

Examining Differential Item Functioning (DIF) in Self-Reported Health Survey Data: Via Multilevel Modeling

Dandan Chen Kaptur^{1*}, Yiqing Liu², Bradley Kaptur³, Nicholas Peterman⁴,
Jinming Zhang⁵, Justin Kern⁵, Carolyn Anderson⁵

^{1*}Pearson. ORCID: 0000-0002-4020-3422.

²Stanford University.

³HSHS Saint John's Hospital. ORCID: 0000-0003-4142-0231.

⁴Carle Illinois College of Medicine.

⁵University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): danielle.chen@pearson.com;

Abstract

Few health-related constructs or measures have received critical evaluation in terms of measurement equivalence, such as self-reported health survey data. Differential item functioning (DIF) analysis is crucial for evaluating measurement equivalence in self-reported health surveys, which are often hierarchical in structure. While traditional DIF methods rely on single-level models, multilevel models offer a more suitable alternative for analyzing such data. In this article, we highlight the advantages of multilevel modeling in DIF analysis and demonstrate how to apply the DIF framework to self-reported health survey data using multilevel models. For demonstration, we analyze DIF associated with population density on the probability to answer “Yes” to a survey question on depression and reveal that multilevel models achieve better fit and account for more variance compared to single-level models. This article is expected to increase awareness of the usefulness of multilevel modeling for DIF analysis and assist healthcare researchers and practitioners in improving the understanding of self-reported health survey data validity.

Keywords: differential item functioning, measurement equivalence, multilevel modeling, health disparity, population density, depression

1 Introduction

To examine the disproportionate impact of health interventions or other determinants on health outcomes for certain populations, including disadvantaged minorities, it is crucial to establish measurement equivalence when evaluating outcomes for different demographic groups. However, few health constructs or measures have undergone critical evaluation in this regard [1], despite the

routine practice of validating psychometric instruments in research. Recently, more health studies have employed differential item functioning (DIF) analysis to examine measurement equivalence and the differential impact of groups differing in gender and ethnicity [e.g., 2–6]. DIF analysis assesses whether there is a systematic difference in the probability of obtaining a targeted response between groups while controlling for a latent trait [7]. That said, some health studies did

not clearly describe the method used for DIF analysis [e.g., 3], and conventional DIF methods based on single-level models were frequently used to analyze health survey data with a nesting structure [e.g., 2], for which recent DIF methods based on multilevel models are better alternatives in terms of accuracy of DIF estimation.

2 Challenge: Examine DIF in self-reported health survey data

Self-reported health survey data encapsulate rich information about physical, mental, and social health trends of the studied population [e.g., 8, 9]. However, its inherent subjectivity makes it susceptible to geographical, cultural, and socioeconomic biases, which can threaten the validity of the data and pose challenges in getting to know the truth [e.g., 10]. The utilization of self-reported health survey data in public health research and interventions necessitates a rigorous examination of the validity of this data. It underscores the importance of adopting appropriate methods that can navigate the complexities associated with self-reported health data and improve the accuracy of our findings.

Existing research has shown that bias can manifest itself as construct bias, method bias, and item bias [e.g., 11, 12]. The framework of differential item functioning [DIF; 13] underpins many modern methods to investigate item bias, specifically. In the psychometric literature, DIF analysis examines whether there is a systematic between-group difference in examinees' probability to answer an item correctly while controlling for their ability [7]. While DIF is not equivalent to item bias, the former informs judgment on the latter when its presence is attributed to unintended content in the studied item [14, 15].

To examine systematic between-group differences in self-reported health survey data, we can apply existing DIF methods by generalizing the DIF concept with the following modifications:

1. focusing on the response of interest instead of a "correct" response,
2. describing the subjects who provide responses as "respondents" instead of "examinees,"

3. using a latent trait variable instead of "ability," selecting one closely related to the probability of obtaining the response of interest (similar to how "ability" relates to the probability of a correct response in the conventional DIF framework).

Some existing DIF methods examine both uniform and nonuniform DIF while many others do not. *Uniform DIF* occurs when respondents from one group consistently outperform respondents of the same latent trait from another group; *nonuniform DIF* exists when this performance difference is not consistent [16].

Most DIF methods currently used in health research, as well as in the broader DIF literature, are based on single-level modeling [e.g., 2]. They are not best suited for self-reported health survey data that has a nesting or hierarchical structure (e.g., individual responses are nested within larger units differentiated by population density, economy, and culture). These single-level DIF methods include the Mantel-Haenszel procedure [MH; 17], the logistic regression procedure [LR; 18], Lord's Wald test [19], and the IRT likelihood-ratio test [IRT-LR; 20]. The first two do not require the IRT model and are labeled with "the observed-score approach," whereas the latter two require the IRT model and are categorized as "the IRT approach" [21, 22]. An extensive review of these methods can be found in Chen [23].

Single-level modeling approaches have at least three problems when the response data has a hierarchical structure. First, they waste information and render inaccurate estimates because of the lack of consideration of variances between hierarchies of the data [24]. Second, they do not help model the effect of higher-level variables associated with DIF on the outcome variable at the lower level [25]. Third, their model estimates are limited to describing the sample and are not generalizable to describe the population [26]. Moreover, the single-level modeling for DIF analysis is limited to the analysis of two groups at a time, not suitable for DIF analyses involving more than two groups [23].

3 Solution: Multilevel modeling for DIF analysis

For the self-reported health survey data that is hierarchical in nature, multilevel modeling has been demonstrated to be a superior alternative to single-level modeling. It effectively addresses issues that arise in differential item functioning (DIF) methods built on single-level models. First, multilevel modeling is advantageous when fundamental assumptions in single-level modeling such as independence and homoscedasticity are violated, as is often the case with hierarchical data [24]. In this regard, multilevel modeling can account for correlated errors resulting from the dependency of individual observations within a nested structure, and it does not require the same sample size or variance for higher-level units due to its randomization approach [27].

Second, multilevel modeling allows for the assessment of higher-level variables' impact on DIF [25]. For instance, it can evaluate how cluster-level factors, like access to healthcare facilities, influence individual responses in health surveys, and identify whether these cluster characteristics contribute to DIF observed between population groups at the lower level of the model. Third, results from multilevel modeling are generalizable to the population because it incorporates random effects from higher-level clusters [26]. This ensures that conclusions about DIF in self-reported response data are applicable to a broader range of regions. Fourth, multilevel modeling accommodates multi-group analyses by using multiple dummy-coded variables to cover more than two groups [28]. For instance, it can include multiple age groups in health data, allowing researchers to analyze and compare health outcomes across various age categories while accounting for cluster-specific random effects.

