

Case Study 5*for February 26*

You get an email from a friend working at a law firm:

Regarding statistics, quick question, if I may. I'm working with a 0.41 correlation between a witness's certainty in their identification of a suspect and their being correct. The authors of the study I'm using say this equates to 70% of those above average being correct and 30% of those below average being correct. Does that sound right to you? And what does that mean overall? Given a 0.41 correlation, are 70% of all witnesses are correct or is the number lower than that?

Does that question make sense? Specifically, I'm looking at language from this article (http://www.psychology.iastate.edu/~glwells/Wells_articles_pdf/Manson_article_in_LHB_Wells.pdf) on pages 11-12 (paragraph that starts on 11 and ends on 12). The paper is also available on the class website.

Explain how the paper interprets the correlation value and computes these percentages. Does it make sense? Why or why not? How would you answer your friend?

The paper is also available on the course website.

Group 1:		Group 2:		Group 3:	
Name	Email	Name	Email	Name	Email
Cindy Houser	house109	Ying Lu	luxxx255	Qing Mai	maixx034
Yi Yang	yang1138	Shu Ding	dingx099	Xiao Zhong	zhong072
Changqing Ye	yexxx058	Danning Li	lixx0700	Eric Graalum	graal002
Gang Cheng	chen2285	Ran Song	songx162	Shanshan Ding	dingx056
John Zobel	zobe0025	Teng Zhang	zhang620	Jing Yang	yang1387
Lingzhou Xue	xuexx041	Andy Wang	wang1074	Chun Pu Song	songx183
Heng Zhang	zhang440	Yi Wang	wangx857	Ka Young Park	parkx748
		Wei Qian	qianx029		

The chair for this week is Craig Rolling.

Students with a "bye" week are: Pamela Sweeney, David Zepeda.