

AD-A157 898 BUG DISTRIBUTION AND PATTERN CLASSIFICATION(U) ILLINOIS 1/1  
UNIV AT URBANA COMPUTER-BASED EDUCATION RESEARCH LAB  
K K TATSUOKA ET AL. 15 JUL 85 CERL-85-3-ONR


UNCLASSIFIED

N00014-82-K-0604

F/G 12/1

NL

									END					
									FILED					
									DTM					



NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS  
MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

Computer-based Education Research Laboratory

CERL

BUG DISTRIBUTION  
AND  
PATTERN CLASSIFICATION

KIKUMI K. TATSUOKA  
MAURICE M. TATSUOKA

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

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training  
Research Program, Psychological Science Division, Office  
of Naval Research, under Contract No. N00014-82-K-0604,  
Contract Authority Identification Number NR 150-495.

DTIC FILE COPY

RESEARCH REPORT 85-3-ONR

DTIC  
ELECTE  
AUG 15 1985  
S D B

JULY 1985



University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

### REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release Distribution unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) 85-3-ONR		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION University of Illinois	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Computer-based Ed Res Lab University of Illinois	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Grants and Contracts 105 Davenport House - 809 S. Wright St. Champaign, IL 61820	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 103 S, Mathews St. Urbana, IL 61801		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Personnel & Training Research Programs 800 N. Quincy St., Arlington, VA 22217		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 6115N	PROJECT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Unclassified: Bug distribution and Pattern Classification		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. NR150-495
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Kikumi K. Tatsuoka and Maurice M. Tatsuoka			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Research	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985, July, 15	15. PAGE COUNT 24
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	Rule space model, <del>cognitive skill acquisition,</del> error diagnosis, <del>bug distribution,</del> hypothesis testing, Bayes' decision rules, classification, latent knowledge.	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) <p>&gt; A model (called rule space) which permits measuring cognitive skill acquisition, diagnosing cognitive errors, detecting the weaknesses and strengths of knowledge possessed by individuals was introduced earlier. This study further discusses the theoretical foundation of the model by introducing "Bug Distribution" and hypothesis testing (Bayes' decision rules for minimum errors) for classifying an individual into his/her most plausible latent state of knowledge. The model is illustrated with the domain of fraction arithmetic and compared with the results obtained from a conventional Artificial Intelligence approach.</p>			
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

Footnotes

The authors would like to acknowledge Mr. Robert Baillie for developing several computer programs and for useful discussions concerning this research.

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Program, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research.

Some of the analyses presented in this report were performed on the PLATO® system. The PLATO® system is a development of the University of Illinois, and PLATO® is a service mark of Control Data Corporation.

Copies of this report may be requested from Kikumi K. Iatsuoka, Computer-based Education Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, 103 S. Mathews St., Rm. 252, Urbana, IL 61801.

**S** DTIC  
ELECTE **D**  
AUG 15 1985  
**B**

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

DTIC  
COP  
RESERVED  
0

## Introduction

Several deterministic methods commonly used in Artificial Intelligence have been applied to develop problem-solving programs, or error-diagnostic systems. These methods have successfully diagnosed many erroneous rules of operation in arithmetic, algebra, and some science domains. The results of such error analyses have contributed to our current understanding of human thinking and reasoning.

These approaches, however, lack taking the variability of response errors into account, and they also depend on a specific model of problem solving. Therefore, they often cannot diagnose responses affected by random errors (sometimes called "slips") or produced by innovative thinking that is not taken into account by the current models. It is very difficult to develop a computer program whose underlying algorithms for solving a problem represents a wide range of individual differences. Yet, when these diagnostic systems are used in educational practice, they must be capable of evaluating any responses on test-items, inconsistent performances as well as those yielded by creative thinking. Therefore, we need a model that is capable of diagnosing non-systematic cognitive errors and is also capable of evaluating non-conventional problem-solving activities.

Tatsuoka and her associates (Tatsuoka, 1985, 1984a; Tatsuoka & Linn, 1983; Tatsuoka & Tatsuoka, 1983, 1982) have developed such a model called rule space and have successfully applied it to diagnose misconceptions possessed by students in signed-number and fraction arithmetic. The model maps all response patterns into a set of ordered pairs, the latent ability variable  $\theta$  and one of the IRT based caution indices ( $\zeta$ ) introduced by Tatsuoka (1984a). However, the approach used in their model lacks, somehow, a sound statistical foundation in expressing

random errors when a specific rule is applied for solving a problem. The simulation study by Tatsuoka and Baillie (1982) showed that the response patterns yielded by not-perfect-applications of a specific erroneous rule of operation in a procedural domain form a cluster around the rule. Moreover, they found empirically that the two random variables,  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$  obtained from those response patterns in the cluster follow a multivariate normal distribution. This cluster around a rule is called a "bug distribution" hereafter. The theoretical foundation of this empirical evidence will be discussed in this study. First, a brief description of the probabilistic model introduced in Tatsuoka (1985) will be given. Then the connection of each "bug distribution" to the model will be discussed in the conjunction with the theory of statistical pattern classification and recognition.

#### Distribution of Responses around an Erroneous Rule

The responses around a particular rule of operation in a procedural domain which are produced by not-perfectly-consistent applications of the rule to the test items form a cluster. They include responses which deviate, in various degrees of remoteness, from the response generated by the rule. When these discrepancies are observed, they are considered as response errors. These response errors are called "slips" by cognitive scientists (Brown & VanLehn, 1980). The properties of such responses around a given erroneous rule will be investigated in this section.

First, the probability of having a "slip" on item  $j$  ( $j=1,2,\dots,n$ ) is assumed to be the same value,  $p$  for all items and it will be called "slip probability" in this paper. Let us denote an arbitrary rule for which the total score is  $r$  by Rule  $R$  and let the corresponding response pattern be:

$$(1) \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ x_r \\ x_{r+1} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ x_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad x_1 = x_2 \dots = x_r = 1, \text{ and } x_{r+1} = \dots = x_n = 0.$$

The response patterns existing one slip away from Rule R are of two kinds: a slip of "one to zero" occurring at  $1 \leq j \leq r$  and "zero to one" at  $r < j \leq n$ . The number of response patterns having one slip is therefore  $\binom{r}{1} \binom{n-r}{0} + \binom{r}{0} \binom{n-r}{1}$ , and the probability of having one slip on items  $j=1, \dots, n$  is given by  $\binom{r}{1} p^1 (1-p)^{r-1} \binom{n-r}{0} p^0 (1-p)^{n-r} + \binom{r}{0} p^0 (1-p)^r \binom{n-r}{1} p^1 (1-p)^{n-r-1}$  if the probability  $p$  is the same for all items,  $j=1, \dots, n$ . Therefore the following equation (2) is obtained;

$$(2) \quad \text{Prob } (x_j - 1 \text{ for some } j=1, \dots, r \text{ or } x_j + 1 \text{ for some } j=r+1, \dots, n) = \\ \text{Prob (having a slip on an item)} = \left( \binom{r}{1} \binom{n-r}{0} + \binom{r}{0} \binom{n-r}{1} \right) p^1 (1-p)^{n-1} .$$

