



## Enhancing Learning Through Open Book Assessments: Exploring Strategies, Impact, and Perceptions Across Academic Disciplines

Sarthak Acharya

M.Ed. Student, Visva-Bharati, West Bengal

Email - [asarthak055@gmail.com](mailto:asarthak055@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** Open book assessments (OBAs) have emerged as an alternative approach to traditional closed-book examinations, allowing students to access reference materials during evaluations. This systematic review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of OBAs, exploring their strengths, weaknesses, and applications across various academic disciplines. By conducting an extensive literature review, this study examines the theoretical foundations underpinning OBAs, their alignment with pedagogical principles, and their potential to promote higher-order thinking skills and authentic learning experiences. The review critically evaluates the strengths of OBAs, such as fostering problem-solving abilities, reducing test anxiety, and encouraging knowledge application. Conversely, potential weaknesses, including concerns about surface learning, resource management challenges, and academic integrity issues, are also addressed. Furthermore, the review investigates the implementation of Open book assessments (OBAs) across STEM fields, humanities, social sciences, and professional programs, highlighting subject-specific considerations, adaptations, and examples of successful implementation. The impact of Open book assessments (OBAs) on student learning outcomes, engagement, and performance is evaluated, considering both merits and limitations. The review synthesizes existing empirical evidence, identifies emerging trends, and proposes recommendations for stakeholders to support the effective implementation of Open book assessments (OBAs) in educational settings. By providing a comprehensive understanding of OBAs, this systematic review contributes to the ongoing discourse on assessment practices and their alignment with the demands of the contemporary educational landscape.

**Key Words:** Open book assessments, alternative assessment, higher-order thinking skills, authentic learning, subject-specific considerations, systematic review.

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

Open book assessments (OBAs) have gained considerable attention in educational settings as an alternative evaluation method to traditional closed-book exams.

Open book assessments (OBAs) and closed book (CB) assessments are two common assessment methods used by teachers to measure learning outcomes of students, differing in whether students can use external references like textbooks or online resources during the test (Ramamurthy et al., 2016). The primary objective of Open book assessments (OBAs) is to assess students' ability to locate, evaluate, and apply relevant information effectively, rather than solely testing their ability to memorize content (Tussing, 1951). This approach emphasizes higher-order thinking skills, such as analysis, synthesis, and application, which are essential for problem-solving and decision-making in professional and academic contexts (Johanns et al., 2017). The significance of OBAs lies in their potential to promote deep learning, critical thinking, and the development of lifelong learning skills (Durning et al., 2016). By allowing access to resources, OBAs encourage students to engage with the material more comprehensively, fostering a deeper understanding of concepts and their practical applications (Teodorczuk, 2017).



In recent years, researchers have explored the strengths and weaknesses of Open book assessments (OBAs) across various disciplines, aiming to understand their impact on student learning outcomes and educational practices. Open book assessments (OBAs) are believed to promote critical thinking, problem-solving, and knowledge application (Eilertsen & Valdermo, 2000). Studies have shown that compared to closed-book exams, Open book assessments (OBAs) can reduce test anxiety and enhance student performance, particularly in online environments (Agarwal & Roediger, 2011; Francis, 1982; Ramamurthy et al., 2016). Additionally, Open book assessments (OBAs) foster creativity and deeper learning behaviours among students, leading to improved exam scores and reduced instances of cheating (Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000; Husain et al., 2022). However, despite these advantages, Open book assessments (OBAs) present certain challenges and limitations. Critics argue that students may adopt surface learning approaches, focusing on locating and reproducing information rather than developing a deep understanding of the subject matter (Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000). Moreover, the expectancy of Open book tests may affect long-term retention and transfer of knowledge compared to closed-book exams (Agarwal & Roediger, 2011). Additionally, effective performance in Open book assessments (OBAs) requires strong resource management skills and efficient use of exam time, posing challenges for students lacking these skills (Eilertsen & Valdermo, 2000; Spiegel & Nivette, 2021).

The scope of this review is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the current state of open book assessments in educational settings encompassing various educational levels, from secondary education to higher education, across different academic disciplines, including STEM, humanities, social sciences, and professional programs. It will explore the theoretical foundations, implementation strategies, and empirical evidence surrounding the effectiveness of OBAs.

## **2. Research Objectives :**

- To evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of open book assessments (OBAs) in educational settings across various disciplines.
- To examine the impact of Open book assessments (OBAs) on student learning outcomes, such as critical thinking, problem-solving, knowledge application, and academic performance.

