### AD 755 171

LIBRARY TECHNICAL REPORT SECTION NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940



# NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

WTR 73-10

January 1973

PRELIMINARY RESULTS ON THE EVALUATION OF A FLEET POST-TRAINING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TECHNIQUE

> Bernard A. Rafacz Paul P. Foley

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

### WASHINGTON NAVY YARD WASHINGTON, D.C. 20390



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY WASHINGTON NAVY YARD WASHINGTON, D. C. 20390

> NPRDL:71:PPF:rdb 3930 Ser 52 2 9 JAN 1973

From: Commanding Officer, Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory To: Distribution List

- Personnel Technology: Relating Individual Performance Sub1: Effectiveness to Unit and Ship Effectiveness
- (1) "Preliminary Results on the Evaluation of a Fleet Post-Encl: training Performance Evaluation Technique", WTR73-10, January 1973

1. Enclosure (1) is an evaluation of four different performance estimators relative to a criterion measure of absolute technician performance. The technicians were involved in fleet electronic maintenance activities in one of the ratings - EM, ET, FT, IC, RD, RM, ST, and TM.

The report is forwarded for information. Comments and recommendations 2. are invited.

DISTRIBUTION LIST See report

AD

WTR 73-10

January 1973

#### PRELIMINARY RESULTS ON THE EVALUATION OF A FLEET POST-TRAINING PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TECHNIQUE

Bernard A. Rafacz Paul P. Foley

#### Principal Investigator: Paul P. Foley

Supported by Personnel and Training Research Programs, Office of Naval Research, under Project Order Number 2-0046, NR 150-336

> APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

NAVAL PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20390

A LABORATORY OF THE BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

#### FOREWORD

This research effort is being performed with the support of the Personnel and Training Research Programs Office, Office of Naval Research, under Project Order No. 2-0046, Work Unit Number NR 150-336 entitled PERSONNEL TECHNOLOGY: Relating Individual Performance Effectiveness to Unit and Ship Effectiveness. This is the first in a series of reports on the analysis of the performance data collected in the course of the project.

Appreciation is expressed for the cooperation and assistance provided by Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Force, Atlantic Fleet, Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Force, Pacific Fleet, and Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla NINE for providing the ships and men that took part in the data collection effort of this project.

The assistance of Dr. Arthur I. Siegel of Applied Psychological Services, Inc., Wayne, Pennsylvania, is also appreciated for providing some of the computer programs which were employed in analyzing the performance related data.

#### SUBMITTED BY

#### PAUL P. FOLEY

#### Director, Personnel Measurement Research Division

#### APPROVED BY

#### E. M. RAMRAS

#### Acting Director, Psychological Research Department

ALVA L. BLANKS Captain, U. S. Navy Commanding Officer EUGENE M. RAMRAS Technical Director

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Problem

The advent of a more streamlined Navy operating under reduced manning levels and heightened operational requirements imposes the need for accurate human-performance evaluation of ship personnel systems. On the personnel systems level, electronic technician reliability measurement is a necessary and integral part in the evaluation of particular combat systems of which technicians are components. The objective is then to develop and evaluate human-performance reliability estimates so as to be able to effectively alter the personnel system in order to maximize the overall performance of the system. The purpose of this project is to validate the utility and effectiveness of a unique human performance measurement procedure developed under a prior Office of Naval Research project and designed to improve upon existing performance measuring techniques in a systems environment.

#### Background and Requirements

Human reliability performance estimation can be accomplished by considering the individuals being evaluated as components of a personnel system. This consideration allows the use of much of the theory already applied to equipment reliability estimation to be adopted to human-performance estimation. After this theory is applied to evaluate the performance of human components in a personnel system, appropriate combinations of the individual performance estimators will provide a performance or reliability estimate of the personnel system itself.

In order to improve upon existing performance estimators of the human component in a personnel system, Dr. Arthur I. Siegel and his associates of Applied Psychological Services, Inc., Wayne, Pennsylvania, developed fleet post-training performance criteria for electronic maintenance personnel with the support of the Office of Naval Research. The cumulation of these efforts resulted in the development of unique human performance measurement techniques, closely allied with equipment reliability estimation techniques. Siegel also developed procedures for combining the technician performance estimates in appropriate ways in order to estimate team, ship or squadron performance.

An outgrowth of the prior research effort was the suggestion that the techniques be introduced on a limited basis to determine how they may be modified or elaborated upon. The Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory is presently validating the utility and effectiveness of these techniques. The main technical objectives of this validation effort are to determine the validity of the performance measurement techniques, identify the restrictions or modifications required in order to maximize their validity, and to comment on the statistical properties of those techniques as related to their effectiveness in an operational context.

#### Approach

In order to realize an efficient and timely data collection effort, optical scanning instruments were utilized similar to those employed by Applied Psychological Services in prior research efforts.

The main data collection instruments were:

1. <u>Personnel Identification Information Forms</u> (PIIF) - this form records demographic data on the technician being evaluated.

2. <u>Technical Proficiency Checkout Form</u> (TPCF) - this form records the level of technical complexity at which a man is able to perform without direct supervision.

3. Job Performance Questionnaire (JPQ) ANSWER SHEET - this form records supervisory estimates of the total number of a technician's uncommonly ( $\Sigma UE$ ) and ineffective performances ( $\Sigma UI$ ) that the supervisor has observed during a specified time period.

On each of the above instruments an individual in one of the electronic maintenance ratings EM, ET, FT, IC, RD, RM, ST, and TM was evaluated by his supervisor. On the basis of the total number of uncommonly effective ( $\Sigma$ UE) and the total number of uncommonly ineffective ( $\Sigma$ UI) incidents of performance recorded on the Job Performance Questionnaire (JPQ), four different performance estimators were developed. These estimators are functions of the total number of uncommonly effective ( $\Sigma$ UE) and the total number of uncommonly ineffective ( $\Sigma$ UI) incidents of performance observed by the supervisor on each of eight job dimensions characteristic of electronic maintenance activities. The four estimators of human reliability are:

1. Series Reliability Estimate (SRE)

- 2. Series-Parallel Reliability Estimate (PRE)
- 3. Geometric Mean Reliability Estimate (GRE)
- 4. Weighted-Average Reliability Estimate (WRE)

Utilizing the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form as a criterion measure, the validity of each of the four estimators was established. Finally an appropriate statistical analysis of the performance data revealed areas of difficulty with each of the four estimators and suggested modifications required to increase their efficiency.

#### Findings

The relevant findings of this preliminary investigation of the sample data resulted mainly from an analysis of the distributional properties of the predictor and criterion variables. From an application of Geary's test for normality it was found that only the predictor variable WRE could be termed normally distributed. As a result of this finding, a curvilinear multiple regression technique was applied to a portion of the sample data with an emphasis upon the least-squares analysis resulting from an application of this technique.

A comparison of the multiple correlation coefficients resulting from the curvilinear regression analysis revealed that in every case a straight-line was the best fit to the performance data. The productmoment correlation between the predictor variables (SRE, PRE, GRE, and WRE) and criterion variable were respectively -.069, -.009, .024 and .242 indicating moderate validity on the part of the WRE for appraising the absolute level of technician performance.

#### Conclusions

Even though the statistical analysis for this report was concerned with the data collected at only one location (Flotilla NINE, San Diego, California), tentative conclusions can be made on the characteristics of the performance evaluators.

The extreme skewness of the distributions of the SRE, PRE, and GRE will probably not be possible to avoid, thus eliminating many convenient analyses of the data. In particular the distribution of the criterion variable as derived from the TPCF is so markedly skewed that no improvement in it is likely with larger sample sizes. The moderate validity of the WRE indicates that the technique of deriving individual performance estimates as a function of supervisory estimates of uncommonly effective and uncommonly ineffective performance is a promising area but requiring further research. Although the other performance estimators did not fare as well as the WRE, it is clear that they could be improved upon if certain areas of difficulty are avoided. It can be concluded that none of these areas of difficulty are insurmountable. In fact they have revealed the appropriate modifications that are needed in order to increase the validity of the performance estimators, e.g., by evaluating only those individuals who actually do work at a high proportion of the job activities.

Research is continuing upon the evaluation of the performance measurement technique with respect to the totality of data collected. It is felt that the larger data base will reveal other aspects of the performance measurement technique, particularly when individual ratings are being considered.

#### **REPORT USE AND EVALUATION**

Feedback from consumers concerning the utilization of reports is a vital element in improving products so that they better respond to specific needs. To assist the Chief of Naval Personnel in future planning, it is requested that the use and evaluation form on the reverse of this page be completed and returned. The page is preaddressed and franked; fold in thirds, seal with tape, and mail.

Department of the Navy

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY



Official Business

Commanding Officer Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory Building 200 Washington Navy Yard Washington, D. C. 20390

#### Report Title & No.: Preliminary Results on the Evaluation of a Fleet Post-Training Performance Evaluation Technique WTR 73-10

1. EVALUATION OF REPORT. Please check appropriate column.

·····	R	ATING							
FACTORS	LOW	AVE	нібн						
USEFULNESS OF DATA									
TIMELINESS									
COMPLETENESS									
TECHNICAL ACCURACY									
VALIDITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS									
SOUNDNESS OF APPROACH									
PRESENTATION AND STYLE				· · ·					
OTHER (Please Explain)									
2. USE OF REPORT. Please fill in	n answ	ers as	approp	riate. Use continuation Pages as necessary.					
A. WHAT ARE YOUR MAIN US	ES FOF	THE	MATE	RIAL CONTAINED IN THE REPORT?					
B. ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC THE REVERSE) TO YOUR /	CS OF	THE F DF RE	REPOR	T THAT YOU FIND ESPECIALLY BENEFICIAL (OR SIBILITY? IF SO, PLEASE AMPLIFY					
C. WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU	RECOM	MEND	IN REP	ORT FORMAT TO MAKE IT MORE USEFUL?					
D. WHAT TYPES OF RESEARC PERSONNEL TO CONDUCT	D. WHAT TYPES OF RESEARCH WOULD BE MOST USEFUL TO YOU FOR THE CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL TO CONDUCT?								
E. DO YOU WISH TO REMAIN	он тн	E DIST	RIBUT	TION LIST? YESNO					
F. PLEASE MAKE ANY GENER RESEARCH PROGRAM.	RAL C	оммет	NTS YO	OU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL IN PLANNING THE					

NAME:	CODE:
ORGANIZATION:	
ADDRESS:	

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
FOREWORD.       if         SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS       iii         USE AND EVALUATION FORM (AUTHORIZED TEAR-OUT FORM)
INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND
Critical Incidents Technique in Personnel Performance Estimation
for Obtaining Estimates of SUE and SUI
to Estimate Technician Reliability
Performance Estimators
Main Results of Prior Studies
THE DATA COLLECTION EFFORT
Data Collection Instruments.
Results of the Data Collection Effort
DATA ANALYSIS AND OBSERVATIONS
Cases of Difficulty in Calculating Performance
Estimates
Performance in Certain Job Activities
The Weighted-Average Reliability Estimator
by a Triserial Correlation
Associating Performance Estimators with the TPCF 11 Curvilinear Regression Ananysis as an Alternative
to Triserial Correlation
SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS
APPENDICES
REFERENCES
DISTRIBUTION LIST

0

#### LIST OF TABLES

#### Page

1.	TRISERIAL CORRELATION INFORMATION FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO	•	•	•	•	10
2.	GEARY'S TEST STATISTIC VALUES FOR THE PERFORMANCE ESTIMATORS	•	•	•	•	13
3.	RESULTS OF THE CURVILINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS	•	•	•	•	14

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to comment on the data collection effort and initial data reduction methods and analyses that have been performed to date for the ONR work unit entitled Personnel Technology: Relating Individual Performance Effectiveness to Unit and Ship Effectiveness (Office of Naval Research, Project Order Number 2-0046, NR 150-336). The goal of this research project is to provide an empirical basis for assessing the utility to the Navy of a performance measurement technique developed under a prior ONR contract. Under that contract Dr. Arthur I. Siegel, Philip J. Federman, and their associates of Applied Psychological Services, Inc., Wayne, Penn., developed fleet post-training performance evaluative measures which seemed to be of value for eventual widespread implementation within the report - Development of Performance Evaluative Measures: Investigation into and Application of a Fleet Post-Training Performance Evaluative System [12]. Furthermore, the research effort undertaken by Naval Personnel Research and Development Laboratory (NAVPERSRANDLAB) is not only to replicate the efforts of Siegel and Federman [12]<sup>1</sup>, but also to further research their techniques and similarly related performance measurement techniques.

#### BACKGROUND

In order to better appreciate the techniques employed in this report, it will be necessary to discuss the development of the performance measurement techniques which were employed by Siegel and Federman [12]. Fundamentally the authors had employed magnitude estimates of functions of critical incidents. In the past this has seemed to be a valid approach to obtain estimates of human performance.

Generally the main problem is to estimate the performance of a particular personnel system as a function of the performance of individuals that are a part of the system. This necessarily reduces personnel system performance estimation to a discussion of estimators of individual performance where individuals are the components of the system. Compounding

<sup>1</sup>All numbers enclosed in brackets refer to corresponding numbers of documents and publications listed under References.

the individual estimates in a meaningful way will provide estimates of personnel system performance.

#### Critical Incidents Techniques in Personnel Performance Estimation

Let  $\Sigma UE$  ( $\Sigma UI$ ) be the total number of uncommonly effective (uncommonly ineffective) incidents of performance observed by a rater in a certain time period on some individual under observation. Using these functions of critical incidents, previous researchers (see, for example, Whitlock [17], et al.) demonstrated that there is a definite straight line or curvilinear relationship between  $\Sigma UE$  (or the ratio  $\Sigma UE/\Sigma UI$ ) and corresponding performance evaluations. Prior results such as these seemed to leave little doubt that a critical incidents technique to performance evaluation is a valid and useful approach.

Following upon the results of Whitlock, et al., Siegel has further developed and applied the above mentioned techniques to the post-training performance evaluation of individuals in various avionic or electronic ratings in the U. S. Navy. In particular Siegel and Pfieffer [14] suggested that judgments of uncommonly effective and uncommonly ineffective performances possess merit as useful indicators of overall personnel proficiency. The researchers employed magnitude estimates of the number of uncommonly effective and uncommonly ineffective performances relative to a short prior period for avionic personnel. They derived a performance index from the ratio of the sum of uncommonly effective ( $\Sigma UE$ ) performances to the sum of uncommonly effective plus the sum of uncommonly ineffective ( $\Sigma$ UI) performances, namely ( $\Sigma$ UE/[ $\Sigma$ UE +  $\Sigma$ UI]). Siegel and Pfeiffer [14] concluded that: (1) magnitude estimates of uncommonly effective and ineffective performances yielded useful data which could form the basis for a personnel subsystem reliability index; (2) the ratio of the sum of uncommonly effective plus the sum of uncommonly ineffective performances yields an index which discriminates in the anticipated direction; and, (3) the obtained avionic personnel subsystem index could be utilized for post-training performance appraisal, personnel placement, and squadron evaluative purposes.

