

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 567

TM 009 711

AUTHOR McDermott, Paul A.; Watkins, Marley W.
 TITLE Program STANDARD (Statistic of Conjoint Multiple Observer Agreement with a Standard).
 PUB DATE 79
 NOTE 19p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Classification; *Computer Programs; *Goodness of Fit; Nonparametric Statistics; Observation; Rating Scales; Reliability; Statistical Analysis; *Tests of Significance
 IDENTIFIERS Interrater Reliability; *STANDARD Computer Program

ABSTRACT

A computer program named Program STANDARD is presented and demonstrated. This program calculates the statistical significance of the overall agreement of the categorical assignments. The program is based on Light's statistic, G, for describing the conjoint agreement of many observers with correct or standard set of classifications on nominal scales. The present documentation includes a description of the program's purposes, input, output, language and processing, limitations and computational formulae. Also provided are instructions for preparing the job deck, a listing of the FORTRAN source deck, order of the card deck for computer processing, and a complete set of sample input and output data. (Author/CTM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Program STANDARD

(Statistic of Conjoint Multiple Observer Agreement with a Standard)

by

Paul A. McDermott

and

Marley W. Watkins

University of Pennsylvania

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul A. McDermott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1979

ED178567

TM009 711

SUMMARY

A computer program named Program STANDARD is presented and demonstrated. This program calculates the statistical significance of the overall agreement of the categorical assignments of two or more observers with a set of true or correct categorical assignments. The present documentation includes a description of the program's purposes, input, output, language and processing, limitations and computational formulae. Also provided are instructions for preparing the job deck, a listing of the FORTRAN source deck, order of the card deck for computer processing, and a complete set of sample input and output data.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION, FEATURES,
AND
COMPUTATIONAL FORMULAE

Description and Features

Introduction. Several measures of response agreement for observers' or raters' classifications on nominal scales appear to be finding increased popularity and a variety of applications among researchers and practitioners. Cohen's (1960) development of the statistic K provided a means to determine the level and significance of the agreement between two observers in their assignments of objects or subjects to nominal scale categories. Later, Light (1971) refined and extended K for use in the situation where multiple (i. e., more than two) observers would be making such assignments and further provided a method for testing the agreement among such multiple observers upon each specific nominal category considered. This multiple observer agreement statistic, known as K_m , was further extended by Fleiss (1971) to the case in which the sets of multiple observers would not remain identical from one case to another.

The several noted response agreement measures share two principal properties in common: first, they make no assumption that any true, correct or standard set of nominal scale classifications might exist against which the classifications offered by the various observers might be evaluated, and second, in cases where versions of K_m are applied, there being more than two observers involved, the classifications of all observers are weighted equally thus rendering a measure of the overall conjoint agreement of the observers with one another and not with any existing correct or standard set of classifications.

However, when considering response agreement among observers in applied and research settings, it is frequently desirable to test the conjoint agreement among observers relative to a standard set of classifications. This is true, for example, whenever it is necessary to assess the categorizing ability of trainee observers in the light of an expert's categorizations or when the classification accuracy of a categorical rating device must be sized up against the conjoint ratings of independent expert observers. For this purpose Light (1971) has defined the statistic G to test the significance of the conjoint agreement of many observers with a correct or standard set of classifications on nominal scales.

G is based upon a special variation of a multiple contingency table routine which first compares the obtained agreement of each of the observers' categorical choices with the standard categorical choice and thereafter compares this obtained level of agreement with what would be expected under the null hypothesis of random assignment of cases to categories. For purposes of testing statistical significance, G is distributed approximately according to the unit normal deviate.

The computer program presented and demonstrated in this paper, known as Program STANDARD, tests the statistical significance of the conjoint agreement of two or more observers with a standard set of classifications based upon Light's (1971) computational formulae for the statistic G .

Input. Each analysis requires four control cards and a data card deck as follows: (1) a title card; (2) a problem card to specify the number of cases being classified, number of categories and number of observers; (3) a pair of standard cards indicating the standard category choices for each case considered; and (4) a set of observer cards, one or two per each observer, specifying observers' category choices for each case.

Output. The information provided for each analysis includes: (1) an alphanumeric job title; (2) number of cases, categories and observers; (3) standard category choices for each case; (4) observers' category choices for each case; and (5) value of the G statistic (see Equation 1 ff., pp. 5-6) and level of statistical significance associated with the unit normal deviate.

Language and Processing. Written in FORTRAN IV, Program STANDARD is compatible with machines in the IBM 360 series. Variables are in mnemonic form according to Light (1971) computational formulae. Input editing and output specifications are provided for user's syntactical errors.

