

Instructional Integrity for Blended Learning of Faculty Members in a Philippine State University

Charlene Joy Rectra Amar^{1,*}, Runato Armenia Basañes²

¹Department of College of Teacher Education, University of Antique, Tibiao, Philippines.

²Department of Student Affairs and Services Division, University of Antique, Sibalom, Philippines.
charlenejoyamar@gmail.com¹, runato.basan@antiquespride.edu.ph²

Abstract: For quality instructions to be successful in the blended learning modality, it is essentially important to ensure the faculty member's instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport. Thus, this mixed-method research, particularly explanatory sequential design, aimed to assess the instructional integrity of faculty members for blended learning in one of the State Universities in the Western Visayas Region in the Philippines. 378 participants evaluated their 209 course instructors/ professors using a validated and reliable researcher-made questionnaire-checklist titled Instructional Integrity Questionnaire. Descriptive statistics employed were frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. At the same time, t-tests for Independent Samples, One-way Analysis of Variance, and Least Significant Difference (LSD) were used as inferential statistics set at a .05 alpha level in a two-tailed test. The findings of the study revealed that the level of instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport was very high. There was a significant difference in the level of instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport when categorized as college. Moreover, the majority of the participants in the focus group discussion emphasized that their instructors/professors were highly credible, highly understandable and highly enjoyable, as evident in their coded responses and the themes provided.

Keywords: Behavioural Change; Blended Learning; Clarity and Credibility; Instructional Integrity; Mixed-Method Research; Rapport and Academics; Thematic Analysis; Learning Approach.

Received on: 28/08/2023, **Revised on:** 02/11/2023, **Accepted on:** 29/12/2023, **Published on:** 07/03/2024

Journal Homepage: <https://www.fmdbpub.com/user/journals/details/FTSTL>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69888/FTSTL.2024.000203>

Cite as: C. J. R. Amar and R. A. Basañes, "Instructional Integrity for Blended Learning of Faculty Members in a Philippine State University," *FMDB Transactions on Sustainable Techno Learning*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 11–31, 2024.

Copyright © 2024 C. J. R. Amar and R. A. Basañes, licensed to Fernando Martins De Bulhão (FMDB) Publishing Company. This is an open access article distributed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/), which allows unlimited use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium with proper attribution.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic was expected to have a long-term negative effect on the world economy and have a dramatic influence on academics' professional or personal lives. The pandemic has also directly influenced Higher Education and student experience. In most academic institutions, face-to-face (F2F) learning, often referred to as traditional learning, has been replaced by blended learning (BL) and/or online learning. According to UNESCO, as of April 10, 2020, more than 188 countries had implemented nationwide school and university closures. During these school closures, all face-to-face lessons were cancelled, compelling many institutions to immediately transition from in-person learning to entirely online learning. Online learning is often stigmatized as a weaker option that provides a lower quality education than in-person learning. Despite this notion, the University of Antique's administration found ways and means to mitigate the effect of the pandemic on the academic community. To enhance faculty members' and students' competence and confidence in both pedagogical and technical aspects

*Corresponding author.

of teaching and learning online and to ensure that quality instruction is continuously provided to students by their professors/instructors at the peak of the pandemic, the University of Antique launched e-skUelA: the kasUbAy Learning Management System (LMS) on June 15, 2020. It was developed and implemented across the University of Antique system. The eskUelA is a learning management system that uses the learning platform Moodle to create, migrate, manage, and track online instruction initiatives. Given the sudden change in the academic environment, it is important to document student preferences to report how students have perceived different teaching approaches before, during, and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Lesson planning and communication strategies require serious thought when moving from in-person to online instruction because the change is not natural [18]. Moreover, students' expectations of the course and the nature of instruction are influenced by their prior experience with online learning, which is a factor that cannot be ignored.

Considering that the majority of the University of Antique personnel and students were fully vaccinated, the University of Antique adopted this blended learning in the first semester of the Academic year 2021-2022 as a scheme for instructing students after complying with the requirements of the Commission on Higher Education, and the Department of Health, and the different Local Government Units and Local Inter-Agency Tasks Force. With this mixture of online and face-to-face learning, it provides teachers with the ability to personalize learning for students. It can transform teachers into learning designers, mentors, facilitators, tutors, evaluators and counsellors to reach each student in ways never before possible. As online learning technologies continue to advance, instructional communication researchers view these changes as chances to reflect on and improve their own pedagogical practices for use in online and hybrid classrooms. Instructors may do a better job of meeting students' expectations if they are aware of what those expectations are in relation to the delivery of both online and in-person courses. This study examines the faculty members' instructional integrity and instructional climate for blended learning and their expectancy violations, which will help identify opportunities for classroom relations and learning improvement among students.

Therefore, for quality instruction to be successful in the blended learning approach, it is important to ensure the faculty member's instructional integrity, which involves dimensions such as credibility, clarity, and rapport. This study aimed to assess the University of Antique faculty members' instructional integrity for blended learning in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport when taken as an entire group and when categorized according to academic rank, college, courses taught, and employment status. It further seeks to find out whether or not a significant difference existed in faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport for blended learning when categorized according to the variables mentioned. The Connectivism theory is an autonomous way of learning. The group was independent in choosing a medium, aggregating, creating, relating and sharing the information outside the classroom. They were responsible for setting learning goals, managing time, identifying resources, trying out new media tools and making them work. What constitutes an online educational experience includes learning theory and internet technologies. The cognitive theory of learning originally proposed a pedagogical triangle consisting of students, teachers, and content; however, in the connectivism learning theory, this triangle is transformed into a tetrahedron consisting of students, teachers, networks, and content, thereby including the network into the educational process.

Learning and knowledge are based on diversity of opinion, according to Siemens' Eight Principles of Connectivism Learning Theory. 3) Learning can exist in non-human appliances. 4) The capacity to know more is more important than what is currently known. 5) In order to facilitate continual learning, it is necessary to nurture and maintain connections. Recognizing the interconnectedness of several domains, ideas, and concepts is an essential competency. 8) Making decisions is a form of learning, and 7) The goal of all connectivism learning activities is to acquire currency, which is to say, correct and current knowledge. The current state of affairs caused by the COVID-19 outbreak makes traditional classroom instruction seem impossible. As a result, the DepEd proposed strategies to adjust to the dynamic nature of education. The introduction of hybrid curricula in the Philippines is one such example.

One way to educate students is through blended learning, which mixes online resources with more conventional classroom approaches. In response to the widespread assumption that this is a completely new strategy, Leonor Briones, secretary of the department, clarified that distant learning has been in use in the country for many years. Online courses and exams have recently become standard components of the curriculum at several universities. Despite this assertion, there are still current obstacles to online education. Still, we can have a successful semester if we have the right information and the government backs us. CHED Memorandum Order 16 series of 2022 cited that for HEIs that will opt to deliver their degree programs in hybrid learning modality, "at least 50 percent of the total contact time on onsite learning experiences" should be implemented. "The rest of the contact hours may be delivered through other flexible learning strategies such as self-paced printed or online learning modules, synchronous or asynchronous learning sessions and remotely guided peer learning approaches." The following are identified benefits of blended learning: enhances safety, promotes autonomy, improves feedback system, boosts efficiency, and allows flexibility.

According to research out of Saudi Arabia, most teachers knew what to do in a mixed classroom. The study also concluded that blended learning makes it easier to provide students with access to lessons at any time and from any location. The results showed that faculty members have a favorable impression of the cost-effectiveness of blended learning. The flexibility it provides in terms of accessing course materials at any time and from any location describes blended learning. It shows how much people value their own space and how easy it is to obtain educational materials. Blended learning is one example of how it provides a foundation for a number of important instructional tools for distant learning [34]. Furthermore, this clarifies how blended-based instruction's access to a variety of course materials helps students retain more knowledge [32] outside of traditional classroom settings. In addition, students are more actively involved and engaged when blended-based learning is used [9].

According to research out of Saudi Arabia, most teachers knew what to do in a mixed classroom. The study also concluded that blended learning makes it easier to provide students with access to lessons at any time and from any location. The results showed that faculty members have a favorable impression of the cost-effectiveness of blended learning. The flexibility it provides in terms of accessing course materials at any time and from any location describes blended learning. It shows how much people value their own space and how easy it is to obtain educational materials. Blended learning is one example of how it provides a foundation for a number of important instructional tools for distant learning [34]. Furthermore, this clarifies how blended-based instruction's access to a variety of course materials helps students retain more knowledge [32] outside of traditional classroom settings. In addition, students are more actively involved and engaged when blended-based learning is used [9].

While some faculty members have reservations about web-based instruction due to its time-consuming nature and more stringent teaching-learning preparations, the majority of academic staff members agree that it complements physical teaching well. Blended learning, which combines online and in-person training, encourages more active participation from students and implies that both methods work well together. So, it gives students more leeway to actively participate in class [1]. Blended learning has also been defined as a mixed method of teaching that provides students with beneficial learning possibilities. According to the findings, most educators agree that collaborative planning opens doors for professional growth in blended learning settings [29]. As a result, rather than relying on a patchwork of smaller learning tasks, instructors may better guarantee that their students' goals are in line with the course material and activities [26]. This leads to a more holistic approach to training. In the context of blended-based instruction, this clarifies how the two parts work hand in hand. In order to achieve the desired learning result, it differentiates and offers customisation [25].

