scope

Contemporary Research Topics

learning & teaching 15

October 2025

Article

https://doi.org/10.34074/scop.4015007

NAVIGATING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN THE AGE OF AI: A SINGLE COHORT'S JOURNEY

Lizzy Guest, Elizabeth Youard,

Rachel Scrivin and Vikkie Harre

Published by Otago Polytechnic Press.

Article https://doi.org/10.34074/scop.4015007

NAVIGATING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN THE AGE OF AI: A SINGLE COHORT'S JOURNEY

Lizzy Guest, Elizabeth Youard, Rachel Scrivin and Vikkie Harre

Tertiary education institutions are currently grappling with new challenges around academic integrity in the age of generative artificial intelligence (AI). In particular, the widespread availability of chatbots that can assist students with learning and assessment completion has influenced teaching practices. This technological advancement is creating a "paradigm shift" in education (Gruenhagen et al., 2024). In this article, we reflect on how we navigated new teaching practices around academic integrity.

This article presents critical reflections from four members of a health teaching team involved in a Level 7 Graduate Diploma (NZQA, 2025) in Health and Rehabilitation during 2024. The cohort consisted of 11 students. All had international undergraduate degrees and spoke English as an additional language. This was their first experience with tertiary education in Aotearoa.

Three key themes were identified from the teaching team's reflections: (1) AI usage; (2) the nature of the international cohort, and (3) teacher professional development. The theme of AI usage explores how our students engaged with AI. The second theme examines how specific characteristics of the international cohort influenced these patterns of AI use. The final theme considers the role of teacher professional development in students' engagement with AI.

We retrospectively reflected upon these themes, utilising and adapting Brookfield's lenses for critical reflection (theoretical, autobiographical, student insights into AI use, and collegial lenses). This multi-faceted approach led to a "differently highlighted picture of who we are and what we do" (Brookfield, 1998). We conclude our reflections by discussing the challenges and opportunities of navigating academic integrity within a teaching environment that incorporates AI.

THEORETICAL LENS

In this section we will briefly consider the cohort's journey in relation to some literature pertinent to academic integrity and AI.

AI usage

Academic integrity is promoted by the institute as academic honesty, while academic misconduct is outlined in the student code of conduct as seeking academic advantage by deception or unfair means (Toi Ohomai, n.d.). The value of academic integrity is upheld within the health teaching and learning environment. All students are engaged in conversations about the importance of academic integrity and appropriate AI usage. This approach is supported by research that shows that a teaching environment that promotes academic integrity alongside student AI education decreases misconduct among students (Miles et al., 2022). For instance, students were

informed up front that Grammarly was not allowed due to embedded AI. This became the institute's academic policy in November 2024. At this tertiary institute, Turnitin is utilised as a plagiarism detection tool, and the team leader highlighted this to students. Prior to submission of online assessments, students are required to indicate that the work is their own. AI detection software and authenticity declarations have been reported to counter potential student excuses for inappropriate AI usage (Birks & Clare, 2023).

The teaching team was aware of the rapidly changing educational environment related to AI and at the start of 2024 had modified assessment tasks to minimise inappropriate AI usage. This included clear assessment instructions, templates for assignments, providing marking rubrics, and closely monitoring students' work. Birks and Clare (2023) advocate implementing innovative assessments for each cohort, incorporating students' ability to select topics of choice and the submission of formative drafts. Additional mitigating strategies were effectively applied to this cohort, as outlined later in this article.

After submission of the first assessments in early 2024, teachers became aware that approximately 80 percent of the cohort had utilised generative AI inappropriately. Initial mitigations to prevent inappropriate AI usage were insufficient to address the scale of AI use among this cohort of learners. AI detection software and a knowledge of learner voice identified this academic misconduct. The approach taken to first instances of academic misconduct was educative rather than punitive. An educative approach has been found to enhance academic integrity at tertiary institutes in Australia (Striepe et al., 2023) and is therefore deemed an effective first line approach. The teachers reiterated the institute's values on academic integrity and appropriate AI usage, framing this as a learning opportunity. Where further instances of academic misconduct occurred, students received written warnings in individual meetings with the health team leader, at which the need to uphold academic integrity was explicitly reiterated. The written academic warnings were successful with some students, but other students continued to use AI inappropriately in assessment tasks. A small number of students were given repeated written warnings for academic misconduct. Two students received the maximum allowable number of written academic warnings and were removed from the course in line with the institute's academic policy.

