



LIVED EXPERIENCES OF EDUCATORS IN ADDRESSING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Jocelyn Martinez¹

¹Student, Graduate School, Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra21874>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra21874

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to understand how educators perceive and manage instances of AI-assisted academic dishonesty, and the strategies they employ to uphold academic integrity in their classrooms. Also, this employed a qualitative research design, specifically adopting a phenomenological approach, to explore the lived experiences of educators in addressing academic dishonesty in the era of artificial intelligence, with eight participants, all of whom are educators with experience in teaching in environments where AI tools are becoming increasingly prevalent. The findings of this study offer meaningful implications for educators, institutions, and policymakers as they navigate the challenges of academic integrity in the age of artificial intelligence. As AI continues to reshape the learning environment, the insights from faculty experiences reveal the urgency of redefining assessment practices, reinforcing ethical awareness, and building institutional frameworks that are both supportive and adaptable. These implications underscore the need for a shared commitment across stakeholders to foster a culture of integrity that goes beyond compliance one that empowers students, equips educators, and aligns institutional strategies with the realities of modern education.

KEYWORDS- *Lived Experiences, Educators, Addressing Academic Dishonesty, Age of Artificial Intelligence*

INTRODUCTION

Academic dishonesty has long been a focal point of educational discourse, often framed within the context of fairness, ethical behavior, and the development of authentic learning experiences. However, the integration of AI technologies into education has redefined the ways in which students access and utilize information, creating blurred lines between permissible academic assistance and unethical practices. Tools such as AI-driven writing assistants, plagiarism checkers, and personalized learning platforms have emerged as both aids and potential enablers of misconduct, challenging educators to navigate an increasingly complex academic environment.

The article of The Atlantic (2024) argues that institutions like Haverford College provide a model for integrating AI tools into higher education while preserving the integrity of academic work. The key lies in fostering a culture of responsibility, trust, and collaboration rather than relying solely on restrictive measures. This approach not only upholds academic standards but also prepares students to engage ethically with AI in their personal and professional lives.

One of the primary challenges faced by educators is the absence of comprehensive policies addressing the use of AI in academia. While some institutions have begun to develop guidelines, many faculty members feel uncertain about what constitutes acceptable use of AI, leaving them without a clear framework to address suspected cases of AI plagiarism. The spread of AI-generated plagiarism reflects a broader challenge for the education system in adapting to technological advancements. The article calls for a collaborative effort among educators, institutions, and policymakers to develop ethical frameworks for AI use in academia. Without such measures, the increasing misuse of AI threatens to undermine the value of higher education and the trust that underpins the student-teacher relationship, (Nolan, 2024).

Also, the article, "Does A.I. Really Encourage Cheating in Schools?", published in The New Yorker (2024), critically examines the relationship between AI tools and academic dishonesty. It challenges assumptions that AI inherently promotes cheating and instead emphasizes the nuanced role of these tools in education. The piece explores the limitations of AI detection tools, the ethical considerations of AI use, and the role of educators in fostering a culture of integrity and productive work habits among students.

Meanwhile in the Philippines, an articles reflect a growing recognition of the dual-edged nature of AI tools in education. While they offer immense potential to enhance productivity and learning, their misuse poses significant ethical and academic challenges. UP Diliman's proactive stance underscores the need for clear guidelines, ethical education, and a collective commitment to maintaining the integrity of the academic process amidst the rapid evolution of technology, (Cruz, 2023).



The article, "UPD Condemns AI-Generated Academic Outputs; Says It's for Enhancement of Learning, Productivity Only," Manila Bulletin (2023), outlines the University of the Philippines Diliman's (UPD) official position on the use of AI tools in academic contexts. UPD emphasizes the responsible integration of AI technologies, condemning their misuse while highlighting their potential as supplementary tools to enhance learning and productivity. The article reinforces the need for a balanced approach, where AI is viewed as a means to enhance learning rather than replace the human effort and creativity fundamental to education.

