



Research Article

© 2024 Bodinaku et al.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 7 August 2024 / Accepted: 29 October 2024 / Published: 05 November 2024

Ethics in Conflict: Diverging Views on Unethical Behavior Among Students and Faculty in Albanian Higher Education

Blerta Bodinaku

Gerda Sula

Skerdi Zahaj

*¹Department of Psychology and Education,
Faculty of Social Sciences,
University of Tirana,
Tirana, Albania*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0196>

Abstract

This study investigates unethical behaviors among students and faculty within higher education institutions in Albania. It seeks to identify the most prevalent unethical actions and analyze the differing perceptions between students and faculty. A quantitative explanatory research design was utilized, with a stratified sample comprising 736 participants from public universities in Albania. Separate questionnaires were designed and administered to capture the perceptions of students and faculty, respectively. Findings reveal that while both groups perceive unethical behaviors as serious, they do not consider them frequent. Plagiarism, grade manipulation, student exploitation, unequal treatment, and classroom disruptions were identified as the most common unethical behaviors reported by both students and faculty. Across all cases, students reported a higher frequency and perceived severity of unethical behaviors, whether enacted by students or faculty, whereas faculty members demonstrated a greater sensitivity to the severity of these behaviors. The study concludes with key recommendations, including strengthening the legislative framework and mechanisms for preventing and addressing ethical violations, as well as enhancing ethical education and professional development opportunities for faculty.

Keywords: unethical behavior, student, lecturer, higher education, Albania

1. Introduction

The investigation of unethical practices within higher education has garnered substantial attention in recent years, reflecting the increasing understanding of the importance of academic integrity to the credibility and quality of educational systems. Research highlights that unethical conduct within academic settings can have an extensive impact, including reducing public trust in educational institutions (Fanelli, 2018), declining research quality, and reinforcing inequities within academic environments (Morris, 2018). An unethical institutional climate may also result in lower student enrollment, diminished funding opportunities, decreased educational quality (Rosinger et al., 2023),

and limited opportunities for marginalized groups (Al Bakri & Alshahrani, 2024; Lincoln & Stanley, 2021). Such behaviors adversely affect students' academic experiences, devaluing their accomplishments and undermining the legitimacy of their qualifications (Gallant, 2016; Stroebe, 2020). Additionally, this environment fosters a culture of dishonesty, which can compromise students' moral development and hinder their professional progress (Alleyne & Thompson 2019).

Unethical practices in higher education include data manipulation, fabrication, favoritism, discrimination, abuse of power, and conflicts of interest, all of which erode the foundational values of academic integrity, fairness, and accountability (Bretag et al., 2018; Taylor, 2024). Additional unethical behaviors encompass grade inflation, contract cheating, biased admissions, costly or unnecessary textbooks, limited academic advising, exploitation through excessive workloads, inadequate supervision, inappropriate relationships (Tesar et al., 2021) retaliation against whistleblowers, and insufficient protections for human research participants (Ahsan et al., 2022; Hilton et al., 2017; Sillat et al., 2021; Gallant & Rettinger, 2022). Not surprisingly, however, students and faculty often differ in their perceptions of the severity of each other's unethical behaviors (Rakhat et al., 2021).

Increasing competition in higher education along with cultural factors related to impunity are closely linked to increasing unethical behavior within academic institutions (Harrad, Keesley, & Jefferies, 2024). The pressure to succeed in a competitive academic landscape drives both, students and faculty to engage in unethical practices. Financial competition, budget constraints, and the commercialization of higher education further strain faculty, risking ethical standards, particularly in terms of resource allocation and educational quality. Research indicates that funding limitations can lead to practices such as grade inflation and the use of costly course materials, often prioritizing revenue over student growth (Ortagus et al., 2020; Spica & Biddix, 2021).

