

AD-A118 667

PORTLAND STATE UNIV OR DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY F/6 12/1
EMPIRICAL BAYES ESTIMATION OF PROPORTIONS IN SEVERAL GROUPS.(U)
JAN 81 J A PAULSON N00014-79-C-0214
UNCLASSIFIED TR-81-1 NL

(of)
40 x
1967

| |
|--------|
| END |
| DATE |
| FILMED |
| 09:32 |
| DTIC |

(11)

Technical Report 81-1
January 1981

EMPIRICAL BAYES ESTIMATION OF PROPORTIONS IN SEVERAL GROUPS

James A. Paulson
Psychology Department
Portland State University

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for
any purpose of the United States Government.

AUG 30 1982

E

This research was supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects
Agency and monitored by the Office of Naval Research, Personnel and
Training Research Programs, under Contract N00014-79-C-0214, NR 154-429.

AD A118667

DTIC FILE COPY

00 07 078

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 81-1 | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A118667 | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Empirical Bayes Estimation of Proportions in Several Groups | | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report |
| | | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) James A. Paulson | | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-79-C-0214 |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Psychology Department Portland State University Portland, OR 97207 | | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61153N RR 042-06-01 NR 154-429 |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22217 | | 12. REPORT DATE January 31, 1981 |
| | | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 26 |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217 | | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified |
| | | 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Empirical Bayes estimation Weighted estimators of variance components Estimation of proportions Optimal linear estimator | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A straightforward empirical Bayes approach to the problem of estimating binomial proportions in several similar but not necessarily identical groups is proposed. The approach compares favorably with similar methods proposed by Jackson (1972) and Novich, Lewis, and Jackson (1973). | | |

EMPIRICAL BAYES ESTIMATION OF PROPORTIONS IN SEVERAL GROUPS

The problem of estimating binomial proportions in several similar but not necessarily identical groups occurs frequently in psychological and educational settings. A straightforward empirical Bayes approach to this problem using a slight extension of the standard Bayesian method for estimating a single proportion is proposed. Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973) suggest a purely Bayesian solution to the problem which uses a root arcsine transformation of the proportions. They contrast their method with a similar approach using the same transformation, due to Jackson (1972) using examples to show that the Bayesian approach is better. This note shows that an improved version of Jackson's approach yields much more satisfactory results than the original, so the advantage of the purely Bayesian approach is questionable. But the revised version of Jackson's approach and the new beta-binomial approach yield practically identical results, so even the need for using the root-arcsine transformation is questionable, except when the proportions are concentrated near zero or one.

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For | |
| 1973 GRAI | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GAZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973GBT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GBZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GCZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GDZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GED | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GER | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GES | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GET | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GEZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GFZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 G GK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GGT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GPZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GQZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GRZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GST | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GSZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GTZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GUZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GV F | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GVZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GWZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GXZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GYZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZA | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZC | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZE | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZF | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZG | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZH | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZI | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZJ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZK | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZL | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZN | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZO | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZP | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZQ | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZR | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZS | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZT | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZU | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZV | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZW | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZX | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZY | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1973 GZZ | <input type="checkbox"/> |

A



EMPIRICAL BAYES ESTIMATION OF PROPORTIONS IN SEVERAL GROUPS

I. Introduction

The problem of estimating binomial proportions in several similar but not necessarily identical groups occurs frequently in psychological and educational settings. Standard practice suggests two conflicting ways to deal with the problem. One might stress the similarities between the groups and use the overall proportion as a common estimate for each group proportion. This option makes sense if the variance between the group proportions is so small that it is plausible that it is just due to the variability of sample proportions drawn from the same population. The second possibility stresses the differences between the groups. It assumes that each group is a sample from a population distinct from the other groups and hence uses the sample proportion for each group to estimate its distinct population proportion. The greater the variance between the proportions in the separate groups, the more justified the second option becomes. The typical situation falls in a awkward middle ground where neither way suggested by standard practice seems completely appropriate: it is implausible on the basis of the data that the groups come from identical populations, yet the groups are similar enough that one must view with some skepticism sample proportions which differ markedly from the rest of the groups, particularly when those proportions are based on relatively small samples. This paper concerns efforts to find a middle way between the two approaches just described which can weigh the direct information available in a single sample with the collateral information obtained from distinct but similar samples.

Jackson (1972) proposes a method inspired by the Kelley regression estimate of true score given observed score, from classical test theory. This is a weighted estimator which gives weight $r_{xx'}$ to an individual's observed test

score and weight $1-r_{xx}$, to the mean score for all individuals, where r_{xx} is the reliability coefficient. The analogy between the testing situation and the present problem is made by identifying the group proportions with test scores. Actually, the root arcsine transforms of the proportions are used instead because they fit the test-theory assumptions behind the Kelley formula better, being approximately normally distributed with conditional variance, given the true proportion, independent of the value of the true proportion. Observing that the reliability coefficient can be thought of as the ratio of true-score variance to observed score variance reduces the problem of determining how much weight to give to individual scores (or transformed group proportions) to one of estimation of variance components. Jackson suggests simple estimators which lead to easily computed estimates of the proportions.

By specializing results of Lindley and Smith (1972) concerning Bayesian analysis of variance-components in the general linear model, Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973) provide a Bayesian rationale for and extension of Jackson's approach. Their extension has both advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage is that the more thorough-going Bayesian approach avoids some nasty problems associated with the estimation of variance components, such as negative estimates of between-groups variance, which can make Jackson's original approach yield unconvincing analyses. The disadvantages are increased computational complexity and some technical problems concerning specification of the prior distribution for transformed proportions.

