Academic dishonesty *cheating* in synchronous and asynchronous classes: A proctored examination intervention

Homer T. Alvarez[1], Reynald S. Dayrit[2], Maria Crisella A. Dela Cruz[3], Clariza C. Jocson[4], Renzo T. Mendoza[5], Ariel V. Reyes[6], Joyce Ni ña N. Salas[7]

Pampanga State Agricultural University

Corresponding Email: reynald2399dayrit@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T

In time of pandemic, synchronous and asynchronous learning occurred as a form of distance learning implemented by the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education. This research entitled "Academic Dishonesty *Cheating* in Synchronous and Asynchronous Classes: A Proctored Examination Intervention" was conducted to identify the self-report and types of assessment stated by the respondents. It also determined the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination in preventing the cheating practices of students. The researchers used a quantitative research design and three adapted questionnaires with 40 participants. The results generated from the questionnaires were analyzed using frequency, percentage, and Mann-Whitney U test. The results obtained the following: most students cheated on assignments, exams, or quizzes; the primary reasons for student dishonesty were stress and worry essentially, and homework was the kind of evaluation that enabled pupils to cheat. Proctored exams provide similar results regardless of whether the exams were conducted asynchronously or synchronously. The following findings on the impact of proctored synchronous and asynchronous exams on students revealed that: most students will be less likely to cheat in a proctored examination. Most of the students believed that these proctored examinations would be a good solution in monitoring remote learning. Therefore, proctored synchronous and asynchronous examinations prevent the academic dishonesty or cheating practices of students.

INTRODUCTION

There is no current playbook that specifies the route for dealing with a worldwide pandemic of this scale, whether at the federal or state level or in our institutions or schools; it is an effort to discover new paradigms that reconceptualize not only learning and teaching but also assessment and evaluation (Bonk et al., 2020). In the time of the pandemic, synchronous and asynchronous learning occurred as a form of distance learning implemented by the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education. In terms of evaluation and assessment a study by Stanford University found that 86 percent of high school students had admitted to cheating on tests at some time throughout their academic careers (Long, 2020). The research also discovered that, in the past, it was often the struggling kid who was found to cheat. However, nowadays, students above average and headed for college cheat at a higher rate. As a teacher, it is a responsibility to assure those students' scores and performances must be based on what they have learned from the lesson.

In today's generation, technology in education has a significant role in the teaching and learning process. With technology, both teachers and learners can submit their projects or any requirements within a short time. It helps them be more encouraged and motivated in the teaching and learning process. In the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Education 4.0), the evaluation of learning outcomes via online examinations is becoming more popular and essential due to its accessibility and mobility (Bui, Nguyen A, Nguyen N, & Tran, 2021). The biggest obstacles faced by the respondent-teachers are students' struggles to grasp the lesson and delivery of teaching. This is backed up by technological challenges as well as a difficulty with monitoring and assessment (Dulay & Manuel, 2021). On the other hand, learners are more exposed to academic dishonesty, which is the most popular and common problem in every class – cheating. Encouraging high-quality and regular involvement in both synchronous and asynchronous forums will help students achieve their highest possible levels of achievement (Duncan, Kenworthy, & McNamara, 2012).

Academic dishonesty can happen in synchronous classes, where teachers can see clearly what the learners were doing while taking the examination. According to Chen, West, and Zilles (2017), it is rather unexpected to see that, rather than growing over the test time, as expected in widespread collaborative cheating, exam results drop throughout the examination period. The fact that weaker students are delaying examinations may be a contributing factor; nevertheless, this impact persists even when considering student aptitude, as assessed by a synchronous exam during the same semester. The experiment demonstrates the possibility and practicality of conducting interpretation exams online utilizing the particular technology of synchronous cyber classrooms, as shown by the experiment results (Chen & Ko, 2010). When compared to traditional face-to-face exams, there are several limitations to this kind of assessment. Having the validity of the scores of the students in an examination must secure by the teacher its truthfulness. Based on the study of Mackay and Munoz (2019), the typology provides general normative advice to educators who are constructing online exams to minimize risks to assessment inference validity and challenges to academic integrity in general that are caused by student cheating. According to Dendir and Maxwell (2020), academic dishonesty in online courses may be mitigated by using online proctoring, which is a cost-effective technique.

