





ELECTE SEP 0 9 1986

09

9

86

052

**RESEARCH REPORT ONR-86-I** 

# CONJUNCTIVE ITEM RESPONSE THEORY KERNELS

Robert J. Jannarone

Psychology Department University of South Carolina Columbia, SC 29208

August, 1986



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

This research was sponsored by Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-86-K00817, Authority Identification Number, NR 4421-544.

ECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE		A	<u>D-AI</u>	71834		
	REPORT DOCU	MENTATION	PAGE			
a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	16. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS					
a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT					
b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCH	Approved for public release;					
A DEPEOPMING OPGANIZATION DEPOPT NUMBER(S)		5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)				
ONR 86-1					• •	
a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL	7a. NAME OF MO	ONITORING ORG			
University of South Carolina	(If applicable)	Office	of Naval	Research		
ic. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		7b. ADDRESS (Cit	y, State, and Zil	Code)		
Columbia, South Carolina 2	9208	800 N. Quincy St., Code 442 Arlington, VA 22217				
Ba. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL	9. PROCUREMEN	INSTRUMENT I	DENTIFICATION NU	JMBER	
Personnel and Training Resea	rci	N0001	4-86-K0081	7		
c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS				
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO	WORK UNIT	
A TITLE (Jacking Comments of a first state		61153N 42	RR04204	RR0420401	4421-544	
Conjunctive Item Response T	leory Kernels					
2 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Robert J. Ja	annarone	_				
3a. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIN	E COVERED	14. DATE OF REPO	RT (Year, Month	, Day) 15. PAGE	COUNT	
Technical Densut			00			
Technical Report FROM	3/1/86_ 10 0/15/00	8/15/				
Technical Report FROM 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	3/1/86_ 10 0/13/00	9. 8/ 15/				
Technical Report     FROM       16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION     17.       17.     COSATI CODES	18. SUBJECT TERMS	Continue on revers	e if necessary ai	nd identify by bloc	ck number)	
Technical Report     FROM       6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       7.     COSATI CODES       FIELD     GROUP       SUB-GROUP	18. SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on revers	e if necessary ai	nd identify by bloc	ck number)	
Technical Report     FROM       16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.     COSATI CODES       FIELD     GROUP   SUB-GROUP	18. SUBJECT TERMS	Continue on revers	e if necessary ai	nd identify by bloc	ck number)	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if neces)	18. SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on revers	e if necessary ai	nd identify by bloc	ck number)	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi         Conjunctive item response	18. SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on reverse number)	e if necessary ai	nd identify by bloc	stics for	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.       COSATI CODES         17.       COSATI CODES       FIELD         FIELD       GROUP       SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession conjunctive item response latent traits are not necesion continue on the conditional content of the content of the conditional content of the content of the c	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS sary and identify by block models are introd	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score	e if necessary an it (a) suff es; (b) iter	nd identify by bloc icient stati ns are not no	stics for ecessarily	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.       COSATI CODES         17.       COSATI CODES       19.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       10.       10.         10.       10.       10.       10.         10.       10.       10.       10.         10.       10.       10.       10.	18. SUBJECT TERMS	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score	e if necessary and it (a) suff es; (b) item tive) item	icient stati response mod	stics for ecessarily dels in-	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.       COSATI CODES         17.       COSATI CODES       17.         FIELD       GROUP       SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessing       16.         Conjunctive item response       17.         Iatent traits are not necesing       10.         Iocally independent; and (cluding the binomial, Raso cases.       Simple estimates are	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes	(Continue on reverse number) luced such that in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun	e if necessary and t (a) suff ts; (b) iten tive) item ly independent	icient stati ns are not no response mod dent model a ls are intro	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.       COSATI CODES         17.       COSATI CODES       19.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession)       10.       10.         10. Conjunctive item response latent traits are not neceson locally independent; and (cluding the binomial, Rascon cases. Simple estimates a evaluated as well. Conjunctive are not neceson locally independent. Conjunctive are not n	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS any and identify by block models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi	e if necessary an et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independent octive mode ed with con	icient stati ns are not no response mo dent model a ls are introo gnitive mode	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       17.         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if neces         i       Conjunctive item response         latent traits are not nece         locally independent; and (         cluding the binomial, Rasc         cases.       Simple estimates a         evaluated as well.       Conjunctive         assume the existence of se	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall	(Continue on reverse number) luced such that in item score nsatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iten tive) item ly independent of with con- omponent pr	icient stati ns are not no response mo dent model a ls are intro gnitive mode rocesses for	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global	
Technical Report       FROM         6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION       6. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         9. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessing         Conjunctive item response         latent traits are not necesing         locally independent; and (         cluding the binomial, Rase         cases.       Simple estimates and         evaluated as well.       Conjunctive.         assume the existence of sea         ability.       It is concluded         structing improved tests and	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT T	(Continue on reverse (Continue on reverse number) luced such that in item score nsatory (addi general local ts for conjunt also identifi y necessary con models and me junctive con	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iten tive) item ly independ octive mode ed with cog omponent po thods may s	icient stati ns are not no response mod dent model a ls are intro gnitive mode rocesses for show promise	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con-	
Technical ReportFROM16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION17.COSATI CODESFIELDGROUPSUB-GROUP19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if neces10. Conjunctive item response10. altent traits are not nece10. conjunctive item response10. altent traits are not nece10. conjunctive item response11. conjunctive item response12. conjunctive item response13. conjunctive item response14. conjunctive item response15. conjunctive item response16. conjunctive16. co	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall that conjunctive nd uncovering con item response th	(Continue on reverse (Continue on reverse number) Nuced such that in item score nsatory (addi general local ts for conjunt also identifi y necessary co models and me junctive cogn eory may help	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) item ly independent outive mode ed with con- omponent pro- thods may so itive struc- to clarify	icient stati ns are not no response model and ls are introde gnitive mode rocesses for show promise cture. It is y the relation	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical ReportFROM16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION17.COSATI CODESFIELDGROUPSUB-GROUP19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession10. Conjunctive item response11. Conjunctive item response12. Conjunctive item response13. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession14. Conjunctive item response15. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION17. COSATI CODES18. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necession10. Conjunctive item response10. Conjunctive item response10. Conjung the binomial, Rasc10. Cally independent; and (10. Cluding the existence of set10. Summe the existence of set10. Structing improved tests a10. Concluded that conjunctive10. Between local dependence,	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall that conjunctive nd uncovering con item response th multidimensionali	(Continue on reverse (Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independ of tive mode ed with cost omponent po thods may so itive struct to clarify response fu	icient stati ns are not no response model a ls are introd gnitive model rocesses for show promise cture. It is the relation	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical ReportFROM16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION17.COSATI CODESFIELDGROUPSUB-GROUP19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessiConjunctive item responselatent traits are not necelocally independent; and (cluding the binomial, Rasccases.Simple estimates aevaluated as well.Conjunctiveability.It is concludedstructing improved tests aconcluded that conjunctivebetween local dependence,	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 19. Subject TERMS 10. Subject T	(Continue on reverse (Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independ of with con- omponent pro- thods may so itive struc- to clarify response fu	icient stati ns are not no response mod dent model and ls are introd gnitive mode rocesses for show promise cture. It is y the relation	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP       SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi         10. Conjunctive item response         10. atent traits are not necessi         10. cluding the binomial, Rasc         cases. Simple estimates a         evaluated as well. Conjunctive         ability. It is concluded         structing improved tests a         concluded that conjunctive         between local dependence,         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRA         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRA	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS and identify by block models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall that conjunctive nd uncovering con item response th multidimensionali	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independ ed with con omponent pro- thods may so itive struct to clarify response fur curity classified	icient stati ns are not no response model and ls are introde gnitive model rocesses for show promise cture. It is y the relation unction form.	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP       SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         10. Conjunctive item response       Iatent traits are not nece         10. Colling the binomial, Rasc       Cases. Simple estimates a         evaluated as well.       Conjur         assume the existence of se       ability. It is concluded         structing improved tests a       concluded that conjunctive         between local dependence,       20         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRA         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRA         22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL         Charles E. Davis	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS and identify by block models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall that conjunctive nd uncovering con item response th multidimensionali	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independent outive mode ed with con- omponent pro- thods may sub- itive struct to clarify response fur curity classified include Area Coo 4046	icient stati ns are not no response model an ls are introde gnitive mode rocesses for show promise cture. It is the relation (ATION (ATION)	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical Report       FROM         16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         17.       COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP       SUB-GROUP         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi       Conjunctive item response         10. Conjunctive item response       Latent traits are not necesion         10. Colling the binomial, Rase       Cases. Simple estimates a         10. Cluding the binomial, Rase       Cases. Simple estimates a         10. Cluding the binomial.       Conjunctive         11. Conjur       Assume the existence of set         11. Souncluded that conjunctive       between local dependence,         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTR.       Same         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTR.       Same         20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTR.       Same         22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL       Charles E. Davis         22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL       Charles E. Davis         22b FORM 1473, 84 MAR       Content for the set of the set	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS 19. SubJECT T	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item 21 ABSTRACT SE uncl 22b TELEPHONE (202) 696- until exhausted.	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independent of the struct to clarify response fu CURITY CLASSIFI assified include Area Coo 4046	icient stati ns are not no response model at ls are intro- gnitive model rocesses for show promise cture. It is the relation (CATION (CATION)	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	
Technical Report       FROM         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION         COSATI CODES         FIELD       GROUP         SUB-GROUP         ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessi         Conjunctive item response         latent traits are not necess         locally independent; and (         cluding the binomial, Rasc         cases.       Simple estimates at         evaluated as well.       Conjunctive         assume the existence of set         ability.       It is concluded         structing improved tests at         concluded that conjunctive         between local dependence,         Constribution/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTR         Dotorrelease         Single Scheder         Some Constribution/AVAILABILITY of ABSTR         Constribution/AVAILABILITY of ABSTR         Dotorrelease         Deform 1473, 84 MAR	18. SUBJECT TERMS 18. SUBJECT TERMS and identify by block models are introd ssarily additive c) existing compe h, logistic, and nd hypothesis tes ctive models are veral individuall that conjunctive nd uncovering con item response th multidimensionali ACT AS RPT DTIC USER B3 APR edition may be used of All other editions are	(Continue on reverse number) luced such tha in item score insatory (addi general local ts for conjun also identifi y necessary c models and me junctive cogn eory may help ty, and item 21 ABSTRACT SE uncl 22b TELEPHONE( (202) 696- until exhausted. obsolete.	e if necessary and et (a) suff es; (b) iter tive) item ly independ ed with con omponent pri thods may so itive struct to clarify response fu CURITY CLASSIFI assified Include Area Coo 4046	icient stati ns are not no response model an ls are introde oritive model rocesses for show promise cture. It is the relation (CATION (CLASSIFICATION ssified	stics for ecessarily dels in- re special duced and ls that a global for con- s also onships	