The article, "Students Under Probe for Allegedly Using AI in Submitted Academic Requirements," published by GMA News Online (2023), reports on ongoing investigations into University of the Philippines Diliman (UPD) students who are suspected of using AI tools to complete academic requirements. The article delves into the potential consequences of this misuse, the ethical concerns surrounding it, and the university's approach to addressing the issue. This investigation highlights the growing concern in academic institutions regarding the ethical use of AI tools. As AI becomes more widely accessible, educational leaders are grappling with the challenges of ensuring that students use these technologies responsibly. The case at UPD serves as a cautionary tale for other institutions, emphasizing the need for clear policies, ethical education, and the cultivation of academic integrity in an increasingly tech-driven world.

Locally, another study contributes to the growing body of research on the ethical use of AI in education, particularly in the context of Philippine educational settings. It provides valuable insights into the perspectives of educators from diverse fields, highlighting the need for a balanced approach to AI integration in academic settings. The findings suggest that while AI has the potential to revolutionize education, it also requires careful consideration of ethical issues and the development of strategies to ensure that it is used responsibly. The study emphasizes the importance of fostering a culture of academic integrity and responsible technology use, not just in Mindanao but across educational institutions worldwide, (Chavez, 2024).

Through qualitative inquiry, this study will examine how educators perceive and respond to instances of AI-facilitated dishonesty, the resources and support systems they rely upon, and the ethical dilemmas they face in fostering a culture of integrity. By capturing these experiences, the research contributes to the broader discourse on the interplay between technology and education, offering insights that can inform policy development, professional training, and classroom practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of Thomas and Zhang (2021) specifically focuses on the experiences of faculty members as they navigate instances of academic dishonesty within virtual classrooms, a growing concern with the rise of online learning platforms. The shift to online learning has introduced new challenges to maintaining academic integrity. With the increased reliance on digital platforms, instructors have reported difficulties in ensuring that students complete assignments honestly and independently. The accessibility of resources such as AI tools, online essays, and other forms of academic dishonesty in the digital space has compounded the issue, making it harder for faculty to detect violations.

Also, Mahmood and Ahmed's (2023) study provides valuable insights into the experiences of university educators in Pakistan as they confront academic dishonesty. By adopting a phenomenological approach, the authors give voice to the challenges faced by faculty in upholding academic integrity in the face of cultural, institutional, and emotional barriers. The findings of this study underscore the need for better institutional support, clear policies, and effective strategies to combat academic dishonesty, particularly in environments where traditional methods may be insufficient. The study offers practical recommendations that can help universities create a more supportive and ethical academic environment, benefiting both educators and students.

The study highlights the moral and ethical dilemmas that educators face when addressing plagiarism. Many instructors express concern about the fairness of penalizing students for plagiarism, especially when students are unaware of the seriousness of their actions or when the institution's policies on plagiarism are not clearly communicated. Some faculty members also struggle with feelings of guilt, wondering whether their teaching methods may have contributed to the students' tendency to plagiarize. O'Brien and Wilson's (2022) study offers a deep and empathetic examination of the emotional and professional challenges that university educators face in dealing with plagiarism. The findings underscore the psychological toll that academic dishonesty takes on faculty members, highlighting the need for better institutional support, clearer policies, and more effective professional development opportunities. The study also calls for a shift toward building a stronger culture of academic integrity in Australian universities, which could help reduce the incidence of plagiarism and mitigate the emotional burden on educators.

Significantly, another study offers valuable insights into the challenges faced by Filipino educators in addressing academic dishonesty. It emphasizes the need for comprehensive institutional policies, stronger support for teachers, and a cultural shift in how academic integrity is perceived and practiced in the Philippines. By examining the experiences of educators, the study contributes to the ongoing dialogue about the importance of maintaining ethical standards in education and highlights the emotional toll that academic dishonesty takes on faculty members. The recommendations provided by the authors aim to address these issues by fostering a more supportive and ethical academic environment for both educators and students, (Santos and Cruz, 2022).



Additionally, Reyes and Dela Cruz (2023) study provides a comprehensive exploration of the challenges that university educators in the Philippines face when it comes to academic dishonesty. Through their findings, the authors underscore the emotional and professional impact that these issues have on teachers, as well as the institutional and cultural factors that contribute to academic misconduct. By offering practical recommendations such as clearer institutional policies, better support for educators, and fostering a culture of integrity, the study provides valuable insights into how universities in the Philippines can address the growing concern of academic dishonesty.

