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ABSTRACT**

This paper introduced the new diagnostic method for detecting misconceptions. The method was based on the rule assessment approach which stated that each testee had various rules of operation, and that the same responses might be obtained from the same or different rules. Therefore, the rule assessment of the whole set of testee’s responses would make possible the tracing back of the rule and the diagnosis of the testee’s misconceptions. This diagnostic process consisted of 3 steps: the first one was the developing of cognitive patterns in accordance with the concept of the content wanted to be diagnosed; the second one was the construction of item forms and the test in such a way that the response pattern could be traced back to get the testee’s cognitive pattern; the last one was the two-step diagnostic process: exploratory diagnosis and confirmatory diagnosis. From the diagnostic method for misconceptions in mathematics, the negative signed-number addition, of a sample of 940 grade 8 students, it was found that the diagnostic result of the developed method was stable and had criterion-related validity when the teachers’ diagnostic


result were used as a criterion. This method provided diagnostic result consistently with that of the Rule Space model’s, and was able to avoid the limitation of the Rule Space model; i.e. - to discriminate misconceptions of the testees whose item score response patterns were the same or all zero’s. In addition, the computer program written from this diagnostic method functioned as planned.

INTRODUCTION

Recently several researchers from various disciplines such as cognitive psychology and psychometrics have developed rule assessment methods for diagnosing students’ misconceptions. Researchers from each of these disciplines were motivated by an interest in knowledge structure and development in human cognition (i.e. Anderson (1981) and Siegler (1976) from cognitive psychology, and Tatsuoka (1982) from cognitive psychometrics) Tatsuoka and associates (Tatsuoka, 1983a, 1983b, 1985, 1987; Tatsuoka & Tatsuoka, 1985, 1987) have developed a systematic approach to the study of psychometric properties of misconceptions such as the stability of misconceptions committed by a student throughout a test.

Diagnosis of misconceptions can provide useful information in evaluating instruction and instructional materials and can suggest specific prescription for remediating a student. For example, the source of many of the misconceptions constructed by students is the ambiguity of explanation or the lack of precise, accurate instruction (Harnisch & Tatsuoka, 1991). Multiple-choice type diagnostic test is more widely popular in Thailand than other methods. This kind of test can diagnose student’s misconception by the choice he/she chooses which is in accordance with the provided misconceptions. In fact there are a lot of misconceptions committed by the students in a specific content, but each item in the test can contain only four or five choices. The students might have other misconceptions which are not in the choices but they must choose one of the provided choices. In addition, the same choices could be obtained from various misconceptions that are not always the specific misconception provided by the test-maker and either the right choices could be obtained from misconceptions. To avoid these limitations of the multiple-choice type diagnostic test, personal indices (Drasgow, 1982; Harnisch, 1981, 1983; Harnisch and Linn, 1981, 1982; Harnisch and Tatsuoka, 1983; Sato, 1975; Wright and Stone, 1979) designing to summarized response patterns are used for detecting anomalous patterns which may result from application of some erroneous rules, but they have only limited power. For instance, these indices cannot diagnose sources of misconceptions or provide prescriptive information for
remediating students. Nevertheless, the use of personal indices is economical and applicable to general areas because such indices can first be used to spot candidates among students who may possibly possess misconceptions and may hence need personal attention from teachers. This procedure seem to be widely used in Japan (Tatsuoka, 1983). To get the more information for the misconceptions diagnosis beyond the personal indices’ capability, Tatsuoka and associates (Tatsuoka, 1983a, 1983b, 1985, 1986; Tatsuoka & Tatsuoka, 1983, 1987) have developed a new probabilistic model for handling actual response patterns together with theoretically estimated response curves. This model has been named the Rule Space model. The model begins by mapping all response patterns in a cartesian product space \( \{0, f(x)\} \), called rule space. Mapping is accomplished using the Standardized Extented Caution Index and the true score \( \theta \) following the Item Response Theory. This approach facilitated the discovery that a large number of actual response patterns match response patterns associated with some erroneous rule of operation by examining the proximity of a student’s position in the rule space to the position represented by the erroneous rules. The Rule Space model has the limitation to discriminate misconceptions of the testees whose item score response patterns were the same or all zero’s and it does not suitable to use in the classroom level because this model, applying Item Response Theory, has to take a large number of student to estimate the parameters in the model. The developed diagnostic method which is based on rule assessment approach was designed to handle the limitations of the previous approaches and provide the exact prescriptive information for remediating each student who has misconception.