Limitations. Currently Program STANDARD will permit up to 160 cases to be assigned by 100 or fewer observers to a maximum of 10 nominal categories.

Computational Formulae

The Program STANDARD algorithms are as follows:

$$\underline{G} = \frac{\underline{tm} - \underline{E}(\underline{tm})}{(\sum \underline{tm})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sim \underline{N}(0,1); \quad (1)$$

$$\underline{tm} = \sum_{p=1}^{\underline{m}} \sum_{i=j}^{\underline{C}} \underline{n}_{ij}^{(p)}; \quad (2)$$

$$\underline{E}(\underline{tm}) = \frac{1}{\underline{n}} \sum_{i=j}^{\underline{C}} [\underline{n}_{i+} (\sum_{p=1}^{\underline{m}} \underline{n}_{+j}^{(p)})]; \quad (3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{V} \underline{tm} = & \frac{i}{\underline{n} - 1} \sum_{i=j}^{\underline{C}} [\underline{n}_{i+} (\sum_{p=1}^{\underline{m}} \underline{n}_{+j}^{(p)})] + \frac{1}{\underline{n}^2 (\underline{n} - 1)} \underline{Z} \\ & - \frac{1}{\underline{n} (\underline{n} - 1)} \sum_{i=j}^{\underline{C}} [\underline{n}_{i+}^2 (\sum_{p=1}^{\underline{m}} \underline{n}_{+j}^{(p)})] \\ & - \frac{1}{\underline{n} (\underline{n} - 1)} \sum_{i=j}^{\underline{C}} \underline{n}_{i+} (\sum_{p=1}^{\underline{m}} (\underline{n}_{+j}^{(p)})^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and where \underline{Z} in the former equation equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{n}_{1+} [\underline{n}_{1+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) + \underline{n}_{2+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) + \dots \\ & \quad + \underline{n}_{\underline{C}+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+\underline{C}}^{(p)})] \\ & + \underline{n}_{2+} [\underline{n}_{1+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) + \underline{n}_{2+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \underline{n}_{\underline{c}+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+\underline{c}}^{(p)})]$$

$$+ \underline{n}_{\underline{c}+} [\underline{n}_{1+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+\underline{c}}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+1}^{(p)}) + \underline{n}_{2+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+\underline{c}}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+2}^{(p)}) + \dots$$

$$+ \underline{n}_{\underline{c}+} \sum_p (\underline{n}_{+\underline{c}}^{(p)}) (\underline{n}_{+\underline{c}}^{(p)})]. \quad (5)$$

PROGRAM INSTRUCTIONS

AND SOURCE LISTING

Instructions for Preparing Job Deck

The following cards must be prepared:

Card 1:

Title Card--A job title may be punched in columns 1-80

Card 2:

Problem Card--Specifications defined below. All numbers must be right-adjusted.

Columns	Punch
1-3	Number of cases (maximum = 160)
4-5	Number of categories (maximum = 10)
6-8	Number of observers (maximum = 100)

Cards 3 & 4:

Standard Cards--A standard or "correct" category choice must be indicated for each category specified in columns 4-5 of the Problem Card. If the standard category choice for the 1st case is category 1, then punch 1 in column 1. If the standard category choice for the 1st case is category 2, then punch 2 in column 1....If the standard category choice for the 1st case is category 9, then punch 9 in column 1. If the standard category choice for the 1st case is category 10, then punch 0 in column 1. Repeat standard category specifications with each column corresponding to each case specified in columns 1-3 of the Problem Card. Two standard cards must be provided. If the number of cases is less than 81, the second card must be a blank card.

Observer Cards--One or two observer cards must be punched for each case. If the problem calls for more than 80 cases, then two observer cards must be punched for each case. If the observer category choice for the first case is 1, then punch 1 in column 1. Continue as outlined in directions for Standard Cards.

