

---

## ASSESSING ACADEMIC HONESTY IN SCHOOLS FOR VISUALLY IMPAIRED STUDENTS

---

**Kashif Iqbal**

Ph.D. Scholar,  
Institute of Special Education, University of Punjab, Lahore  
Punjab, Pakistan.  
Email: [kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com](mailto:kashif.iqbal.tsa@gmail.com)

**Samina Ashraf**

Assistant Professor,  
Institute of Special Education, University of Punjab, Lahore  
Punjab, Pakistan.  
Email: [samina.dse@pu.edu.pk](mailto:samina.dse@pu.edu.pk)

-----

**ABSTRACT**

*Academic honesty is very essential for any school for visually impaired students. This study aimed to assess academic honesty in special education schools for students who are visually impaired. This study was quantitative and descriptive. The sample of study included teachers of visually impaired students (N=100) from the special education schools for visually impaired students. Convenient sampling technique was used to collect data for this study. A self-developed structured questionnaire was used as tool for data collection. Validity of instrument was assured by the expert opinion (N=03) and reliability of the instrument was examined through Cronbach alpha .757. Statistical data were analyzed with IBM version 21. Frequencies and percentages of the responses along with Mann-Whitney test were performed to reach the conclusion. The findings of study revealed that majority of the respondents reported that teachers of visually impaired students work on improving academically honest behaviors of their students in classes. The study recommended particular trainings of motivation and academically honest behaviors for teaching and non-teaching staff in the schools for visually impaired students.*

**KEYWORDS**

*Academic honesty, Children with visual impairment, School level, Future, Education*

**INTRODUCTION**

Education helps visually impaired students to become fully developed individuals. It is a deliberate activity with distinct goals, and the spread of knowledge (Chazan, 2022). There is significant role of academic honesty in the entire lives of visually impaired students. It's crucial to establish clear policies throughout the institution's

adherence to academic honesty among the students in order to dishonest behaviors (Holden et al., 2021). Academic honesty is about being a good student and acting in a way that will help the visually impaired students succeed. The pursuit of a high standard of education is academic honesty (Ozoliņa and Bernia, 2021).

Academic dishonesty is when academic honesty disappeared. Academic dishonesty includes a variety of behaviors, such as encouraging others to cheat, using unauthorized materials, displaying plagiarized work, and misrepresenting one's own work, for example, Şendağ et al. , (2012), giving the students a benefit that they don't deserve (Hylton et al. , 2016). In general, the caliber of such endeavors is unsuitable for any university's conduct (Hylton et al., 2016). As a result, there are expectations for certain behaviors (Kitahara and Westfall, 2007). Academic honesty provides students with visual impairments with a motivated and comfortable environment to demonstrate their acquired skills. Visually impaired students who adhere to academic honesty tend to be more relaxed, productive, confident, and goal-oriented. A student with visual impairment who consistently performs academically below expectations may experience occasional unease and problems (Ömür et al., 2014). Awareness for the teachers about academic honesty is essential, with a focus on plagiarism and cheating in particular (Soroya et al., 2017).

### **Purpose of Study**

Academic honesty is important for the development of any institution serving students with visual impairment. It is based on the school teaching staff's internal perception of what they believe about academic honesty, without taking any external authoritative pressure into account. Students with visual impairment learn from their teachers using these internal, firm stimuli of honesty as a foundation. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to identify the perception and efforts delineated by the teachers for academic honesty in the schools for visually impaired students. It also includes the factors that diminish academic honesty in any school for students with visual impairment. The ease of cheating, a lack of knowledge, indolence, procrastination, family pressure, and anxiety over a poor grade are some of the factors that lead to academic dishonesty (Nichols, 2014). Academic honesty is present phenomenon in education which stabilizes the foundation of academic integrity. Therefore, the statement of the problem is academic honesty in special education school for visually impaired students. The study will be vital for teachers of visually impaired students teaching in schools. This research becomes a concept and topic with more prominence in government and governance, as well as in actual policy-making at all levels. This study is unique in its nature because this study gives rise to the thoughts that academic honesty produce commitment among all the members present in any institute to work with honesty. This study will be beneficial for the teachers at the school level to understand academic honesty, its nature, and its existence with students with visual impairment. This study

will give a comprehensive understanding to find out the reasons for academic dishonesty in special education schools for visual impairment. This study is useful for students with visual impairment to overcome with suitable remedies for academic dishonesty. Furthermore, this study will be beneficial for Government and other policy makers and stakeholder to arrange accordingly all those safety measure which could protect visually impaired school level students to promote the academic honesty.

