous question, it became clear that the instructors who fell into the category of ambassadors mainly used several sources to teach about academic integrity: YouTube videos and the Turnitin website. They did not give names of particular YouTube channels, but most of them made their presentations and printed handouts based on that information. It was a particular case in point for those instructors who taught third-year students. In addition, one instructor viewed academic integrity as an essential part of her subject, and therefore, dedicated some of her lessons to developing students’ independent writing skills. Also, one of the instructors decided to teach about academic integrity through an inductive approach: her students were asked to write an essay without being reminded about academic honesty. As a result, most of them failed this assignment due to the high percentage of plagiarism. Following this, the instructor introduced her own detailed guide on academic integrity which she hoped would help students. Overall, the abovementioned points illustrate two roles: gatekeepers of the academy and role modelers who constantly teach about academic integrity.

Concerning passive instructors (casual and detached categories) and threatening ones, they did not utilize any external sources in teaching about academic integrity. Some of them explained that their syllabi contained an adapted version of the university’s rules on academic

integrity which was mentioned at the beginning of the semester. When students did not adhere to these rules, these instructors considerably decreased their grades.

*“But you know, we don’t have strict regulations within the faculty yet. So, I just invented my own rules to deal with the problem and used my own materials to explain it” (Participant 9).*

*“I sometimes tell students about academic integrity. That is the only thing I do. I don’t make ppts devoted to that or show any videos. That is not something I do” (Participant 8).*

#### **4.3.3 The Use of Turnitin (code UT)**

All instructors used Turnitin to check the originality of their students’ written assignments. It was generally agreed that this application is a beneficial tool for maintaining academic integrity. The respondents saw several advantages of utilizing Turnitin. First, this application shows an approximate plagiarism percentage and provides a list of sources from which the information was taken to complete the task. In addition, it was possible for teachers to leave feedback in students’ uploaded files. Another advantage was the possibility of conducting peer assessment when the instructors could randomly send students’ works for additional feedback. Finally, there was an automatically created grade book that enabled students to check their progress over the course of the semester. By using this strategy to minimize academic dishonesty in English lessons, the instructors fall into the categories of teachers of rules and values and gatekeepers of the academy.

However, it was noted that Turnitin was not always accurate in determining AI-generated content. Even the developers of this application made a threshold according to which less than 20% of AI is not shown as it may be a false alternative. As such, the respondents complained about the difficulty of proving the unpermitted use of Chat GPT and other similar applications. In addition, common phrases, such as “this essay will focus on…” were frequently counted as

plagiarism and impacted the overall percentage of it. Therefore, to minimize the influence of these external factors, the instructors had to double-check their students' papers. Despite the identified challenges, still Turnitin was considered to be a deterrent for cheating.

*“I believe that the multifunctionality of Turnitin makes it the best application for checking students' written assignments” (Participant 5).*

*“I think it doesn't show the correct percentage of using artificial intelligence which I consider a disadvantage” (Participant 6).*

#### **4.3.4 The Use of Honor Codes (Code UHC)**

The respondents were moderately familiar with honor codes, and one instructor used them in her lessons. As such, Participant 5 claimed to have used honor codes when she taught English for Academic Purposes at another university, and she also emphasized its usefulness in conducting research-related courses. Participant 5 also explained that currently, not all Kazakhstani universities have developed their own honor code; therefore, she used an adapted version of it compiled by the Kazakhstan Educational Researchers Association (KERA). She expressed a positive attitude towards the implementation of honor codes aiming to promote academic integrity. Two other respondents heard about the idea of honor codes and had to sign them while they were studying at the master's level. One of them believed that it was effective since it served as a contract between students and teachers but the other was doubtful since putting an electronic signature did not fully ensure academic honesty. In addition, the majority of respondents realized that they included an adapted variant of honor codes in their syllabi and explained the consequences in case of misbehavior. Consequently, those instructors who use honor codes fall into the category of teachers of rules and values with a focus on students' responsibility.

As regards the other part, it was evident that these instructors either lacked awareness or did not know about honor codes and could not provide any insights into this issue.

*“Honor codes are helpful in reducing plagiarism. I frequently use them in my teaching practice” (Participant 5).*

*“I have never heard about honor codes, that’s why I cannot say anything about them” (Participant 3).*

#### **4.3.5 The Use of Authentic Assessment (code UAA)**

Another strategy to impede cheating is conducting authentic assessment to evaluate students’ knowledge. It is particularly popular among those instructors who teach Reading and Writing 1-2 B1 and English for Specific Purposes because these subjects require the application of knowledge in a variety of academic situations. Respondent 1 asked students to write a research proposal based on a topic that seemed interesting to them. She emphasized that this task increased students’ motivation since they could apply the knowledge, they got from her subject to research their topic of interest. It also helped to sharpen students’ research skills to prepare them for the upcoming thesis writing. Another instructor taught English for Specific Purposes and asked students to complete a business plan by using all the grammatical structures and topic-related vocabulary they studied throughout the semester. The instructors noticed that authentic assessment fosters students’ problem-solving, critical, and creative thinking skills. Despite having these advantages, these instructors noted that authentic assessment should be combined with traditional to maximize objectivity.

However, about 30% of instructors considered traditional assessment to be more appropriate. They believed that this method is more beneficial as it does not involve subjectivity. Moreover, by using traditional assessment methods, it is possible to create various types of tasks,

such as true/false, sentence completion, and short answer questions to increase the reliability of the conducted assessment. In addition, traditional tests do not require complicated scoring rubrics which affect the teachers' choice, and they are less time-consuming to check. Overall, it was found that all instructors sometimes conducted traditional tests, however, some of them also opted for authentic assessment to evaluate students' knowledge fairly.

