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Editorial to the Special Issue: Current Innovations in Computer-Based Assessments

**Introduction**

Assessment matters. Indeed, scientific progress largely depends on the extent to which assessments can provide reliable and valid measures of variables – be it well-defined and observable variables in the natural sciences or complex and unobservable variables in the social sciences (Duckworth & Yeager, 2015). With the rapid development of information and communication technologies, new potentials also arise for assessing complex psychological skills and human behavior (Mayrath, Clarke-Midura, & Robinson, 2012; Shute & Rahimi, 2017). Computer-based assessments (CBAs), for example, now allow researchers to capture complex constructs such as collaborative problem-solving and computational thinking skills that have recently gained importance across domains and contexts (Greiff, Holt, & Funke, 2013; Grover & Pea, 2013; Scherer, 2015), and assess constructs that have been considered essential skills for decades with more innovative and perhaps more authentic item formats (e.g., mathematical, reading, and scientific literacy; OECD, 2016). Besides the core testing purposes of distinguishing between students of different knowledge, skills, and performance levels, CBAs can also be used to assess student learning – without any high-stakes consequences based on a single, final score. In this sense, CBAs are powerful tools for both assessment of learning (i.e., summative) and assessment for learning (i.e., formative assessment; Shute & Rahimi, 2017).

The potential of CBA is widely recognized, especially in the areas of educational and psychological testing (Drasgow, 2016). Even further, international large-scale assessments in education, such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), and the International Computer and Information Literacy Study
(ICILS), have shifted from paper-and-pencil towards CBA approaches of educationally relevant constructs. These constructs comprise not only “traditional” skills (e.g., mathematical, reading, scientific literacy) but also “new” skills that have become relevant for students in the 21st century (e.g., complex and collaborative problem solving, ICT literacy, computational thinking). The core potential of CBAs lies in the provision of novel, interactive tasks (OECD, 2013), and the possibility to obtain information on test-taking behavior (Goldhammer, Martens, Christoph, & Lüdtke, 2016; Greiff, Wüstenberg, & Avvisati, 2015).

Taking an educational measurement perspective, Zenisky and Luecht (2016) summarize the core innovations of computer-based assessment and highlight the assessment and psychometric modeling of complex constructs, the automated scoring and test assembly (Gierl, Latifi, Lai, Boulais, & De Champlain, 2014; Veldkamp, 2015), and the availability of process data to describe not only performance (for example, by the correctness of item responses) but also strategic behavior, sequences, and patterns of actions (Greiff, Niepel, Scherer, & Martin, 2016). It is the designated aim of this special issue to present both the core innovations of CBAs in various domains and contexts and the challenges associated with them.

**Objectives, Scope, and Content**

Considering the opportunities that come with the technological advancements in assessments, this special issue presents empirical research on current innovations in CBAs of existing and new constructs across various sectors, along with state-of-the-art applications focusing on the use of the resulting data to describe human behavior that go beyond traditional assessment approaches. We expect this special issue to impact future research and practice of using modern technologies as assessment tools, to generate publicity of CBAs, and to create an awareness of their potential in various contexts and disciplines.
In fact, with the increasing technical developments in the world of information and communication technologies is the implementation of computers for assessment inevitable, possibly to the point where CBAs take over assessment in general. Researchers and designers should be prepared to deal with this and can provide guidelines instead of only reacting to students being confronted with sub-optimal design in and use of CBAs. If this is not done, the possibilities of CBAs can be negated and/or even bring with them serious adverse effects. For instance, when introducing CBAs, it is tempting to simply put paper-and-pencil assessments on a computer. This change of medium without adaptation to that medium can cause disadvantages, for example to the processing of information because paper pages that can easily be turned often cannot be revisited on computer pages leading to distinct differences between the two versions (Kirschner, Park, Malone, & Jarodzka, 2016). On the other hand, CBAs can allow for assessment to be more adaptive to the learner. With a large enough database of well-designed items accompanied by a (smart) adaptivity algorithm, it becomes possible to provide different versions of an assessment to different groups of learners in different situations. Hence, the assessment can be adapted to each student’s knowledge level and thus, not only be conducted more quickly (by avoiding too difficult and too simple questions), but also be more accurate by carving out the abilities of a student in detail. Hence, proper study – and the bundling of such studies in a special issue – is of utmost importance.

