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ABSTRACT

Background. Single, best response, multiple choice questions (MCQs) with 4 options (3 distractors and 1 correct answer) or 5 options (4 distractors) have been widely used as an assessment tool in medical education in India and globally. Writing plausible distractors is time consuming and the most difficult part of preparing MCQs. If the number of options can be reduced to 3, it will make preparing MCQs less difficult and time consuming, thus reducing the likelihood of flaws in writing MCQs. We reviewed the literature to find out if the number of options in MCQ test items could be reduced to 3 without affecting the quality of the test.

Methods. A systematic database search was done using the following question as a framework: How many options are optimal for multiple choice questions? Theoretical, analytical and empirical studies, which addressed this issue, were included in the review.

Results. There was no significant change in the psychometric properties of the 3 options test when compared with 4 and 5 options. MCQs with 3 options improved the efficiency of the test as well as its administration compared with 4- or 5-option MCQs. MCQs with 3 options had a higher efficiency because fewer distractors needed to be prepared, took up less space and required less reading time, decreased the time required to develop the items and the time to administer, and more items could be administered in a given time thus increasing the content sampled.

Conclusion. Our review of the literature suggests that MCQs with 3 options provide a similar quality of test as that with 4- or 5-option MCQs. We suggest that MCQs with 3 options should be preferred.


INTRODUCTION

Multiple choice questions (MCQs) are used globally as test items for assessment in various fields of education.1–4 In India, MCQs have been commonly used for undergraduate and postgraduate medical entrance and university examinations.5–8 These are also used as an assessment tool for paramedical courses and formative assessment in the medical curriculum.9–11 The main challenge in preparing MCQs is to construct good test items.12–15 This requires a good knowledge of the content and understanding of the objectives of assessment as well as good skills in writing the items.15–17 Though there are many guidelines for writing good test items,18–22 these are usually not adhered to; leading to the preparation and administration of faulty MCQs.2,22,23 The single, best-response type MCQ (the format that asks the student to choose the best answer from a list of possible answers) with 4 or 5 options is the most commonly used format.14,22,24–28 For a distractor (wrong option) to be useful, it should represent a common misconception among students about the correct answer.26 Writing plausible distractors is time consuming and the most difficult part of preparing MCQs.17,26–29,30 Some of the main flaws in writing distractors include implausible distractors, more than one or no correct answer, the longest option being correct, and the use of ‘all of the above’ and ‘none of the above’ options.22,23 Lack of training of the faculty in preparing MCQs and lack of time have been identified as important reasons that contribute to flaws in writing distractors/items.18–21 Training faculty in the skills required for writing items and reducing the number of distractors in an MCQ could be some possible remedial measures.

We hypothesized that if the number of options in an MCQ can be reduced to 3 from the commonly used 4 or 5, it would make MCQ writing less difficult and less time consuming, thus reducing the likelihood of flaws in writing MCQs. We, therefore, reviewed the existing literature to determine if the number of options in an MCQ can be reduced to 3 without affecting the quality of the test.

METHODS

A systematic database search was done using Science Direct, Pubmed, Ovid and ERIC search engines for the period 1960–2007. Specific articles were also looked for in the Sage publications, JStor and Blackwell Synergy electronic resources. The articles were searched using the following question as a framework: How many options are optimal for multiple choice questions? The search terms included the keywords: MCQ, multiple choice questions, optimal distractors, optimal options, number of options, number of distractors, one best response, item analysis and item writing guidelines.

All studies that assessed the 3-option format were included in the review. Studies not available in electronic format were excluded from the review. The initial results were screened for pertinence, which yielded 15 articles for reading. A review of the reference lists identified 8 additional articles of interest.

RESULTS

Studies on the optimal number of options were grouped into (i) theoretical and analytical studies, and (ii) empirical studies,
based on the approach of the study. These studies are described based on the parameters used by them for recommending 3 options over 4 and 5 options in a single, best-response MCQ.

