

# Bayesian Active Learning for Multi-Criteria Comparative Judgement in Educational Assessment [Working Paper]

Andy Gray<sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Alma Rahat<sup>b</sup>, Tom Crick<sup>b</sup> and Stephen Lindsay<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Bath Spa University, Bath, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup>Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom

<sup>c</sup>University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Comparative judgement,  
Bayesian learning,  
Active learning,  
Machine learning,  
Education,  
Assessment,

## ABSTRACT

Comparative judgment (CJ) offers an alternative approach to assessment by focusing on the holistic evaluation of a piece of work rather than dissecting it into discrete components to provide an overall rank of a student's work. CJ allows evaluators to consider the overall quality and coherence of work. This method leverages the human ability to make nuanced comparisons, enabling more reliable and valid assessments. By emphasising the overall of a piece, CJ aligns more closely with real-world evaluations, where the interplay of various elements determines overall impact and effectiveness. However, rubrics are commonly used in educational assessment to break down work into specific criteria, enabling educators to grade each section individually. This approach allows for detailed feedback to be provided to students, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement in each aspect of their work. Therefore, we believe that there is a gap between using CJ and being able to have a breakdown detailed dissemination of a student's performance based on the focused learning areas.

In this paper, our aim is to address this issue in a Bayesian way. We take inspiration from the recent work on Bayesian CJ (BCJ) proposed by Gray *et al.*, where they proposed to model the preferences are directly, instead of using likelihoods over the total scores, which ultimately can be used to derive expected ranks and the uncertainty therein. In addition, they proposed an entropy based active learning approach for selecting the most information rich pair to show to the assessors. We propose to extend BCJ to tackle multiple *independent* learning outcome (LO) components, defined on a rubric, and illustrate how LO based pairwise comparison can be used to derive component wise and holistic predictive ranks of the items under evaluation, along with appropriate uncertainty estimations. We also devise an avenue to combine the entropies and identify the most promising pair to show the assessor for evaluation. **Through experiments with synthetic and real data, we demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed method.** Finally, noting that there is no way to identify the level of agreements between multiple assessors in the current BCJ approach, we show how this can be derived to render greater transparency.


## 1. Introduction

In the realm of education, the process of marking and assessment stands as a critical cornerstone in the quest for meaningful learning outcomes. Therefore, marking is an intrinsic part of teaching [1]. Marking allows teachers to verify the class's progress quantitatively and will enable the teacher to report on the student's progress [1]. Among the various methodologies educators employ to evaluate student performance, rubric marking has emerged as a powerful tool that transcends the traditional confines of grading [2]. It has since become an essential tool, providing a transparent framework for both instructors and students. This is primarily because it allows assessors to clearly delineate expectations and criteria, facilitating a student's understanding of the requisite components for excelling in academic assignments [2, 3]. The inherent consistency of rubrics ensures a more expedited, uniform, and equitable grading

process, which is paramount for maintaining educational assessments' integrity [4].

Furthermore, rubrics serve as a medium for delivering constructive feedback, enabling students to gain insights into their academic strengths and areas necessitating improvement [5]. This process not only aids in performance reflection but also encourages the development of critical thinking skills as students assess their work. Despite these advantages, implementing rubrics is not devoid of challenges [6]. The complexity of rubric terminology can sometimes lead to ambiguity, counteracting the goal of clarity. Additionally, the use of negatively connoted language within the lower echelons of the grading scale may inadvertently demotivate learners [7]. Moreover, as some perceive, the subjective nature of rubric criteria may introduce an element of bias, contrasting with the objectivity traditionally associated with letter grades [7].

Comparative judgement (CJ) is an alternative to traditional marking, and is known to reduce the cognitive load marking generates and remove the potential bias in marking [8, 9, 10]. At its core, CJ involves assessors comparing two pieces of student work to determine which one does better at a holistic level [11]. This approach diverges from popular assessment methods that rely on predefined criteria

 a.gray2@bathspa.ac.uk (A. Gray); 445348@swansea.ac.uk (A.

Gray); a.a.m.rahat@swansea.ac.uk (A. Rahat); thomas.crick@swansea.ac.uk (T. Crick); stephen.lindsay@glasgow.ac.uk (S. Lindsay)

ORCID(S): 0000-0002-1150-2052 (A. Gray); 0000-0002-5023-1371 (A. Rahat); 0000-0001-5196-9389 (T. Crick); 0000-0001-6063-3676 (S. Lindsay)

 <https://twitter.com/codingWithAndy> (A. Gray), <https://twitter.com/AlmaRahat> (A. Rahat), <https://twitter.com/ProfTomCrick> (T. Crick)

and rubrics, offering a dynamic and often more nuanced evaluation of student performance.

The strength of CJ lies in its simplicity and flexibility. Here, assessors are compelled to make judgments based on their professional expertise and understanding of the subject matter, possibly at a rapid pace [10]. This process can lead to more reliable assessments, reducing the potential for bias and the influence of distinctive interpretations of criteria. This is based on the premise that humans are better at making comparative than absolute judgements [12]. So, even though it may require many comparisons to derive a reasonable rank [13], generating an overall ranking may be less intensive for the assessors. Moreover, CJ can be facilitated by digital tools, making it a practical option for contemporary educational settings where digitalisation is increasingly prevalent.

CJ is not only a tool for summative assessment but also serves as a means for formative feedback. By engaging in the comparative judgment process, educators can better understand the qualities characterising high-quality work within their discipline. This, in turn, can inform teaching practices and help educators provide students with more targeted and effective feedback. It offers a promising alternative to traditional assessment methods. It provides a reliable and efficient means of evaluating student work while supporting professional development and formative assessment practices [8, 9, 11].

While CJ is promising, there are some valid critiques of it within education settings. For instance, Kelley *et al.* in [14] criticises the modelling approach – typically a Bradley-Terry model (BTM) [15], based on the original contributions by Thurstone [16] which showed how pairwise comparisons may be turned into ranks, and his assumptions (e.g. Normality of scores) – and how they may not be appropriate for assessments. They also rightly argue that human judgements are flawed, which the typical model ignores. These shortcomings are prevalent even in Bayesian versions of the BTM as the fundamental modelling structure remain [17].

A recent innovation in CJ is the Bayesian CJ (BCJ) proposed by Gray *et al.* [13]. The authors firstly propose to model the pairwise preferences directly as outcomes of Bernoulli trials rather than what BTM does (i.e. imposing some likelihood on the scores, and then using a form of maximum likelihood algorithm to identify the expected ranks), and thus avoid the assumptions that are unnatural in assessments. Most importantly, this readily allows for imperfect judgements, from an individual or multiple assessors, and encodes such uncertainties directly as Beta distributions. They then propose an important approach for selecting the most informative pair to be shown next to the assessors in order to gain most knowledge in an entropy driven manner, and thus solving another key shortcoming in traditional BTM where selecting the most informative pair was never an option, which prompted researchers to select randomly or propose other approaches for adaptive judgements [10]. BCJ was shown to be superior in performance in synthetic and real-world examples.

Nonetheless, like CJ, BCJ is only able to consider holistic comparison data thus far. Hence, there is a need to extend the mechanism to allow for rubric like LO-specific comparisons and respective aggregations to ranks. Also, we are unable to compute a definitive measure of the agreement between assessors, which, therefore, BCJ falls short of rendering full confidence in the method. Addressing these shortcomings, the key contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose novel methods for approximating an overall rank and associated predictive uncertainty from pairwise comparisons specific to each LO, as well as deriving LO specific predictive rank distributions; we call this multi-criteria BCJ (MBCJ).
- We show how a holistic entropy can be calculated as to drive the selection of the next pair to be evaluated in MBCJ.
- For the first time, we show how MBCJ could work as well as BCJ in experiments based off real assessment data, conferring better granularity in how the items are being preferred and LO specific ranks.
- We derive a couple of new metrics – mode agreement percentage (MAP and expected agreement percentage (EAP) under the assumption of Beta prior over preference between a pair of items – to measure the level of agreement for different comparisons made by assessors, and help identify controversial pairs. These, particularly EAP, can directly indicate the level of reliability, and provide a natural avenue to stop collecting further comparison data.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the study's related work and some background; Section 3 outlines how the main algorithms rank students' work. We will explain the three methods used for selecting the following pairs to be compared in Section 4; we present our results and discussions in Section 6, with general conclusions and future work articulated in Section 7.

## 2. Related Work

Learning is an essential part of life, and teaching is one of the most important roles in society. The process of teaching and learning is often challenging, but it is also incredibly rewarding. However, it is essential that teachers can assess and track a student's performance. This is for several reasons like reporting, ability setting, identifying if students need intervention and providing feedback on improving their work [18, 19].

### 2.1. Rubric Marking

Rubrics, grounded in explicit criteria and specific expectations, provide a systematic framework for evaluating students' knowledge and their ability to apply it effectively [20]. In the current educational climate, which prioritises holistic development and deeper understanding, rubric marking has emerged as an essential tool for educators [21]. It enables

Level	Knowledge	Understanding	Skills	Critical analysis	Reflection
70–100% In principle, publishable quality	Comprehensive knowledge of Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods that is current and extends beyond essential materials. Extensive, appropriately-used background material. Potential new or extended knowledge.	Clear evidence of applying and interrelating knowledge relevant to the problem at hand. Strong internal relations, e.g., of theory to practice as appropriate to the coursework.	Clear ability to select appropriate techniques and skills to solve a problem. High literacy and coherent organisation of the coursework. Strong evidence of largely independent, self-directed work.	Original ideas, insights or critical thinking. Clear analysis and construction of arguments. Excellent use of and synthesis of ideas. Strong structure.	Strong element of self-awareness and critical evaluation of own work. Assessment of contribution to the discipline. Objective justifications of opinion.
50–69%	Comprehensive knowledge of essential ideas in Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods. Good background work and understanding of course resources.	Significant application of knowledge to the problem at hand. Thorough grasp of concepts. Good relation of theory to practice.	Good ability to select appropriate techniques and skills to solve a problem. Good literacy and reasonable organisation. Evidence of own initiative and independent work.	Good analysis and critical arguments. Occasional uncritical reliance on accepted arguments. Good structure.	Reasonable self-evaluation and assessment of value of contribution. Justified opinions.
30–49%	Undergraduate-level, incomplete knowledge of ideas in Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods. Some relevant background material.	Some ability to apply knowledge and identify appropriate concepts. Some relation of theory to practice.	Limited selection of techniques or skills. Some problems with language and attempts to organise ideas. Considerable guidance or direction given.	Informed evaluation of facts but no real independent analysis. Reasonable structure and argument.	Incomplete or sketchy evaluation of work. Opinionated, without justification.
0–29%	Lack of essential elements of Human-Centred Perspectives and Methods knowledge. Absence of background work.	Limited application of knowledge. No clear grasp of concepts. No relation of theory to practice.	Poor or inappropriate choice of skills. Poor language. Incoherent organisation. Little or no independent working.	Uncritical dependence on facts or published arguments. Descriptive rather than argumentative. Poor or irrelevant structure and argument.	No or little self evaluation.