### The Job Performance Questionnaire as an Instrument for Obtaining Estimates of SUE and SUI

The Job Performance Questionnaire (JPQ) is an instrument for providing information on supervisory estimates of EUE and EUI. Siegel and Federman [12] demonstrated the utility and practicality of a Job Performance Questionnaire (see Appendix A of this paper) for technicians in the eight electronic maintenance ratings (EM, ET, FT, IC, RD, RM, ST, and TM). From an evaluation of 499 technicians in those ratings, the researchers found that the JPQ yields on estimate of the total number of uncommonly effective and uncommonly ineffective incidents of behavior on eight job activity factors. The eight job factors and their definitions are given in Appendix B. The job activity factors were isolated by Siegel and Schultz [15] and were descriptive of naval avionic electronic maintenance jobs.

It was the contention of Siegel and Federman [12] that estimates of uncommonly effective and of uncommonly ineffective behavior along eight dimensions of job activities could be compounded into a meaningful measure of technician effectiveness. Moreover, the individual technician effectiveness values can be further treated to form effectiveness values for ratings, ships, and squadrons. In particular, for each job activity the reliability ratio ( $\Sigma UE / [\Sigma UE + \Sigma UI]$ ), as employed in the prior reports [12, 14], yields an estimate of the probability of effective performance for the technician and job activity considered. The reliability ratios are then compounded in meaningful ways to provide estimates of individual effectiveness or reliability of on-the-job performance.

#### Various Procedures for Compounding Reliability Ratios to Estimate Technician Reliability

Employing the reliability ratios defined above, Siegel and Federman [12] have employed those ratios to develop the following reliability estimates:

1) SERIES RELIABILITY ESTIMATE (SRE)

The series reliability measure of total effectiveness for an individual is derived by multiplying individual job activity reliability ratios to yield a total reliability score, i.e.,

```
R = r_1 \times r_2 \times \cdots \times r_8
```

where  $R_s = series reliability^2$ , and

r<sub>i</sub> = (ΣUE/[ΣUE + ΣUI]) is the reliability ratio for i<sup>th</sup> job activity.

It is to be noted that use of the series reliability estimate requires the assumption that performance reliability on each job activity is independent of performance on other job activities.

<sup>2</sup>It is helpful to note that the series reliability estimate possesses the following properties:

a) for each of the i = 1, ..., 8 job activities  $0 \le r_i \le 1$ , and, therefore,

b) 
$$0 \leq R_{g} \leq 1$$

c)  $R_{c} \leq \text{smallest } r_{i}$ .

2) SERIES-PARALLEL RELIABILITY ESTIMATE (PRE)

It has been stated by Siegel and Federman [12] that "the series and series-parallel reliabilities provide measures of personnel proficiency relative to performance on the entire job (i.e., all eight job activities)." The series-parallel estimate of individual proficiency is defined as:

 $R_{p} = R_{s} x(2 - r_{1}) x \dots x(2 - r_{8})$ 

where  $R_{i}$ ,  $r_{i}$  (i = 1, ..., 8) are defined in 1) above.

This particular estimate tends to provide a more optimistic estimate of individual performance, however, its content validity and derivation is deserving of further development.

3) GEOMETRIC MEAN RELIABILITY ESTIMATE (GRE) Let  $r_1^*$ ,  $r_2^*$ ,  $r_3^*$ , and  $r_4^*$  be the four highest job activity reliability ratios of the eight reliability ratios for a technician being evaluated. The geometric mean reliability for the technician is defined as:

$$R_{s} = \sqrt[4]{r_{1}^{*} \times r_{2}^{*} \times r_{3}^{*} \times r_{4}^{*}}$$

This particular estimate is an estimate of individual performance that stresses the strong points of an individuals performance. However, it also tends to ignore his weak points and therefore should be used with caution.

#### Development of a Criterion for Validating Performance Estimators

In order to determine the validity of the above estimates (SRE, PRE, and GRE) in estimating the absolute level of an individual's performance, performance data were collected by Siegel and Federman [12] by means of an evaluative instrument called the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form (TPCF) (see Appendix C of this paper). The TPCF consists of eight job tasks listed in hierarchial order from easiest to most difficult. The eight tasks meet the Guttman requirements for scalability (see, for example, Guttman [9]). Siegel, Schultz, and Lanterman [16], 1964, employed the scale underlying the eight tasks to determine the cutting points for placing avionic petty officers, third class and strikers in one of the three levels of technical proficiency. The three TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY CHECKOUT (TPC) levels are:

Level 1:	above	desirable					
Level 2:	below	desirable	but	at	least	minimally	acceptable
Level 3:	below	minimally	acce	epta	able.		

The trichotomous division was based on supervisor's judgments of the performance level required for achieving the objectives given in Appendix D of this paper.

In order to facilitate understanding of the procedure for placing an individual in one of the TPC levels, define the function  $F_{i}(i = 1, ..., 8)$  as:

 $F_{i} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if the technician is checked out on the i}^{th} \\ 1 \text{ task of the TPCF} \\ 0 \text{ if the technician is not checked out on the i}^{th} \text{ task of the TPCF.} \end{cases}$ 

The TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY (TP) score for a technician is then defined as  $\sum_{i=1}^{8} F_{i}$ Finally, in the prior report [16], the procedure for determining the TPC level is given by:

- a) add 0.5 to TP score for an individual. Let TP<sup>\*</sup> be the resultant score.
- b) if  $TP^* < 3.92$ , then TPC level = 3
- c) if  $3.92 \le TP^* \le 5.63$ , then TPC level = 2 d) if  $TP^* > 5.63$ , then TPC level = 1.

In a later study Siegel and Fischl [13] correlated technicians TPC levels with the technicians total scores on a performance test. Employing a triserial correlation coefficient (see, for example, Jaspen [10]) as an estimate of the product-moment correlation, they found a triserial correlation of .40. When corrected for the lack of perfect reliability in the performance test criterion, its value became .74. On the basis of their investigation of the concurrent validity of the TPCF, they concluded that " the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form, previously shown to be reliable and practical, may now be considered to possess a substantial degree of validity for appraising the absolute proficiency level of avionics technicians in the fleet." Finally, Siegel and Federman [12] recorded a triserial correlation of .38 between the TPC level of the technicians evaluated and their Series Reliability Estimate (SRE), concluding there is some basis to believe that the SRE correlates with on-the-job performance.

#### Main Results of Prior Studies

While there are other results which many of the previous studies have found relative to the post-training performance estimation of technicians involved in fleet electronic maintenance activities, this report has been and will only be concerned with the validity of the

Series Reliability Estimate (SRE), Series-Parallel Reliability Estimate (PRE), Geometric Mean Reliability Estimate (GRE) in estimating on-thejob performance where the TPCF is the primary measure or criterion of on-the-job performance. Some of the more important conclusions of prior reports relative to content validity of the SRE, PRE, and GRE are:

1. Reliability ratios of the form  $\Sigma UE/(\Sigma UE + \Sigma UI)$  indicate the probability of effective performance on a particular job activity for the technician being evaluated.

2. The JPQ is an instrument for providing magnitude estimates of  $\Sigma UE$  and  $\Sigma UI$  for each man being evaluated by his immedate supervisor.

3. The TPCF possesses a substantial degree of validity for appraising the absolute level of technician proficiency and may be employed as a criterion for the JPQ.

4. There is some basis (triserial correlation of .38 with TPC level) to believe that the SRE is a good estimator of on-the-job performance.

#### THE DATA COLLECTION EFFORT

The data collection effort that this report will be concerned with was conducted with ships from Commander, Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla NINE, Pacific Fleet, during the months of March and April, 1972. The methodology for the data collection required a project coordinator at Destroyer Flotilla NINE to seek the ships (all of which were destroyers) to take part in the project and the assignment of a liaison officer aboard each ship. Essentially the project coordinator served to coordinate the activities of the project researchers of NAVPERSRANDLAB and those of the ship liaison officers. Initially a meeting was arranged between the ship liaison officers and the project researchers by the project coordinator. In the initial meeting the researchers acquainted the liaison officers of the purpose of the project and their subsequent duties in the data collection effort.

A total of 11 ships from Destroyer Flotilla NINE participated in the project with 582 technicians being evaluated by their immediate supervisors. As in the previous report [12], the technicians were in one of the eight electronic ratings EM, ET, FT, IC, RD, RM, ST, and TM.

#### Data\_Collection Instruments

The performance evaluation forms that were completed by each supervisor are given in Appendices C, E, and F. In particular the forms were:

a) Job Performance Questionnaire (JPQ) ANSWER SHEET This form, an example of which is in Appendix E, serves the same purpose as the JPQ of the previous report [12] given in Appendix A of this paper, i.e., to record estimates of the total number of uncommonly effective ( $\Sigma$ UE) and uncommonly ineffective ( $\Sigma$ UI) performances the supervisor has observed on the man he is evaluating.

b) Technical Proficiency Checkout Form (TPCF) This form is essentially identical to the TPCF usedby Siegel and Federman [12] and was discussed in detail in the Bachground section of this report.

c) Personnel Identification Information Form (PIIF) This form, an example of which is in Appendix F, was concerned with the background data of the man being evaluated. It was completed in part by his supervisor with the administrative officer providing the remaining information.

#### Results of the Data Collection Effort

All forms were returned in a useable condition with very few errors in completion and little missing data. All of the missing data was concerned with background information as recorded on the PIIF (Appendix F) and in no way influences the results of this report. Finally the PIIF and JPQ ANSWER SHEET, being optical scanning sheets, were reduced to computer cards ready for the subsequent data analysis.

The entire data collection effort briefly discussed above follows essentially the procedure employed in the previous report [12]. Every effort has been made to insure accuracy and correctness of the data analysis to be discussed in the next section. Also, to achieve a similarity in results, every effort has been made to perform a statistical analysis identical to that of the previous report [12]. Where this is not possible or appropriate, the changes or deviations in analysis from that of the previous report [12] will be commented on.

#### DATA ANALYSIS AND OBSERVATIONS

In order to initiate the data analysis it will be necessary to investigate in some detail a fundamental problem relating to the Series, Series-Parallel, and Geometric Mean Reliability estimates (the SRE, PRE, and GRE respectively).

#### Cases of Difficulty in Calculating Performance Estimates

The reader will recall, as discussed in the Background section of this report that reliability ratios of the form  $(\Sigma UE/[\Sigma UE + \Sigma UI])$  were derived for each man on each of eight job activities and that these ratios were combined in some way to form the SRE, PRE, and GRE. How-ever, the following two cases require the adoption of some convention in order to calculate the reliability ratios:

- 1) the technician did not work at that job activity, or
- 2) the technician received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  by the supervisor, implying that the reliability ratio  $\frac{0}{0+0}$  is undefined.

By observing the frequency with which such cases occur across all 11 ships, one can determine the extent to which any convention for estimating performance in those cases would effect individual SRE, PRE, and GRE values. A complete discussion of this effect is given in Appendix G and the interested reader is referred to that section for a more detailed account. For now it suffices to say that the above two cases can have a dramatic effect upon the individual performance estimates and that these estimates will be greatly influenced by the convention that is adopted.

#### The Adoption of a Convention for Estimating Performance in Certain Job Activities

Siegel and Federman [12] chose to employ "the average value for his rating on his ship," on those job activities which the technician did not work at or received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  by his supervisor. Unfortunately the results of the data collection effort at San Diego indicated that this technique was not feasible for that data. The main reason for this is that on every ship there were ratings for which in some job activities those two cases occured for all men in that rating. In Appendix I is provided a detailed account of this observation for the interested reader. In order to overcome this problem, the convention adopted in this report was to employ a composite reliability value across all ships for each job activity and rating. Let  $\Sigma UE$  (i, j) be the sum across all ships of all  $\Sigma UE$ 's over all men in the i<sup>th</sup> rating and j<sup>th</sup> job activity. Similarly the sum of all  $\Sigma UI$ 's is calculated; denote this sum by  $\Sigma UI$  (i, j). The composite reliability score for the i<sup>th</sup> rating and j<sup>th</sup> job activity is defined as

 $R(i,j) = \Sigma UE(i,j) / [\Sigma UE(i,j) + \Sigma UI(i,j)].$ 

This particular estimate of job performance provides an "expected" level of effectiveness for a technician in the i<sup>th</sup> rating and j<sup>th</sup> job activity (for ships at San Diego). Appendix K gives the resulting composite reliability values (R(i,j)) for each rating and job activity. For example, from Appendix K, R(1,3) is the composite reliability value for EM's on job activity number 3 - Electronic Circuit Analysis - and is given by R(1,3) = .8465. For definiteness, we state that for all EM's who have not worked at job activity number 3 or who received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  for that job activity, their reliability ratio for that job activity is given by  $r_3 = R(1,3) = .8465$ . Similarly such a procedure is employed on the other ratings and job activities.

The composite reliability score is an estimate that can always be derived when many ships are involved, however, in no way does it overcome the implications of the results discussed in Appendix G and their subsequent effect on the estimates SRE, PRE, and GRE.

#### The Weighted-Average Reliability Estimator

In addition to the three performance estimators (SRE, PRE, and GRE) previously introduced, this report will also discuss an estimate of the form

$$R_{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{NJ} r_{i} w_{i} / NJ$$

### where, NJ = number of job activities the technician actually worked at r, = the reliability ratio for the i<sup>th</sup> job activity

w = weight denoting the importance of the i<sup>th</sup> job activity in
 estimating the technician's overall performance

The estimator  $R_w$  will be called a Weighted-Average Reliability Estimate (WRE) of technician effectiveness. This estimator

has the desirable property of providing a performance estimate on only the job activities the technician actually worked at during the rating period.<sup>1</sup> By eliminating those job activities the technician did not work at, the WRE yields an estimate of greater utility.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, it tends to give most (least) importance to job activities which would be more (less) indicative of the technician's overall performance.

#### Validity of the Performance Estimators as Determined by a Triserial Correlation

A triserial correlation between each of the four estimators (SRE, PRE, GRE, and WRE) and Technical Proficiency Checkout (TPC) level was calculated to determine the validity of each reliability estimator. The associated results are given in Table 1:

#### TABLE 1

TRISERIAL CORRELATION INFORMATION FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO

	·	Mean Reliabilit	ies in Each T	PC Level
TPC LEVEL	SRE	PRE	GRE	WRE
1	. 3507	•5968	.9308	.6565
2	•3312	.5527	.9194	.5662
3	.4274	<b>.</b> 6245	.9225	.5572
TRISERIAL CORRELATIONS	-0.0900	-0.0149	0.0325	.2555
	•			

<sup>1</sup>Included within the NJ job activities may be cases where  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$ . For those cases the composite reliability values (Appendix K) must be used for the reliability ratios. This procedure was previously discussed on page 9.

<sup>2</sup>Appendix L provides a detailed account of the greater utility of the WRE and an explanation of how the weights ( $w_i$ , i=1,..., NJ) are derived.