This research will be beneficial for future researchers because it provides new dimensions to work on broader perspective of academic honesty. Educationists will be able to show their transparency towards their profession. Moreover, If academic honesty and transparency increased in schools there will provide honest sincere citizens which made the country progressive and the government have a corruption free environment in their sectors. The study was limited to the province of Punjab only due to financial and time constraints. Study was delimited to teachers of students with visual impairment teaching in schools. The researchers used a self-made structured questionnaire due to the unavailability of standardized instruments related to our ground realities.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Honesty, a fundamental component of teaching, learning, research, and service, is necessary to manifest trust, fairness, respect, and accountability fully. Academic integrity has received much attention recently due to how important and pervasive it is in higher education (Bretag, 2016). Scholars emphasize receiving intellectual acknowledgment since it shows that the academic community has acknowledged their study and is required to obtain the appropriate professional reputation, social position, and other resources (Mahat & Tatebe, 2019). Teachers concerned with ethics and human rights should also be involved with accessibility. A multi-stakeholder strategy is needed for academic honesty. Everyone on campus must assume responsibility in various ways to ensure that learning, teaching, and other related activities, such as creating learning materials and evaluations, are carried out ethically (Morris, 2016; Morris & Carroll, 2016).

Students are less prone to participate in academically dishonest actions when they have a connection to their surroundings. However, institutions often fall into one of five categories: those with honor code policies (McCabe et al., 2012). In tackling academic misbehavior, moral and ethical development emerges as best practice policies. According to studies, those responsible for offering that type of instruction outside the classroom, specifically in student affairs settings, are academic integrity professionals (Gallant 2020). The staff frequently serve as the official academic misconduct process gatekeepers, providing access to documents and appeals, providing due process, and acting as an unbiased source for inquiries and concerns

(Mitchell & Parnter, 2018). The intricacy of academic honesty was summed up by Bretag (2016). The integrated cheating model demonstrated how attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and moral obligations affect students' intentions to engage in dysfunctional behavior. Some focus more on the relationship between motivation and cheating behavior, and others on the association between sociodemographic characteristics and cheating behavior. (Jung et al., 2015).

### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. Find the perception of the teachers about academic honesty in the schools of visually impaired students.
2. Explore the level of academic honesty among teachers of visually impaired students.
3. Identify the factors that diminish the academic honesty in special education school for visually impaired students,
4. Highlight the efforts delineated by the teachers to maintain academic honesty in the schools.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What is the perception of the teachers about academic honesty in the schools of visually impaired students?
2. What is the level of academic honesty among teachers of visually impaired students?
3. What are the factors that diminish the academic honesty in special education school for visually impaired students?
4. What are the efforts delineated by the teachers to maintain academic honesty in the schools?

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **Research Design**

This study was quantitative and descriptive.

#### **Population**

The population of the study was teachers teaching in various special education schools in the province of Punjab to visually impaired students.

#### **Sample of the study**

The sample of the study was 100 teachers of visually impaired students. Both male and female teachers were included in study. Age range of teachers is from 25 to 50 Years. The designation of the teachers were JSET, SSET. For the selection of sample, Purposive sampling techniques were used.

#### **Instrument of the Study**

A self-developed structured questionnaire was used as an instrument for this study.

### Validity & Reliability

The validity of the instrument was confirmed through the expert opinion (N=03) and the reliability of the instrument was examined through Cronbach alpha .757 through SPSS version 21.

### RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The researchers collected the data by complying all ethical procedures of the research. To measure the responses of the respondents about academic honesty in the schools of visually impaired students, statistical package of social sciences (SPSS) version – 21 was used for descriptive statistics and the frequencies were drawn. This helped the researchers to reach towards findings of this study.

