InSight
A Journal of Scholarly Teaching

Volume 22 INST-1

Double Take: Using True-False Exams to Deepen Student Learning

Angela Collins, PhD
University of Central Missouri

Eric Nelson, PhD
University of Central Missouri

Follow this and additional works at https://insightjournal.park.edu/

Recommended Citation
Collins, A., & Nelson, E. (2026). Double take: Using true-false exams to deepen student learning. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *22*, INST-1. https://doi.org/10.46504/22202601co

Double Take: Using True-False Exams to Deepen Student Learning

Angela Collins, PhD
Associate Professor, Criminal Justice & Criminology Department
University of Central Missouri

Eric Nelson, PhD
Professor, Department of Management
University of Central Missouri

Abstract. The Double Take True-False Test is a proposed revitalization of a traditionally dismissed assessment format. By embracing, rather than avoiding, intentional ambiguity, this article suggests that instructors craft deliberately provocative true-false statements that lack definitive answers. Students first respond individually, justifying their reasoning in writing, then reconvene in small groups to argue the opposite position. Drawing on cooperative learning theory and two-stage exam research, this approach develops critical thinking, perspective-taking, and applied reasoning skills that prepare students for real-world professional environments in which clear-cut answers rarely exist.

Introduction

The much-maligned true-false (TF) test seems, on the surface, to be on its deathbed (Case & Swanson, 2002; Grosse & Wright, 1985; Storey, 1966). One of the difficulties is writing TF test items that are understood by all students to have the same meaning (Frisbee & Becker, 1991; Storey, 1966; Weidemann & Newens, 1932). Put plainly, a well-written TF question is difficult to construct (Brabec et al., 2020; Burton, 2005; Storey, 1966; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning , 2026). Compounding the issue is artificial intelligence (AI), which is very good at analyzing binary questions (University of Pittsburgh Staff, 2026) in a straightforward search pattern. Thus, writing AI "proof" questions is even more difficult today. As a result, instructors may have lost faith in the item validity of TF tests since it feels like writing the items creates ambiguity in the items themselves. We propose revitalizing the TF approach but with a twist: write your TF items to be intentionally ambiguous, and let your students work together to create shared meaning in developing an answer.

Our first step in revitalizing the TF test is for instructors to write intentionally ambiguous statements (provocative statements). Next, students take the exam individually but must articulate the logic behind selecting true or false in an open-ended answer. The result is a justification of logic, or a justification of how the student understood the statement (Kwan, 2010). Lastly, students in small groups are tasked to re-examine each individual's answers. Each student submits another exam, but they are required to argue the opposite answer that they gave on their individual test. The result is that students help each other clarify their thinking on a topic.

This paper provides instructors with direction for writing ambiguous/provocative statements in the context of a TF test taken individually. Next, we advocate for retaking the test in a small group setting, address the construct of group learning, and make a case that TF can be a group learning activity from the perspective of cooperative learning. Finally, we share our experiences with the "Double Take True-False Test."

Step 1: Take The Double Take True-False Test Alone

As instructors, we want to know how our students think and what their thought processes were in formulating an answer. True-false tests struggle to document this thought process, but what if we could draw some of these thoughts out of our students (Kwan, 2010)? Research has shown that using TF questions can help students with the learning process (Brabec et al., 2020; Kwan, 2010), so flatly refusing to use them could mean students miss out on remembering valuable information.

While there is no consensus on the advantages and disadvantages of using TF questions, many faculty believe they are not useful (Brabec et al., 2020). According to Frisbie and Becker (1991), this lack of consensus and the often contradictory guidelines for writing TF questions have led to many misconceptions about TF tests. There is little to no reason to limit the use of TF questions, and if written well, they can be quite useful (Frisbie & Becker, 1991). The literature seems to indicate that TF questions may not have earned their poor reputation (Burton, 2005); however, most

sources would agree that they are difficult to write well (Ebel, 1970, 1971; Puthiaparampil et al., 2019; Storey, 1966; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning, 2026; Weideman & Newens, 1932) and can lead to ambiguous items that students interpret in a variety of ways (Puthiaparampil et al., 2019).