Research suggests that persistent academic integrity issues could be due to a variety of reasons. Mukasa et al. (2023) report that students primarily use AI due to concerns of failing assessments, with additional motivations including the convenience of using AI to produce content and time pressures. These factors could have been applicable to the students within this cohort.

Nature of the international cohort

The international nature of this cohort, all of whom had English as an additional language, presented specific challenges. The cohort's international status increased their contextual risks of using AI inappropriately. International students typically have high internal and external pressures to succeed in study (Education New Zealand Manapou ki te Ao, 2024; Miles et al., 2022). These pressures to succeed, combined with the challenge of forging new social relationships within Aotearoa, racial discrimination, and financial burdens (Education New Zealand Manapou ki te Ao, 2024), further increase the likelihood of academic misconduct.

AI can be beneficial for international students' learning. Kaur and Trifan (2024) identified specific advantages of generative AI for those facing language barriers. For example, generative AI can alleviate embarrassment speaking in a foreign language by enabling students to ask questions via chatbots (Kaur & Trifan, 2024). This utilisation of technology can empower the students and facilitate their understanding of content. This cohort were observed at times to be uncomfortable speaking in English or indicating that they did not understand a topic. Appropriate use of AI chatbots could have mitigated this situation. AI, and in particular generative AI, has been demonstrated to provide further benefits by encouraging active education and engagement (Kaur & Trifan, 2024). Utilising AI for translation can be appropriate for international learners and can facilitate access to academic content (Paterson, 2022). Google translate as an AI translation app was used with this cohort for assessment instructions

and resource material. The teachers were unclear about whether the app was able to effectively translate more complex documents such as articles in academic journals.

The teaching team was keen to harness the advantages of AI and facilitate student use of AI by incorporating this into in-class student activities; however, pedagogical change was outpaced by technological change. The teachers reflected that they could have used generative AI more as a tool to support the cohort. The institute's Technology Enhanced and Enabled Learning team (TEEL) (a team of advisors with expertise in educational technology who support teachers) had been proactive in offering personalised learning support through the introduction of chatbots. However, the team opted not to introduce chatbots due to large volumes of content, multiple content topics, workload pressures, and a reluctance to increase student utilisation of AI when it was problematic with in-class and assessment tasks.

Teacher professional development

Teacher education on academic integrity has been identified as a key factor in the reduction of academic misconduct (Jones, 2023; Miles et al., 2022). The teaching team attended external online professional development focusing on strategies to mitigate inappropriate AI use through assessment design. The teaching team utilised this knowledge to promote authentic assessment design. An institute-led professional development session was also provided. This focused on the use of AI as an educational tool in the classroom, but was implemented after this cohort had completed their course. Overall, the teaching team found this professional development beneficial, although earlier provision on integrating AI into the classroom to facilitate learning would have been helpful.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL LENS

In this section, under an autobiographical lens, we reflect on the teaching team's experiences with academic integrity and AI use by the cohort.

Nature of the international cohort

At the start of the course, many of the cohort reported unfamiliarity with the use of electronic devices, such as laptops and tablets, in the tertiary education environment. However, the students quickly became familiar with these devices and it was not long before students were observed to be using AI inappropriately. This was demonstrated during in-class activities by some students not appearing to actively engage in group discussions yet producing high-quality, detailed work within a brief period. Tasks submitted through Turnitin showed high levels of plagiarism, suspected to result from copied content or generative AI use. The teachers provided frequent encouragement and reminders to use problem-solving, judgement, and critical thinking skills instead of relying on generative AI. The teaching team reflected that AI can be a useful classroom tool when used appropriately and that it is important that students can identify appropriate and inappropriate usage. However, as Fatemi and Saito (2019) identify, critical thinking and writing in English may be new skills for international students. These students generally lacked confidence, even with low-risk activities, to voice their own opinions. This suggests that critical thinking was still a developing skill for the cohort.

