

2009 MFTHBA Celebration Summary of Judge Performance

- Class #178 - Open 3 yr old WGC - 2009
- Class #183 - Open 5 yr old WGC - 2009
- Class #132 - Open 5 Yr & Older Mares - 2009
- Class #134 - Open 5 Yr & Older S&G - 2009
- Class #155 - Am 4 Yr Old WGC - 2009
- Class #73 - Open 3 Yr Old Mares - 2009
- Class #44 - Open Am 4 Yr Old Mares - 2009
- Class #133 - Open Am 3 Yr Old Mares - 2009
- Class #47 Open Am 4 Yr & Older S&G - 2009
- Class #67 Open Am 5 Yr & Older Mares - 2009
- Grand averages for 10 classes - 2009

## 2009 MFTHBA Celebration Summary of Judge Performance

The performance of the 2009 Celebration judges was typical of what has been seen over the last dozen years. There were a few classes where they agreed on placings, several with moderate disagreement and a few where there was almost no agreement. Before reviewing these results it would be very helpful for you to be familiar with the basics of what is being measured and how the statistics reported herein should be interpreted. If you have not already done so, I recommend you read the information in the [Judge Performance Tutorial](#). There are more examples given in the [MFT2003](#) and [MFT2004](#) summaries.

The preferred classes to use in evaluating judge performance are the open classes because it is within them we have the best horses and best exhibitors in general and that translates to the entries being quite consistent in their performance as they circle the arena which gives all the judges a very similar view of each exhibitor and horse. Only classes with at least 10 entries are eligible for judge evaluation because placing smaller classes is not nearly as challenging as placing classes with 10 or more entries and we want to see how judges perform when challenged. There was a problem finding enough open classes that qualified for use in 2009 judge evaluation because there were very few open classes with 10 or more entries in the 2009 Celebration. As a result there are only 5 open classes included in the 2009 judge evaluation summary. Five other classes were included which were open amateur and amateur WGC classes in order to get enough data to do a reasonable evaluation of the 2009 judges' performances. The use of amateur classes in all likelihood caused more disagreement among the judges' placings because of less consistency in the exhibitors' performances. The extra variation in exhibitor performance doesn't affect the comparisons of the 2009 judges to one another as we are still able to evaluate which were more consistent with their peer judges even though they all were evaluating exhibitors who may not have been as consistent in their performances as we would have liked in some classes. However, the fact that there were five amateur classes in the 2009 results should be kept in mind when comparing the 2009 summary results to other years that didn't include any amateur classes in their summary data. We can assume the 2009 judges would have been somewhat more consistent than they were over the 10 classes chosen here had I been able to base their evaluation on 10 open classes.

The judging tutorial explains how the distance measure we use to quantify how different a judge is from his peers when placing a class. It shows that if a judge agrees completely with the consensus of his peers, his distance measure will be zero. That is the goal we seek but seldom occurs. In the discussion below we discuss the distance the judges are from the consensus of their peers for the first 3 places because we feel they are the most important places as far as exhibitors are concerned. If a judge switches an adjacent pair in the top 3 positions such as places horses 2, 1, 3 rather than 1, 2, 3, his distance for the class would be 1.41. If he picks the top 3 horses that were picked by his peer judges but places them in reverse order, i.e. places them 3, 2, 1 rather than 1, 2, 3, his distance will be 2.83. Ideally we would like to see judges have distances that are in the range of zero to 3 because that range reflects that there is class agreement among a judge and the consensus placings of his peers. When distance values get into the 4 and up range it indicates a judge didn't agree very well with his peers in placing a class. We also use *theta* as a generalized measure of agreement. It may be easier to interpret when comparing the amount of disagreement between judges because its range is 0 to 1. 0 is perfect agreement and 1 is no agreement at all. *Theta* less than 0.3 correlates to a short 1-3 distance and indicates good agreement among judges in the first 3 positions. Values near 0.5 and larger indicate the judges disagreed considerably on how the horses should have been placed.