**Figure 1:** The figure shows an example marking rubric for a Masters of Science (MSc) module offered at the Swansea University, UK. It gives an overview of skills and knowledge expected to be demonstrated by the students at the different grade levels within the module to achieve certain marks/grades. It also gives descriptions of the different focuses within the assignment that the lecturer is looking to be seen displayed within the assignment. These are Knowledge, understanding, skills, critical analysis, and reflection.

a more detailed and comprehensive appraisal of student accomplishments. This shift in assessment methodology paves the way for constructive feedback, personalised learning trajectories, and the nurturing of well-rounded individuals equipped to succeed in the dynamic milieu of the 21st century [22].

A marking rubric, also referred to as a scoring rubric, is a tool that delineates the expectations for an assignment by listing criteria and describing levels of quality; see, for example, Figure 1. It offers a clear and objective method to assess student work, including essays, group projects, creative endeavours, and oral presentations. Rubrics can be employed for any assignment in a course, or for any way in which students are asked to demonstrate what they have learned.

Rubric marking has solidified its role as a structured evaluative method within educational assessment, offering a systematic approach to gauging student performance. The

deployment of scoring rubrics is backed by extensive research, which underscores their reliability, validity, and impact on learning outcomes. The consistency of rubric-based assessments is well-supported, particularly when they are analytic, subject-specific, and bolstered by exemplars and rater training, as noted by Jonsson et al. [23]. Although rubrics are not inherently valid, their validity can be enhanced through a comprehensive validity framework during the rubric validation process [23]. The explicit criteria provided by rubrics facilitate feedback and self-assessment, promoting learning and improving instruction [23]. When clear and focused, descriptive rubrics yield high-quality information [7], contributing to the positive overall impact of rubrics on student performance. While the effects on self-regulation of learning are mixed, there is evidence supporting a positive correlation between rubric use and motivation to learn [7].

Rubrics have several advantages, such as providing clarity and consistency in grading [23]. They offer clear expectations and grading criteria to students, which can assist them

in understanding what is required to excel in an assignment [24]. They can make grading much quicker, more consistent, and fair [23]. Furthermore, rubrics can provide students with informative feedback on their strengths and weaknesses so that they can reflect on their performance and work on areas that need improvement [25]. Rubrics also encourage learners to develop critical thinking about their own scores and work [25]. However, rubrics also have their drawbacks. The language of rubrics is not always as clear as it is supposed to be, which adds to their complexity [26]. The lower scale may use negative terms to describe student performance, which may discourage the learners. Some opponents of rubrics feel they are more subjective than a letter grade.

In higher education, rubrics have been recognised for enhancing student self-assessment, self-regulation, and understanding of assessment criteria [24]. However, some students perceive rubrics as restrictive and associate them with increased stress related to assessments [24]. The involvement of students in the design and implementation of rubrics is essential for their success [24]. In primary education, particularly in the teaching and assessment of mathematical reasoning, rubrics have been found to improve teachers' diagnostic skills and indirectly influence their use of formative feedback [27]. However, the direct effects on student self-assessment are more apparent than the effects on student outcomes, highlighting the need for further research into the mediated effects of self-regulation and self-efficacy [27].

Empirical data from higher education indicates increased use, driven by the demands for consistency and transparency in assessment [28]. While the reliability of rubrics is supported by evidence, the impact on student learning necessitates further robust evaluation [28]. Ultimately, rubrics are invaluable tools in educational assessment, with their effectiveness contingent upon their design, implementation, and the context in which they are used. The potential of rubrics is vast, yet challenges remain that require ongoing research to understand and address fully. When effectively implemented, rubric marking can significantly enhance the reliability and validity of assessments, positively influencing student learning and performance. However, the actual impact of rubric marking varies depending on specific contexts and implementations, and it is influenced by factors such as the clarity of criteria, assessor training, and the feedback provided to students. These general pros and cons underscore the need for a nuanced application of rubrics in educational settings.

## 2.2. Comparative Judgement

CJ is a technique used to derive ranks from pair-wise comparisons. The concept of CJ is used in academic settings to allow teachers to compare two pieces of work and select which is better against selected criteria in a holistic manner. After each comparison, another pair is selected. This is repeated until enough pairs have been compared to generate a ranking of the work marked. We detail a typical CJ process in Algorithm 1 [13].

---

### Algorithm 1 Standard comparative judgement procedure.

---

#### Inputs.

- $N$  : Number of items.
- $K$  : Multiplier for computing the budget for the number of pairs to be assessed.
- $I$  : Set of items.

#### Steps.

- 1:  $B \leftarrow N \times K$  ▷ Compute the budget.
  - 2:  $G \leftarrow \langle \rangle$  ▷ Initialise list of selected pairs.
  - 3:  $W \leftarrow \langle \rangle$  ▷ Initialise list of winners.
  - 4:  $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \left( \frac{N}{2}, \dots, \frac{N}{2} \right)^\top$  |  $|\mathbf{r}| = N$  ▷ Initialise rank vector with mean rank for all items.
  - 5: **for**  $b = 1 \rightarrow B$  **do**
  - 6:    $(i, j) \leftarrow \text{SelectPair}(I)$  ▷ Pick a pair of items.
  - 7:    $G \leftarrow G \oplus \langle (i, j) \rangle$  ▷ Append the latest pair.
  - 8:    $w \leftarrow \text{DetermineWinner}(i, j)$  ▷ Pick a pair of items.
  - 9:    $W \leftarrow W \oplus \langle w \rangle$  ▷ Append the latest winner.
  - 10:    $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \text{GenerateRank}(G, W)$  ▷ Update rank vector.
  - 11: **end for**
  - 12: **return**  $\mathbf{r}$
- 

An important benefit to CJ within an academic setting is reducing the teacher's cognitive load [29], as comparing two pieces of work is faster than marking each individual piece of work, while also insisting the teacher is being non-biased towards a student and consistent [30]. This is difficult to achieve [31], and CJ helps, to an extent, address this challenge; for further discussion of this, we refer to the following literature where the teachers can be referred to as the judges [32, 33, 34].

CJ is based on Thurstone's proposed technique in 1927, known as 'the law of comparative judgement' [16]. Thurstone discovered that humans are better at comparing things to each other rather than making judgements in isolation, for example, judging if a piece of fruit is bigger than another without having the other fruits to compare against at the point of judgement. Therefore, he proposed making many pair-wise comparisons until a rank order has been created [16, 32, 33]. Pollitt *et al.* played a crucial role in introducing and popularising it within an education setting [35, 36].

A growing body of evidence supports using CJ as a reliable alternative for assessing open-ended and subjective tasks. The judgements recorded by teachers, more generally termed *raters* or *judges*, are fed into a BTM (see [8, 13] for more details on the BTM) to produce scores that represent the underlying quality of the scripts [15, 37]. These scores have the appealing property of being equivalent across comparisons [38].

A key justification for using CJ within the educational assessment process is that the rank orders it produces tend to have high levels of reliability. For example, in 16 CJ exercises conducted between 1998 and 2015, the SSR indices, which is equivalent to Cronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency and scale reliability [39]. The correlation



coefficient scores were between 0.73 to 0.99 compared to rubric-based grades [40]. With a correlation coefficient of 1.0 representing perfect agreement, an SSR score of 0.70 or above is typically considered high enough to proclaim strong agreement [41].

To the best of our knowledge, in a multi-criteria aspect, CJ's potential in this area has been researched once, with two criteria where pairwise comparisons were used to rank exemplar scripts required for later script evaluation [42]. McGrane et al.'s study aimed to expand the traditional use of CJ to incorporate a two-staged process, using CJ to generate calibrated exemplars followed by matching exemplars to performances. The study evaluated performances across two tasks—narrative and persuasive writing—and comprised performances from two calendar years of administration. Judgements were made using two different dimensions, which they referred to as writing conventions and authorial choices criteria. However, the rankings for the different dimensions were independent and not combined to create an overall score and rank for the items being compared. It was used to create a sample scale as a source of 36 calibrated exemplars for the second part of their experiment where they used where they then used these exemplars to match the remaining items to the most similar item in the calibrated exemplars. So, there is a clear gap in the literature in the use of CJ for multi-criteria pairwise comparisons, and aggregation of ranks to produce overall ranks.

### 2.2.1. Pair Selection Methods

One of the key questions when implementing a CJ approach for marking is how to select the next pair to evaluate (step 6 in Algorithm 1) to identify comparative preference. There are many ways to generate these pairs, see, for example, [11], but these are typically *ad hoc* in nature. Furthermore, Ofqual has stated that if the number of pairs goes too far over the optimal number, then the final ranking becomes less effective, but knowing this optimal number of comparisons is unknown [43]. Although CJ is typically fast and offers a good means of ranking items of work, it does not give insight into how the model generated its results.

Our goal in this paper is to provide further insight into the process for the assessors, particularly the uncertainties illustrated in the previous section. More importantly, we want to drive the selection of the pairs to be evaluated using the knowledge that we have already gathered, thus facilitating informed decision-making and reducing the need for many evaluations.