The teaching team reflected that generative AI is a useful tool for teaching and planning specific class activities. It provides opportunities for critical discussion on AI generated content, highlighting gaps or areas that require further investigation or explanation. Another possibility is to integrate AI with a flipped, student-centric learning approach, where students are expected to come to class prepared for activities. An example of flipped learning using AI is where students access an AI-powered platform to help simplify pre-class task instructions and summarise readings or interact with chatbots to deepen understanding (Diwanji et al., 2018; López-Villanueva et al., 2024). This may enhance student engagement and motivation and scaffold prior learning while also providing support for diverse learning needs.

AI use

Formative assessments

A variety of assessment types were implemented for this cohort. Assessment design was proactive in responding to the rapidly evolving impact of AI on assessments. In semester one, a series of formative assessments with teacher feedback were utilised. This format was specifically chosen to support this cohort with several opportunities for constructive feedback and feedforward, enabling students to achieve the standards required for Aotearoa New Zealand's tertiary education. However, the teaching team raised concerns about high AI use in the formative assessments. The teachers identified challenges related to recognising potential AI use in the students' work and ensuring they had sufficient evidence to support cases of academic misconduct. Similar teacher concerns have been identified in literature related to higher education (Miles et al., 2022). It was fortunate that this cohort was small, enabling the teaching team to become familiar with individual students' writing styles and capabilities. The TEEL team provided support, including using Originality.ai as an additional AI detection software. One of the students admitted to purchasing this software for personal use, which was considered an attempt to bypass AI detection. In semester two, Originality.ai was no longer available due to the institute's shift towards assessment modification to mitigate against AI usage. In the second semester, assessment design and types were modified to promote increased student authenticity. Examples of the assessment types used are provided below.

Class presentations

Students presented PowerPoint presentations to their peers. The teachers identified instances where content in slides or commentary was inconsistent with the assessment topic. This inconsistent use of language, such as abrupt shifts in tone or vocabulary, has been demonstrated to be an indicator of AI usage (Doru et al., 2024). However, the teachers reflected that the cohort having English as an additional language could also have caused some of these inconsistencies. Group presentations were also utilised. The group members were chosen so that students with previous academic misconduct warnings were placed in groups with those who had not received such warnings. Group work mixing students, alongside frequent formative feedback, appeared to reduce the use of generative AI.

Reflective tasks with media clips

Video media clips were utilised to prompt student reflection and critical analysis. Tasks that encourage critical thinking and application of knowledge have been identified to be more challenging for generative AI to complete effectively (Jones, 2023). The teaching team therefore viewed reflections on media clips to be a low-risk assessment when it came to AI use. However, inconsistent language and out of context ideas did occur, raising concerns about AI usage. Again, these students had English as an additional language, which may have impacted their ability to understand media clips produced within Aotearoa. Students may have relied on generative AI due to comprehension barriers or inaccurate AI translation or subtitling tools. The teaching team considered that, whilst changing a task to a reflective activity may reduce AI usage, it is insufficient to completely prevent this. It was also apparent that the complexity of language in the media clips was not suitable for this international cohort. Reflective tasks based on written scenarios may have been more appropriate.

Online tests

The TEEL team advised that online tests would be a suitable assessment design to promote authenticity. Students were required to complete summative written tests using an online learning platform. These were completed in class, online, and invigilated with the aim of detecting and preventing AI usage. Prior to the commencement of the tests, warnings on AI usage were provided. Monitoring software was not available, but invigilation was used. Despite the presence of invigilators, suspicious activity was observed, including unauthorised tabs with generative AI or websites. One student was observed having completed multiple paragraphs within minutes despite being observed to have typed just a few words. The inappropriate AI use in this closely supervised setting

was unexpected. The teaching team reflected that the opportunity to have access to monitoring software would have been beneficial. Alternatively, a hand-written format to prevent AI usage could have been used. Seating arrangements were used to mitigate AI usage, with students with prior AI misuse seated closest to the invigilators. This appeared to reduce academic misconduct.