2. Literature Review

2.1. Academic Integrity

The four commonalities among the various definitions of integrity—justice, coherence, ethical principles, and suitable motivation—are outlined by Bosch and Cavallotti [31]. A concept that aligns with this idea would be to behave in a fair and consistent manner, driven by principles of ethics and with a focus on doing good. Academic integrity, as it pertains to education, can be defined as the practice of consistently studying and completing academic tasks in a fair and consistent manner, with a desire to learn and a focus on how that knowledge can benefit others. Academic integrity, according to the International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI), is a set of fundamental principles that serve as a roadmap for future students to follow in order to overcome personal and professional obstacles and succeed in all areas of life. Academic integrity is the refusal to engage in any form of dishonesty or cheating, regardless of how challenging the work may be, and the execution of all academic tasks with a sense of responsibility, honesty, respect, trust, equity, and bravery. The goal of every academic institution should be to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity because it is a fundamental quality of all academic endeavors and a necessary component of any teaching-learning process that aims to achieve these goals. Conceptually, there is a framework provided by approaches to academic integrity. Nevertheless, it is necessary to outline specific student behaviors associated with academic integrity. These behaviors include being truthful, participating actively in class and assignments, following directions to the letter, answering exams with only approved material, properly attributing others' work, and working together in a fair manner on group projects [46]. A prerequisite for these "observable" behaviors to be considered authentic expressions of academic integrity is a desire to learn [14].

2.2. Instructor's Credibility

The importance of a speaker's credibility in persuading an audience to believe what they say has been acknowledged in various situations and dates back to the time of Aristotle. It should come as no surprise that the credibility of the instructor plays a crucial role in the interactions and outcomes between the teacher and the students. Teachers need their students to view them as reliable sources of knowledge if they want to enhance learning through meaning transfer [3]. Students' emotional and intellectual development were shown to be intricately related to instructors' credibility, which is a multi-faceted concept.

Instructor credibility is defined by their scale as having goodwill, trustworthiness, and competency all rolled into one [15]. Goodwill pertains to whether students perceive their instructors as caring about their welfare through the demonstration of empathy, understanding, and responsiveness; trustworthiness centers on the degree to which students believe their instructors possess integrity; competence refers to the extent to which students consider their instructors to be subject matter experts. Students are less likely to be rude, more engaged in class, and driven to learn when they have faith in their teacher.

Researchers have looked at how students perceive teachers' credibility based on their appearance, but they've discovered that teachers' communication behaviors both in and out of class had the biggest impact [10]. Instructor credibility has a wide range of effects on students, including an increase in the following: [3] better lecture memorization and accuracy; [47] more student intent to persist in college; and more students' likelihood of re-enrollment with or recommendation of the instructor. The importance of credibility in the instructor-student communication has been acknowledged by many. However, researchers did not start looking into how different teacher actions affect students' views of it until the 1990s. A number of factors have been identified since then that contribute to students' good views of instructors' trustworthiness, including technology utilization [35], fairness [41], clarity [36], humor [27], and instructors' immediacy behaviors [45]. Studies have shown that students' post-test scores are higher when they regard their instructors as credible, which in turn is connected with better affective and cognitive learning [11]. Students are less likely to act rudely and more likely to participate actively in class when they have a positive impression of their teachers' believability. These findings highlight the significance of credibility in the classroom by showing a correlation between a credible teacher and successful student results.

Research on the reliability of online courses has mostly been on the ways in which teachers employ technology in relation to its integration into face-to-face (FTF) lessons [35]. The impact of teachers' usage of social media on students' views of their credibility has been the subject of several research. But there is a dearth of studies that examine how online students evaluate the authenticity of their teachers. Credibility and expert power are conceptually similar; both are linked to students' favorable impressions of the teacher and their judgments of their own cognitive development [39]. Based on their findings, which include improved study motivation, an impact on the instructor and the course, and a perception of cognitive learning, Kaufmann and Buckner [40] suggest that online educators display expert power. They provide a number of actions that online teachers can do to establish their authority and credibility, which in turn increases their expert power. Replicating this study with an emphasis on credibility would probably find the same results, since credibility is a component of expert power. Despite a lack of extensive research on what makes an online instructor credible, it's reasonable to assume that nonverbal immediacy and humor, for example, are hard to convey in settings where visual and auditory cues are scarce or nonexistent. The impact of nonverbal immediacy behaviors on threat mitigation was examined in a study of online text-only educational communication by Trad et al. [30]. Students' state motivation was comparable in the text-only face threat mitigation condition to that in the nonverbal immediacy condition, according to the study. This suggests that, just as nonverbal immediacy behaviors have an impact on students' perceptions of instructor credibility in face-to-face (FTF) courses, face threat mitigation may do the same in text-only online courses.

2.3. Instructor's Clarity

There are many factors that contribute to an instructor's clarity, which is generally understood as their ability to present course material in an organized and understandable way [42]. These include the instructor's vocal clarity, the organization of their presentations, the amount of time they spend on each topic, and their speaking pace. Student involvement and understanding are enhanced when both the instructor's performance and the course material are easily understood. Muir et al. [44] conducted a qualitative and longitudinal study, and participants consistently cited well-structured courses with explicit goals and objectives as crucial to their success in online learning. It is crucial for online instructors to be clear with their students so that they can achieve better results and retain more of what they learn. Research has shown that when instructors are clear and concise, it has a beneficial impact on students' motivation, cognitive learning, and emotional assessments of both the instructor and the course [23]; [38]. So, fundamental to teaching is the pursuit of facilitation of learning and the creation of a pleasant learning environment through the use of clear and succinct instruction [21]; [22].

By investigating strategies that help students follow directions more effectively, researchers have identified numerous important ways in which teachers can improve their own clarity in the classroom [24]. The use of transitions and previews, as well as the structuring of content and presentation structure, have been identified as useful approaches for boosting instructional clarity in these research [19]. Signaling is drawing students' attention to key points by highlighting them and making use of outlines and titles [37]. Lack of specificity in language refers to explanations or vocabulary that don't make sense, "tangles of words" that cause others to become confused, and speech patterns that make it hard for others to understand what you're trying to say. When teachers talk about how their lessons are relevant, they're referring to coherence and redundancy. It can be detrimental to students' learning if teachers load their lectures with superfluous, repetitious, or "extra" information. Students won't be able to grasp the concepts taught in class if they are unable to keep up with the pace of the information [42]. To avoid overwhelming students' working memory capacity, teachers should use appropriate pacing that allows them enough time to reflect on the

material [20]. The present study includes clarity as a focal construct because there is strong evidence that it is important for effective training. There has been very little investigation into clarity in relation to online education in the last several years. When online education first started to gain traction in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, that's when the vast majority of the study on the topic was done. Although the circumstances under which these tests were conducted have probably changed substantially due to the fast development of technology, there are several elements that remain constant. In a qualitative research conducted in 2006, participants were specifically asked about the requirements for succeeding in an online course. According to [13], most students want more direction, more specific objectives from teachers, and more frequent feedback on their work. Clear feedback, uniform layout, easy navigation, and learner control over pacing are fundamental elements that promote effective online training, according to a synthesis of the work of the late 20th century.

Regardless of this strong backing for clarity, online learning is reliant on technology. Consequently, students' expectations for clarity in their online classes need to be reevaluated because, as technology has progressed, so has their perception of clarity. An early research on asynchronous online learning indicated that students' happiness and perceived learning were affected by three main criteria, one of which was the clarity of the course design [28]. Recent research by Limperos et al. [2] cast doubt on the idea that clarity has a favorable effect on either perceived or actual learning; instead, they postulated that instructional environment would mitigate this effect. In this study, the construct was only slightly altered; in the high-clarity condition, preview and summary slides were added, whereas in the low-clarity condition, they were removed. However, additional investigation into clarity in online contexts is necessary due to the disparity in results. Perceptions of instructor credibility, as judged by the McCroskey and Teven [15] credibility scale, were shown to be greater in the higher clarity condition, according to Limperos et al. [2]. The inclusion of both constructs in the present investigation is supported by this evidence of a link between them.

2.4. Instructor's Rapport

Originally envisioned for corporate settings, rapport was later extended to the instructional environment by Gremler and Gwinner [12]. These authors defined rapport as the personal connection between interactants, like when a consumer has a nice engagement with a service provider. It consists of a pleasant interaction, which occurs when one person has a positive impression of another through communication, and a personal connection or bond between the people involved that goes beyond their assigned duties [12]. After adapting this construct for use in the classroom, Frisby and Myers [5] discovered a strong relationship between rapport and the following outcomes: effect, motivation, satisfaction, and engagement. A crucial component of effective instructional communication, instructor rapport reliably predicts students' cognitive and affective learning [5]. The capacity to connect with students on a personal level is cited by students as a crucial quality of good teachers [43]. Students' attitudes and motivation are positively impacted when they establish rapport with their instructor. This is because students see an understanding or caring attachment, which in turn leads to greater motivation [17]. Positive affective states, like confidence, and negative affective ones, like worry, are both enhanced by rapport [6].

