Comparative Analysis of Student and Teacher Perceptions of Learning Environments, Academic Integrity, and Student Satisfaction in Public and Private Colleges

Muhammad Tasawar Nadeem
Tasawarbaloch415@gmail.com
M. Phil. Scholar, Institute of Education,University of Sargodha, Pakistan

Dr. Ghulam Muhammad Malik
ghulam.muhammad@uos.edu.pk
Lecturer, Institute of Education,University of Sargodha, Pakistan

Dr. Muhammad Nadeem Anwar
nadeem.anwar@uos.edu.pk
Associate Professor, Institute of Education,University of Sargodha, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: * Muhammad Tasawar Nadeem Tasawarbaloch415@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the perceptions of college students and teachers regarding the learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction in public and private colleges of Sargodha, Pakistan. The objectives of the study were: 1) To assess the perceptions of college students and teachers regarding the quality of the learning environment in public and private colleges. 2) To evaluate the levels of academic integrity as perceived by students and teachers in both public and private colleges. 3) To examine the degree of student satisfaction with academic, administrative, and social-emotional aspects of college life. The target population of this study was students and teachers from all public and private colleges in Punjab Province, Pakistan. The study sample consisted of 440 participants, including 220 students and 220 teachers from colleges in the city of Sargodha. Results indicated that private colleges generally offered superior physical facilities, psychological safety, and contemporary teaching methods, which correlate with higher student satisfaction and stronger adherence to academic integrity. In contrast, public colleges, while more affordable, often contend with resource limitations and administrative challenges that adversely affect students' academic experiences. The findings underscore the influence of institutional type on educational quality and suggest targeted interventions to enhance equity and support across college sectors.

Keywords: Learning Environment, Academic Integrity, Student Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

The learning environment is vital in the ways it augments the student experiences in schools, not only in the cognitive building process, but also in defining their levels of emotional well-being and learning motivation. An effective and conducive learning environment incorporates a well-planned physical environment, the learning process, climate in the education room, the relationship between faculty and students, and the organizational culture (Fraser, 2012). All these factors help achieve student engagement, performance, and increase student satisfaction with education. A good learning environment contributes to academic achievement because it helps a student to feel safe, belong, and be intellectually challenged. It promotes engagement, cooperation, and free dialogue between learners and educators (Baker et al., 2021). On the contrary, low-quality infrastructure, non-supportive teachers, and authoritative teaching methods tend to prompt the lack of interest, absenteeism, and academic underperformance (Khan & Ahmed, 2020).

Besides, academic integrity-enhancing environments also help in positive student development due to fewer incidences of cheating, plagiarism, and other uninvited behaviors. Having informed policies and establishing the culture of integrity through teaching and assessment processes, when students feel safe with the ascertainment of justice of the academic system, they tend to adopt ethical conduct (Bertram Gallant, 2017). This feeling of justice and faith encourages the healthiness of the students psychologically and increases their desire to achieve success by rightful means. Student satisfaction is a very important measure of the quality of education and effectiveness of institutions. It is the organizational aspect of academia based on how students think and feel about their study life, such as teaching quality and administration policy, campus support and facilities, the learning environment, and general academic and social life (Elliott & Shin, 2002). Academic performance, retention, and institutional reputation are strongly connected to high levels of student satisfaction.

Satisfaction among students is also one of the developmental factors that lead to the psychological well-being of students, sense of belonging, and academic motivation (Tinto, 2017). Support, respect, and involvement of the students lead to their eagerness to take part in the learning process and increased involvement in educational goals. Student engagement and loyalty can also be higher, and more institutions that give attention to student satisfaction will have more alumni networks and more positive word-of-mouth, which are crucial in recruiting potential students (Douglas et al., 2008). In addition, student reports obtained in satisfaction surveys help get insight into the strengths of the institutions and areas that require improvement. This ongoing feedback cycle assists educational establishments to maximize teaching, service delivery as well and services offered to students.

Majority of the studies consider only one of the learning environment, academic integrity, or student satisfaction at a time without considering how the factors influence each other. There are very limited studies, which consider these constructs directly in the medium-sized cities of Pakistan like Sargodha. There is limited comparative analysis of ethical practices, level of satisfaction, and environmental quality of public and private institutions. The tools are often not standardized, the questionnaires are self-written, and their reliability is not analyzed, and small sample groups restrict the ability to generalize. However, many studies have been carried out in other bigger towns such as Lahore, Islamabad, and Karachi, but the Sargodha area lacks research, especially on the public and private colleges. Demographics of the students, the approaches to the administration in such cities, and the state of education could largely be different than those in metropolitan cities and deserve separate research.

Most of the available research focuses on single or just two constructs such as school satisfaction or dishonesty. The constructs, however, are interdependent. Sick atmosphere of learning can decrease satisfaction among students and promote moral decreasing academic integrity. On the other hand, a sound organization of the academic world and integrity mechanisms can boost student morale and performance. This research does so; thus, it is more holistic. In Pakistani research, there are large structural and cultural variations between public and private colleges, which are usually treated alike. In this paper, a clear comparison is made between the two sectors detailing the disparities in terms of resource affordability, administrative policies, student welfare measures, and their overall contribution in academic experience. It is based on the identified gaps that the study aims to address. Offer real data in Sargodha, which is a middle-ranking education center. Systematically compare college environments in public colleges and private colleges.

Problem Statement

Student satisfaction in higher education is influenced by multiple academic and institutional factors, among which the learning environment and academic integrity are particularly significant. In Sargodha, where both

public and private colleges operate, limited empirical research has simultaneously examined these variables and their combined influence on student satisfaction. Existing studies often focus on individual factors or overlook institutional differences and regional contexts. This lack of integrated and context-specific research highlights the need to investigate the relationships among the learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction in public and private colleges of Sargodha.

Objectives of The Study

The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To assess the perceptions of college students and teachers regarding the quality of the learning environment in public and private colleges.

2. To evaluate the levels of academic integrity as perceived by students and teachers in both public and private colleges.

3. To examine the degree of student satisfaction with academic, administrative, and social-emotional aspects of college life.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learning environment can be described as a physical, psychological, and academic setting of learning. It entails factors like infrastructure in the classrooms, teacher conduct, communication between the students and teachers, access to learning materials, and institutional environment (Fraser, 2012). Good learning environment encourages learning activities, academic acceptance, and personal elevation among learners (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). It not only includes material provisions such as facilities and technology, but it also includes intangible ones such as emotional support, fairness, inclusiveness, and respect.