In-class writing tasks

The teaching team utilised regular supervised in-class assessment writing in essay format. At the end of each session, work completed was submitted to Turnitin. This facilitated in-class support and frequent checks for AI content. The teachers noticed that some of the submitted assessment work did not match a particular student's writing style. Conversations with the student revealed that they had used AI due to concerns with explaining concepts and writing skills. The teachers used this as an opportunity to build written language skills and promote academic integrity. This educational approach could promote future authenticity with assessment tasks. Although this assessment format had benefits, it imposed a high time burden on the teaching team, reducing the time for content to be taught.

Further academic misconduct

As in semester one, formative assessments building towards a summative portfolio assessment were also utilised. To promote academic integrity, students were provided with a template, in-class support, and feedback and feedforward on drafts. Despite teacher efforts to reinforce authenticity, a small number of students were identified as not presenting original work. A high-performing student admitted to authoring research proposals for these students. In this instance academic misconduct was not related to AI; however, these students had already received repeated warnings for AI use. These students may have shifted to non-AI forms of plagiarism after realising AI use could be detected.

Teacher professional development

The autobiographical lens further highlights the importance of professional development for the teaching team to enable the skills and confidence to support students to produce authentic work and accurately identify AI usage. Practical sessions aimed at developing teachers' skills and confidence with a variety of AI tools would foster greater integration of AI's beneficial applications into tertiary education. These sessions could facilitate teachers to explore AI's positive implementations, such as supporting students' critical thinking, reducing comprehension barriers, fostering independent learning, and promoting authentic student assessment practices. Familiarisation with and information on the accuracy of translation apps would also be advantageous. The strategic exploration of how teachers could promote AI translation in the classroom would have been especially valuable for this cohort.

In summary, our reflections through this autobiographical lens revealed that despite utilising a variety of assessment types, the teaching team still identified recurring inappropriate uses of AI. A key challenge was that some students, despite safeguards and detection risks, were still strongly tempted to use AI. The prevalence of AI use highlights the importance of knowing each student's writing style. Ultimately, any assessment type can be exploited by a motivated student.

STUDENT INSIGHTS INTO AI USE

In this section we focus on the third lens, offering the teaching team's reflections on student insights into AI use. The students were not canvassed specifically on their opinions related to AI usage and academic integrity. The team's reflection was retrospective, after the students had completed their qualification and graduated. Ideally, students' reflections would have been best captured at critical points during their learning journey. Nevertheless, valuable perspectives were obtained by the teaching team through individual and group student conversations and observations of this cohort.

Students expressed a lack of confidence with academic skills as a reason for using generative AI. At the commencement of the course, essential academic skills were taught. However, the students continued to report difficulties with academic writing, identifying relevant sources through library search engines, and referencing skills. This cohort was provided with an additional academic skills workshop and in-class activities to promote the development of academic skills. These interventions were successful for most students, and reduced incidences of AI identified in assessment tasks. However, some students developed habitual AI use, which hindered their academic skill development, reduced confidence, and trapped them into relying on AI, despite understanding the consequences. The teaching team reflected that the more challenging the student found the task, the more likely they were to engage in inappropriate AI usage. Further reflections noted that the lower-performing students were more likely to rely on AI, which was more frequently detected in assessment tasks from this group.

Unintentional plagiarism has been reported among international students in higher education due to cultural differences between their current and prior institutes of learning (Fatemi & Saito, 2019). Several students in our cohort identified a lack of confidence with written English, or with skills such as grammar. This led to unintentional AI usage when students utilised online grammar tools such as Grammarly to assist with their written English. Another student informed staff that a peer had advised them to use generative AI because their writing was too simplistic. Again, the lack of confidence with written English skills led to AI usage. The English language admission requirements for international students do not necessarily translate to proficiency with academic writing (Paterson, 2022). This gap was apparent with this cohort and more comprehensive support on written English was required. The students further identified challenges reading academic articles with more complex academic language. This cohort appeared shy speaking in English, especially during semester one, with an observed reluctance to admit to difficulties understanding topics. The previously discussed flipped classroom approach or chatbot support could have addressed these issues. With this cohort, it appeared that a lack of confidence or ability with written English and academic skills promoted the use of AI with assessment tasks.

