

AI-Enabled grading with near-domain data for scaling feedback with human-level accuracy

Shyam Agarwal¹, Ali Moghimi^{2*}, Kevin C. Haudek³

¹Department of Computer Science, University of California, Davis, One Shields Ave, Davis, 95616, CA, USA.

²Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, University of California, Davis, One Shields Ave, Davis, 95616, CA, USA.

³Department of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology and CREATE for STEM Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 48824, Michigan, USA.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): amoghimi@ucdavis.edu;

Contributing authors: shyagarwal@ucdavis.edu; haudekke@msu.edu;

Abstract

Constructed-response questions are crucial to encourage generative processing and test a learner’s understanding of core concepts. However, the limited availability of instructor time, large class sizes, and other resource constraints pose significant challenges in providing timely and detailed evaluation, which is crucial for a holistic educational experience. In addition, providing timely and frequent assessments is challenging since manual grading is labor intensive, and automated grading is complex to generalize to every possible response scenario. This paper proposes a novel and practical approach to grade short-answer constructed-response questions. We discuss why this problem is challenging, define the nature of questions on which our method works, and finally propose a framework that instructors can use to evaluate their students’ open-responses, utilizing near-domain data like data from similar questions administered in previous years. The proposed method outperforms the state of the art machine learning models as well as non-fine-tuned large language models like GPT 3.5, GPT 4, and GPT 4o by a considerable margin of over 10-20% in some cases, even after providing the LLMs with reference/model answers. Our framework does not require pre-written grading rubrics and is designed explicitly with practical classroom settings in

¹ORCID: [0009-0009-2147-5674](https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2147-5674)

²ORCID: [0000-0002-9249-8365](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9249-8365)

³ORCID: [0000-0003-1422-6038](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1422-6038)

mind. Our results also reveal exciting insights about learning from near-domain data, including what we term as accuracy and data advantages using human-labeled data, and we believe this is the first work to formalize the problem of automated short answer grading based on the near-domain data.

Keywords: AI-Enabled Grading, Automated Feedback Generation, BERT, GPT, Large Language Models, Near-Domain Data

1 Introduction and Related Works

Assessments play a significant role in a student’s learning outcomes. On one hand, they provide valuable information to students about where they are lacking and what improvements they can make. On the other hand, they can inform instructors about student progress and understanding of the various concepts being taught. Well-designed assessments can also promote the development of students’ logical aptitude, problem-solving, critical thinking, and other cognitive skills. Feedback from these assessments has a strong influence on their learning and achievement (Hattie and Timperley 2007). In fact, many historical works have identified the importance of feedback in either improving knowledge and acquiring skills (Azevedo and Bernard 1995; Bangert-Drowns et al. 1991; Corbett and Anderson 1989; Epstein et al. 2002; Moreno 2004; Pridemore and Klein 1995) or an essential factor in motivating the learning process (Lepper and Chabay 1985; Narciss and Huth 2004).

With an increasing demand for quality education, class sizes have grown considerably, while the availability of instructors and teaching assistants to assess student learning remain limited. This creates significant time constraints, increasing the need for efficient learning support that can provide timely feedback to the learners. Scaling this feedback has been a widely accepted challenge, often referred to as the “feedback” challenge (Wu et al. 2018).

To solve these problems, there have been efforts to leverage technology, especially AI models to automate feedback generation, addressing the existing constraints in education. Automated grading has emerged as the first step in this process because once we know which category the response falls in (correct or incorrect, for example), then it becomes easier to provide template-based feedback or more personalized feedback with some additional overhead work.

It is important to note that the challenge in the classification or evaluation of responses largely depends on the type of question being considered. Objective questions, such as multiple-choice, are relatively straightforward to grade since the possible response choices are limited. However, these questions do not provide much insight into a student’s learning journey. In contrast, constructed-response questions (CRQ) provide a great way to understand student thinking more deeply, serving as a powerful means of evaluating a learner’s understanding of concepts. These questions require learners to organize their thoughts, provide explanations, and demonstrate higher-level thinking skills which further requires an ability to reason through elaborate answers (Zhao et al. 2021). Short answers are a type of CRQ that asks learners to write their

answers in a few sentences. The grading of these questions focuses on the content, instead of the writing quality. Despite their effectiveness, compared to objective questions, CRQs are significantly more challenging to grade due to the complexity and variability of student responses.

Although Automated Short Answer Grading (ASAG) is a widely studied problem, it has emerged to be a hard problem and the following challenges have been identified as the major causes for it and other human-centered AI tasks (Wu et al. 2018; Malik et al. 2021):

1. Student work shows a great amount of diversity, with many responses being unique (long tail/zipf distribution). Thus, statistical supervised grading techniques would find it hard to produce promising results.
2. The manual labeling of responses is subjective, laborious, time-consuming and expensive. Thus, access to relatively large annotated datasets is difficult.
3. Grading is a domain where not only accuracy but also precision (reproducibility) is paramount due to the high stakes involved in misgrading.
4. The entire grading process must be transparent and justifiable to instructors and students alike.

ASAG has a strong literature background with people using many approaches, from traditional statistical ones to modern day neural networks (Zhai et al. 2020). The choice of what approach to use mostly boils down to the availability of enough manually annotated dataset. If enough data is available to train the models, one would likely assume that high performance can be obtained by just using supervised learning techniques or statistical models. This is in part due to the ability to fine tune models to learn patterns present in domain specific tasks, like evaluating science explanations or reasoning (Jescovitch et al. 2021).

Various methods have been studied for this application. For short-answer grading, Heilman and Madnani (2013) took a domain adaptation approach with using word and character n-gram features. Sultan et al. (2016) employs supervised learning methods like linear regression, and Hou and Tsao (2011) uses support vector machines and incorporates POS tags and term frequency to get good results. Madnani et al. (2013) built a logistic regression classifier using simple features like count of commonly used words and the length of responses.

The performance of such conventional ML models won't necessarily increase as we feed more data as they eventually get to a plateau and saturate. Even in the case of achieving promising results, conventional machine learning models are often limited by their lack of generalization. These models are typically highly specialized and less capable of generalizing across new or unseen questions as they are trained on fixed sets of questions and corresponding answers. This results in poor performance when attempting to grade answers to questions that weren't part of the initial training set, even if they belong to the same domain. Additionally, these models require significant effort to update or retrain to accommodate new data or question formats.

Many researchers have also used embedding-based neural networks. Riordan et al. (2017) used standard neural architectures using conventional word embeddings, attention, and LSTM layers on a number of varied datasets. The list goes on with Zhang

et al. (2016) using a combination of deep belief networks and feature engineering, Yang et al. (2018) using deep autoencoder models, Liu et al. (2019) using multi-way attention networks, Tan et al. (2020) encoding student responses using Graph Convolutional Networks and Qi et al. (2019) using CNN and Bi-LSTM models to create hierarchical word-sentence model. Transformer architectures have also been widely used by a number of researchers. Sung et al. (2019) achieved human-comparable performance by just fine-tuning BERT model on a domain-specific task. Gaddipati et al. (2020) evaluated different response embeddings for their ASAG task, namely ELMo, GPT, BERT, and GPT-2. The size of transformers and their ability to generalize to different languages has also been studied (Camus and Filighera 2020). However, the availability of large amounts of data is a concern here. In most practical settings, it is rare to find such large amounts of training data. Instead, most instructors have access to near-domain data (data pertaining to the same overarching topic), which is what we leverage in our work.

Most recently, people have started using large language models for these grading tasks (Henkel et al. 2023; Schneider et al. 2024). Although LLMs are not trained for classification tasks, many works have shown promising results on these tasks by using few-shot prompting techniques giving few examples in the system prompt (Cohn et al. 2024; Kortemeyer 2023; Ouyang et al. 2022). Golchin et al. (2024) attempted to replace peer grading in massive open online courses using OpenAI’s GPT 3.5 and GPT 4 models. Yoon (2023) uses one-shot prompting and text similarity scoring (aligned with the three-step approach). Kortemeyer (2023) utilized the standard benchmark 2-way and 3-way datasets SciEntsBank and Beetle, and studied the performance of OpenAI’s GPT-4 on them with and without a reference answer.

Keeping the above approaches in mind and the recent progresses in large language models like BERT and GPT, we show that the necessary algorithms to achieve the state-of-the-art performance for evaluating science assessments already exist if utilized in a proper manner. The rest of this paper discusses this approach and shares our insights gathered throughout the process. Our main contributions can be summarized as following:

1. We provide a novel framework to automate the grading of short constructed-response questions that requires a very limited amount of data to achieve a competitive performance, especially because it relies on near-domain data like similar questions administered in previous years.
2. We compare the performance of high-compute (large number of parameters) models like GPT 3.5 Turbo, GPT 4 Turbo, and GPT 4o with the performance of low-compute (smaller number of parameters) models like BERT (and its fine-tuned versions).
3. We identify and analyze the patterns of mistakes that the models make.
4. We provide a discussion on the trade-offs between model size, environmental impact, and how the framework is applicable in practical settings, ensuring consistency, fairness, and efficiency in automated grading systems.

