

How Do the Type of Exam Questions and the Type of Proctors Influence Cheating in Exams?

From the Learners' and Teachers' Perspective

BENMESMOUDI Aali

University of Mascara Algeria

Receipt date: 30/09/2018; Acceptance date: 12/02/2021; Publishing Date: 28/02/2022

Abstract .The study investigates the reasons behind the students' will to cheat mainly the type of exam questions and the type, of proctors, in influencing the academic dishonesty. Therefore, the mixed method has been adopted. Sixty-three students responded to a questionnaire designed for this purpose, and five teachers were interviewed through a semi- structured interview. The findings showed that the majority of the students considered the two factors as main factors of cheating, where the majority among them confessed that they cheat when the proctors are indulgent, and a bit above the average cheat when the exam questions are closed-ended. However, they did not see the two factors as the most important causes of cheating; they consider the type of exam questions and the type of proctors are less important than other reasons. The results showed that the majority of teachers estimated that the two factors are very important in motivating the learners to cheat.

Keyword: type of proctors- type of exam questions- cheating in exams.

ملخص. تتناول الدراسة الحالية أهمية ودور كل من: نوع أسئلة الامتحان، ونوعية الحراس في الغش في الامتحانات لتحقيق هذا. من منظور عينتين من الطلبة والأساتذة الهدف تم الاعتماد على الطريقة المختلطة؛ المنهج الكمي لإجراء البحث على عينة من طلبة علم النفس بجامعة طالبيا، تم اختيارهم بطريقة 63 معسكريقدر عددهم ب عشوائية بسيطة، والمنهج الكيفي لاستقراء منظور الأساتذة اتجاه الموضوع. حيث تم اختيار 05 أساتذة من نفس القسم. بينت النتائج إن أغلبية الطلبة لا يرون إن العاملين محل الدراسة (نوع أسئلة الامتحان ونوع الحراس) أنهما العاملين الأكثر أهمية في إجابتهم للجزء الأول من الاستبيان، ونفس النظرة توضح في الإجابات على الجزء الثاني من الاستبيان. غير أن أفراد نفس العينة يقيمون المتغيرين بأنهما 'مهمان' حين طلب من أفراد العينة بتحديد درجة الأهمية في الجزء الثالث من الاستبيان. في حين أن عينة الأساتذة قيمت المتغيرين بأنهما 'مهمان جدا' في دفع الطلبة للغش في الامتحان.

الكلمات المفتاحية: نوع الحراس، نوع الامتحان، الغش في الامتحان.

1. Introduction

This research came as a reaction to the spread of academic dishonesty among the learners such as: plagiarism, fabrication, deception, bribery, cheating... It seems that the most important threat is around plagiarism and cheating. When talking about cheating in education, we can refer to different types; for instance, we have cheating in homework, cheating in assignment, projects, and examinations. To emphasize our study and make it as deeper as possible, the research is focused on cheating in examination; hence, the research is not concerned with other types of cheating.

When surveying the studies done on this topic, it was prominent that they may be classified to two main tendencies, the first adopted the experiment designs and the second based on the non-experimental methods 'descriptive designs. As far as the studies which investigated the causes of cheating in exams are concerned, two types of causes can be distinguished, as mentioned in a study done in UNL-CBA in summer 2015:' the literature divides the characteristics associated with cheating into individual factors (gender, age, major, etc.), and environmental factors (pressure, self-confidence, reason for learning, etc.) (UNL-CBA. 2015)'. It is clear that the current research is situated in the second category, since we dealt with 'the type of proctors' and 'the type of exam questions', which are environmental factors. In order to clarify the importance of the two factors among all the possible reasons, and how our students and teachers perceive them, three main questions were asked. Firstly, a question about the reasons that motivate the learners to cheat. Secondly, on the importance of the type of proctors in influencing cheating in exams from the students' and teachers' point of view, where the study hypothesized that indulgent proctors motive the learners to cheat, whereas firm proctors reduce the cheating will within the learners. Thirdly, about the weight of the type of exam questions, according to the students' and the teachers' perspective; supposing that the closed-ended questions motivate cheating, while the open-ended questions weaken and even break the cheating desire within the students.

The major limitation which may a researcher in cheating in examination may face is the nature of the topic itself; cheaters usually hesitate to interact with the researchers who tackle such topic, regarding that cheating is classified as an academic misconduct, and this was what faced when conducting this research. Furthermore, cheaters are badly seen by the society, what it is observed that they do not care about their situation now as students, but they really worry about their reputation as future cadres. Another limitation restricted this research and did affect the validity of our experiment, it is related to the tool used to collect data, and the type of the research design adopted, it did not allow us to collect authentic data which reflect the moral reasoning of the students who participated in the study. It is believed that the individuals' moral reasoning generally differs from the moral behavior; People behaviorally belong to a less ethical stage than those to which they belong mentally. Many people think highly about the moral issues, whereas they behave badly when they face moral situations. This is why we always wonder, when dealing with such topics, about the authenticity of the data gathered; it was better to conduct our research through the experimental method instead of the non-experimental design selected, but that was not possible because of many reasons.

1.1 Literature review:

Many studies investigated the topic of the factors influencing cheating, but few of them dealt with the impact of the type of questions and proctors on motivating learners to cheat. In this respect, the study aims at gathering the maximum of studies, and trying to analyze them through following a systematic literature review; including only what is relevant to the topic. Therefore, the literature review was planned as follows:

- Studies confirm the influence of the type of both questions and proctors or only one of them on cheating. Some found that the two factors, or at least one of them, are the most important in cheating; others discovered that they are less important than other factors.
- Studies deny the impact of the types of questions and proctors, or one of them, on cheating, and see that it is not a reason which may influence the cheating will.