Educational institutions should foster a culture that values academic integrity by integrating ethics into the curriculum, hosting workshops, and promoting discussions on the importance of honesty in education. This cultural shift would help reinforce the idea that academic integrity is essential to both personal and professional growth. Mendoza and Garcia's (2021), study sheds light on the widespread issue of academic dishonesty in Metro Manila's educational institutions, focusing on the emotional and professional challenges faced by educators. The study emphasizes the need for clear institutional policies, better support for teachers, and a cultural shift toward valuing academic integrity. By identifying the root causes of academic dishonesty and offering practical recommendations, the authors contribute to the ongoing dialogue about how to create a more ethical academic environment in Metro Manila and beyond.

Furthermore, Abueva and Tan's (2022) study reveals that academic dishonesty is a significant concern in universities across Cebu, with teachers reporting a variety of misconduct, such as cheating during exams, submitting plagiarized work, and falsifying academic records. Educators describe these behaviors as increasingly prevalent, particularly in competitive academic environments where students feel pressured to perform well at any cost. This issue spans both private and public universities in Cebu, indicating a widespread problem. Faculty members often feel frustrated when students are caught cheating, as they perceive it as a violation of the trust that is foundational to the educational relationship.

Research Questions

In an era where technology continues to redefine the boundaries of possibility, understanding how educators address academic dishonesty in the context of AI is crucial. Their insights not only shed light on the immediate challenges but also provide a roadmap for navigating the ethical and practical complexities of a rapidly evolving educational landscape. Specifically, this study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the Lived Experiences of Educators in Addressing Academic Dishonesty in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?
2. What are the coping strategies of Educators in Addressing Academic Dishonesty in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?
3. What are the educational insights learned by the Educators in Addressing Academic Dishonesty in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically adopting a phenomenological approach, to explore the lived experiences of educators in addressing academic dishonesty in the era of artificial intelligence. The research design aligns with the study's aim to understand how educators perceive, navigate, and respond to the challenges posed by AI-enabled academic dishonesty.

A qualitative design is best suited for this study as it emphasizes depth over breadth, enabling the researcher to gain a nuanced understanding of the phenomenon from the participants' perspectives. By focusing on educators' subjective experiences, the research uncovers the meanings, emotions, and strategies they associate with academic dishonesty in the context of AI.

Phenomenology, as a specific qualitative approach, seeks to capture the essence of participants' lived experiences. In this study, it provides a structured framework to delve into educators' firsthand encounters with AI-assisted academic dishonesty, uncovering shared themes, patterns, and individual variations. This approach allows the study to focus on how educators make sense of their experiences and adapt their teaching practices in response.

Moreover, the qualitative phenomenological research design ensures that the study captures the complexities and nuances of educators' experiences in addressing academic dishonesty. By focusing on their lived experiences, the design provides a rich, detailed understanding of how educators interact with, adapt to, and mitigate the challenges posed by AI in maintaining academic integrity.

Research Participants

This study involved eight participants, all of whom are educators with experience in teaching in environments where AI tools are becoming increasingly prevalent. The participants will be selected using purposive sampling to ensure that individuals with relevant experience, insights, and perspectives regarding academic dishonesty in the context of



AI technology are chosen. Specifically, the participants must have experience with addressing academic dishonesty related to AI tools, such as AI-powered essay generators or automated plagiarism checkers.

To be eligible for participation, the educators must meet the following criteria: they must currently be employed as educators with teaching responsibilities in any subject area, and they should have at least one year of experience teaching in an environment where AI tools are integrated into student learning or where issues of academic dishonesty related to these tools have arisen. Participants must also be willing to openly share their personal experiences and strategies for handling academic dishonesty related to AI.

The selection process will begin with initial contact through email or phone to introduce the study, explain its goals, and outline expectations. Potential participants will then be screened to confirm they meet the eligibility criteria. Once selected, participants will be provided with an informed consent form detailing the study's objectives, procedures, risks, benefits, and the voluntary nature of their participation.

Research Instrument

The primary research instrument utilized in this study is the semi-structured interview guide, designed to explore the lived experiences of educators in addressing academic dishonesty in the age of artificial intelligence. The choice of this instrument aligns with the qualitative and phenomenological nature of the study, ensuring in-depth, meaningful data collection while providing flexibility to delve into emergent themes.