By deliberately providing students with statements that lack a clear answer (similar to our proposed ambiguous TF question), Sherlock and Morgan (2009) found that the majority of students classified the experience as positive. Students reported that evaluating provocative statements fostered critical thinking, allowed for self-reflection on personal contradictions and potential biases in thinking, and helped them acquire skills that would help them in other areas of their lives (Sherlock & Morgan, 2009).

Exposing students to ambiguity puts them in a gray area, asking them to interpret complex situations that lack clear-cut answers (Rowland, 2003; Wiggins, 1998). In a rapidly changing world where today's "right" answer is tomorrow's "wrong" answer, instructors should want students to build a robust skill set to interpret the world around them. Thus, our newly minted TF test first asks each student to individually take a stand on a complex, non-standard issue/topic in their field; to provide their personal logic on why they see "true" or "false" as the best answer to a complex situation.

Instructors are prepared to avoid ambiguity; we base our modern education system on syllabi, lesson plans, cognitive scaffolding, course schedules, assessment procedures, program accreditation standards, and a variety of other criteria. Designed to help the student move from the known to the unknown, it is a highly structured learning system that provides little ambiguity. An overt attempt at creating Snider's (2023) transparent ambiguity, the Double Take True-False Test intentionally creates ambiguity in the learning process, putting students into a learning environment where they examine a topic from many angles/perspectives. To create this environment, instructors need to intentionally write ambiguous TF questions, which we call "provocative statements."

Provocative Statements

Research supports the use of provocative statements as tools for developing critical thinking and persuasive communication skills (Sherlock & Morgan, 2009) and for helping students clarify their thought processes (Kwan, 2010). By using provocative statements in a collaborative setting, students build these skills in a controlled, classroom setting. The Double Take True-False Test is a technique for creating "transparent ambiguity" (Snider, 2023). Once in the workforce, students will rarely find themselves in situations with a clear resolution or conclusion, so these skills are necessary, regardless of major or career path.

Human Beings Have Free Will

This statement is regularly used in Criminology courses (theories that attempt to explain why people commit crimes). The above statement has no clear answer and has been the subject of debate across many disciplines (Beccaria, 1764; Bentham, 1789). Most of the time, when this statement is discussed in class, students will say, "It depends." They have a general idea of how they want to answer it, but there are always exceptions. By forcing students to pick true or false, they have to explain their thought processes and justify any exceptions to their answer. For example, students often say that human beings have free will except in the case of diminished capacity or mental illness. If they answer this question as true, then they will have to explain how people with diminished capacity or mental illness have free will. To do this, they will need a solid understanding of the underlying theoretical constructs.

Globalization Has Been Good for the World

The introductory week of International Management, a business course taken by students after their first year, examines the pros and cons of globalization. The above statement has no clear answer as the globalization aspect of the statement is dependent on perspective (Hill, 2025; Stobierski, 2024). While there has been a backlash against globalization (Hill, 2025; Walter, 2021), many countries continue to buy into the positive aspects of economic development that come with globalization (Hill, 2025; Stobierski, 2024). However, often for political reasons, other countries have begun to question the benefits of globalization (Walter, 2021). In addition, the word "good" is open for interpretation, again driving the answer toward the perspective one takes in answering. What is "good" for one country

(improved product access, reduced prices, specialization of labor, etc.) may be "bad" for another country (environmental concerns, resource exploitation, access to skilled labor, etc.). Savvy students will also look at the word "world" and differentiate outcomes between highly developed countries, lesser developed countries, and underdeveloped countries.

Creating provocative statements must be driven by the desire to deliberately make such TF questions ambiguous. Along with this desire, instructors must have a deep understanding of their field. The purpose is to create questions that capture large topics in a way that allows for discussion without diluting the topics so much that discussion is meaningless. While this effort may be unfamiliar at first, instructors probably will find that writing them requires less deliberation, ensuring each question does not have a definitive answer. Instructors adopting provocative statements as a testing approach will need to trust that students can coach each other during the group discussion element of the test.

