Academic Dishonesty and Online English Testing inthe Algerian University:
The Moodle Platform as a Model

الغش الأكاديمي واختبار اللغة الإنجليزية عبر الإنترنت في الجامعة الجزائرية: منصة مودل 'Moodle' أنموذجا

Dallel AOUAR , BATNA1 University

dallel.aouar@univ-batna.dz

Abstract:

As educational institutions increasingly adopt distance learning methods, concerns about academic dishonesty in online education have become a significant issue for educators worldwide. This study focuses on this issue within Algerian higher education institutions, particularly regarding evaluations of English modules administered via the Moodle platform. Drawing from personal teaching experiences, the study aims to present examples of academic dishonesty encountered during online student assessments, including plagiarism, unauthorized assistance during exams, and exploitation of weaknesses in online testing. Highlighting specific instances of academic dishonesty will illustrate the scope of the problem, identify gaps in English module testing on Moodle, and provide practical tips for reducing cheating and promoting academic integrity. Furthermore, adapting to evolving student learning strategies requires accurate assessment and updating of teachers' anti-cheating strategies and systems.

Keywords: academic dishonesty; cheating; online English teaching; anti-cheating strategies; academic integrity.

ف

ملخص:

نظرا إلى اعتماد المؤسسات التعليمية بشكل متزايد على أساليب التعلم عن بعد، أصبحت المخاوف بشأن غياب الأمانة الأكاديمية في التعليم عبر الإنترنت مشكلة مهمة للأساتذة الجامعيين في جميع أنحاء العالم. تركز هذه الدراسة على هذه المسألة داخل مؤسسات التعليم العالي الجزائرية، خاصة فيما يتعلق بتقييم وحدات اللغة الإنجليزية التي يتم إدارتها عبر منصة Moodle. واستنادا إلى تجارب التدريس الشخصية، عمدنا في هذه الدراسة إلى تقديم أمثلة على خيانة الأمانة الأكاديمية التي تم رصدها أثناء تقييمات الطلاب عبر الإنترنت، بما في ذلك الانتحال والمساعدة غير المصرح بها أثناء الامتحانات واستغلال نقاط الضعف في الاختبار عبر الإنترنت. إن تسليط الضوء على حالات معينة من عدم الأمانة الأكاديمية سوف يوضح نطاق المشكلة، ويحدد الثغرات في اختبار وحدة اللغة الإنجليزية على نظام Moodle، ويقدم نصائح عملية للحد من الغش وتعزيز النزاهة الأكاديمية. علاوة على ذلك، يتطلب التكيف مع أساليب التعلم المتطورة لدى الطلاب تقييمًا وتحديثًا دقيقًا لاستراتيجيات وأنظمة الأساتذة لمكافحة الغش الأكاديمي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: خيانة الأمانة الأكاديمية، الغش، تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية عبر الإنترنت، استراتيجيات مكافحة الغش، النزاهة الأكاديمية.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic among many other reasons has contributed to a global shift towards online platforms, which has resulted in a serious transformation of the educational landscape with the widespread adoption of remote learning approaches. But much like every shift, this one comes with some challenges, chief among them being security. In other words, even though these developments have made education more flexible and accessible, they have also raised concerns about issues with academic integrity, particularly when it comes to online tests undertaken via sites such as Moodle. Kumar and Dotta (2011) believe that though they are becoming more technologically mature, e-learning systems still do not offer complete security, despite the continuous introduction of new ones and the enhancement of old ones (as cited in Keresztury & Cser, 2013).

Like many other institutions of higher learning worldwide, Algerian ones have adopted online learning as a way to increase educational options and adjust to shifting standards in the field. But

these developments also raise questions about academic dishonesty which can call into question the validity and efficacy of online evaluations.

This research especially focuses on online English module assessment on Moodle; given that it is an Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research accredited platform. We also aim to emphasize academic integrity in Algerian higher education institutions. The English module is now a required component of the curriculum, particularly in light of the qualitative change towards a more structured approach to English instruction for Algerian university teachers and students alike. This led to a reevaluation of the teaching and assessment methods for this subject. More specifically, in order to determine learners' language proficiency and ability, it becomes imperative to guarantee that this type of evaluations is sufficiently accurate; that it is not a prey of academic dishonesty.

