

Comparison of Two Logistic Multidimensional Item Response Theory Models

Research Report ONR90-8

**Judith A. Spray, Tim C. Davey, Mark D. Reckase
Terry A. Ackerman
James E. Carlson**

Prepared under Contract No. N00014-89-J-1908, Contract Authority
Identification No. NR 154-531, with the Cognitive Science Research Program of
the Office of Naval Research.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in
whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

October 1990

For additional copies write:
ACT Research Report Series
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52243

**Comparison of Two Logistic Multidimensional Item
Response Theory Models**

Judith A. Spray, Tim C. Davey, and Mark D. Reckase
American College Testing


Terry A. Ackerman
University of Illinois

James E. Carlson
Auburn University at Montgomery

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No 0704-0188	
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the U.S. Govt.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ONR 90-8			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION ACT		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION COGNITIVE SCIENCE RESEARCH PROGRAMS OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) P.O. Box 168 Iowa City, IA 52243			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Code 1142CS Arlington, VA 22217-5000		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-89-J-1908		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61153N	PROJECT NO. RR04204	TASK NO. RR0420401
					WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. 4421556--- 02
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Comparison of two logistic multidimensional item response theory models					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Judith A. Spray, Tim C. Davey, Mark D. Reckase, Terry A. Ackerman, James E. Carlson					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, October	
				15. PAGE COUNT 37	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Multidimensional Item Response Theory, Compensatory Models, Noncompensatory Models		
05	09				
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Test data generated according to two different multidimensional item response theory models were compared at both the item response level and the test score level to determine if measurable differences between the models could be detected when the data sets were constrained to be equivalent in terms of item p-values. Although differences could be detected at the item level, these differences decreased as the correlation between examinee abilities increased. Furthermore, these item differences were small in magnitude and could be considered unimportant or insignificant from a practical standpoint. No differences were found at the total test score level, and it was concluded that, at least for the data used in this study, the models were indistinguishable.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. Charles Davis			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (703) 696-4046		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ONR 1142CS

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE



Abstract

Test data generated according to two different multidimensional item response theory models were compared at both the item response level and the test score level to determine if measurable differences between the models could be detected when the data sets were constrained to be equivalent in terms of item p -values. Although differences could be detected at the item level, these differences decreased as the correlation between examinee abilities increased. Furthermore, these item differences were small in magnitude and could be considered unimportant or insignificant from a practical standpoint. No differences were found at the total test score level, and it was concluded that, at least for the data used in this study, the models were indistinguishable.

Comparison of Two Logistic Multidimensional Item Response Theory Models

Psychometricians who have some interest in multidimensional item response theory (MIRT) modeling may be familiar with the terms, *compensatory* and *noncompensatory* as they relate to two general model classification schemes. Ansley and Forsyth (1985) contrasted the two types of model classifications as follows. "Compensatory models, unlike noncompensatory models, permit high ability on one dimension to compensate for low ability on another dimension in terms of probability of correct response. In the noncompensatory models, the minimum factor (probability) in the denominator is the upper bound for the probability of a correct response. Thus, for a two-dimensional item, a person with a very low ability on one dimension and very high ability on the other has a very low probability of correctly answering the item" (p. 40).

Typically, MIRT models of the compensatory type, such as the logistic MIRT model (Doody-Bogan & Yen, 1983; Hattie, 1981; Reckase, 1985, 1986) or the normal ogive MIRT model (Samejima, 1974) imply linear combinations of the multidimensional abilities in the exponent of the expression for the probability of a correct response. In this linear fashion, a low ability on one or more of the k ability dimensions can be compensated by a higher ability on one or more of the remaining dimensions. Because the compensation is a characteristic of this linear combination, such models are probably more accurately labeled *linear* MIRT models. A typical linear logistic MIRT model of the compensatory type can be written as

$$P_j(\theta_i) = c_j + (1 - c_j) \frac{e^{\left[\sum_{m=1}^k f_{ijm} \right] + d_j}}{1 + e^{\left[\sum_{m=1}^k f_{ijm} \right] + d_j}} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_{ijm} &= a_{jm} \theta_{im} \\
 c_j &= \text{the pseudo-guessing parameter of the } j\text{th item,} \\
 a_{jm} &= \text{the discrimination parameter for the } j\text{th item on} \\
 &\quad \text{the } m\text{th dimension,} \\
 d_j &= \text{the difficulty parameter for the } j\text{th item, and} \\
 \theta_{im} &= \text{the } m\text{th element in the } i\text{th person's ability vector,} \\
 &\quad \theta_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

In this model the favorable response probability, $P_j(\theta_i)$, is bounded from below by c_j . However, because the upper bound of $P_j(\theta_i)$ is not a function of any one ability dimension, it increases monotonically as $\sum_{m=1}^k f_{ijm}$ increases.

On the other hand, noncompensatory MIRT models (Simpson, 1978; Embretson, 1984) describe the probability of a favorable response in terms of a product of k functions of ability on a single dimension and item characteristics. In its most common form, a logistic MIRT model of this noncompensatory or multiplicative type can be written as

$$P_j(\theta_i) = c_j + (1 - c_j) \prod_{m=1}^k \frac{e^{f_{ijm}}}{(1 + e^{f_{ijm}})}, \quad (2)$$

where now we let $f_{ijm} = [a_{jm} (\theta_{im} - b_{jm})]$ with $b_{jm} =$ the difficulty parameter for the j th item on the m th dimension. $P_j(\theta_i)$ is bounded by an upper asymptote equal to the minimum of $\exp\{f_{ijm}\}/(1 + \exp\{f_{ijm}\})$, and the lower asymptote, c_j , for any given examinee with $\theta = \theta_i$. Thus, the noncompensatory nature of the model is due to the fact that $P_j(\theta_i)$ can never be greater than the minimum value of the terms in the product, $\exp\{f_{ijm}\}/(1 + \exp\{f_{ijm}\})$, a function of the smallest value of the k

ability dimensions for a given examinee. Because of its multiplicative form, the model is more generally labeled as a *multiplicative* MIRT model.