The problems with the specification of the prior distribution of the transformed proportions derive from the fact that the transformed proportions are bounded between 0 and $\pi/2$. Let γ denote the true transformed proportion for a given group, and let μ_γ and σ_γ^2 denote the mean and variance of the prior distribution of γ . The calculation of posterior distributions is greatly facilitated by assuming that the joint prior distribution of μ_γ and σ_γ^2 has them independently

distributed, with μ_Y uniformly distributed, σ_Y^2 distributed as inverse chi-squared, and γ , given μ_Y and σ_Y^2 , normally distributed. These assumptions are jointly compatible only if the prior for σ_Y^2 is tightly specified to keep the probability of large values of σ_Y^2 negligible. This is no problem if a tight specification accurately represents the investigator's prior beliefs. However, Novick, Lewis, and Jackson caution that setting an unrealistically tight prior in order to make the mathematical machinery run can have serious consequences.

If the conditional distribution of γ is to be approximately normal, then there must be room for two standard deviations between μ_Y and the nearest bound. Therefore, the probability of large values of σ_Y^2 must be kept small. Of course, the finite range of γ puts a limit on the size of σ_Y^2 anyway, but the normality assumption sharpens the bound considerably. Plausible skewed conditional distributions for γ could have values of σ_Y^2 much closer to the upper bound. The added constraint that the assumption of normality places on plausible values of σ_Y^2 is more stringent for values of μ_Y near 0 or $\pi/2$ than for μ_Y near $\pi/4$, so the assumption that μ_Y and σ_Y^2 are independently distributed further exacerbates the problem.

In the Novick, Lewis, and Jackson procedure the estimated proportions for the groups are obtained from the mode of the joint posterior distribution of the γ 's. It is necessary to solve a set of simultaneous equations, the Lindley equations, to find this mode. The solution cannot be given in closed form and the process of successive approximation can require many iterations to converge. Sometimes a unique mode does not exist. Novick, Lewis, and Jackson give formulas which can be calculated to check for uniqueness.

It is not clear how critical the problems just discussed are in practice. However, these problems and the increased computational complexity of the procedure do suggest that other ways to modify Jackson's simpler approach which could

avoid its weak points, but retain its computational simplicity, would be welcome. The following sections will show that simply using a better estimator of σ_Y^2 in Jackson's procedure goes far in this direction and that an even simpler approach inspired by the standard Bayesian analysis for a single proportion, which does not require a transformation, is possible. The latter approach is described in the next section. Jackson's approach and the proposed modification of it are discussed in the section after that. Finally, some examples discussed by Novick, Lewis, and Jackson are reexamined in the last section.

2. A Beta-Binomial Solution

The usual Bayesian approach to the estimation of a binomial proportion p assumes that the investigator's personal probability distribution for p prior to the gathering of data can be represented by a member of the beta family of distributions, the natural conjugate family for the binomial distribution. If we let \underline{r}' and \underline{n}' be the parameters identifying the particular member of this family which represents the investigator's prior belief, then the density of the prior distribution is given by

$$(2.1) \quad f_{\beta}(p|\underline{r}',\underline{n}') = \frac{1}{B(\underline{r}',\underline{n}' - \underline{r}')} p^{\underline{r}'-1} (1-p)^{\underline{n}'-\underline{r}'-1}$$

where $B(\underline{r}', \underline{n}' - \underline{r}')$ is the complete beta function. The mean of the investigator's prior distribution is $\underline{r}'/\underline{n}'$ and the posterior distribution, given \underline{r} successes in a sample of \underline{n} tries of an experiment carried out to provide further information about p , is the beta distribution with parameters $\underline{r} + \underline{r}'$ and $\underline{n} + \underline{n}'$. The mean of the posterior distribution, which can be used as a point estimate of p , is given by

$$(2.2) \quad \hat{p} = \frac{\underline{r} + \underline{r}'}{\underline{n} + \underline{n}'}$$

$$= \frac{\underline{n}}{\underline{n} + \underline{n}'} \cdot \frac{\underline{r}}{\underline{n}} + \frac{\underline{n}'}{\underline{n} + \underline{n}'} \cdot \frac{\underline{r}'}{\underline{n}'}$$

The second expression for \hat{p} shows that it is a weighted average of the sample proportion, $\underline{r}/\underline{n}$, and the mean of the prior distribution of p , $\underline{r}'/\underline{n}'$. The sample proportion receives most of the weight if \underline{n} is large relative

to \underline{n}' , whereas the overall mean, $\underline{r}'/\underline{n}'$, receives the most weight if \underline{n} is small relative to \underline{n}' .

When data from J different groups are available, it is possible for the experimenter to avoid the difficult problem of specifying his or her prior distribution for p , because the parameters \underline{r}' and \underline{n}' can be estimated from the data (hence the term empirical Bayes). If all J proportions are based on the same number of observations, and the J different p parameters are assumed to be a random sample from a population with a beta distribution, then the distribution of the sample proportions is beta-binomial. The parameters of the beta-binomial distribution are the number of observations per group, the number of groups, and the parameters \underline{r}' and \underline{n}' of the underlying beta distribution. By equating the sample mean and variance of the obtained number of successes in each group with theoretical expressions for their expected values in a beta-binomial, one obtains a system of equations which can be solved for \underline{n}' and \underline{r}' . The resulting estimators are

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{\underline{n}}' = \frac{\underline{n}(\underline{n} - 1) \underline{p} \cdot (1 - \underline{p} \cdot) - \Delta v_r}{\Delta v_r} ,$$

$$\hat{\underline{r}}' = \underline{p} \cdot \hat{\underline{n}}' ,$$

where $\underline{p} \cdot$ is the mean of the sample proportions and $\Delta v_r = s_r^2 - \underline{n} \underline{p} \cdot (1 - \underline{p} \cdot)$ is the difference between the sample variance of the number of successes between groups and the variance one would expect if the average p value had generated the data in all the groups.