1. Definition of Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is generally referred to as "cheating" in nearly all of the relevant literature. Since there is no obvious distinction betweenthe two terms, they are used interchangeably. Lewellyn and Rodriguezdescribed it as "all forms of cheating … [as] plagiarism, unauthorized assistance assignments and examinations" (2015, p. 1). It has increased substantially in higher education milieu (Lewellyn & Rodriguez, 2015) to the extent that it prompted research worldwide (Salehi& Ghlampour, 2021; Hard, Conway & Moran, 2006 as cited in Harmon& Lambrinos, 2006). Along with plagiarism, cheating is seen as a reflection of the need to get good grades at all costs, and it remains a major problem in academia (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). According to the same source, it is more harmful to the educational community than stakeholders realize, as it "affects faculty, students, and administration" (2010, p. 6).

Similarly, Boehm et al. (2009) believed that academic dishonesty "cost institutions administrativetime, loss of integrity within the school, and student lack of respect forethics and values. Faculty members point to a failure of institutional leadership to establish integrity standards and practices across campus" (Behm et al., 2009, para.10 as cited in Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010, p.6)

The majority of academic dishonesty research has concentrated on the prevalence of cheating, while some studies have examined factors related to the personal histories of cheaters as well as demographics

including age, gender, achievement, job, and discipline (Salehi & Gholampour, 2021; Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). The topics exploring cheating generally relate to "reasons for cheating", "reasons for not teaching", "methods of cheating", and "attitudes towards cheating" (Salehi & Gholampour, 2021).

However, students seem to have another philosophy of academic dishonesty. Gomez (2001) noted that many of them believe that cheating is a victimless crime, and they are applying the "no big deal phenomenon" (as cited in Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). Besides, it is well acknowledged that the development of web technology and the emergence of countless online businesses offering term papers have worsened the problem of academic dishonesty. The issue lies not just in the shifting demographics of students, but also in the way that academic dishonesty at colleges and universities is being perpetrated and amplified by the continuous advent of new electronic devices (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010).

2. Academic Dishonesty Motives

According to the majority of the related literature, the idea that students need a degree for personal, professional, and financial security purposes is the very product of society, and ~~that~~ many students think that if they maintain excellent marks throughout their college careers, employers will pay them more (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). Consequently, students are under pressure to achieve well and are deeply concerned about their marks because they are key social indicators that have an impact on their future life.

In general, while academic dishonesty has been identified as primarily motivated by a few causes including the uselessness of the materials and a lack of preparation for the exam; avoiding social stigma was recognized as the main motives behind avoiding cheating (Salehi & Gholampour, 2021). In the same vein, Wilkerson (2009) provided a more thorough explanation of the factors that deter people from cheating including: "attitudes towards plagiarism based on peer influences and religious and ethical positions; fear of failure or penalties if caught; and the intensity of institutional anti-plagiarism activities‖" (as cited in Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010, p. 10).

However, when faced with the prospect of failing a test, some university students resort to the unethical practice of examination cheating. Put differently, the dread of failing an exam can cause anxiety, which in turn can be a strong incentive to engage in cheating. In this

respect, Mokula (2014) advanced that for university students failing a summative examination "entails the repeat of a semester, discontinuation of student support grant or even getting expelled from a programme" (p. 261). Without a doubt, these reasons represent students' pet peeve!

Another powerful motivator is the lack of trust in teachers and the willingness to scapegoat them for any failure. Rather than confronting the fact that they are not very well prepared for the test, some students attribute their expected failure to teachers' desire for them to fail and their determination to keep them from succeeding. That is why, as Peters (2010) stated, they often hunt for a method that will assist them in the exam to combat the imagined animosity that they believe their teachers harbor against their passing (as cited in Mokula, 2014). Other students opt for flimsy reasons to justify their lack of preparation for exams including health issues, social issues at home and death in the family. Others are so desperate to prove their lack of preparation for exams that they will even pay a doctor to write a report certifying that they are still or have ever been unsuitable to write exams because of health issues (Mokula, 2014).

In what relates to online tests, several research findings advocate the existence of no consistent differences in terms of academic cheating between online tests and classical tests. Grijalva, Kerkvliet and Nowell, (2006) argue that "panic cheating", a common type of cheating in traditional classrooms, is less common in online courses and that the architecture of online courses may lessen the necessity for cheating. Harmon and Lambrinos (2006) find out that online tests given in a proctored setting may equalize the frequency of academic dishonesty between online and face-to-face courses.