**Table 1: Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Designation's**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
SSET	41	41%	41%
JSET	40	40%	81%
Others	19	19%	100
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 41% (N=41) were SSET, 40% (N=40) respondent were JSET and 19% (N=19) were from different disciplines. Therefore, maximum respondents were SSET 41%.

**Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Experience's**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 5 years	22	22%	22%
Above 5 years	78	78%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that experiences of 22% (N=22) respondents were below 5 years and 78% (N=78) were above 5 years. Therefore, maximum respondent were above 5 years of experience 78%.

**Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Age's**

Age	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
25-30	14	14%	14%
31-35	27	27%	41%
36-40	30	30%	71%
40 and above	29	29%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 14%(N=14) of respondent fall 25-30 age group, 27%(N=27) were from 31-35, 30%(N=30)were to 36-40 and 29%(N=29)were from the 40 and above. Therefore, maximum respondent 36-40 age group were 30%.

**Table 4: Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Qualification**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
BS/MA	83	83%	83%
M. Phil	17	17%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table displays that there were 83% BS/MA qualified respondent and 17% were M. Phil. Therefore, maximum qualification of respondent 83% were BS/MA.

**Table 5: Frequency Distributions of Responses Regarding Academic Dishonesty Exist In Special Education School**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	21	21%	21%
To some extent	42	42%	63%
Yes	37	37%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 37% (N=37) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 42% (N=42) respondents said to some extent, and 21% (N=21) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents ratio of 42% said some extent about academic dishonesty exist in special education school.

**Table 6: Frequency Distributions of Responses Regarding Teachers of Visually Impaired Students Work on Improving Academically Honest Behaviors of Their Students in Classes**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	0	0%	0%
To some extent	16	16%	16%
Yes	84	84%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table highlights that 84% (N=84) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 16% (N=16) respondents said to some extent, and 0% (N=0) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 84% said yes about teachers of visually impaired students work to improve their students' academically honest behavior in the classroom.

**Table 7: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Students with Visual Impairment Perform Unethical Behavior Because They Are Not Aware of Academically Honest Behaviors**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	26	26%	26%
To some extent	47	47%	73%
Yes	27	27%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 27% (N=27) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 47% (N=47) respondents said to some extent, and 26% (N=26) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 47% said to some extent about the students with visual impairment perform unethical behavior because they are not aware of academically honest behaviors.

**Table 8: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Heads of Schools Involved in Academically Dishonest Behaviors in School**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	43	43%	43%
To some extent	44	44%	87%
Yes	13	13%	100%
Total	100	100	%

This table contains 13 % (N=13 ) of respondents who said yes to the above statement, 44% (N=44) of respondents who said it to some extent, and 43% (N=43) of respondents who said no to the above statement. Therefore, a maximum number of respondents 44% said to some extent about heads of schools involved in academically dishonest behaviors in school.

**Table 9: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Visually Impaired Students Cheat in Exams Due to Support of Their Teachers?**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	51	51%	51%
To some extent	37	37%	88%
Yes	12	12%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 12% (N=12) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 37% (N=37) respondents said to some extent, and 51% (N=51) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents ratio 51% said no about visually impaired students cheat in exam due to support of their teachers.

**Table 10: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Students with Visual Impairment Copy Their Friends Work Because They Have a Lot of Tasks at One Time**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	20	20%	20%
To some extent	39	39%	59%
Yes	41	41%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table identifies that 41% (N=41) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 39% (N=39) respondents said to some extent, and 20% (N=20) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondent's ratio 41% said yes about students with visual impairment copy their friends work because they have a lot of tasks at one time.

**Table 11: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Non-Teaching Staff Disrespect the Teaching Staff**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	59	59%	59%
To some extent	32	32%	91%
Yes	9	9%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 9% (N=9) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 32% (N=32) respondents said to some extent, and 59% (N=59) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 59% said no about non-teaching staff disrespects the teaching staff.

**Table 12: Frequency and Distribution of Responses Regarding Students with Visual Impairment Disrespect Their School Staff**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	73	73%	73%
To some extent	20	20%	93%
Yes	7	7%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 7% (N=7) respondents said yes to the above statement, while 20% (N=20) respondents said to some extent, and 73% (N=73) respondents said no to the above statement. Therefore, a maximum number of respondents 70% said no to students with visual impairment disrespecting their school staff.

