CIEX JOURN@L

INNOVATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

No. 18

RESEARCH PAPERS
Students' & Teachers' Voices

VALUES AND CULTURE
Personal Development and Growth

CIEX
Excellence in English

CRMCYT
SISTEMA DE CLASIFICACIÓN DE
REVISTAS MEXICANAS
DE CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGÍA

latindex
catálogo

Google Scholar

Ethics and English Language Classes:
Experiences among undergraduate students

Autores:
Alejandrina Del Carmen Zurita Sarao - alejandrinazusa25@gmail.com
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco
Irma Alejandra Coeto Calcáneo - irma.coeto@ujat.mx
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco
Sara Margarita Alfaro García - sara.alfaro@ujat.mx
Universidad Juárez Autónoma de Tabasco

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to know the frequency and opinions about fraudulent behavior among undergraduate English language learners. Facts were collected through a survey designed to gather data, analyze it in terms of severity levels, and name the most common ones. Preliminary results show that 32% of students said that behaviors such as copying exam answers or bribing are minimal, while only 19% consider them to be of maximum severity. However, 67% admitted to never having committed such behaviors, while 15% admitted to having committed these acts one to ten times. Finally, only 3% accepted having committed this type of irregularity. In conclusion, the results were favorable since the majority did not practice these behaviors. However, it is necessary to pay attention to the minority that carries out this type of academic fraud, which is why the analysis concludes with suggestions to reduce these actions.

KEY WORDS:

Academic dishonesty, academic misconduct, cheating practices, plagiarism, higher education

RESUMEN

El propósito de esta investigación es conocer la frecuencia y opiniones sobre conductas fraudulentas entre estudiantes universitarios del idioma inglés. Los hechos se recopilaron mediante una encuesta diseñada específicamente para reunir datos y analizarlos en términos de niveles de gravedad e identificar los más comunes. Los resultados preliminares muestran que 32% de los estudiantes afirmó que conductas como copiar respuestas de exámenes o sobornar son de mínima gravedad, mientras que sólo 19% las considera de máxima gravedad. Sin embargo, 67% admitió nunca haber cometido tales conductas, en cambio, 15% admitió haber cometido estos actos de una a diez veces. Finalmente, sólo 3% aceptó haber realizado este tipo de irregularidades. En conclusión, los resultados fueron favorables ya que la mayoría no practica estas conductas, pero es necesario prestar atención a aquella minoría que realiza este tipo de

fraudes académicos, por ello el análisis concluye con sugerencias para reducir estas acciones.

PALABRAS CLAVE:

Deshonestidad Académica, mala conducta académica, prácticas de trampa, plagio, educación superior.

Introduction

Almost ten years ago, a BBC investigation revealed thousands of people had allegedly cheated in an English language test needed for a student visa. Consequently, "2,500 people were deported, and at least 7,200 were forced to leave Britain after ETS accused them of cheating in an exam it set and marked" (Main & Watson, 2022). Back in 2014, UK's Home Secretary Theresa May said more face-to-face interviews should be introduced and urged the educational sector to do more to tackle fraud (Watson, 2014).

Evidently, this problem arose due to the poor levels of English proficiency students have, which do not meet the minimum entry requirements set by universities. But is having poor English a factor that can lead to cheating? In an academic context, is cheating considered misconduct? How common is academic dishonesty?

As fraud practices among students are increasing within the online modality and in the classroom, educational institutions face an ever-growing challenge when evaluating students since there is no 100% reliable method demonstrating whether students apply their knowledge. Furthermore, there is a relationship between academic dishonesty and professional dishonesty. Studies such as those of Comas et al., (2021) show students who have acted fraudulently in academic environments are more likely, in the future, to perform dishonest behaviors in their professional workplace. They have suggested that "educational institutions are the first test bed of corruption and dishonest behavior." So, these institutions should be doing something to reduce this trend.