In regions like Eastern Europe, the expansion of private higher education institutions has intensified ethical concerns. For instance, Albania's shift to a market-oriented model has accelerated the growth of private institutions with limited regulatory oversight, leading to inequitable access and compromised standards (Zhllima et al., 2018; Barlett et al., 2016).

1.1 Unethical behavior in HE in Albania

In recent decades, Albania's higher education (HE) system has experienced significant transformation, moving from a state-controlled model to a market-oriented approach. This shift has introduced new challenges across various domains, including ethics (Tafaj & Shahini, 2020). The rapid expansion of HE institutions, the proliferation of private universities, and increased student enrollment have highlighted systemic weaknesses and ethical concerns within the sector (Lami, 2019).

One major factor contributing to an unethical climate in HEIs is the lack of a robust regulatory framework on ethics. Since the 1990s, the Albanian education system has undergone swift changes, including shifts in educational philosophy, increased access, and private sector growth (Tafaj & Shahini, 2020). While this growth has expanded higher education access, it has also led to disparities in educational quality and ethical standards, with the private sector often operating under minimal oversight (Barlett et al., 2016; Kodhel, 2020). Zhllima et al. (2018) note that many private HEIs prioritize profit, which may compromise academic integrity when financial goals overshadow educational standards. In both public and private institutions, the absence of clear ethics regulations has raised concerns over conflicts of interest, favoritism, and academic reliability (Tase & Xhaferri, 2019). These regulatory shortcomings are further amplified by the limited capacity of Albania's accreditation and evaluation agencies, which face challenges in maintaining consistent standards across the diverse HE sector (Barlett et al., 2016).

Academic dishonesty, especially in the form of plagiarism and cheating, is a significant ethical issue in Albanian HE. Weak institutional policies, limited oversight, and a high-pressure academic environment contribute to these problems (Tase & Xhaferri, 2019; Xhemollari, 2020), as well as

declining institutional autonomy (Lami, 2019). Barlett et al. (2016) emphasize the lack of a unified academic integrity framework, noting that both public and private HEIs in Albania struggle to enforce effective measures against dishonesty. The rapid expansion of HE has also outpaced job market needs, increasing competition and encouraging credential-focused misconduct (Lami, 2019; Qosja & Çabiri, 2023). The educational quality has similarly been affected, with concerns about grade inflation and superficial academic achievements, particularly in private institutions where financial considerations may influence grading standards (Tafaj & Shahini, 2020; Tase & Xhaferri, 2019).

The nature of faculty-student relationships in Albanian HE raises additional ethical concerns. The power imbalances in these relationships can render students vulnerable to exploitation or unfair treatment. The hierarchical structure of HEIs often leaves students without effective channels for reporting grievances, especially in cases of harassment or favoritism. This problem is further aggravated by the lack of policies that protect students from exploitation, with many fearing academic retaliation if they voice complaints (Çera, 2017; Xhemollari, 2018). In response, scholars and advocates have called for enforceable, standardized policies to address academic misconduct, as current mechanisms are widely regarded as inadequate (Xhemollari, 2020).

This paper aims to examine the most prevalent unethical behaviors in Albanian HEIs from both student and faculty perspectives, analyze differences in their perceptions of the frequency and severity of these behaviors, and offer recommendations to improve the ethical climate within these institutions.

2. Methods

This paper aims to examine: a) the most prevalent unethical behaviors in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Albania from the perspectives of both students and faculty; b) the divergences in perceptions between faculty and students concerning the frequency and severity of these behaviors; and c) to provide recommendations for enhancing the ethical climate within Albanian HEIs.

2.1 Population - Sampling and Participants

The study employed a sequential stratified random sampling procedure aiming at representing all students and faculty in public HEIs in Albania. This procedure minimized sample selection bias and avoided any segments of the student and faculty population being over or underrepresented. The sampling frame for this study was obtained from the Albanian Institute of Statistics (INSTAT) and from the statistical yearbook of education from the Ministry of Education, Sport and Youth.