**Table 13: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Non-Teaching Staff Involved in Academic Dishonesty Behaviour in Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	62	62%	62%



To some extent	29	29%	91%
Yes	9	9%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 9% (N=9) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 29% (N=29) respondents said to some extent, and 62% (N=62) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 62% said no about the non-teaching staff involved in academic dishonest behaviors in schools.

**Table 14: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding There Any Change in Behavior of School Staff before/after the Visit of Inspection Team**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	16	16%	16%
To some Extent	26	26%	42%
Yes	58	58%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table displays that 58 % (N=58) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 26 (26%) respondents said to some extent, and 16% (N=6) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 58% said yes about there any change in behavior of school staff before/after the visit of inspection team.

**Table 15: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Teachers Involved in Academically Dishonest Behaviors in Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	46	46%	46%
To some Extent	47	47%	93%
Yes	7	7%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table highlights that 7% (N=7) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 47% (N=47) respondents said to some extent, and 46% (N=46) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 47% said to some extent about the teachers involved in academically dishonest behaviors in schools.

**Table 16: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding Students With Visual Impairment Ask From Their Class Teachers About The Answer To A Difficult Question During Exams.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	18	18%	18%
To some extent	40	40%	58%

Yes	42	42%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table contains 42% (N=42) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 40% (N=40) respondents said to some extent, and 18% (N=18) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 42% said yes about students with visual impairment ask from their class teachers about the answer to a difficult question during exams.

**Table 17: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding The Teachers In Schools Disrespect Their Heads.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	85	85%	85%
To some extent	12	12%	97%
Yes	3	3%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table portrays that 3% (N=3) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 12% (N=12) respondents said to some extent, and 86% (N=86) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 86% said no about the teachers in schools disrespect their heads.

**Table 18: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding Teachers Of Students With Visual Impairment Work Together With One Or More Colleagues To Commit Or Attempt To Commit Academic Dishonesty.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	59	59%	59%
To some extent	31	31%	90%
Yes	10	10%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 10% (N=10) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 31% (N=31) respondents said to some extent, and 59% (N=59) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 59% said no teachers of students with visual impairment work together with one or more colleagues to commit or attempt to commit academic dishonesty.

**Table 19: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding You Seen Any Of Your Colleague Awarded With Any Penalty Due To Violation Of Academic Honesty Rules In Your School.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	78	78%	78%

To some extent	13	13%	91%
Yes	9	9%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 9% (N=9) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 13% (N=13) respondents said to some extent, and 78% (N=78) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 78% said no about you seen any of your colleague awarded with any penalty due to violation of academic honesty rules in your school.

**Table 20: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding You Know What Penalties Applied To Students for Different Forms of Cheating And Academic Dishonesty**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	22	22%	22%
To some extent	26	26%	48%
Yes	52	52%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table illustrates that 52% (N=52) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 26% (N=26) respondents said to some extent, and 22% (N=22) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 52% said yes about you knows what penalties applied to students for different forms of cheating and academic dishonesty.

**Table 21: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Students with Visual Impairment Cheat in Exam because they are Afraid of Failing in the Subject.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	14	14%	14%
To some extent	23	23%	37%
Yes	63	63%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table represents that 63% (N=63) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 23% (N=23) respondents said to some extent, and 14% (N=14) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 63% said yes about the students with visual impairment cheat in exam because they are afraid of failing in the subject.

**Table 22: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Students with Visual Impairment Involved in Academic Dishonest Behaviors against Their Visually Impaired Teachers**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	21	21%	21%

To some extent	29	29%	50%
Yes	50	50%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 50% (N=50) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 29% (N=29) respondents said to some extent, and 21% (N=21) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 50% said yes about the students with visual impairment involved in academic dishonesty behaviors against their visually impaired teachers.