**RULE ASSESSMENT APPROACH**

The rule assessment approach (Seigler, 1976) focused upon conceptual development. It can be summarized in terms of five core assumptions.

1. Children’s conceptual understanding progresses through a regular sequence of qualititatively discrete rules.

2. These rules are ordered in terms of increasing correlation with the correct rule in environments that the children encounter. Children will not adopt a new rule that is less highly correlated with the correct rule than the rule that they are already using.

3. The effectiveness of a learning experience is largely determined by whether the learning experience distinguished the child’s existing rule from the correct rule. If the learning experience does not discriminate between the two rules, the child will continue to use the original rule. If the learning experience does discriminate between the two rules, the child will either adopt a more advance rule or will enter into a “rule search” state character-
ized by uncertainty as to which rule is correct.

4. A major reason why children do not immediately adopt the correct rule for all concepts and why they have difficulty in learning it consists in the limited encoding of the correct rules' component dimensions. Understanding of concepts frequently requires integration of several component dimensions. Failure to encode one or more of them can restrict children’s ability to learn the concepts.

5. Failure to encode a dimension may be caused by lack of knowledge of the dimension’s importance or lack of perceptual salience relative to other dimensions in the situation in which the concept is to be applied. Increasing a child’s knowledge of the dimension’s importance or increasing the dimension’s salience can lead to improve ability to learn, which in turn can lead to improve knowledge. Central to this approach is a methodology for determining which rule an individual child is using. According to this approach, each testee had various rules of operation, and that the same responses might be obtained from the same or different rules. Therefore, the rule assessment of the whole set of testee’s responses would make possible the tracing back of the rule and the diagnosis of the testee’s misconceptions.

THE DEVELOPED DIAGNOSTIC METHOD

The developed diagnostic method consisted of 3 steps: the development of the rules of operation; the construction of item forms and the test; and the two-step diagnostic process. The first step was the development of cognitive patterns or the rules of operation in accordance with the concept of the content wanted to be diagnosed. A rule was a description of a set of procedures or operations that one used in solving a problem in some well-defined domain such as arithmetic. A right rule was defined as a rule that produced the right answer to every item in a test, but an erroneous rule might fortuitously yeild the right answer for some subset of the items (Tatsuoka & Tatsuoka, 1987). The rules were developed on the basis of logical analysis of the task of solving signed-number addition problems and on analysis of actual responses given by students on a test, followed by clinical interviews. In this study 126 rules of the sign-number addition were developed. Table I describes three examples of the signed-number addition rule.
### TABLE I
The Sets of Response Generated by Three Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Rule 1-2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rule 2-1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rule 2-4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (-9 + 3)</td>
<td>(-6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (-6 + (-2))</td>
<td>(-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (2 + (-7))</td>
<td>(-5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) (-4 + 8)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) (-3 + (-9))</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) (5 + (-3))</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rule 1-2: If the signs of the two numbers are same then the student adds the two absolute values together and takes the sign of the number with the smaller absolute value in his/her answer.

Rule 2-1: The two numbers are always added and the sign of the number with the larger absolute value is always taken in the answers.

Rule 2-4: The two numbers are always added as seen in Rule 2-1 but the negative sign is always taken in the answers.

The second step was the construction of item forms and the test in such a way that the response pattern could be traced back to get the testee’s cognitive pattern. The basic strategy that has been used involves the formulation of problem types that yield distinct patterns of correct answers and errors for students using different rules. The six item forms were formulated for the content of the signed-number addition and used to construct the test as shown in figure I.
ITEM FORMS

1) \(-L + (-S)\)
2) \(-S + (-L)\)
3) \(L + (-S)\)
4) \(S + (-L)\)
5) \(-L + S\)
6) \(-S + L\)

L : The number with the larger absolute value
S : The number with the smaller absolute value

TEST

1. \(-9 + 3 =\)
2. \(-6 + (-2) =\)
3. \(2 + (-7) =\)
4. \(-4 + 8 =\)
5. \(-3 + (-9) =\)
6. \(5 + (-3) =\)

FIGURE I The six item forms for the content of the signed-number addition and the test.