and the second secon

	•	-		 •	•				
•				 ·. • .			·	· · ·	
÷		 	 	 		<u>.</u>	A. U.S.		 . '

. . . .

# Acknowledgement

An early draft of this report was submitted to <u>Psychometrika</u> before I became affiliated with ONR. I wish to thank Ivo Moleenar and two <u>Psychometrika</u> reviewers for some useful suggestions that have been incorporated into this report.

Accession For X NTIS CRANE DTIC TAR  $\Box$ Untern ap ted Justification By\_ Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Special Dist



# Introduction

Research during the last decade has led to increased generality in item response theory. Important results include multidimensional item response models (Embretson, 1984; Fischer, 1973; McKinley & Reckase, 1983), locally dependent models (Kempf, 1977; Fischer & Formann, 1982), tests for unidimensional and locally independent models (Holland, 1981; Kelderman, 1984; Molenaar, 1983; Rosenbaum, 1984; Yen, 1981), and attempts to distinguish local dependence from multidimensionality (Goldstein, 1980; Hambleton, Swaminathan, Cook, Eignor, & Clifford 1978; Kelderman, 1984).

Applications of extended item response theory have also appeared, notably in componential reasoning models (Sternberg, 1977; Whitely, 1980). The componential approach involves breaking down each item reflecting a global ability or trait into subtask items. The subtask items presumably reflect component abilities/traits that are individually necessary for having the global attribute. Statistical procedures are then used to fit multidimensional item response models to subtask performance measures (Embretson, 1984; Fischer & Formann, 1982; Whitely, 1980).

Componential cognitive models as well as other serial process models (e.g., Anderson, 1981) imply a nonadditive combination rule for items that reflect distinct, individually necessary ability components. In particular, if binary items were used to reflect such components then the global trait would be reflected only if all component items were passed, as indicated by a product of item scores rather than a weighted sum. Parallel processes, on the other hand, would imply that items should be combined additively. Thus, serial process models are conjunctive in that all components are necessary for the process to occur, as potentially reflected by multiplicative composites of item scores. In contrast, parallel processes are compensatory (Embretson, 1985) in that deficits in one component ability could be overcome by strengths in another, as reflected by additive composites of item scores. Moreover, additive item combination rules may be inappropriate for reflecting conjunctive/serial processes, whereas multiplicative item combination rules may be inadequate for reflecting compensatory/parallel processes.

Despite the above-cited recent advances in latent trait theory, no latent trait models have yet appeared with the potential for reflecting serial processing in standard paper and pencil tests. Standard test theory models including the Rasch, logistic, binomial, and classical models (Lord & Novick, 1968) lack this potential, because they imply sufficient statistics for latent traits that are additive in the item scores. Other special-purpose models have appeared for certain tests that are inherently conjunctive (Embretson, 1984; Stegelmann, 1983; Fischer & Formann, 1982). However, no general models currently exist for uncovering and reflecting conjunctive processes underlying standard tests. This is especially noteworthy given the prominence of serial process models in modern cognitive psychology.

Another existing gap in latent trait theory lies in the class of available locally dependent models. Although methods are available for detecting local dependence (Kelderman, 1984), weak variants of local independence have been formulated (Holland, 1981), and specialized locally dependent models have appeared (Embretson, 1984; Fischer & Formann, 1982: Kempf, 1977), no general family of locally dependent latent trait models has yet been introduced. (One general latent class model has been introduced, however--see Harper, 1972.) Furthermore, the lack of locally dependent models is directly connected with the lack of nonadditive models for conjunctive cognitive structure, as will be shown below. The main purpose of this article is to provide a variety of kernels for item response models that reflect both conjunctive cognitive structure and local dependence. (The conditional distributions appearing in observable probability mixtures for these models are called kernels.) An auxiliary purpose is to demonstrate the utility of related procedures for estimating conjunctive item parameters and testing specific conjunctive/locally dependent structures.

Before describing conjunctive item response theory, the substance of conjunctivity and its connection to some related work will be illustrated.

<u>Conjunctivity and configural scoring</u>. For simplicity, suppose that a global trait ( $\theta$ ), say analogical reasoning ability, were tied to two individually necessary component abilities, say vocabulary (V) and inductive reasoning (I). Thus, items that were easy with respect to V yet moderately difficult with respect to I might reflect I alone, whereas items with the converse property might reflect V alone. If there were a few such pure items in an analogical reasoning test with the remaining items reflecting the global trait, then the test could be represented by Figure 1. As Figure 1 suggests, an optimal estimate of  $\theta$  involving raw scores on  $x_3$  through  $x_M$  might also involve  $x_1x_2$ , because passing both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  is similar to passing each of the others, whereas passing either  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  alone is not.

Insert Figure 1 about here

More generally, a collection of M binary items may involve several conjunctive components. In this case an optimal estimate for  $\theta$  might take the form,

$$\widetilde{\Theta} = t(\Sigma \times_{G_{M}} \dots \times_{m_{s}} \alpha_{m_{1}} \dots m_{s}), \qquad (1)$$

where  $G_{M}$  is the power set  $(G_{M} = \{(m_{1}, \dots, m_{s}) \subseteq \{1, \dots, M\}; s = 1, \dots, M\}$ --the M subscript will be deleted from G and similar expressions in the sequel). We point out that the existence of optimal estimates satisfying (1) with any of the  $\alpha_{m_{1} \cdots m_{s}} \neq 0$  for s>2 would preclude the existence of any additive test model, including the logistic (Birnbaum, 1968), Rasch (Rasch, 1980), binomial (Huynh, 1977), and classical models.

Prior studies of nonadditive item scoring methods seem to stem from Horst's so-called configural scoring methods (Horst, 1954; Bussmeyer & Jones, 1983; Gaier & Lee, 1953; Jannarone & Roberts, 1984; McDonald, 1967). Configural scoring simply reflects nonadditivity in prediction by regressing criterion variables on raw items in a scale as well as on their cross-products. For example if there were an external criterion, Y, available in the Figure 1 case, then the configural approach would fit

$$E(Y|_{\Sigma}) = \sum_{m=1}^{N} \alpha_{m} x_{m} + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{N} \alpha_{mn} x_{m} x_{n}, \qquad (2)$$

using regression methods, and ideally identify only  $\alpha_{12}$  and  $\alpha_3$  through  $\alpha_M$  as nonzero. Jannarone and Roberts (1984) used a configural variant to reflect nonadditivity in the absence of external criteria. They performed two-by-two analyses of variance to evaluate contributions of cross-products among each pair of items, but with the sum of the remaining M-2 item scores instead of an external variable as a criterion. Highly nonadditive item pairs were reflected by augmenting unit-weight scores with scores based on corresponding pairwise item cross-products, which are known as technical items (Fischer & Formann, 1982).

1'5.1'5.FA.5'6.\*'

Configural scoring methods for binary items have not become popular, probably because they have not led to improved predictability under crossvalidation. This problem is not only well known in external prediction (e.g. Wainwright, 1965) but also seems to hold in internal scale development (Jannarone & Roberts, 1984).

The failure of binary-item configural scores to cross-validate may be due to the lack of a justifying model for configural methods when items are binary. In particular, the only model that seems to justify configural scoring methods is a linear model with errors independent of observed scores. However, just as such models and methods have been found to be inappropriate for raw binary item scores, they seem to be inappropriate for binary item cross-products as well. For example, Jannarone and Roberts (personal communication) have found that their method leads to distorted conclusions for pairs of items that are very easy or very difficult, in line with similar problems that often occur when fitting linear models to binary items.