*“In my opinion, authentic assessment is good for students because they practice soft skills, for example, communication and collaboration that are of utmost importance in real life. For this reason, I prefer it rather than tests which I treat with caution” (Participant 5).*

*“On the contrary, I am not a big fan of authentic assessment, especially when we are talking about final exams. Since students really put a lot of effort to do this task, I feel pressured when putting grades to them because on the one hand, I want to acknowledge their preparation but on the other hand, how can I be sure that they really learned what they were supposed to?” (Participant 4).*

#### **4.3.6 The Use of Online Proctoring Applications (code UOPA)**

Based on the responses, it is evident that instructors do not trust online proctoring applications, such as Examus and Moodle, that are recommended for use at their university. They claimed that many students managed to cheat in online settings despite being proctored by the system. Also, one participant compared the grades of two of her groups who were taught the same subject but in a different mode of delivery. She determined that those students who had online lessons outperformed her other group that studied in the traditional mode. Moreover, instructors complained about poor Internet connection and lack of devices which disrupted their exams. Also, some instructors tried using Kahoot, Quizziz, and Quizlet, to conduct summative assessments. As proctoring is not installed in these applications, the instructors limited the time

for completing tasks and created several variants for their students. Another strategy was to make a test in Google Forms but create such questions the answers to which could not be easily found on the Internet. However, all these strategies had significant limitations, and as a result, the participants considered paper-based tests to be more effective in assessing students' knowledge.

*"In my point of view, academic dishonesty can be kept to a minimum only when exams are conducted in the offline mode. In online exams, students can easily cheat and this will decrease the reliability and validity of assessment" (Participant 4).*

*"Cheating online is very easy and that's what all students do whenever they have such an opportunity. They feel that their teacher is not physically present and therefore, this fact affects them psychologically. Therefore, I don't believe that students will show the same results in the offline setting" (Participant 7).*

## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion

This research investigated the students' awareness of academic integrity and the instructors' roles and promoting strategies they use to ensure it. Thus, this part will compare my findings with those of other researchers in the same field. As the aim of this research is double-folded, the discussion part is divided into two subchapters: the first is related to the students' awareness of academic integrity and the second demonstrates the instructors' roles and promoting strategies.

#### 5.1 The Students' Awareness of Academic Integrity

The research revealed that the students are fairly familiar with academic integrity. Unlike the participants in Bazylkhanova and Dalelkhanova's study, they did not limit this notion only to avoiding plagiarism. Instead, they elaborated more and presented viewpoints concerning showing a respectful attitude towards oneself and others, being honest in exams, and ensuring equal contribution in group work assignments. In addition, the participants expressed positive attitudes towards maintaining academic integrity which is similar to the findings of Woith et al. (2012) and Di Paulo (2022). Another interesting finding is that more than half of students were familiar with academic integrity before coming to university and around 90% claimed to have understood it after their first year. The most important sources of information were the orientation program and faculty members. Consequently, this finding contradicts Zangla (2023) who believed that students' lack of awareness is the main determinant of their dishonest behavior. Also, academic integrity policies, posted on the students' portal, were regarded as moderately effective in communicating the consequences of breaching the rules. Thakkar and Weisfeld-Spotter (2012) also agreed that it is fundamental for students to be aware of academic

integrity. In addition, this finding complies with Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), as it supports the claim that institutional culture affects students' awareness.

Concerning the instructors' role in promoting academic integrity, the respondents pointed out that they were taught not only about plagiarism but also about proper citation and referencing and effective collaboration in group work which are seen as a new finding. In addition, from the students' point of view, Turnitin and authentic assessment are the strategies to diminish the likelihood of cheating. This opinion was supported by Ismail and Jabri (2023), Sotiriadou (2019), and Openo (2019) who described the effectiveness of these strategies.

Moving on to the perceived seriousness of academic dishonesty, it is possible to say that the respondents considered cheating on exams as moderate cheating. In particular, they found using digital technology and copying from another student with/ without his knowledge as the most dishonest behaviors. Categories, related to conducting research and doing homework, were perceived as trivial or insignificant cheating. Having identified the students' attitudes towards certain types of academic dishonesty, the research revealed that it was related to the extent of self-reported engagement in it. For instance, paraphrasing and copying information without citing and using a forged excuse to prolong deadlines, were more frequently reported than cheating from someone. In this respect, this research disagrees with earlier findings provided by Munir et al. (2011) who reported sabotage, electronic cheating, and seeking outside help as the top-three behaviors. Similarly, the more recent findings shown in the works of Anitha and Sundaram (2021) and Landa-Blanco (2021) partially agree with mine since the students saw cheating and plagiarism as dishonest behaviors and rejected being involved in them. Despite this, it was evident that the majority of the respondents had an idea of what would be in their exams

since they discussed it with those who had already taken the test. The Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) also focused on how people perceived certain rules and restrictions.

The reasons for violating academic integrity corresponded with Bachore (2016) whose participants disobeyed the rules to get higher grades and complained about questions, unrelated to the course materials. Another common reason, the desire to conform to parental expectations, was also in line with Anitha and Sundaram (2016). However, the importance of other subjects and assignments is seen as a new finding. Also, half of the respondents used the abovementioned reasons as justification for their dishonesty. In the same vein, Landa Blanco et al. (2021) agreed that students frequently tried to justify their behavior.

The last part of the questionnaire focused on students' subsequent actions if they noticed any violations. It was revealed that only half of them would inform teachers or the dean's office while others would not do anything not to worsen relationships. Thakkar and Weisfeld-Spolter (2012) also believed that some students may become partners who help in upholding the standards of academic integrity. In the future, the respondents claimed that they would use plagiarism-checking applications and make creative tasks for their students. The findings, concerning academic honesty and morality, as well as possible justifications, were explained in Moral Development Theory (Kohlberg, 1958). Similarly, the study dealt with these aspects.

## **5.2 The Instructors' Roles and Promoting Strategies**

As regards the instructors, overall, it can be seen that most of instructors had a profound understanding of what constitutes academic integrity by providing different definitions.

