NPS55Ea72051A

## NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California





Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

QA297

Library Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940

#### NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California

Rear Admiral A. S. Goodfellow, USN Superintendent

M. U. Clauser Provost

#### ABSTRACT

In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes, including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is a fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.

Prepared by:

ter

Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences

Approved by:

Borsting, Chairman, J. R.

Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences

Released by:

C. E. Menneken Dean of Research Administration

NPS55Ea72051A

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ι.	Introduction	1
II.	Derivation and Computational Solution	2
III.	Mathematics of the Computational Procedure	5
IV.	Examples	8
۷.	Summary	12

Page

#### 网络小学校会会 医静脉管 化甘油 10.1 I. INTRODUCTION

6. 1936 B The section following this shows that the amount of variance a component contributes to a set of composite scores is a function of 1 21 the component's variance and its covariances with the other components. If a component's original covariances are low, it may be an indication that this variable is measuring attributes different from those being measured by the remaining component variables, or that it is measuring the same attributes less reliably. By using the procedure and assumption described in this paper, a researcher can equalize the contributions 1.11 2001 11 12 of all of the components to the variance of the set of composite scores. Before doing so, however, he should have evidence available which leads him to conclude that it is necessary to increase the contribution of a variable having low covariance terms. If, for example, the component having low covariances consists of a set of judgments made by any individual rater, the researcher should be convinced that this rater was judging relevant attributes of behavior ignored by other raters, or that he is not, instead, contributing non-valid variance to the composite scores. If the latter is true, increasing, the effect of these data by using the method presented in this paper is, at best, unfortunate.

لې<sup>6</sup> + \$رېدو و + د د د د د ر د ور ر

This report is an extension of an earlier article by R. S. Elster and C. O. Nystrom, titled, "A computerized Method for Controlling Components' Contributions to the Variance of a Composite", appearing in Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 30, No. 3, Autumn 1970.

#### II. DERIVATION AND COMPUTATIONAL SOLUTION

Beginning with an initial data matrix, the necessary equations can be developed. In general terms, we usually have an n x k score matrix B, giving the scores of n units (or some other objects of evaluation) on k variables (components). This matrix is then standardized so that each component's observations have a mean of zero and a variance of one; this is designated as matrix Z. Matrix Z is also n x k.

Before applying weights to any of the k component scores in Z, a composite score,  $C_i$ , may be computed for each of the n evaluated objects by using:

$$C_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} Z_{ij}, e.g., C_{j} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} Z_{jj}$$
 (1)

The variance of the array of  $C_i$ 's is given by:

$$s_{c}^{2} = s_{1}^{2} + s_{1}s_{2}r_{12} + \dots + s_{1}s_{k}r_{1k} +$$

$$s_{2}^{2} + s_{2}s_{1}r_{21} + \dots + s_{2}s_{k}r_{2k} +$$

$$\dots +$$

$$s_{k}^{2} + s_{k}s_{1}r_{k1} + \dots + s_{k}s_{k-1}r_{k}(k-1) ,$$
(2)

where  $r_{k(k-1)}$  designates the correlation between components k and

(k-1). For standard scores having a mean of zero and a variance of one, the variance of the array of C<sub>i</sub>'s is given by:

 $S_c^2 = 1 + r_{12} + \cdots + r_{1k} +$ 

$$1 + r_{k1} + \cdots + r_{k(k-1)}$$
  
In equation (3) is a series of terms for each component consisting of  
the component's variance along with its correlations with all of the  
other components. As can be seen from equation (3), the contribution

 $1 + r_{21} + \cdots + r_{2k} + \dots$ 

other components. of the jth component to the composite score variance is given by:

the

Var (C<sub>j</sub>) = 1 + 
$$\sum_{\substack{m=1 \ m\neq j}}^{k} r_{jm}$$
 (4)

In order to accomplish the goal of controlling the proportion of the composite's variance contributed by each of the components, one obviously must be able to adjust the magnitudes of their variances. The adjustment method to be used here is similar to that used by Dunnette and Hoggatt (1957, pp. 430-434): we shall multiply the set of component scores by a set of weights; the weights will have values so that the magnitudes of their new variances will equal the proportions of variance we wish the separate components to contribute to the composite.