<u>Rationale</u>. So far it has been suggested that conjunctive processes should naturally be reflected through the use of item cross-products in latent trait estimates. Also, configural scoring methods seem to be the only methods developed up until now with provisions for such cross-products as a goal but with poor cross-validation as a result, evidently because they are not appropriate for binary data. Thus, configural scoring seems to be in the same state as the classical test model was before the development of item response theory. It seems natural to ask then, whether a viable set of binary item response models can be constructed that accommodate item cross-products. Given such models it should be possible to construct valid methods for identifying conjunctivity. The models to be described in the sequel were developed with a justification for the inclusion of binary item cross-products as a goal. The basis that was ultimately selected for justifying item cross-products was their appearance in sufficient statistics for latent traits. For example, just as the Rasch kernel is based on the sum of item scores as a sufficient statistic, the conjunctive Rasch model to be described is based on a sufficient statistic involving the sum of item scores as well as item crossproduct scores. Similarly, just as the logistic kernel is based on a weighted-sum sufficient statistic, the conjunctive logistic extension to be described is based on a weighted sum of item scores and cross-products. Out of several bases for establishing satisfactory conjunctive models that were pursued, sufficiency was by far the most successful, yielding models that retain many advantages of their additive counterparts, as will be shown.

The conjunctive models and methods be described have been designed to extend their compensatory (additive) counterparts, while including their strongest features. For example, the conjunctive Rasch extension, which will be described in detail, leads to:

- (a) a variety of possible conjunctive models and corresponding sufficient statistics for  $\theta$ --for example, in order to accommodate the Figure 1 case with M=4, one extended Rasch model could yield the sufficient statistic,  $x_1x_2+x_3+x_4$ , indicating that  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ have no unique additive contributions to  $\theta$ , whereas another extended Rasch model could yield the sufficient statistic,  $x_1x_2+x_1+x_2+x_3+x_4$ , allowing  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  to have both additive and multiplicative contributions;
- (b) item parameters that can be estimated independently of person parameters;

(c) consistent estimates of the item parameters;

- (d) conditional maximum likelihood estimates of  $\theta$  given the item parameters; and finally
- (e) methods for testing different conjunctive models such as those implied by the sufficient statistics in (a).

Also, the conjunctive logistic extension, which will be briefly described, yields sufficient statistics of the form,  $\Sigma \alpha_{m_1 \cdots m_s} m_1 \cdots m_s$ , as well as unique conditional maximum-likelihood ability parameter estimates. Thus, the conjunctive models as well as accompanying methods to be described have useful features along the lines of their additive counterparts.

From the viewpoint of efficient ability estimation, conjunctive methods may be seen as alternatives to the current test construction practice of deleting or replacing items that do not fit, say, an additive Rasch model. Conjunctive methods have the potential for considerable precision improvements, as can be seen from the technical item viewpoint (Fischer & Formann, 1982). Suppose for example that a pool of verbal analogies items behaved conjunctively, say with 10 items of the V type, 10 of the I type and 10 of the VI type. In this case standard item selection practice might lead to the retention of fewer than the 30 original items and as a result fewer than 31 distinct possible test scores, because many of the items would not fit a Rasch model. However, a conjunctive approach would not only retain all of original items, but also include 100 additional technical items obtained by multiplying each V item by each I item. Thus, it would be possible for individuals to have many more distinct test scores, given a conjuctive model, than 31, given a Rasch model. Consequently, conjuctively scored tests have the potential for increased precision. (On the other

hand, if the Rasch model held, attempts to include the 100 technical items would not increase precision at all.)

Some of the results to follow will show that such conjunctive structure may indeed be present in existing scales. These results will be given in terms of empirical tests for additivity among all possible item triplets in two selected measures. Other results will show the kind of precision increase that could be expected if conjunctive structure were properly reflected through a nonadditive sufficient statistic. These results will be in the form of maximum possible validity coefficients for certain nonadditive versus additive models. Details will be given in the sequel.

In practice, it would be useful not only to include the  $\alpha_{m_1...m_s}$  instead of unit weights but also to identify the relative contributions of the individual components for each item. For example, if the Figure 1 case held for verbal analogies items, it seems likely that the relative contributions of V and I would vary over items. However, describing procedures for identifying such relative contributions are beyond this article's scope. In addition, only one of the simplest conjunctive extensions to be described, the conjunctive Rasch model, will be described in detail. Other conjunctive extensions will only be briefly introduced.

A specialized Rasch model developed by Fischer and Formann (1982) for describing Rorschach test data as well as Kempf's (1977) dynamic test model seem to be special cases of the conjunctive models to follow.

# Conjunctive Rasch Models

<u>The conjunctive Rasch kernel</u>. One familiar form for the usual Rasch model (e.g. Andersen, 1980) is

$$\Pr\{X=x\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Pr\{X=x|\theta\} dG(\theta)$$
$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\exp\{(\theta-\beta_m)x_m\}}{1+\exp\{(\theta-\beta_m)\}} dG(\theta), \qquad (3)$$

where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_M)$  is a realization of  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_M)$ , and  $G(\Theta)$  is the latent trait distribution function. We will use the following equivalent formulation, because it can be directly extended to reflect conjunctive structure:

$$\Pr\{X=x\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\theta) \exp\{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} x_m(\theta-\beta_m)\} dG(\theta), \qquad (4)$$

where

$$v(\theta) = \left[\sum_{X} \exp\{\sum_{m=1}^{M} u_{m}(\theta - \beta_{m})\}\right]^{-1},$$

and  $X = \{ u: u_m = 0, 1; m = 1, ..., M \}$ , the set of all 2<sup>M</sup> possible score patterns. With either formulation it is easy to verify that local independence holds, that is for any  $\theta \in (-\infty, \infty)$ ,

Our conjunctive extension replaces the Rasch kernel in (4) with

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \underset{\sim}{X=x} | \theta \} = v_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) \exp\{ \sum_{\mathcal{R}} m_{1} \dots m_{s}^{(\theta-\beta)} m_{1} \dots m_{s}^{(\theta-\beta)} \}, \qquad (6)$$

where

$$v_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) = \left[\sum_{X} \exp\{\sum_{\mathcal{R}} u_{\mathfrak{m}_{1}} \dots u_{\mathfrak{m}_{s}}(\theta - \beta_{\mathfrak{m}_{1}} \dots \mathfrak{m}_{s})\}\right]^{-1},$$
(7)

and

$$R \underline{c} G = \{(\mathsf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{m}_s) \underline{c} \{1, \ldots, \mathsf{M}\}; s=1, \ldots, \mathsf{M}\}.$$

(We need to consider subsets of G because the kernel (6) is not identified when R=G as we will show below.) As a first example, a conjunctive kernel corresponding to Figure 1 would have  $R=\{(1,2),3,\ldots,M\}$ . As a second example, two models that Fischer and Formann (1982, equations (16) and (17)) describe for Rorschach plate responses involves 10 pairs of subitems, (1a,1b,...,10a, 10b), such that each pair behaves conjunctively. The appropriate restricted summation set for that model would be  $R=\{1a,1b,(1a,1b),2a,2b,(2a,2b),\ldots,10a,$ 10b,(10a,10b)}. Fischer and Formann motivate their model as an additive Rasch model involving 20 physical items as well as 10 technical items. (Restrictions of model (6) could be thought of in a similar way, once it is noticed that all physical items may not necessarily appear, whereas many other technical items may appear.)

We point out that conjunctive Rasch kernels violate local independence in general, even though the technical and physical items may be factored in the numerator of (6) into

$$\exp\{\sum_{\mathcal{R}} x_{m_1} \cdots x_{m_s} (\theta - \beta_{m_1} \cdots m_s)\} = \prod_{\mathcal{R}} \exp\{x_{m_1} \cdots x_{m_s} (\theta - \beta_{m_1} \cdots m_s)\}.$$

The local dependence is determined in the denominator of (6) through the functional dependence among the physical and technical items. For example, if M=2 and  $R=\{1,2,(1,2)\}$  then

# Conjunctive Kernels 12

$$v_{R}^{(\theta)} = \sum_{u_{1}=0}^{1} \sum_{u_{2}=0}^{1} \exp\{u_{1}^{(\theta-\beta_{1})+u_{2}^{(\theta-\beta_{2})+u_{1}}u_{2}^{(\theta-\beta_{12})}\}$$

$$= 1 + \exp\{\theta-\beta_{1}\} + \exp\{\theta-\beta_{2}\} + \exp\{(\theta-\beta_{1})$$

$$+ (\theta-\beta_{2}) + (\theta-\beta_{12})\}$$

$$\not\equiv v_{1}^{(\theta)}v_{2}^{(\theta)}v_{12}^{(\theta)}, \qquad (8)$$

for any  $\boldsymbol{v}_1$  and  $\boldsymbol{v}_{12}.$  As a result,

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ X_2 = x_2 | X_1 = 0; \theta \} = \frac{\exp\{(\theta - \beta_2) x_2\}}{1 + \exp\{\theta - \beta_2\}},$$

but

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ X_2 = x_2 | X_1 = 1; \theta \} = \frac{\exp\{(2\theta - \beta_2 - \beta_{12}) x_2\}}{1 + \exp\{2\theta - \beta_2 - \beta_{12}\}} \neq \Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ X_2 = x_2 | X_1 = 0; \theta \}.$$
(9)