The exponential development of online courses and the increasing number of educational institutions were to bring in students worldwide. The problem of online evaluation for distant learners can no longer be disregarded or put off indefinitely, as it was in the past, as it has been in previous years (Khare & Lam, 2008). Cheating or academic dishonesty is a global problem in the educational system as it continuously spreads in the institution. In the study of Farisi (2013), behaviours regarding academic dishonesty and culture in higher education institutions were all over the globe. Variables have a significant influence on the development of academic dishonesty behaviours and practices in higher education institutions. A comprehensive model of moral education is also discussed as an interdisciplinary approach for fighting academic dishonesty and fostering literary culture and integrity in the Department of Education.

Students' experience in peers, culture, and family can urge the student to practice academic dishonesty. This action was influenced by various variables, including the location of the student population participating in online courses and the institution's cheating culture, among others (Tolman, 2017). In the research conducted by Abbas and Naeemi (2011), the variables taken into consideration include the student's grade point average, pressure given by the parents, less time preparation for a particular test, the amount of time a kid spends participating in extracurricular activities, and the gender of the students involved in cheating. The research results revealed that academic dishonesty and disloyalty, mainly test/exam-related cheating and plagiarism on written assignments and papers, is widespread in the educational setting. Testing/exam difficulties, time constraints, irrelevant course material, the pressure to get good grades while losing clarity on policy, and the desire to have extra points to raise their rates were all factors that contributed to these practices (Bachore, 2016). In addition, students practice academic dishonesty depending on the type of assessment tool they have to answer. In the findings of Bretag, Harper, and Rundle (2019), the simple suggestion is seen in the literature, and public discussion that colleges should transition from text-based assignments to invigilated examinations as a method of preventing contract cheating is called into question. Exams are not intrinsically secure, even though text-heavy assessments are not immune to academic dishonesty. The authenticity of reviews was evaluated using five criteria taken from the real world. Students frequently outsource assessment assignments that do not include all, including the criteria (Bretag, Ellis, Haeringen, Harper, and Zucker, 2018).

In line with this problem of academic dishonesty, the researchers seek to find out if online exam proctoring prevents students' cheating practices. Exam proctoring over the internet is regarded as a deterrent to cheating. Online test proctoring makes it less probable for them to cheat; 63 percent (n = 65) of those who took the survey agreed or strongly agreed; with just 26 percent (n = 26) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing (Aviv, Balash, Fainchtein, Kim, Shaibekova, and Sherr, 2020). In the study of Mendonca, Okada, and Scott (2015), students and assessors agreed that the most significant advantages were: a trustworthy examination, credible technology, genuine assessment, an interactive e-Viva, a lower overall cost, a scalable procedure, and less time, effort, and money. In the classroom, students were able to learn more easily and quickly by using mobile devices (Lim and Arcilla, 2021). It is said to be a different way of imparting the lesson. According to Nie et al. (2020), live proctoring is the only form of OPE because the examination is not only monitored remotely, but the proctor can also see the students through the screen; in many cases, a photo is taken by the device's camera and saved to the device's memory.

Cheating is considered as a subcategory of academic dishonesty by Howard (2000). Moreover, academic dishonesty is characterized as students' engaging in illegal activities, tactics, or forms of fraud during their examination or evaluation processes, usually to improve their grades. Smart (2020) stated that cheating is beneficial to the students because it helps them achieve high rates, and it helps them during some high-stake assessments such as scholarships. In high school, students' habits and attitudes about cheating are formed (Mccabe, Butterfield, & Trevino, 2012). In the study of Diego (2017), the result found out that aside from peer pressure, the difficulty of the exam and the inability to study for it are the most common reasons for cheating. Many schools around the globe might experience that some students cheat during their examinations, homework, and evaluation. Some of their consequences might be minor or major. On the other hand, significant consequences are grade failure, probation, suspension, or expulsion in class/course (Penn State University (2019). In line with this, cheating may result from course failure, self-esteem, and self-respect, which can ruin the students' academic integrity or reputation. Also, cheating makes a person hard to find a job, false character, stopped progress in learning, and embarrassing (Smart, 2020). According to Graves (2008), students who cheat on exams are more likely to participate in dishonesty in the workplace than students who do not. Moreover, such actions may endanger not only their co-workers, particularly those in high-risk professions like engineering, medicine, and nursing but also the company in which they work. In Starovoytova and Namango's (2016) study entitled "Factors Affecting Cheating-Behaviour at Undergraduate-Engineering," over the 100 respondents, 82 percent of the respondents felt that there is a need to cheat on a test if you study correctly. Consequently, cheating has emerged as one of the most severe forms of academic misconduct; furthermore, it has become one of the most prevalent serious issues facing educational institutions today (Wilkinson, 2009). According to Hosny