Step 2A: Take the Double Take True-False Test with a Group to Learn Together

In general, group learning is viewed as a classroom activity. Research suggests that students may score higher on tests when they work in small groups to answer practice questions (Stockwell et al., 2017). A meta-analysis also found that small group work is more effective for learning than traditional lecture-based classroom formats (Kalaian et al., 2018). While instructors probably use small-group work more frequently before an exam (e.g., study groups, in-class activities), there is a benefit to using small groups during an exam (Cortright et al., 2003; Stearns, 1996). Stearns (1996) posits improved performance on the exam, increased student retention and engagement in the course, improved collaboration, interpersonal, and group process skills, and reduced anxiety in test-taking. Called two-stage exams, students take an exam individually and then immediately complete the second part of the exam in small groups (Gilley & Clarkston, 2014; Stearns, 1996). Two-stage exams have been found to increase student scores and learning (Gilley & Clarkston, 2014; Zipp, 2007) while also reducing student stress toward exams (Levy et al., 2023). However, the key to group learning in two-stage exams is to ensure complexity (ambiguity) in the questions (Stearns, 1996).

A part of adult learning is to interact with others about the content, to share our current understanding of a topic with others (Knowles et al., 2012; Merriam & Baumgartner, 2020; Palis & Quiros, 2014). We believe students need to learn from each other as much as from experts (O'Brien, 2019) since learning from peers is a likely part of their developmental future as professionals in their respective fields (Bandura, 1986; Palmer & Blake, 2018; Schunk & Usher, 2012). The Double Take True-False Test is, in part, a group endeavor to interpret deliberately ambiguous questions and construct a "best answer" together. As an intentional attempt at connecting adult learning through Roumell's (2019) social learning, the second stage of the test is to ask students to work in small groups of two or three members to reexamine a complex (ambiguous) situation/statement and to help each other better align their individual thinking, creating shared meaning in their discussion. Students will have answered the questions differently in their individual effort; although they may have marked the same answer, they will have different reasoning based on their experience (Knowles et al., 2012) and previous learning. Instructors will need to rely on students articulating their own logic in this collaboration since it is focused on answering with the opposing perspective.

Step 2B: Take the Double Take True-False Test with a Group, Arguing Opposite of Individual Answer

Cooperative learning is a pedagogical strategy that enables students to actively work together to improve their own learning and that of their peers (Herrmann, 2013; Robbins & Hoggan, 2019; Vespone, 2023). Cooperative learning incorporates a variety of teaching methods, including debate, active learning, and student engagement. Walker and Warhurst (2000) found that implementing class debates in which students switch roles (arguing for or against a position or deciding the "winner") promotes critical thinking. Students reported needing to prepare for debates based on provocative statements to either make arguments in class or judge their classmates' arguments. They also reported that, by studying the materials, students were able to understand that the answer to a question is not always black and white (Walker & Warhurst, 2000). The Double-Take True-False Test does not involve a "winner" of the debate or forcing students to only argue one side; students still need to switch roles and support both true and false answers.

In today's world, students need to understand where "the opposite side" is coming from (Budesheim & Lundquist, 1999), so in a way, the Double Take True-False Test is a form of small-group applied debate. For example,

in criminal justice, a lawyer needs to anticipate what the other side might argue and develop potential rebuttals. Defense attorneys, for example, may not agree with their clients' claims of innocence, but they still need to mount an appropriate defense to preserve their clients' due process rights. The attorney needs to be able to evaluate (critically think about) all evidence and claims presented by the prosecution. While they may not agree with every argument they are making, they do need to understand the arguments. The Double Take True-False Test allows students to practice this type of reasoning and skill. Instructors who want to foster argument, debate, and help students rethink their assumptions will want to consider administering the Double Take True-False Test.

Conclusions: Administering The Double Take True-False Test

As noted in the introduction to this paper, instructors appear reluctant to adopt the TF approach to testing. Adopting our proposed Double Take True-False Test provides such instructors with an opportunity to examine the logic behind students' answers. Below, we provide our experiences with the test, our personal reasons for adopting it, and what continues to drive us toward the Double Take True-False Test. For clarity, we have embedded our *tips for adoption* for interested instructors in *italics*. We envision an instructor who might adopt the process as someone who is similar in thinking to our own, someone who is looking for adult learning in a social context, cooperative learning, transparent ambiguity, active learning, and to help students rethink their assumptions. Below we discuss our personal experiences to illustrate the type of mindset instructors might need to embrace. As a result, the sections are written in first person.