Because the triserial correlation coefficient is an estimate of the product-moment correlation, a test of the hypothesis that the triserial correlation coefficient for each estimate is equal to zero is possible (see, for example, Guilford [8]). However, for only the SRE and WRE could this hypothesis be rejected (at the  $\alpha = .05$  level of significance), implying that the PRE and GRE are not good linear estimators of the absolute level of technician performance. On the other hand, the triserial correlation of SRE and TPC level (-.09) is significantly different from zero ( $\alpha = .05$ ), but the sign is not in the hoped for positive direction. The resulting triserial correlation of TPC level with WRE was .2555, which was significantly different from zero ( $\alpha = .05$ ) and in the right direction. As such, at this stage of the analysis, it must be concluded that the WRE is the superior type of estimator, even though, in some sense, SRE possesses minimal merit as an estimator.

#### The Appropriateness of a Triserial Correlation for Associating Performance Estimators with the TPCF

The previous analysis represents essentially the data analysis techniques adopted by Siegel and Federman [12] but now applied to the sample data at San Diego. However, in an attempt to employ a data analysis appropriate to the data, consider the following assumptions that one is inherently making when applying the triserial correlation (see again Jaspen [10]):

- a) the segmented variable is basically continuous and normally distributed
- b) all the segments which together would form a whole normal distribution are present.

Our attention will be focused on requirement a). Consider the histogram in Appendix N. This is a histogram of all the Technical Proficiency (TP) scores (defined in the Background section of this report) for technicians evaluated at San Diego. Recall that this variable, Technical Proficiency score (TP score), was segmented into one of three levels of technical proficiency. If in fact all the required segments are present, then the histogram in Appendix N represents the entire distribution of the segmented variable, which may be taken as continuous. Clearly this does not seem to represent a normal distribution. For a more valid proof of this statement, Geary's test for normality [7] was applied to the distribution of TP scores. Geary's test statistic<sup>1</sup> is given by

$$a = \frac{2(\Sigma' - N'\overline{X})}{\sqrt{N\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2}}$$

where X represents an observation,  $\overline{X}$  the sample mean, N the sample size,  $\Sigma'$  the sum of all observations greater than  $\overline{X}$ , and N' the number of observations greater than  $\overline{X}$ . If the null hypothesis is that the underlying distribution is normal, then it has been shown [2] that

$$z = \frac{(a - .7979) \sqrt{N}}{.2123}$$

is approximately normal with mean zero and variance one. In fact a conservative test of the hypothesis that the underlying distribution is normal (at the  $\alpha$  = .05 level of significance) is given by:

reject the null hypothesis of normality if z is greater than 1.96 or less than -1.96.

When Geary's test statistic was applied to the sample data of TP scores, the resulting test statistic values were

$$a = .8476$$
, implying  $z = 5.6429$ 

Therefore, the assumption of normality for TP scores must be rejected and so an application of the triserial correlation is <u>inappropriate</u> for the sample data collected at San Diego.

For future reference, when Geary's test for normality was applied on the distribution of SRE, PRE, GRE, and WRE, the following table was derived:

<sup>1</sup>This particular goodness of fit test has several advantages over the usually applied Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests or the well-known Chi-square tests in that, in particular, the population mean and standard deviation need not be precisely known and the test need not be applied just to large samples. Furthermore Geary's test seems to be more sensitive to departures from normality than the other two tests [3, 4, or 11].

12

TΑ	BT	E.	2
			_

	SRE	PRE	GRE	WRE
а	.8747	.8890	.5456	.7876
Z	8.726	10.3472	-28.6657	-1.1716

GEARY'S TEST STATISTIC VALUES FOR THE PERFORMANCE ESTIMATORS

Clearly the only estimator which is indicative of being normally distributed is the WRE. The lack of normality on the part of the other estimators is not necessarily an undesirable feature, but it is true that this exercise does point out yet one more desirable feature of the WRE, namely, its normality. The reader is also referred to the histograms of the frequency of occurrence of the SRE, PRE, and WRE values given in Appendices O, P, and Q with class intervals for the histograms presented in Appendix R.

#### Curvilinear Regression Analysis as an Alternative to Triserial Correlation

Essentially due to the non-normality of the TP scores, an alternate analysis is suggested in order to determine the degree of association between the predictor variables (SRE, PRE, GRE, and WRE) and criterion variable (TP score). The particular procedure to be employed to achieve this end will be a curvilinear multiple regression procedure. The reader may review this subject in any of the texts that elaborate on the procedure. In particular Draper and Smith [5] give an excellent concise explanation of all the ramifications of this and related observations on regression in general. However, a few remarks on this subject for the purposes of this report have been provided in Appendix S.

The curvilinear regression analysis that will follow is essentially a replication of the technique in Cooley and Lohnes [1]. Throughout this analysis the predictor variable is one of SRE, PRE, GRE, or WRE while the criterion variable is the TP score. The computer program employed in [1] for curvilinear regression is also used in this paper. Appendices T, U, V, and W of this paper provide computer printouts<sup>1</sup> as are found in [1] but for the predictor and criterion variables of this report. The computer printouts are in terms of "centered" data making maximum use of the correlation matrix. This technique improves the computation of the printout values by minimizing roundoff errors. Table 3 provides the essential information for the curvilinear regression analysis and is taken from the computer printouts given in Appendices T, U, V, and W.

#### TABLE 3

				Туре с	f Curv	e	
Predictor		_lin	ear	quad	<u>ratic</u>		bic
Variable (X)	r <sub>xy</sub>	R <sup>2</sup>	s	R <sup>2</sup>	s	R <sup>2</sup>	s
SRE	069	.005	.002	.007	.002	.072	.002
PRE	009	.000	.002	.043	.002	.047	.002
GRE	.024	.001	.002	.003	.002	.004	.002
WRE	.242	.058	.002	.058	.002	.062	.002

#### RESULTS OF THE CURVILINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS

r = product moment correlation between the predictor variable X and the criterion variable Y (TP score)

 $R^2$  = multiple correlation coefficient

 $s^2$  = residual mean square (M.S.)

Consider Table  $3^2$  and the evaluation of SRE(X) as a predictor of TP score (Y). The product-moment correlation between SRE and TP score

<sup>1</sup>Please disregard the numerous F-ratios which as discussed in Appendix S are of little value for this data.

 $^{2}$ Note that because the results of Table 3 are in terms of centered data, one must be concerned with the <u>relative magnitude</u> of the residual mean square from attempting to fit a linear model to fitting a cubic model to the data.

is -.069 (not significantly different from zero at the  $\alpha$  = .05 level). Therefore SRE seems to be non-predictive of TP score (and the absloute level of technician performance). In attempting to fit a linear, quadratic, and cubic model to the data of SRE values and TP scores, the R<sup>2</sup> values were .005, .007, and .072 respectively. However, in view of the fact that the regression mean square(M.S.) does not change from the linear to cubic model, it would be just as well to chose the linear model (particularly since R<sup>2</sup> for the cubic equation is only slightly larger than .005). Therefore, the best regression equation is

$$Y = 5.458 - 0.447X.$$

Because X and Y are essentially independent, the best estimate of Y will always be  $\overline{Y}$ , the mean of the observed Y values, regradless of the observed SRE. This result is further reflected in noticing that the sample  $\overline{Y}$  is 5.284, approximately equal to 5.458 - the Y-intercept of the regression line. Finally one must conclude that the SRE is a very poor estimator of TP score and therefore cannot be held to possess significant utility for widespread implementation.

Observing the results of Table 3 for the predictor variables PRE and GRE, one will have to draw the same conclusions as the above on SRE. In fact the PRE and GRE seem to be even poorer estimators of TP score than SRE. Only the WRE, with a computer printout for regression given in Appendix W, seems to possess any merit as an estimator of TP score. In particular the product-moment correlation of .242 does offer some hope that the WRE can be associated with on-the-job performance. Because  $R^2$ is essentially the same and the Residual M. S. does not vary, the linear fit would seem to be the best fit to the sample data. The linear regression equation is given by

#### Y = 3.66 + 2.646X

where Y is TP score and X is WRE. In conclusion it must be said that WRE possesses modest value as an estimator of absolute technician proficiency. Hopefully further research into this estimator and associated ones will provide a more valid estimator of technician performance as a function of magnitude estimates of critical incidents.

#### SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

The data collection effort conducted by NAVPERSRANDLAB at Destroyer Flotilla NINE, Pacific Fleet, involved immediate supervisors evaluating technicians in the eight electronic ratings - EM, ET, FT, IC, RD, RM, ST, and TM. From the evaluations of 582 men at that location predictor variable information was collected on the JPQ ANSWER SHEET (Appendix E) and criterion variable information was collected on the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form (Appendix C). The following conclusions have been made in this paper relative to four estimators of technician proficiency:

a) The Series Reliability Estimate, the Parallel-Series Reliability Estimate, and the Geometric Mean Reliability Estimate (as predictor variables derived from information on the JPO ANSWER SHEET) do not seem to be predictive of the absolute level of technician proficiency as deterby Technical Proficiency (TP) Score (the criterion variable derived from information on the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form). In every case the product-moment correlation coefficient could not be termed significantly different from zero (at the  $\alpha = .05$  level). This conclusion was made in view of the results of a curvilinear regression analysis. For each estimator the best least squares fit to the sample data seemed to be a linear fit. Finally in every case the mean of the sample criterion variable (technical proficiency score) is the best estimate of an absolute level of technician proficiency. As such none of these predictor variables seem to estimate absolute technician proficiency and cannot at this stage of the data analysis be held to possess utility for widespread implementation.

b) The Weighted-Average Reliability Estimator possesses moderate validity as an estimator of the absolute level of technician proficiency. The results of the curvilinear regression analysis indicated that a linear equation was the best fit to the sample data. Furthermore, a correlation of .242 with the criterion variable indicates that it possesses a possibility for future use in arriving at estimates of personnel system performance proficiency.

The above results were made under the assumption that the Technical Proficiency Checkout Form possesses a high degree of validity for appraising the absolute level of technician proficiency. This assumption is made here as it was by Siegel and Federman [12]. However, this assumption was verified for technicians in avionic ratings by Siegel and Fischl [13]. Further research in this area will involve a comparison of the above results with a similar statistical analysis applied to the sample data collected at Newport, Rhode Island, and Boston, Mass., in which a total of 367 men were involved. Furthermore, subsequent data analysis will investigate the possibility of whether or not any of the predictor variables can be validly applied to particular ratings, rather than to the population of eight electronic ratings as a whole as this report had done. Finally the possibility of combining worthwhile estimators of electronic ratings performance proficiency in a meaningful way to calculate ship or squadron efficiency will be researched.

#### APPENDIX A

### JOB PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Supervisor\_\_\_\_\_\_Rating\_\_\_\_Ship or Unit\_\_\_\_\_

Instructions to Supervisor. The purpose of this form is to determine the number of effective and ineffective performances you have observed among your men during the past two months. We are only interested in the uncommonly effective and the uncommonly ineffective performances.

List below the names of all the men under your supervision who are currently striking for, or in any of the following ratings: DS, EM, ET, FT, IC, MT, RD, RM, ST, TD, TM (AE, AT, AQ, AX). If you supervise more than one of these ratings, please use a separate form for each rating.

Now, considering the fleet electronic maintenance objectives, enter your estimate of the number of uncommonly effective (UE) and uncommonly ineffective (UI) performances during the past two months for each man being rated. Please refer to the definitions lists for the meanings of the JOB ACTIVITIES and of the OBJECTIVES involved.

The first line has been filled in as an example. The supervisor completing the example felt that Peter Smith had ten unusually effective performances and two unusually ineffective performances while performing *Electronic Circuit Analses* when considered against the objectives of fleet electronic maintenance. He also felt that Smith showed two uncommonly effective performances in the area of *Electrosafety* and four uncommonly ineffective performances in *Instruction*.

If a man has *not* had an opportunity to perform in a particular area, enter a dash (-); if he has had an opportunity but has not shown any uncommonly effective or ineffective performances, enter a zero (0).

30B ACTIVIT Instruction Tlectronic cognition ersonnel lectro

	/				/			•					/		/	
Name and rating	UE	UI	UE	UI	UΕ	UI	UE	UI	UE	Ul	UE	UI	UE	UI	UE	UI
Peter Smith ST3			0	0	10	2	ü	Ö	2	0	0	4	0	0		-
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·																
													_			
																_

#### APPENDIX B

#### DESCRIPTION OF JOB ACTIVITIES

#### JOB ACTIVITY

#### DESCRIPTION

- 1. Using Reference Materials--includes the following type of activities:
  - a. use of supporting reference materials
  - b. making out reports
- 2. Equipment Operation--includes the following type of activity:
  - a. operating equipment, electrical and electronics test equipment, and other electronic equipments
- 3. Electronic Circuit Analysis--includes the following type of activities:
  - a. understanding the principles of electronic circuitry
  - b. making out failure reports
  - c. keeping records of maintenance usage data
- 4. Personnel Relationships--includes the following type of activity:
  - a. supervising the operation, inspection, and maintenance of electronic equipments
- 5. Electro-safety--includes the following type of activity:
  - using safety precautions on self and equipment
- 6. Instruction--includes the following type of activity:
  - a. teaching others how to inspect, operate, and maintain electronic equipments
- 7. Electro-repair--includes the following type of activity:

a. equipment repair in the shop

- 8. Electro-cognition--includes the following type of activities:
  - maintenance and troubleshooting of electronic equipments
  - b. use of electronic maintenance reference materials

APP	ENDIX	С

### TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY CHECKOUT FORM

NAM	E OF SUPERVISORRATING/	RATE	
FUL	L NAME OF MAN EVALUATED		
SHI	P OR UNITLOCATION	DATE	
	TASK DESCRIPTION	CHECKED OUT	NOT CHECKEI OUT
1.	Capable of <u>employing safety precautions</u> on most of this unit's equipment with which his rating is concerned.		
2.	Capable of <u>replacing</u> most of this unit's equip- ment with which his rating is concerned.		
3.	Capable of <u>removing</u> most of this unit's equip- ment with which his rating is concerned.		
4.	Capable of following block diagrams for most of this unit's equipment with which his rating is concerned.		
5.	Capable of knowing relationship of equipment to other related equipment with which his rating is concerned.		
6.	Capable of <u>calibrating</u> most of this unit's equip- ment with which his rating is concerned.	-	
7.	Capable of trouble-shooting/isolated mal- function(s) in most of this unit's equipment with which his rating is concerned.		
8.	Capable of employing electronic principles involved in maintenance of most of this unit's equipment with which his rating is concerned.		

MAKE CERTAIN THERE IS AN "X" IN A BOX OPPOSITE EACH TASK DESCRIPTION

#### APPENDIX D

#### MEANINGS OF FLEET ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE OBJECTIVES

#### 1. Readiness

To maintain efficiently self, subordinate personnel, equipment, and systems in state of readiness consistent with fleet requirements.

#### 2. Performance

To complete any given mission in minimum time with appropriate level of accuracy and reliability.

#### 3. Operation

To obtain optimum system output when equipment is operated, i.e., output characterized by precision and variability appropriate to mission.

#### 4. Safety

To carry out duties with maximum protection for men and equipment consistent with mission.