## **3. Research Methodology:**

This study employs a systematic literature review methodology. An extensive search was conducted across multiple academic databases, such as ERIC, ScienceDirect, JSTOR, and Web of Science, to identify relevant peer-reviewed articles, research papers, and scholarly publications related to open book assessments. The search focused on literature that explored the theoretical foundations, implementation strategies, and impacts on student learning outcomes of open book assessments. The identified literature underwent a rigorous screening process based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria to ensure the relevance and quality of the sources included in the review. Key information, findings, and insights from the selected literature were extracted, critically analysed, and synthesized to provide a comprehensive understanding of open book assessments across various academic disciplines. The review systematically examined the strengths, weaknesses, subject-specific considerations, and empirical evidence surrounding the effectiveness of open book assessments in promoting higher-order thinking skills, knowledge application, and authentic learning experiences. By following established guidelines and best practices for systematic literature reviews, this study ensured a systematic and unbiased approach to synthesizing the existing body of knowledge on this topic.

## **4. Analysis and Findings :**

### **Applications Across Disciplines**

Open Book Assessments have been implemented across various academic disciplines, each with its unique considerations and adaptations. This section explores the use of open book assessments in different subject areas, highlighting subject-specific considerations and examples of successful implementation.

1. STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) Disciplines: Traditional closed-book exams have long been a staple of STEM education. However, a growing trend is emerging with Open book Assessments (OBAs). These assessments allow students to utilize resources like textbooks, notes, or online materials during exams. Proponents argue that Open book assessments (OBAs) better reflect real-world scenarios where



professionals rely on reference materials to solve problems. However, the effectiveness of Open book assessments (OBAs) in STEM education presents a complex picture, with both strengths and weaknesses to consider. Open book assessments (OBAs) offer potential benefits for simulating real-world engineering practices, where professionals rely on reference materials to solve problems (Eilertsen & Valdermo, 2000). However, research on their effectiveness presents a complex picture.

Studies suggest Open book assessments (OBAs) might not be universally effective across STEM disciplines. Roberts & Berry (2023) found students in math and physics experienced higher stress and adapted less well to OBOW exams compared to those in biology or geography. This suggests Open book assessments (OBAs) may require tailoring to specific disciplines. There's also some debate on the impact of Open book assessments (OBAs) on learning. While some studies, like Nsor-Ambala (2020), suggest formats like cheat sheets might be effective, others like Sanborn (2012) found no significant difference in exam performance or retention with or without reference materials.

Student attitudes towards Open book assessments (OBAs) seem more positive. Studies like Starovoytova (2017) report reduced test anxiety and student approval of using help sheets during exams. Additionally, these formats might not encourage cheating, as suggested by Starovoytova (2017).

2. **Humanities and Social Sciences:** Open book assessments (OBAs) hold promise for promoting critical thinking and higher-order skills in humanities and social sciences. These assessments, unlike closed-book exams, can evaluate students' ability to analyse and synthesize information from various sources, such as literature, historical documents, or scholarly articles (Francis, 1982; Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000). For instance, in literature, OBEs can assess a student's ability to interpret texts, consult criticism, and construct arguments (Francis, 1982). Similarly, social science Open book assessments (OBAs) might involve case studies or problem-based scenarios requiring applying theoretical concepts to real-world issues (Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000). This aligns well with educational goals that emphasize critical thinking and problem-solving over rote memorization (Pillai & Pillai, 2022). Studies also suggest potential benefits for student engagement. Research by Cutler (2018) found that students in OBEs reported using course materials more frequently and for longer durations compared to those in closed-book exams. Additionally, students perceived a stronger connection between course materials and the OBE itself (Cutler, 2018). This suggests OBEs may encourage deeper engagement with learning resources. However, some research on student perceptions lacks control groups or comparisons with traditional closed-book exams, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions (Cutler, 2018). While some studies indicate positive student attitudes towards OBEs, including reduced stress (Abu-Snoubar et al., 2022), the effectiveness of Open book assessments (OBAs) in promoting deeper learning remains inconclusive (Heijne-Penninga, 2008). Further research is needed to explore how Open book assessments (OBAs) can be designed to optimize these potential benefits and mitigate weaknesses. For instance, a study by Westerkamp (2013) found no significant correlation between frequent reference usage during medical Open book assessments (OBAs) and higher scores, highlighting a need to understand how students effectively utilize resources in Open book settings.
3. **Professional Programs:** Open book assessments (OBAs) are gaining popularity, particularly in professions like law, medicine, and business, where applying knowledge to real-world scenarios is essential. Proponents argue that Open book assessments (OBAs) can promote deeper learning by encouraging students to analyse information and develop solutions that mimic real-world practices. In law schools, for instance, OBEs can assess a student's ability to interpret legal documents and apply legal principles to specific situations (Cahill-Ripley, 2015). Similarly, medical Open book assessments (OBAs) can simulate clinical settings where students consult resources to diagnose and develop treatment plans. Some studies support this notion, suggesting that Open book assessments (OBAs) can lead to reduced test anxiety and improved student performance (Kruger, 2020; Ashri & Sahoo, 2021). However, the effectiveness of Open book assessments (OBAs) in promoting deeper learning remains inconclusive. Research by Heijne-Penninga (2008) highlights this uncertainty. While Open book assessments (OBAs) are hypothesized to encourage deeper understanding compared to closed-book exams, more research is needed to confirm this benefit. Additionally, a study by Westerkamp (2013) found no significant correlation between frequent reference usage during medical Open book assessments (OBAs) and higher scores. This finding suggests that simply providing access to resources may not guarantee deeper learning, and highlights the need to explore how students utilize these resources effectively. Furthermore, the design of Open book assessments (OBAs) can influence the types of knowledge assessed. Davies et al. (2021) compared student performance on a traditional closed-book exam (CBE)