It should be noted that the traditional stopping criterion is usually expressed as a budget on the number of pairs evaluated: here, we assume that the budget is  $N \times K$  where  $K$  is the multiplier that is often set to 10 [11].

This section describes three ways to identify the next pair to be compared: randomly, using NRP and the novel entropy approach proposed by Gray et al. [13].

The random approach picks every pair presented to the user at random until the budget is reached. This can cause the same pair to be presented to the user, but that would be

unlikely, especially as  $N$  increases in size. This is a random search method known to be effective for high-dimensional problems [44]. This is usually the most widely used method [11, 32].

Another approach used is where no repeating pairs occur until we have selected all possible pairs [11, 43]. This ensures that all  $N$  items are seen the same number of times, but what item is compared against what item is decided uniformly as random. This prevents the same pairs from being presented to a user until every other pair has been rated. However, as we have no indication of uncertainty, certain pairs may be selected despite the difference between them being clear.

The entropy pair-picking method is part of an active learning (AL) approach used in BCJ to determine the next pairs to present to the marker. This method aims to select the most informative pairs for comparison, thereby increasing the efficiency of the ranking process [13]. Entropy, in the context of information theory, measures the amount of randomness or information in a random variable. In the entropy pair-picking method, pairs are chosen based on the amount of information or uncertainty they can potentially resolve in the ranking model [13]. The BCJ combined with the entropy-driven AL pair-selection method is an effective method compared to other alternatives. It helps improve the accuracy of the ranking with more comparisons and provides transparency by giving insights into how it's making its decisions. This addresses the issue of the current method deteriorating if too many comparisons are performed [13].

### 2.2.2. Bayesian Comparative Judgement

Gray et al. [13] proposed a new approach to conducting CJ, Bayesian Comparative Judgement (BCJ). BCJ proposes a different way of conducting the CJ backend process. The process begins the same; for example, when selecting a pair to present to be compared, a preferred item is selected, and a rank is created. The more traditional approach uses the Bradley-Terry Model (BTM), Bradley and Terry proposed BTM in their seminal paper on the topic [8, 9, 32, 45, 46]. The technique is an iterative minorisation-maximisation (MM) method [47] for estimating the maximum likelihood of the expected preference score  $\gamma_i$  for the  $i$ th student's item of work, given the observed data. With the expected preferences, we can then use this to arrange the items of work and then generate a rank where a higher value represents a better quality of work. We present a mathematical description of the model below, broadly following Hunter's work [47]. Meanwhile, the BCJ approach uses a Bayesian machine learning approach to determine the final ranks. Within the paper, it was discovered that the BCJ approach is more accurate at deciding the desired rank compared to a target rank. The new approach also made the CJ process more transparent while allowing the educator to set grade goals for the algorithm to predict the grades of the presented work.

Bayesian machine learning is a powerful paradigm within the field of artificial intelligence that leverages Bayesian

statistical methods to make predictions and decisions. Unlike traditional machine learning approaches, which often provide point estimates of parameters and predictions, Bayesian machine learning incorporates uncertainty into its models. It relies on Bayes' theorem to update beliefs about parameters and predictions as new data becomes available [48]. By representing uncertainty explicitly, Bayesian models are well-suited for scenarios where limited data is available or where the consequences of incorrect predictions are high. This approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of the underlying uncertainties in the data, leading to more robust and flexible models [49]. Bayesian machine learning has found applications in various domains, including finance, healthcare, and natural language processing, offering a principled framework for handling uncertainty in complex and dynamic environments.

Bayesian inference is a general framework for updating beliefs about parameters or hypotheses in light of new evidence or data. It is based on Bayes' theorem, which describes how to revise probabilities based on prior knowledge and new observations [50].

In the context of machine learning, Bayesian inference is applied to model parameters. In traditional machine learning, models often provide point estimates for parameters, assuming that the parameters are fixed and not uncertain. However, Bayesian machine learning treats model parameters as probability distributions, incorporating uncertainty into the modelling process [51].

In Bayesian machine learning, prior beliefs about parameters are combined with observed data using Bayes' theorem to obtain a posterior distribution, which represents the updated beliefs about the parameters given the data [52]. This posterior distribution captures both the information from the data and the prior beliefs, allowing for a more comprehensive and probabilistic understanding of the model parameters [53].

Bayesian machine learning provides several advantages, including the ability to handle small datasets, incorporate prior knowledge, and quantify uncertainty. It has been applied to various machine learning tasks, such as regression, classification, and model selection, offering a principled and flexible approach to modelling in the presence of uncertainty.

Bayesian inference allows us to create complex models, which contain Bayesian modelling [54]. Bayesian modelling is a form of conceptual modelling which aims to help people know, understand or simulate a process the model represents [50]. While Bayesian inference is associated with obtaining conclusions based on evidence and reasoning it is a particular statistical inference that combines probability distributions to get other distributions. Bayes' theorem provides us with a general recipe to estimate the value of the parameter  $\theta$  given that we have observed some data  $Y$ :

$$\underbrace{p(\theta | Y)}_{\text{posterior}} = \frac{\overbrace{p(Y | \theta)}^{\text{likelihood}} \overbrace{p(\theta)}^{\text{prior}}}{\underbrace{p(Y)}_{\text{marginal likelihood}}} \quad (1)$$

The equation 1 is the famous formula used to calculate the Bayes theorem. It has four main parts: the posterior, the likelihood, the prior and the marginal likelihood.


Other experiments [17, 55, 56] aim to use a Bayesian approach with CJ, which is done alongside the BTM. For example, a paper titled "A Bayesian Bradley-Terry model to compare multiple ML algorithms on multiple data sets" by Jacques Wainer uses a Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) approach to determine what ML algorithms produced the best results. Their experiments provided good results. However, they used an approach where they pre-created the results from running the ML models and then compared them using a Bayesian approach paired with the MCMC. The predictive posterior check shows that the Bayesian model is indeed a good model of the given data, and it showed that a more complex model such as Davidson's is not needed. It worsens the fitness between the model and the data [17]. While Maeyer [56], talks about using Bayesian CJ through the R package pcFactorStan can be applied to analyse data from CJ within a Bayesian framework, making use of data from CJ judgements on argumentative writing coming from the D-PAC project. Therefore, this study again looks at using Bayesian analysis tools to analyse the data rather than being the main factors driving the CJ process.

However, our novel approach uses Bayes from the ground up, fundamentally rewriting the process that most CJ methods use. We are using Bayes to inform us every step of the way rather than conducting comparisons. When done, we put the exact comparisons and results into a BTM and our Bayes approach to see what the results generate from the comparisons and compare their performance.

The whole process of CJ is done in a holistic overview kind of way. Ultimately, taking a rubric assessment and then trying to create a preference for items of work in an overview holistic way.

### 3. Multi-Criteria Bayesian Comparative Judgement

The traditional approach to CJ has taken a marking rubric for assessing a pieced piece of work but has then ensured that the markers take a holistic approach to the items being judged. Therefore, just creating an overall rank. While the judges are taking into account the different areas of the rubric into account, they are only making an overall judgement. Therefore, losing a lot of valuable information about what parts of the rubric impacted the overall ranking the most. In education, it is usually important for the teacher to know where each student's strengths and weaknesses are to ensure they can plan and deliver content that will help address the



**Figure 2:** A radar plot depicting an items  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  performance across five LOs. Enabling more transparency and detail on where this item performed well and not so well. Therefore, enabling educators to be able to identify areas where this candidate would possibly need personalised intervention. Furthermore, it provides more insight than a traditional CJ rank would to the educator.

possible misconceived knowledge, but in the current method of CJ, this is lost.

Therefore, we wanted to be able to explore the idea of creating a multi-dimensional version of CJ. This involved taking all the individual components that make up a rubric, which we assign as a dimension within our results, to then create an overall rank, which is therefore derived from the preferences of the dimensions of each item by each marker. Therefore, we aim to generate a BCJ rank for every individual dimension. Therefore, not losing this valuable information as well as creating even more transparency to the overall ranking taking place. Figure 2 shows an example of this. Which shows the results of the item's ranks based on their individual marking focuses based on the rubric.

However, we need to decide on a way to create an overall rank from the individual dimensions of the comparisons. Therefore, we are comparing three different approaches to generate these overall ranks. These methods are explained in the sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.

### 3.1. Weighted Expected Value Rank

The expected value, a fundamental concept in probability and statistics, represents the long-term average or mean value of a random variable over numerous trials of an experiment. Mathematically, the expected value of a random variable  $X$  is denoted as  $\mathbb{E}(X)$  and is defined as the weighted average of all possible values that  $X$  can take, with the weights being the probabilities of each value. For a discrete random variable, the expected value is calculated as  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_i x_i P(X = x_i)$ , where  $x_i$  are the possible values of  $X$  and

$P(X = x_i)$  is the probability of  $X$  taking the value  $x_i$ . For a continuous random variable, the expected value is given by  $\mathbb{E}(X) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x f_X(x) dx$ , where  $f_X(x)$  is the probability density function of  $X$  [57].

The concept of expected value is crucial in various domains, including economics, finance, and decision theory, where it is used to determine the average outcome of uncertain processes. For instance, in finance, the expected value helps in calculating the anticipated return on investment by considering all possible returns weighted by their probabilities. This allows investors to make informed decisions based on average performance rather than being swayed by extreme outcomes. Moreover, expected value plays a vital role in formulating strategies in games of chance and in evaluating risk in insurance [58]. By providing a single summary measure of the central tendency of a random variable, the expected value aids in simplifying and analysing complex probabilistic scenarios.