First, it is important to understand how serious fraud is in order to reduce corruption and dishonest behaviors. In this descriptive research, we discuss the occurrence of academic dishonesty among undergraduate students enrolled in English language courses. They will either become language teachers or work as translators and interpreters. So that means that all of them are required to be proficient in English. If international students lie to get a visa to go to the UK, how honest are the undergraduate students at a public university in the south of Mexico?

Literature review

Academic dishonesty (AD) encompasses the various forms of copying, cheating, or cheating and committing plagiarism or fraud used by students to give or receive help that has not been cleared in academic assignments with the intent to receive credit, a qualification, or benefit (Medina & Verdejo, 2021).

Existing literature suggests that academic integrity or honesty is based on 3 axes linked with academic management: teaching, research, and learning and study (Comas, 2009). In the third group, in which this work is circumscribed, there are, according to Comas et al., (2011), various conducts and/or behaviors that are considered to threaten the principles of integrity: on the one hand, those derived from improper conduct in the development evaluation tests and work preparation (copying in written tests, plagiarizing work totally or partially, falsifying data in papers,

allowing others to copy another's projects and written tests, etc.).

Assessment fraud (AF) is one of dishonesty's most visible and widespread manifestations. International works analyze the relationship between the existence and severity of academic regulations regulating sanctions for dishonest practices and the percentage of this behavior among students.

In 2002, (Medina & Verdejo, 2005) conducted a survey with 791 undergraduate students from the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus. They investigated the following institutional factors: (a) the establishment, knowledge, and application of an academic integrity policy; (b) the reactions of the faculty and administration to incidents of academic dishonesty; and (c) the possibility of discovering acts of academic dishonesty. Between 5% and 75% of the student body admitted that they had committed, at least once since they entered the university, one of the 42 behaviors included in the administered Academic Honesty Questionnaire. (Medina & Verdejo, 2005).

Two years later, Mejía & Ordóñez (2004) published an article about a study of academic fraud at the Universidad de Los Andes, Colombia. One thousand one hundred ninety-four students from 50 courses and 64 teachers took part. The students identified the severity of 14 fraudulent behaviors and whether they had ever carried them out at the university. In addition, they selected the reasons for committing them and for abstaining. They found that approximately 94.4% and 36.6% of the male and female students admitted that they had engaged in at least one of the 14 behaviors in college and in the past semester, respectively. More than 70% had let their classmates copy their answers on a test, and 50% admitted that they had cheated on a test at some point in college. A similar percentage had let an assignment be copied, and close to 30% had copied the homework of a partner (Mejía & Ordóñez, 2004).

While there is already a tradition of research on the phenomenon in the United States, academic fraud at the university level has received little attention in Colombia and Latin America. In the United States and Europe, there are studies on the matter, different from Colombia or even Latin America, where not many works and interventions deal with the phenomenon of (AF). The research covered the topics of prevalence and depth of the phenomenon, causes, profile of offenders, and detection intervention of the phenomenon.

The frequency with which copying/cheating cases occur is one of the aspects that has the most interested researchers, with very different results. Authors (Burling et al., 2001, as cited in Mejia & Ordóñez, 2004) reviewed fraud frequencies identified in several studies. They concluded that 75% and 98% of American university students have been involved at least once in academic misconduct. (Mejia & Ordóñez, 2004).

McCabe et al., (2001), fraud is widely spread in universities and is increasing, as indicated by Becker, Davis, Grover, and McGregor record dramatic increases. For example, in 1941, it was reported that 23% of students committed fraud at North American universities. However, recent studies show rates greater than 80% (Becker et al.,1992, as cited in Mejia & Ordóñez, 2004).

In general terms, it is concluded that, on the one hand, the existence of regulations that include sanctions for proven academic fraud behaviors reduces the commission of this type of acts by students, and on the other, the stricter the regulation, the less practices against academic integrity that occur in the institution will be committed (McCabe et al.,1993; McCabe et al., 1999; Turner et al., 2003; Ercegovac & Richardson, 2004; LoSchiavo et al., 2011).

