

Presented at the 2022 Conference on Test Security October 26-28 Princeton, NJ

A Comparison of an Approximation Score Similarity

Index to Other Similarity Indices

Amanda A. Wolkowitz Senior Psychometrician

Russell W. Smith Chief Innovation Officer

Purpose

- Compare relative performance of an approximate score similarity index to other indices
 Without Item Response Theory (IRT)/specialized software
 Less computationally intense
 - Can be run in real time or near real time
- The purpose is *not* to determine whether one method performs better than another, but rather if the relative outcome of the methods are comparable



Purpose



• Extension of an NCME presentation by Smith (2021, 2022) and CoTS presentation at 11am in the Palmer Room

Approximation answer and response similarity analyses: A practical approach

- 60% or more of the content exposed, 20% of examinees with pre-knowledge







Comparison of 4 methods

- aSSI
 - Approximation of the GBT method using the Bock's model
- Wollack's omega
 - Using the Bock model
 - Using the Rasch model
- Generalized binomial model (GBT) (van der Linden and Sotaridona (2006))
 - Using the Bock model
 - Using the Rasch model
- B3 (residual correlations for persons) (Foley 2019, Smith 2019)

Datasets

- 1 simulation
- 3 real datasets



aSSI

- aSSI = z-score (for persons 1 and 2) $Z_{12} = \frac{(M_{12} - E_{12}^*)}{\sqrt{npq}}, \text{ where}$ M is count of observed matches n is the number of items
 - $p \text{ is } E^*_{12} / n \text{ and } q \text{ is } (1 p)$
 - E_{12}^* is the adjusted expected value:

 $E_{12}^* = n \cdot [s_1 s_2 + (1 - s_1)(1 - s_2)] + n \cdot b(1 - |s_1 - s_2|)(1 - |s_1 + s_2 - 1|)$

where, **s**_i is proportion correct score for person *i*, **b** is an adjustment to the magnitude of the correction set at 12.5%

Wollack's (1996) Omega



- Calculation involves the use of a z-score (i.e., assumes a normal distribution)
- IRT-based model

$$\omega = rac{O-E}{\sqrt{var(E)}}$$
 , where

- *E* = expected agreement between two examinees
 - sum of the probabilities that the copier's response (0,1) equals the observed source's response given the ability of the copier and the item's IRT parameters
- *O* = observed agreement between two examinees





- Calculation involves the use of a z-score (i.e., assumes a normal distribution)
- IRT-based model

$$GBT = rac{O-E}{\sqrt{npq}}$$
 , where

- *E* = sum of joint probabilities of matching scores (0,1) between two examinees given the ability of each examinee and the item's IRT parameters
- *O* = observed agreement between two examinees

B3



- Correlation of residuals for two people indicates they are locally dependent
- Use interquartile range (IQR) to detect outliers
 - In a N(0,1):
 - z-score for Q1 = -0.6745
 - z-score for Q3 = 0.6745
 - → IQR = 1.349
 - Q1 m(IQR) = z, where z = outlier z-score value, m = IQR multiplier

Example: Assume mean = 0, SD = 1 of the correlations of the person residuals

One-tail p	Z	m
0.025	1.96	0.95
0.005	2.58	1.41
0.001	-3.09	1.79
0.0001	-3.72	2.26
0.00001	-4.26	2.66

Study

Multiple critical values
Real data
Exam A – 66 items 416 exam

with pre-knowledge

- Exam A 66 items, 416 examinees, known security issues
- Exam B 60 items, 1992 examinees
- Exam C 66 items, 1109 examinees
- Focus on correlation of methods, not accuracy of detection

Data notes

Simulation

- Focused on SSI, so only detection based on 0/1 responses
- Methods applying Bock's model were collapsed to 0/1 responses
- Methods applying Bock's model were also applied using the Rasch model

100 item test, 1000 examinees, normal distribution, 60% of exposed content, 1% of examinees



Simulation: 1% of people with pre-knowledge on first 60% of items



N items = 100 N examinees = 1,000 N items exposed = 60

N examinees with pre-knowledge = 10 N pairs of examinees with pre-knowledge = c(10,2) = 45Total N pairs of examinees = c(1000,2) = 499,500

For each critical value,

True positive = N pairs of correctly flagged pairs of examinees/45

False positive =

N pairs of incorrectly flagged pairs of examinees/(499,500-45)

-	_						
True Posit	ive	S					\frown
		Wollack's	Wollack's				
1-tail probability	z	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	GBT - Bock	GBT - Rasch	B3	aSSI
0.025	1.96	91.1%	91.1%	46.7%	46.7%	57.8%	37.8%
0.005	2.58	80.0%	80.0%	22.2%	26.7%	26.7%	17.8%
0.001	3.09	53.3%	55.6%	6.7%	6.7%	4.4%	4.4%
0.0001	3.72	31.1%	31.1%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
0.00001	4.26	8.9%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
False Posit	tive	S					
		Wollack's	Wollack's				
1-tail probability	z	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	GBT - Bock	GBT - Rasch	B3	aSSI
0.025	1.96	2.3%	2.4%	0.8%	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%
0.005	2.58	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
0.001	3.09	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
0.0001	3.72	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
0.00001	4.26	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Simulation – Correlations of SSI Statistics

	Α	В	С	D	ш	F
Α		0.999	0.950	0.951	0.938	0.928
В			0.952	0.95	0.937	0.926
С				0.998	0.869	0.978
D					0.870	0.981
Е						0.853

Which method is represented by the letters shown in the correlation matrix above?