The first research conducted by Hamzeh M. Dodeen in his study called 'under graduate student cheating in exams'. The researcher asked the following questions :

- What is the prevalence of cheating in exams ?
- What are the common cheating types used by college students?
- What are the main reasons for cheating and the main reason for not cheating?

To answer these questions, the researcher selected a random sample of 40 classes from the United Arab Emirates University, and the actual number of participants was 928 students, among them 33% males and 67% females. They came from different colleges: humanities (28%), science (15.2%), education (16.9%), business and administration (18.2%), sharia and law (5.5%), food systems (2.9%), engineering (7.1%) and information technology (6.1%). He used a self-report questionnaire consisting of four sections to collect data.

The result showed that the overall percentage of students admitted to cheating in exams while at college was 37.8%, 65% among them were males and 24% females. Whereas the common cheating methods were: using sheet scribes (5.3%), writing on hands and desks (8.8%), looking at another test paper (29.4%), helping another student to cheat (46.4%) and going out of test room to cheat (3.7%).

The findings showed that the main reasons of cheating are: hard courses, hard exams, time pressure, improving one's chance, and fear of failure. The factor of 'instructor vigilance' is less important than eighteen other factors. The study concluded that courses and exams are hard on students because many of them did not select their major wisely or based on their desire and interest, and some study several semesters without having a clear idea about what they are going to do with their degree after graduation, and register a maximum load of courses, which is above their ability, and puts a lot of pressure on their schedule (Dodeen, 2012). Dodeen in this study succeeded to highlight and survey the main reasons that may lead to cheat, although the results did not emphasize the reason tackled by me. In addition, that he investigated the reasons which prevent the learners from cheating, and this point is considered as strength in this study too.

Another study highlighted more clearly the factor of the role of proctors in increasing cheating it was that conducted by Mahmoud I. Sayam and Fatima Al-Shaykh from Qatar University. They surveyed 146 students, and used a questionnaire to collect data. The findings showed that 'over 70% of students believed that indulgence invigilator during the exam make it easier for students to cheat'. Although the researchers did not investigate the role of type of questions in cheating, they recommended: 'lack of focus on the written tests as the sole measure to evaluate the student and finding other methods to assess students such as oral tests and classroom and home work activities' (Sayam.& Al-Shaykh, 2013). This recommendation refers simply to the role of the type of questions in motivating cheating; this is why they advised to diversify the tests.

In his study, Jemimah Muchai aimed at clarifying the reasons of cheating in exams he used three instruments to collect data, the observation, the interview and the document analysis, the results showed:

- Contextual factors: attendance rate, lecturer-student interaction, poor invigilation, provision of course outline, lack of adequate facilities and communication of academic policy.
- Personal characteristics: lack of confidence, peer influence, poor time management, and poor study habit.
- Social factors: pressure from parents.

In this study, the focus is on the first category of factors, that is to say contextual factors, although, this research did not refer to the type of questions and proctors, which are the subject of my study. These results may be interpreted either by the unimportance of the two factors studied, or simply because Jemimah Muchai did not deal with the two factors at all (Muchai, 2014).

Doctor Amin Rahmani summarized the factors of cheating in exam papers as follows; 'the focus, therefore, mainly remains on achieving higher grades or marks. Students remain under tremendous pressure from their parents and schools to do well in examinations. Peer pressure is also felt for fear of being ridiculed in case of failure or low grades. Fear of failing and not being able to get admissions in colleges or universities looms over students at secondary and higher secondary levels (Rahmani, 2013). The researcher has distinguished many factors, firstly the desire to get higher marks, secondly the pressure on students from their parents and schools, thirdly peer pressure and the fear to be ridiculed, and finally the fear from not being accepted in the desired specialty.

Andy Ozment and other researchers conducted a study entitled 'Causes for cheating: unclear expectations in the classroom', the goal of this study was 'to determine whether different groups of participants held similar beliefs about what actions constitute cheating'. The members were required to classify scenarios into one of the following categories: not cheating, trivial cheating, or serious cheating (Ozment, A et al). The findings referred to the disagreement among all the groups and even within the same group about the definition of cheating. This result helps us to know that some learners cheat and they ignore that they are doing wrong, and it is another reason why some cheat.

In his doctoral thesis presented to the faculty of the school of education, Colby J. B aimed at better understand the relationship between classroom environment cheating, and the teacher's role in reinforcing academic dishonesty. Therefore, he asked the following questions (Colby, 2007) :

- What is the relationship between the classroom environment and the student cheating?
- In what kinds of environments does cheating flourish, and in what kinds of environments does academic integrity flourish?
- What can classroom teachers and school administrators do to alert classroom environments in order to focus on learning and integrity, effectively reducing cheating rates ?

To answer these questions, the researcher used the mixed method, and used two main data collection instruments :

1. Classroom environment scale (CES), where the respondents had to answer 90 true/false questions. This scale contained 9 sub-scales about :involvement, affiliation, teacher support, task orientation, competition, order and organization, rule clarity, teacher control, and innovation.

2. The second tool used was, academic integrity survey (AIS), where the members of the sample had to accomplish a self-report about how many times they had cheated.

In the qualitative side of this study, the researcher used:

1. Open-ended interviews, where 8 students were interviewed.
2. Classroom observation, the researcher observed 12 classes.