Researchers have used the multiplicative MIRT model to examine characteristics of unidimensional item response theory parameter estimates derived from MIRT response data (Ansley & Forsyth, 1985) and to model certain multicomponent latent traits in response processes (Embretson, 1984). Reckase (1985) has used a linear MIRT model on real response data to estimate two-dimensional item and person parameters on an ACT Assessment Mathematics Usage test. However, no one has actually shown that one model is more representative of the actual item-examinee response process than the other. It may even be possible that one model may be appropriate under one set of circumstances while the other type may be more appropriate in other situations.

In this paper we investigate the differences between item responses generated by these two logistic MIRT models. We have been interested in determining whether or not it is possible to distinguish one model or process from the other through some evaluation of response data. More specifically, our concern has been in establishing whether or not it is possible to detect differences between these two MIRT models, either at the item response or test score level, when the item parameters from each MIRT model have been matched or equated in some sense.

The first task was to establish the item parameters from one of the logistic MIRT models that would produce "reasonable" p -values or proportion-correct indices for a specified examinee population. Therefore, a target distribution of p -values for a 20-item test was conceived and item parameters for a linear or compensatory MIRT model were chosen, basically by trial-and-error, until the expected p -value with respect to this examinee population matched the target distribution. Table 1 gives the set of item parameters for the 20 items for the model given by equation (1). The table also gives the expected value of each p -value under the assumption that the ability vector, θ , for the examinee population,

was distributed as bivariate normal with mean vector, $\mathbf{0}$, and variance-covariance matrix of ones along the diagonal and with nondiagonal values equal to rho (.00, .25, .50, or .75). All c-parameters were set to zero.

Insert Table 1 Here

In order to produce a comparable or "matched" set of noncompensatory, or multiplicative model item parameters, estimates of these item parameters were obtained by minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \{ [P_C(\theta_i, \mathbf{a}, d)] - [P_{NC}(\theta_i, \mathbf{a}, \hat{\mathbf{b}})] \}^2 \quad (3)$$

for $N = 2000$ randomly selected examinees with ability, θ , distributed as given previously, where P_C and P_{NC} represent logistic MIRT models given by equations (1) and (2), respectively. This process was repeated for 10 replications for each of $k = 1, 2, \dots, 20$ items to insure that the estimates obtained weren't unduly influenced by the samples selected or the starting values used. Mean values of the replication estimates yielded the noncompensatory item parameters listed in Tables 2-5, for rho values of .00, .25, .50, and .75. The expected value of each item's p -value is given in the last column of each table. Because the least squares minimization procedure produces unbiased estimates of P_{NC} , the expected value of each p -value under the noncompensatory model should be equal to that of the compensatory model, within some estimation error. Equivalence of p -values was the critical matching criterion between the two MIRT models.

Insert Tables 2-5
Here

Model Differences at the Total Test Level

By treating the two sets of item parameters as known for each of the two MIRT models, we first investigated the differences between expected number-correct score frequencies of a 20-item test when θ was distributed as a bivariate normal random vector with distributions given previously. These frequencies were estimated by evaluating either the number-correct distribution under the compensatory model, $h_C(y)$ or the noncompensatory model, $h_{NC}(y)$, for $y = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 20$, or

$$h_C(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_C(y | \theta) g(\theta) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \quad (4)$$

and

$$h_{NC}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{NC}(y | \theta) g(\theta) d\theta_1 d\theta_2 . \quad (5)$$

In each case, the conditional frequencies, $f_C(y | \theta)$ and $f_{NC}(y | \theta)$, were computed using either models (1) or (2), and a recursive procedure described by Lord and Wingersky (1984). Table 6 gives the signed differences between the frequencies, $h_C(y) - h_{NC}(y)$, for $y = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 20$, for rho values of .00, .25, .50, and .75. The greatest differences, as expected, occurred for the highest number-correct scores, but the differences in frequencies were small, never greater than .015. For most number-correct score values, these differences became smaller as rho increased.

Another way to assess the significance of these differences was to determine how much data would need to be observed before the differences were statistically detectable. This was done by calculating the minimum sample size required to reject the homogeneity of parallel populations with given levels of test significance and power. These calculations assumed a multivariate normal approximation for each model's multinomial distribution of observed-score frequencies which in turn produced the quadratic form of the noncentrality parameter of a noncentral chi square distribution. The minimum sample size followed as a direct function of this parameter, the specified test significance, and power. For example, with a significance level of .01 and power equal to .95, the minimum sample sizes were 1678, 3242, 7466, and 15311 for correlated ability distributions with ρ equal to .00, .25, .50, and .75, respectively. These sample sizes state that even in the unlikely event of uncorrelated ability distributions, it would *still* require at least 1678 observed scores from both the compensatory *and* noncompensatory MIRT models before the null hypothesis of model equivalence could be rejected with a power of .95.

Insert Table 6 Here

The first four (central) moments of each number-correct distribution are given in Table 7 for each value of ρ . Both distributions were negatively skewed with the compensatory distribution slightly more platykurtic and both were generally flatter than the normal distribution. The variances of the number-correct scores increased with an increase in ρ , and in general, the distributions of number-correct scores became increasingly similar as ρ increased.

Insert Table 7 Here

A contour plot of the (signed) difference between the number-correct true scores under the two models, or

$$\sum_{j=1}^{20} P_{jC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \sum_{j=1}^{20} P_{jNC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

was another way to observe model differences at the total test level for various (θ_1, θ_2) points in the ability space. The greatest differences occurred when either θ_1 or θ_2 was low. See Figures 1-4 for rho values of .00, .25, .50, and .75, respectively. It should be noted that, in these plots, the only influence of rho was through the values of the noncompensatory item parameters. Recall that the compensatory item parameters were fixed for all values of rho. Therefore, when interpreting these contour plots, one has to mentally superimpose the appropriate bivariate normal distribution over the contours in order to evaluate the importance of the true-score differences observed.

.....

Insert Figures 1-4
Here

.....

Another way to compare the two MIRT models was to observe the amount of multidimensional information (MINF) for different points in the ability space between the two models. MINF has been defined (Reckase, 1986) as a direct generalization of the unidimensional IRT concept of item information (i.e, the ratio of the square of the slope of the item characteristic curve at an ability point, θ , to the variance of the error of the item score at that level of θ). For the definition of MINF, the slope of the item characteristic surface must be evaluated in a particular direction, α , a vector of angles with the coordinate axes of the ability space.

