



## Online assessment and the features in language education context: A brief review

Behnam Behforouz<sup>a 1</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> *University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Shinas, Oman*

### APA Citation:

Behforouz, B. (2022). Online assessment and the features in language education context: A brief review. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 564-576. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.203

Submission Date: 11/05/2021

Acceptance Date: 18/10/2021

---

### Abstract

The present study aimed to cover a holistic viewpoint toward assessment and its features. It discussed the problems in this area during the dominance of COVID-19. This study sought to present some notes on the current online assessment strategies used by the institutions. It measured the effects of the implemented techniques on the nature and purposes of assessment. The issue of cheating was also discussed briefly as the most crucial disadvantage of online measurements, which makes a gap between learners' knowledge, performance, and authentic learning capabilities in virtual platforms. Meanwhile, a short survey was distributed among teachers of the Middle East. It was revealed that assessment lost its main features and objectives during the dominance of COVID-19. Moreover, it was noticed that academic integrity is still deficient despite the highest levels of precautionary actions taken by the teachers and institutions in online platforms.

*Keywords:* online assessment; assessment characteristics; cheating; online; measurements; academic integrity

---

## 1. Introduction

Earlier this year, COVID-19 started to spread all over the world like an epidemic disease. As a result, most educational institutions, from nursery schools to universities, were profoundly affected and have remained globally closed until the present moment. Almost all the institutions were in the middle of their semesters. So, this virus made them take a sudden transfer to continue online or finish the current semester and plan for the new and future semesters. There is no clear point when the virus will be gone, or the countries will be free of the infection, so institutions should implement some strategies to continue their business. In this case, online platforms have started to be used widely all over the world. Moodle, Zoom, Skype, WhatsApp, Microsoft Teams, among others, are the busiest ones. Although this is a tremendous chance for scholars, teachers, and students, some suffer from such a move. The academicians in higher education systems have been told to exploit the quick progress of the technology, with a high percentage of expectation that this implementation of technology will improve the learning among the students (Sweeney et al., 2017). Socio-culturally speaking, some countries are the holders of students with visual and kinaesthetic learning styles, and this online shift

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Behnam.Behforouz@shct.edu.om.

has made education in these countries profoundly vulnerable. Technically speaking, some of the students live in remote areas where there is no access to the speedy Internet. And professionally speaking, some teachers and students are not keen to use online platforms because they do not have enough knowledge of using them. Considering all of these issues, assessment can be regarded as one of the most significant areas affected intensely, more than any other aspect of education. Some of the institutions rely on the assessment and testing results as indicators of the learners' performance. They primarily measure students' ability through testing, and concurrently, the nature, purpose, and procedures of testing and assessment have been changing somehow negatively.

## **2. Theoretical Background**

### *2.1. Assessment in General*

Teachers' instructions do not entirely affect students' learning. No assessment would be required if they learned every taught point. Though the method is used for designing and implementing the instruction by the teachers, it is not possible to estimate the students' learning. Therefore, filling the gap between teaching and learning is the gist of assessment. Based on the results of the assessment, learning is quite different among the learners. Furthermore, a well-designed examination can be an engine to ultimately derive the student's active learning (Cowen, 2005, cited in Ghanavati Nasab, 2015).

Assessment with a vital role contributes critically to improving and informing ongoing learning (Bell & Cowie, 1999). Pierce (2002), Kırmızı and Kömeç (2016) state that assessment is a critical part of any teaching and learning activity. It informs daily-based instructional decisions and contributes to recognizing students' classroom instruction-related weaknesses and strengths; moreover, it provides a particular reaction to students for supporting their learning. Furthermore, immediate feedback is provided through assessment for teachers to form their teaching practices based on their students' learning styles. Teachers should use various tests to evaluate students' achievements and determine their grades. Evaluation models, tests, and examinations are the principal instruments for the learning procedure (Tosuncuoglu, 2018).

Generally speaking, assessment is established as a crucial part of teaching, enabling educators to determine their students' level of knowledge or skills (Taras, 2005). Wojtczak (2002) debated that assessment helps teachers assess their students' weaknesses and strengths and motivate them. Moreover, valuable feedbacks are provided by examinations for teachers regarding students' learning achievements (Stiggins, 2002; Taras, 2005). This process allows the teachers to assess learning and utilize the information to enhance the students' knowledge (Tosuncuoglu, 2018).