360 participants were selected among the students of Catholic High School, in terms of gender: 56.2% were males and 43.8% females, on the other hand, the sample consisted of the following educational levels: 17.8% freshmen, 32.7% sophomores, 25.1% juniors, and 24.4% seniors (Colby, 2007). The results showed that:

A significant effect of classroom environments on student cheating; cheating varied significantly:

- Positive environments had been linked to higher levels of student performance, motivation, and attitudes.
- Classroom environment had a significant effect on levels of student cheating; the more positive the environment is, the less students will cheat.
- seven out of nine sub-scales in (CES) are related to levels of classroom cheating, which are :involvement, teacher support, task orientation, competition, order and organization, rule clarity, and teacher control.

The most consistent findings included: involvement; order, and organization (Colby, 2007)

The results of the qualitative side of the research showed an impact of environment on student cheating. Furthermore, it emphasized the results found through the quantitative method, where order and organization, involvement, and teacher control had the strongest impact on cheating. That is to say, when the classroom environment reflected the lack of order, poor organization, no engaging of students, and inability of control, these factors are the suitable environment of cheating. In addition, the level of student cheating is affected by students' perception to their teacher's consciousness (whether or not they view their teacher as a friend, and how much they respect him (Colby, 2007).

The researcher concluded that in order to reduce cheating, the teacher has to make changes in the classroom environments:

- To limit students' ability to cheat, the teacher should create well-ordered classroom environment, and to insist that students behave in orderly and polite ways. As well as improve their organizational skills, and the order and organization of their tests and testing procedures. In addition, teachers need to be alert and aware during testing periods, and not sit at their desks and grade, or work on their computers, and they should walk around the room paying close attention to students' behaviors.
- To diminish students' desire to cheat, the teacher should focus on learning and integrity. The researcher provided some suggestion to achieve that; the teacher should get students more involved in class; the more the students learn the less they need to cheat. Teachers can increase students' involvement through demonstrating energy and excitement about the subject matter, creating opportunities for meaningful dialogue and collaboration in class, differentiating instruction, and relating class material to students' lived experiences (Colby, 2007). The teacher should ensure that assignment grades actually reflect student learning. This can be done through using authentic standards-based assessments instead of using multiple guess testing formats ; which requires students to use the content rather than guess

or cheat. The teacher has to make learning easier than cheating, and improving abilities to complete projects and assignments. He has to cultivate their students respect ;students are less willing to cheat when they respect their teachers. We can achieve this by taking their jobs seriously, working hard, and being passionate about the subject. The last suggestion was that the teacher has to talk about academic dishonesty as a topic of classroom conversation.

The researcher succeeded in investigating this topic ; where he gave many solutions to the problem tackled as we have seen. The most important strength is that he used the mixed method, which allowed him to ensure the results obtained twice; through the quantitative method and the qualitative one. Furthermore, he conducted his study on a large sample, and this affected positively the external validity of the experiment. However, I noticed some negative points in the study; the most prominent was that as if the researcher was lost in the huge number of the data gathered, which made the analysis more difficult.

1.2 The research variables :

This topic tackles the expected relationship between three variables; two independent variables, which are: the type of exam questions, and the type of proctors, and a dependent variable which is cheating in examination. It is necessary to identify these terms first, and start by cheating in exams.

1.2.1 Cheating in examination:

Cheating needs to be defined, for this reason, a study was done in Georgia institute of technology college of computing by Andy Ozment entitled '*causes for cheating: unclear expectation in the classroom*', the researchers confirmed: 'the results showed that the first difficulty in studying cheating is defining it. Not only were there wide discrepancies between three groups, there was also wide deviation within the groups' (Ozment, A et al). That is to say the participants in the research do not have the same perspective about the meaning of cheating; some of them see that bringing formulas into the exam on the back of a calculator is not cheating, others see using technology (e.g. sending each other messages on cell phones) as a loyal behavior. Therefore, we have to set a clear definition to cheating before tackling our main issue, how can we define cheating?

We can define Cheating as : 'using materials to obtain help in completing an assignment, report, quiz or exam that are not available to the entire class' . This definition highlights the absence of justice among the students, since not all of them have the same chance to use the forbidden devices and materials. Hence, the notion of equality between learners who take an exam, and the violation of this principle draw a frontier between what is considered as cheating and what is seen as integrity. Defining cheating is important since many researchers found 'that some cheating may occur due to students' confusion over its definition, the researchers said that people are very confused about what is meant by cheating'

1.2.2 The type of exam questions :

There are four main types of exam questions commonly used by the teachers at the different levels of education: multiple choice questions, and true/false questions, these two types are known by closed questions, short answer, and essay questions which are called the open questions as well. The teacher should construct his achievement test on the basis of some criteria: the nature of the material, the type of learners, and the objectives of the curriculum. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in our schools; where teachers generally construct randomly their tests without taking into account any of those criteria.

The main purpose of any examination is to examine the learners' comprehension of the courses done during a period of time ;this is why there are four key characteristics of effective exams (Zuker, 2003)

1. Valid: the exam tests what you intend it to test, and is consistent with the course
2. Reliable : the exam allows consistent measurement of student performance, and discriminates between different levels of performance.
3. Recognizable: it is representative of what you taught in the class.
4. Realistic: it is designed so that it can be completed in the time available for the examination

In this study, I hypothesize that using closed-ended questions ; such as true/false or multiple choice questions, motivates more learners to cheat in the examinations than using open-ended questions ; short answer and essay questions. In closed-ended questions, which are difficult and time-consuming to construct, neglects writing items to test, scores can be influenced by reading ability, and encourage guessing in addition to all these weaknesses, it motivates cheating through making it easier. Whereas open questions and mainly essay ones do not have such weaknesses; they require from the learner to produce his answer with his own words, and this makes any two similar answers impossible.