& Fatima (2014), to decrease or stop the students' cheating behaviour and the moral qualities of the pupils and teachers involved faculty members, administrations and heads of every school, parents/guardians, and most students. Also, teachers can fight against academic dishonesty, which is cheating, by giving enjoyable, more engaging, fun activities and relevant activities and assignments to the students. In addition, teachers must be more attentive, detecting and report cheating incidents (Ma, Wan, and Lu, 2008).

This study investigated the effectiveness of synchronous and asynchronous proctored examinations to prevent the cheating of students. It also identified the self-report dishonest behaviour of students in synchronous and asynchronous classes. In line with this, the researchers also found out the causes, reasons, and type of assessment why students engage in academic dishonesty. This research addressed the perception of students in terms of the benefits and negative consequences of cheating. Therefore, the researchers conducted a proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination to identify if this action can prevent and address academic dishonesty (cheating).

Objectives

The primary goal of this study was to determine the students' academic dishonesty and check the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination in addressing the problem. Therefore, it seeks to inquire answers to the following questions:

1. How do students rate themselves having dishonest behaviour in synchronous and asynchronous classes?
2. How do the students describe cheating in terms of:
    2.1 causes
    2.2 type of assessment
    2.3 reason
3. Is there a significant difference between the scores of students who were under proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam?
4. How is the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous tests described in terms of:
    4.1 Students less likely to cheat, proctored examination as a good solution for monitoring remote examination, preference of students
    4.2 The methods/applications used in proctored exams
    4.3 Benefits of using online exam proctoring

METHODS

The descriptive approach alludes to explore that portrays a wonder or probably a gathering under investigation. It was principally helpful in social affair information on a specific populace, circumstances, and occasions. This research design was more towards gathering information and discovering some knowledge out of that information utilizing measurable investigation.

Respondents

The researchers considered the 40 first and second-year students as the respondents of this study. The respondents were grouped into two as randomly selected with the use of the fishbowl method technique. The reason why there were only 40 participants was that the researchers used a purposive sampling technique. As in the midst of pandemic, the researchers were tasked to conduct the study with their college department particularly with their field of specialization. A fishbowl discussion is a type of discourse that can be utilized while examining themes inside group meetings (Wageningen University and Research, 2012). Each group undergoes separately using a proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination.

Instruments

The adapted questionnaires were from the following researchers: Armstead (2001) and Sottile and Watson (2010). The questionnaire from Armastead, Sottile, and Watson were used before the examination of the student. These questionnaires consist of the students' self-report, causes, type of assessment, reason, and negative consequences of cheating. On the other hand, the questionnaire from Aviv, Balash, Fainchtein, Kim, Shaibekova, and Sherr was used to determine the students' perception of the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination. The said questionnaires were replicated using Google form because gathering the data were done only via online communication, where face-to-face contact is prohibited in this pandemic. The respondents were tasked to answer the given questionnaires via Zoom meeting after the synchronous and asynchronous exam to assure that they were the one who answered the stated instrument.
Since the researchers used an adapted questionnaires and those questionnaires came from other countries, which the reason why the researchers conducted a validity and reliability test. The researchers conducted a validity test. The computed value or ratio of the validity test in each question was ranging from 0.35-0.78, therefore each questions were valid. On the other hand, the researchers used the Fleis Kappa to compute for the reliability test. The computed *kappa* was 0.7 where the questionnaire was reliable as the computed value is greater than 0.60

