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Abstract

(to do)

# Introduction

In *comparative judgment* (CJ) studies, judges assess a specific trait or attribute across various stimuli by performing pairwise comparisons (Thurstone 1927; Pollitt 2004, 2012a). Each comparison produces a dichotomous outcome, indicating which stimulus is perceived to exhibit a higher trait level. For example, when assessing text quality, judges compare pairs of written texts (the stimuli) to determine the relative quality each text exhibit (the trait) (Laming 2004; Pollitt 2012b; Whitehouse 2012; van Daal et al. 2016; Lesterhuis 2018; Coertjens et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023).

Numerous studies have documented the effectiveness of CJ in assessing traits and competencies over the past decade. These studies have emphasized three aspects of the method’s effectiveness: its reliability, validity, and practical applicability. Research on reliability indicates that CJ requires a relatively small number of pairwise comparisons (S. Verhavert et al. 2019; Crompvoets, Béguin, and Sijtsma 2022) to produce trait scores that are as precise and consistent as those generated by other assessment methods (Coertjens et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023). Furthermore, evidence suggests that the reliability and time efficiency of CJ are comparable, if not superior, to those of other assessment methods when employing adaptive comparison algorithms (Pollitt 2012b; San Verhavert, Furlong, and Bouwer 2022; Mikhailiuk et al. 2021). On the other hand, research on validity suggests that scores generated by CJ can accurately represent the traits under measurement (Whitehouse 2012; van Daal et al. 2016; Lesterhuis 2018; Bartholomew et al. 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023). Finally, research on practical applicability highlights the method’s versatility across both educational and non-educational contexts (Jones 2015; Bartholomew et al. 2018; Jones et al. 2019; Marshall et al. 2020; Bartholomew and Williams 2020; Boonen, Kloots, and Gillis 2020).

Nevertheless, despite the increasing number of CJ studies, unsystematic and fragmented research approaches have left several critical issues unaddressed. This research primarily focuses on three: the over-reliance on Thurstone’s Case V assumptions in the statistical analysis of CJ data, the apparent disconnect between CJ’s trait measurement and hypothesis testing, and the unclear role and influence 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 aims to address all three concerns simultaneously.

# Three critical issues in CJ literature

## The Case V and the statistical analysis of CJ data

In its most general form, Thurstone’s theory (1927) posits that when a judge compares two stimuli, the resulting dichotomous outcome depends on two main factors: the discriminal process and the law of comparative judgment. The *discriminal process* refers to the psychological effect each stimulus has on the judges, or more simply stated, the judges’ perception of the trait level of each stimulus. Thurstone assumes that the discriminal process for each stimulus follows a Normal distribution. In this distribution, the mode (mean), known as the *modal discriminal process*, represents the position of the stimulus on the trait continuum, while the dispersion, known as the *discriminal dispersion*, reflects variability in the perceived trait level of the stimulus. [Figure 1](#fig-discriminal_process) shows a visual depiction of the discriminal process of two stimuli (objects).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 1: Discriminal processes of two stimuli (objects). Extracted from Bramley (2008, 249) |

However, since the discriminal mode and dispersion of a single stimulus are not directly observable without comparing it to other stimuli, the *law of comparative judgment* becomes essential. This law asserts that when assessing a specific trait by comparing two stimuli, the stimulus positioned further along the continuum is perceived as having a higher level of that trait. Thus, the observed dichotomous outcome is determined by the distribution of the difference between the discriminal processes of the two stimuli, called the *discriminal difference*. [Figure 2](#fig-comparative_judgment) shows a visual depiction of the discriminal difference of two stimuli (objects).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 2: Discriminal difference between two stimuli (objects). Extracted from Bramley (2008, 251) |

Thurstone’s general form of the theory primarily applies to pairwise comparisons of stimuli made by a single judge (Thurstone 1927, 267). Therefore, to enhance the theory’s practical applicability, he developed five distinct cases, each incorporating a series of increasingly simplifying assumptions. [Figure 3](#fig-thurstone_cases) outlines each case along with their key assumptions. For a detailed explanation of this theoretical progression, see Thurstone (1927) and Bramley (2008, 248–53).

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 3: Thurstones cases and asumptions |

Surprisingly, Case V is the most commonly used case in the CJ literature, despite incorporating the largest number of simplifying assumptions (Bramley 2008, 253). This widespread adoption is primarily due to the Bradley-Terry-Luce (BTL) model (Bradley and Terry 1952; Luce 1959), which offers a simpler statistical representation of the case. The BTL model closely aligns with Case V’s assumptions, with one key difference: the distribution of the discriminal process. While Case V assumes a Normal distribution, the BTL model uses the more mathematically tractable logistic distribution (Bramley 2008, 254) (see [Figure 3](#fig-thurstone_cases)). However, this adjustment does not significantly affect the model’s estimation or interpretation, as the logistic and normal distributions are related to each other by a factor of approximately (van der Linden 2017, 1:16).

However, because Case V was originally developed to provide a “rather coarse scaling” of traits (Thurstone 1927, 269), prioritizing statistical ease of use over precision in trait measurement, two of its assumptions may be causing more problems than expected: the assumption of zero correlation between the stimuli, and the assumption of equal dispersion between stimuli.

## The disconnect between trait measurement and hypothesis testing

As outlined in the previous section, the BTL model typically functions as the measurement model in a CJ study (Andrich 1978; Bramley 2008). A measurement model specifies how manifest variables contribute to the estimation of latent variables (Everitt and Skrondal 2010). For example, when evaluating text quality, researchers use the BTL model to process the dichotomous outcomes resulting from the pairwise comparisons (the manifest variables) to estimate scores that reflect the underlying quality level of the texts (the latent variable) (Laming 2004; Pollitt 2012b; Whitehouse 2012; van Daal et al. 2016; Lesterhuis 2018; Coertjens et al. 2017; Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023).

Researchers then typically use the estimated BTL scores, or their transformations, to conduct additional analyses or hypothesis tests. For example, these scores have been used 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 assessment methods (Goossens and De Maeyer 2018; Bouwer et al. 2023), or test hypotheses related to the underlying 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 advises caution when using estimated scores to conduct additional analyses or hypotheses tests. A key consideration is that BTL scores are parameter estimates that inherently carry uncertainty. Ignoring this uncertainty can introduce bias into the analysis and reduce the precision of hypothesis tests. Notably, the direction and magnitude of the bias are often unpredictable; results may be attenuated, exaggerated, or remain unaffected, depending on the amount of uncertainty present in the scores and the actual effects being tested (Kline 2023, 25; Hoyle 2023, 137). Furthermore, reduced precision in hypothesis tests weakens their statistical power, ultimately increasing the likelihood of committing type-I or type-II errors (McElreath 2020).

To mitigate these risks, principles from Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (Hoyle 2023, 138) and Item Response Theory (IRT) (Fox 2010, chap. 6; van der Linden 2017, vol. 1, chap. 24) recommend conducting these analyses and tests within a structural model. A structural model specifies how different manifest or latent variables influence the latent variable of interest (Everitt and Skrondal 2010). This approach allows analyses that can account for both the BTL scores and their uncertainties simultaneously, rather than treating them as separate elements. Therefore, an integrated approach that combines CJ’s measurement and structural models can offer significant advantages.
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