With a county-wide total number of 3,153 faculty and 117,313 students, the sample size was calculated 343 faculty (CL 95%, CI 5%) and 383 students (CL 95%, CI 5%) (61.9% female and 35.5% male). For triangulation reasons, the number of faculty was decided to be 383 (58.4% female and 38.1% male).

2.2 Measures

A review of existing literature identified no previous instruments for measuring unethical behavior in the Albanian HE system. Therefore, a new measurement for unethical behavior was necessitated for the sake of this study. Unethical behavior examples were identified through a) a thorough literature review process; b) an examination of Codes of Ethics in HEIs in Albania; c) input from faculty and d) students, which was obtained through questionnaires and focus groups.

The process generated 1,114 items out of which 100 unique items of unethical behaviors were extracted after a thorough systematic examination.

Two different scales were developed: one for faculty and one for students' unethical behavior. A team of 27 judges conducted a thematic analysis to generate variables for each scale. Eleven (11)

dimensions of unethical behavior of faculty and 9 for students were identified. Dimensions of unethical behavior for faculty included disrespect toward students, unequal treatment, prejudice, privacy violation, abuse, biased assessment, lack of preparation, sexual abuse, and lack of collaboration. Dimensions of unethical behavior for students included prejudices, copying and plagiarism, defiant behaviors, substance use, manipulation of assessment, abuse, sexual abuse, damage to school equipment, and disruptive behaviors.

2.3 Data analysis

The data analysis was conducted with the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS, 22). First, the data were checked for normality distribution and homogeneity of variance. Descriptive statistics and inferential analyses (bivariate correlations, T-test and Anova) were performed.

3. Results

Table 1 shows the perceptions of faculty and students on the presence of unethical behaviors in HEIs. Results show that 23% of faculty and 17% of students report being affected in person by unethical behaviors and 43% of faculty and 56% of students report the existence of unethical behaviors in their HEI without being personally affected.

Both faculty and students report students engaging in unethical behaviors more frequently compared to faculty. Most faculty (60.9%) and students (43.9%) report that unethical behaviors in their HEI go unaddressed or addressed insufficiently.

Table 1. Contrasted perceptions of faculty and students on the presence of unethical behaviors in HEIs

Category	Variables	Faculty		Students	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Appearance of unethical behavior	There is no unethical behavior	57	14.5	38	9.6
	Unethical behaviors exist, but they have not affected me	168	42.6	219	55.6
	Unethical behaviors exist and they have affected me	89	22.6	68	17.3
	I do not know/No answer	66	16.8	60	15.2
Who violated ethics more often?	Faculty	37	9.4	83	21.1
	Students	233	59.1	141	35.8
	Psychosocial staff (psychologist, social worker)	25	6.3	68	17.3
	Supportive services staff (guardian, cleaner, etc.)	86	21.8	94	23.9
	I do not know/No answer				
Cases of unethical behaviors that have been treated	None	35	8.9	72	18.3
	Few	154	39.1	86	21.8
	Some	86	21.8	87	22.1
	Many	13	3.3	28	7.1
	I do not know/No answer	93	23.6	113	28.7
		57	14.5	38	9.6

Tables 2 and 3 show the contrasted reporting of faculty and students on the frequency and severity of unethical behaviors of students and faculty, respectively. For the sake of this paper, both tables present a summary of behaviors that exhibit the most significant contrasts, excluding other statements that were part of the comprehensive questionnaire. The data indicate that unethical behaviors in HEIs are not very frequent as reported by both, faculty and students, but when they occur they are perceived to be very severe.

Findings suggest that the most common unethical behaviors among students, as reported by both faculty and students (table 2), involve academic dishonesty—specifically cheating, sharing answers, and submitting copied work. When asked about the severity of these behaviors, students particularly display minimal differentiation between types of misconduct. However, faculty tend to

express a heightened sensitivity to the severity of students' behaviors.

