



Anxiety Related to Online and Remote Exams among Spanish University Students

Olga Malas

Psychological Service of the Emergency Medical System (SEM)

Department of Health - Generalitat of Catalonia (Spain)

Received: 2022-06-27

Accepted: 2022-12-07

doi: 10.51698/aloma.2023.41.1.121-128

Anxiety Related to Online and Remote Exams among Spanish University Students

Abstract. Exams are a common part of university studies, and they often generate a significant amount of anxiety, which can increase when they are taken remotely and online. The aim of this multi-centric, cross sectional study was to provide additional knowledge on this subject. The sample consisted of 1,024 Spanish university students with a mean age of 20.34 (SD: 1.78), 66.4% of them women. They were recruited from seven different universities and six areas of study. The instruments applied were the Exams Anxiety Self-Assessment Questionnaire and the Anxiety subscale of the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21). For the purposes of data analysis, frequency and descriptive statistics were used. The results showed moderate to high rates of anxiety related to online and remote exams in 50.1% of the sample for generalized symptoms, levels not explicable by anxiety related to the person and their context, which was 32.9%. Anxiety is greater among women and among students in the disciplines of economics, business and law, followed by arts and humanities and health sciences. Based on the results, interventions to reduce anxiety related to online and remote examination techniques are recommended.

Keywords: exam-related anxiety; online exams; e-assessment; university students

Ansiedad relacionada con los exámenes online y en remoto en estudiantes universitarios españoles

Resumen. Los exámenes, comunes en los estudios universitarios, generan una importante cantidad de ansiedad, que puede incrementarse cuando se realizan en línea y de forma remota. Este estudio multicéntrico y transversal fue planificado con el objetivo de aportar conocimiento sobre el tema. La muestra del estudio estuvo formada por 1.024 estudiantes españoles, de 20,34 (DE: 1,78) años de edad, siendo el 66,4% mujeres. Fueron reclutados de 7 universidades diferentes y 6 áreas de estudio. Se aplicó el Cuestionario de Autoevaluación de Ansiedad ante los Exámenes y la subescala de Ansiedad de la Escala de Depresión, Ansiedad y Estrés (DASS-21). Para el análisis de los datos se utilizaron estadísticas de frecuencia y descriptivas. Como resultado, para la ansiedad relacionada con los exámenes en línea y a distancia se registraron índices de moderados a altos en el 50,1 %, niveles no justificados por la ansiedad relacionada con la persona y su contexto, que fue del 32,9%. La ansiedad fue mayor en las mujeres y en los estudiantes de las áreas de economía, empresa y derecho, seguidas de artes y humanidades y ciencias de la salud. Teniendo en cuenta los resultados, se recomiendan intervenciones para reducir la ansiedad relacionada con técnicas de examen en línea y en remoto.

Palabras clave: ansiedad ante los exámenes; exámenes en línea; E-assessment; estudiantes universitarios

Correspondence

Olga Malas

ORCID: 0000-0002-9861-198X

malas.tolsa@outlook.es

Introduction

Prior to the pandemic, a number of studies had been carried out on anxiety related to face-to-face exams, for example, on medical students in Arabia (Aziz & Serafi, 2017; Khoshhal et al., 2017), Germany (Cipra & Muller-Hilke, 2019), India (Patil & Aithala, 2017), Pakistan (Jadoon et al., 2010), Serbia (Latas et al., 2010) and Tanzania (Tsegay et al., 2019); students of medicine and other disciplines in Colombia (Arias et al., 2015); nursing students in the USA (Moore, 2013) and Iran (Darabi et al., 2019); pharmacy students in Malaysia (Rajiah et al., 2014), and pre-university students in Turkey (Kavakci et al., 2014). These studies have registered levels of prevalence of problematic anxiety ranging from 28% (Jadoon et al., 2010), to 48% (Kavakci et al., 2014), to 66% (Darabi et al., 2019).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, university students have been subjected to online and remote exams, which they tend to perceive as more stressful than face-to-face exams (Elsalem et al., 2021). However, at the time this study was conducted, only two prior studies examining anxiety related to online and remote exams were found. One was carried out by Mastour et al. (2021), who recorded a prevalence of 27.9% for mild anxiety, 36.9% for moderate anxiety, and 35.2% for severe anxiety. Another study carried out by Arora et al., (2021) reported low levels for anxiety induced by the coronavirus (23%) in comparison with the levels of anxiety related to online and remote exams (55%), concluding that there was an increase in anxiety that was not solely attributable to the pandemic itself. It is clear that studies of the topic are scarce and therefore inconclusive.

