

Item Response Theory Analysis **Mechanics** Baseline Test



C. Cardamone*, A. Barrantes, S. Rayyan, D. Seaton, R. E. Teodorescu, A. Wu & D. E. Pritchard

Physics Department, MIT

http://relate.mit.edu

Abstract

*cnc@mit.edu

Item response theory (IRT) provides a more accurate measure of a student's skill than overall test score by employing a Bayesian calculation that considers the individual characteristics of each item (question) the student responds to, right or wrong. It also determines individual item parameters (difficulty, discrimination). In turn, these measure the effectiveness of the item in determining student skill, and identify items with pathological behavior (e.g. less skillful students outperform more skillful ones). These data allow evaluation and improvement of a test.

We present the results from an analysis of the Mechanics Baseline Test given at MIT during 2005-2010. Using the item parameters, we identify questions that are not effective in discriminating between MIT students of different abilities. We show that a limited subset of the highest quality questions on the Mechanics Baseline Test returns accurate measures of student skill. We compare student skills as determined by item response theory to the more traditional measurement of the raw score and show that a comparable measure of learning gain can be computed.

Item Response Theory

The item response function expresses the probability that a student of a given skill level (θ) will answer an item of difficulty (δ) and discrimination (α) correctly. The Item Response Function



- * Item Parameters: accurate and efficient assessments can be designed with the most effective items.
 - ★ Difficulty identifies items most useful in evaluating a given population of students.
 - \star Discrimination determines how effective a given item is at distinguishing high and low skilled students.
- * Student skill: depends on the difficulty and discrimination of each item and are more accurate than a classical test score, which depends only on the number of items correct.





Improving the Test

IRT skill can be computed using a smaller set of items.

- $\begin{array}{c} \underline{21 \ Os: Remove 5 \ questions \ of \ low \ \alpha \ (\underline{Table \ I''a''):} \\ \hline Raw \ test \ score: \ lower \ skill \ students \ get \ even \end{array}$ lower relative scores on the shortened exam. IRT Skills are unchanged (R=0.996), because it discounts the eliminated questions due to their low discrimination.
 - Therefore, we have improved the exam's ability to identify low skill students, making the resulting test score a better representative of the intrinsic student skill.



The gain in IRT skill reflects the same gains seen in the percent correct on the pre and post test.

Skill

IRT

Student



In

%<Post>"- %<Pre>

Items of Poor δ

Items 1 & 2: too easy for the student population

Item 17: students of all skill levels misread

- 17. A car has a maximum acceleration of 3.0 m/s^{-2} . What would its maximum acceleration be while towing a second car twice its mass? (A) 2.5 m/s^2 (B) 2.0 m/s^2 (C) 1.5 m/s^2 (D) 1.0 m/s^2 (E) 0.5 m/s^2
- 60 % of the students answer correctly (average skill θ = 0.07) 30 % select answer c, forgetting to include the mass of the first car
- in their computation (average skill $\theta = -0.19$) Students at the highest skill levels selected both answers
- Further study, including interviews, may suggest alternative wordings to this item that could improve its discrimination value.



4) Indicate the direction of acceleration at I

Skilled students may perceive the track where the block is located to be curved and select "2". In contrast, students of low skill often confuse the concepts of acceleration and velocity and hence select "4".



Students misinterpreting the force as impulsive rather than constant in time will answer this question incorrectly. Looking at their response patterns on the other two questions for this diagram, most students who misinterpret the force to be impulsive in question 22, also answer question 20 assuming that an impulsive force was applied.

References

R. R. Hake, "Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses," American Journal of Physics, 66, 64–74 (1996).