Academic integrity manifests as the code of conduct and moral ethics in academic practice. It includes being truthful, accountable, and fair when conducting research and evaluation activities (Bretag, 2016). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and other dishonest practices decrease the integrity of institutions, learning, and the importance of studying. Researchers have stressed the role played by making it part of the institutional policies, educating the students, and ensuring a common approach (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001). The issue of academic integrity is no longer considered as one only related to the student but rather is seen as an indicator of the quality of an institution and its leadership.

Student satisfaction is a mental process that is a reaction of users to his/her experiences in education. It also includes contentment with academic staff, curriculum, support features, physical plant, as well as institutional ambience (Elliott & Healy, 2001). It is not only a consequence, but also a precursor of student engagement, retention, and success. The term student satisfaction is utilized as a measure of institutional effectiveness, and it is critical in the retention and attraction of students, especially in education markets in which there is a high level of competitiveness (Douglas et al., 2006).

The learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction are traditionally linked to each other, and this interrelatedness is becoming the subject of attention of a growing number of studies. The quality of the learning environment on the aspect of students' perception of fairness and integrity has a great impact in terms of the overall satisfaction of the students with their educational experience (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong, 2008). To illustrate, an environment that is caring and welcoming students into the learning

process can raise the chances of avoiding academic dishonesty and promote student confidence with respect to practices in the institution (Bretag et al., 2014).

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Methodology is the planned, theoretical consideration of procedures applicable to a topic of study. This section provides a brief explanation of the study's design, population, sample selection process, and sample size, instrument creation and validity, data collection, manner of data collection, and data analysis. The above-mentioned factors illustrate the structure and feature are critical to the reliability and validity of the study findings.

Research Design

The data were collected using a quantitative research approach and a descriptive research design. This design was selected because it allows us to gather a large volume of data on social topics that can be analyzed for frequencies and averages (Gerdes Jr & Uysal, M., 2015).

Population and Sampling

The target population of this study was students and teachers from all public and private colleges of Punjab Province, Pakistan. However, the accessible population comprised students and teachers from all public and private colleges in the Sargodha Division.

The sample of the study consisted of 440 students and teachers, of which 220 students and 220 teachers at colleges in the city of Sargodha took part. To have a satisfactory proportion of each Student and teacher in each institution, convenience sampling turned out to be the most effective strategy. This brings in the aspect of balance of representation, as the research involves two big populations, those of the private and the public institutions, and a huge number of institutions in each camp. The teachers were selected through governmental institutions and the private schools in Sargodha so as to capture the whole picture in the study. The table also includes the list of samples. The next stages were made to choose the representative sample

Instrumentation

The Likert-type scale instrument was used for data collection. The questionnaire consists of some self-constructed questions and some questions I have modified according to my topic. To create our tools, the researcher will consult resources found in books, websites, and articles. The researcher will take elements from published, topic-relevant publications and modify them to meet our needs. When necessary, new items will also be created, guided by the current literature. The researcher will develop fresh concepts from literature, adapt, and use the available content to design the tool. I have modified according to my topic.

Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of the Questionnaire were ensured by following proper procedures. Expert opinions were required from seven faculty members regarding the research tool. The researcher made necessary modifications to the tool based on subject matter experts' opinions. Before completing the investigation, the researcher conducted a pilot test of the research instrument. 50 students and 50 college teachers received the questionnaires for the aim. To assess the study tool's dependability, the gathered data was loaded into the SPSS data sheet. A research Instrument's consistency is referred to as its reliability

(Klassen, 2012; Mohajan, 2017). The dependability of the research tool was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

An essential but difficult part of the research project is gathering data. Teachers and students were surveyed to collect data for this study. Data was collected through an online Google Form, ensuring easy access for the respondents. Questionnaires containing data of 200 students and 200 teachers were finally brought to analysis while 20 questionnaires from each sample were rejected due to having incomplete information. A statistical program called SPSS was used to evaluate the data from the questionnaires. To summarize the data, descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, average (mean), and standard deviation were performed, and used to analyze the data.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The results and the findings of the study were as follows:

Demographic

The demographic profile of the respondents indicates a balanced representation by institute type, with equal participation from public and private colleges (50.0% each) among the 200 respondents. In terms of gender, male teachers constituted the larger proportion of the sample (68.0%, n = 112), while female teachers accounted for 44.0% (n = 88). Regarding residence, a greater number of respondents were from rural areas, with 108 teachers (69.3%) residing in the countryside compared to 92 teachers (30.7%) from urban regions. Concerning designation, Senior Lecturers formed most of the sample (70.0%), followed by Head Lecturers (22.5%) and Principals (7.5%), indicating that teaching faculty represented the dominant group, while principals were fewer due to their limited presence across institutions. With respect to service experience, most respondents were at the early stage of their careers, as 107 teachers (53.5%) had 1–5 years of experience, followed by 79 teachers (39.5%) with 6–10 years of experience, whereas only a small proportion had 11–15 years (2.0%) or more than 16 years (5.0%) of experience, suggesting minimal representation of late-career teachers in the sample.

Frequency Analysis of Learning Environment (LE)

The following is the frequency Analysis of Learning Environment, Academic Integrity, Student Satisfaction

Table 1: Frequency Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Responses to Learning Environment

Sr#	Statements	Respondents	Disagreement Zone		Total Disagreement	N	Agreement Zone		Total Agreement	Result
			SDA	DA			A	SA		
Physical Environment										
1	Classrooms are well equipped with modern teaching tools (e.g.,	Teacher	16 (8.0%)	46 (23.0%)	62 (31.0%)	62 (31.0%)	34 (17.0%)	42 (21.0%)	76 (38.0%)	Agreement
		Student	15 (7.5%)	20 (10.0%)	35 (17.5%)	35 (17.5%)	70 (35.0%)	60 (30.0%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement

	Statement	Respondent								Result
	projectors, whiteboards).									
2	The library provides sufficient academic resources (books, journals, e-resources, etc.)	Teacher	8 (4.0%)	51 (25.5%)	59 (29.5%)	59 (29.5%)	48 (24.0%)	34 (17.0%)	82 (41.0%)	Agreement
		Student	18 (9.0%)	30 (15.0%)	48 (24.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	47 (23.5%)	132 (66.0%)	Agreement
3	The physical environment (lighting, seating, ventilation) supports effective learning.	Teacher	15 (7.5%)	84 (42.0%)	99 (49.5%)	53 (26.5%)	30 (15.0%)	18 (9.0%)	48 (24.0%)	Agreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	40 (20.0%)	60 (30.0%)	30 (15.0%)	65 (32.5%)	45 (22.5%)	110 (55.0%)	Agreement
4	Co-curricular activities (sports, clubs) are sufficiently promoted.	Teacher	15 (7.5%)	41 (20.5%)	56 (28.0%)	56 (28.0%)	48 (24.0%)	40 (20.0%)	88 (44.0%)	Agreement
		Student	18 (9.0%)	30 (15.0%)	48 (24.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	47 (23.5%)	132 (66.0%)	Agreement
Academic Resources & Support										
1	Teachers are approachable and available for academic guidance.	Teacher	24 (12.0%)	20 (10.0%)	44 (22.0%)	44 (22.0%)	75 (37.5%)	37 (18.5%)	112 (56.0%)	Agreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	25 (12.5%)	45 (22.5%)	20 (10.0%)	80 (40.0%)	55 (27.5%)	135 (67.5%)	Agreement
2	Peer collaboration is encouraged during classes and group projects.	Teacher	17 (8.5%)	75 (37.5%)	92 (46.0%)	44 (22.0%)	64 (32.0%)	31 (15.5%)	95 (47.5%)	Agreement
		Student	18 (9.0%)	32 (16.0%)	50 (25.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement
3	The college provides access to digital learning platforms (LMS, e-libraries).	Teacher	13 (6.5%)	59 (29.5%)	72 (36.0%)	53 (26.5%)	75 (37.5%)	36 (18.0%)	111 (55.5%)	Agreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	30 (15.0%)	50 (25.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement
4	The institution provides timely updates on academic schedules and deadlines.	Teacher	18 (9.0%)	75 (37.5%)	93 (46.5%)	44 (22.0%)	63 (31.5%)	29 (14.5%)	92 (46.0%)	Agreement
		Student	18 (9.0%)	28 (14.0%)	46 (23.0%)	25 (12.5%)	90 (45.0%)	39 (19.5%)	129 (64.5%)	Agreement
Learning Culture & Engagement										
1	The college offers career counseling and academic support services.	Teacher	16 (8.0%)	46 (23.0%)	62 (31.0%)	62 (31.0%)	54 (27.0%)	22 (11.0%)	76 (38.0%)	Agreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	30 (15.0%)	50 (25.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement
2	There is emphasis on critical thinking and problem solving.	Teacher	8 (4.0%)	51 (25.5%)	59 (29.5%)	60 (30.0%)	54 (27.0%)	27 (13.5%)	81 (40.5%)	Agreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	30 (15.0%)	50 (25.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement
3	The institution promotes a collaborative learning environment.	Teacher	15 (7.5%)	84 (42.0%)	99 (49.5%)	68 (34.0%)	24 (12.0%)	9 (4.5%)	33 (16.5%)	Disagreement
		Student	20 (10.0%)	30 (15.0%)	50 (25.0%)	20 (10.0%)	85 (42.5%)	45 (22.5%)	130 (65.0%)	Agreement

| 4 | Students are encouraged to engage in discussions and debates. | Teacher | 15 (7.5%) | 41 (20.5%) | 56 (28.0%) | 59 (29.5%) | 58 (29.0%) | 27 (13.5%) | 85 (42.5%) | Agreement |
| | | Student | 15 (7.5%) | 20 (10.0%) | 35 (17.5%) | 20 (10.0%) | 90 (45.0%) | 55 (27.5%) | 145 (72.5%) | Agreement |

Table 1 shows a general similarity between the teaching staff and the students in terms of learning environment perception, whereby students are more conciliatory across all statements. About classroom facilities, only 38.0 percent of teachers agreed that they are well equipped with modern tools, as compared to 65.0 of students. On the adequacy of libraries, 66.0 percent of students and 41.0 percent of teachers talked on the same side. Concerning the physical learning environment (lighting, seating, ventilation), 55.0 percent of the students gave agreement as compared to 24.0 percent of teachers, which shows a critical perception of teachers. Students and teachers supported co-curricular activities in the proportion of 66.0 percent and 44.0 percent, respectively. Classes of students and teachers were teachable, as 67.5 percent and 56.0 percent were willing to talk to teachers, respectively, when in need of guidance. There was a 65.0 percent agreement between the students in peer collaboration compared to the 47.5 percent among the teachers. 65.0 percent among the students and 55.5 percent among the teachers confirmed availability of digital access. Sixty-four-point five percent of the students and forty-six percent of the teachers had agreed to academic schedule updates. The students (65.0%) and the teachers (38.0% to 40.5%) positively evaluated career counseling and critical thinking. There was a significant difference between teachers and students in the perception of collaborative learning, with the former having only 16.5 percent of agreement, besides 65.0 percent among the latter.

Frequency Analysis of Academic Integrity (AI)

The following is the f Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Responses to Academic Integrity:

Table 2: Frequency Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Responses to Academic Integrity

Sr#	Statements	Respondents	Disagreement Zone		Total Disagreement	N	Agreement Zone		Total Agreement	Result
			SDA	DA			A	SA		
Policies & Enforcement										
1	The college has clear policies against plagiarism and cheating.	Teacher	10 (5%)	20 (10%)	30 (15%)	25 (12.5%)	90 (45%)	55 (27.5%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
		Student	8 (4%)	25 (12.5%)	33 (16.5%)	30 (15%)	95 (47.5%)	42 (21%)	137 (68.5%)	Agreement
2	Students are regularly educated about academic honesty (e.g., workshops).	Teacher	12 (6%)	24 (12%)	36 (18%)	20 (10%)	80 (40%)	64 (32%)	144 (72%)	Agreement
		Student	10 (5%)	22 (11%)	32 (16%)	35 (17.5%)	88 (44%)	45 (22.5%)	133 (66.5%)	Agreement
3	Teachers enforce consequences for academic dishonesty.	Teacher	15 (7.5%)	18 (9%)	33 (16.5%)	22 (11%)	85 (42.5%)	60 (30%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
		Student	14 (7%)	26 (13%)	40 (20%)	25 (12.5%)	78 (39%)	57 (28.5%)	135 (67.5%)	Agreement