The first published work on DIF using multilevel modeling was by Swanson et al. [28], who adopted a multilevel logistic regression model. This approach significantly improved the accuracy of DIF estimates and pooled information across items to explain sources of DIF, when including random item effects. Subsequently, den Noortgate and de Boeck [29] proposed a series of multilevel models for DIF analysis, grounded in the Rasch model within item response theory (IRT). These

models demonstrated the potential to integrate random effects associated with respondents, items, or other factors, along with item- or group-related covariates, to explain DIF. French and Finch [30] proposed a multilevel MH statistic that adjusts the traditional MH statistic using a ratio of random variances from the multilevel model from Swanson et al. [28]. Huang and Valdivia [31] introduced a multilevel Wald test for polytomous items based on Lord's Wald χ^2 test and a two-stage procedure about first identifying anchor items and then evaluating DIF items for non-anchor items.

In the following sections, we focus on the multilevel logistic regression procedure from Swanson et al. [28] because of its versatility. Compared to the models from den Noortgate and de Boeck [29] and from Huang and Valdivia [31], the multilevel logistic regression procedure does not require IRT or its stringent assumptions, such as local independence of item responses and monotonicity of the probability of the targeted response [32]. Meanwhile, to enhance the utility of the multilevel model in Swanson et al. [28], we have adapted it into a more general version that permits the inclusion of various types of random effects. For clarity, we also cover its single-level counterpart, the logistic regression procedure [18], to help readers understand how the multilevel logistic regression evolved from its origins in single-level modeling. Hereafter, we refer to the multilevel logistic regression procedure as "multilevel LR" and the logistic regression procedure as "traditional LR." Also, we use the word "group" when referring to the group membership variable for group comparisons in DIF analysis, and the word "cluster" when referring to units of analyses across levels in the hierarchical data structure in multilevel modeling.

3.1 Multilevel LR

The multilevel LR [28] was initially designed to include random effects associated with items, accounting for variations among items and offering more accurate DIF estimates compared to the traditional LR [18]. We have modified its notation to allow the incorporation of random effects from higher-level clusters in hierarchical data (e.g., access to healthcare, geographical locations, age groups, education levels). In this modified version, the level-1 submodel pertains to responses to a studied item from individual respondents (indexed

by p) within a level-2 stratum (indexed by i), similar to the binary logistic regression model used in traditional LR but without an interaction term. This level-1 submodel is expressed as

$$\text{logit}(\pi_{pi}) = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}\theta_p + \beta_{2i}g_p, \quad (1)$$

where

π_{pi} is the probability for respondent p to provide the targeted response to the studied item (i.e., the “probability targeted”);

β_{0i} denotes the log-odds of the “probability targeted” in the reference group;

β_{1i} is the effect of respondents’ latent trait on the log-odds of the “probability targeted” in the reference group;

β_{2i} is the effect of respondents being in the reference group on the log-odds of the “probability targeted;”

θ_p is the latent trait of respondent p (e.g., it could be proxied by a continuous variable concerning the respondent’s overall health status);

g_p is a dummy variable representing the group membership of respondent p ($g_p = 0$ for the reference group, $g_p = 1$ for each focal group).

The level-2 submodel in the multilevel LR accounts for random effects associated with higher-level clusters, written as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0i} &= \delta_{00} + U_{0i}, \\ \beta_{1i} &= \delta_{10} + U_{1i}, \\ \beta_{2i} &= \delta_{20} + \delta_{21}v_1 + \delta_{22}v_2 + \cdots + \delta_{2V}v_V + U_{2i}, \end{aligned}$$

where

δ_{00} is the average log-odds of the “probability targeted;”

δ_{10} is the average effect associated with respondents’ latent trait;

δ_{20} is the average effect associated with being in the focal group;

$\delta_{21}, \delta_{22}, \dots, \delta_{2V}$ denote the effect of covariates v_1, v_2, \dots, v_V (either continuous or dummy-coded) that are associated with level-2 clusters; they are useful to explain why DIF occurs, but can be omitted if no level-2 covariate is investigated here;

U_{0i} is the random effect associated with level-2 clusters on the intercept β_{0i} ;

U_{1i} and U_{2i} denote the random effect associated with level-2 clusters on the slopes β_{1i} and β_{2i} , respectively;

U_{0i}, U_{1i} , and U_{2i} follow a multivariate normal distribution with the mean being 0.

Using this multilevel LR, we can conclude that the studied item exhibits DIF if β_{2i} is significantly different from 0.

3.2 Traditional LR

In the traditional LR proposed by Swaminathan and Rogers [18], the binary logistic regression model used for DIF analysis specifies the effect of respondents’ latent trait and group membership on the log-odds of the probability of the targeted response to a studied item. In Swaminathan and Rogers [18], the authors first rewrote the DIF model inherent in the widely used Mantel-Haenszel procedure using binary logistic regression:

$$\text{logit}(\pi) = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k \theta_k + \tau g, \quad (2)$$

where

π is the probability to provide the targeted response to the studied item;

β_0 denotes the average log-odds of the “probability targeted” in the reference group;

θ_k is the k th total score (in discrete units) in a fixed-item instrument for respondents;

τ is equivalent to the common odds ratio in the Mantel-Haenszel procedure;

g is the group membership ($g = 0$ for the reference group, $g = 1$ for the focal group) of respondents.

Inspired by Mellenbergh [16], Swaminathan and Rogers [18] revised (2) by specifying separate terms for uniform and nonuniform DIF, written as

$$\text{logit}(\pi) = \beta_0 + \beta_1\theta + \beta_2g + \beta_3(\theta g), \quad (3)$$

where

θ denotes respondents’ latent trait (proxied by the examinee’s total score);

β_1 is the effect of respondents’ latent trait on the log-odds of the “probability targeted” in the reference group;

β_2 is the effect of respondents being in the reference group on the log-odds of the “probability targeted;”

β_3 is the ability-moderated group difference in the effect on the log-odds of the “probability targeted;”

g is respondents’ group membership ($g = 0$ for the reference group, $g = 1$ for the focal group).