Although they frequently observed academic dishonesty in the form of plagiarism and the unpermitted use of artificial intelligence, they acknowledged the vitality of their contribution to promoting academic integrity by becoming role models for students. To achieve this aim,

instructors prepared additional materials on proper citation and paraphrasing techniques, organized seminars, and frequently reminded their students about the rules and their importance. Another part of the instructors did not consider themselves active promoters and drew attention to academic integrity only in case of serious violations. However, several teachers did not pay attention to maintaining academic integrity in their lessons. As such, based on the explanation provided by Peters et al. (2019), the instructors can be classified into ambassadors, casuals, and detached ones. The results go in line with the abovementioned study bearing the fact that the most widespread roles were ambassador and detached. Apart from this, there was a new role – threateners which is almost similar to the detached but differs in the sense that these instructors never teach about academic integrity but use severe penalties for its violations. Other categories, namely collaborator, cooperator, and delegator, were not identified which is different from Peters et al. (2019) findings. In comparison with Lofstrom et al. (2019), there were some similarities as well: gatekeepers of the academy were perceived as role models for students; academic integrity skill-builders paid attention to teaching effective paraphrasing techniques, and academic integrity modelers who pointed out at students' responsibility to adhere to the established rules.

Looking closer at the strategies, the participants of the current research did not use any certain applications which makes it difficult to compare with studies conducted by Belter and Du Pre (2014) and Stoesz and Los (2019). However, the instructors reported to have compiled the content of videos posted on YouTube, the Turnitin website, and the academic integrity policy to make their own regulations. As such, they prepared presentations and guidelines to teach students about academic integrity. This approach is seen as a different one since other authors experimented with an online application and did not teach about academic integrity themselves. Comparing this strategy with the classification of roles proposed by Lofström et al. (2014), these

instructors fall into the category of gatekeepers of the academy because they develop their own materials and adjust teaching methods.

Another strategy, the use of Turnitin, was considered to be effective. The instructors believed that it acts as a deterrent to cheating; thus, decreasing the percentage of AI-generated and plagiarized content which is similar to Ismail and Jabri's (2023) and Abrahamson's (2024) opinions. This application also provided numerous advantages, such as the availability to leave feedback in the document, automatic creation of grade books, and random appointment of peer reviewers. However, apart from these advantages, it was noted that this application is not always accurate in determining plagiarism which coincides with Sutherland-Smith and Carr (2005) and AI. In addition, the instructors noticed that when their low-achieving students started using advanced grammatical structures, they believed their assignments were AI-generated. Despite this, Turnitin did not detect anything and they could not prove their viewpoint. Consequently, there is a need for conducting more research to find out the extent to which Turnitin is accurate in determining the real percentage of plagiarism and AI. According to Löffström et al. (2014), all the instructors can be related to teachers of rules and values, because they try to limit plagiarism by using this application.

This research revealed that there were mixed opinions about the use of honor codes in education. One of the reasons was the fact that many participants did not know about this strategy and as a result, had never tried them in their teaching. In addition, when they were explained about honor codes, they considered them ineffective, disagreeing with Tatum and Schwartz (2017), Gurung et al. (2012), and Shu et al. (2012). However, approximately half of the instructors knew about honor codes, but believed that training in advance and explanation are required for students; otherwise, they will not show the desired results. In this sense, Scanlan

(2006) agreed that it is vitally important to explain the moral part of honor codes to students. Based on these findings, it is believed that honor codes are a novel idea for both instructors and students which needs further development and reinforcement. Based on Löffström et al. (2014), the instructors who regularly use honor codes are teachers of rules and values.

The instructors perceived authentic assessment to be relatively effective. The main idea of this type of assessment was to create tasks that could not be completed with the help of the Internet. In addition, they promoted the development of higher-order thinking skills which is not always achieved when conducting multiple-choice tests. Moreover, the participants noticed that students' soft skills, namely, effective communication, creative thinking, and problem-solving, improved when the authentic assessment was used which confirms the previous findings of Sotiriadou et al. (2019) and Evangelista (2025). Turning to disadvantages, the instructors noted the difficulty of creating assessment rubrics and the difference in grades for tests and authentic tasks. To minimize subjectivity in assessment, Openo (2023), who experienced the same issue, suggested a special five-dimensional framework. In contrast, the participants of this research did not mention any ways to decrease subjectivity in authentic assessment. As a way forward, their suggestion was to combine traditional and authentic assessment.

The perceptions of instructors concerning online proctoring applications, do not match with the findings provided by Bergmans et al. (2021), Mutawa and Sruthi (2021), and Shaushenova et al. (2021). The instructors justified their opinion by pointing out the difficulties with the connection, inability to log on to Moodle (learning management system), and lack of reliability of these systems. Since students could cheat under online proctoring conditions, there was a significant improvement in their grades in comparison with previous years. Ivic and Sostaric (2022) also observed the same issues in terms of students' grades. To mitigate these

challenges, the instructors opted for conducting paper-based tests or using Quizziz and Kahoot where they set strict time limits to stop students from cheating. In addition, they did not use any online proctoring applications, such as Examus, which is different from Mutawa and Sruthi (2021). As a result, this strategy was seen as an ineffective one which should not be used.

## CHAPTER 6

### Conclusion

The maintenance of academic integrity has become one of the central issues in education. As a result, all educational institutions around the world take measures to prevent academic dishonesty. Kazakhstan has also taken steps in the promotion of academic integrity in higher education. That's why this research had a double aim: to identify students' awareness of academic integrity and to investigate the strategies that instructors use to uphold its standards.

Overall, 187 students took part in the adapted version of M-AIS. Based on the results, they generally knew what academic integrity is as they were frequently informed about it by their instructors. In addition, the students also reported holding positive attitudes towards it and expressed their views about the importance of its maintenance. For this reason, many behaviors, especially related to cheating on exams, were perceived as serious cheating. The students also believed that the actions taken by their instructors to prevent academic dishonesty were effective. They even admitted taking similar steps themselves in their teaching careers.