(3)

Designating the weight for the jth component by  $A_j$ , the new composite may be computed by:

$$C_{i}' = \sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{j} Z_{ij}, e.g., C_{l}' = \sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{j} Z_{lj}$$
 (5)

If the components are in standard score form, the variance of the  $C_i$ 's is given by:

$$(ar(C_{i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} A_{j}^{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{m=1}^{k} A_{j} A_{m} r_{j} m$$
 (6)

and the contribution,  $b_j$ , of the jth component to the composite score variance is given by:

$$b_{j} = A_{j}^{2} + \sum_{\substack{m=1 \ m \neq j}}^{k} A_{j} A_{m} r_{jm}$$
(7)

An equation such as (7) can be written for each of the j components. Given this set of j equations, and given that  $b_j$  designates the variance we wish component j to contribute to the composite, the following system of quadratic equations must be solved.

$$A_{j}^{2} + \sum_{\substack{m=1 \ m\neq j}}^{k} A_{j} A_{m} r_{jm} = b_{j}$$
(8)

j = 1, 2, ..., k

The solution to the above set of equations will yield the set of weights (the  $A_j$ 's) to be used as multipliers with the k components so that the desired values of the  $b_j$ 's are obtained.

The procedure used for solving the system of simultaneous quadratic equations shown in equation (8) is the Newton-Raphson method as shown by Scarborough (1962, pp. 213-217).

The computational procedure has been programmed as a subroutine. To use it, the practitioner need only supply: 1) the original score matrix, giving the scores of n persons on the j components; 2) the proportion,  $b_j$ , that each of the j components is to contribute to the variance of the composite (each  $b_j$  must be expressed as a positive decimal, and the sum of the b 's must be equal to one); and 3) an  $\varepsilon$  value that terminates the iterative computational procedure. The parameter  $\varepsilon$  will be discussed later in this report.

#### III. MATHEMATICS OF THE COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE

In the case of two components, there would be two equations in two unknowns. Let  $\phi(X,Y) = 0$ , and  $\psi(X,Y) = 0$  represent the two equations. If  $X_0$ ,  $Y_0$  are approximate roots of  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , and h and  $\ell$  are corrections, then let

$$X = X_0 + h$$

$$Y = Y_0 + \ell$$

Scarborough (1962, pp. 214) shows that

$$\phi(X_{0}, Y_{0}) + h(\delta\phi/\delta x)_{0} + \ell(\delta\phi/\delta y)_{0} = 0$$
  
$$\psi(X_{0}, Y_{0}) + h(\delta\psi/\delta x)_{0} + \ell(\delta\psi/\delta y)_{0} = 0$$

or

6

l

-

The goal is to solve for h and  $\ell$  letting  $X_1 = X_0 + h$ ,  $Y_1 = Y_0 + \ell$ , etc.; iterating until a desired level of accuracy is achieved.

In the general case of weighting components which are in standard score form (using the notation from equation (8)):

$$\phi_{j} = A_{j} \sum_{m=1}^{K} A_{m} r_{jm} - b_{j}; j = 1, 2, ..., K$$
 (10)

Then, letting  $\phi_j^* = \phi_j / A_j$ , and differentiating,  $\delta \phi_j^* / \delta A_m = r_{jm}$ , when  $j \neq m$  and  $\delta \phi_j^* / \delta A_m = b_j / A_j^2 + 1$ , when j = m.