Conditioned by this general framework, Spanish universities have faced the problem of fraud under various types of standards and provisions for all students: evaluation standards, general student standards, and ethical codes. In addition, there are unique rules for a center, a school, a faculty, and even a department, ranging from ethical codes to specific regulations.

Finally, there are isolated cases of teaching guides for subjects in which references to fraud are incorporated when presenting the evaluation criteria.

Even so, the existence of a regulation does not guarantee anything: for it to take effect, it must be known by both teachers and students, and, above all, this type of situation must not be overlooked; that is, it must be applied. (Comas, 2009).

In Antioquia, in 2013, within the framework of the social development program "Antioquia legal," a campaign was carried out to identify and address the phenomenon of fraud in universities; 5944 students from 15 public and private institutions in the department were surveyed where the following figures were obtained: 80% admitted to having let a classmate copy them on an exam; 56% said they had copied answers from a classmate; 9% confessed to having presented a false medical certificate to justify an absence; more than 75% of the students accepted having committed some type of fraud; 11% showed as their authorship a work that they copied from the internet and 3.2% took an exam for a classmate (Martinez & Ramírez, 2018).

Research on this matter in Mexico is scarce in specialized literature. For example, Diez (2014) conducted research whose. The objectives consisted of analyzing some of the dishonest practices in educational institutions among students and teachers and determining if these practices enhanced situations concerning a sensible problem in our society, that of corruption and the moral disengagement it involves. A questionnaire was applied to a sample of 208 high school and university students living in Queretaro, Mexico. Data show significant frequencies of academic dishonesty behaviors among students and professors. (Diez, 2014).

Academic performance is another variable that has also been associated with AD. A study conducted with 315 students secondary and university students (Finn & Frone 2004 as cited in Vaamonde,2008) found that AD acts are more frequent among students with depressed school performance and little identification with their institution, as well as among students with good performance but reduced academic self-confidence. Also, Individual perceptions of students with respect to personality and the behavior of the teacher seem to influence the execution of AD. In this sense, it has been observed (d, 2001) that if students negatively perceive their teachers, they are likely to be actively engaged in dishonest academic acts, unlike those who evaluate them positively, who will show marked respect for institutional norms and rules (Vaamonde, 2008).

The institution must support teachers in acting and intervening in such situations and following up on the problem instead of letting it go unnoticed. As for academic management, the proper thing would be to propose activities such as programs, seminars, and courses where that integrate practices of ethics and honesty.

Finally, focused on learning during the evaluations, the objective should be for students to develop their ideas and reason from the questions that are asked, so the questions should be presented in a way that makes students reflect and analyze.

Research Methodology

A descriptive investigation with a quantitative approach was designed to collect information about students' position toward academic dishonesty and how often these dishonest situations take place. This methodology, according to Sampieri (2006, p. 103), "seeks to specify the properties, characteristics, and profiles of people, groups, communities, or any other phenomenon that is subjected to analysis."

We began this investigation by posing the following questions:
1. What are the behaviors students evaluated as dishonest?
2. What are the most common acts of academic fraud among students?
3. What kind of behaviors do teachers grade as the most dishonest?
4. What dishonest behaviors have teachers detected the most?

I. Participants

The participants are undergraduate students enrolled in a BA in languages at a public university in the south of Mexico. All the students take ten English language courses during their studies. By completing their BA, they must have reached a B2 level in English, French, or Italian. Taking an English test is not compulsory, but students are encouraged to take one. There are two courses where they are trained to present one English language exam: Academic English I and Academic English II.

II. Sample

During the semester of August 2023-January 2024, there were 10 English Language groups. Teachers in charge of those courses were contacted to invite them and their students to participate in the research. So far, five teachers have accepted and collaborated in sharing the survey among their students, so these five groups represent 50% of the universe.

III. Instruments

A survey was chosen to get the information needed for the research. It included 38 questions organized in three sections. The first section aimed to get some general information about the participants, whereas the second and third sections were devoted to academic dishonesty.

