$$SC_j = NW_j \otimes DVC_j \quad (6)$$

and the obtained score for suitable alternative is calculated through the equation (7):

$$Al \approx \oplus_{j=1}^{n} SC_j. \quad (7)$$

Let us note, that in the present work, $\otimes$ is the usual multiplication, $\oplus$ is the usual addition and $n = 7$.
For example, if the teacher in her/his course is planed two different assessment activities: C1-Quizz and C4-Project/Course work, then she/he is looking for suitable TeSLA instruments for activities implementation. If the rule (5) and equations (6) and (7) are applied, then the result will be the following:

$$SC_1 = NW_1 \otimes DVC_1 = 0.266 \otimes 0.9 = 0.2394,$$
$$SC_4 = NW_4 \otimes DVC_4 = 0.087 \otimes 0.72 = 0.0626,$$
$$Al \approx SC_1 \oplus SC_4 = 0.2394 \oplus 0.0626 = 0.302.$$

The closest alternatives to the obtained score Al are alternatives A12 and A9, including instruments for students' authentication and authorship confirmation.

If the teacher has to perform two equal assessment activities during a course, for example, two quizzes C1, then the obtained score Al is 0.4788 that is close to the alternatives A1 and A2.

In the case when the teacher has to design three assessment activities and two of them are the same, then she/he has to take into account just two different assessment activities at alternative Al calculation. For example, the teacher designs three assessment activities during a course – two quizzes C1 and one online task C7, the she/he will consider just one quiz and one online task and the obtained alternative Al is with score 0.2747. It leads to the alternatives A12 and A9 with instruments for students' authentication and authorship check.

4. Conclusions

In this paper we suggested our ideas how to support teachers to decide which instrument to integrate in their courses and whether they will use one or more TeSLA instruments for one assessment activity. A possible solution for teachers' facilitation in their decision process at assessment activities design is presented. It is based on multi-criteria analysis in fuzzy set theory that leads to alternatives rating according to the assessment activity type. Also, evaluation with fuzzy logic is proposed in the case when teachers have to implement in the TeSLA system two or more assessment activities during one course. At the application stage, it is important for the teachers to understand the advantages of different TeSLA instruments before taking the decision. For this reason, the teachers of the TeSLA team should communicate with them and present the instruments, membership functions and the developed criteria.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by H2020-ICT-2015/H2020-ICT-2015 TeSLA project "An Adaptive Trust-based e-assessment System for Learning", Number 688520.

References

[1] N. Alruwais, G. Wills, and M. Wald: Advantages and Challenges of Using e-Assessment. International Journal of Information and Education Technology. 8(1), January 2018, 34-37.
[2] M. Ivanova, M. Durcheva, D. Baneres, and E. Rodríguez: eAssessment by using a Trustworthy System in Blended and Online Institution. ITHET, IEETeL, Olhao, Algarve, Portugal, April 26-28, 2018.
[3] L. A. Zadeh: Fuzzy Sets. International Journal of Information and Control, 8(3), 1965, 38-353.
[4] A. Nagar: Development of Fuzzy Multi Criteria Decision Making Method for Selection of Optimum Maintenance Alternative. International Journal of Applied Research in Mechanical Engineering (IJARME), ISSN: 2231 –5950, 1(2), 2011, 87-92.
[5] A. Karami and Z. Guo: A Fuzzy Logic Multi-Criteria Decision Framework for Selecting IT Service Providers. Proceedings of the 45th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences HICSS 2012, January 4-7, 2012, Maui, Hawaii, 1118-1127. Available at: http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sis_research/1866
[6] T. A. Thakre, O.K. Chaudhari, and Nita Dhawade: A Fuzzy Logic Multi Criteria Approach for Evaluation of Teachers Performance. Advances in Fuzzy Mathematics, ISSN 0973-533X 12(1), 2017, 129-145.
[7] A. Alekseev, M. Aleksieieva, K. Lozova, and T. Nahorna: Using Fuzzy Logic in Knowledge Tests. Available at: http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1356/paper_4.pdf
[8] A. Kaufmann and M. M. Gupta: Introduction to Fuzzy Arithmetic: Theory and Applications. ISBN-13: 978-1850328810, (Publ. Van Nostrand Reinhold), July 1, 1991.
[9] W. Sałabun: Application of the Fuzzy Multi-criteria Decision-Making Method to Identify Nonlinear Decision Models. International Journal of Computer Applications, 89(15), March 2014.
[10] G. Gokmena, T. Ç. Akincib, M. Tektaú, N. Onatc, G. Kocyigita, and N. Tektaú: Evaluation of student performance in laboratory applications using fuzzy logic. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2, 2010, 902–909.
[11] T. Takagi and M. Sugeno: Fuzzy identification of systems and its applications to modeling and control. IEEE Trans. Sys. Man. Cybern. 1985, 15, 116–132.