
Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8 Final Report December 1982 REVISED JULY 1983 A REMOTE VIEWING EVALUATION PROTOCOL (U) Bv: EDWIN C. MAY Prepared for: DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301 Attention: SG1J DT-5A CONTRACT MDA908-82-C-0034 SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAM FOR GRILL FLAME. RESTRICT DISSEMINATION TO ONLY INDIVIDUALS WITH VERIFIED ACCESS.



CLASSIFIED BY: DT-5A REVIEW ON: 31 December 2002

333 Ravenswood Ave. • Menlo Park, California 94025
(415) 326-6200 • Calgo S. L. T. HOK. • TWX: 910-373-1246

Ational

Overline Not Release 2000/08/08 • CA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

NOT RELEASABLE TO
Paroved For Release 2000/08/08 • CA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

Approved For Release 2000 ACS FFED 0788R001800050001-8

CONTENTS (U)

LIST	OF	ILLU	JSTI	RAT:	IONS	3 (U)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	iii
LIST	OF	TABI	LES	(U)		•		•			•		•	•	•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	iv
I	OB.	JECT:	[VE	(U)		•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1
II	INT	rodu	JCT:	ION	(U)	•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•		2
III	ANA	ALYS	[S I	PRO	FOCC	L	(ប)	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	2
IV	COI	1CLUS	OIE	NS ((U)	•		•	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	13
Apper	ndix	к A	-EV	ALU	ATIC	N	OF	F	'OU	IR	CC	OOF	RDI	NA	ΛTΕ	ER	EN	101	ſΈ	V]	ΕV	JIN	1GS	3 ((U)		•	12
Apper	ndix	к В	-SUN	MMAI	RY C	F	ΕV	ΑL	ŪΑ	TI	.01	1]	ΈC	CHN	Ίζ)UE	E ((U)		•	•			•			•	43
REFEI	RENC	CES ((υ.																									44

Approved For Release 2000 ASSIE D0788R001800050001-8

FIGURES (U)

1	Sample RV Assessment Form (U)	
A-1	Transcript 1 (U)	14
A-2	Transcript 2 (U)	1.5
A-3	Transcript 3 (U)	16
A-4	Transcript 4 (U)	1
A-5	Target Site Hangö (U)	19
A-6	Target Site Fernando de Noronha (U)	20
A-7	Target Site Inverness (U)	21
4-8	Target Site Punkaharin (II)	22

iii

Approved For Release 2006/08/64-ASSIFIED 788R001800050001-8

TABLES (U)

1	Task-Defined Relevance Scale for Target Elements (U)	6
2	Quality Assessment Scale (U)	8
3	Numerical Score Conversion Table (U)	8
A- 1	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Hango (U)	23
A-2	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Inverness (U)	23
A-3	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Fernando de	
	Noronha (U)	24
A-4	Target Element Relevance Ratings for Punkaharju (U)	24
A-5	RV Assessment Forms for Calibration of Remote Viewing (U)	25
A-6	A Rank Ordering of Weighted Averages (U)	41

iv

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

I OBJECTIVE (U)

(U) The objective of this task was to develop an evaluation procedure to assess the relative quality of a set of different remote viewing (RV) responses.

L

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

III ANALYSIS PROTOCOL (U)

- (U) To quantify the analysis procedure, we have divided the task into four separate areas: subject response, target/task definition, quality assessment, and numerical analysis. Figure 1 is a sample RV Assessment Form that has been designed to emphasize the separation of the analysis tasks. Each of the parts of the form are described below.
- (U) The subject's response should be prepared for analysis without any knowledge of either the target site or the overall task. The aim of this method of response preparation is to reduce a possibly redundant, rambling response to a coherent set of concepts. To meet this requirement we have developed a set of initial guidelines to the conceptualization procedure.
- (U) A concept is defined as a paraphrase of a single idea that has been expressed in the RV verbal or drawing response. That coherent idea should not be fragmented into component parts. For example, a response might be of the form, "I see a large, textured, gray building." The single concept that expresses this idea should be "large, textured, gray building," rather than four separate concepts—one for each word in the phrase. Each concept should be entered under the "Transcript Concept" column in the RV Assessment Form.
- (U) For this initial evaluation technique, a particular concept should be used only once in the analysis. (Some weighting factor proportional to concept frequency could be utilized, but, for the initial attempt, only unique concepts are used.) If in the construction of the transcript concept list a concept later in the transcript is a duplicate of an earlier one, it should be so noted by placing the concept number of the original concept in the "D" column.

