Journal of Education & Humanities Research (JEHR)
Institute of Education & Research (IER), University of Balochistan, Quetta-Pakistan
Volume: 15, Issue-I, 2023; ISSN:2415-2366 (Print) 2710-2971 (Online)
Email: *jehr@um.uob.edu.pk*
URL: *http://web.uob.edu.pk/uob/Journals/jehr/jehr.php*

"Prevalence of Academically Honest Behaviors at Higher Education Level for Educational Development of Visually Impaired Students"

Kashif Iqbal[1]: *Ph. D Scholar, Institute of Special Education, University of Punjab Lahore*
Samina Ashraf[2]: *Assistant Professor, Institute of Special Education, University of the Punjab, Lahore*

Received: April 30, 2023
Accepted: June 20, 2023
Published: June 30, 2023

KEY WORDS

Academically Honest Behaviors, Visually Impaired Students, College, Classroom, Higher Education

ABSTRACT

Academically honest behaviors in higher education are essential to maintain for visually impaired students. This study intended to seek the prevalence of academically honest behaviors among visually impaired students for their educational development at higher education level. The research was quantitative and descriptive. The study sample included 79 teachers from special education colleges of Punjab. A purposive sampling technique was used to collect data through a self-developed structured questionnaire. The experts' opinion (N=02) and pilot testing technique ensured the instrument's validity& reliability. The data was analyzed through SPSS version 21 for descriptive and inferential statistical. Frequencies were drawn to reach towards results. The findings revealed majority of respondents reported that visually impaired students do trust their classmates for help during exam. The study recommended special education department should review assessment and evaluation procedures for teachers and students with visual impairment in their colleges to promote true academically honest behaviors for a quality teaching & learning process.

Introduction

Educational process is carried out through the compliance of academic integrity policies in any educational institute for the sake of quality education.

For visually impaired students to maximize their potential and lessen the effects of their handicap, higher education is required. Regrettably, there are several challenges and cultural barriers for visually impaired students in higher education in Pakistan (Ahmad &Yousaf, 2011).

Academically honest behaviors are based on academic integrity foundation. Academic integrity (AI) is a dedication to the core values of accountability in learning, teaching, and research, as well as honesty, trust, fairness, and respect. (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2021; Bretag, 2016).

In a classroom, even on the smallest of tests, when students cheat, they are dishonest by lying about what they know, have done, and can do. They also maintain inequity by earning an unfair advantage (Gallant and Stephens, 2020). Higher education is becoming increasingly concerned with upholding of academically honest behaviors. Academically honest behaviors are not just a phenomenon related to cheating or plagiarism but also to trust/ honesty, fairness and responsibility.

Statement of Problem

Academically honest behaviors are not simply about avoiding plagiarism; they also refers to destroying classroom decorum, being dishonest, and building trust, among other things. This study aims to examine how academically honest behaviors impact on the educational development of visually impaired students.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the research were to:

1. Find out the perception of teachers about academically honest behaviors on educational development of visually impaired students at higher education level.
2. Inquire the nature of academic misconduct among students with visual impairment at higher education level.
3. Investigate the reasons of breaching the academically honest behaviors by students with visual impairment in their classrooms.
4. Highlight the measures taken by the teachers in assuring academically honest behaviors while teaching to students with visual impairment.

Research Questions

The question for this research were:

1. What is the perception of teachers about academically honest behaviors on educational development of visually impaired students at higher education level?
2. What is the nature of academic misconduct among students with visual impairment at higher education level?
3. What is the reason of breaching the academically honest behaviors by students with visual impairment in their classrooms?
4. What are the measures taken by the teachers in assuring academically honest behaviors while teaching to students with visual impairment?

Significance of the Study

Academically honest behaviors supports learning possibilities. The path of academic honesty must be firmly set to guarantee lifetime integrity. When students are encouraged to develop their ideas, it leads to their development. Therefore, this study is beneficial for students with and without visual impairment, their teachers and even for the individuals around the matrix of visually impaired students to improve academically honest behaviors in their respective institutes.

Limitations of the Study

a. The study was limited to the province of Punjab only due to time and financial constraints.

Delimitations of the Study

a. The study was delimited to the college teachers only from the special education department in Punjab.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

b. A structured questionnaire was developed due to non-availability of a standardized instrument.

Literature Review:

McCabe (2016) found that classroom integrity is the moral code or ethical policy. Higher education includes everything from instruction to rigorous practical work (as in dental and medical schools) and university-based social services (Pucciarelli & Kaplan, 2016).

Recent attention has been focused on academically honest behaviors because it is crucial and prevalent in higher education. (Bretag, 2016). However, plagiarism is not only a moral and ethical issue; it may also be viewed and analyzed as an issue with academic literacy, denoting a student's short or deficient writing. (Jamieson 2016). Others may plagiarise as a result of their inability to write effectively while some choose to do it intentionally. (Pecorari, 2016).

