

**How Do Assessors Mark? The Process of Assessing Written
Work Produced by Students in Higher Education**

**Submitted by Calum Milne Delaney to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of *Doctorate of Education in Education*
June 2012**

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(Signature).....

Abstract

Much research into assessment has concentrated on its role in learning and educational practice, issues relating to objectivity and reliability in assessment, and the political and policy implications of assessment more generally. The means by which assessors arrive at their judgement has received comparatively little attention and remains obscure. There has been a focus on factors relating to the product rather than the subjectively experienced process of assessment. A greater understanding of the process is important for the validity of assessment and its wider consequences for students and others.

The aim of this study was to examine how assessors conceptualise and carry out the assessment of discursive writing produced by students in a higher education context. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with experienced lecturers in health care subjects. The interviews and the data analysis were approached from within a hermeneutic phenomenological tradition, involving both description and interpretation. The participants' descriptions provided an analogue of what they thought they did cognitively as they assessed. These texts were then subjected to interpretation negotiated with participants to develop an understanding of the assessment process.

There were two main findings relating to how participants carried out the process of assessment. Firstly, they made use of a framework of meanings that appeared in part to arise from the practice of evaluating in terms of grade-bands. These were viewed as having categorical identities with discontinuities between them, as opposed to representing ranges within a continuous scale. The data suggested that there were changes in the aspects of writing to which assessors paid attention (content versus argument/integration and components versus the whole), and the kinds of judgements they made (quantitative versus qualitative), at different points along the grade band scale.

Secondly, the participants made use of six categories of processes during the course of performing an assessment. Some were objective and analytical while others were more subjective and integrative. They were not carried out sequentially, but appeared to be determined by the demands of the assessment task and to serve a function of simplification. The variety of processes within each category, their co-occurring usage and interdependence, and the selective use (or awareness) of processes by different assessors may help to explain some of the apparent complexity inherent in the assessment task, and the difficulty that experienced assessors demonstrate when trying to explain what it is they do and how they do it.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| List of Tables | 9 |
| List of Figures | 9 |
| Acknowledgements | 11 |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | |
| Motivation for the research | 15 |
| The broader context of assessment | 18 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review | |
| Introduction | 23 |
| Meaning-making | 24 |
| Criteria | 28 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | 28 |
| <i>Assessment reliability</i> | 29 |
| <i>Sources of criteria</i> | 31 |
| <i>Writing as a generic skill</i> | 32 |
| <i>Writing as a means of communication</i> | 33 |
| <i>Criteria as properties of the written text</i> | 34 |
| <i>Writing as socialisation versus negotiation</i> | 35 |
| <i>Departures from explicit assessment criteria</i> | 37 |
| <i>Variations in writing quality and criteria</i> | 39 |
| <i>The grading system</i> | 41 |
| <i>Grades as measurements</i> | 42 |
| <i>Summary</i> | 44 |
| Judgement | 46 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | 46 |

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Reading, interpretation, evaluation and judgement in assessment decision-making</i> | 47 |
| <i>Cognitive aspects of decision-making</i> | 49 |
| <i>Dual-process decision-making and writing assessment</i> | 52 |
| <i>Thinking processes while assessing</i> | 54 |
| <i>An initial model of the assessment process</i> | 57 |
| <i>'Think aloud' methods of data collection</i> | 60 |
| <i>Summary</i> | 61 |

Chapter 3: Research Perspective, Methodology and Methods

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 65 |
| Epistemological considerations | 66 |
| Theoretical perspective | 68 |
| Methodological considerations | 71 |
| Methods | 75 |
| <i>Rigour in qualitative research</i> | 75 |
| <i>Design</i> | 76 |
| <i>Participants</i> | 78 |
| <i>Context of assessment</i> | 79 |
| <i>Ethical considerations</i> | 80 |
| <i>Data collection</i> | 82 |
| <i>Method of analysis</i> | 84 |

Chapter 4: Findings

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 89 |
| Part1: Criteria | 90 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | 90 |
| <i>The C grade-band</i> | 91 |
| <i>Low versus high grade-bands</i> | 92 |
| <i>Writing spanning several grade-bands</i> | 95 |
| <i>Grade-bands and sub-grades</i> | 96 |
| <i>Borderline grades</i> | 96 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Content versus Argument</i> | 98 |
| <i>Content and argument in grading</i> | 99 |
| <i>Further dimensions of content and argument</i> | 102 |
| <i>Structure of writing versus structure of argument</i> | 104 |
| <i>Summary of Part 1</i> | 105 |
| Part 2: Processes | 106 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | 106 |
| <i>Content elements and components</i> | 109 |
| <i>Preparation processes</i> | 112 |
| <i>Reading processes</i> | 113 |
| <i>Positioning processes</i> | 115 |
| <i>Testing/deciding processes</i> | 116 |
| <i>Evaluating processes</i> | 118 |
| <i>Integrating processes</i> | 121 |
| <i>Summary of Part 2</i> | 128 |
| | |
| Chapter 5: Discussion | |
| Introduction | 129 |
| Criteria | 131 |
| <i>Types of criteria</i> | 131 |
| <i>Grading</i> | 133 |
| <i>Writing</i> | 135 |
| <i>Criteria and interpretation</i> | 137 |
| <i>Variations in approaches to assessment</i> | 139 |
| Processes | 141 |
| <i>Introduction</i> | 141 |
| <i>Six categories of processes</i> | 142 |
| <i>Preparation processes</i> | 146 |
| <i>Reading processes</i> | 147 |
| <i>Positioning processes</i> | 149 |
| <i>Testing/deciding processes</i> | 150 |
| <i>Evaluating processes</i> | 151 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Integrating processes</i> | 152 |
| <i>Theories of decision-making</i> | 154 |
| Chapter 6: Conclusion | |
| Introduction | 159 |
| Constituents of assessment | 159 |
| Simplification in assessment | 161 |
| Use of criteria | 163 |
| Processes | 164 |
| Professional implications | 168 |
| Limitations | 169 |
| Summary | 171 |
| References | 173 |
| Appendix 1: Interview questions | 185 |
| Appendix 2: Example of data analysis - Drawing display | 187 |
| Appendix 3: Example of data analysis - Spreadsheet display | 189 |
| Appendix 4: Example of data analysis - Narrative summary | 191 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| <i>Table 4.1</i> | <i>Aspects of criteria</i> | 91 |
| <i>Table 4.2</i> | <i>Assessment processes</i> | 107 |
| <i>Table 4.3</i> | <i>Content elements</i> | 110 |
| <i>Table 4.4</i> | <i>Content components</i> | 111 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|-------------------|--|------------|
| <i>Figure 4.1</i> | <i>Participants' constructions of grades and writing</i> | 105 |
| <i>Figure 4.2</i> | <i>Relationships between process categories</i> | 108 |