The impact of rapport on students' cognitive learning is, of course, the most intriguing to teachers. According to research, it improves both the expected and actual final grades, as well as the grade point average and test scores. Students are more likely to engage in communicative behaviors that are connected with learning outcomes when they and their teachers have a good rapport, according to a popular line of study on rapport [8]. Because students' active engagement is "an essential part of the teaching and learning process," teachers should prioritize developing and sustaining positive relationships with their students. There is a dearth of literature on rapport in distance education courses at the present time. This study seeks to fill a research vacuum by investigating strategies for increasing student engagement in online classrooms [7].

A wide range of helpful actions taken by teachers constitute rapport. Students listed a variety of behaviors—including being attentive (e.g., using names), being personable (common grounding), courteous (e.g., empathy), connecting (e.g., humor), and sharing information (e.g., credibility)—as ways in which their teachers establish rapport with them [33]. What is less known is how these behaviors are transferred to virtual classrooms. Despite the ever-improving state of online learning tools, students may still find it challenging to establish rapport with their instructors when taking classes remotely. Building rapport can be tough due to the asynchronous nature of online learning, which is why it is popular with students. Teachers can help students feel more connected by making use of audio and video records. However, there are many that try to implement synchronous classes using video conferencing software; however, these approaches fall short when it comes to making up for the absence of face-to-face interaction that is inherent to online education. However, there are advantages to having no visual cues from a speaker as well. The participants are evaluated solely based on their written responses, not their physical appearance or vocal delivery. Social presence has been positively associated to happiness and perceived learning [16], and there is some evidence that rapport in online classroom contexts increases feelings of social presence [5]. Nevertheless, there is a need for additional research on rapport in online contexts. This research should focus on understanding how students' expectations of rapport, whether fulfilled or not, influence their judgments of emotional and cognitive learning. The study also looks at how students

perceive the online classroom climate, which is essential because rapport is a relational component that has a beneficial effect on classroom climate.

3. Methodology

This mixed-method research, particularly explanatory sequential design, primarily aimed to assess the University of Antique faculty members’ instructional integrity for blended learning as evaluated by students. Since the purpose of this study was to determine the faculty members’ instructional integrity for blended learning, it was necessary to collect information from students enrolled in the main, external or extension campuses of the university. The respondents were randomly chosen as the secondary variables. Thus, the study was conducted during the synchronous or asynchronous online and face-to-face class schedules of faculty members and students. The participants were coded as P1 and so on. Furthermore, this study used two sets of questionnaire-checklists, one for Online/Asynchronous Classes and the other set for Face-to-Face classes. The instrument titled Faculty Members’ Instructional Integrity is divided into two parts. Part 1 is for personal information that includes secondary variables, and Part 2 is the questionnaire on faculty members’ instructional integrity. These were used to gather quantitative data, while focus group interviews were used to gather qualitative data that followed the thematic data analysis method in describing the results. The reliability test revealed the following Cronbach’s alpha results for the various dimensions of instructional integrity: credibility = 0.93, clarity = 0.94, and rapport = 0.92.

The participants of this study presented in Table 1 are the 378 stratified randomly selected students of the University of Antique system who represented the various colleges of the university. They evaluated their 209-course instructors/professors who are either permanent or part-time/contract of service. The expected respondents were the randomly chosen students enrolled in the e-skUelA: Learning Management System of the University. The researcher centralized the study in the university and its identified campuses, for it was noted that only this university had established an online teaching-learning platform, which is e-skUelA in the Western Visayas has an official schedule of asynchronous and synchronous and/or Face-to-Face classes; thus, this study was restricted to this university as to its implementation.

Table 1: Distribution of Student-Participants by Year Levels in All Campuses

Year Levels	Population Size	Percentage	Sample Size
First Year	7, 542	35	132
Second Year	5, 872	27	102
Third Year	4, 084	19	72
Fourth Year	4, 223	19	72
Total	21,721	100	378

Table 2 presents the data of 209 faculty members across campuses of the University of Antique as evaluated by their students, wherein 61% were from the main campus, and 39% were from external campus broken down as follows: 29% were from campus B, 6% were from campus C, 2% were from campus D, and another 2 % were from campus E.

Table 2: Faculty Members of All Campuses Evaluated by Students

University of Antique Campuses	Population Size	Percentage	Sample Size
Main Campus:			
Campus A	277	61	127
External Campus:			
Campus B	132	29	61
Campus C	29	6	13
Campus D	8	2	4
Campus E	7	2	4
Total	453	100	209

Table 3 shows the distribution of participants according to selected variables. As to the entire group, 378 student participants were involved in the study. As to year level, there were 132 from the first year, 102 from the second year, 72 from the third year, and 72 from the fourth year. As to campus, there were 259 from the main campus and 119 from the external campus, broken down as follows: 71 from campus B, 27 from campus C, 13 from campus D, and 8 from Campus E. As to colleges, 42 were from College A, 44 were from College B, 51 were from College C, 99 were from College D, 81 were from College E, 36 were from College F, and 25 were from College G. As to courses taken, 118 student-participants taken general education, 127 taken professional education, and 133 taken specialization. On the other hand, as to the entire group of 209 faculty members to

be evaluated by students, 98 were instructors, 71 were assistant professors, and 40 associate professors and full professors. As to employment status, 119 were permanent, and 90 were in contract of service or part-time. As to courses taught, 65 faculty members taught general education, 71 taught professional education, and 73 taught specialization courses.

Table 3: Distribution of Participants According to Variables

Variables	f	%
Entire group of respondents (Students)	378	100
Year level		
First Year	132	35
Second Year	102	27
Third Year	72	19
Forth Year	72	19
Campus		
Main Campus:		
Campus A	259	69
External Campus:		
Campus B	71	19
Campus C	27	7
Campus D	13	3
Campus E	8	2
Colleges		
College A	42	11
College B	44	12
College C	51	13
College D	99	26
College E	81	21
College F	36	10
College G	25	7
Courses taken		
General Education	118	31
Professional Education	127	34
Specialization	133	35
Entire group of subjects to be evaluated by students	209	100
Academic rank		
Instructor	98	47
Assistant Professor	71	34
Associate Professor/ Professor	40	19
Employment status		
Permanent	119	57
Contract of Service/Part-time	90	43

To determine the score of the individual respondents on the faculty members’ instructional integrity for blended learning, the numerical equivalents of the respondents’ options were added, and the mean for the particular area was computed. The mean was translated into a numerical scale with a corresponding verbal description shown below:

Scale	Description
3.26 - 4.00	Very High
2.51 - 3.25	High
1.76 - 2.50	Low
1.00 - 1.75	Very Low

To determine the score of the individual respondents on the faculty members’ instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning, the numerical equivalents of the respondents’ options were added, and the mean for the particular area was computed. The mean was translated into a numerical scale with a corresponding verbal description shown below:

Scale	Description
3.26 - 4.00	Highly Credible
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Credible
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Credible
1.00 - 1.75	Not Credible

To determine the score of the individual respondents on the faculty member's instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning, the numerical equivalents of the respondents' options were added, and the mean for the particular area was computed. The mean was translated into a numerical scale with a corresponding verbal description shown below:

Scale	Description
3.26 - 4.00	Highly Understandable
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Understandable
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Understandable
1.00 - 1.75	Not Understandable

To determine the score of the individual respondents on the faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning, the numerical equivalents of the respondents' options were added, and the mean for the particular area was computed. The mean was translated into a numerical scale with a corresponding verbal description shown below:

Scale	Description
3.26 - 4.00	Highly Enjoyable
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Enjoyable
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Enjoyable
1.00 - 1.75	Not Enjoyable

Statistical tests used to interpret the data were frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation for descriptive statistics, t-test for Independent Samples, One-way ANOVA, and Least significant difference (LSD) for inferential statistics. The significance level for all inferential data was set at alpha 0.05 in a two-tailed test. All statistical computations were processed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, Version 22.0.

4. Results and Discussion

Environmental Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility for Blended Learning. The level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was ascertained in this study. The level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility was taken as an entire group and classified according to academic rank, colleges, courses taught, and employment status. It was determined by computing the mean scores and standard deviation. As an entire group, results of the study showed that, as an entire group, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was noted as "Highly credible", as indicated by an overall mean of 3.63 (SD =0.35). The result implies that the instructors/professors manifested behaviours like being intelligent, sensitive and understanding, trustworthy and honourable, competent in their work, etc. They greatly influence the students in their face-to-face and online learning.