So for the general case, Equation (9) becomes

The iterations are performed by letting  $A_j^{(t+1)} = A_j^{(t)} + h_j$ , j = 1, 2, ..., k, and recalculating both the right-hand array and the diagonal of the coefficient array. For an exact solution, the right-hand side of Equation (11) will go term by term to zero. The convergence procedure used by the author of this paper tested to determine if the terms on the right side of Equation (11) had all become equal to, or less than, an epsilon ( $\varepsilon$ ). The user must specify an  $\varepsilon$  value which is used in terminating the iterations when all of the terms on the right-hand side of Equation (11) are  $<\varepsilon$ . Initially,

 $A_{j}^{(o)} = 1.0$  for all j.

#### IV. EXAMPLES

Artificial raw scores were generated yielding the standard score covariance matrix given in Table 1. (This matrix is an optional output available from the computer program allowing the user to examine the original component weights.)

By examining the row of figures in Table 1 giving the percent contribution of each rater (component) to the variance of the composite scores, it is evident that the original components are unequally weighted. Using the data given in the table, two solutions are demonstrated in the following paragraphs. The first example illustrates the case in which the user wishes to assign equal weights to all of the components. In the second example, the user assigns unequal proportions to the components.

Table 1

#### 1 STANDARD SCORE COVARIANCE MATRIX

Raters (Component	s) A	Rater B	s (Compon C	ents) D	E	F
Α	1.00	225	.233	084	.118	509
В	225	1.00	009	. 521	.099	151
С	.233	009	1.00	.112	.256	306
D	084	.521	.112	1.00	.196	264
E	.118	.099	.256	.196	1.00	236
F	509	151	306	264	236	1.00
Rater's Co to the com	ntributio posite sc	ore				
variance	.533	1.235	1.286	1.481	1.433	466

Total score variance = 5.502

#### A. Equal Weighting

The data summarized in Table 1 were initially run through the computational subroutine with the specification that each of the six components should make an identical contribution to the variance of the composite. The weights to be applied to the components' standard scores in order to equate the contributions of the six components are given in Table 2. The weights in Table 2 were derived by applying the computational method outlined above to the system of six equations similar to that given in Equation (8); the weights in Table 2 are the roots of the six equations for this example.

WEIGHTS TO BE USED AS MULTIPLIERS WITH Table 2 THE COMPONENTS' STANDARD SCORES FOR THE EQUAL CONTRIBUTION EXAMPLE F Raters (Components) A В С E D Weights 1.638 1.031 .937 .904 .858 2.144

Table 3 shows the covariance matrix that resulted after applying these weights to the components' standard scores. Table 3 (using the notation of Equation 8) contains the elements  $A_j 2 r_{jj}$ on the main diagonal and the elements  $A_j A_m r_{jm}$  off the diagonal.

The column in Table 3 that lists the percentage of the composite's variance contributed by each of the components shows that the contributions of the six components were equated by the computational method. The solution of the equations required 4 iterations; about 3.2 seconds of computer time was required for the entire run.

(The iterations were terminated when each of the six roots had an accuracy of  $\leq .00001.$ )

B. Unequal Weighting

To illustrate that the computatonal procedure can also be used in solving for differential weights, Tables 4 and 5 show the results obtained when the six components were specified as contributing .50, .10, .10, .10, and .10 of the composite's variance. This run required 4 iterations to achieve  $\leq$ .00001 accuracy for each of the six roots.

Table 3	COVARIAN	ICE M	ATRIX	DERI	VED	AFTER	APPL	YING	THE	COMPUTED
	WEIGHTS	FOR	THE E	QUAL	CONT	RIBUTI	ON E	EXAMPL	.E	

Raters (Components)	А	Rater B	rs (Compo C	onents) D	E	F	Per Cent <sup>a</sup>
А	2.683	380	.357	125	.166	-1,788	16.67
В	380	1.063	008	.485	.087	334	16.67
С	.357	008	.878	.095	.206	615	16.67
D	125	.485	.095	.817	.152	512	16.65
Е	.166	.087	.206	.152	.736	433	16.68
F	-1.788	334	615	512	433	4.595	16.67
Rater's Cont	ributio	n					100.01 <sup>b</sup>
variance	.913	.913	.913	.912	.914	.913	

Total score variance = 5.478

<sup>a</sup>Percent the component contributed to the composite's variance <sup>b</sup>This column does not total to 100.00 due to rounding errors.