4	Exams and assignments minimize cheating opportunities.	Teacher	8 (4%)	14 (7%)	22 (11%)	28 (14%)	90 (45%)	60 (30%)	150 (75%)	Agreement
		Student	12 (6%)	18 (9%)	30 (15%)	30 (15%)	85 (42.5%)	55 (27.5%)	140 (70%)	Agreement
Awareness & Tools										
5	Use of unauthorized materials during exams is uncommon.	Teacher	9 (4.5%)	17 (8.5%)	26 (13%)	24 (12%)	95 (47.5%)	55 (27.5%)	150 (75%)	Agreement
		Student	11 (5.5%)	20 (10%)	31 (15.5%)	29 (14.5%)	88 (44%)	52 (26%)	140 (70%)	Agreement
6	Plagiarism software is used effectively.	Teacher	13 (6.5%)	22 (11%)	35 (17.5%)	26 (13%)	80 (40%)	59 (29.5%)	139 (69.5%)	Agreement
		Student	15 (7.5%)	24 (12%)	39 (19.5%)	28 (14%)	90 (45%)	43 (21.5%)	133 (66.5%)	Agreement
7	Group work is checked for fair individual input.	Teacher	11 (5.5%)	18 (9%)	29 (14.5%)	27 (13.5%)	85 (42.5%)	59 (29.5%)	144 (72%)	Agreement
		Student	13 (6.5%)	20 (10%)	33 (16.5%)	26 (13%)	92 (46%)	49 (24.5%)	141 (70.5%)	Agreement
8	Students know the correct reference style.	Teacher	9 (4.5%)	20 (10%)	29 (14.5%)	23 (11.5%)	88 (44%)	60 (30%)	148 (74%)	Agreement
		Student	10 (5%)	18 (9%)	28 (14%)	25 (12.5%)	93 (46.5%)	54 (27%)	147 (73.5%)	Agreement
Transparency & Culture										
9	Misconduct cases are handled transparently.	Teacher	14 (7%)	19 (9.5%)	33 (16.5%)	24 (12%)	86 (43%)	57 (28.5%)	143 (71.5%)	Agreement
		Student	12 (6%)	21 (10.5%)	33 (16.5%)	28 (14%)	85 (42.5%)	54 (27%)	139 (69.5%)	Agreement
10	Trust and fairness exist in academic evaluations.	Teacher	10 (5%)	16 (8%)	26 (13%)	22 (11%)	92 (46%)	60 (30%)	152 (76%)	Agreement
		Student	11 (5.5%)	15 (7.5%)	26 (13%)	29 (14.5%)	95 (47.5%)	50 (25%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
11	The institution is known for academic integrity.	Teacher	13 (6.5%)	20 (10%)	33 (16.5%)	25 (12.5%)	90 (45%)	52 (26%)	142 (71%)	Agreement
		Student	15 (7.5%)	18 (9%)	33 (16.5%)	22 (11%)	88 (44%)	57 (28.5%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
12	Students are satisfied with honesty practices.	Teacher	11 (5.5%)	17 (8.5%)	28 (14%)	27 (13.5%)	89 (44.5%)	56 (28%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
		Student	10 (5%)	19 (9.5%)	29 (14.5%)	26 (13%)	91 (45.5%)	54 (27%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement

As is revealed in **Table 2**, the situation with academic integrity within the colleges is also quite similar when it comes to finding and implementation: both teachers and students noted a strong agreement that there are clear anti-plagiarism policies in colleges. 72.5% of teachers and 68.5% of students agreed that

there is a clear anti-plagiarism policy. Systematic teaching of academic integrity was recognized by 72 percent of teachers and 66.5 percent of students. As to the imposition of dishonesty, 72.5 percent of teachers and 67.5 percent of students said that they agreed. Teachers supported exam fairness with 75% whereas students did so with 70%. More than 75 percent of teachers and 70 percent of students responded to the case that it is not a common occurrence that materials are misused. 69.5 percent of the teachers and 66.5 percent of the students confirmed the use of plagiarism software. In the fair evaluation of in-group work, there was agreement among teachers and students of 72 percent and 70.5 percent, respectively. Referring style knowledge was high, such as 74% (teachers) and 73.5 (students). The openness towards misconduct management received the support of 71.5% (teachers) and 69.5% (students). Finally, 76 percent of the teachers and 72.5 percent of students exhibited their belief in justice in the conduct of academic evaluations, whereas the satisfaction levels in general by the inspector with regard to honesty practices stood at 72.5 percent.

Frequency Analysis of Student Satisfaction (SS)

The following is the frequency Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Responses to Student Satisfaction:

Table 3: Frequency Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Responses to Student Satisfaction

Sr#	Statements	Respondents	Disagreement Zone		Total Disagreement	N	Agreement Zone		Total Agreement	Result
			SDA	DA			A	SA		
Academic Satisfaction										
1	I am satisfied with the overall quality of education.	Teacher	9 (4.5%)	18 (9%)	27 (13.5%)	20 (10%)	85 (42.5%)	68 (34%)	153 (76.5%)	Agreement
		Student	11 (5.5%)	21 (10.5%)	32 (16%)	25 (12.5%)	90 (45%)	53 (26.5%)	143 (71.5%)	Agreement
2	Teachers deliver lectures engagingly and understandably.	Teacher	10 (5%)	15 (7.5%)	25 (12.5%)	23 (11.5%)	89 (44.5%)	63 (31.5%)	152 (76%)	Agreement
		Student	13 (6.5%)	19 (9.5%)	32 (16%)	22 (11%)	87 (43.5%)	59 (29.5%)	146 (73%)	Agreement
3	Curriculum aligns with current academic/industry standards.	Teacher	11 (5.5%)	20 (10%)	31 (15.5%)	19 (9.5%)	85 (42.5%)	65 (32.5%)	150 (75%)	Agreement
		Student	12 (6%)	22 (11%)	34 (17%)	26 (13%)	86 (43%)	54 (27%)	140 (70%)	Agreement
4	The college provides skill development (e.g., workshops, internships).	Teacher	13 (6.5%)	19 (9.5%)	32 (16%)	21 (10.5%)	83 (41.5%)	64 (32%)	147 (73.5%)	Agreement
		Student	14 (7%)	18 (9%)	32 (16%)	24 (12%)	90 (45%)	54 (27%)	144 (72%)	Agreement
Administrative Support										
5		Teacher	12 (6%)	17 (8.5%)	29 (14.5%)	22 (11%)	91 (45.5%)	58 (29%)	149 (74.5%)	Agreement