Similarly, the probability of having two slips on the items is given by Equation (3) as follows:

$$(3) \quad \text{Prob (having two slips on the items)} = \left( \binom{r}{2} \binom{n-r}{0} + \binom{r}{1} \binom{n-r}{1} + \binom{r}{0} \binom{n-r}{2} \right) p^2 (1-p)^{n-2} .$$

In general, the probability of having  $k$  slips on the items is given by:

(4) Prob (having k slips on the items)

$$= \sum_{k_1+k_2=k} \binom{r}{k_1} \binom{n-r}{k_2} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} .$$

The generating function of the distribution of frequencies up to k slips will be given by Equation (5) as follows:

$$(5) \sum_{s \leq k} \text{Prob (having s slips)} = \sum_{s \leq k} \left( \sum_{s_1+s_2=s} \binom{r}{s_1} \binom{n-r}{s_2} \right) p^s (1-p)^{n-s} .$$

Since the coefficient term inside the braces equals  $\binom{n}{s}$ , Equation (5) will be simply a binomial distribution, given by Equation (6).

$$(6) \sum_{s \leq k} \text{Prob (having s slips)} = \sum_{s \leq k} \binom{n}{s} p^s (1-p)^{n-s} .$$

Therefore, a cluster around Rule R which consists of response patterns including various numbers of slips (not-perfectly-consistent application of Rule R) has a frequency distribution of a binomial form with the equal slip probability p for the items. One weakness in Equation (6) is that the value of p is not known and it is very unlikely that the value of p is constant over the test items. If we assume each item has an unique slip probability, then the binomial distribution expressed by Equation (6) will be a compound binomial distribution. Equation (7) is the generating function of the compound binomial distribution.

$$(7) \sum_{s \leq k} \text{prob (having s slips)} = \sum_{s \leq k} \prod_j^k (p_j + q_j)$$

Before an approximation of the slip probabilities  $p_j$  is discussed, the rule-space concept will be briefly introduced in the next section.

#### A Brief Summary of the Probabilistic model Rule Space

One of the purposes of the model, the rule space, is to interpret semantically the relationships among various erroneous rules and the right rule, and compare the characteristic of each rule to the right rule or other rules. An analogy for the underlying motivation of seeking a norm-referenced characteristic of "bug behavior" may be found in the theory and practice of norm-referenced tests. This starts by selecting the right rule as a norm and then comparing the other erroneous rules to the characteristic of the norm. By doing so, the psychometric behavior of "bugs" as compared with the right rule, understanding why and how various misconceptions are related and transformed from one to another will be explained more clearly than by just describing the list of bugs.

The rule space model begins by mapping all possible binary response patterns into a vector space of  $(\theta, \zeta)$ , where  $\theta$  is the latent ability variable in Item Response Theory (IRT) and  $\zeta$  (or  $\zeta(x_j\theta)$ ) is one of the IRT based caution indices (Tatsuoka, 1984a; Tatsuoka & Linn, 1983). The mapping function  $f(x)$  is expressed as an inner product of two residual vectors,  $\tilde{P}(\theta) - \tilde{x}$  and  $\tilde{P}(\theta) - \tilde{T}(\theta)$  where  $P_j(\theta)$ ,  $j=1, \dots, n$  are the one- or two-parameter logistic-model probabilities,  $\tilde{x}$  is a binary response vector and  $\tilde{T}(\theta)$  is the mean vector of the logistic probabilities.  $f(x)$  is a linear mapping function between  $\tilde{x}$  and  $\zeta$  at a given level of  $\theta$ , and the response patterns having the same sufficient statistics for the maximum likelihood estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  of  $\theta$  are dispersed into different locations on the line of  $\theta = \hat{\theta}$ . For example, on a 100-item test, there are 4950 different response patterns

having the total score of 2. The  $\zeta$ 's for the 4950 binary patterns will be distributed between  $\zeta_{\min}$  and  $\zeta_{\max}$ , where  $\zeta_{\min}$  is obtained from the pattern having 1 for the two easiest items and zeros elsewhere, and  $\zeta_{\max}$  is from the pattern having 1 for the two most difficult items.  $f(\underline{x})$  has the expectation zero and variance  $\sum_{j=1}^n P_j(\theta) Q_j(\theta) (P_j(\theta) - T(\theta))^2$  (Tatsuoka, 1985). Since the expectation of the random variable  $x_j (j=1, \dots, n)$  is  $P_j(\theta)$ , the expectation of a vector  $\underline{x}$  is  $\underline{P}(\theta)$  whose  $j$ th component is  $P_j(\theta)$ . The vector  $\underline{P}(\theta)$  will be mapped to zero as shown in (8), thus the pattern corresponds to  $(\theta, 0)$  in the rule space.

$$(8) \quad f(\underline{P}(\theta)) = 0$$

As for an erroneous rule  $R$ , the response vector  $\underline{R}$  given by (1) will be mapped onto  $(\theta_R, f(\underline{R}, \theta_R))$ , where the  $\zeta$  value is  $\sum_{j=1}^n (P_j(\theta) - R_j)(P_j(\theta) - T(\theta))$ , and is given by (9). That is,

$$(9) \quad f(\underline{R}) = - \sum_{j=1}^r Q_j(\theta_R) (P_j(\theta_R) - T(\theta_R)) + \sum_{j=r+1}^n P_j(\theta_R) (P_j(\theta_R) - T(\theta_R)).$$

Similarly, all the response vectors resulting from several slips around rule  $R$  will be mapped into the vicinity of  $(\theta_R, f(\underline{R}))$  in the rule space and form a cluster (called the cluster around  $R$  hereafter). Figure 1 shows computer-simulated examples of such clusters done on the PLATO system.

-----  
 Insert Figure 1 about here  
 -----




Figure 1: Two Clusters of Groups 1 and 8 with Two Slips. n=631

The two variables  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $f(\underline{x})$  are mutually uncorrelated so their covariance matrix has a diagonal form as follows;

$$(10) \begin{bmatrix} \text{var}(\hat{\theta}) & 0 \\ 0 & \text{var}(f(\underline{x})) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/I(\hat{\theta}) & 0 \\ 0 & \sum P_j(\hat{\theta}) Q_j(\hat{\theta}) (P_j(\hat{\theta}) - T(\hat{\theta}))^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $I(\theta)$  is the information function of the test and is given by  $\sum a_j^2 P_j(\theta) Q_j(\theta)$  where the  $a_j$  ( $j=1, \dots, n$ ) are item discriminating powers.