A low to moderate level of anxiety could push students to work harder and learn better, but poorly managed higher levels can alter their self-concept (Cañamero et al., 2021), and lead to negative feelings, poor performance and demotivation (e.g.: Ibrahim et al., 2013; Saravanan et al., 2014), negatively affecting student learning and performance (e.g.: Dyrbye et al., 2006; Ibrahim et al., 2013; Quek et al., 2019). Therefore, it is recommended to apply interventions to reduce high anxiety levels (e.g.: Arbabisarjou et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2020) particularly in at-risk groups.

With respect to sociodemographic variables, the highest levels have been reported in females (e.g.: Cipra & Muller-Hilke, 2019; Latas et al., 2010; Mastour et al., 2021), among first-year university students (Tsegay et al., 2019), and in health science degrees (Mastour et al., 2021). No information has been found on the influence of other sociodemographic variables on exam-related anxiety. For example, researchers have not found differences related to university management (public/private) or differences between universities in different countries or cultures.

E-learning and E-assessment are becoming increasingly common worldwide, because they reduce costs and time, but the advantages and disadvantages of these online approaches not well known. Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine the level of anxiety re-

lated to remote online exams in a large and heterogeneous sample of Spanish university students from the autonomous community of Catalonia. Taking into account previous knowledge on the subject, the hypotheses were: (1) that university students would present high levels of anxiety related to remote online exams; (2) that the anxiety levels would not be attributable to the broader context (such as the COVID-19 pandemic); (3) that anxiety levels would be higher among women, first-year students, and health science students; and (4) that results would not differ as a function of the university analyzed.

Method

Participants

For this multicenter study, a non-probabilistic random sample of 1,024 Spanish university students was recruited. Of them, 33.6% were men and 66.4% women. The mean age was 20.34 (SD: 1.78), and there was an age range of 18 to 24 years. The sample came from seven different universities in the Autonomous Community of Catalonia (University of Barcelona, Autonomous University of Barcelona, University of Girona, University of Lleida, University of Rovira & Virgili, Polytechnic University of Catalonia and University of Pompeu Fabra). Other characteristics of the sample can be seen in Table 1.

Procedure and ethics

This cross-sectional study was carried out in January 2022, coinciding with the sixth wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, which forced all Spanish universities to conduct their exams online and remotely. The study instruments were also administered online. Secure Google Forms were used for data collection and storage. Recruitment was done via an email message containing a link to the study. The message was sent to approximately 50% of the professors of all the Catalan universities, in the hope that they would voluntarily forward it to their students. Student participation was also voluntary, and participants were not compensated in any way. Individuals who clicked on the survey link were able to read a description of the study and its aims on the first page. They were assured that their data would be recorded anonymously and confidentially, and they read a statement informing them that they had the choice to stop participating in the survey at any point. Participants digitally provided their informed consent by clicking to proceed to take part in the survey. Thus, to continue administering the questionnaires, each participant had to agree to the terms of the study, which complied with the Declaration of Helsinki. There were no additional institutional ethical requirements for the author.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

In order to be included, a participant had to be a student at a university in the autonomous community

of Catalonia. They had to be enrolled in one of the four years or the first four years of a degree program. Potential participants were excluded if they represented a demographic variable shared by fewer than 30 participants. This was done because it was necessary to have a minimum number of participants per group to be able to perform a comparative statistical analysis based on selected demographic factors.

Measures

Participants were asked to answer sociodemographic questions (age, gender, name of university, area of study and year), and to complete the Exams Anxiety Self-Assessment Questionnaire (CAAE, by its Spanish initials: UdN, 2005), a tool measuring exam-related anxiety, and the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21: Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995), an instrument that measures anxiety related to the individual and his or her context.

According to Lang's (1968) tripartite theory, anxiety is expressed through a set of manifestations that can be grouped into three systems or areas: cognitive, physiological and motor responses. The cognitive, mental or subjective response includes restlessness, apprehension, intrusive thoughts, obsessions, alarm, fear, panic, etc. The physiological, somatic or bodily response can consist of rapid heart rate, hyperventilation, palpitations, tremor, muscle tension, sweating, dilated pupils, facial pallor, vomiting, fainting, etc. The motor or behavioural response includes observable changes in behaviour such as facial expression, body movements and postures, as well as other avoidance and escape responses.