4

Ä	Begin Time:	line:				1	Ta	Target:					Ì		1	, >	Viewer:					
Ñ	End Time:					ı	Me	Method of Targeting:	f Tar	getin					1	a	Date:					
រុំ	ength o	Length of Session:				l	Sei	Session:							1	J	Class:					
L	Concept Number		Trans	cript	Transcript Concept	ept			Д	G,	Ei	Element of		Target		Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score	PxRxQ	A Score	Normalized Score	ized
	1																		°	0	0.00	
_	83																			-	0.36	
	3																		8	8	0.71	
1	4								-										8	က	1.07	_
NO	5																		4	4	1.43	
OITAU	9																		က	25	1.79	
L EAVT	7	·																	9	ဖ	2.14	
IAIR	80																		8	7	2.50	
SNA9	6																		6	∞	2.86	
! L	10																		9	6	3.21	
1	11																		12	10	3.57	
I	12																		15	11	3.93	
	13																		16	12	4.29	
	14								\dashv										70	13	4.64	
	15																		25	14	5.00	
	* of	Score # of Concepts	0	-	N	e	4- ت	ω	2	x	6	10	11	12 13	3 14		Weig	Weighted Average	erage			
																1						

3

SAMPLE RV ASSESSMENT FORM

FIGURE 1

5

Approved For Release 2009/08/08-05-05-00788R001800050001-8

- (U) To utilize an analysis procedure that is capable of quantitative assessment, it is necessary to define, in advance, what the goals of the assessment are. In the RV Assessment Form, columns "Element of Target" and "Relevance" are provided to clearly define the goal of the analysis. In the ideal situation, an RV target should be completely specified in advance. A target typically consists of a number of target elements, each of which may have varying relevance with regard to the overall RV task. For any given target, an independent list of target elements should be prepared. The selection of what constitutes a target element is left completely to the discretion of the task coordinator. The target element must be selected with little regard to task relevance (target element relevance is accounted for later). Because an RV target consists, in principle, of an essentially infinite number of possible elements, discretion needs to be exercised in the selection process.
- (U) For each target element identified for the site, the task coordinator must define a relevance rating. This rating allows the coordinator to tailor the analysis to the task requirements. Table 1 shows the scale that is used for the target element relevance rating.

Table 1

(U) TASK-DEFINED RELEVANCE SCALE FOR TARGET ELEMENTS (U)

Rating	Relevance Scale
1	A target element of trivial interest
2	A target element of minor interest
3	A target element of intermediate interest
4	A target element of major interest
5	A target element of key interest

Approved For Release 200 18 GLASSIFIED 788R001800050001-8

- (U) For each transcript concept on the RV Assessment Form (Figure 1), the analyst should attempt to find the element on the list of target elements that he/she considers to be the best match. The analyst should be quite liberal in the concept/element matching (i.e., the quality of the match should be considered at this point in the analysis). If he/she is able to identify a target element that might be considered a match to the given concept, a 1 is placed in the "p" (present) column on the assessment form. If no element can be identified, a 0 is placed in the "p" column. After making a target element identification, the selected target element, and its corresponding overall relevance rating should be entered in the appropriate columns on the assessment form.
- (U) Having identified a corresponding target element for each concept, it is now appropriate to assess the quality of the match. The quality assessment is done on the basis of how well the single concept in question matches the selected target element. The judgement is to be made without regard to any other issues, such as importance of the concept to the transcript, or importance (relevance) of the target element to the target. Table 2 shows the quality assessment scale that is used for this part of the analysis. The appropriate quality score from Table 2 is entered in the "Quality" column on the RV Assessment Form for each concept for which a matching target element has been identified.
- (U) An intermediate numerical score is computed for each concept from the relevance and quality (Tables 1 and 2) evaluation as follows:

$$S' = P \times R \times Q$$

where P is the value in the "p" column (0 or 1); R is the relevance evaluation; and 0 is the quality assessment. S' can assume values ranging between 0 and 25. Table 3 demonstrates how to determine the final score, S, for a given value of S' for each concept. The conversion table is

7

II INTRODUCTION (U)

- (U) In addressing the remote viewing (RV) evaluation question, we consider two separate requirements:
 - Absolute evaluation of a single response for a single unknown target.
 - Relative evaluation of a set of responses for a series of known targets.

The first of these is of the most interest in an operational setting. As part of the RV enhancement task, we have considered this problem in two ways. First, by conducting an operational RV session between two calibration RV sessions, a tentative a priori assessment of operational efficacy can be determined. The evaluation is made on the basis of performance during the calibration sessions, and on the basis of adherence to a predetermined session structure.

- (U) A second technique for an a priori evaluation was explored as part of the Fiscal Year 1982 program in an audio-linguistic task. This task provided indications that careful linguistic analysis, when coupled with technical audio analysis, could yield an assessment in the absence of knowledge about the target.
- (U) Various techniques have been used in the past¹ in an attempt to solve the relative evaluation problem. The most common of these was the simple rank ordering of all responses, as assessed against all possible targets used in an experimental series. In this procedure, a judge is presented with n RV transcripts and n target sites. His task is to arrange

2

⁽U) References are listed at the end of this report.

Approved For Release 2000/08/58-CA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

(U)

the transcripts in order of the best to least match for each of the n targets. A simple numerical counting procedure is then used to estimate the likelihood that the judge's transcript/target matches are by chance alone. This early technique contained little systematic structure for determining the final order of matches.

- (S) The first step toward systematizing the rank order judging procedure was to preprocess the raw data in the transcript by "conceptualizing" both the verbal and the pictorial responses. Conceptualizing a transcript requires an analyst to paraphrase the transcript into a list of coherent statements. This concept list is then compared and scored concept-by-concept to each of the targets in the experiment. The resulting scores are averaged for each response, and all responses are rank-ordered on the basis of these scores. This improved analysis procedure was applied to a number of experiments within the Technology Transfer Task for INSCOM in FY 1980.
- (U) The problem with the above technique is that there are no guidelines as to how the analyst should paraphrase the transcript; furthermore, the method in which the concepts are to be assessed against the targets remains undefined. The purpose of the Evaluation Task in FY 1982 was to identify a procedure that corrected these deficiencies.