Let us map all response patterns of the test, including clusters around various rules into the Cartesian product space of  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $f(\underline{x})$ , where

$$(11) \quad f(\underline{x}) = (P(\theta), P(\theta) - T(\theta)) - (\underline{x}, P(\theta) - T(\theta))$$

or

$$= K(\theta) - \sum_{j=1}^n x_j (P_j(\theta) - T(\theta)),$$

In particular, Rule R itself will be mapped as

$$\underline{R} = \underline{x} + (\hat{\theta}_R, f(\underline{R})),$$

where  $f(\underline{R})$  is given by Equation (9). The variance of the cluster around R will be expressed by using the slip probability of item j,  $p_j$  as follows;

$$(12) \quad \text{Var}(\text{the cluster around R}) = \sum p_j q_j (P_j(\theta_R) - T(\theta_R))^2.$$

The quantities  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  are associated with Rule R as well as with item j, and their values are unknown. However, if the ordered pair  $(\theta_R, \zeta_R)$  in the rule space falls close to the  $\theta$  axis, then  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  may be approximated by the logistic probability  $P_j(\theta_R)$  and its complement  $Q_j(\theta_R) = 1 - P_j(\theta_R)$ ,

respectively, without too much loss of accuracy. If  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  are thus approximated, then the variance of Equation (12) will be the same as the variance of the mapping function  $f(x)_j$  that is

$$(13) \quad \text{Var}(\zeta \text{ in the cluster around } R) \approx \sum P_j(\theta) Q_j(\theta) (P_j(\theta) - T(\theta))^2$$

The variance of  $\theta$  in any cluster, on the other hand, is given by the reciprocal  $1/I(\theta)$  of the information function, which can be computed as

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\theta \text{ in the cluster around } R) &= 1/I(\theta_R) \\ &= 1/\sum a_j^2 P_j(\theta_R) Q_j(\theta_R) \end{aligned}$$

where  $a_j = 1$  for the one-parameter logistic model.

The above two variances, along with the fact that  $\zeta$  and  $\hat{\theta}$  are uncorrelated, plus the reasonable assumption that they have a bivariate normal distribution, allow us to construct any desired percent ellipse around each rule point  $\underline{R}$ . The upshot is that, if all erroneous rules (and the correct one) were to be mapped into the rule space along with their neighboring response patterns representing random slips from them, the resulting topography would be something like what is seen in Figure 2. That is, the population of points would exhibit modal densities at many rule points that each forms the center of an enveloping ellipse with the density of points getting rarer as we depart farther from the center in any direction. Furthermore, the major and minor axes of these

-----  
 Insert Figure 2 about here  
 -----

ellipses would -- by virtue of the uncorrelatedness of  $\zeta$  and  $\hat{\theta}$  -- be parallel to the vertical ( $\zeta$ ) and horizontal ( $\hat{\theta}$ ) reference axes of the rule space, respectively.

Recalling that for any given percentage ellipse, the lengths of the major and minor diameters are fixed multiples of the respective standard deviations

$$\left[ \sum_{j=1}^n P_j(\theta) Q_j(\theta) (P_j(\theta) - T(\theta))^2 \right]^{1/2} \text{ and } I(\hat{\theta})^{-1/2}$$

we may assert that the set of ellipses gives a complete characterization of the rule space. By this is meant that, once these ellipses are given, any response-pattern point can be classified as most likely being a random slip from one or another of the erroneous rules (or the correct one). We have only to determine, for a suitable percent value, which one of the several ellipses uniquely includes the given point.

#### Operational Classification Scheme

The geometrics scheme outlined above for classifying any given response-pattern point as being a "perturbation" from one or another of the rule points has a certain intuitive appeal (especially to those with high spatial ability!). However, it is obviously difficult if not infeasible to put it into practice. We, therefore, now describe the algebraic equivalent of the foregoing geometric classification-decision rule, which is none other than the well-known minimum- $D^2$  rule, where  $D^2$  is Mahalanobis' generalized squared-distance (Fukunaga, 1972; Tatsuoka, 1971). Then the




Figure 2: Fifteen Ellipses Representing Fifteen Error Types Randomly Chosen From Forty Sets of Ellipses

Bayes' decision rule for minimum error will be introduced.

Without loss of generality, we may suppose that a given response-pattern point  $\underline{x}$  has to be classified as representing a random slip from one of two rule points  $\underline{R}_1$  and  $\underline{R}_2$ . Let  $\underline{y}$  be a point in the rule space

corresponding to  $\underline{x}$ ,  $\underline{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta}_{\underline{x}} \\ f(\underline{x}) \end{bmatrix}$ . The Mahalanobis distance of  $\underline{y}$

from each of the two rule points is

$$(15) \quad D_{\underline{x}j}^2 = [\underline{y} - \underline{R}_j]' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} [\underline{y} - \underline{R}_j] \quad (j=1,2)$$

where  $\underline{R}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta}_{R_1} \\ f(R_1) \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\underline{R}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\theta}_{R_2} \\ f(R_2) \end{bmatrix}$ , and the variance-covariance matrix

will be,

$$\underline{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/I(\hat{\theta}) & 0 \\ 0 & \text{var}(f(\underline{x})) \end{bmatrix}$$

The decision rule is, of course, to classify  $\underline{x}$  as a perturbation from  $\underline{R}_1$  if  $D_{\underline{x}1}^2 < D_{\underline{x}2}^2$  and otherwise as a perturbation from  $\underline{R}_2$ . However, the decision based on the Mahalanobis distances,  $D_{\underline{x}1}^2$  and  $D_{\underline{x}2}^2$  does not provide error probabilities of misclassification. The next section will discuss them.

The Bayes Decision Rule for Minimum Error

Suppose  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are two clusters of points corresponding to Rules 1 and 2, respectively. Let  $\underline{Y}$  be a vector  $(\hat{\theta}, \zeta)$  corresponding to an observed response pattern  $\underline{x}$ , and  $\zeta$  be the standardized value of  $f(\underline{x})$ , IRT-based caution index. Then the variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  will be

$$\underline{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/I(\hat{\theta}) & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

A decision rule based on probabilities may be summarized as follows:

- (16) If  $\text{Prob}(R_1 | \underline{Y}) > \text{Prob}(R_2 | \underline{Y})$  then  $\underline{Y} \in R_1$  and  
 if  $\text{Prob}(R_1 | \underline{Y}) < \text{Prob}(R_2 | \underline{Y})$  then  $\underline{Y} \in R_2$ .