2 Methodology

As shared earlier, we propose a novel method to grade the short-answer responses, which is the first step in the feedback generation process.

2.1 Dataset

Our dataset consists of three related CRQs about the biological information flow (Central Dogma of Molecular Biology). In this section, we share some important insights about the dataset.

2.1.1 Significance of the underlying topic

The topic of information flow has been acknowledged as a fundamental biological concept by many researchers (AAA 2011; NGSS Lead States 2013). However, both secondary and postsecondary level students have shown difficulty in understanding it (Prevost et al. 2016). As highlighted by Lewis et al. (2000) and Mills Shaw et al. (2008), the difficulty for many students lies in understanding how the genetic information is stored and exchanged. In contrast, many students find it difficult to understand how the genetic information (DNA) is encoded into proteins through a RNA intermediate. Many works have highlighted student misconceptions about these topics (Fisher 1985; Mills Shaw et al. 2008; Wood-Robinson 2000; Marbach-Ad 2001; Smith and Knight 2012; Smith et al. 2008).

Many researchers (Wright et al. 2014; Prevost et al. 2016) have tried to understand why this barrier in understanding the topic of central dogma exists, often focusing on root causes in pedagogy such as the use of un insightful diagrams for explaining the concept. In contrast, this study aims to further previous work using an automated text classification system to assess students' understanding of the process and help instructors identify patterns of mistakes.

2.1.2 Origin of the Dataset

The Genetics Concept Assessment (GCA) is a concept inventory mainly focused on information flow, exchange and storage which are fundamental ideas in many undergraduate biology and genetics courses (Smith et al. 2008). The instrument reveals student understanding of nine learning goals through twenty-five multiple choice questions. For this study, we employ a version of a GCA multiple-choice question that was modified by Prevost et al. (2016). The modified item tests understanding of a core concept in undergraduate biology (i.e. information flow) (American Association for the Advancement of Science 2010) and maintains alignment to the original learning goal in the GCA. This modified item is composed of three, related, open-ended prompts that asked students to explain the effect of a mutation in a strand of DNA that results in a premature stop codon. Students are asked to explain the effect on three closely related processes in information flow, namely replication, transcription, and translation. The question is as follows: *The following DNA sequence occurs near the middle of the coding region of a gene. DNA 5' A A T G A A T G G* G A G C C T G A*

A G G A 3' There is a G to A base change at the position marked with an asterisk. Consequently, a codon normally encoding an amino acid becomes a stop codon.

- **Q1:** *How will this alteration influence DNA replication?*
- **Q2:** *How will this alteration influence DNA transcription?*
- **Q3:** *How will this alteration influence DNA translation?*

Some sample responses for each of these questions along with their classification is shown in table 1. These questions were administered to undergraduate biology in introductory cell and molecular biology-focused courses at multiple large public research universities in the US as a part of their regular online homework assignments after the relevant content on central dogma was taught. The completion of the assignment was rewarded with one point and students were encouraged to just try their best. A total of 2,861 students participated, each providing one response per question across the three questions. These responses were marked as either correct, incomplete or incorrect by human experts with an inter-grader agreement of 80% (Prevost et al. 2016; Bierema et al. 2021). Majority vote was accounted for when any disagreements happened. Some responses were removed from the data because they were nonsensical (like "IDK"). We believe that the data is representative since it is coming from multiple universities, class populations, and time periods. The data distribution is shown in table 2.

Table 1: Sample responses and model classification/evaluation for questions on the effects of a genetic alteration on Replication, Transcription, and Translation

Question	Response	Classification
Effect on Replication	This will have a severe effect on DNA replication. Once the DNA polymerase reads the stop codon it stops replicating the nucleotides in the DNA code. This will leave a major chunk of the gene to be lost due to the fact that it is not replicated because the DNA polymerase reached a stop codon before it was supposed to.	Incorrect
Effect on Replication	It wouldn't really change the speed of replication at all. The strand that had this mutation on it would be mutated, so the effect for that copy would be permanent, but there would be no evidence of mutation on the other strand, so it would still be a G in that daughter strand. In summary, you'd get one daughter with A and one with G. I don't believe the proofreading mechanisms on the polymerase would catch it since they only catch errors that they make, and this error happened at another time.	Correct

Continued on next page...

Question	Response	Classification
Effect on Replication	A mutation that results in a stop codon in the middle of a DNA sequence results in the stopping of translation and therefore the protein is not formed. This changes DNA replication because not all of the protein is formed which messes up the DNA of the cell.	Incomplete
Effect on Transcription	The stop codon signals the end of the DNA sequence that is to be transcribed. During transcription the DNA sequence is copied to RNA and when the G to A base change occurs a stop codon is produced resulting in that codon as the last to be transcribed. Because the mRNA ends with the stop codon only.	Incorrect
Effect on Transcription	This alteration will cause a mutation in the DNA replication. A point mutation occurs and then DNA replication will begin replicating the mutated gene sequence. A stop code is a nucleotide triplet within messenger RNA that signals a translation. The stop codon tells the ribosomes executing the mRNA code that it's time to stop.	Incomplete
Effect on Transcription	Because DNA is always replicated and transcribed from 5' to 3', mRNA will transcribe the chain into UUA/CUU/ACC, with ACC acting as the stop codon. Because there is a stop codon, the following nucleotides will not be translated into amino acids. However, mRNA will continue to transcribe the DNA into mRNA strands of UUA/CUU/ACC/CUC/GGA/CUU/CCU, but they will only be translated up to the stop codon.	Correct
Effect on Translation	The stop codons are UAA, UAG, and UGA. None of these are in this strand of DNA even with the base change so nothing will happen with the stop codon. Translation will decode the mRNA that is made by replicating the template strand which will then produce polypeptides.	Incorrect

Continued on next page...

Question	Response	Classification
Effect on Translation	The term point mutation originated before the advent of DNA sequencing and therefore before it was routinely possible to discover the molecular basis for a mutational event. Nowadays, point mutations typically refer to alterations of single base pairs of DNA or to a small number of adjacent base pairs. Examples include deletions, insertions, substitutions, etc.	Incomplete
Effect on Translation	The alteration will be slightly detrimental in translation because the polypeptide chain will be very short and may not consist of all the amino acids needed to produce the right proteins needed by the body. In this sense then the body becomes deprived of some proteins and different diseases associated with this deprivation occur as a result.	Correct

Table 2: Distribution of collected data for Replication, Transcription, and Translation questions across training, validation, and testing sets, categorized as Correct, Incomplete, and Incorrect

Question	Label	Training	Validation	Testing	Total
Replication	Correct	785	219	554	1558
	Incomplete	240	64	169	473
	Incorrect	405	146	279	830
Transcription	Correct	759	217	554	1530
	Incomplete	220	79	146	445
	Incorrect	451	133	302	886
Translation	Correct	940	272	665	1877
	Incomplete	310	96	203	609
	Incorrect	180	61	134	375

2.2 Terminology and Approach

2.2.1 Splitting Data

We will use the following symbols to denote different aspects in our process. As described above, our dataset is composed of student responses to three different questions. We denote each student as S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n . Q_1 refers to the first question which deals with the effect on replication, Q_2 refers to the second question which deals with the effect on transcription, and Q_3 refers to the third question which deals with the

effect on translation. The responses from a given student S_k are written as $S_{k|1}$, $S_{k|2}$, $S_{k|3}$. From the data that we have, we reserve responses from 50% (1430) of the students for training (T_1 , T_2 , T_3 for Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 respectively) and 15% (429) of the students for validation purposes (V_1 , V_2 , V_3 for Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 respectively). The training data is used to train the model and adjust its parameters, while the validation data is used to evaluate the model’s performance, aiding in model tuning and preventing overfitting.

We ensure that all three responses from a single student remain within the same dataset partition. This partitioning guarantees that a student’s response to one question is never used to predict any characteristics of their responses to other questions. In other words, since we have responses to all three questions from a particular student, we do not train a model using some of their responses while testing it on others. This helps maintain generality throughout the process by ensuring that the model does not inadvertently rely on the dependency between responses from the same student across different questions, thereby making the results applicable to other experiments where responses from the same student to all three questions are considered independently.