Substituting the estimates of \underline{r}' and \underline{n}' given in Equation 2.3 into Equation 2.2 yields a formula for estimating the proportions in each group. These results, which assume that the sample sizes are equal, were given by Maritz (1966). We now propose a generalization which does not require this

assumption. First, let us rewrite the expression for \hat{n}' in Equation 2.3 as

$$(2.4) \quad \hat{n}' = \frac{p \cdot (1 - p) - \hat{\sigma}_p^2}{\hat{\sigma}_p^2}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_p^2 = \Delta v_r / n (n - 1)$ is an unbiased estimate of the variance of the beta distribution generating the p 's. The idea of estimating \hat{n}' and \hat{r}' by equating the first two sample moments of the distribution of the number of successes with the theoretical values for the beta-binomial breaks down because the sampling distribution is no longer beta-binomial when the n 's are unequal. Equation 2.4 can be used as the basis for the estimation if we can find a suitable estimator for σ_p^2 . One possible estimator can be obtained from a general theorem concerning the analysis of variance components in an unbalanced one-way random effects model. If we assume the means in such a model represent a random sample from a population with mean μ and variance σ_m^2 , then, even without making the assumption of homoscedasticity, we know that

$$(2.5) \quad \hat{\sigma}_m^2 = (J - 1) \left(N - \frac{\sum n_j^2}{N} \right)^{-1} (MS_{\text{between}} - MS_{\text{within}})$$

is an unbiased estimator of σ_m^2 , where n_j is the number of observations in group j , N is the total number of observations in the J groups, and MS_{between} and MS_{within} are the mean sums of squares in an unbalanced fixed effects analysis of variance.

In applying the theorem to the problem at hand, the estimation of σ_p^2 for use in Equation 2.4 to estimate \hat{n}' and \hat{r}' , it helps to note that $X_{ij}^2 = X_{ij}$ for 0-1 data. The sums and sums of squares required for the

analysis of variance reduce to counts:

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_i X_{ij}^2 = \sum_i X_{ij} = r_j, \text{ the number of successes in the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ group;}$$

$$\sum_{i,j} X_{ij}^2 = \sum_{i,j} X_{ij} = R, \text{ the total number of successes.}$$

We use Equation 2.6 to obtain a convenient computational formula for $\hat{\sigma}_p^2$.

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{\sigma}_p^2 = \frac{\frac{N(N-1)}{N-J} \sum_j \frac{r_j^2}{n_j} - R^2 - \frac{J-1}{N-J} R}{N^2 - \sum_j n_j^2}.$$

In summary, we propose to estimate similar proportions in J different groups as follows. First, we estimate the mean of the distribution of the p parameters generating the proportions by $\hat{p} = R/N$ and the variance by Equation 2.7. Then we find the parameters of the beta distribution having that mean and variance via Equation 2.4. Adopting this beta distribution as our prior, we apply Equation 2.2 successively to the sample results for each group to obtain the posterior expected proportions for the respective groups.

In the case of equal sample sizes, the approach just described coincides with one proposed by Griffin and Krutckoff (1971). The proposed weighted estimator of σ_p^2 for the extension of the method to the case of unequal sample sizes is potentially a weak link in the procedure. One problem is that it can yield negative estimates of variance. When this occurs, we assume σ_p^2 is zero and regress the estimates of the proportions for all groups to the overall proportion of success. It will be argued below that in the context of estimating the variance of proportions between groups the proposed estimator is

less subject to this problem than unweighted estimators that have been suggested and is satisfactory for the use intended here. This is not to say that it is the best possible estimator. The problem of estimating the between group variance component is very complicated in the unbalanced case. Tukey (1957) has studied the variance of a family of estimators based on a very general weighting scheme that includes the weighted and unweighted estimators discussed here as special cases. Which of the latter has smaller variance depends in a complicated way on several factors. Other estimators in the family can be devised which are better than either of these under some circumstances. A single "best" estimator does not exist. The situation seems to call for the utilization of prior information about the distribution which Bayesian procedures provide for. Hill (1965) has studied such procedures under normal distribution assumptions. Unfortunately, these procedures are cumbersome to apply and must invoke assumptions and approximations to simplify the mathematics which make one question how much one would gain by employing them. The legitimate consideration of ease of computation will often limit the possibilities seriously entertained to the simple weighted and unweighted estimators. As has already been indicated, reasons for preferring the former in the context of the present problem will be presented below in the discussion of application of the proposed procedure.

Before discussing applications of the approach to estimation of proportions in several groups described in this section, let us describe Jackson's (1972) classical Model II solution to the problem. This approach is similar in spirit to the one proposed here, but somewhat more complicated to carry out.

3. An Improved Classical Solution

The main way in which the classical Model II approach to the problem of estimating proportions in several groups differs from the approach just described is that it first transforms the proportions via the root arcsine transformation

$$(3.1) \quad g_j = \sin^{-1} \left(\frac{r_j + 3/8}{n_j + 3/4} \right)^{1/2} .$$

The steps carried out above on the proportions themselves are carried out on the transformed proportions in the classical approach. The transformed proportions have the desirable property of being approximately normally distributed with known variances. The approximate mean and variance of g_j are given by

$$(3.2) \quad E(g_j) = \sin^{-1} \sqrt{\pi_j} = \gamma_j$$

$$\text{Var}(g_j) = \frac{1}{4n_j + 2} ,$$

where π_j is the true proportion in group j . Thus, the variance of a transformed sample proportion depends only on the sample size, not on the true value of the proportion. Let μ_Y and σ_Y^2 be the mean and variance of the population of transformed true proportions from which the γ_j 's are considered to have been sampled. These are estimated from the data by methods to be discussed below. Then assuming a normal prior with these parameter values,

the posterior means of the transformed proportions are

$$(3.3) \quad \hat{\gamma}_j = \frac{g_j \hat{\sigma}_Y^2 + \hat{\mu}_Y (4n_j + 2)^{-1}}{\hat{\sigma}_Y^2 + (4n_j + 2)^{-1}} .$$