Although I concentrate exclusively on the first 3 places which is referred to as the 1-3 distance, note that the 1-5 distance and 1-10 distance are also reported for each class. These are measures of the distance between a judge and his peer consensus ranking for the first 5 and all 10 places, respectively. They may be of interest at times even though I do not mention them in my discussion of results.

## Class #178 - Open 3 yr old WGC - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

b	m	t	r	s
115	115	97	115	115
42	42	42	97	98
347	392	236	42	42
97	98	744	347	744
392	97	115	236	236
236	236	347	98	97
744	744	392	392	347
177	347	177	744	392
98	177	98	177	177
974	974	974	974	974

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

b	m	t	r	s
1	1	3	1	1
2	2	2	3	8
5	6	4	2	2
3	8	7	5	7
6	3	1	4	4
4	4	5	8	3
7	7	6	6	5
9	5	9	7	6
8	9	8	9	9
10	10	10	10	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

b	m	t	r	s
1	1	3	1	1
2	2	2	3	8
8	8	6	2	2
3	7	8	7	7
7	3	1	4	4
4	4	5	8	3
6	6	7	6	5
9	5	9	5	6
5	9	4	9	9
10	10	10	10	10

						Averages
1-3 Distance	5.000	5.000	3.606	1.414	6.083	4.221
1-5 Distance	5.477	6.164	6.708	3.464	6.856	5.734
1-10 Distance	7.211	7.211	8.485	5.099	8.000	7.201

Theta hat for class: 0.425

There was considerable disagreement in this class. Both theta and the average 1-3 distance are larger than desirable and judges b, m, and s all disagreed strongly with their peers in how the class should be placed. A WGC class should be placed with considerably more agreement than seen here.

## Class #183 - Open 5 yr old WGC - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

m	t	r	s	g
152	745	745	739	152
739	682	739	745	745
470	739	682	682	674
682	100	674	470	100
745	470	746	674	739
439	152	152	152	682
100	674	100	746	746
746	746	734	100	76
762	391	391	734	391
277	76	470	391	734

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

m	t	r	s	g
4	1	1	2	4
2	3	2	1	1
7	2	3	3	6
3	5	6	7	5
1	7	8	6	2
11	4	4	4	3
5	6	5	8	8
8	8	10	5	12
13	9	9	10	9
14	12	7	9	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

m	t	r	s	g
4	2	1	2	4
2	4	2	1	2
8	1	4	4	7
3	6	7	8	6
1	8	8	6	1
14	3	3	3	3
6	5	6	7	8
7	7	12	5	14
13	11	10	11	10
12	12	5	9	9

Averages

1-3 Distance	5.831	3.000	1.000	1.732	5.000	3.313
1-5 Distance	7.141	4.690	4.359	4.472	6.708	5.474
1-10 Distance	11.705	6.633	8.426	6.557	9.644	8.593

Theta hat for class: 0.365

Note the 1-3 distance and theta both show the disagreement is not great but that there was some which came primarily from judges m and g not being in agreement with the other 3 judges. This class verifies the importance of using Olympic style judging which eliminates the extreme score at either end of the rankings for each horse. Note judge r was in close agreement with the consensus of his peers except for their 3<sup>rd</sup> place choice.

This is a very poor performance as far as being the class where the breed champion was selected. These judges could not have all been going by the same breed standard in choosing their top placings.

Note that in the 2003 TWH WGC class the average 1-3 distance was 1.4 and theta was 0.16. Comparing these values to those above pretty well summarizes the judge situation in the MFTHBA.