#### 5. Preparation

To prepare for personnel requirements of present and future equipment, systems, and situations through use of training programs, maintenance of high morale, etc. **R**PPENDIX E



22

IN GOOD CONCITION SO THAT REMINDER: WHEN TYPING LAYOUT, PL YOU WILL HAVE A SHARP, EASE MAKE SURE THE DARK COPY FOR BETT possible of the TECHNICIAN'S NAME. Start with his last name, print one letter to a box. Leave one box blank, then print his first name; leave another box blank, then his middle name, etc. 43 44 45 46 ÷ ŝ ş 4 1 : .1 õ ò đ Â, F 0 Technician's Social Security No. σ Use a #2 pencil only. Blacken the answer rectangle completely. Cleanly erase answers ĥ e ... 0 È ľ, you want to change. Erase any stray marks. 'TECHNICIAN' is the man being evaluated. Ë ÷ ŝ đ ÷. ; ĵ ŧ Į. Ņ l, Ą β į! ſ 2 ji ij ê ľ ć ē ſ i, ġ 3 In the boxes just below, print as much as д, Å ú A sup A car × N Ċ ۵ 1~~1= 0 .... 0 .... d ---- d --- d --σ ý, ≻ ъ ы A ma A a m ۹-[] l) b 2 === 5 i<sup>-1</sup> 8-12 .....**6** ¢ 1 ē 5. . L 3 j1 ] Ņ r S ţ ŋ f rati **J** con. 877 **S** 111 attan a sin i Į ä i (17.9 c ... and the × **p** ----ي بي ال ) ( C ін П 7 2 1 ŗ. 25 i. į, ą į. h ĥ ľ, ſ -Ŋ Ó S 0 ò œ ġ. ¢ Ś 1 ĥ 5 . 0 3 đ ц с с ο 5 --- 5 --- 5 e 8 S n \_\_\_ n \_\_\_ n \_\_\_ 5 ſ 1 6 1 Q and X and 1 Ŕ 9 ::: ا 6 0 507 1 CE COS COS S LOS 1 **x** = :: 10 6 1 2 .... 8 ---- 8 cii DIRECTIONS e ci 0 c= 2, ່ວ [] ġ. ų į <del>بر</del> [ 2 \*\*\* 2 С ..... d ъ [] 8 0 8 1 11 n o 0 1 10 j G à J р () j. h u in I ٦ ا 0 0 5 ä 0 ¢ م ĵ G ŗ 0 l Ŋ ĥ ij ĵ 3 " B L' B L' Ü ij ģ 0 --- 0 1 1 ß i I 2 := 2 م ا 1 1 1 1 1 <del>ק</del> ח 2 თ c Ð •.-1 [] u \_\_\_ u 0 0 ant at cut cut 8 بو [] S can S can S can S can 1 i i i 2 ] ĵ g Ŋ 6 л Ц 1 8 1 ß l ° ₽ -| н Ц l d l d Į, li U 6 5 n l 0 ] G 0 5 0 X may م ٦ ا Υ..... Rating - paygrade 1 Đ a --- a ---D 5 ß N 5 ļ. Technician's 🚽 n U ļ f 9 ß 0 1 Î ľ, Ņ Ę Ņ ą م ا J (I) . 89 [] ٦ | 0 H e [] ••• 0 n III E-2 с Ц C [] C n 4 q 🛛 2 9 е, L . į م Ū 60 E 0 ů ſ į ĉ ţ ŝ . Birthdate 2-5 J 2. **6** 찘다다 2885 0---0 una | 1 m 2""" 2""" Assignment on Current Job and 1 1.14 Technician's Technician's Months 1 г. . **С** n J ĩ ŗ Ş ŗ P 19 Months of Active σ PERSONNEL IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION FORM (PIIF) Technician's Duty Service i į Ī а С 3 ĵ j Ē ĩ 0 i. ) g ġ ; i, Ģ ú ١. RATING/RATE . 4 . . 80 , **6** ..... **JUSNR** Feb Mar Jun Jul Sep Nov Jan Dec 2 i Supervisor LOCATION Known by . 0 ....0 5 .... 5 7 000.4 œ σ 2 ..... 2 3 (----) 8 L LaL 1 cm ii 16 USN ----9 í 8 2 m 2 m ···· 0 ···· 3 (1) 3 [1] Î σ E ... 8 3.5 ē. : 0 h i Î [ 1991 E. ij თ ß 3 ŝ School **.** ] 2 'n Yrs. Ed. .) 8 5 ſ. h i, ł ņ ŗ ٦ و ġ ľ Ę e ; ] 0 \_\_\_\_\_ 0 1. 1. 5 3 3 3 4 700 760 ģ 9 -- 9 a 5 an 5 c. ---- 0 e... . О ·· 0 ··· 0 . 9 11 8 1 10.2 1 .s 5 2 ] 3 ,L ..... 0 d 8 2 0 ڡ 6 ---- 6 ڡ [] 9 2 C) 2 1 101 1 9 crat 6 9 550 ĵ, l ij ļ **ں** ا ſ ij 6 .... σ η ā e . ſ. n η i ÷ CLER SHIP OR UNIT 0 3 -FINAL MARK :: h 3 ñ 3 þ ŝ 5 ġ. ] 2 il . è ÷ s; School STANDI SIZ 8 0 . . . . 0 1. ...1 27.00 **6** 11 œ œ σ 4 9 1.2 1 ...... 5 ß ίų. 3 ----66 ". ! ះ ប ņ :: ... 1. 9 8 5 Ę ÷, :: F : ÷. ] j. â ì į. i. 1 ...0... ÷ 2 👘 CLASS MECH œ Ð 'n œ σ 1 ŝ وب æ σ B ASS ł; . . . 9 ٦ ÷ Ċ ť NAME OF SUPERVISOR e, ĥ Ę n. .. Į. 126 ----10 į. į Ì ы ł ł . **5** [ :" 8 ю . æ č و 2 ---- 2 ARI 9 æ 7 | キャッチョン た 1 ī Ĺ i ii 5 ... lj g ŝ . լ 3 л Ц 1 - L mar L ÷ i. ; ť Schoo 4 ഹ് 0 ٩ 'n 9.09.0 c m S ø œ ŝ 3 ò œ ص σ . , , r ß Ş ţ: ٦ Ģ : i. . S 1116 01 Ē i ļ : 0 **m** : .**†** σ ŝ , **2** ċ m ف ف രത ف œ 6 0.36 -GCT 1 1 p d DATE ~ ~ ŵ 0 ÷ ဖ် დ თ 80 ŝ 5 ī, ź / i Ģ 1. :1 - 4 3 j 12 :: UPD. ITY Layout PRINTED IN U.S.A. DS 2966

APPENDIX F

23

#### APPENDIX G

The purpose of this section is to examine the frequency with which the two cases:

1. a technician did not work at a job activity, and

2. a technician received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$ ,

occured for each rating and job activity across all eleven ships participating in the project. From this one can infer on the extent which any convention for estimating performance in those cases would effect individual SRE, PRE, and GRE values.

Refer to the table in Appendix H. Each square in the table represents the number and proportion of technicians by rating evaluated at San Diego who did not work at a particular job activity or received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  by their supervisor. Therefore, on job activity Number 1, 10 of the EM's (or 18.5% of the EM's) evaluated at San Diego either do not work at that job activity (Using Reference Materials) or received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and EUI = 0. This, however, may seem a tolerable level of occurence of such cases, but when the proportion of such cases exceeds .33, one should begin to consider whether the performance of some individuals is due more to the convention that must be adopted rather than to the individual's own job effectiveness. Of the 64 squares in the table, 46 squares had one-third or more of the men in some rating falling into the two cases for some job activity, 25 squares had one-half or more of the men in some rating falling into the two cases, and most critically, 6 squares had at least 75% of the men in those cases. In particular the RD and RM ratings were particularly notorious for this type of situation occuring. It is clear in the RD and RM ratings that any convention adopted will probably poorly reflect individual performance and more reflect the effect of the convention. No rating seems to be free of this situation for some job activities, however, some ratings demonstrate this effect for more job activities.

		•			PATING				
104 AC	т.	E₩	εT	FT	IC	RD	RM	ST	TM
•	1	10	26	43	. 6	31	32	23	5
		0.135	0.220	0.489	0.143	0.373	0.372	0.277	0.179
	2   ·	11	37	34	4	29	25	21	7
		0.204	0.314	0.386	0.095	0.349	0.291	0.253	0.250
	з	18	36	41	11	78	72	39	20
		0.333	0.305	0.466	0.262	0.940	0.837	0.470	0.714
	•	0 5	60	60	· 20	49	50	47	8
		0.370	0.508	0.682	0.476	0.590	0.581	0.566	0.286
	5	11	63	54	6	47	33	35	8
		0.204	0.534	0.614	0.143	n.566	0.384	0.422	0.286
		27	81	69	23	62	54	50	12
		0.500	0.685	0.784	0.548	0.747	0.628	0.602	0.429
	7	۹.	36	49	· 3	82	. 81	38	. 18
		0.167	0.305	0.557	0.071	0.988	0.942	0.458	0.643
	H	20	41	. 41	· - A	82 8	71	30 .	16
_		0.370	0.347	0.456	0.190	0.944	0.826	0.361	0.571

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MEN WHO DID NOT WORK AT A PARTICULAR JOB ACTIVITY OR RECEIVED EUE=0 AND EUI=0 BY RATING

•••

NUMBER OF MEN IN EACH RATING 54 118

42

- 88

83

86

83

28

25

#### APPENDIX I

This section will be concerned with justifying the hypothesis that no convention can be adopted per ship that will account for those cases in which a technician either does not work at a particular job activity or received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  from his supervisor. As an example, observe the table in Appendix J. This table is of the same type as that previously reported on for all men at San Diego given in Appendix G, however, it is reporting on only one typical ship out of the eleven ships in the project. For this ship there were 8 (out of 64) instances where those two cases occured for all men in some job activity and rating. The other ten ships demonstrated 16, 7, 8, 10, 13, 12, 5, 5, 5, and 16 (out of 64) such instances. Therefore, it is impossible to form an average estimate (or some composite value) per ship for each rating and job activity based upon the performance of individuals in that rating and job activity who received  $\Sigma UE \neq 0$  and/or  $\Sigma UI \neq 0$  if in fact no such individuals exist.

.

		•		•	RATING				
À ECL	ст.	EM	FT	FT	IC	RD	RH	ST	TM
	1	4	4	5	0	0	9	0	0
		0.667	0.310	0.417	0.0	0.0	0.900	0.0	0.0
	5		13	7	. 0	0	9	0	1
	•	1.000	0.44H	0.543	0.0	0.0	.0.900	0.0	0.077
	з	5	14	7	<u>,</u> 1	0	10	0	9
		0.833	0.483	0.543	0.167	0.0	1.000	0.0	0.692
	4	6	14	10	3	0	9	0	5
		1.000	0.621	0.833	0.500	0.0	0.900	0.0	0.385
••••	5	6	21	H	0	0	В	0	1
		1.000	0.724	0.667	0.0	0.0	0.400	0.0	0.077
·	6	5	-21	. 4	· : 0	0	10	0	5
		0.833	0.724	0.750	0.0	٦.0	1.000	0.0	0.385
	7	5.	11	12	1	0	g .	0	9
		0.933	0.379	1.000	0.167	0.0	0.900	0.0	0.692
	8	6	16	ц	1	0	10	0	6
		. 1.000	0.552	0.657	0.167	0.0	1.000	0.0	0.462

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MEN WHO DID NOT WORK AT A PARTICULAR JOB ACTIVITY OR RECEIVED SUE=0 AND SUI=0 BY RATING ON A PARTICULAR SHIP AT SAN DIEGO

NUMBER OF MEN IN EACH RATING 6 29 12 6 0 10 0 13

#### APPENDIX K

.

#### COMPOSITE RELIABILITY VALUES FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO

JOB ACTIVITY	ЕМ	ET	FT	10	RD	RM	ST	тм
1	0.8770	0.6831	0.7160	0.7466	0.9257	0.9310	0.8537	0.7333
2	0.9050	0.7733	0.7802	0.8217	0,9110	0.9497	0,8899	0,8165
3	0.8465	0.6932	0.7340	0.7981	0.9000	1.0000	0.8662	0.8667
4	0.8639	0.5987	0.7890	0.7692	0.9300	0.9671	0.8930	0.7733
5	0.9004	0.7706	0.9107	0.7865	0.9012	0.9712	0.9161	0.7284
6	0.9333	0.8481	0.8435	0.8039	0.9677	0.9877	0.8571	0.8974
7	0.8981	0.7872	0.8701	0.8163	1.0000	1.0000	0.9078	0,8269
<b>8</b> ·	0.8744	0.7097	0.7771	0.8105	1.0000	0.9949	0.8571	0.7419

#### ' RATING

28

#### APPENDIX L

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the greater utility of the WRE as an estimator of individual performance. Essentially it is a better type of estimator in that it is not dependent on a convention to be adopted for the case whereby a man did not work at a particular job activity. As such the convention need only provide reliability ratios for those job activities for which the man being evaluated received  $\Sigma UE = 0$ and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  from his supervisor.

Consider the table in Appendix M. Each square in the table represents a breakdown of the table given in Appendix G into the number (and proportion) of men who did not work at a particular job activity and those men who received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$ . For example, on job activity Number 1, 6 (11% of the EM's) received  $\Sigma UE = 0$  and  $\Sigma UI = 0$  and 4 (7% of the EM's) did not work at that job activity. The composite reliability values need then only be employed on 11% of the men in that rating and job activity rather then on 18.5% of the men as required by the SRE, PRE, and GRE. More significantly, in the case of RD's and RM's for example, at most 52% (as compared to 98% for the SRE, PRE, and GRE) of the men in those ratings derive reliability ratios for some job activities from the composite reliability table. Clearly this is a significant improvement which should improve individual performance estimates. The statistical analysis in the main text of this paper verified this conjecture.