COLLEGIAL LENS

Throughout the academic year, the institute's Technology Enhanced and Enabled Learning team provided advice and support. The teachers worked collaboratively with the TEEL team to promote academic integrity and authenticity of assessment tasks. This collaboration included facilitating the conversion from written assessments to online tests and providing technological support during the tests. The TEEL team further assisted with guidance on the detection of AI use in students' submitted assessment tasks. The TEEL team provided additional training for the teaching team on the use of AI within the tertiary education setting.

The learning support team provided targeted support to the whole cohort on academic skills. This occurred both at the commencement of semester one and during the mid-semester break to further support these skills. This support reduced AI usage. Fatimo and Saito (2019) highlight the importance of culturally responsive training for international students on academic writing. This training should be regular and tailored to their specific needs. Although the support provided was customised to this cohort, ongoing regular skill sessions would have been of benefit to further scaffold academic skills. Learning support also offered individual assessment assistance, which was utilised by approximately half of the students. However, the students frequently chose to attend these sessions in small groups, which compromised opportunities for truly individualised support.

The international team at the institute were an important support service for the teaching team and students. The international team reported that students from outside Aotearoa New Zealand have a lot of internal and external pressures to pass courses—for example, family and financial pressure, and a desire to gain or maintain social status—which helped provide a level of understanding and essential context for the teaching team. As previously noted, the internal and external pressures international students experience may lead to undue reliance on the use of AI tools to support their learning (Education New Zealand Manapou ki te Ao, 2024; Miles et al., 2022). The international team, in collaboration with the teaching team, supported the students to adjust to the home and

teaching environment within Aotearoa. They also reinforced to students the importance of upholding academic integrity. The support and assistance from these institute teams was appreciated by the teachers and helped to foster success for the students.

Teacher professional development

Collaboration with institute teams also contributed significantly towards the team's professional development. For instance, TEEL facilitated an AI workshop, showcasing some of the effective classroom applications of AI. The teaching team then reflected on how AI could be integrated as an educational tool to assist to enhance classroom learning. Further practical workshops applying these skills would have been of additional benefit. However, the available opportunities for professional development on AI use have been embraced by the teaching team, enabling the adaptation of in-class activities and assessment tasks. The teaching team is currently proactively developing new student cohorts' AI literacy using chatbots for learning support and assessments and Notebook LM as an in-class activity. Through learning about the responsible use of AI the teachers are cautiously confident that student awareness of inappropriate AI use will increase. As teachers, our AI literacy is also rapidly developing as we embrace new technologies in health.

CONCLUSION

With the advent of AI, tertiary institutes face new challenges in developing the academic integrity of students. These reflections aim to highlight the practical realities and responses of a small teaching team in a vocational education setting, offering three significant and interrelated observations. Firstly, despite measures to promote academic integrity, persistent inappropriate use of AI and academic misconduct occurred. Secondly, this international cohort brought specific challenges due to cultural norms and imperatives to succeed. Thirdly, the teaching team experienced challenges combining proactive and reactive strategies, balancing the need to discourage inappropriate use of AI whilst leveraging the advantages of AI for this cohort.

As a result of these reflections, we recommend that institutes prioritise the importance of timely and well-resourced professional development for teachers in practical AI skills to enable meaningful integration of AI into teaching pedagogy frameworks. This would enhance students' academic learning. However, professional development opportunities for teaching staff may be subject to a range of constraints, creating significant barriers to learning and skill enhancement. Institutional commitment and strategic planning are required to ensure that professional development in AI is accessible, evolves with technology, and supports the requirements of teaching teams. Additionally, we recommend adequate investment in international students' academic skill development, including tailored learning support services. Such investment is vital to ensure students' AI literacy is fostered without compromising academic integrity. Embedding the above recommendations into institutions will create an environment where teachers and students obtain the necessary support for students to achieve academic success with integrity.

