REPORT	DOCUMENTATION	PAGE	Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188
Fusic resorcing burden for this collection settlering and maintaining the data need	a of information is estimated to average 1 nour c ed, and completing and reviewing the collection	of information. Send comments re	r raviewing instructions, searching sinding data sources. Igarding this burden extensite or any other place of this
Collection of information, including sugge Davis Highway, Surge 1208, Arlington, VA	22202-4302, and to the Office of Management a	Headquarters Services, Directoring Ind Budget, Papenwork Reduction J	for information Coarations and Reserts, 1215 Jefferson Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE	25 Oct 1990	J. REPORT TYPE A	rch 1 90 - Dec 31 90
A TITLE AND SUBTITLE			S. FUNDING NUMBERS
Volume I: Splits	trap and parametric per Analysis: A method for	rcentile contrast	G = Grant
tendenc	y comparisons	noncentral	AF AF03K~90-0190
C AUTHOR(S)			
Jeifrey Lee Kasmu	ssen		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATIO	IN NAME(S) AND ADORESS(ES)		L PERFORMING ORGANIZATION
Department of Psy	chology		ALPORT NUMBER
Indiana Unive <del>rsit</del> 1125 East 38th St	<del>y </del> Purdue University at	Indianapolis	
Indianapolis, IN	46202	AFOS	R-R- 00 1198
SPONSORING / MONITORING	AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS	(ES)	10. SPONSORING / MONITORING
Indiana Universit	y Research and Sponsore	ed Programs	43 947 02
620 Union Drive	46202		
Indianaporis, IN	40202		
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
No. Limitotion			
NO limitations	YAYANDI CARSTERENT F	6 25	
1 DISTERSI	JACK STREET		
	ad tor public relation		
	ad for public related		
DISTRICT Approv Dist 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200	ad tor purche relation and tor purche relation and an under the second and a second		
DISTRICT Approv Dist 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200	ad tor public related	<u> </u>	
DISTRICT Approv Dist 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 In 50	words	comparisons i	n terms of
IL ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 In so upper or	ad for public released nougon Universed words me instances group lower portions of t	comparisons i the score dist	n terms of ributions are
In so more info	me instances group lower portions of t prative than compar	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent	n terms of ributions are ral tendency.
In so upper or more info These com on the da	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent the by carrying tysis of varia	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA).
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul	me instances group lower portions of to parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent he by carrying lysis of varia c from ANOVA i	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent the by carrying tysis of varia from ANOVA i pwever, and re	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluatio monte-car	me instances group lower portions of to parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho on for significance lo distribution.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying lysis of varia from ANOVA i wever, and re relative to a An example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluatio monte-car program a	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho on for significance lo distribution. A presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying lysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a An example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluatio monte-car program a	me instances group lower portions of to parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho to for significance lo distribution. A the presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying lysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a An example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluation monte-car program a	me instances group lower portions of to parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho to for significance lo distribution. A the presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying lysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a An example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluation monte-car program a	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho on for significance lo distribution. A presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying tysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a An example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluation monte-car program a	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho on for significance lo distribution. A presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying lysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a an example and	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer
In so upper or more info These com on the da The resul distribut evaluatio monte-car program a 14. SUBJECT TERMS Splits analysis 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATIO ON REPORT	me instances group lower portions of t parisons can be dor ta prior to an anal ting test statistic ed as an <u>F</u> ratio ho on for significance lo distribution. A presented.	comparisons i the score dist risons of cent by carrying tysis of varia from ANOVA i owever, and re relative to a an example and statistical inf	n terms of ributions are ral tendency. out a split nce (ANOVA). s not quires n empirical computer 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 13 fé. PACE CODE

1

Evaluation of bootstrap and parametric percentile contrasts - Volume I

Splits Analysis: A Method for Noncentral Tendency Comparisons Jeffrey Lee Rasmussen Purdue University School of Science Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis 1125 East 38th Street Indianapolis, Indiana 46205-2810

Running Head: SPLITS ANALYSIS

# 91 1 3 035

2

#### Abstract

In some instances group comparisons in terms of upper or lower portions of the score distributions are more informative than comparisons of central tendency. These comparisons can be done by carrying out a split on the data prior to an analysis of variance (ANOVA). The resulting test statistic from ANOVA is not distributed as an <u>F</u> ratio however, and requires evaluation for significance relative to an empirical monte-carlo distribution. An example and computer program are presented.

Accesion For NTIS CRARE DTIC TAB U al or cod Justification: By Dist ibutio.../ Availability means Avail to do a Dist Specifi



Splits Analysis: A Method for Noncentral Tendency Comparisons

In the behavioral sciences, comparison of groups typically concerns contrast of central tendency. For example, a researcher interested in the effects of violent vs nonviolent tv programs would typically compare the mean, or perhaps the median, subsequent aggression of the first group vs the second group. There are instances, however when researchers would be interested not with central tendency differences; rather they would be concerned with differences in say the upper ten percent or the lower third of each group. For example, an industrial psychologist may want to investigate the efficacy of two training techniques in resultant skill acquisition. Since only the top ten percent of trainees may be hired or promoted, the two techniques would be best evaluated in terms of their effect on the upper ten percent of each group.