The responses from the remaining 35% (1002 samples) of students for Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 are reserved to test generalization of the model on unseen datasets, hereby referred as T'_1 , T'_2 , T'_3 respectively. We have S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n students in some random order and let $p = 0.5n$ and $q = 0.15n$, then for $i = 1, 2, 3$ for question Q_i , we have

$$T_i = \{S_{1|i}, S_{2|i}, \dots, S_{p|i}\} \quad (1)$$

$$V_i = \{S_{p+1|i}, S_{p+2|i}, \dots, S_{p+q|i}\} \quad (2)$$

$$T'_i = \{S_{p+q+1|i}, S_{p+q+2|i}, \dots, S_{n|i}\} \quad (3)$$

2.2.2 Fine-tuning BERT models

We start with a basic BERT model (hereby, referred as base model B_0), and fine tune it on all of T_1 to get BMQ_1 , fine tune it on all of T_2 to get BMQ_2 , and fine tune it on all of T_3 to get BMQ_3 . BMQ_1 was evaluated on T'_1 , BMQ_2 was evaluated on T'_2 , and BMQ_3 was evaluated on T'_3 . We did not evaluate these models on other questions because each model was fine-tuned specifically to categorize responses for one question only, and lacks the context to handle responses from other questions. Corresponding validation sets V_1 , V_2 , and V_3 were used during training for early stopping and model selection. Specifically, during training, if the validation accuracy did not improve for 10 consecutive epochs, training was stopped early and the model weights from the best-performing epoch were restored.

2.2.3 Near-domain Data

In our work, the questions share a common subject matter (information flow through the Central Dogma of molecular biology), which means that in order to predict classification scores for a particular question, the model trained on another question can also be leveraged. The data on which this other model is trained is what we refer to as near-domain data throughout the work. We wanted to confirm if a model trained

on near domain data would require less training dataset to perform similarly to the model that is trained on a larger dataset, but without near domain data.


2.2.4 Models leveraging near-domain data

In order to test how well a model can leverage the knowledge from one question to potentially improve the performance of others within the same domain, we fine-tune BMQ_1 on different subsets of T_2 to obtain the best model BMQ_1Q_2 , and then we fine tune BMQ_1Q_2 on different subsets of T_3 to obtain the best model, $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$. For reference, refer to Figure 1 for an easier understanding of the terminology. The subsets of training data used for $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models were chosen by using a fixed random seed and stratified sampling of the particular training dataset in increments of 2.5% or about 35 student samples (from 0% to 100%). Throughout the training process, we use a batch size of 16 and drop out any remaining samples that could not be accounted in the batch. Again, as explained above, since any of these BERT and BERT derivative models do not have the context of the question, it does not make sense to evaluate them on responses to other questions. Thus, BMQ_1 was evaluated on T'_1 , BMQ_1Q_2 was evaluated on T'_2 and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ was evaluated on T'_3 only. The success of this strategy would imply that in the future, we would only need a small set of annotated samples for new questions, significantly reducing the amount of labeled data required to achieve optimal model performance. Annotating data for machine learning models, especially in specialized domains like this, is time-consuming and costly. Thus, if successful, this approach would allow us to leverage existing models trained on related questions, minimizing the need for extensive annotation efforts for each new question. This strategy, if proven effective, could have widespread implications for educational models and other domains where labeled data is scarce. Further details about the process are explained in 2.3.1.


To identify the best-performing model for each question, we examined two factors - the evaluation metric (chosen as accuracy in this study) and the amount of training data used for fine-tuning. Specifically, for each $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) model, we assessed how accuracy changed as the percentage of training data from T_j increased, helping us determine the most efficient or smallest subset size required for relatively optimal performance. To confirm the consistency and reliability of the accuracy metric obtained on the training data, we used the respective validation sets: BMQ_1 was evaluated on V_1 , BMQ_2 and BMQ_1Q_2 were evaluated on V_2 , and BMQ_3 and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ were evaluated on V_3 . On the testing data, we find the top 5 most accurate models, calculate their average accuracy, and choose the most accurate model with the least amount of data that is within 1 standard deviation of this average accuracy. Details of this can be found in table 3.

2.3 Model Architecture and Training

Since the advent of BERT (Devlin et al. 2018) and GPT (Radford et al. 2018), the dominant adaptation technique has been model tuning or fine-tuning (Lester et al. 2021) even for variants of GPT that came afterwards like (Radford et al. 2019). The two most common ways of fine-tuning include freezing the weights in the earlier layers



(a)



(b)

Fig. 1: Model terminology and fine-tuning process: (a) B_0 represents the base BERT model, fine-tuned separately on training data T_1 , T_2 , T_3 to create BMQ_1 , BMQ_2 , BMQ_3 and (b) Near-domain fine-tuning is applied sequentially where B_0 is fine-tuned on T_1 to produce BMQ_1 , BMQ_1 is fine-tuned on a subset of T_2 to produce BMQ_1Q_2 , which is further fine-tuned on a subset of T_3 to obtain $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$.

and only changing the ones in the later layers or retraining all the parameters in the model as proposed by Howard and Ruder (2018). We tried our experiments with both the approaches and found out that the latter produced results that were suboptimal by a huge margin of 10-20% across all questions. Thus, the results shared in the rest of the paper are based on training all the parameters. We share the specific details around fine-tuning BERT model and OpenAI’s GPT models below:

2.3.1 BERT

BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) is a language representation model based on the Transformer model (Vaswani et al. 2017) that is trained on a large corpus of unlabeled text. One particularly distinguishing characteristic of BERT is the Transformer model’s self-attention mechanism that compares the significance of every word in a piece of sentence to every other word in that sentence




Fig. 2: GPT-based student response classification pipeline: The question type (Replication, Transcription, or Translation), sample correct, incomplete, and incorrect answers, and the student response are added for different cases into the prompt which is then fed into pre-trained GPT models (both fine-tuned and non-fine-tuned versions) to generate classification outputs with Human assistance needed to map the model-generated text to classification categories (Correct, Incomplete, or Incorrect). Domain expert-graded answers serve as the ground truth for evaluation.

enabling it to collect context in both the forward and the backward direction. This bidirectional nature helps BERT capture and represent deeper and richer language representations than traditional unidirectional models.

The B_0 model consists of input IDs and attention masks mapping to the main layer, which comprises 12 layers and 12 attention heads with the pooler output having 768 nodes (totaling, 108,310,272 parameters). For BMQ_1 , BMQ_2 , and BMQ_3 , we attach this main layer to an intermediate layer (IL_1) with 512 nodes (393,728 parameters) which is attached to a classification head (CH_1) of 3 nodes (1,539 parameters), each of which is associated with a single class (correct, incomplete, or incorrect class). All the parameters are trainable.

For training these models, we employ the Adam Optimizer (Kingma and Ba 2014) with a learning rate of $1e - 5$, and use categorical cross entropy as the loss function. The number of epochs are guided by an early stopping callback function that monitors the validation accuracy for 10 successive epochs without an improvement before it restores the weights of the model performing the best on validation data.

2.3.2 GPT Series

To understand how good LLMs are at grading these responses, we also perform several experiments with fine-tuned and non-fine-tuned models from OpenAI’s GPT series. We directly prompt GPT 3.5 Turbo, GPT 4, and GPT 4o without fine-tuning. We also fine-tune GPT 3.5 Turbo (the only model allowed to be fine-tuned at the time of

the experiments), but for this fine-tuning, instead of using increments of 2.5% to test the model performance, we used the entire training data. All these experiments are done using different temperatures (0, 0.5, and 1).

For GPT fine-tuning, we follow the standard procedure as suggested by OpenAI. For the prompt that is used to train the GPT models, we take inspiration from [Golchin et al. \(2024\)](#) to decide our root prompt which is as follows:

You are a fair and knowledgeable instructor whose task is to evaluate the student's assignments in accordance with the correct answers to each of the questions that are presented in the section that follows.

The student does not need to share every information from the model answer category as long as they convey the right idea.

Then, we provide the question, the model answer, the student response, and ask the model to classify it as either correct, incorrect, or incomplete as a multiple-choice question as suggested and done by [Santurkar et al. \(2023\)](#). The rest of the prompt is given below, where `<substring>` represents the answer provided by the student and `<sample_correct>`, `<sample_incomplete>`, and `<sample_incorrect>` refer to the sample correct, sample incomplete, and sample incorrect responses for each `<question_type>` (replication, transcription, translation). Table 4 shares the exact samples, which is inspired from ([Prevost et al. 2016](#)). Details about the entire pipeline are shown in Figure 2.

Question:

The following DNA sequence occurs near the middle of the coding region of a gene.

DNA 5' A A T G A A T G G G A G C C T G A A G G A 3'*

There is a G to A base change at the position marked with an asterisk. Consequently, a codon normally encoding an amino acid becomes a stop codon.

How will this alteration influence DNA <question_type>?