The weighted expected rank is building upon the method used within BCJ [13], treating each LO as an individual BCJ producing a  $\mathbb{E}[r]$ . However, this time around, we then apply the weights to each LO's  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  and then sum these values together to create the new heuristic  $\mathbb{E}[r_i]$ .

$$\text{new}\mathbb{E}[r_i] = \sum_n \mathbb{E}[r_i] W_n \quad (2)$$

Where the weighted calculations use the modified Chebyshev (MTCH) [59], which is a slightly modified version of the augmented Chebyshev (ATCH) [59] weighted sum approach in equation 3, where the  $z_i^*$  is the utopian objective vector between the values of  $[0, 1]$  [59] 0.01 as the ideal target is position 1.

$$g = \max_i [w_i (|f_i - z_i^*| + \alpha \sum_{i=1}^k |f_i - z_i^*|)] \quad (3)$$

A modified Chebyshev was used for the  $W_n$  in equation 2 as in [60], two different scalarising functions weighted sum and augmented Chebyshev was used adaptively in the solution process in the framework of MOEA/D by using a multi-grid scheme. The proposed idea was tested on a knapsack problem with four and six objectives and performed better than the original version of MOEA/D, a technique used within Bayesian optimisation [61].

### 3.2. Weighted Monte Carlo Sampling

Monte Carlo sampling, a cornerstone in Bayesian inference, provides a robust method for approximating posterior distributions when analytical solutions are intractable. This technique involves generating a large number of random samples from a probability distribution to approximate its properties, such as means, variances, and quantiles. In the context of Bayesian statistics, Monte Carlo methods are particularly powerful because they allow for the estimation of posterior distributions by sampling from the prior distribution and updating it with observed data through the likelihood function. One of the most popular methods within

this framework is the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), which constructs a Markov chain that has the desired posterior distribution as its equilibrium distribution. Algorithms such as the Metropolis-Hastings and the Gibbs sampler are commonly employed to facilitate this process [62, 63].

The advantage of Monte Carlo sampling in Bayesian analysis lies in its flexibility and scalability. Unlike deterministic numerical integration methods, Monte Carlo sampling can handle high-dimensional parameter spaces and complex models with ease. This makes it suitable for a wide range of applications, from simple models to highly intricate hierarchical Bayesian models. Furthermore, advancements in computational power and algorithms have significantly enhanced the efficiency and feasibility of Monte Carlo methods. For instance, Variational Bayes and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo are modern techniques that have improved the convergence rates and accuracy of posterior approximations [64, 65]. These developments underscore the importance of Monte Carlo sampling as an indispensable tool in the Bayesian statistician's toolkit, enabling precise and comprehensive inference in the face of uncertainty.

The weighted MC sampling approach takes the same stages as the MC sampling proposed in the [13] paper. However, we are doing the sampling stage for all the individual LOs as was done, but at the  $\mathbf{X}$  stage we add the weights to the results. To perform MC estimation of the expected rank of an item  $i$ , we first take samples from the respective row of the matrix  $\mathcal{P}$ . This generates a sample vector  $\mathbf{x}'_i = (x'_{[i,j]})_{j \in [1, N] \wedge i \neq j}^\top$ . We then take the sample vector and apply the corresponding weights to the samples as follows:

$$\text{rvs} = \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \sum_{j=1}^N X_i^{(j)} \cdot w_i \right) \quad (4)$$

Where  $x'_{[i,j]} = [X] \mid X \sim \mathcal{P}_{[i,j]}$ . This allows us to count the number of times  $i$  has won a comparison  $w' = \sum_{j \in [1, N] \wedge i \neq j} x'_{[i,j]}$ . Naturally, the rank is  $r'_i = (N + 1) - w'$ . For  $R$  samples, we can then estimate the expected rank of  $i$  as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[r_i] = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{k=1}^R r'_i[k], \quad (5)$$

Once the  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  values have been calculated, we rank the items in the same manner as the traditional BCJ approach. So overall, this approach follows the same stages as the traditional BCJ MC approach, but at the sampling stage, adds the corresponding weights to those samples for their corresponding LOs.

### 3.3. Weight Ensemble

Ensemble learning, which integrates data fusion, data modelling, and data mining into a unified framework, has been recognised for its superior knowledge discovery and predictive performance in complex data situations [66]. This

approach is further enhanced by weighted ensemble methods, which have been shown to improve overall performance, accuracy, variance, and time consumption in machine learning models [67].

These weighted ensemble methods are particularly effective in improving classification performance. They achieve this by striking a balance between diversity and accuracy, thereby attaining high total classification performance. Furthermore, these methods have the added advantage of being able to update individual classifiers based on ensemble performance [68].

The concept of ensemble methods extends beyond weighted ensembles. In general, ensemble methods aim to improve the predictive performance of a single model by training multiple models and combining their predictions [69]. This approach has proven to be highly effective, with ensemble learning techniques achieving state-of-the-art performance in a diverse range of machine learning applications. This is achieved by combining the predictions from two or more base models [70].

In our approach to a weighted ensemble, we carry out the BCJ ranking process on the LOs as if they are individual single-dimension BCJ ranking calculations. However, at the point of calculating the CDFs, we apply the weighted ensemble method to the BCJ process. We multiply the corresponding LO's CDF with the appropriate weight and then sum the CDFs of all the LOs together to create a heuristic overall CDF value (see eq: 6), which then gets put through the process of calculating the  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  to provide an overall rank.

$$\text{newCDF}_{i,j} = \frac{\sum_n \text{CDF}_{i,j} W_n}{\sum W} \quad (6)$$

Once we have generated the  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  from the combined CDFs, we rank the items as the process in the standard BCJ approach.

## 4. Extension to the Entropy Picking Method

To handle the extra dimensions within the CJ project, we enabled the entropy-picking method to have a preference matrix for each LO. We are calculating the entropy for each LO independently, as we would calculate the entropy if it were for a single dimension. However, we looked at several approaches that could combine the individual LO's entropy results and then make a heuristic decision. We created four different approaches to compare. These are weighted entropy sum (4.1), weighted entropy sum (4.2), max entropy (4.3) and multi-dimensional differential entropy (4.4).

### 4.1. Entropy Sum

The formula for calculating the entropy sum item-picking method is depicted as follows:

$$H(i, j) = \sum_k E(i, j, k) \quad (7)$$



The entropy sum approach calculates the overall entropy by taking the  $i^{th}$  and  $j^{th}$  positions of each LO entropy matrix to create a heuristic overview of the individual LO entropy matrix into one by summing together all the individual LO entropy scores. In equation 7 *NewM* depicts the new overall entropy from each LO's entropy matrix,  $E_{i,j}$  while  $n$  represents the LO.

Once the *NewM* has been created, the approach used in the standard single dimension is then used to select the corresponding pair to present to the judges.

#### 4.2. Weighted Entropy Sum

The weighted entropy sum follows a very similar approach to the approach in section 4.1. However, this method adds weight to the overall LO entropy score to represent the importance or impact of the LOs with the most marks on the overall scores. So, to represent the importance of the LOs in the comparisons, a multiplier is added to the original formula to consider these weights. The overall weights must all add to a combined value of 1. For example, if there are 4 LOs, with LO1 having X points, LO2 X points, LO3 X points and LO4 having X points, then the weights would be Y.

$$H(i, j) = \sum_k^n w_k \cdot E(i, j, k) \quad (8)$$

Explain equation 8.

Once the *newEntM* has been created, again the approach used in the standard single dimension is then used to select the corresponding pair to present to the judges.

#### 4.3. Max Entropy

The max entropy approach is similar to the entropy sum in section 4.1. However, this time, instead of calculating the sum or weighted sum of all the LOs, it just finds the highest entropy score from all of the LOs and uses that score to represent the entropy for all of the LOs.

$$H(i, j) = \max_k E(i, j, k) \quad (9)$$

In equation 9, the  $H(i, j)$  represents the new holistic entropy that holds the *max* at position  $i, j$  from the original entropy matrix  $E$  that consists of  $k$  LOs. For example, if there are three LOs,  $H(i, j)$  will hold the *max* value in location  $i, j$  over the three LO entropy matrices.

#### 4.4. Multi-Dimensional Differential Entropy

The concept of differential entropy extends the classical notion of entropy to continuous random variables, providing a measure of uncertainty associated with a probability distribution [71]. For the beta distribution, which is defined on a finite interval and parameterised by two shape parameters, the differential entropy captures the variability of the distribution over this interval. In one dimension, the differential entropy of a beta distribution is well-documented and can be calculated using the shape parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$

[72]. The differential entropy of a single beta distribution  $X \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$  is given by:

$$H(X) = \log B(\alpha, \beta) - (\alpha - 1)\psi(\alpha) - (\beta - 1)\psi(\beta) + (\alpha + \beta - 2)\psi(\alpha + \beta) \quad (10)$$

where  $B(\alpha, \beta)$  is the beta function:

$$B(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)} \quad (11)$$

and  $\psi(x)$  is the digamma function:

$$\psi(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \log \Gamma(x) \quad (12)$$

In equation 10, the  $B(\alpha, \beta)$  is the beta function, and  $\psi(\cdot)$  is the digamma function, which is the derivative of the logarithm of the gamma function.

When considering the multi-dimensional extension of the beta distribution, we look to the Dirichlet distribution, which is the generalisation of the beta distribution for variables constrained to a simplex. This distribution is parameterised by a vector of shape parameters  $alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_K)$  and is defined over a simplex in a  $K$ -dimensional space [73]. The differential entropy of the Dirichlet distribution is calculated as follows:

$$h(X) = \log B(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^K (\alpha_i - 1)\psi(\alpha_i) + \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i - K \right) \psi \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i \right) \quad (13)$$

Equation 13 reveals each shape parameter's role in influencing the distribution's uncertainty or spread. Specifically, larger values of  $\alpha_i$  indicate that the distribution is more concentrated around the centre of the simplex, thus reducing entropy. Conversely, smaller values of  $\alpha_i$  suggest greater dispersion and higher entropy, indicating increased uncertainty.

The differential entropy is also affected by the dimensionality of the distribution. As the number of dimensions  $K$  increases, the complexity of the distribution also rises, generally leading to higher entropy. This is reflected in the term  $(\sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i - K)\psi(\sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i)$ , which captures the cumulative impact of the shape parameters across all dimensions. This term underscores the importance of the parameters' individual and collective effects on the entropy. Overall, understanding the differential entropy of multi-dimensional beta distributions provides valuable insights into the behaviour of systems modelled by such distributions, especially in applications like Bayesian statistics, machine learning, and reliability engineering, where these distributions are commonly used.