Lunneborg (1986) has described a bootstrap quantile analysis appropriate for comparing two groups at given percentiles. His procedure yields a probability value that the two groups' scores at a given percentile differ by chance. The present work describes an alternative method to Lunneborg's bootstrap procedure, and provides a computer implementation of the

3

4

procedure. The alternative is referred to as a splits analysis as it concerns carrying out a split on the data prior to statistical analysis.

Consider a data set for which we are interested in comparing the upper half of the score distributions of two groups. To carry out the splits analysis the data would be rank ordered within groups, a median split would be carried out on each group, and the upper half of the data would be analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Although an ANOVA is carried out on the data the resulting test statistic is not evaluated using standard <u>F</u> tables. Research by the author has indicated that such an approach would lead to a great inflation in the Type I error rate. For example, using standard <u>F</u> distribution critical values typically resulted in actual Type I error rates in excess of .20 for the nominal .05 significance level (Rasmussen, 1990).

Instead of using the <u>F</u> distribution, monte carlo methods are used to evaluate the significance of the obtained test statistic. Specifically, a large number, say 5000, data sets of the same sample size would be generated under the null hypothesis using a pseudorandom normal deviate generator. Each of the data sets would be processed identically as the original data set, i.e., an empirical test score distribution under

5

the null hypothesis for the same sample size and data split would be created. The obtained test statistic is then evaluated relative to this empirical distribution to determine significance. For example, if 10 of the monte carlo values are larger than the obtained value then the probability value associated with the obtained value would be 10/5000 = 0.002.

The previous example would be roughly analogous to Lunneborg's bootstrap comparison of the 75th percentiles. Initial research by the author has indicated that the splits analysis approach maintained the .01 and .05 alpha levels, whereas the bootstrap procedure tended to be overly conservative (Rasmussen, 1990).

Table 1 presents a small data set along with the results from a splits analysis. In the example, there are 9 cases per group and the splits analysis compares the lower third of each group. The ANOVA test

#### Insert Table 1 about Here

statistic resulting from the splits analysis is 36.75. If this were an standard <u>F</u> ratio (i.e, with 1 and 4 degrees of freedom) it would have a probability value of .0037. The splits analysis probability of 0.016 is

6

less extreme.

Similar to bootstrapping and approximate randomization procedures the probability value associated with splits analysis is an approximation that depends upon the number of monte carlo simulations and the significance level (Rasmussen, 1988; Rasmussen, 1989). With a known significance level, the formula for the standard error is  $\underline{SE} = \operatorname{sqrt}[\underline{s} (1 - \underline{s}) / \underline{m}]$ , where  $\underline{s}$  is the significance level and  $\underline{m}$  is the number of monte carlo simulations.

This formula can be used to evaluate the probability that a given approximate probability value is less than a desired probability value. For example the probability that the approximate probability value of 0.016 is less than a desired probability value of 0.016 is less than a desired probability value of 0.05 can be calculated from <u>SE</u> = [.05 (1 - .05) / 5000] = .00308. Using the standard <u>z</u> score formula, <u>z</u> = (.016 - .05) / .00308 = -11.04. A <u>z</u> score of such magnitude indicates that it is extremely unlikely that the approximate probability value of 0.016 is greater than the 0.05 level. In instances in which the approximate probability value is close to the desired value, a larger number of simulations could be carried out.

7

#### Program execution

The program asks for the analysis parameters interactively and reads the data from a file. The program requires the sample size per group for the entire data set and the lower and upper ordinal values that represent the desired split. For example, for a sample size of 12 a lower value of 1 and an upper value of 3 would compare the lower quarter of the distributions, whereas a lower value of 9 and an upper value of 12 would compare the upper third of the distributions. The program also requests the number of monte carlo simulations to carry out. On the VAX the formula to estimate the execution time is Central Processing Unit (CPU) seconds = 7.4E-5 (nm), where n is the sample size per group after the data split. For example, with a sample size after the data split of 40 per group and with 20,000 repetitions it requires approximately 60 CPU seconds. Finally, the program requires the name of the data file. The data is read in groups using free format with one score per record. The program then carries out the appropriate split on the data and on the monte carlo simulations. The group means on the split data, the test statistic and the probability value is then calculated and printed out.

Table 2 gives the FORTRAN coding of the splits analysis along with an efficient ANOVA function. The

8

program will require a random normal deviate generator

Insert Table 2 about Here

and an efficient sorting routine. These are readily available in Lehman (1977) and Miller (1982) or can be obtained from the author.

The program currently runs on a VAX 8800 computer. To run the program on another system it will probably be necessary to change the OPEN statement and the unit numbers associated with the READ and WRITE statements. In addition the SECNDS and RAN functions may be different on other systems. The SECNDS function is used to give a different series of random numbers based on the time in seconds since midnight. On systems which cannot readily provide a function to give the time the program can be modified to ask the user for a seed (e.g., a random nine digit odd number) to start the random number generator.