When the $\hat{\gamma}_j$'s have been obtained, the estimated proportions themselves are given by the inverse transformation

$$(3.4) \quad \hat{\pi}_j = \sin^2 \hat{\gamma}_j .$$

Jackson (1972) estimates the mean and variance of the transformed parameters by

$$\bar{\mu}_Y = \sum_j g_j / J$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad \bar{\sigma}_Y^2 = (J - 1)^{-1} \sum_j (g_j - \bar{\mu}_Y)^2 - J^{-1} \sum_j (4n_j + 2)^{-1} .$$

That is, he uses the unweighted mean of the transformed sample proportions as the estimator of the mean, and the difference between the sample variance of the observed g_j 's and the mean of their theoretical variances as the estimator of the variance of the parameter γ . We will use the following weighted estimators instead:

$$(3.6) \quad \hat{\mu}_Y = (4N + 2J)^{-1} \sum_j (4n_j + 2) g_j = \bar{g} . ,$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_Y^2 = \left(4N + 2J - \frac{\sum_j (4n_j + 2)^2}{4N + 2J} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_j (4n_j + 2) (g_j - \bar{g})^2 - (J - 1) \right) .$$

The estimator $\hat{\mu}_Y$ weights each g_j inversely to its sampling variance. For each j , the standardized variable

$$Z_g = (4n_j + 2)^{1/2} (g_j - \gamma_j)$$

is approximately normal in distribution, with mean 0 and variance 1. It follows that

$$Z_g^2 = (4n_j + 2) (g_j - \gamma_j)^2$$

is approximately distributed as a chi-squared variate with one degree of freedom.

If there is no variation in the γ_j 's, then the statistic

$$H = \sum_j (4n_j + 2) (g_j - g.)^2$$

is approximately distributed as chi-squared with $J-1$ degrees of freedom. In general, its expected value is given by

$$E(H) = J - 1 + \left(4N + 2J - \frac{\sum_j (4n_j + 2)^2}{4N + 2J} \right) \sigma_Y^2 .$$

The latter relation is the reason we suggest the estimator \hat{q}_Y^2 defined in Equation 3.5 . The weighted estimators in Equation 3.5 reduce to the estimators proposed by Jackson (1972) when the sample sizes are equal. They have much less sampling variability than the unweighted estimators when the sample sizes are grossly unequal and σ_Y^2 is relatively small, because deviations from the overall proportion based on small samples, which tend to be large, are given less weight than the more stable proportions based on larger samples. It will be seen below that the weighted estimators can yield quite different results than the unweighted estimators.

4. Reevaluation of Some Applications

Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973) present detailed analyses of four applications drawn from educational settings. The last example in their discussion is critical because it is the one in which the classical empirical Bayes approach and their purely Bayesian approach appear to be most clearly contrasted. The data concern the performance of students at an Eastern University who were admitted despite the fact that a regression analysis based on Scholastic Aptitude Test scores indicated that they would be unlikely to maintain a grade point average sufficient to complete their undergraduate program. The students were carefully selected on the basis of other variables such as demonstrated motivation and willingness to work hard over an extended period of time. The question addressed by the data is whether there are meaningful differences in success rate as a function of major field within the humanities and social sciences. The data are given in Table 1.

When one applies the variance estimator given in Eq. 3.5 to the data in Table 1, the resulting estimate of the variance of transformed proportions is $-.004$. Given this result, the only sensible course seems to be to assume that there is no real variation in the parameter. A purely Bayesian analysis, on the other hand, does suggest a small amount of real variation in the parameter, which Novick et al. argue is a more plausible interpretation of the data.

One might agree that the latter interpretation is the more plausible, but on the grounds that the negative estimate of parameter variance reflects the inadequacy of the unweighted estimator of σ_Y^2 , rather than the inadequacy of the classical approach per se. The weighted estimator given in Eq. 3.6 yields an estimate of σ_Y^2 of $+0.006$. To put this result in a familiar metric, the corresponding chi-squared test statistic for testing the homogeneity of the transformed proportions is 20.93, which almost reaches the .05 level critical value of 21.03. In fact, the chi-squared statistic calculated on the untransformed proportions

Estimation of Proportions

Table 1. Comparison of different estimates of success rate as a function of major field.*

| Major Field | n_j | n_{j+} | P_j | B | \hat{P}_j | C' | C |
|-------------|-------|----------|-------|-----|-------------|-----|-----|
| 1 | 10 | 5 | .50 | .68 | .66 | .66 | .70 |
| 2 | 8 | 6 | .75 | .69 | .71 | .71 | .70 |
| 3 | 72 | 39 | .54 | .64 | .59 | .60 | .70 |
| 4 | 5 | 4 | .80 | .70 | .71 | .71 | .70 |
| 5 | 25 | 13 | .52 | .71 | .62 | .63 | .70 |
| 6 | 13 | 11 | .85 | .71 | .74 | .73 | .70 |
| 7 | 81 | 63 | .77 | .72 | .76 | .75 | .70 |
| 8 | 97 | 72 | .74 | .71 | .73 | .73 | .70 |
| 9 | 21 | 14 | .67 | .69 | .69 | .69 | .70 |
| 10 | 80 | 62 | .78 | .72 | .75 | .75 | .70 |
| 11 | 11 | 7 | .64 | .69 | .69 | .69 | .70 |
| 12 | 6 | 5 | .83 | .70 | .72 | .72 | .70 |
| 13 | 8 | 5 | .63 | .69 | .69 | .69 | .70 |

*Data adapted from Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973), Table VII.

Column B gives Bayesian Model II estimates for the prior specified by Novick et al. (1973).

Column \hat{P}_j gives the beta binomial estimates described in Section 2.

Column C' gives the estimates using the revised version of Jackson's (1972) classical method, with weighted estimates of μ_Y and σ_Y^2 .