**Table 23: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Academically Dishonest Behaviors Exhibited By Teachers Due To Non-Availability of Instructional Material**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	31	31%	31%
To some extent	38	38%	69%
Yes	31	31%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 31% (N=31) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 38% (N=38) respondents said to some extent, and 31% (N=31) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 38% said some extent about the academically dishonest behaviors exhibited by teachers due to non-availability of instructional material.

**Table 24: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding The School Staff In Special Education Exhibit Academically Dishonest Behaviors Due To Non-Professional Approaches Of The School Head.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	23	23%	23%
To some extent	40	40%	63%
Yes	37	37%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 37% (N=37) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 40%(N=40) respondents said to some extent, and 23%(N=23) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 40% said to some extent about the school staff in special education exhibit academically dishonest behaviors due to non-professional approaches of the school head.

**Table 25: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Students with Visual Impairment Lie to an Instructor in an Attempt to Increase their Grades.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
-----------	-----------	---------	--------------------

No	23	23%	23%
To some extent	48	48%	71%
Yes	29	29%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table displays that 29% (N=29) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 48% (N=48) respondents said to some extent, and 23% (N=23) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 48% said to some extent about the students with visual impairment lie to an instructor in an attempt to increase their grades.

**Table 26: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Your Head Provided You Clear Instructions about Promoting & Maintaining Academic Honesty in Your Classrooms**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	27	27%	27%
To some extent	42	42%	69%
Yes	31	31%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table highlights that 31% (N=31) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 42% (N=42) respondents said to some extent, and 27% (N=27) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 42% said to some extent about your head provided you clear instructions about promoting & maintaining academic honesty in your classrooms.

**Table 27: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Non-Teaching Staff Deceive the School Head for Job Advantage**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	6	6%	6%
To some extent	22	22%	28%
Yes	72	72%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table contains that (N=22) respondents said to some extent, and 6% (N=6) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 72% said yes about then on teaching staff deceive the school head for job advantage.

**Table 28: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Teachers Provide Questions to their Students with Visual Impairment before Exam**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	52	52%	52%
To some extent	30	30%	82%

Yes	18	18%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 18% (N=18) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 30% (N=30) respondents said to some extent, and 52% (N=52) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 58% said no about teachers provide questions to their students with visual impairment before exam.

**Table 29: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding you are Discuss with your Colleagues about Promoting and Maintaining Academic Honesty in your Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	3	3%	3%
To some extent	10	10%	13%
Yes	87	87%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 87% (N=87) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 10% (N=10) respondents said to some extent, and 3% (N=3) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 87% said yes about you discuss with your colleagues about promoting and maintaining academic honesty in your schools.

**Table 30: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding You Use Instructions Related To Academically Honest Behaviors In Your Class.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	2	2%	2%
To some extent	8	8%	10%
Yes	90	90%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 90% (N=90) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 8% (N=8) respondents said to some extent, and 2% (N=2) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 90% said yes about you use instructions related to academically honest behaviors in your class.

**Table 31: Frequency Distribution of Responses regarding you Disobey Your Head/Senior when you are directed to help your Students with Visual Impairment While Attempting the Paper in Any Exam**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	70	70%	70%
To some extent	17	17%	87%
Yes	13	13%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 13% (N=13) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 17% (N=17) respondents said to some extent, and 70% (N=70) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 70% said no you disobey your head/senior when you are directed to help your students with visual impairment while attempting the paper in any exam.

**Table 32: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding you Convey to the Parents of Students With Visual Impairment to Make Understand their Children About Academically Honest Behaviors**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	2	2%	2%
To some extent	14	14%	16%
Yes	84	84%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table displays that 84% (N=84) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 14% (N=14) respondents said to some extent, and 2% (N=2) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 84% said yes about you convey to the parents of students with visual impairment to make understand their children about academically honest behaviors.

**Table 33: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Assessment of Students Should Conduct only Through Braille**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	2	2%	2%
To some Extent	14	14%	16%
Yes	84	84%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table identifies that 84% (N=84) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 14% (N=14) respondents said to some extent, and 2% (N=2) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 84% said no about the assessment of students should conduct only through Braille.