Data gathering procedure

In working the study, the researchers wrote a letter from the teachers/adviser of the respondents. As the letter approved by the teacher, the researchers conducted an orientation on how to answer the research instrument and participate in the Zoom meeting. On July 9, 2021, the researchers send the first adapted questionnaire about their self-report in academic dishonesty, including the causes, assessment, reasons, benefits, and negative consequences of cheating. On July 11, 2021, the respondents consisting of 40 participants were grouped into two using the fishbowl technique. Each group underwent separately in proctored synchronous and asynchronous (Auproctor application) examination with a time limit of 30 minutes. On the same day, the respondents answered the last adapted questionnaire to see if the proctored examination in both synchronous and asynchronous effectively prevented the students' cheating. After gathering all the information from the given questionnaires, the researchers analysed, interpreted, and tabulated the given data.

Ethical consideration

The researchers ensured that the respondents' participation based on informed consent and provided sufficient information suited in this study. The respondents' participations were fully informed, considered, and given free decision without coercion or any pressure. Furthermore, the anonymity and privacy of the respondents are paramount necessary. The respondents were assured that all the gathered data were treated with utmost confidential and highest level of objectivity.

Data analysis

Frequency, percentage, and Mann-Whitney U Test were used as statistical treatment. Frequency was used to count the given answers of the respondents from each question. And percentage was computed to find the part of the students answered from the whole population. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized to look at whether there is a distinction in the reliant variable for two autonomous gatherings. It analyses whether the appropriation of the reliant variable is no different for the two gatherings and in this manner from a similar populace. These tests measured the number of students who are practicing academic dishonesty and identify if there is a significant difference between the performance of students under the proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination. All the data were arranged, tabulated, analysed, and interpreted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Academic Dishonesty (Cheating) was visible in the face-to-face classes. In this time of pandemic, students were constantly engaging themselves even they are in the synchronous and asynchronous classes. Students' cheating practices involved various forms of activities where they exercise this dishonesty in education

Table 1. Students' self-report having dishonest in synchronous and asynchronous classes

Student Self-Reporting	No of Respondents (Out of 40)	%	Rank
I have cheated on an assignment, test or quiz.	26	65	1
I have been caught cheating.	4	10	6.5
I have submitted others' work as mine.	4	10	6.5
I have had someone gave me answers during a class quiz or test.	14	35	2.5
I have received answers to a quiz or test from someone who has already taken it.	2	5	8
I have used instant messaging through a cell phone or a handheld device during quiz or exam.	14	35	2.5
I have copied another students' work without their permission and submitted it as my own.	0	0	9
I have knowingly copied passages from an article or book directly into a paper without citing it as someone else's work.	6	15	4.5
I have used a term paper writing service to complete an assignment.	6	15	4.5
	n=40		

Table 1 shows the self-report of students having dishonesty in synchronous and asynchronous classes. Notably, 26 out of 40 students (65%) have cheated on their assignments, tests, or quizzes. It only shows that most of the students cheated on their assignments, test, or quizzes during their synchronous and asynchronous classes. In support of the study conducted at Stanford University, most students had admitted to cheating on tests at some time throughout their academic careers (Long, 2020). Cheating is a form of students' dishonesty in the field of education. There are factors that contribute why students always practice this action. There are several reasons stated by the students in committing cheating in the blended classroom setup and even during the face to face classes.

Table 2.1. Causes of cheating stated by the students

Causes of Cheating	No of Respondents (Out of 40)	%	Rank
Stress and worry	35	87.5	1
Teachers wanting you to do well	22	55	5
Parents wanting you to do well	27	67.5	3
Being lazy	30	75	2.5
Not being very clever at a subject	30	75	2.5
Not being very well organized	26	65	4
	n=40		

Table 2.1 shows the causes of cheating by the students. The thing that the students think should be called causes of cheating on school work is stress and worry that has 87.5%. In line with this, students mental health was a concern as stress and worry were present as the main cause of their cheating practices. Similar to testing/exam difficulties, time constraints, irrelevant course material, the pressure to gate good grades while losing clarity on policy, and the desire to have extra points to raise their rates were all factors contributing to these practices (Bachore, 2016). Assessments are activities where students perform a certain task or activity. Although these activities requires every students to answer on their own or even in group that is the time where students perform an academic dishonesty. These assessments include examinations, quizzes, and activities where students tend to cheat.