Table 4 WEIGHTS TO BE USED AS MULTIPLIERS WITH THE COMPONENTS' STANDARD SCORES FOR THE UNEQUAL CONTRIBUTION EXAMPLE

Raters (Components	Α	В	С	D	Ε	F
Weights	2.324	.960	.680	.772	.654	2.151

### Table 5COVARIANCE MATRIX DERIVED AFTER APPLYING THE COMPUTED<br/>WEIGHTS FOR THE UNEQUAL CONTRIBUTION EXAMPLE

Raters (Components)	А	В	Rater C	rs (Compo D	nents) E	F	Per Cent <sup>a</sup>
А	5.402	503	.368	151	.180	-2.546	49.99
В	503	.922	Q05	.386	.062	312	9.98
С	.368	006	.463	.059	.114	448	10.00
• D	151	.386	.059	.596	.099	438	10.02
E	.180	.062	.113	.099	.427	331	10.02
F	-2.546	312	448	438	331	4.625	10.00
Rater's Cont	ributio	n					100.01 <sup>b</sup>
variance	2.750	.549	.550	.551	.551	.550	
		Total		ianco =	5 501		

1

5

Total score variance = 5.501

<sup>a</sup>Per cent the component contributed to the composite's variance <sup>b</sup>This column does not total to 100.00 due to rounding errors.

#### V. SUMMARY

A computer procedure was developed for weighting components in a composite. The procedure allows the user to freely choose how much of the variance of a set of composite scores is contributed by each of a number of components.

Two numerical examples using artificial input data were demonstrated illustrating an equal weighting solution and an unequal weighting solution. In both sample problems, the solutions reached the desired level of accuracy in about three seconds.

#### REFERENCES

Dunnette, M.D., and Hoggatt, A.C., "Deriving A Composite Score From Several Measures of the Same Attribute." Educational Psychological Measurement, 1957, 17, 423-434.

Scarborough, J.B., Numerical Mathematical Analysis, (5th Ed.), Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1962.

#### INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Defense Documentation Center (DDC) Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dean C. E. Menneken Dean of Research Administration Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940

Library, Code 0212 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940

Library, Code 55 Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940

R. S. Elster, Code 55Ea Department of Operations Research and Administrative Sciences Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940 1