For example: 5 observers classified 10 cases into 3 categories--

(Title)	EXAMPLE PROBLEM
(Problem)	01003005
(Standard 1)	1223332113
(Standard 2)	blank card
(Observer 1)	1233222123
(Observer 2)	3223311112
(Observer 5)	1233211133

Program Source Listing

```
DIMENSION MATRIX(1000,10),SUMROW(10),SUMCLM(10),RATCLM(100,10),
XSUBSIX(100,10),SEVEN1(10),A(10),SEVEN2(10),B(10),NRAW(100,160),
XKEY(160),TITLE(20)
INTEGER TM,RATCLM,NRAW,MATRIX,TITLE
DOUBLE PRECISION PART1,ETM,ONE,TWO,THREE,FOUR,FIVE,SIX,
XSEVEN1,SEVEN2,ZETA,SEVEN3,SEVEN,ETATM,A
DATA TM/0/,ROW/0.00/,COLUMN/0.00/,PART1/0.00/,ETM/0.00/,ONE/0.00/,
XTWO/0.00/,THREE/0.00/,ZETA/0.00/,FOUR/0.00/,FIVE/0.00/,SIX/0.00/,
XSEVEN3/0.00/,SEVEN/0.00/,ETATM/0.00/,G/0.00/,SEVEN1/10*0.00/,
XSUMROW/10*0.00/,SUMCLM/10*0.00/,A/10*0.00/,B/10*0.00/,
XRATCLM/1000*0/,SUBSIX/1000*0.00/,MATRIX/10000*0/
READ(5,1)TITLE
1  FORMAT(20A4)
   READ(5,4)NCASE,NCAT,NRATE
4  FORMAT(13,12,13)
   READ(5,6)KEY
6  FORMAT(80I1,/,80I1)
C THIS READS THE DATA
   DO 9 I=1,NRATE
   READ(5,8)(NRAW(I,J);J=1,NCASE)
8  FORMAT(80I1)
9  CONTINUE
   WRITE(6,800)
800 FORMAT('1',55X,'PROGRAM STANDARD',//,32X,
X'STATISTIC OF CONJOINT MULTIPLE OBSERVER AGREEMENT WITH A STANDARD
X',///// ,40X,'MARLEY W. WATKINS',9X,'AND',9X,'PAUL A. MCDERMOTT',
X//,33X,
X'UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN',10X,'UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA',
X//////////)
   WRITE(6,900)TITLE
900  FORMAT('0',20A4)
   WRITE(6,901)NCASE,NCAT,NRATE
901  FORMAT('0',5X,'WITH',4X,14,2X,'CASES',4X,13,2X,
X' CATEGORIES',4X,14,2X,'OBSERVERS')
   IF(NCASE.GT.160)GO TO 500
   IF(NCAT.GT.10)GO TO 503
   IF(NRATE.GT.100)GO TO 505
   WRITE(6,902)
902  FORMAT('0',///// ,9X,'THE STANDARD CARD WAS READ AS')
   WRITE(6,903)(KEY(J),J=1,NCASE)
903  FORMAT(' ',80I1)
   WRITE(6,904)
904  FORMAT(' ',///// ,9X,'THE FIRST DATA CARD WAS READ AS')
   I=1
   WRITE(6,905)(NRAW(I,J),J=1,NCASE)
905  FORMAT(' ',80I1)
11  CONTINUE
   DO 20 I=1,NRATE
   DO 20 J=1,NCASE
```

```

IF(NRAW(I,J).EQ.0)NRAW(I,J)=10
IF(KEY(J).EQ.0)KEY(J)=10
20 CONTINUE
NO=NCAT * NRATE
C THIS SERIES OF CARDS(N=1 THRU 60) CALCULATES THE CELLS OF
C AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT AND PLACES THEM IN MATRIX
N=1
I=1
M=1
30 IF(I.GT.NCASE) GO TO 40
J=KEY(I)
K=NRAW(N,I)
IF(N.GT.1) J=NCAT * (N-1) + J
MATRIX(J,K)=MATRIX(J,K) + 1
I=I + 1
GO TO 30
40 N=N + 1
M=M + 2
I=1
IF (N.GT.NRATE)GO TO 60
GO TO 30
60 CONTINUE
J=1
I=1
70 IF(I.GT.NCAT) I=1
TM=TM + MATRIX(J,I)
C THIS CALCULATES THE SUM OF DIAGONAL(S)AGREEMENT CELLS)
I=I + 1
J=J + 1
IF (J.GT.NO)GO TO 73
GO TO 70
73 CONTINUE
C CALCULATES THE SUM OF ROW AND TOTAL ROW VALUE
DO 100 I=1,NCAT
DO 100 J=1,NCAT
SUMROW(I)= SUMROW(I) + MATRIX(I,J)
ROW= ROW + MATRIX(I,J)
100 CONTINUE
DO 120 J=1,NCAT
DO 120 I=1,NO
SUMCLM(J)= SUMCLM(J) + MATRIX(I,J)
COLUMN= COLUMN + MATRIX(I,J)
120 CONTINUE
DO 140 I=1,NCAT
PART1 = PART1 + (SUMROW(I) * SUMCLM(I))
140 CONTINUE
ETM= (1./100.) * PART1
ONE=(1./((NCASE-1.)) * PART1
TWO=1./((NCASE**2 * (NCASE-1.))
FOUR=1./((NCASE * (NCASE - 1.))
DO 200 I=1,NCAT
FIVE= FIVE + 3SUMROW(I)**2 * SUMCLM(I)
C CALCULATES Z
200 CONTINUE

