

Assessing Information-Processing Skills

Sylvia Encheva, Dept. Haugesund, Stord/Haugesund University College,
Bjørnsonsg. 45, 5528 Haugesund, Norway

Sharil Tumin, IT-Dept., University of Bergen, P.O.Box 7800, 5020 Bergen, Norway

Maryna Solesvik, Dept. Haugesund, Stord/Haugesund University College,
Bjørnsonsg. 45, 5528 Haugesund, Norway

Abstract - This paper focuses on Web based assessment of students' conceptual thinking, information-processing skills and decision-making skills. Assessing the level of students' ability to use knowledge in an interrelated way when analyzing and solving problems is also discussed. The impact of guessing is neutralized by combining level of confidence with negative marking.

Keywords: Conceptual thinking, information-processing and decision-making skills, Web based assessment

Introduction

Research suggests that traditional methods of instruction produce greater success in domain specific areas, than those which assist students develop techniques which they can use in multiple topic areas, (de Jong and Ferguson-Hessler, 1996). Most traditional methods of instruction do not seem to assess higher order cognitive skills like critical thinking and reasoning, and focus on discrete components of a domain rather than on the relations among these components.

There is a need for tests assessing the level of students' ability to use knowledge in an interrelated way when analyzing and solving authentic problems. Questions in such tests will ask students to compare different methods, draw together several concepts, evaluate consequences and handle new situations. Understanding of important mathematical ideas and integrating more than one mathematical concept is discussed (Johnstone and Ambusaidi, 2001). A method enabling the instructor to do a post-test correction to neutralize the impact of guessing is developed (Harper, 2003).

Multiple choice (MC) tests can be used to objectively assess cognitive, analytical and other comparatively high-level skills as well as straightforward factual knowledge, (Bush, 2001). More important, MC tests can provide impetus for improving instruction, and increase students' understanding of what they need to know and be able to do.

In this paper we show how tests using rules based automatic scoring methods can assess:

- knowledge of different methods for solving a problem and abilities to recognize several correct answers and concepts
- level of confidence in the correctness of their decision combined with negative marking
- distinguish problems where the provided information is not enough for solving them (a 'Not enough information is given' option) from problems which cannot be solved by a particular student only (a 'Do not know' option)

The impact of guessing is neutralized by enforcement of negative marking and asking students to declare level of confidence for each answer they choose.

Test Types

A test item in an assessment contains *stems* (questions or incomplete sentences) followed by the corresponding putative answers or options - the *key* (correct option) and several *distracters* (incorrect options).

In some MC tests a student is asked to indicate her choice by clicking the radio button next to the answer, which implies that there is only one key among the putative answers. This way of grading does not reward possession of knowledge of different methods for solving a problem and abilities to recognize several correct answers and concepts.

Permutational multiple choice question tests have been used for assessing high-level thinking, Farthing, 1998. An item in such a test has two stems and six putative answers. Usually the student is asked to consider two similar concepts, or two complementary taxonomies. A question is answered correctly if each stem is matched up with the appropriate key. Again this implies only one correct answer. Such a grading does not distinguish a wrong answer caused by miscalculation from a wrong answer caused by lack of conceptual thinking or application of a wrong method.

Other MC tests consist of stems and putative answers where a correct answer gives full credit while an incorrect answer gives zero credit. This grading system does not make a difference between a choice of wrong answer and a choice of a 'Don not know' option. Yet another type of MC tests applies negative marking for choosing a wrong answer to a particular question and thus improve on the problem with the previous type of MC tests. However, both ways of grading imply that a student is 100% confident in her answer.

Being able to properly judge the confidence of one's answers is an important part of being knowledgeable, (Gardner-Medwin, 1995). The paper describes experience from

University College London where medical students are asked to state with each answer their level of confidence (1, 2 or 3) in the correctness of their decision. If the answer is correct, then this is the mark awarded and in a case of a wrong answer the corresponding mark is 0, -2 or -6. Such grading system implies only one correct answer.

One of the common pitfalls of traditional MC tests is that partial answers are not rewarded. A form of MC tests rewarding partial answers called 'liberal' is applied by (Bush, 2001). A question there is followed by three options and a student may choose more than one answer. If the choice contains one option only, provided the correct one, she gets 100% for that question. If she is uncertain and her choice consists of two or three options, again provided one of them is the correct one, she gets 67% or 33% respectively for that question.

Conceptual Thinking

Students' conceptual thinking can be assessed by presenting them with tests where all the correct answers should be chosen and answers require integration of several components or approaches. A check-box may be used as a technical solution.

Consider a test where a student is asked to find all correct answers to every question. The set of putative answers may contain several correct answers and several wrong answers. There is no restriction on the number of correct and wrong options which prevents students from 'intelligent' guessing about the number of correct answers following each question. In addition, we implement different factors for different options where the total sum of all factors after each question is zero. Thus, if a student marks all of them, the resulting mark is zero. Application of different factors allows the examiner to reward partial knowledge and to enforce different deduction for cases like: a simple mistake in calculation, misunderstanding of a concept, lack of knowledge etc.

Assume that a particular question is followed by five putative answers, where two of them are correct and the other three are wrong. The two correct answers have factors 0.6 and 0.4, while the three wrong answers have negative factors -0.1, -0.3 and -0.6 respectively.. If the final mark for that test is negative the system will give zero score.