These posterior probabilities can be obtained from prior probabilities,  $\text{Prob}(R_1)$  and  $\text{Prob}(R_2)$ , and the conditional density function  $p(\underline{Y} | R_i)$ ,  $i=1,2$  as follows;

$$(17) \quad \text{Prob}(R_i | \underline{Y}) = \frac{p(\underline{Y} | R_i) \text{Prob}(R_i)}{p(\underline{Y})}$$

Therefore, the decision rule can be expressed as follows:

$$(18) \quad \text{If } p(\underline{Y} | R_1) \text{Prob}(R_1) > p(\underline{Y} | R_2) \text{Prob}(R_2) \text{ then } \underline{Y} \in R_1 \\ \text{Otherwise, } \underline{Y} \in R_2 .$$

This rule will be rewritten by using the likelihood ratio  $\ell(\underline{Y})$ ,

$$(19) \quad \text{If } \ell(\underline{Y}) = \frac{p(\underline{Y} | R_1)}{p(\underline{Y} | R_2)} > \frac{\text{Prob}(R_2)}{\text{Prob}(R_1)} , \text{ then } \underline{Y} \in R_1 . \\ \text{Otherwise, } \underline{Y} \in R_2 .$$

Sometimes, it is convenient to take the negative log of the likelihood ratio in Expression (19), and rewrite it as Expression (20).

$$(20) \quad \text{If } h(\underline{Y}) = -\ln \ell(\underline{Y}) = -\ln(p(\underline{Y} | R_1)) + \ln(p(\underline{Y} | R_2)) \\ < \ln [ \text{Prob}(R_1) / \text{Prob}(R_2) ] \text{ then } \underline{Y} \text{ belongs to } R_1 .$$

However, the decision rule (20) does not lead to a perfect classification.

As Overall (1972) states (p. 330)

"Statistical classification decisions, like clinical diagnostic decisions, are only probabilistically correct. The clinician realizes this when he lists a secondary diagnosis. The statistician recognizes it more explicitly when he is able to assign a probability estimate to each classification alternative."

The probability of error is the probability of  $\underline{Y}$  to be assigned to the wrong group,  $R_i$ .

Let us denote the Posterior density function by  $P(R_i | Y)$ , prior density function of  $R_i$  by  $P(R_i)$  and let  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  be the regions such that if  $Y \in \Gamma_1$  then  $P(R_1 | Y) > P(R_2 | Y)$  and if  $Y \in \Gamma_2$  then  $P(R_1 | Y) < P(R_2 | Y)$  .

The probability of error is given by the following equations:

$$(21) \quad \varepsilon = \text{Prob}(Y \in \Gamma_2 | R_1) P(R_1) + \text{Prob}(Y \in \Gamma_1 | R_2) P(R_2) .$$

Let us denote the probability of  $Y$  belonging to  $\Gamma_2$  when  $Y$  is from  $R_1$  by  $\varepsilon_1$ , then

$$\varepsilon_1 = \text{Prob}(Y \in \Gamma_2 | R_1) = \int_{\Gamma_2} p(Y | R_1) dY,$$

Similarly, the probability of  $Y$  belonging to  $\Gamma_1$  when  $Y$  is from  $R_2$ ,  $\varepsilon_2$  will be

$$\varepsilon_2 = \text{Prob}(Y \in \Gamma_1 | R_2) = \int_{\Gamma_1} p(Y | R_2) dY .$$

Then expression (21) can be rewritten by  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 P(R_1) + \varepsilon_2 P(R_2)$ , or more precisely

$$(22) \quad \varepsilon = P(R_1) \int_{\Gamma_2} p(Y | R_1) dY + P(R_2) \int_{\Gamma_1} p(Y | R_2) dY .$$

That is, the total probability of errors is a weighted sum of the misclassification of samples from  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  into  $R_2$  and  $R_1$ , respectively.

The integration of the conditional density function is necessary to get the error probability  $\epsilon$ . The dimensionality of the conditional density function is often more than one, while the density function  $p(\ell | R_i)$  of the likelihood ratio is one dimensional, so it is sometimes convenient to integrate the latter (Fukunaga, 1972). Hence, Equations (23) and (24) are used to obtain the error probabilities,  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$

$$(23) \quad \epsilon_1 = \int_0^{\frac{P(R_2)/P(R_1)}{P(R_2)/P(R_1)}} p(\ell | R_1) d\ell$$

$$(24) \quad \epsilon_2 = \int_{\frac{P(R_2)/P(R_1)}{P(R_2)/P(R_1)}}^{\infty} p(\ell | R_2) d\ell$$

If the density function  $p(\underline{Y} | R_i)$  is normal with expectations  $\underline{M}_i$  and covariance matrices  $\underline{\Sigma}_i$ , the decision rule is summarized by the following statements:

$$(25) \text{ If } h(\underline{Y}) = -\ln \ell(\underline{Y})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_1)' \underline{\Sigma}_1^{-1} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_1) - \frac{1}{2} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_2)' \underline{\Sigma}_2^{-1} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_2)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\underline{\Sigma}_1|}{|\underline{\Sigma}_2|} < \ln \frac{P(R_1)}{P(R_2)} \rightarrow \underline{Y} \in R_1$$

$$\phantom{+ \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{|\underline{\Sigma}_1|}{|\underline{\Sigma}_2|}} > \phantom{\ln \frac{P(R_1)}{P(R_2)}} \phantom{\rightarrow \underline{Y}} \in R_2 \quad .$$

If  $\underline{\Sigma}_1 = \underline{\Sigma}_2 = \underline{\Sigma}$ , then  $h(\underline{Y})$  becomes a linear function of  $\underline{Y}$

and the decision rule has the following form if  $\underline{Y}$  follows a normal distribution:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (26) \quad h(\underline{Y}) &= \frac{1}{2} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_1)' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_1) - \frac{1}{2} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_2)' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} (\underline{Y} - \underline{M}_2) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} (\underline{M}_2' - \underline{M}_1') \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{Y} - \frac{1}{2} \underline{Y}' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} (\underline{M}_1 - \underline{M}_2) + \frac{1}{2} \underline{M}_1' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{M}_1 - \frac{1}{2} \underline{M}_2' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{M}_2 \\
 &= (\underline{M}_2' - \underline{M}_1') \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{Y} + \frac{1}{2} (\underline{M}_1' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{M}_1 - \underline{M}_2' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} \underline{M}_2) \} \ln [P(R_1)/P(R_2)] = t.
 \end{aligned}$$

then, 
$$Y \in \begin{cases} R_1 \\ R_2 \end{cases}$$

The error probability  $\epsilon_1$  is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (27) \quad \epsilon_1 &= \int_t^{\infty} p(h(\underline{Y}) | R_1) dh(\underline{Y}) = \int_{\frac{t+\eta}{\sigma}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{z^2}{2}\right) dz \\
 &= 1 - \Psi\left(\frac{t+\eta}{\sigma}\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $t = \ln [p(R_1) / p(R_2)]$  and  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is the unit normal distribution.

