

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF  
RESEARCH  
DESIGN  
VOLUME 1

EDITED BY  
NEIL J. SALKIND  
*University of Kansas*

 SAGE

  
reference

**DOCKET  
ALARM**

Find authenticated court documents without w

Genome & Co. v. Univ. of Chicago  
PGR2019-00002  
UNIV. CHICAGO EX. 2068

Copyright © 2010 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*For information:*



SAGE Publications, Inc.  
2455 Teller Road  
Thousand Oaks, California 91320  
E-mail: [order@sagepub.com](mailto:order@sagepub.com)

SAGE Publications Ltd.,  
1 Oliver's Yard  
55 City Road  
London EC1Y 1SP  
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.  
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area  
Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044  
India

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd.  
33 Pekin Street #02-01  
Far East Square  
Singapore 048763

Printed in the United States of America.

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

Encyclopedia of research design/edited by Neil J. Salkind.  
v. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4129-6127-1 (cloth)

1. Social sciences—Statistical methods—Encyclopedias. 2. Social sciences—Research—Methodology—Encyclopedias.  
I. Salkind, Neil J.

HA29.E525 2010

001.403—dc22

2010001779

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

11 12 13 14 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

---

<i>Publisher:</i>	Rolf A. Janke
<i>Acquisitions Editor:</i>	Jim Brace-Thompson
<i>Editorial Assistant:</i>	Michele Thompson
<i>Developmental Editor:</i>	Carole Maurer
<i>Reference Systems Coordinators:</i>	Leticia M. Gutierrez, Laura Notton
<i>Production Editor:</i>	Kate Schroeder
<i>Copy Editors:</i>	Bonnie Freeman, Liann Lech, Sheree Van Vreede
<i>Typesetter:</i>	C&M Digitals (P) Ltd.
<i>Proofreaders:</i>	Kristin Bergstad, Kevin Gleason, Sally Jaskold, Sandy Zilka
<i>Indexer:</i>	Virgil Diodato
<i>Cover Designer:</i>	Glenn Vogel
<i>Marketing Manager:</i>	Amberlyn McKay

# Contents

---

## Volume 1

List of Entries	<i>vii</i>
Reader's Guide	<i>xiii</i>
About the Editors	<i>xix</i>
Contributors	<i>xxi</i>
Introduction	<i>xxix</i>

### Entries

A	<i>1</i>	E	<i>399</i>
B	<i>57</i>	F	<i>471</i>
C	<i>111</i>	G	<i>519</i>
D	<i>321</i>		

## Volume 2

List of Entries	<i>vii</i>
-----------------	------------

### Entries

H	<i>561</i>	M	<i>745</i>
I	<i>589</i>	N	<i>869</i>
J	<i>655</i>	O	<i>949</i>
K	<i>663</i>	P	<i>985</i>
L	<i>681</i>		

## Volume 3

List of Entries	<i>vii</i>
-----------------	------------

### Entries

Q	<i>1149</i>	V	<i>1589</i>
R	<i>1183</i>	W	<i>1611</i>
S	<i>1295</i>	Y	<i>1645</i>
T	<i>1489</i>	Z	<i>1653</i>
U	<i>1583</i>		

Index	<i>1675</i>
-------	-------------

of measurement uses, and consequently it should be viewed within a much larger system of reliability analysis, generalizability theory. Moreover, alpha focused attention on reliability coefficients when that attention should instead be cast on measurement error and the standard error of measurement.

For Cronbach, the extension of alpha (and classical test theory) came when Fisherian notions of experimental design and analysis of variance were put together with the idea that some "treatment" conditions could be considered random samples from a large universe, as alpha assumes about item sampling. Measurement data, then, could be collected in complex designs with multiple variables (e.g., items, occasions, and rater effects) and analyzed with random-effects analysis of variance models. The goal was not so much to estimate a reliability coefficient as to estimate the components of variance that arose from multiple variables and their interactions in order to account for observed score variance. This approach of partitioning effects into their variance components provides information as to the magnitude of each of the multiple sources of error and a standard error of measurement, as well as an "alpha-like" reliability coefficient for complex measurement designs. Moreover, the variance-component approach can provide the value of "alpha" expected by increasing or decreasing the number of items (or raters or occasions) like those in the test. In addition, the proportion of observed score variance attributable to variance in item difficulty (or, for example, rater stringency) may also be computed, which is especially important to contemporary testing programs that seek to determine whether examinees have achieved an absolute, rather than relative, level of proficiency. Once these possibilities were envisioned, coefficient alpha morphed into generalizability theory, with sophisticated analyses involving crossed and nested designs with random and fixed variables (*facets*) producing variance components for multiple measurement facets such as raters and testing occasions so as to provide a complex standard error of measurement.

By all accounts, coefficient alpha—Cronbach's alpha—has been and will continue to be the most popular method for estimating behavioral measurement reliability. As of 2004, the 1951

coefficient alpha article had been cited in more than 5,000 publications.