Specifically, the CAAE has 15 elements structured around the three dimensions of Lang's (1968) tripartite theory. The items were designed to elicit responses about anxiety symptoms before, during and after the exams. The cognitive factor is assessed by items 1, 4, 8, 11 and 14); the physiological factor by items 2, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 13; and the motor factor by items 3, 6, 9 and 15. Examples of items are "Q1: I am very worried about the exams" and "Q8: I have thoughts like: I am going to fail, I don't know anything, or my mind will go blank" for the cognitive factor; "Q5: My stomach is bothering me, or I have nausea, dizziness" or "Q13: I am sweating, I feel chills, or I have hot flashes" for the physiological factor; and "Q11: I feel insecure, I think I will not remember anything, that perhaps I should not take the exam" and "Q15: I make repeated movements with some parts of my body. I have nervous tics" for the motor factor. The items are answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The psychometric and structural analysis of the sample indicates the presence of a general anxiety factor. The final assessment of the general factor is made by adding up all the scores and dividing by 15. If the result is between 1 and 3, the anxiety level is considered low; if it is between 3 and 4, the anxiety is moderate; and if it is between 4 and 5, it is high. Good

internal consistency was obtained for the study sample, with a Cronbach's α of 0.923.

The DASS-21 scale has three subscales, one for anxiety, one for depression, and one for stress. For this study, only the anxiety subscale was used to determine anxiety related to the individual and the context. The items ask about anxiety symptoms in daily life that are unrelated to exams. This subscale has seven elements, each of which is answered using a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (= did not apply to me at all) to 3 (= applied to me very much, or most of the time), with reference to the presence of symptoms the previous week. The subscale includes questions related to cognitive anxiety responses ("Q20: I felt afraid for no reason") and physiological responses ("Q4: It was difficult for me to breathe"). In the analysed sample, the subscale presents a unifactorial structure. Scores can range from 0 to 21. If the result is 4 or lower, the level of anxiety is considered low; if it is between 5 and 7, the anxiety is moderate; if it is between 8 and 9, the anxiety is high; if it is more than 10, it is very high. Good internal consistency was obtained for the study sample, with a Cronbach's α of 0.918 for the anxiety subscale.

Statistical analysis

Demographic characteristics were studied using frequency analysis. To identify whether there were significant differences in anxiety levels related to sociodemographic variables, a comparative analysis of mean values was performed using Student's *t*-test (variables with two levels) or ANOVA (more than two levels). The anxiety variables, exam-related anxiety as obtained with the CAAE and general anxiety as obtained with the DASS-Anxiety, were studied using frequency and descriptive analysis. In order to verify the normal distribution of the data, the mean, deviation, skewness and kurtosis for every variable were determined, and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test ($n > 50$) was carried out. Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS v.27 package.

Results

Demographic characteristics

Demographic prevalences can be seen in Table 1. The percentage of men is much lower than that of women. The Polytechnic University of Catalonia also contributes a much larger number of students than the rest of the universities, which explains the greater representation of Engineering and Computer Science students in the total sample. Despite this, the representation in all sociodemographic groups is sufficient to allow the study to continue.

Significant differences were observed related to gender both for the general factor ($t = -5.57$; $p = .000$), and for the cognitive factor ($t = -6.68$; $p = .000$) of exam-related anxiety. There were also gender differences in general anxiety as determined with the DASS-

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the study sample (n = 1024) and mean levels of exam-related anxiety determined by CAAE and anxiety determined by DASS-Anxiety subscale