Students mainly tend to concentrate their energies to pass the tests in the most expeditious or the best way. Hence, assessment strategies can be used to manipulate the types of ongoing learning. For instance, superficial learning may be promoted by the assessment approaches, focusing predominantly on the recollection of knowledge. Instead, the student's higher performance level or achievements can be understood by choosing assessment strategies requiring creative problem-solving or critical thinking. The well-designed assessments also have vital roles in educational decision-making. They are the critical components of ongoing quality enhancement procedures at the lesson, curriculum level, and course (Yambi, 2018).

It is evident that learners would like to see themselves progressing from the current level to the higher ones through higher grades. Although for most of the students, especially those who are less motivated and looking for certification, the previous statement can be true; few learners are looking for the knowledge increment rather than gaining a mark. Here, there could be two different strategies

to implement the assessment. The worst and the dangerous one, supposedly, is the type of evaluation assessing superficial learning. This type of testing focuses on the recall aspect of tests. During the pandemic period of COVID-19, it can be observed that most of the academic places, especially in fraudulent and less-equipped institutions with restricted socio-cultural factors, tend to focus on this type of less effective testing as an option for assessment and it will unintentionally downsize the real nature of testing. These types of assessment and testing cannot be leading factors in determining the quality of teaching and learning, the potential progress of the learners, and the effectiveness of implemented material.

Recently, a distinct feature of the studies on assessment was the change in focusing on the interactions between classroom learning and assessment, not concentrating on the restricted forms of the tests that are only weakly connected to the students' learning experiences. This shift was coupled with numerous expressions for making a substantial contribution to the classroom assessment enhancement in improving learning (William & Black, 1998).

The previous paragraph clearly described the change of focus from mere testing to the interaction between testing and the classroom. If there is a positive change in the assessment, it will definitely improve learning. During the pandemic period, online assessment replaced the traditional face-to-face and in-class ways of teaching. Such a shift urged all the assignments, tests, and assessments to be performed through online platforms; hence, the nature of the evaluation and classroom interaction is vague and not understandable at the present moment. There has been no clue whether the real learners participate in the classes and exams or somebody else. Observations have also confirmed that some students open their applications and leave the session to do their routines. As a result, as both options, i.e., assessment and classroom, are online and uncontrollable, how do the educationalists measure learning and assessment improvement?

Student learning assessment refers to "the systematic information collection regarding the student learning, spending the time, expertise, available knowledge, and resources, to inform decisions regarding how to enhance learning" (Zacharis, 2010: 61; Walvoord, 2004). An understanding is developed for educators through an assessment of the materials the learners have learned, their effective task accomplishment, and the effectiveness of materials, techniques, and methods used over students' learning (Zacharis, 2010).

A system has an internal discipline to achieve the goals. Assessing the students' learning, as stated earlier, involves lots of factors to improve learning. The practicality of materials, teaching, and learning strategies can be clearly indicated through assessment, and future decisions can be taken accordingly.

Assessment of foreign language learning and teaching is carried out for various reasons. First, it reveals the number of students achieving their objectives in learning a foreign language and the students who have problems or difficulties within their learning process. It discloses the valuable methods for teaching a foreign language. Second, the teacher might take a decision regarding continuing the foreign language teaching plan (Tosuncuoglu, 2018). It is, undoubtedly, challenging to measure all the earlier statements about goal achievements, learning objectives, and the discovery of problematic areas in learning and teaching.

## 2.2. *Assessment for Learning (AFL)*

Mary James first used the word assessment for learning at a conference in 1992. Then, this term was used by Gipps (1994) to clarify a change from the traditional assessment model, including "checking the reception of the information" to a more holistic assessment of "the students' quality and structure of understanding and learning."

