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Abstract

This paper reports on an empirical study regarding the generation of automated feedback for a computer-adaptive test (CAT) application. In the study reported here, two groups of Computer Science undergraduate students participated in a session of assessment using our CAT application (N=106 and N=82). Participants had 40 minutes to answer 30 questions organised into 5 topics within the Visual Basic.Net subject domain. Participants were provided with feedback on CAT performance via a web-based application specially designed and implemented for this purpose. The feedback provided was divided into three sections: overall proficiency level, performance in each topic and recommended topics for revision. Thirty-one participants from the first group and 25 participants from the second group rated the usefulness of the feedback provided from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). The mean values obtained for the usefulness of the feedback provided were respectively, 4.10 and 3.52. These results were taken to indicate that learners’ attitude towards the feedback approach employed was positive overall.

Introduction

Computer-adaptive tests (CATs) are computer-assisted assessment applications in which Item Response Theory (IRT) (Lord, 1980; Wainer, 2000) is employed to adapt the level of difficulty of the test to each test-taker’s proficiency level within a subject domain.

At the University of Hertfordshire, a CAT prototype has been designed, implemented and evaluated (Lilley & Barker, 2002; Barker & Lilley, 2003; Lilley et al., 2004). The CAT application comprises a graphical user interface, an adaptive algorithm based on the Three-Parameter Logistic Model (Lord, 1980; Wainer, 2000) from IRT and a database of questions. All questions in the question database are classified according to topic and Bloom’s taxonomy of cognitive skills (Bloom, 1956; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).
Findings from previous studies (Barker & Lilley, 2003; Lilley & Barker, 2003) suggested that the CAT approach was a fair assessment method, capable of offering consistent and accurate measurement of learner proficiency levels. Conejo et al. (2000), Fernandez (2003), He & Tymms (2004), Yong & Higgins (2004) amongst others have also reported the benefits of the CAT approach in a wide range of educational contexts.

In spite of the substantial work that has been conducted in this area, research on how CAT proficiency level estimates could be employed to support learners’ individual development has received relatively little attention from academic staff and educational researchers.

As part of our research into how such proficiency level estimates can be employed to provide learners with timely and meaningful feedback on their performance, a second version of our feedback prototype has been constructed and evaluated by a group of learners. The first version of our feedback prototype is described in full in Lilley et al. (2004).

**Background information on assessment sessions**

Two groups of Computer Science undergraduate students, Group 1 (N=106) and Group 2 (N=82), participated in a session of summative assessment using our CAT application.

The assessment session took place in computer laboratories, under supervised conditions. Participants had 40 minutes to answer 30 questions organised into 5 topics within the Visual Basic.Net subject domain. The topics covered in the test are listed in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 1 summarises the performance of both groups of participants. Values for the proficiency level ranged from -3 (lowest) to +3 (highest). In a CAT, the estimated proficiency level for a given learner depends not only on the number of questions answered correctly but also on the level of difficulty of the questions administered during the assessment session. A discussion on how proficiency levels are estimated using IRT is beyond the scope of this paper and the interested reader is referred to Lord (1980) and Wainer (2000). The approach to proficiency level estimate used in the prototype introduced here is described in detail by Lilley & Barker (2002), Barker & Lilley (2003) and Lilley & Barker (2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Correct Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of learners’ overall performance

Tables 2 and 3 summarise learners' performance according to topic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 1</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Correct Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Visual Basic.Net Development Environment</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes and Controls</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing data: Variables and Constants</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions and Expressions</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Flow</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Performance according to topic for Group 1 (N=106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 2</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Correct Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Visual Basic.Net Development Environment</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes and Controls</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing data: Variables and Constants</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions and Expressions</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Flow</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Performance according to topic for Group 2 (N=82)

About the feedback approach employed

It was intended that feedback on assessment performance should be made available to learners via a web-based application. This web-based application is an enhancement of the previous version described in Lilley et al. (2004b). The previous version of the feedback made use of an MS Word email attachment to deliver feedback on performance. The current enhanced version was designed to avoid compatibility issues associated with the use of MS Word. It also enabled the number of times learners used the application to be logged.