Furthermore, as testified by the majority of academic dishonesty literature, the choice to cheat is based on a rational comparison of the benefits and costs of cheating. Whereas, cheating can be advantageous in that it can lead to higher grades offering potential status and incentives after graduation, cheating costs are more intricate but are positively correlated with both the severity of the punishment and the chance of being caught (Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006). Those costs and benefits are, according to the same source, weighed against what are thought to be social norms surrounding academic dishonesty. Put differently, the act of cheating is determined by its perception within the university's local community or society at large.

Moreover, it is also assumed that students who do not have a negative attitude towards cheating are probably complicit in some manner. Salehi and Ghlampour (2021), advanced "letting others look at test papers" as a universally common method whereas "sending someone to the exam hall" is a rather rare method.

3. Academic Dishonesty Methods

In the past, a lot of research has concentrated on conventional methods of plagiarism and cheating, like using crib sheets, writing on the hand, turning in a classmate's paper, working together on projects and whispering test answers (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). Similarly, Colnerud and Rosander (2009) presented three taxonomies of academic dishonesty including: cheating as using unauthorized materials; relying on unauthorized collaboration in tests which are initially meant to be individually executed; and plagiarism and fabrication such as attributing oneself a text that belongs to someone else (as cited in Salehi & Ghlampour, 2021, p. 2).

From the students' perspective, survey data show that academic dishonesty behavior is categorized into two groups: panic cheating and planned cheating (Caudill, Gropper, and Bunn, 1992 as cited in Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006). However, if social norms surrounding the two types of cheating are different, there may be differences in the perception of costs and benefits that are filtered via the social environment. This has been defined by McCabe, Trevino, and Butterfield (2002) as "the cheating culture" that emerges on university campuses. If planned cheating occurs when a student deliberately copies school work, fabricates course sheets for tests, or plagiarizes a paper knowing full well that it is wrong; Panic cheating occurs when a student is unable to think of an answer during an exam and therefore chooses a dishonest way to get out of trouble (Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006).

However, it has been proven that planned cheating poses a far bigger risk in online classrooms than panic cheating, primarily because the conditions that encourage or enable panic cheating may be less common than in a traditional classroom (Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006). According to the same authors, planned cheating is more dishonest, easier to detect which implies higher social costs and almost guaranteed punishment, if compared with panic cheating.

555

By referencing relevant research, Witherspoon, Maldonado, and Lacey (2010) proposed two categories of cheating methods: traditional and contemporary, using the advancement of technology in education as a significant point of divergence. The first type labeled "traditional cheating methods" includes cheating inside of the classroom, cheating outside of the classroom, and plagiarism. The second deals with computer, the Internet and the World Wide Web; Personal Data Assistants(PDAs); and cell phones. In what follows, we will describe each of these methods in the light of the work of Witherspoon, Maldonado, andLacey (2010, pp. 7-14).

3.1. Traditional Cheating Methods

According to these authors, inside the class plagiarism is concerned with analysis "of discarded cheat sheets … stealing a test, lying to an instructor to get more time for an assignment, falsifying lab data, taking an exam for a classmate, and having a friend forge one's name on an attendance sheet" (2010, p. 8). Cheating outside the classroom stands for 'providing a paper for another student, copying homework, copying a friend's computer program, working on an assignment with others when the instructor asked for individual work, failing to report cheating by others, non-attribution, and purchasing a paper someone else wrote" (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010, p. 9). The last type "plagiarism" is assumed to be the most confusing among the three types. It is related to two main issues: academic transgressions as to refer others' works to oneself; the second relates to online businesses selling ready-made term papers and customized research.

Moreover, Brandt (2002) brought a more accurate categorization of plagiarism as reported by Witherspoon, Maldonado and Lacey (2010):
The methods included a) stealing material from another sourceand passing it off as their own (e.g., buying a paper from an essay bank or term paper mill, copying a whole paper from a source without proper acknowledgment, and submitting another student's work); b) submitting a paper written by
someone else (e.g., a peer or relative) and passing it off as one'sown; c) copying sections of material from one or more sourcesand deleting the full reference; and d) paraphrasing material from one or more source(s) without providing appropriatedocumentation. (p. 10)

It's important to note that just because these three forms of

academicdishonesty are categorized as "traditional methods," it doesn't mean that students no longer use them.