Such a test is difficult to construct since the teacher should find good putative answers and should choose a suitable way to give the corresponding factors in case they are different. We assign higher factors to correct answers obtained by applying general methods and lower factors to correct answers requiring smart conceptual thinking. This way we are fair to the average student, recognize exceptional thinking and

reward partial knowledge in a sense that a student may recognize only some of the correct answers and still get a positive mark. If the goal is to reward partial knowledge only, another type of assessment may be better applied. For wrong answers we assign the following factors: -0.1 for a small miscalculation which does not lead to a wrong answer to the question, -0.3 for a miscalculation which leads to a wrong answer and -0.6 for choosing a wrong method. Thus we differentiate between lack of understanding and a miscalculation.

Such tests should be constructed using inquiry-based learning principles.

How Much Confidence Do You Have in Your Answer

In our tests we enforce negative marking for a wrong choice and ask students to state a level of confidence (20%, 40%, 60%, 80% or 100%) after each answer. Thus a correct answer is awarded with a positive mark, a wrong answer by a corresponding negative mark and each of them is multiplied by a confidence, selected by the student.

This way of marking is better than a traditional paper and pencil exam where a correct answer is assumed to be supported by 100% of the student's certainty and both a wrong answer or no answer have no effect on the final mark for the test. In that case it is always beneficial for the student to write something, because it can improve the final grade if it is correct and does not make it worse if it is wrong. The Web based assessment principals we use are related to the opinion that students should take part in the assessment process of their work. Another reason to involve this evaluation form in our practice is connected with real life situations. In their future working life students are supposed to make decisions and ask for expert's opinion in case of considerable doubt.

A 'Not enough information is given' option is one of the putative answers following some stems. Students should experience MC tests where some questions may not contain enough information to answer the question or the given data in other questions is more than the information needed for answering the question. Our experience indicates that most students do not apply concepts thought in subject while working with other subjects. For most of them 'Not enough information is given' is equivalent to 'Do not know'.

Method

We consider first year engineering students studying mathematics on undergraduate level. Traditional face to face teaching is supported by a Web based asynchronous

learning system. The system contains lecture notes, problems to be solved during tutorial hours, homework problems, formative and summative assessments. Material in lecture notes is divided in logically discrete instructional steps. Problem sections contain positive examples reinforcing understanding and negative examples establishing conceptual boundaries.

Activities are sequenced for increasing difficulty or complexity. To maximize learning efficiency, learners may be advised to repeat certain sections of material based on results from a diagnostic test, or tests within the sequence of learning activities. As a result of gradual removal of a tutor's support students became independent problem solvers.

Changing assessment methods encourages changing learning methods and results in students shifting from pure memorization to real learning. We believe that different skills should be assessed by different test methods. Further more students are told explicitly about the scoring being used:

- either there is only one correct option among the putative answers or there are several correct options among the putative answers
- negative marking is either enforced or both wrong answered and not answered questions do not effect the final mark
- attach a confidence level or not
- reward partial answers or reward only correct answers.

Conclusion

To prepare students for a job situation where they have to deal with problems which are not yet recognized they should experience solving complex problems with multiple correct answers and requirement for making a decision in a limited amount of time.

In our tests we enforce negative marking for a wrong choice and include an option button where a student declares a level of confidence in the correctness of each answer. Thus a correct answer is awarded with a positive mark, a wrong answer by a corresponding negative mark and both are multiplied by a level of confidence, declared by the student. This way of marking is better than a traditional paper and pencil exam where a correct answer is assumed to be supported by 100% of the student's certainty and both a wrong answer or no answer have no effect on the final mark. In that case is always beneficial for the student to write something, because it can improve the final grade if it is correct and does not make it worse if it is wrong.

We believe that different skills should be assessed by different test methods. Further more students should be told explicitly about the scoring being used - either there is only one correct option or there are several correct options among the putative answers, negative marking is either enforced or both wrong answered and not answered question do not effect the final mark, attach a confidence level or not, reward partial answers or reward only correct answers.

The formal evaluation elicited useful perceptions concerning the effectiveness of the way in which Web based materials and assessments were integrated into lectures and tutorials. Recommendations arising from this formal evaluation will be used for redesigning features in the next version of these materials and assessments.

References

Bush, M.: 2001, 'A multiple choice test that rewards partial knowledge', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 25(2), 157-163.

Farthing, D. W.: 1998, 'Permutational multiple choice questions: An objective and efficient alternative to essay-type examination questions', *Proceedings of 3rd Annual Conference on Integrating Technology into Computer Science Education*, 81-85.

Gardner-Medwin, A.R.: 1995, 'Confidence assessment in the teaching of basic science', *Association for Learning Technology Journal*, 3, 80-85.

Johnstone, A.H. and Ambusaidi A.: 2001, 'Fixed-response questions with a difference', *Chemistry education: Research and practice in Europe*, 2(3), 313-327.

de Jong, T. and Ferguson-Hessler M.G.M.: 1996, 'Types and qualities of knowledge', *Educational Psychologist*, 31, 105-113.

Harper, R.: 2003, 'Correcting computer-based assessments for guessing', *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 19, 2-8.

Thompson, S.D., Martin L., Richards L. and Branson D.: 2003, 'Assessing critical thinking and problem solving using a Web based curriculum for students', *Internet and Higher Education*, 6, 185-191.