Table 2. Contrasted reporting of students and faculty on unethical behaviors of students in HEIs

No	Affirmations	Faculty				Students			
		Frequency		Severity		Frequency		Severity	
		M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1	Students exert violence against other students	1.7	0.9	4.7	0.9	1.7	1.1	3.8	1.5
2	Students exert violence against service staff	1.4	0.7	4.6	1	1.5	1	3.6	1.6
3	Students insult other students in HEI	2.2	1	4.5	0.8	2.3	1.2	3.9	1.3
4	Students insult faculty	2	0.9	4.6	0.8	2.2	1.3	3.8	1.4
5	Students harass students with special needs	1.5	0.9	4.6	0.9	1.7	1.2	3.9	1.6
6	Students harass students based on gender	1.8	1	4.5	0.9	1.9	1.2	3.7	1.4
7	Students harass students based on origins (rural, ethnic)	1.9	0.9	4.5	0.8	2.1	1.3	3.8	1.4
8	Students harass students based on religion	1.7	0.9	4.5	0.9	2.6	2.6	3.7	1.5
9	Students harass students based on physical appearance	2	1	4.4	0.9	2.3	1.3	3.7	1.4
10	Students bias students with special needs	1.6	0.9	4.6	0.9	1.7	1.1	3.7	1.6
11	Students bias students based on gender	1.7	0.9	4.4	0.9	1.8	1.1	3.6	1.5
12	Students create groups based on socio-economic status	2	1	4.3	0.9	2.1	1.3	3.6	1.5
13	Students bias students based on origins (urban, rural, ethnic)	1.9	1	4.5	0.8	2.1	1.3	3.8	1.5
14	Students bias students based on religion	1.7	0.9	4.4	1	1.7	1.1	3.6	1.5
15	Students bias students based on physical appearance	2	0.9	4.4	0.9	2.3	1.3	3.7	1.4
16	Students bias students' with certain diseases presence in class	1.6	0.9	4.5	0.9	1.8	1.1	3.7	1.5
17	Students bias faculty based on different characteristics	2.2	1.1	4.4	0.9	2.3	1.3	3.6	1.4
18	Students cheat during exams	3.1	1.1	4.5	0.8	3.2	1.4	3.9	1.3
19	Students exchange responses with peers during exams	3	1.1	4.4	0.8	3.1	1.3	3.6	1.3
20	Students hand down the same work/project in several subjects	2.5	1.2	4.5	0.7	2.5	1.3	3.7	1.3
21	Students impose other students to do their homework	2.2	1.1	4.5	0.8	2.1	1.2	3.6	1.4
22	Students hand out work from previous years as their own	2.7	1.1	4.5	0.8	2.7	1.3	3.7	1.2
23	Students hand out work from internet as their own	3	1.2	4.4	0.8	2.9	1.4	3.7	1.2
24	Students allow to attend exam a different student	1.7	1	4.6	0.9	2.1	1.3	3.8	1.5
25	Students change/manipulate data of their work	1.9	1	4.6	0.8	2	1.2	3.7	1.5
26	Students bribe or offer gifts in exchange for better grades	2	1.1	4.7	0.8	2.5	1.3	4.1	1.3
27	Students manipulate faculty in exchange for better grades	1.9	0.9	4.7	0.8	2.4	1.3	4	1.3
28	Students insult faculty due to their grades	2	0.9	4.6	0.8	2.2	1.3	3.9	1.4
29	Students flirt with pedagogues	1.7	0.9	4.6	0.9	2	1.3	3.7	1.5
30	Students try to create romantic relationship with pedagogue	1.6	0.8	4.7	0.9	1.9	1.2	3.8	1.5
31	Students sexually harass other students	1.7	1	4.6	1	2.1	1.3	3.9	1.5
32	Students attempt to destruct class	2.2	0.9	4.4	0.9	2.2	1.2	3.9	1.3
33	Students do not respect class schedule	2.7	0.9	4.1	1	2.7	1.2	3.8	1.2
34	Students do not commit to class	2.9	1	4.2	0.9	2.8	1.2	3.6	1.2
35	Students abandon class	2.7	1	4.2	1	2.9	1.2	3.8	1.2
36	Students damage other students' property	1.8	0.9	4.4	1	1.8	1.1	3.7	1.5