Reliability

Theoretical and analytical study. Grier in 1975 provided mathematical proof of increased reliability with 3 options, provided the total number of test items was increased to balance the decrease in the number of alternatives.31

Empirical studies. In their review of 10 empirical studies, Haladyna and Downing showed that reliability increased with increasing number of options.24 However, this increase was small when more than 3 options were used.24 Other studies have shown little difference in reliability estimates of different test formats using a different number of options.32–35 and an increase in score reliability on removal of non-functioning distractors.36 Rodriguez in 2005 did a meta-analysis of 80 years of research on the number of options38 and concluded that reducing the number of options decreased test score reliability (5 to 4 options, 5 to 2 options, 4 to 2 options), except when the reduction was from 4 to 3 options, which increased the test score reliability.

Haladyna and Downing,24 in their review of research on writing MCQs, concluded that ‘empirical research supports theoretical study in indicating that three options achieve the optimal balance between reliability and efficiency’.

Validity

Empirical studies. Green et al. in 1982 showed that the 5-option MCQ was the least defensible.37 Owen and Froman in 198738 and Trevisan et al. in 199444 concluded that 3-option MCQs improved validity. Also, more test items could be added in the 3-option MCQs. This would provide the benefit of increased sampling from the domain to be tested thus increasing validity.34,36,38 Rodriguez16 in his meta-analysis concluded that the validity remains the same when the number of options are reduced from 5 to 3 and from 5 to 4 to 3.

Item discrimination

Theoretical and analytical study. Tversky, in 1964, in his landmark paper provided mathematical proof that ‘whenever the amount of time spent in the test is proportional to its total number of alternatives, the use of three choice alternatives at each point will maximize discriminability, power and the amount of information obtained per unit time’.39

Empirical studies. To summate the observations, Costin in 1970 gave empirical evidence for Tversky’s mathematical proof on the number of options.40 He showed higher mean discrimination indices for the 3 choice items. In 1985, Haladyna and Downing in their review of research on MCQs showed mixed results for item discrimination.24 In their review, while one study showed no difference in item discrimination between 3 and 4 options, another study showed 3-option items to have better item discrimination than 4 options.24 However, later studies showed an increase in item discrimination with 3-option MCQs.16,32,33

Item difficulty

Empirical studies. Haladyna and Downing reviewed studies on the number of options in terms of item difficulty and concluded that 3–4 options are optimal.32,33 Studies have shown no difference in mean item difficulty, between 3 and 5 options36 and between 3 and 4 options.42 Yet other studies have shown that student performance improved while at the same time the difficulty of the test item increased with the 3-option format compared with the 4-option format.32,33 A small increase in difficulty index was observed when reducing the items from 4 to 3 options while there was a large increase in the difficulty index (items were easier) if the options were reduced to 2.16 Hence, it can be concluded from empirical studies that there is not much difference in item difficulty between 3 and 4 options.

Test efficiency

Theoretical and analytical studies. Lord in 1977 used the item characteristic curve (ICC) theoretical model to show that the test efficiency for different groups of students may differ.25 Budescu and Nevo proposed the use of the law of proportionality for deciding on the number of options.43 The law of proportionality is based on Grier’s assumptions of generalized proportionality. In his work, Grier showed that ‘the approximate lower bound of the test reliability is maximized by using three options in tests with at least n=18 items, and two options in shorter tests’.31 Later, Bruno and Dirkzwager27 used information-based theoretical perspectives to conclude that 3 choices to a multiple choice item are optimal. This is based on ‘information content or the channel capacity of the multiple-choice test items for determining the optional number of alternatives for multiple-choice items’.27

Empirical studies. Levine and Drasgow in 1983 showed that information is maximized by using more options per item for lower ability groups and fewer numbers of options for higher ability groups.42 This approach uses the concept of ‘ability’ and does not show much advantage when comparing 3 and 4 options. Haladyna and Downing reviewed studies on the number of options in terms of efficiency and concluded that 3–4 options are optimal.24 Compared with 4-option formats, 3-option formats have been shown to improve student performance, are considered to be a better measure of student knowledge, are preferred by students, and perceived by them to be less confusing and tricky.33,38 The students’ preference for the 3-option format was evaluated using ballots on which they could vote for their preferred choice.38