The semi-structured interview guide was chosen for its flexibility and ability to elicit detailed, rich descriptions of participants' experiences. The open-ended nature of the questions allows participants to share their perspectives freely, while the structured format ensures that the core research objectives are addressed. Probes and follow-up questions are included to clarify or expand upon responses, providing depth to the collected data.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process for this qualitative study will follow Creswell's (2019) six-step approach to ensure a rigorous and systematic examination of the data. This method allows for a comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences and perspectives while maintaining the study's alignment with its research objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Implication

The findings of this study offer meaningful implications for educators, institutions, and policymakers as they navigate the challenges of academic integrity in the age of artificial intelligence. As AI continues to reshape the learning environment, the insights from faculty experiences reveal the urgency of redefining assessment practices, reinforcing ethical awareness, and building institutional frameworks that are both supportive and adaptable. These implications underscore the need for a shared commitment across stakeholders to foster a culture of integrity that goes beyond compliance one that empowers students, equips educators, and aligns institutional strategies with the realities of modern education.

The emergence of AI in academic contexts necessitates a critical reassessment of what constitutes academic dishonesty. Traditional notions of cheating and plagiarism must now consider the blurred boundaries between human-generated and AI-assisted outputs. The implication here is that institutions must redefine academic integrity frameworks to reflect these technological developments. Moreover, student ethical literacy must be strengthened to address the responsible use of AI. Educators and administrators must collaborate to implement policies that distinguish between acceptable support and dishonest use of AI. This theme also highlights the need for proactive conversations around ethics, urging institutions to embed AI-awareness early in the curriculum to help students make informed, ethical decisions.

Educators play a frontline role in addressing AI misuse, and their adaptability is crucial in safeguarding academic integrity. The implications point to the importance of continuous faculty development that equips teachers with updated strategies and digital literacy. Through redesigning assessments to be more reflective, process-oriented, and context-specific, educators reduce the opportunities for academic dishonesty. Institutions must support this shift by providing resources and training for alternative assessment methods such as oral defenses, journaling, and collaborative projects. Additionally, this theme emphasizes that the emotional and cognitive load on educators must be acknowledged support mechanisms and peer collaboration should be institutionalized to prevent burnout and ensure sustainability of these adaptive practices.

This theme underscores the collective responsibility of academic communities in addressing AI-related dishonesty. Institutional collaboration through faculty meetings, policy formulation, and curriculum alignment emerges as a crucial force for coherence and consistency. The implication is that policies must not only exist but must also be uniformly communicated and implemented. Institutions must foster a culture of shared accountability where academic integrity is reinforced across departments and levels. Furthermore, collaborative policy development ensures that responses to AI misuse are contextually relevant and widely accepted. This theme also highlights the value of student involvement and policy transparency in cultivating a culture where ethical behavior is modeled, expected, and practice



This study is anchored on two significant frameworks: Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1986) and the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) Framework by Mishra & Koehler (2006). Both theories offer a solid foundation for interpreting how educators respond to and manage academic dishonesty in the age of Artificial Intelligence.

Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the role of observational learning, social interactions, and personal agency in shaping behavior. This theory supports the findings in the following ways: The data revealed that educators actively modeled academic integrity, believing that their consistent actions and discussions on ethics would influence student behavior. This aligns with the idea that learners develop values by observing others, particularly authority figures like teachers. The institutional collaboration and peer discussions among teachers (Main Theme 3) reflect vicarious learning, where educators adapt and improve strategies by learning from their colleagues' practices.

The TPACK framework highlights the interdependence of technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge in effective teaching. The study's results showed how teachers must balance these dimensions to promote academic honesty: Educators adapted their assessments (Main Theme 2 and Subtheme 3) by integrating technology-aware pedagogy, such as using reflective journals and personalized tasks that minimize the chance of AI misuse showcasing thoughtful alignment between technological and pedagogical knowledge. Teachers demonstrated technological knowledge not only in using AI tools but also in understanding their limitations and potential misuse, guiding students in the responsible use of these tools. This represents an integration of pedagogical ethics with digital fluency, a key aspect of TPACK.