Stiggins (2002) explains the basic tenet of AFL that is an assessment to enhance students' learning. The Black and William's definitions (1998a) are possibly the most extensively cited among the formative assessment's first-generation definitions. Black and William (1998a p. 2) defined AFL as "all the activities taken by the students and teachers to assess themselves, to obtain the information as feedback for modifying their learning and teaching activities." Similarly, narrower definitions have been proposed by other authors. For example, AFL was defined in the Assessment Reform Group (2002) as "the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go and how best to get there" (p. 2). Ten principles were identified by the Assessment Reform Group (2002, p. 2) to explain the definition more, indicating that:

1. AFL is part of operative planning.
2. It concentrates on how students learn.
3. It is the central classroom practice.
4. It is the primary professional skill.
5. It has an emotional effect.
6. It influences the learners' motivation.
7. It enhances commitment to learning goals and assessment criteria.
8. It helps the learners to improve.
9. It inspires self-assessment.
10. It distinguishes all achievements.

The most crucial components of AFL include the collaboration of students and teachers in questioning and classroom discussions, sharing and defining the criteria for success and learning intentions, formative feedback, peer- and self-assessment. These approaches reduce the distance between the current level of students and the preferred objectives while helping students control their learning procedures (Sadler, 1989).

### *2.3. The Assessment Principles*

Brown and Abeywickrama (2010) and Sariçoban (2011) argued that standardized tests are mostly related to the assessment principles, including authenticity, reliability, validity, and the washback effect.

#### *2.3.1. Authenticity*

Mainly, within the authenticity principle, the test is used to perform an assignment in a real-life situation. Therefore, a test is authentic if:

- a) It contains natural language as much as possible.
- b) It includes contextualized components.
- c) It possesses real-life, relevant, and meaningful themes.
- d) It offers some thematic organization like an episode or storyline.
- e) It provides assignments replicating real-world assignments (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

### 2.3.2. Reliability

There should be consistency and dependability between a reliable test and performance (Genesee & Upshur, 1999; Badjadi, 2013). For example, by giving the same test to the same group of students or the same students on two various occasions, similar outcomes should be obtained by the test. Hence, reliability:

- a) is consistent.
- b) provides clear directions for assessment.
- c) has uniform rubrics for evaluation.
- d) includes an unambiguous allocation for the test-taker (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

Richards and Renandya (2002) stated that the same outcomes would be obtained within an appropriate procedure. This indicates its reliability.

### 2.3.2. Validity

An assessment can be valid if the technique is consistent with the curriculum, the teaching material and if the results are accurate (Brown, 2002; Gür, 2013). The advocates of alternative assessment do not recommend skipping these criteria. There are some concerns regarding the reliability and validity of assessment tools in qualitative research by using the term honesty. The validity measures what is supposed to be measured, and the instrument will reveal the same outcomes if it repeats (Toucouleur, 2018).

### 2.3.3. Washback Effect

The washback effect is the fourth primary standard of foreign language testing principles. Anderson et al., (2001), Brown (2004) believed that the principle is determined as the impact of testing on learning and teaching a foreign language. The washback effect may imply language learning self-consciousness and promotion (Tosuncuoglu, 2018), reflecting the effects of the test on learning and teaching.

The washback should be used while considering the following issues:

- a) It positively affects how and what teachers teach and how the students learn.
- b) It recommends a preparation chance for the students.
- c) It provides feedback data for the students to assess language achievement.
- d) It offers circumstances for students' peak performance (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

## 2.4. Assessment, Testing, and Test Characters

Testing is standardized and formal, which offers to score the students' performed tasks. Testing is a timed and single-occasion exercise regarded as the sole criterion to measure the students' learning. Nowadays, numerous scholars refuse to accept that there is a single technique to gather data regarding students' learning. Therefore, testing is considered as one of the assessment components (Kulieke et al., 1990).

A test will serve as the tool to observe an attribute either in a written form or observation, an oral question, or an assessment intended to measure the respondents' knowledge or other abilities. So, if the test is a tool, the test score is the sign of what was observed through the analysis, either qualitative or quantitative (Yambi, 2018). Not only should a good test have reliability and validity, but also it should include objectivity, comprehensiveness, objective baseness, discriminating power, comparability, practicability, as well as utility (Shohamy, 1993). A test is objective when no personal bias interferes with inferring its scope and scoring. The objectivity can be increased by using more objective type test items; moreover, the responses are predetermined (Shohamy, 1993). Objective

baseness implies that a test should be based on predetermined objectives; furthermore, a test setter should include a definite idea regarding the aim behind each item (Shohamy, 1993). Comprehensiveness indicates that the test should include the whole syllabus; all the relevant learning materials should be covered in the test. Further, it should cover all the anticipated objectives (Shohamy, 1993).