For multiple independent beta distributions  $X_i \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ , the multi-dimensional differential entropy is:

$$H(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \log B(\alpha_i, \beta_i) - (\alpha_i - 1)\psi(\alpha_i) - (\beta_i - 1)\psi(\beta_i) + (\alpha_i + \beta_i - 2)\psi(\alpha_i + \beta_i) \right] \quad (14)$$

The given formula in equation 14 calculates the total differential entropy  $H(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$  for  $n$  independent beta-distributed random variables  $X \sim Beta(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ . The differential entropy is a measure of uncertainty or variability associated with continuous probability distributions. Each beta distribution is characterised by two shape parameters,  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$ , which define its behaviour over the interval  $[0, 1]$ . The formula sums the entropy of these individual beta distributions, considering each parameter's contribution to the overall uncertainty.

The expression inside the summation includes several components. The term  $\log B(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$  represents the natural logarithm of the beta function, which normalises the beta distribution and depends on the shape parameters. This term captures the overall "size" of the parameter space defined by  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$ . Following this, the components quantify the contributions of the individual shape parameters to the entropy. Here,  $(\alpha_i - 1)\psi(\alpha_i)$  and  $(\beta_i - 1)\psi(\beta_i)$  are digamma functions, which are the logarithmic derivatives of the gamma function, measuring how the parameters  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$  affect the distribution's uncertainty.

The term  $(\alpha_i + \beta_i - 2)\psi(\alpha_i + \beta_i)$  reflects the joint influence of both shape parameters. By incorporating the sum of  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$ , it evaluates the collective impact of these parameters on the entropy.

## 5. Models, Dataset & Metrics

In order to conduct the experiments to evaluate the BCJ extension methods, we had to decide on what model we wanted to use to compare the MDBCJ approaches, the dataset on which to conduct the CJ, and the metrics to help underpin the performance of the approaches.

### 5.1. Models Compared

To create a ground truth for comparison, we carried out the comparisons using BCJ and BTM in their traditional single-dimensional approach with the pair types random pairs, no repeating pairs and entropy to compare how the multi-dimensional version performs on the same target scores.

We also created a BTM MD model that totals the  $\theta$  results for the individual LO results to create a holistic overall score for the items or work. This was to allow us to be able to compare the performance of the Bayesian models against the BTM approach in the multi-dimensional aspect as well as across the single and multi-dimensional aspects.

### 5.2. Datasets

The *DREsS<sub>New</sub>* [74] dataset is a real-classroom dataset that includes 1.7K essays authored by English as a foreign

language (EFL) undergraduate students. The DREsS dataset comprises three sub-datasets, these are the *DREsS<sub>New</sub>*, *DREsS<sub>Std.</sub>*, and *DREsS<sub>CASE</sub>*. Each of these datasets serves a unique purpose in the context of AES. However, we only used the *DREsS<sub>New</sub>* because the *DREsS<sub>New</sub>* dataset, in particular, is significant because it reflects real-world EFL writing scenarios.

These essays were scored by experts in English education, ensuring a high evaluation standard. The dataset is part of the larger DREsS dataset, which aims to provide a standard for rubric-based automated essay scoring (AES). DREsS is designed to address the limitations of previous AES models that were not tailored to the practical scenarios of EFL writing education. It also introduces a corruption-based augmentation strategy, CASE, which generates synthetic samples to improve the performance of AES systems.


The DREsS dataset uses a rubric that evaluates essays based on three key criteria [74]. The first area is Content. This measures the relevance and depth of the essay's subject matter. The second is Organisation. This assesses the essay's structure, coherence, and flow of ideas. The third and final one is Language. This criterion evaluates the grammar, vocabulary, and overall language use. Each of these sections is scored by experts in English education to provide a comprehensive assessment of the EFL essays.

The other dataset is another real-classroom dataset that includes 69 assessment results. The assessment is a summative assessment from a year one undergraduate module in which the students were given multiple scenarios to select from and then created a web page on each scenario, ensuring certain skills were being demonstrated. The samples selected were all from the same scenario, resulting in 38 scores being sampled, which has three focuses for the marking: quality of implementation, effective implementation of the additional requirements of the brief, and documentation quality. The three focuses are all marked out of 100 but have a weighting to the overall score of 50%, 25%, and 25%. The tolerance level for the moderation of this dataset is 6 marks.

We took subsamples of 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 to generate the target values and the pair-comparison target ranks from these datasets. The traditional overall heuristic and multi-dimensional approaches had the same target samples. The conventional method used only the final overall score of the items. In contrast, the multi-dimensional approach used the individual LO scores.

### 5.3. Metrics

This allows us to measure performance via normalised Kendall's  $\tau$  rank distance, which measures the difference between two ranking lists. The metric is calculated by counting the discrepancies between the two lists. The greater the distance, the more disparate the lists [75, 76]. The normalised distance ranges from 0 (indicating perfect agreement between the two lists) to 1 (indicating complete disagreement between the lists). For example, a distance of 0.03 means that only 3% of the pairs differ in ordering. In this paper, when a method progressed, we noted the  $\tau$  distance after each paired



**Figure 3:** A figure of the  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25$  against all  $K=5, 10, 20, 30$ , comparing the multi-dimensional model's weighted ensemble, Monte Carlo sampling, weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  against the single dimension version of the BTM and BCJ models. The multi-dimensional versions use the entropy-weighted sum approach for picking pairs, while the single dimension uses the standard entropy-picking method. The plots show that all methods have performed well compared to the single-dimension counterparts, but the weighted ensemble has performed on par with the single-dimension models in these experiments.

comparison, and this showed how well the relevant method converged to the target rank.

The Mann-Whitney U test, also known as the Wilcoxon rank-sum test, is a nonparametric statistical test that is used to determine if there are statistically significant differences between two independent groups [77]. It is often viewed as the nonparametric equivalent of Student's t-Test for Independent Samples.

## 6. Results and Discussion


We used the same targets for both to compare the performance of the multidimensional and single-dimensional models. This ensured we could then compare as best across the different approaches.

In figure 3, we can see that the tau results for 25 items for the DREsS dataset, between the weighted ensemble method and the single dimension BCJ are very close, the MCBCJ results are also very similar in performance, but not quite as well performing. We can also see that as the  $K$  value increases, the performance also increases in a consistent manner between them. However, we can see that the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$ , while performing within a respectable level, is clearly outperformed by the other methods.

In figure 4, we can see the results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum comparisons for the DREsS dataset. The rank-sum

comparisons are the different ranking methods across the different pair-picking methods against each other, including the single-dimension version of the BCJ using the standard entropy-picking method. So we can see in plots 4a, 4b, 4d, 4d that the weighted entropy was not dominated by any other ranking method when ranking the comparison results from the DREsS dataset. The Monte Carlo method performed well across the board until  $N = 20$  items, but then it was dominated by the weighted ensemble method and single dimension BCJ.

As the weighted ensemble method was not dominated by any other ranking method, including single dimension BCJ, we compared the rank-sum scores on this method against the different pair-picking methods. This comparison enabled us to see which combination performed best with the paired comparison results of the DREsS dataset. In figure 5, we see that the best-performing combination was the differential entropy pair selection method and the weighted ensemble. This combination was not dominated by any other pair selection methods. Additionally, we can see that the max entropy pair selection did not perform as well as the others, while the sum and weighted sum entropy pair selectors performed similarly. We believe that this is the case as the DREsS dataset's weights were all  $1/3$ , so the weights potentially didn't really have much impact on the summing element as they are all equally weighted.



**Figure 4:** An illustration of the statistical comparison of results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for the DREsS dataset of the weighted ensemble method in the first row and the differential entropy (4a), max entropy (4b), sum of the entropy 4c and weighted sum of the entropy 4d pair selector. In the second row, the Monte Carlo method and the differential entropy 4e, max entropy 4f, the sum of the entropy 4g and the weighted sum of the entropy 4h pair selector. In the final row the weighted  $E[r]$  method and the differential entropy 4a, max entropy 4b, sum of the entropy 4c and weighted sum of the entropy 4d pair selector. The plots show the number of times that a combination of a ranking method and a pair selection method has been the best, or equivalent to the best, with the darkest colour representing that it was not beaten by any other method for that configuration, including against the results of BCJ using the standard entropy picking method. The weighted ensemble ranking method shows the best performance out of the 20 distinct experiments.

In figure 6, we can see the  $\tau$  results for the second dataset depicting 25 items with the  $K$  value being set to 10 for the different multi-dimensional ranking models and the different entropy extension picking methods differential entropy 6a, weighted entropy 6b, entropy sum 6c and the max entropy 6d against the standard entropy picking method's results of a standard BCJ single-dimension comparison.


Figure 7 shows the  $\tau$  results for the Wilcoxon rank-sum results on the final  $\tau$  scores for the second dataset. In this comparison, we can see that the weighted ensemble method paired with either of the extended entropy-picking methods outperformed the other ranking methods. The weighted entropy method was only ever beaten by the single-dimension version of the BCJ. Interestingly, regarding the weighted ensemble method and the differential entropy (7a), sum entropy (7c) and weighted sum entropy (7d) was only beaten

by the traditional BCJ approach in  $N = 5$  and  $K = 30$ . We feel that this could be a sign that after a certain point of comparison, the single-dimension version could get to a quicker convergence compared to the multi-dimensional approach or that an element of stochasticness involved in the simulations has just impacted the results of this particular experiment. Either way, we feel that this could be a good point for further analysis in the future.


In figure 7, we can see that the weighted ensemble method Wilcoxon rank-sum results when comparing the extended entropy picking methods against each other, that any other the other methods did not dominate the differential entropy and the sum entropy for the second dataset.

The  $\tau$  results from both datasets (see fig: 3 & 6) show that the weighted ensemble and Monte Carlo sampling performed relatively in line with the standard single-dimensional







**Figure 5:** An illustration of the statistical comparisons of the weighted ensemble method against the other picking methods of differential entropy (5a), max entropy (5b), sum of the entropy (5c) and the weighted sum of the entropy (5d). The results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test show that the weighted ensemble method paired with the differential entropy (5a) was not dominated by any other ranking method.