In the second section of the survey, the students were asked to evaluate the degree of severity of eighteen behaviors considered to be dishonest. Each item was evaluated using a Likert scale with six levels ranging from minimum severity to maximum severity. The last section of the instrument was designed to determine the frequency at which each of the eighteen behaviors occurs.

The survey was produced in Microsoft Forms and requested through Microsoft Teams.

IV. Procedure

Data collection was carried out in Villahermosa, Tabasco in a public university in the south of Mexico and occurred over two months, September and October 2023. The platforms that were used to share this survey were WhatsApp, Teams, and Gmail.

The collection of information was divided into two phases:

- Phase 1: The first part of this project was carried out with students who are enrolled in Academic English I and Academic English II to know their opinion regarding dishonest academic behaviors and in the second part to know whether they had committed any of them or not.
- Phase 2: The second part of this research was focused on teachers who are teaching English subjects and were asked to give their opinions from their own experience, mainly to know how frequently they found fraudulent behavior in their classes.

Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics methods to summarize and describe the main characteristics.

Results

The preliminary results presented in this paper include data related to students, and only two professors were interviewed.

General data of participants

96 students have participated in the study so far. Their ages range from 19 to 38 years old, with an average of 21.93 and a mean of 21 years of age. The majority of them are women (69%). Most of the participants do not work (71%). Most of the students who do work are men.

Regarding their academic level, they are enrolled in the 5th (29%) and 6th (30%) semesters, and a large part of them are taking the English 5, English 6, and Academic English 1 courses. They seem to be studying the English course that corresponds to the cycle they are taking. So, they are likely to have an adequate academic performance, although this aspect should be verified in the following stage of the research.

A relevant piece of information was obtained, a minimum number of students have completed a certification in English (Table 1). Among the tests mentioned, we could find those offered by Cambridge English Qualifications (KET and PET), ETS (TOEFL iTP), and IELTS. However, most of them reported that they had taken the free tests offered by EF (EFSET). Fortunately, most students have plans to take one English Test in the future.

Table 1. Certifications

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	14	14%
No	82	86%
Total	96	100%

Contrasting severity vs. frequency

The first behavior that was evaluated was "copying answers from a classmate on a test," which resulted in behavior judged as one with a "minimum or very low severity" by half of the students. However, this consideration contrasts with the frequency of the behavior, like a minimum part of them affirming that they frequently and always copy. There are also those who point out that they have never cheated, with an almost similar percentage of those who have rarely done it, which is a pretty positive result.

Does that mean that students try to analyze and reason the questions on the exam and obtain a grade on their own merits without copying them?

In related misconduct, "giving the answers to a classmate," participants consider it an act of minimum severity, but when they were asked if they had done it, most of them said that rarely (less than five times) and never.

Table 2. Giving answers to a classmate on an exam

Answers	Percent	Percent	Answers
Minimum severity 0	25.8%	0%	**Always**
1	28.9%	6.2%	**Frequently (more than 10 times)**
2-3	18.6%	23.7%	**Occasionally (5 to 10 times)**
4	15.5%	38.1%	**Rarely (less than 5 times)**
Maximum severity 5	11.2%	32%	**Never**
Total	100%	100%	

So, regarding copying, it seems that they do not want to copy, but they do accept giving a copy, perhaps because they think it will not have a consequence. Another analyzed behavior in which most of the students remained neutral, saying that it is not of maximum severity but not of minimum severity either, is to copy an assignment from a classmate. Despite having assured that, there was a positive response to this behavior since the majority of them said they had never presented a work that was not theirs.

Table 3. Copy an assignment from a classmate

Answers	Percent	Percent	Answers
Minimum severity 0	22.7%	1%	**Always**
1	23.7%	0%	**Frequently (more than 10 times)**
2-3	40.2%	4.1%	**Occasionally (5 to 10 times)**
4	5.2%	9.3%	**Rarely (less than 5 times)**
Maximum severity 5	8.2%	85.6%	**Never**
Total	100%	100%	

Information is provided about other fraudulent conduct; Table 4 shows that 35% of students think that "presenting a work downloaded from the internet" is a behavior of maximum severity, and it contrasts with 33% of those who consider it to be of minimum severity. However, most of them (75%) have not presented internetwork as their own.