Model Answer:

- 1. Correct: <sample_correct>*
- 2. Incomplete/Irrelevant: <sample_incomplete>*
- 3. Incorrect: <sample_incorrect>.*

Student Answer:

- 1. <substring>*

Which of the following categories does the student response fall in?

- A. Correct*
- B. Incorrect*
- C. Incomplete*

These experiments were performed with three different temperatures (0, 0.5, 1), which is an OpenAI parameter that determines the creativity of the model. The usual range is from 0 to 2 with higher values making the output more random, while lower values making it more focused and deterministic. When the temperature is set to 0, the model uses log probability to automatically increase the temperature until certain thresholds are hit. We also performed experiments with higher temperatures like 1.5 and 2.0, but the output from the model was gibberish in most cases, so we do not report any results from these experiments.

Table 3: Performance metrics of various BERT models as evaluated on the corresponding testing dataset, namely T'_1 for BMQ_1 , T'_2 for BMQ_2 and BMQ_1Q_2 , and T'_3 for BMQ_3 and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$


Model Name	Mean Acc.	Median Acc.	Std. Dev. (SD)	Max Acc.	% data for max	Acc. within 1 SD	% data for 1 SD
BMQ_1Q_2	89.48	90.32	05.05	91.42	82.5	91.32	62.5
$BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$	82.81	84.23	09.96	86.93	82.5	86.93	82.5

Table 4: Examples of student responses and their classification across the three questions, with each response shown given by a different student. These sample responses have been used in the GPT prompts.


Question	<sample.correct>	<sample.incomplete>	<sample.incorrect>
Replication	It will not have any effect on the replication process.	This would be an example of a nonsense mutation.	The DNA will stop replicating when it reaches the stop codon.
Transcription	It will not have any effect on transcription.	This will cause a mutation in the transcription process.	In the process of transcribing DNA into RNA, the newly added stop codon will inhibit the rest of the chain from being transcribed into RNA.
Translation	This will influence translation because the stop codon will cause the amino acid sequence to end before it should. This will create a different polypeptide or protein that will either not function or function differently than it should have.	The code will be translated with a different base and will be read differently. This will result in a different protein being built.	This will have no influence on translation.

2.4 Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used popular large language models (LLMs), including Claude Sonnet by Anthropic and GPT models by OpenAI, solely to enhance the clarity and structure of the text. After using these tools, the author(s) thoroughly reviewed and edited the content to ensure accuracy and originality, and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the published article.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 3: Advantages from Sequential Fine-Tuning with Near-Domain Data: Accuracy versus training data percentage for sequentially fine-tuned $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models on transcription and translation questions. In particular, (a) Accuracy of BMQ_1Q_2 on the transcription task as training data increases shown in comparison to the accuracy of BMQ_2 and (b) Accuracy of $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ on the translation task as training data increases shown in comparison to the accuracy of BMQ_3 . The results demonstrate that sequential fine-tuning on near-domain data enhances model performance on both tasks, achieving higher accuracy with less training data compared to BMQ_i models. The results also show that the accuracy plateaus off as more data is fed into the model.

3 Results

We share the main experiments and their key results in this section.

3.1 Base BERT on Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3

Starting from Base BERT B_0 , and fine-tuning on entirety of the training dataset for Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 , we get BMQ_1 , BMQ_2 , and BMQ_3 which have an accuracy of 90.72%, 91.22%, and 82.83% respectively. Without any training, B_0 gives an accuracy of 16.87% on T'_1 (test data of Q_1), 14.77% on T'_2 (test data of Q_2), and B_0 gives an accuracy of 13.37% on T'_3 (test data of Q_3). This observed difference in model performance highlights the importance of fine-tuning, as the base model trained on general data does not generalize well to specialized domains such as biology without further adaptation. More metrics can be found in table 5 and table 6.

3.2 Pretrained model results on Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3

As a reminder, models BMQ_i and $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) differ from each other in the method used to train them. Model BMQ_i is trained directly on Base BERT using the question i whereas model BMQ_1Q_2 is BMQ_1 trained on subset of T_2 and model $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ is BMQ_1Q_2 trained on subset of T_3 . For Question 2, BMQ_1Q_2 achieves an accuracy of 91.32% after training on 62.5% of the data which is the accuracy within 1 standard deviation of the average accuracy of the top 5 models and uses the least amount of training data. We see that the model accuracy for BMQ_1Q_2 started at 58.38% (Figure 3). However, the accuracy eventually plateaus off i.e., the accuracies stabilize after a given point and show only negligible point differences later on. This suggests that near-domain data from other questions is helpful in improving accuracy on a particular question but only to a particular extent. For Question 3, $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ achieves an accuracy of 86.93% after training on 82.5% of the data, which is the accuracy within 1 standard deviation of the average accuracy of the top 5 models and uses the least amount of training data. This time, $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ starts with a very low accuracy initially, precisely 20.86%. However, after training on merely 2.5% of T'_3 , the accuracy jumps to 82.63% and it also eventually plateaus off on adding more data. This suggests that $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ was able to learn insights from Q_1 and Q_2 that helped improve accuracy on Q_3 by just utilizing a small amount of data. More metrics can be found in table 5 and table 6.

Table 5: Comparison of model accuracy between fine-tuned B_0 and sequentially fine-tuned models ($BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$)) under different data conditions, namely accuracy on training with 0% data and the percentage of data required to achieve the comparable baseline accuracy for Transcription (Q_2) and Translation (Q_3) questions

Question	Percentage of data used	$BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$)
Transcription	Accuracy when trained on 0% data	58.38
	Percentage of data needed to achieve comparable baseline accuracy	7.5%
Translation	Accuracy when trained on 0% data	66.37
	Percentage of data needed to achieve comparable baseline accuracy	2.5%

3.3 Non-fine-tuned GPT Results

We use the same prompt as described in section 2.3.2 to prompt GPT 3.5 Turbo, GPT 4 Turbo (gpt-4-0125-preview endpoint), and GPT 4o. We perform these experiments with different temperatures as described in section 2.3.2. For each of the GPT model experiments, the results obtained from using different temperatures are very close to each other as seen in Table 7. Thus, we can consider the different accuracy from changing temperatures to be insignificant and thus, we feel comfortable comparing results for each model using the mean accuracy. Across all the three questions, GPT 3.5 Turbo does not perform very well with a gap of 5% - 10% from the best performing model out of the non-fine tuned versions of GPT in each category. This gap is maximum for Q_3 (9.78%), lesser for Q_2 (9.08%), and the least for Q_1 (8.05%). Comparing GPT 4 Turbo and GPT 4o, the former performs way better than the latter for Q_2 and Q_3 , surpassing the accuracy by 7.29% and 10.05% on those questions respectively. However, GPT 4o beats GPT 4 Turbo on Q_1 by a small margin of 1.23%. It is interesting to note that for Q_3 , GPT 3.5 Turbo also surpasses the performance of GPT 4o, although by merely 0.27 points.

We do not have a good reasoning on why some architectures perform better on some questions than others. Just like Shazeer mentions in his work on the GLU variants, "we attribute their success, as all else, to divine benevolence," referring to the somewhat unpredictable and often unexplained nature of certain architectures' performance despite seemingly similar conditions and hyperparameters. (Shazeer 2020)

3.4 Fine-tuned GPT Results

Using the same prompt and multiple temperatures as described in section 2.3.2, we fine-tune GPT 3.5 Turbo (the only model that OpenAI allowed to fine-tune at the time these experiments were performed). On Q_1 , we get an accuracy of 93.71%, 93.81%, 93.41% with temperatures 0, 0.5, and 1 respectively. On Q_2 , we get an accuracy of 93.91% with all temperatures 0, 0.5, and 1. On Q_3 , we get an accuracy of 88.02%, 87.62%, 87.92% with temperatures 0, 0.5, and 1 respectively. The rest of the metrics can be found in table 6.

Table 6: Comprehensive comparison of the metrics (macro versions, where applicable) used to evaluate the performance of the different BERT and LLM models on their respective questions. N/A means not-applicable, indicating that no training happened in the experimental setting.

Model Name	Training Data %age	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
BMQ_1	100	90.72	86.93	88.40	87.58
gpt-3.5-turbo fine-tuned, temperature=0)	(Q_1 , 100	93.71	91.51	91.00	91.20

Continued on next page...