2

14

5

5

District Component of Uffice Node of advance and advance and advance of the owner log many the construction of Many Logical California       In the comparison of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Image: Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Image: Control Variable         Image: Control the Influences       Im	(Security classification of title, body of abstract and in DRIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California	ndexing ennotation must be e	ntered when the over 24. REPORT SECU Unclas	arall report is classified) JRITY CLASSIFICATION
Maral Postgraduate School Monterey, California       Set REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFIED         Maral Postgraduate School Monterey, California       Set Report SECURITY CLASSIFIED         Memory Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Description       Technical Report         Authorst (firstrawer, middle Influences of Component Variables         Description       Technical Report         R. S. Elster         Nerver of the provide state and the state and the state of the state of the state and the state of the state of the state and the state of the state	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California		24. REPORT SECU Unclas	JRITY CLASSIFICATION
Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California       Unclassified b. GROUP         Unclassified       Unclassified         Wonterey, California       Unclassified         Controlling the Influences of Component Variables       Unclassified         Descriptive Notes (Type of report and, inclusive dates) Technical Report       Technical Report         R. S. Elster       14. OTAL NO. OF PACES       15. NO. OF MEES         Memory 1000 Statement       14. OTAL NO. OF PACES       15. No. OF MEES         Outstand the State No.       14. OTAL NO. OF PACES       15. No. OF MEES         May 1972       20       4         Contract for EMAIT NO.       14. OTHER REPORT NUMBERIES         PROJECT NO.       14. OTHER REPORT NUMBERIES         DISTANSUTION STATEMENT       12. SPONSONING WILLIARY ACTIVITY         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       12. SPONSONING WILLIARY ACTIVITY         Asstract       12. SPONSONING WILLIARY ACTIVITY         Asstract       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the control component covariances and, thus, to control the component measures. It is fairly component means of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a composite measure (variab	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California		Unclas	
Monterey, Čalifornia       Procur         General Hill       Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Descriptive Notes (Type of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report       Technical Report         R. S. Elster       R. S. Elster         May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT DR ERANT NO.       May 1972       20       4         PROJECT NO.       May 1972       20       4         Distribution statement       Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       10. No. or mers         SupPlementant No.       May 1972       20       4         Instruction statement       Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       10. Statement Activity         SupPlementant Notes       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY       13. Statement Activity         Asstract       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a component measures, It is fairly common practice to control the control component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control of a component covariances and, thus, to control the controlbution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The	Monterey, California			sified
Technical Report         Authomatic (Free of report and inclusive dates)         Technical Report         Authomatic (Free of report and inclusive dates)         R. S. Elster         Report CATE         May 1972         CONTRACTOR GAMATINO.         PROJECT NO.         In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a component to the acomponent to the acomponent to the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control of a component to the variance of the component measure. It is fairly common practice to control the control the control of a component to the variance of the component measure of the component measure of the component measure of a component to the variance of the composite presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariance. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	REPORT TITLE		2b. GROUP	
Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Controlling the Influences of Component Variables         Description of the Influences descent         Control Report         Notice Influences of Component Variables         Notice Influences         Notice Influences         Notice Influences         Notice Influences         Notice Influences         Inflitary units or systems, many attributes			L	
Controlling the Influences of Component Variables  DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Pype of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report AUTHORIZE (First mark, middle initial, lest name)  R. S. Elster  Heront OATE May 1972 20 4. ONIGNATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)  PROJECT NO.  PROJECT NO.  IS OTHER MERONT NO(IS (Any other numbers that may be sealers)  ISTRIBUTION STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  IS The comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is fairly common practice to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite measure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite measure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report AUTHORISI (First name, middle initial, last name) R. S. Elster REPORT DATE May 1972 2 20 4 CONTRACT ON GRANT NO. PROJECT NO. PROJECT NO. PROJECT NO. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 12. SPONSORING WILLTARY ACTIVITY ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly component to the component measures, it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the component measures in this measure to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	Controlling the Influences of Co	omponent Variables		
Description of the composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the composite measure differential influences on the composite by the use of component measures, and covariances. In this method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite by the use of component measures. In this method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite by the use of component measures. In this method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite by the use of component measures. In this method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite measure for the differential influences on the composite measure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite measure for assigning equal on differential influences on the composite measure differential influences on the composite by the use of component means. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	<b>J</b>	•		
In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component covariance s and, thus, to control the component covariance terms are allocated equally be tween each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
R. S. Elster          Report Date       14. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES       15. NO. OF REFS         May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT OWNERNAME.       20       4         PROJECT NO.       14. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES       15. NO. OF REFS         PROJECT NO.       14. OTHER REPORT NUMBERS       14. OTHER REPORT NUMBERS         OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT       14. OTHER REPORT NUMBERS       15. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         ABSTRACT       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the composite measure of a component covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	lechnical Keport			The second second
R. S. Elster         Nepont Date       10. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES       10. NO. OF REFS         May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT ON GRANT NO.       He. ONIGINATION'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         PROJECT NO.       He. ONIGINATION'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         OUSTRIEUTION STATEMENT       Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         AbSTRACT       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