Table 4. Present internet work as your own

Answers	Percent	Percent	Answers
Minimum severity 0	33%	1%	**Always**
1	11.3%	2.1%	**Frequently (more than 10 times)**
2-3	15.5%	4.1%	**Occasionally (5 to 10 times)**

4	5.2%	17.5%	Rarely (less than 5 times)
Maximum severity 5	35%	75.3%	Never
Total	100%	100%	

Due to the use of modern technologies within the academic field, it was decided to include this behavior in which contradictory, but nevertheless positive results are presented since they have never used any electronic device in an exam, although the majority of students said that using unauthorized tools during an exam is not that serious.

Table 5. Use of electronic devices in exam

Answers	Percent	Percent	Answers
Minimum severity 0	39%	0%	Always
1	9%	1%	Frequently (more than 10 times)
2-3	17%	3%	Occasionally (5 to 10 times)
4	8%	8%	Rarely (less than 5 times)
Maximum severity 5	27%	88%	Never
Total	100%	100%	

Finally, relevant information about another demeanor is shown but in a positive way, as shown in Table 2. According to these responses, students think that bribing a teacher to get a passing grade is not considered so serious, but a favorable result was obtained because 88% of them affirmed they have never committed this type of fraud.

Table 6. Bribing teachers

Answers	Percent	Percent	Answers
Minimum severity 0	40%	0%	Always
1	10%	1%	Frequently (more than 10 times)
2-3	17%	4%	Occasionally (5 to 10 times)
4	9%	9%	Rarely (less than 5 times)
Maximum severity 5	27%	88%	Never
Total	100%	100%	

In these types of situations, it can be seen both the ethics and professionalism that teachers have and the honesty and values that students must share to avoid committing this type of fraud, which is considered one of the most serious and should have profound consequences for those who do it.

Finally, these results contrast with the frequencies of fraud identified in various studies, as the undergraduate students involved in our research do not commit fraud as the students from American colleges, where between 75% and 98% of them have been involved at least once in situations of academic fraud (Burling et al., 2001 as cited in Mejia & Ordóñez, 2004).

Main findings

In summary, the findings of the reviewed studies do not show that acts of academic dishonesty are more likely to occur in online courses than in face-to-face ones. They certainly occur in both modes and may be more challenging to detect or monitor in online courses. Among the possible reasons for engaging in these acts are the following: easy access to information through technology and the Internet (Espiñeira-Bellón,2021) the notions of ownership, authenticity, and student collaboration (Blum, 2009; Evering & Moorman, 2012, as cited in Medina & Verdejo, 2008) and the lack of knowledge of institutional policies and personal contact with professors and Adzima professors (2020). It should be noted that, in general, the teacher is responsible for attending to and reporting the acts that occur in the courses. However, managing them informally or even ignoring them seems to be a common practice due to personal and institutional factors (Medina & Verdejo, 2008) To deal with acts of academic dishonesty, universities have resorted to three main strategies: defense, detection, and prevention.

For this reason, a multidisciplinary intervention is of the utmost importance, mainly both to the institution and the professors, in reiterating to the students that learning and the skills acquired and developed during the degree are more valuable than qualifications.

In addition, not ignoring this type of situation and enforcing the sanctions imposed in the regulations is necessary. Otherwise, there will be a rise in fraud detections, where not only students and teachers in one institution are involved, but greater frauds planned overseas affecting people, institutions, and governments.

Main limitations

The main limitation of this study was based on the implementation of the survey because it was developed in a short period of time for the availability of some professors and learners to respond since they were carrying out some other type of activity during class time but the most difficult fact regards to limitation was to find the characteristics of the group which was needed to perform the research; however, these limitations can be avoided in other future research projects.