Demographics (n = 1024)		CAAE (% level)		DASS-Anxiety (% level)	
Age: M: 20.34 (SD: 1.78)		Mean (SD)	IC95%	Mean (SD)	IC95%
Gender					
Men	344 (33.6%)	1.47 (0.65)	1.40-1.54	1.51 (1.65)	1.33-1.69
Women	680 (66.4%)	1.72 (0.73)	1.67-1.78	2.24 (1.66)	2.11-2.36
		$t = -5.57; p = .000$		$t = -6.61; p = .000$	
University*					
UB	86 (8.4%)	1.64 (0.71)	1.48-1.79	2.19 (1.72)	1.82-2.56
UAB	94 (9.2%)	1.60 (0.69)	1.45-1.73	2.13 (1.62)	1.79-2.46
UdG	204 (19.9%)	1.63 (0.72)	1.52-1.72	1.84 (1.67)	1.61-2.07
UdL	175 (17.1%)	1.71 (0.75)	1.59-1.82	2.04 (1.70)	1.78-2.30
URV	67 (6.5%)	1.88 (0.75)	1.69-2.06	2.31 (1.71)	1.89-2.73
UPC	351 (34.3%)	1.60 (0.69)	1.52-1.67	1.94 (1.72)	1.76-2.12
UPF	47 (4.6%)	1.57 (0.71)	1.36-1.78	1.80 (1.67)	1.31-2.30
		$F = 1.82; p = .091$		$F = 1.11; p = .353$	
Study area**					
HS	151 (14.7%)	1.66 (0.71)	1.54-1.77	1.92 (1.72)	1.64-2.19
SC	184 (18.0%)	1.64 (0.71)	1.53-1.74	1.99 (1.64)	1.75-2.22
SPE	122 (11.9%)	1.55 (0.69)	1.43-1.68	2.03 (1.73)	1.72-2.34
EBL	94 (9.2%)	1.85 (0.80)	1.68-2.01	2.27 (1.61)	1.94-2.60
AH	138 (13.5%)	1.68 (0.74)	1.56-1.81	2.17 (1.69)	1.88-2.46
EC	335 (32.7%)	1.59 (0.69)	1.52-1.67	1.87 (1.72)	1.68-2.06
		$F = 2.37; p = .037$		$F = 1.23; p = .292$	
Academic year					
First	277 (27.1%)	1.65 (0.71)	1.56-1.73	2.05 (1.71)	1.84-2.53
Second	303 (29.6%)	1.66 (0.71)	1.58-1.74	2.04 (1.69)	1.85-2.23
Third	218 (21.3%)	1.63 (0.72)	1.53-1.73	1.97 (1.68)	1.75-2.20
Fourth	226 (22.1%)	1.62 (0.72)	1.52-1.71	1.89 (1.69)	1.67-2.11
		$F = 0.21; p = .889$		$F = 0.45; p = .715$	

Note: M: Mean. SD: standard deviation. (*): UB = University of Barcelona. UAB = Autonomous University of Barcelona. UdG = University of Girona. UdL = University of Lleida. URV = University of Rovira & Virgili. UPC = Polytechnic University of Catalonia. UPF = University Pompeu Fabra. (**): HS = Health sciences. SC = Sciences. SPE = Social science, Psychology & Education. EBL = Economy, business & law. AH = Arts & humanities. EC = Engineering and Computing.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for exams anxiety determined by CAAE and for anxiety determined by DASS-Anxiety (n = 1024)

	Mean (SD)	Skewness	Curtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	
				z	p
CAAE	1.64 (0.71)	0.64	-0.83	10.05	.000
DASS-Anxiety	7.15 (1.69)	5.84	-0.66	7.33	.000

Anxiety subscale ($t = -6.61; p = .000$). For the study area, a significant difference was obtained for the general factor of exam-related anxiety ($F = 2.37; p = .037$), but not for the cognitive factor or for general anxiety. Students of economics, business and law registered the highest level of anxiety, followed by arts and humanities students. Health science students had the lowest levels. No differences were observed as a function of the university or year of study.

Descriptive statistics and correlations

The mean, skewness and kurtosis for dependent variables can be seen in Table 2. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicates that all the variables follow a non-parametric distribution ($p < 0.05$), but the results for skewness and kurtosis for the general factor was within ± 1 , indicating that the distribution curve is relatively symmetric. For CAAE the mean for anxiety (M: 1.64; SD: 0.71) is more than 1,5 on a scale of 1 to 3 indicating that the sample present exams anxiety. For DASS-Anxiety, the mean obtained (M: 7.15; SD:

1.69), on a scale of 0 to 21, can be considered that it is a non-clinical sample.

Table 3 shows the anxiety prevalence data. The cut-off points of the CAAE and DASS-Anxiety scale and subscale indicate that CAAE scores greater than 3 out of 5 points are considered moderate-high, while DASS-Anxiety scores greater than 10 out of 21 points are considered very high. Therefore, comparisons should be made accordingly. Thus, moderate to high rates of anxiety related to online and remote exams have been recorded in 50.1% of the subjects. Meanwhile, very high levels of anxiety related to the subject and his or her environment were recorded in 32.9% of the students. Consequently, in this sample, an increase in anxiety related to remote and online exams is observed.