The last step was the two-step diagnostic process: exploratory diagnosis and confirmatory diagnosis.

Exploratory Diagnosis: After formulating the response sets of each rule, the student’s response set was compared with the response set of the rule one by one. All of 126 rules generated unique response sets. Therefore, the results of the comparisons were classified into three cases.

CASE I: Student’s response set was the same as the response set of a rule. It will be diagnosed that he/she used that rule.
EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s response</th>
<th>Rule produced the same response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) $-9 + 3$</td>
<td>$-6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) $-6 + (-2)$</td>
<td>$8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) $2 + (-7)$</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) $-4 + 8$</td>
<td>$-4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) $-3 + (-9)$</td>
<td>$12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) $5 + (-3)$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASE II : Student’s response set was not absolutely the same as the response set of any rules, but it was mostly like the response sets of only one rule. It will be diagnosed that he/she used that rule.

EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s response</th>
<th>Rule produced the same response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) $-9 + 3$</td>
<td>$-6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) $-6 + (-2)$</td>
<td>$9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) $2 + (-7)$</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) $-4 + 8$</td>
<td>$4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) $-3 + (-9)$</td>
<td>$12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) $5 + (-3)$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The response set of Rule 1–7 was -6, 8, -5, 4, 12, 2).

CASE III : Student’s response set was not absolutely the same as the response set of any rules, but it was mostly like the response sets of more than one rule. This student had to be diagnosed in the confirmatory diagnosis process.

EXAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s response</th>
<th>Rule produced the same response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) $-9 + 3$</td>
<td>$-6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) $-6 + (-2)$</td>
<td>$-8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) $2 + (-7)$</td>
<td>$-5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) $-4 + 8$</td>
<td>$4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) $-3 + (-9)$</td>
<td>$12$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) $5 + (-3)$</td>
<td>$2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(The response set of Rule 1-1 was -6, -8, -5, 4, -12, 2
The response set of Rule 1-7 was -6, 8, -5, 4, 12, 2)

**Confirmatory Diagnosis**: The students in case III had to be diagnosed by taking the confirmatory test. It is a true or false type test constructed from the previous test by selecting the items that are not be found all the suspect rules. From case III item I and item V are selected to construct the true or false type test which the provided answer of each item is generated from the rule that cannot be found in the his/her answer in the previous test.

**CONFIRMATORY TEST**

1) \[ -6 + (-2) = 8 \]
2) \[ -3 + (-9) = -12 \]

The provided answer of item 1 is generated from the rule 1-7 and the answer of item 2 is generated from the rule 1-1. The students’ response can be generated into two cases.

**CASE I**: True and false or false and true response.

1) \[ / -6 + (-2) = 8 \]
2) \[ x -3 + (-9) = -12 \]

The student with these responses is diagnosed to have rule 1-7.

1) \[ x -6 + (-2) = 8 \]
2) \[ / -3 + (-9) = -12 \]

The student with these responses is diagnosed to have rule 1-1.

**CASE II**: All true or false response.

The student with all true or all false responses is diagnosed to have no consistent rules or use guessing.
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE DEVELOPED METHOD

The developed method was used to diagnose misconceptions of a sample of 940 grade 8 students. It was found that the diagnostic result of the developed method was stable and had criterion-related validity when the teachers’ diagnostic result were used as a criterion. This method provided diagnostic result consistently with that of Rule Space model’s, and was able to avoid the limitation of Rule Space model; i.e. – to discriminate misconceptions of the testees whose item score response patterns were the same or all zero’s. In addition, the computer program written from this diagnostic method functioned as planned.

CONCLUSION

The developed diagnostic method, by comparing the students’ response sets to the rules’ response sets with the confirmatory test for some students, facilitates diagnosis of the misconception that resulted in the erroneous rule. Students’ responses are often affected by random errors produced by uncontrollable factors (Harnisch & Tatsuoka, 1991). The developed method enables us to take into account the careless, the erroneous rules, and the guessing. This approach for classifying students’ error patterns avoid some of the weakness of personal indices, such as the problems of setting cut-off scores for determining atypicality of response patterns, dependence on a baseline ordering of items, and the lack of prescriptive information for remediating. In addition, it decreases the limitation of the Rule Space model; i.e. – to discriminate misconceptions of the testees whose item score response patterns were the same or all zero’s.
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