Using the traditional LR specified in (3), we can conclude that the studied item exhibits nonuniform DIF if β_3 is significantly different from 0, and it exhibits uniform DIF if β_3 is not significantly different from 0 whereas β_2 is.

The traditional LR was established for analyzing two groups at a time. While a common practice in psychometrics is to perform pairwise comparisons using the traditional LR [e.g., 33], this approach can be computationally intensive and lead to increased Type-I error rates and reduced power [34, 35]. In contrast, the multilevel LR allows for multi-group analyses by employing multiple dummy variables to represent more than two groups [28], while controlling for cluster-specific random effects to ensure accuracy and generalizability.

4 Example: Analysis of population-density DIF in NSDUH data

To show the impact of multilevel modeling on DIF results, below we describe our DIF analyses when using both the multilevel LR and the traditional LR for comparison. The NSDUH data released in 2022 was utilized in these analyses. It provides comprehensive information on substance use and mental health trends among the U.S. population aged 12 and older. We are interested in examining DIF associated with population density because existing research has demonstrated that population density can affect the quality of life, health perceptions, and reported behaviors [36–39]. In our multilevel analysis, we utilize a two-level model in which the level-2 clusters are defined by respondents’ education levels, as existing research has unveiled that an additional year of education could reduce the likelihood of reporting depression and anxiety [40].

Specifically, we want to examine whether DIF exists for respondents from high and low population density areas in the probability to answer “Yes” to a selected NSDUH item. This item asks

respondents the following question: “Have you ever in your life had a period of time lasting several days or longer when most of the day you felt sad, empty or depressed?” The latent trait variable to be controlled for is a score assigned to respondents that reflects respondents’ psychological distress level over the past 30 days, based on their responses to another six questions. The reference group is the respondents from areas with low population density, and the focal group is the respondents from areas with high population density. The variable describing respondents’ education level is utilized for accounting for variations between the higher-level clusters. We acknowledge the potential for DIF in this latent trait variable originally derived from six survey items, but we do not examine DIF for this variable to focus on demonstrating the application of the multilevel LR rather than conducting a comprehensive DIF analysis across all measures.

4.1 Data preparation

The original NSDUH data file contains 2,605 variables and 59,069 respondents, composed by 27,047 males and 32,022 females aged 12 and older. We keep the following four variables for DIF analysis:

1. The item response variable (named “ADDPREV” in the survey). It contains the following responses to the selected survey item. It is recoded to have 1 for the response “Yes” and 0 for “No.”
2. The group membership variable (named “PDEN10”). It indicates the population density of the area where respondents are residing. It is recoded to have 1 for “high-density” (i.e., with one million or more people) and 0 for “low-density” (i.e., with fewer than one million people), based on Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) classifications. These areas are also known as “large metropolitan” and “small metropolitan” areas [41].
3. The latent trait variable (named “KSSLR6MON”). It is a score that describes respondents’ distress, ranging from 0 to 24. This score is closely associated with the probability of obtaining the response of interest in the item response variable.
4. The level-2 variable (named “IRE-DUHIGHST2”). It describes respondents’

Table 1 Sample size for each data cluster.

Level-2 clusters	Group		Response		
	Edu. level	Low-density	High-density	No	Yes
1		126	140	224	42
2		75	115	172	18
3		45	49	76	18
4		158	102	203	57
5		314	206	391	129
6		407	273	488	192
7		1228	1059	1590	697
8		6488	4430	7435	3483
9		5208	3895	5323	3780
10		2286	1563	2463	1386
11		7630	7874	9780	5724

education level, and there are 11 distinct levels, ranging from 1 for “completing fifth grade or less” to 11 for “completing college or more advanced education.”

Appendix C displays information from the NSDUH codebook about how the selected categorical variables were originally coded.

Considering that the multilevel LR and the traditional LR use the binary logistic regression that are limited to the binary response data analysis, we focus on the respondents associated with “Yes” and “No,” removing the respondents that answer “Don’t know,” refuse to answer or leave a blank, or are led to skip the selected survey item due to the survey logic. So, for further analysis, we first drop 13,242 respondents associated with neither “Yes” nor “No.” Then, because we focus on DIF associated with population density, we exclude 2,156 respondents associated with non-CBSA classifications for which there is a lack of information of the population density. In this way, we retain 43,671 eligible respondents. They comprise 19,348 males and 24,323 females, with no missing values. Table 1 displays sample sizes for the level-2 clusters, which are large enough for multilevel modeling [42, 43].

4.2 Analysis and Results

We carried out DIF analyses using a series of models: three multilevel models associated with the multilevel LR shown in (1), and the single-level traditional LR model shown in (3). The first multilevel model we utilize does not contain explanatory variables in the level-1 submodel,

which makes it the commonly known *null model* or *empty model* that sets a baseline for understanding the proportion of variance explained by the hierarchical structure of the data [27]. The second multilevel model is the exact model used in the multilevel LR, incorporating both the latent trait and group membership variables in the level-1 submodel. The third multilevel model adds the interaction term between the latent trait and group membership, the same as the interaction term in (3), to check if the model performance would be improved when adding this interaction. These three multilevel models are named “Model 0,” “Model 1,” and “Model 2.” The single-level model is labeled with “Model 3.”

The modeling results in Table 2 reveal several key insights regarding the performance of different models on DIF associated with population density in responses to the selected NSDUH item about depression. The null model (Model 0) serves as a baseline, showing the proportion of variance attributable to the hierarchical structure of the data. Its adjusted intraclass correlation coefficient [ICC; 24] of 0.071 indicates that 7.1% of the response variability stemmed from differences between education levels. This highlights the importance of considering this structure in DIF analyses with this data. Model 1, incorporating both the latent trait and group membership variables, displays a significant negative effect of high population density on the probability of responding “Yes” to the item. This suggests that this item has DIF, as individuals residing in high-density areas were less likely to provide the targeted response to the selected item compared to those in low-density areas, after accounting for all these individuals’ latent trait about depression. Model 2, which includes the interaction term, does not show a better model fit compared to Model 1 in this specific example. This implies that the interaction term does not substantially affect the model’s performance. Model 3, the single-level model, does not reveal a significant effect of high population density, which leads to the conclusion that there is no DIF, contrasting with the result from Model 1. This difference underscores the importance of model selection when conducting DIF analyses.