Table 2.2. Type of assessment that enables students to cheat

Assessment	f	%	Rank
Homework	29	72.5%	1
GCSE's (General Certificate of Secondary Education)	0	0%	7.5
Classwork	6	15%	5
Exams	8	20%	4
Course work	1	2.5%	6
Tests	9	22.5	3
A-Levels	0	0%	7.5
Games	12	30%	2
n = 40			

Table 2.2 presents the type of assessment that enables or students will be most likely to cheat. The assessment that the students will choose to cheat on is the homework that acquired 72.5%. Assignments was the main activity or assessment where students most likely to cheat. In comparison, students frequently outsource assessment assignments that do not include all, including the criteria (Bretag, Ellis, Haeringen, Harper, Mcbride, and Zucker, 2018). In this time of pandemic, distance learning is divided into synchronous and asynchronous classes. During synchronous class, students and teachers met virtually via video-conferencing application while asynchronous class, students and teacher do not meet virtually. In this study, examinations were conducted in both classes to figured out if students performance may differ in each mode of delivery in terms of class.

3. Scores of students in proctored synchronous and asynchronous examinations

Students (Synchronous)	Score	Students (Asynchronous)	Score
1	6	1	10
2	13	2	6
3	10	3	14
4	6	4	11
5	11	5	10
6	13	6	5
7	12	7	10
8	5	8	9
9	12	9	8

10	12	10	13
11	10	11	7
12	10	12	5
13	12	13	9
14	12	14	8
5	13	5	6
6	8	6	11
17	9	17	10
18	11	18	14
19	11	19	5
20	4	20	11

The U-value is 154.5. The critical value of U at p < .05 is 127. Therefore, the result is not significant at p < .05.
The Z-Score is 1.21725. The p-value is .22246. The result is not significant at p < .05.

Table 3 presents the scores of the students from proctored synchronous and asynchronous examinations. Based on the computed U-value (154.5) where the critical value of 127 with 5% level of significance, therefore, there is no significant difference in the scores of students in synchronous and asynchronous examinations. Similarly, encouraging high-quality and regular involvement in both synchronous and asynchronous forums will help students achieve their highest possible levels of achievement (Duncan, Kenworthy, & McNamara, 2012). Synchronous and asynchronous examinations identify the perception of students in terms of their academic dishonesty. Synchronous examinations where teacher acts as the proctor of the examination, while in asynchronous class, virtual application may act as the proctor. In this form of examinations, students can decided whether which of the two will lessen their attempt for cheating.

*4.1. Use of online exam proctoring tools/examinations makes
it less likely that students will cheat*

	Use of online exam proctoring tools/examinations				Online exam proctoring is a good solution for monitoring remote examinations.				Prefer online exam proctoring services over traditional exam formats.			
	Proctored Synchronous		Proctored Asynchronous		Proctored Synchronous		Proctored Asynchronous		Proctored Synchronous		Proctored Asynchronous	
	f	%	f	%	f		%		F		%	
Strongly disagree	0	0	3	15	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	5
Disagree	2	10	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	3	15
Neither agree nor disagree	3	15	1	5	2	10	3	15	6	30	8	40
Agree	9	45	9	45	13	65	8	40	8	60	8	40
Strongly agree	6	30	6	30	5	25	8	40	3	15	0	0
TOTAL	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100	20	100

Based on the result in table 4.1, it clearly states that almost half of the students that are 45% agree that the use of online synchronous exam proctoring tools/examinations makes it less likely that students will cheat. On the other hand, in terms of proctored asynchronous examination, the "use of online exam proctoring tools/examinations makes it less likely that students will cheat." The highest score on the data on the

asynchronous group agrees (45%) that the majority of them agree that using online proctor reduces students' cheating. Also, 65% of the students in the proctored synchronous group agree that online exam proctoring is a good solution for monitoring remote examinations for synchronous classes while proctored asynchronous examination where 40% both strongly agree and agree that it is a good solution for monitoring remote learning. Furthermore, more than half of the students in proctored synchronous exams or 60% of the participants prefer online exam proctoring services over traditional exam formats. Regarding proctored asynchronous examination, 40 percent of the students prefer this practice to traditional exam formats. In the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (Education 4.0), the evaluation of learning outcomes via online examinations is becoming more popular and essential due to its accessibility and mobility (Bui, Nguyen A, Nguyen N, & Tran, 2021). In this industrial revolution in education, several applications were invented to be used in the online classroom. One of these applications is *Auto Proctor*, a Google extension for Google forms where students are being proctored while they are taking any forms of quizzes or examination. These applications allow the teacher to proctor or to see the students' activity during their examinations.