Column C gives the classical estimates using unweighted estimators of μ_Y and σ_Y^2 .

$$\bar{p} = .70, \hat{\sigma}_p^2 = .006 \text{ (weighted estimates).}$$

$$\bar{y} = .99, \hat{\sigma}_y^2 = .006 \text{ (weighted estimates).}$$

Estimation of Proportions

is 21.36, which would lead one to reject homogeneity at the .05 level. Estimates of parameter variability close to 0 should indicate that the observed variability between samples is close to the expected value, given homogeneous parameters, which is patently not the case with these data. The sample sizes are extremely variable in this example, with the four largest samples having 72 or more cases each and the four smallest having 8 cases or less. Any adequate estimator of the variation between groups must take this variation of sample size into account.

The weighted estimator of the variance of σ_{γ}^2 will yield negative estimates only when the variation between sample proportions is such that the chi-squared statistic for testing equality of the proportions is less than its expected value under the null hypothesis. This is analogous to a F-statistic less than 1 in testing equality of means in an analysis of variance. Under these circumstances, the sensible thing to do is usually to use the overall proportion as the common estimator for all of them. To do so is not inconsistent with the belief that there must be some real differences between the parameters. It merely indicates that either the samples are so small or the sample proportions so close to one another, or both, that distinct estimates for each proportion would be misleading regarding the differences.

Both the weighted and unweighted estimators of σ_{γ}^2 can yield negative results. In order to make sure that it is not just the luck of the draw that makes the weighted estimator come out better in this case, one hundred replications mimicking the situation in this data set were simulated on a computer. In each replication, γ 's having mean 1.00 and variance .006 were generated for thirteen groups using a random normal number generator. The γ for each group was then modified by a random normal sampling error with mean 0 and variance $(4n_j + 2)^{-1}$. Then weighted and unweighted estimates of σ_{γ}^2 were calculated. The distribution of the results is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of weighted and unweighted estimates of σ_Y^2 in 100 simulated replications under conditions represented in Table 1.

| <u>Estimated σ_Y^2</u> | <u>Weighted Estimates</u> | <u>Unweighted Estimates</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| est. $\sigma_Y^2 \leq .000$ | 10 | 35 |
| .000 < " $\leq .003$ | 24 | 11 |
| .003 < " $\leq .006$ | 20 | 8 |
| .006 < " $\leq .009$ | 20 | 11 |
| .009 < " $\leq .012$ | 17 | 10 |
| <u>.012 < "</u> | <u>9</u> | <u>25</u> |
| | 100 | 100 |
| mean | .00575 | .00567 |
| standard deviation | .00527 | .01110 |

The unweighted estimates are negative 35 times out of 100, whereas the weighted estimates are negative only 10 times in 100. The unweighted estimates are more than double the actual value of σ_Y^2 25 times compared to only 9 times for the weighted estimates. Clearly, under the conditions present in this data set, namely large variation in sample size and small variation in γ , the weighted estimator is much better behaved than the unweighted estimator. These remarks apply with equal force to the comparison of the weighted and unweighted estimators of σ_p^2 in the direct beta-binomial method described in Section 2. The γ 's in the simulations just described were transformed to p 's via the relation $p = \sin^2 \gamma$, and the resulting p 's used to generate binary data for each group. The unweighted estimator of σ_p^2 yielded negative estimates 35 times, whereas the weighted estimator in Eq. 2.11 did so only 12 times. The standard deviation of the weighted estimator was less than half that of the unweighted estimator.

The estimates of success rate by major field produced by the different estimators are compared in Table 1. All the estimates are sharply regressed toward the overall success rate of .70, with the estimates of Jackson's (1972) method entirely regressed to .70. The contrast between the different estimators is clearest for Majors 3 and 5, whose observed success rates of .54 and .52 based on moderately large samples represent noteworthy deviations from the overall success rate. The critical ratios for these deviations from a hypothetical rate of .70 are -2.93 and -1.96 respectively. For Major 3 the empirical Bayes estimates using weighted estimates of parameter variation are .59 for the direct beta-binomial method and .60 for Jackson's method; for Major 5 these methods yield .62 and .63, respectively. There is little to choose between the direct beta-binomial method and the revised version of Jackson's method in this set of data, since the two approaches never differ by more than one point in the second decimal place. The estimates produced by either method seem more plausible for Majors 3 and 5 than .70.

The data set just discussed is well suited for showing the weighted estimators at their best because the sample sizes are so variable and the apparent variation in the underlying proportions so small. Let us turn now to an example more likely to show the unweighted estimators at their best. The first data set discussed by Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973) involved the analysis of the proportions of students attaining the 70th percentile on the Iowa Test of Educational Development composite score in eleven Midwestern high schools. Novick et al. consider several possible specifications of prior for σ_Y^2 , the one with largest variance having mean equal to .035. They argue that this is about as large as it can be and still be consistent with the constraints imposed by the desire that the prior for σ_Y^2 have an inverse chi-square form with mode falling within the interquartile range, and the fact that the γ 's are in the bounded interval $(0, \pi/2)$. The sample sizes in this example range from 14 to 30, but the second largest sample has only 21 subjects, so the variability in sample size is much less extreme than it was in the previous example. Moderate variation in sample size and large variation in the underlying parameter should make this example very favorable to unweighted estimators of σ_Y^2 and σ_p^2 .

A simulation study similar to the one done in the previous example was conducted using the sample sizes of the present example, a mean γ of .80, and σ_Y^2 equal to .035. The unweighted and the weighted estimates of σ_Y^2 were negative in 3 of 100 replications (the same replications, as it happened). The standard deviation and mean squared error were slightly smaller for the unweighted estimator, .018 vs .020. The correlation between the two estimators was .974. The results were even closer for the two estimators of σ_p^2 . The weighted estimate was negative once whereas the unweighted estimates never were. On the other hand the weighted estimator was (very) slightly less variable than the unweighted estimator.