(a) The  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25$  and  $K = 10$  with the differential entropy picking method.



(b) The  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25$  and  $K = 10$  with the weighted entropy picking method.



(c) The  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25$  and  $K = 10$  with the entropy sum picking method.



(d) The  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25$  and  $K = 10$  with the max entropy picking method.


**Figure 6:** A figure of the  $\tau$  results from  $N = 25, k = 10$  for all the picking methods, comparing the multi-dimensional model's weighted ensemble, Monte Carlo sampling, weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  against the single dimension version of BCJ. The multi-dimensional versions use the entropy-extension methods approach for picking pairs, while the single dimension uses the standard entropy-picking method. The plots show that all methods have performed relevantly well compared to the single-dimension counterpart, but the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  has performed worse than the single-dimension or other ranking methods in these experiments.

version of BCJ, while the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  consistently performed worse compared to the other methods multi-dimensional methods as well as single-dimensional standard BCJ approach.

Overall, we can see that the combination of the differential entropy and the weighted sum did the best across both datasets. While the sum entropy paired with the weighted ensemble method performed well in the second dataset results (see fig: 8), in the first DREsS dataset, the weighted sum paired with the weighted ensemble method was beaten once

by the differential entropy approach. Therefore, we can see that the combination of the differential entropy and weighted ensemble approach has consistently performed well across the two datasets with their different weights assigned to each LO dimension.

An interesting insight that was discovered in our findings was that we found that the SSR scores over all the experiments had the lowest value of 0.272 for  $N = 5, K = 5$ , but yet the  $\tau$  score was 0.1 and the highest value of 0.916 which was for  $N = 25, K = 30$ . However, in some instances where



**Figure 7:** An illustration of the statistical comparison of results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for the undergraduate level 4 dataset of the weighted ensemble method in the first row and the differential entropy (7a), max entropy (7b), sum of the entropy 7c and weighted sum of the entropy 7d pair selector. In the second row, the Monte Carlo method and the differential entropy 7e, max entropy 7f, the sum of the entropy 7g and the weighted sum of the entropy 7h pair selector. In the final row the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  method and the differential entropy 7a, max entropy 7b, sum of the entropy 7c and weighted sum of the entropy 7d pair selector. The plots show the number of times that a combination of a ranking method and a pair selection method has been the best, or equivalent to the best, with the darkest colour representing that it was not beaten by any other method for that configuration, including against the results of BCJ using the standard entropy picking method. The weighted ensemble ranking method for this dataset also shows the best performance out of the 20 distinct experiments.


that  $\tau$  score was 0, only an SSR score of 0.564 was given for  $N = 5$ ,  $K = 5$ , and for  $N = 5$ ,  $K = 30$  SSR score was 0.564 but the  $\tau$  score was 0. Which is below the perceived recommendation of 0.7 or greater, yet the desired target was reached. Additionally, on one occasion, for  $N = 5$ ,  $K = 30$ , the SSR score was 0.564 but the  $\tau$  score was 0.3. The SSR score was 0.564 for 38 of the experiments, and the  $\tau$  score was 0 for 25. For example, when  $N = 5$  and  $K = 10$ , the average SSR score was 0.556 with the highest value of 0.564 and the lowest of 0.472, but yet 28 of the 50 runs produced a  $\tau$  score of 0. When the SSR score was its lowest, the  $\tau$  score was 0.1. When it was at its highest, 0.564, the  $\tau$  score ranged from 0.0 to 0.1. From our findings, it seems to suggest that it was more linked to the amount of comparisons being done, as the more comparisons is done the higher the RSS score would be. This brings to question whether using SSR is a

good metric on which to base the accuracy of the CJ process, which we believe requires more research into this.

### 6.1. Testing Approach for Robustness

Quasi-Monte Carlo and the Halton Sequence is a Monte Carlo method is a technique used in mathematics, physics, and finance for solving problems that involve randomness. It typically relies on generating a large number of random samples to approximate a solution, such as estimating an integral or simulating random processes. However, randomness can lead to inefficiencies due to clustering or uneven coverage of the space.

The Quasi-Monte Carlo (QMC) method improves on this by replacing random sampling with low-discrepancy sequences, which are designed to cover the space more evenly. These sequences minimise gaps and overlaps, leading to



**Figure 8:** An illustration of the statistical comparisons of the weighted ensemble method against the other picking methods of differential entropy (8a), max entropy (8b), sum of the entropy (8c) and the weighted sum of the entropy (8d) for the level 4 undergrad dataset. The results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test show that the weighted ensemble method paired with the differential entropy (8a) and the sum entropy (8c) was not dominated by any other ranking method.

more accurate approximations with fewer samples compared to traditional Monte Carlo methods.

One common type of low-discrepancy sequence is the Halton sequence, introduced by J. H. Halton in 1960 [78]. It is constructed using prime numbers to generate a multi-dimensional sequence that systematically fills the space. Each dimension of the sequence uses a different prime number base to ensure the points are spread out uniformly.

How the Halton Sequence Works is step one: Choose a base, typically a prime number (e.g., 2 for one dimension, 3 for another). Step two: Convert integers into their base representation (e.g., for base 2:  $1 = 1_2, 2 = 10_2, 3 = 11_2$ ). Reflect the digits across the decimal point to form a fraction (e.g.,  $1 \rightarrow 0.5, 2 \rightarrow 0.25, 3 \rightarrow 0.75$ ). Repeat for higher dimensions using different bases. The result is a sequence of points that are well-distributed across the space, reducing the "clumping" effect often seen in random sampling.

The Halton sequence and other QMC methods are widely used in computational simulations, finance, and engineering because they can achieve higher accuracy with fewer samples. However, they are not inherently probabilistic like Monte Carlo, which can limit their application in problems that depend on true randomness.

However, due to the method using more than two dimensions and the sum of all the dimensions weights need to add up to 1, we then applied unit simplex. The unit simplex is a mathematical concept that represents a set of points satisfying two key conditions: all points are non-negative, and their values add up to one. It's a generalisation of shapes like triangles and tetrahedra into higher dimensions, often used in fields such as optimisation, probability, and machine learning [79].

In mathematical terms, the unit simplex in  $n$ -dimensional space, denoted as  $\Delta^n$ , is the set of points  $x = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n + 1$  where  $x_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i = 1$ . This simply means that each coordinate of a point in the simplex is non-negative, and all coordinates together must sum to one [80].

To understand this intuitively, consider simple examples. In one dimension, the unit simplex is just a line segment between 0 and 1. For instance, any point on this segment can be represented by two numbers, such as (0.3, 0.7), where both values are non-negative and add up to one. Moving to


two dimensions, the simplex becomes a triangle. Here, each point inside the triangle is described by three coordinates that are non-negative and sum to one, such as (0.2, 0.5, 0.3). In three dimensions, the simplex extends to a tetrahedron, with points like (0.1, 0.3, 0.4, 0.2) lying within it.

The unit simplex is particularly useful in many applications. For example, it naturally represents probability distributions since probabilities are always non-negative and sum to one [80]. Similarly, it is used in optimisation problems, where variables often need to satisfy these same constraints. In machine learning, the simplex can represent mixing weights, which are used to combine models or features effectively [81].

While the simplex is easy to visualise as a line segment, triangle, or tetrahedron in lower dimensions, its higher-dimensional forms cannot be directly visualised. Nevertheless, the defining rules of non-negativity and summing to one remain the same. These properties make the unit simplex a fundamental concept in constrained optimisation and probabilistic modelling [79].

To test the robustness of these approaches, we applied the random weights to the two datasets sets and updated the target score based on the new weights that were assigned at random using the QMC Halton approach with the applied unit simplex to ensure all weights sum up to 1. Figure 9, shows the results to the applied 50 random weights for the DRES dataset.

We can see that the weighted ensemble ranking method had done consistently well across all the different entropy pair selection methods. The weighted ensemble performs better than the MC and the weighted  $E[r]$  method. However, the weighted ensemble method's  $\tau$  scores were better once in the Wilcoxon rank sum test by the standard BCJ, but the actual range between the standard single dimension BCJ approach and the weighted ensemble method was remarkably close, with points matching the performance of the standard BCJ approach. So, while we can't definitively say that the multi-dimensional version of the weighted ensemble in the robustness test compared to the standard BCJ is better, we can say it performs well in comparison to the BCJ approach as well as providing the additional information from the



**Figure 9:** An illustration of the statistical comparison of results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for the undergraduate level 4 dataset of the weighted ensemble method in the first row and the differential entropy (9a), max entropy (9b), sum of the entropy 7c and weighted sum of the entropy 9d pair selector. In the second row, the Monte Carlo method and the differential entropy 9e, max entropy 9f, the sum of the entropy 7g and the weighted sum of the entropy 9h pair selector. In the final row the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  method and the differential entropy 9a, max entropy 9b, sum of the entropy 9c and the weighted sum of the entropy 9d pair selector. The plots show the number of times that a combination of a ranking method and a pair selection method has been the best, or equivalent to the best, with the darkest colour representing that it was not beaten by any other method for that configuration, including against the results of BCJ using the standard entropy picking method. The weighted ensemble ranking method for this dataset also shows the best performance out of the 20 distinct experiments.

multi-dimensional approach can be per the LOs depending on the required level of detail needed is a viable trade-off.


The results for the undergraduate degree dataset, shown in figure 10, shows a similar picture to the DREsS dataset results. However, these results the weighted sum entropy pair method performed strongly as well. The weighted ensemble method is only beaten by the standard BCJ approach, therefore performing better across the board compared to the MC and  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  versions.

When comparing the weighted ensemble method against the different ranking methods in figure 11, we can see the DREsS dataset's differential, sum and weighted sum entropy (see figs: 11a, 11c, 11d) we can see that they all performed

well against each other and wasn't dominated by one apart from the max entropy (see fig: 11b) this performed significantly worse than the other entropy picking methods. While for the level 4 dataset, the differential entropy pair selector was beaten by one method in  $N = 25, K = 10$  (see fig: 11e) and the sum entropy was beaten twice with  $N = 5, K = 20$  and  $N = 15, k = 10$  (see fig: 11g). On the other hand, the max entropy pair selector method was dominated in both the DREsS and level 4 datasets consistently (see fig: 11b) and 11f), with the DREsS dataset being dominated by all three other methods for the majority of the experiments.