Table 3. Contrasted reporting of students and faculty on unethical behaviors of faculty in HEIs

No	Affirmations	Faculty				Students			
		Frequency		Severity		Frequency		Severity	
		M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
1	Faculty uses punitive practices against students	2.3	1	3.4	1.3	2.2	1.2	3.1	1.4
2	Faculty humiliates the student at the front of the classroom	1.5	0.7	4.4	1.1	2	1.2	3.7	1.5
3	Faculty threatens students to decrease grades	1.8	0.9	4.2	1.1	2.3	1.3	3.7	1.4
4	Faculty uses physical abuse in the classroom	1.2	0.5	4.5	1.1	1.4	1	3.3	1.9
5	Faculty uses psychological abuse in the classroom	1.7	0.9	4.5	1	2	1.2	3.7	1.5
6	Faculty punishes students who make noise during class	2.3	0.9	3.4	1.3	2.4	1.2	3.1	1.4
7	Faculty supports harassment between students	1.3	0.6	4.4	1.1	1.6	1.1	3.4	1.7
8	Faculty punishes students for not fulfilling school obligations	2.4	1.1	3.4	1.4	2.4	1.4	3.1	1.5
9	Faculty punishes students at the front of the classroom	1.6	0.8	4	1.2	1.7	1.1	3.3	1.5

No	Affirmations	Faculty				Students			
		Frequency		Severity		Frequency		Severity	
		M	DS	M	DS	M	DS	M	DS
10	Faculty threatens students with class failure	1.7	0.9	4.3	1.1	2.3	1.3	3.8	1.5
11	Faculty not informing students about decisions taken on them	1.9	0.9	4	1.1	2.4	1.3	3.5	1.4
12	Faculty is silent on psychological abuse against students	1.5	0.7	4.4	1.1	1.9	1.3	3.6	1.6
13	Faculty yells at students during class	2.4	0.9	3.6	1.1	2.6	1.2	3.2	1.3
14	Faculty neglects students' requests in the classroom	1.9	0.9	4	1	2.4	1.3	3.5	1.3
15	Faculty insults students in the classroom (irony, sarcasm)	1.8	0.9	4.3	1.1	2.3	1.3	3.7	1.4
16	Faculty releases the accumulated anger to the students	1.7	0.9	4.4	1	2.2	1.3	3.7	1.4
17	Faculty avoids communication with special students	1.8	0.9	4	1.1	2	1.2	3.4	1.4
18	Faculty violates students' dignity	1.5	0.7	4.5	1	2.1	1.3	3.7	1.5
19	Faculty changes class schedule based on personal needs	2.2	1	3.6	1.3	2.5	1.4	3.3	1.4
20	Faculty forces students to buy not approved books	1.8	1	4.2	1	2.4	1.4	3.7	1.4
21	Faculty asks from students payments beyond decisions taken from the school board on administrative payments	1.7	0.9	4.4	1.1	2	1.3	3.5	1.6
22	Faculty uses students' work as personal work	1.6	0.9	4.3	1.1	2	1.3	3.3	1.6
23	Faculty uses students for personal engagements	1.8	1	4.3	1.1	2.3	1.3	3.7	1.5
24	Faculty treats students unequally	2	1	4.3	1	2.8	1.4	3.9	1.3
25	Faculty favours students based on personal recognitions	1.5	0.8	4.7	0.8	2	1.3	3.6	1.6
26	Faculty prejudice students based on origin (rural, ethnic)	1.3	0.7	4.5	1	1.5	1	3.5	1.7
27	Faculty has romantic relationship with student	1.4	0.8	4.6	1	1.8	1.1	3.7	1.6
28	Faculty sexually harasses student	1.3	0.7	4.7	1	1.7	1.2	3.9	1.6
29	Pedagogue encourages/forces students to attend political party activities	1.6	0.9	4.4	1	1.9	1.2	3.5	1.5
30	Pedagogue consumes alcohol before and/or during class	1.4	0.7	4.4	1.1	1.7	1.1	3.5	1.7
31	Pedagogue smokes during teaching process	2.2	1	3.8	1.2	2.7	1.3	3.3	1.3
32	Pedagogue uses mobile phone during class	1.2	0.6	4.3	1.1	1.5	1	3.2	1.7
33	Pedagogue consumes food during class	1.7	0.9	4.2	1	2	1.2	3.5	1.5
34	Pedagogue prevents students to discuss their grades	1.6	0.8	4.3	1	1.7	1.1	3.3	1.6
35	Pedagogue dresses in inappropriate way	1.8	0.9	4.3	1	2.2	1.1	3.7	1.4