Student academic dishonesty has been linked to eventual unethical behavior on the job; it has been highlighted that international students are more susceptible to this. (Brown et al., 2019). According to Kuznekoff (2020), students can access online lecture videos that impact their learning, but their education suffers when they view videos for long periods. Cheating cannot be completely eliminated but can be decreased, students who want to cheat will find a way to do so (Swartz and Cole, 2013). According to Bearman et al. (2020), academic integrity focuses on equipping students with the knowledge and principles.

Students' academically honest behaviors is also influenced by professors' capacity to impart information about and encourage acceptance of the standards of academically honest behaviors (O'Connell, 2016). On campus, dishonest academic behavior is acknowledged by 40%and 70% of students while occurring (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2020). Gallant (2020) found that most schools and institutions have a department or office dedicated explicitly to actions promoting academically honest behaviors.

Plagiarism is the most prevalent kind of academic dishonesty in both undergraduate and graduate programs (Lang, 2013). The three causes of cheating—the situational elements, pressure from competitors, and a lack of morals—are discussed in this part. (Stoltzfus, 2015).

Students know they can get away with it, students cheat, despite competition pressure being the most common defense (Vittrup, 2016).

Academic dishonesty has several issues specific to educational institutions in the community, one of which impacts how well schools operate and how well students do.

Academic dishonesty was described by Jurdi, et al., (2012) as any form of fraud used in a learning environment, including plagiarism, invention, deception, and inducement. Academic dishonesty among students is a problem that the educational background cannot be ignored because of its serious consequences (Ratu et al., 2020).

According to Yu et al., (2016), when higher education institutions become common with academic dishonesty, the legitimacy and integrity of diplomas from those schools are jeopardized. Teferra (2021) believes that students face other issues besides academic dishonesty.

Research Methodology

Research Design:

The type of research was descriptive, and it was quantitative in nature.

Population

The population of the study was teachers teaching to visually impaired college students in special education department Punjab.

Sample of the Study

The sample of the study was teachers of visually impaired students (N=79) teaching at college level to students with visual impairment. There were lecturers (N=62), assistant professors (N=12), and associate professors (N=5) from various cities of Punjab. The purposive or judgmental sampling technique was used to collect data.

Instrument

As an instrument, a self-developed structured questionnaire was used to collect data. The first part of the questionnaire includes demographic information, e.g., Age, Gender, Designation, Academic Qualification, Institution name, and Total teaching

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

experience. The 2nd part of the questionnaire deals with the items developed by considering the research objectives. There were four major areas in the instrument including teachers' perception, the nature of academic misconduct, reasons for breaching academically honest behaviours, and measures taken by the teachers to ensure academically honest behaviors.

Validity & Reliability

The instrument's validity was confirmed through the expert opinion (N=02) from the field and the pilot testing of the instrument. However, the instrument's reliability was confirmed through statistical package (SPSS) version-21, in which Cronbach's Alpha was .767 for a total of 33 items.

Data Collection Procedure

The data was collected by complying with the proper ethical procedure. The respondents were informed about the topic, its purpose and its background. The respondents were approached through the use of personal contacts. The researcher visited the respondents physically in Lahore. However, respondents outside the Lahore district were approached telephonically due to limited financial resources and time constraints.

Data analysis

After the data collection, the data was analyzed through the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version -21. The data was entered initially, descriptive and inferential statistics were administered to find the results, and frequencies were also drawn to reach the results.

Table 1: ***Frequency Distribution of Respondents by their Demographics***

Sample	Frequency
Gender	32 Males (40.5%), 47 Females (59.5%)
Age	25-30 Yrs 20 (25.3%), 31-35 Yrs 21 (26.6%), 36-40 Yrs 15 (19%), 41 Yrs&abv 23 (29.1%)
Academic Qualification	22 BS/MA (27.8%), 43 M.Phil (54.4%), 11 Ph.D Scholar (13.9%), 3 PhD (3.8%)
Experience	Less than 5 Yrs 18 (22.8%), 10 Yrs 16 (20.3%), 11-15 yrs 17 (21.5%), 15 Yrs&abv (35.4%)
Sample	Frequency
Gender	32 Males (40.5%), 47 Females (59.5%)
Age	25-30 Yrs 20 (25.3%), 31-35 Yrs 21 (26.6%), 36-40 Yrs 15 (19%), 41 Yrs&abv 23 (29.1%)
Academic Qualification	22 BS/MA (27.8%), 43 M.Phil (54.4%), 11 Ph.D Scholar (13.9%), 3 PhD (3.8%)
Experience	Less than 5 Yrs 18 (22.8%), 10 Yrs 16 (20.3%), 11-15 yrs 17 (21.5%), 15 Yrs&abv (35.4%)

Table 1 depicts that the frequency percentage of demographics including

32 Males (40.5%), 47 Females (59.5%), age 25-30 Yrs 20 (25.3%), 31-35 Yrs 21 (26.6%), 36-40 Yrs 15 (19%), 41 Yrs&abv 23 (29.1%), qualification 22 BS/MA (27.8%), 43 M.Phil (54.4%), 11 Ph.D Scholar (13.9%), 3 PhD (3.8%), and experience Less than 5 Yrs 18 (22.8%), 10 Yrs 16 (20.3%), 11-15 yrs 17 (21.5%), 15 Yrs&abv (35.4%).