Model Name	Training Data %age	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_1 , fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	100	93.81	91.69	91.06	91.32
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_1 , fine-tuned, temperature=1)	100	93.41	91.10	90.54	90.76
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	69.46	65.77	68.14	64.36
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	68.76	65.34	67.47	63.69
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	66.37	63.67	65.39	61.73
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	74.75	71.24	65.45	61.71
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	75.25	70.94	66.03	62.47
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	75.05	69.56	65.49	61.65
gpt-4o (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	77.15	70.99	73.96	71.03
gpt-4o (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	76.95	71.23	74.41	71.34
gpt-4o (Q_1 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	74.65	69.17	72.20	68.87
BMQ_2	100	91.22	87.70	86.34	86.98
BMQ_1Q_2	62.5	91.32	88.14	86.09	86.87
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_2 , fine-tuned, temperature=0)	100	93.91	90.43	92.95	91.53
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_2 , fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	100	93.91	90.43	92.95	91.53
gpt-3.5-turbo (Q_2 , fine-tuned, temperature=1)	100	93.91	90.43	92.95	91.53
<i>Continued on next page...</i>					

Model Name	Training Data %age	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	(Q_2 , N/A	64.77	58.07	58.39	57.28
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	(Q_2 , N/A	63.37	56.86	56.64	55.71
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	(Q_2 , N/A	63.97	57.08	57.63	56.44
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	73.05	58.46	60.38	55.24
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	73.25	59.16	60.62	55.67
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	73.05	58.77	60.50	55.56
gpt-4o (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	67.56	64.99	65.71	62.50
gpt-4o (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	65.77	64.17	63.76	60.93
gpt-4o (Q_2 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	64.17	62.21	61.12	58.85
BMQ_3	100	82.83	72.88	69.84	70.70
$BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$	82.5	86.93	79.91	74.65	76.70
gpt-3.5-turbo fine-tuned, temperature=0)	(Q_3 , 100	88.02	82.60	75.80	78.22
gpt-3.5-turbo fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	(Q_3 , 100	87.62	81.83	74.97	77.39
gpt-3.5-turbo fine-tuned, temperature=1)	(Q_3 , 100	87.92	82.37	75.55	77.94
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	(Q_3 , N/A	68.56	61.82	56.89	56.99

Continued on next page...

Model Name	Training Data %age	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	(Q_3 , N/A	68.46	61.94	57.04	57.15
gpt-3.5-turbo non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	(Q_3 , N/A	66.97	55.61	55.32	54.80
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	77.84	66.09	66.12	66.10
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	77.45	65.57	65.12	65.33
gpt-4-0125-preview (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	78.04	66.99	66.87	66.92
gpt-4o (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0)	N/A	67.56	68.58	62.71	60.66
gpt-4o (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=0.5)	N/A	67.37	67.20	62.30	60.05
gpt-4o (Q_3 , non-fine-tuned, temperature=1)	N/A	68.26	66.62	62.67	60.27

4 Discussion

4.1 Sources of Error in Model Results

Upon evaluation of models on test data, we found several human-machine disagreements. In particular, as shown in Table 8, BMQ_1 had 70 (in T'_1), BMQ_2 had 85 (in T'_2), BMQ_3 had 162 (in T'_3), BMQ_1Q_2 had 87 (in T'_2), and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ had 131 (in T'_3) disagreements. With help from domain experts, we studied the different errors in the model predictions and classified them into three categories that are useful for further research in this field.

1. **Human Errors:** While evaluating the results given by the models, a domain expert re-evaluated the assigned classifications on miscoded responses. After this review, the domain expert also disagreed with the initial assigned score on about 10% misscored cases (Table 8), suggesting these responses may have mistakenly been given the wrong scores initially or were difficult for even experts to agree on classification. It’s worth noting that the initial inter-grader agreement was around 80%, indicating a fairly strong but not absolutely perfect baseline consistency among annotators. This further reinforces the idea that some level of ambiguity or subjectivity was present in the data from the beginning. This is quite exciting

because this suggests that the model is able to learn well despite the presence of potential noise in the data. Upon second evaluation, BMQ_1 had 10, BMQ_1 had 8, BMQ_3 had 17, BMQ_1Q_2 had 12, and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ had 11 possible human misscores.

Table 7: Model performance comparison across three questions calculated from experiments with different temperatures as presented in table 6

Question	Model Name	Mean Accuracy	Sample Standard Deviation
Replication	GPT 3.5 Turbo (fine-tuned)	93.64	0.21
	GPT 3.5 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	68.20	1.62
	GPT 4 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	75.02	0.25
	GPT 4o (non-fine-tuned)	76.25	1.39
Transcription	GPT 3.5 Turbo (fine-tuned)	93.91	0.00
	GPT 3.5 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	64.04	0.70
	GPT 4 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	73.12	0.12
	GPT 4o (non-fine-tuned)	65.83	1.70
Translation	GPT 3.5 Turbo (fine-tuned)	87.85	0.21
	GPT 3.5 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	68.00	0.89
	GPT 4 Turbo (non-fine-tuned)	77.78	0.30
	GPT 4o (non-fine-tuned)	67.73	0.47

2. **Shared errors across models:** For Q_2 and Q_3 , we analyzed how many responses were not classified correctly by any of the BMQ_i or $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models i.e., which Q_2 responses were not classified correctly by both BMQ_2 and BMQ_1Q_2 and which Q_3 responses were not classified correctly by both BMQ_3 and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$. For each of the three human labels, there are two possible different classifications generated by BMQ_i model and two possible different classifications generated by $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) model, which means there are twelve scenarios. In total, there are 62 such Q_2 responses and 102 such Q_3 responses (number of samples for each combination is shown in Table 9).

In Q_2 , errors are more prominent in responses that are labeled "Incomplete" by human graders whereas in Q_3 , errors are more prominent in responses that are labeled "Incorrect" by human graders. Specifically, the scenario "Incomplete,

Table 8: Human errors: Number of samples that were counted as misclassified by the models, but were actually misunderstood because of original human miscodes.

Question	Model	Human-machine disagreements	Possible Human Miscodes
Replication	BMQ_1	93	10
Transcription	BMQ_2	88	8
	BMQ_1Q_2	87	12
Translation	BMQ_3	172	17
	$BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$	131	11

Incorrect, Incorrect” appears most often in Q_2 (17 instances), and “Incorrect, Incomplete, Incomplete” occurs most frequently in Q_3 (27 instances), highlighting the prevalence of wrong predictions whenever the human label or ground truth is not strictly “Correct.” Conversely, when the human label is “Correct,” relatively fewer instances fall into incorrect or incomplete predictions, implying that correct responses tend to be correctly identified by both models. We believe this pattern arises because the correct answer to a question is usually singular or limited, while an incorrect or incomplete answer can take on a variety of forms. Consequently, even if the model learns how to classify the correct response, accounting for every possible way in which an answer might be wrong or incomplete proves much more challenging.

If we include the results from GPT models too, there are 14 responses in Q_1 , 17 responses in Q_2 and 35 responses in Q_3 that are not classified correctly by any model. We attribute this behavior to the general heavy-tailed zipf distribution of student responses in natural language which has been noted by other works (Nguyen et al. 2014; Piech 2016). A distribution is said to follow zipf’s law if the probability of the n -th most probable outcome follows an inverse power-law with respect to n . This is to say that the probability of an outcome o is proportional to:

$$p(o) \propto \frac{1}{\text{rank}(o)^\beta} \quad (4)$$

where $\text{rank}(o)$ is calculated after ordering all the outcomes based on their probabilities, and β is the exponent parameter guiding the shape of the distribution. Such distributions are called Zipfian distributions or power-law distributions. Useful inferences can be made from identifying the zipf nature of distributions, but the most relevant one is identifying that zipf distributions have a long tail which implies that a huge portion of the responses will only be observed exactly once and hence, it is difficult to generalize algorithms/models to accurately classify them because during test time, there will be new examples that can introduce new student strategies or unseen tokens or new misconceptions.

This challenge is further compounded in natural language processing (NLP), where even two individuals attempting to express the same idea may do so using different lexical or syntactic constructions. That is, semantically similar responses

can vary significantly in wording, leading to a proliferation of unique combinations of tokens. Consequently, even correct or meaningful responses may appear rare or entirely novel to a model simply due to surface-level differences which increase the difficulty of building robust systems that can generalize beyond frequently seen patterns. As discussed by Piantadosi (2014), Zipfian distributions are a fundamental characteristic of human language, reflecting a balance between communicative efficiency and cognitive constraints. In educational settings and open-response evaluation tasks, this implies that a small number of responses or linguistic patterns will be very frequent, while the majority will be rare or even unique. Models must therefore be especially sensitive to these low-frequency, long-tail responses—those that may only appear once but nonetheless represent meaningful, valid, or insightful contributions. Ignoring this Zipfian behavior risks systematic underperformance on responses that differ from the norm in form but not in substance, including novel misconceptions or creative solution strategies that are pedagogically significant.