The results of the simulation study suggest that it will make little difference whether weighted or unweighted estimators are used when there is not too much variability in sample size and the variation in the underlying proportions is substantial. The analyses of data for the example confirm this expectation. The data are given in Table 3. Estimators C , C' , and \hat{p} are defined as in Table 1. When Novick et al. applied their Bayesian analysis using a diffuse prior with $\sigma_Y^2 = .035$, the posterior estimate of σ_Y^2 went down to .015. The marked discrepancy between prior and posterior estimates of σ_Y^2 led them to try another analysis using the posterior specification of σ_Y^2 as if it were their prior. The results of this analysis, which is similar in spirit to the empirical Bayes approach, are given in the column headed B(t=16). The various analyses yield very similar results. The largest discrepancy between the weighted and unweighted versions of Jackson's method is .010. Between the direct beta-binomial approach and the weighted version of Jackson's method the largest discrepancy is .005. The largest difference between any two of the methods is .014.

In summary, the differences in performance between weighted and unweighted estimators of σ_Y^2 and σ_p^2 are not very significant when σ_Y^2 or σ_p^2 are large and the variability of sample sizes is moderate; that is, under conditions which would in general favor unweighted estimators. On the other hand, the differences in favor of weighted estimators are substantial when the sample sizes are extremely variable and σ_Y^2 is small. It is therefore recommended that weighted estimators be used as a general practice when applying these procedures.

The advantages of the empirical Bayes approaches over a strictly Bayesian Model II approach to the estimation of proportions in several groups are twofold: they are much easier to compute and they avoid the problem of the specification

Estimation of Proportions

Table 3. Comparison of analyses using different estimators of proportions of students attaining the 70th percentile on the Iowa Test of Educational Development composite score in eleven Midwestern high schools.*

| <u>School Number</u> | <u>n_j</u> | <u>n_{j+}</u> | <u>P_j</u> | <u>C</u> | <u>C'</u> | <u>\hat{P}_j</u> | <u>$B(\tau=16)$</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | 15 | 10 | .667 | .555 | .557 | .561 | .562 |
| 2 | 21 | 13 | .619 | .551 | .552 | .555 | .556 |
| 3 | 16 | 5 | .313 | .481 | .473 | .468 | .468 |
| 4 | 17 | 10 | .588 | .541 | .540 | .543 | .543 |
| 5 | 15 | 6 | .400 | .502 | .496 | .493 | .494 |
| 6 | 17 | 11 | .647 | .554 | .556 | .559 | .560 |
| 7 | 18 | 9 | .500 | .521 | .518 | .518 | .518 |
| 8 | 20 | 15 | .750 | .585 | .591 | .595 | .599 |
| 9 | 30 | 12 | .400 | .488 | .478 | .474 | .474 |
| 10 | 19 | 8 | .421 | .502 | .496 | .493 | .494 |
| 11 | 14 | 7 | .500 | .522 | .519 | .519 | .520 |

*Data adapted from Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973), Table IV.

of a prior distribution. The discussion of the latter problem by Novick, Lewis, and Jackson (1973) shows that it can be a rather delicate matter. An objection to the empirical Bayes methods is that the estimators of the variance of the underlying parameter are so poor that they cannot be trusted. The examples presented here suggest that the use of weighted estimators reduces the force of this objection considerably.

The weighted estimators are by no means perfect and in some other contexts an investigator might be well advised to use a Bayesian estimator enabling him to incorporate his prior beliefs about the extent of variation into his estimate. This might be the case, for example, if the data represent the results of a pilot study to determine the size of sample required to estimate the between group variance component accurately. The practice of setting a negative estimate of variance to zero could lead to a rather misleading conclusion in such a situation. However, in the present context, setting a negative estimate of variance to zero leads to the sensible decision to regress estimates of proportions to the overall proportion. For present purposes, the weighted estimators proposed in this paper seem to be adequate.

The beta-binomial method of Section 2 and Jackson's classical method yield practically identical results when weighted estimators of σ_p^2 and σ_Y^2 are used, at least for the examples presented here. This is not too surprising since the root arcsine transformation is a very weak transformation of proportions falling in the broad middle range of the unit interval, as is the case with the examples discussed here. In this range it in effect just adds the constant $\pi/4 - \frac{1}{2} = .29$ to each proportion, where the constant is the difference between the midrange of transformed unit interval and the midrange of unit interval itself. For example, the interval (.20, .80) is transformed to the interval (.46, 1.11) by the root arcsine transformation and to (.49, 1.09) by adding the constant .29. Even for the interval (.10, .90), the transformed

interval (.32, 1.25) is not very different from the shifted interval (.39, 1.19). The root arcsine transformation has a substantial effect on the spacing of proportions only when they are concentrated near zero or one. In such cases Jackson's method, using the Freeman and Tukey (1950) modification of the arcsine transformation

$$g = 1/2 \left(\sin^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{r}{n+1}} + \sin^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{r+1}{n+1}} \right) ,$$

may yield better results than the beta-binomial method. However, for problems where most of the proportions are between .10 and .90 the direct beta-binomial approach would be preferred because of its computational and conceptual simplicity.