Main applications and impact of the research

Thanks to the results and discoveries that were made, other works can be generated that complement and enrich this study. As well as addressing issues such as implementing solutions that help to avoid dishonest behavior in future professionals. In the academic field, what is fair is to have equity by holding responsible both those who commit an offense and those who allow them to execute it. Within the regulations of the University where the study was carried out, the rights and obligations of both teachers and students are marked, and their main norm is to respect the legislation of the institution, such as discipline, conduct, and ethics. Otherwise, anyone who breaks the established rules will be punished. The fundamental basis to prevent development in the professional field from being affected in the future is to raise awareness, promote a culture of honesty and integrity within the learning-teaching processes, develop habits and customs, and guide students in certain situations.

Conclusion

Studies from different countries have demonstrated that academic dishonesty is common. However, the perception and frequency of fraud varies. As mentioned in the previous section, a set of positive and negative aspects were detected in the behaviors and perceptions of the participants in this research.

To address and reduce the incidence, that is, the number of students who admitted to having practiced any of these dishonest behaviors and measure the impact that this type of behavior has had to get a passing grade, both teachers and institutions must get involved.

The problem is that if students do not learn and therefore do not manage to develop the necessary skills society is demanding because, during their studies, they presented a false medical certificate, copied answers during an exam, or even something as simple as answering the attendance list on behalf of a colleague, the behavior is likely to prevail when they go out into the working world. If they lack ethics and professionalism from their academic training, they may be prone to commit this type of offense.

Therefore, a multidisciplinary intervention is of utmost importance, regarding both the institution and the teachers, by reiterating to students that the skills obtained and developed during their studies are more valuable than the one number in the school record.

Given this problem, it would be reasonable not to overload students with an excessive number of tasks or topics that are irrelevant to the aim or learning that they are intended to achieve, moreover than to complete not only individual activities but also group activities where they can share different points of view on any topic. To promote peer work where feedback from students who have better performance can help classmates who have fallen behind and thus obtain better learning and understanding.

References

Comas, R., Lancaster, T., Calvo, A. & Negre, J. (2021). Copias en exámenes y violaciones de la integridad académica durante la pandemia de COVID-19: un análisis de la actividad de búsqueda en Internet en España. *Heliyon*, 7(10), e08233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. heliyon.2021.e08233

Del R Medina, M., & Verdejo, A. L. (2021). La deshonestidad académica estudiantil en cursos en línea y estrategias de defensa, detección y *prevención. HETS Online Journal*, 12(1), 49-77. https://doi.org/10.55420/2693.9193.v12.n1.44

Diez, E., (2015). Deshonestidad académica de alumnos y profesores: Su contribución en la desvinculación moral y corrupción social. *Sinéctica*, (44), 1-17. http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1665-109X2015000100014&lng=es&tlng=es.

Ercegovac, Z., & V. Richardson, J. (2004). Academic dishonesty, plagiarism included, in the digital age: A literature review. *College & Research Libraries*, (65), 300-318. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.65.4.301

Espiñeira, E., Mosteiro, M.J., Muñoz-Cantero, J.M., &Porto-Castro, M. (2020). La honestidad académica como criterio de evaluación de los trabajos del alumnado universitario. *RELIEVE*, 26(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.26.1.17097

LoSchiavo, F.M., & Shatz, M. A. (2011). The impact of an honor code on cheating in online *courses. MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(2), 179-184. https://silo.tips/download/ the-impact-of-an-honor-code-on-cheating-in-online-courses

Main, E. & Watson, R. (9 February 2022). The English test that ruined thousands of *lives. BBC News.* https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-60264106?zephr-modal-register

Martinez, L. & Ramírez, R. (2018). Fraude académico en universitarios en Colombia: ¿Qué tan crónica es la enfermedad? *Educação e Pesquisa*, (44), 1-19. http://www.redalyc.org/ articulo.oa?id=29858802007

McCabe, D.L., (1993). Faculty responses to academic dishonesty: The influence of student honor codes. *Res High Educ* (34), pp. 647–658. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00991924

McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Higher Education*, (70), 211–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1999.11780762