Criminology

When I became an instructor, I wanted to provide my students with memorable, meaningful classroom experiences. I pulled from class periods that stood out from my past, including student presentations in a general education class on sustainability (I gave a presentation on colonizing Mars), and group research projects on international topics in a sociology course. Along with those experiences, I also wanted students to be able to practically apply the information they were getting. In my first job out of college, I felt underprepared, and it would have helped to have some of this more applied practice in college. Essentially, I wanted to give my students things that I wish I had had as a student. All of this led me to adopt the Double Take True-False test.

The idea was introduced to me about halfway through the semester. Because of this, I did not want to drastically change the way my class had already been taking tests, so I used it as a class activity. At the beginning of every semester, I assigned my class into *small teams* that they keep throughout the entire semester. Those same teams took this true/false test. They completed the first part individually, then discussed it together. I did instruct them not to use any materials to provide a similar environment to the testing process. In our shared experience, *smaller groups (2-3 students) are better suited to finishing on time*, given the short class period (50 to 75 minutes) in which we administer the test.

Since the purpose was to make the questions deliberately ambiguous, I spent less time deliberating to ensure each question had a definitive answer. Therefore, creating the questions was not difficult for me. My students, when asked, thoroughly enjoyed the activity. When challenged to explain why they answered the questions a certain way, some of them had to really think through their reasoning. This suggested to me that they are not often asked to do this. Aside from classroom experience, the criminal justice field regularly requires students to explain abstract concepts, such as probable cause and reasonable suspicion. Because of this tie to fieldwork, I strongly believe that this type of exam prepares students for real-world situations.

The class was small (12 students), but *class size* is not as important as the test process. Because of the small class, I also did not have to contend with *space issues* as students completed the individual part at roughly the same time. For a larger class, I *book a separate space* for students to use as they complete the individual portion or *let them use various study spaces* available. If I had concerns about having students spread out, I could *use a graduate student or a teaching assistant* to help me monitor them.

Business

Rhetoric as a form of learning was embedded in my undergraduate and graduate experiences. Oral interaction with my peers was a self-evident learning process. When I began teaching, I wanted students in my classes to have similar experiences. My logic as a business faculty member is that managers have to influence others to get work done, often in a public way.

I first experienced the Double Take True-False Test process as a PhD student in the mid-1990s and have been using it consistently since then to foster discussion among students. Class sizes vary from 12 to 35 students. I dominantly use *groups of three, spacing odd numbers with pairs*. I match students based on the speed at which they complete the test: first-in, first-out. I track who is in each group in real time (Google Drive sheet or whiteboard) and note their elapsed time to ensure that I have "dialed in" on the right number of questions. I prepare 8 to 10 questions for a 75-minute period; the number of questions depends on the students' background, level, and familiarity with group/team work. I have found no difference in grades earned as compared to the time students spend on the test. However, my experience is that *fewer questions for student backgrounds not familiar with group work* is a good idea.

As students complete the individual component, I match them and *send the groups to another room*. I also collect their individual exams before they leave for the discussion element (I *do not call it a group test*); thus, they come to the front of the room, copy the opposite answer to their discussion test, and leave the room so that the rest of the students can work in peace. I am lucky that there is a set of 10 breakout rooms down the hall from my classrooms. In larger classes, *a teaching or graduate assistant* could help to usher groups to another room and to take questions. Students sit in separate small rooms, but sometimes those rooms are busy, so the discussion groups *share another larger classroom*. The core focus of this testing process is to foster discussion and improve shared understanding, those rhetorical skills I feel managers need. Thus, I am not bothered if teams talk to each other, but that does slow them down, so they have choices to make, choices they need to live with.

Over COVID, 50% of my students Zoomed in, and I emailed the individual test out. Students were required to return that individual element within 35 minutes to ensure there was plenty of time to complete the discussion (group) exam, which I emailed immediately upon receiving the individual exam. I maintained the first-in, first-out grouping approach. I simply emailed student groups and asked them to contact each other via telephone or app to take part in the discussion. Groups consisted of a mix of in-class and Zoom attendees. At first, I worried about students using their books or AI to cheat, but students shared that it took them more time to use external resources properly and that students who tried to cheat actually ended up with lower scores (they were VERY honest with me over COVID). I still use this email approach at times, and every time I do, the "Zoomers" scores are the same or lower than the in-class students; thus, instructors with a hybrid classroom approach could do the same, given this anecdotal evidence. The key is to make sure there are enough questions in the time frame available to create a need for students to move quickly instead of engaging with their AI. Instructors should *be prepared for some trial and error*.