REFERENCES

- Griffin, B.S., and Krutchkoff, R.G. Optimal linear estimators: An empirical Bayes version with application to the binomial distribution. Biometrika, 1971, 58, 195-201.
- Hill, B.M. Inference about variance components in the one-way model. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1965, 60, 806-825.
- Jackson, P.H. Simple approximations in the estimation of many parameters. British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 1972, 25, 213-228.
- Lindley, D.V., and Smith A.F.M. Bayesian estimates for the linear model. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1972, 34, 1-41.
- Maritz, J. Smooth empirical Bayes estimation for one-parameter discrete distributions. Biometrika, 1966, 53, 417-429.
- Novick, M.R., Lewis, C., and Jackson, P.H. The estimation of proportions in m groups. Psychometrika, 1973, 38, 19-46.
- Tukey, J.W. Variances of variance components: II. The unbalanced single classification. Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1957, 28, 43-56.

| Navy | Navy |
|---|--|
| 1 Dr. Alvah Bittner Naval Biodynamics Laboratory New Orleans, Louisiana 70189 | 1 Dr. George Moeller Head, Human Factors Dept. Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab Groton, CN 06340 |
| 1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting Provost & Academic Dean U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940 | 1 Dr William Montague Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 |
| 1 Chief of Naval Education and Training Liason Office Air Force Human Resource Laboratory Flying Training Division WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224 | 1 Mr. William Nordbrock Instructional Program Development Bldg. 90 NET-PDCD Great Lakes Naval Training Center, IL 60088 |
| 1 CDR Mike Curran Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy St. Code 270 Arlington, VA 22217 | 1 Ted M. I. Yellen Technical Information Office, Code 201 NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92152 |
| 1 DR. PAT FEDERICO NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92152 | 1 Library, Code P201L Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 |
| 1 Dr. John Ford Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 | 1 Technical Director Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 |
| 1 Dr. Norman J. Kerr Chief of Naval Technical Training Naval Air Station Memphis (75) Millington, TN 38054 | 6 Commanding Officer Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390 |
| 1 Dr. William L. Maloy Principal Civilian Advisor for Education and Training Naval Training Command, Code 00A Pensacola, FL 32508 | 1 Psychologist ONR Branch Office Bldg 114, Section D 666 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210 |
| 1 CAPT Richard L. Martin, USN Prospective Commanding Officer USS Carl Vinson (CVN-70) Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co Newport News, VA 23607 | 1 Office of Naval Research Code 437 800 N. Quincy SStreet Arlington, VA 22217 |
| 1 Dr. James McBride Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 | 5 Personnel & Training Research Programs (Code 458) Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217 |

Navy

- 1 Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, CA 91101
- 1 Office of the Chief of Naval Operations
Research Development & Studies Branch
(OP-115)
Washington, DC 20350
- 1 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USN (Ph.D)
Selection and Training Research Division
Human Performance Sciences Dept.
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laborat
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 Dr. Gary Poock
Operations Research Department
Code 55PK
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Worth Scanland, Director
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation
N-5
Naval Education and Training Command
NAS, Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 Dr. Sam Schiflett, SY 721
Systems Engineering Test Directorate
U.S. Naval Air Test Center
Patuxent River, MD 20670
- 1 Dr. Alfred F. Smode
Training Analysis & Evaluation Group
(TAEG)
Dept. of the Navy
Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 Dr. Richard Sorensen
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. Ronald Weitzman
Code 54 WZ
Department of Administrative Sciences
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Navy

- 1 Dr. Robert Wisher
Code 309
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Mr John H. Wolfe
Code P310
U. S. Navy Personnel Research and
Development Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Army

- 1 Technical Director
U. S. Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Myron Fischl
U.S. Army Research Institute for the
Social and Behavioral Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Michael Kaplan
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Mr. Robert Ross
U.S. Army Research Institute for the
Social and Behavioral Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Robert Sasnor
U. S. Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Joseph Ward
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Air Force

- 1 Air Force Human Resources Lab
AFHRL/MPD
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific
Research
Life Sciences Directorate, NL
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, DC 20332
- 1 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi
HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Mr. Raymond E. Christal
AFHRL/MO
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Dr. Genevieve Haddad
Program Manager
Life Sciences Directorate
AFOSR
Bolling AFB, DC 20332
- 1 David R. Hunter
AFHRL/MOAM
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Research and Measurement Division
Research Branch, AFMPC/MPCYPR
Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 Dr. Malcolm Ree
AFHRL/MP
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Marines

CoastGuard

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1 Director, Office of Manpower Utilization 1 HQ, Marine Corps (MPU) BCB, Bldg. 2009 Quantico, VA 22134</p> <p>1 Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps Code MPI-20 Washington, DC 20380</p> <p>1 Special Assistant for Marine Corps Matters Code 100M Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217</p> <p>1 Major Michael L. Patrow, USMC Headquarters, Marine Corps (Code MPI-20) Washington, DC 20380</p> <p>1 DR. A.L. SLAFKOSKY SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR (CODE RD-1) HQ, U.S. MARINE CORPS WASHINGTON, DC 20380</p> | <p>Chief, Psychological Reserch Branch U. S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/2/TP42) Washington, DC 20593</p> <p>1 Mr. Thomas A. Warm U. S. Coast Guard Institute P. O. Substation 18 Oklahoma City, OK 73169</p> |
|--|---|

Other DoD

Civil Govt

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>12 Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station, Bldg 5 Alexandria, VA 22314 Attn: TC</p> <p>1 Dr. William Graham Testing Directorate MEPCOM/MEPCT-P Ft. Sheridan, IL 60037</p> <p>1 Military Assistant for Training and Personnel Technology Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research & Engineering Room 3D129, The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301</p> <p>1 Dr. Wayne Sellman Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (MRA & L) 2B269 The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301</p> <p>1 DARPA 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209</p> | <p>1 Dr. Susan Chipman Learning and Development National Institute of Education 1200 19th Street NW Washington, DC 20208</p> <p>1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde Personnel R&D Center Office of Personnel Management of USA 1900 E Street NW Washington, D.C. 20415</p> <p>1 Mr. Richard McKillip Personnel R&D Center Office of Personnel Management 1900 E Street NW Washington, DC 20415</p> <p>1 William J. McLaurin 66610 Howie Court Camp Springs, MD 20031</p> <p>1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar Science Education Dev. and Research National Science Foundation Washington, DC 20550</p> <p>1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko Program Director Manpower Research and Advisory Services Smithsonian Institution 801 North Pitt Street Alexandria, VA 22314</p> <p>1 Dr. Vern W. Urry Personnel R&D Center Office of Personnel Management 1900 E Street NW Washington, DC 20415</p> <p>1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director Memory & Cognitive Processes National Science Foundation Washington, DC 20550</p> |
|---|---|