Table 9: Shared errors across models: Number of samples where both models predicted wrong output (for Q_2 and Q_3)

Question	Human Label	BMQ_i	$BMQ_{1...Q_j}$ ($j = 2, 3$)	Total
Transcription (Q_2)	Correct	Incomplete	Incomplete	14
	Correct	Incomplete	Incorrect	0
	Correct	Incorrect	Incomplete	1
	Correct	Incorrect	Incorrect	4
	Incomplete	Correct	Correct	12
	Incomplete	Correct	Incorrect	3
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Correct	1
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Incorrect	17
	Incorrect	Correct	Correct	3
	Incorrect	Correct	Incomplete	0
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Correct	2
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Incomplete	5
Translation (Q_3)	Correct	Incomplete	Incomplete	7
	Correct	Incomplete	Incorrect	1
	Correct	Incorrect	Incomplete	1
	Correct	Incorrect	Incorrect	2
	Incomplete	Correct	Correct	17
	Incomplete	Correct	Incorrect	5
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Correct	2
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Incorrect	7
	Incorrect	Correct	Correct	26
	Incorrect	Correct	Incomplete	2
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Correct	5
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Incomplete	27

3. **Model-specific errors:** For both Q_2 and Q_3 , we also study the responses that were classified incorrectly by one model, but were classified correctly by the other.

For each of the three human labels, we are seeing which of the two models is providing a different classification, and there are two ways in which the classification can be different. Thus, there are twelve total scenarios, and the number of samples across them are listed in Table 10. From the data, we see that most misclassifications involve the "Incomplete" category—either the model predicts "Incomplete" when the ground truth is "Correct" or "Incorrect," or it predicts "Correct"/"Incorrect" where the ground truth is "Incomplete." This pattern is somewhat expected, as "Incomplete" often represents a middle ground between "Correct" and "Incorrect," making it more susceptible to boundary confusion during classification. For example, this is most noticeable in Q_3 where there are 14 scenarios of "Incomplete" response predicted as "Correct" by BMQ_3 , 17 scenarios of "Incorrect" response predicted as "Incomplete" by BMQ_3 , and 12 scenarios of "Incorrect" response being predicted as "Incorrect" by $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$, which outnumbers the direct "Correct" to "Incorrect" or vice versa swaps. In other words, the biggest share of errors stems from confusion involving the "Incomplete" label, rather than straightforward flips between "Correct" and "Incorrect." The scenarios where either of the models predicts the correct class as incorrect or vice versa are limited.

Based on domain expert evaluation, there were some themes that were noticed across these models. For the Transcription question (Q_2), many of the responses misclassified only by BMQ_2 (and correctly coded by BMQ_1Q_2) involved content that is actually relevant to the subsequent Translation question (Q_3) rather than strictly to Transcription. Moreover, BMQ_2 produced more unique misclassifications on responses that compared an abnormal transcription process (arising from the mutation) with a normal process. For the Translation question (Q_3), the $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ model made more errors than BMQ_3 on responses containing detailed descriptions of the translation steps or definitions of different types of mutations. Conversely, BMQ_3 had more unique misclassifications on responses discussing the consequences of cells possessing mutated proteins.

4.2 Advantages of Employing Near-Domain Data

As can be seen in Figure 3 and Table 6, for both Q_2 and Q_3 , the $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models achieve comparable or even better performance than BMQ_i models using lesser amount of data. The performance of these $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models level off as more data is fed into them. However, we tried to better understand the efficacy of using near-domain data and observed that using near-domain data offers two key advantages: *data advantage* and *accuracy advantage*.

Data Advantage refers to the ability of $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models trained on near-domain data to achieve the same level of accuracy as the BMQ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) model trained on 100% of the target data, but with significantly less training data. We observed this pattern for both questions. For Q_2 , BMQ_1Q_2 achieves the same accuracy as BMQ_2 using only 62.5% of the training data (Table 6). In fact, BMQ_1Q_2 reaches 90% accuracy with just 7.5% of the data, after which its performance plateaus around 90%–92% (Figure 3). For Q_3 , $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ matches the performance of BMQ_3 with only 2.5% of the training data. These findings suggest that prior exposure to related

Table 10: Model-specific errors: Number of samples where one model predicted wrong output whereas the other model predicted correct output (for Q_2 and Q_3)

Question	Human Label	BMQ_i	$BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$)	Total
Transcription (Q_2)	Correct	Correct	Incomplete	3
	Correct	Correct	Incorrect	5
	Correct	Incomplete	Correct	5
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	2
	Incomplete	Correct	Incomplete	5
	Incomplete	Incomplete	Correct	8
	Incomplete	Incomplete	Incorrect	7
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Incomplete	5
	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	2
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Incorrect	4
	Incorrect	Incorrect	Correct	1
	Incorrect	Incorrect	Incomplete	1
Translation (Q_3)	Correct	Correct	Incomplete	3
	Correct	Correct	Incorrect	2
	Correct	Incomplete	Correct	7
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	7
	Incomplete	Correct	Incomplete	14
	Incomplete	Incomplete	Correct	5
	Incomplete	Incomplete	Incorrect	12
	Incomplete	Incorrect	Incomplete	9
	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	6
	Incorrect	Incomplete	Incorrect	17
	Incorrect	Incorrect	Correct	4
	Incorrect	Incorrect	Incomplete	3

concepts through near-domain data enables the model to generalize more effectively, thereby significantly reducing the need for extensive manual annotation.

Our approach is a form of few-shot learning, where the model generalizes to a new question with only a small number of labeled examples by leveraging prior training on conceptually related (near-domain) questions. Rather than learning from scratch, the $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models benefit from shared conceptual structure across questions (e.g., within the Central Dogma), allowing them to generalize more quickly and accurately with minimal labeled data from the new target question. Therefore, our approach represents a domain-adaptive, few-shot learning idea as a practical and scalable solution for real-world educational settings, where collecting large amounts of labeled data for every new assessment is infeasible.

This means that instructors in academic settings can achieve the same automated grading accuracy with significantly less labeled data if they have access to near-domain data. A data advantage implies that a model trained on responses to related questions requires fewer labeled examples to match the performance of a model trained solely on the target question. This greatly reduces manual grading effort, making automated

grading more efficient and scalable in real-world classrooms. Instructors can leverage responses from previously asked, related questions—especially on the same topic—to compensate for limited labeled data on new questions. Instead of grading hundreds of responses for every new question, they only need to label a small subset, enabling the model to generalize from past knowledge and streamline the grading process.

Accuracy Advantage, on the other hand, refers to the model’s ability to achieve higher accuracy with the same amount of training data when it has been exposed to related, near-domain data. This occurs when $BMQ_1...Q_j$ ($j = 2, 3$) models yield higher accuracy than the BMQ_i model using the same amount of data. The advantage was evident when comparing the performance of B_0 on Q_2 (14.77%) and Q_3 (13.37%) with BMQ_1Q_2 (58.38%) and $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ (20.83%), where all models were trained on 0% of the target data. In addition, compared to BMQ_3 , the $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ model offers accuracy advantage when both are trained on the 100% training dataset (Figure 3). In fact, one can argue that $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ offers both accuracy and data advantage, as it achieves a higher accuracy (86.93%) with less training data (82.5%) compared to BMQ_3 (82.83%), which is trained on 100% of the training dataset.

Even with a limited number of labeled responses for a new question, a model can achieve higher grading accuracy by leveraging knowledge from similar, near-domain questions. For example, if a model has already been trained to grade answers about DNA transcription, it can more effectively classify responses about DNA translation—even when the latter has only a small set of labeled examples. This accuracy advantage means that the model benefits from shared concepts, terminology, and response structures across related questions, allowing it to generalize better without requiring extensive new annotations.

This is particularly useful in academic settings where instructors often face constraints on time and resources for manual grading. Instead of labeling hundreds of responses for each new question, they can rely on models that have learned from previous, related questions to maintain grading quality. This not only reduces the likelihood of misclassification when labeled data is scarce but also ensures greater fairness and reliability—especially important in high-stakes educational environments. By using near-domain data, instructors can make automated grading more efficient, scalable, and practical for real-world classrooms.

We note that the accuracy advantage in Q_3 (improvement of 7.46%) is relatively smaller compared to that in Q_2 (improvement of 43.61%) when trained on 0% data. We believe that the reason that we see a low initial accuracy on Q_3 is because unlike Q_1 and Q_2 , where the correct answer is that there will be no effect on replication and transcription respectively, the correct answer for Q_3 is that there would be an effect on translation. Since the $BMQ_1Q_2Q_3$ model does not have any context about the change of question or change of correct answer, it did not perform very well initially. However, when trained with only a few trained examples (2.5%), data advantage kicks in and we get high accuracy performance.