Given our backgrounds, we feel strongly that application occurs in environments where students are forced to orally defend their thinking. Specifically, we both work in fields that are highly applied in nature (Business and Criminal Justice). It simply made sense to us to adopt this type of process to encourage our students to interact with each other around the content. The Double Take True-False Test, as we have described in this paper, probably best fits instructors who feel similarly.

Implications

As far as we can tell, the history of the Double Take True-False Test process finds itself with Dr. Robert Nelson of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), as we were unable to find a history preceding Dr. Robert Nelson's in-class application. One of the co-authors of this paper experienced the test as a doctoral student at UIUC. Dr. Robert Nelson used this unpublished process in his entrepreneurship training, specifically during the period when he was training Polish entrepreneurs in post-Cold War Poland. He felt strongly that people learn by discussing the blurry (ambiguous) concepts of entrepreneurial practice. Ambiguity is a regular occurrence in criminal justice and in business; this testing process exposes students to uncertainty and allows them to practice some of the skills necessary to navigate unclear situations.

Instructor-Focused Implications

If nothing else, we encourage instructors to embrace the ambiguity of true/false questions—use it to your advantage! As discussed throughout this paper, there are several reasons to adopt this testing approach. But there are also larger implications for students. It is the gray area of disciplines that students need help understanding, especially in fields where there is no obvious right or wrong answer. Realistically, there are few, if any, fields that have true black and white decisions to make.

One of the most promising outcomes is that students correct each other's thinking, especially when all group mates mark the same answer on the individual test. We included a few select student opinions on the test in Appendix A to illustrate how students help each other during the process of taking the test. The ensuing discussion to "find" the other side together is fascinating to listen to. As demonstrated in Appendix A, the discussion element clearly leads to learning beyond our regular classroom learning processes.

The Double Take True-False Test incorporates components of active learning. While active learning is often defined as in-class participation (Herrmann, 2013), it also encompasses skills such as active listening. All types of students can benefit from the Double Take True-False Test as an active learning activity because there is an individual component (students complete the first part of the exam individually, benefiting students who may struggle in group settings) and a small-group component (students complete the second part of the exam together, allowing for clarification, discussion, and more, benefitting students who may need help putting their thoughts into words, for example).

The small groups of three (or even pairs if there are odd numbers) mean students ask each other to break down what they think and examine their thoughts and opinions. All students will have opinions that they might not have taken the time to analyze. They may be repeating opinions they have heard from friends and family without taking the time to determine whether they truly believe them. This type of exam forces students to ask themselves questions like: *Why do I think the way I think? How did I come to this conclusion? In real time, how do I apply these concepts in the classroom (or at work)?* This is the epitome of critical thinking.

Finally, this is a strategy that works well for instructors who enjoy trying new things in the classroom. It provides a unique experience for students and allows them to practice a variety of important skills. As we like to tell students on the first day of class, "Whoever is doing the work is doing the learning; guess who is going to do the work?" The Double Take True-False test forces students to do the work and thus, learn, whether they realize it or not.

Future Research Implications

While this paper includes our anecdotal experiences (see student comments in Appendix A), we plan to gather data on this technique in the future. The purpose of our informal use of the Double Take True-False test was to attempt the strategy for an appropriate fit in our courses. With this foundation, we are more confident in developing a research project around the use of the Double Take True-False test.

Research that evaluates the combined impact of TF or provocative statements and two-stage exams is needed. How do these techniques combined compare to standard exams with a variety of question types? How does the combination of these techniques impact the effectiveness of each technique on its own?

We also need to understand how these techniques work across disciplines. Is there a difference between social sciences and STEM, for example? We both work in the social sciences, though within different disciplines (criminal justice and business). While we learned from the differences across our respective social science disciplines, it would be prudent to investigate how the Double Take True-False Test applies to the hard sciences, the arts, and the humanities.