Overall, Models 1-2 outperform others, based on fit statistics. Both Model 1 and Model 2 show

Table 2 Results from a series of models.

	Model 0	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Fixed effects				
β_{0i}	-1.03*** (0.15)	-2.39*** (0.15)	-2.41** (0.15)	-1.90*** (0.03)
β_{1i}		0.25*** (0.00)	0.25*** (0.00)	0.25*** (0.00)
β_{2i}		-0.12*** (0.02)	-0.09* (0.04)	-0.07 (0.04)
β_{3i}			-0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)
Variiances				
τ_0^2	0.25	0.22	0.22	
σ^2	3.29	3.29	3.29	
N	43671	43671	43671	43671
AIC	56460	44197	44198	44697
BIC	56477	44232	44241	44732
-2LL	56455	44189	44188	44689
ICC	0.071	0.064	0.064	
R^2_{marg}	0.000	0.331	0.331	0.269
R^2_{cond}	0.071	0.374	0.374	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

a low intercept variance ($\tau_0^2 = 0.22$), indicating an advantage in capturing more data variability. Additionally, they share the lowest AIC, BIC, and -2LL values, and the highest R^2 values. Their R^2 values signify that each of the two models explains 37.4% of the data variability through random and fixed effects and 33.1% solely through fixed effects. In contrast, the single-level model, Model 3, explains 26.9% of the variance, which is less favorable.

Researchers might consider Model 2 when separate interpretations of uniform and nonuniform DIF are desired, analogous to the traditional LR approach. A significant interaction term in Model 2 suggests the presence of non-uniform DIF, where the effect of population density on the probability of responding “Yes” varies across the continuum of psychological distress scores. In contrast, a non-significant interaction term but a significant coefficient for the group membership variable would indicate uniform DIF, suggesting a constant difference in the probability of responding “Yes” between the high- and low-density groups regardless of the level of psychological distress.

It is important to acknowledge potential limitations of this analysis. While the sample size for each level-2 cluster appears sufficient based

on existing recommendations, further exploration of the data distribution within each cluster could be beneficial [27]. This might involve examining potential skewness or outliers that could influence model estimates. Additionally, although we controlled for a latent trait variable reflecting psychological distress, the inclusion of other relevant covariates (e.g., socioeconomic status, access to healthcare) might provide a more comprehensive picture of potential DIF effects.

In conclusion, our results highlight the strengths of multilevel modeling for DIF analysis in health research with clustered data. By accounting for the hierarchical structure of the data (respondents nested within education levels), multilevel models provided a more accurate picture of the underlying relationships. This is evident in the superior model fit statistics (lower AIC, BIC, and -2LL values, and higher R-squared values) of multilevel models and the identification of DIF that was missed by the single-level model. Future research could explore the generalizability of our findings by applying multilevel DIF analysis to other self-reported health survey data.

5 Discussion

Multilevel modeling we describe in this article is a useful tool for examining DIF in the data from health-related constructs or measures, such as self-reported health survey data. By leveraging this approach, researchers can gain a more accurate understanding of DIF and glean valuable insights into health survey data, ultimately enhancing the precision and reliability of health research findings. Built on prior research that highlights the benefits of multilevel modeling in DIF analysis, our study provides a practical application of how this approach can be used with self-reported health survey data.

Given that single-level LR is not suitable for polytomous items or multiple groups and that we want to have a comparison between single-level and multilevel LR models, our empirical analysis centers on a dichotomous item and a variable involving two groups for DIF assessment. Rather than making a blanket recommendation in favor of multilevel models, we intend to raise awareness of how to use multilevel LR to analyze DIF and how to choose the appropriate model when

a series of competing models are available. Different from some other studies that evaluated models via Monte Carlo simulation [e.g., 44], our empirical analysis examines a series of competing models based on model fit indices. Our findings indicate that multilevel modeling more effectively captures variability in our data compared to single-level modeling, which is crucial to accurate DIF detection.

Future research is crucial to comprehensively explore the cost-benefit balance of multilevel modeling for DIF analysis in dynamic health survey settings. Monte Carlo simulations can be a powerful tool to systematically evaluate model performance under a wide range of data structures. These simulations can vary factors such as ICC, number and size of clusters, and the magnitude and proportion of DIF items. Studies by Moineddin et al. [45] and [46] provide valuable groundwork, but further exploration is necessary. While initial efforts have been made to explore multilevel DIF analysis [e.g., 47–49], limitations exist regarding model construction, ICC calculation, and generalizability [23]. Scrutinizing model performance under various realistic scenarios that mimic real-world health survey data is essential. This includes exploring the impact of factors like missing data patterns (missing completely at random, missing at random, or missing not at random) and different types of DIF (uniform vs. non-uniform) on model performance. Also, researchers might consider developing or applying more advanced models capable of multilevel modeling for DIF analysis with polytomous items or more than two groups, ideally built on existing models without IRT-related assumptions such as ordinal logistic regression [50, 51] or nonparametric measures [e.g., 52]. By addressing these limitations, we can solidify the role of multilevel modeling in DIF analysis for health research. This will ultimately lead to more robust and reliable estimates captured through self-reported surveys.

Declarations

Funding. The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

Competing Interests. The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

Availability of Data and Materials.

The NSDUH data and the codebook used in this article can be downloaded here: <https://www.datafiles.samhsa.gov/dataset/national-survey-drug-use-and-health-2022-nsduh-2022-ds0001>

Appendix A R code

A.1 For data preparation

```

1 # initialize
2 load("NSDUH_2022.Rdata")
3 d <- NSDUH_2022
4
5 # keep relevant data
6 d <- d[, c("addprev", # item
7           "PDEN10", # group membership
8           "KSSLR6MON", # latent trait
9           "IREDUHIGHST2" # Level-2 variable
10          )]
11
12 # rename variables
13 names(d) <- c("item", "group", "score", "level2"
14              )
15
16 # remove invalid values
17 d <- d[which(d$group != 3), ] # non-CBSA areas
18 d <- d[which(d$item %in% c(85, 94, 97, 98, 99)
19          == FALSE),] # invalid response values
20
21 # recode two variables
22 d$item[d$item == 2] <- 0 # to have 1=Yes, 0=No
23 d$group[d$group == 2] <- 0 # 1=high, 0=low
24
25 # check missing values
26 apply(d, MARGIN = 2, function(x){
27   table(x, useNA = "always")
28 })
29
30 # check level-2 sample sizes
31 table(d$level2, d$group)
32 table(d$level2, d$item)
33
34 # finalize the data
35 dta <- d
36 dta$group <- as.factor(dta$group) # to make
37   sure it is formatted as a categorical
38   variable, allowing glmer() to proceed with
39   dummy coding