Mejía, J. F., (2004b). El fraude académico en la Universidad de los Andes. ¿Qué, qué tanto y por qué? *Revista de Estudios Sociales*. (18), pp. 13–25. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo. oa?id=81501802

Negre, J., Reynes, J., & Comas-Forgas, R. (2016). Reglamentación contra el fraude académico en las universidades españolas. *Revista de la Educación Superior*, 45(178), 31-44. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.resu.2016.03.002

Turner S., Beemsterbooer Phyllis L., (2003). Enhancing academic integrity: Formulating effective honor codes. *Journal of Dental Education*, 67(10), 1122-1129. https://doi. org/10.1002/j.0022-0337.2003.67.10.tb03705.x

Vaamonde, J., Omar, A. (2008). La deshonestidad académica como un constructo multidimensional. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos* (México), vol. XXXVIII, (3-4), 7-27. http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=27012440002

Watson, R. (10 February 2014). Student visa system fraud was exposed in a BBC investigation. BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-26024375

This call is addressed to: Professors – Researchers, graduate students from any Bachelor of Arts in English Letters and Masters in Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics programs, and any researchers and scholars who wish to publish research articles, research essays, or thesis results, all related to topics of the Journal: Language Teaching and Learning, Applied Linguistics, Values, and Culture.

The sections of the Journal are:
  a) Research Papers: Graduates' & teachers' voices – National and international research articles.
  b) Updating Language Teaching Professionals: CIEX Symposiums Proceedings.
  c) Personal Development and Growth: Moral Values and Culture Essays.

The guidelines for writing and presenting the proposals are described below:

1. Title: in English and in Spanish.

2. Summary (in English and Spanish, 150 words), containing the following aspects:
  a) **Introduction:** This section describes the context where the research was carried out, the reason why the research was carried out, and the importance of the study.
  b) **Purpose:** Here the writer states and explains the research objectives, intentions, questions, or hypothesis.
  c) **Research method:** In this part, the author mentions and justifies the research approach and method that were selected, briefly describes the subjects, the context, and the research procedures, as well as the instruments that were used for the data collection.
  d) **Results:** Here, the writer presents the main findings, the degree to which the research objectives were reached, and the answers to the research questions.
  e) **Conclusion:** This section presents the main conclusions, the importance of the findings, considering the contribution to the theory, the research area, or professional practice, and suggesting practical uses of the results, as well as possible applications for further research.

3. Body of the article:

  a) **Key words.** Five, in English and Spanish.
  b) **Introduction:** It presents the research topic area, and the research topic, mentioning if it is descriptive, explanatory, evaluative, correlational, interpretative, etc. Also, it emphasizes the research problem.
  c) **Literature review:** It presents the main terms, concepts, theoretical claims or principles, models, etc. analyzing and discussing the ideas presented by the main authors who have studied the topics related to the research or study presented. The references should not be more than 10 years after their publication, except from those classical research works.
  d) **Research methodology:** It describes the research approach: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods.
  e) **Describe the research method:** case study, phenomenology, action-research, classroom research, longitudinal research, transversal research, experimental research, cause-experimental research, etc.
    • Describe the **data type** (describe and justify the data base, universe, or sample, etc.)
    • Characterize the **subjects** (describe the participants in the research).
    • **Context** (describe the geographic and institutional context where the research was carried out).
    • **Instruments** (describe the research instruments used to collect information and data).
    • **Data analysis** (explain the way the data was systematized and analyzed).
  f) **Main findings.** Synthesize, present, interpret, and argue the most significant results found and the proposal, if the case of developing one.

g) **Conclusions.** Describe the main conclusions generated from the answers to the research questions.
h) **Main limitations of the study** (related to the geographical or institutional context, or knowledge area and the research process).
i) **Main implications and impact of the research.** Describe the main benefits of the research and the possible applications of the proposal.

