This study investigated the performance of students who missed regularly scheduled examinations and took make-up examinations in an upper-level psychology course. Four sections of a 300-level Educational Psychology course enrolled 123 students, of whom 52 missed one or two examinations, one missed four examinations, and one missed the comprehensive final. The examination scores, quiz scores, and finals scores were compared for those students missing examinations and those who did not. Results indicated that students who missed examinations scored lower on their make-up examinations than on their regularly scheduled examinations. These students also had lower quiz and comprehensive final examination scores than students who did not miss regular examinations. Since the make-up examinations were the same as the regularly scheduled examinations, factors other than examination difficulty account for these results. Possible explanations include: students who miss examinations are less capable, have more personal problems, have more absences, are less interested in the subject matter, are more likely to procrastinate, or are less dedicated. (Contains 10 references.) (BF)
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Abstract

This study investigated the performance of students who missed regularly scheduled examinations and took makeup examinations in an upper-level psychology course. It analyzed how these students performed on makeup examinations, regularly scheduled examinations, quizzes, and comprehensive final examinations. Results indicated that students who missed examinations scored lower on their makeup than their regularly scheduled examinations. These students also had lower examination, quiz, and comprehensive final examination scores than students who did not miss examinations. The inclusion of these findings in instructors' manuals that accompany psychology textbooks was discussed.
Missed Examinations and Student Performance in an Upper-Level Course

Students often take a makeup examination when they miss a regularly scheduled examination. Instructors' manuals that accompany psychology textbooks often give advice about makeup examinations (Bolt, 1995; Conrad & Rafter, 1991; George, 1994; Goss & Bernstein, 1991; Sandlin & Diaz-Rico, 1995), and books on college teaching (McKeachie, 1986; Prichard & Sawyer, 1994) often address issues related to testing (e.g., administering test, scoring tests, proofreading tests); however, these sources provide little or no information about how students who miss examinations perform on makeup examinations or other evaluation procedures (examinations, quizzes, comprehensive final examinations) typically used in college or university classrooms.

The purpose of this study was to investigate student performance on makeup examinations taken in an upper-level psychology course. It compared students' performance on makeup examinations with their performance on regularly scheduled examinations. In addition, examination, quiz, and comprehensive final examination scores of students who missed examinations were compared to those scores of students who did not miss examinations.

Method

Participants

Participants were 123 students enrolled in four sections of a 300-level Educational Psychology course. Of these students, 52 missed one or two examinations, one missed four examinations, and one missed the comprehensive final. All students who missed exams took makeups. The large percentage of students who took makeup examinations was the result of a liberal makeup policy described below.
Procedure

Students could miss a regularly scheduled examination for any reason. They did not need to provide the instructor with an excuse. All makeup examinations, except for the one missed final given after finals week, were given on the last day class met before final examination week. Makeups were the same regularly scheduled examination the student missed when the examination was originally given to the entire class. For example, if a student missed the third test, their makeup was the identical third test given to the entire class.

Four 50-point multiple-choice examinations, one 55-point multiple-choice comprehensive final, and 12 5-point quizzes were given during the semester. Quizzes were typically unannounced. They took a variety of forms including actual quizzes, opinion on an issue, participation in a class demonstration, etc.

Lecture was the primary teaching method. All students had the same instructor, textbook (Woolfolk, 1995), sequence of chapters and lectures, examinations, lecture material, etc. Since live lectures were given, some variation in the presentation of lecture material occurred.

Results

A t test for correlated observations compared the makeup examination scores with the mean of the regularly scheduled examination scores for the 52 students who missed one or two examinations. The results indicated that regularly scheduled examination scores (M = 60.71%, SD = 17.59) were significantly higher than makeup examination scores (M = 57.54%, SD = 19.75, t(51) = 2.05, p < .05). Students scored better on their regularly scheduled than their makeup examinations.

The examination scores, quiz scores, and comprehensive final examination scores of students who missed examinations were compared to the examination, quiz, and comprehensive final examination scores of
students who did not miss examinations using \( t \) tests for independent observations. These \( t \) tests indicated that students who did not miss examinations had higher examination scores (\( M = 135.01, SD = 20.40, t(121) = 2.20, p < .05 \)), quiz scores (\( M = 49.15, SD = 8.82, t(121) = 3.34, p < .05 \)), and final examination scores (\( M = 36.52, SD = 6.71, t(121) = 2.45, p < .05 \)) than students who missed examinations and had to take a makeup examination (\( M = 126.94, SD = 20.02; M = 42.80, SD = 12.25; M = 33.65, SD = 6.13 \), respectively for examination, quiz, and final examination scores). Students who did not miss examinations performed better on all forms of evaluation than students who missed examinations.

