

A new Comparative Judgement (CJ) approach: Exploring the potential of criteria-based CJ

Conference Abstract

Nicky Rushton

Victoria Crisp

AEA-Europe conference, 6–9 November 2024

Author contact details:

Nicky Rushton & Victoria Crisp
Assessment Research and Development,
Research Division
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA
UK

nicky.rushton@cambridge.org
vicki.crisp@cambridge.org
<https://www.cambridge.org/>

As a department of the university, Cambridge University Press & Assessment is respected and trusted worldwide, managing three world-class examination boards, and maintaining the highest standards in educational assessment and learning. We are a not-for-profit organisation.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment is committed to making our documents accessible in accordance with the WCAG 2.1 Standard. We're always looking to improve the accessibility of our documents. If you find any problems or you think we're not meeting accessibility requirements, contact our team: [Research Division](#)
If you need this document in a different format [contact us](#) telling us your name, email address and requirements and we will respond within 15 working days.

How to cite this publication:

Rushton, N., & Crisp, V. (2024, November 6–9). *A new Comparative Judgement (CJ) approach: Exploring the potential of criteria-based CJ*. [Paper presentation]. Annual conference of the Association for Educational Assessment – Europe (AEA-Europe), Paphos, Cyprus.

Abstract

Previous comparative judgement (CJ) studies show that some judges find making judgements difficult and lack confidence in their decisions. The lack of transparency regarding the criteria that judges use may also be a concern. Some studies have provided reference documents such as importance statements to support judgements; however, judges still differed in the criteria used. The current research explored whether asking judges to make separate comparative judgements for several broad criteria better supports judgements.

Ten assessors completed a holistic exercise where they judged which exam script in each of a series of pairs showed better overall performance, and a criteria-based exercise where they judged which script in each pair was better with regard to each Assessment Objective (AO). The order of the exercises was counterbalanced. Assessors completed a workload questionnaire and an experience questionnaire after each exercise, and a final experience questionnaire.

Results suggest that criteria-based CJ is a plausible alternative CJ approach. Script ranks correlated strongly with those from holistic CJ and the approach provides greater reassurance that key constructs inform judgements, with some evidence of more script features being considered. However, criteria-based CJ did not strongly improve perceived ease of making judgements.