4.2. Methods that were used to proctor the exam(s) that was proctored online

	Proctored Synchronous		Proctored Asynchronous	
	f	%	f	%
Live proctor visible to me	17	85	9	45
Live proctor not visible to me	2	10	7	35
Web browser history monitoring	1	5	4	20
Eye movement tracking	5	25	18	90
Facial detection	6	30	13	65
Lockdown browser	2	10	15	75
Mouse movement tracking	2	10	9	45
Keyboard restrictions (E.g. no copy and paste)	3	15	10	50
Screen recording	9	45	9	45
Microphone recording	7	35	4	20
Internet activity monitoring (E.g. interaction with a web site)	7	35	1	5
Webcam recording	11	55	9	45
	n=20		n=20	

In table 4.2, the 20 students in the proctored synchronous examination check what methods were used for proctoring the exam(s) during synchronous classes; the results are 17 checked (85%) for the "live proctor visible to me" during online classes. In terms of the proctored asynchronous exam, 18 out of 20 students said that the method used in the exam was eye movement tracking. In support with Nie et al. (2020), live proctoring is the only form of OPE because the examination is not only monitored remotely, but the proctor can also see the students through the screen; in many cases, a photo is taken by the device's camera and saved to the device's memory. A proctored examination indicates that there is a person who is looking at the students during their examination. In this virtual setup, teacher acts as a proctor in the virtual classes at the time of their quiz. Students and teachers met in any video-conferencing app that enables teacher to monitor the students.

4.3A. Benefits of using online exam proctoring (Synchronous)

Benefits	f	%
Less possibility of cheating	10	50
It can help on monitoring the students during examinations for real-time interventions	3	15
It saves paper, time and money	2	10
Professors can easily detect students that are cheating.	1	5
Allow students to know the level of their knowledge as they would be assessed based on their performance during the examination	2	10
Teach to be honest, having a deep and serious reviews with our subjects and get the real grades based on our performances	2	10
	n=20	

The participants gave their perceptions, and table 4.4A shows the benefits of using online exam proctoring in synchronous classes. Fifty percent of the students respond that online exam proctoring lessens the chances of cheating among the students. According to Dendir and Maxwell (2020), it may be mitigated by using online proctoring, a cost-effective technique in support of academic dishonesty in online courses. In the asynchronous examinations, Auto Proctor was used to monitor the students' activity during their examinations. Teachers with the help of Google form extension can monitor the actions done by the students from their locations, web browsers, and camera. In this case, students engage themselves to take the exams as the teacher look at them in the manner of an application.

4.4B. Benefits of using online exam proctoring (Asynchronous)

Benefits	f	%
Prevent Cheating	15	75
Motivate to study hard	7	35
Hold Students to a high academic standard	1	5
It gets me a nice/ comfortable seat in our home	1	5
Being Honest	1	5
Its Fine	1	5
Lessen the Work of the Teacher/Help the Teacher	3	15
Provides a Better Monitoring	1	5
Hard to access/the system is lagging	4	20
	n=20	

The participants gave their perceptions, and table 5.5B shows the benefits of using online exam proctoring in asynchronous classes. 75% of the students respond that online exam proctoring prevents cheating among the students. According to Dendir and Maxwell (2020), it may be mitigated by using online proctoring, an effective and practical technique supporting academic dishonesty in online courses. The researchers mounted to execute proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam and become aware of its effectiveness in college students' educational dishonesty. Most of the students cheated on an assignment, test, or quiz. Students' reason of dishonest was due to strain and involved. Homework becomes the kind of evaluation that permits college students to cheat. At the same time, there was no tremendous distinction among the rankings of the students who go through proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam. While in phrases of the effectiveness of the

proctored synchronous and asynchronous examinations primarily based totally on the scholars, the subsequent conclusions have been drawn. A large number of students can be much less probably to cheat in a proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam. Majority of the studnets stated that the pleasant gain of those proctored examinations changed into it save you dishonest. The researchers finish that maximum of the students cheated on their assignments, tests, or quizzes. Stress and fear had been the reasons of dishonest of the students. This take a look at indicates the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam in addressing and stopping the dishonest practices of the students.