The most frequent behaviors of faculty, as reported by students and faculty themselves (Table 3), involve faculty shouting at students, treating students unequally, and enforcing punitive actions for unmet obligations. In terms of severity, faculty favoritism based on personal connections, forcing students to attend political activities, consuming alcohol before or during classes, and sexual harassment are viewed as the most severe unethical behaviors. However, all these behaviors are reported as not frequent in HEIs. Again, faculty displays higher sensitivity when assessing the severity of their own unethical behaviors.

Compared to faculty, students report a higher frequency across all categories of unethical behavior occurring within higher education institutions. Conversely, when assessing the perceived severity of these behaviors, faculty members rate the severity as higher in all cases of unethical conduct, indicating an increased awareness on the detrimental effects of unethical behaviors of faculty and students. The data further reveal that the most substantial differences between students and faculty regarding perceived severity are found in cases involving ethical violations committed by students.

When correlational analyses were conducted, the findings indicated strong positive relationships between various forms of unethical behavior in higher education. For faculty-reported behaviors, there is a strong correlation between violence against students and lack of respect ($r = .804, p < .05$), as well as between lack of respect and both abuse ($r = .774, p < .05$) and inequality in treatment ($r = .765, p < .05$). Violations of student privacy strongly correlate with prejudice ($r = .813, p < .05$), suggesting that higher prejudice is associated with greater privacy violations. Similar patterns emerge in student-reported data, with strong correlations between violence and lack of respect ($r =$

.720, $p < .05$). Additionally, lack of respect is linked to exploitation and inequality in treatment by faculty ($r = .747$, $p < .05$ and $r = .755$, $p < .05$, respectively).

4. Discussions

The findings indicate that unethical behavior in higher education institutions (HEIs) in Albania is not perceived as frequent either by students or faculty. However, when identified, they are perceived as severe. Unethical behaviors are primarily informally recognized. Faculty members report being personally affected by unethical behavior at a higher rate (23%) than students (17%), yet both groups report that students engage in unethical actions more frequently than faculty.

Notable differences exist between faculty and student perceptions of both the frequency and severity of unethical behaviors. Students consistently report a higher occurrence of unethical conduct, regardless of whether the behavior is attributed to faculty or students. In contrast, faculty consistently perceive the severity of unethical actions as higher. This pattern may suggest that students, facing greater exposure to ethical violations, have developed a more desensitized outlook, whereas faculty, being less frequently exposed, may be more reluctant to report such issues and are more attuned to ethical standards. It may also suggest an increased awareness of faculty on unethical behaviors and the detrimental effects they have on students and education in general.

Interestingly, while both groups agree that students violate ethics more often, each group perceives its own members as less frequently engaged in unethical conduct than perceived by the other group. Consequently, students report higher levels of unethical behavior among faculty than faculty report among themselves, and vice versa.