**Table 34: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding there be More Training for Teachers on Avoidance of Cheating and Academic Dishonesty At Institution**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	24	24%	24%
To some extent	11	11%	35%
Yes	65	65%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 65% (N=65) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 11% (N=11) respondents said to some extent, and 24% (N=24) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 65% said yes about there are be more training for teachers on avoidance of cheating and academic dishonesty at institution.

**Table 35: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Discipline Should Be Strict in Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	8	8%	8%
To some extent	15	15%	23%
Yes	77	77%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table represents that 77% (N=77) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 15% (N=15) respondents said to some extent, and 8% (N=8) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 77% said yes about the discipline should be strict in schools.

**Table 36: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding The Monitoring & Evaluation Mechanism Should Be Introduced In Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	8	8%	8%
To some extent	23	23%	31%
Yes	69	69%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table contains that 69% (N=69) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 23% (N=23) respondents said to some extent, and 8% (N=8) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 69% said that yes about the monitoring & evaluation mechanism should be introduced in schools.

**Table 37: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding the Qualified Research Scholars should be Given Responsibilities to Observe, and Identify Gaps of Academic Honesty in Special Education Institutions.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	1	1%	1%
To some extent	16	16%	17%
Yes	83	83%	100%
Total	100	100%	



This table displays that 8% (N=83) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 16% (N=16) respondents said to some extent, and 1% (N=1) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 83% said yes about the qualified research scholars should be given responsibilities to observe, & identify gaps of academic honesty in special education institutions.

**Table 38: Frequency Distribution Of Responses Regarding The Professional Training Based On Moral Development Should Be Designed Especially For Schools Heads, Teachers, Non-Teaching Staff On Monthly Grounds.**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	53	53%	53%
To some extent	14	14%	67%
Yes	33	33%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table depicts that 33% (N=33) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 14% (N=14) respondents said to some extent, and 53% (N=53) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 53% said no about the professional training based on moral development should be designed especially for schools heads, teachers, non-teaching staff on monthly grounds.

**Table 39: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding there are online Lectures in Schools Should be delivered to Promote and Maintain the Level of Academic Honesty in the Schools of Special Education**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	28	28%	28%
To some extent	21	21%	49%
Yes	51	51%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table shows that 51% (N=51) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 21% (N=21) respondents said to some extent, and 28% (N=28) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 51% said yes about there are online lectures in schools should be delivered to promote and maintain the level of academic honesty in the schools of special education.

**Table 40: Frequency Distribution of Responses Regarding Head should be Require to Discuss or Conduct Weekly Meeting to Promote Academic Honesty in their Schools**

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	20	20%	20%
To some extent	21	21%	41%
Yes	59	59%	100%
Total	100	100%	

This table indicates that 59% (N=59) respondents said yes on the above statement, while 21% (N=21) respondents said to some extent, and 20% (N=20) respondents said no on the above statement. Therefore, maximum number of respondents 59% said yes about head should be require to discuss or conduct weekly meeting to promote academic honesty in their schools.

## FINDINGS

The findings of the study are given below:

Maximum respondents were females who were senior special education teacher (SSET).

### Teachers' Perception

42% of the respondents responded to some extent about existence of academic dishonesty in special education school.

A majority 84% of the respondents responded yes on teachers of visually impaired students work on improving academically honest behaviors of their students in classes. 44% of the respondents said that heads of schools involved in academically dishonest behaviors in school.

51% of the Respondents said that visually impaired students cheat in exams with the support of teachers.

### Level of Academic Honesty

#### Among Teachers of Visually Impaired Students

47% of respondents said to some extent about the involvement of the teachers in academically dishonest behaviors in schools.

42% respondents said yes to students with visual impairment ask from their class teachers about the answer to a difficult question during exams.

A majority 86% of respondents said no about the teachers in schools disrespecting their heads.

59% of respondents said no teachers of students with visual impairment work together with one or more colleagues to commit or attempt to commit academic dishonesty.

78% of respondents said know about their colleague being awarded any penalty due to violation of academic honesty rules in their school.

52% of respondents said yes about knowing of penalties applied to students for different forms of cheating and academic dishonesty.

---

**Factors Diminish the Academic Honesty**

63% of respondents said yes about the students with visual impairment cheating in exams because they are afraid of failing in the subject.