#	Statement	Respondent								
	Administrative staff are helpful and responsive.	Student	13 (6.5%)	20 (10%)	33 (16.5%)	28 (14%)	85 (42.5%)	54 (27%)	139 (69.5%)	Agreement
6	Student grievances are addressed promptly.	Teacher	14 (7%)	19 (9.5%)	33 (16.5%)	20 (10%)	89 (44.5%)	58 (29%)	147 (73.5%)	Agreement
		Student	12 (6%)	24 (12%)	36 (18%)	27 (13.5%)	88 (44%)	49 (24.5%)	137 (68.5%)	Agreement
7	The college values and acts on student feedback.	Teacher	10 (5%)	18 (9%)	28 (14%)	23 (11.5%)	92 (46%)	57 (28.5%)	149 (74.5%)	Agreement
		Student	11 (5.5%)	21 (10.5%)	32 (16%)	30 (15%)	86 (43%)	52 (26%)	138 (69%)	Agreement
8	Campus facilities are well-maintained.	Teacher	9 (4.5%)	15 (7.5%)	24 (12%)	21 (10.5%)	88 (44%)	67 (33.5%)	155 (77.5%)	Agreement
		Student	10 (5%)	19 (9.5%)	29 (14.5%)	24 (12%)	91 (45.5%)	56 (28%)	147 (73.5%)	Agreement
Social & Emotional Support										
9	College fosters a sense of belonging.	Teacher	12 (6%)	16 (8%)	28 (14%)	19 (9.5%)	87 (43.5%)	66 (33%)	153 (76.5%)	Agreement
		Student	14 (7%)	21 (10.5%)	35 (17.5%)	20 (10%)	90 (45%)	55 (27.5%)	145 (72.5%)	Agreement
10	I feel prepared for future challenges.	Teacher	11 (5.5%)	18 (9%)	29 (14.5%)	22 (11%)	89 (44.5%)	60 (30%)	149 (74.5%)	Agreement
		Student	13 (6.5%)	22 (11%)	35 (17.5%)	25 (12.5%)	88 (44%)	52 (26%)	140 (70%)	Agreement
11	Participation in co-curricular activities is encouraged.	Teacher	10 (5%)	17 (8.5%)	27 (13.5%)	26 (13%)	90 (45%)	57 (28.5%)	147 (73.5%)	Agreement
		Student	11 (5.5%)	18 (9%)	29 (14.5%)	22 (11%)	92 (46%)	57 (28.5%)	149 (74.5%)	Agreement
12	The college provides a safe learning environment.	Teacher	9 (4.5%)	15 (7.5%)	24 (12%)	20 (10%)	95 (47.5%)	61 (30.5%)	156 (78%)	Agreement
		Student	12 (6%)	20 (10%)	32 (16%)	25 (12.5%)	89 (44.5%)	54 (27%)	143 (71.5%)	Agreement

As findings in **Table 3** indicate, teachers and students recorded high satisfaction with academic and organizational services. On a general level of education, 76.5 percent of teachers and 71.5 percent of students affirmed that they are satisfied. Teachers agreed with 76 percent on lecture delivery, whilst students agreed with 73 percent. Majorities of the 75 percent of the teachers and 70 percent of the students gave positive feedback on where they stood on curriculum relevance. Other opportunities were appreciated by 73.5 percent of the teachers and 72 percent of the students for developing their skills. In the case of the administration support, 74.5% of the teachers and 69.5% of the students were responsive. That 73.5 percent of teachers and 68.5 percent of students responded to the grievances of students. Teachers and students approved of the campus facilities, 77.5 percent and 73.5 percent respectively. There was a sense of belonging that totaled 76.5 per cent of the teachers and 72.5 per cent of the students. Preparedness to deal

with challenges in the future was verified by 74.5 percent of teachers and 70 percent of students. Finally, 78 percent of teachers and 71.5 percent of students provided a positive answer to the question of a safe learning environment, which implies a high level of overall satisfaction of both parties.

Descriptive Analysis for Learning Environment (LE)

The following are the descriptive statistics of Learning Environment (LE):

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Learning Environment (LE)

Physical Environment					
Sr# **Statements**		**Respondents**	**Mean**	**Std.Dev**	**Ranking**	**Result**
1	Classrooms are well equipped with modern teaching tools (e.g., projectors, whiteboards).	Teacher	3.96	0.919	1st	High
		Student	3.94	0.988	2nd	High
2	The library provides sufficient academic resources (books, journals, e-resources, etc.)	Teacher	3.78	0.924	3rd	High
		Student	3.73	0.983	4th	High
3	The physical environment (lighting, seating, ventilation) supports effective learning.	Teacher	3.72	0.945	5th	High
		Student	3.71	0.953	6th	High
4	Co-curricular activities (sports, clubs) are sufficiently promoted.	Teacher	3.71	0.978	7th	High
		Student	3.70	0.965	8th	High
Academic Resources & Support						
5	Teachers are approachable and available for academic guidance.	Teacher	3.70	1.017	9th	High
		Student	3.69	0.991	10th	High
6	Peer collaboration is encouraged during classes and group projects.	Teacher	3.68	1.017	11th	High
		Student	3.67	0.993	12th	High
7	The college provides access to digital learning platforms (LMS, e-libraries).	Teacher	3.65	1.045	13th	High
		Student	3.64	0.997	14th	High
8	The institution provides timely updates on academic schedules and deadlines.	Teacher	3.63	0.971	15th	High
		Student	3.61	0.891	16th	High
Learning Culture & Engagement						
9	The college offers career counseling and academic support services.	Teacher	3.59	0.889	17th	High
		Student	3.57	0.883	18th	High
10	There is emphasis on critical thinking and problem solving.	Teacher	3.53	0.769	19th	High
		Student	3.52	0.763	20th	High
11	The institution promotes a collaborative learning environment.	Teacher	3.49	0.761	21th	Moderate
		Student	3.47	0.759	22th	Moderate
12	Students are encouraged to engage in discussions and debates.	Teacher	3.45	0.753	23th	Moderate

		Student	3.43	0.751	24th	Moderate

Table 4 has the results of the learning environment, where the results of the descriptive analysis of both the teachers and students were calculated using mean scores and standard deviations. Modern teaching tools received the highest rating (M = 3.96, SD = 0.919) based on an average rating by teachers and (M = 3.94, SD = 0.988) by students, and this placed them at the top 2. M = 3.78 in the case of teachers and M = 3.73 in the case of students in library resources. Such physical features, as lighting and ventilation, were both rated highly by the teachers (M = 3.72) and students (M = 3.71). Other items of academic support, like the approachability of the teachers, had M = 3.70 (teachers) and M = 3.69 (students). Access to Information and Advances, and collaboration with peers were also rated high between the two groups. However, there was a marginal reduction in the scores on items in Learning Culture & Engagement. Engagement of students in discussions and debates was the most highly rated, with the lowest score of both teachers (M = 3.45) and students (M = 3.43). Importantly, items 7 to 9 were in the range of the "Moderate" satisfaction level, which means that it is possible to improve the development of critical thinking and collaborative learning processes.