4.1 Unethical behaviors of faculty

The most frequently reported unethical behaviors by faculty, as cited by both faculty and students, include punishing students for unmet academic obligations or classroom disruptions. Students report that such punitive actions may involve expelling students from class, humiliating them publicly, or threatening grade manipulation.

Additional common unethical practices among faculty, highlighted in this study, include chronic tardiness, missing classes, failure to adhere to the class schedule, using mobile phones during class, disregarding the syllabus, exploiting textbook requirements, claiming credit for others' work, and withholding information about student assessments. These findings are in line with prior research (Mato et al., 2014; Kächelein et al., 2013).

A further prevalent issue is faculty ignoring unethical actions by colleagues, which may be attributed to a lack of support structures, diminished social and professional accountability, and an absence of organizational culture. Vertical reporting is the predominant approach, reflecting a lack of confidence in peer-level reporting structures.

4.2 Unethical behaviors of students

Students' most frequent ethical violations include cheating during exams, such as sharing answers with peers and using mobile phones. Research consistently identifies plagiarism and cheating as common ethical breaches among students in Albanian HEIs (Lamallari et al., 2016). Key factors that contribute to academic dishonesty include inadequate understanding of plagiarism, lack of accountability, poor time management, distrust in fair academic assessment, and social norms that condone dishonest practices (Park, 2003).

Other prevalent unethical behaviors among students involve displaying prejudice against faculty based on personal characteristics, insulting faculty, harassing peers on religious grounds, using inappropriate language, and dressing inappropriately within institutional premises.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Ethical and unethical behaviors are not isolated incidents; rather, they exist within a broader context of underlying attitudes, values, and institutional climate. Despite differences in how students and faculty perceive the frequency and severity of these behaviors, their mutual attitudes and values influence each other, shaping the overall ethical climate in higher education institutions (HEIs).

Improvement of ethical education in higher education system in Albania requires a) improved legal framework and relevant mechanisms for the prevention and treatment of cases of ethics violation; b) increased attention in regard to professional development at work for faculty; c) improved legal framework and the mechanisms for the publication and the use of academic texts; d) improved university curricula and research programs focused on understanding ethical behavior, ethical practice, and ethical research.

5.1 Limitations

The research was based on self-reporting of perceptions, therefore the data may be affected by over- or under-reporting.

References

- Ahsan, K., Akbar, S., & Kam, B. (2022). Contract cheating in higher education: a systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(4), 523-539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1931660>
- Al Bakri, S. T., & F. Alshahrani, B. (2024). Exploring the Perspectives of Students with Disabilities on the Reasonable Accommodations Provided in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 14(6), 286. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0172>
- Alleyne, P., & Thompson, R. (2019). Examining Academic Dishonesty. *Prevention and Detection of Academic Misconduct in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-7531-3.CH008>.
- Barlett, W., Uvalić, M., Durazzi, N., Monastiriotis, V. & Sene, T. (2016). From university to employment: Higher education provision and labour market needs in the Western Balkans synthesis report. European Commission. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/business/consulting/reports/from-university-to-employment>
- Bretag, T., Harper, R., Burton, M., Ellis, C., Newton, P., Rozenberg, P., ... van Haeringen, K. (2018). Contract cheating: a survey of Australian university students. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(11), 1837-1856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1462788>
- Çera, E. (2017). Fight against corruption in the system of Higher Education in Albania: The case of the University of Tirana. [Lufta kunder korrupsionit ne sistemin e Arsimit te Larte in Albania: Rasti i Universitetit tw Tiranes]. Tirane: US Embassy Youth Council. <https://doi.org/10.1515/bjreecm-2017-0013>
- Fanelli, D. (2018). Opinion: Is science really facing a reproducibility crisis, and do we need it to? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2628-2631. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708272114>
- Gallant, T. B. (2016). Academic integrity in online education: A call for proactive leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9(4), 30-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1308173>
- Gallant, T.B. & Rettinger, D. (2022). An introduction to 30 years of research on academic integrity. *Journal of College and Character*, 23(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2021.2017975>
- Harrad, R., Keasley, R., & Jefferies, L. (2024). Academic integrity or academic misconduct? Conceptual difficulties in higher education and the potential contribution of student demographic factors. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(7), 1556-1570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2339833>
- Hilton, J., Fischer, L., Wiley, D., & Williams, L. (2017). Maintaining momentum toward graduation: OER and the course throughput rate. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(4), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.19173/IRRODL.V17I6.2686>
- Kächelein, H., Jasini, A. & Zhllima, E. (2013). Abusive behaviors in universities: a qualitative assessment for the case of Albania. *Proceedings of social political and economic change in the Western Balkans Conference, Belgrade: Regional Research Promotion Program*.
- Kodhel, E. (2020). Albanian Higher Education Quality Assurance Reforms and Policy Convergence Within the European Higher Education Area (2014-2019). *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, 20(1), 89-108.