to a remote OBE during the COVID-19 pandemic. Their study found that while overall performance increased in the OBE, the improvement was more pronounced for factual recall questions compared to higher-order thinking questions. This suggests that OBEs may make it easier for students to access and recall information, but careful design is necessary to ensure they also assess deeper understanding and critical thinking skills. Open book assessments (OBAs) also present potential weaknesses. Kruger's (2020) study found discrepancies in student and lecturer perceptions of OBAs' impact across different subjects in accounting. Additionally, the study revealed that African students perceived Open book assessments (OBAs) as less beneficial than white students, suggesting potential equity concerns that educators need to address.

## **5. Strengths and Weaknesses of Open Book Assessments :**

Open Book Assessments offer numerous strengths and potential advantages for enhancing the learning experience and promoting authentic assessment practices. However, it is important to acknowledge and address the potential weaknesses and challenges associated with this approach to ensure its effective implementation. Open book examinations may offer solutions to problems associated with closed-book testing, such as removing fear and emotional blocks, eliminating cheating, and constructing traditional test forms (Durning et al., 2016; Norris & Webb, 1957).

### **Strengths:**

1. **Promoting Higher-Order Thinking Skills:** Open book assessments (OBAs) shift the focus from memorization and recall towards higher-order cognitive skills, such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Durning et al., 2016). This aligns with findings from a systematic review by Johanns et al. (2017), which suggests that a combined approach of closed-book and Open book assessments in nursing education can promote critical thinking skills, potentially leading to better patient outcomes (Johanns et al., 2017). By allowing students to consult relevant resources, these assessments encourage them to engage in critical thinking, problem-solving, and the application of knowledge to complex situations (Eilertsen & Valdermo, 2000).
2. **Reducing Test Anxiety:** Compared to traditional closed-book exams, which can be a major source of stress and anxiety for students, particularly those who struggle with memorization (Johanns et al., 2017), Open book assessments offer a more positive learning experience. By allowing students to access resources during exams, Open book assessments (OBAs) shift the focus from rote memorization to understanding and applying concepts (Agarwal & Roediger, 2011). This can not only alleviate test anxiety but also lead to higher levels of achievement compared to traditional exams (Francis, 1982). Research by Tatari et al. (2021) further supports these benefits, demonstrating that Open book assessments effectively reduce test anxiety, increase the depth and speed of learning, and ultimately lead to greater student satisfaction and interest. Their study found that a significant majority of students reported positive experiences with Open book assessments, including a reduction in test fear and anxiety, a deeper understanding of the material, and increased motivation to learn.
3. **Improving Exam Performance:** Research suggests that Open book assessments can significantly benefit student learning in online environments. Studies have demonstrated improved performance on exams across various disciplines, including pediatrics (Schumacher et al., 1978) and pharmacy (Ramamurthy et al., 2016), compared to traditional closed-book formats. Furthermore, incorporating Open book strategies can enhance overall learning outcomes in online courses (Williams & Wong, 2009; Rakes, 2008). These findings suggest that Open book assessments not only improve exam performance but also contribute to a more positive and effective learner experience.
4. **Fostering Creativity:** Open book exams involve more creative and deeper study behaviours leading to higher composite scores compared to closed-book exams (Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000).
5. **Promotes Deeper Learning and Knowledge Application:** This study by Teodorczuk (2017) suggests that Open book exams in medical school curricula can encourage deeper learning, reduce reliance on memorizing facts, and promote the adoption of more authentic assessment approaches.
6. **Reduces Cheating:** According to Norris & Webb (1957), Open book examinations in introductory geology courses can be beneficial in two ways. They can reduce classroom cheating and encourage students to develop reasoning





skills. However, this approach also requires instructors to dedicate more time to preparation and grading. Open book examinations have a pass percentage of nearly 70%, better marks, and fewer cheating incidents compared to closed book examinations (Husain et al., 2022).

