

The Effect of Answering Questions that Differ in Specificity on Mental Effort and Text Retention

Citation for published version (APA):

Kester, L., Tabbers, H., Gorissen, C., & Kirschner, P. A. (2011). *The Effect of Answering Questions that Differ in Specificity on Mental Effort and Text Retention*.

Document status and date:

Published: 21/12/2011

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Document license:

CC BY-SA

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

<https://www.ou.nl/taverne-agreement>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

pure-support@ou.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Downloaded from <https://research.ou.nl/> on date: 04 Dec. 2023

Open Universiteit
www.ou.nl



Liesbeth Kester
Liesbeth.kester@ou.nl

Huib Tabbers
Tabbers@fsw.eur.nl

Chantal Gorissen
chantal.gorissen @ ou.nl

Paul A. Kirschner
paul.kirschner@ou.nl

The Effect of Answering Questions that Differ in Specificity on Mental Effort and Text Retention

Tested information is retained longer than studied information. This, so called, testing effect is thoroughly studied in memory research. Recently, a renewed interest in the testing effect in an educational context can be observed. This study is placed within this line of research and investigates two aspects of the testing effect, namely, effortful retrieval and retrieval induced facilitation. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions that differed in the learning strategy used. Participants either restudied a text that they had received, answered specific questions after studying the text, or answered less specific questions after studying the text. It is assumed that more effort is needed to answer the less specific questions than to answer the specific questions. Therefore, we hypothesize that the less specific questions will produce a stronger testing effect than the specific questions. In addition, we investigate if the benefits of taking an initial test spill over to answering questions that were not initially tested. The results of this study confirm that answering less specific questions requires more effort, however, this does not pay off in a better retention of facts after a week. Nevertheless, a testing was found for the specific questions. No spill over effects were found.

The testing effect shows that effortful retrieval enhances the retention of information. Here, participants either restudied, answered specific or unspecific questions after studying a text. As expected, a testing effect was found for the specific questions but unexpectedly, not for the unspecific questions, although, answering these questions required more effort.

Tested information is retained longer than studied information. This, so called, testing effect is thoroughly studied in memory research (Roediger & Karpicke, 2006). Recently, a renewed interest in the testing effect in an educational context can be observed. This study is placed within this line of research and investigates two aspects of the testing effect, namely, effortful retrieval and retrieval induced facilitation. The effortful retrieval hypothesis holds that the testing effect occurs because it costs less effort to restudy a wordlist or word-pair list than to retrieve it from memory and that the extra effort that is invested to retrieve a fact results in a stronger and more elaborated memory trace of that fact which makes it easier to retrieve the fact at a later moment (Bjork, 1994). Retrieval induced facilitation means that the benefits of testing on retention spill over to related facts that were not initially tested (Chan, McDermott & Roediger, 2006).

To investigate the effortful retrieval hypothesis, this study examines the effects of specific (e.g., 'What did the dogs in Pavlov's experiments do when they heard a bell ringing?') and less specific questions (e.g., 'Describe how Pavlov proved that dogs can distinguish between different stimuli') on expository text retention. It is assumed that more effort is needed to answer the less specific questions than to answer the specific questions. Therefore, we hypothesize that the less specific questions will produce a stronger testing effect than the specific questions. In addition, we investigate if the benefits of taking an initial test spill over to answering questions that were not initially tested.

Method

Participants

Ninety-three Dutch high school juniors and seniors (57 males, 36 females; mean age = 16.32, SD = .90) from general secondary education participated in this experiment during regular school hours.

Materials

Instructional text. An expository text on the 'Pavlov reaction' (861 words) was used as learning content. The text was divided in ten paragraphs printed on separate pages.

Initial specific test. Ten specific, short-answer questions were formulated to determine recall of specific facts from the text. These questions required a one-or-two-words response and their answers were literally available in the text. Each correct answer received 1 point.

Initial less specific test. Ten less specific, short-answer questions to measure how well the participants could recall combinations of facts from the text were formulated. The questions allowed for a few-sentences response and their answers could be found literally in the text. Each correct fact received 1 point.

Final test. The final test consisted of the initial specific test with four new, specific questions and the initial less specific test with four new, less specific questions. The final test was scored in the same manner as the initial tests.

Effort measure. Paas' (1992) subjective 9 point rating scale was used to measure retrieval effort. It ranged from very, very, very low effort (1) to very, very, very high effort (9). Participants were asked 'How much effort did it cost you to understand the paragraph?' or 'How much effort did it cost you to answer the question?'

Design and Procedure

Participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions that differed in the learning strategy used. Participants either restudied a text that they had received ($n = 29$), answered specific questions ($n = 35$) after studying the text, or answered less specific questions

(n = 29) after studying the text.

The participants had 1 minute to study each paragraph and fill in the effort scale, then 5 minutes to perform a distracter task. Next depending on the experimental condition they were in, they restudied the text, answered the specific or less specific questions. They had 1 minute to restudy each paragraph or answer each question and fill in the effort scale, then 5 minutes to perform a distracter task. After a week, they took the final test. They were given 1 minute to answer each less specific test-question and 30 seconds to answer each specific test-question.

Results and Discussion

ANOVA revealed a significant effect of learning strategy on mean effort invested during the 'learning strategy phase', $F(2, 90) = 35.41$; $MSE = 52.52$; $p < .001$; $\eta^2p = .44$, indicating that the self-reported effort was differentially affected by each learning strategy. Bonferroni post-hoc tests revealed that: participants restudying the text reported experiencing significantly less effort restudying the text than participants answering specific or less specific questions, and participants answering the less specific questions reported experiencing significantly more effort than participants answering the specific questions (all $ps < .001$).

A MANOVA revealed a significant effect of learning strategy on the initially tested specific questions, $F(2,90) = 7.57$; $MSE = 18.98$; $p < .01$; $\eta^2p = .14$, and no significant effects on all other test questions, all $F(2,90) < 1$ and all $ps > .05$. A Bonferroni post-hoc test revealed that participants who had answered the specific questions before performed better on these questions after a week than participants who had restudied the text or who answered the less specific questions (both $ps < .01$). No significant difference between the latter two groups was found.

Discussion

Although a testing effect was found for the specific questions, no testing effect was found using the less specific questions and no spill over effects were found in this study. Reasons for these unexpected results will be discussed during our presentation at EARLI.

Bjork, R. A. (1994). Memory and meta memory considerations in the training of human beings. In J. Metcalfe & A. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing* (pp. 185-205). Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Chan, J. C. K., McDermott, K. B., & Roediger, H. L. (2006). Retrieval-induced facilitation: Initially nontested material can benefit from prior testing of related material. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 135, 553-571.

Paas, F. (1992). Training strategies for attaining transfer of problem-solving skill in statistics: A cognitive-load approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 429-434.

Roediger, H. L. & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). The power of testing memory. Basic research and implications for educational practice. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1(3), 181-210.