Table 2
(U) QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE (U)

Rating	Discrimination Scale
1	Poor description; only one or two aspects of the material match.
2	Fair description; a few aspects of the material match, but a large ambiguity exists.
3	Reasonable description; many aspects of the material match, but there remains some ambiguity.
4	Good description; a large number of aspects of the material matches, but it is possible to conceive of material that would be a better match.
5	Excellent description; all or nearly all aspects of the material match.

Table 3

(U) NUMERICAL SCORE CONVERSION TABLE (U)

$S = P \times R \times Q$	Score	Normalized Score
0	0	0.00
1	1	0.35
2	2	0.71
3	3	1.07
4	4	1.43
5	5	1.79
6	6	2.14
8	7	2.50
9	8	2.86
10	9	3.21
12	10	3.57
15	11	3.93
16	12	4.29
20	13	4.64
25	14	5.00

8

(U) used to eliminate the nonuniformly-distributed gaps in scoring numbers that occur if one simply uses the product S'. Thus, the final score for each concept ranges from 0 to a maximum of 14. This conversion table is provided as part of the RV Assessment Form.

- (U) If an assessment of an individual concept is required, the final score for each concept/target-element match can be related to the quality assessment scale by using the conversions shown in the third column of Table 3 and on the assessment sheet. It should be noted, however, that the integer scores are used to simplify the remaining calculations.
- (U) To determine a final evaluation of the complete transcript assessed against a given target, a weighted average of concept scores is computed. To assist in the calculation of the weighted average, a tally box score is provided at the bottom of the RV Assessment Form. For each of the possible scores, 0 through 14, the number of concepts that attained that particular score are counted. For example, if 3 concepts were evaluated with a score of 12, a 3 is entered in the box below the 12 score. If the frequency of occurrence of score S_j is f_j, then the final weighted average is computed by

$$A_{k}' = \Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} X S_{j}/\Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}}$$

$$A_{k} = 0.357 A_{k}'$$

(U) The normalized, weighted average score, \mathbf{A}_k , is entered in the weighted average box on the assessment sheet. The weighted average score has been normalized to be within the range

$$0 \le A_k \le 5.0 \quad .$$

To aid in the interpretation of the result, the quality assessment scale (Table 2) can be used to assess quality of the match between the whole RV response and the given target site.

(U) At this point in the evaluation protocol, the following options are available, depending on the task requirement:

Approved For Release 2010018ASSH51196000788R001800050001-8

(U)

- An n X n rank ordering on the basis of the weighted averages.
- A simple selection of the best match.
- A statistical evaluation on a concept-by-concept basis.

IV CONCLUSIONS (U)

- (S) A protocol has been developed to address the relative evaluation portion of the overall RV transcript assessment problem. As a demonstration of the technique, we provide in Appendix A an analysis of a series of four remote viewings that were performed as calibrations during operational sessions at DIA in December 1981. In this series the remote viewing products were of relatively high quality, but nonetheless require a sensitive technique to differentiate because of the similarity of the targets and, hence, of the descriptions. (The series was chosen primarily for that reason.) Application of the assessment technique resulted in the correct blind matching (highest scoring in matches versus cross matches) of three of the four.
- (U) Appendix B is a one page, step-by-step procedure for the application of this evaluation technique.
- (U) The material in this document thus constitutes an instruction manual or protocol for application of a step-by-step procedure for quantitative assessment of the relative target/transcript correlations of a series of transcripts matched into a series of targets.

Appendix A

EVALUATION OF FOUR COORDINATE REMOTE VIEWINGS (U)

12

Approved For Release 2000/e0/08 CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

- (S) On 14 December 1981, four coordinate remote viewings were conducted as calibrations during an operational remote viewing session targeted on client-designated sites of interest. The calibrations and the operational RV session were conducted at the client's organization and were witnessed by client representatives. These four calibrations were chosen as a test bed for the evaluation procedure for the following reasons, (1) they were conducted in an operational setting, and (2) the targets had many similar features, and would thus provide a sensitive test of the protocol.
- (S) Figures A-1 through A-4 are the transcripts that were presented to the analyst. They are exactly as they were when collected, except that the coordinates have been removed. Figures A-5 through A-8 are the National Geographic magazine targets that were used during the calibration sessions. Finally, the task coordinator provided Tables A-1 through A-4 as target element relevance scales for the four targets in Figures A-5 through A-8. This completes the information that was given to the analyst, and thus the analysis was carried out blind as to the matching target/ transcript pairs.
- (U) Table A-5 is a compilation of the completed work sheets that were used by the analyst in this evaluation. They are shown in groups by session number, and alphabetized on the four targets. (The task coordinator first randomized the transcript order then assigned the session number used above.) For each of the transcripts, the analyst simply included all phrases and all drawings as concepts. For example, seven concepts were found during Session 2.
- (U) All concepts were then analyzed as described in the text. The matching target element, its relevance rating, and the computed score are shown for all possible combinations of transcript/target pairs in Table A-5. The score distributions and their resulting weighted averages are also shown in Table A-5.