These results show that the weighted ensemble approach to multi-dimensional BCJ has performed well and has only





**Figure 10:** An illustration of the statistical comparison of results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for the undergraduate level 4 dataset of the weighted ensemble method in the first row and the differential entropy (10a), max entropy (10b), sum of the entropy 10c and weighted sum of the entropy 10d pair selector. In the second row, the Monte Carlo method and the differential entropy 10e, max entropy 10f, the sum of the entropy 10g and the weighted sum of the entropy 10h pair selector. In the final row the weighted  $\mathbb{E}[r]$  method and the differential entropy 10a, max entropy 10b, sum of the entropy 7c and weighted sum of the entropy 10d pair selector. The plots show the number of times that a combination of a ranking method and a pair selection method has been the best, or equivalent to the best, with the darkest colour representing that it was not beaten by any other method for that configuration, including against the results of BCJ using the standard entropy picking method. The weighted ensemble ranking method for this dataset also shows the best performance out of the 20 distinct experiments.


been beaten by the standard BCJ approach using entropy on occasion. So, taking into account the randomness involved regarding the pairs being selected and what item is then selected to be the winner there is reason to be positive. However, we do feel that further exploration into this would be a beneficial distribution of the weights and at what point they start to impact the rankings. Still, nonetheless, the results show a promising potential when random weights have been applied.

## 7. Conclusion

Assessment is an important part of education, allowing teachers to verify progress and allow the teacher to provide

feedback to their students. An approach adopted by teachers to aid in assessing is the use of marking rubrics. These enable educators to evaluate students against a core-level descriptor. However, marking using a rubric involves marking in absolute, which has the same flaws of any other type of marking (list here, so why CJ is a good approach). Due to these flaws, this is where CJ can help improve the quality of marking.

Through CJ, several benefits emerge for educational assessment. It allows for a more nuanced and holistic evaluation of student work by comparing pairs of responses, reducing the subjectivity and bias often associated with traditional marking schemes [82]. CJ can efficiently handle complex, open-ended tasks where standardised marking is



**Figure 11:** An illustration of the statistical comparisons of the weighted ensemble method against the other picking methods for the DREsS and BSU dataset of differential entropy (11a, 11e), max entropy (11b, 11f), sum of the entropy (11c, 11g) and the weighted sum of the entropy (11d, 11h). We can see across both datasets that the max entropy picking method performed poorly. Meanwhile, differential, sum and weighted sum entropy performed well for the DREsS dataset and the level 4 ungraderate dataset’s weighted sum. These methods were not dominated in their Wilcoxon rank-sum scores. The differential entropy for the level 4 dataset was beaten once, and the sum entropy was beaten on two separate occasions,  $N = 5, K = 20$  and  $N = 15, K = 10$ .

challenging, providing more reliable and valid assessment outcomes. Additionally, it facilitates rapid and scalable assessment processes, making it a practical tool for large-scale educational settings [83]. However, CJ has its faults, too. For example, CJ expects judges to mark the work, which is highly likely to have a rubric, more holistically, asking the judges which item they think is better [84]. While this approach has its benefits, it does lose a lot of valuable information regarding how well a student might have performed across the different LOs on the rubric being marked against.

Through our novel multi-dimensional BCJ approach, we can provide insights into how well a student has performed across the individual LOs and provide an overall rank. Therefore, if required, we can provide a detailed and holistic overview. By combining the machine learning weighted ensemble approach and the differential entropy pair-picking methods, we can be on par with the performance of the standard, single-dimensional BCJ.

The results indicate variability in SSR scores, with some falling below the recommended threshold of 0.7 but still achieving the desired target rank when the  $K$  multiplier was at 5, but for any other  $K$  multiplier value, the SSR score was above the recommended threshold level, sitting around 0.8. Notably, when  $N = 5$ , the average SSR score was 0.5565, yet over half of the runs yielded a  $\tau$  score of 0, and  $K = 10$ . Therefore, questions about the reliability of SSR as an accuracy metric for the CJ process are raised.

Analysis of the DREsS dataset showed that the weighted ensemble multi-dimensional method and single-dimension BCJ had similar  $\tau$  results, with performance improving as

the  $K$  value increased. The differential entropy method consistently performed well, as demonstrated by Wilcoxon rank-sum comparisons, outperforming other ranking approaches, including the Monte Carlo method. The best-performing combination across both datasets was the differential entropy pair selection with the weighted ensemble method, indicating its potential as a superior ranking strategy. This consistency suggests the differential entropy and weighted ensemble combination is robust and effective for multi-dimensional ranking.

This multi-dimensional approach can potentially enable more effective and personalised feedback to be provided to students based on their LO performance; this concept is a focus of future work and the use of the proposed approaches to the CJ process with educators. In both quantitative and qualitative manners, we will seek to answer what works and what doesn’t and how to scale BCJ to real-world studies with potentially many items while reducing the cognitive load of many assessors.

## 8. Acknowledgements

Andy Gray is funded by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in *Enhancing Human Interactions and Collaborations with Data and Intelligence-Driven Systems* (EP/S021892/1) at Swansea University. Additionally, the project stakeholder is CDSM. We are particularly grateful to their CTO, Darren Wallace. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC-BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) version arising from this

submission. All underlying data to support the conclusions are provided within this paper.

## References

- [1] I. Abbott, P. Huddleston, D. Middlewood, Preparing to teach in secondary schools: a student teacher's guide to professional issues in secondary education, McGraw-Hill Education (UK), 2012.
- [2] G. Cox, J. Morrison, B. Brathwaite, The rubric: An assessment tool to guide students and markers, *Headache* (2015) 26–32doi:10.4995/HEAD15.2015.414.
- [3] B. L. G. Poh, K. Muthoosamy, C. Lai, G. B. Hoe, A marking scheme rubric: To assess students' mathematical knowledge for applied algebra test, *Asian Social Science* 11 (2015) 18. doi:10.5539/ASS.11124P18.
- [4] K. Ragupathi, A. Lee, Beyond fairness and consistency in grading: The role of rubrics in higher education, *Diversity and inclusion in global higher education: Lessons from across Asia* (2020) 73–95.
- [5] T. Ahoniemi, V. Karavirta, Analyzing the use of a rubric-based grading tool, *Proceedings of the 14th annual ACM SIGCSE conference on Innovation and technology in computer science education* (2009). doi:10.1145/1562877.1562977.
- [6] S. E. Boudamoussi, Using criteria-based assessment rubrics for on-line marking: Technological and pedagogical challenges, *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice* (2022). doi:10.33423/jhetp.v22i8.5316.
- [7] S. Brookhart, F. Chen, The quality and effectiveness of descriptive rubrics, *Educational Review* 67 (2015) 343 – 368. doi:10.1080/00131911.2014.929565.
- [8] A. Gray, A. A. Rahat, T. Crick, S. Lindsay, D. Wallace, Using Elo rating as a metric for comparative judgement in educational assessment, in: *Proceedings of 6th International Conference on Education and Multimedia Technology (ICEMT 2022)*, 2022, pp. 272–278. doi:10.1145/3551708.3556204.
- [9] A. Pollitt, Comparative judgement for assessment, *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 22 (2) (2012) 157–170. doi:10.1007/s10798-011-9189-x.
- [10] A. Pollitt, The method of adaptive comparative judgement, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 19 (3) (2012) 281–300.
- [11] I. Jones, B. Davies, Comparative judgement in education research, *International Journal of Research & Method in Education* (2022). doi:10.1080/1743727X.2023.2242273.
- [12] T. Bramley, A rank-ordering method for equating tests by expert judgement (2005).
- [13] A. Gray, A. Rahat, T. Crick, S. Lindsay, A bayesian active learning approach to comparative judgement within education assessment, *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* (2024) 100245doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100245.  
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X24000481>
- [14] K. T. Kelly, M. Richardson, T. Isaacs, Critiquing the rationales for using comparative judgement: a call for clarity, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 29 (6) (2022) 674–688.
- [15] R. A. Bradley, M. E. Terry, Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: The method of paired comparisons, *Biometrika* 39 (3–4) (1952) 324–345. doi:10.1093/biomet/39.3-4.324.
- [16] L. L. Thurstone, A law of comparative judgment, *Psychological Review* 34 (4) (1927) 273–286. doi:10.1037/h0070288.
- [17] J. Wainer, A bayesian bradley-terry model to compare multiple ml algorithms on multiple data sets, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24 (341) (2023) 1–34.  
URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/22-0907.html>
- [18] J. Wellington, *Secondary education: The key concepts*, Routledge, 2007.
- [19] J. Yeomans, C. Arnold, *Teaching, Learning and psychology*, Routledge, 2013.
- [20] J. M. Olson, R. Krysiak, Rubrics as tools for effective assessment of student learning and program quality, in: *Curriculum Development and Online Instruction for the 21st Century*, IGI Global, 2021, pp. 173–200.
- [21] G. Cox, J. Morrison, B. Brathwaite, The rubric: an assessment tool to guide students and markers, in: *1ST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION ADVANCES (HEAD'15)*, Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València, 2015, pp. 26–32.
- [22] K. Sambell, S. Brown, P. Race, Assessment to support student learning: eight challenges for 21st century practice, *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (AISHE-J) Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 11* (2) (2019).
- [23] A. Jonsson, G. Svingby, The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity, and educational consequences, *Educational Research Review* 2 (2007) 130–144. doi:10.1016/J.EDUREV.2007.05.002.
- [24] A. Cockett, C. Jackson, The use of assessment rubrics to enhance feedback in higher education: An integrative literature review., *Nurse education today* 69 (2018) 8–13. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2018.06.022.
- [25] Y. M. Reddy, H. Andrade, A review of rubric use in higher education, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 35 (2010) 435 – 448. doi:10.1080/02602930902862859.
- [26] E. Panadero, A. Jonsson, A critical review of the arguments against the use of rubrics, *Educational Research Review* 30 (2020) 100329. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100329.
- [27] R. Smit, P. Bachmann, V. Blum, T. Birri, K. Hess, Effects of a rubric for mathematical reasoning on teaching and learning in primary school, *Instructional Science* 45 (2017) 603–622. doi:10.1007/S11251-017-9416-2.
- [28] C. Hack, Analytical rubrics in higher education: A repository of empirical data, *British Journal of Educational Technology* 46 (5) (2015) 924–927.
- [29] O. Chen, F. Paas, J. Sweller, A Cognitive Load Theory Approach to Defining and Measuring Task Complexity Through Element Interactivity, *Educational Psychology Review* 35 (63) (2023). doi:10.1007/s10648-023-09782-w.
- [30] D. R. Sadler, Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems, *Instructional Science* 18 (1989) 119–144. doi:10.1007/BF00117714.
- [31] T. Bramley, Paired comparison methods, in: *Techniques for monitoring the comparability of examination standards*, 2007, pp. 246–300.
- [32] T. Benton, T. Gallagher, Is comparative judgement just a quick form of multiple marking, *Research Matters: A Cambridge Assessment Publication* 26 (2018) 22–28.
- [33] S. R. Bartholomew, G. J. Strimel, E. Yoshikawa, Using adaptive comparative judgment for student formative feedback and learning during a middle school design project, *International Journal of Technology and Design Education* 29 (2) (2019) 363–385. doi:10.1007/s10798-018-9442-7.
- [34] D. Christodoulou, *Making Good Progress?: The future of Assessment for Learning*, Oxford University Press, 2017.
- [35] A. Pollitt, N. L. Murray, What raters really pay attention to, *Studies in Language Testing* 3 (1996) 74–91.
- [36] A. Pollitt, Let's stop marking exams, in: *IAEA Conference, 2004*, University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate.
- [37] R. D. Luce, *Individual choice behavior* (1959).
- [38] D. Andrich, A rating formulation for ordered response categories, *Psychometrika* 43 (4) (1978) 561–573. doi:10.1007/BF02293814.
- [39] S. Verhavert, S. De Maeyer, V. Donche, L. Coertjens, Scale Separation Reliability: What Does It Mean in the Context of Comparative Judgment?, *Applied Psychological Measurement* 42 (6) (2018) 428–445. doi:10.1177/0146621617748321.
- [40] J. T. Steedle, S. Ferrara, Evaluating Comparative Judgment as an Approach to Essay Scoring, *Applied Measurement in Education* 29 (3) (2016) 211–223. doi:10.1080/08957347.2016.1171769.
- [41] D. E. Hinkle, W. Wiersma, S. G. Jurs, *Applied Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences*, 6th Edition, Houghton Mifflin, 2002.
- [42] J. A. McGrane, S. M. Humphry, S. Heldsinger, Applying a thurstonian, two-stage method in the standardized assessment of writing, *Applied Measurement in Education* 31 (4) (2018) 297–311.