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Erling B. Andersen
Department of Statistics
Studiestraede 6
1455 Copenhagen
DENMARK
- 1 Dr. John R. Anderson
Department of Psychology
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 1 psychological research unit
Dept. of Defense (Army Office)
Campbell Park Offices
Canberra ACT 2600, Australia
- 1 Dr. Isaac Bejar
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Ina Bilodeau
Department of Psychology
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA 70118
- 1 Dr. Menucha Birenbaum
School of Education
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv, Ramat Aviv 69978
Israel
- 1 Dr. Werner Birke
DezWPs im Streitkraefteamt
Postfach 20 50 03
D-5300 Bonn 2
WEST GERMANY
- 1 Dr. R. Darrel Bock
Department of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637
- 1 Liaison Scientists
Office of Naval Research,
Branch Office, London
Box 39 FPO New York 09510

Non Govt

- 1 DR. JOHN F. BROCK
Honeywell Systems & Research Center
(MN 17-2318)
2600 Ridgeway Parkway
Minneapolis, MN 55413
- 1 Dr. John S. Brown
XEROX Palo Alto Research Center
3333 Coyote Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
- 1 Dr. John B. Carroll
Psychometric Lab
Univ. of No. Carolina
Davie Hall 013A
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 1 Dr. Norman Cliff
Dept. of Psychology
Univ. of So. California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. William E. Coffman
Director, Iowa Testing Programs
334 Lindquist Center
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Dr. Meredith P. Crawford
American Psychological Association
1200 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
- 1 Dr., Fritz Drasgow
Yale School of Organization and Manageme
Yale University
Box 1A
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank, Jr.
McFann-Gray & Associates, Inc.
5825 Callaghan
Suite 225
San Antonio, Texas 78228

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Leonard Feldt
Lindquist Center for Measurment
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Dr. Richard L. Ferguson
The American College Testing Program
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields
Dept. of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Univ. Prof. Dr. Gerhard Fischer
Liebiggasse 5/3
A 1010 Vienna
AUSTRIA
- 1 Professor Donald Fitzgerald
University of New England
Armidale, New South Wales 2351
AUSTRALIA
- 1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen
Bolt Beranek & Newman
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Dr. Bert Green
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
- 1 Dr. Ron Hambleton
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01002
- 1 Dr. Chester Harris
School of Education
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Lloyd Humphreys
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820
- 1 Library
HumRRO/Western Division
27857 Berwick Drive
Carmel, CA 93921
- 1 Dr. Steven Hunka
Department of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA
- 1 Dr. Earl Hunt
Dept. of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98105
- 1 Dr. Jack Hunter
2122 Coolidge St.
Lansing, MI 48906
- 1 Dr. Huynh Huynh
College of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
- 1 Professor John A. Keats
University of Newcastle
AUSTRALIA 2308
- 1 Mr. Jeff Kelety
Department of Instructional Technology
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 92007
- 1 Dr. Michael Levine
Department of Educational Psychology
210 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Charles Lewis
Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Oude Boteringestraat 23
9712GC Groningen
Netherlands
- 1 Dr. Robert Linn
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Gary Marco
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Scott Maxwell
Department of Psychology
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77004
- 1 Dr. Samuel T. Mayo
Loyola University of Chicago
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
- 1 Professor Jason Millman
Department of Education
Stone Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
- 1 Dr. Melvin R. Novick
356 Lindquist Center for Measurment
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Wayne M. Patience
American Council on Education
GED Testing Service, Suite 20
One Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Non Govt

- 1 MR. LUIGI PETRULLO
2431 N. EDGEWOOD STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22207
- 1 DR. DIANE M. RAMSEY-KLEE
R-K RESEARCH & SYSTEM DESIGN
3947 RIDGEMONT DRIVE
MALIBU, CA 90265
- 1 MINRA: M. L. RAUCH
P II 4
BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG
POSTFACH 1328
D-53 BONN 1, GERMANY
- 1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase
Educational Psychology Dept.
University of Missouri-Columbia
4 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211
- 1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose
American Institutes for Research
1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman
Department of Psychology
Montgomery College
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf
Bell Laboratories
600 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
- 1 Dr. Lawrence Rudner
403 Elm Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20012
- 1 Dr. J. Ryan
Department of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
- 1 PROF. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE, TN 37916

Non Govt

- 1 DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820
- 1 DR. ROBERT J. SEIDEL
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY GROUP
HUMRRO
300 N. WASHINGTON ST.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Kazuo Shigemasa
University of Tohoku
Department of Educational Psychology
Kawauchi, Sendai 980
JAPAN
- 1 Dr. Edwin Shirkey
Department of Psychology
University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL 32816
- 1 Dr. Richard Snow
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Robert Sternberg
Dept. of Psychology
Yale University
Box 11A, Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 DR. PATRICK SUPPES
INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN
THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan
Laboratory of Psychometric and
Evaluation Research
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Brad Sympson
Psychometric Research Group
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541
- 1 Dr. David Thissen
Department of Psychology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66044
- 1 Dr. Robert Tsutakawa
Department of Statistics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201
- 1 Dr. David Vale
Assessment Systems Corporation
2395 University Avenue
Suite 306
St. Paul, MN 55114
- 1 Dr. Howard Wainer
Division of Psychological Studies
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 DR. THOMAS WALLSTEN
PSYCHOMETRIC LABORATORY
DAVIE HALL 013A
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROL
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss
N660 Elliott Hall
University of Minnesota
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 DR. SUSAN E. WHITELY
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044
- 1 Dr. Christopher Wickens
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Non Govt

- 1 Wolfgang Wildgrube
Streitkraefteamt
Box 20 50 03
D-5300 Bonn 2

FILMED

9-8