3.2. Contemporary Cheating Methods

As technology proliferated, new traditions swept through the academic environment, particularly in universities. These customs have become so ingrained that it is impossible for us to imagine teaching or learning today without them. However, technology is criticized for being misused in the classroom.

According to the majority of linked research, technological innovations like PDAs (Personal Data Assistants), mobile phones, sophisticated calculators, and the Internet have made student cheating easier and more widespread than it was in the past (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010). Researchers have found that the computers, and/or the Internet, have been the most misused technology in academia. Offering a huge amount of information, Internet makes cheating easier and more accessible. With regard to the more sophisticated PDAs, which combine information and communication technologies and incorporate three-way wireless (computer, phone, and camera), they are accused of giving students access to cheating tools and storing large databases and spreadsheets.

According to Gomez (2001), referenced in Witherspoon, Maldonado, and Lacey (2010), the third category of modern cheating techniques has elevated cheating to a new level. This results from students' texting their classmates their answers to questions and taking images of their tests using their phones' cameras to save or share with peers, even from other classes. Moreover, it is to take images of an exam. Snapping images of one's' study materials, storing them on the phone, and then accessing them at a later time during the exam is considered one effective and simple methods of today's cheating.

Moving beyond the previously mentioned approaches, technological advancements have given birth to a new dilemma that, if not carefully handled, might bring about the collapse of all ethical educational concepts. This is true of artificial intelligence (AI) and ChatGPT, one of its very products and a variant of GPT-3. In a relatively recent study, Debby Cotton (2023, p. 1) described chatGPT as being "specifically designed to generate human-like text in a conversational style". She believed that AI essay-writing systems, designed to generate essays based on a set of parameters or prompts, may be quite challenging for assessment in higher education if misused by students to cheat on their

assignments by submitting essays that are not theirs (Cotton, 2023). This type of artificial intelligence may also lead to inequities in the assessment process. Cotton explained this by saying that students who have access to this program may grade better than those who do not. Furthermore, it can be challenging to discern between a student's original work and the responses provided by a given chatbot.

All things considered, there is an unavoidable link between the so-called modern cheating methods and online education. Consequently, teachers have great challenges harnessing technology to enhance the teaching-learning process and mitigate its drawbacks.

4. Anti-Cheating Strategies

Several studies came to the same conclusion about the need to think about some doable strategies to stop and combat teaching, particularly in relation to the meticulous design of assessments. In this vein, it is believed that the use of a variety of question types in a single exam, for instance, could reduce cheating (Davis, Drinan, & Gallant, 2009). In parallel, other studies advocate introducing the fundamental principles required to create a culture that is hostile to academic dishonesty at the university.

Drawing on the findings of Davis, Drinan and Gallant (2009) Abdaoui argues that "moral development" and "the institutionalization of integrity" in educational institutions are two effective strategies for combating cheating (Abdaoui, 2018). Davis et al. (2009) found that the kind of students' education, which focuses primarily on imparting "universal moral values," has a good impact on moral development. The process of institutionalizing integrity was also divided into four stages: the "recognition and commitment" stage, during which the educational institution acknowledges the inconvenience of cheating; the "response generation stage," denoting the academic community's reaction to the problem; the "implementation stage," during which teachers and administrators work together to put the solutions into practice; and finally, the "institutionalization stage," when a satisfactory level of control over the phenomenon is attained, even when there are occasional instances of cheating (Davis, Drinan, & Gallant, 2009, pp. 156-159).

As well, Keresztury and Cser (2013, p. 4) divided academic dishonesty prevention into two levels: organizational and technical. The first type stands for enforcing security policies through the implementation of an organizational policy that clearly defines the aids allowed for different types of exams and instructions about caught cheaters along with a description of the roles that proctors and teachers

play in busting cheaters. Accordingly, specific training should be organized to ensure teachers' and proctors' acquisition of techniques to detect forbidden actions; simultaneously, students should be guaranteed awareness-raising campaigns regarding the negative effects of cheating. The second, however, deals with techniques to prevent high-tech cheating. These include preventing the use of removable storage devices in exams requiring the use of computers; cutting access to common storage through firewall rules or access restrictions; disabling the copy function in browser or the examination tool to avoid copying the questions electronically; distributing the questions in different files to prevent saving them or sharing them easily; inhibiting the use of cell phones to avoid taking pictures of the questions for instance (Keresztury & Cser, 2013). According to the same source, preventing academic dishonesty in online open-book exams is expensive since it necessitates the increase of proctors; and the installation of content-sensitive proxy to filter out the majority of undesirable traffic (Keresztury & Cser, 2013, p. 4).