As can be seen in Table 3, the data indicate much higher prevalences in women than men. While the figures for men were 38.4% and 23.5% for generalized symptoms related to exams and anxiety related to the individual and the context, respectively, the corresponding data for women were 56%, and 37.6%, respectively.

Table 3. Prevalence of exam-related anxiety determined by CAAE and anxiety determined by DASS-Anxiety (n = 1024)

	N	CAAE (% level)			DASS-Anxiety (% level)			
		Low	Moderate	High	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
Gender								
Men	344 (33.6%)	61.6	29.7	8.7	54.4	15.7	6.4	23.5
Women	680 (66.4%)	44.0	38.8	17.2	34.9	15.3	12.2	37.6
Total sample	1024	49.9	35.7	14.4	41.4	15.4	10.3	32.9

Discussion

The study was able to meet its stated aims. The sample obtained is large and heterogeneous, and the tools were applied at a critical moment of the pandemic, coinciding with the sixth wave in Spain, which occurred in January 2022, just when universities were forced to administer their first-semester exams online and remotely. The hypotheses that were posed based on previous knowledge can be analyzed and discussed.

Thus, the first hypothesis is confirmed, as the study detected high levels of exam-related anxiety in students. The data are consistent with those reported by Arora et al., (2021) and Mastour et al., (2021). In this study, moderate to high levels of anxiety were detected in 50.1% of the sample. Mastour et al. (2021) reported moderate to high anxiety values in 69.1% of students, and Arora et al. (2021) found 55%. In face-to-face exams, prior to the pandemic, Kavakci et al. (2014) reported a prevalence of 48% in a general sample of pre-university students, and Arias et al. (2015) recorded a prevalence of 58% in a sample of students of medicine and other studies. In health students, prevalences ranging from 28% (Jadoon et al., 2010) to 66% (Darabi et al., 2019) have been recorded. Quek et al. (2019) analyzed data from 40,348 medical students from different backgrounds, obtaining a mean prevalence of anxiety of 33.8% worldwide. Based on these data, it could be said that online and remote exams, in a state of pandemic, significantly increase anxiety levels. In any case, the cut-off points applied to the scales should be analyzed before making comparisons. Thus, for example, in this study it was found that the data recorded as very high anxiety on the DASS-Anxiety corresponded, depending on its cut-off point, with the sum of the data for moderate and high anxiety on the CAAE, and data recorded as medium and high on the DASS-Anxiety corresponded with the low anxiety level on the CAAE.

The second hypothesis is also confirmed. In this study, the prevalence of anxiety related to the individual and the context was 32.9%, much lower than that obtained with the CAAE, which confirms the observation of Arora et al. (2021), who concluded that there was an increase in anxiety that was not due to the pandemic itself but that could be attributed to exams.

The third hypothesis cannot be confirmed in its entirety since, although higher levels have been observed in women, no significant differences have been observed in first-year students, nor in the area of health sciences. The results related to gender are consistent with those obtained by other researchers (e.g.: Cipra

& Müller-Hilke, 2019; Elsalem et al., 2020; Latas et al., 2010; Mastour et al., 2021). In terms of the academic disciplines, significant differences have been recorded, but not the expected ones. Although Quek et al (2019) found no differences in this regard, Mastour et al. (2021) refers to antecedents that postulate a higher prevalence among health students. However, in this study, the highest average levels of anxiety were recorded in students of economics, business and law, followed by those of arts and humanities, which can be considered a striking finding. The average values registered among students of health sciences and other sciences were very similar. Meanwhile, students of social sciences, psychology and education presented the lowest mean value. The data are concordant both for the general and cognitive symptomatology of test anxiety and for anxiety related to the individual and the context, validating the results. Much as Quek et al. (2019) or Vatankehah et al. (2018) found, the prevalence of anxiety was not higher among first-year students, nor were there any notable differences in relation to the university of origin of the students.

Since the students analyzed had chosen to attend universities with face-to-face classes, this was in many cases their first experience with remote electronic exams. Therefore, as indicated by Arora et al. (2021), Elsalem et al. (2021) and Mastour et al. (2021), greater stress was expected with this type of examination, but this had to be confirmed. This study expands the knowledge of the subject and helps confirm the hypothesis.