#### Derivation of the Weights Employed by the WRE

On the JPQ ANSWER SHEET in Appendix E in column (c) for each job activity the following question was answered by the supervisor on the man he is evaluating:

- QUESTION (c) Considering this man's <u>overall</u> performance, it is your opinion that the importance of this job activity, as a factor in determining the overall performance of this man, is best described as being:
  - 3. of central and primary importance
  - 2. a significant factor, but of secondary importance
  - of only moderate importance in estimating overall performance
  - 0. of little or no importance

The weights (w<sub>i</sub>) for the i<sup>th</sup> job activity are determined by the formula: If the supervisor recorded the i<sup>th</sup> job activity as:

- of central and primary importance, the weight  $w_i = 1.0$
- of secondary importance, the weight  $w_i = .75$
- of moderate importance, the weight  $w_{i} = .5$
- of little or no importance, the weight  $w_i = .25$

APPENDIX M

A NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MEN WHO RECEIVED EUE=0 AND EUI=0 AND NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MEN WHO DID NOT WORK AT A PARTICULAR JOB ACTIVITY BY RATING

				PATING				
JOB ACT.	E₩	ετ	FT	tc	RD	RM	ST	TM .
	NZ 19	NZ N9	N7 N9	NZ N9	N7 N9	NZ N9	NZ N9	NZ N9
. 1	6 4	26 0	38 5	6 0	28 3	16 16	19 4	5 0 ·
	0.111 0.074	0.220 0.0	0.432 0.057	0.143 0.0	0.337 0.036	0.186 0.186	0.229 0.048	0.179 0.0
٤.	5 6	37 0	331	4 0	29 0	18 7	51 0	7 0
	0.093 0.111	0.314 0.0	0.375 0.011	0.095 0.0	0.349 0.0	0.209 0.081	0.253 0.0	0.250 0.0
3	1,3 5	33 3	37 4	11 0	43 35	· <b>3</b> 5 37	29 10	17 3
	0.241 0.093	0.200 0.025	0.420 0.045	0.262 0.0	0.518 0.422	0.407 0.430	0.349 0.120	0.607 0.107
4	1-2 8	37 23	45 15	16 4	30 19	20 30	36 11	7 1
	0.222 0.148	0.314 0.195	0.511 0.170	0.381 0.095	0.361 0.229	0.233 0.349	0.434 0.133	0.250 0.036
5	н 3	62 1	53 1	6 0	43 4	26 7	34 1	7 1
	9.148 0.056	0.525 0.004	0.602 0.011 1	0.143 0.0	0.518 0.048	0.302 0.081	0.410 0.012	0.250 0.036
6	14 9	58 23	45 24	17 6	34 28	55 35	29 21	.9 3
	0.333 0.167	0.492 0.195	0.511 0.273	0.405 0.143	0.410 0.337	0.256 0.372	0.344 0.253	0.321 0.107
7	4 5	35 1	40 . <del>.</del> .	3 0	30 52	31 50	25 13	. 17 1
	0.074 0.093	0.247 0.008	0.455 0.102	0.071 0.0	0.361 0.627	0.360 0.581	0.301 0.157	0.607 0.036
F.	11 9	41 0	37 4	8 0	32 50	27 44	21 9	13 3
	0.204 0.167	0.347 0.0	0.420 0.045	0.190 0.0	0.385 0.602	.0.314 0.512	0.253 0.109	0.464 0.107

NUMBER OF MEN IN EACH RATING 54 118

÷.

83

83

28

86

 $KZ = NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF MEN WHO RECEIVED <math>\Sigma UE=0$  and  $\Sigma UI=0$  in that job activity and rating N3 = NUMBER and proportion of men who did not work at that job activity in that rating

. 42

88

.

APPENDIX N

FREQUENCY	11	37	46	51	52	81	92	68	144
144									0000
141									0000
134									
135									
132									
129									
126									0000
123									***
120									
117									
114									
111									****
108									****
105									****
102									
99									0000
96					•				
93									
90									
87									
84									****
81						0000			****
78									
75							0000		
72									
69									
66						0000	****		
63									****
60								0000	***
57						0000			
54						0000			
51					0000		0000		****
48					0000	0000			
45					0000				****
42									
39			****				0000	0000	****
36		0000	0000	0000	0000		0000		
33								0000	****
30			0000					0000	****
27		0000	0000					0000	
24							0000	0000	
21							0000	0000	
18		0000							****
15									
12				0000					
9		0000	0000	0000					
6		0000	0000		0000				
3		****		****					
TP SCOPE						 5			A

#### HISTOGRAM OF TP SCORES FOR SAN DIEGO CAL

EACH \*\*\*\* EQUALS 3 POINTS

FREQUENCY 29 13 19 30 15 24 17 17 13 20 21 19 28 25 18 23 42 18 18 13 160 -----. . . . . 153 156 153 150 147 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* 144 \*\*\* \*\*\* \* \* \* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... • • • \* \* \* \* \* \* ... \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \* \* \* \* \* • • • \* \* \* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \* \* \* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* -------- - -CLASS 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 INTERVAL 1 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

HISTOGRAM OF SERIES RELIABILITY ESTIMATES (SRE) FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

EACH \*\*\* EQUALS 3 POINTS

32

APPENDIX O

28 21 39 35 18 10 15 4 7 2 2 7 2 0 4 0 FREQUENCY 142 40 46 n 160 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 159 . ... 156 153 150 147 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* 144 \*\*\* 141 \*\*\* 138 ... \*\*\* 135 132 129 126 123 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* 120 \*\*\* 117 114 \*\*\* \*\*\* 111 108 105 \*\*\* 102 99 96 93 90 87 84 78 75 72 69 66 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \* \* \* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... ... \*\*\* ÷ \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* 60755185296330722185296 \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* , ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*1 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* ... ... \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... 3 \*\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\* ... \*\*\* ... \* \* \* ... ... ... \*\*\* \*\*\* ... ... ------------..... ----. . . . . -----------------. . . . . . . . . ----CLASS 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 INTERVAL 1

EACH +++

APPENDIX P

HISTOGRAM OF SERIES-PARALLEL RELIABILITY ESTIMATES (PRE) FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

.

EQUALS 3 POINTS

HISTOGRAM OF WEIGHTED-AVERAGE RELIABILITY ESTIMATES (WRE) FOR TECHNICIANS AT SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

FREQUENCY	15	19	34	35	51	47	54	59	55	52	38	28	28	15	12	3	8	9	2	1	11
59								***													
58								***													
56								***													
55								***	***												
54							***	***	***												
52							***	***	***	***											
51					***		***	***	***	***											
50					***		***	***	***	***											
45					***		***	***	***	***											
. 47					***	***	***	***	***	***											
46					***	***	***	***	***	***											
45					***	***	***	***	***	***											
43					***	***	***	***	***	***											
42 1					***	***	***	***	***	***											
40					***	***	***	***	***	***											
39					***	***	***	***	***	***						•					
38					***	***	***	***	***	***	***										
36					***	***	***	***	***	***	***										
35				***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***										
34			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***				•						
32			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***											
31			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***										
30			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***										
28				***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
27			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
25			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
24			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
23			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
21			***	***	***	***	***	***	***		***	***	***								
20			***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
19		***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
17		***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
16		***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***								
15	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	.***	***	***	***	***	***	***							
13	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***							
12	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***						
11	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***						***
Ĵŷ	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***		***			***
8	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***			***
7 6	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***			***
5	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***			***
4	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***			***
2	***	***	***		***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***		***
1	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
CLASS																				••••	
INTERVAL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21

EACH \*\*\* EQUALS 1 POINT

•

34

#### APPENDIX R

Class Intervals for Histograms of Various Reliability Estimates

CLASS INTERVAL NUMBER	CLASS INTERVAL	
1	[.96, 1.0]	
2	[.91, .96)	
3	[.86, .91)	
4	[.81, .86)	
5	[.76, .81)	
6	[.71, .76)	
7	[.66, .71)	
8	[.61, .66)	
9	[.56, .61)	
10	[.51, .56)	
11	[.46, .51)	
12	[.41, .46)	
13	[.36, .41)	
14	[.31, .36)	
15	[.26, .31)	
16	[.21, .26)	
17	[.16, .21)	
18	[.11, .16)	
19	[.06, .11)	
20	[.01, .06)	
21	[.00, .01)	

The class interval [a, b) is defined to be the set of all numbers x such that a  $\leq x \leq b$ .

#### APPENDIX S

Let Y be a criterion variable and X the predictor variable. If N is the number of observations on each of X and Y, then  $4' = [Y_1, \ldots, Y_N]$  is the row vector of observations on Y. For a given matrix A, A' will be the transpose of A. In particular one wishes to establish a linear regression equation for a particular response Y in terms of the variables X,  $X^2$ ,  $X^3$ , i.e. it is desirable to establish which of the three power curves, linear, quadratic, or cubic:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \beta_i X^i$$
  $p = 1, 2, or 3$ 

best fit the data obtained on X and Y. In matrix notation the above equations, in terms of the sample observation vectors, can be expressed as:

$$4 = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\beta} + \mathbf{E}$$

where  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{}$  was defined above. The matrix  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{} = [J, \stackrel{\text{d}}{}_1, \stackrel{\text{d}}{}_2, \stackrel{\text{d}}{}_3]$  where  $J' = [1, \ldots, 1]_{1\times N}, \stackrel{\text{d}}{}_1 = [\stackrel{\text{d}}{}_1, \ldots, \stackrel{\text{d}}{}_N]$  for i = 1, 2, or 3 and therefore  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{}_1$  is an N x 1 column vector of observations.  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{} = [\beta_0, \ldots, \beta_p]$ , the vector of p + 1 regression parameters. E' = [e\_1, \ldots, e\_N] is the vector of errors due to lack of fit in the particular linear model. One wishes to estimate  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{}$  such that the error sum of squares E'E is minimized. In particular a <u>least squares estimate</u>  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{}$  of  $\stackrel{\text{d}}{}$  is given by

$$\widetilde{\beta} = (\mathfrak{X}'\mathfrak{X})^{-1}\mathfrak{X}'\mathfrak{X}$$

provided the square matrix %% is nonsingular and the regression problem has been properly expressed. The usual assumption one makes is that E' is distributed with mean  $[0, \ldots, 0]_{1\times N}$  and variance-covariance matrix  $\sigma^2 I$ 

where I is the identity matrix.  $\sigma^2$  is called the common error variance of the observations. The assumption of normality of the error vector E is not required in order to obtain the least square estimates for any of the parameters in the regression equation. Because any assumption of normality for E implies that the observations on Y or X are normally distributed, this paper will be concerned with only least squares estimates. One cannot discuss normality on X or Y because of prior results (TABLE 2) where it was shown that the distribution of TP scores, SRE, PRE, and GRE are not normally distributed. Therefore, it is imperative that the reader be aware that while the assumption of E being normally distributed is <u>not</u> required in order to obtain  $\beta$ , it is required in order to make tests of hypothesis, as contained in an Analysis of Variance Table, which depend on the assumption of normality. These tests are the usual t- or F-tests and they <u>cannot be validly</u> applied to the sample data obtained at San Diego.

#### A Least Squares Analysis of the Sample Data

It is possible that a least squares analysis can be attempted independently of the distributional properties of the criterion and predictor variables. For a <u>particular</u> predictor variable (X) and criterion variable (Y), the square of the multiple correlation coefficient ( $\mathbb{R}^2$ ) provides a measure of the degree to which a particular regression model explains variation in the data.  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is defined as

$$R^{2} = \frac{\text{Sum of squares due to regression - Sum of squares due to } \beta_{0}}{\text{Total (corrected) sum of squares}}$$
$$= (\vec{\beta}' \vec{x}' \vec{\gamma} - \frac{\vec{\gamma}' \vec{\gamma}}{N}) / (\vec{\gamma}' \vec{\gamma} - \frac{\vec{\gamma}' \vec{\gamma}}{N})$$

It should be clear that the larger  $R^2$  is, the better the fitted equation explains the variation in the data. Furthermore,  $0 \le R^2 \le 1$ , and therefore  $R^2 = 1$  implies a perfect fit. However, there are a few problems with this approach (see, for example, Draper and Smith [5] page 63). Rather one must weight the value of  $R^2$  with the least squares estimate (s<sup>2</sup>) of the common error variance ( $\sigma^2$ ) where

 $s^{2} = residual mean square$  $= (\dot{\Upsilon}'\dot{\Upsilon} - \frac{\dot{\Upsilon}'\dot{\Upsilon}}{N})/(N - p - 1)$ 

Of course, the smaller s is for a particular model under consideration the better the model fits the data. Therefore, the approach is to weight increases in  $R^2$  with decreases in s in order to arrive at the best least squares model for the data.

	PS. the same		375 A A		·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·····
	میں بیاد میں ہے۔ اور اور میں میں میں میں اور		•·····			APPENDIX T	
:							
. r	THE PREDICTOR V	ARTABLE(X) IS SRE, AN	D THE CRITERIAN	VARIABLE(Y)	IS TP SCORE		يرجد حديد بيرك وليتجرب والتركين
. 1							
غ	TEST MEANS AND	STANDARD DEVIATIONS					
	1 X 2 SQUAR	0,365 0,335		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	•		• • •
	3 X CUBE	0,188 0,285					
	CORRELATION MAT	RIX			· <u> </u>	·	. · · · ·
• • • •	1 X 2 Squar	1,000 0,957 C,957 1,000	0.977 0.975	=0,089 =0,080			
	3 X CURE	C,897 U,985	1,010	-0.063			
• •							••
. –	ATTENTA SECONDA	AND 14180 000850 POLY Teessitesitesi	8018883F1038888				
•	HULTIPLE R SGUA Multiple R =	RE # C,005					
ſ	N.D.F.1 = 1	69A				•	
i	F.FOR ANALYSIS	OF VARIANCE ON R .	2,740		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	
-	BETA WEIGHTS -0.069						
-	CONTRIBUTIENS T	O MULTIPLE CERPELATIE	N CALIMNA				
ļ	1 X	0,005 +1,000		•			
-	SQUARED BETA WE	IGHTS	······				······
	8 WEIGHTS -0.477		• .				
	INTERCEPT CONST	ANT 8 . 5,458					
. :	MULTIPLE R SOUA	RE 0.007				<u></u>	
•	HULTIPLE R = 2	0,084					
<del>.</del>	N. D. F. 2 #	579	7:068			······································	
	BETA WEIGHTS	OF VANIANDE CN N -	21000			•	
: 	CENTRIBUTIENS T	G MULTIPLE CORPELATIO	N			i-	
	AND REGRESSI	ON FACTOR LEADINGS,	SVD COLUMN)				
5	2 SCUAR	0,013 -0,947			•		
•	0,009 0,029			•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	8 WEIGHTS 0.648 -1.282	I					
-	INTERCEPT CONST	ANT = 5,361					
· .	MULTIPLE R SQUA	RE . 0,072					
<u>.</u>	$\frac{MULTIPLE R = 3}{N_*D_*F_*1 = 3}$	0,408					
	N,D.F.2 = F FOR ANALYSIS	578 GF VARIANCE ON R =	14,953			•	
•.	BETA WEIGHTS	T 205		· · ·			•
	CONTRIBUTIENS T	A MULTIPLE CORRELATIO	N				
	AND REGRESSI	=0,124 =0,256	SUD CHENNY				
-	2 SQUAR	0,397 -U,298 +0.201 +U.234	·····			······	
;	SOUARED BETA WE	IGHTS		-	11 - F	•	
: <u>-</u>	B HEIGHTS	J <u></u>	<u></u>				······································
	12.627 +37.742 INTERCEPT CONST	26,158 ANT = 5,017	•				
-				•			
	ANOVA TABLE FE	R PELVNOMIALS					
-	REDUCTION DUP	TA LINEAR FIT, WITH 1	DF = 0.00	5			
1	RESIDUAL S.S.	# 0,995 EF #	SHO RESIDUAL	H,S, *	0,002		
-			************				
	REDUCTION DUE	TE GENERAL GUADHATIC	FIT WITH DF 2.	. 0.007			
-	REDUCTION P.S. RESIDUAL S.S.	* 0,004 * 0,993 DF *	579 RESIDUAL	H.S. #	0.002	· · · ·	
· L	F FOR QUADRATIC	F17 8 2,068					
	F FOR QUADRATIC	TEHH ALONE # 1.39	5 5				
			************				
	REDUCTION DUE T	B GENERAL CURIC FIT &	ITH DF 3; =	0,072			··· ·
-	RESIDUAL S.S.	* 0,928 DF *	578 RESIDUAL	H,S, #	0.002		
	F FOR GENERAL C	UBIC FIT #14.852			۰.		
	REDUCTION DUE T	0 CLUIC TERM ALONE WI	TH 1 DF	0,044	3	8	
		***************	******	**********	**************************************		
				-			
						•	•