1.2.3 The type of proctors

The proctor is usually a teacher; this is why it has been focused on the types of teachers. Nevertheless, in this respect we are concerned more in the teachers when proctoring the exams. Generally speaking, we can distinguish two main types of proctors: the strict and firm proctors, and the indulgent ones. Strict proctor supervises the exams without any indulgence ;he does not allow the learners to do any doubtful movement using the time of exam. The learners know that it is impossible to bargain with him; therefore, his behavior does not encourage cheating, neither implicitly nor explicitly. On the contrary, the indulgent proctor is too lenient, which encourages cheating through creating the desire to cheat in the hearts of the learners. Indulgent proctors are seen as gullible and credulous by the learners, this is why they liven up when they know that those teachers will supervise the exam.

1.3 Theoretical frame work

It is clear that the concept 'cheating' involves a moral content, this is why hamzeh M. Dodeen found that the most important reasons which influence students' behavior for not to cheat in examinations were religious beliefs and the ethical considerations. As far as the first reason 'religious beliefs' is concerned, it is the strongest reason for not to cheat; those students who avoid cheating just to be believers in religious teachings, mainly in Islam, see cheating as a sin that should be avoided, and they do that for fear to be punished by almighty God. They avoid cheating like avoiding eating in Ramadan even if they are hidden. The second reason regarded as an important factor for not to cheat is that students see "cheating is immoral"; and it is known that moral norms and values are acquired through socialization. The third important factor for not cheating, the researcher said, is 'personal pride'; it is related to what an individual considers as true, and he acts on the light of his own thinking. The structure of the student's personality has a critical role in refusing cheating; he is behaving like a knight who sees that cheating makes him loose his self-consideration.

This research is based on the theory of Jean Piaget, who distinguished two stages in the moral development; the external "objective" morality; where parents play an important role in judging actions as true or false, and the internal "subjective" morality; where conscience or super ego becomes active in differentiating true actions and false ones. An adult, normally,

belongs to the second stage ;he is controlled by his conscience, then he cannot do wrong things; otherwise he will be psychologically punished by a sort of feeling guilt. Those students who are morally matured cannot cheat because of this self-control. We should guide students to adopt principles of the second stage, and this may be done through dynamic group technique, to help group members to pass to higher level by favoring standards and values of the target stage in discussions.

It's clear that Dodeen's research is related to morality, that is to say the phenomenon can be explained only on the light of a moral theory, in the current study Jean Piaget's theory is adopted as a theoretical background.

1.4 The aim of the study:

This study aims at:

- Highlighting the main factors of cheating.
- Clarifying the role of the type of questions in increasing cheating among the students.
- Clarifying the role of the type proctors in increasing cheating among the students.

1.5 The research problem:

Cheating in examinations is a topic which can be tackled from two different points of view the first one is dealing with it as a moral or ethical issue, and the second is to see it as a learning strategy. As far as the first point of view is concerned, which is the core of my study, cheating is classified as a misconduct and misbehavior; therefore, we should treat this deviation through finding solutions to overcome the phenomenon whereas in the second case, we have to benefit from cheating as a technique to improve the learning process.

It is known that there are many reasons which motivate the learner to cheat; my concern in this context is to list all the possible factors, after that, to determine the weight of each factor, and mainly the type of exam questions (closed/ open questions) and the type of proctors (firm/ indulgent), which are the subject of my study, in influencing cheating in examinations.

- What are the main causes of cheating in exam?
- What is the importance of the type of exam questions (closed /open questions) in motivating students to cheat?
- What is the importance the type of proctors (firm/indulgent proctors) in influencing cheating?

We hypothesized that:

- Closed questions motivate cheating more than open questions.
- Indulgent and careless proctors facilitate cheating more than absolute and strong-willed ones.

1.6 The setting of the study: This study is conducted in the department of Psychology in the University of Mascara, during the second semester of 2017/2018 academic year. The department of Psychology and Education Sciences, which is part of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, comprises three main specialties: Clinical Psychology, School Psychology, and Industrial Psychology, about 250 students are enrolled in this department.

2. Method and Tools. The mixed method is used for the following reasons; the need to collect data from the sample represented by two groups, a group of students, and a group of teachers. To gather data from students the quantitative method is used; it is appropriate to deal with a large number of respondents who represent the population. Whereas, to collect data from the group of teachers, the qualitative method is used; it is adequate to deal with a small number of respondents, that is to say cases. Since the two methods are equally used (the

qualitative and the quantitative)they have the same importance in this research hence, the mixed method is labeled QUANT/QUAL.

2.1 Tools:

The method used in this research requires the use of two instruments in data collection:

2.1.1 The questionnaire: The questionnaire used for gathering data from the sample of student includes three parts; each part intends to collect a type of data adequate for a level of analysis. The first part is a set of questions (21 questions), in the second part the respondents are asked to order the four main reasons of cheating, and in the last part they are asked to determine the importance of the factors which are the topic of this study. The first part of the questionnaire used in the research was designed by Hamzah Dodeen; the original version contains four parts: the first one was used to collect data about the methods used in cheating. The second section used to investigate the reasons of cheating, and the third one to gather data about the reasons which influence students not to cheat in exams. The last part of the questionnaire constructed by Hamzah Dodeen investigates why students often cheat while at college (Dodeen, 2012).

2.1.2The interview:

The second tool employed in this research is that directed to gather data from cases represented by 5 teachers; it is the main instrument in the qualitative method. The goal of using such instrument is to investigate the teachers' perception about the reasons of cheating, and mainly the importance of the two factors which are the topic of this research, the type of the exam questions (open/ closed questions), and the type of proctors (indulgent/ firm proctors).