50% of respondents said yes about the students with visual impairment involved in academic dishonest behaviors against their visually impaired teachers.

38% of respondents said to some extent about the academically dishonest behaviors exhibited by teachers due to the non-availability of instructional material.

42% of respondents said to some extent about their head provided them clear instructions about promoting & maintaining academic honesty in their classrooms.

58% of respondents said no to the provision of questions to students with visual impairment before exams by their teachers.

**Efforts Delineated by the Teachers**

A majority of the respondents 87% said yes to their discussion with their colleagues about promoting and maintaining academic honesty in their schools.

A majority 90% of respondents said yes about the usage of instructions related to academically honest behaviors in class.

70% of respondents said no about disobedience to their heads when they were directed to help their visually impaired students while attempting the paper in an exam.

A maximum 84% of respondents said yes that they convey to the parents of students with visual impairment to make them understand their children about academically honest behaviors.

**DISCUSSION**

The act of conducting all academic work honestly, without using any sources that have not been properly cited or authorized, lying, or accepting assistance from anyone else, is known as academic honesty. If there is a less-than-professional attitude among school personnel, the special education teachers believe that academic integrity exists in the institution. The effectiveness of a principal has an impact on how well a school operates. As one of the variables influencing student achievement, the principal's reality assumes a crucial and significant role (Malingkas, et al., 2018). A student's teacher has a significant impact on their entire life. The students with visual impairment learn from their teachers. According to teachers, the majority of teachers do not engage in academic dishonesty. The behaviors of students are negatively impacted by teachers' dishonesty in a number of ways (Saidina and Nurliyana, 2013). Academic honesty and objectivity in evaluation are still very important to educational institutions (Popisotiriadou et al. 2020). Finding a way to maintain and advance academic honesty is very difficult to improve the Braille-based academic honesty exam and give researchers the chance to spend their time in classrooms learning about the fundamental truths. This demonstrated that administration and faculty work closely together to stop the spread of academic dishonesty (Coalter, et al, 2007).

---

Academic integrity refers to conducting yourself in a way that is truthful, equitable, polite, and responsible during your studies and academic work. Academic honesty exists in some places in special education schools. Teachers are more honest in schools they try their best to promote or maintain academic honesty in their schools. Head and other school staff members are required to continue their effort to improve academic honesty. Students and nonteaching staff need to show their loyalty toward their work. School discipline and policies must be strict to supervise academic situations in school.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic honesty in schools must be endorsed through implementation of academic honesty policy.

Instructional material must be provided to students with visual impairment to reduce the risk of cheating during exam.

Teachers should be encouraged and motivated by their concerned respective authorities to work honestly with visually impaired students.

Assessment and evaluation mechanism for visually impaired students must be reviewed to reduce the risk of cheating.

Particular training should be conducted by the training institutes to develop academically honesty behaviors among school staff and students.

### REFERENCES

- Arain, M. , Campbell, M. J. , Cooper, C. L. , and Lancaster, G. A. (2010). A review of current practice and editorial policy about feasibility study. *Journal of Medical Research Methodology*, 10(67). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288/10/67>
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_76)
- Bretag T, Mahmud S, Wallace M, Walker R, McGowan U, East J, Green M, Partridge L, James C. (2014). An Australian Academics Integrity Student Survey. *Journal of Study High Academics*, 39(7). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406v>
- Chazan, Barry (2022). "What Is "Education"?". *Principles and Pedagogies in Jewish Education*. Springer International Publishing. pp. 13–21. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-83925-3\_3. ISBN 978-3-030-83925-3. S2CID 239896844. Retrieved 13 May 2022.
- Coalter, Terry, Lim Chi Lo, and WanorieTekle. (2007). Factors that Influence Faculty Actions: A Study on Faculty Responses to Academic Dishonesty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol,1(1). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstol.2007.01011>
- Gallan B. T. (2020). Academic integrity and the student affairs professional. In A. M. Hornak (Ed.) *Ethical and Legal Issues in Student Affairs and Higher Education* (pp. 95 –