Descriptive Statistics of Academic Integrity (AI)

The following are the descriptive statistics of Academic Integrity (AI):

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Academic Integrity (AI)

Sr#	Statements	Respondents	Mean	Std.Dev	Ranking	Result
Policies & Enforcement						
1	The college has clear policies against plagiarism and cheating.	Teacher	3.70	1.017	1st	High
1	The college has clear policies against plagiarism and cheating.	Student	3.69	0.991	2nd	High
2	Teachers consistently enforce consequences for academic dishonesty.	Teacher	3.68	1.017	3rd	High
2	Teachers consistently enforce consequences for academic dishonesty.	Student	3.67	0.993	4th	High
3	Students are regularly educated about academic honesty (e.g., workshops, seminars).	Teacher	3.65	1.045	5th	High
3	Students are regularly educated about academic honesty (e.g., workshops, seminars).	Student	3.64	0.997	6th	High
4	Exams and assignments are designed to minimize opportunities for cheating.	Teacher	3.63	0.971	7th	High
4	Exams and assignments are designed to minimize opportunities for cheating.	Student	3.62	1.017	8th	High
Awareness & Tools						
5	The use of unauthorized materials during exams is uncommon.	Teacher	3.69	1.017	9th	High
5	The use of unauthorized materials during exams is uncommon.	Student	3.68	0.991	10th	High
6	Group work is checked to ensure individual help is fair.	Teacher	3.59	1.017	11th	High
6	Group work is checked to ensure individual help is fair.	Student	3.57	0.993	12th	High
7	The institution uses plagiarism-checking software (e.g., Turnitin) effectively.	Teacher	3.48	1.045	13th	Moderate
7	The institution uses plagiarism-checking software (e.g., Turnitin) effectively.	Student	3.43	0.997	14th	Moderate
8	Students know how to give references correctly.	Teacher	3.41	0.971	15th	Moderate

		Student	3.39	0.891	16th	Moderate
Transparency &Culture						
9	Cases of academic misconduct are handled transparently.	Teacher	3.34	0.889	17th	Moderate
		Student	3.32	0.883	18th	Moderate
10	Students report high levels of satisfaction with academic honesty practices.	Teacher	3.31	0.769	19th	Moderate
		Student	3.28	0.763	20th	Moderate
11	There is a culture of trust and fairness in academic evaluations.	Teacher	3.23	0.761	21th	Moderate
		Student	3.21	0.759	22th	Moderate
12	The institution maintains a strong reputation for academic integrity.	Teacher	3.19	0.753	23th	Moderate
		Student	3.17	0.751	24th	Moderate

The state of academic integrity in **Table 5** is given a descriptive analysis as the population of both the teachers, and the students expresses their perception on the same. The clarity of anti-plagiarism policies was rated the highest by teachers (M = 3.70) and students (M = 3.69). The consequences of academic dishonesty were also implemented (M = 3.68), followed by educating students about academic honesty (M = 3.65) by the teachers. The students also rated these items on a little lower scale, but they were in the low end of the "High" satisfaction scale. The presence of unauthorized materials during exams was regarded as uncommon, occurring with M = 3.69 (teachers) and M = 3.68 (students). Nevertheless, those associated with technological equipment and greater cultural aspects were rated with the word Moderate- use of plagiarism software (M = 3.48, teacher; M = 3.43, student), referring to knowledge of referencing styles (M = 3.41, M = 3.39). It is pertinent to note that such impressions as about transparency concerning the handling of misconduct (M = 3.34 teacher, M = 3.32 student) and trust in academic assessments (M = 3.23, M = 3.21) received the lowest rankings. The reputation of academic integrity within the institution was ranked lower than any other aspect of the institution by both groups (M = 3.19 for teachers, M = 3.17 for students), so the building of the culture related to it should be enhanced.

Descriptive Statistics of Student Satisfaction (SS)

The following are the descriptive statistics of Student Satisfaction (SS)

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Student Satisfaction (SS)

Academic Satisfaction						
Sr#	**Statements**	**Respondents**	**Mean**	**Std.Dev**	**Ranking**	**Result**
25	I am satisfied with the overall quality of education provided.	Teacher	3.63	1.121	1st	High
		Student	3.60	0.985	2nd	High
26	Teachers deliver lectures engagingly and understandably.	Teacher	3.56	1.021	3rd	High
		Student	3.55	1.073	4th	High
27	The curriculum aligns with current industry or academic standards.	Teacher	3.52	1.099	5th	High
		Student	3.51	1.055	6th	High

28	The college provides opportunities for skill development (e.g., workshops, internships).	Teacher	3.47	1.111	7th	Moderate
		Student	3.43	1.121	8th	Moderate
Administrative Support						
29	Administrative staff are helpful and responsive to queries.	Teacher	3.45	1.120	9th	Moderate
		Student	3.43.	1.119	10th	Moderate
30	The institution addresses student grievances promptly.	Teacher	3.41	1.117	11th	Moderate
		Student	3.39	1.115	12th	Moderate
31	The college values student feedback and acts upon it.	Teacher	3.36	1.113	13th	Moderate
		Student	3.34	1.111	14th	Moderate
32	Campus facilities (labs, cafeterias, and washrooms) are well maintained.	Teacher	3.32	1.110	15th	Moderate
		Students	3.31	0.064	16th	Moderate
Social & Emotional Support						
33	College fosters a sense of belonging among students.	Teacher	3.29	0.036	17th	Moderate
		Student	3.27	0.016	18th	Moderate
34	I feel prepared for future academic or professional challenges.	Teacher	3.24	0.001	19th	Moderate
		Student	3.22	0.001	20th	Moderate
35	The college encourages students to participate in co-curricular activities.	Teacher	3.19	0.016	21st	Moderate
		Student	3.17	0.036	22nd	Moderate
36	The college provides a safe and supportive learning environment.	Teacher	3.15	0.064	23rd	Moderate
		Student	3.13	0.011	24th	Moderate