The papers in this special issue present several innovations associated with CBAs. These innovations range from generic assessment approaches to the measurement of highly complex skills (e.g., collaborative problem-solving skills) by innovative task designs all the way through to ways of capturing the complexity of computer-generated data (e.g., log-file and multi-channel data) to describe the processes that underlie these complex skills. Table 1 provides an overview of the topics covered by the nine papers in this special issue along with their core innovations, which fall into four main categories: (1) Assessment of new constructs
or widening the assessment of existing constructs; (2) Use of log-file and multi-channel data; (3) Psychometric models and experiments that inform the measurement of complex skills and task construction; (4) Integration of assessment and learning. Each paper showcases how the potential of CBAs can be exploited to address substantively relevant issues, primarily in educational and psychological measurement. The papers take different perspectives on the assessment of constructs, ranging from task design to data mining strategies and psychometric models (see Table 1).

**Concluding Remarks**

The papers presented in this special issue feature core innovations in the field of CBAs that not only tap design issues or the development of interactive and perhaps more authentic tasks in comparison to existing assessments, but also present ways of making sense of the resultant data that are stored in log files. These ways comprise both the extraction of relevant information from log-file data (e.g., sequential actions, response times) and the psychometric modeling techniques. In doing so, the contributions that make up this special issue highlight at least two perspectives on CBAs: (1) the need for crafting a validity argument of indicators derived from CBAs; (2) the need for the simultaneous development of assessments and psychometric models that combine performance and behavioral data meaningfully. The nine papers presented in the special issue exemplify the integration of these perspectives. At the same time, these papers point to possible future directions of research and development of CBAs. These directions include the application of CBAs across psychological sub-disciplines, their theoretical and empirical foundation and validation, the integration of assessment and learning, modern test designs, and, perhaps most importantly, the development of a CBA-specific, cognitive theory.
### Tables

**Table 1**

Overview of studies describing innovations in computer-based assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Core innovation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of new constructs or widening the assessment of existing constructs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graesser, Cai, Morgan, and Wang (2017)</td>
<td>Assessment with computer agents that engage in conversational dialogues and trialogues with learners</td>
<td>Assessment of collaborative skills and processes with log-file data based on human-agent interaction, including cognitive and non-cognitive aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Assessing implicit science learning in digital games</td>
<td>Assessment of implicit learning (i.e., unarticulated knowledge development) based on log-file data and data-mining strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Davier, Hao, Liu, and Kyllonen (2017)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary research agenda in support of assessment of collaborative problem solving: Lessons learned from developing a collaborative science assessment prototype</td>
<td>Assessment of collaborative problem-solving skills and processes with log-file data based on a statistical definition of collaboration and data-mining strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of log-file and multi-channel data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista, Care, and Awwal (2017)</td>
<td>Visualizing and examining sequential actions as behavioral paths that can be interpreted as markers of complex behaviors</td>
<td>Assessment of collaborative problem-solving skills and processes with log-file data based on data-mining strategies (i.e., visualization of behavioral sequences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zechner, Yoon, Bhat, and Leong (2017)</td>
<td>Comparative evaluation of automated scoring of syntactic competence of non-native speakers</td>
<td>Assessment of language skills applying automated scoring techniques to spoken item responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Psychometric models and experiments that inform the measurement of complex skills and task construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veldkamp, Avetisyan, Weissman, and Fox (2017)</td>
<td>Stochastic programming for individualized test assembly with mixture response time models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Rienties, Toetenel, Ferguson, and Whitelock (2017)</td>
<td>Examining the designs of computer-based assessment and its impact on student engagement, satisfaction, and pass rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integration of assessment and learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Rienties, Toetenel, Ferguson, and Whitelock (2017)</td>
<td>Potential of log-file data to inform test development; Examination of the stability and changes of performance over time (i.e., generation of time-intense log-file data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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