```

```

SIX= FOUR * FIVE
DO 240 J=1, NCAT
N=1
I=1
M=1
210 IF (N .GT. NCAT) M=M + 1
IF (N .GT. NCAT) N=1
IF (I .GT. NO) GO TO 240
RATCLM(M, J)= RATCLM(M, J) + MATRIX(I, J)
SUBSIX(M, J)= RATCLM(M, J)**2
I=I + 1
N=N + 1
GO TO 210
240 CONTINUE
L=1
I=1
J=1
K=2
160 IF (L .GT. NCAT) GO TO 180
A(J)= (RATCLM(I, J) * RATCLM(I, L) + RATCLM(K, J) *
XRATCLM(K, L)) * SUMROW(L)
B(J)= B(J) + A(J)
L=L + 1
GO TO 160
180 L=1
J= J + 1
IF (J .GT. NCAT) GO TO 190
GO TO 160
190 CONTINUE
DO 195 I=1, NCAT
ZETA= ZETA + (SUMROW(I) * B(I))
195 CONTINUE
C FINAL CALCULATIONS OF G
THREE= TWO * ZETA
DO 260 J=1, NCAT
DO 260 I=1, NRATE
SEVEN1(J)= SEVEN1(J) + SUBSIX(I, J)
260 CONTINUE
DO 270 I=1, NCAT
SEVEN2(I)= SEVEN1(I) * SUMROW(I)
270 CONTINUE
DO 280 I=1, NCAT
SEVEN3= SEVEN3 + SEVEN2(I)
280 CONTINUE
SEVEN= FOUR * SEVEN3
ETATM= ONE + THREE - (FOUR * FIVE) - SEVEN
G= (TM - ETM)/ETATM**.5
GO TO 599
500 WRITE(6, 501)
501 FORMAT('0', 'NUMBER OF CASES SPECIFIED ON PROBLEM CARD
XIS TOO LARGE')
GO TO 99
503 WRITE(6, 504)
504 FORMAT('0', 'NUMBER OF CATEGORIES SPECIFIED ON PROBLEM

```

```

XCARD IS TOO LARGE')
GO TO 99.
505 WRITE(6,506)
506 * FORMAT('0', 'NUMBER OF OBSERVERS SPECIFIED ON PROBLEM CARD
XIS TOO LARGE')
GO TO 99
599 CONTINUE
IF (ABS(G).GE.3.21)GO TO 740
IF (ABS(G).GE.2.81)GO TO 720
IF (ABS(G).GE.2.58)GO TO 700
IF (ABS(G).GE.1.96)GO TO 680
IF (ABS(G).GE.1.76)GO TO 660
IF (ABS(G).GE.1.65)GO TO 640
IF (ABS(G).LT.1.65)GO TO 600
600 WRITE(6,80)G
80 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- NON-SIGNIFICANT')
GO TO 99
640 WRITE (6,84)G
84 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .10')
GO TO 99
660 WRITE (6,86)G
86 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .08')
GO TO 99
680 WRITE (6,88)G
88 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .05')
GO TO 99
700 WRITE(6,90)G
90 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .01')
GO TO 99
720 WRITE (6,92)G
92 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .005')
GO TO 99
740 WRITE (6,94)G
94 FORMAT('0', '9X, 'G OF', F9.4, '----- P LESS THAN .001')
99 STOP
END

```

Order of Card Deck for Computer Processing

The job deck for each analysis is arranged sequentially as follows:

- A. Computer systems job classification cards.
- B. Program STANDARD source deck.
- C. Computer systems end of source deck card.
- D. Program STANDARD title card.
- E. Program STANDARD problem card.
- F. Program STANDARD standard card 1.
- G. Program STANDARD standard card 2.
- H. Program STANDARD observer card deck.
- I. Computer systems end of job card.

SAMPLE INPUT AND OUTPUT DATA

REFERENCES

Cohen, J.A. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 37-46.

Fleiss, J.L. Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 378-382.

Light, R.J. Measures of response agreement for qualitative data: Some generalizations and alternatives. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 365-377.