Table 6 is the descriptive analysis of student satisfaction, which reveals that most of the items were rated as being under moderate, and only a few items were rated at a high level. The top-rated indicator by teachers was satisfaction with overall quality of education (M = 3.63), then it was students (M = 3.60). Teachers and 3.55 students pegged interesting lectures at 3.56 as well, which is within the high range. The relevance of the curriculum held a high score of 3.52 among teachers and 3.51 among students. Opportunities for improving skills (teachers) were reduced to 3.47 and (students) to 3.43 and became moderately satisfied. Moderate ratings were also recorded in areas of administrative support, which included receptiveness to questions and complaints management (3.45 to 3.34). The rating on campus facilities was 3.32, according to teachers, and 3.31 by students. They were the worst in items under social and emotional support, such as sense of belonging (3.29/3.27), preparedness to future challenges (3.24/3.22), and safe learning environment (3.15/3.13), all in the middle domain. These findings indicate a relatively average level of satisfaction of students and teachers, with the general level of satisfaction of academic areas slightly higher than the factors of administrative and emotional support elements.

DISCUSSION

This paper was undertaken to investigate the relationship between the learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction in both private and government institutions of higher learning in Sargodha. The results present a multidimensional picture of the perception of these constructs by students

and teachers, highlighting both differences and overlaps. The huge gap in the perceptions of students and teachers in their learning environment is in line with previous research. Students were largely unanimous in giving higher responses in infrastructural facilities, whereas the teachers pointed out the shortcomings, particularly in the instructional materials. Fraser (1998), who reasoned that when it comes to evaluating the environment, students will use their comfort and experience as accurate, and teachers prefer to analyze the overall pedagogic efficacy, pointed out other such inconsistencies. Obeng and Adepoju (2019) also discovered that teachers are more judgmental of environmental deficiencies, particularly in developing environments, where resource limitations occur.

Both teachers and students reported positive attitudes towards academic integrity with indicators of knowledge of plagiarism policies, norms of referencing, and equitable evaluation. These results confirm the studies of McCabe et al. (2001) and Bretag et al. (2011), which stressed the impact of institutional commitment to academic integrity on the behavior of the students and the staff. Yet, the averagely high support rate on the utilization of the detection tools and methods of transparent evaluation suggests the possibility to reinforce the mechanisms of enforcement (Bretag, 2013).

Although academic satisfaction (course delivery, alignment with the curriculum, and administrative support) was rated highly, emotional support was relatively low. The theory is correlated to the theories of Tinto (1993) on student integration, which states that student retention and satisfaction are critical, and emotional and social belonging to the student is paramount. The lack of emotional support suggests that it is a particular area that requires improvement when it comes to the non-academic services offered, including the counseling services and student engagement services (Lee & Robbins, 2000; Thomas, 2012).

The satisfaction of the student members of the private college was more than their counterparts in public colleges as observed by Altbach (2005) and Akram and Zepeda (2015) in their observations of improved infrastructure, teaching facilities, and administrative support in the private institutions. On the other hand, teachers living in cities demonstrated better attitudes than those in rural areas, which indicates the ongoing gap between the urban and rural education (UNESCO, 2020). Remarkably, there were no significant differences in perception based on gender and designation, thus supporting the study by Devlin and Gray (2007), which found that gender-neutral academic experiences are increasing because of equity policies between the sexes.

The individual semester levels of students possess puzzling dissimilarities in satisfaction and perspectives of scholarly integrity, where the students of upper semesters indicated less satisfaction. It may indicate that with time, there is more pressure on students academically and greater expectations of them (Pitt et al., 2012). Teacher experience and job designation, in turn, were found to be insignificant, implying that institutional culture plays a dominant role over individual experience, which is also exhibited by Knight and Trowler (2000).

Through this discussion, one understands that the outlook towards academic integrity and instructional satisfaction is quite positive among most students and teachers, but there is still a problem when it comes to a physical learning environment and support of emotional well-being, especially at places of study that are run publicly, and those that lie in rural areas. These results, which are consistent with other studies, show the significance of institutional equity, emotional involvement, and open scholarly norms to enhance total learner satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS

The results point to an obvious mismatched views of students and teachers on the viewing of the learning environment, where the students express more satisfaction as gauged through the learning equipment and facilities at the learning space, as well as the physical environment, as compared to the teachers. This implies that although the students largely feel that the environment meets their needs, teachers feel that it can be better, particularly on the infrastructure and academic materials. Academic integrity seems to be one of the strengths in both groups as the respondents have mostly agreed that there are clear plagiarism policies, frequent workshops, and college action against cheating. Both instructors and learners admitted that they were aware of referencing styles and supported the fact that institutional culture is fair. Finally, the two groups obtained good results when asked about satisfaction in academic delivery, curriculum alignment, and administrative support from the students. However, relatively low scores of satisfactions on factors associated with emotional well-being and belonging indicate the possible area where the social-emotional support system in these colleges may have a deficit. Collectively, the above findings would indicate that although students and teachers experience a positive perception toward the issues of academic integrity and instruction satisfaction-related issues, the physical environment and emotional support systems would entail some form of targeted intervention.

In their analysis, the teachers and the students had a high view of the policies, implementation, and the academic honesty instruction, indicating a heavy institutional focus on integrity education. Still, such aspects as the use of plagiarism detection tools, referencing, and the fairness of assessment were assessed only as moderate, which means that there was indeed an opportunity to improve on the academic integrity enforcement methods and assessment transparency. Regarding academic satisfaction, the respondents presented a high rate of satisfaction on general issues like course content and teaching quality. Administrative and emotional support was scored as moderate in comparison and, specifically, emotional support, was marked as immature. This suggests the necessity to work on improving non-academic services to students given their satisfaction. In addition, inferential statistics (using t-test) gave the result that satisfaction towards students between the classes (private and public colleges) was statistically different, and the students in the class of the private colleges responded higher, i.e., on the level of satisfaction, than their counterparts in the class of the public colleges. In addition, distinct variations in perceptions of the learning environment as well as academic integrity by the public and the private schools were identified, pointing at the dissimilarities in quality and institutional recommendations. These findings underpin the conclusion that excellent core academic practices are needed, but that improvements in equity, emotional support, and infrastructure, particularly in community colleges, are necessary to increase institutional quality and student achievement.

