

summary of the pre-reading articles

Boitshwarelo, B., Reedy, A.K., & Billany, T. (2017). Envisioning the use of online tests in assessing twenty-first century learning: A literature review. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 12(16). doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0055-7

Summary:

- If not explicitly stated otherwise, students may consider the practice of online searching during an online test as acceptable, indeed resourceful.
- Cheating in low- or zero-value unproctored online tests raises different levels of concern for different lecturers, but it has been shown (Arnold, 2016) that cheating in formative online unproctored tests does not pay off in the long run as those students are likely to perform worse in final summative assessments than students who have not cheated.
- hacking and other cyber security threats are more likely to impact high-stake examinations and be less of a concern for low-stake formative assessment of the type that is more usual in online tests.
- While regular online tests and multiple attempts are recommended, there is a risk that a high frequency of tests can become overwhelming for both staff and students. Therefore, a balance needs to be struck between optimising student learning and consideration for staff and student workload.
- students' differing knowledge, skills, and confidence in using digital technologies may also impact on assessment outcomes and where online tests are used, consideration needs to be given to preparing students so they are not disadvantaged by the technology or procedures used (Stöddberg, 2012). This is particularly the case for older students, indigenous students and international students from certain countries, who may not have current or strong knowledge of digital technologies used in higher education.

Mellar, H., Peytcheva-Forsyth, R., Kocdar, S., Karadeniz, A., & Blagovesna, Y. (2018). Addressing cheating in e-assessment using student authentication and authorship checking systems: teachers' perspectives. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 14(2). doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0025-x

Issues:

- though the problem of assuring effective authentication was seen by many teachers as a barrier to increased use of e-assessment. Authorship checking was seen, as copying and pasting from the web, ghost writing and plagiarism were all reported as widely prevalent, and authorship checking a third category of cheating behaviours, which was the accessing of information from other students, from written materials, and from the internet during assessments.
- - on **why students cheat** Brimble (2016) identified seven themes: (1) changing attitudes; (2) education, training, and learning; (3) curriculum design; (4) situational factors; (5) life of the modern student; (6) life of the modern academic; and (7) individual student characteristics.

Michael, T. & Williams, M. (2013). Student Equity: Discouraging Cheating in Online Courses. Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research, 3(2). dx.doi.org/10.5929/2013.3.2.8
(Used in tips below)

Okada, A., Noguera, I., Alexieva, L., Rozeva, A., Kocdar, S., Brouns, F., Ladonlahti, T. Whitelock, D., & Guerrerp-Roldan, A. (2019). Pedagogical approaches for e-assessment with authentication and authorship verification in Higher Education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, Advance online publication. doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12733

- increasing the awareness of data security and privacy among all end-users will be important to enhance the trust of the e-assessment system with e-authentication and authorship verification.
- Universities must develop and share best practices for verifying fraud supported by the e-assessment system based on combined e-authentication and authorship verification instruments.
- Universities should support course teams to plan useful activities and assessment tasks with e-authentication and authorship verification instruments.

Tsai, N. (2016). Assessment of students' learning behavior and academic misconduct in a student-pulled online learning and student-governed testing environment: A case study. *Journal of Education for Business*, 91(7), 387-392. doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2016.1238808

Term- student governed/ unsupervised

- Students were informed that the lesson and practice exam were not available on the final exam date. Access to the courseware using the same courseware code via different computers at the same time was prohibited. These two practices were aimed at reducing the misconduct of using the instant online help during the final exam.
- escalation in student's academic misconduct is **not significant** under the unsupervised (student-governed) testing environment compared with a supervised testing environment.