REPORT DATE       14. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES       10. NO. OF REFS         May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT ON GRANT NO.       14. ORIGINATOM'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         PROJECT NO.       14. ORIGINATOM'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT       Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         ABSTRACT       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best invOlves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measure. It is to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	R. S. Elster			
NEEPORT DATE       10. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES       20       4         May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT ON RENAT NO.       20       4         PROJECT NO.       20       20       4         DISTRIBUTION BYATEMENT       20       4         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       20       4         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       20       20       4         Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.       20       20       4         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       20       20       20       4         ABSTRACT       20       20       4       20       4         ABSTRACT       20       20       20       4       20       20       20       20       20       20       20       20       4       20 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
May 1972       20       4         CONTRACT ON GRANT NO.       Mail ONIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         PROJECT NO.       The ONIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)         DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT       Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.         DUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         ABSTRACT       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the component measure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	REPORT DATE	78. TOTAL NO. O	FPAGES 7	b. NO. OF REFS
CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.       PROJECT NO.         PROJECT NO.       PROJECT NO.         DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT       PROVED for public release; distribution unlimited.         SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY         ABSTRACT       In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the control component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	May 1972	20		4
PROJECT NO.  Phoject NO.  Phoject NO(3) (Any other numbers that may be set[quited in the internet inte	CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	98. ORIGINATOR	> REPORT NUMBE	R(3)
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT     Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.     In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes     including performance, might be measured. One general approach to     determining which system is best involves forming a composite     measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is     fairly common practice to control the component measures, it is less common, and more difficult, to control component     covariances and, thus, to control the composite by the use of     component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this     method leading to a computer procedure for assigning     equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of     component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this     method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair     of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one     illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique     appears to be both fast and precise.	PROJECT NO.			
In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. It his method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
CISTRIBUTION STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.		95. OTHER REPO	RT NO(S) (Any othe	r numbers that may be assigned
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  ADSTRACT  In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the composite by the use of presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.		(interreport)		
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES I.2. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the control component covariances and, thus, to control the control component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  I. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY  ABSTRACT  In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
IL: SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	Approved for public release; dis	stribution unlimi	ted.	
ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING	MILITARY ACTIVI	тү
ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
ABSTRACT In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	ABSTRACT			
In the comparison of military units or systems, many attributes including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.				
including performance, might be measured. One general approach to determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	In the comparison of milit	ary units or syst	ems, many at	tributes
determining which system is best involves forming a composite measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	including performance, mig	ht be measured.	One general	approach to
measure of the differentially weighted component measures. It is fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	determining which system is	s best involves f	orming a con	nposite .
fairly common practice to control the component means and variances; it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	measure of the differentia	11y weighted comp	onent measur	res. It is
it is less common, and more difficult, to control component covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	fairly common practice to	control the compo	nent means a	and variances;
covariances and, thus, to control the contribution of a component to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	it is less common, and more	e difficult, to c	ontrol compo	onent
to the variance of the composite measure (variable). This paper presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	covariances and, thus, to	control the contr	ibution of a	a component
presents a method leading to a computer procedure for assigning equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	to the variance of the com	posite measure (v	ariable). 🗌	This paper
equal or differential influences on the composite by the use of component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	presents a method leading	to a computer pro	cedure for a	assigning
component means, standard deviations, and covariances. In this method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	equal or differential infl	uences on the com	posite by th	ne use of
method covariance terms are allocated equally between each pair of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	component means, standard	deviations, and c	ovariances.	In this
of components. Two numerical examples are given herein, one illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	method covariance terms ar	e allocated equal	ly between o	each pair
illustrating equal and the other unequal weighting. The technique appears to be both fast and precise.	of components. Two numeri	cal examples are	given herein	n, one
appears to be both fast and precise.	illustrating equal and the	other unequal we	ighting. Th	he technique
	appears to be both fast an	d precise.		
	N 0101-807-6811		Security	Classification

#### UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

4. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LIN	KB	LINKC	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Donformance evaluation						
Performance evaluation				-		
Decision making						
Composite						
Controlled weights						
component measures						
						·
	·					
			×			
						3
· · ·						
	1.5.1.					
			÷.,			
					•	
DD FORM 1473 (BACK)	UN	CLASSI	FIED	1		

S/N 0101-807-6821

Security Classification

A-31409

3

16

.

e \*

>

.