- Lamallari, B., Madhi, G., & Shpuza, M. (2016). Academic (dis)honesty in Albania: concerns on plagiarism. *Regional Research Promotion Program*
- Lami, A. (2019). The Challenges And Priorities Of Higher Education In Albania. In E. Soare, & C. Langa (Eds.), *Education Facing Contemporary World Issues*, vol 67. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 681-686). Future Academy. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.08.03.81>
- Morris, E. J. (2018). Academic integrity matters: five considerations for addressing contract cheating. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 14(15), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0038-5>
- Ortagus, J., Kelchen, R., Rosinger, K., & Voorhees, N. (2020). Performance-Based Funding in American Higher Education: A Systematic Synthesis of the Intended and Unintended Consequences. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 42, 520 - 550. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373720953128>.
- Qosja, E., & Çabiri, K. (2023). Challenges of University-Industry cooperation in Albania. *International Journal of Management, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.53615/2232-5697.12.s13-27>.
- Rakhat, Y., Aigerim, B., Tolqyn, I., Aigerim, M., Binazar, B., Matayev, B., & Khalikova, G. (2022). Ethical Perceptions of Engineering Faculty Students. *Int. J. Eng. Pedagog.*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v12i2.29335>.
- Rosinger, K., Ortagus, J., Kelchen, R., & Choi, J. (2023). The Impact of Performance Funding Policy Design on College Access and Selectivity. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 45, 655 - 681. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221147905>.
- Sillat, L.H., Tammets, K., Laanpere, M. (2021). Digital competence assessment methods in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Education Science*, 11(8), 402. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080402>
- Spica, E., Biddix, J. (2021). Prices They Pay: Academic Achievement and Progress to Graduation Barriers Experienced by Community College Students Due to the Cost of Course Materials. *Innovative Higher Education* 46, 643-662. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09557-7>
- Stroebe, W. (2020). Student evaluations of teaching encourages poor teaching and contributes to grade inflation: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 42(4), 276-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2020.1756817>
- Tafaj, M., Shahini, A. (2020). Higher Education Systems and Institutions, Albania. In: Teixeira, P.N., Shin, J.C. (eds) *The International Encyclopedia of Higher Education Systems and Institutions*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-8905-9_422
- Tase, M., & Xhaferri, M. (2019). The Development of Higher Education in Albania, Problems and Challenges. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Social Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.22158/jetss.v11n1p21>.
- Tesar, M., Peters, M., & Jackson, L. (2021). The ethical academy? The university as an ethical system. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(5), 419-425, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2021.1884977>
- Taylor, J. S. (2024). Reassessing Academic Plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 22, 211-230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09478-4>
- Xhemollari, R. (2018). Tirane: Qendresa Qytetare & Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Xhemollari, R. (2020). Transparency and financial management in public universities. Tirane: Qendresa Qytetare & Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Zhllima, E., Imami, D., Rama, K., & Shahini, A. (2018). Corruption in Education during Socialism and the Postsocialist Transition. *Slavica Publishers*, 7(2), 51-57.