- aSSI
- B3
- GBT Bock

- GBT Rasch
- Wollack's ω Bock
- Wollack's ω Rasch

Simulation – Correlations of SSI Statistics

	Wollack's	Wollack's	GBT -	GBT -		
	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	Bock	Rasch	B3	aSSI
Wollack's ω - Rasch		0.999	0.950	0.951	0.938	0.928
Wollack's ω - Bock			0.952	0.950	0.937	0.926
GBT - Bock				0.998	0.869	0.978
GBT - Rasch					0.870	0.981
B3						0.853

Simulations – Correlations of SSI Statistics

	Wollack's	Wollack's	GBT -	GBT -		
	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	Bock	Rasch	B3	aSSI
Wollack's ω - Rasch		0.999	0.950	0.951	0.938	0.928
Wollack's ω - Bock			0.952	0.950	0.937	0.926
GBT - Bock				0.998	0.869	0.978
GBT - Rasch					0.870	0.981
B3						0.853



Wollack's Wollack's GBT -GBT aSSI ω - Rasch ω - Bock Bock Rasch **B3** Wollack's ω - Rasch Exam A – Correlations of SSI 0.961 0.907 0.922 0.886 0.909 Wollack's ω - Bock 0.894 0.942 0.891 0.891 **Statistics GBT** - Bock 0.951 0.850 0.951 **GBT** - Rasch 0.832 0.973 **B3** 0.839



Exam B – Correlations of SSI Statistics

	Wollack's	Wollack's	GBT -	GBT -		
	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	Bock	Rasch	B3	aSSI
Wollack's ω - Rasch		0.788	0.740	0.924	0.888	0.930
Wollack's ω - Bock			0.962	0.854	0.701	0.844
GBT - Bock				0.868	0.656	0.855
GBT - Rasch					0.851	0.986
B3						0.835



Exam C – Correlations of SSI Statistics

	Wollack's	Wollack's	GBT -	GBT -		
	ω - Rasch	ω - Bock	Bock	Rasch	B3	aSSI
Wollack's ω - Rasch		0.929	0.892	0.927	0.891	0.908
Wollack's ω - Bock			0.948	0.845	0.858	0.813
GBT - Bock				0.904	0.807	0.860
GBT - Rasch					0.810	0.982
B3						0.765





Contributions: Approximation SSI



- Does aSSI do a good job and detecting preknowledge compared to other methods?
 - Yes. It is also much simpler to compute and does not require IRT.
- Does aSSI work well with real and simulated data?
 Yes. The strength of the correlation of the methods is strong under both situations.
- With which true SSI method does aSSI most strongly correlate?

	Min. <i>r</i>	Max. <i>r</i>	
GBT - Rasch	0.973	0.986	0
Wollack's ω - Rasch	0.908	0.930	
GBT - Bock	0.855	0.951	
Wollack's ω - Bock	0.813	0.894	
B3	0.765	0.839	



Contributions: Approximation SSI



- aSSI is good for "real-time"
- Solves a real-world problem
- No IRT, no calibration, computationally less intense
- Provides pairwise estimated probabilities
- All that's required is scores, test length, and a weight
- It does well under the right conditions (see Smith's presentation at 11am)
- It correlates well with other known SSI statistics, but critical value may need to be adjusted for similar effectiveness
- B3 is less well known, but does a reasonable job, too!

References



Foley, B. P. (2019). Collusion Detection Using an Extension of Yen's Q3 Statistic. Presented at the 8th Annual Conference on Test Security. Miami, FL.

Smith, R. W. (2019). Comparing B3 to Answer Similarity Index for Detecting Collusion. Presented at the 8th Annual Conference on Test Security. Miami, FL.

Smith, R. W. (2021, October 6-7). A Practical Approximation of Response Similarity. Conference on Test Security, online.

Smith, R. W. (2022, April). *Approximation answer and response similarity analyses: A practical approach* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME), San Diego, CA.

van der Linden, W. J., & Sotaridona, L. (2006). Detecting answer copying when the regular response process follows a known response model. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *31*(3), 283-304.

Wollack, J.A.(1996). Detection of answer copying using item response theory. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57/05*, 2015.



. . .

•••

Thank you!

amanda.wolkowitz@alpinetesting.com russell.smith@alpinetesting.com

VALIDITY Fair, Reliable, Secure