- [43] S. Holmes, B. Black, C. Morin, Marking reliability studies 2017: Rank ordering versus marking – which is more reliable?, Tech. rep., Ofqual (January 2020).
- [44] J. Bergstra, Y. Bengio, Random search for hyper-parameter optimization, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13 (2) (2012) 281–305.
- [45] M.-J. Bisson, C. Gilmore, M. Inglis, I. Jones, Measuring Conceptual Understanding Using Comparative Judgement, *International Journal of Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education* 2 (2) (2016) 141–164. doi:10.1007/s40753-016-0024-3.
- [46] N. Marshall, K. Shaw, J. Hunter, I. Jones, Assessment by comparative judgement: An application to secondary statistics and English in New Zealand, *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 55 (2020) 49–71. doi:10.1007/s40841-020-00163-3.
- [47] D. R. Hunter, MM algorithms for generalized Bradley-Terry models, *Annals of Statistics* 32 (1) (2004) 384–406. doi:10.1214/aos/1079120141.
- [48] W. Kurt, Bayesian statistics the fun way: understanding statistics and probability with Star Wars, Lego, and Rubber Ducks, No Starch Press, 2019.
- [49] M. E. Tipping, Bayesian inference: An introduction to principles and practice in machine learning, in: Summer School on Machine Learning, Springer, 2003, pp. 41–62.
- [50] A. B. Downey, Think Bayes, O'Reilly Media, 2021.
- [51] S. Theodoridis, Machine learning: a Bayesian and optimization perspective, Academic press, 2015.
- [52] S. Shen, B. Pan, T. Shi, T. Li, Z. Shi, Bayesian domain invariant learning via posterior generalization of parameter distributions, *ArXiv abs/2310.16277* (2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2310.16277.
- [53] L. Hasenclever, S. Webb, T. Lienart, S. Vollmer, B. Lakshminarayanan, C. Blundell, Y. Teh, Distributed bayesian learning with stochastic natural gradient expectation propagation and the posterior server, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 18 (2015) 106:1–106:37.
- [54] O. A. Martin, R. Kumar, J. Lao, Bayesian Modeling and Computation in Python, 2021.
- [55] K. Tsukida, M. R. Gupta, How to analyze paired comparison data, Tech. Rep. UWEETR-2011-0004, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington (2011).
- [56] S. De Maeyer, Bayesian analysis of comparative judgement data, <https://svendemaeyer.netlify.app/posts/2021-01-18-bayesian-analysis-of-comparative-judgement-data/> (January 2021).
- [57] G. Grimmett, D. Stirzaker, Probability and random processes, Oxford university press, 2020.
- [58] R. V. Hogg, J. W. McKean, A. T. Craig, et al., Introduction to mathematical statistics, Pearson Education India, 2013.
- [59] T. Chugh, Scalarizing functions in bayesian multiobjective optimization, in: 2020 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC), IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [60] H. Ishibuchi, Y. Sakane, N. Tsukamoto, Y. Nojima, Simultaneous use of different scalarizing functions in moea/d, in: Proceedings of the 12th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation, 2010, pp. 519–526.
- [61] H. Ishibuchi, K. Doi, Y. Nojima, Use of piecewise linear and nonlinear scalarizing functions in moea/d, in: Parallel Problem Solving from Nature-PPSN XIV: 14th International Conference, Edinburgh, UK, September 17-21, 2016, Proceedings 14, Springer, 2016, pp. 503–513.
- [62] C. P. Robert, G. Casella, G. Casella, Monte Carlo statistical methods, Vol. 2, Springer, 1999.
- [63] S. Brooks, A. Gelman, G. Jones, X.-L. Meng, Handbook of markov chain monte carlo, CRC press, 2011.
- [64] D. M. Blei, A. Kucukelbir, J. D. McAuliffe, Variational inference: A review for statisticians, *Journal of the American statistical Association* 112 (518) (2017) 859–877.
- [65] R. M. Neal, Mcmc using hamiltonian dynamics, arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.1901 (2012).
- [66] X. Dong, Z. Yu, W. Cao, Y. Shi, Q. Ma, A survey on ensemble learning, *Frontiers of Computer Science* 14 (2019) 241 – 258. doi:10.1007/s11704-019-8208-z.
- [67] M. A. Shehab, N. Kahraman, A weighted voting ensemble of efficient regularized extreme learning machine, *Comput. Electr. Eng.* 85 (2020) 106639. doi:10.1016/j.compeleceng.2020.106639.
- [68] S. Mao, W. Lin, L. Jiao, S. Gou, J. Chen, End-to-end ensemble learning by exploiting the correlation between individuals and weights, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 51 (2021) 2835–2846. doi:10.1109/TCYB.2019.2931071.
- [69] O. Sagi, L. Rokach, Ensemble learning: A survey, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* 8 (2018). doi:10.1002/widm.1249.
- [70] I. D. Mienye, Y. Sun, A survey of ensemble learning: Concepts, algorithms, applications, and prospects, *IEEE Access* 10 (2022) 99129–99149. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3207287.
- [71] M. Abramowitz, I. a. Stegun (editors), handbook of mathematical functions, Applied Mathematics Series (1972).
- [72] T. M. Cover, Elements of information theory, John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [73] S. Kotz, N. Balakrishnan, N. L. Johnson, Continuous multivariate distributions, Volume 1: Models and applications, Vol. 334, John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- [74] H. Yoo, J. Han, S.-Y. Ahn, A. Oh, Dress: Dataset for rubric-based essay scoring on efl writing, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16733 (2024).
- [75] M. G. Kendall, A new measure of rank correlation, *Biometrika* 30 (1-2) (1938) 81–93. doi:10.1093/biomet/30.1-2.81.
- [76] R. Fagin, R. Kumar, D. Sivakumar, Comparing Top k Lists, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 17 (1) (2003) 134–160. doi:10.1137/S0895480102412856.
- [77] T. W. MacFarland, J. M. Yates, et al., Introduction to nonparametric statistics for the biological sciences using R, Springer, 2016.
- [78] J. H. Halton, On the efficiency of certain quasi-random sequences of points in evaluating multi-dimensional integrals, *Numerische Mathematik* 2 (1960) 84–90.
- [79] S. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004, see Chapter 4 for constrained optimisation problems, including the simplex. URL <https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/cvxbook/>
- [80] T. Hastie, The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction (2009).
- [81] J. H. Friedman, J. W. Tukey, A projection pursuit algorithm for exploratory data analysis, *IEEE Transactions on computers* 100 (9) (1974) 881–890.
- [82] P. Tarricone, C. Newhouse, Using comparative judgement and online technologies in the assessment and measurement of creative performance and capability, *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 13 (2016) 1–11. doi:10.1186/s41239-016-0018-x.
- [83] I. Jones, M. Inglis, The problem of assessing problem solving: can comparative judgement help?, *Educational Studies in Mathematics* 89 (2015) 337–355. doi:10.1007/s10649-015-9607-1.
- [84] L. Coertjens, M. Lesterhuis, B. D. D. Winter, M. Goossens, S. de Maeyer, N. Michels, Improving self-reflection assessment practices: Comparative judgment as an alternative to rubrics, *Teaching and Learning in Medicine* 33 (2021) 525 – 535. doi:10.1080/10401334.2021.1877709.