4.3 Fine-tuned vs Non-Fine-Tuned GPT 3.5 Turbo

From table 7, we can clearly see that fine-tuning GPT 3.5 Turbo performs way better than its non-fine-tuned counterpart with a margin of 25.446%, 29.873%, and 19.856%

on Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 respectively. This suggests that although GPT models are trained on vast amounts of diverse data, they struggle to generalize effectively to specific downstream tasks without targeted fine-tuning. Feeding information particular to the question under consideration helps them better understand the patterns. In other words, despite having seen a wide range of data, the non-fine-tuned models lack the necessary task-specific grounding, leading to poor performance on unseen, domain-specific examples. Providing fine-tuned data aligned with the structure and intent of each question allows the model to better capture relevant patterns and nuances.

4.4 Overall Performance across Questions

An interesting result to note is that the performance of both the fine-tuned GPT model and fine-tuned BERT models is consistently reduced for Q_3 compared to that of Q_1 and Q_2 across all metrics - accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score. This trend is consistent with previous results for ASAG based on this question (Prevost et al. 2016). Examining these misclassifications, we found that the most errors resulted from both approaches assigning the same code, but different from the human label (see Table 8). Based on human experts, translation is considered to be a more difficult concept for students to master because developing a proper understanding of it requires knowledge of the preceding processes (e.g., transcription) and molecules (e.g., DNA and RNA). Consequently, even the models found it more challenging to evaluate responses to this question accurately. We also noted that a number of human disagreements occur assigning either Incomplete or Incorrect label to Translation responses. This may suggest that coding criteria could be improved or there are many borderline responses between these categories. Previous work found that responses coded as Incorrect for Translation include a wide variety of ideas and concepts, more so than for responses to Replication and Transcription question, representing diverse, yet incorrect, thinking about the science (Uhl et al. 2021).

4.5 Model Size and Environment

The results of this study suggest that the best performing models are the fine-tuned versions of BERT and GPT. Using the LLM average accuracy from Table 7 and the BERT derivative model accuracy from 6, we observed that fine-tuned GPT 3.5 Turbo surpasses the fine-tuned BERT model by 2.59% and 0.92% on Q_2 , and Q_3 respectively. Fine-tuned GPT 3.5 Turbo surpasses BMQ_1 by 2.92% as well. However, it is important to note that the GPT models are quite huge and consist of a large number of parameters (in the scale of hundreds of billions or trillions depending on the precise model) compared to BERT with lesser number of parameters (in the scale of hundreds of millions). In addition, GPT models require significant training time. Fine-tuning and training large models demand significant time, energy, and computational resources, resulting in substantial carbon dioxide emissions that negatively impact the environment (Agarwal and Chakraborti 2025). While the performance gains may appear negligible in individual instances, when scaled across thousands or millions of grading tasks, the cumulative environmental and computational costs become far more consequential. In light of the growing climate-related concerns, this tradeoff in accuracy

seems quite reasonable and suggests that training small models for automated grading tasks would be more appropriate than utilizing foundational and large language models like GPT.

4.6 Significance of automated grading

4.6.1 Efficiency in grading

Providing feedback at the right time and frequency for various topics throughout the semester is crucial for fostering effective learning. Automated grading systems ensure rapid and consistent evaluation of student responses, thereby allowing instructors to focus their attention on pedagogy and student learning experience, rather than administrative grading tasks. By providing iterative learning opportunities through timely feedback, these systems allow students to reflect on their thought process, correct any misunderstandings and eventually, improve their performance progressively. Moreover, automated grading techniques enhance scalability, making frequent assessments feasible even in large or multi-disciplinary courses with low teacher-to-student ratio. With less time spent on manual evaluations, educators can devote more effort to teaching and mentoring. This allows instructors to devote more effort to curriculum and instructional design, enhancing the quality of learning materials. Furthermore, data from previous assessments can be leveraged to reshape future course content, addressing knowledge gaps, and tailoring instruction to student needs.

4.6.2 Consistency and Fairness

Consistency and fairness are critical aspects of any grading system, and automated grading techniques excel in addressing these concerns. Automation ensures uniform grading standards, eliminating human bias and variability that can arise from subjective judgment or fatigue. While human grading often results in inconsistencies—as seen in the dataset used in our study where the human-labels have an intergrader agreement of 80%—automated systems evaluate responses based on predefined criteria, leading to more objective and transparent assessments that ensure fair treatment for all students. Since the automated systems only see the information provided them in input, which is the student response, their outputs are irrespective of any other student information that could make a human grader biased. This balance of fairness and consistency in output strengthens the credibility of the grading process while promoting student growth.

4.6.3 Self-assessment tool

Automated grading systems support self-assessment, allowing students to gauge their understanding without the pressure of affecting their final grades. Since the students have the flexibility to interact with these systems on their own time and pace, it also helps them prepare more effectively. By reducing test anxiety, they minimize its impact on performance, creating a more equitable learning experience. Additionally, self-assessment can uncover hidden expectations and areas requiring further preparation, enabling students to track their progress and see tangible evidence of their learning

over time. When the data is shared with instructors, it can also help them learn better insights about student learning experience.

5 Conclusion

Providing automated feedback at scale is a challenging problem due to various factors, including student response variability, subjectivity in grading, and the computational demands of AI models. In this work, we proposed a novel framework that leverages near-domain data to enhance short-answer grading accuracy while requiring significantly less labeled data. By fine-tuning BERT-based models, we demonstrated that our approach outperforms state-of-the-art large language models (LLMs) like GPT-3.5, GPT-4, and GPT-4o, even when these models are provided with reference answers. The key takeaways from our work are the accuracy advantage, which refers to the model’s ability to achieve higher accuracy with the same amount of training data when exposed to related, near-domain data; and the data advantage, which captures the model’s ability to reach the same target accuracy as a model trained on 100% of the target data, but using significantly less training data due to prior exposure to near-domain data. These findings have significant implications for scalable, resource-efficient automated grading systems. These results demonstrate that incorporating prior knowledge from related questions can enhance generalization, reduce annotation demands, and improve the scalability of automated feedback systems in educational contexts.

Beyond grading performance, our study also analyzed patterns of grading errors, identifying cases where AI models diverged from human-labeled ground truth. This analysis sheds light on key challenges in automated grading, particularly in ensuring fairness, explainability, and adaptability across different domains. Our comparative analysis of high-compute models (GPT-3.5, GPT-4, GPT-4o) versus low-compute models (BERT and fine-tuned versions) revealed important insights. While fine-tuning GPT models provides the best performance, this approach is often impractical due to high computational costs and energy demands. In contrast, fine-tuned BERT models provide a strong alternative, offering high accuracy without requiring the extensive computational power needed for large-scale LLMs.

While our framework presents a scalable and high-performing solution, it is not without limitations that could be removed in future. First, the dataset used in this study has an inter-grader agreement of 80%, meaning there is some level of subjectivity in human-labeled data, which can impact model performance. Second, our study focuses on a specific topic (Central Dogma in Molecular Biology), making it difficult to generalize results to other subjects and disciplines. Future work should evaluate our approach across diverse domains to validate its broader applicability. Third, while we fine-tuned BERT, we did not have access to fine-tune GPT-4 or other large-scale models, which could provide additional insights into how different architectures benefit from near-domain data. Future work could explore evaluations with DeepSeek, Gemini, and other emerging LLMs, as well as fine-tuning experiments with GPT-4 Turbo and other proprietary models to further benchmark and validate our findings.

Despite these limitations, our work offers valuable contributions to the field of AI-driven education. The insights gained from near-domain data adaptation and model efficiency trade-offs can inform future research on integrating automated grading into adaptive learning environments. Additionally, the classifications produced by our framework could be extended to support formative feedback mechanisms, helping students not only receive scores but also understand their mistakes and improve their learning outcomes.

5.1 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the Center for Educational Effectiveness at UC Davis for providing feedback.

6 Statements and Declarations

6.1 Funding

The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

6.2 Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

6.3 Ethics approval and consent to participate

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

6.4 Consent for publication

The manuscript does not contain any individual person's data in any form.

6.5 Data availability

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

6.6 Materials availability

Any relevant materials regarding this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

6.7 Code availability

Any code files regarding this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

6.8 Author contribution

SA: Methodology; Software; Formal analysis; Visualization; Writing - Original Draft.
AM: Conceptualization; Methodology; Supervision; Formal analysis; Resources; Writing - Review & Editing. KCH: Data Curation; Writing - Review & Editing.