As to academic rank, the Results of the study showed that as to academic rank, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was "Highly credible". It is noticed that faculty members ranked as instructors and associate professors/full professors are of the same mean of 3.63 and vary on their SD of .01 only. However, assistant professors have a mean value of 3.60 (SD = .30), which is lower than the mean for instructors and associate professors/full professors. As to colleges, the results of the study revealed that, as to colleges, the level of faculty member's instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was "Highly credible". This implies that in whatever college faculty members belong to, they are said to be capable of establishing a positive relationship that enhances students' affective and cognitive learning. Taking into consideration the values of mean per college, it is noticed that college G (\bar{x} =3.83, SD=.27) has a greater mean score, followed by college A (\bar{x} =3.73, SD=.21), followed by college C (\bar{x} =3.70, SD=.31), followed by college E (\bar{x} =3.68, SD=.30), followed by college B (\bar{x} =3.58, SD=.35), and of college F (\bar{x} =3.58, SD=.36) they are of the same mean score. The college that has a lower mean score is the college grouped as college D (\bar{x} =3.49, SD=.40).

As to courses taught, the results of the study explained that, as to courses taught, the level of faculty member's instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was "Highly credible". That is to say, faculty members teaching either general education, professional education, and or specialization are subject matter experts and possess exemplary influence on

the learning of students. Considering the values of the mean for general education (\bar{x} =3.62, SD =.35), professional education (\bar{x} =3.63, SD =.35), and specialization (\bar{x} =3.63, SD =.33), it is noticed that general education has a lower mean value compared to professional education and specialization. As to employment status, the Results of the study revealed that employment status and the level of faculty member’s instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning was “Highly credible”. This explains that whether the faculty members are permanent or part-time/contract of service, they are concerned with the welfare of their students by demonstrating empathy, understanding and responsiveness. Considering the mean value, permanent faculty (\bar{x} =3.65, SD =.32) has a greater mean compared to part-time/contract of service (\bar{x} =3.58, SD =.39). Table 4 presents the data.

Table 4: Level of Faculty Members’ Instructional Integrity in terms of Credibility for Blended Learning

Variables	Mean	SD	Description
Entire group	3.63	.35	Highly Credible
Academic rank			
Instructors	3.63	.36	Highly Credible
Assistant Professors	3.60	.30	Highly Credible
Asso Professors/Full Professors	3.63	.35	Highly Credible
Colleges			
College A	3.74	.21	Highly Credible
College B	3.58	.35	Highly Credible
College C	3.70	.31	Highly Credible
College D	3.49	.40	Highly Credible
College E	3.68	.30	Highly Credible
College F	3.58	.36	Highly Credible
College G	3.83	.27	Highly Credible
Courses taught			
General Education	3.62	.35	Highly Credible
Professional Education	3.63	.35	Highly Credible
Specialization	3.63	.33	Highly Credible
Employment status			
Permanent	3.65	.32	Highly Credible
Part-time/Contract of Service	3.58	.39	Highly Credible

*Legend:

3.26 - 4.00	Highly Credible
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Credible
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Credible
1.00 - 1.75	Not Credible

The faculty members’ instructional integrity in terms of credibility for blended learning results was further elaborated and given emphasis by the thematic results of a focus group discussion (FGD) with open-ended questions on faculty member’s instructional integrity and instructional climate for blended learning (Face-to-Face and Online). Qualitative research question 1 focuses on instructional integrity in terms of credibility, which inquired about “the characteristics of the participants’ instructors/professors that make them feel that they are credible”. The themes that emerged from the analysis conducted to answer research question 1 can be found in table 5 with the descriptions and frequencies of each theme. Table 5 shows that the most frequently occurring theme is the instructor’s and professor’s conduct. In response to the open-ended question, “What characteristics of your instructor/professor make you feel that he/she is credible?” The majority of the participants pointed out that their instructors/professors are intelligent, competent, knowledgeable, well-informed, topic-oriented, presentable, strict, time-conscious, problem-solver and flexible. For instance, one participant revealed that,

“the characteristics of our instructor that makes him credible is intelligent dahil during our face-to-face class ga discuss tana kahit wara tana ginakaptan, nasaulo na tapos may handouts man kami, nasundan man namon kag tana naga eskuwela sa masters degree na.” (the characteristics of our instructor that make him credible is his intelligence because,

during face-to-face class, he discusses topics with mastery, we were provided with handouts to keep track of our lessons, and he pursues a master's degree).

Another participant stated that,

“Sa face-to-face our instructor/professor is time-conscious, well-informed kag topic-oriented kag ga attend man sanda ka seminar kag same man sa online class ma explain man tanda kay syempre ang topic namon is daw tama ka budlay kag may in real life situation pa.” (During face-to-face [classes], our instructor/professor is time-conscious, well-informed, and topic-oriented. They attend seminars as well. During online classes, they can explain difficult topics that require real-life examples with clarity).

This qualitative research question 1 was further supported by the second most frequently occurring theme, which is relational, as defined by the following descriptions for blended learning. These are caring, understanding, motivating or encouraging, good-natured, kind, considerate, approachable, friendly or easy-going. As one participant explained,

“Our teachers or professors, be it online or face-to-face and characteristics Nanda is pareho sanda knowledgeable, approachable and easy-going.” (Our teachers or professors are all knowledgeable, approachable, and easy-going whether they conduct classes online or face-to-face).

Another participant emphasized that,

“The thing that makes (sic) our instructors credible is before we start our online class, our instructor checks us first to see if we are all present if our network or internet is stable, and if she is audible like that. She is very approachable. She is willing to give advice and motivates his/her students to continue our goals in life.”

Some themes that the researcher formulated were based on the participant's responses, such as credentials, organization, and quality of the materials/information. An additional theme was feedback from students, which was the basis for improvement in relation to faculty members' instructional integrity and credibility. Table 5 reveals the data.

Table 5: Instructional Integrity Open-Ended Responses Regarding Credibility

Theme	Description	Frequency
Credentials	Educational attainment, master's degree, accomplishments or achievements, lifelong learner, experiences (professional growth), attended seminars.	(3) P1,P2, P10
Conduct	Intelligent, mastery of the lesson, competence (strong understanding of the curriculum and the usage of the online platform), articulate, knowledgeable, well-informed, topic-oriented, smooth delivery of info, collaborative, active, presentable, energetic, firm voice, soft-spoken, calm presence, authoritative demeanour, strict, disciplinarian, time-conscious, problem-solver, flexible,	(15) P1, P8, P12, P13, P14, P16, P4, P2, P6, P15, P5, P11, P9, P10, P12
Organization	Classroom management skills: well-prepared, easy to navigate course material/information through repetition of examples, well-prepared, gives regular updates/reminders and checks attendance and internet connectivity.	(6) P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7
Relational	Caring, loving, understanding, motivating or encouraging, good-natured, kind, considerate, lively, approachable, friendly or easy-going, fun, upbeat, sense of humour, empathetic, accepting, sincere, genuine, patient, helpful, accommodating of different attitudes or diverse learners, believable, determined, humble, compassionate.	(14) P1, P3, P6, P4, P7, P9, P12, P13, P2, P8, P15, P5, P16, P14
Quality Materials/Info	Accurate/detailed/thorough with lessons/discussion, drawing connections using real-life examples	(2) P10, P12,
Feedback from Students	Some teachers are inconsiderate. Limited time is given for the math quiz. Some teachers are time-conscious, and some are not. Some professors have limited knowledge and skills in educational technology and cannot adapt to online classes. Delay or late in online class meetings.	(3) P9, P10, P13

4.1. Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Clarity for Blended Learning

The level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning when they were taken as an entire group and when they were classified according to academic rank, colleges, courses taught, and employment status was determined by computing the mean scores. As an entire group, results of the study affirmed that, as an entire group, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning was described as "Highly understandable", as indicated by an overall mean of 3.60 (SD =0.36). This pointed out that in blended learning, faculty members of the University of Antique were viewed by their students as someone who clearly define major concepts (explicitly state definitions, correct partial or incorrect students' responses, refine terms to make definitions clearer), and comprehensively and appropriately detailed in giving instruction which helped them develop their critical and analytical skills. Further, Bolkan et al. [42] emphasize that if students cannot keep up with the course materials, they cannot understand their lessons; hence, pacing has been noted as an important factor in student comprehension.

As to academic rank, results of the study revealed that academic rank, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning was "Highly understandable", as revealed by the mean scores of those in instructor positions (\bar{x} =3.61, SD=.36) which has a greater mean value compared to assistant professor (\bar{x} =3.58, SD=.36) and associate professor (\bar{x} =3.60, SD=.33). This elucidates the idea that faculty members whether they are ranked as instructors, assistant professors, and associate professors or full professors are effective in presenting the course content in an understandable and organized manner. As to colleges, the results of the study expressed that the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning was "Highly understandable". This clarifies that, in whatever college faculty members belong to, they could structure their presentations well and manage the time spent and the speaking pace both online and face-to-face. Taking into consideration the values of mean per college, it was noticed that college A (\bar{x} =3.75, SD=.19) has a greater mean score, followed by college G (\bar{x} =3.72, SD=.39), followed by college C (\bar{x} =3.66, SD=.31), with the same mean score with college E (\bar{x} =3.66, SD=.32), followed by college F (\bar{x} =3.59, SD=.35), and of college B (\bar{x} =3.56, SD=.40). The college that has a lowest mean score is college D (\bar{x} =3.47, SD=.39).

