

Re: A misapplication of probability theory in exam grading

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-12/msg04917.html>

- *From:* jankrihau@xxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 15 Dec 2006 13:35:05 -0800
-

pauldepstein@xxxxxxx wrote:

If you want the expected score of random guessers to be 0, you don't need to fuss with silly rule changes in this way. You can just use the normal system and then do a final subtraction of (number of questions)/5.

Yes, the random guessers get an expected score of 0, but those who don't answer get a negative score. I think it makes sense that they both score 0 (one hasn't displayed more knowledge than the other).

I don't know why you use the tentative formulation "still an element" of randomness.

Well, English is (obviously) not my native language. I mean that I think you are caught up in the randomness, and that this system achieves a different goal which has its merits, despite not removing the randomness.

My whole point is that the penalty system (when used optimally by students) has exactly the same degree of randomness as the more traditional no-penalty system.

The penalty-system was introduced with a completely dishonest and fallacious propaganda campaign that the new system is "fairer" and removes some randomness. It does absolutely nothing of the kind.

I think it is more fair to those who leave questions unanswered, and agree that it does not remove randomness. I am not familiar with the campaign.

Re: A misapplication of probability theory in exam grading

Paul Epstein

J K Haugland

<http://home.no.net/zamunda>

.