ROSE 11

~~ROSE 12~~

ROSE AM/FERNANDES K
AN INFORMATION PROCESSING APPROACH TO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:
I. EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF AN INFORMATION PROCESSING PERFORMANCE
BATTERY. WASHINGTON DC: AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH NOV.1977
PEARSON R'S; SELECTED VARIABLES DAY 1 TABLE 11A P.70
M & F GEORGETOWN UNIV. STUDENTS

N=50

*** HIERARCHICAL FACTOR MATRIX, ORDER 1 ***

V#		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	H^2
	FACTOR 1: O2;F1 GEN'L INFOR.PROC'G SPEED..2T; ORDER 2									
	FACTOR 2: O1;F2 VIS/MEM SEARCH:SLOPE.....R5; ORDER 1									
1	+14 STERNBERG SLOPE POSITIVE	.61	.30	-.03	.044	-.575	.02	.01	-.00	.79
2	+16 STERNBERG SLOPE NEGATIVE	.56	.30	.034	-.495	.014	-.6654	-.405	.26	1.30
3	+18 JUOLA WORD SLOPE POSITIVE	.55	.25	.02	-.00	-.21	-.034	.525	.06	.69
4	+#4 POSNER 'DIFFERENT'	.91	.23	.25	.03	.02	-.00	.04	-.01	.95
5	+27 CLARK 'NEGATION'	.44	.22	-.11	-.06	-.03	-.21	-.06	-.00	.31
6	+#3 POSNER RULE MATCH	.82	.18	.23	.19	.04	-.00	.05	-.00	.79
	FACTOR 3: O1;F1 SEMANTIC INFO.PROC'G SPD..R4; ORDER 1									
7	+10 BARON SENSE-NONSENSE	.67	-.02	.71	-.14	-.04	.05	.02	.01	.98
8	+11 BARON SENSE-HOMOPHONE	.64	-.00	.70	-.23	.05	.02	-.00	.18	.98
9	+12 BARON HOMOPHONE-NONSENSE	.71	.02	.58	-.00	.03	-.03	-.13	.06	.86
10	+#7 MEYER 'WORD'	.57	-.01	.53	.03	-.10	-.05	-.19	-.01	.66
11	+33 COLLINS PROPERTY INTERCEPT ...	.59	.01	.50	-.04	.01	-.024	.365	-.13	.75
12	+#8 MEYER 'NONWORD'.....	.55	.02	.45	-.18	.02	-.254	-.465	-.04	.82
13	+#2 POSNER NAME MATCH	.77	.11	.37	-.00	.27	-.12	-.18	.12	.88
14	+29 CLARK 'BASE'	.59	.06	.33	.15	-.03	-.25	-.10	-.03	.56
15	+#1 POSNER PHYSICAL MATCH	.72	.10	.27	.09	.28	.10	.08	-.06	.70
	FACTOR 4: O1;F7 JUOLA CAT./STERNBERG:NEG..S0; ORDER 1									
16	+24 JUOLA CAT. SLOPE NEGATIVE	.23	-.01	.02	.74	-.18	.01	-.02	-.03	.63
17	+25 JUOLA CAT. INTERCEPT NEGATIVE.	.54	.18	.29	-.77	-.02	.01	-.01	-.04	.99
	FACTOR 5: O1;F4 SPEED MENTAL COMPARISON ..S0; ORDER 1									
18	+15 STERNBERG INTERCEPT POSITIVE .	.26	-.01	-.01	.02	.86	.00	-.03	-.02	.80
	FACTOR 6: O1;F6 JUOLA WORD/STERNBERG:NEG..S0; ORDER 1									
19	+21 JUOLA WORD INTERCEPT NEGATIVE.	.72	.19	.25	-.06	.01	.56	-.02	.18	.96
20	+17 STERNBERG INTERCEPT NEGATIVE .	.48	.02	.014	.545	.20	.534	.4354	-.445	1.22
21	+20 JUOLA WORD SLOPE NEGATIVE	-.00	.00	-.02	-.01	.17	-.77	.05	.02	.62
	FACTOR 7: O1;F3 JUOLA WORD TASK/POSITIVE..S0; ORDER 1									
22	+31 COLLINS SUPERSET INTERCEPT ...	.67	.09	.17	.26	.18	-.02	.30	-.27	.74
23	+19 JUOLA WORD INTERCEPT POSITIVE	.53	-.004	.335	-.024	.445	.01	-.55	.06	.89

ROSE AM/FERNANDES K

AN INFORMATION PROCESSING APPROACH TO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT:
I. EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF AN INFORMATION PROCESSING PERFORMANCE
BATTERY. WASHINGTON DC: AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH NOV.1977
PEARSON R'S; SELECTED VARIABLES DAY 1 TABLE 11A P.70
M & F GEORGETOWN UNIV. STUDENTS

N=50

(CONTINUED)

V#		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	H^2
FACTOR 8: O1;F5 JUOLA CAT.TASK/POSITIVE ..S0; ORDER 1										
24 +22	JUOLA CAT. SLOPE POSITIVE	.21	.11	.24	.02	-.03	.01	-.05	.90	.93
25 +23	JUOLA CAT. INTERCEPT POSITIVE	.33	-.01	.01	.01	-.01	.02	-.06	-.84	.82
	SMSQ:	8.51	.49	2.86	1.92	1.59	1.82	1.47	1.97	20.64

*** HIERARCHICAL FACTOR MATRIX, ORDER 2 ***

HF #	1ST-ORD FACTOR	1	H^2
FACTOR 1: O2;F1 GEN'L INFOR.PROC'G SPEED..2T; ORDER 2			
HF 2	O1;F2 VIS/MEM SEARCH:SLOPE.....R5	.94	.88
HF 3	O1;F1 SEMANTIC INFO.PROC'G SPD..R4	.75	.56
HF 4	O1;F7 JUOLA CAT./STERNBERG:NEG..S0	.34	.12
HF 5	O1;F4 SPEED MENTAL COMPARISON ..S0	.30	.09
HF 6	O1;F6 JUOLA WORD/STERNBERG:NEG..S0	.04	.00
HF 7	O1;F3 JUOLA WORD TASK/POSITIVE..S0	-.08	.01
HF 8	O1;F5 JUOLA CAT.TASK/POSITIVE ..S0	-.36	.13
	SMSQ:	1.79	1.79