Validity is the degree to which the test measures what is intended to measure. The reliability of a test indicates the level of consistent measuring of what is designed to be measured. A test needs not to be valid; rather, it may be reliable since it may result in consistent scores. However, these scores need not represent what is precisely measured and what is supposed to be measured (Shohamy, 2001).

The discriminating power of a test distinguishes the lower and upper-level learners who are taking the test. The questions of a test should be of various difficulty levels. The test practicality relies on scoring, administrative, economy interpretative, and easiness (Yambi, 2018).

Comparability of a test is achieved when the resulting scores can be interpreted in terms of a common base that has a natural or accepted meaning. Finally, a test has the utilization feature if it offers the conditions to facilitate an understanding of its objective. Educators believe that certain qualities should be included in every measurement tool. Validity and reliability are perhaps the two most mutual technical concepts in measuring (Weir, 2005). Any type of assessment, whether authentic or traditional, must be established to provide the assessor with such accurate information regarding the individual's performance (Weir, 2005). For example, the person would not be asked to paint a picture in evaluating the writing skill. A highly valid test is also reliable for scoring consistency in both cases, i.e., Traditional or authentic assessment. Although a valid test is reliable as well, a reliable test may not necessarily be valid (Shohamy, 2001).

## *2.5. Online Assessment*

### *2.5.1. Attitudes a towards Online Assessment*

Cowan (2005) believes that any person who starts the study in any form of it will have some kind of assessment. It seems that there are problems in discussions about assessments to define what is meant by an evaluation on the web. A broad "grey zone" has two ends; one end deals with tests and course evaluations and the other one with the assessment as the basis for the credits of the students of a course eventually as a part of a university degree curriculum (Johannesson & Jonsson, 2005, cited in Hmdi, 2011).

Students may inaccurately suppose that they need not dedicate as much effort to complete assessments or learn course materials within online environments since they are no longer in a traditional course (Kebritchi et al., 2017). This criterion can be discussed almost in all aspects of learning and teaching, and particularly in online assessment. The observations of some of the researchers and consultation with peers and colleagues approved that during online learning and teaching, students feel less responsible in the process. It can be considered that in the assessment as well as testing, issues like easy questions, assessment based on a single component rather than all skills, Internet problems, lack of importance of class attendance, and housework responsibilities may be the possible excuses that help reduction of student's commitment through the online course period. For designing an online course, the assessments should be carefully considered to ensure the practical activities of the students at meeting their learning outcomes while fitting within the online space (Gikandi Morrow & Davis, 2011).

The assessment implementation and design significantly affect students' performance. There was no difference in well-designed online and face-to-face course assessments in various studies in students' grades and achievement (Hewson, 2012; Page & Cherry, 2018; Spivey & McMillan, 2014;

Tsai, 2016). Additionally, the students' performance on the online assessment are not influenced by their preferences or rate regarding their comfort with technology (Hewson, 2012). Although these statements were about the promising results of well-developed testing and assessment methods to reduce the gap in the performance of students in face-to-face and online learning, it can be critically argued. Factors like stress, time management, readiness for the exam, availability of fast broadband connection, and where students are gathered to review the materials are all critical in assigning online tests.

#### *2.5.2. The Opposition of Online VS. Paper-Based Assessment*

The same academic rigor should be included in the online assessment as in face-to-face assessment; it still needs to conform to the learning program and the course outcomes, providing valuable learning opportunities for students with an excellent level for students' performance (Vlachopoulos, 2016). It is noteworthy that for most institutions, using an online platform is urgent, so they are not ready for such a big step; thus, it cannot be assured that online learning is similar to face-to-face course objectives. Although such institutions are changing their platforms so fast and are ready to deliver the courses through online applications, the learning outcomes are not designed for such online procedures. Another long way is needed to develop a curriculum and determine online learning, teaching, and assessing objectives.