5. Teaching English on the Moodle Platform

Algeria has shifted its focus to a fresh consideration on English teaching within the educational framework from 2021. Reforms have impacted every specialty and involved both instructors and students at the university level. The concept is based on the reality that English is now crucial for advancing scientific research, expanding student mobility opportunities and broadening the university's visibility.

This shift was intertwined with the global orientation towards online education particularly in the wake of the Covid-19 outbreak. In this regard, the Higher Education and Scientific Research Ministry took important measures to establish the fundamentals of online education and provide the necessary means and facilities. These include setting up language labs, using hybrid teaching, and introducing the Moodle platform to host various online courses to the advantage of students. The latter involves training teachers to understand the principles of Moodle and to handle its different functions. Consequently, several training cycles have been carried out on the part of teachers to ensure efficient teaching. This mainly encompasses course design, course implementation, activity conception and selection and adaptation of different resources and activities.

In an article submitted to the occasion of the first Moodle Research Conference, Kotzer and Elran (2012) held the opinion that Moodle prioritizes providing educators with the greatest resources to oversee and encourage learning and gives them the ability to plan, manage, and deliver course materials. Moodle was initially designed according to socio-constructivist pedagogy (Brandl, 2005 as cited in Kotzer & Elran, 2012). In other words, its objective is to offer a collection of resources that facilitate an online learning strategy that is inquiry- and discovery-based. Also, it aims to establish a setting "that allows for collaborative interaction among students" either alone or in conjunction with traditional classroom learning (2012, p. 123).

As stated earlier, Moodle's strength lies in the vast array of pedagogical implications it may provide based on the range of resources and activities it can offer. Goodwin-Jones (2003) displayed a list of these resources including "chats and forums … online booklets, a variety of questions, collections of problems and exercises, lecture notes; including any kind of text-based or HTML-formatted documents, multimedia resources such as graphics, video or audio (e.g., MP3 files), PowerPoint, or Flash-based applications and Java applets" (as cited in Kotzer & Elran, 2012). However, just like any other teaching tool, Moodle is susceptibleto academic dishonesty. Moodle-based English instruction is probably more vulnerable to these problems.

6. English Module Assessment on the Moodle Platform

Taught as a horizontal unit that implements a hybrid instruction, the English module requires a continuous online assessment and a finalface-to-face test, as indicated by the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education. Said differently, the online assessment of the English module requires that students' performance in the many interactive activities be continuously evaluated. And given the impact of technology both in society and institutions of higher education (Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010), as well as students' avaricein wanting to succeed at all costs (Cotton, 2023; Grijalva, Kerkvliet, &Nowell, 2006; Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010; Salehi & Gholampour, 2021; Mokula, 2014), academic dishonesty seems to be inevitable.

Generally, two types of assessment are required: continued evaluations and a final quiz. A set of resources and activities are displayedon Moodle to offer both types of assessments an array of

options to test students' knowledge assimilation and the development of their four skills concerning English course content. In what follows, we aim to highlight certain methods of cheating associated with the 'quiz', as a type of tests, and offer some solutions based on our experience of teaching English using Moodle for around seven years at the University of Batna1 Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

6.1. Moodle Quiz and Cheating Methods

Available on the Moodle platform as an activity, the quiz enables teachers to create tests "comprising questions of various types, including multiple choice, matching, short-answer and numerical" (Moodle 4.0). To this list, we can add questions like true/false, embedded answers, select missing words, drag and drop, to name but a few. These questions can be automatically scored once the settings meant for each question have been established. Exceptionally for 'essay' question, answers have to be corrected manually since automatic marking cannot be configured. The test may consist of an endless number of random or obligatory questions that have been generated and saved in the question bank. The first indicates the types of questions that appear to all participants in the test without exception. The second refers to the type of questions that may appear to some and not to others but never in the same order.

The test must be configured according to several steps including the name of the test, the description, timing, grade, layout, question behavior, review options, appearance and others. It is imperative to evoke the test's validity and reliability to apostrophize its quality. The validity of the test depends largely on the precision of the settings and the accuracy, number and variety of questions. As far as reliability is concerned, the settings of the test being accurate, well determined, and unified assuring the same conditions for all the participants are sufficient to guarantee reliability.