```

A.2 For DIF analyses

```

1 library(lme4)
2
3 # Model 0
4 model0 <- glmer(item ~ 1 + (1 | level2), data =
5   dta, family = binomial)
6 summary(model0)
7 tau00 <- as.data.frame(VarCorr(model0))[4]
8 icc <- performance::icc(model0)
9 resid <- tau00/icc$ICC_adjusted - tau00
10 #// residual variance

```



```

10
11 # Model 1
12 model1 <- glmer(item ~ score + group + (1 |
13   level2), data = dta, family = binomial)
14 summary(model1)
15 tau00 <- as.data.frame(VarCorr(model1))[4]
16 icc <- performance::icc(model1)
17 resid <- tau00/icc$ICC_adjusted - tau00
18
19 # Model 2
20 model2 <- glmer(item ~ score + group + score*
21   group + (1 | level2), data = dta, family =
22   binomial)
23 summary(model2)
24 tau00 <- as.data.frame(VarCorr(model2))[4]
25 icc <- performance::icc(model2)
26 resid <- tau00/icc$ICC_adjusted - tau00
27
28 # Model 3
29 model3 <- glm(item ~ score + group + score*group
30   , data = dta, family = "binomial")
31 summary(model3)
32
33 # compile results
34 library(texreg)
35 screenreg( list(model0, model1, model2, model3)
36   )
37
38 # obtain other statistics with this one
39 sjPlot::tab_model(list (model0, model1, model2,
40   model3))

```

Appendix B DIF Methods on Single-level Models

An extensive review of DIF methods can be found in Chen [23]. Table B1 summarizes the limitations of some popular DIF methods based on single-level models. In this appendix, we detail the Mantel-Haenszel procedure [MH; 17] and the Lord’s Wald test with worked examples, including the R code we used for computations. Our analyses were done via difR package [53] with R4.4.0 in RStudio.

B.1 The Mantel-Haenszel Procedure

The Mantel-Haenszel (MH) procedure, introduced by Holland and Thayer [17], is an extension of Pearson’s chi-square test of independence that uses odds ratios from tables to quantify the association between two dichotomous variables, conditional on a third variable that could be a confounder. In Holland’s work, a 2×2 table is created to cross-classify the type of responses (i.e., correct vs. incorrect) by group (i.e., reference group vs. focal group) for the k th total score ($k = 1, 2, \dots, K$), demonstrated in Table B2. The row margins are fixed to 1 by design because an item response

is either the targeted response (e.g., “Yes”) or not (e.g., “No”), and hence the cell values follow a binomial distribution for each row. The probabilities of answering an item correctly in the reference and focal groups are π_{Rk} and π_{Fk} , respectively, conditional on the k th total score. Correspondingly, the probabilities of obtaining a targeted response in the reference and focal groups are $(1 - \pi_{Rk})$ and $(1 - \pi_{Fk})$, respectively.

In the MH, the null hypothesis is that there is no DIF, or in other words, that there is conditional independence between an examinee’s group membership and their response after accounting for their total scores. It is expressed as

$$H_0: \frac{\pi_{Rk}}{1 - \pi_{Rk}} = \frac{\pi_{Fk}}{1 - \pi_{Fk}} \text{ for all } k.$$

The alternative hypothesis is

$$H_1: \frac{\pi_{Rk}}{1 - \pi_{Rk}} = \alpha \frac{\pi_{Fk}}{1 - \pi_{Fk}} \text{ for all } k,$$

where α is the *common odds ratio* shared by the k tables.

Probabilities in Table B2 can be expressed as counts, as shown in Table B3. Then the *MH test statistic* (with continuity correction to improve

Table B1 Limitations of the single-level DIF methods reviewed in Chen [23].

Method	Limitations
MH [17]	Limited to two groups; using observed, discrete total scores; assuming that scores are equally spaced, and that the common odds ratio remains constant.
LR [18]	Limited to two groups; lacking a valid effect size measure; inflated errors with uniform DIF detection, with 3PL items.
Lord’s Wald test [19]	Limited to two groups; item parameter estimates depend on the item set; lacking a valid effect size measure.
IRT-LR [20]	Limited to two groups; computationally intensive; lacking a valid effect size measure.

Table B2 A 2×2 table in probabilities (by group membership and item response) for the k th total score.

	Yes (1)	No (0)	Total
Reference group	π_{Rk}	$1 - \pi_{Rk}$	1
Focal group	π_{Fk}	$1 - \pi_{Fk}$	1

Table B3 A 2×2 table in counts (by group and response) for the k th total score.

	Yes (1)	No (0)
Reference group	A_k	B_k
Focal group	C_k	D_k

the approximations of significance levels) can be expressed as

$$\chi_{MH}^2 = \frac{(|\sum_k A_k - \sum_k E(A_k)| - \frac{1}{2})^2}{\sum_k \text{var}(A_k)},$$

which follows a chi-square distribution, which assumes independence of observations.

Holland and Thayer [17] proposed an effect size measure of DIF, specified as

$$\hat{\Delta}_{MH} = -2.35 \ln(\hat{\alpha}),$$

where the logarithm puts $\hat{\alpha}$ on an additively symmetric scale, making it convenient for interpretation. Since the 1990s, ETS has been flagging DIF items with A (i.e., negligible/nonsignificant DIF), B (i.e., slight to moderate DIF), and C (i.e., moderate to large DIF) using χ_{MH}^2 and $\hat{\Delta}_{MH}$, as documented in Zwick [54].

The MH method is simple and widely used in educational assessment development, but it has some limitations. Firstly, MH uses observed, discrete total scores as a proxy for a latent trait, resulting in information loss. Secondly, using discrete total scores as the third dimension for analyzing two-way tables involves unrealistic assumptions: that total scores are equally spaced and that the common odds ratio α remains constant for different total scores [54].

