

Introduction

- Differential Step Functioning (DSF) examines between-group differences in measurement properties at each step of a polytomous response item.
- Advantages for using DSF over omnibus measures of Differential Item Functioning (DIF) include:
 - DSF tests can be more powerful than omnibus measures when the sign and/or magnitude of the DSF effect varies across steps
 - DSF allows analysts to find and isolate the precise step responsible for an observed DSF effect

Interpreting DSF Magnitude

Measures of DSF using the cumulative log-odds ratio approach ($\hat{\lambda}_j$) and logistic regression ($\hat{\beta}_2$) can be interpreted using the following classification scheme:

- Small DSF effects correspond to DSF measures less than 0.43.
- Medium DSF effects correspond to DSF measures between 0.43 and 0.64.
- Large DSF effects correspond to DSF measures greater than 0.64.

DSF Taxonomy

	Pervasive	Non-Pervasive
Constant	All steps display a DSF effect equal in magnitude and sign	Only one or a few steps display a DSF effect equal in magnitude and sign across affected steps
Convergent	All steps display a DSF effects having the same sign, but different magnitudes	Only a few steps display a DSF effects having the same sign, but different magnitudes
Divergent	All steps display a DSF effect, but the signs vary across steps	Only a few steps display a DSF effect and the signs vary across steps

Summary of Results

- Both the cumulative log-odds ratio and logistic regression obtained very similar results.
- Of the 30 items, 12 demonstrated evidence of DSF.
- There were 6 items that demonstrated non-pervasive DSF where only one step was affected, thus indicating a step-level effect.
- There are 5 items that demonstrated pervasive DSF where all or most steps evidenced a DSF effect in the same direction, thus indicating an item-level effect.
- There was 1 item that demonstrated divergent DSF, where one step was found to favor one group, while another step was found to favor the other group.

Objectives

This study aims to:

- Compare and contrast the logistic regression and cumulative log-odds ratio approaches for measuring DSF
- Apply these approaches to real achievement data
- Identify/interpret existing DSF effects

Methods

- Logistic regression and cumulative log-odds ratio approaches for measuring DSF were applied to 30 polytomous math items of the School Achievement Indicators Program (SAIP), a nationally administered Canadian achievement test.
- Of the 7,519 participants, 4,652 (61.9%) were administered the English version of the SAIP and 2,867 (35.1%) were administered the French version.

Results

Affected steps, DSF measures, magnitude, and direction

Item/Step	$\hat{\lambda}_j$ (SE)	$\hat{\beta}_2$	Magnitude of DSF Effect	Direction of DSF Effect
Item 5 Step 3	0.421(0.169)	0.463	Small to medium	+
Item 6 Step 2	0.735(0.138)	0.701	Large	+
Item 6 Step 4	1.252(0.503)	0.911	Large	+
Item 7 Step 2	0.522(0.069)	0.525	Medium	+
Item 7 Step 4	1.905(0.506)	1.264	Large	+
Item 10 Step 1	-0.426(0.221)	-0.451	Small to medium	-
Item 11 Step 2	0.572(0.055)	0.576	Medium	+
Item 12 Step 4	0.481(0.140)	0.450	Medium	+
Item 13 Step 4	0.694(0.125)	0.675	Large	+
Item 14 Step 4	0.490(0.061)	0.486	Medium	+
Item 15 Step 1	0.769(0.705)	0.718	Large	+
Item 15 Step 2	1.023(0.590)	1.071	Large	+
Item 15 Step 3	0.897(0.425)	0.877	Large	+
Item 16 Step 1	-1.123(0.055)	1.119	Large	-
Item 16 Step 4	1.315(0.280)	1.250	Large	+
Item 26 Step 1	-0.460(0.066)	-0.453	Medium	-
Item 26 Step 2	-0.452(0.066)	-0.446	Medium	-
Item 26 Step 3	-0.586(0.068)	-0.578	Medium	-
Item 30 Step 1	1.306(0.234)	1.311	Large	+
Item 30 Step 2	1.168(0.169)	1.175	Large	+
Item 30 Step 3	0.849(0.141)	0.866	Large	+

Summary of affected items and interpretation

Item	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	DSF form	Interpretation
5	No DSF	No DSF	M+	No DSF	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
6	L+	L+	-	-	Constant pervasive	Item-level effect
7	M+	L+	-	-	Constant pervasive	Item-level effect
10	M-	No DSF	No DSF	No DSF	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
11	M+	No DSF	-	-	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
12	No DSF	No DSF	No DSF	M+	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
13	No DSF	No DSF	No DSF	L+	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
14	No DSF	No DSF	No DSF	M+	Non-pervasive	Step-level effect
15	L+	L+	L+	No DSF	Constant pervasive	Item-level effect
16	L+	No DSF	No DSF	L+	Divergent	Step-level effects
26	M-	M-	M-	No DSF	Constant pervasive	Item-level effect
30	L+	L+	L+	No DSF	Constant Pervasive	Item-level effect

- M- represents a medium negative DSF effect
- M+ represents a medium positive DSF effect
- L- represents a large negative DSF effect
- L+ represents a large positive DSF effect

Implications

- Implementing a DSF approach for polytomous items rather than using an omnibus measure of DIF can provide additional useful information.
- Distinctive patterns of DSF observed among various items can lead to a better interpretation of the causes of DIF.
- Using a DSF approach with polytomous items is a promising way to help improve the validity of educational and psychological test scores.

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant DED-R305C050052 to University of Miami. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the U.S. Department of Education.