As to courses taught, the results showed that, as to courses taught, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning was "Highly understandable". This would mean that faculty members teaching either general education, professional education, and/or specialization are organized regarding the course materials used, providing clear instructions and clear expectations, which are integral in supporting and maintaining learning engagement among students. Considering the values of the mean for general education (\bar{x} =3.62, SD=.38), professional education (\bar{x} =3.57, SD=.37), and specialization (\bar{x} =3.62, SD=.33), it is noticed that professional education has a lower mean value compared to general education and specialization that both have similar mean values of 3.62. As to employment status, as revealed in the result, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning was "Highly understandable". This connotes that whether a faculty member is permanent or part-time/contract of service, they are skilful in redirecting low-clarity conditions to high-clarity conditions among students in both online and face-to-face classes. The mean value illustrates that permanent faculty (\bar{x} =3.63, SD=.33) has a greater mean compared to part-time/contract of service (\bar{x} =3.55, SD=.40).

To further attest to the results on faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning, qualitative research question 2 inquired about "the help of the mechanisms provided by the instructors/professors to participants in order to understand better the course content." The themes that emerged from the analysis conducted to answer research question 2 can be found in Table 7, with the descriptions and frequencies of each theme. Table 6 presents the data.

Table 6: Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Clarity for Blended Learning

Variables	Mean	SD	Description
A. Clarity			
Entire group	3.60	.36	Highly Understandable
Academic rank			
Instructors	3.61	.36	Highly Understandable
Assistant Professors	3.58	.36	Highly Understandable
Associate Professors/Full Professors	3.60	.33	Highly Understandable
Colleges			
College A	3.75	.19	Highly Understandable
College B	3.56	.40	Highly Understandable

College C	3.66	.31	Highly Understandable
College D	3.47	.39	Highly Understandable
College E	3.66	.32	Highly Understandable
College F	3.59	.35	Highly Understandable
College G	3.72	.39	Highly Understandable
Courses Taught			
General Education	3.62	.38	Highly Understandable
Professional Education	3.57	.37	Highly Understandable
Specialization	3.62	.33	Highly Understandable
Employment status			
Permanent	3.63	.33	Highly Understandable
Part-time/Contract of Service	3.55	.40	Highly Understandable

*Legend:

3.26 - 4.00	Highly Understandable
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Understandable
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Understandable
1.00 - 1.75	Not Understandable

Table 7 showed that the most frequently occurring theme was the instructor's and professor's pace/timing. The majority of the participants pointed out that their instructors/professors could help them understand the course content by observing the appropriate pace, making the lesson understandable, explaining the lesson repeatedly/at length the topics or points until understood, spending extra time for those who need more explanation or need to ask questions, talks slowly, clearly and taking time to fully explain and elaborate the topic and provide assistance during laboratory experiments. For instance, one participant stated that,

"In our online class, our teacher explained her topics para maintindihan gid namon kag naga tugro tana kang activities para ma understand gid namon kag mapadalum man ang amon knowledge kag ma improve pa gid amon skills. So, what gives them clarity on teaching different lessons to us is they provide a relevant example, then they connect the lesson to what is happening around us, and they have the ability to become relatable in lessons; they are slow to speak but quick to listen when we asked questions and they really explained it further not just pahapyaw lang nga pag explain bala but to deepen our understanding about the lesson, they also provide relevant and realistic examples" (In our class, our teacher explained her topics in a way we could understand; she provides activities that heighten our understanding and improve our skills..they really provide substantial explanation to deepen our understanding of the lesson...)

Another participant stressed that,

"During our face-to-face class, as science majors, our professors and teachers helped us during our laboratory time, and they assisted and showed us how to perform our laboratory experiments."

This qualitative research question 2 was further supported by the two second most frequently occurring themes, which are more/varied content and quality/complete information. The following descriptions for blended learning define the more/varied content. These are scaffolding the lessons to be understood by the students, video presentations, laboratory activities, reporting, activities utilizing in-depth research of a lesson/topic, group activities, integrating different strategies, providing lecture notes, and providing multiple format explanations (visual/audio/text). For the quality/complete information, these descriptions help define this theme: detailed in his/her explanations, provide numerous examples, integrate real-life situations as an example, provide clear instructions, and provide learning activities. As one participant shared:

"While during online classes, they show us some video presentations to understand how these things happened, to elaborate on our first content." Another participant stated that, "in our face-to-face class, gina state nanda ang concept nga gina tugro kanamon tapos gina master nanda ang subject matter, tapos gina state nanda man ang anda nga objectives, kung man an bala kang estudyante sa andang leksyon. Nagatugro man tanda kang examples nga para mas lalo mintindihan namon ang gina discuss nanda." (...they state the objectives of the lesson and the concepts they are teaching while checking their students' prior knowledge. They also provide examples that help us gain a better understanding of the concepts. They show mastery of the subject matter).

Some themes that the researcher formulated were based on the participant's responses, which include the following: descriptions and examples, more/repetitive communication, varied content delivery, supporting resources, and thorough communication. Table 7 reveals the data.

Table 7: Instructional Integrity Open-Ended Responses Regarding Clarity

Theme	Description	Frequency
Descriptions & Examples	Clear, relatable, real-life, detailed, thorough	(7) P2, P3, P1, P12, P13, P14, P8
More/ Repetitive Communication	Reminders or follow-up assignments, announcements (soft copies of handouts)	(2) P9, P6
More/Varied Content	Scaffolding the lessons to be understood by the students, video presentations, laboratory activities, reporting activities utilizing in-depth research of a lesson/topic, group activities, for example, role play, applying/integrating different strategies, providing lecture notes, providing multiple format explanations (audio/visual/text)	(10) P2, P3, P5, P6, P8, P11, P10, P12, P13, P16
Vary Content Delivery	PowerPoint presentation, providing activity sheets/games, and using educational technologies such as social media. (Facebook Group/Facebook Messenger), upload quizzes, assignments, and exams in the LMS(eskUelA) and Google Meet and Zoom, use YouTube videos, Powerpoint presentations, and PDF	(6) P1, P5, P10, P12, P13, P16
Pace/Timing	Understandable: explain repeatedly/at length the topics/points until understood, approachable/extra time for those who need more explanation, provide assistance during laboratory experiments, observe appropriate pace, talk slowly and clearly, and take time to explain fully, elaborate the topic or lesson until understood.	(12) P1, P2, P3, P4, P8, P9, P13, P15, P5, P11, P14, P16
Supporting Resources	Provide up-to-date activities and quizzes, resources (educational technologies), techy/techno-savvy,	(1) P2
Thorough Communication	Allow students to raise and answer their questions, be interested or ask questions, open communication, provide learning objectives and expectations, ask for feedback/questions, and discuss the course syllabus at the start of the semester.	(5) P1, P7, P14, P15, P6
Quality/ Complete Info	Thorough or detailed in his/her explanations and lessons, provides numerous, relevant and realistic activities and examples, integrates real-life situations as an example, and provides clear instruction mastery of the lesson.	(6) P1, P2, P7, P13, P15, P8
Feedback From Students	Online classes per college are not 100%. Online classes are time-consuming, with limited topics covered, and not all topics are discussed.	(1) P10

4.2. Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Rapport for Blended Learning

The level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning when they are taken as an entire group and when they are classified according to academic rank, colleges, courses taught, and employment status is determined by computing the mean scores. As an entire group, the results of the study explained that the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning was noted as "Highly enjoyable", as indicated by an overall mean of 3.47 (SD =0.47). This result indicates that students enjoyed interacting with their instructors or professors in their online and face-to-face classes. Students' attitudes and motivation are positively impacted when they establish rapport with their instructor. This is because they sense a loving affiliation or understanding with their teacher. In addition, research has demonstrated that rapport can alleviate anxious feelings while simultaneously boosting confidence and other favorable emotional states.

As to academic rank, the results of the study showed that academic rank, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning was "Highly enjoyable". This explains that faculty members who are ranked instructors,

assistant professors, and associate professors or full professors are, to a great degree, contented as they dispense instruction in blended learning. This was evident in the values of the mean and standard deviation. The faculty members ranked as instructors ($\bar{x}=3.47$, $SD=.47$) have a higher mean compared to assistant professors ($\bar{x}=3.46$, $SD=.41$) and associate professors/full professors ($\bar{x}=3.46$, $SD=.54$). It can further be surmised on the results that assistant professors and associate professors/full professors are of the same mean of 3.46 and vary on their SD value only. As to colleges, the results of the study as to colleges revealed that the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning was "Highly enjoyable". This discloses that in whatever college a faculty member belongs to, they are inspired to identify connections among students and provide instruction to students in the blended learning environment. Taking into consideration the values of mean per colleges it is noticed that college G ($\bar{x}=3.70$, $SD=.42$) has a greater mean score, followed by college A ($\bar{x}=3.58$, $SD=.45$) followed by college C ($\bar{x}=3.54$, $SD=.34$), followed by college F ($\bar{x}=3.51$, $SD=.45$), followed by college E ($\bar{x}=3.49$, $SD=.42$), followed by college B ($\bar{x}=3.39$, $SD=.54$). The college that has a lowest mean score is college D ($\bar{x}=3.32$, $SD=.51$).