Given the conjunctive Rasch kernel (6), we have

$$\Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \underset{\mathcal{X}=x}{\overset{\mathcal{X}=x}{\sim}} = \exp\{-\sum_{\mathcal{R}} \sum_{m_{1}} \dots \sum_{m_{s}} \beta_{m_{1}} \dots \sum_{m_{s}} \beta_{m_{s}} \bigcup_{\mathcal{R}} (\theta) \exp\{\theta t_{\mathcal{R}}(x)\} dG(\theta)$$
  
$$= \Pr_{\mathcal{R}} \{ \underset{\mathcal{R}=x}{\overset{\mathcal{X}=x}{\sim}}, T=t_{\mathcal{R}}(x) \}, \qquad (10)$$

where

$$t_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{n}_{1}} \dots \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{m}_{s}}.$$
 (11)

By the factorization theorem  $t_R$  is a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ . In addition, R can be chosen so that either  $t_R$  is additive, satisfying the Rasch model, or multiplicative, yielding a class of conjunctive/locally dependent models indexed by R. Finally, it is easy to verify that kernels satisfying (6) are well-defined probability functions for all  $R\underline{c}G$  and real  $\beta_{m_1\cdots m_s}$ . (For any  $\underline{x}$  the numerator is positive and the denominator is simply the sum of all possible numerators.)

(A potentially puzzling point should be clarified here. In most treatments of item response models, local independence is treated as an axiom, leading to kernels that are expressible as individual item probability products. In contrast, kernel (6) has been derived not from local independence but from the requirement that item cross-products appear in the sufficient statistic for  $\theta$ . It only happens that the numerator of (6) can be analyzed into a product involving one factor for each physical and technical item. Fortunately, only the numerator of (6) can be factored into such a product, <u>not</u> the entire expression. Thus, (6) implies local dependence, in line with the cognitive dependence that should be associated with conjunctive processes as in Figure 1.)

The forms that item response functions take for conjunctive models are relatively complicated. Unlike the additive locally independent case (5), which leads to the simple and well-known item response functions,

 $Pr{X_m=1|\theta} = 1/(1+exp{\theta-\beta_m})$ , m=1,.., M,

the conjuctive/locally dependent item response functions satisfying (6) cannot in general be simplified beyond the basic form,

$$\Pr\{X_{m}=1|\theta\} = v_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) \sum_{\substack{X \in X \\ X_{m} = 1}} \exp\{\sum_{\substack{X \in X \\ R = 1}} \dots \sum_{\substack{M \in X \\ R = 1}} (\theta - \beta \dots m_{S})\}, m=1,\dots,M.$$

However, for some simple conjunctive kernels such as in the above first (Figure 1) example, item response functions are correspondingly simpler. For that example, it can be shown that if m=3,4,...,M, then

$$\Pr\{X_{m}=1|\theta\} = 1/(1+\exp\{\theta-\beta_{m}\}),$$

in line with the additive case, but if m=1 or 2 then

$$\Pr\{X_{m}=1|\theta\} = \frac{\exp\{\theta-\beta_{m}\}(1+\exp\{2\theta-\beta_{3-m}-\beta_{12}\})}{1+\exp\{\theta-\beta_{3-m}\}+\exp\{\theta-\beta_{m}\}(1+\exp\{2\theta-\beta_{3-m}-\beta_{12}\})}$$

<u>Estimation</u>. This section follows developments by Andersen (Andersen, 1982) and Kelderman (Kelderman, 1984) for the Rasch model. (R subscripts are omitted in the sequel.) We have,

$$Pr{T=t} = C(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(\theta) exp{\theta t} dG(\theta),$$

where

STATES AND A

$$C(t) = \sum_{T} \exp\{-\sum_{R} m_{1} \dots m_{s} \beta_{m_{1}} \dots m_{s}\}$$

and

$$T = \{ \underset{\mathcal{R}}{\times} : \underset{\mathcal{R}}{\times} \underset{\mathfrak{R}}{\times} \underset{\mathfrak{R}}{\ast} {\mathfrak{R}} {\mathfrak$$

Thus from (9),

$$\Pr\{X=x \mid T=t\} = \frac{1}{C(t)} \exp\{-\sum_{R} m_1 \cdots m_s \beta_{m_1} \cdots m_s\}, x \in X,$$
(12)

# = 0 elsewhere.

Equation (12) leads to consistent item parameter estimates and hypothesis tests, following known procedures for both additive Rasch model estimation (Rasch, 1980) and multinomial hypothesis testing (Landis & Koch, 1979). As an estimation example, if the model in Figure 1 held with M=4, then  $t=x_1x_2+x_3+x_4$  would be a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  and the following equation would hold:

$log[Pr {X = (0,0,0,0) T=0}]$		100000		
$log[Pr {X = (1,0,0,0) T=0}]$		100000		
$log[Pr {X = (0,1,0,0) T=0}]$		100000		
log[Pr { $\chi$ = (1,0,1,0) T=1}]		010010		
$\log[\Pr \{X = (1,1,0,0) T=1\}]$		010100		
log[Pr { $\chi$ = (0,1,1,0) T=1}]		010010	X(U)	
$\log[\Pr \{X = (0,0,1,0) T=1\}]$		010010		
$log[Pr {X = (0,1,0,1) T=1}]$	=	010001	X(2)	(13)
$log[Pr \{ X = (0,0,0,1)   T=1 \} ]$		010001	P12	
log[Pr { $\chi$ = (1,0,0,1) T=1}]		010001	P3	
$\log[\Pr \{X = (1,1,1,0)   T=2\}]$		001110	[ <sup>P</sup> 4 ]	
log[Pr { $\chi$ = (1,1,0,1) T=2}]		001101		
$\log[\Pr \{X = (1,0,1,1) T=2\}]$		001011		
$log[Pr {X = (0,0,1,1) T=2}]$		001011		
$log[Pr {X = (0,1,1,1) T=2}]$		001011		

where  $\chi(j) = -\log[C(j)]$  (j=0,1,2). (For this example there are four possible values of the sufficient statistic: t=0,1,2, and 3; t=3 is not included in (13) because only one possible pattern, (1,1,1,1), could yield t=3, hence  $\Pr{\{\chi=\chi|T=3\}}$  would be completely determined. Also, the design matrix in (13) is not of full rank, although this could easily be remedied through reparameterization.) Thus, consistent estimates for the item parameters can be easily obtained after replacing the left-hand side of (13) with logs of corresponding relative frequencies (although required sample sizes could be very large for some items). For some restricted kernels, more elegant estimation procedures seem possible, such as conditional maximum likelihood approaches following those of Andersen (Andersen, 1982, p. 245 ff.) for the additive Rasch kernel.

As (13) suggests, four-fold item contingencies can always be explained completely with enough conjunctive item parameters. Furthermore, it is easy to show that any M-fold item contingencies can be explained perfectly by some conjunctive Rasch model. In this sense conjunctive Rasch models are as general as would ever be necessary.

Equations of the form (13) can be easily used to show that Rasch conjunctive models with R=G are unidentifiable. For example, 7 additive and technical item parameters would be involved when M=3 and R=G, although only 6 conditional probabilities could be obtained that are not necessarily 0 or 1. Thus, the 6 x 7 design matrix in the version of (13) with R=Gwould have rank of at most 6 and consequently the 7 parameters could never be identified. Restricted conjunctive Rasch models may also be unidentifiable, especially when subsets of the total number of items must be used to estimate parameters, for example when some of the 2<sup>M</sup> possible cells in an M-item frequency table are empty. In such instances graph-theoretic methods due to Fischer (1981) could be used to establish identifiability conditions and conjunctive models could be chosen accordingly.

For tests of even moderate length, the number of possible conjunctive item parameters can be prohibitively large, due to the small cell sizes expected in corresponding  $2^{M}$  frequency tables. The problem can be alleviated by imposing theoretical restrictions on the structure, as in the above Rorschach example. Also, very simple conjunctive structures may be assumed, such as the involvement of pair-wise item cross-products only, and simple methods may be used to uncover them, such as looking only at three-way item contingencies to evaluate a given cross-product parameter. This latter approach will be illustrated in the following sections. Even so, the simple estimation and hypothesis testing procedures described here would have major defects for the global treatment of large test structures. Turning next to ability estimation, we will simply point out that unique maximum likelihood estimates of  $\theta$  exist, given the item parameters, under any conjunctive version of (6) and (7). The existence of such estimates for all t except t=0 and t=t(1,1,...,1) follows because the kernel (6) is a distribution from the one-parameter exponential family (see Andersen, 1980, Section 3.3). Given such unique estimates as well as the existence of unique item parameter estimates already illustrated, feasible ability estimation procedures are assured. (The argument parallels that of Birnbaum, 1968, p. 458).