However, the research revealed that despite showing relatively high awareness, the students still disobeyed academic integrity, in particular, when it came to research. Moreover, this dishonesty was frequently justified as students wanted to save their scholarships. The study also revealed that as the year of study progressed, the students perceived academic dishonesty as more immoral and violated it less frequently. The same applied to GPA and perceived severity and self-reported engagement. In addition, the students' perceptions impacted on the instances of academic dishonesty.

As for the students' English instructors, their role was determined to be moderately active in promoting academic integrity. Most of them focused on teaching paraphrasing skills, using

plagiarism checking softwares, and assigning creative tasks. On the contrary, a small proportion of participants did not take action to prevent students from cheating. In their point of view, the students were responsible for learning about academic integrity themselves.

The most popular and effective strategy to prevent plagiarism was the Turnitin application. Despite having minor disadvantages, all instructors believed in its effectiveness as it acts as a deterrent to cheating and presents a fairly accurate percentage of artificial intelligence and plagiarism. The implementation of online applications and authentic assessment were the other two strategies considered effective. However, the instructors believed that there should be clear evaluation rubrics to decrease subjectivity; otherwise, this assessment will not result in the desired outcomes. The use of online proctoring applications was seen as an ineffective strategy since students could easily deceive the applications. The last strategy, the use of honor codes, was not popular among the instructors; therefore, only the minority recommended using them with caution.

In conclusion, it became evident that despite being aware of academic integrity, the students still violated it. As such, it is suggested instructors pay more attention to teaching about academic integrity from the very beginning. Since this research was limited to one specialty, it is recommended to conduct further research on the identification of students' awareness and instructors' attitudes among other faculties. In addition, it will be beneficial to conduct qualitative research as well to determine what other factors might lead students to break the rules.

## References

- Abrahamson, E. D. (2024). A Student-focused Critical Analysis of Turnitin Software: Understanding its Role as a Learning Tool. *Current Research Journal of Pedagogics*, 5(10), 1-7.
- Adhikari, S. (2018). Beyond Culture: Helping international students avoid plagiarism. *Journal of International Students*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v8i1.170>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Alleyne, P., & Phillips, K. (2011). Exploring academic dishonesty among university students in Barbados: An extension to the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(4), 323-338.
- Alschuler, A. S., & Blimling, G. S. (1995). *Curbing Epidemic Cheating Through Systemic Change*. *College Teaching*, 43(4), 123–125. doi:10.1080/87567555.1995.99
- Altaibekova, M. (2020). *Teacher perceptions and promotion of academic honesty: A qualitative case study of humanities teachers within a Diploma Program (DP) at one International Baccalaureate (IB) school in Kazakhstan* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education).
- Amin, M. Y. M. (2019). Students' Attitude toward Effectiveness of Anti-Plagiarism Software, Turnitin. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2019.66376>
- Amit, K. M. (2023, January 16). *Descriptive Analytics: Steps, Techniques, Use Case, Examples*. <https://www.knowledgehut.com/blog/data-science/descriptive-analytics>
- Anitha, P., & Sundaram, S. (2021). Prevalence, types and reasons for academic dishonesty

- among college students. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 7(1), 1-14.
- Anohina-Naumeca, A., Birzniece, I., & Odiņeca, T. (2020). Students' awareness of the academic integrity policy at a Latvian university. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00064-4>
- Bachore, M. M. (2016). The nature, causes and practices of academic dishonesty/ cheating in Higher education: The case of Hawassa University. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(19), 14-20. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1109249>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Bazylkanova, A., & Dalelkanova, I. (2022). The Concept of Academic Integrity Perceived Through the Eyes of Students at One Higher Educational Institution in Kazakhstan. *InterConf*, 12(105), 101–121. <https://doi.org/10.51582/interconf.19-20.04.2022.009>
- Belter, R. W., & Du Pré, A. (2009). A strategy to reduce plagiarism in an undergraduate course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36(4), 257–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00986280903173165>
- Bergmans, L., Bouali, N., Luttikhuis, M. and Rensink, A., 2021, April. On the Efficacy of Online Proctoring using Proctorio. In *CSEDU (1)* (pp. 279-290).
- Bhandari, P. (2020, June 12). What is quantitative research? Definition, uses & methods. *Scribbr*.
- Boehm, P. J., Justice, M., & Weeks, S. (2009). Promoting academic integrity in higher education. *The Community College Enterprise*, 15(1), 45-61
- Bonner, E., Lege, R., & Frazier, E. (2023). Large Language Model-Based Artificial Intelligence in the Language Classroom: Practical Ideas for Teaching. *Teaching English with Technology*, 23(1), 23-41.

- Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.
- Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., Partridge, L., & Peat, M. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(2), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v7i2.759>
- Bylieva, D., Lobatyuk, V., Tolpygin, S., & Rubtsova, A. (2020, April). Academic dishonesty prevention in the e-learning university system. Presented at the World Conference.
- Carpenter, D. D., Harding, T. S., Finelli, C. J., & Passow, H. J. (2004). Does academic dishonesty relate to unethical behavior in professional practice? An exploratory study. *Science and engineering ethics*, 10(2), 311-324.
- Calovic Nenezic, S., Krtolica, M., Jelic, M., & Sekaric, S. (2023). Perceptions of students and teachers of the university of Montenegro on academic integrity. *CEPS Journal*, 13(3), 75-104.
- Chirikov, I., Shmeleva, E., & Loyalka, P. (2020). The role of faculty in reducing academic dishonesty among engineering students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(12), 2464-2480.
- Chow, H., Jurdi-hage, R. & Hage, H. S. (2021). Justifying academic dishonesty: A survey of Canadian university students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 7 (1), 16-28. <https://doi.org/10.17985/ijare.951714>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228-239.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 31*(4), 388.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-6405.2007.00096.x>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DiPaulo, D. (2022). Do preservice teachers cheat in college, too? A quantitative study of academic integrity among preservice teachers. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 18*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00097-3>
- Ellis, C., van Haeringen, K., Harper, R., Bretag, T., Zucker, I., McBride, S., ... Saddiqui, S. (2019). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. *Higher Education Research & Development, 16*. <https://doi:10.1080/07294360.2019.1680956>
- Elzubeir, M. A., & Rizk, D. E. (2003). Exploring perceptions and attitudes of senior medical students and interns to academic integrity. *Medical education, 37*(7), 589-596.
- Eret, E., & Ok, A. (2014). Internet plagiarism in higher education: tendencies, triggering factors and reasons among teacher candidates. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(8), 1002-1016.
- Espinosaa, C. D., & Toquero, C. M. D. (2018). Academic Integrity: Influence on the Research Skills of the Pre-Service Teachers. *International Journal, 4*(2), 15-28.