As to courses taught, the results of the study exhibited that, as to courses taught, the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning was "Highly enjoyable". This suggests that faculty members teaching either general education, professional education, or specialization were highly satisfied with the teaching-learning process in blended learning. This provided more evidence that a common thread in studies examining rapport has focused on students' propensity to actively engage in class discussions and other communication behaviors that are directly related to their learning results. Taking into account the values of the mean for general education ($\bar{x}=3.47$, $SD=.48$), professional education ($\bar{x}=3.42$, $SD=.50$), and specialization ($\bar{x}=3.51$, $SD=.43$), it is noticed that professional education has the lowest mean value compared to general education and specialization. As to employment status, the results of the study showed that employment status and the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity for blended learning were "Highly enjoyable". This suggests that whether a faculty member is permanent or part-time/contract of service, they greatly appreciated and ensured the effective transfer of learning to students in blended learning. Further scrutiny of the mean scores revealed that permanent faculty ($\bar{x}=3.50$, $SD=.45$) has a greater mean compared to part-time/contract of service ($\bar{x}=3.47$, $SD=.47$).

These results revealed that as an entire group and according to identified variables, the faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning is, to a high degree, satisfied in the delivery of instruction in the blended learning modality. This emphasizes that the faculty members of the University of Antique provide fruitful interaction, which significantly considers affection, motivation, satisfaction, and participation among students in their online and face-to-face classes. Consistent with previous research linking social presence to happiness and perceived learning, this supports the notion that building rapport in virtual classrooms increases students' impressions of the instructor's ability to be present. Table 8 presents the data.

Table 8: Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in terms of Rapport for Blended Learning

Variables	Mean	SD	Description
B. Rapport			
Entire group	3.47	.47	Highly Enjoyable
Academic rank			
Instructors	3.47	.47	Highly Enjoyable
Assistant Professors	3.46	.41	Highly Enjoyable
Associate Professors/Full Professors	3.46	.54	Highly Enjoyable
Colleges			
College A	3.58	.45	Highly Enjoyable
College B	3.39	.54	Highly Enjoyable
College C	3.54	.34	Highly Enjoyable
College D	3.32	.51	Highly Enjoyable
College E	3.49	.42	Highly Enjoyable
College F	3.51	.45	Highly Enjoyable
College G	3.70	.42	Highly Enjoyable
Courses Taught			
General Education	3.47	.48	Highly Enjoyable
Professional Education	3.42	.50	Highly Enjoyable
Specialization	3.51	.43	Highly Enjoyable

Employment status			
Permanent	3.50	.45	Highly Enjoyable
Part-time/Contract of Service	3.47	.47	Highly Enjoyable

*Legend:

3.26 - 4.00	Highly Enjoyable
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Enjoyable
1.76 - 2.50	Slightly Enjoyable
1.00 - 1.75	Not Enjoyable

The results of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport for blended learning were further expounded through a focus group discussion, which revealed along a qualitative research question 3, which inquired about "what should the instructor or professor do to make the course interesting to students." The themes that emerged from the analysis, which answer research question 3, can be found in Table 9 with the descriptions and frequencies of each theme. Table 9 shows that the most frequently occurring theme was the instructor and professor's attention. In response to the open-ended question, "What should your instructor/professor do to make the course interesting to you?" the majority of the participants pointed out that their instructor/professors should get to know the students, make use of collaborative activity (brainstorming), provide interesting activities (role-playing, maths trail, quiz bowl, games, group activities, laboratory experiments, self-created learning activities, competitive activities), show video clips and instructional materials, observes deductive method, and integrating team building or teamwork. For instance, one participant declared,

"Sometimes our teachers do some on-the-spot oral recitation nga daw maka challenge guide para kanamon, so it is very interesting. It is because of gina-test na and some critical thinking skills. Kung ano imo na learn or knowledge sa past lesson, so interesting tana kay sometimes we act as a lawyer, gina-apply namon ang mga lessons nga gin tudlo nanda kanamon. Sometimes, we are also doing our activities like role-playing and different group activities like, for example, a lesson on human namon kang kanta, verse choir, as in you are not just doing it for fun but also at the same time learning. So, it is very interesting; kay sometimes we do competitions even sa amon classroom lang. So, daw mas machallenge kaw, mahambal kaw nga matuon guid ako kay may reward si Sir, may reward si Ma'am. So it is very interesting para kanamon nga students." (Sometimes, our teachers give us challenging on-the-spot recitations. It is very interesting because it tests our critical thinking skills and checks our knowledge and learning from the previous lesson. It is also interesting because sometimes we act like lawyers and apply the lessons they teach us. We also perform activities like role-playing [and] different group activities like composing songs, verse choir; we learn while having fun... it is very interesting because sometimes we do competitions in the classroom. It challenges us to study more because our teachers give us rewards).

Another participant expressed that,

"For me, our instructor let us do brainstorming, and we have demo reporting where we can enhance our knowledge and skills as a future educator, and we also do role playing and reporting, group reporting so that it will make our lesson, or it makes us more learned and we can more knowledge on what we are discussing."

This qualitative research question 3 was further supported by the second most frequently occurring theme, which was emotional support, as defined by the following descriptions for blended learning. These were kind (giving incentives/rewards), encouraging and supportive, appreciative, enthusiastic, or having a sense of humour, inspiring, passionate, cooperative, and helpful (valuing the importance of the lesson) to students. As one participant avowed,

"In my experience, in the online class, teachers should really provide creative, more entertaining PowerPoint presentations as well as movies and other learning material aside from the module itself. With LMS Ma'am and in Google Classroom, our teachers, especially in online classes, provide this chat box where we can share some insights, and we could connect to them so that we would be more interested in the online class."

Another participant specified that,

"During online classes, our professors let us do our own presentations so that we have ideas about how we should make it and can easily understand the lesson. Kung sa virtual Ma'am, before mag-start and klase Ma'am, may small exercises Ma'am nga ginatugro ang amon nga professor, as part of the attendance Ma'am, para maganahan kami sa amon nga klase, daw mabugtaw bala kami para makafocus kami." (In virtual classes, our teacher gives us motivational exercises to get us ready to learn).

Some themes that the researcher formulated were based on the participant's responses, which pertain to the following: availability/open communication and class hours. An additional theme is feedback from students, which will be the basis for improvement in relation to faculty members' instructional integrity and rapport. Table 9 reveals the data.

Table 9: Instructional Integrity Open-Ended Responses Regarding Rapport

Theme	Description	Frequency
Emotional Support	Kind (giving incentives), giving handouts in advance, encouraging and supportive, appreciative, enthusiastic or sense of humour, sense of competitiveness, inspiring, passionate, cooperative, helpful (valuing the importance of the course), observing break-time,	(11) P1, P2, P6, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P5, P7, P8
Availability/ Open Communication	Encourages questions (on-the-spot oral recitation), enhances the critical thinking skills of the students, incorporates past lessons, summarises lessons, encourages participation and volunteerism, solicits feedback from students, provides various effective and creative presentations and more relatable real-life situations as an example (hugot lines, and trendy memes), encourages interaction in different video conferencing applications used (Google Meet, Zoom), through LMS (eskUelA) and Google Classroom.	(5) P2, P4, P10, P13, P14,
Class Hours	Establishes classroom routines (greetings, prayer, checking attendance), facilitates or encourages learning	(5) P3, P8, P9, P10, P13,
Personal Attention	Get to know students, collaborative (brainstorming), provide interesting activities (role-playing, Math trail, quiz bowl, games, group activities, laboratory experiments, self-created learning activities, competitive activities), show video clips and instructional materials, observe deductive method, integrating teambuilding or teamwork	(15) P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P15, P16, P8, P14
Feedback From Students	Some teachers are boring and not passionate about teaching. Lessons should be based on real-life situations.	(1) P6

Differences in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility, Clarity, and Rapport for Blended Learning. The differences in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport for blended learning are reflected in Table 10 to Table 15, which was further examined in this study. The statistical tools employed were the One-way ANOVA with the Least Significant Difference as a posteriori test for significant ANOVA results. As to academic rank, ANOVA results in Table 10 show that there was no significant difference in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility ($F=.235, p>.05$), clarity ($F=.273, p>.05$) and rapport ($F=.037, p>.05$). These results imply that regardless of academic rank, the faculty members had the same level of extending competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill to the students. Moreover, they have a similar level in terms of presenting course content in an understandable and well-organized manner; indeed, they build the same relationship, which is characterized by agreement, mutual understanding and empathy that makes two-way communication possible. Table 10 presents the data.

