

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALBERTO, P. & TROUTMAN, A. 1990. *Applied behavior analysis for educators*. 3<sup>rd</sup>. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE. 2006. Fouchè, A.P. (Principal Educator); Dlodlo, J. (Senior Educator); Joubert, A.G. (Senior Educator). Department: Process Control and Computer Systems; Vaal University of Technology.
- ATKINSON, R.C. & WILSON, H.A. 1969. *Computer-Assisted Instruction: A Book of Readings*. New York: Academic Press.
- BENNET, R. 1998. Reinventing assessment: speculations on the future of large-scale educational testing, technical report, educational testing service, Princeton [Online]. Available at: <http://www.ets.org/research/pic/bennet.html>. Accessed: 17/09/2005.
- BERK, R. 1986. A consumers guide to setting performance standards on criterion-referenced tests. *Review of educational research*, (56):112-122.
- BLACK, P. & HARRISON, C. 2000. Good practice in science teaching: What research has to say. Formative assessment. Open university Press.
- BLAINE, S. 2005. Curbs on University numbers planned. Business day C/64/05. Wednesday 11 May 2005.
- BLOOM, B.S. 1956. *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans.
- BROWN, G., BULL, J. & PENDLEBURY, M. 1997. *Assessing student learning in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- BRESCIANI, M. J. 2004. *The Assessment of Assessment*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- COGHLAN, D., & BRANNICK, T. 2001. *Doing action research in your own organisation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- COOK, T.D. & CAMPBELL, D.T. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis for Field Settings*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.
- CRONBACH, L.J. 1973. *Essentials of Psychological Testing*. New York: Harper and Row.
- DALZIEL, J. & GAZZARD, S. 1999. Assisting student learning using web-based assessment: An overview of the webmcq system [Online]. Available at: [www.webmcq.com/public/pdfs/ovrview.pdf](http://www.webmcq.com/public/pdfs/ovrview.pdf). Accessed: 14/11/2005.
- DAVIS, A. 1998. *The limits of educational assessment*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.

- DEALE, R.N. 1975. *Asses sment and testing in the secondary school*. London: Evans Bros.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. 1997. A programme for the transformation of Higher Education. General notice - 1196 of 1997. Education white paper 3. 24 July 1997. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/whitepapers/highed.html>. Accessed: 03/03/2000.
- DESSUS, P., LEMAIRE, B. & VERNER, A. 2000. Free-text assessment in a virtual campus. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.umpf-grenoble.fr/sciedu/pdessus/caps00.pdf>. Accessed: 11/05/2005.
- EBEL, R.L. 1979. *Essentials of educational measurement*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- FLEW, A. 1987. *Cultural diversity at schools*. United Kingdom: Routledge.
- FREEMAN, R. & LEWIS, R. 1998. *Planning and implementing assessment*. London: Kogan Page.
- GARDER, L., SHERIDAN, D. & WHITE, D. 2002. A web-based learning and assessment system to support flexible education. *Journal of computer-assisted learning*, 18:125-136.
- GUILFORD, J.P. 1982. *Cognitive psychology's ambiguities: Some suggested remedies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- HEARD, S., NICOL, J. & HEATH, S. 1997. *Setting Effective Objective Tests*. University of Aberdeen: MERTaL.
- HILLS, J.R. 1981. *Measurement and Evaluation in the Classroom*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Company.
- IMRIE, B.W. 1995. Assessment for learning: quality and taxonomies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 20(2):175-189.
- LLOYD-JONES, R. 1986. An overview of assessment. In Lloyd-Jones, R. & Bray, E., *Assessment: From principles to Action*. London: Macmillan Educational Limited.
- MAREE J.G. & FRASER W.J. 2004. *Outcomes-based assessment*. South Africa: Heineman.
- McKENNA, C. & BULL, J. 2000. Quality assurance of computer-assisted assessment: practical and strategic issues. *Quality assurance in Education*, 8(1):24-31.

- McMILLAN, J.N. 1997. *Classroom assessment: principles and practices for effective instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- MEHRENS, W.A. & LEHMAN, I. J. 1969. *Standardized test in education*. New York: Holt: Rinehart and Winston, INC.
- MESSICK, S. & ROSS, J. 1962. *Measurement and personality and cognition*. New York: Wiley.
- NIXON, J. 1981. *An educators guide to action research*. London: Grant McIntyre.
- NUNALLY, J. C. & BERNSTEIN, I.H. 1994. *Psychometric theory*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- METSÄMUURONEN, J. 2002. *Small book of test theory and test construction*. Finland: International methelp KY.
- MILLAN, J. & ARTER, J.A. 1984. Current concerns in validity theory. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 21(4):315-322. December.
- OOSTERHOF, A. 1994. *Classroom applications of educational measurement*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing company.
- O'REILLY, M. & MORGAN, C. 1999. *Online assessment: Creating communities and opportunities*. In Brown S., Race P., & Bull J., eds. *Computer Assisted Assessment in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page SEDA, pp.149-161.
- PAHAD, M. 1997. *Assessment and the national qualifications framework. A guide for educators*. South Africa: Heineman.
- POPHAM, W. J. 1995. *Classroom Assessment: What educators need to know*. Needham Heights, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon.
- PYRCZAK, F. 1973. Validity of discrimination index as a measure of item validity. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, (10) 227–231. Fall.
- RAMASODI, D. 2006. Interview with Mr D. Ramasodi, Information and Technology Director, Vaal University of Technology. Unpublished.
- REDDY, C. H. 2004. Assessment principles and approaches. In *Outcomes-based assessment*. Maree, J.G. & Fraser, W.J., eds. pp. 111-117.
- RIBEIRO, J. 2005. Meeting held at the Vaal University of Technology (VUT) on June 2005. Minutes in possession of the VUT.
- ROID, G.H. 1989. Item writing and item banking by microcomputer: An Update. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 8(3): 17-20. Fall.