Nonetheless, in this study, unlike in earlier studies of face-to-face exams, no differences were observed as a function of academic discipline, nor were there any differences between first-year students and those in later years of their degrees. Here, all the students suddenly faced online and remote exams, which may explain the differences found. According to Bisht et al. (2020), technical problems with the electronic exam platform or internet connections may be behind this general increase, since the universities saw the need to implement these exams quickly, without time to train students in their use, or to provide alternatives in case of problems. Wibowo et al. (2016) indicate that problems related to the e-exam platform may include problems password-related, navigating between questions (one-way or two-way), or problems saving and restoring answers. According to Bernik and Jereb (2006) and Birch and de Wolf (2020), the duration of the exam was a critical point, because it was not always calculated appropriately. Meanwhile, as Chirumamilla et al. (2020) and Weiner and Hurtz (2017) indicate, remote

electronic exams involve many challenges, including the possible increase in dishonest behavior among students and the need to implement measures to prevent it, which can increase stress. For all these reasons, and coinciding with Hampton et al. (2020) and Mishra et al. (2020), resources, staff preparation, confidence, accessibility and student motivation are essential to achieve healthy and quality learning, particularly during exceptional circumstances such as COVID-19. That is why it is necessary to prepare and validate systems that will make it possible to deal with future situations without putting the health of students at risk.

Limitations

The results may be influenced by several limitations present in the study. First, the sample includes a high proportion of women. Also, there is a greater representation of Engineering and Computer Science students in the total sample. Second, the ethics approval process meant that it was impossible to gather information on participants before inviting them to enroll in the study. Thus, it is likely that the final sample examined in the study may not be representative of the analyzed groups. Also, the absence of students from private universities prevents the analysis of differences between public/private universities. Third, the cross-sectional design, without a control group to contrast results does not allow conclusions to be drawn as to cause and effect. Finally, the current study relied exclusively on self-report. The nature of the self-report measures has not allowed us to objectively evaluate the associations between the study variables, which could in turn be affected by factors of social desirability. Despite this, the results open up the possibility of continuing research into this matter.

Future implications

Despite their limitations, the findings of this study provide new evidence on the matter. The most notable findings of this study to be taken into account in future research were:

- The highest prevalence of anxiety related to exams in the female gender, and in economics, business and law students, followed by those of arts and humanities, health sciences and other sciences, engineering and computing and those of social sciences, psychology and education.
- The need to analyze and equate the cut-off points applied to the questionnaires in order to be able to carry out comparative analyses of results.

The results of this study were consistent with those of other research that has reported a high prevalence of exam-related anxiety in students. It is recommended to apply interventions to reduce anxiety levels, particularly in the highest risk groups. Although this study was unable to confirm increased anxiety related to remote and online exams, Butler-Henderson & Crawford (2020) indicated that frequent use of online exam

platforms by students helps reduce anxiety associated with them, so training and education in their use can be recommended.

This study also allows us to propose new lines of research. As indicated in the discussion, some common risk factors are confirmed to replicate those of face-to-face examinations, such as gender. However, it has not been possible to verify the influence of the type of university (public/private), nor the effects of socioeconomic or family factors, as these issues were not analyzed. Also, taking into account the limitations discussed above, in future studies it would be advisable to test control groups, which would allow for a more precise estimate of the prevalence. Cause-effect studies also are recommended to delve more deeply into this topic.

Author Disclosure Statement

There are no conflicting interests.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank to participants.