Creating a new online course or converting it from face-to-face to online can inspire instructors to improve and reflect on their teaching practices and course design. Instructors may be exposed to teaching and assessment methods while investigating developing new and exciting online courses (Bennett et al., 2017). The instructors are at risk of utilizing online assessment without sufficient pedagogical justification and innovative technology (Abubakar & Adeshola, 2019; Sweeny et al., 2017). However, instructors can avoid ineffective teaching choices and use technology to appear modern when institutions provide pedagogical development opportunities and resources for instructors willing to teach online (King & Boyatt, 2014).

#### *2.6. Concerns Regarding Online Assessment*

Despite the online learning benefits, instructors often have concerns about limiting the extensive use of online assessment. They are worried about academic misconduct, plagiarism, cheating, or otherwise obtaining unfair advantages over their peers (Abubakar & Adeshola, 2019; Dermo, 2009; Mellar et al., 2018). Instructors feel that they do not have the same ability to monitor students to ensure academic integrity without in-person proctoring (Fask et al., 2014). Simple measures are built into Learning Management System (LMS) and can be easily employed to protect academic integrity on online assignments and quizzes, including randomization of questions, blocking access to other course content over the assessment period, or varying the numbers (Boitshwarelo et al., 2017; Tsai, 2016). It was shown that anti-plagiarism software utilized in conjunction with education regarding academic integrity has reduced instances of plagiarism (Levine & Pazdernik, 2018). Academic misconduct can also be reduced through diverse assessment methods (McLaughlin & Yan, 2017). Technologically advanced approaches like checking biometric data or keystroke dynamics are necessary to authenticate students on written exams or assignments (Mellar et al., 2018; Okada et al., 2019). However, further research and technical improvements are required before they can be extensively adopted. It was shown that most of these methods could scale up for large student groups (Weleschuk Dyjur & Kelly, 2019). Although there were some possible but ineffective measures to control the online platforms, the concern is that students may buy the project, contact their friends during the exam and receive help to find the answers, ask their family members to sit with them

besides the computer and answer the questions, and finally, they can ask somebody else to deal with their assignments.

In a face-to-face way of learning and teaching, the teacher can ask students to do half of the task inside the class or help them develop their research papers or writing; for example, inside the class to monitor their practice and control cheating possibilities.

Using online assessment, there is another concern, i.e., students will be less collaborative and isolated if they are not together in a physical classroom (Abubakar & Adeshola, 2019; Bolliger & Shepherd, 2010; Dumford & Miller, 2018; Kebritchi et al., 2017); hence, building relationships facilitates the inherently social learning (Bolliger & Shepherd, 2010; Gikandi Morrow & Davis, 2011; Kehrwald, 2010). There are opportunities to increase connectedness and communication between students in online courses through strategies like discussion boards (Champion & Gunnlaugson, 2017; Skinner, 2007 cited in Weleschuk Dyr & Kelly, 2019), peer feedback activities (Mostert & Snowball, 2013), and implementing studying or working in groups for the assignments or discussions (Wang, 2010). These strategies seem challenging to be performed on online platforms because students voluntarily participate in discussions so that passive students will remain silent.

Instructors' workloads during online courses indicate that they require to invest a considerable deal of time and effort at the beginning of the course (Amelung Krieger & Rosner, 2011). All of the course materials should be prepared ahead of time. The LMS should be well-organized, and the actions for communicating with students should be placed before students' access. This is necessary to make sure that all information is readily available to students throughout the course (Beebe et al., 2010). Hence, the students can stay away from the course material and feel prepared to complete assessments.

Transparency of the methods used to determine grades and the reasoning behind online assessments provides more comfort and understanding for the students (Khan & Khan, 2019). Moreover, students ask for their instructors' competency with technology (Khan & Khan, 2019). Since students' grades are determined online, they should be confident about non-diminishing their achievements by an instructor's inabilities or technical issues (Bennett et al., 2017). Instructors need to know learning technologies. Then, they can explain the processes for students in place when technical problems are occurring. The students can become comfortable with the technological devices and explore them without the high stakes of a graded assessment by a short, ungraded practice assessment (Khan & Khan, 2019).

Since who or what the assesse brings to the assessment cannot be observed, it is often easier to cheat online from a practical view. This increases the temptation. It is more convenient for most students to work with computers, and they know the computer potential for cheating well compared to their instructors. Furthermore, students are often less committed to the distance-learning program's integrity than traditional programs (Rowe, 2004).