CONCLUSION

The researchers established to execute proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination and identify its effectiveness in students' academic dishonesty. The conclusions of this study were the following: 1) majority of the students cheated on an assignment, test, or quiz; 2) most common causes of cheating of the students was because of stress and worried 3) homework was the type of assessment that enable students to cheat; 4) there is no significant difference between the scores of the students who undergo proctored synchronous and asynchronous exam. While in terms of the effectiveness of the proctored synchronous and asynchronous examinations based on the students, the following conclusions were drawn: 5) most of the students will be less likely to cheat in a proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination; 6) almost half of the students believed that these proctored examinations would be a good solution in monitoring remote learning; 7) most of the students preferred this proctored services/examinations than the traditional exam format; 8) the standard method used by these proctored examinations were its visibility and eye movement tracking, and 9) majority of the students said that the best benefit of these proctored examinations was it prevent cheating. The researchers conclude that most of the students cheated on their assignments, tests, or quizzes. Stress and worry were the causes of cheating of the students. This study shows the effectiveness of proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination in addressing and preventing the cheating practices of the students.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were drawn. To students, prevent the practicing of academic dishonesty as it stops them from learning new concepts. To teachers, the use and practice of using proctored synchronous and asynchronous examination prevent the students' academic dishonesty this time of pandemic and ensure that the students understand the activity and the lesson. Teachers shall minimize giving homework as an assessment as it enables students to cheat. To school guidance counselor, conduct seminar or observe the situation of the students especially the concept of stress and worry as it provokes student to practice cheating. To curriculum and institution, the inclusion of proctored synchronous examination was a tool in achieving valid scores and assessment in distance learning with the consideration of the students' context and internet connectivity. Furthermore, future researchers examine and conduct a further study regarding the causes of cheating of the students. This research also serves for reference and future studies.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A. & Naeemi, Z. (2011). Cheating Behavior among Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(3). http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol._2_No._3_[Special_Issue_-_January_2011]/30.pdf

Armstead, P.K. (2001).What Factors Affect Cheating in Secondary School and Why? https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk/handle/10026.1/1840

Aviv, A.J., Balash, D.G., Fainchtein, R.A., Kim, D., Shaibekova, D. & Sherr, M. (2020). Examining the Examiners: Students' Privacy and Security Perceptions of Online Proctoring Services. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2106.05917

Bachore, M.M. (2016). The Nature, Causes and Practices of Academic Dishonesty/Cheating in   Higher Education: The Case of Hawassa University. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1109249

Bonk, R.J., et al. (2020). Pedagogy in the Time of Pandemic: From Localisation to Glocalisation. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10101902/

Bretag, T., Ellis, C., Haerengin, K., Harper, R., Mcbride, S. & Zucker, I. (2018). Does authentic assessment assure academic integrity? Evidence from contract cheating data. *Higher Education Research and Development, 39*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1680956

Bui, T.A., Nguyen, N.H. ., Tran, T.T.T. & Nguyen, A.N.P. (2021). Online Tests in the Trend of Education 4.0: An Empirical Study in Mathematics at High Schools of Can Tho City. *Vietnam Journal of Education, 5*(1), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.52296/vje.2021.29

Chen, B., West, M. & Zilles, C. (2017). Do Performance Trends Suggest Wide-spread Collaborative Cheating on Asynchronous Exams? https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3051457.3051465

Chen, N.S. & Ko, L. (2010). An Online Synchronous Test for Professional Interpreters. *Educational Technology & Society, 13* (2),153-165. https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.13.2.153

Dendir, S. & Maxwell, R. (2020). Cheating in online courses: Evidence from online proctoring. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2451958820300336