In sum, Social Cognitive Theory helps explain the behavioral and cultural dynamics behind academic dishonesty and ethical formation, while the TPACK framework captures the pedagogical-technological strategies educators used to address the challenges of AI in the classroom. Together, these theories underscore the need for both ethical modeling and instructional innovation in shaping a culture of integrity in the AI era. Teachers improving their practice through faculty collaboration align with the TPACK model's emphasis on continuous professional learning in evolving tech-based educational landscapes.

Future Directions

As Artificial Intelligence continues to influence teaching and learning environments, especially in the context of academic integrity, this study underscores the need for proactive and collaborative efforts across all levels of the education system. The findings reveal that AI-related dishonesty is not merely a technological issue but a pedagogical, ethical, and institutional concern. To sustain a culture of integrity in the AI era, future actions must be deliberate, student-centered, and systemically integrated.

Based on the themes that emerged from the study, the following future directions are proposed for the Department of Education (DepEd), school heads, teachers, and future researchers to strengthen academic integrity while embracing the potential of AI in education.

For the Department of Education (DepEd)

Policy Modernization and Alignment: DepEd should review and update academic integrity guidelines to address AI use in educational settings. National policies must include explicit provisions on responsible AI use and its ethical boundaries in basic and higher education.

Integrate AI and Ethics in Curriculum: Develop modules on AI literacy and digital ethics, particularly in Values Education, Media and Information Literacy, and other related subjects.

Support for Capacity Building: Allocate resources and programs for training educators on adaptive assessment methods, digital tools, and academic integrity strategies aligned with the demands of the AI era.

For School Heads and Administrators

Institutionalize Integrity Policies: Ensure consistent implementation of institutional policies on academic honesty that include AI-specific provisions (e.g., AI use disclosures, reflective assessments, plagiarism tools).

Foster Collaborative Culture: Encourage regular academic coordination meetings and professional learning communities (PLCs) focused on addressing AI-related challenges collaboratively.

Holistic Student Support: Enhance guidance and counseling services that address the root causes of dishonesty such as academic pressure, lack of understanding, or mental health concerns.

For Teachers and Educators

Innovate Assessments: Redesign learning tasks to emphasize critical thinking, reflection, and real-life application types of work less prone to AI misuse.

Promote Ethical AI Use: Educate students about the responsible use of AI tools, setting clear boundaries on acceptable use while modeling ethical behavior themselves.



Professional Growth: Continuously engage in training and action research focused on emerging trends in digital pedagogy and academic integrity.

For Future Researchers

Longitudinal Studies on AI and Integrity: Investigate how students' understanding and behavior around AI and ethics evolve over time.

Comparative Analyses: Explore how different school types (e.g., public vs. private, urban vs. rural) approach AI-related academic dishonesty.

Student Perspectives: Include students as core participants in future studies to understand their motivations, struggles, and insights regarding AI and academic integrity.

Tech-Based Interventions: Examine the effectiveness of digital tools and AI-assisted teaching platforms in promoting honesty and reducing misconduct.

