

---

# **Title Registration for a Systematic Review: Collaborative Testing for Improving Student Learning Outcomes and Test- Taking Performance in Higher Education: A Systematic Review**

**Renée Cantwell, Jeanann Sousou, Yuri Jadotte, Jenny  
Pierce**

---

Submitted to the Coordinating Group of:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Crime and Justice
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disability
<input type="checkbox"/>	International Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nutrition
<input type="checkbox"/>	Social Welfare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:

Plans to co-register:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Cochrane	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maybe		

Date Submitted: 29 May 2013

Date Revision Submitted: 13 June 2013

Approval Date: 16 June 2013

Publication Date:

---

## **TITLE OF THE REVIEW**

---

Collaborative Testing for Improving Student Learning Outcomes and Test-Taking Performance in Higher Education: A Systematic Review

---

## **BACKGROUND**

---

Collaborative learning has been purported to be an effective method for student learning, and one modality frequently utilized in collaborative learning is collaborative testing. Collaborative testing, also referred to as group testing or double testing, has been utilized in a variety of educational settings, yet little research exists to demonstrate the effects on learning outcomes. It can be further described as a student-centered, active learning approach. It has been stated that students perceive that they learn better in collaborative testing modes and that collaborative testing leads to improved individual test scores. Benefits of collaborative testing include—but are not limited to—better critical thinking skills, better collaboration and team work among peers, reduced test anxiety, and improved test taking performance. Complicating the issue, however, is the fact that multiple methods and procedures for implementing this collaborative testing are described in the literature, making comparisons of outcomes difficult.

---

## **OBJECTIVES**

---

It is the aim of the proposed review to assess the effect of collaborative, group, or double testing on learning outcomes for students in higher education settings.

---

## **INTERVENTION**

---

This review will examine the effects of individual testing versus collaborative testing: i.e., examinations given to the individual as compared to examinations given to groups of various sizes that are either random or not randomly teamed, using various procedural methods and grading of collaborative examinations.

---

## **POPULATION**

---

This review will include studies with the following populations:

- All higher education students
- Post high school age students
- Traditional and non-traditional students
- English as second language students

- Students aged 18-89
- Male and female students
- Students from all socioeconomic statuses
- Students in schools of higher education

---

## **OUTCOMES**

---

This review will have the following primary outcomes:

- learner class performance as measured in class grade
- student test taking anxiety

This review will have the following secondary outcomes:

- individual learners' test scores
- overall student collaboration
- student self-confidence with test taking
- student comprehension of class material

---

## **STUDY DESIGNS**

---

All experimental designs—including but not limited to randomized control trials and quasi-experimental studies, pre-post and time series designs with control groups, as well as observational studies with control groups, such as longitudinal cohort studies—will be included in this study. Data will be pooled into a meta-analysis to the extent possible. If pooling is not possible, the results will be presented in narrative form.

The following types of studies will be included:

- English language studies
- Studies that focus on higher education students
- Student population ages greater than 18 years

The following types of studies will be excluded:

- Non English or translated studies
- Studies performed with less than higher level students

---

## SOURCES OF SUPPORT

---

None reported.

---

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

---

There are no author conflicts of interest.

---

## REQUEST SUPPORT

---

The authors have not requested support at this time.

---

## AUTHORS REVIEW TEAM

---

### Lead reviewer:

Name:	Renée Cantwell, DNP, RN, CNE, CPHQ
Title:	Assistant Professor
Affiliation:	University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, School of Nursing
Address:	40 East Laurel Road
City, State, Province or County:	Stratford, New Jersey
Postal Code:	08084
Country:	USA
Phone:	+1-856-566-6338
Email:	cantweer@umdnj.edu

### Co-authors:

Name:	Jeanann Sousou, DNP, RN, MA, CNM
Title:	Certified Nurse Midwife, Instructor
Affiliation:	University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, School of Nursing
Address:	40 East Laurel Road
City, State, Province or County:	Stratford, New Jersey
Postal Code:	08084
Country:	USA
Phone:	+1-856-566-6376
Email:	sousoujh@umdnj.edu

Name:	Yuri Jadotte, MD
Title:	Assistant Professor
Affiliation:	The Northeast Institute for Evidence Synthesis and Translation at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, School of Nursing
Address:	65 Bergen Street, Suite GA-190
City, State, Province or County:	Newark, New Jersey
Postal Code:	07107
Country:	USA
Phone:	+1-973-972-9731
Email:	yuri.jadotte@rutgers.edu

Name:	Jenny Pierce, MS
Title:	Public Services Librarian
Affiliation:	UMDNJ- Health Sciences Library at Stratford
Address:	One Medical Center Drive
City, State, Province or County:	Stratford, New Jersey
Postal Code:	08084
Country:	USA
Phone:	+1-856-566-6992
Email:	<a href="mailto:piercejb@umdnj.edu">piercejb@umdnj.edu</a>

---

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

---

- Content: Cantwell and Sousou
- Systematic review methods: Cantwell, Sousou, and Jadotte
- Statistical analysis: Cantwell, Sousou, and Jadotte
- Information retrieval: Cantwell, Sousou, and Pierce

---

## **PRELIMINARY TIMEFRAME**

---

Approximate date for submission of Draft Protocol: December 2013

---

## DECLARATION

---

### Authors' responsibilities

By completing this form, you accept responsibility for preparing, maintaining, and updating the review in accordance with Campbell Collaboration policy. The Coordinating Group will provide as much support as possible to assist with the preparation of the review.

A draft protocol must be submitted to the Coordinating Group within one year of title acceptance. If drafts are not submitted before the agreed deadlines, or if we are unable to contact you for an extended period, the Coordinating Group has the right to de-register the title or transfer the title to alternative authors. The Coordinating Group also has the right to de-register or transfer the title if it does not meet the standards of the Coordinating Group and/or the Campbell Collaboration.

You accept responsibility for maintaining the review in light of new evidence, comments and criticisms, and other developments, and updating the review every five years, when substantial new evidence becomes available, or, if requested, transferring responsibility for maintaining the review to others as agreed with the Coordinating Group.

### Publication in the Campbell Library

The support of the Coordinating Group in preparing your review is conditional upon your agreement to publish the protocol, finished review, and subsequent updates in the Campbell Library. The Campbell Collaboration places no restrictions on publication of the findings of a Campbell systematic review in a more abbreviated form as a journal article either before or after the publication of the monograph version in *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Some journals, however, have restrictions that preclude publication of findings that have been, or will be, reported elsewhere and authors considering publication in such a journal should be aware of possible conflict with publication of the monograph version in *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Publication in a journal after publication or in press status in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* should acknowledge the Campbell version and include a citation to it. Note that systematic reviews published in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* and co-registered with the Cochrane Collaboration may have additional requirements or restrictions for co-publication. Review authors accept responsibility for meeting any co-publication requirements.

**I understand the commitment required to undertake a Campbell review, and agree to publish in the Campbell Library. Signed on behalf of the authors**

]



**Date:**  
**6/21/13**