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Abstract:

Introduction: An examination based on Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs) serves as an excellent tool of assessment. This modality eliminates subjectivity and makes scoring of answer sheets time efficient. It is, thus, not surprising that this modality is used frequently. MCQ may lose its value altogether due to presence of Item Writing Flaws (IWFs) and must be designed well for examination to remain valuable as a truthful assessment tool. Therefore, it is a routine practice to subject MCQs to prevalidation by experienced faculty, before including these in the question paper. This study looked at the IWFs detected at the stage of prevalidation, with a view to recommend measures to prevent the same.

Methods: One thousand draft MCQs were prevalidated. The IWFs were classified, tabulated and critically analyzed wherever required. The precise cause of the IWFs was arrived at and suitable rectificatory measures listed.

Observations: IWFs were discovered in 45% of the MCQs. Flawed MCQs mostly (84%) had a solitary IWF with only 15% had two each. More than two flaws in an MCQ were rare.

Results: Most of the IWFs were traceable to carelessness with the usage of language. Only 7% were traceable to suboptimal knowledge of content.

Conclusion: The single most effective measure to prevent IWFs is sensitization of the faculty to the issue. Due importance must be given to the optimal use of language. Content knowledge of the faculty was not found to have been a major issue.
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Introduction:

In ancient Greece, Socrates tested his students through conversations, the ‘Socratic method’. Frederick J. Kelly, University of Kansas, was the first to use multiple choice questions (MCQs) as part of a large scale assessment in 1914. A strong correlation has been reported between the scores of MCQs and essay questions.¹,² Well-constructed MCQs are considered a satisfactory replacement and even superior to essay questions in testing the higher cognitive skills of undergraduate medical students and high stakes exit examinations.³-⁵ Use of well-constructed MCQs has been reported the most accurate measure of student achievement compared with other forms of evaluations including written assignments.⁶ Advantages of this method include ease of administration, even to a large group of students, avoidance of subjectivity and prompt optical reader aided scoring of the answers. As the factors irrelevant to the assessed material, such as handwriting and
clarity of presentation, do not come into play, grading is based purely on the knowledge of the topic. Administration of examinations based on MCQs, thus, remains an efficient method of assessment at various entrance examinations as well as the formative and summative assessments during MBBS course.\textsuperscript{[1,3,4,6]} However, to remain effective, it is of paramount importance that a high standard of quality of MCQs be maintained. Those with item writing flaws (IWFs) are unlikely to be good assessment tools.\textsuperscript{[7,8]} Flawed items have been reported 0-15 percentage points more difficult than standard items measuring the same construct.\textsuperscript{[9]} Thus high-achieving students have been reported more likely than borderline students to be penalized by such items.\textsuperscript{[10]} IWFs have been reported even in the MCQs of continuing medical education (CME) activities published by major medical journals.\textsuperscript{[11-13]} Prevalidation has been recommended to reduce the occurrence of IWFs and to improve the quality of test questions.\textsuperscript{[14]} Guidelines are available for sound construction of MCQs and must be exploited.\textsuperscript{[5,15-18]} Sensitization of faculty to the issue of occurrence of various types of IWFs and possible means to avoid those go a long way in maintaining a high standard & thus utility of MCQs.\textsuperscript{[19-21]}

**Aims & Objectives:**

This study aimed to analyze the occurrence of IWFs, classify, find the causes and recommend means to avoid the same while constructing MCQs.

**Material & Methods:**

One thousand MCQs drafted by faculty, for formative assessment of I MBBS students in Physiology, were subjected to prevalidation. All the MCQs were supposed to have the question (stem), followed by four choices of answers (options), amongst which there were to be one correct answer (key) and three incorrect answers (distracters). The IWFs noted were classified & tabulated. This study was initiated under the guidance of Medical Education Technology Unit, Dr. DY Patil Medical College, Hospital & Research Centre, Pune, as part requirement of ‘Basic Course Workshop in Medical Education Technologies’.
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Observations & Results:

Table 1. Frequency of occurrence of IWFs in MCQs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MCQs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without any IWFs</td>
<td>549 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawed</td>
<td>451 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Frequency of coexistence of IWFs in flawed MCQs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MCQs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCQs with a solitary IWF</td>
<td>379 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCQs with two IWFs</td>
<td>68 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCQs with three IWFs</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCQs with four IWFs</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>451 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Distribution of the different types of IWFs [No. (%)]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MCQs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stem: Not matching the options grammatically</td>
<td>16 (03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clear-cut</td>
<td>61 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative statement not highlighted</td>
<td>26 (05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options (general): Repeated words</td>
<td>168 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not following an ascending/descending order for values</td>
<td>10 (02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options (key): Other than one key</td>
<td>77 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values not from a standard textbook</td>
<td>05 (&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well deliberated</td>
<td>05 (&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowed down to two options</td>
<td>02 (&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options (distracter): Ruled out/synonymous/obvious/ineffective to be useful</td>
<td>19 (04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous: Spelling mistakes</td>
<td>40 (08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suboptimal usage of language</td>
<td>94 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not test any important issue</td>
<td>05 (&lt;1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>528 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:
Forty five percent MCQs revealed IWFs. Our results fare better than 46% - 47% reported by Tarrant M, et al, 65% by Downing SM, 68% by Kühne-Eversmann L, et al and 100% by Stagnaro-Green AS, et al. Our results are marginally adverse compared to 43% reported by DiSantis DJ. 15% of the flawed MCQs revealed multiple IWFs.