<u>Hypothesis</u> <u>testing</u>. We will illustrate one of several possible approaches for which the latent trait distribution need not be specified. For any RcG we have,

$$\Pr\{\chi = \chi\} = \Pr\{\chi = \chi \mid T = t(\chi)\} \Pr\{T = t(\chi)\}$$

$$= \frac{\exp\{-\Sigma x_{m_1} \cdots x_{m_s} \beta_{m_1} \cdots \beta_{m_s} \sum_{\substack{\substack{\nu \in T} \\ \chi = \chi}} \sum_{\substack{\substack{\nu \in T \\ \chi = \chi}}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in T \\ \chi = \chi}} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \pi} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \chi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \chi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \chi} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \chi} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi}} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \pi} \sum} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in$$

Turning again to the Figure 1 example, when M=3 and t=1 (14) yields

$$\Pr\{\chi=(0,0,1)\} - \frac{e^{-\beta_{3}}}{3e^{-\beta_{3}}+e^{-\beta_{12}}} \left[ \Pr\{\chi=(0,0,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,0,1)\} + \frac{1}{3e^{-\beta_{3}}+e^{-\beta_{12}}} \right] \Pr\{\chi=(0,1,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,1,0)\} = 0,$$
(15a)

$$\Pr\{\chi=(1,0,1)\} - \frac{e^{-\beta_3}}{3e^{-\beta_{12}}} \left[ \Pr\{\chi=(0,0,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,0,1)\} + \frac{1}{3e^{-\beta_{12}}} \right] \Pr\{\chi=(0,1,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,1,0)\} = 0,$$
(15b)

$$\Pr\{\chi=(0,1,1)\} - \frac{e^{-\beta_3}}{3e^{-\beta_3} + e^{-\beta_{12}}} \left[ \Pr\{\chi=(0,0,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,0,1)\} + \frac{1}{2} \right]$$
(15c)  
$$\Pr\{\chi=(0,1,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,1,0)\} = 0,$$

Conjunctive Kernels 18

and

$$\Pr\{\chi=(1,1,0)\} - \frac{e^{-\beta_{12}}}{3e^{-\beta_{3}} + e^{-\beta_{12}}} \left[ \Pr\{\chi=(0,0,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,0,1)\} + \frac{1}{3e^{-\beta_{12}}} \right] \left[ \Pr\{\chi=(0,1,1)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,1,0)\} \right] = 0, \quad (15d)$$

When t=0 (14) yields

$$\Pr\{\chi=(0,0,0)\} = \frac{1}{3}[\Pr\{\chi=(0,0,0)\} + \Pr\{\chi=0,1,0)\} + \Pr\{\chi=(1,0,0)\}$$
(15e)

$$= \Pr\{\chi = (0,1,0)\}$$
(15f)

$$= \Pr\{\chi = (1,0,0)\}.$$
(15g)

Now since consistent estimates of  $\beta_{12}$  and  $\beta_3$  exist, standard methods can be used to test equations (15) by simultaneously evaluating any exhaustive, linearly independent set of resulting functions. (e.g., Koch & Landis, 1977). For example, (15) may be tested by evaluating

$$H_0: f(p) = 0,$$
  
5x1 7x1

where  $f_1(p)$  through  $f_3(p)$  are the left-hand sides of (15a) through (15c), respectively,  $f_4(p)=\Pr\{X=(0,0,0)\}-\Pr\{X=(0,1,0)\}$ ,  $f_5(p)=\Pr\{X=(0,1,0)\}$  $-\Pr\{X=(1,0,0)\}$ , and  $p^T=[\Pr\{X=(0,0,1)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(1,0,1)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(0,1,1)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(1,1,0)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(0,0,0)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(0,1,0)\}$ ,  $\Pr\{X=(1,0,0)\}]$ , where T denotes transposition. (In the  $f_j(p) \beta_{12}$  and  $\beta_3$  are replaced with appropriate functions of p based on an expression like (13).) The test statistic is  $f(\hat{p})^T S_{f}^{-1} f(\hat{p})$ , where  $\hat{p}$  is the vector of relative frequencies corresponding to p, and

$$S_{f} = \frac{1}{N_{\hat{p}}} \left[ \frac{\partial f_{i}}{\partial p_{j}} \Big|_{p=\hat{p}} \right]^{T} \left[ \hat{p} \hat{p}^{T} - \hat{p}_{p} \right] \left[ \frac{\partial f_{i}}{\partial p_{j}} \Big|_{p=\hat{p}} \right],$$

where  $(\underline{D}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}})_{ii}=\hat{p}_i$ ,  $(\underline{D}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}})_{ij}=0$  ( $i\neq j; j=1,\ldots,7$ ), and  $N_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}$  is the total observed frequency associated with the relative frequencies in  $\hat{p}$ . ( $N_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}$  is the same as overall sample size unless some individuals have some missing item responses.) The sampling distribution for the test statistic is asymptotically chi square with 5 degrees of freedom (as sample size increases--sample size should be sufficiently large that f is approximately 5-variate normal).

and a second state of

Other conjunctive and additive Rasch models may be tested similarly.

<u>Potential conjunctive model utility</u>. We will briefly illustrate the potential for improved ability estimation, the potential for uncovering conjunctive structure, and some preliminary evidence that test data are nonadditive.

Several indices of estimator precision could be used to compare conjunctive with compensatory model performance. These include analytic as well as Monte Carlo measures of ability-estimator squared error, efficiency, bias, and how precisely the estimators rank-order individuals with respect to latent traits. We have chosen an analytic measure of rank-ordering precision, namely the product-moment correlations of latent traits with Bayes estimates (based on squared-error-loss), equivalent to the <u>validity</u> (Lord & Novick, 1968) of Bayes estimators. (The Bayes estimates to be evaluated are based on prespecified, discrete latent trait distributions defined on a small set of points.) We chose this measure because Bayes estimate-latent trait correlations are the best possible validity coefficients for any model (Rao, 1965, p. 265), hence useful global indices of optimal test efficiency. In addition, these correlations may be nearly achievable in practice, given the large test sizes available in educational testing applications. Finally, Bayes estimates and their validities can be easily machine-computed and evaluated (given a discrete prior on a small point set) without using Monte Carlo methods.

Returning once again to the Figure 1 case, we will compare Bayes validities from three kernels, each based on  $M=M_V+M_I+M_{VI}$  items. The compensatory comparison kernel has a sufficient statistic of the form,

and equivalent items with zero-valued parameters. The two conjunctive kernels to be compared both involve three equivalent item sets-- $M_V$  items of the V type,  $M_I$  items of the I type and  $M_{VI}$  of the global type--along with zero-valued item parameters. The first conjunctive kernel has the sufficient statistic,

$$\begin{array}{cccc} M_{V} & M_{V} + M_{I} & M_{V} + M_{I} + M_{VI} \\ \Sigma & \Sigma & x_{m} x_{n} + \Sigma & x_{m} \\ m=1 & n=M_{V} + 1 & m=M_{V} + M_{T} + 1 \end{array}$$
(17)

and the second conjunctive kernel has the sufficient statistic,

$$\underset{m=1}{\overset{M}{\Sigma}} \overset{M}{\overset{V}{\Sigma}} \overset{M}{\overset{V}{\Sigma}} \overset{M}{\overset{M}{\Sigma}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\Sigma}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{M}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{M}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{M}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{V}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{\overset{H}{\Lambda}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}{}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{\overset{H}}{\overset{H}}} \overset{M}{$$

Kernel (18) extends (17) to include items that are both compensatory and conjunctive. Equation (18) is considerably less restrictive than (17) and more in line with the configural model (2).

Insert Table 1 about here

Conjunctive Kernels 21

Table 1 gives validity comparisons for kernels (16), (17), and (18), six different latent trait distributions, and three scale size configurations:  $M_V=M_I=M_{VI}=5$ , 10, and 15. The results range from much higher conjunctive model validity than additive model validity for low-variance latent trait distributions to slightly higher additive model validity for the highest-variance distribution.

In evaluating the potential for uncovering conjunctive structure, we will provide performance data from hypothesis tests that are similar to the test illustrated in the previous section. The tests evaluate two prespecified structures among a pair of items, labelled items 1 and 2 below: additive pair-wise structure satisfying (16) and purely conjunctive pair-wise structure satisfying (17). Although only the structure between items 1 and 2 will be of interest, a third item, labelled item 3 below, will be included in order to resolve the two structures empirically.