	ANTERRESETATION SERVICES AND THE STATES AND THE SERVICES
<b>-</b> .	APPENDIX U
	THE PRECIETOR VARIABLE (X) IS PRE. AND THE CRITERIAN VARIABLE (Y) IS TO SCORE.
	TEST MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
	1 X 0,594 0,399 2 SQUAR C.512 U.SPR
	3 X CUPE 0,454 0,384
	CORRELATION MATRIX
	2 SQUAR 0,974 1,000 0,989 =0,056
	3 X CUBE 0,930 0,989 1,000 -0,087 4 YC,009 -J,056 -0,087 1,000
	FIRST, SECENE, AND THIRD REGARE PELYNEMIALS, MULTIPLE R SCUARE # 0,000 MULTIPLE R SCUARE # 0,000
	N,D,F,1 3 1
	Y FOR ANALYSIS OF VA <u>RIANCE EN R +</u> 0.047
	-0,009 Contributions to multiple corpelation
	1 X 0'000 +1'000 YUD HERLESSICH FELINH FERTURS! YUD GERDWAL
<u>-</u>	5,000 BETA HEIGHTS
	3 NEIGHTS -0.052
	INTERCEPT CONSTANT . 5,315
	MULTIPLE R SCUARE = 0,243
	N, D, F, 1 = 2
	N,D,F,Z = 579 F FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE EN R = 13,014
	3ETA WEIGHTS 0,884 w0,917
	CONTRIBUTIONS TO HULTIPLE CORFELATION AND REGRESSION FACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND. COLUMN)
	1 X +0,009 +0,043 2 SCUAR 0,031 70,268
	SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS 0,781 0,840
	B HEIGHTS 5,154 -5,496
	INTERCEPT_CONSTANT = 5,035
	MULTIPLE R SGLARE # 0,047
	N,D,F,1 = 3
	V, D, F, Z = 578 F FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R = 0,492
	JETA KEIGHTS -D,053 1,444 =1,465
	CONTRIBUTIENS TO MULTIPLE CERPELATION AND REGRESSION FACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)
	1 X 0,000 +0,041 2 SCUAR +0.080 +0.257
	3 X CUBE 0,127 +0,399
	0,003 2,006 <u>3,147</u>
	3 WEIGHTS
<b>.</b>	INTERCEPT CONSTANT =
	•••••
	ANAVA TADIF FAR DELYNAMIALS
·····	GENERALSEGETER TETERTERTERTERTERTERTERTERTERTERTERTERTE
	RESIDUAL S.S. # 1,000 DF # 580 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002
• •• • -	атаванавана тарат. Алдал.
	REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUACHATIC FIT WITH DF 2, . 0,043
	REDUCTION M.S. = 0.022 RESIDUAL S.S. = 0.957 CF-= 579 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0.002
<del></del> .	FOR QUADRATIC FIT # 13,014 Reduction due to cladratic term aloné, with 1 DF. # 0.043
	FOR DUADRATIC TERM ALONE = 25,979
	(EDUCION DUE 18 GENERAL CUBIC FIT WITH DF 3, # 0,047 Reduction M.S. #
-	RESIDUAL 5,5, = 0,993 DF = 578 RESIDUAL M.S, = 0,002
	F FER GENERAL CUBIC FIT # 9,492 Reduction the to curic term alone with a DF =
	F FOR CUBIC TERM ALONE # 2,345
•	F FOR GENERAL CUBIC FIT # 9,492 REDUCTION DUE TO CUBIC TERM ALONE WITH 1 DF # , 0,000 F FOR CUBIC TERM ALONE # 2,305

-	THE PREDICTOR VAR	INGLE(X) I	S GREE AND	THE CHITERIA	N VARIABLE	) 15 TP SCORE	·		
-									-
	TEST HEANS AND STA	ANDARD DEV 0.926	14TLENS 0,156						
• • •	2 SQUAR 3 X CUBE	C.882	0,1P6 0,217						
	4 CORRELATION MAIRIN	5.284	2,329						
	1 X 2 SQUAR	1.000 0.958	U,958 1,000	0,897 0,985	0.024				
	-3 X CUBE	0,897	0,905 0,008	1,000	-0,001				
	FIRST, SECOND, AND	D THIRD DE	GREE PELYNG	**************	*********	***********			
1	HULTIPLE R SGUARE	.024	1	************					
	N, D, F, 1 = 1 N, D, F, 2 = 5	580		A 124		•			
	BETA HEIGHTS 0,024		<u> </u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	CONTRIBUTIENS TO I AND REGRESSION	FACTOR LE	ERPELATIEN Adings, 2N1	D CELUMN)					
	SQUARED BETA HEIGH	9,001 HTS	1,000						
	0,001 8 WEIGHTS 0.353					•			
	INTERCEPT CONSTAN	f = 4,	957						
	MULTIPLE R SCUARE	• 0,00 038	3						
	N, U, F, 1 = 2 N, D, F, 2 = 1 F F OP ANALYSIE OF	579	AN 8 -						
	BETA WEIGHTS 0,202 -0,186	YARIANUE		V1702			•		
_	CONTRIBUTIENS TO T AND REGRESSION	FACTOR LE	CRECLATIEN	D COLUMN)				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	2 SQUAR SDUARED BETA VEIG	-0,001 HTS	0,130						
	0.041 0.034 B HEIGHTS		·····			•			
	3.003 +2.320 INTERCEPT CONSTAN	T # 4.	549						
	MULTIPLE R SGUARE	• C,00	4					:	
	N,D,F,1 = 3 N,D,F,2 =	578							
	F FOR ANALYSIS OF Beta weights	VARIANCE	EN R .	0,837	·				
	0.729 -1.584 CONTRIBUTIENS TO 1	0.936 HULTIPLE C	BRRELATIEN						
	AND REGRESSION	FACTOR LE	ADINGS, 2N	D COLUMN)					•
	2 · SQLAR 3 X CLBE	•0,012 •0,001	+0,017			·····			1
	300AHED BETA VEIG 0,532 2,510 8 Letcute	0.821			•			4	
	10.859 +19.791 INTERCEPT CONSTAN	9,719	474						
***+* *	φ των πολιά ποι, <sub>«δατο</sub> ταν ΝΟΙ Ψ.Δ.ΩΠου	14							
							·		
	ANOVA TABLE FOR	PELYNOHIAL	·	*******		*********		•	
1	RESIDUAL S.S. # F FOR LINEAR FIT 4	LINEAR FI 0,999 0,326	TA HIN I DE	580 PESIDUA	L M.S. =	0.002		•	· ·
		********	**********	*********					
	REDUCTION DUE TO REDUCTION P.S. =	SENERAL C	CATRATIC FIT	T HITH DF 2,					· · ·
	RESIDUAL 5,5, * F FOR QUACHATIC FI REDUCTION THE TO P	0,997 17 # 0; 24 0001710	982	WITH COR	L 7,3, 8	0.002		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
1	F FOR QUACRATIC TE	ERM ALONE	* 1,638			, 			
	REDUCTION DUE TO C	GENERAL CU	BIC FIT NITH	₩ GF 3. *	0.004				
!	REDUCTION M.S. = RESIDUAL S.S. =	D,001	DF .	576 RESIDUA	L H,S, P	0.002			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	F FOR GENERAL CUB	11 FIT #	n,e37						
		17211022.0							