References

- (2011) Vision and change in undergraduate biology education: A call to action. Report by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, URL <https://www.compadre.org/Repository/document/ServeFile.cfm?ID=16832&DocID=5914>, accessed: 2025-08-15
- Agarwal S, Chakraborti M (2025) The hidden ai race: Tracking environmental costs of innovation. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.22781>, [arXiv:2511.22781](#)
- American Association for the Advancement of Science (2010) Vision and change: A call to action. https://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/content_files/VC_report.pdf, accessed: YYYY-MM-DD
- Azevedo R, Bernard RM (1995) A meta-analysis of the effects of feedback in computer-based instruction. *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 13(2):111–127
- Bangert-Drowns RL, Kulik CLC, Kulik JA, et al (1991) The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research* 61(2):213–238
- Bierema A, Hoskinson AM, Moscarella R, et al (2021) Quantifying cognitive bias in educational researchers. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* 44(4):395–413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2020.1804541>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2020.1804541>
- Camus L, Filighera A (2020) Investigating transformers for automatic short answer grading. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Springer, Cham, pp 43–48
- Cohn C, Hutchins N, Le T, et al (2024) A chain-of-thought prompting approach with llms for evaluating students’ formative assessment responses in science. *arXiv preprint* URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14565>, [arXiv:2403.14565](#) [cs.CL]
- Corbett AT, Anderson JR (1989) Feedback timing and student control in the lisp intelligent tutoring system. In: Bierman D, Brueker J, Sandberg J (eds) *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on Artificial Intelligence and Education*. IOS, Springfield, VA, pp 64–72
- Devlin J, Chang MW, Lee K, et al (2018) Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint* [arXiv:1810.04805](#)

- Epstein ML, Lazarus AD, Calvano TB, et al (2002) Immediate feedback assessment technique promotes learning and corrects inaccurate first responses. *The Psychological Record* 52:187–201
- Fisher KM (1985) A misconception in biology: amino acids and translation. *J Res Sci Teach* 22:53–62
- Gaddipati SK, Nair D, Plöger PG (2020) Comparative evaluation of pretrained transfer learning models on automatic short answer grading. arXiv preprint URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/>
- Golchin S, Garuda N, Impey C, et al (2024) Grading massive open online courses using large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:240611102 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.11102>
- Hattie J, Timperley H (2007) The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77(1):81–112
- Heilman M, Madnani N (2013) ETS: Domain adaptation and stacking for short answer scoring. In: *Second Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (*SEM)*, Volume 2: *Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pp 275–279
- Henkel O, Roberts B, Hills L, et al (2023) Can llms grade short-answer reading comprehension questions? an empirical study with a novel dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:231018373 Submitted: October 2023
- Hou WJ, Tsao JH (2011) Automatic assessment of students’ free-text answers with different levels. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools* 20(2):327–347
- Howard J, Ruder S (2018) Universal language model fine-tuning for text classification. In: *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia, pp 328–339, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1031>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1031>
- Jescovitch LN, Scott EE, Cerchiara JA, et al (2021) Comparison of machine learning performance using analytic and holistic coding approaches across constructed response assessments aligned to a science learning progression. *Journal of Science Education and Technology* 30(2):150–167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09858-0>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-020-09858-0>
- Kingma DP, Ba J (2014) Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980
- Kortemeyer G (2023) Performance of the pre-trained large language model gpt-4 on automated short answer grading. *Educational Development and Technology*, ETH

Zurich Dated: September 19, 2023

- Lepper MR, Chabay RW (1985) Intrinsic motivation and instruction: Conflicting views on the role of motivational processes in computer-based education. *Educational Psychologist* 20(4):217–230
- Lester B, Al-Rfou R, Constant N (2021) The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, pp 3045–3059, <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.243>, URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.243>
- Lewis J, Leach J, Wood-Robinson C (2000) All in the genes? young people’s understanding of the nature of genes. *J Biol Educ* 34:74–79
- Liu T, Ding W, Wang Z, et al (2019) Automatic short answer grading via multi-way attention networks. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Springer, Cham, pp 169–173
- Madnani N, Burstein J, Sabatini J, et al (2013) Automated scoring of a summary writing task designed to measure reading comprehension. In: Tetreault JB, Leacock C (eds) *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Atlanta, pp 163–168
- Malik A, Wu M, Vasavada V, et al (2021) Generative grading: Near human-level accuracy for automated feedback on richly structured problems. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.09916v5>
- Marbach-Ad G (2001) Attempting to break the code in student comprehension of genetic concepts. *J Biol Educ* 35:183–189
- Mills Shaw KR, Van Horne K, Zhang H, et al (2008) Essay contest reveals misconceptions of high school students in genetics content. *Genetics* 178:1157–1168
- Moreno R (2004) Decreasing cognitive load for novice students: Effects of explanatory versus corrective feedback in discovery-based multimedia. *Instructional Science* 32:99–113
- Narciss S, Huth K (2004) How to design informative tutoring feedback for multimedia learning. In: Niegemann HM, Leutner D, Brunken R (eds) *Instructional design for multimedia learning*. Waxmann, Munster, New York, p 181–195
- NGSS Lead States (2013) *Next Generation Science Standards: For States, by States*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC

- Nguyen A, Piech C, Huang J, et al (2014) Codewebs: scalable homework search for massive open online programming courses. In: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web, pp 491–502
- Ouyang L, Wu J, Jiang X, et al (2022) Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. arXiv preprint <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.02155>, URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.02155>, arXiv:2203.02155 [cs.CL]
- Piantadosi ST (2014) Zipf’s word frequency law in natural language: a critical review and future directions. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 21(5):1112–1130. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-014-0585-6>
- Piech CJ (2016) Uncovering patterns in student work: Machine learning to understand human learning. PhD thesis, Stanford University
- Prevost LB, Smith MK, Knight JK (2016) Using student writing and lexical analysis to reveal student thinking about the role of stop codons in the central dogma. *CBE Life Sciences Education* 15(4):ar65. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.15-12-0267>
- Pridemore DR, Klein JD (1995) Control of practice and level of feedback in computer-based instruction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 20:444–450
- Qi H, Wang Y, Dai J, et al (2019) Attention-based hybrid model for automatic short answer scoring. In: SIMUtools 2019, LNICST, vol 295. Springer, Cham, pp 385–394
- Radford A, Narasimhan K, Salimans T, et al (2018) Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. OpenAI Technical Report
- Radford A, Wu J, Child R, et al (2019) Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. OpenAI Blog 1(8):9
- Riordan B, Horbach A, Cahill A, et al (2017) Investigating neural architectures for short answer scoring. In: Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications, pp 159–168
- Santurkar S, Durmus E, Ladhak F, et al (2023) Whose opinions do language models reflect? Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2303.17548v1.pdf>, arXiv:2303.17548
- Schneider J, Schenk B, Niklaus C (2024) Towards llm-based autograding for short textual answers. arXiv preprint Submitted on 9 Sep 2023 (v1), last revised 8 Jul 2024 (this version, v2)
- Shazeer N (2020) Glu variants improve transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05202 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2002.05202>, arXiv:2002.05202 [cs.LG]
- Smith MK, Knight JK (2012) Using the genetics concept assessment to document persistent conceptual difficulties in undergraduate genetics courses. *Genetics* 191:21–32

- Smith MK, Wood WB, Knight JK (2008) The genetics concept assessment: a new concept inventory for gauging student understanding of genetics. *CBE Life Sci Educ* 7:422–430
- Sultan MAM, Salazar C, Sumner T (2016) Fast and easy short answer grading with high accuracy. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp 1070–1075
- Sung C, Dhamecha T, Saha S, et al (2019) Pretraining BERT on domain resources for short answer grading. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp 6071–6075
- Tan H, Wang C, Duan Q, et al (2020) Automatic short answer grading by encoding student responses via a graph convolutional network. *Interactive Learning Environments* pp 1–15
- Uhl JD, Sripathi KN, Saldanha JN, et al (2021) Introductory biology undergraduate students’ mixed ideas about genetic information flow. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education* 49(3):372–382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.21483>
- Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, et al (2017) Attention is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03762*
- Wood-Robinson C (2000) Young people’s understanding of the nature of genetic information in the cells of an organism. *J Biol Educ* 35:29–36
- Wright LK, Fisk JN, Newman DL (2014) Dna → rna: what do students think the arrow means? *CBE Life Sci Educ* 13:338–348
- Wu M, Mossé M, Goodman ND, et al (2018) Zero shot learning for code education: Rubric sampling with deep learning inference. *ArXiv abs/1809.01357*. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:52166291>
- Yang X, Huang Y, Zhuang F, et al (2018) Automatic chinese short answer grading with deep autoencoder. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Springer, Cham, pp 399–404
- Yoon SY (2023) Short answer grading using one-shot prompting and text similarity scoring model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18638* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18638>
- Zhai X, Yin Y, Pellegrino JW, et al (2020) Applying machine learning in science assessment: A systematic review. *Studies in Science Education* 56(1):111–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.1735757>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2020.1735757>

Zhang Y, Shah R, Chi M (2016) Deep learning + student modeling + clustering: A recipe for effective automatic short answer grading. In: Proceedings of the International Educational Data Mining Society

Zhao J, Larson K, Xu W, et al (2021) Targeted feedback generation for constructed-response questions. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:233295226>