However, the issue of academic integrity appears to be problematic. Considering that the test is administered online, teachers have little control over how students complete it. In other words, they are unable to demonstrate whether the student passed the test or whether someone else did. Else, students' unlimited access to various online and offline information resources is another significant issue. This is a reference to the extent to which students can benefit from unauthorized online

assistance.

Since online teaching was a new pedagogical approach when we first started using it six years ago, we conducted pilot tests to ensure the validity of the material, confirm students' level of proficiency with the tool, and assess the teaching-learning process before deciding on the final format of the exam. One of these was a test conducted in the early stages that showed a substantial difference in results between the performance of a group of Master students on an online English exam and a test conducted in-person covering the same content, the same questions, and the same length of time. Findings indicated that students did better on the online test than the in-person one, with a small number of students receiving comparable or the same scores in both cases. This remainedtrue even when the online test was restricted to 10 minutes and given one attempt instead of two.

This usually happens when all students take an online test with the same set of questions. One reason is that it makes it easier for studentsin the same group to communicate the questions and their answers, as well as for students in other groups or at higher levels. Another reason is unlimited access to available online and offline resources. Moreover, students have admitted resorting to some available online programs to ease the task- in other words 'cheating legally'. They typically use online translators such as Google Translation for assistance, especially when exams are given in a foreign language. Yet,this casts doubt on the test's reliability and validity stated earlier. In a similar vein, while few students admit it, most use AI programs to helpthem with the writing sections of online tests. Just another egregious cheating method that undermines the validity and reliability of the test!

6.2. Tips to Prevent Cheating in English Online Tests on Moodle

Given that any student's aim is to succeed and rich the safe side ofthe river, academic dishonesty will remain a tough thorn to remove. Inthe absence of 'the moral' and the 'institutionalization' of academic integrity in our university (Davis et al., 2009 as cited in Abdaoui, 2018), this practice will continue to trap students one after the other, if action is not taken. In other words, there is a need to establish the core values necessary to create a culture that is hostile to academic dishonesty in our environment either on the part of students who already practice cheating (or those considered potential cheaters), or teachers who may have a lenient attitude towards cheating. This could be accomplished by holding awareness events to alert students to the risks associated

with these behaviors from the perspective of morality, pedagogy, and scientific advancement in general. Misconceptions like good marks are a fatality to social and economic success and cheating is 'victimless' (Gomez, 2001 cited in Witherspoon, Maldonado, & Lacey, 2010) must be banned. Additionally, academic and administrative staff must collaborate to put the regulations that encourage integrity and outlaw all forms of dishonesty—basically, a blueprint of honesty covering ways to double costs of cheating and lessen its benefits. All of this talk, however, will be in vain if nothing is done to increase students' faith in their teachers, reduce animosities and be professionals in exam conception.

As mentioned earlier, new customs spread throughout the academic environment, especially in universities, as technology proliferated more widely. Online instruction has become an essential ingredient in education in general. As far as we are concerned, using the Moodle platform to teach English is an interesting experience. Yet, there are issues with online evaluation. A set of technical measures have to be taken to hinder at least 'planned cheating' and minimize 'panic cheating' (Caudill, Gropper, and Bunn, 1992 as cited in Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006).

Since the architecture of online courses may lessen cheating (Grijalva, Kerkvliet, & Nowell, 2006), the introduction of appropriate adjustments to the online tests format, as important parts of these courses, is believed to raise their validity (Harmon & Lambrinos, 2006). Similarly, this includes randomized questions from a large pool of test questions, open book testing with time constraints so students do not have time to look up answers, etc. In plain words, the number of questions is of a great importance. The quality of an online test in Moodle is tightly related to the number of questions stored in the bank and how they are manipulated. Put another way, the more questions are randomized the less likely it is to have a similar set of questions. On the contrary, using obligatory questions makes it easy to copy and share questions and answers among students in the same group or other groups. This greatly influences the degree to which students experience planned panic.

Moreover, timing is another important element in online cheating prevention. It is imperative to limit the time of the attempt according to

the number and complexity of questions. This requires a duration that is neither too long for students to switch to cheating and sharing answers, nor too short to deny them their rights. Also, it is imperative to pay attention to the 'Review Option'. That is to say, the correct response needs to be set up so that it appears only after the test has closed, not after attempts have been made.