Table 2: ***Mean, Standard Deviation, t-test on the scale of Academically Honest Behaviors Scale among Male and Female Visually Impaired Students (n=79).***

Scale	Gender	n	M	SD	T	p
AHB*	Males	32	76.63	6.719		
					-0.11	912
	Females	47	76.83	8.813		
TP*	Males	32	20.25	2.712		
					.376	.708
	Females	47	20.04	2.177		
NAM*	Males	32	16.59	3.591		
					-1.937	.043
	Females	47	18.34	4.151		
RBCI*	Males	32	23.13	2.152		
					-1.63	.107
	Female	47	24.51	4.457		
MTTAAHB*	Males	32	16.66	2.458		
					4.72	.00
	Female	47	13.94	2.549		

This table shows that academically honest behaviors for the educational development of students with visual impairment at higher education level in males and females is same. Because there is almost no difference in mean value. But nature of academic misconduct and measures taken by the teachers in assuring academically honest behaviors in male and female is significantly different because value of p less than 0.5.

*Academically Honest Behaviors, *Teachers' Perception, *Nature of Academic Misconduct, *Reasons of Breaching academically honest behaviors, *Measures taken to improve academically honest behaviors.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 3: ***One-way analysis of Academically Honest Behaviors with Qualification***

Scale		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
AHB	Between Groups	149.957	3	49.986	.777	.510
	Within Groups	4822.980	75	64.306		
	Total	4972.937	78			
MTTA AHB	Between Groups	44.947	3	14.982	1.931	.132
	Within Groups	581.939	75	7.759		
	Total	626.886	78			
RBAH B	Between Groups	27.799	3	9.266	.652	.584
	Within Groups	1065.999	75	14.213		
	Total	1093.797	78			
NAM	Between Groups	49.037	3	16.346	1.020	.388
	Within Groups	1201.318	75	16.018		
	Total	1250.354	78			
TP	Between Groups	16.913	3	5.638	.984	.405
	Within Groups	429.821	75	5.731		
	Total	446.734	78			

Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference in IAHB And its Factors.

Table 4: ***Mean, Standard Deviation on the scale of IAHB factors.***

		N	Mean	Std. Devi.
IAI	BS/M. A	22	75.09	6.070
	M.Phil.	43	77.65	8.124
	Ph. D Scholar	11	75.55	11.290
	Ph.D.	3	80.33	1.155
	Total	79	76.75	7.985
MTTAAHB	BS/M. A	22	15.18	2.666
	M.Phil.	43	15.00	2.820
	Ph.D. Scholar	11	14.00	3.130
	Ph.D.	3	18.33	.577
	Total	79	15.04	2.835
RBCI	BS/M. A	22	23.09	2.942
	M.Phil.	43	24.44	3.705
	Ph.D. Scholar	11	23.91	5.467
	Ph.D.	3	23.33	2.082
	Total	79	23.95	3.745
NAM	BS/M. A	22	16.55	3.363
	M.Phil.	43	18.28	4.250
	Ph.D. Scholar	11	17.64	4.433
	Ph.D.	3	16.33	2.082
	Total	79	17.63	4.004
TP	BS/M. A	22	20.27	2.313
	M.Phil.	43	19.93	2.334
	Ph.D. Scholar	11	20.00	2.828
	Ph.D.	3	22.33	2.082
	Total	79	20.13	2.393

Table 4 depicts that Ph.D. have high mean value. In MTTAAHB, Ph.D. have high mean value. In RBCI, M.Phil. have high mean value. In NAM, M.Phil. have high mean value. In TP, Ph.D. have high mean value.

Table 5: ***One-way analysis of Academically Honest Behaviors with Qualification***

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
IAI	Between Groups	31.396	3	10.465	.159	.924
	Within Groups	4941.541	75	65.887		
	Total	4972.937	78			
MTTAAHB	Between Groups	26.705	3	8.902	1.11	.350
	Within Groups	600.181	75	8.002		
	Total	626.886	78			
RBCI	Between Groups	.455	3	.152	.010	.999
	Within Groups	1093.343	75	14.578		
	Total	1093.797	78			
NAM	Between Groups	19.387	3	6.462	.394	.758
	Within Groups	1230.968	75	16.413		
	Total	1250.354	78			
TP	Between Groups	2.918	3	.973	.164	.920
	Within Groups	443.816	75	5.918		
	Total	446.734	78			

Table 5 depicts that there is no significance in academically honest behaviors And its Factors.