Approved For Release 20 40 61 ASSIEFED 0788R001800050001-8 14 Dec81 002 TM Break. 12.40 Augodom
Bsanochy
ad coastal cets
Brigh

FIGURE A-1 TRANSCRIPT 1 (U)

UNCLASSIFIED

14

Approved For Release 24 10 608 ASS FD FD 00788R001800050001-8

14 Dec 81 002 B 3.23

Aolfondoni N 777 Brook.

A straight angles
B -

manoch)

siw

Bundding,

FIGURE A-2 TRANSCRIPT 2 (U)

15

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

002

clouds.
gnown /w rwais of
frozen.
Storing cleffor with ...
Sincl

FIGURE A-3

Jeeling of tom.


16

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

Approved For Release 2000 SGL ASSA E D00788R001800050001-8 10/ Dec81 002 12.46 12.417 A down jassed
B
A flat
B water ? 5.2 green trees and? aals winding river. Jungle. Break A downfup. FIGURE A-4(a) TRANSCRIPT 4 (U)

17



4


desendend L/W interja es

End

FIGURE A-4(b) TRANSCRIPT 4 (concluded) (U)

18

Approved For Release 2000/08/08/2015-PP-00788R001800050001-8 CPYRGHT




UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8 **UNCLASSIFIED**


CPYRGHT



UNCLASSIFIEDApproved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

Approved For Release 3000/68/08 SGAPPP5-00788R001800050001-8

CPYRGHT




21

UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

CPYRGHT

UNCLASSIFIED



22

Table A-1

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR HANGO (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Town	5
Cold	4
Peninsula	5
Rocky	3
Vegetation	2
Bay	3

Table A-2

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR INVERNESS (U)

Target Element	Relevance
City	5
River	4
Bridge	3
River banks	2
Vegetation	1

Table A-3

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR FERNANDO DE NORONHA (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Island	5
Surf	3
Hills	4
Uninhabited	3
Mountain peak	3
Temperate climate	2
Vegetation	2
Ocean	4

Table A-4

(U) TARGET ELEMENT RELEVANCE RATINGS FOR PUNKAHARJU (U)

Target Element	Relevance
Connect lakes	5
Town	4
Bridges	2
Cold	4
Vegetation	1
Islands	4

UNCLASSIFIEDApproved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

Picture 1 Twin church towers 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ed is	Begin Time: Frd Tyme.	 .						Wathod	1	Toyou	mant too		4 6 6 7		ı	2	! :	14 Page		1 6		1
Transcript Concept D P Element of Target Path Pa	a .										1 STR	. Sur.		dinate	s	1	5		14 December 1981	MDer	186		1
ture 1	T.	ength o.	f Sessic	ä					Sessi	: :::			-			1	ជ		В				1
ture 1		Concept		4	anscr	1pt Cc	ncept			Α .	Α.		Element		get		Pance (E)	Quality (Q)	Score	PXRXQ	XQ Bcore	2	
sud down 1 Buildings 5 iky 0 River 4 ture 3 1 River 4 ture 4 1 River 4 tising 1 River 5 stal city 1 River 5 stal city 1 City 5 ords 1 City 5 stal city 2 4 5 o 1 2 4 5 6 o 1 2 3 4 5 6 o 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		1	Pictu								1	T	n church		s		1	1	1	°	0	Ι_	
ture 3 ture 4 ture 5 ture 4 ture 5 ture 5 ture 5 ture 6 ture 7 ture 7 ture 7 ture 7 ture 7 ture 7 ture 8 ture 1 ture 1 ture 1 ture 4 ture 1 tu	1	2	Pictu	1						1										1	1		
ture 3 ture 4 ture 4			Uр апс	wob b	a						-	Bu	Idings				5	1	5	81	2		
1 River 4 1 Twin church towers 1 1 Twin church towers 1 1 River 4 1 River 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </td <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>Rocky</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>3 3</td> <td></td> <td></td>		4	Rocky								0								0	6.3	3 3		
tture 3 tture 4 ttsing ttsi		5	Land/1	water	inte	rface					1	R11	7e r				4	4	12		4 4		
titre 4 titings 1 Buildings 5 tit statal city 1 River 5 istal city 1 City 5 a statal city 1 City 5 a statal city 1 City 5 a statal city 1 City 5		9	Pictu								1	7	in church	1 tower	ža.		1	1	1		5 5		
tising 1 Buildings 5 lift 0 1 River 5 ords 1 River 5 sstal city 1 City 5 nstal city 1 City 5 nstal city 2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 n 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		1	Pictu:				e e				1	Riv	/er	:			4	4	12		9 9		
1 River 5 Satal city 1 City 5 Satal city 5 S		80	Upris	ing							1	Bu	11dings				5	1	5		8 7		
ords 1 River 5 astal city 1 City 5 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		6	Cliff								0					-			0		8		
1 C1ty 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		10	Fjord	œ							1	Ri	/er				5	1	5	10	6 0		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		11	Coast	al ci	ty						1	Ct	ty.				5	4	20	12	01 2		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		12																		15	5 11		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		13						i i												16	6 12		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		14								-										20	0 13		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		15																		25	5 14		
		Sc	ore	0		2	3	4	5	9	7	-					14	77	1			<u> </u>	
2 3 3		Conce	pts	2	5			3	3						2			T am	nanııg		Average		-53