- Evangelista, E. D. L. (2025). Ensuring academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT: Rethinking exam design, assessment strategies, and ethical AI policies in higher education. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(1), ep559.
- Glossary – ENAI*. (n.d.). <https://www.academicintegrity.eu/wp/glossary/>
- Gcu. (2021, October 29). 5 Qualitative research designs and research methods. *GCU*.  
<https://www.gcu.edu/blog/doctoral-journey/5-qualitative-research-designs>
- Guerrero-Dib, J., Portales, L., & Gallego, D. (2023). Academic integrity as a way to promote workplace ethical behaviour. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 165–183).
- Gurung, R. A. R., Wilhelm, T. M., & Filz, T. (2012). Optimizing honor codes for online exam administration. *Ethics & Behavior*, 22, 158–162.
- Firat, M. (2023). What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 57-63.
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., & Singh, R. P. (2022). An era of ChatGPT as a significant futuristic support tool: A study on features, abilities, and challenges. *BenchCouncil transactions on benchmarks, standards and evaluations*, 2(4), 100089.
- Henslee, A. M., Goldsmith, J., Stone, N. J., & Krueger, M. (2015). An Online Tutorial Vs. Pre Recorded Lecture For Reducing Incidents Of Plagiarism. *American Journal of Engineering Education (AJEE)*, 6(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.19030/ajee.v6i1.9249>
- Ismail, I., & Jabri, U. (2023). Academic Integrity: Preventing Students' Plagiarism with TURNITIN. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 7(1), 28-38.  
<https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v7i1.5392>

- International Center for Academic Integrity. (2019). *The fundamental values of academic integrity* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). [https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019\\_ICAIFundamental-Values\\_R12.pdf](https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAIFundamental-Values_R12.pdf)
- Iverson, H. L., Lewis, M. A., & Talbot, R. M., III. (2008). Building a framework for determining the authenticity of instructional tasks within teacher education programs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(2), 290–302.
- Ivić, V., & Šoštarić, B. (2022). Lessons Learned on Academic Integrity in E-Teaching and E Learning during the Coronavirus Crisis. *Folia Linguistica Et Litteraria*, XIII(42), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.31902/fl.42.2022.7>
- Janke, S., Rudert, S. C., Petersen, Ä., Fritz, T. M., & Daumiller, M. (2021). Cheating in the wake of COVID-19: How dangerous is ad-hoc online testing for academic integrity? *Computers and Education Open*, 2, 100055.
- Kala, D., Smith, N., Samaah, F., & Kuraku, S. (2023). Study and analysis of Chat GPT and its impact on different fields of study. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(3), 827–833.
- Kennet, A., & Shkodkina, Y. M. (2018). A review of the factors behind academic integrity violations: Comparing the United States and Ukraine.
- Khan, Z. R., et al. (2021). Lessons from delivering emergency online workshops that can enhance academic integrity values and skills among K-12 students. Presented at the European Conference on Academic Integrity and Plagiarism 2022.
- Kidwell, L. A., K. Wozniak, and J. P. Laurel, 2003, Student Reports and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Dishonesty, *Teaching Business Ethics*, 7: 205-214.

- Kohlberg, L. (1958). The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years 10 to 16 [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Lambert, K., Ellen, N., & Taylor, L. (2003). Cheating—what is it and why do it: a study in New Zealand tertiary institutions of the perceptions and justifications for academic dishonesty. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 3(1/2), 98-103.
- Landa-Blanco, M., Santos-Midence, C., & Blanco, A. L. (2020). Academic integrity: attitudes and practices of students of a public university in Honduras. *Academia*, (20-21), 202-217.
- Lanier, M. M. (2006). Academic integrity and distance learning. *Journal of criminal justice education*, 17(2), 244-261.
- Lipson, C. (2018). *Doing Honest Work in College: How to Prepare Citations, Avoid Plagiarism, and Achieve Real Academic Success* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., & Shephard, K. (2014). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it? *Higher Education*, 69(3), 435–448.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734014-9784-3>
- Luniachek, V., Brovdii, A., Kulakovskiy, O., Varenko, T., & Tirri, K. (2020). Academic integrity in higher education of Ukraine: Current state and call for action. *Education Research International*, 2020, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8856251>
- MacLeod, P. (2021). A new framework for enhancing (academic) integrity. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 4(2), 57. <https://doi.org/10.11575/cpai.v4i2.74188>

- Makhmutova, A. (2021). *Academic Dishonesty in Kazakhstani Higher Education: The Current Situation and Antecedents* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education).
- McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). TeN (Updated) Principles of Academic Integrity: How Faculty Can Foster Student Honesty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 36(3), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091380409605574>
- McCabe, D. L., & Treviño, L. K. (1996). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522–538.
- Munir, M., Ahmad, Z., & Shahzadi, E. (2011). A study on academic dishonesty of university students. *Recent Advances in Statistics*, 285.
- Mutawa, A., & Sruthi, S. (2021). Online Proctoring and Assessment in Distance Learning During COVID-19. In *EDULEARN21 Proceedings* (pp. 5887-5895). IATED.
- Nerdynav. (2024, January 5). ChatGPT Cheating Statistics & Impact On Education (2024). *Nerdynav*. <https://nerdynav.com/chatgpt-cheating>
- Nikolopoulou, K. (2022, August 11). What is purposive sampling? Definition & examples. *Scribbr*.
- Openo, J. (2023). Academic Integrity and the Affordances and Limitations of Authentic Assessment. *Handbook of Academic Integrity*, 217.
- Oranga, J. (2023). Benefits of Artificial Intelligence (ChatGPT) in Education and Learning: Is ChatGPT Helpful?. *International Review of Practical Innovation, Technology and Green Energy (IRPITAGE)*, 3(3), 46-50.