Table 6: ***Mean, Standard Deviation on the scale of Academically Honest Behaviors & its factors.***

		N	M	SD
AHB	Less Than 5%Year's	18	77.06	7.424
	6-10Year's	16	77.50	6.613
	11-15Year's	17	75.65	8.965
	15Year'sAndAbove	28	76.79	8.741
	Total	79	76.75	7.985
MTTAAHB	Less Than 5%Year's	18	14.83	3.222
	6-10Year's	16	16.19	1.940
	11-15Year's	17	14.71	3.331
	15Year'sAndAbove	28	14.71	2.651
	Total	79	15.04	2.835
RBCI	Less Than 5%Year's	18	23.83	3.585
	6-10Year's	16	23.94	3.296
	11-15Year's	17	24.06	4.038
	15Year'sAndAbove	28	23.96	4.087
	Total	79	23.95	3.745
NAM	Less Than 5%Year's	18	17.94	3.963
	6-10Year's	16	17.50	3.266
	11-15Year's	17	16.76	4.493
	15Year's and above	28	18.04	4.221
	Total	79	17.63	4.004
TP	Less Than 5%Year's	18	20.44	2.854
	6-10Year's	16	19.88	1.821
	11-15Year's	17	20.12	2.205
	15Year'sAndAbove	28	20.07	2.567
	Total	79	20.13	2.393

Table 6depicts that 6-10Year's have high mean value. In MTTAAHB,6-10Year's have high mean value. In RBCI, 11-15 years have high mean value. In NAM, 15 years and above have high mean value. In TP, less than 5%Years have high mean value.

Table 7: Academically honest behaviors has an impact on education of visually impaired students at higher education level.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	28	35.4	35.4
Agree	36	45.6	81.0
Disagree	5	6.3	87.3
Strongly Disagree	10	12.7	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 7 shows that 35.4% respondents were strongly agree on academically honest behaviors has an impact on education of visually impaired students at higher education level. 45.6 % respondents were agree, 6.3% respondents were disagree and 12.7 % respondents were strongly agree. It means that majority of respondents 45.6% in the study were agree that academically honest behaviors has an impact on education of visually impaired students at higher education level.

Table 8: Academic dishonesty exists at higher education level.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	6	7.6	7.6
Agree	46	58.2	65.8
Disagree	25	31.6	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 8 shows that 7.6% respondents were strongly agree that academic dishonesty exists at higher education level, 58.2 % respondents were agree,31.6% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 58.2% in the study were agree that academic dishonesty exists at higher education level.

Table 9: There is tendency to misunderstand of academically honest behaviors at higher education level.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	5	6.3	6.3
Agree	48	60.8	67.1
Disagree	25	31.6	98.7
Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 9 depicts that 6.3% respondents were strongly agree that there is tendency to misunderstand of academically honest behaviors at higher education level, 60.8 % respondents were agreed,31.6% respondents were disagreed, and1.3% respondents were strongly disagreed. It means that majority of respondents 60.8% in the study were agree that there is tendency to misunderstand of academically honest behaviors at higher education level.

Table 10: Visually Impaired students are having trust on their class fellows for help in class test.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	7	8.9	8.9
Agree	66	83.5	92.4
Disagree	5	6.3	98.7
Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 10displays that 8.9% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students are having trust on their class fellows for help in test, 83.5 % respondents were agree, 6.3% respondents were disagree, 1.3% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 83.5% in the study were agree that visually impaired students are having trust on class fellows for help in class test.

Table 11: Academically honest Behaviors are maintained by the students with visual impairment on the basis of their previous learning from school.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percent
Strongly Agree	0	0	0
Agree	65	82.3	82.3
Disagree	5	6.3	88.6
Strongly Disagree	9	11.4	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 11depicts that 0% respondents were strongly agree that academically honest behaviors are maintained by the students with visual impairment on the basis of their previous learning from school, 82.3 % respondents were agree, 6.3% respondents were disagree, and 11.4% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 82.3% in the study were agreeing that academically honest behaviors are

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

maintained by the students with visual impairment on the basis of their previous learning from school

Table 12: Visually Impaired students show responsible behavior in completing their educational tasks.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	3	3.8	3.8
Agree	63	79.7	83.5
Disagree	13	16.5	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 12 contains that 3.8% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students show responsible behavior in completing their educational tasks, 79.7 % respondents were agree, 16.5% respondents were disagree, and 0% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 79.7% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students show responsible behavior in completing their educational tasks.

Table 13: Visually Impaired students depict appropriate behavior with class fellows during their academic endeavors.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.3
Agree	65	82.3	83.5
Disagree	12	15.2	98.7
Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 13 shows that 1.3% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students depict appropriate behavior with class fellows during their academic endeavors, 82.3 % respondents were agree, 15.2% respondents were disagree, and 1.3% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 82.3% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students depict appropriate behavior with class fellows during their academic endeavors.

***Table 14: Academically dishonest behaviors are exhibited by visually impaired students in their classroom*.**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	3	3.8	3.8
Agree	45	57.0	60.8
Disagree	24	30.4	91.1
Strongly Disagree	7	8.9	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 14depicts that 3.8% respondents were strongly agree that academically dishonest behaviors are exhibited by visually impaired students in their classroom, 57.0 % respondents were agree, 30.4% respondents were disagree, and 8.9% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 57.0% in the study were agreeingthat academically dishonest behaviors are exhibited by visually impaired students in their classroom.