Even with all of these measures, it is still unclear whether the student behind the screen is the same one who is meant to be taking the test. A problem that educators are genuinely powerless to solve since it depends on significant resources. Harmon and Lambrinos (2006) believe that a proctored test is the best practice for online assessment. Stated differently, teachers must assign all students to computers in their classrooms that are linked to the internet on the day of the online test. Here again, it is difficult to guarantee academic honesty. Since achieving 100% safety requires a lot of proctors, up to one teacher per student. Also, it requires installing a 'content-sensitive proxy' to block out the majority of unwanted exchanges of information(Keresztury & Cser, 2013). These are cost-prohibitive measures that even the wealthiest institutions find unfeasible!

CONCLUSION

Given all that preceded, avoiding academic dishonesty is not an easy taskespecially nowadays. Addressing problems such as Moodle online testsintegrity demands both rigor and wisdom. The first suggests that stringent regulations on how to deal with cheaters and prevent cheating must be put in place. This implies restricting planned cheating and reducing the factors that may evoke panic cheating. Major considerations to keep in mind are the quality of the questions and how well they match the students' level of proficiency and the knowledge they have acquired during the course. Timing is another important ingredient. To prevent undue constraints and the incitement of dishonesty, an authentic online exam must be completed within a time frame that is neither excessively brief nor excessively lengthy.

The second 'wisdom' deals with moral issues. It is crucial to emphasize that adolescents are controlled by their emotions, which dictates their behaviors. Therefore addressing their emotions is the only way to try to alter their behavior towards academic honesty. In other words, we need to establish a culture where ethics constrict the need to behave dishonestly. This necessitates planning awareness-raising events for students to awaken their better nature and encouragethe most

upright. The stigmatization of academic dishonesty, in all its forms, should be emphasized for both teachers and students. Prohibiting the trivialization of dishonest behavior that students perceive as 'victimless' is also necessary. However, the rapid evolution of technology gives us the impression of constantly being one step behind the latest learning strategies and cheating techniques. Hence, maintaining focus on the requirements of students while adhering to modern demands is the optimal approach.

List of References:

Abdaoui, M. (2018). *Strategies for Avoiding Cheating and Preserving Academic Integrity in tests.* Retrieved from ResearchGate: https://bit.ly/3UNoG02

Cotton, D. (2023). *Chatting and Cheating. Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT.* Retrieved from Academia: https://bit.ly/4bFVcbn

Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Gallant, T. (2009). Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do. *Wiley-Blackwell*. DOI: 10.1002/9781444310252

Grijalva, T. C., Kerkvliet, J., & Nowell, C. (2006, January). *Academic Honesty and Online Courses.* Retrieved April 24, 2024, from ResearchGate: https://bit.ly/4bDhU3O

Harmon, O. R., & Lambrinos, J. (2006, March). Are Online Exams an Invitation to Cheat? *The Journal of Economic Education , 39* (02), pp. 116-125. DOI: 10.3200/JECE.39.2.116-125

Keresztury, B., & Cser, L. (2013). New Cheating Methods in the Electronic Teaching Era. (ELSEVIER, Ed.) *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 93*, 1516-1520. https://bit.ly/4dKTnfe

Kotzer, S., & Elran, Y. (2012). Learning and teaching with Moodle-based E-learning environments, combining learning skills and content in the fields of Math and Science & Technology., *01*, pp. 122-131. https://bit.ly/3X2TsoH

Lewellyn, P. G., & Rodriguez, L. C. (2015). Does Academic Dishonesty Relate to Fraud Theory? A Comparative Analysis. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research , 5*(3), 1-6. https://bit.ly/4dIgSFs

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2002). Honor codes and other contextual influences on academic integrity: A replication and extension to modified honor code settings.
Research in Higher Education 43(3): 357-378.

Mokula, L. L. (2014, October). Forms, Factors and Consequences of Cheating in University Examinations: Insight from Open and Distance Learning Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education , 15* (4), pp. 259-280.DOI: 10.17718/tojde.89240

Moodle 4.0. (n.d.). https://bit.ly/3wEU8FO

Salehi, M., & Gholampour, S. (2021, May). Cheating on Exams: Investigating Reasons, Attitudes, and the Role of Demographic Variables. *Sage Open* , pp. 1-9.

Witherspoon, M., Maldonado, N., & Lacey, C. H. (2010). Academic Dishonesty of Undergraduates: Methods of Cheating. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (pp. 1-28). Denver, Colorado. https://bit.ly/3WN0X2G