- 
- 133). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Holden O. L. Norris, M. E. and Kuhlmeier, V. A. (2021). Academic Integrity in Online Assessment: A Research Review. *Front. Educ. , Sec. Higher Education*. Volume 6 – 2021 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.639814>
- Hylton, K. , Levy, Y. , and Dringus, L. P. (2016). Utilizing Webcam-Based Proctoring to Deter Misconduct in Online Exams. *Comput. Edu.* 92-93, 53–63. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2015.10.002
- Jung In, S. B. , Jun, M. K. and Shane, C. B. (2015), Students' Unethical Academic Behaviors: A Self Determination Theory Approach m. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 3(2): 6.
- Kitahara, R. T., and Westfall, F. (2007). Promoting Academic Integrity in Online Distance Learning Courses. *J. Online Learn. Teach.* 3 (3), 12.
- Mahat, M. & Tatebe, J. (2019). Demystifying the Academic Promotion Process. In M. Mahat, & J. Tatebe (Eds. ), *Achieving Academic Promotion (Surviving and Thriving in Academia)* (pp. 3-27). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-899-020191003>.
- Malingkas, M. FransSenduk, J. Simandjuntak, S. Binilang B. B. (2018). The Effects of Servant Leader and Integrity of Principal Performance In Catholic Senior High Schools in North Sulawesi. *Indonesia Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 8(1). Doi: <http://www.jielusa.org/> ISSN: 2161-7252
- McCabe, D. L. , Butterfield, K. D. , & Trevino, L. K. (2012). *Cheating in College: Why Students Do It and What Educators Can Do about It*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mitchell, G. R. L. , & Parnther, C. (2018). The shared responsibility for academic integrity education. *New Directions for Community Colleges* , 2018(183), 55 -64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20317>.
- Morris, E. J. (2016). Academic integrity: A teaching and learning approach. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 1037-1053). Singapore: Springer Singapore. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/39667>.
- Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: five considerations for addressing contract cheating. *Int J EducIntegr*, 14(15). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0038-5>
- Morris, E. J. , & Carroll, J. (2016). Developing a sustainable holistic institutional approach: Dealing with realities “on the ground” when implementing an academic integrity policy. In T. Bretag (Ed. ), *Handbook of Academic Integrity* (pp. 449-462). Singapore: Springer Singapore. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11575/PRISM/39667>.
- Nichols, R. (2014). *Academic expectations of a high school and the frequency of academic dishonesty as reported by high school principals in Virginia* (Doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia
- Ömur, Y. E. , Aydin, R. , & Argon, T. (2014). Relationship between prospective teachers' Fear of negative evaluation and their academic dishonesty tendencies. *Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and Practice*, 5(9), 131-149.
- Ozoliņa, R and Bernia L. , H. (2021). Academic Integrity InLatvia"s Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Educational Integrity*, 16(1). Doi: [https://freepolicybriefs.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/free\\_policy\\_brief\\_putnins\\_sauka\\_sep655](https://freepolicybriefs.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/free_policy_brief_putnins_sauka_sep655)
-

- Popisotiriadou, Danielle Logan, Amanda Daly & Ross Guest. (2020). The role of authentic assessment to preserve academic integrity and promote skill development and employability. *Journal of Studies in Higher Education*, 45(11). DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2019.1582015
- Saidina, N. Nurliyana. (2013). Investigating Academic Dishonesty among Language Teacher Trainees: The Why and How of Cheating. *Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol, 90(3). Doi: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/>.
- Şendağ, S. , Duran, M. , and Robert Fraser, M. (2012). Surveying the Extent of Involvement In Online Academic Dishonesty (E-dishonesty) Related Practices Among university Students and the Rationale Students Provide: One university's Experience. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 28 (3), 849–860. doi:10. 1016/j. chb. 2011. 12. 004
- Soroya, M. S. , Hashmi, M. A. , and Soroya, S. H. (2017). Status of Academic Integrity In Pakistan: An Overview. *Journal of Academic Studies*, 31(2). Doi: <https://www.epigeum.com/courses/research/research-integrity-uk-edition/>
- Youseef Mubarik and Almutairi. (2022). Effects of Academic Integrity Of Faculty Members On students Ethical Behavior. *International Journal Of Education Research*, Vol, 12(7). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/68067522>