Table 10: ANOVA Results of the Difference in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility, Clarity and Rapport for Blended Learning Across Academic Rank

Areas	Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-value	Sig. level
Credibility	Between groups	.057	2	.028	.235	.790
	Within groups	45.199	375	.121		
	Total	45.256	377			
Clarity	Between groups	.069	2	.035	.273	.762
	Within groups	47.755	375	.127		
	Total	47.824	377			
Rapport	Between groups	.017	2	.008	.037	.963
	Within groups	83.213	375	.222		
	Total	83.230	377			

As to college, ANOVA results in Table 11 show that there was a significant difference in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity for blended learning in terms of credibility ($F=6.477$, $p>.05$), clarity ($F=4.835$, $p>.05$) and rapport ($F=3.698$, $p>.05$) when they were classified across colleges. These results suggest that the faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of the three dimensions of blended learning, regardless of their college, differ in their level of interest, kindness, teaching attitude, ways of emphasizing key points in lecture/presentation, evaluating students, clarifying classroom communication; establishing interactions and displaying appropriate gestures/body language. Furthermore, instructors/professors in all colleges vary in establishing connections with students as they provide constructive feedback that affirms how they are performing well and details ways to improve in their studies. By providing students in the colleges with choices or some flexibility since the University of Antique is observing blended learning platforms hence, students have a more personalized learning experience. As Muirhead [4] supports it, "teachers need the expertise to develop a class structure that stimulates social interaction and affirms rigorous academic standards while fostering independent learning skills." Table 11 presents the data.

Table 11: ANOVA Results of the Difference in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility, Clarity and Rapport for Blended Learning Across College

Areas	Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-value	Sig. level
Credibility	Between groups	4.291	6	.715	6.477**	.000
	Within groups	40.965	371	.110		
	Total	45.256	377			
Clarity	Between groups	3.468	6	.758	4.835**	.000
	Within groups	44.356	371	.120		
	Total	47.824	377			
Rapport	Between groups	4.696	6	.783	3.698**	.001
	Within groups	78.534	371	.212		
	Total	83.230	377			

Since a significant difference was found in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity and rapport for blended learning across colleges, post hoc tests were performed using the Least Significant Difference (LSD). The results presented in Tables 12, 13 and 14 revealed the mean differences in the level of credibility, clarity and rapport and the colleges that serve as contributory factors in the significance. The LSD results reveal that the mean differences in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility among nine groups of colleges were between College A and College B, between College A and College D, between College A and College F, between college B and college G, between college C and college D, between college D and college E, between college D and college G, between college E and college G. Between college F and college G. Table 12 reveals the data.

Table 12: LSD Results for Mean Differences in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility for Blended Learning as to College

Multiple Comparisons	Mean Difference	Sig.(2-tailed)
College A vs. College B	.165*	.021
College A vs. College D	.258*	.000
College A vs. College F	.167*	.026
College B vs. College G	.251*	.003
College C vs. College D	.219*	.000
College D vs. College E	.193*	.000
College D vs. College G	.343*	.000
College E vs. College G	.151*	.049
College F vs. College G	.252*	.004

The LSD results reveal the mean differences in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of clarity among five groups of colleges: between college A and college B, between college A and college D, between college C and college D, between college D and college E, between college D and college G. Table 13 presents the data.

Table 13: LSD Results for Mean Differences in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Clarity for Blended Learning as to College

Multiple Comparisons	Mean Difference	Sig.(2-tailed)
College A vs. College B	.190*	.011
College A vs. College D	.275*	.000
College C vs. College D	.191*	.002
College D vs. College E	.188*	.000
College D vs. College G	.250*	.001

*p<.05

The LSD results reveal the mean differences in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of rapport among seven groups of colleges: between College A and College D, between College B and college G, between College C and College D, between College D and college E, between college D and college F, between college D and college G, between college E and college G. Table 14 shows the data.

Table 14: LSD Results for Mean Differences in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Rapport for Blended Learning as to College

Multiple Comparisons	Mean Difference	Sig.(2-tailed)
College A vs. College D	.260*	.002
College B vs. College G	.309*	.007
College C vs. College D	.224*	.006
College D vs. College E	.164*	.018
College D vs. College F	.193*	.030
College D vs. College G	.380*	.000
College E vs. College G	.215*	.042

*p<.05

It can be said that the faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity, and rapport for blended learning was significantly influenced by the identified colleges in terms of dimensions. A closer analysis of the data, however, revealed that engineering and technology were the main contributors to its significance in terms of credibility, considering the mean difference value of .000 between colleges linked to it. Further analysis of the results showed that, as to clarity, the same grouping of colleges linked to other colleges served as the main factor in its significance, taking into account its mean difference value of either .000 or .001/.002. On the other hand, in terms of rapport, between Engineering and Technology and Maritime Education differed significantly as to its mean difference value of .000. Overall results imply that these groups of colleges greatly affect the faculty members of the University of Antique as to how they are known to students being credible, understandable, and enjoyable as they dispense quality teaching to students in either face-to-face or online/ blended learning classroom.

As to courses taught, ANOVA results in Table 15 show that there was no significant difference in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity and rapport for blended learning when they were classified as courses taught in terms of credibility (F=.072, p>.05), clarity (F=.929, p>.05), and rapport (F=.808 p>.05). These results suggest that regardless of the courses taught by the faculty members, they had a similar level of instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity and rapport for blended learning. This means that, as to courses taught, faculty members of the University of Antique are trustworthy people; they are credible, understandable and enjoyable instructors/professors. This was affirmed that "the course's level of interpersonal interaction was the most important factor in predicting student grades; students in low-interaction courses earned nearly one letter grade lower than students in high-interaction courses." Table 15 presents the data.

Table 15: ANOVA Results of the Difference in the Level of Faculty Members' Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility, Clarity and Rapport for Blended Learning Across Courses Taught

Areas	Source of variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-value	Sig. level
Credibility	Between groups	.017	2	.009	.072	.930
	Within groups	45.239	375	.121		

	Total	45.256	377			
Clarity	Between groups	.236	2	.118	.929	.396
	Within groups	47.588	375	.127		
	Total	47.824	377			
Rapport	Between groups	.498	2	.249	.808	.446
	Within groups	82.732	375	.221		
	Total	83.230	377			

As to employment status, T-test results in Table 16 show that there was no significant difference in the level of faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility ($t=1.867, p>.05$), clarity ($t=1.832, p>.05$), and rapport ($t=1.854, p>.05$) for blended learning when they were classified across employment status. These results imply that regardless of the employment status of the faculty members' instructional integrity as to its dimension for blended learning, they had the same level of providing expertise in the teaching-learning process, establishing clear instructions and ensuring a warm atmosphere in the classroom. Table 16 illustrates the data.

Table 16: t-test Results of the Difference in the Level of Instructional Integrity in Terms of Credibility, Clarity, and Rapport as to Employment Status

Variable	Mean		t-value	df	Sig level
	Permanent	COS			
Credibility	3.65	3.58	1.867	376	.063
Clarity	3.63	3.55	1.832	376	.068
Rapport	3.50	3.40	1.854	376	.065

5. Conclusion

Furthermore, In view of the preceding findings, the conclusions drawn were: The University of Antique faculty members demonstrate apparent achievements (e.g. professional growth) and accomplishments, intelligence, competence, and classroom management as evident in their delivery of meaningful and effective instruction to students, as one of the thrusts of the university towards the attainment of its vision, mission, goals, and objectives. The faculty members' instructional integrity fosters its greater heights by elucidating their education/experience and conducting themselves professionally and competently while attending to the students' relational and academic needs and providing students with an avenue for their self-improvement and self-efficacy in blended learning. In the context of this study, instructional integrity embraces a strong commitment to diverse foundational values, as well as courage, fairness, honesty, integrity, kindness, respect, responsibility, and trust, which surely build an integral foundation for a strong and resilient educational community. In the context of education, on the other hand, academic integrity embodies honesty in the characterization of the completed work of the faculty, either inside or outside the classroom. This simply goes with the preparation, completion, and submission of assigned activities or assignments and even examinations, as well as the engagement among students and educators. The significant difference in the faculty members' instructional integrity in terms of credibility, clarity and rapport for blended learning lies only in one particular variable, which is the college. Nevertheless, faculty members' academic rank, courses taught, and employment status reveal otherwise. This entails attention and pondering on the details of why colleges become a contributory factor to its significance as it affects students' learning improvement and achievement towards success.

Acknowledgement: First and foremost, the researchers praise and thank God, the Almighty, for His showers of blessings and guidance throughout the completion of this research. The researchers would also like to acknowledge the continuous support, encouragement, patience, and valuable input of important persons, namely, Drs. Gerald Malabarbas, Jelyn O. Alentajan, Grace C. Pastolero, Sammy V. Militante, Edward E. Baña, Dr. Pablo S. Crespo, Jr. The researchers are extremely grateful to Mr Lorenzo S. Rectra and Mrs Gilda B. Rectra for their love, prayers, care and sacrifices, Mrs Cristeta T. Amar, Warren Tubang Amar, Raffy Baleña Rectra, Renz Saddie Rectra Amar and Lorrenz Matthew Rectra Amar for their love, understanding, prayers and continuing support in the completion of this research work.