Application in R. Using the data of the respondents answering either “Yes” or “No” to the selected item we described in the main text, we found the MH test statistic for the item is 15.406, its p -value is 0.0001, which is highly significant, suggesting strong evidence against the null hypothesis that there is no DIF. The common odds ratio is greater than 1 ($\alpha_{MH} = 1.0980$), suggesting that the respondents in the reference group is more likely to answer “Yes” to the selected item than the focal group.

However, it is important to consider both the statistical significance (p -value) and the effect size when interpreting these results, as a statistically

significant finding may not always have practical significance. The effect size measure of DIF indicates a negligible effect ($\hat{\Delta}_{MH} = -0.2197$, labeled with A).

Table B4 Results from the Mantel-Haenszel procedure.

Measure	Statistic	p -value
χ_{MH}^2	15.406***	0.0001
α_{MH}	1.098	
$\hat{\Delta}_{MH}$	-0.220	
Effect Size	A	

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

In summary, the MH test results indicate that DIF exists for the item. Nevertheless, its effect size is negligible, suggesting that the practical significance of this DIF might be small. The following R code demonstrates how to use an existing R function `difMH()` to do the MH analysis, as well as how to directly compute the MH test statistic without that function. We found that the MH test statistic is 15.406 via either of the procedures.

```

1 # label the groups with "F" for reference groups
  and "R" for focal groups
2 dta$group <- ifelse(dta$group == 1, "F", "R")
3
4 # MH test (via an existing R function)
5 library(difR)
6 mh_result <- difMH(Data = as.data.frame(dta$item
  ), group = dta$group, focal.name = 'F',
  match = dta$score)
7 mh_result
8 #// display results
9
10 # MH test (via direct computation)
11 l <- split(dta, as.factor(dta$score))
12
13 vals <- list()
14 for(i in 1:length(l)){
15
16   x <- l[[i]]
17
18   d <- data.frame(table(x$group, x$item))
19
20   a <- d$Freq[which(d$Var1 == "R" & d$Var2 == 1)
21   ]
22   n <- sum(d$Freq)
23
24   m1 <- sum(d$Freq[which(d$Var1 == "R")])
25   n1 <- sum(d$Freq[which(d$Var2 == 1)])
26   a_expected <- m1*n1/n
27
28   m2 <- sum(d$Freq[which(d$Var1 == "F")])
29   n2 <- sum(d$Freq[which(d$Var2 == 0)])
30   variance <- (m1/10*m2/10*n1/10*n2/10)/(n^2*(n
  -1))*10^4
31   #// function: m1*m2*n1*n2/(n^2*(n-1)) -- we
  added "/10" and "*10^4" here to avoid the
  overflow error in R
32
33   t <- data.frame(cbind(a, a_expected, variance)
  )
34   names(t) <- c("a", "a_expected", "variance")

```

```

34 vals[[i]] <- t
35 }
36 vals <- do.call(rbind, vals)
37
38 chi <- (abs(sum(vals$a) - sum(vals$a_expected))
39         - 1/2)^2 / sum(vals$variance)
40 chi
40 #// display the test statistic

```

B.2 Lord's Wald Test

Lord's Wald test [19], derived from the traditional Wald test [55], is historically significant. It requires the item response theory models (IRT) to estimate item parameters before computing DIF. Its two-sided null hypothesis is

$$H_0: \beta - \beta_0 = 0, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where β denotes a population parameter such as a linear effect of an explanatory variable about the group membership in a model. The test statistic, in the form of a z score that approximately follows a standard normal distribution, is

$$z = \frac{\beta - \beta_0}{SE}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where SE is the standard error.

Specifically, Lord's Wald test statistic is derived from the IRT-based item difficulty parameter from two groups for a studied item i , written as Langer [35]

$$\hat{B} = \frac{\hat{b}_F - \hat{b}_R}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{b}_F) + \text{var}(\hat{b}_R)}}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where

\hat{b}_F is the maximum likelihood estimate of the item difficulty parameter in the focal group;

\hat{b}_R is the maximum likelihood estimate of the item difficulty parameter in the reference group;

$\text{var}(\hat{b}_F)$ and $\text{var}(\hat{b}_R)$ denote the sample variances of \hat{b}_F and \hat{b}_R .

(B3) is a special materialization of (B2) for deriving the z score, where the numerator is the tested parameter value and the denominator is the true standard error SE .

Lord extended (B3) to include the IRT-based item discrimination and pseudo-guessing parameters for two groups. The hypothesis about the

joint between-group difference derived from multiple IRT parameters is tested using a chi-square statistic expressed as

$$\chi_{Lord}^2 = \hat{\gamma}' \Sigma^{-1} \hat{\gamma},$$

where

$\hat{\gamma}'$ is $[\hat{a}_F - \hat{a}_R \ \hat{b}_F - \hat{b}_R]$ when considering item discrimination together with item difficulty;

it is $[\hat{a}_F - \hat{a}_R \ \hat{c}_F - \hat{c}_R]$ when considering item discrimination together with item pseudo-guessing;

Σ^{-1} is the variance-covariance matrix of $\hat{\gamma}$.

Although Lord's Wald test has not often been used for DIF detection in psychometric practice, it has been revived in modern DIF method discussions by Kim et al. [56], Langer [35], and Woods et al. [46]. Kim et al. [56] extended the method for DIF analyses with three or more groups. Langer [35] argued that the poor performance of Lord's Wald test was partly due to its original item parameter estimation method. Woods et al. [46] compared improved versions of Lord's Wald test.

As mentioned earlier, we first need to estimate the item parameters of this selected item when running Lord's Wald test. It is important to highlight that estimating the parameters of a single item is not feasible because the corresponding IRT model would be under-identified. Moreover, the parameter estimate for an item fluctuates when varying the other items included in the analysis, owing to variations in the latent trait scale associated with each different item set. In practice, only one item set is needed to make conclusions about the DIF presence; this item set is chosen because it is deemed most appropriate to help describe the respondents.

Application in R. For this analysis, we used the Verbal Aggression data [57], made of the responses from 316 respondents to a questionnaire about verbal aggression. The response data were coded with 1 to mean that the respondent would want to respond to a frustrating situation aggressively, and with 0 to mean otherwise. To show the impact of the item set on Lord's Wald test statistic, we explored this DIF analysis of our targeted item named "S1wantCurse" when using four different item sets that involved this item in addition to one, two, three other items, and all

the other items in the Verbal data set, respectively. All these items were calibrated using the one-parameter item response model for parsimony. The selected items are specified below, for each of the item sets labeled with A, B, C, and D.