## Class #132 - Open 5 Yr & Older Mares - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

r	g	s	m	b
12	739	739	739	682
739	391	470	470	12
391	682	682	698	739
682	417	12	682	417
417	51	51	51	470
51	12	153	12	391
470	153	391	153	51
756	756	417	391	756
698	470	756	756	153
153	698	698	417	698

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

r	g	s	m	b
3	1	1	1	2
1	5	4	4	3
5	2	2	10	1
2	7	3	2	7
7	6	6	6	4
6	3	8	3	5
4	8	5	8	6
9	9	7	5	9
10	4	9	9	8
8	10	10	7	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

r	g	s	m	b
3	1	1	1	2
1	6	7	7	3
6	2	2	10	1
2	7	3	2	7
7	5	6	6	5
5	3	10	3	4
4	9	4	8	6
10	10	5	4	10
9	4	9	9	8
8	8	8	5	9

Averages

1-3 Distance	3.742	4.123	5.099	8.602	2.449	4.803
1-5 Distance	4.690	5.099	5.292	8.888	3.873	5.568
1-10 Distance	6.325	8.485	8.124	11.402	5.099	7.887

Theta hat for class: 0.499

Note the magnitude of the average 1-3 distance and theta indicating a lot of disagreement in this class. Judge m picked his peer's 10<sup>th</sup> place horse as his 3<sup>rd</sup> place horse and their 7<sup>th</sup> place horse as his 2<sup>nd</sup> place. Judge b did really well relative to his peers.

## Class #134 - Open 5 Yr & Older S&G - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

b	t	r	g	s
745	674	745	745	745
152	745	100	674	152
100	100	674	152	674
674	76	746	100	695
695	152	695	734	100
734	695	76	695	277
746	734	152	746	76
277	277	734	76	746
76	746	277	277	734
764	764	764	764	764

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

b	t	r	g	s
1	2	1	1	1
4	1	3	2	4
3	3	2	4	2
2	6	8	3	5
5	4	5	7	3
7	5	6	5	9
8	7	4	8	6
9	9	7	6	8
6	8	9	9	7
10	10	10	10	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

b	t	r	g	s
1	2	1	1	1
4	1	4	2	4
3	4	2	4	2
2	8	8	3	5
5	3	5	8	3
8	5	7	5	9
7	7	3	7	8
9	9	6	6	7
6	6	9	9	6
10	10	10	10	10

Averages

1-3 Distance	2.000	1.732	2.236	1.000	2.236	1.841
1-5 Distance	2.828	4.796	4.583	3.317	3.162	3.737
1-10 Distance	4.690	5.831	6.481	4.000	5.477	5.296

Theta hat for class: 0.268

This class was well judged with only minor disagreements in the first 3 placings. Note that all the 1-3 distances are small and so is theta.

## Class #155 - Am 4 Yr Old WGC - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

t	g	m	s	b
333	333	382	333	411
401	379	333	401	382
8	401	454	382	379
379	382	401	34	415
411	8	8	415	333
415	415	415	8	34
378	396	379	411	378
454	411	411	379	17
34	378	234	454	401
382	34	378	234	396

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

t	g	m	s	b
1	1	3	1	6
2	4	1	2	3
7	2	9	3	4
4	3	2	8	5
6	7	7	5	1
5	5	5	7	8
10	11	4	6	10
9	6	6	4	13
8	10	12	9	2
3	8	10	12	11

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

t	g	m	s	b
1	1	4	1	7
3	6	1	4	3
7	3	11	3	5
4	2	2	10	6
6	7	7	6	1
5	5	6	7	9
10	13	3	5	10
9	4	5	2	13
8	10	13	9	2
2	8	9	13	11

Averages

1-3 Distance	4.123	4.000	8.602	2.000	6.403	5.026
1-5 Distance	4.243	4.899	9.055	6.403	7.810	6.482
1-10 Distance	9.695	9.055	11.136	9.539	12.410	10.367

Theta hat for class: 0.480

Another blown class where judges m and b were clearly lost.