25

UNCLASSIFIED

RV ASSESSMENT FORMS FOR CALIBRATION OF REMOTE VIEWING (U) TABLE A-5

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 - CIA-RDF96-0788R001800050001-8

				_ -	- II	· -		1					<u> </u>	-, -	- ,			·				2.52
	5	2		8 Score	∭°	<u> </u>	1 6		•	ဖ	9	"	«	۰	ع ا	=	; ;	9 9	13	14		ge
•	100	E E	[م	PxBxQ		<u>,</u>	• •	67	4	2	ဖ	∞		٤	2	<u> </u>	9	3 8	20	25		Average
#000	14 December 1001	manar e		Score	۰	•		n =	13	69	ď	,	,		7	3	T	T			. 1	Weighted A
Viewer:	•		-tass:	Quality (0)		,] ,	-1 LC	4	-	63	-	,	,	- 4							Weig
>		4 (د	Rele- Vance	6			9 6	2	2	m		. u	, ,	2			1			14	Ι.
			1														1	T	1		13	-
	8			Target																	12	
	Coordinates			,								and									11	-
i	Coor	-		Element of	S S		Buildings	_		- a		Slope of land									10	
Hangö	lng:	ı		×	Rocks		Build	Rocks	Coast	Church	Bay	Slope	Coast	Ba	City						6	-
H	Method of Targeting:	1		Ъ	1		-	-	7	-	ч	-	-	-	-			†	\dagger		∞	-
	l of T			Q		-															7	
Target:	Kethod	Session:																			9	
•		V 2																			5	2
ł			1	ept																	4	-
				Transcript Concept					ses												3	
				cript					erfa												2	2
12:40				Trans	1	7	имс		Land/water interfaces	8	4				city							7
12		sion:			Picture	Picture	Up and down	ΚÀ	1/wate	Picture :	Picture '	Uprising	5 H.	sp							0	
: ::	=	f Ses			Pic	Pic.	ď	Rocky	Lanc	Pre	Pict	Upri	Cliff	Fjords	Coastal						Score	pts
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:		Concept		8	က	4	5	9	-	80	6	10	11	12	13	14		15	Sci	Jonce
ď	Ø.	1	L	11	I	<u>.</u>	I	i	NO	ITAU	IAVA	TAIR	OSN V	T					1_	_]		# of Concepts

26

UNCLASSIFIED

Table A-5 (continued)

Table A-5 (continued)

15

14

ដ

7

Ħ

2

TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION

S

ಣ

Concept

27

Approved For Release 2000/08/08: CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

			<u></u>	<u>. 11</u>	 r	 -T	 -T			T		· - T		 1	 T	 T	1				0.00
	1981			Score	٥	-	63	6	*	S	9	-	80	•	01	17	3 12	0 13	5 14	Average	1 9
	ember		L	PxBxQ	°	-	63	<u></u>	4	•	•	∞	6	2	12	12	16	20	25		
#005	14 December 1981	æ		Score	0		4	0	13	0	6	0	0	5	10					To ich tod	1811161
Viewer:	Date:	Class:		Quality (Q)			1		4		8			п	က					15	\$
Vie	Dat	CIS	Rele-	Vance (R)			4		S		5			Z.	4					3 14	
	,	1 1																			_
				Target									İ							112	_
	Coordinates			of Tau					lakes		akes			akes						11	
	pordi										ed 1			ted 1						10	-
nj.	ರ	1		Element			u.		Connected		Connected lakes			Connected lakes	Town					6	,
Punkaharju	1.196))					Town		တ		පි			8	T					8	
Pur	arget	.		Ъ	0	0	-	0	1	0	1	0	0	H					<u> </u>	7	
••	#	::	-	Α		1													_	9	
Target:	Method of Targeting:	Session:																		5	╁
H	1	i va																		7	
			1	Concept																3	١.,
									ace											2	† ,
				Transcript					nterf												†
12:40				Tran	٦,	83	down		Land/water interface	6	4	50			city					0	
12		Session:			Picture	Picture	Up and down	Rocky	nd/wa	Picture	Picture	Uprising	Cliff	Fjords	Coastal						
	i ¥ .	Ses			Pic	Pic	ď'n	P _o	Lai	Ĭ	Pid	h h	C	F	8	_			-	Score	100
Boorin Time.	DOKIN TIME.	Length of		Concept Number	н	8	m	4	5	9	-	∞	6	97	=	2	2	7	: 2		# of Concepts
Bog	39 4	ן, הות היים	L	రికే	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	EAVIN	L	1000	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	Ц		3	ψ.