Diego, L.A., (2017). Friends with Benefits: Causes and Effects of Learners 'Cheating Practices During Examination. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *5*(2), 126-133. http://iafor.org/archives/journals/iafor-journal-of-education/10.22492.ije.5.2.06.pdf

Dulay, M.A.B. & Manuel, S.K.J. (2021). Emergency remote teaching experience: Challenges, actions and suggested measures of STEM research teachers in Pangasinan Philippines. International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management, 1(2), 150-161. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5726572

Duncan, K., Kenworthy, A. & McNamara, R. (2012). The Effect of Synchronous and Asynchronous Participation on Students' Performance in Online Accounting Courses. *Accounting Education, 21*:4, 431-449, DOI: 10.1080/09639284.2012.673387

Farısı, M.İ. (2013). Academic Dishonesty In Distance Higher Education: Challenges And Models For Moral Education In The Digital Era. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *14* (4), 176-195. https:// dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tojde/issue/16898/176100

Graves, M.S. (2008). Students Cheating Habits: A Predictor of Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Diversity Management, 3*(1), 15-22. https://doi:10.19030/jdm.v3i1.4977

Hosny M. & Fatima S. (2014). Journal of Applied Sciences: Attitude of Students Towards Cheating and Plagiarism. *University Case Study, 14*(8), 748-757.

Howard, R.M. (2000). The Ethics of Plagiarism. In: The Ethics of Writing Instructions: Issues in Theory and Practice, Pemberton, M.A. (Ed). Ablex, Stamford, CT., USA, pp. 79-89.

Khare, A. & Lam, H. (2008). Assessing Student Achievement and Progress with Online Examinations: Some Pedagogical and Technical Issues. *International Journal on E- Learning, 7*(3), 383-402. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/23620/

Lim, R.A. & Arcilla Jr., F.E. (2021). Mobile assisted language learning: Perspectives from senior high school students. International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management, 1(2), 108-118. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5726387

Long, E. (2020). Cheating in School is at an All-Time High. https://www.blhsnews.com/opinion/2020/03/02/cheating-in-school-is-at-an-all-time-high/

Ma, H.J., G. Wan, E.Y. & Lu. (2008). Digital Cheating and Plagiarism in Schools. *Theory Into Practice, 47*:197- 203. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802153809

Mackay, J. & Munoz, A. (2019). An online testing design choice typology towards cheating

McCabe, D., Butterfield, K. & Treviño, L. (2012). Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/18818

Mendonca, M., Okada, A., & Scott, P. (2015). Effective web videoconferencing for proctoring online oral exams: A case study at scale in Brazil. *Open Praxis, 7* (3), 227-242. https://doi/abs/10.3316/INFORMIT.542913013965904

Nie, D., Panfilova, E., Samusenkov, V., Mikhaylov, A. (2020). E-Learning Financing Models in Russia for Sustainable Development. *Sustainability, 12*, 4412. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12114412

Penn SU (2021). Guide to Evaluating Severity of Academic Misconduct.

Smart, A. (2020). 12 Effects of Cheating in College: Examples and Solutions. https://gradebees.com

Sottile, J. & Watson, G. (2010). Cheating in the Digital Age: Do Students Cheat More in Online Courses? https://w ww.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring131/watson131.html

Starovoytova, D., & Namango, S., (2016). Factors Affecting Cheating-Behavior at Undergraduate-Engineering. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(31), 75-78. ISSN 2222-1735 threat minimisation. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *16*(3).

Tolman, S. (2017). Academic Dishonesty in Online Courses: Considerations for Graduate Preparatory Programs in Higher Education. *College Student Journal, 51(4),* 579-584 https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/prin/csj/2017/00000051/00000004/art00014

Upen. (2018). Descriptive and Experimental Research. https://pediaa.com/difference-between-descriptive-and-e xperimental-research/

Wageningen University & Research. What is Fishbowl Method. http://www.mspguide.org/tool/fish-bowl

Wilkinson, J. (2009). Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 98–105. ISSN 1812-9129

Witte, A.S. (2008). Speeding is Okay and Cheating is Cool. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council 9*(2). https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nchcjournal/64/