THE PREDICTOR VARIABLE VALLE CONTROLOGY VARIABLE (V) IS JP SCORE. THE PREDICTOR VARIABLE VALLE (VALLE CONTROLOGY VARIABLE (V) IS JP SCORE. TEST MEANS AND STRANDEDD DEVISITIES S CALL S CA	ENDIX W
IPPE_PREQUEICH_TARLATION_DECRIPTION         THEST MEANS AND STALDAPD DEVIATIONS         1 SUPE       C.111         1 SUPE       C.111         1 SUPE       C.111         1 SUPE       C.111         2 SUPE       C.111         2 SUPE       C.111         3 C.025       C.222         2 SUPE       C.111         3 C.025       C.221         3 SUPE       C.121         4 C.025       C.221         2 SUPE       C.221         3 S.COSE       C.221         4 C.025       C.221         4 C.025       C.221         5 C.225       C.222         5 C.225       C.221         5 C.225       C.221         5 C.225       C.225	
TEST MEANS AND STINUARD DETINITIES 1 X CALL 2 SOURCE 2 SOURCE 2 SOURCE CLASS AND STINUARD DETINITIES 2 SOURCE CLASS AND STINUARD DETINITIES 2 SOURCE CLASS AND STINUARD DESCRIPTION 2 SOURCE CLASS	
Tesh Man S and Strand PD Deviatings         Soura C Costs       0.230         Soura C Costs       0.240         Soura C Costs       0.241         Soura C Costs       0.242         Soura C Costs       0.242         Soura C Costs       0.242         Soura C Costs       0.243         Soura C Costs       0.242         Soura C Costs       0.243         A Costs       0.243         A Costs       0.243         A Costs       0.242         Ississes       0.242         Ississes       0.242         Ississes       0.253         Internet Costs       0.242         Internet Costs       0.254         Internet C Costs       1.000         Internet C Costs	
2         SOULAR         C.418         C.420           3         C.020         C.220         C.221           SARCHAILEN PATRIN         1.000         C.947         C.231           3         S.CUPE         C.921         C.921         C.924           3         SOUAR         C.971         C.921         C.924           3         SOUAR         C.971         C.924         C.924           4         SOUAR         C.972         C.915         C.924           4         SOUAR         C.972         C.915         C.924           4         SOUAR         C.972         C.915         C.924           4         SOUAR         C.912         C.924         C.924           4         SOUAR         SOUAR         C.932         C.924           4         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR         C.932           4         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR           5         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR           5         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR           5         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR         SOUAR	
1         5,224         2,339           1         1,000         0,947         0,915         0,242           2         500,0         0,940         0,231         0,024           1         1,000         0,947         0,213         0,024           1         1,000         0,947         0,213         0,000           1         1,000         0,947         0,213         0,000           1         1,000         0,224         0,231         0,000           1         1,000         0,242         0,231         0,000           1         1,004         0,432         0,232         0,000           1         1,042         0,432         0,234         0,000           1         0,142         0,442         0,442         0,442           1         0,142         1,000         0,000         0,000           0,0460         0,442         1,000         0,000         0,000           0,0460         0,442         1,000         0,000         0,000           0,047         0,044         0,442         0,000         0,000           0,047         0,041         0,042         0,000         0,000	
1         1         1         1.000         0.947         0.15         0.242           2         SQUAR         0.07         1.000         0.915         0.924           3         X.CUPE         0.915         0.946         0.000         0.213           1         X.CUPE         0.912         0.946         0.000         0.213           1         X.CUPE         0.424         0.213         0.213           1         X.CUPE         0.424         0.233         0.213           1         X.CUPE         0.422         0.234         0.242           1         X.CUPE         X.SUPARA         0.424         0.441           1         X.SUPARA         0.422         0.441         0.442           1         X.SUPARA         0.424         0.442         0.442           1         X.SUPARA         0.442         0.442         0.442           1         X.SUPARA         0.444         0.4	
2 SUDAR 1 - C. () 2	
4         Y         C,242         0,233         1,000           1351, SECENE, ALE TAIND FEARE PELIFICATION.	
1351, SECENC, AND TAIRD TEGREE PELYMENTALS.         ULTIPLE A SQUARE - 0,058         1011, SECENC, AND TAIRD TEGREE PELYMENTALS.         1011, SECENC, AND TERMENTALS.         1011, SECENC, AND	
ULTIPLE R SQUARE - 0,050 .0.5.1 - 1 - 560 .0.5.2	
UL 1PLE H	
<pre>&gt;:P_G.Z., VSIS DF V21AVGE ON R =</pre>	
BETA WELDATS       0.442         OAD REGENESSION FACTOR (EXDINES, 2ND CELUMN)         JOURDED BETA WELDATS         JOURDED ETA WELDATS         JOURDED TA WELDATS         JOURDED TA WELDATS         JOURDED TA WELDATS         JOURDED TA WE	
DOWNED STORMULTIPLE CREVELATION ADD REGRESSION FACTOR (EADINGS, 2ND CALUMN) ADD REGRESSION FACTOR (EADINGS, 2ND CALUMN) C.038 4610475 2.444 2.444 2.444 2.444 2.444 1.000 0.77 1.000 0.77 1.000 0.77 1.000 0.77 1.000 0.77 1.000 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.000 0.77 1.000 1.07 1.07 1.	
And represent ration learners, and calony,	
OUARED_BETA_WEIGHTS       0.038         0.038       WEIGHTS         2.0446       D.028         WIERCEPT CONSTANT = 0.028       D.028         ULTIPLE R.SCUARE = 0.028       D.028         0.277.00.032       C.956         COLOBITION FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R = 17.962       D.027         CARATOR SESSION FACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)       1         1       XAD RECRESSION FACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)         1       XAD RECRESSION FACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)         1       XAD RECRESSION FACTOR LEADING         VUTIPLE R.SCUARE = 0.002       O.002         VUTIPLE R.SCUARE = 0.0220       O.002         VUTIPLE R.SCUARE = 0.0220       O.002         SCUCTIEN DESTIN AUXIPLE CERPELATIEN       AND RECRESSING HACTOR LEADING FG 2ND COLUMNY         AND RECRESSING HACTOR LEADING FG 2ND COLUMNY         2.020 A O.028	• · · · · ·
<ul> <li>N + Eignts</li> <li>2,440</li> <li>NTERCEPT CONSTANT = 3,467</li> <li>NULTIPLE R.SQUARE D.028</li> <li>UULTIPLE R.SQUARE D.028</li> <li>UULTIPLE R.SQUARE D.028</li> <li>UULTIPLE R.SQUARE D.028</li> <li>D,F,1 = 2</li> <li>C,F,2 = 7</li> <li>SQUARESTON FARIANCE ON R = 17,962</li> <li>SQUARESTON FARIANCE ON R = 17,962</li> <li>SQUARED SETA WEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 17,962</li> <li>SQUARED SETA WEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>C,F,2 = 374</li> <li>C,250 = 0,924</li> <li>C,270 = 0,924</li> <li>C,270 = 0,924</li> <li>C,270 = 1,392 - 0,914</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>UULTIPLE R = 0,022</li> <li>C,270 = 1,392 - 0,914</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>C,72 = 374</li> <li>C,62 = 1,392 - 0,914</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>C,72 = 1,392 - 0,914</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>C,72 = 1,392 - 0,914</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIATION</li> <li>AND PEORESSION FARIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>C,829 I,330 - 0,934</li> <li>C,829 I,330 - 0,934</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIANCE ON R = 12,939</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIANCE ON R = 12,930</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE COMPLIANCE ON R = 12,930</li> <li>SQUARED SETA VEITIPLE READ READ READ READ READ READ READ REA</li></ul>	
NTERCEPT CONSTANT * 3.667 ULTIPLE R. SOUARE * 0.242 .D.F.1.* 2 .D.F.2.* 579 FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R * 17.062 ETA WELGHTS 0.277.*0.032 .C.NTRIBUTIES TO MULTIPLE CRANELATION AND PECRESSION FACTOR LOADINGS, 2XD COLUMN) 1, X	
ULTIPLE R.SCUARE.	
ULTIPLE R = 0,242 .0,F,1 = 2 .0,F,1 = 2 .0,F,2 =	
D F 2 =	
To A TALL 313 OF TARIANS CON TO TARGET ON TO TARGET A VELOCITA 0.277. 10.037 0.277. 10.037 AND PECRESSION FACTOR LADINGS, 2ND COLUMN) 1	·
0.0270000       0.0570000       0.0590000         1	
AND REGRESSION FACTOR LCADINGS, 2ND C4LUMN)         1	
3         SCUAR	
DUG ALSO DELIVED         0.007       0.001         WEIGHTS       3.327         NUTIPLE R SCUARE = 0.062         UUTIPLE R SCUARE = 0.062         D.F.2 = 578         FGR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R = 12,439         JETA WEIGHTS         JONTRIBUTIENS TO MULTIPLE CERPELATIEN         AND REGESSIS, ALCODE O,964         2       SOUARE 0.042         3       X CUBE -0,194         3       0.051         SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS         0.067       1.4909         SOUARED STANT * 4.124   ANBVA TABLE FGP PELYNOMIALS REDUCTIEN DUE TO LIVEAP FIT, MITH 1 FF * 0,058 REDUCTIEN DUE TO LIVEAP FIT, MITH 1 FF * 0,058 REDUCTIEN LUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT MITH DF 2, * 0,002 F FRR LINEAR FIT * 35,920 RESIDUAL S.S. * 0,002 F FRR LINEAR FIT * 35,920 RESIDUAL S.S. * 0,002 F FRR UNARTIC TERM ALONE * 0,005 REDUCTION DUE TO CLADMATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, * 0,000 F FRR QUARATIC TERM ALONE * 0,005 REDUCTION DUE TO CLADMATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, * 0,002 RESIDUAL S.S. * 0,003 RE	
A REDUCTION DUE TO CLUDHATIC FIT WITH DF 2, • 0,002 ANDUATERCEPT CONSTANT • 0,002 ULTIPLE R SCUARE • 0,002 ULTIPLE R SCUARE • 0,002 ADJF.1 • 3 ADJF.2 • 578 FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R • 12,839 SETA WEIGHTS -0,258 1,382 •0.914 CONTRIBUTIONS TO MULTIPLE CORPELATION AND RECRESSISM ACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN) 1 X • 0,062 0.966 2 SQUAR 0.9310 0.924 3 X CLBE • 0,194 0.951 SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS -0,067 .1,909 0.833 3 K CLBE • 0,194 0.951 SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS -2,829 13,380 • 0.888 MMERCEPT CONSTANT • 4,124 ANDWA TABLE FOR PELYNOMIALS REDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 FF * 0,058 REDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 FF * 0,058 REDUCTION DUE TO CLMPARINE 0.029 F FRR LINEAR FIT = 35,920 REDUCTION DUE TO CLMPARINE 0.025 REDUCTION DUE TO CLMPARIE 0.025 REDUCTION DUE TO CLMPARIE 0.055 REDUCTION DUE TO CLMPARIE 0.055 REDUCTION DUE TO GLMPARAL CURIC FIT WITH DF 3, * 0,062 REDUCTION NS, * 0,930 DF * 578 RESIDUAL M.S, * 0,002	
INTERCEPI CENSIANI =	
HULTIPLE R SQUARE 0,062         WILTIPLE R 0,220         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 12,830         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 10,052         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 10,051         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 10,051         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 14,051         YER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R 14,12         YER ANALYSIS ON VARIANCE ON R 14,12         YER ANALYSIS ON VARIANCE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
N.D.F.1       3         N.D.F.2       578         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       1,382         Y.D.F.2       0,054         Y.D.F.2       0,055         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       0,055         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       0,055         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       0,055         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.F.2       1,1909         Y.D.7       1,1909         Y.D.7       1,1909         Y.D.7	
PER ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON R =       12,339         DETA WEIGHTS       -0,050       1,302 -0,914         CONTRIBUTIENS TO MULTIPLE CERPELATION       AND REGRESSIST HACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)         1       x       -0,052         3       X CUBE       -0,052         0,050       0,924         3       X CUBE       -0,051         0,057       .1,909       0,051         SOUARED 0ETA WEIGHTS       -0,052         0,057       .1,909       0,053         -2,829       13,380       -2,880         INTERCEPT CONSTANT *       4,124         ANBVA TABLE FER PELYNOMIALS       -2,829         RESUDUTIEN S.S. *       0,042         -2,829       13,380       -2,820         EVELOTIS       -2,820         -2,829       13,380       -2,820         RESUDUTIEN S.S. *       0,042         FF FAR LINEAR FIT *       35,920         RESUDUTIEN CUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT HITM DF 2, *       0,002         RESUDUTIEN CUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT HITM DF 2, *       0,002         RESUDUTIEN LUE TO GELAPHATIC TERM ALENE, WITH 1 DF, *       0,002         F FER QUADRATIC FIT *       17,962         RESUDUTIEN LUE TO GELAPHATIC TERM ALENE, WITH 1 DF, * </td <td>•</td>	•
G1 A WEIGNIS         -0.258       1,382 -0.914         CONTRIBUTIENS TO MULTIPLE CERPELATION         AND REGRESSION + ACTOR LEADINGS, 2ND COLUMN)         1       x       -0,062         2       SQUAR       0,310       0.924         3       X CUBE       -0,190       0.851         SOUARED 001 A KEIGHTS       -0,007       .0,035         -2,829       13,380       -0,042         -2,829       13,380       -0,042         -2,829       13,380       -0,042         -2,829       13,380       -0,042         REDUCTIS       0,042       F       5800         INTERCEPT CONSTANT *       4,124         ANOVA TABLE FOR PCLYNOMIALS         ************************************	
Dentributiens to multiple cerrelation         AND REGRESSISH FACTOR LEADINGS, 2KD COLUMN)         1       X       -0,062       0,966         2       SQUAR       0,319       0,924         3       X CUBE       -0,194       0,851         Source BETA WEIGHTS       0,067       1,909       0.833         0.067       1,909       0.833         3       X CUBE       -0,058         -2,829       13,380       -0,888         INTEACEPT CONSTANT       4,124         ANBVA TABLE FER PELYNOMIALS         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,092         DEDUCTIEN DLE TO LINEAR FIT, NITH 1 TF = 0,058         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,992         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,992         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,992         REDUCTIEN DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT MITH DF 2, = 0,003         REDUCTIEN DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT MITH DF, * 0,002         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,029         F FER QUADRATIC FIT S 17,962       579         RESIDUAL S.S.       0,002         F FER QUADRATIC FIT S 17,962       579         REDUCTION DUE TO CLAPHATIC TERM ALENE, MITH 1 DF, * 0,000         F FER QUADRATIC FIT MARKAL CUBIC FIT WITH DF, * 0,000         F FER QUADRATIC TERM ALENE * 0,055 <td></td>	
1       X       -0,062       0,966         2       SQUAR       0,350       0,924         3       X CUBE       -0,194       0,051         SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS       0,067	
3       X CUBE       0,091         SOUARED BETA WEIGHTS       0,092         0.007       1,909       0,033         aweiGHTS       -2,829       13,380       -8,888         INTERCEPT CONSTANT       4,124         ANBVA TABLE FER PELVNOMIALS         PEDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, MITH 1 DF = 0,058         RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,942         OF =       580         RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,942         DF =       579         RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,029         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT MITH DF 2, =       0,002         RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,042         DF =       579       RESIDUAL M.S. =         REDUCTION DUE TO CLADHATIC TERM ALONE =       0,000         FER GUADRATIC TERM ALONE =       0,055         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF 3, =       0,062         REDUCTION M.S. =       0,021 <tr< td=""><td>•</td></tr<>	•
SOUARED BEIN KEIGHTS         0,007       1,909       0,035         B WEIGHTS       -2,829       13,380       -2,888         INTERCEPT CONSTANT #       4,124         ANBVA TABLE FER PELVNOMIALS         REDUCTION DUE TO LINGAR FIT, WITH 1 DF #       0,058         RESIDUAL S.S. #       0,942       DF #       580         RESIDUAL S.S. #       0,942       DF #       580         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, #       0,002         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, #       0,003         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, #       0,003         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, #       0,003         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC TERM ALONE, #       0,000         F FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE #       0,000         F FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE #       0,005         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF, #       0,000         REDUCTION TOE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF, #       0,002         REDUCTION TOE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF, #       0,002         REDUCTION TOE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF, #       0,002         REDUCTION TOE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF, #       0,002         RESIDUAL S,S, #       0,021         RESIDUAL S,S, #       0,023 </td <td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
ANBVA TABLE FER PELVNOMIALS REDUCTION DLE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 DF = 0,050 RESIDUAL S.S. = 0,942 DF = 580 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002 REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, = 0,050 REDUCTION F.S. = 0,042 DF = 579 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 F FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE = 0,055 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE = 0,055 REDUCTION TO CLADRATIC TERM ALONE = 0,055 REDUCTION TO TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF 3, = 0,062 REDUCTION M.S. = 0,930 DF = 578 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002	
INTERCEPT CONSTANT #       4,124         ANOVA TABLE FOR PELYNOMIALS         REDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 DF # 0,050         RESIDUAL S.S. 0,942 DF # 580 RESIDUAL M.S. 0,002         F FOR LINEAR FIT # 35,920         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, # 0,050         REDUCTION F.S. # 0,020         F FOR QUADRATIC FIT # 17,962         REDUCTION DUE TO CLADMATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF, # 0,000         F FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF, # 0,002         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF, # 0,002	
ANBVA TABLE FOR PELVNOMIALS PEDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 FF # 0,058 RESIDUAL S.S. 0,942 DF # 580 RESIDUAL M.S. 0,002 FRR LINEAR FIT # 35,920 PEDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL GUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, # 0,058 REDUCTION F.S. # 0,029 FFR QUADRATIC FIT # 17,962 RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,942 DF # 579 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002 FFR QUADRATIC FIT # 17,962 REDUCTION DUE TO GLAPHATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, # 0,000 FFOR QUADRATIC FEM ALONE # 0,055 REDUCTION THE TO GLAPHATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055 REDUCTION THE TO GLAPHATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055 REDUCTION THE TO GLAPHATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055 REDUCTION THE TO GLAPHATIC FIT WITH DF 3, # 0,062 REDUCTION M.S. # 0,021 RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,936 DF # 578 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002	
ANBVA TABLE FER PELVNOMIALS PEDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 FF = 0,058 RESIDUAL S.S. = 0,942 DF = 580 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002 FRR LINEAR FIT = 35,928 REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL GUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, = 0,058 REDUCTION F.S. = 0,042 DF = 579 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002 FOR QUADRATIC FIT = 17,962 REDUCTION CUE TO GLADHATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, = 0,000 FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE = 0,055 REDUCTION CUE TO GENERAL CUPIC FIT WITH DF 3, = 0,062 REDUCTION M.S. = 0,021 RESIDUAL S.S. = 0,938 DF = 578 RESIDUAL M.S. = 0,002	
ANBVA TABLE FOR PELVNOMIALS         REDUCTION DLE TO LINGAR FIT, WITH 1 DF 1 DF 2         RESIDUAL S,S, =       0,942 DF =         ST FAR LINEAR FIT =       35,920         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, =       0,058         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, =       0,058         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, =       0,058         REDUCTION DUE TO GEVERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2, =       0,058         RESIDUAL S,S, =       0,029         RESIDUAL S,S, =       0,042 DF =         579 RESIDUAL M,S, =       0,002         RESIDUAL S,S, =       0,942 DF =         579 RESIDUAL M,S, =       0,002         REDUCTION DUE TO CLADHATIC TERM ALENE, WITH 1 DF, =       0,000         FOR GUADRATIC TERM ALENE =       0,055         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF 3, =       0,062         REDUCTION M,S, =       0,021         RESIDUAL S,S, =       0,930 DF =       578 RESIDUAL M,S, =       0,002	
REDUCTION DUE TO LINEAR FIT, WITH 1 FF # 0,058         RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,042 DF # 580 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002         FAR LINEAR FIT # 35,920         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADHATIC FIT WITH DF 2, # 0,058         REDUCTION P.S. # 0,029         RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,029         RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,042 DF # 579 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002         FFR QUADRATIC FIT # 17,962         REDUCTION DUE TO CLAPHATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, # 0,000         FFR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055         REDUCTION TUE TO GENERAL CLRIC FIT WITH DF 3, # 0,062         REDUCTION M.S. # 0,021         RESIDUAL S.S. # 0,938 DF # 578 RESIDUAL M.S. # 0,002	
REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL GUADRATIC FIT HITH DF 2,	•
REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADRATIC FIT WITH DF 2,	
REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUADMATIC FIT WITH DF 2, •       0.008         REDUCTION F,S. =       0.029         RESIDUAL S,S. =       0.042         DUCTION F,S. =       0.042         DUCTION CUE TO CLADHATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, •       0.000         FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE =       0.000         FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE =       0.055         REDUCTION CUE TO GENERAL CLPIC FIT WITH DF 3, •       0.062         REDUCTION M,S. •       0.021         REDUCTION K,S. •       0.936         DEDUCTION CUE TO GENERAL CLPIC FIT WITH DF 3, •       0.062         REDUCTION K,S. •       0.021         RESIDUAL S,S. •       0.936	0
RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,942 DF =       579 RESIDUAL M.S. =       0,002         F FOR QUADRATIC FIT =       17,962       0,000         REDUCTION DUE TO CLAPPARTIC TERM ALONE =       0,055         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CLRIC FIT WITH DF, =       0,002         REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CLRIC FIT WITH DF, =       0,062         REDUCTION M.S. =       0,021         RESIDUAL S.S. =       0,938 DF =         STOR RESIDUAL M.S. =       0,002	
REDUCTION DUE TO CLADHATIC TERM ALONE, WITH 1 DF, * 0,000 F FOR QUADRATIC TERM ALONE # 0,055 Reduction due to general cupic fit with DF 3, * 0,062 Reduction M.S. * 0,021 Residual S.S. * 0,930 DF * 578 Residual M.S. * 0,002	
REDUCTION DUE TO GENERAL CUDIC FIT WITH DF 3, * 0,062 Reduction M.S. * 0,021 Residual S.S. * 0,938 DF * 578 Residual M.S. * 0,002	
REDUCTION EUE TO GENERAL CURIC FIT WITH DF 3, # 0,062 Reduction M.S. # 0,021 Residual 5.5, # 0,930 DF # 578 Residual M.S. # 0,002	
REDUCTION M.S. = 0.021 Residual S.S. = 0.930 DF = 578 Residual M.S. = 0.002	
MESTANE state . Alton to	
REDUCTION DUE TO CLOID TERM ALONE WITH & DF # . 0,004	