A \( t \) test comparing the number of quizzes that were handed in indicated that students who did not miss examinations handed in more quizzes than those who missed examinations (\( Ms = 10.14 \) and 8.80, \( SDs = 1.71 \) and 2.44 respectively; \( t(121) = 3.60, p < .05 \)). This suggests that students who did not miss examinations attended class more frequently than students who missed examinations.

**Discussion**

Students scored higher on their regularly scheduled examinations than their makeup examinations. Furthermore, students who did not miss examinations earned higher examination scores, quiz scores, final examination scores, and handed in more quizzes than students who missed examinations. The explanation for these findings is unclear. Since the makeup examinations were the same as the regularly scheduled examinations, factors other than examination difficulty accounted for these results. It may be that students who miss examinations are less capable, have more personal problems, are less interested in the subject matter, are more likely to procrastinate, are less dedicated, etc.
Students miss class for different reasons (Van Blerkom, 1992); likewise, they miss exams for different reasons.

Until recently (Kahn, 1995), little research has been conducted on the performance of students who miss exams. The findings reported here provide some information about student performance on makeup examinations, and compare the performance of students who miss examinations with those of students who do not miss examinations on a number of typical types of evaluation methods (examinations, quizzes, comprehensive finals) used in college and university classrooms. These findings support the concerns of those instructors who believe that students who miss examinations do poorly on makeup examinations and other types of evaluation methods. The results of this study should be included in instructors' manuals that accompany textbooks used in psychology courses. If this information was available in instructors' manuals, instructors might inform their students about these results to discourage them from missing examinations.
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This study was presented at the American Psychological Association's 105th Annual convention in Chicago, Il, August 1997.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Irwin Kahn, Department of Social Sciences, Ferris State University, Big Rapids, MI 49307; e-mail: kahni@ferris.edu.
Title: Missed Examinations and Student Performance in an Upper-Level Course

Author(s): Irwin Kahn

Corporate Source: Ferris State University
Social Sciences Department
820 Campus Drive, ASC 2108
Big Rapids, MI 49307-2225

Printed Name/Position/Title: Irwin Kahn/Professor

Telephone: 616-592-2759
FAX: 616-592-2541
E-Mail Address: kahni@ferris.edu
Date: January 12, 1998

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here please

Signature: __________________________

Organization/Address: Ferris State University
Social Sciences Department
820 Campus Drive, ASC 2108
Big Rapids, MI 49307-2225
COUNSELING AND STUDENT SERVICES CLEARINGHOUSE

Dear 1997 APA Presenter:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a written copy of the presentation you made at the American Psychological Association’s 105th Annual Convention in Chicago August 15-19, 1997. Papers presented at professional conferences represent a significant source of educational material for the ERIC system. We don’t charge a fee for adding a document to the ERIC database, and authors keep the copyrights.

As you may know, ERIC is the largest and most searched education database in the world. Documents accepted by ERIC appear in the abstract journal Resources in Education (RIE) and are announced to several thousand organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, counselors, and educators; provides a permanent archive; and enhances the quality of RIE. Your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of RIE, through microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the country and the world, and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). By contributing your document to the ERIC system, you participate in building an international resource for educational information. In addition, your paper may listed for publication credit on your academic vita.

To submit your document to ERIC/CASS for review and possible inclusion in the ERIC database, please send the following to the address on this letterhead:

1. Two (2) laser print copies of the paper,
2. A signed reproduction release form (see back of letter), and
3. A 200-word abstract (optional)

Documents are reviewed for contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality. Previously published materials in copyrighted journals or books are not usually accepted because of Copyright Law, but authors may later publish documents which have been acquired by ERIC. However, should you wish to publish your document with a scholarly journal in the future, please contact the appropriate journal editor prior to submitting your document to ERIC. It is possible that some editors will consider even a microfiche copy of your work as “published” and thus will not accept your submission. In the case of “draft” versions, or preliminary research in your area of expertise, it would be prudent to inquire as to what extent the percentage of duplication will effect future publication of your work. Finally, please feel free to copy the reproduction release for future or additional submissions.

Sincerely,

Jillian Barr Joncas
Assistant Director for Acquisitions and Outreach

School of Education
201 Ferguson Building  P.O. Box 26171
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, NC 27402-6171
800/414.9769
910/334.4114
FAX: 910/334.4116
mail: ericcas2@dewey.uncg.edu