*Jeffrey T. Steedle and Richard J. Shavelson*

*See also* Classical Test Theory; Generalizability Theory; Internal Consistency Reliability; KR-20; Reliability; Split-Half Reliability

#### Further Readings

- Brennan, R. L. (2001). *Generalizability theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 64(3), 391–418.
- Haertel, E. H. (2006). Reliability. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (pp. 65–110). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Shavelson, R. J. (2004). Editor's preface to Lee J. Cronbach's "My Current Thoughts on Coefficient Alpha and Successor Procedures." *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 64(3), 389–390.
- Shavelson, R. J., & Webb, N. M. (1991). *Generalizability theory: A primer*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

## COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE

Proposed by Maurice G. Kendall and Bernard Babington Smith, Kendall's coefficient of concordance ( $W$ ) is a measure of the agreement among several ( $m$ ) quantitative or semiquantitative variables that are assessing a set of  $n$  objects of interest. In the social sciences, the variables are often people, called *judges*, assessing different subjects or situations. In community ecology, they may be species whose abundances are used to assess habitat quality at study sites. In taxonomy, they may be characteristics measured over different species, biological populations, or individuals.

There is a close relationship between Milton Friedman's two-way analysis of variance without replication by ranks and Kendall's coefficient of concordance. They address hypotheses concerning the same data table, and they use the same  $\chi^2$  statistic for testing. They differ only in the formulation of their respective null hypothesis. Consider Table 1, which contains illustrative data. In Friedman's test, the null hypothesis is that there is no

**Table 1** Illustrative Example: Ranked Relative Abundances of Four Soil Mite Species (Variables) at 10 Sites (Objects)

	Ranks (column-wise)				Sum of Ranks
	Species 13	Species 14	Species 15	Species 23	$R_i$
Site 4	5	6	3	5	19.0
Site 9	10	4	8	2	24.0
Site 14	7	8	5	4	24.0
Site 22	8	10	9	2	29.0
Site 31	6	5	7	6	24.0
Site 34	9	7	10	7	33.0
Site 45	3	3	2	8	16.0
Site 53	1.5	2	4	9	16.5
Site 61	1.5	1	1	2	5.5
Site 69	4	9	6	10	29.0

Source: Legendre, P. (2005) Species associations: The Kendall coefficient of concordance revisited. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, & Environmental Statistics*, 10, 230. Reprinted with permission from the *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, & Environmental Statistics*. Copyright 2005 by the American Statistical Association. All rights reserved.

Notes: The ranks are computed columnwise with ties. Right-hand column: sum of the ranks for each site.

real difference among the  $n$  objects (sites, rows of Table 1) because they pertain to the same statistical population. Under the null hypothesis, they should have received random ranks along the various variables, so that their sums of ranks should be approximately equal. Kendall's test focuses on the  $m$  variables. If the null hypothesis of Friedman's test is true, this means that the variables have produced rankings of the objects that are independent of one another. This is the null hypothesis of Kendall's test.

### Computing Kendall's $W$

There are two ways of computing Kendall's  $W$  statistic (first and second forms of Equations 1 and 2); they lead to the same result.  $S$  or  $S'$  is computed first from the row-marginal sums of ranks  $R_i$  received by the objects:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i - \bar{R})^2 \text{ or } S' = \sum_{i=1}^n R_i^2 = SSR, \quad (1)$$

where  $S$  is a sum-of-squares statistic over the row sums of ranks  $R_i$ , and  $\bar{R}$  is the mean of the  $R_i$  values. Following that, Kendall's  $W$  statistic can be obtained from either of the following formulas:

$$W = \frac{12S}{m^2(n^3 - n) - mT}$$

or

$$W = \frac{12S' - 3m^2n(n+1)^2}{m^2(n^3 - n) - mT}, \quad (2)$$

where  $n$  is the number of objects and  $m$  is the number of variables.  $T$  is a correction factor for tied ranks:

$$T = \sum_{k=1}^g (t_k^3 - t_k), \quad (3)$$

in which  $t_k$  is the number of tied ranks in each ( $k$ ) of  $g$  groups of ties. The sum is computed over all groups of ties found in all  $m$  variables of the data table.  $T = 0$  when there are no tied values.

Kendall's  $W$  is an estimate of the variance of the row sums of ranks  $R_i$  divided by the maximum possible value the variance can take; this occurs when all variables are in total agreement. Hence  $0 \leq W \leq 1$ , 1 representing perfect concordance. To derive the formulas for  $W$  (Equation 2), one has to know that when all variables are in perfect agreement, the sum of all sums of ranks in the data table (right-hand column of Table 1) is  $mn(n+1)/2$  and that the sum of squares of the sums of all ranks is  $m^2n(n+1)(2n+1)/6$  (without ties).

There is a close relationship between Charles Spearman's correlation coefficient  $r_s$  and Kendall's  $W$  statistic:  $W$  can be directly calculated from the

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.