Table 15: Teachers believe that visual impairment becomes hurdle to develop academically honest behaviors for classroom.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percent
Strongly Agree	10	12.7	12.7
Agree	27	34.2	46.8
Disagree	29	36.7	83.5
Strongly Disagree	13	16.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 15 portrays that 12.7% respondents were strongly agree that teachers believe that visual impairment becomes hurdle to develop academically honest behaviors for classroom, 34.2 % respondents were agree, 36.7% respondents were disagree, and 16.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 36.7% in the study were disagreeingthat teachers believe that visual impairment becomes hurdle to

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

develop academically honest behaviors for classroom.

***Table 16: Visually impaired students use plagiarize paper material for assignment*.**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	8	10.1	10.1
Agree	38	48.1	58.2
Disagree	33	41.8	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 16 depicts that 10.1% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students use plagiarize paper material for assignment, 48.1 % respondents were agree, 41.8% respondents were disagree, and 0% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 48.1% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students use plagiarize paper material for assignment.

***Table 17: Visually Impaired students paraphrase someone else's assignment and submitting it as their own*.**

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percent
Strongly Agree	18	22.8	5.1
Agree	16	20.3	57.0
Disagree	17	21.5	98.7
Strongly Disagree	28	35.4	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 17 shows that 22.8% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students paraphrase someone else's assignment and submitting it as their own, 20.3 % respondents were agree, 21.5% respondents were disagree, and 35.4% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 35.4% in the study were strongly disagreeing that visually impaired students paraphrase someone else's assignment and submitting it as their own.

Table 18: Visually impaired students relying on some group members to do all the work.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	6	7.6	7.6
Agree	46	58.2	65.8
Disagree	21	26.6	92.4
Strongly Disagree	6	7.6	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 18 depicts that 7.6% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students with visual impairment relying on some group members to do all the work, 58.2 % respondents were agree, 26.6% respondents were disagree, and 7.6% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 58.2% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students relying on some group members to do all the work.

Table 19: Visually impaired students involved in unfair means to do their academic task.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	7	8.9	8.9
Agree	25	31.6	40.5
Disagree	35	44.3	84.8
Strongly Disagree	12	15.2	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 19 shows that 8.9% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students involved in unfair means to do their academic task, 31.6 % respondents were agree, 44.3% respondents were disagree, and 15.2% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 44.3% in the study were disagreeing that visually impaired students involved in unfair means to do their academic task.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 20: Visually impaired students are involved in cheating in class test.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	6	7.6	7.6
Agree	29	36.7	44.3
Disagree	32	40.5	84.8
Strongly Disagree	12	15.2	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 20depicts that 7.6% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students are involved in cheating in class test, 36.7 % respondents were agree, 40.5% respondents were disagree, and 15.2% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 40.5% in the study were disagreeing that visually impaired students are involved in cheating in class test.

Table 21: Visually impaired students are involved in violating the classroom rules.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	4	5.1	5.1
Agree	29	36.7	41.8
Disagree	23	29.1	70.9
Strongly Disagree	23	29.1	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 21 shows that 5.1% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students are involved in violating the classroom rules, 36.7 % respondents were agree, 29.1% respondents were disagree, and 29.1% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 36.7% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students are involved in violating the classroom rules.

Table 22: Visually impaired students make excuses of coming late in class because of their visual impairment.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	8	10.1	10.1
Agree	36	45.6	55.7
Disagree	25	31.6	87.3
Strongly Disagree	10	12.7	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 22depicts that 10.1% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students make excuses of coming late in class because of their visual impairment, 45.6 % respondents were agree, 31.6% respondents were disagree, and 12.7% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 45.6% in the study were agreeing that visually impaired students make excuses of coming late in class because of their visual impairment.

Table 23: Visually impaired students disrespect others in class.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	7	8.9	8.9
Agree	9	11.4	20.3
Disagree	60	75.9	96.2
Strongly Disagree	3	3.8	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 23highlights that 8.9% respondents were strongly agree that visually impaired students disrespect others in class, 11.4 % respondents were agree, 75.9% respondents were disagree, and 3.8% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 75.9% in the study were disagreeing that visually impaired students disrespect others in class.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 24:Teachers at higher education level are unable to maintain the discipline.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	11	13.9	13.9
Agree	4	5.1	19.0
Disagree	45	57.0	75.9
Strongly Disagree	19	24.1	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 24depicts that 13.9% respondents were strongly agree that teachers at higher education level are unable to maintain the discipline, 5.1 % respondents were agree, 57.0% respondents were disagree, and 24.1% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 57.0% in the study were disagreeing agree that teachers at higher education level are unable to maintain the discipline.

Table 25: Sighted Student's breach academically honest behaviors more than visually impaired students.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	4	5.1	5.1
Agree	39	49.4	54.4
Disagree	25	31.6	86.1
Strongly Disagree	11	13.9	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 25 shows that 5.1% respondents were strongly agree that sighted student's breach academically honest behaviors more than visually impaired students, 49.4 % respondents were agree, 31.6% respondents were disagree, and 13.9% respondents strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 49.4% in the study were agreeing that sighted student's breach academic honest behaviors more than visually impaired students.