The conditional expectation of the likelihood function  $h(\underline{Y})$  is given

by (28) and (29),

$$(28) \quad E(h(\underline{Y}) | R_1) = -\frac{1}{2} (\underline{M}_2 - \underline{M}_1)' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} (\underline{M}_2 - \underline{M}_1) = -\eta$$

$$(29) \quad E(h(\underline{Y}) | R_2) = +\frac{1}{2} (\underline{M}_2 - \underline{M}_1)' \underline{\Sigma}^{-1} (\underline{M}_2 - \underline{M}_1) = +\eta$$

and, the variance of  $h(\underline{Y})$  is given by Equation (30):

$$(30) \sigma_i^2 = E\{(h(Y) - \eta_i)^2 | R_i\}$$

$$= (M_2 - M_1)' \Sigma^{-1} (M_2 - M_1) = 2\eta \quad .$$

Similarly,  $\epsilon_2$  can be obtained by calculating  $1 - \Psi\left(\frac{\eta-t}{\sigma}\right)$ , i.e.,

$$(31) \epsilon_2 = \int_{-\infty}^t p(h(Y) | R_2) dh(Y) = 1 - \Psi\left(\frac{\eta-t}{\sigma}\right) \quad .$$

#### Illustration of the model with an example

A 40-item fraction subtraction test was given to 535 students at a local junior high school. A computer program adopting a deterministic strategy for diagnosing erroneous rules of operation in subtracting two fractions was developed on the PLATO system. The students' performances on the test were analyzed by the error-diagnostic program and summarized by Tatsuoka (1984a). In order to illustrate the rule space model and the decision rule described in the previous section, two very common erroneous rules (Tatsuoka, 1984a) are chosen to explain the model.

Rule 8. This rule is applicable to any fraction or mixed number. A student subtracts the smaller from the larger number in unequal corresponding parts and keeps corresponding equal parts as is in the answer. Examples are,

$$1. \quad 4 \frac{4}{12} - 2 \frac{7}{12} = 2 \frac{3}{12} = 2 \frac{1}{4}$$

$$2. \quad 7 \frac{3}{5} - 4 \frac{4}{5} = 7 \frac{1}{5}$$

$$3. \quad \frac{3}{4} - \frac{3}{8} = \frac{3}{4}$$

Rule 30. This rule is applicable to the subtraction of mixed numbers where the first numerator is smaller than the second numerator. A student reduces the whole-number part of the minuend by one and adds one to the tens digit of the numerator.

1.  $4 \frac{4}{12} - 2 \frac{7}{12} = 3 \frac{14}{12} - 2 \frac{7}{12} = 1 \frac{7}{12}$
2.  $3 \frac{3}{8} - 2 \frac{5}{6} = 2 \frac{13}{8} - 2 \frac{5}{6} = \frac{19}{24}$
3.  $7 \frac{3}{5} - \frac{4}{5} = 6 \frac{13}{5} - \frac{4}{5} = 2 \frac{9}{5}$

These two rules are applied to 40 items and two sets of responses are scored by "right or wrong" scoring procedure. The binary score pattern made by Rule 8 is denoted by  $R_8$  and the other made by Rule 30 is denoted by  $R_{30}$ .

Besides the two rule mentioned above, 38 different error types are identified by a task analysis. However, these error types do not necessarily represent microlevels of cognitive processes such as erroneous rules of operation. They are somehow, defined more coarsely, like borrowing errors are grouped as a single error type, or the combination of borrowing and getting the least common multiple of two denominators is counted as one error type. In other words, 38 binary response patterns representing 38 error types are obtained.

The 535 students' responses on the 40 items are scored and used for estimating item parameters  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  by the maximum likelihood procedure. By using these  $a$ - and  $b$ -values,  $\theta$ -values associated with the two rules and 38 error types are computed. Then corresponding  $\zeta$ -values are calculated. Thus, 40 points,  $(\hat{\theta}_k, \zeta_k)$ ,  $k=1, \dots, 40$  are plotted in the rule space (Rule 8 is renumbered to 39 and Rule 30 to 40. It is only coincidence that the number of rules equals the number.

-----  
 Insert Table 1 about here  
 -----

Table 1

The 40 Centroids Representing 40 different error types in Fraction  
Subtraction Tests (N = 535, n = 40)

Group	$\theta$	$\zeta$	No. of Items	Group	$\theta$	$\zeta$	No. of Items
1	-2.69	-.80	1	21	.24	-.89	22
2	-1.22	-.69	4	22	-.22	-1.23	14
3	-.75	-.68	8	23	.62	-1.55	32
4	-.46	.75	10	24	1.04	-.61	38
5	.11	.91	18	25	.75	-.05	34
6	.64	1.74	30	26	-.51	-1.62	10
7	-.17	1.48	13	27	-.87	-.56	6
8	.40	-.16	25	28	-1.99	1.01	2
9	.60	-.43	31	29	-.19	1.53	12
10	.57	-.24	29	30	-.24	2.74	10
11	.99	.72	37	31	-1.18	1.46	4
12	1.19	.86	39	32	-1.45	.58	4
13	-.60	-1.58	10	33	.64	1.74	30
14	-.44	-2.31	12	34	.57	-.66	31
15	-.18	.67	14	35	.59	-1.39	30
16	-.08	-1.81	16	36	-1.66	-1.96	4
17	.16	-.86	20	37	-.52	-.94	10
18	-.01	-2.12	18	38	-.32	-1.26	14
19	.09	-2.26	20	39	-.41	-2.57	13
20	.29	-1.51	24	40	.17	-2.34	22

\*These items will have the score of 1, otherwise the score will be 0.

Now, two students A and B who used Rules 8 and 30 for a subset of 40 items are selected. This was possible because their performances are diagnosed independently by the error-diagnostic system SPFBUS mentioned in Tatsuoka (1984b). The circles shown in Figure 3 represent A and B. Their Mahalanobis distances,  $D^2$ , to the 40 centroids are calculated respectively and the smallest values of two distances,  $D^2$ , are selected to compute probabilities of errors. Table 2 summarizes the results.