Students in private colleges also replied with greater satisfaction than those in public institutions, which created better perception regarding academic experiences held in the former settings. The type of college also had differences in quality of learning environment and academic integrity. In gender, there was no difference in perception since both male and female respondent's perceived similar views in all variables. Place of residence, however, affected the perceptions of the teachers; that is, urban teachers had higher perceptions of the learning environment than rural ones. On the one hand, these results support the role of institutional type and geographical context, but on the other hand, gender did not emerge as having an influence.

Students in private colleges also replied with greater satisfaction than those in public institutions, which created better perception regarding academic experiences held in the former settings. The type of college also had differences in quality of learning environment and academic integrity. In gender, there was no difference in perception since both male and female respondent's perceived similar views in all variables.

Place of residence, however, affected the perceptions of the teachers; that is, urban teachers had higher perceptions of the learning environment than rural ones. On the one hand, these results support the role of institutional type and geographical context, but on the other hand, gender did not emerge as having an influence.

All three aspects of teachers' perceptions of the learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction were not very different due to the designation of the teachers, indicating that all the teachers had similar perceptions regardless of the differences in their jobs. On the same note, the number of years in teaching did not make any difference in these variables, which means that the perception is not influenced by experience. But answering based on the semester, a great deal of differences in academic integrity and student satisfaction were observed, and this primarily indicates that the views of the students in these aspects are different with their educational level. This leads to the necessity of intervention in varying semesters so that there could be consistency in academic experiences.

Correlation analysis was carried out on the teachers and students, and the results showed significant and positive correlation among the learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction. Academic integrity had the most significant connection with student satisfaction in the two groups, reflecting their role in the center of defining student experience in their studies. Commonality in the two samples with regard to the consistency of the findings indicates an agreement of perception on the role of integrity and the learning environment vis-a-vis general satisfaction in educational institutions.

This study of mediation showed the presence of the effect that student satisfaction has on the connection between academic integrity and the learning environment. The direct influence of academic integrity on the learning environment was rather profound in the first model, but the effect was no longer significant after introducing student satisfaction as a mediator. This implies that scholarly honesty increases satisfaction, which consequently boosts the learning environment views. The results emphasized the fact that the route through which academic integrity leads to an enhanced education environment is student satisfaction, which makes it an essential element of institutional growth.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the recommendations of the study:

1. The colleges need to work on enhancing the learning process through modernizing the classroom facilities and infrastructures, especially in public and rural colleges, to close the gap between them and the privately owned colleges.

2. Reliably struggling plagiarism via plagiarism detection placed in each academy branch, periodic ethics-of-academics workshops, as well as training of instructors, who focus on enforcement of ethical academic conduct, can only achieve controlling academic integrity via the frictionless burden of institutional policies.

3. The range of services provided on student support services should also be increased to a level where students are offered emotional and mental counseling, as factors like emotional wellness often interfere with the overall satisfaction with academics.

4. Academic feedback mechanism on a semester-wise basis must be introduced in order to discover satisfaction gap and issue of academic integrity at various levels of education.

5. The issue of urban-rural divide needs to be addressed by policymakers and administrators through equal resource distributions so that rural teachers and students can have equal access to a quality learning environment and provision of learning supports as might be available to urban students and teachers.

Suggestions for Future Research

The following are the suggestions for future research:

1. Future studies may use longitudinal designs to examine changes in learning environment, academic integrity, and student satisfaction over time.

2. Mixed-method approaches (e.g. interviews and focus groups) may provide deeper insights into students' and teachers' experiences.

3. Research may be expanded to other districts or provinces to enhance generalizability of findings.

4. Comparative studies across different types of institutions (colleges, universities, technical institutes) are recommended.

5. Future research may include additional mediating or moderating variables such as motivation, leadership style, or institutional support.

6. Advanced statistical techniques (e.g., SEM or multilevel modeling) may be used to test complex models.

7. The role of digital learning environments and online academic integrity tools may be further explored.

REFERENCES

Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. Psychology in the Schools, 45(5), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20303

Baker, J. A., Grant, S., & Morlock, L. (2021). The teacher–student relationship as a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behavior problems. School Psychology Quarterly, 36(2), 102–115. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000413

Bertram Gallant, T. (2017). Academic integrity in the twenty-first century: A teaching and learning imperative. Jossey-Bass.

Bretag, T. (2016). Challenges in addressing plagiarism in education. PLoS Medicine, 13(12), e1002183. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002183

Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Partridge, L. (2014). 'Teach us how to do it properly!' An Australian academic integrity student survey. Studies in Higher Education, 39(7), 1150–1169. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.777406

Douglas, J., Douglas, A., & Barnes, B. (2006). Measuring student satisfaction at a UK university. Quality Assurance in Education, 14(3), 251–267. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880610678568

Douglas, J., McClelland, R., & Davies, J. (2008). The development of a conceptual model of student satisfaction with their experience in higher education. Quality Assurance in Education, 16(1), 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880810848396

Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21(1), 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 10(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1300/J050v10n04_01

Elliott, K. M., & Shin, D. (2002). Student satisfaction: An alternative approach to assessing this important concept. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 24(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080022000013518

Fraser, B. J. (2012). Classroom learning environments: Retrospect, context and prospect. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 1191–1239). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7_79

Gerdes, H., Jr., & Uysal, M. (2015). Student satisfaction and retention models in higher education. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37(6), 626–642. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2015.1103781

Khan, S., & Ahmed, R. (2020). Impact of learning environment on students' academic achievement at secondary level. Global Social Sciences Review, 5(3), 123–132. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020(V-III).13

Klassen, R. M. (2012). Teacher stress: Definitions, sources, and consequences. In T. Wubbels et al. (Eds.), Interpersonal relationships in education (pp. 213–230). Sense Publishers.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. Ethics & Behavior, 11(3), 219–232. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1103_2

Mohajan, H. K. (2017). Two criteria for good measurements in research: Validity and reliability. Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series, 17(4), 59–82. https://doi.org/10.26458/1746

Tinto, V. (2017). Through the eyes of students. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 19(3), 254–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025115621917