- Peters, M., Boies, T., & Morin, S. (2019). Teaching Academic Integrity in Quebec Universities: Roles professors adopt. *Frontiers in Education, 4*.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00099>
- Rosyanafi, R. J., Lestari, G. D., Susilo, H., Nusantara, W., & Nuraini, F. (2023). The dark side of innovation: Understanding research misconduct with chat gpt in nonformal education studies at universitas negeri surabaya. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dasar: Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan dan Hasil Penelitian, 9*(3), 220-228.
- Roumeliotis, K., & Tselikas, N. (2023). Chat GPT and Open-AI models: A preliminary review. *Future Internet, 15*(6), 1. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15060001>
- Sarsenbayeva, A. (2020). *The Effect of Academic Integrity Policy on Students' Perception of Academic Dishonesty: A Case of One Kazakhstani University* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education).
- Scanlan, C. L. (2006). Strategies to promote a climate of academic integrity and minimize student cheating and plagiarism. *Journal of allied health, 35*(3), 179-185.
- Simmons, A. (2018, April 28). *Why students cheat—and what to do about it*. Edutopia.  
<https://www.edutopia.org/article/why-students-cheat-and-what-do-about-it/>
- Shalevska, E. (2023). AI language models, standardized tests, and academic integrity: A Chat (GPT). *International Journal of Education Teacher, 26*(26), 17–25.
- Sharma, S., & Yadav, R. (2022). Chat GPT—A technological remedy or challenge for education system. *Global Journal of Enterprise Information System, 14*(4), 46-51.
- Shaushenova, A., Zulpykhar, Z., Zhumasseitova, S., Ongarbayeva, M., Akhmetzhanova, S., Mutalova, Z., ... & Zueva, A. (2021). The Influence of the Proctoring System on the

- Results of Online Tests in the Conditions of Distance Learning. *AD ALTA: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 11(2).
- Shu, L. L., & Gino, F. (2012). Sweeping dishonesty under the rug: How unethical actions lead to forgetting of moral rules. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 1164-1177.
- Sotiriadou, P., Logan, D., Daly, A., & Guest, R. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(11), 2132-2148.
- Stoesz, B. M., & Los, R. (2019). Evaluation of a tutorial designed to promote academic integrity. *Canadian Perspectives on Academic Integrity*, 2(1), 3-26.
- Stone, A. (2023). Student perceptions of academic integrity: a qualitative study of understanding, consequences, and impact. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21(3), 357-375.
- Sutherland-Smith, W., & Carr, R. (2005). Turnitin.com: Teachers' Perspectives of Anti Plagiarism Software in Raising Issues of Educational Integrity. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 2(3), 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.2.3.10>
- Tatum, H., & Schwartz, B. M. (2017). Honor codes: Evidence based strategies for improving academic integrity. *Theory into practice*, 56(2), 129-135.
- Thakkar, M., & Weisfeld-Spolter, S. (2012). A Qualitative Analysis of Students' Perceptions of Academic Integrity on Campus. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 16, 81.
- Types of academic misconduct*. (2024, September 18). Australian National University. <https://www.anu.edu.au/students/academic-skills/academic-integrity/best-practice-principles/types-of-academic-misconduct>

- Turner, S. P., & Beemsterboer, P. L. (2003). Enhancing academic integrity: Formulating effective honor codes. *Journal of Dental Education*, 67(10), 1122–1129.
- Turnitin. (2024.). *Empower students to do their best, original work* | Turnitin. Retrieved February 8, 2024. <https://turnitin.com/>
- Weber-Wulff, D., et al. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(26), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00129-1>
- Woith, W., Jenkins, S. D., & Kerber, C. (2012, October). Perceptions of academic integrity among nursing students. In *Nursing Forum* ,47, (4), 253-259.
- Wu, S., Cao, Y., Cui, J., Li, R., Qian, H., Jiang, B., & Zhang, W. (2024). A Comprehensive Exploration of Personalized Learning in Smart Education: From Student Modeling to Personalized Recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01666*.
- Yu, H. (2023). Reflection on whether Chat GPT should be banned by academia from the perspective of education and teaching. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1181712.
- Zangla, K. (2023). Reasons Why Students Violate Academic Integrity Rules in a University Setting.

## Appendix A

Dear Anastasiya Nesterova,

the decision of Research Ethics committee is provided below:

DISCUSSION:

1. The research work of Anastasiya Nesterova, a master student of the Two Foreign languages program of Education and Humanities faculty was reviewed:

- recommended to change the options of 2nd question in background information questionnaire by following: a) 1-2; b) 3-4;

DECISION:

1. The research work of Anastasiya Nesterova «Undergraduate Students' Perception of Academic Integrity in EFL Classrooms» is **conditionally approved** but based on addressing those comments (revised changes must be sent to [rethics@sdu.edu.kz](mailto:rethics@sdu.edu.kz) email);

## Appendix B

### Questionnaire

#### Background information:

- 1) What is your age?
  - a) 18-20    b) 21-23    c) 24+
- 2) What is your year of study?
  - a) Year 1-2
  - b) Year 3-4
- 3) What is your gender?
  - a) Male    b) female
- 4) What is your approximate GPA?
  - a) 3.5-4.0    b) 3.0-3.49    c) 2.5-2.99    d) 2.0-2.49    e) less than 1.99