Because of our focus on student learning, we also want to understand students' perceptions of the combined techniques. It is important to understand how students perceive these exams; research on learning shows that students often do not like techniques that help them learn the most (Lang, 2021). Is it possible that this combination could increase learning and be positively perceived by students?

Given the focus of this paper, we end with the following sentiment: The True False-Test is not dead! Long live the Double Take True-False Test!

References

Bandura, A., & National Institute of Mental Health. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Beccaria, C. (1764). *On crimes and punishments.* Bobbs-Merrill.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Dover Publications.

Brabec, J. A., Pan, S. C., Bjork, E. L., & Bjork, R. A. (2020). True-false testing on trial: Guilty as charged or falsely accused? *Educational Psychology Review, 33*, 667-692. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09546-w

Budesheim, T. L., & Lundquist, A. R. (1999). Consider the opposite: Opening minds through in-class debates on course-related controversies. *Teaching of Psychology, 26*(2), 106-110.

Burton, R. F. (2005). Multiple-choice and true/false tests: Myths and misapprehensions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(1), 65-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042003243904

Case, S., & Swanson, D. (2002). *Constructing written test questions for the basic and clinical sciences.* National Board of Examiners. https://health.uconn.edu/faculty-development/wp-content/uploads/sites/69/2017/06/constructing_written_test_questions.pdf

Cortright, R. N., Collins, H. L., Rodenbaugh, D. W., & DiCarlo, S. T. (2003). Student retention of course content is improved by collaborative-group testing. *Advances in Physiology Education, 27*(3), 102-108. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00041.2002

Ebel, R. L. (1970). The case for true-false test items. *The School Review, 78*(3), 373-389. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1084159

Ebel, R. L. (1971). How to write true-false test items. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 31,* 417-426. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447103100208

Frisbie, D. A., & Becker, D. F. (1991). An analysis of textbook advice about true-false tests. *Applied Measurement in Education, 4*(1), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324818ame0401_6

Gilley, B. H., & Clarkston, B. (2014). Collaborative testing: Evidence of learning in a controlled in-class study of undergraduate students. *Research and Teaching, 43*(3), 83-91. https://doi.org/10.2505/4/jcst14_043_03_83

Grosse, M. E., & Wright, B. D. (1985). Validity and reliability of true-false tests. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *45*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164485451001

Herrmann, K. J. (2013). The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: Results from an intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 14*(3), 175-187. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787413498035

Hill, C. W. L. (2025). *Global business today*. McGraw-Hill.

Kalaian, S. A., Kasim, R. M., & Nims, J. K. (2018). Effectiveness of small-group learning pedagogies in engineering and technology education: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Technology Education, 29*(2), 20-35. https://doi.org/10.21061/jte.v29i2.a.2

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., III, & Swanson, R. A. (2012). *The adult learner (7th ed.)*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080964249

Kwan, F. B. (2010). True/false test: Enhancing its power through writing. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies, 4,* 1-10. https://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/10542.pdf

Lang, J. M. (2021). *Small teaching: Everyday lessons from the science of learning* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Levy, D., Svoronos, T., & Klinger, M. (2023). Two-stage examinations: Can examinations be more formative experiences? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 24*(2), 79-94. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418801668

Merriam, S. B., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2020). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. John Wiley & Sons.

O'Brien, T. (2019, November). *Overcoming peer learning phobia: It's time to release the reins and let students evolve their own thinking.* Harvard Business Impact: Harvard Business School Publishing. https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/overcoming-peer-learning-phobia

Palis, A. G., & Quiros, P. A. (2014). Adult learning principles and presentation pearls. *Middle East African Journal of Ophthalmology, 21*(2), 114-22. https://doi-org.cyrano.ucmo.edu/10.4103/0974-9233.129748

Palmer, K., & Blake, D. (2018, November). *How peer learning drives performance.* Harvard Business Impact: Harvard Business School Publishing. https://hbr.org/2018/11/how-to-help-your-employees-learn-from-each-other

Puthiaparampil, T., Gudum, H. R., Rahman, M. M., Saimon, R., & Lim, I. F. (2019). True-false analysis reveals inherent flaws in multiple true-false tests. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, *6*(10), 4204–4208. https://doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20194476

Robbins, S., & Hoggan, C. (2019). Collaborative learning in higher education to improve employability: Opportunities and challenges. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 95-108. https://doi-org.cyrano.ucmo.edu/10.1002/ace.20344

Roumell, E. A. (2019). Priming adult learners for learning transfer: Beyond content and delivery. *Adult Learning*, *30*(1), 15-22.