9

# Author's note

This research was funded in part by Air Force Grant AF AFOSR-90-0190. Their support is gratefully acknowledged.

10

#### References

Lehman, R. S. (1977). Computer Simulation and

<u>Modeling: An Introduction</u>. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Lunneborg, C. E. (1986). Confidence intervals for a

quantile contrast: Application of the bootstrap.

Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 451-456.

Miller, A. R. (1982). FORTRAN Programs for Scientists and Engineers. New York: Sibex.

- Rasmussen, J. L. (1988). "Bootstrap confidence intervals: Good or bad": Comments on Efron (1988) and Strube (1988) and further evaluation. <u>Psychological Bulletin, 104, 297-299.</u>
- Rasmussen, J. L. (1989). Computer-intensive correlational analysis: Bootstrap and approximate randomization techniques. <u>British Journal of</u> <u>Mathematical and Statistical Psychology</u>, <u>42</u>, 103-111.
- Rasmussen, J. L. (1990). <u>Evaluation of bootstrap and</u> <u>parametric statistical analysis of percentile</u> <u>contrasts</u>. Unpublished manuscript.

•

11

# Table 1

# <u>Sample</u> <u>splits</u> <u>analysis</u>

Group 1	Group 2			
13	28	Mean 1	Mean 2	
16	29	16.0	30.0	
19	33	Test Stat:	istic: 36.	75
	• • • • • •	Probab	ility: 0.	016
24	34			
29	38			
32	40			
36	41			
37	43			
42	45			

\_\_\_\_\_

•

12

# Table 2

Source Code for Splits Analysis

19	1	<pre>REAL X(1000), Y(1000), FMC(100000) CHARACTER IFILE*20 XXX = 1.0 III = SECNDS(XXX) * 2000 + 1 WRITE (6,19) FORMAT(' This program calculates probability values'/ ' for splits on data. Give the sample size per group.'/</pre>
	1	<pre>' upper and lower split values, and number of monte'/ ' carlo trials. '/) READ (6,*) NPERG, ISPLTL, ISPLTU, NMC XNMC = NMC NSPLT = ISPLTU - ISPLTL + 1</pre>
		XNSPLT = NSPLT
29		WRITE (6,29) FORMAT(! Give the name of the data file !/)
23		READ (6,39) IFILE
39		FORMAT (A20)
		OPEN (27, FILE = IFILE, STATUS = 'UNKNOWN')
		DO IO I = 1, NPERG READ (27 $\pm$ ) X(T)
10		CONTINUE
		DO 20 I = 1, NPERG
~ ~		READ (27,*) Y(I)
20		CONTINUE CALL SORT (Y NDERC)
		CALL SORT (X, NPERG)
		FOBS = ANOVA (X, Y, TOTX, TOTY, ISPLTL, ISPLTU, NSPLT)
		XMEAN = TOTX / XNSPLT
		YMEAN = TOTY / XNSPLT
		DO 40 IREP = 1, NMC
		DO 30 1 = 1, NPERG Y(1) = PNOPM(111)
		X(I) = RNORM(III) Y(I) = RNORM(III)
30		CONTINUE
		CALL SORT (X, NPERG)
		CALL SORT (Y, NPERG)
		FMC(IREP) = ANOVA (X, Y, TOTX, TOTY, ISPLTL, ISPLTU, NSPLT)
40		CONTINUE CALL SORT (FMC NMC)
		ITST = 0

Table 2 continues

Table 2, continued

Source Code for Splits Analysis

```
DO 50 IREP = 1, NMC
        IF (FOBS .LT. FMC(IREP)) GOTO 51
        ITST = ITST + 1
50
        CONTINUE
51
        CONTINUE
        XTST = ITST
        PROB = (XNMC - XTST) / XNMC
        WRITE (6,49) XMEAN, YMEAN, FOBS, PROB
49
        FORMAT(//'
                            Means:',2F12.4/
        ' Test Statistic:',F12.4/'
                                      Probability:',F12.4//)
     1
        STOP
        END
С
        FUNCTION ANOVA (X, Y, TOT1, TOT2, ISPLTL, ISPLTU, N)
        REAL X(1000), Y(1000)
        XN = N
        XNTOT = XN * 2.0
        DFW = 2.0 * (XN - 1.0)
        TOT1 = 0
        TOT2 = 0
        SXSQ = 0
        DO 10 I = ISPLTL, ISPLTU
        TOT1 = TOT1 + X(I)
        TOT2 = TOT2 + Y(I)
        SXSQ = SXSQ + X(I) **2 + Y(I) **2
10
        CONTINUE
        TOTV = (TOT1**2 + TOT2**2) / XN
        CF = (TOT1 + TOT2) * 2 / XNTOT
        SSB = TOTV - CF
        SSW = SXSQ - TOTV
        VMSW = SSW / DFW
        ANOVA = 0.0
        IF (VMSW .GT. 0.0) ANOVA = SSB / VMSW
        RETURN
        END
```