REFERENCES

1. Abueva, J., & Tan, R. (2022). "Academic dishonesty in Cebu universities: Teachers' narratives and experiences." *Cebu Studies Journal*, 15(1), 45-62.
2. Anderson, K., & Smith, P. (2021). "Faculty mental health and academic integrity enforcement: Strategies for maintaining well-being." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103-117.
3. Aquino, L., & Santos, P. (2022). "Teaching moments in academic integrity: Lessons from Philippine university faculty." *Asian Journal of Education Studies*, 19(1), 45-60.
4. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Bautista, R., & Villanueva, S. (2021). "Strategic approaches of Filipino faculty members in managing academic dishonesty." *Education Research International*, 2021, 1-12.
6. Brown, J., & Miller, T. (2023). "Lessons learned: Faculty perspectives on preventing academic misconduct in higher education." *Studies in Higher Education*, 48(4), 567-582.
7. Chavez, J. V., None Jhordan T. Cuilan, Sali, N., Ibrahim, U., Carolino, A. A., None Abubakar Radjuni, Salman, N., & Benigno, N. (2024). *Discourse Analysis on the Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings from ICT, Science, and Language Instructors*. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349-363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
8. Chen, H., & Liu, Y. (2022). "Preventive measures and coping mechanisms: A study of university teachers dealing with academic misconduct in China." *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 40(3), 278-293.
9. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
10. Cruz, J. P. (2023, January 18). UP AI professors warn students against use of AI tools in academic requirements. *Interaksyon*. <https://interaksyon.philstar.com/trends-spotlights/2023/01/18/240453/up-ai-professors-warn-students-against-use-of-ai-tools-in-academic-requirements/?utm>
11. De Guzman, A., & Torres, M. (2023). "Coping mechanisms of Filipino educators in handling academic dishonesty cases." *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 26(2), 167-182.
12. Dizon, M., & Cruz, A. (2021). "Transforming challenges into opportunities: Educational insights from handling academic dishonesty in Philippine universities." *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 4(3), 278-293.
13. Flores, M., & Ramos, C. (2023). "Davao City college teachers' strategies in maintaining academic integrity." *Mindanao Academic Journal*, 12(2), 78-93.
14. Harper, T. A. (2024, October 23). *The Atlantic*. *The Atlantic*; [theatlantic](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2024/10/chatgpt-vs-university-honor-code/680336/?utm). <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2024/10/chatgpt-vs-university-honor-code/680336/?utm>
15. Kang, J. C. (2024, August 30). Does A.I. Really Encourage Cheating in Schools? *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/fault-lines/does-ai-really-encourage-cheating-in-schools?utm>
16. Kumar, R., & Patel, S. (2022). "Transformative insights: How dealing with academic dishonesty shaped teaching practices." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(6), 789-804.
17. Luna, E., & Santos, B. (2022). "Teacher resilience in addressing academic integrity violations: A Philippine perspective." *Asian Journal of Teacher Education*, 14(3), 89-104.
18. Mahmood, K., & Ahmed, S. (2023). "Navigating academic dishonesty: A phenomenological study of university educators in Pakistan." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(1), 78-93.
19. Mendoza, L., & Garcia, F. (2021). "Teaching through challenges: Academic dishonesty experiences of educators in Metro Manila." *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 4(2), 167-182.
20. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J.: (2006). *Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge*. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 1017-1054
21. News, G. I. (2015). Students under probe for allegedly using AI in submitted academic requirements. *GMA News Online*. <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/857872/using-ai-to-write-essays-is-cheating-says-up-prof/story/?utm>
22. Nolan, B. (2024, September 30). AI plagiarism is overwhelming college professors. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/ai-cheating-colleges-plagiarism-chatgpt-professor-2024-9?utm>
23. O'Brien, M., & Wilson, J. (2022). "The emotional toll: Understanding educator experiences with student plagiarism in Australian universities." *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(4), 412-428.
24. Pascual, R., & Rivera, M. (2023). "Learning from experience: Filipino educators' insights on promoting academic integrity." *Philippine Education Research Journal*, 35(2), 123-138.



25. Reyes, A. B., & Dela Cruz, P. (2023). "Understanding academic integrity challenges: Voices from Philippine university teachers." *Asian Journal of Education*, 18(3), 234-249.
26. Robertson, M., & Lee, S. (2021). "Beyond punishment: Educational approaches to fostering academic integrity." *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 39(4), 345-360.
27. Santos, M. C., & Cruz, R. (2022). "Filipino educators' encounters with academic dishonesty: A qualitative inquiry." *Philippine Journal of Education*, 45(2), 89-106.
28. Santos, R., & Lim, A. (2023). "Lessons from the classroom: Academic integrity insights from educators in Iloilo City." *Western Visayas Education Review*, 16(2), 112-127.
29. Thomas, R., & Zhang, L. (2021). "Walking the tightrope: Faculty experiences with academic integrity violations in online learning environments." *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 39(2), 145-162.
30. UPD condemns AI-generated academic outputs; says its for enhancement of learning, productivity only. (2023). *Manila Bulletin*. https://mb.com.ph/2023/01/20/upd-condemns-ai-generated-academic-outputs-says-its-for-enhancement-of-learning-productivity-only?utm_
31. Williams, S., & Johnson, R. (2023). "Resilience in academia: How faculty members cope with student cheating." *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1-15.