References

- Arbabisarjou, A., Zare, S., Shahrakipour, M. & Ghoreishinia, G. (2016). Analyzing test anxiety among medical sciences students of Zahedan in 2015. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 5(7), 334-337. <http://eprints.zaums.ac.ir/id/eprint/1836>
- Arias, J. A. C., Restrepo, D. P., Ocampo, S. R. & Martínez, J. G. (2015). Prevalencia de ansiedad en estudiantes universitarios. [Prevalence of anxiety in university students.] *Diversitas: perspectivas en psicología*, 11(1), 79-89. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/679/67943296005/movil/>
- Arora, S., Chaudhary, P. & Singh, R. K. (2021). Impact of coronavirus and online exam anxiety on self-efficacy: the moderating role of coping strategy. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 18(3), 475-492. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-08-2020-0158>
- Aziz, N. & Serafi, A. H. (2017). Increasing levels of test anxiety and psychological distress with advancing years of medical education. *British Journal of Medical and Health Research*, 4(3), 40-2. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Bernik, I. & Jereb, E. (2006). Students' readiness for electronic examinations'. In *Proceedings of the 5th WSEAS International Conference on Education and Educational Technology* (pp. 142-145). Tenerife. <https://www.researchgate.net/>
- Birch, E. & de Wolf, M. (2020). A novel approach to medical school examinations during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Medical education online*, 25(1), 1785680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2020.1785680>
- Bisht, R. K., Jasola, S. & Bisht, I. P. (2020). Acceptability and challenges of online higher education in the era of COVID-19: a study of students' perspective. *Asian*

- Education and Development Studies*, 11(2), 401-414. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-05-2020-0119>
- Blanch, D. C., Hall, J. A., Roter, D. L. & Frankel, R. M. (2008). Medical student gender and issues of confidence. *Patient education and counseling*, 72(3), 374-381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2008.05.021>
- Butler-Henderson, K. & Crawford, J. (2020). A systematic review of online examinations: A pedagogical innovation for scalable authentication and integrity. *Computers & Education*, 159, 104024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104024>
- Cañamero, L. M., Cueli, M., Areces, T. G. D. & González-Castro, P. (2021). Autoconcepto y ansiedad: Diferencias entre niños y niñas en una muestra clínica de TDAH. [Self-concept and anxiety: Differences between boys and girls in a clinical sample of ADHD]. *Revista iberoamericana de psicología y salud.*, 12(2), 90-99. <https://doi.org/10.23923/j.rips.2021.02.047>
- Cipra, C. & Müller-Hilke, B. (2019). Testing anxiety in undergraduate medical students and its correlation with different learning approaches. *PloS one*, 14(3), e0210130. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210130>.
- Chirumamilla, A., Sindre, G. & Nguyen-Duc, A. (2020). Cheating in e-exams and paper exams: the perceptions of engineering students and teachers in Norway. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(7), 940-957. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1719975>
- Darabi, M., Aivazi, A. A., Gholami-Parizad, E., Ghazanfari, Z. & Imanzad, M. (2013). Test anxiety among Ilam UMS'students, 2012. *Advances in Nursing & Midwifery*, 23(82), 1-7. <https://journals.sbm.u.ac.ir/en-jnm/article/view/6123>
- Dyrbye, L.N., Thomas, M.R. & Shanafelt, T.D. (2006). Systematic review of depression, anxiety, and other indicators of psychological distress among US and Canadian medical students. *Academic medicine*, 81(4), 354-373. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200604000-00009>
- Elsalem, L., Al-Azzam, N., Jum'ah, A. A., Obeidat, N., Sindiani, A. M. & Kheirallah, K. A. (2020). Stress and behavioral changes with remote E-exams during the Covid-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study among undergraduates of medical sciences. *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*, 60, 271-279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.10.058>.
- Farooqi, Y. N., Ghani, R. & Spielberger, C. D. (2012). Gender differences in test anxiety and academic performance of medical students. *International journal of psychology and behavioral sciences*, 2(2), 38-43. <http://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijpbs.20120202.06>
- Hampton, D., Culp-Roche, A., Hensley, A., Wilson, J., Otts, J. A., Thaxton-Wiggins, A. & Moser, D. K. (2020). Self-efficacy and satisfaction with teaching in online courses. *Nurse educator*, 45(6), 302-306. <http://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000805>
- Ibrahim, A.K., Kelly, S.J., Adams, C.E. & Glazebrook, C. (2013). A systematic review of studies of depression prevalence in university students. *Journal of psychiatric research*, 47(3), 391-400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2012.11.015>
- Jadoon, N. A., Yaqoob, R., Raza, A., Shehzad, M. A. & Zeshan, S. C. (2010). Anxiety and depression among medical students: a cross-sectional study. *JPMA. The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 60(8), 699-702. <https://europepmc.org/article/med/20726214>
- Kavakci, O., Semiz, M., Kartal, A., Dikici, A. & Kugu, N. (2014). Test anxiety prevalence and related variables in the students who are going to take the university entrance examination. *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 27(4), 301. <https://doi.org/10.5350/DAJPN2014270403>
- Khoshhal, K. I., Khairy, G. A., Guraya, S. Y. & Guraya, S. S. (2017). Exam anxiety in the undergraduate medical students of Taibah University. *Medical teacher*, 39(sup1), S22-S26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2016.1254749>
- Lang, P.J. (1968). Fear reduction and fear behavior: Problems in treating a construct. In *Research in psychotherapy conference, 3rd, May-Jun, 1966, Chicago, IL, US*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10546-004>
- Latas, M., Pantić, M. & Obradović, D. (2010). Analysis of test anxiety in medical students. *Medicinski pregled*, 63(11-12), 863-866. <https://doi.org/10.2298/mpns1012863l>
- Liu, Y., Pan, H., Yang, R., Wang, X., Rao, J., Zhang, X. & Pan, C. (2020). Test anxiety and emotion regulation among undergraduate medical students in China: the mediating role of psychological resilience. *Research Square*, 1(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-31326/v1>
- Lovibond, P. F. & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 33(3), 335-343. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967\(94\)00075-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-U)
- Mastour, H., Ghalibaf, A. M. & Niroumand, S. (2021). Remote online exams anxiety during the COVID-19 crisis: a cross-sectional study among medical students. *Research Square*, 1(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-144112/v1>
- Mendoza, M. A. V., Bonifaz, M. A. T., Caluña, W. C. & Tutiven, J. D. H. (2022). Depresión y Ansiedad en Universitarios por Covid-19. [Depression and Anxiety in University Students by Covid-19]. *Polo del Conocimiento: Revista científico-profesional*, 7(2), 71. <https://doi.org/10.23857/pc.v7i2.3709>
- Mishra, L., Gupta, T. & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1, 100012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012>
- Moore, B. (2013). *Test Anxiety and Nursing Students*. Undergraduate Honors Theses. Paper 169. <http://dc.etsu.edu/honors/169>
- Patil, S.G. & Aithala, M.R. (2017). Exam anxiety: Its prevalence and causative factors among Indian

