

## Psychometrician's summary feedback of note

“Overall, the SSM forced-choice strengths instrument demonstrates a methodologically appropriate psychometric foundation. Combining a theoretically grounded construct framework with modern forced-choice modelling techniques, the assessment provides a coherent and differentiated representation of strengths, supported by stable model estimation, strong construct separation, and consistent item-level performance. These characteristics position the SSM framework as a promising and methodologically appropriate tool for strengths-based assessment.”

Important findings are outlined below, attesting to the validity and reliability of the assessment:

- Strong multidimensional structure confirmed – The SSM assessment demonstrates a stable and coherent 12-construct framework, with traits that are related but clearly distinct, supporting its intended design.
- Excellent construct differentiation (discriminant validity) – All constructs show strong separation (maximum HTMT  $\approx$  0.34, well below the 0.85 threshold), indicating minimal overlap and high conceptual clarity between strengths.
- Robust modern modelling approach with good fit – The Bayesian Thurstonian IRT model converged successfully, showed good fit to the data, and produced stable, interpretable trait estimates.
- Item quality is high – The majority of items demonstrate moderate to strong discrimination, with only ~9% flagged for improvement—typical for early-stage calibration. The identified items have subsequently been revised, to strengthen discrimination.
- Reliability is acceptable for early-stage forced-choice assessment – Reliability levels (mean  $\approx$  0.38) are within expected ranges for this methodology and are expected to improve with further refinement (which has since occurred) and even larger sample testing.
- Fairness and low bias across demographic groups – No meaningful overall score differences were found across gender, age, or other groups, with only minor item-level differences identified for review. The few identified items have subsequently been revised, to reduce bias.