-----  
 Insert Table 2 & Figure 3 about here  
 -----

The  $D^2$  values of Student A to Sets 40 and 19 are 0.008 and 0.119, respectively, and both the values are small enough to judge that A may be classified to either of the sets. Since  $D^2$  follows the  $\chi^2$ -distribution with two degrees of freedom (Tatsuoka, 1971), the null hypotheses that  $D^2_{(A, \text{Set } 40)} = 0$  and  $D^2_{(A, \text{Set } 19)} = 0$  cannot be rejected at, say  $\alpha = .25$ . The error probabilities  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  are .581, .266, respectively. Therefore, we conclude A belongs to Set 19 although  $D^2_{(A, \text{Set } 40)}$  is smaller than  $D^2_{(A, \text{Set } 19)}$ . This happened because the prior probability of Prob(Set 40) is smaller than that of Prob(Set 19), where the threshold value,  $t$ , is determined as follows:

$$t = -\ln [ \text{Prob}(\text{Set } 40) / \text{Prob}(\text{Set } 19) ]$$

$$\text{and } \text{Prob}(\text{Set } k) \propto (1/2\pi) \exp[ -(\hat{\theta}_k, \zeta_k)' \Sigma_k^{-1} (\hat{\theta}_k, \zeta_k)/2 ] .$$

Table 2

Summary of Classification Results of Students A and B

	Student A	Student B
$D^2$	$D_A^2$ , Set 40 .008	$D_B^2$ , Set 39 .021
	$D_A^2$ , Set 19 .119	$D_B^2$ , Set 14 .135
$\epsilon_1$	.581	.979
$\epsilon_2$	.266	.010
$\eta$	.088	.040
$t$	-.174	-.613




Figure 3: Forty Centroids (+) Representing Different Error Types Determined by a Detailed Task Analysis and Students A and B (o).

### Discussion

A new probabilistic model that is capable of measuring cognitive-skill acquisition, and of diagnosing erroneous rules of operation in a procedural domain was introduced by Tatsuoka and her associates (Tatsuoka, 1985; Tatsuoka & Baillie, 1982; Tatsuoka & Tatsuoka, 1982; Tatsuoka, 1983; Tatsuoka, 1984a). The model, called rule space, involves two important components: 1) determination of a set of bug distributions, or in other words, bug density functions representing clusters around the rules, and 2) establishment of decision rules for classifying an observed response pattern into one of the clusters around the rules and computing error probabilities. If each cluster around a rule can be described by a bivariate normal distribution of  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$ , then application of the techniques available in the theory of statistical classification and pattern recognition is fairly straightforward and easy.

This study introduces the fact that the cluster around the rule consisting of the response patterns resulting from one, two, ..., several slips away from perfect application of the rule indeed follows a compound binomial distribution with centroid  $(\theta_R, \zeta_R)$  and variance  $\sum_{j=1}^n p_j q_j$ , where  $p_j$  ( $j=1, \dots, n$ ) is the probability of having a slip from Rule R for item j. The values of  $p_j$  and  $q_j$  are approximated by the logistic probabilities  $P_j(\theta_R)$  and  $Q_j(\theta_R)$ ,  $j=1, \dots, n$ , in this study instead of estimating them from the dataset. Plausibility of the approximation of the slip probabilities associated with each erroneous rule by the logistic function is left as a future topic of investigation, although the fit with data seems to be good.

The determination of a set of ellipses representing clusters around the rules can be automatic after all the erroneous rules are discovered. Many researchers in cognitive science and artificial intelligence have started constructing error diagnostic systems in various domains in this decade. Expert teachers usually know their students' errors, as well as the weaknesses and strengths of each child's knowledge structure. Since the model does not require a large-scale computation such as strategies commonly used in the area of artificial intelligence do, the rule-space model is helpful in more general areas of research and teaching, and for those who have microcomputers for testing their hypotheses, validating their data with probabilistically-sound information, and evaluating their teaching methods and materials. Moreover, the model can be "intelligent" in the sense that the researcher can improve and modify the information for the cluster ellipses as they get more new students whose performances they can study.

The set of ellipses can represent many things besides erroneous rules. They can represent specific contents of some domain, usage errors in the language arts, or processes required in algebra. However, further research is necessary to develop methods for determining the set of ellipses other than relying on an expert teacher. The method must be efficient and compatible with the recent theories of human cognition and learning.

References

- Brown, J. S., & VanLehn, K. (1980). Repair Theory: A generative theory of bugs in procedural skills. Cognitive Science.
- Fukunana, K. (1972). Introduction to statistical pattern recognition. NY: Academic Press.
- Overall, J. E., & Klett, C. J. Applied multivariate analysis. NY: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Tatsuoka, K. K. (1983) Rule Spaces: An approach for dealing with misconceptions based on item response theory. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20, 4, 345-354.
- Tatsuoka, K. K. (1984a). Caution indices based on item response theory. Psychometrika, 9, 1, 95-110.
- Tatsuoka, K. K. (Ed.) (1984b). Analysis of errors in fraction addition and subtraction problems (Final Report for Grant No. NIE-8-81-0002). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, CERL.
- Tatsuoka, K. K. (1985). A probabilistic model for diagnosing misconceptions by the pattern classification approach. Journal of Educational Statistics, 10, 1, pp. 55-73.
- Tatsuoka, K. K., & Baillie R. (1982). Rule space, the product space of two score components in signed-number subtraction: An approach to dealing with inconsistent use of erroneous rules (Technical Report 82-3). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, Computer-based Education Research Laboratory.
- Tatsuoka, K. K., & Linn, R. L. (1983). Indices for detecting unusual response patterns: Links between two general approaches and potential applications. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1983, 7(1), 81-96.
- Tatsuoka, K. K., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1982). Detection of aberrant response

patterns. Journal of Educational Statistics, 7(3), 215-231.

Tatsuoka, K. K., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1983). Spotting erroneous rules of operation by the individual consistency index. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20(3), 221-230.

Tatsuoka, M. M. (1971). Multivariate Analysis: Techniques for Educational and Psychological Research. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Personnel Analysis Division  
AF/MPXA  
5C360, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330

Air Force Human Resources Lab  
AFHRL/MPD  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Air Force Office  
of Scientific Research  
Life Sciences Directorate  
Bolling Air Force Base  
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. Robert Ahlers  
Code N711  
Human Factors Laboratory  
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Ed Aiken  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Erling B. Andersen  
Department of Statistics  
Studiestraede 6  
1455 Copenhagen  
DENMARK

Dr. John R. Anderson  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Technical Director  
Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Isaac Bejar  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450

Dr. Menucha Birenbaum  
School of Education  
Tel Aviv University  
Tel Aviv, Ramat Aviv 69978  
Israel

Dr. Werner Birke  
Personalstammamt  
der Bundeswehr  
D-5000 Koeln 90  
WEST GERMANY

Code N711  
Attn: Arthur S. Blaiwes  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. R. Darrell Bock  
University of Chicago  
Department of Education  
Chicago, IL 60637

Mr. Arnold Bohrer  
Psychological Research Section  
Caserne Petits Chateau  
CRS  
1000 Brussels  
BELGIUM

Dr. Nick Bond  
Office of Naval Research  
Liaison Office, Far East  
APO San Francisco, CA 96503

Dr. Robert Breaux  
Code N-095R  
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert Brennan  
American College Testing  
Programs  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. John S. Brown  
XEROX Palo Alto Research  
Center  
3333 Coyote Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. Glenn Bryan  
6208 Poe Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817