Plots of the absolute difference between the compensatory and noncompensatory test information vectors (i.e, the sum of item information across

the 20 items) for item parameters estimated with rho values of .00, .25, .50, and .75 (Figures 5-8, respectively) showed that model differences might be significant if abilities were negatively correlated. However, for all "likely" ability distributions, there were no meaningful differences in MINF between the two models, and these absolute differences appeared to decrease as rho increased.

Insert Figures 5-8 Here

Model Differences at the Item Level

It was also of interest to evaluate the differences between models at the single item response level. There were two ways in which this was done. The first involved the evaluation of the *ideal observer index* (Davey, Levine, & Williams, 1989; Levine, Drasgow, Williams, McCusker, & Thomasson, 1990). A more complete definition of this index is provided in the appendix of this paper. However, a simplified definition is as follows. The *ideal observer index* (IOI) is a measure of the proportional number of times that a correct decision is made concerning which of the two competing models produced a particular response to an item. The decision is one that is made hypothetically by an "ideal observer," or an individual who has access to all of the information necessary to yield the highest possible percent of model classification (i.e., compensatory vs. noncompensatory). As far as the ideal observer is concerned, if the item response data fail to distinguish between the two competing models, then the value of this index would be at or near the chance level of .5. Conversely, readily distinguishable models should yield an index near 1.0.

Table 8 shows that the IOI was greater than chance, implying that there was a difference between the models for all 20 items. However, the IOI was never greater than .60 and was greater than .55 for only three items, numbers 3, 6,

and 7, when rho was .00. The value of the IOI decreased for each item as rho increased, implying that it became more difficult to distinguish between the models as the correlation coefficient increased.

One way to think of the magnitude of the IOI was to imagine how many trials of the IO experiment would be necessary before the ideal observer could ascertain, with some given level of certainty, that the models were actually distinguishable. This would be comparable to a test of the difference between any obtained IOI from Table 8 and the null proportion of correct model classifications due to chance. For example, to be able to detect a true difference between the models for item number 6 with a zero value of rho would require at least 40 trials of the IO experiment. This would be comparable to a test of the null proportion of correct classifications due to chance or .50 versus the (true) alternative proportion (.555) with a significance of .01 and power of .95. Conversely, a true IOI of .52 would require more than 290 trials at similar levels of test significance and power.

.....
Insert Table 8 Here
.....

Another way to evaluate model differences at the item level was to use a generalized MIRT model, or a reparameterization of both the compensatory and noncompensatory models into a single MIRT model, or

$$P_j(\theta_i) = c_j + (1-c_j) \frac{e^{f_{ij1} + f_{ij2}}}{1 + e^{f_{ij1} + f_{ij2}} + \mu(e^{f_{ij1}} + e^{f_{ij2}})}, \quad (6)$$

where μ represented an indicator variable such that

$$\mu = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for the linear or compensatory MIRT model,} \\ 1, & \text{for the multiplicative or noncompensatory MIRT model.} \end{cases}$$

Item response data, x_{ij} , were generated from samples of size $N = 2000$ of θ_i drawn from the bivariate normal distributions mentioned previously. The response data were known to have been produced by either the compensatory or noncompensatory MIRT model and were simulated by comparing the known values of $P_j(\theta_i)$ to a pseudorandomly drawn uniform deviate, ω , such that

$$x_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq \omega < P_j(\theta_i) \\ 0, & P_j(\theta_i) \leq \omega < 1. \end{cases}$$

The least squares estimation procedure was used to estimate the generalized MIRT model parameters. Each estimation was replicated 10 times with randomly selected starting values. Either four or five unique item parameters were estimated from the generalized MIRT model, as given by equation (6). The same item parameters that were given in tables 1-5 were used to generate the response data for the estimation procedure. When the response data were generated by the compensatory model, a_1 , a_2 , and d (i.e., $d = -a_1b_1 - a_2b_2$) as well as μ , were estimated. When the response data were generated by the noncompensatory model, a_1 , a_2 , b_1 , b_2 , and μ were estimated.

Table 9 shows the average bias in the item parameter estimates and the standard deviations of the estimates (in parentheses). For compensatory data, the model parameter, μ was estimated fairly accurately for the uncorrelated situation, but the amount of bias and the standard deviation of the estimates increased as ρ increased. A similar situation occurred with noncompensatory data. However, although the amount of estimation error increased as the correlation between the abilities increased, the model still remained *identifiable*, in the sense that for compensatory data, the μ estimates were statistically "close" to zero.

Likewise, for noncompensatory data, the μ estimates were statistically "close" to one.

.....
Insert Table 9 Here
.....

The IOI analysis and the generalized MIRT model estimation gave similar results. That is, there were model differences at the item level, but these differences tended to decrease as the correlation in abilities increased. The generalized MIRT analysis also suggested that these differences might still be estimable, however, even when abilities are strongly correlated.

Summary and Conclusions

These analyses and results seem to indicate that even though it is difficult to observe model differences at the overall test score level, there still may be measurable differences between the responses at the item level. Because the matching criterion between the two models resulted in similar expected p -values, we anticipated small differences at the total test score response level, or at the true score level. The differences that were detected at this level were consistent with the differences implied in the two models. Fewer high, number-correct scores or estimated true scores were observed from the noncompensatory model, but these and other total test differences decreased as ρ increased. As for the item response level analysis, both the IOI and the generalized MIRT model estimation showed that it is possible to quantify these differences and to distinguish between the data generated by carefully matched item response models of these two types. However, these differences, although real, are very small and probably not significant from any practical standpoint.

Although it is difficult to generalize beyond the two-dimensional situation used in the present study, it would appear to be difficult to distinguish between the two models without the benefit of any prior knowledge of item parameters or abilities. Even *with* such prior knowledge, response data generated by the models are nearly indistinguishable, especially with correlated abilities, which is likely the case in many real testing situations.

References

- Ansley, T. N., & Forsyth, R. A. (1985). An examination of the characteristics of unidimensional IRT parameter estimates derived from two-dimensional data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9, 37-48.
- Davey, T., Levine, M., & Williams, B. (1989, May). *Quantifying item and model fit*. Paper presented at the Office of Naval Research Contractor's Meeting on Model-based Psychological Measurement, Norman, OK.
- Doody-Bogan, E., & Yen, W. M. (1983, April). *Detecting multidimensionality and examining its effects on vertical equating with the three-parameter logistic model*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Embretson, S. (1984). A general latent trait model for response processes. *Psychometrika*, 49, 175-186.
- Hattie, J. (1981). *Decision criteria for determining unidimensionality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Levine, M. V., Drasgow, F., Williams, B., McCusker, C., & Thomasson, G. (1990). *Distinguishing between item response models*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Lord, F. M., & Wingersky, M. S. (1984). Comparison of IRT true-score and equipercentile observed-score "equatings." *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 8, 453-461.
- Reckase, M. D. (1985). The difficulty of test items that measure more than one ability. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9, 401-412.
- Reckase, M. D. (1986, April). *The discriminating power of items that measure more than one dimension*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Samejima, F. (1974). Normal ogive model on the continuous response level in the multidimensional latent space. *Psychometrika*, 39, 111-121.

References

- Sympson, J. B. (1978). A model for testing with multidimensional items. In D. J. Weiss (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1977 Computerized Adaptive Testing Conference* (pp. 82-98). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, Psychometric Methods Program.

Appendix

Analytical Definition of the *Ideal Observer Index*

A hypothetical observer is presented with two abilities, t_1 and t_2 , each with their associated item responses, u_1 and u_2 . The observer is informed that one ability-response pair was generated by one of two competing item response models, while the other pair was generated under the second model. The task is to correctly match each ability-response pair with the proper generating model. To make this decision, the observer is given access to both competing item response functions, P_1 and P_2 , and the common ability distribution, $f(t)$.

An ideal observer bases this decision on an optimal rule, δ , which is determined by the ratio of likelihood functions, $L_i(t_j, u_j) = P_i(t_j)^{u_j} Q_i(t_j)^{1-u_j}$, where $Q_i(t_j) = 1 - P_i(t_j)$, $i = 1, 2$; $j = 1, 2$. The decision rule, δ , is then defined as

$$\delta = \begin{array}{l} \text{if } L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) > L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1), \text{ then decide model } \{P_1; f\} \\ \text{produced sample } \{t_1, u_1\} \text{ while model } \{P_2; f\} \text{ produced } \{t_2, u_2\}. \\ \\ \text{if } L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) > L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2), \text{ then decide model } \{P_2; f\} \\ \text{produced sample } \{t_1, u_1\} \text{ while model } \{P_1; f\} \text{ produced } \{t_2, u_2\}. \end{array}$$

The probability of this decision rule being correct, given the model, is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct} | \text{model}] = & \text{Prob}[L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) > L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] + \\ & \text{Prob}[L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) > L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}]. \end{aligned}$$

The response pair, \mathbf{u} , where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$, can be defined in four possible patterns: (1,1), (1,0), (0,1), and (0,0). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Prob}[L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) > L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] = \\ & \text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(1,1)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(1,1) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(1,0)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(1,0) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(0,1)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(0,1) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(0,0)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(0,0) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}]. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Define } \pi_{ij} = \int \int P_1(t)^{u_i} Q_1(t)^{1-u_i} P_2(g)^{u_j} Q_2(g)^{1-u_j} f(t) f(g) dt dg.$$

$$\text{Then, } \text{Prob}[L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) > L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) | \{P_1; f\} \& \{P_2; f\}] =$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{11} \text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(1,1)] + \\ & \pi_{10} \text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(1,0)] + \\ & \pi_{01} \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(0,1)] + \\ & \pi_{00} \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u}=(0,0)]. \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Similarly, } \text{Prob}[L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) > L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}] =$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u}=(1,1)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(1,1) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u}=(1,0)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(1,0) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > P_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u}=(0,1)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(0,1) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}] \\ & + \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u}=(0,0)] \cdot \text{Prob}[\mathbf{u}=(0,0) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\text{Prob}[L_1(t_2, u_2) \cdot L_2(t_1, u_1) > L_1(t_1, u_1) \cdot L_2(t_2, u_2) | \{P_2; f\} \& \{P_1; f\}] =$

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{11} \text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (1,1)] + \\ & \pi_{10} \text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (1,0)] + \\ & \pi_{01} \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > P_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (0,1)] + \\ & \pi_{00} \text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (0,0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Omega_{u_1 u_2}$ be defined as that region of the ability space where

$$P_1(t_1)^{u_1} \cdot Q_1(t_1)^{u_1-1} \cdot P_2(t_2)^{u_2} \cdot Q_2(t_2)^{u_2-1} > P_1(t_2)^{u_2} \cdot Q_1(t_2)^{u_2-1} \cdot P_2(t_1)^{u_1} \cdot Q_2(t_1)^{u_1-1}$$

holds, and likewise let $\bar{\Omega}_{u_1 u_2}$ be defined as that region of the ability space where

$$P_1(t_2)^{u_2} \cdot Q_1(t_2)^{u_2-1} \cdot P_2(t_1)^{u_1} \cdot Q_2(t_1)^{u_1-1} > P_1(t_1)^{u_1} \cdot Q_1(t_1)^{u_1-1} \cdot P_2(t_2)^{u_2} \cdot Q_2(t_2)^{u_2-1}$$

is true. Then

$$\text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u} = (1,1)] = \int \int_{\Omega_{11}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

$$\text{Prob}[P_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u} = (1,0)] = \int \int_{\Omega_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

$$\text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) > P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u} = (0,1)] = \int \int_{\Omega_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

and

$$\text{Prob}[Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) > Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) | \mathbf{u} = (0,0)] = \int \int_{\Omega_{00}} f(t) f(g) dt dg.$$

Then

$$\text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > P_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (1,1)] = \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{11}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

$$\text{Prob}[P_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot P_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (0,1)] = \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

$$\text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot P_2(t_1) > Q_2(t_2) \cdot P_1(t_1) | \mathbf{u} = (1,0)] = \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg,$$

and

$$\text{Prob}[Q_1(t_2) \cdot Q_2(t_1) > Q_1(t_1) \cdot Q_2(t_2) | \mathbf{u} = (0,0)] = \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{00}} f(t) f(g) dt dg.$$

Thus, $\text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct} | \text{model}] =$

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{11} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{11}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \pi_{10} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \\ & \pi_{01} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \pi_{00} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{00}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \\ & \pi_{11} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{11}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \pi_{10} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \\ & \pi_{01} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \pi_{00} \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{00}} f(t) f(g) dt dg \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_{11} + \pi_{10} \left\{ \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg \right\} + \\ & \pi_{01} \left\{ \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{01}} f(t) f(g) dt dg + \int \int_{\mathfrak{a}_{10}} f(t) f(g) dt dg \right\} + \pi_{00} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $\text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct}] = \text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct} | \text{model}] \cdot \text{Prob}[\text{selecting a model}]$. Because each model is equally likely, the probability of selecting a model is equal to .5. Thus, $\text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct}] = .5(\text{Prob}[\delta \text{ correct} | \text{model}])$.

Table 1

Original Item Parameters for the Compensatory Model

Item #	a_1	a_2	d	E(p-value) rho			
				.00	.25	.50	.75
01	0.90	1.31	-0.67	.39	.39	.40	.40
02	2.10	0.50	-1.13	.34	.35	.36	.36
03	0.89	1.10	0.52	.59	.59	.58	.58
04	0.99	1.00	-0.44	.42	.42	.43	.43
05	0.58	1.65	0.78	.63	.62	.62	.61
06	0.91	1.27	0.42	.57	.57	.57	.56
07	1.03	0.95	1.08	.69	.68	.67	.67
08	0.32	2.27	0.38	.55	.55	.55	.55
09	0.61	0.72	1.63	.80	.79	.79	.78
10	0.67	1.12	0.60	.61	.61	.60	.60
11	0.91	0.91	-0.21	.46	.46	.46	.47
12	0.64	1.72	-0.05	.49	.49	.49	.49
13	1.65	0.38	0.40	.57	.56	.56	.56
14	0.18	1.61	1.84	.78	.78	.78	.77
15	0.82	1.02	0.09	.52	.52	.52	.51
16	1.45	0.81	-0.24	.46	.46	.46	.46
17	1.64	0.62	0.85	.64	.63	.63	.62
18	0.77	0.76	-0.91	.32	.33	.34	.34
19	1.46	0.62	0.10	.52	.52	.52	.52
20	0.39	1.37	0.32	.56	.56	.55	.55

Table 2

Item Parameters for the Noncompensatory Model with $Rho = .00$

Item #	a_1	a_2	b_1	b_2	E(p-value)
01	1.26	1.60	-0.92	-0.15	.38
02	2.30	1.04	0.38	-2.28	.34
03	1.22	1.39	-1.42	-0.99	.59
04	1.32	1.35	-0.62	-0.58	.42
05	1.02	1.82	-2.71	-0.62	.62
06	1.25	1.53	-1.45	-0.79	.56
07	1.30	1.26	-1.48	-1.63	.68
08	0.92	2.38	-3.95	-0.22	.55
09	0.93	1.00	-2.75	-2.35	.80
10	1.05	1.37	-1.96	-0.90	.61
11	1.24	1.25	-0.78	-0.75	.46
12	1.07	1.92	-2.17	-0.19	.49
13	1.81	0.88	-0.36	-3.25	.56
14	0.85	1.67	-5.26	-1.17	.78
15	1.17	1.32	-1.21	-0.75	.51
16	1.71	1.23	-0.27	-1.35	.45
17	1.83	1.06	-0.68	-2.55	.63
18	1.09	1.09	-0.31	-0.32	.32
19	1.69	1.07	-0.35	-1.98	.51
20	0.88	1.54	-2.98	-0.41	.55

Table 3

Item Parameters for the Noncompensatory Model with $Rho = .25$

Item #	a_1	a_2	b_1	b_2	E(p-value)
01	1.38	1.74	-0.79	-0.14	.39
02	2.40	1.14	0.35	-1.88	.34
03	1.36	1.50	-1.27	-0.91	.58
04	1.44	1.45	-0.56	-0.51	.42
05	1.17	1.94	-2.30	-0.60	.61
06	1.40	1.66	-1.28	-0.73	.56
07	1.45	1.40	-1.34	-1.47	.72
08	1.05	2.47	-3.30	-0.22	.55
09	1.02	1.09	-2.49	-2.17	.79
10	1.17	1.47	-1.72	-0.85	.60
11	1.34	1.34	-0.71	-0.68	.46
12	1.21	2.06	-1.82	-0.20	.49
13	1.90	0.98	-0.36	-2.80	.56
14	0.93	1.72	-4.65	-1.15	.78
15	1.29	1.42	-1.08	-0.69	.51
16	1.84	1.33	-0.27	-1.16	.45
17	1.97	1.20	-0.66	-2.19	.62
18	1.15	1.16	-0.28	-0.27	.33
19	1.80	1.18	-0.35	-1.71	.51
20	0.98	1.61	-2.57	-0.40	.55

Table 4

Item Parameters for the Noncompensatory Model with $Rho = .50$

Item #	a_1	a_2	b_1	b_2	E(p-value)
01	1.52	1.82	-0.66	-0.12	.39
02	2.48	1.27	0.32	-1.51	.35
03	1.49	1.63	-1.14	-0.85	.58
04	1.54	1.54	-0.50	-0.45	.42
05	1.32	2.04	-1.97	-0.59	.61
06	1.55	1.79	-1.13	-0.68	.56
07	1.58	1.55	-1.23	-1.33	.67
08	1.20	2.51	-2.78	-0.22	.55
09	1.10	1.17	-2.30	-2.03	.78
10	1.28	1.56	-1.53	-0.80	.60
11	1.44	1.43	-0.64	-0.61	.46
12	1.36	2.13	-1.54	-0.19	.49
13	1.96	1.09	-0.36	-2.39	.56
14	1.03	1.77	-4.07	-1.13	.77
15	1.39	1.51	-0.97	-0.64	.51
16	1.95	1.47	-0.26	-0.99	.46
17	2.08	1.35	-0.63	-1.89	.62
18	1.21	1.20	-0.23	-0.23	.33
19	1.89	1.30	-0.34	-1.46	.51
20	1.08	1.66	-2.23	-0.40	.55

Table 5

Item Parameters for the Noncompensatory Model with $Rho = .75$

Item #	a_1	a_2	b_1	b_2	E(p-value)
01	1.65	1.92	-0.51	-0.10	.40
02	2.53	1.43	0.31	-1.14	.35
03	1.60	1.73	-1.01	-0.77	.58
04	1.63	1.64	-0.42	-0.39	.43
05	1.48	2.14	-1.67	-0.57	.61
06	1.69	1.92	-0.98	-0.62	.56
07	1.69	1.66	-1.13	-1.21	.66
08	1.36	2.57	-2.25	-0.22	.55
09	1.15	1.21	-2.17	-1.93	.78
10	1.38	1.63	-1.36	-0.76	.60
11	1.50	1.51	-0.56	-0.54	.46
12	1.53	2.23	-1.22	-0.19	.49
13	1.98	1.26	-0.36	-1.99	.56
14	1.15	1.78	-3.60	-1.11	.77
15	1.47	1.59	-0.85	-0.59	.51
16	2.03	1.63	-0.23	-0.81	.46
17	2.15	1.53	-0.61	-1.60	.62
18	1.24	1.24	-0.18	-0.18	.34
19	1.94	1.44	-0.33	-1.23	.51
20	1.17	1.70	-1.92	-0.40	.55

Table 6

Compensatory Minus Noncompensatory Density Differences in Number-correct Score

Number-correct score (y)	rho			
	.00	.25	.50	.75
20	.013	.014	.014	.011
19	.015	.012	.009	.004
18	.012	.007	.003	.000
17	.007	.003	.000	-.002
16	.002	-.001	-.002	-.003
15	-.003	-.003	-.004	-.003
14	-.006	-.005	-.004	-.003
13	-.009	-.007	-.005	-.003
12	-.011	-.007	-.005	-.002
11	-.012	-.008	-.005	-.002
10	-.012	-.008	-.004	-.001
9	-.011	-.007	-.004	-.001
8	-.009	-.006	-.003	.000
7	-.006	-.004	-.002	.001
6	-.003	-.002	-.001	.001
5	.001	.000	.001	.002
4	.005	.002	.002	.002
3	.008	.005	.003	.002
2	.009	.006	.004	.001
1	.008	.006	.003	-.001
0	-.005	.003	.001	-.004

Table 7

Central Moments of Number-correct Scores

MIRT Models	rho	Mean	Second Central Moment	Third Central Moment	Fourth Central Moment
Compensatory	.00	10.90	25.79	-16.56	1362.83
	.25	10.88	29.40	-20.44	1680.36
	.50	10.86	32.64	-24.01	1980.03
	.75	10.84	35.57	-27.27	2262.98
Noncompensatory	.00	10.79	20.67	-9.42	946.49
	.25	10.78	25.43	-15.86	1336.75
	.50	10.78	30.12	-24.30	1760.64
	.75	10.78	34.70	-32.74	2200.57

Table 8

Ideal Observer Index

Item #	rho			
	.00	.25	.50	.75
01	.5479	.5397	.5295	.5179
02	.5311	.5265	.5205	.5128
03	.5513	.5418	.5307	.5183
04	.5461	.5377	.5279	.5171
05	.5421	.5353	.5265	.5157
06	.5550	.5451	.5332	.5194
07	.5511	.5419	.5304	.5175
08	.5243	.5212	.5165	.5102
09	.5276	.5227	.5162	.5092
10	.5430	.5351	.5254	.5149
11	.5435	.5355	.5260	.5156
12	.5448	.5375	.5281	.5166
13	.5291	.5246	.5185	.5112
14	.5124	.5109	.5082	.5048
15	.5456	.5370	.5271	.5161
16	.5497	.5411	.5307	.5182
17	.5442	.5371	.5276	.5162
18	.5281	.5232	.5175	.5114
19	.5425	.5352	.5260	.5156
20	.5292	.5241	.5179	.5108

Table 9

*Average Bias (parameter estimate - true parameter) and Standard Deviation
of Bias in Estimates of the Generalized MIRT Model Parameters*

Response Data Model	rho	a ₁	a ₂	d	b ₁	b ₂	μ
Compensatory	.00	.044 (.042)	.024 (.073)	.069 (.158)			.013 (.009)
	.25	.044 (.047)	.040 (.042)	.125 (.275)			.026 (.052)
	.50	.078 (.055)	.069 (.081)	.255 (.238)			.064 (.060)
	.75	.098 (.128)	.113 (.080)	.787 (1.930)			.107 (.094)
Noncompensatory	.00	-.008 (.099)	.009 (.115)		.130 (.448)	.230 (.354)	-.199 (.163)
	.25	-.006 (.090)	-.004 (.083)		.250 (.622)	.254 (.464)	-.197 (.144)
	.50	.039 (.145)	-.076 (.104)		.191 (.888)	.183 (.265)	-.200 (.125)
	.75	-.155 (.220)	-.059 (.105)		.071 (.439)	.250 (.421)	-.288 (.175)

Note: standard deviations are in parentheses

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory True Scores:
Rho = .00

Figure 2. Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory True Scores:
Rho = .25

Figure 3. Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory True Scores:
Rho = .50

Figure 4. Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory True Scores:
Rho = .75


Figure 5. Absolute Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory Test
Information Vectors: Rho = .00

Figure 6. Absolute Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory Test
Information Vectors: Rho = .25


Figure 7. Absolute Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory Test
Information Vectors: Rho = .50

Figure 8. Absolute Difference Between Compensatory and Noncompensatory Test
Information Vectors: Rho = .75


Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory True Scores:
 $\text{Rho} = .00$




**Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory True Scores:
 $\text{Rho} = .25$**




**Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory True Scores:
 $\text{Rho} = .50$**




**Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory True Scores:
 $\text{Rho} = .75$**




**Absolute Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory Test Information Vectors:
 $\text{Rho} = .00$**




**Absolute Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory Test Information Vectors:
 $\text{Rho} = .25$**



Rho = .50



**Absolute Difference Between Compensatory
and Noncompensatory Test Information Vectors:
 $\text{Rho} = .75$**



Distribution List

Dr. Terry Ackerman
Educational Psychology
210 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

Dr. James Algina
1403 Norman Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32605

Dr. Erling B. Andersen
Department of Statistics
Studiestraede 6
1455 Copenhagen
DENMARK

Dr. Ronald Armstrong
Rutgers University
Graduate School of Management
Newark, NJ 07102

Dr. Eva L. Baker
UCLA Center for the Study
of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Laura L. Barnes
College of Education
University of Toledo
2801 W. Bancroft Street
Toledo, OH 43606

Dr. William M. Bart
University of Minnesota
Dept. of Educ. Psychology
330 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Dr., S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Isaac Bejar
Law School Admissions
Services
P.O. Box 40
Newtown, PA 18940-0040

Dr. Menucha Birenbaum
School of Education
Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv 69978
ISRAEL

Dr. Arthur S. Blaiwes
Code N712
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Bruce Blom
Defense Manpower Data Center
99 Pacific St.
Suite 155A
Monterey, CA 93943-3231

Cdt. Arnold Bohrer
Sectie Psychologisch Onderzoek
Rekruterings-En Selectiecentrum
Kwartier Koningen Astrid
Bruijnstraat
1120 Brussels, BELGIUM

Dr. Robert Breaux
Code 281
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32826-3224

Dr. Robert Brennan
American College Testing
Programs
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Gregory Candell
CTB/McGraw-Hill
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. John B. Carroll
409 Elliott Rd., North
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. John M. Carroll
IBM Watson Research Center
User Interface Institute
P.O. Box 704
Yorktown Heights, NY 10596

Dr. Robert M. Carroll
Chief of Naval Operations
OP-01B2
Washington, DC 20350

Dr. Raymond E. Christal
UES LAMP Science Advisor
AFHRL/MOEL
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Mr. Hua Hua Chung
University of Illinois
Department of Statistics
101 Illini Hall
725 South Wright St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Norman Cliff
Department of Psychology
Univ. of So. California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1061

Director, Manpower Program
Center for Naval Analyses
4401 Ford Avenue
P.O. Box 16268
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Director,
Manpower Support and
Readiness Program
Center for Naval Analyses
2000 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Stanley Collyer
Office of Naval Technology
Code 222
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Hans F. Crombag
Faculty of Law
University of Limburg
P.O. Box 616
Maastricht
The NETHERLANDS 6200 MD

Ms. Carolyn R. Crone
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. Timothy Davey
American College Testing Program
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. C. M. Dayton
Department of Measurement
Statistics & Evaluation
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Ralph J. DeAyala
Measurement, Statistics,
and Evaluation
Benjamin Bldg., Rm. 4112
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Lou DiBello
CERL
University of Illinois
103 South Mathews Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Dattprasad Divg
Center for Naval Analyses
4401 Ford Avenue
P.O. Box 16268
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Mr. Hei-Ki Dong
Bell Communications Research
Room PYA-1K207
P.O. Box 1320
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1320

Dr. Fritz Drasgow
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Defense Technical
Information Center
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5
Alexandria, VA 22314
(2 Copies)

Dr. Stephen Dunbar
224B Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. James A. Earles
Air Force Human Resources Lab
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Susan Embretson
University of Kansas
Psychology Department
426 Fraser
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dr. George Englehard, Jr.
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University
210 Fishburne Bldg.
Atlanta, GA 30322

ERIC Facility-Acquisitions
2440 Research Blvd, Suite 550
Rockville, MD 20850-3238

Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank
Operational Technologies Corp.
5825 Callaghan, Suite 225
San Antonio, TX 78228

Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Consultant
Cognitive & Instructional Sciences
2520 North Vernon Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. P-A. Federion
Code 51
NPRDC
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Leonard Feldt
Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Richard L. Ferguson
American College Testing
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Gerhard Fischer
Liebiggasse 5/3
A 1010 Vienna
AUSTRIA

Dr. Myron Fischl
U.S. Army Headquarters
DAPE-MRR
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0300

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald
University of New England
Department of Psychology
Armidale, New South Wales 2351
AUSTRALIA

Mr. Paul Foley
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Alfred R. Freely
AFOSR/NL, Bldg. 410
Bolling AFB, DC 20332-6448

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons
Illinois State Psychiatric Inst.
Rm 529W
1601 W. Taylor Street
Chicago, IL 60612

Dr. Janice Gifford
University of Massachusetts
School of Education
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Drew Gitomer
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research
& Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Sherrie Gott
AFHRL/MOMJ
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5601

Dr. Bert Green
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Michael Habon
DORNIER GMBH
P.O. Box 1420
D-7990 Friedrichshafen 1
WEST GERMANY

Prof. Edward Haertel
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton
University of Massachusetts
Laboratory of Psychometric
and Evaluative Research
Hills South, Room 152
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Delwyn Harnisch
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Grant Henning
Senior Research Scientist
Division of Measurement
Research and Services
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Ms. Rebecca Hetter
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 63
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Thomas M. Hirsch
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Paul W. Holland
Educational Testing Service, 21-T
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Paul Horst
677 G Street, #184
Chula Vista, CA 92010

Ms. Julia S. Hough
Cambridge University Press
40 West 20th Street
New York, NY 10011

Dr. William Howell
Chief Scientist
AFHRL/CA
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5601

Dr. Lloyd Humphreys
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 East Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Steven Hunika
3-104 Educ. N.
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA T6G 2G5

Dr. Huynh Huynh
College of Education
Univ. of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Robert Jannarone
Elec. and Computer Eng. Dept.
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Kumar Joag-dev
University of Illinois
Department of Statistics
101 Illini Hall
725 South Wright Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Douglas H. Jones
1280 Woodfern Court
Toms River, NJ 08753

Dr. Brian Junker
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Statistics
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Michael Kaplan
Office of Basic Research
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Milton S. Katz
European Science Coordination
Office
U.S. Army Research Institute
Box 65
FPO New York 09510-1500

Prof. John A. Keats
Department of Psychology
University of Newcastle
N.S.W. 2308
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Jwa-keun Kim
Department of Psychology
Middle Tennessee State
University
P.O. Box 522
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

Mr. Soon-Hoon Kim
Computer-based Education
Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. G. Gage Kingsbury
Portland Public Schools
Research and Evaluation Department
501 North Dixon Street
P. O. Box 3107
Portland, OR 97209-3107

Dr. William Koch
Box 7246, Meas. and Eval. Ctr.
University of Texas-Austin
Austin, TX 78703

Dr. Richard J. Koubek
Department of Biomedical
& Human Factors
139 Engineering & Math Bldg.
Wright State University
Dayton, OH 45435

Dr. Leonard Kroeker
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Jerry Lehnus
Defense Manpower Data Center
Suite 400
1600 Wilson Blvd
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Dr. Thomas Leonard
University of Wisconsin
Department of Statistics
1210 West Dayton Street
Madison, WI 53705

Dr. Michael Levine
Educational Psychology
210 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

Dr. Charles Lewis
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541-0001

Mr. Rodney Lim
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert L. Linn
Campus Box 249
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309-0249

Dr. Robert Lockman
Center for Naval Analysis
4401 Ford Avenue
P.O. Box 16268
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Dr. Frederic M. Lord
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Richard Luecht
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. George B. Macready
Department of Measurement
Statistics & Evaluation
College of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Gary Maron
Stop 31-E
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Clesen J. Martin
Office of Chief of Naval
Operations (OP 13 F)
Navy Annex, Room 2832
Washington, DC 20350

Dr. James R. McBride
HumRRO
6430 Elmhurst Drive
San Diego, CA 92120

Dr. Clarence C. McCormick
HQ, USMEPCOM/MEPCT
2500 Green Bay Road
North Chicago, IL 60064

Mr. Christopher McCusker
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert McKinley
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Mr. Alan Mead
c/o Dr. Michael Levine
Educational Psychology
210 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

Dr. Timothy Miller
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Robert Milevy
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. William Montague
NPRDC Code 13
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Ms. Kathleen Moreno
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Headquarters Marine Corps
Code MPI-20
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. Ratna Nandakumar
Educational Studies
Willard Hall, Room 213E
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

Library, NPRDC
Code P201L
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Librarian
Naval Center for Applied Research
in Artificial Intelligence
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 5510
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.
School of Education - WPH 801
Department of Educational
Psychology & Technology
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. James B. Olsen
WICAT Systems
1875 South State Street
Orem, UT 84058

Office of Naval Research,
Code 1142CS
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
(6 Copies)

Dr. Judith Orasanu
Basic Research Office
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Jesse Orlansky
Institute for Defense Analyses
1801 N. Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Peter J. Pashley
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

Wayne M. Patience
American Council on Education
GED Testing Service, Suite 20
One Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James Paulson
Department of Psychology
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Dept. of Administrative Sciences
Code 54
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5026

Dr. Mark D. Reckase
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Malcolm Ree
AFHRL/MOA
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Mr. Steve Reiss
N660 Elliott Hall
University of Minnesota
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344

Dr. Carl Rossi
CNET-PDCD
Building 90
Great Lakes NTC, IL 60088

Dr. J. Ryan
Department of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Fumiko Samejima
Department of Psychology
University of Tennessee
310B Austin Peay Bldg.
Knoxville, TN 37916-0900

Mr. Drew Sands
NPRDC Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Lowell Schoer
Psychological & Quantitative
Foundations
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Mary Schratz
4100 Parkside
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Dr. Dan Segall
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Robin Shealy
University of Illinois
Department of Statistics
101 Illini Hall
725 South Wright St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Kazuo Shigematsu
7-9-24 Kugenuma-Kaigan
Fujisawa 251
JAPAN

Dr. Randall Shumaker
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 5510
4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Richard E. Snow
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Richard C. Sorensen
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Judy Spray
ACT
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Martha Stocking
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Peter Stolfoff
Center for Naval Analysis
4401 Ford Avenue
P.O. Box 16268
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

Dr. William Stout
University of Illinois
Department of Statistics
101 Illini Hall
725 South Wright St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan
Laboratory of Psychometric and
Evaluation Research
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Mr. Brad Sympton
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code-62
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. John Tangney
AFOSR/NL Bldg. 410
Bolling AFB, DC 20332-6448

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuka
Educational Testing Service
Mail Stop 03-T
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Maurice Tatsukawa
Educational Testing Service
Mail Stop 03-T
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. David Thiessen
Department of Psychology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66044

Mr. Thomas J. Thomas
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Mr. Gary Thomasson
University of Illinois
Educational Psychology
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert Tsutakawa
University of Missouri
Department of Statistics
222 Math. Sciences Bldg.
Columbia, MO 65211

Dr. Ledyard Tucker
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. David Vale
Assessment Systems Corp.
2233 University Avenue
Suite 440
St. Paul, MN 55114

Dr. Frank L. Vicino
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Howard Wainer
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Michael T. Waller
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Educational Psychology Department
Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Dr. Ming-Mei Wang
Educational Testing Service
Mail Stop 03-T
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Thomas A. Warm
FAA Academy AAC934D
P.O. Box 25082
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Dr. Brian Waters
HumRRO
1100 S. Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. David J. Weiss
N660 Eliott Hall
University of Minnesota
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0344

Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman
Box 146
Carmel, CA 93921

Major John Welsh
AFHRL/MOAN
Brooks AFB, TX 78223

Dr. Douglas Wetzel
Code 51
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Rand R. Wilcox
University of Southern
California
Department of Psychology
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1061

German Military Representative
ATTN: Wolfgang Wildgrube
Streitkräfteamt
D-5300 Bonn 2
4000 Brandywine Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Bruce Williams
Department of Educational
Psychology
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Hilda Wing
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20591

Mr. John H. Wolfe
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. George Wong
Biostatistics Laboratory
Memorial Sloan-Kettering
Cancer Center
1275 York Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Kentaro Yamamoto
02-T
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Wendy Yen
CTB/McGraw Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Joseph L. Young
National Science Foundation
Room 320
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20550

Mr. Anthony R. Zaro
National Council of State
Boards of Nursing, Inc.
625 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 1544
Chicago, IL 60611