The test for pair-wise additivity evaluates kernels of the form,

$$\Pr\{\chi = \chi|\theta\} = \nu(\theta) \exp\{\sum_{m=1}^{3} x_m(\theta - \beta_m)\}, \qquad (19)$$

whereas the test for pure pair-wise conjunctivity evaluates kernels of the form,

$$\Pr\{\chi = \chi|\theta\} = v_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta) \exp\{x_1 x_2(\theta - \beta_{12}) + x_3(\theta - \beta_3)\}.$$
(20)

To the extent that these two tests reject kernels when appropriate, it should be possible to partition pairs of scale items into the V, I, and VI types suggested by Figure 1. However, additive and conjunctive kernels for pairs of items satisfying (18) cannot be directly tested using item triplets, because (18) requires more estimated parameters than three-way item contingencies can yield. Even so, if both kernels (19) and (20) were rejected an additive and conjunctive kernel satisfying (18) would be implied. Each entry in Table 2 gives correct rejection proportions among 100 .05-level tests. The first two columns correspond to tests for the additivity associated with (19), given either conjunctivity and additivity as in (18) or pure conjunctivity as in (20). The last two columns correspond to tests for the conjunctive kernel (20), given either pure additivity as in (19) or conjunctivity and additivity as in (18). Rows correspond to different latent trait distributions as in Table 1, and each entry in parentheses gives correct rejection proportions among 100 tests based on 1,000, 5,000, and 10,000 simulated observations, from left to right.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Insert Table 2 about here

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Table 2 shows that even 10,000 observations are not enough to yield high correct rejection rates when latent trait distributions have low variances, especially for the additivity test. However, correct rejection rates are very high when latent trait distributions have high variances. This makes sense because individuals having extreme latent trait values will tend to show much different test patterns for the three models than individuals with less extreme values. Overall Type I error rates for the tests of (19) and (20) were obtained by noting whether or not the data for columns one and two of Table 2 led to rejections of models (19) and (20), respectively. These Type I error rates were .047 and .054, respectively.

As the results in Table 2 clearly show, the tests for resolving items into additive and conjunctive subsets could lead to a substantial proportion of incorrect item classifications. Moreover, the incorrect classification rates would be even higher if more complicated conjunctive structures existed involving more than two component processes. These prollems may be lessened if enough correct classifications can be obtained in practice to suggest a theoretical basis for grouping items, given their cognitive content. For example, if the most significant items included in an empirically determined analogical reasoning component clearly contained a pure vocabulary element, correct decisions could be made about other items that were less significant based on their vocabulary content. Whether such theoretical cues will in fact aid in correctly resolving items remains to be seen. (Of course, matters would be simpler from a methodological viewpoint if cognitive theory suggested certain structures at the outset and the above methods were used only to check them--practitioners, on the other hand, might welcome these methods as exploratory aids in uncovering conjunctive structures.)

Although detailed empirical results are beyond this article's scope, two preliminary results seem promising. We have performed additivity tests for all item triplets based on 1,000 scores from a 50-item verbal analogies test (from the Spring, 1970 normative sample of the Level 3, Form A, Verbal School and College Ability subtest, provided by Educational Testing Service) as well as a 42-item personality scale (the Responsibility Scale from the CPI (Megargee, 1972)--respondents were high school males). Among the respective 19,600 and 11,480 triplet tests performed at the .01 level, 4,378 cr 37% of the verbal analogies results were significant and 2,092 or 18% of the personality results were significant. Since Rasch nonadditivity far exceeded chance levels in these data, it seems that fitting conjunctive models could improve trait estimation efficiency. Moreover, for scales such as these, where there is reason to expect some conjunctive structure, fitting simple conjunctive models may be a useful alternative to the current practice of deleting items that do not fit a given additive model.

الدينينينينية

# Other Conjunctive Kernels

In this section, conjunctive extensions will be first be given for three other compensatory item response models: the binomial model,

$$\Pr\{X=X\} = \int_{0}^{1} \left[\prod_{m=1}^{M} \pi^{m} (1-\pi)^{1-X_{m}}\right] dH(\pi),$$

the logistic model,

$$\Pr\{\chi=\chi\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{m=1}^{M} \frac{\exp\{x_{m}\alpha_{m}(\theta-\beta_{m})\}}{1+\exp\{x_{m}\alpha_{m}(\theta-\beta_{m})\}} dS(\theta),$$

and the general item response model,

$$\Pr\{X = X\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \prod_{m=1}^{M} [\tau_{m}(\theta)]^{X_{m}} [1 - \tau_{m}(\theta)]^{1 - X_{m}} dU(\theta),$$

where the monotone increasing item response functions,  $\tau_m(\theta)$ , satisfy  $0 < \tau_m(\theta) < 1$ . The conjunctive extensions are respectively,

$$\Pr\{X=x\} = \int_{0}^{1} \gamma(\pi) \prod_{R} \int_{R}^{m_{1} \cdots m_{m}} dH(\pi), \qquad (21)$$

$$\Pr\{\chi = \chi\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(\theta) \exp\{\sum_{\mathcal{R}} m_1 \dots m_s \times m_1 \dots \times m_s (\theta - \beta_{m_1} \dots m_s)\} dS(\theta), \quad (22)$$

and

$$\Pr\{X=x\} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon(\theta) [\prod_{\mathcal{R}} \tau (\theta)_{m_1 \cdots m_s}^{m_1 \cdots m_s}] dU(\theta), \qquad (23)$$

where  $\gamma$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\varepsilon$  are normalizing functions and H, S, and U are distribution functions, analogous to v and G respectively, for the conjuctive Rasch model.

Among these conjunctive kernels the binomial with R=G is the least interesting, because the values of its sufficient statistic are in oneto-one correspondence with the usual number-correct binomial statistic, hence it has no potential for improved precision over the usual binomial model. However, restricted versions are more useful as for example in (17) and (18), which are actually restricted conjuctive binomial kernels.

For the conjunctive logistic kernel, similar arguments to those given earlier for the Rasch conjunctive model identify

$$\sum_{\substack{R \\ m_1 \cdots m_s}} x_{m_1} \cdots x_{m_s}$$
(24)

as a sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  (given the  $\alpha_{m_1 \cdots m_s}$ ). Functionally, the  $\alpha_{m_1 \cdots m_s}$  can provide for differential weights in item cross-product terms as well as raw item terms. However, the logistic extension has the same liabilities relative to the Rasch extension as does the logistic model relative to the Rasch model. For example, the distribution of  $\chi$  given t is not independent of  $\theta$  for the logistic conjunctive kernel.

Finally, it may be shown that the above four discrete conjunctive kernels follow the same generality hierarchy as their compensatory counterparts. That is, for the following ordering of conjunctive kernels--(1) binomial, (2) Rasch, (3) logistic and (4) general--each among models (1) through (3) is a special case of its successors.

Conjunctive extensions of kernels for the classical test theory model may also be constructed, as will be shown next. Using the preceding notation, the classical model requires that  $\chi$  have conditional expectation  $E\{\chi|\theta\}=\sigma^2_{e^2M}$ , where  $\sigma_e^2$  is the classical model item error variance and  $l_M$  is an M-vector of ones.

Now it is well known that the classical model requirements are satisfied when  $\chi$  is continuous and its M-variate kernel density has the normal form,

$$f\{\underline{x}|\theta\} = \zeta(\theta, \sigma_{e}^{2}) \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{x}-\underline{1}_{M}\theta)^{T} \underbrace{y}_{\underline{x}}^{-1}(\underline{x}-\underline{1}_{M}\theta)\}, \qquad (25)$$

where  $V_{\chi} = I_M \sigma_e^2$ ,  $I_M$  is the (MxM) identity matrix, and

$$\zeta(\theta,\sigma_{e}^{2}) = \{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{u}-\underline{1}_{M}\theta)^{T} \underbrace{\bigvee}_{\underline{X}}^{-1}(\underline{u}-\underline{1}_{M}\theta)\} du_{1} \dots du_{M}\}^{-1}.$$

Also, it can be shown that if (25) holds then  $x_1^+...+x_M$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ . We introduce the following general conjunctive extension of the normal kernel (25). For  $w^T = (x_1, ..., x_M, x_1x_2, ..., x_1x_2, ..., x_1x_2, ..., x_M)$ , let

$$g\{\underline{x}|\theta\} = \zeta(\theta,\sigma_{e}^{2})\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{w}-\underline{1}_{2}M^{\theta})^{\mathsf{T}}\underline{y}_{\underline{w}}^{-1}(\underline{w}-\underline{1}_{2}M^{\theta})\},\$$

where  $\bigvee_{w} = I_{2^{M}} \sigma_{e}^{2}$  and

$$\xi(\theta,\sigma_{e}^{2}) = \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}(\underline{t}-\underline{1}_{2}M^{\theta})\underbrace{\bigvee}_{\underline{w}}^{-1}(\underline{t}-\underline{1}_{2}M^{\theta})\right\} du_{1} \dots du_{M}\right]^{-1},$$

where  $t_{i}^{T} = (u_{1}, \dots, u_{M}, u_{1}u_{2}, \dots, u_{1}u_{2}, \dots u_{M})$ . It may be shown that if (26) holds  $g(\underline{x}|\theta)$  is a <u>bona fide</u> probability density;  $x_{1}^{+} \dots + x_{M} + x_{1}x_{2} + \dots + x_{1}x_{2} \dots x_{M}$  is sufficient for  $\theta$ ; the items are locally dependent (note that  $\zeta$  cannot be analyzed into physical and technical item factors due to functional dependencies among the  $w_{m}$ , just as v cannot be so factored for the Rasch case--the two kernels are thus very closely related); and although (26) may not be adequately identified as it stands (as with the unrestricted conjunctive Rasch kernel) it may be restricted as in the previously described discrete cases to yield sufficient statistics of the form (11)--in particular if any subvector of w and corresponding submatrix of  $V_{w}$  replaces w and  $V_{w}$ respectively in (26), then terms in the sufficient statistic for  $\theta$  will correspond to the elements retained in the subvector. Also, (26) may be extended to include weighted-sum sufficient statistics of the form (24) by replacing  $V_{w}$  with a nondiagonal positive definite matrix. Finally, estimation and hypothesis testing seem feasible given the similarity of (26) to the multivariate normal kernel and the fact that (26) belongs in the multiparameter exponential family.

# Conclusion

THE SUPPOSE PERIAL SUPPOSE SUPPOSES

Future directions. Conjunctive model aspects requiring more work include resolving identifiability and capitalizing-on-chance problems, developing efficient estimation procedures such as conditional maximum likelihood for the Rasch extensions, formulating extensions with guessing provisions for multiple choice tests, and determining whether these models are useful in practice. Conjunctive models might also be used to resolve certain issues regarding dimensionality, item response function form, and local dependence. For example, all five kernels presented seem to imply that a model may be both unidimensional and locally dependent, in contrast to some seemingly sensible assertions (Andrich, 1984). Finally, a closer look at the conjunctive kernels that have only been briefly mentioned here could be useful. For example, it seems likely that the conjunctive extensions of the normal ogive and Thurstonian choice models could be based on variants of kernel (26), or its continuous logistic analog (Yellot, 1977). Such extensions could provide some needed flexibility in the available models for choice data. Thus, with the continuous as well as discrete kernels presented, many questions remain unanswered.

<u>Summary</u>. First, an item response theory has been introduced that includes multiplicative sufficient statistics based on locally dependent models, which have a conjunctive cognitive structure interpretation. Second, it has been shown that consistent estimation and ad hoc hypothesis testing procedures exist for conjunctive models and that more efficient methods seem possible. Third, these ad hoc procedures have been used to show that conjunctive models may have promise for constructing more efficient tests and uncovering conjunctive structure in large samples. Finally, it is clear that major work remains before concluding whether or not conjunctive models are useful in practice.

194244444

# References

Andersen, E. B. (1980). <u>Discrete statistical models with social science</u> <u>applications</u>. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Andersen, E. B. (1982). Latent trait models and ability parameter estimation. Applied Psychological Measurement, 6, 445-461.

Anderson, N. H. (1981). <u>Foundations of information integration theory</u>. New York: Academic Press.

- Andrich, D. (1984). The attenuation paradox of traditionalist test theory as a breakdown of local independence in person item response theory. Paper presented at the National Conference of Measurement in Education, New Orleans.
- Birnbaum, A. (1968). Some latent trait models and their use in inferring an examinee's ability. In F. M. Lord, and M. R. Novick (Eds.),

<u>Statistical theories of mental test scores</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bussmeyer, J. R., & Jones, L. E. (1983). Analysis of multiplicative combination rules when the causal variables are measured with error.

Psychological Bulletin, 93, 549-552.

- Embretson (Whitely), S. (1984). A general latent trait model for response processes. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>49</u>, 175-186.
- Embretson, S. (1985). Component latent trait models: a remedy for local dependence? Paper presented at the annual Psychometric Society meetings, Nashville.
- Fischer, G. (1973). The linear logistic test model as an instrument in educational research. Acta Psychologica, 37, 359-374.
- Fischer, G. (1981). On the existence and uniqueness of maximum-likelihood estimates in the Rasch model. <u>Psychometrika</u>, 46, 59-77.

Fischer, G., & Formann, A. K. (1982). Some applications of logistic latent trait models with linear constraints on the parameters. <u>Applied</u> <u>Psychological Measurement</u>, 6, 397-416.

Gaier, E. L., & Lee, M. C. (1953). Pattern analysis. The configural approach to predictive measurement. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, <u>50</u>, 140-148.

Goldstein, H. (1980). Dimensionality, bias, independence and measurement scale problems in latent trait test score models. <u>British Journal of</u> <u>Mathematical and Statistical Psychology</u>, <u>33</u>, 234-246.

PERSONAL ANALYSIS (SECOND PROPERTY ANALYSIS)

a a a a a a a a a

- Hambleton, R. K., Swaminathan, H., Cook, L. L., Eignor, D. E., & Gifford, J. A. (1978). Developments in latent trait theory: Models, technical issues, and applications. <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, <u>48</u>, 467-510.
- Harper, D. (1972). Local dependence latent structure models. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>37</u>, 53-57.
- Holland, P. W. (1981). When are item response models consistent with observed data? <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>46</u>, 79-92.

Horst, P. (1954). Pattern analysis and configural scoring. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Clinical Psychology</u>, 10, 3-11.

Huynh, H. (1977). Two simple cases of mastery scores based on the betabinomial mode. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>42</u>, 601-608.

- Jannarone, R. J., & Roberts, J. S. (1984). Reflecting item interactions in scale construction: Meehl's paradox revisted. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 631-637.
- Kelderman, H. (1984). Loglinear Rasch model tests. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>49</u>, 223-245.
- Kempf, W. F. (1977). A dynamic test model and its use in the microevaluation of instructional material. In H. Spada & W. F. Kempf (Eds.), <u>Structural</u> <u>models of thinking and learning</u>. Vienna: Hans Huber.

Conjunctive Kernels 31

- Koch, G. G., & Landis, J. R. (1977). A general methodology for the analysis of experiments with repeated measurements of categorical data. <u>Biometrics</u>, <u>33</u>, 133-158.
- Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. (1968). <u>Statistical theories of mental test</u> <u>scores</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- McDonald, R. P. (1967). Nonlinear factor analysis. <u>Psychometric Monographs</u>, <u>32</u>, Number 15.
- McKinley, R. L., & Reckase, M. D. (1983). An extension of the two-parameter logistic model to the multidimensional latent space. Research Report Number R83-2. Iowa City: American College Testing Program.
- Megargee, E. I. (1972). <u>The California Psychological Inventory Handbook</u>. London: Josey-Bass.
- Molenaar, I. W. (1983). Some improved diagnostics for failure of the Rasch model. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>48</u>, 49-72.
- Rao, C. R. (1965). Linear statistical inference and its applications. (2nd Ed.), New York: Wiley.
- Rasch, G. (1980). <u>Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment</u> tests. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (1984). Testing the conditional independence and monoticity assumptions of item response theory. Psychometrika, 49, 425-436.
- Stegelmann, W. (1983). Extending the Rasch model to a general model having more than one dimension. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>48</u>, 259-268.
- Sternberg, R. S. (1977). <u>Intelligence</u>, <u>information processing and analogical</u> <u>reasoning</u>. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wainwright, G. (1965). Configural information in item responses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Whitely, S. E. (1980). Multi-component latent trait models for ability tests. <u>Psychometrika</u>, <u>45</u>, 479-494.

Yellot, J. I., Jr. (1977). The relationship between Luce's choice axiom, Thurstone's theory of comparative judgement and the double exponential distribution. <u>Journal of Mathematical Psychology</u>, <u>15</u>, 109-144.
Yen, W. M. (1981). Using simulation results to test a latent trait model.

Applied Psychological Measurement, 5, 245-262.

Ċ.

# Table 1

Latent Trait Distributions <sup>a</sup>	Additive(16) <sup>b</sup>	<u>Kernels</u> Conjunctive(17)	Conjunctive and additive (18)	
Quasinormal		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
( .75) (1.5 ) (3.0 )	(59,72,79) <sup>C</sup> (82,89,93) (93,97,98)	(83,93,95) (91,95,96) (94,96,97)	(85,95,97) (93,96,97) (96,97,97)	
Uniform				
( .75) (1.5 ) (3.0 )	(72,83,88) (90,95,96) (96,98,99)	(91,96,96) (94,96,97) (95,97,97)	(92,97,98) (96,97,97) (96,97,98)	

# Validities of Bayes Estimators for Additive and Conjunctive Rasch Models (x10<sup>2</sup>)

- a Latent trait distributions are discrete with positive probability on 5 points:  $-\theta$ ,  $-\theta/2$ , 0,  $\theta/2$  and  $\theta$ . Numbers in parentheses below this heading are values of  $\theta$ . Quasinormal distributions assign probabilities of .07, .24, .38, .24, and .07 respectively to the 5 points, whereas uniform distributions assign .2 to each point.
- b The numbers to the right of kernel labels are the text equations that describe the kernels fully.
- c Each triplet gives Bayes estimate-latent trait correlations based, from left to right, on 5, 10, and 15 items of each type  $(M_V, M_I, M_I)$  in equations 16, 17, and 18).

Conjunctive Kernels 34

# Table 2

Correct Rejection Percentages for Additive and Conjunctive Tests (among 100 .05 level tests for each entry).

Latent Trait Distributions <sup>a</sup>	Test for Additive Model(16) When the True Model is (17)	Test for Additive Model(16) When the True Model is (18)	Test for Conjunc- tive Model(17) When the True Model is (16)	Test for Conjunc- tive Model(17) When the True Model is (18)
Quasinormal	<u></u>	······································		
( .75) (1.5 ) (3.0 )	(4,9,9) <sup>b</sup> (13,35,66) (47,100,100)	( 8,22, 44) (20,83,100) (30,98,100)	( 25, 70, 93) ( 92,100,100) (100,100,100)	( 17, 84, 99) ( 98,100,100) (100,100,100)
<u>Uniform</u>				
( .75) (1.5 ) (3.0 )	( 5, 11, 23) (33, 98, 99) (91,100,100)	(11,46, 76) (49,98,100) (59,99,100)	( 30,100,100) (100,100,100) (100,100,100)	( 70,100,100) (100,100,100) (100,100,100)

a Latent trait distributions are discrete with positive probability on 5 points:  $-\theta$ ,  $-\theta/2$ , 0,  $\theta/2$  and  $\theta$ . Numbers in parentheses below this heading are values of  $\theta$ . Quasinormal distributions assign probabilities of .07, .24, .38, .24, and .07 respectively to the 5 points, whereas uniform distributions assign .2 to each point.

b Each triplet gives correct rejection percentages for .05 level chi-square tests from simulations based, from left to right, on 1000, 5000, and 10,000 observations.



#### ONR Distribution List

1986/06/30

University of South Carolina/Jannarone

Personnel Analysis Division, AF/MPXA 5C360, The Pentagon Washington, DC 20330

Air Force Human Resources Lab AFHRL/MPD Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Earl A. Alluisi HQ, AFHRL (AFSC) Brooks AFB, TX 78235

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

Dr. Phipps Arabie University of Illinois Department of Psychology 603 E. Daniel St. Champaign, IL 61820

Technical Director, ARI 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333

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

Dr. Isaac Bejar Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08450

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

Dr. Arthur S. Blaiwes Code N711 Naval Training Systems Center Orlando, FL 32813 Dr. Bruce Bloxom Administrative Sciences Code 54B1 Navy Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5100

Dr. R. Darrell Bock University of Chicago NORC 6030 South Ellis Chicago, IL 60637

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

Dr. Robert Breaux Code N-095R Naval Training Systems Center Orlando, FL 32813

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

Dr. Patricia A. Butler OERI 555 New Jersey Ave., NW Washington, DC 20208

Mr. James W. Carey Commandant (G-PTE) U.S. Coast Guard 2100 Second Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20593

Dr. James Carlson American College Testing Program P.O. Box 168 Iowa City, IA 52243

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

### University of South Carolina/Jannarone

Dr. Robert Carroll OP 01B7 Washington, DC 20370

Dr. Norman Cliff Department of Psychology Univ. of So. California University Park Los Angeles, CA 90007

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

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

Dr. Hans Crombag University of Leyden Education Research Center Boerhaavelaan 2 2334 EN Leyden The NETHERLANDS

CTB/McGraw-Hill Library 2500 Garden Road Monterey, CA 93940

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

Dr. Hei-Ki Dong Ball Foundation 800 Roosevelt Road Building C, Suite 206 Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station, Bldg 5 Alexandria, VA 22314 Attn: TC (12 Copies) Dr. Stephen Dunbar 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. Kent Eaton Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. John M. Eddins University of Illinois 252 Engineering Research Laboratory 103 South Mathews Street Urbana, IL 61801

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

ERIC Facility-Acquisitions 4833 Rugby Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank Performance Metrics, Inc. 5825 Callaghan Suite 25 San Antonio, TX 78228

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

Dr. Richard L. Ferguson American College Testing Program P.O. Box 168 Iowa City, IA 52240

.....

- Service of the Serv

# University of South Carolina/Jannarone

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

**6633 656** 

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. Carl H. Frederiksen McGill University 3700 McTavish Street Montreal, Quebec H3A 1Y2 CANADA

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons University of Illinois-Chicago P.O. Box 6998 Chicago, IL 69680

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

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

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

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton Prof. of Education & Psychology University of Massachusetts at Amherst Hills House Amherst, MA 01003 Ms. Rebecca Hetter Navy Personnel R&D Center Code 62 San Diego, CA 92152-6800

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

Prof. Lutz F. Hornke Institut fur Psychologie RWTH Aachen Jaegerstrasse 17/19 D-5100 Aachen WEST GERMANY

Dr. Paul Horst 677 G Street, #184 Chula Vista, CA 90010

Mr. Dick Hoshaw OP-135 Arlington Annex Room 2834 Washington, DC 20350

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

Dr. Steven Hunka Department of Education University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta CANADA

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

Dr. Robert Jannarone Department of Psychology University of South Carolina Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Douglas A. Jones P.O. Box 6640 Lawrenceville NJ 08648

# University of South Carolina/Jannarone

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 University of Texas-Austin Measurement and Evaluation Center Austin, TX 78703

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

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

Dr. Charles Lewis Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen Rijksuniversiteit Groningen Oude Boteringestraat 23 9712GC Groningen The NETHERLANDS

Dr. Robert Linn College of Education University of Illinois Urbana, IL 61801

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. James Lumsden Department of Psychology University of Western Australia Nedlands W.A. 6009 AUSTRALIA Dr. William L. Maloy Chief of Naval Education and Training Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL 32508 Dr. Gary Marco Stop 31-E Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08451 Dr. Clessen Martin Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Blvd. Alexandria, VA 22333 Dr. James McBride Psychological Corporation c/o Harcourt, Brace, Javanovich Inc. 1250 West 6th Street San Diego, CA 92101 Dr. Clarence McCormick HQ. MEPCOM MEPCT-P 2500 Green Bay Road North Chicago, IL 60064 Mr. Robert McKinley University of Toledo Department of Educational Psychology Toledo, OH 43606 Dr. Barbara Means Human Resources Research Organization 1100 South Washington Alexandria, VA 22314 Dr. Robert Mislevy Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08541 Headquarters, Marine Corps Code MPI-20 Washington, DC 20380 Dr. W. Alan Nicewander University of Oklahoma Department of Psychology Oklahoma City, OK 73069

## University of South Carolina/Jannarone

Dr. William E. Nordbrock FMC-ADCO Box 25 APO, NY 09710

Dr. Melvin R. Novick 356 Lindquist Center for Measurement University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242

Director Manpower and Personnel Laboratory, NPRDC (Code 06) San Diego, CA 92152-6800

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

Commanding Officer, Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390

Dr. James Olson WICAT, Inc. 1875 South State Street Orem, UT 84057

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

Special Assistant for Marine Corps Matters, ONR Code 00MC 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217-5000

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

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 Dr. Roger Pennell Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lowry AFB. CO 80230 Dr. Mark D. Reckase ACT P. O. Box 168 Iowa City, IA 52243 Dr. Malcolm Ree AFHRL/MP Brooks AFB, TX 78235 Dr. Carl Ross 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 Knoxville, TN 37916 Mr. Drew Sands NPRDC Code 62 San Diego, CA 92152-6800 Dr. Robert Sasmor HODA DAMA-ARL Pentagon, Room 3E516 Washngton, DC 20310-0631 USA Dr. Mary Schratz Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152-6800 Dr. W. Steve Sellman

OASD(MRA&L) 2B269 The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301

### University of South Carolina/Jannarone

Dr. Kazuo Shigemasu 7-9-24 Kugenuma-Kaigan Fujusawa 251 JAPAN

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

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko Manpower Research and Advisory Services Smithsonian Institution 801 North Pitt Street Alexandria, VA 22314

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

Dr. Paul Speckman University of Missouri Department of Statistics Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Martha Stocking Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Peter Stoloff Center for Naval Analysis 200 North Beauregard Street Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. William Stout University of Illinois Department of Mathematics Urbana, IL 61801

Maj. Bill Strickland AF/MPXOA 4E168 Pentagon Washington, DC 20330

Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan LabByalosyiof Reselemetric and School of Education University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 Mr. Brad Sympson Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka CERL 252 Engineering Research Laboratory Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Maurice Tatsuoka 220 Education Bldg 1310 S. Sixth St. Champaign, IL 61820

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

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. Vern W. Urry Personnel R&D Center Office of Personnel Management 1900 E. Street, NW Washington, DC 20415

Dr. David Vale Assessment Systems Corp. 2233 University Avenue Suite 310 St. Paul, MN 55114 Dr. Frank Vicino Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152-6800

# University of South Carolina/Jannarone

Dr. Howard Wainer Division of Psychological Studies Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Ming-Mei Wang Lindquist Center for Measurement University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Thomas A. Warm Coast Guard Institute P. O. Substation 18 Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Dr. Brian Waters Program Manager Manpower Analysis Program HumRRO 1100 S. Washington St. Alexandria, VA 22314

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

Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman NPS, Code 54Wz Monterey, CA 92152-6800

Major John Welsh AFHRL/MOAN Brooks AFB, TX 78223

Dr. Rand R. Wilcox University of Southern California Department of Psychology Los Angeles, CA 90007

German Military Representative ATTN: Wolfgang Wildegrube Streitkraefteamt 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 Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff Navy Personnel R & D Center San Diego, CA 92152-6800

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