Now, three of the most critical problems are considered here:

Problem 1: Getting assessment answers in advance

The major problem with online assessment is ensuring all students are taking it concurrently (Olt, 2002). Then, earlier students can respond to later students using the same questions. The previous students could remember questions or even take screenshots simply performed under most operating systems (Rowe, 2004).

Problem 2: Unfair retaking of assessment

Another severe problem with online assessment is that retaking the examination several times may be possible for students until they are satisfied with their performance. If not designing the server software appropriately, the students can disconnect from the server over the assessments and then



claim to lose the test answers. The need to initiate over that gives them extra time to consult unauthorized reference materials or collaborators. The stop is not difficult with the numerous currently available hacker instruments. To alter the system clock is another trick; hence, the grading server thinks that a novel test assessment is truly before an earlier assessment. Most operating systems cannot sufficiently control access to their system clock (Rowe, 2004).

#### Problem 3: Unauthorized help within the assessments

Probably to indicate if the student himself/herself is using an online assessment system. Since collaboration is encouraged by many distance-learning approaches like online discussion teams and email among students, they have an outstanding habit of unapproved collaboration on assessments. A poor student may ask a good student easily to do their tests, or consultants could be arranged to contact for the difficult questions over an assessment. Providing the password by the student does not indicate they are the ones responding to the items at a remote site. This authentication issue is the subject of numerous studies on computer security; however, the problem is to ensure that a particular person is present, which needs various techniques (Rowe, 2004).

### 3. Results, Discussion, and Conclusion

One of the problems during the infectious period of COVID-19 is that the online testing that was absolutely the main focus of this study might not fully pursue the principles of the assessment. The authenticity of materials in an online platform is not achievable since there is not adequate time and the possibility to engage real-life themes and contexts. Indeed, reliability cannot be perfectly accomplished. There are many behind such a dilemma. In most institutions, two teachers are responsible for correcting the students' papers according to approved rubrics of the department in which the teacher of the class is either the second marker of the documents or does not have any responsibility to correct the papers of his class; however, this was the style of on-campus studies. Online courses make the teacher responsible for designing, implementing, and marking all the assessments; in this case, the teacher can be subjective in scoring; he can conduct mock exams or give the students practices similar to the final exam intentionally or unintentionally; thus, the reliability of tests can be under the question. It is also not clear that if the teacher adheres to the official rubrics to give a mark. One of the essential factors of testing and assessment principles is the validity of the assessment. Validity cannot be clearly stated and shown during online testing and evaluation. Almost in all institutions, learning outcomes have been designed and implemented to be accomplished in the traditional way of teaching, learning, and assessment. For example, in a traditional way of testing, the final exam may take 3 hours, covers all skills, and with some invigilators to reduce the possibility of cheating as much as possible; however, is it true about online assessment? The answer, unfortunately, is negative. A two- or three-hour exam is not possible due to some limitations, and also, the integrity of the exam is under question and uncontrollable.

During COVID-19 dominance, the principles and purposes of testing are not transparent as well. Objectivity is the common criterion between assessment and testing. In an online assessment, the teacher who has been in contact with students for the whole semester is responsible for testing and marking. This endangers the objectivity of the test. It has been observed that some institutions tried to finish the semester desperately due to the restrictions caused by COVID-19. Thus, there is no real exam and assessment. Some institutions attempted to measure the summative assessment to give the mark to the students. In contrast, informative examinations like midterm and final exams have the highest effect on the pass and fail outcome in such institutions.

Moreover, the word comprehensiveness cannot be measured precisely in such situations as well. In this criterion, the anticipated objects should be measured while there is an inconsistency between what

was taught and what was tested. Some types of exams or policies to design online assessments underestimate the discriminative power of testing. In such environments, the discrepancy between excellent achievers and their lower counterparts is vague and disappears.

A short survey on various types of assessment, their advantages, and disadvantages was designed and shared with some of the teachers working in the Middle East. The teachers stated that they were following online procedures to get the marks or final evaluation. They confirmed that the disadvantages of such online assessment platforms outweigh the benefits. Issues like time consumption, cheating, plagiarizing, more effort on the teacher's side, student attendance, passive learning, no group or cooperative learning, lack of interest and motivation, Internet issues, and technical issues are just a small number of online assessment's implementation problems.