As AI continues to evolve, integrating its roles into education will challenge both students and teachers, while also providing opportunities to promote academic learning. Proactive strategies are essential to navigating this evolving landscape. The insights we have discussed emphasise the importance of forward thinking and informed and ethical engagement with AI, equipping teachers and students as they navigate the shifting paradigms of contemporary tertiary education.

Lizzy Guest is a Senior Academic Staff Member at Toi Ohomai within the Faculty of Health, Education and Environment. Lizzy is a physiotherapist and works clinically in addition to her role at Toi Ohomai.

Elizabeth Youard is a Senior Academic Staff Member at Toi Ohomai within the Faculty of Health, Education and Environment. Elizabeth has a background in speech language therapy.

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8784-0579

Rachel Scrivin is a Senior Academic Staff Member at Toi Ohomai within the Faculty of Health, Education and Environment, mainly teaching the online Diploma in Sterilisation courses. Rachel is a New Zealand Registered Dietitian with over 30 years' work experience and has recently completed her PhD in exercise gastroenterology.

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4293-1834

Vikkie Harre is an Academic Staff Member at Toi Ohomai within the Faculty of Health, Education and Environment with 14 years' experience in teaching across many academic levels, from level 2 to level 8.

REFERENCES

Birks, D., & Clare, J. (2023). Linking artificial intelligence facilitated academic misconduct to existing prevention frameworks. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00142-3

Brookfield, S. (1998). Critically reflective practice. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions, 18*(4), 197–205. https://doi.org/10.1002/chp.1340180402

Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

Diwanji, P., Hinkelmann, K., & Witschel, H. F. (2018). Enhance classroom preparation for flipped classroom using AI and analytics. In S. Hammoudi, M. Smialek, O. Camp & J. Filipe (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems, Volume 1* (pp. 477–483). ICEIS. https://doi.org/10.5220/0006807604770483

Doru, B., Maier, C., Busse, J. S., Lücke, T., Schönhof, F. J., Enax-Krumova, E., Hessler, S., Berger, M., & Tokic, M. (2025) Detecting artificial intelligence-generated versus human-written medical student essays: Semirandomized controlled study. *JMIR Medical Education*, 11, Article e62779. https://doi.org/10.2196/62779

Education New Zealand Manapou ki te Ao. (2024) *International student experience survey report 2024* [Briefing]. https://www.enz.govt.nz/assets/PR-2425-040-International-Student-Experience-Survey-Report-2024-v2.pdf

Fatemi, G., & Saito, E. (2019). Unintentional plagiarism and academic integrity: The challenges and needs of postgraduate international students in Australia. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *44*(10), 1305–1319. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2019.1683521

Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, Article 100273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273

Kaur, K., & Trifan, V. A. (2024). Navigating the double-edged sword of ChatGPT: Enhanced learning vs. ethical issues. *Ovidius University Annals*, *Series Economic Sciences*, *24*(1). https://doi.org/10.61801/OUAESS.2024.1.31

López-Villanueva, D., Santiago, R., & Palau, R. (2024). Flipped learning and artificial intelligence. *Electronics*, *13*(17), Article 3424. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13173424

Miles, P. J., Campbell, M., & Ruxton, G. D. (2022). Why students cheat and how understanding this can help reduce the frequency of academic misconduct in higher education: A literature review. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education, 20*(2), A150–A160. https://doi.org/10.59390/LXMJ2920

Mukasa, J., Stokes, L., & Mukona, D. M. (2023). Academic dishonesty by students of bioethics at a tertiary institution in Australia: An exploratory study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00124-5

New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). (2025). The *New Zealand qualifications and credentials framework*. https://www2.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/Qualifications-standards/Understanding-NZQF/The-New-Zealand-Qualifications-and-Credentials-Framework.pdf

Paterson, K. (2022). Machine translation in higher education: Perceptions, policy and pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, *14*(2), Article e690. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.690

Striepe, M., Thomson, S., & Sefcik, L. (2023). Understanding academic integrity education: Case studies from two Australian universities. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *21*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09429-x

Toi-Ohomai Institute of Technology. (n.d.) *Student code of conduct*. https://www.toiohomai.ac.nz/sites/default/files/files/uploaded/TO_Student%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf