**Modelos de Resposta ao Item Não-Paramétricos: Comparando a Recuperação de
Escore Verdadeiros**

Nonparametric Item Response Models: A Comparison on Recovering True Scores

**Modelos De Respuesta al Item No-Paramétricos: Comparando la Recuperación de
Puntuaciones Verdaderas**

Víthor Rosa Franco¹; Marie Wiberg²; and Rafael Valdece Sousa Bastos¹

¹ São Francisco University, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil

² Umeå University, Umeå, Västerbottens län, Sweden

Correspondence Author: Víthor Rosa Franco. Universidade São Francisco - Campus de Campinas. Rua Waldemar César da Silveira Jardim Cura D'Ars, 13045510 - Campinas, SP – Brasil. Phone number: + 55 19 37793396. E-mail: yithorfranco@gmail.com.

Situation: preprint was submitted for peer review in the PsicoUSF journal (<https://www.scielo.br/j/pusf/>).

This preprint was submitted under the following conditions:

- The submitting author declares that all authors responsible for preparing the manuscript agree with this deposit.
- The authors declare that they are aware that they are solely responsible for the content of the preprint and that the deposit in PsyArXiv does not mean any commitment on the part of PsyArXiv, except its preservation and dissemination.
- The authors declare that the research that originated the manuscript followed good ethical practices and that the necessary approvals from research ethics committees are described in the manuscript, when applicable.
- The authors declare that the preparation of the manuscript followed the ethical norms of scientific communication.
- The authors declare that the manuscript was not deposited and/or previously made available on another preprint server.
- The authors declare that in the event that this manuscript has previously been submitted to a journal and being evaluated, they have received the journal's consent to make the deposit on the PsyArXiv server.
- The submitting author declares that all authors' contributions are included in the manuscript.
- The authors declare that if the manuscript is posted on the PsyArXiv server, it will be available under a Creative Commons CC-BY license.
- If the manuscript is in the process of being reviewed and published by a journal, the authors declare that they have received authorization from the journal to make this deposit.
- The deposited manuscript is in PDF format.

Resumo

Procedimentos não paramétricos são usados para adicionar flexibilidade aos modelos. Três modelos não paramétricos de resposta ao item foram propostos, mas não comparados diretamente: o Kernel smoothing (KS-IRT); a Curva Davidiana (DC-IRT); e o modelo semiparamétrico Rasch Bayesiano (SP-Rasch). O objetivo principal do presente estudo é comparar o desempenho desses procedimentos na recuperação de escores verdadeiros simulados, utilizando escores de soma como benchmarks. O objetivo secundário é comparar seus desempenhos em termos de equivalência prática com dados reais. De forma geral, os resultados mostram que, além do DC-IRT, que é o modelo que apresenta o pior desempenho, todos os outros modelos apresentam resultados bastante semelhantes aos de quando se usam somatórios. Esses resultados são seguidos de uma discussão com implicações práticas e recomendações para estudos futuros.

Palavras-Chave: Modelo de resposta ao item não paramétrica; Modelagem Bayesiana; Simulação Monte Carlo.

Abstract

Nonparametric procedures are used to add flexibility to models. Three nonparametric item response models have been proposed, but not directly compared: the Kernel smoothing (KS-IRT); the Davidian-Curve (DC-IRT); and the Bayesian semiparametric Rasch model (SP-Rasch). The main aim of the present study is to compare the performance of these procedures in recovering simulated true scores, using sum scores as benchmarks. The secondary aim is to compare their performances in terms of practical equivalence with real data. Overall, the results show that, apart from the DC-IRT, which is the model that performs the worse, all the other models give results quite similar to those when sum scores are used. These results are followed by a discussion with practical implications and recommendations for future studies.

Keywords: Nonparametric item response model; Bayesian modeling; Monte Carlo simulation.

Resumen

Se utilizan procedimientos no paramétricos para agregar flexibilidad a los modelos. Se propusieron tres modelos de respuesta al ítem no paramétricos, pero no se compararon directamente: Kernel smoothing (KS-IRT); la curva davidiana (DC-IRT); y el modelo bayesiano de Rasch semiparamétrico (SP-Rasch). El objetivo principal del presente estudio es comparar el desempeño de estos procedimientos en la recuperación de puntajes verdaderos simulados, utilizando puntajes de suma como puntos de referencia. El objetivo secundario es comparar su desempeño en términos de equivalencia práctica con datos reales. En general, los resultados muestran que, además de DC-IRT, que es el modelo con peor desempeño, el resto de modelos presentan resultados muy similares a los utilizados cuando se utilizan sumas. Estos resultados son seguidos por una discusión con implicaciones prácticas y recomendaciones para estudios futuros.

Palabras Clave: Modelo de respuesta de ítem no paramétrico; Modelado bayesiano; simulación del Monte Carlo.

Nonparametric Item Response Models: A Comparison on Recovering True Scores

Nonparametric item response models (NIRM) have been proposed as alternatives to traditional parametric item response theory (IRT) models. NIRMs can relax any of the pragmatic assumptions (normal density and logistic link function) of parametric models of IRT without affecting the general assumptions (unidimensionality, latent monotonicity and local independence) of IRT. Several different procedures can be considered as NIRMs, such as Mokken scale analysis (Sijtsma & van der Ark, 2017); Bayesian semiparametric models (Falk & Cai, 2016) and nonparametric models (Karabatsos & Sheu, 2004); kernel based (Ramsay, 1991) and spline based (Ramsay & Wiberg, 2017) smooth estimate for item response functions (IRFs); and others. Nevertheless, several of these procedures have never been directly compared on their effectiveness in recovering true scores.

Nonparametric regression (Barlow & Brunk, 1972), nonparametric density estimation (Izenman, 1991) and the general nonparametric Bayesian procedure known as Dirichlet Process (DP; Ferguson, 1973) are some of the main procedures for estimating NIRMs. In general, these procedures aim at adding flexibility to the estimates, reducing underfitting while also compensating for overfitting the data (Müller et al., 2015; Tsybakov, 2009). Applying these procedures to IRT promotes at least two advantages. First, the possibility of estimating latent IRFs that are more flexible than any parametric model. Secondly, nonparametric density estimation can aid in the estimation of true scores when skewed or multimodal distributions can be expected.

Three NIRMs are evaluated in the present study. The first is Kernel smoothing IRT (KS-IRT; Ramsay, 1991), which uses B-spline basis to estimate non-decreasing monotonic item characteristic curves (ICCs), but assumes a parametric form for the true scores. Another procedure is the Davidian curve IRT (DC-IRT; Woods & Lin, 2009),

which uses B-spline basis to smooth the distribution of the estimated true scores, but assumes a parametric IRF. Finally, the semiparametric Bayesian Rasch model (SP-Rasch; San Martín et al., 2011) uses a Dirichlet Process mixture that originates smooth estimates for both ICCs and true scores. The main reason for choosing these specific procedures is due to previous results showing that they can outperform other nonparametric (Lee, 2007; Woods & Lin, 2009) and parametric procedures (Duncan & MacEachern, 2008; Miyazaki & Hoshino, 2009) on recovering true scores. Nevertheless, these models have not yet been directly compared. Each procedure relaxes different assumptions (i.e., parametric IRF or normal distribution for the true scores) about the item response process, so comparing them can help achieve further understanding about which or even if any parametric assumption improves the true scores' estimation.

The primary purpose of this study is to compare the three described NIRMs for dichotomous data on several simulated conditions for their effectiveness in recovering latent true scores, defined in terms of their bias, magnitude of average residuals and correlations with the known simulated true scores. The second purpose is to compare their practical equivalence (i.e., if conclusions from real data can change) using real data from a college admissions test. The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In the next three sections we present the three procedures KS-IRT, DC-IRT and SP-Rasch, respectively. In the fifth section, simulated and real data are used to compare the procedures. The paper ends with a discussion and some concluding remarks with practical implications.

Kernel smoothing IRT (KS-IRT)

The basic idea of KS-IRT (Douglas 1997; Ramsay, 1991) is to obtain a nonparametric estimate of the ICCs by taking a (local) weighted average i.e., curve

smoothing of the probability of response $\Pr(\theta)$ of the N respondents' x_{ij} responses to item i :

$$\Pr_i(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j(\theta - \theta_j) x_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

where θ_j is the true score of the respondent j , θ is the vector of true scores estimates for the respondents and the weights $w_j(\theta - \theta_j)$ are defined by a kernel function $K(\cdot)$ which imposes three conditions to these weights. They must be nonnegative; they must reach their maximum when $\theta = \theta_j$; and they will approach or equal zero as $|\theta - \theta_j|$ increases. To assure interpretability of the weights, two extra conditions are to be met: $w_j(\theta - \theta_j) \geq 0$ and $\sum_j w_j(\theta - \theta_j) = 1$. The normalizing function proposed by Nadaraya (1964) and Watson (1964) are a commonly used alternative to assure these two extra conditions:

$$w_j(\theta - \theta_j) = \frac{K\left(\frac{\theta - \theta_j}{b}\right)}{\sum_i K\left(\frac{\theta - \theta_i}{b}\right)}, \quad (2)$$

where b is the bandwidth parameter, which determines the degree of smoothing. When b is small, the bias (i.e., underfitting) is also small, but variance (i.e., overfitting) is larger.

Another requirement for using the KS-IRT is, due to the fact that θ_j is not observable, to use an estimate for the true score, denoted $\hat{\theta}_j$. A default procedure (Ramsay, 1991) is to rank the sum scores and define $F(\theta)$ as the normal cumulative distribution function (CDF), which finally leads to

$$\Pr_i(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N K\left(\frac{\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_j}{b}\right) x_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^N K\left(\frac{\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_j}{b}\right)}. \quad (3)$$

The ICCs estimated by the KS-IRT procedure will also be monotonically related to the latent scores, but with no particular parametric function defined. Some ICCs are more

similar to a logistic IRF, but quite different curves can be estimated. The densities, on the other hand, will always conform to the defined CDF; the normal CDF in this case.

For properly fitting a KS-IRT, an adequate level of the bandwidth parameter, b , must be chosen. The selection of the bandwidth is a complex procedure and demands an optimal choice criterion. For selecting the bandwidth, one can use a cross-validation procedure (Wong, 1983) with the form

$$CV(b_i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (x_{ij} - \text{Pr}_i^{-j}(\hat{\theta}_j))^T (x_{ij} - \text{Pr}_i^{-j}(\hat{\theta}_j)), \quad (4)$$

where Pr_i^{-j} is the vector of estimated probabilities of response after removing $\hat{\theta}_j$. This procedure relies on minimization algorithms, being the value of b_i that minimizes CV considered the best one for avoiding under or overfitting.

Davidian curve IRT (DC-IRT)

Davidian curve IRT (DC-IRT) was proposed by Woods and Lin (2009) as a procedure for fitting item response models in which the distribution of the random latent variable is estimated simultaneously with the item parameters. DC-IRT combines traditional logistic IRF models, like the two-parameter logistic (2PL) model, with a density estimation method known as Davidian curves (DCs; Zhang & Davidian, 2001). DCs are defined by:

$$DC(\theta) = P_k^2(\theta)\varphi(\theta), \quad (5)$$

where P_k is a polynomial of order k and $\varphi(\theta)$ is the standard normal density function. P_k is defined as:

$$P_k^2(\theta) = \left\{ \sum_{\lambda=0}^k m_{\lambda} \theta^{\lambda} \right\}^2, \quad (6)$$

where λ is a nonnegative integer and m_λ are the weight coefficients for the θ^λ polynomial transformations. Two other constraints are also necessary. First, Woods and Lin (2009) used a polar coordinate transformation which assures that corrections in the estimation steps have identical density as the originally estimated θ . This assures that $DC(\theta)$, which is a probability density function, integrates to 1. The second constraint is to fix the mean and standard deviation of the initial latent density to 0 and 1, respectively, so the model is identifiable.

For effective implementation of this procedure, Woods and Lin (2009) propose an expectation maximization (EM) algorithm with two iteration steps. In the first step (E-step) random initial values for the latent scores and the item parameters are used to estimate the number of people expected to give a specific response to each item. In the second step (M-step) parameters of the DC are estimated by maximizing the following likelihood

$$L_g = \prod_{q=1}^Q DC(\theta_q)^{N(\theta_q)}, \quad (7)$$

where q is each specific quadrature point, Q is the total quadrature points, $N(\theta_q)$ is the number of people expected to give a specific response on the quadrature q , and $DC(\theta_q)$ is the DC estimate for the quadrature q .

As DC-IRT models with different k parameters should be compared to achieve the best model, model selection is carried out using the Hannan–Quinn (HQ) criterion (Hannan, 1987). The HQ criterion is similar to the Akaike and to the Bayesian information criteria, although defined slightly differently

$$HC = -2\log Lik + 2p(\log(\log(N))), \quad (8)$$

where p is the number of parameters estimated. Woods and Lin (2009) use this criterion as it has shown good performance with DCs (Davidian & Gallant, 1993; Zhang & Davidian, 2001) and Ramsay curves IRT (RC-IRT; Woods, 2006, 2007).

Semiparametric Bayesian Rasch model

In Bayesian semiparametric and nonparametric model, it is common for researchers to use the Dirichlet Process (DP; Ferguson, 1973). DP is defined as a probability distribution which the domain is a set of probability distributions, with parameters M_0 and α , representing the base distribution and a scaling parameter, respectively. The base distribution parameter can be interpreted as the expected value of the process, while the scale parameter is how similar is the realizations to the base distribution; in the limit $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, the realization follows the same distribution as the base distribution.

DP is typically used for estimating non regular densities (Müller & Quintana, 2004). Nevertheless, it is also possible to use DP to sample from functions (Müller et al., 2015), resulting in estimates of nonlinear and nonparametric functions. San Martín et al (2011) proposed to use the DP to give flexibility to the parametric Rasch model. Let μ represent means, and let σ^2 represent variances, the estimates of true scores as θ and the estimates of difficulties as δ , their model can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_i &\sim Normal(\mu_\delta, \sigma_\delta^2) \\
 \alpha_j &\sim Gamma(.001, .001) \\
 M_{0j} &\sim Normal(\mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta^2)T(-3, 3) \\
 M_j &\sim DP(\alpha_j, M_{0j}) \\
 \theta_j &\sim M_j
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$\eta_{ij} = \theta_j - \delta_i$$

$$\Pr_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\eta_{ij})}{1 + \exp(\eta_{ij})}$$

$$X_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\Pr_{ij}),$$

where $\sim$ is read as “is distributed as”, and T represents a truncation.

The semiparametric Bayesian Rasch (SP-Rasch) model can be labelled as a hierarchical mixed model, which complexity implies that the posterior distribution of the parameters cannot be found in closed form (Kruschke, 2015, chapter 6). A common alternative Bayesian procedure for fitting this type of model is through the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC; Kruschke, 2015, chapter 7) method. MCMC samples estimates of the posterior distribution (which is not directly accessible) from the unnormalized posterior. Due to the descriptive and sometimes exploratory characteristic of measurement models, non-informative priors (Kruschke, 2015, chapter 10) for the parameters are usually preferred (e.g., Duncan & MacEachern, 2008). Following these procedures, irregular densities and nonparametric ICCs can be properly estimated.

Procedures' performance and hypothesis

Previous studies (Guo & Sinharay, 2011; Lee, 2007) found that KS-IRT is one of the best procedures based on smoothing of the ICCs for recovering both items and respondents' latent variables values. The formal structure of this procedure was also extended for applications in nonparametric test equating (De Ayala et al., 2018), and item selection for computerized adaptive testing (Xu & Douglas, 2006). As stated before, one of its limitations is the need to define a parametric form to $F(\theta)$. We are not aware of any study which compared the KS-IRT with other procedures that use more flexible distributions for the estimated true scores.

DC-IRT was proposed as a more efficient version of the Ramsay curve IRT (RC-IRT; Woods & Thissen, 2006), which uses B-spline based densities estimates for the latent scores. Woods and Lin (2009) present at least two advantages of DC-IRT over RC-IRT. The first is the number of tuning parameters. RC-IRT uses three tuning parameters (the number of knots, the order of the splines, and the standard deviation of the prior distribution), DC-IRT uses only one (k). In this case, needing fewer tuning parameters is an advantage because one optimal model can be selected among 10 models for DC-IRT, while for RC-IRT it is one over 25 models. The second advantage is that DC-IRT will perform at least as well as RC-IRT in several conditions, but better when the true distribution of latent scores is skewed. This is particularly interesting as the RC-IRT has been shown to perform better—in a number of conditions—than parametric and other nonparametric procedures (Woods, 2006, 2007).

The SP-Rasch has not yet been directly compared to other models. Nevertheless, similar models have shown good performance when compared to parametric models (e.g., Duncan & MacEachern, 2008). An extension of the SP-Rasch using a three-parameter logistic instead of a Rasch model as the base distribution has also shown good performance when compared to parametric models (Duncan & MacEachern, 2013). Another extension, proposed by Arenson and Karabatsos (2018), which uses no specific parametric function as base distribution, was able to perform better than the parametric 2PL model, especially when symmetric priors, as the ones used in the present study, are used. Finally, these models can all be compared to sum scores, which can be considered as lower bound benchmarks for the performance of the models (Wiberg, Ramsay, & Li, 2018).

Simulation study

Method

Following Woods and Lin (2009), we used the 2PL model as the true IRF for data generation. Random draws of 1,000 simulated respondents and 25 items were iterated 800 times. Discriminations were drawn from a truncated normal distribution with mean equals to 1.7, standard deviation equals to .8 and bottom truncation equals to .5. Difficulties were drawn from a normal distribution with mean equals to 0 and standard deviation equals to 1.2.

Our three conditions were based on the densities used to generate the latent true scores: a standard normal distribution; a skewed distribution; and a bimodal distribution. The authors used a mixture of normal distributions for both the skewed and the bimodal distributions, where the one used for the bimodal distribution was unequal in the mixtures' standard deviations. To better represent a bimodal and a skewed distribution, we used other procedures for both conditions. For the skewed distribution, we used Azzalini's (1985) skewed normal distribution with parameters equal to: skewness = 1.57, mean = 0, and standard deviation = 1. For the bimodal distribution, we used a mixture of normal distributions, but with equal standard deviations and with means equally distant from the standard mean: $N(-1,.5) + N(1,.5)$. The three conditions are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1*The three real data distributions*

Note. From left to right: the standard normal distribution; the skewed distribution; and the bimodal distribution.

To assess effectiveness of each procedure, three measures related to the accuracy of the estimates and one measure related to distributional properties were used. The first measure related to accuracy was Spearman's correlation, which was used to assess accuracy in ranking simulated respondents. Bias was used to assess accuracy on the range of true scores' estimates, as measured by the residuals of an additive regression between estimated and true scores. The final measure of accuracy was mean absolute error (MAE). MAE was preferred over the more common root mean square error (RMSE) because the latter increases with the variance of the distribution of error magnitudes (Willmott & Matsuura, 2005). MAE is defined as

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N |\theta_j - \hat{\theta}_j|. \quad (10)$$

The $\hat{\theta}_j$ estimated by DC-IRT and KS-IRT were recovered using the expected a posteriori (EAP) procedure. For the SP-Rasch, true scores were recovered using the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate.

Distributional properties were measured using the integrated square error (ISE; Shirahata & Chu, 1992). The ISE is defined as

$$\text{ISE}(\hat{g}) = \int \{\hat{g}(\theta) - g(\theta)\}^2 d\theta, \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{g}(\theta)$ is the feature scaled density of the distribution of estimates of the true score θ and $g(\theta)$ is the feature scaled density of the real distribution of true scores. Both $\hat{g}(\theta)$ and $g(\theta)$ were calculated using kernel density estimates with the number of equally spaced points equal to the sample size and the bandwidth chosen adaptively using Sheather and Jones (1991) method.

All simulations and data analyses were done in R (R Core Team, 2019). We used the DC-IRT implemented in the mirt package (Chalmers, 2012). For the kernel smoothing IRT, we used the implementation in the KernSmoothIRT package (Mazza et al., 2012). For the SP-Rasch model, we used the implementation in the DPpackage package (Jara et al., 2011). The skewed distribution was generated using the rsn function from the sn package (Azzalini, 2018). The residuals of the additive regression for bias were calculated using the gam function from the mgcv package (Wood, 2012). The ISE was calculated using the density.integrate.xy function from the sfsmisc package (Meachler, 2018). The code with the full simulation is available from the corresponding author upon request.

Results

Table 1 presents the overall results and also the findings for each condition. Numbers in bold show, for a particular condition and performance's measure, which procedure performs best. In general, sum scores, the scores estimated with KS-IRT and with the SP-Rasch are very similar in their performances. The DC-IRT procedure performed the worst in every measure and every condition. The sum scores performed the best in all conditions in terms of MAE. It also performed best in terms of ISE in the

bimodal condition. The KS-IRT scores performed the best in all but the bimodal condition in terms of ISE. The SP-Rasch scores performed the best in all but the normal condition in terms of correlation's measures.

Table 1

Average Accuracy and Distributional Properties Estimated

Condition	Procedure	Correlations	MAE	ISE
Overall	Sum score	.904	.253	.831
	DC-IRT	.846	.301	1.478
	KS-IRT	.903	.257	.350
	SP-Rasch	.905	.282	.811
Normal	Sum score	.916	.259	.887
	DC-IRT	.860	.303	1.201
	KS-IRT	.915	.264	.101
	SP-Rasch	.913	.291	.778
Skewed	Sum score	.868	.241	.916
	DC-IRT	.788	.285	1.159
	KS-IRT	.866	.245	.220
	SP-Rasch	.869	.264	.638
Bimodal	Sum score	.927	.259	.688
	DC-IRT	.891	.315	1.083
	KS-IRT	.928	.261	.729
	SP-Rasch	.933	.291	1.017

Note. DC-IRT = Davidian curve model. KS-IRT = Kernel smoothing model. SP-Rasch = Bayesian Semiparametric Rasch model. MAE = Mean Absolute Error. ISE = Integrated squared error.

These results can be complemented with the bias in Figure 2, which is averaged over all conditions. It is evident that all the procedures have similar bias throughout the range of possible values for the true scores, with one exception: when scores are extremely low, the SP-Rasch will underestimate the true scores more than the other procedures. Also, all the procedures will underestimate scores below the mean true score, and overestimate scores above the mean true score. This is a likely result for two reasons.

First because all procedures estimate θ from monotonic transformations of sum scores. Second because the simulated true scores are denser around 0. Finally, it can also be seen that scores below average are more biased than scores above average. This is a likely consequence from the fact of one of the true distributions is skewed, having a higher number of scores between 0 and 1 than 0 and -1 .

Figure 2

The bias for each procedure at estimating the true score, averaged over all conditions

Note. DC-IRT = Davidian curve model. KS-IRT = Kernel smoothing model. SP-Rasch = Bayesian Semiparametric Rasch model.

Empirical Example

For an illustrated comparison between the procedures, we used a sample of data from one administration of the Swedish Scholastic Assessment Test (SweSAT). The

SweSAT is a college admissions test that is administered twice a year and the scores are valid to use when applying to university for five years. It consists of a verbal and a quantitative subtest which each contain 80 items and which are scored, analyzed and equated separately. In this example, we used the quantitative subtest of the SweSAT. We choose the quantitative test scores because they are more skewed than the verbal sum scores. This condition was chosen as it should maximize the difference of performance between the procedures.

The total sum score is equated and transformed to a normed score, which is used in selection to higher education in Sweden (Stage, 2003). Therefore, differences in the order, or ranking, of the respondents can result in different people accessing higher education. The estimated nonparametric scores were compared to the sum scores using three different measures. First, the densities of the nonparametric estimates were compared to the sum scores' density using the ISE. Next, Kolmogorov-Smirnov d statistic was calculated for the distributions of scores estimated using sum scores and the NIRMs. The d statistic simply represents the largest distance (in absolute value) between the CDFs of the target distribution (i.e., a normal distribution) and the distribution of the estimated scores. Finally, the Spearman's correlation was used to compare how similar the scores rank respondents, using the whole sample and the top 5% and 1% performers on the sum scores of the quantitative subtest.

Results

From Table 2 it is evident that, by evaluating the d statistic, the KS-IRT estimates are more normally distributed than the other estimates. The SP-Rasch distribution was shown, by means of ISE, to be the most similar to the sum scores' distribution.

Table 2*Distributional Properties of the Estimated Scores*

Measure	Sum score	DC-IRT	KS-IRT	SP-Rasch
d	.9999	.0847	.0002	.310
ISE	—	9.605	8.624	7.319

Note. Distance to a Normal Distribution (d) and Difference from the Sum Score's

Distribution (ISE). DC-IRT = Davidian curve model. KS-IRT = Kernel smoothing model. SP-Rasch = Bayesian Semiparametric Rasch model.

The values of d and ISE can also be reflected by the densities represented in Figure 3. The SP-Rasch has almost the same distribution as the DC-IRT. KS-IRT has a normal distribution and the sum scores have a positive–asymmetric distribution, with a different peak than SP-Rasch and DC-IRT.

Figure 3*Densities of the estimated scores*

Note. DC-IRT = Davidian curve model. KS-IRT = Kernel smoothing model. SP-Rasch = Bayesian Semiparametric Rasch model.

The Spearman correlations in Figure 4 show how similarly the different procedures rank the respondents. When the whole sample is used, all procedures gave almost the same ranking of participants, with the smaller Spearman correlation equals to .98. The rank correlation between KS-IRT, SP-Rasch and the sum scores are almost the same when we compare the procedures using only the top 5% and 1% performers. The DC-IRT presents a decrease in its rank correlation with the other procedures. Summing up, using any procedure but the DC-IRT will give basically the same rank of respondents.

Figure 4

Correlation between scores given the whole sample, the top 1% and the top 5% performers

Note. DC = Davidian curve model. KS = Kernel smoothing model. SP = Bayesian Semiparametric Rasch model. SS = Sum score.

Discussion

The main aim of the present study was to compare the performance of DC-IRT, KS-IRT and SP-Rasch in recovering simulated true scores, using sum scores as benchmarks. The secondary aim was to compare their performances in terms of practical equivalence with real data. Our results support the claim that the estimated distribution of θ is arbitrary (Ramsay, 1991) and, therefore, nonparametric density estimation adds little to the

effectiveness of IRMs. This follows from the fact that using an arbitrary parametric distribution for the true scores and a nonparametric procedure for ICC estimation gave the best estimates. Using parametric IRFs and nonparametric estimation of the density of the true score, by means of DC-IRT, had the least accurate performance. As expected, the KS-IRT and the SP-Rasch outperformed the sum score estimates, due to their flexibility in fitting noisy data. For ranking participants, in terms of estimates of true scores, sum scores, KS-IRT and SP-Rasch are equally effective procedures. These results seem to support the fact that the parametric assumptions about the IRFs are less relevant, or even more restricting, for estimating true scores.