Table 26: Students show dishonesty when there is poor organization of grading.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.3
Agree	51	64.6	65.8
Disagree	18	22.8	88.6
Strongly Disagree	9	11.4	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 26 indicates that 1.3% respondents were strongly agree that students show dishonesty when there is poor organization of grading, 64.6 % respondents were agree, 22.8% respondents were disagree, and 11.4% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 64.4% in the study were agreeing that students show dishonesty when there is poor organization of grading.

Table 27: Students cheat when the seating order is freely allowed.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	12	15.2	15.2
Agree	49	62.0	77.2
Disagree	16	20.3	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 27 shows that 15.2% respondents were strongly agree that students cheat when the seating order is freely allowed, 62.0 % respondents were agree, 20.3% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 62.0% in the study were agreeing that students cheat when the seating order is freely allowed.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 28 : Students cheat because they have shortage of time for revision.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	6	7.6	7.6
Agree	16	20.3	27.8
Disagree	56	70.9	98.7
Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 28 shows that 7.6% respondents were strongly agree that students cheat because they have shortage of time for revision, 20.3 % respondents were agree, 70.9% respondents were disagree, and 1.3% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 70.9% in the study were disagreeing that students cheat because they have shortage of time for revision.

Table 29: Students cheat because of difficult content.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	2	2.5	2.5
Agree	27	34.2	36.7
Disagree	48	60.8	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 29 depicts that 2.5% respondents were strongly agree that students cheat because of difficult content, 34.2 % respondents were agree, 60.8% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 60.8% in the study were disagreeing that students cheat because of difficult content.

Table 30: Teachers talk with each other's in front of students in classroom for a long time.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	2	2.5	2.5
Agree	15	19.0	21.5
Disagree	47	59.5	81.0
Strongly Disagree	15	19.0	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 30highlights that 2.5% respondents were strongly agree that teachers talk with each other's in front of students in classroom for a long time, 19.0 % respondents were agree, 59.5% respondents were disagree, and 19.0% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 59.5% in the study were disagreeingthat teachers talk with each other's in front of students in classroom for a long time.

Table 31: Teachers do other college works during class time.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	2	2.5	2.5
Agree	15	19.0	21.5
Disagree	46	58.2	79.7
Strongly Disagree	16	20.3	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 31indicates that 2.5% respondents were strongly agree that teachers do other college works during class time, 19.0 % respondents were agree, 58.2% respondents were disagree, and 20.3% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 58.2% in the study were disagreeing that teachers do other college work during class time.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 32: Teachers ensure the element of respect while communicating visually impaired students in classrooms.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	32	40.5	40.5
Agree	44	55.7	96.2
Disagree	1	1.3	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 32 shows that 40.5% respondents were strongly agree that teachers ensure the element of respect while communicating visually impaired students in classrooms, 55.7 % respondents were agree, 1.3% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 55.7% in the study were agreeing that teachers ensure the element of respect while communicating visually impaired students in classrooms.

Table 33: Teachers encourage students without visual impairment to show responsibility for visually impaired students in class.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	23	29.1	29.1
Agree	55	69.6	98.7
Disagree	1	1.3	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 33depicts that 29.1% respondents were strongly agree that teachers encourage students without visual impairment to show responsibility for visually impaired students in class, 69.6 % respondents were agree, 1.3% respondents were disagree, and 0% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 69.6% in the study were agreeing that teachers encourage students without visual impairment to show responsibility for visually impaired students in class.

Table 34: Teachers do apology in case of misbehaves to students with and without visual impairment in class.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	19	24.1	24.1
Agree	48	60.8	84.8
Disagree	10	12.7	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 34 shows that 24.1% respondents were strongly agree that teachers do apology in case of misbehaves to students with and without visual impairment in class, 60.8 % respondents were agree, 12.7% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 60.8% in the study were agreeing that teachers do apology in case of misbehaves to students with and without visual impairment in class.

Table 35: Teachers show supportive behavior for students with visual impairment at higher education level.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	22	27.8	27.8
Agree	48	60.8	88.6
Disagree	7	8.9	97.5
Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 35 depicts that 27.8% respondents were strongly agree that teachers show supportive behavior for students with visual impairment at higher education level, 60.8% respondents were agree, 8.9% respondents were disagree, and 2.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 60.8% in the study were agreeing that teachers show supportive behavior for students with visual impairment at higher education level.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Table 36: Teachers take actions against the students who breach class room integrity.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	22	27.8	27.8
Agree	53	67.1	94.9
Disagree	4	5.1	100.0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 36 contains that 27.8% respondents were strongly agree that teachers take actions against the students who breach class room integrity, 67.1 % respondents were agree, 5.1% respondents were disagree, and 0% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 67.1% in the study were agreeing that teachers take actions against the students who breach class room integrity.

Table 37: Teachers trust on the students for attempting class test honestly in their absence.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	8	10.1	10.1
Agree	42	53.2	63.3
Disagree	23	29.1	92.4
Strongly Disagree	6	7.6	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 37 displays that 10.1% respondents were strongly agree that teachers trust on the students for attempting class test honestly in their absence, 53.2 % respondents were agree, 29.1% respondents were disagree, and 7.6% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 53.2% in the study were agreeing that teachers trust on the students for attempting class test honestly in their absence.