#### Policies – Awareness

- 1) Please define what academic integrity is in your own words. (short answer question) **2.1 Students' perceptions of academic integrity**
- 2) What is your attitude towards academic integrity? / What is your perception of academic integrity? Relates to positive/negative connotations of this word (short answer question) **2.1 Students' perceptions of academic integrity**
- 3) Before coming to SDU University, did your school have an academic integrity policy that you had to follow? **2.2 Factors influencing the adherence of academic integrity**
  - a) Yes    b) no
- 4) Have you been informed about the academic integrity policies in SDU University? **2.2 Factor: awareness**
  - a) Yes    b) no
- 5) Where and how much have you learned about these policies? (1 – learned little or nothing, 3 – learned some, 5 – learned a lot). Select all that apply **2.2 Factor: awareness**
  - a) First-year orientation program 1    3    5
  - b) Campus website 1    3    5
  - c) Student handbook 1    3    5

- d) Academic advisor 1 3 5
- e) Other students 1 3 5
- f) Faculty members (program coordinators or dean)
- 6) How would you rate...? (1 - very low, 2 - low, 3 - average, 4 - high, 5 – very high) **2.2**

**Factor: awareness**

- a) The severity of penalties for cheating at SDU University 1 2 3 4 5
- b) Your own understanding of these policies 1 2 3 4 5
- c) The faculty's understanding of these policies 1 2 3 4 5
- d) The effectiveness of these policies 1 2 3 4 5
- 7) In your past year (s), how often, on average, did your EFL instructors discuss policies related to the following items. Rate on the scale from 1 to 5 (1- never, 2 – very seldom (1-2 times per semester), 3 – sometimes (3-4 times per semester), 4 – often (before each assignment, midterm, final exam), 5 – very often ( on every or almost every lesson): **2.2**

**Factor: instructors**

- a) Plagiarism 1 2 3 4 5
- b) Guidelines on group work or collaboration 1 2 3 4 5
- c) Proper citation/referencing of sources 1 2 3 4 5
- d) Falsifying/ fabricating research data 1 2 3 4 5
- 8) List strategies your instructors use to promote academic integrity in their English lessons.

**2.2 Factor: instructors**

**Students' awareness of academic integrity cont. and academic dishonesty:**

- 9) Please rate how serious you believe each type of behavior is where (1 – not cheating, 2 – trivial cheating, 3 – moderate cheating, 4 – serious cheating)
  - a) Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography 1 2 3 4
  - b) Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work 1 2 3 4
  - c) Inappropriately sharing work in group assignments 1 2 3 4
  - d) Copying another students' homework 1 2 3 4
  - e) Submitting the same paper in more than one course without specific permission 1 2 3 4

- f) Purchasing papers 1 2 3 4
  - g) Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences from any source without citing them in a paper you submitted 1 2 3 4
  - h) Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test 1 2 3 4
  - i) Helping someone else cheat on a test 1 2 3 4
  - j) Copying from another student during a test WITH his knowledge 1 2 3 4
  - k) Copying from another student during a test WITHOUT his knowledge 1 2 3 4
  - l) Using digital technology to get unpermitted help during a test 1 2 3 4
  - m) Using crib notes to cheat on an exam 1 2 3 4
- 10) What would your actions be if you noticed a student violating the rules (cheating on an exam, plagiarizing home assignments, purchasing papers and etc)? **2.2 Factor: awareness**

### **Main types of academic dishonesty**

- 11) Please choose how often, if ever, in the past year(s) you have engaged in any of the following behaviors: 1 – never, 2 – 1-2 times, 3 – sometimes (4-5 times), 4 – often (in the majority of cases when I have a chance), 5 – always (in all cases when I have a chance)
- a) Fabricating or falsifying a bibliography 1 2 3 4 5
  - b) Working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work 1 2 3 4 5
  - c) Inappropriately sharing work in group assignments 1 2 3 4 5
  - d) Copying another students' homework
  - e) Submitting the same paper in more than one course without specific permission 1 2 3 4 5
  - f) Purchasing papers
  - g) Paraphrasing or copying a few sentences from any source without citing them in a paper you submitted 1 2 3 4 5
  - h) Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken a test 1 2 3 4 5
  - i) Helping someone else cheat on a test 1 2 3 4 5
  - j) Copying from another student during a test WITH his knowledge 1 2 3 4 5
  - k) Copying from another student during a test WITHOUT his knowledge 1 2 3 4 5

- l) Using digital technology to get unpermitted help during a test 1 2 3 4 5
- m) Using crib notes to cheat on an exam 1 2 3 4 5

**Reasons for violating academic integrity**

- 12) In your point of view, have you ever violated academic integrity? If yes, what were the reasons? Possible answers: lack of knowledge of the subject matter, desire to get high grades, desire to justify parental expectations, limited time, unrelated exam questions, peer behavior
- 13) To what extent do you think your reasons for violating academic integrity could justify them?
- 14) As a future teacher, will you take action to promote academic integrity? If yes, what will you do? If not, explain the reasons why?

## Appendix C

### Interview Questions

#### Background information questions:

- 1) Please, tell me about your teaching experience:
  - a) How long have you been working as a teacher in higher education?
  - b) What were your previous workplaces (language courses, schools, or colleges)?
  - c) What courses do you teach?

#### **The Instructors' Roles in Promoting Academic Integrity**

- 1) How can you define academic integrity? Have you ever noticed any violations of it? If yes, what were they?
- 2) What do you think your role is in teaching about academic integrity in the era of AI?

*\*If the participant struggles with this question, I'll ask these questions: Do you teach about academic integrity? If yes, how often do you do this? What do you do to ensure adherence to academic integrity in your lessons?*

- 3) Do you do anything to prevent academic dishonesty in your lessons?

*\*If the answer to the previous question isn't "good" enough, the following question will be: What do you do if you catch a student cheating?*

#### **The Use of Online Applications**

- 1) Do you ever integrate tutorials to educate your students about academic integrity? If you use them, please share the names of the website(s) or application(s) that you use.

#### **The Use of Turnitin**

- 1) How do you check the originality of students' written assignments?

- 2) What are the advantages of ... (Turnitin or other app(s) mentioned by the respondent)?  
What are the disadvantages of using it?