Data Availability Statement: The researchers avow that the data supporting the results of this study is in hand in this article and its supplemental materials. Raw data that support the findings are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Funding Statement: No funding has been obtained to help prepare this manuscript and research work.

Conflict of Interest Statement: No conflict of interest has been declared by the author(s). Citations and references are mentioned in the information used.

Ethics and Consent Statement: The consent has been obtained from the colleges during the data collection and has received ethical approval and participant consent.

References

1. A. I. Challob, N. A. Bakar, and H. Latif, "Collaborative blended learning writing environment: Effects on EFL students' writing apprehension and writing performance," *Engl. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 9, no. 6, p. 229, 2016.
2. A. M. Limperos, M. M. Buckner, R. Kaufmann, and B. N. Frisby, "Online teaching and technological affordances: An experimental investigation into the impact of modality and clarity on perceived and actual learning," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 1–9, 2015.
3. A. N. Finn, P. Schrodt, P. L. Witt, N. Elledge, K. A. Jernberg, and L. M. Larson, "A meta-analytical review of teacher credibility and its associations with teacher behaviors and student outcomes," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 516–537, 2009.
4. B. Muirhead, "Encouraging interaction in online classes," *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 45–50, 2004.
5. B. N. Frisby and A. L. Housley Gaffney, "Understanding the role of instructor rapport in the college classroom," *Commun. Res. Rep.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 340–346, 2015.
6. B. N. Frisby and R. J. Sidelinger, "Violating student expectations: Student disclosures and student reactions in the college classroom," *Commun. Stud.*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 241–258, 2013.
7. B. N. Frisby and S. A. Myers, "The relationships among perceived instructor rapport, student participation, and student learning outcomes," *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, vol. 33, no.1 pp. 27–34, 2008.
8. B. N. Frisby, D. H. Mansson, and R. Kaufmann, "The cognitive learning measure: A three-study examination of validity," *Commun. Methods Meas.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 163–176, 2014.
9. C. E. Morton et al., "Blended learning: how can we optimise undergraduate student engagement?," *BMC Med. Educ.*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 195, 2016.
10. C. Obermiller, B. Ruppert, and A. Atwood, "Instructor credibility across disciplines: Identifying students' differentiated expectations of instructor behaviors," *Bus. Commun. Q.*, vol. 75, no. 2, pp. 153–165, 2012.
11. C. T. Carr, P. Zube, E. Dickens, C. A. Hayter, and J. A. Barterian, "Toward A model of sources of influence in online education: Cognitive learning and the effects of web 2.0," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 61–85, 2013.
12. D. D. Gremler and K. P. Gwinner, "Customer-employee rapport in service relationships," *J. Serv. Res.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 82–104, 2000.
13. D. M. Mupinga, R. T. Nora, and D. C. Yaw, "The learning styles, expectations, and needs of online students," *Coll. Teach.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 185–189, 2006.
14. F. Sultana, "The false equivalence of academic freedom and free speech: defending academic integrity in the age of white supremacy, colonial nostalgia, and anti-intellectualism," *ACME: An Int E-Journal for Crit Geographies*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 228–257, 2018.
15. J. C. McCroskey and J. J. Teven, "Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement," *Commun. Monogr.*, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 90–103, 1999.
16. J. C. Richardson, Y. Maeda, J. Lv, and S. Caskurlu, "Social presence in relation to students' satisfaction and learning in the online environment: A meta-analysis," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 71, no 6, pp. 402–417, 2017.
17. J. H. Wilson and R. G. Ryan, "Professor-student rapport scale: Six items predict student outcomes," *Teaching of Psychology*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 130–133, 2013.
18. J. I. Vallade and R. Kaufmann, "Investigating instructor misbehaviors in the online classroom," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 363–381, 2018.
19. J. L. Chesebro and J. C. McCroskey, "The development of the teacher clarity short inventory (TCSI) to measure clear teaching in the classroom," *Commun. Res. Rep.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 262–266, 1998.
20. J. L. Chesebro and J. C. Mccroskey, "The relationship between teacher clarity and immediacy and students' experiences of state receiver apprehension when listening to teachers," *Communication Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 446–455, 1998.
21. J. L. Chesebro and J. C. McCroskey, "The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 59–68, 2001.
22. J. L. Chesebro, "Effects of teacher clarity and nonverbal immediacy on student learning, receiver apprehension, and affect," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 135–147, 2003.
23. J. L. Chesebro, "Using the research on teacher clarity to teach more clearly," *Communication Teacher*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 3–15, 2001.

24. J. M. DeGroot, V. J. Young, and S. H. VanSlette, "Twitter use and its effects on student perception of instructor credibility," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 419–437, 2015.
25. J. S. Hutchens and T. Hayes, "In your Facebook: Examining Facebook usage as misbehavior on perceived teacher credibility," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 5–20, 2014.
26. J. Ward, "Book review of developing adaptive and personalized learning environments," *Open Prax.*, vol. 8, no. 4, p. 361, 2016.
27. K. N. Dunleavy, "The effect of instructor humor on perceived instructor credibility, student state motivation, and student motives to communication in the classroom," *The Kentucky Journal of Communication*, vol. 25, no.1, pp. 39–56, 2006.
28. K. Swan, "Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses," *Distance Educ.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 306–331, 2001.
29. K. T. Arnesen, C. R. Graham, C. R. Short, and D. Archibald, "Experiences with personalized learning in a blended teaching course for preservice teachers," *Journal of Online Learning Research*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 251–274, 2019.
30. L. Trad, J. Katt, and A. Neville Miller, "The effect of face threat mitigation on instructor credibility and student motivation in the absence of instructor nonverbal immediacy," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 136–148, 2014.
31. M. Bosch and R. Cavallotti, "Is it possible a definition of integrity in the business ethics field?," *Rev. Empresa Humanismo*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 51–68, 2016.
32. M. Wang, R. Shen, D. Novak, and X. Pan, "The impact of mobile learning on students' learning behaviours and performance: Report from a large blended classroom," *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 673–695, 2009.
33. N. Webb and L. O. Barrett, "Student views of instructor-student rapport in the college classroom," *J. Scholarsh. Teach. Learn.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 15–28, 2014.
34. P. N. D. Vaughan, A. Reali, S. Stenbom, M. Jansen Van Vuuren, and D. MacDonald, "Blended learning from design to evaluation: International case studies of evidence-based practice," *Online Learn.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 103–114, 2017.
35. P. Schrod, "Content relevance and students' comfort with disclosure as moderators of instructor disclosures and credibility in the college classroom," *Communication Education*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 362–375, 2013.
36. P. Schrod, "Students' attributions of instructor credibility as a function of students' expectations of instructional technology use and nonverbal immediacy," *Communication Education*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2007.
37. R. E. Mayer and R. Moreno, "Nine ways to reduce cognitive load in multimedia learning," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 43–52, 2003.
38. R. J. Sidlinger and J. C. McCroskey, "Communication correlates of teacher clarity in the college classroom," *Commun. Res. Rep.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 1997.
39. R. Kaufmann and J. I. Vallade, "Online student perceptions of their communication preparedness," *E-Learn. Digit. Media*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 86–104, 2021.
40. R. Kaufmann and M. M. Buckner, "Revisiting 'power in the classroom': exploring online learning and motivation to study course content," *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 402–409, 2019.
41. R. M. Chory, "Enhancing student perceptions of fairness: The relationship between instructor credibility and classroom justice," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 89–105, 2007.
42. S. Bolkan, A. K. Goodboy, and D. M. Kelsey, "Instructor clarity and student motivation: Academic performance as a product of students' ability and motivation to process instructional material," *Communication Education*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 129–148, 2016.
43. S. Catt, D. Miller, and K. Schallenkamp, "You are the key: Communicate for learning effectiveness," *Education*, vol. 127, no. 3, pp. 369–377, 2007.
44. T. Muir, N. Milthorpe, C. Stone, J. Dymont, E. Freeman, and B. Hopwood, "Chronicling engagement: students' experience of online learning over time," *Distance Educ.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 262–277, 2019.
45. T. P. Mottet, J. Parker-Raley, S. A. Beebe, and C. Cunningham, "Instructors who resist 'college lite': The neutralizing effect of instructor immediacy on student course workload expectancy violations and perceptions of instructor credibility and affective learning," *Communication Education*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 145–167, 2007.
46. V. Dran, G. M. Callahan, and E. S. Taylor, "Can students' academic integrity be improved? Attitudes and behaviors before and after implementation of an academic integrity policy," *Teach Bus Ethics*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 35–58, 2001.
47. V. E. Wheelless, P. L. Witt, M. Maresh, M. C. Bryand, and P. Schrod, "Instructor credibility as a mediator of instructor communication and students' intent to persist in college," *Commun. Educ.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 314–339, 2011.