In the end, it can be mentioned that implementing such platforms cannot happen all of a sudden, and very long and comprehensive planning is in need to provide a type of curriculum to prepare the suitable ground for this type of education academically and non-academically. Training workshops or courses must be implemented among the teachers and students to familiarize them with online platforms' details. In this case, online universities that are successful and accredited are requested to negotiate and exchange similar ideas. And considering online education, some terms such as academic integrity, transparency, and honesty are constantly under question. Perhaps the best possible option is implementing a type of blended environment for learning, teaching, and assessment to solve this problem. In this case, students could take their exams on campus and use the face-to-face method of testing. The officials of the institutions can reduce the number of students in each test intake and increase the number of other exam halls or determine some classes as the locations for the exams. Meanwhile, more research can be implemented regarding the psychological barriers students tolerate during online exams and their reasons for ignoring academic integrity and cheating.

## References

- Abubakar, A. M., & Adeshola, I. (2019). Digital exam and assessments: A Riposte to Industry 4.0 In A. Elci, L.L. Beith, & A. Elci (Eds.). *Handbook of research on faculty development for digital teaching and learning* (pp. 245-263). Hershey PA: IGI Global.
- Amelung, M., Krieger, K., & Rosner, D. (2011). E-Assessment as a service. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 4(2), 162-174.
- Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Archer, W., & Garrison, R. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in computer conferencing transcripts. *Journal of the Asynchronous Learning Network*, 5(2).
- Assessment Reform Group. (2002). *Assessment for learning: research-based principles to guide classroom practice*. London, UK: Assessment Reform Group.
- Badjadi, N. E. I. (2013). *Conceptualizing essay tests' reliability and validity: from research to theory*. Online Submission.
- Beebe, R., Vonderwell, S., & Boboc, M. (2010). Emerging patterns in transferring assessment practices from f2f to online environments. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 8(1), 1-12.
- Bennett, S., Dawson, P., Bearman, M., Molloy, E., & Boud, D. (2017). How technology shapes assessment design: Findings from a study of university teachers. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(2), 672-682.
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Inside the Black Box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998a). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 7-74.
- 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).
- Bolliger, D. U., & Shepherd, C. E. (2010). Student perceptions of ePortfolio integration in online courses. *Distance Education*, 31(3), 295-314.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2002). *Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland).
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language assessment principles and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education. Inc.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Champion, K., & Gunnlaugson, O. (2017). Fostering generative conversation in higher education course discussion boards. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(6), 704-712.
- Cowan, J. (2005). *Designing assessment to enhance student learning*. [http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/ps/documents/practice\\_guides/practice\\_guides/ps0069\\_designing\\_assessment\\_to\\_improve\\_physical\\_sciences\\_learning\\_march\\_2009.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/ps/documents/practice_guides/practice_guides/ps0069_designing_assessment_to_improve_physical_sciences_learning_march_2009.pdf) [7th February 2012].
- Cowie, B., & Bell, B. (1999). A Model of formative assessment in science education. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 6(1), 101-116.
- Dermo, J. (2009). e-Assessment and the student learning experience: A survey of student perceptions of e-assessments. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(2), 203-214.
- Dumford, A. D., & Miller, A. L. (2018). Online learning in higher education: Exploring advantages and disadvantages for engagement. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(3), 452-465.
- Fask, A., Englander, F., & Wang, Z. (2014). Do online tests facilitate cheating? An experiment designed to separate possible cheating from the effect of the online test taking environment. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 12(2), 101-112.
- Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. (1999). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Ghanavati Nasab, F. (2015). Alternative versus traditional assessment. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(6), 165-178.
- Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education*, 57(4), 2333-2351.
- Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Gür, O. (2013). Ölçme, Değerlendirme ve Kamu Personel Dil Sınavı (KPDS) -Bu Sınav Neyi Ölçüyor? *Sakarya University Journal Education*, 23-32.
- Hewson, C. (2012). Can online course-based assessment methods be fair and equitable? Relationships between students' preferences and performance within online and offline assessments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 28(5), 488-498.