CTB/McGraw-Hill Library  
2500 Garden Road  
Monterey, CA 93940

CDR Mike Curran  
Office of Naval Research  
800 N. Quincy St.  
Code 270  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Mr. Timothy Davey  
University of Illinois  
Educational Psychology  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Dattprasad Divgi  
Syracuse University  
Department of Psychology  
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Hei-Ki Dong  
Ball Foundation  
800 Roosevelt Road  
Building C, Suite 206  
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Dr. Fritz Drasgow  
University of Illinois  
Department of Psychology  
603 E. Daniel St.  
Champaign, IL 61820

Defense Technical  
Information Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Attn: TC  
(12 Copies)

Dr. Stephen Dunbar  
Lindquist Center  
for Measurement  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. John M. Eddins  
University of Illinois  
252 Engineering Research  
Laboratory  
103 South Mathews Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Patricia A. Butler  
NIE Mail Stop 1806  
1200 19th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. James Carlson  
American College Testing  
Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. John B. Carroll  
409 Elliott Rd.  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Robert Carroll  
NAVOP 01B7  
Washington, DC 20370

Director  
Manpower Support and  
Readiness Program  
Center for Naval Analysis  
2000 North Beauregard Street  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Chief of Naval Education  
and Training  
Liaison Office  
AFHRL  
Operations Training Division  
Williams AFB, AZ 85224

Chief of Naval Education  
and Training  
Liaison Office  
Air Force Human Resource Laboratory  
Operations Training Division  
Williams AFB, AZ 85224

Assistant Chief of Staff  
Research, Development,  
Test, and Evaluation  
Naval Education and  
Training Command (N-5)  
NAS Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. Hans Crombag  
University of Leyden  
Education Research Center  
Boernaavelsaan 2  
2334 EM Leyden  
The NETHERLANDS

Dr. John Ellis  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92252

Dr. Richard Elster  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
of the Navy (Manpower)  
Washington, DC 20350

Dr. Susan Embertson--  
University of Kansas  
Psychology Department  
Lawrence, KS 66045

ERIC Facility-Acquisitions  
4833 Rugby Avenue  
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank  
Performance Metrics, Inc.  
5825 Callaghan  
Suite 225  
San Antonio, TX 78228

Dr. Marshall J. Farr  
2520 North Vernon Street  
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. Richard L. Ferguson  
American College Testing  
Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240

Dr. Gerhard Fischer  
Liebiggasse 5/3  
A 1010 Vienna  
AUSTRIA

Dr. Myron Fischl  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald  
University of New England  
Department of Psychology  
Armidale, New South Wales 2351  
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Dexter Fletcher  
University of Oregon  
Computer Science Department  
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
Bolt Beranek & Newman  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Bob Frey  
Commandant (G-P-1/2)  
USCG HQ  
Washington, DC 20593

Dr. Janice Gifford  
University of Massachusetts  
School of Education  
Amherst, MA 01002

Dr. Robert Glaser  
Learning Research  
& Development Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Bert Green  
Johns Hopkins University  
Department of Psychology  
Charles & 34th Street  
Baltimore, MD 21218

H. William Greenup  
Education Advisor (E031)  
Education Center, MCDEC  
Quantico, VA 22134

Dipl. Pad. Michael W. Hahon  
Universitat Dusseldorf  
Erziehungswissenschaftliches  
Universitätsstr. 1  
D-4000 Dusseldorf 1  
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Ron Hambleton  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01002

Dr. Delwyn Harnisch  
University of Illinois  
51 Gerty Drive  
Champaign, IL 61820

Ms. Rebecca Hetter  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152

Prof. Lutz F. Hornke  
Universitat Dusseldorf  
Erziehungswissenschaftliches  
Universitätsstr. 1  
Dusseldorf 1  
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Paul Horst  
677 G Street, #184  
Chula Vista, CA 90010

Dr. Lloyd Humphreys  
University of Illinois  
Department of Psychology  
603 East Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Steven Hunka  
Department of Education  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA

Dr. Earl Hunt  
Department of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98105

Dr. Huynh Huynh  
College of Education  
Univ. of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Zachary Jacobson  
Bureau of Management Consulting  
365 Laurier Avenue West  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
CANADA

Dr. Douglas H. Jones  
Advanced Statistical  
Technologies Corporation  
10 Trafalgar Court  
Lawrenceville, NJ 08148

Prof. John A. Keats  
Department of Psychology  
University of Newcastle  
N.S.W. 2308  
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Norman J. Kerr  
Chief of Naval Education  
and Training  
Code 00A2  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. William Koch  
University of Texas-Austin  
Measurement and Evaluation  
Center  
Austin, TX 78703

Dr. Leonard Kroeker  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Anita Lancaster  
Accession Policy  
OASD/MI&L/MP&FM/AP  
Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Daryll Lang  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Jerry Lehnus  
OASD (M&RA)  
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Thomas Leonard  
University of Wisconsin  
Department of Statistics  
1210 West Dayton Street  
Madison, WI 53705

Dr. Alan M. Lesgold  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Michael Levine  
Educational Psychology  
210 Education Bldg.  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61801

Dr. Charles Lewis  
Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen  
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen  
Oude Boteringestraat 23  
9712GC Groningen  
The NETHERLANDS

Dr. Robert Linn  
College of Education  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Robert Lockman  
Center for Naval Analysis  
200 North Beauregard St.  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Frederic M. Lord  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. James Lumsden  
Department of Psychology  
University of Western Australia  
Nedlands W.A. 6009  
AUSTRALIA

Dr. William L. Maloy (02)  
Chief of Naval Education  
and Training  
Naval Air Station  
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. Gary Marco  
Stop 31-E  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Kneale Marshall  
Operations Research Department  
Naval Post Graduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Clessen Martin  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Blvd.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. James McBride  
Psychological Corporation  
c/o Harcourt, Brace,  
Javanovich Inc.  
1250 West 6th Street  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dr. Clarence McCormick  
HQ, MEPCOM  
MEPCT-P  
2500 Green Bay Road  
North Chicago, IL 60064

Mr. Robert McKinley  
University of Toledo  
Department of Educational Psychology  
Toledo, OH 43606

Dr. Barbara Means  
Human Resources  
Research Organization  
1100 South Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Arthur Melmed  
724 Brown  
U. S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Robert Mislevy  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. William Montague  
NPRDC Code 13  
San Diego, CA 92152

Ms. Kathleen Moreno  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152

Headquarters, Marine Corps  
Code MPI-20  
Washington, DC 20380

Spec. Asst. for Research, Experi-  
mental Programs, & Academic Programs  
Naval Technical Training Command  
(Code 016)  
NAS Memphis (75)  
Millington, TN 38054