In a semi-structured interview, the members of second group were asked the following questions:

1. What do you think in the questionnaire presented to the students?
2. Do you have any further reasons which lead the students to cheat?
3. What is the importance of the types of proctors in influencing cheating?
4. What is the importance of the types of exam questions in influencing cheating?

The expected data may/ may not confirm the results obtained through the questionnaire; teachers may have the same point of view as the students, or simply they differently view the causes of cheating in examinations. In addition, I expect to collect further information about the phenomenon of cheating, since the teachers are more experienced than students; they supervised the periodic exams.

2.2The participants:

This study was conducted at the department of Psychology, University of Mascara. Since the mixed method is used in the research; two different groups of respondents were selected, the first contained a sample of students, and the second included cases of teachers.

2.2.1 Students:

A total of 63 students completed our questionnaire; this sample was randomly selected from a population represented by the students of the department of Psychology. The respondents are students of the second year; they are supposed to be oriented by the end of the year to one of the three different specialties: Clinical Psychology, School Psychology, and Industrial Psychology, in addition to third year and master students from the different specialties. Among the members of the sample, 30% are males, and 70% of females, the average of their age is about 20 years.

2.2.2 Teachers:

Teachers are the respondents of the qualitative part of the mixed method used in this research. Five cases were assigned from the department of Psychology; they were selected among 33 teachers working in this department. The main characteristics required in the study's cases are:

- Being a teacher at least for 5 years, this allows him/her to live the experience of preparing and proctoring examinations, and the acquaintance of strengths and weaknesses of the assessment system adopted by the educational system.
- To accept voluntarily to participate in the study to give all the time and importance adequate to answer questions.

3. Results and Discussion

The questionnaire contains three parts; each represents a level of analysis, the data gathered through the first part is as follows:

We asked more than 70 respondents 22 questions in order to know the reasons that lead them to cheat, but only 63 answered all the questions this why many copies were removed.

Table 01: The students' responses to the first part of the questionnaire

| N° | QUESTIONS | YES | | NO | |
|----|---|-----|--------|----|--------|
| | | N° | % | N° | % |
| 01 | I cheat when I do not have time to revise my lessons | 25 | 39.68% | 38 | 60.32% |
| 02 | I cheat because I hate revising my lessons | 03 | 4.76% | 60 | 95.24% |
| 03 | I cheat in hard courses | 26 | 41.27% | 37 | 58.73% |
| 04 | I cheat when the exam questions are difficult | 36 | 57.14% | 27 | 42.86% |
| 05 | I cheat when the module is important | 24 | 38.09% | 39 | 61.91% |
| 06 | I cheat when the module is not important | 02 | 3.17% | 61 | 96.83% |
| 07 | I cheat when I have an opportunity to do that | 54 | 85.71% | 09 | 14.29% |
| 08 | I cheat to get better marks than my peers | 15 | 23.81% | 48 | 76.19% |
| 09 | I cheat to help my peers | 41 | 65.08% | 22 | 34.92% |
| 10 | I cheat because I fear failure | 34 | 53.97% | 29 | 46.03% |
| 11 | I cheat because getting caught is minimal | 09 | 14.28% | 54 | 85.72% |
| 12 | I cheat because everybody does it | 27 | 42.86% | 36 | 57.14% |
| 13 | I cheat when the question exams are closed (ex: yes/no questions) | 32 | 50.79% | 31 | 49.21% |
| 14 | I cheat when the question exams are open (ex: essay questions) | 07 | 11.11% | 56 | 88.89% |
| 15 | I cheat because my parents want me to get good marks | 14 | 22.22% | 49 | 77.78% |
| 16 | I cheat when the proctors are indulgent | 46 | 73.01% | 17 | 26.99% |
| 17 | I cheat when the proctors are firm | 03 | 4.76% | 60 | 95.24% |
| 18 | I cheat because I do not know how to revise my lessons | 06 | 9.52% | 57 | 90.48% |
| 19 | I cheat because I lack self-confidence | 03 | 4.76% | 60 | 95.24% |
| 20 | I cheat because I used to do that | 04 | 6.35% | 59 | 93.75% |
| 21 | I cheat because my family conditions do not allow me to revise my lessons | 04 | 6.35% | 59 | 93.75% |

The data collected through the first part of the questionnaire reflects the students' perception and view to the causes of cheating. We can easily notice that the majority of our sample sees that the seventh cause is the most important since almost 86% agreed that they cheat because of this reason. This result reflects that the majority of our students does not give importance to the fact that cheating is an immoral act; they cheat as soon as the opportunity arises regardless of anything else. The same result was found by Mark G. Simkin & Alexander McLoad, when they said: one possible explanatory factor may simply be "opportunity". Although such happenstance might not apply in proctored-examination environments, this explanation seems more appropriate in situations where students have access to online resources' (Simkin & McLoad, 2009).

About 73.01% of the participants declared that they cheat when the proctors are indulgent, which means the importance the learners give to the type of proctors who supervise the exam. Unfortunately, sometimes the proctors are not only tolerant, but they connive until they permit the students to cheat in a collective way. When comparing the results of this item with those obtained in item n°17, cheating when the proctors are firm, where only 4.76% said yes, we can understand the crucial role 'the type of proctors' plays in cheating. This result confirms what Mahmoud. I Syam & Fatima Al-Shaykh found; over 70% of students believed that indulgence invigilator during the exam make it easier for students to cheat (Syam, & Al-Shaykh, 2013). But it interferes the results obtained by Callen Nyamwange et al, only 9.58% of the respondents said that poor invigilator is a main factor of cheating, whereas 32.29% of them see the inadequate preparation as the most important cause of cheating (Nyamwange, 2013).

