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Abstract

(to do)

# Introduction

Over the past decade, numerous studies have documented the effectiveness of the *comparative judgment* (CJ) method (Thurstone 1927) for assessing competencies and traits. These studies have evaluated CJ from three main perspectives: its ability to produce reliable and valid trait scores, its practical applicability, and its time efficiency. Research on reliability and validity shows that CJ can generate precise and consistent scores (Pollitt 2012a, 2012b; Coertjens et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Verhavert et al. 2019; Crompvoets, Béguin, and Sijtsma 2022; Bouwer et al. 2023) that accurately represent the traits being measured (Whitehouse 2012; van Daal et al. 2016; Lesterhuis 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023). Research on practical applicability highlights CJ’s versatility across both educational and non-educational contexts, presenting it as an efficient and effective alternative for measurement and evaluation (Pollitt 2004; Jones 2015; Bartholomew et al. 2018; Jones et al. 2019; Marshall et al. 2020; Bartholomew and Williams 2020; Boonen, Kloots, and Gillis 2020). Lastly, research on time efficiency suggests that CJ can offer at least equal, if not significant, time savings when evaluating stimuli compared to traditional marking methods (Pollitt 2012a, 2012b; Coertjens et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018).

Nevertheless, despite the growing number of studies on CJ, unsystematic and fragmented research approaches in the literature have left several critical issues unaddressed. This research primarily focuses on three: the apparent disconnect between CJ’s structural and measurement model, the over-reliance on the assumptions of Thurstone’s Case 5 (1927) in CJ’s measurement model, and the unclear role and impact of comparison algorithms on the method’s reliability and validity. The following sections will discuss each of these issues in detail, followed by the introduction of a theoretical model and its statistical translation, which aim to address all three concerns simultaneously.

# Three critical issues in CJ literature

## The disconnect between structural and measurement models

In a typical CJ study, the Bradley-Terry-Luce (BTL) model (Bradley and Terry 1952; Luce 1959) serves as the measurement model (Andrich 1978; Bramley 2008). This model specifies how latent variables are estimated from manifest variables (Everitt and Skrondal 2010). In CJ, multiple judges engage in several rounds of pairwise comparisons to assess the relative manifestation of a trait between two stimuli. Each comparison generates a dichotomous outcome, indicating which stimulus is perceived to exhibit a higher degree of the trait. The BTL model then uses these observed outcomes to estimate scores that represent the latent trait of interest (Pollitt 2012a, 2012b; Whitehouse 2012; Jones 2015; van Daal et al. 2016; Lesterhuis 2018; Boonen, Kloots, and Gillis 2020; Bouwer et al. 2023).

Moreover, researchers often use these BTL-generated scores or their transformations separately, conducting further analyses or hypothesis testing. The literature shows how these scores have been employed to identify ‘misfit’ judges and stimuli (Pollitt 2012b; van Daal et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018), detect biases in judges’ ratings (Pollitt and Elliott 2003; Pollitt 2012b), calculate correlations with other scoring methods (Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023), or test hypotheses related to the trait of interest (Bramley and Vitello 2019; Boonen, Kloots, and Gillis 2020; Bouwer et al. 2023; van Daal et al. 2017; Jones et al. 2019; Gijsen et al. 2021).

However, the statistical literature cautions against using estimated scores for separate analyses and tests. A key consideration is that BTL-generated scores are parameter estimates that inherently carry uncertainty. Ignoring this uncertainty when conducting separate analyses and tests can inflate their precision and statistical power, increasing the risk of committing a type I error (McElreath 2020), which is when a null hypothesis is incorrectly rejected (Everitt and Skrondal 2010). To mitigate this risk, principles from Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (Hoyle 2023; Kline 2023) and Item Response Theory (IRT) (de Ayala 2009; Fox 2010; van der Linden 2017) recommend conducting these analyses and tests within a structural model that accounts for both the scores and their uncertainties, rather than treating them separately. Thus, an integrated approach combining CJ’s structural and measurement models can offer significant advantages.

## The assumptions of Case 5 and the measurement model

1. the BTL model is the statistical articulation of Case 5

From early on in the literature, it has been clear that the BTL model represents a statistical articulation of Thurstone’s Case 5 (1927). Talk about Pollitt and Elliott (2003) and Bramley (2008)

1. But this model hold the greater number of assumptions

Although Case 5 was originally articulated to produce a “rather coarse scaling” of traits (Thurstone 1927, 269), its assumptions have become predominant in the literature, but Thurstone’s Case 5 is the case that holds the greater amount of simplifying assumptions.

Thurstone (1927) justify the use of case V, on multiple assumptions, but the most important for our purpose are three:

1. related to Case 3, it assumes the correlation between stimuli is zero, this translates into the cancellation of judges effects by mean of opposing and equally weigthed ‘mood’ and ‘simultaneous contrasts’ effects. This is demonstrated using the additivive nature of the logit scale, which helps to cancel ‘bias’ judges effects.
2. related to Case 3, it assumes the correlation between stimuli is zero, this also translates into the idea that stimuli are the main focus of estimation and analysis, but what happens when the focus of analysis is the individuals that generated those stimuli. Meaning there is an amount of correlation that it is not accounted for.
3. related to case 5, discriminal dispersions of the stimuli are equal, but it is not hard to imagine that certain individuals can produce good quality texts with more precision than other individuals.
4. What problems does this bring?

This leaves issues such as the presence of judge’ biases hinted by Bramley (2008) and Kelly, Richardson, and Isaacs (2022), and evidenced by Pollitt and Elliott (2003), (**Arlett\_2003?**), and (**Guthrie\_2003?**)

Reliability is a necessary but not sufficient condition for validity. Reliability can exist without validity but validity cannot exist without reliability (Perron and Gillespie 2015).
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