#### **REFERENCES**

- Cooley, W. W. and Lohens, P. R. <u>Multivariate Data Analysis</u>. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1971.
- [2] D'Agostina, R. B. Simple compact portable test of normality: Geary's test revisited. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1970, <u>74</u>, 138-140.
- [3] D'Agostina, R. B. and Rosman, B. The power of Geary's test of normality. Paper submitted to <u>Journal of the American Statistical</u> <u>Association</u>, 1969.
- [4] David, H. A., Hartley, H. O., and Pearson, E. S. The distribution of the ratio, in a single normal sample, of range to standard deviation. <u>Biometrika</u>, 1954, <u>41</u>, 482-493.
- [5] Draper, N. R. and Smith, H. <u>Applied Regression Analysis</u>. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
- [6] Flanagan, J. C. Critical requirements: a new approach to employee evaluation. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1949, 2, 419-425.
- [7] Geary, R. C. Testing for normality, <u>Biometrika</u>, 1947, <u>34</u>, 209-242.
- [8] Guilford, J. P. <u>Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education</u>. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- [9] Guttman, L. The basis for scalogram analysis. In S. A. Stouffer et al., <u>Measurement and prediction</u>. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950, 60-90.
- [10] Jaspen, N. Serial correlation. <u>Psychometrika</u>, 1946, <u>11</u>, 23-30.
- [11] Shapiro, S. S., Wilk, M. B., and Chen, H. J. A comparative study of various tests for normality. <u>Journal of the American Statistical</u> <u>Association</u>, 1968, <u>63</u>, 1343-1372.
- [12] Siegel, A. I. and Federman, P. J. <u>Development of Performance</u> <u>Evaluative Measures: Investigation into and application of a Fleet</u> <u>Posttraining Performance Evaluation System</u>. Wayne, Pa.: Applied Psychological Services, 1970.
- [13] Siegel, A. I. and Fischl, M. A. <u>Absolute scales of electronic job perform-ance: Empirical validity of an absolute scaling technique</u>. Wayne, Pa.: Applied Psychological Services, 1965.

- [14] Siegel, A. I. and Pfeiffer, M. G. <u>Posttraining performance criterion</u> <u>development and application.</u> <u>Personnel Psychophysics: Estimating</u> <u>personnel subsystem reliability through magnitude estimation methods</u>. Wayne, Pa.: Applied Psychological Services, 1966.
- [15] Siegel, A. I. and Schultz, D. G. <u>Posttraining performance criterion</u> <u>development and application: A comparative multidimensional</u> <u>scaling analysis of the tasks performed by Naval aviation electronics</u> <u>technicians at two job levels</u>: Wayne, Pa.: Applied Psychological Services, 1963.
- [16] Siegel, A. I., Schultz, D. G., and Lanterman, R. S. <u>The development</u> and application of absolute scales of electronic job performance. Wayne, Pa.: Applied Psychological Services, 1964.
- [17] Whitlock, G. H. Application of the psychophysical law to performance evaluation. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1949. 2, 419-425.

#### NAVY

- 4 Director, Personnel and Training Research Programs (Code 458) Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 Director ONR Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210
- 1 Director ONR Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, CA 91101
- 1 Director ONR Branch Office 536 South Clark Street Chicago, IL 60605
- 1 Commander (Code 20P)
   Operational Test and Evaluation Force 1
   U.S. Naval Base
   Norfolk, VA 23511
   ATTN: Mr. James Long
- 6 Director Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390
- 12 Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station, Building 5 5010 Duke Street Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Chairman Behavioral Science Department Naval Command and Management Division U.S. Naval Academy Luce Hall Annapolis, MD 21402
- 1 Commanding Officer Service School Command U.S. Naval Training Center San Diego, CA 92133 ATTN: Code 303

- 1 Chief of Naval Training (Code 017)
  Naval Air Station
  Pensacola, FL 32508
  ATTN: CAPT Allen E. McMichael
- 1 Chief of Naval Technical Training Naval Air Station Memphis (75) Millington, TN 38054 ATTN: Dr. G. D. Mayo
- 1 Chief Bureau of Medicine and Surgery Code 513 Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Chief Bureau of Medicine and Surgery Research Division (Code 713) Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20390
- L Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code AO1M) Washington, DC 20380
- 6 Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-A3) Navy Department Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Commander Naval Air Systems Command Navy Department, AIR-413C Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Commander Submarine Development Group Two Fleet Post Office New York, NY 09501
- 1 Commanding Officer Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit San Diego, CA 92152
- 3 Commanding Officer Naval Personnel and Training Research Laboratory San Diego, CA 92152

44

- Head, Personnel Measurement Staff 1 Capital Area Personnel Service Officer Ballston Tower No. 2, Room 1204 801 N. Randolph Street Arlington, VA 22203
- Program Coordinator 1 Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (Code 71G) Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Research Director, Code 06 Research and Evaluation Department U.S. Naval Examining Center Building 2711 - Green Bay Area Great Lakes, IL 60088 ATTN: C.S. Winiewicz
- 1 Superintendent
  Naval Postgraduate School
  Monterey, CA 93940
  ATTN: Library (Code 2124)
- 1 Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-11b) Navy Department Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Naval Submarine Medical Center Naval Submarine Base New London Groton, Connecticut 06340
- 1 Technical Director Personnel Research Division Bureau of Naval Personnel Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Technical Library (Pers-11B) Bureau of Naval Personnel Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Technical Library
  Naval Ship Systems Command
  National Center
  Building 3 Room 3
  S-08
  Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Technical Reference Library Naval Medical Research Institute National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD 20014

- COL George Caridakis Director, Office of Manpower Utilization Headquarters, Marine Corps (AO1H) MCB Quantico, VA 22134
- Special Assistant for Research and Studies OASN (M-RA) The Pentagon, Room 4E794 Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Mr. George N. Graine Naval Ship Systems Command (SHIPS 03H) Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20360
- 1 CDR Richard L. Martin, USN CONFAIRMIRAMAR F - 14 MAS Miramar, CA 92145
- 1 Mr. Lee Miller (AIR 413E) Naval Air Systems Command 5600 Columbia Pike Falls Church, VA 22042
- 1 Dr. Jamers J. Regan Code 55 Naval Training Device Center Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky Scientific Advisor (Code Ax) Commandant of the Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380
- 1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr., MSC CSOT Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974
- 1 Center for Naval Analyses
  1401 Wilson Blvd
  Arlingtion, VA

#### ARMY

1 Behavioral Sciences Division Office of Chief of Research and Development Department of the Army Washington, DC 20310

- 1 U.S. Army Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory Rosslyn Commonwealth Building, Room 239 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Director of Research U.S. Army Armor Human Research Unit ATTN: Library Building 2422 Morade Street Fort Knox, KY 40121
- 1 COMMANDANT U.S. Army Adjutant General School Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216 ATTN: ATSAG-EA
- 1 Commanding Officer ATTN: LTC Montogomery USACDC - PASA Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249
- 1 Director Behavioral Sciences Laboratory U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine Natick, MA 01760
- 1 Commandant United States Army Infantry School ATTN: ATSIN-H Fort Benning, GA 31905
- 1 U.S. Army Research Institute Room 239 Commonwealth Building 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209 ATTN: Dr. R. Dusek
- 1 Armed Forces Staff College Norfolk, VA 23511 ATTN: Library
- 1 Mr. Edmund Fuchs BESRL Commonwealth Building, Room 239 1320 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209

#### AIR FORCE

- 1 Dr. Robert A. Bottenberg AFHRL/PHS Lackland AFB Texas 78236
  - 1 ARHRL (TR/Dr. G.A. Eckstrand) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio 45433
  - 1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force Chief, Personnel Research and Analysis Division (AFPDPL-R) Washington, DC 20330
  - 1 AFHRL/MD 701 Prince Street Room 200 Alexandria, VA 22314
  - 1 AFOSR (NL) 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
  - 1 COMMANDANT USAF School of Aerospace Medicine ATTN: Aeromedical Library (SCL-4) Brooks AFB, TX 78235
  - 1 Personnel Research Division AFHRL Lackland Air Force Base San Antonio, TX 78236
  - 1 Headquarters, U.S. Air Force Chief, Personnel Research and Analysis Division (AF/SPXY) Washington, DC 20330
  - 1 Research and Analysis Division AF/DPXYR Washington, DC 20330
  - 1 CAPT Jack Thorpe USAF Dept. of Psychology Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, OH 43403

#### DOD

Mr Joseph J. Cowan, Chief Psychological Research Branch (P-1) U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters 400 Seventh Street, SW Washington, DC 20590

46

 Dr. Ralph R. Canter Director for Manpower Research Office of Secretary of Defense The Pentagon, Room 3C980

#### OTHER GOVERNMENT

- 1 CNO (OP-964) Room 4A 538 Pentagon Washington, DC
- 1 CNO (OP-987) Room 4B 525 Pentagon Washington, DC
- 1 CNO (OP-987F) Room 4B 489 Pentagon Washington, DC
- 1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs Room 2519 U. S. Civil Service Commission 1900 E. Street, NW Washington, DC 20415

#### MISCELLANEOUS

- 1 CAPT John F. Riley, USN Commanding Officer, U.S. Naval Amphibious School Coronado, CA 92155
- 1 Dr. Scarvia Anderson Executive Director for Special Development Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Professor John Annett The Open University Waltonteale, BLETCHLEY Bucks, ENGLAND

- Dr. Bernard M. Bass University of Rochester Management Research Center Rochester, NY 14627
- Dr. David G. Bowers Institute for Social Research University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48106
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark University of Rochester College of Arts and Sciences River Campus Station Rochester, NY 14627
- Dr. Rene' V. Dawis Department of Psychology 324 Elliott Hall Univeristy of Minnesota Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Marvin Dunnette University of Minnesota Department of Psychology Elliott Hall Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 ERIC Processing and Reference Facility 4833 Rugby Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields Department of Psychology Montogomery College Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Professor Gerald L. Thompson Carnegie-Mellon University Graduate School of Industrial Admin. Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. David Weiss University of Minnesota Department of Psychology Elliott Hall Minneapolis, MN 55455

- 1 Dr. Albert S. Glickman American Institutes for Research 8555 Sixteenth Street Silver Spring, MD 20919
- 1 Dr. Richard C. Atkinson Department of Psychology Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305
- Dr. Joseph W. Rigney Behavioral Technology Laboratories University of Southern California 3717 South Grand Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson Lawrence Johnson and Associates, Inc. 2001 "S" Street, NW Suite 502 Washington, DC 20009
- 1 Dr. Stanley M. Nealy Department of Psychology Colorado State University Fort Collins, C0 80521
- 1 Dr. Robert D. Pritchard Assistant Professor of Psychology Purdue University Lafayette, IN 47907
- Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee R-K Research & System Design 3942 Fidgemont Drive Malibu, CA 90265
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman Department of Psychology Montgomery College Rockville, MD 20850
- Dr. George E. Rowland Rowland and Company, Inc. Post Office Box 61 Haddonfield, NJ 08033

- LCOL Austin W. Kibler, Director Human Resources Research Office ARPA 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 Century Research Corporation 4113 Lee Highway Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Richard S. Hatch Decision Systems Associates, Inc. 11428 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852
- Dr. Robert R. Mackie Human Factors Research, Inc. Santa Barbara Research Park 6780 Cortona Drive Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo 2431 North Edgewood Street Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Psychological Abstracts American Psychological Association 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036
- Dr. Arthur I. Siegel Applied Psychological Services Science Center 404 East Lancaster Avenue Wayne, PA 19087
- 1 Dr. Henry Solomon George Washington University Department of Economics Washington, DC 20006
- 1 Dr. Benjamin Schneider Department of Psychology University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742

UNCLASSIFIED						
DOCUMENT CONTR	ROL DATA - R 8	L D				
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing a	nnotation must be e	ntered when the	overall report is classified)			
Naval Personnel Research and Development L	aboratory	Unclass	CURITY CLASSIFICATION			
Washington, D. C.		26. GROUP				
3. REPORT TITLE PRELIMINARY RESULTS ON THE EV PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TECH	ALUATION OF NIQUE	A FLEET PO	DST-TRAINING			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)						
5. AUTHOR(5) (First name, middle initial, last name) Bernard A. Rafacz Paul P. Foley						
6. REPORT DATE January 1973	78. TOTAL NO. OF 60	PAGES	76. NO. OF REFS 17			
89. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	98. ORIGINATOR'S	REPORT NUME	BER(S)			
b. PROJECT NO. PO 2-0046 NR 150-336	WTR 73-10	)				
<del>c</del> .	9b. OTHER REPOR this report)	RT NO(5) (Any of	het numbers that may be assigned			
d.	None					
N/A 13. ABSTRACT The purpose of this research effort is	Personnel Programs ( to validate	and Train: Office, Of:	ing Research fice of Naval Research ity and effectiveness			
(NO001467C0107). Performance measurement to (NO001467C0107). Performance data on eight ships of LANTFLT and PACFLT. This report is reports on the statistical analysis of that analysis is provided on performance related personnel sampled from 11 ships of CRUDESFL different performance estimators, as functin with respect to a performance criteria. A tional properties of the performance estima of the factors that lead to the adoption of analysis of the data is discussed. The results of the statistical analysis of the performance data possessed moderate level of technician performance. Detailed also identified the areas of difficulty that improve upon the validity of each of the per-	Navy rating s the first data. In p data for el OT NINE, Sar ons of criti detailed exp tors is pres a curviling s indicated validity for analysis of t have to be	that a cest that a cest that a	lected from es of technical , a statistical maintenance alifornia. Four ents, are evaluated of the distribu- an explanation sion analysis for rtain combination g the absolute rmance data in order to These and			
development and research. The Naval Person is continuing research on this technique wi collected. DD FORM 1473 (PAGE 1)	th respect f	and Deve to the tota	lopment Laboratory ality of data			
S/N 0101-807-6811		Security	y Classification			

/ L	)	1	NOV	6 S	14	1	J	
ŹΝ.	01	0	1-80	)7 <b>-</b>	6811			

UNCLASSIFIED

	• Security Classification						
14.	KEY WORDS	ROLE WT		LINK B		LINK C	
-		AUCE		ROLE		ROLE	W 1
	Personnel System Performance						
	Magnitude Estimation						
	Technician Reliability						
				1			
	Personnel System Model						
	Posttraining Performance Evaluation						
	rosttraining remomance svardation						
	Performance Prediction						
	Personnal Subarata						
	rersonnel Subsystem						
1							
				·			
		l					
	· · ·			•			
	· · ·						
	•						
	•						
	٧						

#### UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

• -

## 11150632

· · · · ·