Table A-5 (continued)

28

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00788R001800050001-8

	1											· ·		т—							– 7	5	4.13
	186			BCOLE	0	1	23	က	4	က	9	2	∞	Ľ	ا م	의	=	12	13	1,4		ege -	-
2	per 1		5,870	N. W.	°	-	2	က	4	တ	φ	&	6		2	12	15	16	20	90	63	Average	
#005	14 December 1981	В		2 2 2 3 3	10	5	10	14	14	13	13											Weighted A	- 1
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality	(g)	د	1	ဗ	ស	သ	4	4											Weis	
V1	B	ជ	Rele-	æ	4	5	4	5	5	5	ເດ											14	2
i	1	ı																				13	2
				Target																		12	
	nate			뜅																		11	
	Coordinate			Element	River bank	Buildings	Ħ	អូ	Bui 1dings													10	2
Inverness	- 1	2		E3	Rive	Bui1	River	River	But 1	City	City											6	
Inve	Method of Targeting:		=	Ч	1		1	-	1	1	1										_	∞	
	of Ta	::		Δ								_	-	1			-	_	-	-	_		
Target:	ethod	Session:																	ł			9	
E	黑	Ø													'						ļ	5	2
		1		ept																		7	2
				Transcript Concept																		3	2
				script		les																2	
15:23				Trans	1	angles			on bo														
15			session:		Mcture	Straight	Picture	River	But 1dings	Wan-made	London											0	
 Si	 				Pic	Str	Ā	E	2	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	1		_	_		_	_		_	_	——	Score	pts
Rooin Time:	End Time:		Length of	Concept	1	8		, ,	r (c	,	, ,	- '	2	6	10	:	:	2	2	14	15	Sc	Jonce
Reg	Rud Rud		5 [ŏ *	IL	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	-i	NOIT.	AULAV	a ra	LEOS I	ENAS	IT.	.L			!	L			# of Concepts

Table A-5 (continued)

29

Approved For Release 2000 65-25-25-20788R001800050001-8

Class: 14 Dece Class: B Class: B Class: B S 3 2 6 5 1 5 1 5 5 1 5 1 4 13 5 3 11 5 3 11 5 4 13	Class: 14 (9) (1) (1) (2) (2) (3) (4) (5) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7
	14 December 1981 B B 17 Score 5 0 0 5 1 1 5 1 2 18 8 8 8 8 8 10 10 10 10 10 20 20 20 20 20 2
	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1

Table A-5 (continued)

30

				n · · · ·	1		· · · · · · ·		,				,	.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			T		0.22
	1		Score	٥	-	8	ო	*	20	9	2	∞	6	10	11	12	13	14		_
İ	198		PXRXQ	•	_	N	ო	4	10	ဖ	∞	6	ន	12	15	16	20	25		Average
#005	14 December 1981	В	Score	0	0	5	က	0	0	0										Weighted A
Viewer:	Date: 14	' '	Quality (Q)			t	1													Wei
.*	Ã	Ö	Rele- vance (R)			ro	3								,				14	
Fernando de Noronha	ing: Coordinate	2	Element of Target			Island	Ocean												3 9 10 11 12 13	
Ferna	arget		ď	0	0	1	1	0	0	0									8	
	of T	 	Δ																7	
Target:	Method of Targeting:	Session:																	5 6	
																			4	
1		١	Concept																3	
																			2	
	ł		Transcript		gles															2
15:23			Pr.	e 1	ht an	e 2		ngs	de										0	5
		Session:		P1 cture	Straight angles	Picture	River	Buildings	Man-made	London									Score	ipts [
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of	Concept Number	1	2	3	4	ĵ.	9	7	œ	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	Sc	# of Concepts
ă	Ø	Z	<u>. </u>		L		L	NO)ITAU	EAVI	Tqia	I	T.		1			_		# of

Table A-5 (continued)

31

Approved For Release 2000 10 6 A \$ \$ 5 5 5 0 788 R001800050001-8

																				2.11
	=		Score	0	1	N	က	4	eo.	9	7	∞	6	10	11	12	13	41		age
	14 December 1981		PXBXG	0	1	2	က	4	2	ဖ	∞	6	10	12	15	16	20	25		Average
#005	сешре	В					·			I		Γ ·	1	1			1	1	1	ted
	14 De		Score	2	2	2	6	13	12	01										Weighted
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	1	1	1	2	5	4	က										W.
.*	Ä	ບ	Rele- vance (R)	2	7	2	5	4	4	4									14	
1	ı	l t																-	13	
			çet																12	1
	nate		Target																11	
	Coordinate		nt of																10	1
ą,	٥	8	Element	Bridge	Bridge	Bridge	Lakes	r,	'n	'n.									6	1
Punkahar ju	ing:			PF	Br	Br	Lal	Town	Town	Тожп									8	
Pun	Method of Targeting:		Q,	1	1	ī	1	1	1	1									7	
	of T	اۃ	Ω																9	
Target:	thod	Session:																	5	1
Ţ	ž	Se																		-
			4				ŀ												4	T
			Concept																3	Н
			pt C																2	1
			Transcript		les														-1	3
15:23		ا		1	it ang	2	Ì	gs	u u										0	
1		Session:		Picture	Straight angles	Picture 2	River	Buildings	Man-made	London									Score	epts
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of	Concept Number	1	7	8	4	2	9	7	œ	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	(V)	# of Concepts
8	En	Le		<u>_</u>			. 1	NC)ITAU	EAVE	RIPT	ович	IT.	1		1	I			# of

Table A-5 (continued)