Table B5 Selected items in the three item sets.

Item Set	N. of Items	Item Names
A	2	S1wantCurse, S1WantScold.
B	3	S1wantCurse, S1WantScold, S1WantShout.
C	4	S1wantCurse, S1WantScold, S1WantShout, S2WantCurse.
D	24	S1wantCurse, S1WantScold, S1WantShout, S2WantCurse, ... S4DoShout.

As we expected, our Lord’s Wald test results varied when using the three item sets, because the item parameter estimates varied when using a different item set. When analyzing the targeted item “S1wantCurse” using each of the item sets A, B and C, we found Lord’s test statistic is 0.0006, 0.0002, 0.0246, and 1.3724, respectively. All these statistics are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. They suggest that no DIF exists between the two gender groups treated as the reference group and the focal group in expressing the tendency to respond aggressively to a frustrating situation, concerning their answers to the survey item “S1wantCurse.” We used four item sets here only to demonstrate that the composition of the item set has an impact on the DIF results.

Table B6 Lord’s Wald test results.

Item	χ^2_{Lord}	p -value
A	0.0006	0.9800
B	0.0002	0.9899
C	0.0246	0.8753
D	1.3724	0.2414

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The following R code demonstrates the use of an existing R function `difLord()` to complete Lord’s Wald test for DIF analysis of the targeted item “S1wantCurse.” The full item set (composed by 24 items) are used for this analysis, and they are calibrated using the one-parameter item response model:

```

1 library(difR)
2 data("verbal")
3
4 d4 = verbal[, c(1:24, 26)]
5 res4 <- difLord(Data = d4, group = "Gender",
6                 focal.name = 1, model = "1PL")
7 res4
8 #// display the test statistic

```

Appendix C Selected Categorical Variables from the Codebook

Table C7 The item response variable “ADDPREV.”

Code	Description
1	Yes
2	No
85	BAD DATA Logically assigned
94	DON’T KNOW
97	REFUSED
98	BLANK (NO ANSWER)
99	LEGITIMATE SKIP

Table C8 The group membership variable “PDEN10.”

Code	Description
1	Segment in a CBSA with 1 million or more persons
2	Segment in a CBSA with fewer than 1 million persons
3	Segment not in a CBSA

References

- [1] Teresi, J. A. and Fleishman, J. A. (2007). Differential item functioning and health assessment. *Quality of Life Research*, 16(1):33–42.
- [2] Rice, S. M., Parker, A. G., Mawren, D., Clifton, P., Harcourt, P., Lloyd, M., Kountouris, A., Smith, B., McGorry, P. D., and Purcell, R. (2020). Preliminary psychometric validation of a brief screening tool for athlete mental health among male elite athletes: The Athlete

Table C9 The level-2 variable “IREDUHIGHST2.”

Code	Description
1	Fifth grade or less grade completed
2	Sixth grade completed
3	Seventh grade completed
4	Eighth grade completed
5	Ninth grade completed
6	Tenth grade completed
7	Eleventh or Twelfth grade completed, no diploma
8	High school diploma/GED
9	Some college credit, but no degree
10	Associate’s degree (for example, AA, AS)
11	College graduate or higher

Psychological Strain Questionnaire. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18(6):850–865.

- [3] Rouquette, A., Nadot, T., Labitrie, P., Broucke, S., Mancini, J., Rigal, L., and Ringa, V. (2018). Validity and measurement invariance across sex, age, and education level of the French short versions of the European Health Literacy Survey Questionnaire. *PLOS ONE*, 13(12):1–15.
- [4] Quistberg, D. A., Diez Roux, A. V., Bilal, U., Moore, K., Ortigoza, A., Rodriguez, D. A., Sarmiento, O. L., Frenz, P., Friche, A. A., Caiaffa, W. T., Vives, A., Miranda, J. J., and the SALURBAL Group (2019). Building a data platform for cross-country urban health studies: The SALURBAL study. *Journal of Urban Health*, 96(2):311–337.
- [5] Tiego, J., Martin, E. A., DeYoung, C. G., Hagan, K., Cooper, S. E., Pasion, R., Satchell, L., Shackman, A. J., Bellgrove, M. A., and Fornito, A. (2023). Precision behavioral phenotyping as a strategy for uncovering the biological correlates of psychopathology. *Nature Mental Health*, 1(5):304–315.
- [6] Jones, R. N. (2019). Differential item functioning and its relevance to epidemiology. *Current Epidemiology Reports*, 6:174–183.
- [7] American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.
- [8] Lorem, G., Cook, S., Leon, D. A., Emaus, N., and Schirmer, H. Self-reported health as a predictor of mortality: A cohort study of its relation to other health measurements and observation time. 10(1):4886.
- [9] Wuorela, M., Lavonius, S., Salminen, M., Vahlberg, T., Viitanen, M., and Viikari, L. Self-rated health and objective health status as predictors of all-cause mortality among older people: A prospective study with a 5-, 10-, and 27-year follow-up. 20(1):120.
- [10] Ulitzsch, E., Henninger, M., and Meiser, T. (2024). Differences in response-scale usage are ubiquitous in cross-country comparisons and a potential driver of elusive relationships. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):10890.
- [11] van de Vijver, F. J. R. and Poortinga, Y. H. (1997). Towards an integrated analysis of bias in cross-cultural assessment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 13(1):29–37.
- [12] Werner, O. and Campbell, D. (1970). Translating, working through interpreters, and the problem of decentering. In Naroll, R. and Cohen, R., editors, *A Handbook of Cultural Anthropology*, pages 389–418. American Museum of Natural History, New York.
- [13] Berk, R., editor (1982). *Handbook of Methods for Detecting Item Bias*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- [14] Penfield, R. D. and Camilli, G. (2006). Item functioning and item bias. In Rao, C. R. and Sinharay, S., editors, *Handbook of Statistics*, volume 26 of *Psychometrics*, pages 125–167. Elsevier.
- [15] Lee, Y.-H. and Zhang, J. (2017). Effects of differential item functioning on examinees’ test performance and reliability of test. *International Journal of Testing*, 17(1):23–54.
- [16] Mellenbergh, G. J. (1982). Contingency table models for assessing item bias. *Journal of*