## Class #73 - Open 3 Yr Old Mares - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

g	b	m	r	t
115	115	115	115	115
392	97	42	97	42
97	744	744	744	97
744	392	392	42	744
42	42	347	347	347
44	347	97	392	392
177	44	177	177	177
347	177	639	639	44
639	639	44	44	241
241	241	241	457	639

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

g	b	m	r	t
1	1	1	1	1
5	2	4	2	4
2	3	3	3	2
3	5	5	4	3
4	4	6	6	6
8	6	2	5	5
7	8	7	7	7
6	7	9	9	8
9	9	8	8	10
10	10	10	11	9

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

g	b	m	r	t
1	1	1	1	1
5	3	4	2	5
2	4	3	3	2
3	5	5	4	3
4	2	6	6	6
8	6	2	5	4
7	8	7	7	7
6	7	9	9	8
9	9	8	8	10
10	10	10	11	9

Averages

1-3 Distance	3.162	1.414	2.000	0.000	3.162	1.948
1-5 Distance	3.464	3.464	2.449	1.000	3.464	2.768
1-10 Distance	4.472	3.742	4.899	2.236	4.243	3.918

Theta hat for class: 0.251

A good job of judging on this class! Note judge r was in near complete agreement all the way to 10<sup>th</sup> place.

## Class #44 - Open Am 4 Yr Old Mares - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

g	m	b	s	r
8	382	382	410	124
454	454	355	8	410
378	415	17	454	355
355	124	124	382	17
415	410	454	124	454
382	378	415	355	8
124	267	378	34	88
410	355	384	28	382
34	8	8	88	415
17	88	410	17	34

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

g	m	b	s	r
6	2	2	5	3
1	1	4	6	5
8	7	9	1	4
4	3	3	2	9
7	5	1	3	1
2	8	7	4	6
3	12	8	10	11
5	4	14	13	2
10	6	6	11	7
9	11	5	9	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

g	m	b	s	r
6	5	5	7	4
3	1	6	6	6
9	8	9	1	3
5	3	3	2	9
8	6	1	3	1
1	9	7	4	5
2	14	8	13	14
4	2	14	14	2
11	4	4	10	7
7	11	2	9	10

	g	m	b	s	r	Averages
1-3 Distance	7.874	6.481	8.246	7.483	5.000	7.017
1-5 Distance	8.485	6.633	9.220	8.000	8.124	8.092
1-10 Distance	12.288	12.806	14.560	11.916	12.490	12.812

Theta hat for class: 0.625

Holy cow! The data say it all. Chaos!

## Class #133 - Open Am 3 Yr Old Mares - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

t	r	g	s	m
434	27	772	434	434
27	772	434	772	772
772	434	27	27	594
677	594	594	677	27
656	677	677	594	677
84	656	656	84	84
26	84	84	656	47
594	299	299	47	26
47	47	47	26	656
299	26	26	299	299

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

t	r	g	s	m
1	3	2	1	1
3	2	1	2	2
2	1	3	3	5
4	5	5	4	3
7	4	4	5	4
6	7	7	6	6
9	6	6	7	8
5	10	10	8	9
8	8	8	9	7
10	9	9	10	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

t	r	g	s	m
2	3	2	1	1
3	2	1	2	2
1	1	3	3	5
5	5	5	4	3
7	4	4	5	4
6	7	7	7	7
10	6	6	6	8
4	10	10	8	9
8	8	8	9	6
9	9	9	10	10

Averages

1-3 Distance	2.449	2.828	1.414	0.000	2.000	1.738
1-5 Distance	3.317	3.162	2.000	0.000	2.449	2.186
1-10 Distance	6.164	4.243	3.464	1.414	4.243	3.906

Theta hat for class: 0.258

A well judged class. All judges kept the top 3 at or near the top.

## Class #47 Open Am 4 Yr & Older S&G - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

s	r	t	g	m
379	379	401	396	333
401	205	379	401	222
333	333	207	333	411
205	411	205	205	401
290	401	411	379	205
222	396	396	222	379
411	234	222	411	234
234	207	333	207	396
207	290	234	290	207
396	222	290	234	290

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

s	r	t	g	m
2	2	1	7	3
1	4	2	1	6
3	3	8	3	5
4	5	4	4	1
10	1	5	2	4
6	7	7	6	2
5	9	6	5	9
9	8	3	8	7
8	10	9	10	8
7	6	10	9	10

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

s	r	t	g	m
2	2	3	8	4
1	4	2	2	8
4	3	10	3	5
3	6	4	4	2
10	1	5	1	3
7	7	7	6	1
5	10	6	5	10
9	8	1	7	6
8	9	8	10	7
6	5	9	9	9

Averages

1-3 Distance	1.732	2.236	7.280	7.000	7.000	5.050
1-5 Distance	5.385	5.000	7.280	8.062	7.550	6.655
1-10 Distance	7.211	7.746	10.296	8.485	10.000	8.748

Theta hat for class: 0.532

Another class with serious disagreements.