One of the limitations of the present study is the fact that the non-normal distribution's conditions seemed to not cause much difference in the performances. Despite following what was recommended by Woods and Lin (2009) for setting these conditions, our results show that stronger deviations from normality are probably necessary for observing relevant differences in performance. Future studies focused on conditions for optimal performance should test a larger number of conditions, with stronger deviations from normality. In terms of practical implications, our results suggest that even if there are some deviations from parametric models of the true data generating process, the KS-IRT and the SP-Rasch are likely to perform similarly. This is particularly true if the aim is to rank respondents by means of estimates of true scores. Our empirical example showed that rank correlations between KS-IRT, SP-Rasch and the sum scores are very high.

In terms of implementations of NIRMs, Bayesian modeling can be used for further extending the SP-Rasch model. For instance, differently from MLE procedures, Bayesian IRMs do not require the specification of a distribution for the sample scores, but only for the prior of possible scores (Fox, 2010). This naturally results in a more flexible

distribution for the estimates of the sample true scores, somewhat similar to the DC-IRT. This can be used to extend the SP-Rasch so it relies less on both the empirical distribution of scores and the strong imposition of having a parametric, Rasch, item response function (Wiberg et al, 2018).

NIRMs have outperformed parametric IRMs in a set of different conditions. Our research is one of few (e.g., Lee, 2007; Woods & Lin, 2009) to compare the effectiveness of different NIRMs in recovering true scores and the first, that we are aware of, to compare the SP-Rasch with other nonparametric procedures. From a theoretical point of view, our findings support that IRMs can be more efficient on recovering true scores if their ICCs are nonparametric, but show little to no improvement in allowing for asymmetric distributions on the estimates of the sample true scores. This means that we agree with Wiberg et al. (2019) that the logistic assumption of IRFs can actually be a limitation for psychometric models which requires further understanding and changes in current research and testing practices.

References

- Arenson, E., & Karabatsos, G. (2018). A Bayesian Beta-Mixture Model for Nonparametric IRT (BBM-IRT). *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 17(1), 1-17. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3102461>
- Azzalini, A. (1985). A class of distributions which includes the normal ones. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 12, 171-178. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4615982>
- Azzalini, A. (2018). sn: The Skew-Normal and Related Distributions Such as the Skew-t R package retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sn/index.html>.

Barlow, R. E., & Brunk, H. D. (1972). The isotonic regression problem and its dual.

Journal of the American Statistical Association, 67(337), 140-147.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1972.10481216>

Chalmers, R. P. (2012). mirt: A multidimensional item response theory package for the R environment. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(6), 1-29.

<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i06>

Davidian, M., & Gallant, A. R. (1993). The nonlinear mixed effects model with a smooth random effects density. *Biometrika*, 80, 475-488.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/80.3.475>

De Ayala, R. J., Smith, B., & Norman Dvorak, R. (2018). A comparative evaluation of kernel equating and test characteristic curve equating. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 42(2), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621617712245>

Douglas, J. (1997). Joint consistency of nonparametric item characteristic curve and ability estimation. *Psychometrika*, 62(1), 7-28.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294778>

Duncan K. A., MacEachern S. N. (2013). Nonparametric Bayesian modeling for item response with a three parameter logistic prior mean. In Edwards M. C., MacCallum R. C. (Eds.), *Current topics in the theory and application of latent variable methods* (pp. 108-125). New York, NY: Routledge

Duncan, K. A., & MacEachern, S. N. (2008). Nonparametric Bayesian modelling for item response. *Statistical Modelling*, 8(1), 41-66.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1471082X0700800104>

Falk, C. F., & Cai, L. (2016). Semiparametric item response functions in the context of guessing. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 53(2), 229-247.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12111>

- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(2), 209-230. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2958008>
- Fox, J. P. (2010). *Bayesian item response modeling: Theory and applications*. New York: Springer.
- Guo, H., & Sinharay, S. (2011). Nonparametric item response curve estimation with correction for measurement error. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 36(6), 755-778. <https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998610396891>
- Hannan, E. J. (1987). Rational transfer function approximation. *Statistical Science*, 2, 135-161. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2245658>
- Izenman, A. J. (1991). Review papers: Recent developments in nonparametric density estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86(413), 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1991.10475021>
- Jara, A., Hanson, T. E., Quintana, F. A., Müller, P., & Rosner, G. L. (2011). DPpackage: Bayesian semi-and nonparametric modeling in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 40(5), 1-30.
- Karabatsos, G., & Sheu, C. F. (2004). Order-constrained Bayes inference for dichotomous models of unidimensional nonparametric IRT. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 28(2), 110-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621603260678>
- Kruschke, J. (2015). *Doing Bayesian data analysis: A tutorial with R, JAGS, and Stan*. Cambridge: Academic Press.
- Lee, Y. S. (2007). A comparison of methods for nonparametric estimation of item characteristic curves for binary items. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 31(2), 121-134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621606290248>

- Mazza, A., Punzo, A., & McGuire, B. (2012). KernSmoothIRT: An R package for kernel smoothing in item response theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.1183*.
- Meachler, M. (2018). sfsmisc: Utilities from 'Seminar fuer Statistik' ETH Zurich. R Package retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sfsmisc/index.html>.
- Miyazaki, K., & Hoshino, T. (2009). A Bayesian semiparametric item response model with Dirichlet process priors. *Psychometrika*, 74(3), 375-393.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-008-9108-6>
- Müller, P., & Quintana, F. A. (2004). Nonparametric Bayesian data analysis. *Statistical Science*, 19(1), 95-110. <https://doi.org/10.1214/0883423040000000017>
- Müller, P., Quintana, F. A., Jara, A., & Hanson, T. (2015). *Bayesian nonparametric data analysis*. New York: Springer.
- Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 9(1), 141-142. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1109020>
- R Core Team (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Ramsay, J. O. (1991). Kernel smoothing approaches to nonparametric item characteristic curve estimation. *Psychometrika*, 56(4), 611-630.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02294494>
- San Martín, E., Jara, A., Rolin, J. M., & Mouchart, M. (2011). On the Bayesian nonparametric generalization of IRT-type models. *Psychometrika*, 76(3), 385-409.
- Sheather, S. J., & Jones, M. C. (1991). A reliable data-based bandwidth selection method for kernel density estimation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society:*

- Series B (Methodological)*, 53(3), 683-690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1991.tb01857.x>
- Shirahata, S., & Chu, I. S. (1992). Integrated squared error of kernel-type estimator of distribution function. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 44(3), 579-591.
- Sijtsma, K., & van der Ark, L. A. (2017). A tutorial on how to do a Mokken scale analysis on your test and questionnaire data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 70(1), 137-158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bmsp.12078>
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. New York: Springer.
- van der Linden, W.J., & Hambleton, R.K. (Eds.) (2013). *Handbook of modern item response theory*. New York: Springer.
- Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, 359-372. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25049340>
- Wiberg, M., Ramsay, J. O., & Li, J. (2018). Optimal scores: An alternative to parametric item response theory and sum scores. *Psychometrika*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-018-9639-4>
- Willmott, C. J., & Matsuura, K. (2005). Advantages of the mean absolute error (MAE) over the root mean square error (RMSE) in assessing average model performance. *Climate Research*, 30(1), 79-82.
- Wong, W. H. (1983). On the consistency of cross-validation in kernel nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 11(4), 1136-1141. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2241303>

- Wood, R. (1978). Fitting the Rasch model: A heady tale. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 31, 27–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.1978.tb00569.x>
- Wood, S. (2012). mgcv: Mixed GAM Computation Vehicle with Automatic Smoothness Estimation. R Package retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mgcv/index.html>.
- Woods, C. M. (2006). Ramsay-curve item response theory to detect and correct for nonnormal latent variables. *Psychological Methods*, 11, 253-270.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.11.3.253>
- Woods, C. M. (2007). Ramsay-curve IRT for Likert type data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 31, 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621606291567>
- Woods, C. M., & Lin, N. (2009). Item response theory with estimation of the latent density using Davidian curves. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 33(2), 102-117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146621608319512>
- Woods, C. M., & Thissen, D. (2006). Item response theory with estimation of the latent population distribution using spline-based densities. *Psychometrika*, 71(2), 281-301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-004-1175-8>
- Xu, X., & Douglas, J. (2006). Computerized adaptive testing under nonparametric IRT models. *Psychometrika*, 71(1), 121-137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-003-1154-5>
- Zhang, D., & Davidian, M. (2001). Linear mixed models with flexible distributions of random effects for longitudinal data. *Biometrics*, 57(3), 795-802.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0006-341X.2001.00795.x>