It was intended that learners should receive feedback on overall proficiency level, performance in each topic and recommended topics for revision.
Overall proficiency level

The overall proficiency level (Lilley et al., 2004b) was obtained by employing the Three-Parameter Logistic Model from IRT (Lord, 1980; Wainer, 2000). Figure 1 illustrates how this information was displayed to learners.

![Feedback on Visual Basic.Net Multiple-Choice Test 1](image)

**Figure 1. Screenshot of overall proficiency level table. Learner's personal details have been omitted**

Performance in each topic

The Three-Parameter Logistic Model from IRT (Lord, 1980; Wainer, 2000) was also employed to estimate a proficiency level per topic. An important assumption of our work is that learners' proficiency levels per topic could be mapped into Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive skills (Lilley et al., 2004b). For instance, a proficiency level between -3 and -1 would indicate that the cognitive skill *knowledge* has been demonstrated. A proficiency level between -1 and 1 would be taken as evidence that the cognitive skills *knowledge* and *comprehension* have been achieved. Finally, a proficiency level between 1 and 3 would denote that the learner has demonstrated the cognitive skills *knowledge*, *comprehension* and *application*. Higher level cognitive skills are deemed to include all lower level skills. So, a question classified as *application* is assumed to embrace both *comprehension* and *knowledge*.

In the work reported by Lilley et al. (2004b), sentences constructed in the light of Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive skills were employed to provide learners with feedback on their performance per topic. Such sentences, however, were deemed 'too long' by some learners who participated in the evaluation of the first version of the feedback prototype. Hence, in the current version of the feedback tool, a pictorial representation was employed instead. This pictorial representation is illustrated in Figure 2.
Recommended topics for revision

Recommended points for revision were extracted from a feedback database, based on the questions answered incorrectly by each learner. Statements in the database comprised directive feedback optionally followed by links to online resources, as illustrated in Figure 3.

Although intrinsically related to the questions answered incorrectly by each learner, the feedback sentences did not replicate the questions themselves. The rationale was that providing learners with a copy of the questions and respective key answers would not foster reflection and/or research (Ellis & Ratcliffe, 2004; Lilley et al., 2004b). Moreover, it is often argued that increased exposure of questions would jeopardise their use in future assessment.
sessions. The possibility of reusing questions is one of the expected benefits of the creation and maintenance of a database of questions (Freeman & Lewis, 1998).

**Learners’ perceived usefulness of the feedback approach employed**

Thirty-one participants from Group 1 and 25 participants from Group 2 rated the usefulness of the feedback provided from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful) using the web page shown in Figure 4. Their responses are summarised in Table 4.

![Figure 4. Web page used by participants to rate the usefulness of the feedback](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Learners’ perceived usefulness of the feedback approach employed

It can be seen from Table 4 that the feedback approach was well received by the group of learners. Participants also entered some free text comments using the text box provided. Although one participant suggested that s/he “was already aware of some of the information on this feedback page”, most learners seemed to value the “Recommended Points for Revision” section. The following examples illustrate their views on this section of the feedback page:

- "I found it useful, gave me an idea of what to revise and work harder on.”
"I now know where I’m going wrong and know how to find out more about the areas of which I scored low marks."

"I rated this as very useful this is because this does not only allows you check your results but this contain enough updated information on required main topics with useful information, where it can be very useful for revisions."

"This feedback page is good because it gives you an insight as to what questions you failed on. It also gives you links to pages that can help you with the questions you did not answer correctly."

"This is very useful. It is good to know the exact areas in which I need to work harder."

Summary and Concluding Remarks

This paper focuses on the second version of the automated feedback tool for a CAT application described by Lilley et al. (2004).

In the automated feedback prototype described here, learners are provided with information on their overall proficiency levels, proficiency levels per topic and recommended points for revision. Overall proficiency level and proficiency level per topic are calculated using an adaptive algorithm based on the Three-Parameter Logistic Model from IRT. Recommended points for revision are selected from a database based on proficiency level estimates and questions answered incorrectly. Individualised feedback on performance is then made available to learners via a web-based application.

Individual automatic feedback for summative assessment is a useful tool for both tutors and learners. We argue that this has been made easier and more informative by the CAT approach. The encouraging results reported here merit further research and we are currently engaged in collecting views from academic staff on the feedback approach introduced here.
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