The ninth question, cheating to help one's peers, the participants marked the third high percentage; almost than 65.08%, which refers to the importance of inter relations among students in committing cheating. This result shows the impact of the culture on the moral reasoning in the Algerian society; students may sacrifice their career to help each other in the exams. The same result was confirmed by S.O Adebayo who conducted a research on the causes of cheating in Nigeria, where he found that 'the corollary of the above is the reason given by our sample for involving in academic cheating, help a friend is the most frequently occurring reason offered, thus suggesting that Nigerian university students get involved in academic cheating because of altruistic purpose (Adebayo, 2011).

The respondents marked the highest scores in the three items mentioned above. Therefore, we can say that our sample cheats first when the opportunity arises, then if the proctors are tolerant as a second factor, and thirdly when they attempt to help their peers. These results go against those found by the researcher Hamzah Dodeen, where he confirmed that the factor of 'professor vigilance is low' is an unimportant factor in cheating, whereas the most compelling reasons for cheating were determined as the following: hard courses, time pressure, hard exams, improving one's chance, and fear of failure (Dodeen, 2012).

The members of our sample obtained scores just above the average, 57.14% in the item n° 4; cheating in hard exam questions. This result seems to be logical, since if the student could not answer the exam questions, he would certainly take risk through making cheating attempts to get the answers somehow, they would have nothing to lose. Hamzah dodeen got almost the same result; when he found that the factor 'hard exams' obtained a mean of 3.60, it was the second most important factor after the factor 'hard courses' (Dodeen, , 2012).

In the tenth item, concerning cheating due to fearing failure, the respondents got 53.97%. This finding reflects the panic of the students from failure in the learning process. This result is less significant than that reached by Mahmoud. I Syam & Fatima Al-Shaykh, where 73% of students agreed that the fear of failure is a reason of cheating (Syam, & Al-Shaykh, 2013). Unlike, the item n°14, which questions the sample about if they cheat when the exam questions are open-ended where only 11.11% said yes, 50.79% of the participants responded yes in the thirtieth item, they cheat more in the closed-ended questions. When comparing the results of the questions 13 and 14, we deduce that the type of exam questions did affect the answers of our participants; it is easier to cheat in closed-ended questions through mimes and gestures only, whereas it seems to be too difficult to do that in open-ended questions.

Regarding the items which less than the average of the participants responded by 'yes', we find questions n° 01, 12, 03, and 05 where the 'yes' answer scored 39.68%, 42,86%, 41,27%, and 38,09% respectively. These findings mean that the majority of the students who participated in this study do not cheat because of the factors: commonness of cheating, the hard modules, or in the important modules. The three factors are less important than the

previous ones mentioned above however, an average of 40% of the participants declared that they cheat because of those factors.

The students included in this study replied to the questionnaire items n° 08 and 15 as follows: only 23.81% said that they cheat to get better marks, and 22.22% do it in response to parents' pressure. The rest of questions obtained a little percentage in yes, which means that the majority of the sample does not cheat when hating revising the lessons, the module is unimportant, being caught is minimal, the proctors are firm, I do not know how to revise my lessons, lack of self-confidence, I used to cheat, and because of my bad family conditions; all these reasons are not enough to lead the students to cheat, the participants declared.

Table 2: The importance of the two factors (type of proctors, type of exam questions)

| Questions Classification | Question n° 13 | percentage | Question n° 16 | percentage |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------|----------------|------------|
| As a 1 st most important | 01/63 | 1.59% | 08/63 | 12.7% |
| As a 2 nd most important | 01/63 | 1.59% | 06/63 | 9.52% |
| As a 3 rd most important | 02/63 | 3.17% | 05/63 | 7.94% |
| As a 4 th most important | 03/63 | 4.76% | 06/63 | 9.52% |
| Total | 07/252 | 2.78% | 25/252 | 9.92% |

Concerning the second part of the questionnaire, it is obvious that both variables (type of exam questions & type of proctors) did not mark a high score. The type of exam questions got only 2.78% as mentioned in the table2, which means that the overwhelming majority of the participants in this research (97.22%) did not select the question n°13, which reflects this factor, as a first main factor of cheating, neither as a second, a third, or a fourth important factor that leads to cheating. The percentage the sample got in the second variable (type of proctors) was a bit higher than that obtained in the first variable. A few students 1.59% chose the type of exam questions as a 1st most important factor, the same thing in as a 2nd most important, 3.17% in as a 3rd most important, and 4.76% in as a 4th most important. A little number of students 12.7% selected the type of exam proctors as a 1st most important factor, 9.52% in as a 2nd most important, 7.94% in as a 3rd most important, and 9.52% in as a 4th most important.

These findings mean that our sample does not consider that the two factors (the type of exam questions & the type of proctors) are the most important causes of cheating. This result may be explained by the ignorance of students to the importance of the two variables in raising or reducing the rate of cheating in our universities. Once entering the exam room, the students usually try to analyze the personalities of the proctors who will ensure the exam; they deduce that from the proctors' gestures, words... on the basis of this analysis they will decide if they cheat or not. The type of exam questions may have the same impact on the cheaters' behaviors; they are more motivated to cheat in closed-ended questions, since the answer can be easily sent through mimes or gestures, or even coughs. If the exam contains multi-choice questions, the number of coughs may reflect the number of the right answer, but this seems to be difficult or impossible in an essay exam; where the students are obliged to reply with their own words.