Removal of non-functioning distractors and reducing the number of options to 3 provided benefits such as reduced testing time,36,38 more efficient use of testing time and greater score precision per unit testing time.34 A study compared the psychometric properties of 3-option and 5-option formats.30 Data were obtained from two batteries of tests administered earlier. Trained item writers had written the items using common principles of writing. The items were analysed using item–total correlations, distractor analysis, item difficulty, chi-square and latent trait techniques. Items were then edited or rewritten as necessary and reviewed by a 3-person expert panel. The remaining items were pilot tested to insure the adequacy of their psychometric properties.30 Removing the options with the lowest response rate from the 5-option test created the 3-option test. The results of the 3-option and 5-option tests were analysed. The means of the two tests were similar. The internal consistency reliability for the two tests was measured using coefficient alpha. Further analyses were done using the z-test to compare p values of the 5-option and 3-option items. The authors concluded that ‘while there were significant differences between some items, the differences tended to be very small and, as the small means suggest, of limited practical significance’.32 They also found that both formats had similar psychometric properties but the 3-option format was more cost-efficient in terms of development and administration.28
Guesing

**Theoretical and analytical studies.** In his observation, Lord took into account the issue of guessing which is more common for low performers. He concluded that for most examinees 3 options appeared to be optimal.25

**Empirical study.** A comparison of 3- and 4-option items showed a decrease in ‘test-wiseness’ or guessing with 3-option items.31 ‘Test-wiseness’ was defined by Millman et al.32 as ‘a subject’s capacity to utilize the characteristics and formats of the test and/or test taking situation to receive a high score’.

**Useful options**

Haladyna and Downing concluded that the 3-option format is optimal as the number of functional distracters per item was optimal.30 Other studies confirmed that the 3-option format had fewer dysfunctional distracters,33,34 the mean number of functioning distracters was much lower than 2 and reducing the least popular option had only a minimal effect on the performance of the remaining options,1 and test items seldom contained more than 3 useful options.26

**DISCUSSION**

The 3-option MCQ formats have a number of advantages without compromising the effectiveness of the test. One advantage is that it is easier to construct two plausible distractors thus reducing the likelihood of flaws in the distractors. Flaws in writing items introduce threats to validity,22,46 which is a major concern for any assessment tool.46–48 The strongest rationale for recommending the 3-option format is that there is no significant change in the psychometric properties of this format when compared with the 4- and 5-option formats. A recent meta-analysis showed that the 3-option format reduces item difficulty, and increases item discrimination and reliability.16 Some studies have shown that the 3-option format improves validity,16,38,42 though more studies are required to confirm this.

Three-option items have also been recommended in the literature because of their ease of preparation as these require fewer distracters, take up less space, require less reading time, and decrease time for item development and administration. More items can be administered in a given time, thus increasing the content that is sampled resulting in improved validity. Moreover, studies have addressed the concern that MCQs may be susceptible to ‘test-wiseness’ or guessing. It has been shown that the 3-option MCQ in a high stakes school-leaving mathematics examination decreases test-wiseness.35

It has also been documented that test items seldom contain more than 3 useful options. In India and globally, 4- or 5-option formats are commonly used. In many countries including India, MCQs in medical education are usually constructed by in-house faculty members.8 Most of them have other commitments, which include teaching, clinical work, research and administrative responsibilities. The use of the 3-option format will save considerable time and energy without compromising on the quality of tests. At the same time, training faculty in the skills for writing items and regular pre- and post-validation of MCQ items is necessary to ensure that the guidelines for writing MCQs are followed.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on our review of the published literature, we recommend that the 3-option format of MCQs should be used. We would also second the recommendations of Rodriguez26 that item writing guidelines should be made more direct.
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