32

#ethod of Targeting:	Begin Time:			13:13				Targ	Target:		Inverness	SSS				-	Viewer:	#005	22		
Transcript Concept D P Element of Target Target								Meti	to bot	Targ	eting		oordin	ates		_	Date:	14 Dec	ember	1981	
Columb C	굣	f Sess	ton:					Sess	ion:			8				Ū	Class:		B		
lacture 1 lacture 2 lacture 3 Little on water Little on water <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>T I</th><th>ransc</th><th>ript (</th><th>Concep</th><th>پ</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>-</th><th>Elem</th><th>ent of</th><th>1 1</th><th></th><th>Rele- vance (R)</th><th>-</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>•</th></t<>			T I	ransc	ript (Concep	پ				-	Elem	ent of	1 1		Rele- vance (R)	-				•
diges 1 River 4 4 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 4 <td>ı — †</td> <td>Pic</td> <td>ture]</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>3ui1di</td> <td>ngs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>ļ</td> <td></td>	ı — †	Pic	ture]	-						1	1	3ui1di	ngs			2	1	5		ļ	
1		Lan	d/wate	er int	terfac	9				1	щ	liver				4	4	12			
auth 1 ups and downs 1 Indication 5 1 6 4 4 coky 1 Church 2 1 2 1 4 4 coky 0 American 5 1 2 6 7 1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>Rid</td><td>ges</td><td></td><td></td><td>İ</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		Rid	ges			İ				0								0			
1		Sma	11 ups	s and	downs						H	3ui 1di	ngs			2	1	5			
ocky. 0		လျှ	70							1	I	ocati	on			က	1	3			
cocky 1 Buildings 5 1 5 1 6 6 6 6 7 cocken 0 1 Buildings 5 1 5 1 5 8 7 cocken 0 1 City 5 4 13 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 11 10		Pic		83						1		Aurch				2	1	2			
toture 3 1 cture 4 toture 4 <td>_</td> <td>Roc</td> <td>ky</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	_	Roc	ky							0								0			
toture 4 toture 4 total colspan="6">total		Pic								1	H	3ui 1di	ngs			2	1	2			
rozen 0 1 0 10 9 seling of town Liff on water 1 City 5 4 13 12 10 Lift on water A weighted Average		Pic								-								0			_
eeling of town Liff on water Liff on water Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8">Colspan="8" Colspan="8">		Fro	zen							0								0	1		
11 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15		Fee	ling c	of tow	u.					1		City				2	4	13	17		
16 12 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15		C11	ff on	water	£ı					1	H	liver	bank			1	1	1	1		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average																			1		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average																			8		
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Weighted Average																			[7]		1
neighted average	× ×	ore	0	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	-		1	1	14	93	ighter	i i	000	L
4 6 1 1 2 3	77	pts	4	9	1	-	2	3						1	1		K	181116	- 1	1 480	

Table A-5 (continued)

-	Begin Time:	tme:	13	13:13			1	T.	Target:		Напдо					٠	Viewer:	9#	#005			
•	End Time:	 					ı	Me.	Method of Targeting:	f Tai	rgeti	29	Coordinates	nates		-	Date:	14 De	14 December 1981	198		
. •	Length of Session:	of Sess	ion:				ī	Ses	Session:				က			-	Class:	В	_			
	Concept Number			ransc	Transcript Concept	Conce	t			Δ	£,	E	Element of	f Target	et.	Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score		PxRxQ	Score	
	1	Pic	Picture	1							1	Rocks	w			က	82	9	и— П	0	0	
	8	Lan	nd/wate	er in	Land/water interface	6					1	Peni	Peninsula			2	4	12	 Т	-	-	
	8	Rid	Ridges								1	Rocks	80			က	7	9	1	83	83	
	4	Sma11	11 ups	and	downs						1	Rocks	s			က	83	9	I	6	₆	
NO	သ	Co1d	g						$\neg \dagger$	\dashv	-	Location	tion			4	4	12	I	44	•	
ITAU	9	Pic	Picture 2	2							-	Church	ch			83	-	63	I	22	63	
EAVI	7	Rocky	ky								-	Rocks	20			က	22	=	I	9	9	
TAIRC	8	Pic	Picture 3								1	Slop	Sloping rocks	83		ო	83	9	1	∞	~	
SNAA	6	Pic	Picture 4							-	0							0	I	6	60	
L	10	Frozen	zen									Location	tion			4	4	12		or	6	
	11	Fee	Feeling of	of town	E							Town				5	2	14	L	12	2	
	12	Cliff	티	water							-	Slopi	Sloping rocks	83		3	2	9	I	15	11	
	13		İ															_	I	16	12	
	14																			20	13	
	15																			25	4.	
	Sc	Score	0		2	3	7	5	9	1	88	6	10 1	11 12	2 13	177]	1]	
Jo	# of Concepts	pts	-	-	,		\ ,	1		T				4	┥		Wei	Weighted		Average	2	.65
			1	-		\dashv	~	7	2					1 2		-						

Table A-5 (continued)