Topics for the articles:

Topics of the articles should be recent and relevant for the academic community and should address one of the following research lines.
1. Language learning and teaching theories
2. Language professional competencies
3. Language teaching approaches and methods
4. Alternative language learning and teaching theories
5. Curriculum design: design of language programs
6. Design, selection, and adaptation of language teaching materials and activities
7. Language learning evaluation
8. Language and culture
9. Human values in language teaching
10. Personal development and growth in language professionals
11. Research and professional development
12. Educational technology in languages

Format:
- Title using Arial font, size 14
- Text using Arial font, size 12
- Margins: top 2.5, bottom 2.5, left 2.5, right 2.5.
- Spaces: 1.5
- No indented paragraphs

Length of the articles:
- 8 to 15 pages containing text (from 3000 to 5000 words approximately)
- Containing 20 to 40 references (using the American Psychological Association APA format)

Languages: The articles can be written in English or Spanish.

The editorial process includes a review by a strict pair of "blind" reviewers and using *Plagius software* to verify that ethical standards are respected and that there is no plagiarism in any of the documents. Then, authors are advised to verify the submissions including the call elements and format in advance.

The evaluation of submissions starts in the editorial process, which may end in declining submissions if they do not match the call and format requirements. When the editorial board accepts a submission, it continues to the double-blind peer review process as the final evaluation with the following results:
A. Accept Submission or Accept Submission with Modifications
B. Revisions Required or Resubmit for Review
C. Decline Submission

It is important to mention that if a blind reviewer declines the article or essay it will not be accepted.

Please upload the articles on the CIEX JOURNAL WEBSITE: http://journal.ciex.edu.mx

CRMCYT
SISTEMA DE CLASIFICACIÓN DE
REVISTAS MEXICANAS
DE CIENCIA Y TECNOLOGÍA

Google Scholar

latindex
LATINDEX-DIRECTORIO

LICENCIATURA EN INGLÉS

MAESTRÍA EN LA ENSEÑANZA DEL IDIOMA INGLÉS Y LINGÜÍSTICA APLICADA

CONVOCATORIA

El Centro de Idiomas Extranjeros "Ignacio Manuel Altamirano"

CONVOCA

A los aspirantes interesados en cursar la **Licenciatura en Letras Inglesas** (Modalidades: Presencial y/o en línea) o la **Maestría en la Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés y Lingüística Aplicada** a participar en el Concurso de Selección para el ingreso al Ciclo Escolar 2024-2025, presentando el examen de admisión que se realizará mediante previa cita hasta el 30 de agosto de 2024, conforme a los siguientes:

REQUISITOS

Los interesados en participar deben realizar todos los trámites y procedimientos institucionales, además de cumplir con los requisitos descritos en el cronograma y el instructivo correspondiente a esta Convocatoria, los cuales son:

- » Leer y aceptar los términos y condiciones de la convocatoria y su instructivo.
- » Realizar el registro en las fechas establecidas en esta Convocatoria.
- » Comunicarse a la institución para realizar una cita para el examen de admisión.
- » Pagar el derecho de examen de selección.
- » Presentar el examen de selección y una evaluación de valores y actitudes en el lugar, día y hora señalados, mediante previa cita.
- » Ser aceptados mediante un concurso de selección, dentro de los periodos que al efecto se señalen.
- » Recibir una carta de aceptación por parte del Comité Evaluador de la institución.
- » En caso de ser seleccionado en la **Licenciatura en Letras Inglesas,** contar con Certificado de Bachillerato con un promedio mínimo de ocho (8.0) o su equivalente y entregarlo con la demás documentación solicitada el día y en el lugar establecidos, de acuerdo con los términos señalados en la institución.
- » En caso de ser seleccionado en la **Maestría en la Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés y Lingüística Aplicada,** contar con Título de Licenciatura, Cédula Profesional, Carta de motivos, Certificación TOEFL (500 puntos mínimo).

Informes:

Teléfono: 747 49 4 79 73
WhatsApp: 747 108 1203
Pagina web: www.ciex.edu.mx
Correo electrónico: info@ciex.edu.mx

CIEX JOURN@L

INNOVATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

No.18

CIEX
Excellence in English