Actually I have a question for Bo regarding the comments you made on some basic IRT concepts at Brent’s lab meeting last week.

So Brent and I have been working on this Conscientiousness project, where we’ve come up with 300 initial items, and collected data from about 1200 people. So far we’ve done some FA on each of the 9 facets, so last Friday Brent and I were talking about applying IRT to the data.

And I remember Bo, you interrupted my conversation with Brent, saying you think we shouldn’t use IRT, because we are using a polytomous response format, instead of a dichotomous one, and you believe that the only applicable model here is SGRM, which according to you is too complicated to calculate. However, besides SGRM, with polytomous data, you can also use other models, one good example would be polytomous GGUM. Although Brent and I may not use GGUM eventually, I still think this is something that should be clarified.

Also, I’m baffled that you think SGRM is complicated to compute. You do know that we don’t calculate by hand anymore, right? I mean you can get the results in like 10 seconds with a proper program.

And then you said that we shouldn’t use IRT because IRT is confirmatory rather than exploratory, and that since we are selecting items, IRT is not the right choice here. But in fact, IRT is a useful tool for item selection and scale development, which I think was the reason why Brent brought it up in the first place.

Lastly, you said we couldn’t use IRT because SGRM always fits poorly. However, according to Sasha’s dissertation, when possible, it’s better to choose SGRM over 3PL or 2PL, and the only reason why Sasha’ did a 3 PL is because he didn’t have a sample size that’s large enough for the SGRM, which he mentioned multiple times in the paper. ~~Furthermore, according to Alan Meade and his student’s simulation study, it’s the ideal point process-generated data that SGRM fits badly.~~

Basically you based your conclusion that Brent and I shouldn’t use IRT on reasons that are not accurate. I guess what I want to say is if you don’t know something well, the responsible thing to do is asking questions, not giving advice.

--------------------------

* 这只是我的看法而已。

但你当时不是这么说的，你当时非常肯定，听起来就像是在引用某些我们没听说过的研究一样。而这也是为什么教授没有继续追问并且也不再提IRT了。

But that’s not what you said. You sounded so sure that it seemed that you were citing some research that no one has heard about. And that’s why Brent didn’t persist.

* 我不太懂 IRT。

你太谦虚了，你和孙天君在B实验室已经是公认的IRT 专家。话说回来，如果你不懂，就问问题，不要给建议。否则你不觉得这样太不负责任了吗？

Awwww you are just being modest. You have already become the IRT expert at Brent’s lab; everybody knows it. What I’m saying is that if you don’t know something, ask questions, do not give advice. Otherwise, it’s just irresponsible.

* 其他关于IRT的辩解：

这件事完全不是personal，只是为了澄清你说的四点而已。这对你也有帮助，你也要做IRT的不是吗？

I think you have misunderstood me. This is nothing personal. I just want to point out that what you said last week about IRT was inaccurate. I mean this is helpful to you, too. You are doing IRT, too, right?