**The Use of Honor Codes (“synonyms” For example, declaration in thesis, agreement)**

- 1) As honor (ethical) codes are becoming popular in educational institutions, in what ways do you think they can impact the promotion of academic integrity? Have you or your colleagues ever used them? Share your experience.

*\*If yes, there will be follow-up questions:* How did you introduce honor codes? What kind of information did you include? Did they help to reduce plagiarism?

**Authentic Assessment as an Alternative to Tests**

- 1) In conducting the final assessment, which format do you usually use: traditional tests or projects/case studies? Why?

*\*If the participant chooses traditional tests, I’ll ask these questions:* Have you ever tried using authentic assessment tasks? What is your opinion about them?

**The Use of Online Proctoring Apps**

- 1) In what format (paper-based or electronic) do you usually conduct quizzes, midterms, or final exams?
- 2) Have you ever had exams in the online format? What applications did you use to do this? Why?

## Appendix D



### SDU University Research Ethics Committee

#### Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled “**Academic Integrity: Students’ Awareness and Instructors’ Promoting Strategies in English Lessons**”.

#### **Dear Participant,**

You are kindly asked to fill out this online questionnaire. Thank you in advance for taking the time to read the following form carefully. If you agree to participate, please press “I agree” to confirm that you are 18+ and your voluntariness.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to explore students’ perceptions of academic integrity, referring to their awareness, factors influencing adherence to academic integrity, types of academic dishonesty, and reasons for these violations.

**Participant Selection:** You were selected as a possible participant in this research based on the fact that you are a student majoring in TFL and have had/ have lessons related to learning English. Thus, the researcher assumes that you are familiar with the concept of academic integrity, and that you can provide some valuable insights into the extent to which it is upheld in English lessons.

**Procedures:** There are several steps, involved in this research. Prior to accessing the questionnaire, you need to read this form and in case you agree to participate, please press “I agree” to proceed. After that, you will be able to answer the questions by ticking the most appropriate answers for you or typing your response. Also, feel free to ask the primary researcher, Anastassiya Nesterova (Gmail: [231302008@sdu.edu.kz](mailto:231302008@sdu.edu.kz)), any questions related to the topic, questions, and purpose of this study. This questionnaire consists of 14 questions, and it will take about 20 minutes. After the completion, do not forget to press “submit” so that to save your answers. Your participation is highly appreciated as you can share beneficial strategies which can help other readers maintain academic integrity in their lessons.

**Confidentiality:** The survey is conducted anonymously in Google Forms. Your names or IP addresses are not collected and will not appear in any official reports. In addition, all research participants will be assigned specific codes in the presentation of verbal data, and anonymity will be maintained in the presentation of results. Any personal information by which you can be identified will be kept strictly confidential. Raw data will be stored in a secure location, and it will be deleted after the completion of the study in June 2025. No one, other than the researchers, Anastassiya Nesterova and Kymbat Smakova, will have access to the raw data. Individual results will not be shared with any third party at the conclusion of this study; only a consent form will be included as it is.

**Potential Risks:** Any possible risks will be kept to a minimum. No names or other personal information will be disclosed without written consent.

**Refusal/ Withdrawal:** Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable with any part, you reserve the right to withdraw from this study without any effect on your future relationships with your educational institution.

**Statement of Consent.**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, agree to participate in this study voluntarily. I have been made aware of the research purpose and objectives and clearly understand what is expected from me.

I know that it is voluntary to participate in this study and I have complete freedom to withdraw my consent at any time without providing any reasons and in this case, there will be no negative consequences to me.

I understand that any personal information obtained in this study will be kept confidential.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: .

Researcher:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:

## Appendix E

### Research Ethics Committee

#### Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled “**Academic Integrity: Students’ Perceptions and Instructors’ Promoting Strategies in English Lessons**”.

**Dear Participant,**

You are invited to participate in this interview. Thank you in advance for taking the time to carefully read the following form. If you agree to participate, please fill it in with your name/surname and signature.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is doublefold: first, the research aims to identify instructors’ perceptions of their role in teaching about academic integrity. Second, the research seeks to investigate what strategies instructors use to prevent students from violating the rules of academic integrity.

**Participant Selection:** You were selected as a possible participant in this study based on the fact that you work as an EFL instructor in higher education. Thus, the researcher assumes that you are familiar with what academic integrity is, and you can provide some valuable insights into how it can be promoted in lessons.

**Procedures:** There are several steps, involved in this research. Prior to beginning the interview, you need to read this form and in case you agree to participate, please sign it in the indicated place. Also, feel free to ask any questions related to the topic and purpose of this study. After that, the interview will begin. This is a semi-structured interview; therefore, you will be asked approximately 10-15 questions, and it will take about 20-30 minutes. The interview will be recorded. Following this, the researcher will transcribe the audio recording and analyze it. Finally, the transcribed version and key takeaways will be sent to you to check for any possible inconsistencies or misunderstandings. Your participation is highly appreciated as you can share beneficial strategies which can help other readers maintain academic integrity in their lessons.

**Confidentiality:** All research participants will be assigned specific numbers, and anonymity will be maintained in the presentation of results. Any personal information by which you can be identified will be kept strictly confidential. Raw data will be stored in a secure location, and it will be deleted after the completion of the study on May 5, 2024. No one, other than my research supervisor, Kymbat Smakova, and me, Anastassiya Nesterova, will have access to the raw data. The transcripts of interviews will not be shared with any third party at the conclusion of this study; only a consent form will be included as it is.

**Potential Risks:** Any possible risks will be kept to a minimum. No names or other personal information will be disclosed without written consent.

**Refusal/ Withdrawal:** Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable with any part, you reserve the right to withdraw from this study without any effect on your future relationships with your educational institution.

**Statement of Consent.**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, agree to participate in this study voluntarily. I have been made aware of the research purpose and objectives and clearly understand what is expected from me.

I know that it is voluntary to participate in this study and I have complete freedom to withdraw my consent at any time without providing any reasons and in this case, there will be no negative consequences to me.

I understand that any personal information obtained in this study will be kept confidential.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