- medical students. *National Journal of Physiology, Pharmacology and Pharmacology*, 7(12), 1323-1328. <http://doi.org/10.5455/njppp.2017.7.0516113072017>
- Quek, T.C, Tam, W.S., Tran, B., Zhang, M., Zhang, Z., Su-Hui Ho, C. & Chun-Man Ho, R. (2019). The global prevalence of anxiety among medical students: a meta-analysis. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(15), 2735. <https://doi.org/10.3390%2Fijerph16152735>
- Rajiah, K., Coumaravelou, S. & Ying, O.W. (2014). Relationship of test anxiety, psychological distress and academic motivation among first year undergraduate pharmacy students. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(2), 68-72. <http://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijap.20140402.04>
- Saravanan, C., Kingston, R. & Gin, M. (2014). Is test anxiety a problem among medical students: a cross sectional study on outcome of test anxiety among medical students. *Int J Psychol Stud*, 6(3), 24. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v6n3p24>
- Tsegay, L., Shumet, S., Damene, W., Gebreegziabhier, G. & Ayano, G. (2019). Prevalence and determinants of test anxiety among medical students in Addis Ababa Ethiopia. *BMC medical education*, 19(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1859-5>
- UdN - University of Navarra (2005). Cuestionario de Autoevaluación de la Exámenes [Exams Anxiety Self-assessment Questionnaire]. https://www.unavarra.es/digitalAssets/112/112234_100000Cuestionario_ansiedad.pdf
- Vatankhah, M., Kalani, N., Rayat Dost, E. & Abiri, S. (2018). Investigation of Anxiety Test in Medical Students of Jahrom University of Medical Sciences: A Cross-sectional, Descriptive Study. *J Biochem Tech*, 2, 114-118.
- Weiner, J. A. & Hurtz, G. M. (2017). A comparative study of online remote proctored versus onsite proctored high-stakes exams. *Journal of Applied Testing Technology*, 18(1), 13-20. <https://jbiochemtech.com/storage/models/article/>
- Wibowo, S., Grandhi, S., Chugh, R. & Sawir, E. (2016). A pilot study of an electronic exam system at an Australian university. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 45(1), 5-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239516646746>
- World Assembly of the Health (2016). *Health in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Report of the Secretariat No. A69/15*. World Health Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/253023>