Table 3: Judgments of the sample on the two factors

| The factors | The results | The interpretation |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| The type of questions | 149 | Important |
| The type of proctors | 180 | Important |

In the third part of the questionnaire (as shown in table 03), the participants obtained 149 points out of 252 as mentioned in the table n° 23 which means that the sample classified the type of exam questions as *important* issue in a scale contains the following categories: not important at all, not important, neutral, important, and very important. The category '*important*' ranges from 126 to 189 points, and '*very important*' between 189 and 252 points. While in the factor type of proctors the group got 180 points, and it has been similarly interpreted; they judged the second factor as an *important* issue in cheating.

The last findings of part two and three can be differently interpreted, while our sample judged the two factors as *important in* cheating, however they did not select them as the most important causes of cheating. Therefore, we can say that they see them important, but not more important than other factors.

As mentioned before the mixed method was used to conduct this research hence, another type of data was gathered from different examinees. The sample contains five teachers belonging to the department of Psychology, and a different instrument was used in data collection. Therefore, five teachers were selected, with minimum of five years in their posts, and have a large experience in organizing and proctoring the exams; in addition to that all of them are specialists in school Psychology.

The participants were asked four main questions during a semi-structured interview:

1. What do you think in the questionnaire presented to the students?
2. Do you have any further reasons which lead the students to cheat?
3. What is the importance of the types of proctors in influencing cheating?
4. What is the importance of the types of exam questions in influencing cheating?

Table 4: answers of the teachers during the interviews

| The teachers The questions | G.R | B.F | B.A | B.M | K.S |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| 01 | It's better to diversify questions about the two factors | Some questions are vague | Modify the question n°10 | / | / |
| 02 | No more reasons of cheating | When the questions are vague | When the exam classroom is not well arranged | No more reasons of cheating | -When I do not have time to revise -to challenge the proctors |
| 03 | Very important | Not important | Very important | Very important | Very important |
| 04 | Very important | Very important | Not important | Very important | Very important |

Regarding the first question asked to the participants in this qualitative study, one of them considered that some questions are a bit vague, another saw that the question n°10 should be modified, and the last one suggested to ask many question about each of the two factors which represent the main topic of this research (the type of exam questions & the type of proctors). In the second question, two respondents did not see to add any further questions to the questionnaire, one of them proposed to ask a question if they cheat when the exam questions are vague. Dr B. A added an item about if they cheat when the exam classroom is not well arranged, and finally Dr K.S added two questions; the first if I do not have time to revise, and the second cheating to challenge the proctors. As far as the two variables the main topic of this research, four teachers out of five classified each of them as a very important issue in cheating, which represents 80%.

It is known that the teachers are more experienced than the students in supervising and organizing the examinations, therefore, we have to examine carefully the answers of the

participants in this stage of our study. A very high percentage of the teachers saw that the type of proctors is very important factor in cheating; they know that an indulgent and a tolerant proctor may destroy the honesty of any exam, whatever the measures taken are. Unfortunately, the majority of studies which tackled this phenomenon investigated the students' perception, whereas, no study concerning the teachers was found. We can say the same thing about the second variable; teachers are more aware of the importance of the type of exam questions in motivating students to cheat. They know that cheating begins when designing an achievement test; including closed-ended questions means encouraging cheating, while open-ended questions makes cheating useless, difficult, and even impossible.

The present research reached its end providing new findings, which can be seen a bit different from those found in the studies reviewed in the first chapter. As far as the students' responses to the questionnaire, the research discovered, as a result to the first part of the tool, that the students considered that the most important factor of cheating is: 'cheating when the opportunity arises', 85.71% of the sample members said that they cheat for this reason, whereas the less important one is: 'I cheat if the module is unimportant', where 3.17% of the participants responded that they are influenced by this factor. Concerning our variables, in the first one 'the type of exam questions' 50.79% of the respondents answered that they cheat when the questions are closed, while only 11.11% of them cheat when the questions are open. These results mean that our sample sees this factor as an important one in cheating. In the second variable; 'the type of proctors', 73.01% of participants confessed that they cheat for this reason, whilst only 4.73% of them cheat when the proctors are firm. Therefore, we can say that the second factor is more decisive in cheating than the first one, both are important however.

The results derived from the analysis of students' responses to the second part of the questionnaire showed that only 2.78% of the respondents selected 'the type of exam questions' as the (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th) most important factor. The same thing for the second factor 'the type of proctors'; where 9.92% of the participants chose it as a (1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th) most important factor. These results can be interpreted by the fact that the sample members see the two factors important in cheating, but less important than other factors.

The respondents' answers to the third part of the questionnaire shows that our sample judged the two factors as '*important*' factors, in a scale containing five grades; not important at all, not important, I cannot decide, important, or very important. This result could be due the emphasis made on the two factors, since they were given in isolation in this stage of analysis.

The qualitative study, conducted on the cases represented by five teachers in the department of Psychology, produced that 80% of them judged the two factors as *very important*. We can see, as a result to the last findings, teachers are more aware of the importance of the two factors, and their impact on cheating, since they are more experienced than students.

4. Conclusion:

When seeking to preserve the academic integrity and to overcome the threat represented with the academic dishonesty, that is to say cheating, the importance of the topic imposes a deep study of the phenomenon. Therefore, conducting this research was decided, and restricting investigation on two main factors which were considered as the major causes of cheating. After reviewing an important number of studies which tackled the same topic the questions of the research were about the importance of the type of exam questions (open-ended questions/closed-ended questions) and the type of proctors (indulgent/ firm) in motivating the learners to cheat. After that, the hypotheses were formulated as a probable explanation; both closed-ended questions and indulgent proctors were hypothesized to be the main factors of cheating.