Program Manager for Manpower,  
Personnel, and Training  
NAVMAT 0722  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. W. Alan Nicewander  
University of Oklahoma  
Department of Psychology  
Oklahoma City, OK 73069

Dr. William E. Nordbrock  
FMC-ADCO Box 25  
APO, NY 09710

Director, Training Laboratory  
NPRDC (Code 05)  
San Diego, CA 92152

Director, Manpower and Personnel  
Laboratory  
NPRDC (Code 06)  
San Diego, CA 92152

Director  
Human Factors  
& Organizational Systems Lab.  
NPRDC (Code 07)  
San Diego, CA 92152

Library  
Code P201L  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Technical Director  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Commanding Officer  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 2627  
Washington, DC 20390

Dr. Harry F. O'Neil, Jr.  
Training Research Lab  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Stellan Ohlsson  
Learning R & D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 1521

Dr. James Olson  
WICAT, Inc.  
1875 South State Street  
Orem, UT 84057

Office of Naval Research  
Code 442PT  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000  
(5 Copies)

Special Assistant for Marine  
Corps Matters  
Code 100M  
Office of Naval Research  
800 N. Quincy St.  
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
1030 Eas. Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91101

Commanding Officer  
Army Research Institute  
ATTN: PERI-BR (Dr. J. Orasanu)  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analyses  
1801 N. Beauregard St.  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Randolph Park  
AFHRL/MOAN  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Wayne M. Patience  
American Council on Education  
GED Testing Service, Suite 20  
One Dupont Circle, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James Paulson  
Department of Psychology  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207

Dr. James W. Pellegrino  
University of California,  
Santa Barbara  
Department of Psychology  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Roger Pennell  
Air Force Human Resources  
Laboratory  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Military Assistant for Training and  
Personnel Technology  
OUSD (R & E)  
Room 3D129, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Administrative Sciences Department  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Department of Operations Research  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Joseph Psotka  
ATTN: PERI-1C  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Ave.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Mark D. Reckase  
ACT  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Malcolm Ree  
AFHRL/MP  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Fred Reif  
Physics Department  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Lauren Resnick  
Learning R & D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 1521

Dr. Mary S. Riley  
Program in Cognitive Science  
Center for Human Information  
Processing  
University of California  
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Bernard Rimland  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Carl Ross  
CNET-PDCD  
Building 90  
Great Lakes NTC, IL 60088

Mr. Robert Ross  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Lawrence Rudner  
403 Elm Avenue  
Takoma Park, MD 20012

Dr. J. Ryan  
Department of Education  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Fumiko Samejima  
Department of Psychology  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37916

Mr. Drew Sands  
NPRDC Code 62  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Robert Sasmor  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Walter Schneider  
University of Illinois  
Psychology Department  
603 E. Daniel  
Champaign, IL 61820

Lowell Schoer  
Psychological & Quantitative  
Foundations  
College of Education  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Mary Schratz  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Judah L. Schwartz  
MIT  
20C-120  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. W. Steve Sellman  
OASD(MRA&L)  
2B269 The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Sylvia A. S. Shafto  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street  
Mail Stop 1805  
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Joyce Shields  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Kazuo Shigemasa  
7-9-24 Kugenuma-Kaigan  
Fujusawa 251  
JAPAN

Dr. William Sims  
Center for Naval Analysis  
200 North Beauregard Street  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Manpower Research  
and Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 North Pitt Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Alfred F. Smode  
Senior Scientist  
Code 7B  
Naval Training Equipment Center  
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Richard Snow  
Liaison Scientist  
Office of Naval Research  
Branch Office, London  
Box 39  
FPO New York, NY 09510

Dr. Richard Sorensen  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Paul Speckman  
University of Missouri  
Department of Statistics  
Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Robert Sternberg  
Department of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, CT 06520

Martha Stocking  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Peter Stoloff  
Center for Naval Analysis  
200 North Beauregard Street  
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. William Stout  
University of Illinois  
Department of Mathematics  
Urbana, IL 61801

Maj. Bill Strickland  
AF/MPXOA  
4E168 Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330

Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan  
Laboratory of Psychometric and  
Evaluation Research  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003

Mr. Brad Sympson  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. John Tangney  
AFOSR/NL  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Maurice Tatsuoka  
220 Education Bldg  
1310 S. Sixth St.  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. David Thissen  
Department of Psychology  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66044

Mr. Gary Thomasson  
University of Illinois  
Educational Psychology  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert Tsutakawa  
Department of Statistics  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Ledyard Tucker  
University of Illinois  
Department of Psychology  
603 E. Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Vern W. Urry  
Personnel R&D Center  
Office of Personnel Management  
1900 E. Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20415

Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps  
Code MPI-20  
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. David Vale  
Assessment Systems Corp.  
2233 University Avenue  
Suite 310  
St. Paul, MN 55114

Dr. Frank Vicino  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Howard Wainer  
Division of Psychological Studies  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Ming-Mei Wang  
Lindquist Center  
for Measurement  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

Mr. Thomas A. Warm  
Coast Guard Institute  
P. O. Substation 18  
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Dr. Brian Waters  
HumRRD  
300 North Washington  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. David J. Weiss  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Donald Weitzman  
MITRE  
1620 Dolley Madison Blvd.  
MacLean, VA 22102

Major John Welsh  
AFHRL/MOAN  
Brooks AFB, TX 78223

Dr. Douglas Wetzel  
Code 12  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Rand R. Wilcox  
University of Southern  
California  
Department of Psychology  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

German Military Representative  
ATTN: Wolfgang Wildegrube  
Streitkraefteamt  
D-5300 Bonn 2  
4000 Brandywine Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Bruce Williams  
Department of Educational  
Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Hilda Wing  
Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Ave.  
Alexandria, VA 22333

Ms. Marilyn Wingersky  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff  
Navy Personnel R & D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Frank Withrow  
U. S. Office of Education  
400 Maryland Ave. SW  
Washington, DC 20202

Mr. John H. Wolfe  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. George Wong  
Biostatistics Laboratory  
Memorial Sloan-Kettering  
Cancer Center  
1275 York Avenue  
New York, NY 10021

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Joe Yasatuke  
AFHRL/LRT  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Dr. Wendy Yen  
CTB/McGraw Hill  
Del Monte Research Park  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Joseph L. Young  
Memory & Cognitive  
Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Leigh Burstein  
Department of Education  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Norman Cliff  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
University Park  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Dr. Lee Cronbach  
Department of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. James Greeno  
LRDC  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Anthony J. Nitko  
School of Education  
Educational Research  
Methodology  
University of Pittsburgh  
5C03 Forbes Quadrangle  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Ross Traub  
Ontario Institute for  
Studies in Education  
252 Bloor St. W.  
Toronto, Ontario  
CANADA M5S 1V6

**END**

**FILMED**

**9-85**

**DTIC**