- ROID, G. H. 1986. *The future of testing*. Hillsdale, N.J: L.Erlbaum Associates.
- SALVIA, J. & YSSELDYKE, J.E. 2001. *Assessment*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- SAX, G. 1997. *Principles of Educational and Psychological measurements*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Albany, New York: Wadsworth.
- THORNDIKE, R. L. 1961. *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education*. New York: Wiley.
- SLY, L. & RENNIE, L. 1999. *Computer managed learning: its use in formative as well as summative assessment*. In Danson, M. & Sharrat, R., eds. Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> annual CAA conference, Loughborough. pp. 179-189.
- SMITH, B., SCHOLTEN, I., RUSSELL, A. & MCCORMACK, P. 1997. Integrating student assessment practices: the significance of collaborative partnerships for curriculum and professional development in a university department. *Higher Education research and development*, 16(1): 69-86.
- STANLEY, J.C. & HOPKINS, K.D. 1972. *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- SUSMAN, G.I. 1983. *Action research: A sociotechnical systems perspective*. London: Sage.
- SUTHERLAND, L. & PECKHAM, G. 1998. A re-appraisal of assessment practices in the light of the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) Act. *South African journal of Higher Education*, 12(2): 98-103.
- TREDOUX, C. & DURRHEIM, K. 2002. *Numbers, hypotheses & conclusions : a course in statistics for the social sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- VACHA-HAASE, T., KOGAN, L.R. & THOMPSON, B. 2000. Sample compositions and variabilities in published studies versus those in test manuals: Validity of score reliability inductions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(4): 509-522.
- VERMA, K.G. & MALLICK, K. 1999. *Researching education: Perspectives and techniques*. London: Palmer Press.
- VICTOR, H.N. 1965. *Introduction to educational measurement*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- WILKINSON, C.L. & TASK FORCE ON STATISTICAL INFERENCE. 1999. Statistical methods on psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54(8): 594-604.

WITHER, J.R., *ed.* 1994. Conceptual dictionary. Kenwyn: Juta. Department of Education, 1997b: 3.

## WORKSHEET: ASSESSMENT VALIDITY REVIEW

ASSESSMENT TITLE/CODE \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

REVIEWER \_\_\_\_\_

GRADE OR LEVEL \_\_\_\_\_

CURRICULUM/OUTCOME \_\_\_\_\_

When reviewers answer some questions about validity they should examine individual assessment procedures. To answer other questions, such as those about content coverage, reviewers should examine all procedures which will be used to assess a particular curriculum component or learning outcome together.

*Directions:* Indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements by answering “yes,” “no,” or “not sure”.

---

### **Individual Assessment Procedures:**

\_\_\_\_ 1. Content quality: Does the assessment procedure represent the current, best conceptualisation of the content? Is it sufficiently challenging to students, and not trivial or restrictive?

\_\_\_\_ 2. Transfer and generalisability: In your judgment, does the assessment procedure measure student attainment of the curriculum or outcome rather than only the specific knowledge or skills required by the questions or tasks included? Does it sufficiently represent the content of the curriculum or outcome?

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Cognitive complexity: Does the assessment procedure require students to use the higher order or critical thinking skills included in the target of the assessment? Or, can students respond to the question or task using only memory?

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. Meaningfulness: Will the assessment procedure be meaningful to students? Are they likely to see it as relevant?

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. Fairness: Is the assessment procedure likely to be fair to all students? Will all students have the same opportunity to show what they know and can do? Will all have had similar opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills assessed?

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. Cost and efficiency: Do the costs and time requirements of the assessment procedure (for purchase, administration, scoring, etc.) appear reasonable? Or will it cost too much? Will it interfere with instructional time? Will it require too much time for scoring?

**All assessment procedures for an outcome considered as a whole:**

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. Consequences: Are the procedures likely to help improve student learning, or are they likely to narrow what is taught? Will assessment results be used appropriately?

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Content coverage: Will the assessment procedures provide comprehensive information showing whether all important components of the curriculum or outcome have been met? Will they cover the breadth and depth of content enough to provide sufficient evidence?

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Cognitive complexity: Do the assessment procedures as a whole require students to use the higher order learning or critical thinking skills included in the curriculum or outcome, even though individual assessment procedures may not?

For any items answered “no” or “not sure”, explain below why the assessment procedures did not meet the criteria. For individual procedures, record which items or tasks receive a rating of “no” or “not sure”.

---

---

---

SIGNED: \_\_\_\_\_