### **Weaknesses and Challenges:**

1. **Potential for Surface Learning:** Critics of open book assessments argue that students may adopt a surface learning approach, focusing on locating and reproducing information rather than developing a deep understanding of the subject matter (Theophilides & Koutselini, 2000). This potential for surface learning could undermine the intended learning outcomes and the development of higher-order thinking skills.
2. **Reduced Long-Term Retention and Transfer:** Expectancy of Open book tests may impair long-term retention and transfer compared to closed-book tests, despite better initial performance on Open book tests (Agarwal & Roediger, 2011).
3. **Managing Resources and Exam Time:** Effective performance in Open book assessments requires students to possess strong resource management skills and efficient use of exam time. This includes the ability to locate, organize, and synthesize relevant information within a limited timeframe (Eilertsen & Valdermo, 2000). Students lacking these skills or who spend excessive time searching for information may experience negative learning experiences or suboptimal performance (Boniface, 1985; Spiegel & Nivette, 2021).

To address these weaknesses and challenges, it is essential to implement strategies and best practices that promote academic integrity, provide appropriate support and training for students, and ensure that assessment tasks align with intended learning outcomes and higher-order cognitive skills.

### **6. Conclusion :**

In conclusion, this review has explored the potential and limitations of Open book assessments (OBAs) across various academic disciplines. The findings suggest that OBAs hold promise for promoting higher-order thinking skills, fostering problem-solving abilities, and encouraging knowledge application. By allowing students to access and utilize relevant resources, OBAs can create a more authentic learning experience that prepares them for future challenges. Additionally, OBAs can potentially reduce test anxiety and improve student performance.

However, the review also identified potential weaknesses associated with OBAs, such as concerns about surface learning and the need for effective resource management skills. To ensure the effectiveness and academic integrity of OBAs, educators need to implement appropriate design strategies and best practices.

By highlighting the importance of considering disciplinary differences and the need for ongoing research, this review contributes to the ongoing discourse on assessment practices. Future research can explore effective design strategies to optimize OBAs for promoting deeper learning and critical thinking across disciplines. Additionally, further investigation is needed to understand the long-term impact of OBAs on knowledge retention and transfer, as well as to address potential equity concerns in their implementation. Ultimately, the effective implementation of OBAs can lead to more engaging, student-centered assessment practices that promote well-rounded learning and prepare students for success in the 21st century.

### **References:**

1. Abu-Snoubar, T., Aldowkat, I., Al-Shboul, Y., Atiyat, M., & Al-Hyari, H. (2022). The attitudes of Jordanian English language and literature undergraduate students toward Open book exams. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.1050587>.
2. Agarwal, P. K., & Roediger, H. L. (2011). Expectancy of an Open book test decreases performance on a delayed closed-book test. *Memory*, 19(8), 836-852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2011.613840>.