Rowland, G. (2003). A little ambiguity can go a long way. Invited paper for workshop at the *Association for Educational Communications and Technology Annual Conference*. http://www.learndev.org/ambiguity.html#anchor1181508

Schunk, D. H., & Usher, E. L. (2012). Social cognitive theory and motivation. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 13–27). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195399820.013.0002

Sherlock, J., & Morgan, G. (2009). Using provocative statement assignments to foster critical thinking in leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(2), 188-205. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418801668

Snider, E. (2023, September 27). *Transparent ambiguity in assignment design.* The Teaching Innovation Blog: Ball State University. https://blogs.bsu.edu/teaching-innovation/2023/09/27/transparent-ambiguity-in-assignment-design/

Stearns, S. A. (1996). Collaborative exams as learning tools. *College Teaching*, *44*(3), 111–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1996.9925564

Stobierski, T. (2024, February 24). *6 pros and cons of globalization in business to consider.* Business Insights Blog: Harvard Business School Online. https://online.hbs.edu/blog/post/pros-and-cons-of-globalization

Stockwell, B. R., Stockwell, M. S., & Jiang, E. (2017). Group problem solving in class improves undergraduate learning. *ACS Central Science, 3*(6), 614-620. https://doi.org/10.1021/acscentsci.7b00133

Storey, A. G. (1966). A review of evidence or the case against the true-false item. *The Journal of Educational Research, 59*(6), 282-285. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27531717

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning. (2026). *Improving your test questions.* https://citl.illinois.edu/improving-your-test-questions

University of Pittsburgh Staff (2026). *Rethinking true/false: Strategies for more rigorous, AI-resistant exam questions.* College of General Studies: Office of Communications. https://www.cgs.pitt.edu/teaching-toolbox/rethinking-truefalse#:~:text=True/False%20questions%20can%20be,students%20arrived%20at%20their%20answers

Vespone, B. (2023). Co-constructing teaching and learning in higher education: A literature review of practices and implications. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education, 27*.

Walker, M., & Warhurst, C. (2000). 'In most classes you sit around very quietly at a table and get lectured at…': Debates, assessment and student learning. *Teaching in Higher Education, 5*(1), 33-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/135625100114948

Walter, S. (2021). The backlash against globalization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *24*, 421-442. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-041719-102405

Weidemann, C. C., & Newens, L. F. (1932). A study of true-false and indeterminate statement examination in the history of education. *The Journal of Educational Research, 25*(3), 197-210. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27525529

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. Jossey-Bass.

Zipp, J. F. (2007). Learning by exams: The impact of two-stage cooperative tests. *Teaching Sociology, 35*(1), 62-76. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20058530

Appendices

Appendix A: Student Comments

Prompt sent to students requesting feedback:
"I am writing to this small batch of students because I know you are still checking student email! :-) Name redacted (CJ) and I put a paper into a journal outlining that True False test you all took in International Management. The journal is asking for some quotable quotes from students, so...
In one to four sentences: From a learning perspective, what was your reaction to the T/F that you took in International Management?
So, like/dislike why? Helped to learn, did not? Group work helped/not? Different from past tests, good bad? WHY!??? Seriously, I need you to type what you think as far as the test being a learning tool. Don't overthink it, just want your reactions. Reply to me directly by Thursday Evening."

Senior with One Semester to Graduation
I really enjoyed the true false questions in international management. I liked that I felt I that I couldn't be wrong because we would have to prove that we were right. It made me feel a lot less nervous while taking the test because I was confident in my ability to show why it was true or false. Overall I think it's a great format and wish more classes had this format.