The research design adopted was the mixed method, adequate to deal with such topic, since we intended to investigate the students' and teachers' perception and points of view about the reasons which influence cheating. Hence a random sample of students and intentional cases of teachers were selected, and suitable instruments were used in data collection; the questionnaire and the interview. To test the feasibility of the study and the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, a pilot study was necessary; consequently, we ensured the feasibility of our study and the safety and usability of our questionnaire.

After treating statically, the data gathered, we found that the students considered the type of exam questions (open-ended/ closed-ended), and the type of proctors (indulgent/ firm) as crucial factors in cheating. However, when comparing the two factors with the remaining factors, the sample members see that there are other factors more important than the two factors. The teachers' perception about cheating differs considerably from that adopted by the learners. Hence, the teachers consider 'the type of exam questions' and 'the type of proctors' as very important reasons of cheating.

We can conclude that treating the first variable can be by keeping the closed-ended questions away as much as possible and trying to diversify the achieving tests by including different types of items. It is essential here to adopt other forms of assessing the students; such as the continued and the oral assessment. As a response to the findings of the second variable, we can suggest to reinforce proctoring by assigning only the firm teachers and excluding those known by their indulgence.

Nowadays, it became important to investigate deeply each probable factor of cheating apart, instead of conducting useless researches through survey about all the reasons together. Furthermore, it will be better to manage experimental studies if possible, since this kind of studies allows us the best manipulation of the independent variables. Nevertheless, descriptive and qualitative studies may help to give an idea about the way the cheaters see the examinations, and why they cheat, in addition to try to give sufficient and effective solutions to this problem.

The fact that academic dishonesty threatens the education system is confirmed, and the fact that we need to more academic integrity is conformed too. Therefore, the emergency to more researches on this phenomenon is now more prominent. The axes which require to be studied may be concluded in the reasons that lead the learners to cheat; how to remove them, and the solutions appropriate to defeat the phenomenon. The most important axis, I believe, is the alternatives that can be provided to the current shape of assessment; so as to make cheating useless. The researchers are called to think in new form of assessment, such as oral evaluation and the emphasis of open-ended questions when designing the achievement tests.

References:

- Adebayo, S.O. (2011). Common cheating behavior among University students: a case study of University of Ado-Ekiti, 01, 144-149
- Bachore, M.M. (2016). The nature, causes and practices of Hawassa University. *Journal of education and practice*, 7 (19), 14-20
- Balbuena, S.E & Lamela, R.A. (2015). Prevalence, motives, and views of academic dishonesty in higher education. *Asia pacific journal of multidisciplinary research*, 03, 69-75
- Colby, J.B. (2007). Teachers and cheating: the relationship between the classroom environment and the high school student cheating. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. Loyola Marymount University.
- Dodeen, H.M. (2012). Undergraduate student cheating in exams. [electronic version] *Damascus University Journal*, 28, 37-55

- Etter, S & Cramar, JJ. (2006). Origins of academic dishonesty: Ethical orientations and personality factors associated with attitudes about cheating with information technology. *Journal of research on technology*, 39, 133-155
- Jurdi, R. (2011). Academic dishonesty in the Canadian classroom: behaviors of a sample of University students. *Canadian journal of higher education*, 41, 1- 35
- Lazarus, L et al. (2014). Forms, factors and consequences of cheating in University examinations: insight from open and distance learning students. *Turkish online journal of distance education*, 15, 259-280
- Mc Cabe, D.L. (August 2013). Cheating in college: why students do it and what educators can do about it? *Journal of college and character*, 14, 275-276
- Muchai, J. (2014). An investigation into factors that contribute to cheating in examinations in technical institutions in central province in Kenya. University of South Africa
- Newman, I & Waeschter, D. (2000). Examination of the factor structure of the cheating scale. ERIC, 01-28
- Nyamwange, C et al. (2013). Factors influencing examination cheating among secondary school students: a case Masaba south district of Kisii county. *Flixir Psychology*, 56, 135196- 13525
- Onyide, C.O. (2015). Examination malpractice in Nigeria: causes and effects on national development. *Journal of education and practice*, 6 (26), 12-17
- Ozment, A et al. Causes for cheating: unclear expectations in the classroom. Georgia Institute of Technology college computing. session 3230
- Rahmani, A. (2013). Why Do students cheat in examinations? The Aga Khan University.
- Sayam, M.I & Al-Shaykh, F. (2013). The factors that lead to cheating in exams and how to avoid them. [electronic version]. Qatar: GSTF Journal on Education, 01, 33-37
- Shariffuddin, S.A & Holmes, R.J. (2009). Cheating in examinations: A study of academic dishonesty in a Malaysian college. *Asian Journal of University education*, 05, 99-124
- Starovoytova, D & Arimi, M. (2017). Witnessing of cheating in exams behavior and factors sustaining integrity. *Journal of education and practice*. 8 (10). 127-141
- Starovoytova, D & Namango, S. (2016). Factors affecting cheating behavior at undergraduate-engineering. *Journal of education and practice*. 7 (31). 66-82
- Wang, J et al. (2015). Analysis on test cheating and its solutions based on extenics and information technology. *Procedia computer science*, 55. 1009-1014
- Weber, J.A & Bradley, K.D. Cheating among students, literature review. University of Kentucky
- Zhou, R.X & Zhou, X.P. (May 2007). On the cause of the University students' cheating phenomenon from the perspective of Albert Bandura's reciprocal determinism. *US- China education review* 04, 7-10
- Zuker, S. (2003). Fundamentals of standardized testing. Harcourt assessment inc. San Antonio.