Table 38: Academically honest behaviors are focused by all teachers in their classrooms.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	17	21.5	21.5
Agree	58	73.4	94.9
Disagree	4	5.1	21.5
Strongly Disagree	17	21.5	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 38 shows that 21.5% respondents were strongly agree that academically honest behaviors are focused by all teachers in their classrooms, 73.4 % respondents were agree, 5.1% respondents were disagree, and 21.5% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 73.4% in the study were agreeing that academically honest behaviors are focused by all teachers in their classrooms.

Table 39: Teachers use instructional material for concept clarity as per needs of the students.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	25	31.6	31.6
Agree	42	53.2	84.8
Disagree	6	7.6	92.4
Strongly Disagree	6	7.6	100.0
Total	**79**	**100.0**	

Table 39 shows that 31.6% respondents were strongly agree that teachers use instructional material for concept clarity as per needs of the students, 53.2 % respondents were agree, 7.6% respondents were disagree, and 7.6% respondents were strongly disagree. It means that majority of respondents 53.2% in the study were agreeing agree that teachers use instructional material for concept clarity as per needs of the students.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Findings

The findings of the study have been given below:

Teacher's Perception

1. The result of T test shows that academically honest behaviors for the educational development of visually impaired students at higher education level in males and females is same.
2. The results from T test depicts that nature of academic misconduct and measures taken by the teachers in assuring academically honest behaviors in male and female is significantly different.
3. A maximum number of respondents were agree about academically honest behaviors have an impact on educational development of visually impaired students at higher education level.
4. A maximum number of respondents were agree about academic dishonesty exists at higher education level.
5. A maximum number of respondents were agree that students with visual impairment do trust on their classmates for help during class test.

Nature of Academic Misconduct

1. A maximum number of respondents were agree that visually impaired students use plagiarize material for assignment.
2. A maximum number of respondents were agree that visually impaired students rely on some group members to do all the work.

Reasons of Breaching Academically Honest Behaviors

1. A maximum number of respondents were agree that sighted Student's breach classroom integrity more than visually impaired students.
2. A maximum number of respondents were agree that students cheat when the seating order is freely allowed.

Measures Taken by the Teachers in Assuring Academically Honest Behaviors

1. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers ensure the element of respect while communicating visually impaired students in classrooms.
2. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers encourage students without visual impairment to show responsibility for visually impaired students in class.
3. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers do apology in case of misbehaves to students with and without visual impairment in class.
4. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers show supportive behavior for visually impaired students at higher education level.
5. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers take actions against the students who breach class room integrity.
6. A maximum number of respondents were agree that teachers trust on the students for attempting class test honestly in their absence.
7. A maximum number of respondents were agree that academically honest behaviors are focused by all teachers in their classrooms.

Discussion

Academically honest behaviors are associated with the moral code, commitment of the teachers and students, task performance with responsibilities. Integrity is required for individuals who are blind or visually impaired to behave well. Visually impaired students at higher education level can exhibit poor performance, misbehave in class, and struggle to finish their given duties (McKibban, 2013). Academically dishonest behavior is characterized by paraphrasing another person's assignment and submitting it as one's own while relying on a few group members to complete all the work among visually impaired students. It is considered cheating when a student has someone else complete their written assignments, tests, or homework for them (Davis et al., 2009). The primary causes of visually impaired students violating classroom integrity in higher education

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

settings were teachers who could not maintain order and students who cheated when the seating arrangement was freely permitted. Sometimes, students unfamiliar with the standards question themselves or do it unknowingly or lack academic literacy abilities like mentioning and referencing (Adam, 2016). The measures taken by the teachers in assuring academically honest behaviors while teaching students with visual impairment were that teachers ensure the element of respect while communicating with visually impaired students in classrooms. Creating a culture of intellectual honesty is neither easy nor straightforward. To develop the habit of academically honest behaviors, a considerable and deliberate effort must be made to alter faculty and students' beliefs, values, and attitudes (Wangaard, 2016).

Conclusion

Academically honest behaviors have an impact on the educational development of visually impaired students at higher education level. The teachers and students play a vital role in maintaining the academically honest behaviors with appropriate decorum. Although, academic dishonesty exists at higher education level. But teachers and students make sure to create an integrated environment in the institutions. Students' behavior toward academic endeavors is significant for higher education. Additionally, visually impaired students are having firm belief on their class fellows during any exam. However, visually challenged students show responsible behavior in completing their educational tasks. This study focused on all the factors affecting integrity at the higher education level. It was shown that four major elements put students' academically honest behaviors at risk and drove them to engage in misconduct during educational activities.

Recommendations

The recommendations of the study have been given below:

1. Teachers should be trained to maintain the level of academic integrity in their respective classrooms.
2. Policies regarding the development of academically honest behaviors must be implemented in special education colleges.
3. Special education colleges should implement guidance and counseling services to develop academically honest behaviors among visually impaired students.
4. The special education department should review assessment and evaluation procedures for teachers and visually impaired students in their college to encourage academically honest behaviors.
5. Future researches should be conducted based on the findings of this study from the psychological and moral perspectives of visually impaired students.