- Educational Statistics*, 7(2):105–118.
- [17] Holland, P. and Thayer, D. T. (1985). An alternate definition of the ETS delta scale of item difficulty. Technical Report 85-43, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ.
- [18] Swaminathan, H. and Rogers, H. J. (1990). Detecting differential item functioning using logistic regression procedures. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 27(4):361–370.
- [19] Lord, F. (1976). A study of item bias, using item characteristic curve theory. Technical Report ED137486, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ.
- [20] Thissen, D., Steinberg, L., and Gerrard, M. (1986). Beyond group-mean differences: The concept of item bias. *Psychological Bulletin*, 99(1):118–128.
- [21] Osterlind, S. and Everson, H. (2009). *Differential Item Functioning*. SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oakes, CA, second edition.
- [22] Lee, S. Y. (2015). *Lord’s Wald test for detecting DIF in multidimensional IRT Models: A comparison of two estimation approaches*. PhD thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- [23] Chen, D. (2023). *Modeling item bias in fixed-item tests and computerized adaptive tests*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- [24] Raudenbush, S. and Bryk, A. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA, second edition.
- [25] Gelman, A. and Hill, J. (2007). *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- [26] Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., and Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, second edition.
- [27] Snijders, T. A. B. and Bosker, R. (2011). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced multilevel modeling*. SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA, second edition.
- [28] Swanson, D. B., Clauser, B. E., Case, S. M., Nungester, R. J., and Featherman, C. (2002). Analysis of differential item functioning (DIF) using hierarchical logistic regression models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 27(1):53–75.
- [29] den Noortgate, W. and de Boeck, P. (2005). Assessing and explaining differential item functioning using logistic mixed models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 30(4):443–464.
- [30] French, B. F. and Finch, H. (2013). Extensions of Mantel–Haenszel for multilevel DIF detection. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 73(4):648–671.
- [31] Huang, S. and Valdivia, D. S. (2024). Wald χ^2 test for differential item functioning detection with polytomous items in multilevel data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 84(3):530–548.
- [32] Lord, F. (1980). *Applications of Item Response Theory to Practical Testing Problems*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Hillsdale, NJ.
- [33] Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., and Drasgow, F. (2006). Detecting differential item functioning with confirmatory factor analysis and item response theory: Toward a unified strategy. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6):1292–1306.
- [34] Penfield, R. D. (2001). Assessing differential item functioning among multiple groups: A comparison of three Mantel-Haenszel procedures. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 14(3):235–259.
- [35] Langer, M. M. (2008). *A reexamination of Lord’s Wald test for differential item functioning using item response theory and modern error estimation*. PhD thesis, University of North Carolina.

- [36] Douglas, E. (2022). Examining the relationship between urban density and sense of community in the Greater Vancouver Regional District. *Cities*, 130:103870.
- [37] Zander, K. K., Cadag, J. R., Escarcha, J., and Garnett, S. T. (2018). Perceived heat stress increases with population density in urban Philippines. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(8):084009.
- [38] Fassio, O., Rollero, C., and De Piccoli, N. (2013). Health, quality of life and population density: A preliminary study on "contextualized" quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(2):479–488.
- [39] Walton, D., Murray, S. J., and Thomas, J. A. (2008). Relationships between population density and the perceived quality of neighbourhood. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(3):405–420.
- [40] Kondirolli, F. and Sunder, N. (2022). Mental health effects of education. *Health Economics*, 31(S2):22–39.
- [41] U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA ERS - Documentation.
- [42] Snijders, T. A. B. (2005). Power and sample size in multilevel linear models. In Everitt, B. S. and Howell, D., editors, *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*, volume 3, pages 1570–1573. Wiley.
- [43] University of Bristol. Sample sizes for multilevel models. <https://www.bristol.ac.uk/cmm/learning/multilevel-models/samples.html>.
- [44] Svetina Valdivia, D., Huang, S., and Botter, P. (2024). Detecting differential item functioning in presence of multilevel data: Do methods accounting for multilevel data structure make a difference? *Frontiers in Education*, 9. Publisher: Frontiers.
- [45] Moineddin, R., Matheson, F. I., and Glazier, R. H. (2007). A simulation study of sample size for multilevel logistic regression models. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 7(34):1–10.
- [46] Woods, C. M., Cai, L., and Wang, M. (2013). The Langer-improved Wald test for DIF testing with multiple groups: Evaluation and comparison to two-group IRT. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 73(3):532–547.
- [47] French, B. F. and Finch, H. (2010). Hierarchical logistic regression: Accounting for multilevel data in DIF detection. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 47(3):299–317.
- [48] French, B. F. and Finch, H. (2015). Transforming SIBTEST to account for multilevel data structures. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 52(2):159–180.
- [49] French, B. F., Finch, W. H., and Immekus, J. C. (2019). Multilevel generalized Mantel-Haenszel for differential item functioning detection. *Frontiers in Education*, 4(47):1–10.
- [50] Crane, P. K., Gibbons, L. E., Narasimhalu, K., Lai, J.-S., and Cella, D. (2007). Rapid detection of differential item functioning in assessments of health-related quality of life: The Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy. *Quality of Life Research*, 16(1):101–114.
- [51] Zumbo, B. D. (1999). *A handbook on the theory and methods of differential item functioning (DIF): Logistic regression modeling as a unitary framework for binary and likert-type (ordinal) item scores*. Directorate of Human Resources Research and Evaluation, Department of National Defense, Ottawa, ON.
- [52] Zwick, R. and Thayer, D. T. (1996). Evaluating the magnitude of differential item functioning in polytomous items. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 21(3):187–201. Publisher: [American Educational Research Association, Sage Publications, Inc., American Statistical Association].
- [53] Magis, D., Béland, S., and Raïche, G. (2020). Collection of methods to detect dichotomous differential item functioning.
- [54] Zwick, R. (2012). A review of ETS differential item functioning assessment procedures: Flagging rules, minimum sample size requirements, and criterion refinement. Technical Report

ETS RR-12-08, Educational Testing Service,
Princeton, NJ.

- [55] Wald, A. (1943). Tests of statistical hypotheses concerning several parameters when the number of observations is larger. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 54(3):426–482.
- [56] Kim, S.-H., Cohen, A. S., and Park, T.-H. (1995). Detection of differential item functioning in multiple groups. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 32(3):261–276.
- [57] Vansteelandt, K. (2001). *Formal models for contextualized personality psychology*. PhD thesis, K.U. Leuven.