- Hmdi, A., M. (2011). Benefits and Drawbacks of Online Assessment. *Al-Mansour Journal*, 16, 63-74.
- Johannesson, C., & Jonsson, B. O. (2005). *Homework as a Pedagogical Tool*. PTEE2005, Brno.
- Kebritchi, M., Lipschuetz, A., & Santiague, L. (2017). Issues and challenges for teaching successful online courses in higher education: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 46(1).
- Kehrwald, B. (2010). Being online: social presence as subjectivity in online learning. *London Review of Education*, 8(1), 39-50.
- Khan, S., & Khan, R.A. (2019). Online assessments: Exploring perspectives of university students. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(1), 661-667.
- King, E., & Boyatt, R. (2014). Exploring factors that influence adoption of e-learning within higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 46(6), 1272-1280.
- Kırmızı, Ö., & Kömeç, F. (2016). An Investigation of Performance-Based Assessment at High Schools. *Üniversitepark Bülten*, 5(1-2), 53-65.
- Kulieke, M., Bakker, J., Collins, C., Fennimore, T., Fine, C., Herman, J., Jones, B.F., Raack, L., & Tinzmann, M.B. (1990). *Why should assessment be based on a vision of learning?* NCREL, Oak Brook: IL Publication.
- Levine, J., & Pazdernik, V. (2018). Evaluation of a four-prong anti-plagiarism program and the incidence of plagiarism: a five-year retrospective study. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1094-1105.
- 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).
- Mostert, M., & Snowball, J. D. (2013). Where angels fear to tread: online peer-assessment in a large first year class. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 674-686.
- Okada, A., Noguera, I., Alexieva, L., Rozeva, A., Kocdar, S., Brouns, F., Ladonlahti, T. Whitelock, D., & Guerrero-Roldan, A. (2019). Pedagogical approaches for e-assessment with authentication and authorship verification in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, Advance online publication.
- Olt, M. (2002). Ethics and distance education: strategies for minimizing academic dishonesty in online assessment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 5(3).
- Page, L., & Cherry, M. (2018). Comparing trends in graduate assessment: face-to-face vs. online learning. *Assessment Update*, 30(5), 3-15.
- Pierce, L. V. (2002). Performance-based assessment: promoting achievement for Language learners. *Center for Applied Linguists (ERIC/CLL News Bulletin)*, 26(1), 1-3.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, C., N. (2004). Cheating in Online Student Assessment: Beyond Plagiarism. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, VII(11), 1-10.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional strategies. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144.

- Sarıçoban, A. (2011). A study on the English language teachers' preparations of tests. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 41(41), 398-410.
- Shohamy, E. (1993). *The Power of Tests. The impact of language tests on teaching and learning.* Washington, DC: NFLC Occasional Papers.
- Shohamy, E. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests.* Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Spivey, M. F., & McMillan, J. J. (2014). Classroom versus online assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 89(8), 450-456.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi-Delta Kappan*, 83(10), 758-765.
- Sweeney, T., West, D., Groessler, A., Haynie, A., Higgs, B. M., Macaulay, J., Mercer-Mapstone, L., & Yeo, M. (2017). Where's the transformation? Unlocking the potential of technology-enhanced assessment. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Taras, M. (2005). Assessment-Summative and Formative-Some Theoretical Reflections. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(4), 466-478.
- Tosuncuoglu, I. (2018). Importance of assessment in ELT. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(9), 163-167.
- 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.
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2016). Assuring quality in e-learning course design: The roadmap. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(6).
- Walvoord, E. (2004). *Assessment Clear and Simple.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wang, L. (2010). Integrating communities of practice in e-portfolio assessments: Effects and experiences of mutual assessment in an online course. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(4), 267-271.
- Weir, J. C. (2005). *Language testing and validation: evidence-based approach.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weleschuk, A., Dyjur, P., & Kelly, P. (2019). *Online assessment in higher education.* Canada: Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning.
- Wojtczak, A. (2002). Medical education terminology. *Medical teacher*, 24(4), 357-357.
- Yambi, C., A., D., T. (2018). Assessment and evaluation in education. Unpublished article.
- Zacharis, Z., N. (2010). Innovative assessment for learning enhancement: issues and practices. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3(1), 61-70.

#### **AUTHOR BIODATA**

**Behnam Behforouz** is an English Lecturer at Foundation Department of University of Technology and Applied Sciences Shinas. His fields of interest are TESOL, Language Education, and Linguistics.