References

Adam, L. (2016). Student perspectives on plagiarism. In T. Bretag (Ed.), Handbook of academic integrity (pp. 519-535). Springer Singapore.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/39667.

Ahmad S, Yousaf M. Special education in Pakistan: In the perspectives of educational policies and plans. Academic Research International. 2011;1(2):228

Bretag T (2016) Defining academic integrity: International perspectives – introduction. In: Bretag T (Ed.) The handbook of academic integrity (pp. 3–5). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_76

Brown, T., Isbel, S., Logan, A. and Etheringto n, J. (2019), "Predictors of academic honesty and success in domestic and international occupational therapy students", Irish Journal of Occupational Therapy, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 18-41, doi: 10.1108/ijot-12-2018-0022.

Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Gallant, T. (2009). Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do. Wiley-Blackwell. Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: What We Know and What We Can Do," Journal of Research Initiatives: Vol. 7: Iss. 2, Article 11.

Gallant B. T. (2020). Academic integrity and the student affairs professional. In A. M. Hornak (Ed.) Ethical and Legal

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

Issues in Student Affairs and Higher Education (pp. 95 -133). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Gallant B. T. StephensJ. M. (2020) Punishment is not enough: The moral imperative of responding to cheating with a developmental approach. J College Char 21(2):57–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2020.1741395.

International center for academic integrity, (2021). The fundamental values of academic integrity. International Center for Academic Integrity. https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAI-Fundamental-Values_R12.pdf.

International Centre for Academic Integrity. (2020). The fundamental values of academic integrity. ISBN: 978-0-9914906-7-7 (pbk).

Jamieson S (2016) Is it plagiarism or patchwriting? Toward a nuanced definition. In: Bretag T(Ed (ed) The handbook of academic integrity. Springer, Singapore, pp 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_68

Jurdi, R., Hage, H. S., & Chow, H. P. (2012). What Behaviours Do Students Consider Academically Dishonest? Findings from a Survey of Canadian Undergraduate Students. Social Psychology of Education, 15, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-011-9166-y.

Kuznekoff, J.H. (2020), "Online video lectures: the relationship between student viewing behaviors, learning, and engagement", Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio, available at: doi/10.1108/JEET-02-2021-0009/full/html.

Lang, J. M. (2013). Cheating lessons: Learning from academic dishonesty. Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press. ISBN-13.978-0674724631, Edition.1st Edition, Publisher, Harvard University Press.

McCabe, D. (2016). Cheating and honor: Lessons from a long -term research project. In T. Bretag, (Ed.), Handbook of Academic Integrity, (pp. 187 -198). Singapore: Springer. ISBN: 978-981-287-098-8.

O'Connell, J. (2016), "Networked participatory online learning design and challenges for academic integrity in higher education", International Journal for Educational Integrity, Vol. 12 No. 1, doi: 10.1007/s40979-016-0009-7.

Pecorari D (2016) Plagiarism, international students, and the second-language writer. In: Bretag T(Ed (ed) The handbook of academic integrity. Springer, Singapore, pp 537–550. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_69.

Pucciarelli F., Kaplan Andreas M. (2016) Competition and Strategy in Higher Education: Managing Complexity and Uncertainty Archived 2019-01-10 at the Wayback Machine, Business Horizons, Volume 59.

Ratu, A., Rai, N. G. M., Prasetya, N., & Yoga, D. S. (2020). Is Self-Efficacy Related to Students' Moral Reasoning?: A Research on Students' Absentee Behaviour. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Psychology in Health, Educational, Social, and Organizational Settings—ICP-HESOS (pp. 397-405). https://doi.org/10.5220/0008590003970405.

Roohi, R. (2016). Role of Big Personality Traits and Academic Self-Efficacy in Tendency to Cheat and Cheat Attempt among High School Students. Focus on Medical Sciences Journal, 2, 1-5.https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2023.141002.

Stoltzfus, K. (2015). To stop exam cheats, economists say, try assigning seats. Chronicle of Higher Education, Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: What We Know and What We Can Do,Vol. 7: Iss. 2, Article 11.

Swartz, L.B. and Cole, M.T. (2013), "Students' perception of academic integrity in online business education courses", Journal of Business and Educational Leadership, Vol. 4, pp. 102-112.

Teferra, D. (2021). The Role of the African Intellectual Diaspora in Advancing Higher Education. International Journal of African Higher Education,

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com

8, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.6017/ijahe.v8i2.13469.

Vittrup, B. (2016). Stop students who cheat before they become cheating professors. Chronicle of Higher Education. Academic Dishonesty in Higher Education: What We Know and What We Can Do, Vol. 7: Iss. 2, Article 11.

Wangaard, DB (2016). Practices to support developing academic integrity in secondary school students. In: T Bretag (ed.), Handbook of academic integrity. Springer, p. 429–448 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_34.

Yu, H., Glanzer, P., & Johnson, B. (2016). Do the Ends Strengthen the Means? An Examination of the Link between Purpose in Life and Academic Misconduct among College Students. Journal of College and Character, 17, 255-270. https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2016.1230762.

Corresponding Author's Email Address: kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com