Graduating Senior in Final Semester
I think the true false test worked better for me as a learner than a standard multiple choice or short answer test because it opened answers up to reasoning rather than a best fitting answer for the question. To me, allowing the student to view a question and answer it with up to three or four supporting evidence, and then later flipping that perspective with the group to argue the other way allowed for some deeper analysis and perspective based discussions. I did enjoy it and it stuck with me more than the basic multiple choice test because we were more focused on recollection and how something can be portrayed both true or false rather than just right or wrong. I also think when you take away the pressure or stress of choosing one "objectively" correct answer, it allows for more of a talk about what we learned, why its important, and then where it does or doesn't work in application.

Junior with Two Semesters to Graduation
What I liked about the true/false tests as a learning tool was that instead of just learning one definition or information about a topic, it forced you to know enough facts about that topic to be able to defend it being true or false on either side. You had to know enough about the topic to defend your answer with multiple reasonings to back it up and this was sometimes the challenge in a good way. Also we would split into being with partners the second time and it really depended on who you got put with on if you could rely on their answers or help or have to rely mostly on what you thought, so usually it was a good idea to always be prepared either way. Overall I liked it as a student, it felt a little less stressful because as long as your logic made sense there wasn't just one right answer.

Graduating Senior in Final Semester
I really enjoyed the true or false test. It made me actually think about the matter and not just have a simple answer memorized that I would forget right after the test. I also really enjoyed that we had to argue for both sides of the question. The group work I enjoyed as well because it's interesting to hear how other people think through things and there are so many different perspectives.

MGT 3345 International Management

Exam 1

Individual Section (18 points)

Each True-False question is worth 2 points, so provide 2 reasons for selecting either T or F. Answering either T or F with no explanation will result in 0 points. I will partner you up when you are done with the individual section.

1.	Who cares about greetings in other cultures? Money talks!	T	F
2.	Globalization has been beneficial to my family. (Nelson)	T	F
3.	Culture is the biggest hurdle when a company wants to expand internationally.	T	F
4.	Rwanda is a good rollout target for my (the one YOU are doing for YOUR project) internationalization plan company.	T	F
5.	Product Life Cycle Theory of Trade is outdated, with little connection to how the world trades today.	T	F
6.	In trade, there is always a loser and a winner.	T	F
7.	Our internationalization plan (module) company needs to be an early entrant to be successful in our chosen country.	T	F
8.	Disney Theme Parks have struggled to roll out internationally.	T	F
9.	Banks leaving England have no impact on the English economy.	T	F

MGT 3345 International Management Exam 1

Discussion Section (18 points)

I will put you in groups of 2-3. Your task is to discuss your answers on the True False sections and select **TWO** compelling arguments that exemplify the opposite point of view that you took on the individual section (**2 points each**).

1.	Who cares about greetings in other cultures? Money talks!	T	F
2.	Globalization has been beneficial to my family. (Nelson)	T	F
3.	Culture is the biggest hurdle when a company wants to expand internationally.	T	F
4.	Rwanda is a good rollout target for my (the one YOU are doing for YOUR project) internationalization plan company.	T	F
5.	Product Life Cycle Theory of Trade is outdated, with little connection to how the world trades today.	T	F
6.	In trade, there is always a loser and a winner.	T	F
7.	Our internationalization plan (module) company needs to be an early entrant to be successful in our chosen country.	T	F
8.	Disney Theme Parks have struggled to roll out internationally.	T	F
9.	Banks leaving England have no impact on the English economy.	T	F

Dr. Angela Collins is currently an Associate Professor in the Criminal Justice & Criminology Department at the University of Central Missouri. She earned a PhD in Criminal Justice from Sam Houston State University, as well as an MS in Criminology and a BS in Sociology & Criminology from Missouri State University. She has experience working with youth with behavioral and emotional disorders in a variety of settings (clinic and residential), along with investigating allegations of elder abuse for the state of Missouri. Angela's research and teaching focus on juvenile justice/delinquency, criminology, and mental health within the criminal justice system.

Dr. Eric Nelson is currently a Professor in the Department of Management at the University of Central Missouri. He earned a PhD in Education, specializing in Human Resource Education from the University of Illinois, a Master of Business Administration from Arizona State University, and a Master of International Management from Thunderbird. He has 16 years of corporate experience working in management development training, and organizational development. He teaches and consults on interpersonal, teamwork, leadership, and self-analysis skills. He brings a lifelong passion for experiential learning to any project and is naturally learner-focused and collaborative.