3. Ashri, D., & Sahoo, B. (2021). Open Book Examination and Higher Education During COVID-19: Case of University of Delhi. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 50, 73 - 86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239521013783>.
4. Boniface, D. (1985). Candidates' use of notes and textbooks during an Open book examination. *Educational Research*, 27, 201-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013188850270307>.
5. Cahill-Ripley, A. (2015). Innovative methods of assessment in law: the value of Open book exams as a catalyst for improving teaching and learning in the law school. *The Law Teacher*, 49, 206 - 218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2015.1016724>.
6. Cuttler, C. (2018). Students' Use and Perceptions of the Relevance and Quality of Open Textbooks Compared to Traditional Textbooks in Online and Traditional Classroom Environments. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 18, 65 - 83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475725718811300>.
7. Davies, D., McLean, P., Kemp, P., Liddle, A., Morrell, M., Halse, O., Martín, N., & Sam, A. (2021). Assessment of factual recall and higher-order cognitive domains in an Open book medical school examination. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 27, 147 - 165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-021-10076-5>.
8. Durning, S. J., Dong, T., Ratcliffe, T., Schuwirth, L., Artino, A. R., Boulet, J. R., & Eva, K. (2016). Comparing Open book and closed-book examinations: A systematic review. *Academic Medicine*, 91(4), 583-599. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000977>.
9. Eilertsen, T. V., & Valdermo, O. (2000). Open book assessment: A practical guide for lecturers and course designers. UCER.
10. Francis, J. (1982). A Case for Open-Book Examinations. *Educational Review*, 34, 13-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191820340102>.
11. Gujral, S., & Gupta, D. (2017). A study of attitude of teachers and students towards open book and closed book assessment. *International Journal of scientific research and management*, 5, 6034-6038. <https://doi.org/10.18535/IJSRM/V5I7.28>.
12. Heijne-Penninga, M., Kuks, J., Hofman, W., & Cohen-Schotanus, J. (2008). Influence of open-and closed-book tests on medical students' learning approaches. *Medical Education*, 42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03125.x>
13. Husain, M., Ahmad, M., Rashid, T., Prasad, D., Thakral, A., & Parvez, S. (2022). A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF OPEN BOOK AND CLOSED BOOK EXAMINATION IN A MEDICAL COLLEGE IN NORTH INDIA. *INDIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED RESEARCH*. <https://doi.org/10.36106/ijar/5302385>.
14. Johanns, B., Dinkens, A., & Moore, J. (2017). A systematic review comparing Open book and closed-book examinations: Evaluating effects on development of critical thinking skills. *Nurse education in practice*, 27, 89-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2017.08.018>.
15. Kruger, S. (2020). Accountancy students' and lecturers' perceptions of the effect of Open book assessments on writing examinations. *South African journal of higher education*, 34, 158-175. <https://doi.org/10.20853/34-1-3376>.
16. Mekala, S. (2012). Open Book Examination a Paradigm Shift. *Journal of Literature, Culture and Media Studies*, 3.
17. Norris, R., & Webb, R. (1957). THE OPEN BOOK EXAMINATION IN INTRODUCTORY GEOLOGY COURSES. *Journal of Geological Education*, 5, 4-9. <https://doi.org/10.5408/0022-1368-5.2.4>.
18. Nsor-Ambala, R. (2020). Impact of exam type on exam scores, anxiety, and knowledge retention in a cost and management accounting course. *Accounting Education*, 29, 32 - 56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2019.1683871>.
19. Pillai, M., & Pillai, N. (2022). BUILDING A CASE FOR OPEN BOOK EXAMINATIONS. *Towards Excellence*. <https://doi.org/10.37867/te140255>.
20. Ramamurthy, S., Er, H., Nadarajah, V., & Pook, P. (2016). Study on the impact of open and closed book formative examinations on pharmacy students' performance, perception, and learning approach. *Currents in pharmacy teaching & learning*, 8 3, 364-374 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2016.02.017>.
21. Rakes, G. (2008). Open Book Testing in Online Learning Environments. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 7, 0-0.
22. Roberts, L., & Berry, J. (2023). Should open-book, open-web exams replace traditional closed-book exams in STEM? An evaluation of their effectiveness in different disciplines. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi28.1030>.
23. Sanborn, M., Purchase, K., & Barry, B. (2012). Kicking Out the Crutch: The Impact of Formula Sheets on Student Performance and Learning.



24. Schumacher, C., Butzin, D., Finberg, L., & Burg, F. (1978). The effect of open- vs. closed-book testing on performance on a multiple-choice examination in pediatrics. *Pediatrics*, 61 2, 256-61. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.61.2.256>.
25. Spiegel, T., & Nivette, A. (2021). The relative impact of in-class closed-book versus take-home Open book examination type on academic performance, student knowledge retention and wellbeing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48, 27 - 40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2016607>.
26. Starovoytova, D. (2017). Experimental-Teaching: 'Help-sheet' in Examination of Engineering-students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8, 52-64.
27. Tatari, F., Raoufian, H., Mashhadi, M., & Gazerani, A. (2021). Effect of group Open book assessment on students' learning and satisfaction: a quasi-experimental study. *Neuropsychiatria i Neuropsychologia*. <https://doi.org/10.5114/NAN.2021.105625>.
28. Teodorczuk, A., Fraser, J., & Rogers, G. (2017). Open book exams: A potential solution to the "full curriculum"? *Medical Teacher*, 40, 529 - 530. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2017.1412412>.
29. Theophilides, C., & Koutselini, M. (2000). Study Behavior in the Closed-Book and the Open book Examination: A Comparative Analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 6, 379 - 393. <https://doi.org/10.1076/edre.6.4.379.6932>.
30. Tussing, L. (1951). A Consideration of the Open Book Examination. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 11, 597 - 602. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316445101100406>.
31. Westerkamp, A., Heijne-Penninga, M., Kuks, J., & Cohen-Schotanus, J. (2013). Open book tests: Search behaviour, time used and test scores. *Medical Teacher*, 35, 330 - 332. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2013.759641>.