## Class #67 Open Am 5 Yr & Older Mares - 2009

5 judges  
10 horses ranked

Rankings are:

g	b	m	r	t
41	41	41	41	41
321	250	250	321	250
394	321	321	250	110
424	424	296	424	321
350	416	424	276	350
250	350	110	110	424
276	276	350	350	276
416	394	276	416	416
56	110	416	56	394
110	56	394	394	56

Orderings based on all 5 judges:

g	b	m	r	t
1	1	1	1	1
2	3	3	2	3
9	2	2	3	7
4	4	10	4	2
5	8	4	6	5
3	5	7	7	4
6	6	5	5	6
8	9	6	8	8
11	7	8	11	9
7	11	9	9	11

Orderings from deleting one judge at a time:

g	b	m	r	t
1	1	1	1	1
3	3	3	2	3
10	2	2	3	9
4	4	11	4	2
6	9	4	7	5
2	5	7	6	4
7	7	5	5	6
8	8	6	9	7
11	6	8	11	8
5	11	9	8	11

						Averages
1-3 Distance	7.071	1.414	1.414	0.000	6.083	3.196
1-5 Distance	7.141	4.243	7.211	2.000	6.403	5.400
1-10 Distance	9.798	5.385	7.937	4.123	7.000	6.849

Theta hat for class: 0.383

This class was marginal at best. Three judges agreed with their peers on the first three places but even then m placed entry 296 4<sup>th</sup> which was way too high according to his peers. Judges t and g apparently made bad choices for their 3<sup>rd</sup> place picks. Judge r did well with all 10 places.

## Grand averages for 10 classes - 2009

Judge	Placed an 8,9,10 as 1, 2, or 3	Placed a 1,2,3 as 8, 9, or 10	Was the only one to place a particular horse	Average 1st two
b	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29
g	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.17
m	0.67	0.11	0.56	0.39
r	0.00	0.11	0.11	0.06
s	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
t	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.25

Average theta: 0.409

	1-10	1-5	1-3	Variance	# classes(10)
Judge-b:	7.59	5.27	3.85	7.403	7
Judge-g:	7.74	5.46	4.52	6.056	9
Judge-m:	9.04	6.39	5.21	7.910	9
Judge-r:	6.35	4.04	2.05	2.769	9
Judge-s:	7.28	4.95	3.30	6.730	8
Judge-t:	7.29	5.11	3.93	3.497	8
Averages	7.55	5.21	3.81		

The summary shows that as a group these judges did not agree as much as we would have liked as is reflected by the average value of theta being 0.41 and the average 1-3 distance being 3.81. Remember that values of theta 0.3 or less and 1-3 average distance of 3 or less are what would indicate a set of judges had generally agreed. Judge r did an outstanding job with an average 1-3 distance of 2.05 and a very small variance of 2.8 which indicates that his 1-3 distance was generally small because his average was small and there was little variation from his average. Judge s performed well having an average distance of 3.3 over all 10 classes. Judges b & t had average distances larger than desired but judge t showed consistency by having a relatively small variance. Judges g & m had large average distance values and large variances indicating that they often but not always judged very differently than their peers. All the judges except r and s picked horses differently than their peers as is indicated by the frequency with which they picked a horse in the lower third of their peers' composite rankings as one of their top 3 choices and judges b and t also made the reverse picks by placing a top 3 consensus horse as either 8, 9, or 10. Judges b and m also were the only ones to pick a particular horse more often than the other judges. Judge m frequently picked horses very differently than the others as did judge b but judge b's differences were less extreme. Clearly judges r & s performed better than the others. These two are judges whom we would recommend be hired for future shows.