The single most common (32%) IWF was ‘repeated words’ in the options. In most (87%) instances these repeated words could be easily incorporated in the stem, though a few (7%) necessitated ingenuity. Thus, very awareness of this type of IWF will keep it from creeping in. This underlines the need for sensitization of the faculty. On about 6% occasions, ‘repeated words’ could be totally dispensed with.

The second most common IWF (18%) was ‘suboptimal usage of language’. Poorly constructed sentences accounted for most (67%) instances of this type of error. This type of IWF showing ‘awkward construction’ has also been reported by Gutmann A, et al, in the MCQs included in CME of a journal. The rest were due to grammatical errors (26%) & presence of redundant words (7%). Fifteen percent cases of grammatical errors ended up giving away the key.

15% MCQs had other than one key. There were instances of no key (19%), two keys (61%), three keys (8%) & all four keys (12%). The reasons for this type of IWF included suboptimal knowledge or comprehension of content (91%), carelessness in framing the MCQs (4%), suboptimal use of language (4%) & values taken from non-standard textbooks (1%).

Stem ‘not clear-cut’ accounted for 12% of the IWFs. Most important cause (75%) of this type of IWF was found to be just poor construction of stem, not originating from suboptimal content knowledge. Only in 25% cases it was due to suboptimal content knowledge. In two instances, poor construction of thestem even gave away the key.

Spelling mistakes accounted for 8% of the IWFs, occurring more often (60%) in technical terms. The rest (40%) mistakes related to common English & seemed to be attributable to ‘autocorrect function of Windows’ or typographic error. All these can be avoided by adding these terms to the ‘Windows dictionary’ and a thorough proof reading. Inability to remove a misspelt word inadvertently added to Windows dictionary remains a problem.

Another 5% of the IWFs were attributed to ‘negative statement not highlighted’ in the stem. Mere awareness of this type of IWF will prevent it.

Distracter being ‘ruled out/ synonymous/ obvious/ ineffective to be useful’ contributed 4% IWFs. Most (68%) were due to suboptimal understanding of the content, some (21%) due to just poor deliberation while constructing and a few (11%) due to typographical error. Such IWFs comprising ‘Non-functioning Distractors’ were reported in 58% MCQs by Hingorjo MR, et al and the author has recommended three functioning distractors should be incorporated in MCQs.

The IWF ‘Stem not matching the options grammatically’ accounted for 3% of the IWFs. However, at times the stem did not match many or even all the distracters, turning this IWF innocuous enough to be a problem. This type or IWF showing ‘unintentional cues’ has also been reported by Gutmann A, et al, in the MCQs included in the CME of a journal.

Options ‘not following an ascending/ descending order for values’ accounted for 2% of the IWFs. Giving values in a particular order prevents avoidable
confusion as well as loss of valuable examination time. This type of IWFs will also be prevented by just being aware.

‘Not well deliberated’ key accounted for less than 1% of the IWFs. These were due to suboptimal content understanding (60%), suboptimal usage of language (20%) & suboptimal deliberation (20%).

MCQ ‘Does not test any important issue’ also accounted for less than 1% of the IWFs. However this type of IWF assumes significance and must be kept in mind while composing MCQs for specialist CME in print media that need to be based on key message of the CME.\[25\]

**Conclusion:**
Occurrence of IWFs is a reality. If not careful, the composer of MCQs may inadvertently introduce these.\[11-13\] It is important to pay attention to not only the content of MCQ but also the correct usage of the language and proper deliberation to avoid IWFs. Most of the IWFs can be avoided by sensitizing the composer to the issue, paying attention to the language, avoiding carelessness, using values from the standard textbooks, using ‘spellcheck’ of ‘Windows’, adding technical terms to ‘Windows’ dictionary and a thorough proof reading. Prevalidation of MCQs serves to improve the quality. Mere sensitizing the composer to the issue will ward off majority of the IWFs. With that end in mind, faculty must be exposed to faculty development programs to sensitize them to the common IWFs, nuisance thereof and the relative ease with which these can be avoided.\[14\]
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