Begin Time:							٠							İ		•					1
End Time:							Method of Targeting:	l of T	arget	ing:		Coordinates	nates			Date:	14 Dec	December 1981	1981		
gth o	Length of Session:				ı	02	Session:	į			3			1		Class: _		В			
Concept Number		Tran	scrip	Transcript Concept	cept			Ω	Δ,		lemen	Element of Target	arget		Rele- vance	Quality (Q)	Score		PxBxQ	Score	
-	Picture 1	-							-1	Hills	ls.				4	8	7		0	0	
8	Land/water interface	ter i	nterf	ace					1	Island	and				2	4	13		7	-	
က	Ridges								1	Hills	ls				4	2	13		N	83	
4	Small ups and downs	ips an	d down	ns					1	Hills	ls				4	3	12		8	6	
ro.	Cold								0								0		4	•	
9	Picture	73							1	Peak	¥				3	3	8		ro.	ın	,
7	Rocky								1	Sho	Shoreline			,	က	8	9		ဖ	9	
8	Picture	3							1	Hills	sı				4	3	10		6 0	7	
6	Picture	4							1	Surf					8	1	က		6	œ	
10	Frozen								0								0		10	6	
11	Feeling	oţ	town						0								0		112	10	
12	Cliff on	n water	er						1	Hills	Ъу	sea			4	2	13		1.5	11	
13																			16	12	
14																		! 	20	13	
15																		 	25	14	
	Score	0	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	∞	6	10		12	13 14		1 2 2				
of Con	Concepts	r	,	٠	·		c	-	,	-		,		,		 	weignled		Average	age	2.49

Table A-5 (continued)

																				2.42
	31		Score	0	1	2	က	4	40	9	7	80	6	10	11	12	13	14		ege age
2	14 December 1981		PXRxQ	0	1	83	မ	4	2	9	∞	6	10	12	15	16	20	25		Average
#005	ecemp	м	<u>, </u>																1 1	
	14 D		Score	2	13		12	12	4	°	4	٥	12	13	0					weignted
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	1	4	83	4	4	1		1		4	5					,	×
Ā	ä	ວ	Rele- vance (R)	5	5	4	4	4	4		4		4	4					14	
ı	١	1																	13	2
	į, Ω		Target																12	m
1	Coordinates	Ì	of Ta	akes	akes												l		11	
	Coord		Element	red 1	red 1	<u>sq</u>	<u>s</u>	no	81		8		uoı						10	
Punkharaja	;;	e	Ble	Scattered lakes	Scattered lakes	Islands	Islands	Location	Islands		Islands		Location	Town					6	
Punkh	Method of Targeting:		Д,																8	
	Tar				1	1		1	1	0	1	0	I	1	0			 -	7	
Target:	bod o:	Session:																-	9	
Tary	Met	Sest																	5	-1
																			4	4
			oncept																3	
			ipt Con		face		WILE									 - -			2	1
<u>87</u>			Transcript		inte		and do							town	water				1	3
13:13		į	#	re 1	water	SQ.	sdn		re 2		re 3	re 4	я	ng of	ä				0	ω
_		Session:		Picture	Land/water interface	Ridges	Small ups and downs	Co1d	Picture 2	Rocky	Picture	Picture	Frozen	Feeling	Cliff				re	ts
Begin Time:	ine:		tă t				4	ı,	9	2		6	10		12	13	11	15	Score	# of Concepts
Begin	End Time:	Length of	Concept Number		2	က	4			Ľ,				11						f Co
		-						N	OITA	EAVIY	TqI	VANSCI	AT							#

Table A-5 (continued)

																				1.21	
	981		Bcore		-	63	က	•	3	9	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14		age	
~1	nber 1		Px8xQ	٥		67	m	4	40	9	•	6	10	12	15	16	20	25]	Average	
#005	14 December 1981	В	Score	0	8	10	12	60	87	۰	0		8	12	8	6	13	64		Weighted	
Viewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (0)		1	3	4	က	1				1	4	1	5	2	1		Wei	
•	Ã	Ö	Rele- vance		2	4	4	1	2				2	4	73	2	4	8	17	1	-
l		1 1																	13	1	
			Target																12	2	
	nates		of Ta		nk				. 80										= =====================================		
	Coordinates		Blement		Sloping bank		Ł	m	River banks					•	_	_			10	-	
Inverness	ı		EI		Slop	Area	River	Grass	Rive				Banks	River	Banks	Trees	River	Trees	6	-	
Inve	Method of Targeting:		- d	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0		1	1	1	-	H	7	∞		
	of Ta		Q									2								<u> </u>	4
Target:	thod	Session:							·										9	ļ	
Ë	ž	Se																	5	2	1
ı	ı	1	pt																7	2	-
			Conce											Se					3	2	
			Transcript Concept					ł						erfac					2	2	
12:46			Trans	ged			Ì			İ	еy			Land/water interfaces	يو		lver		1	5	
		sion:		Down jagged	Picture 1		er	ua	Picture 2	Down/up	Deep valley	Picture 3	-	1/wate	Descending	S.	Winding river	.1e	0	3	
E	<u> </u>	of Ses		Dow	Ъ	Flat	Water	Green	Pic	Down	Deep	Pic	Down	Lanc	Desc	Trees	Wind	Jungle	Score	epts	
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of Session:	Concept Number	1	77	8	4	22	9	7	80	6	92	11	12	13	14	15	S	# of Concepts	
ď	Ñ	Ä	<u></u>	1	L	1	1	NO	ITAU	EAVI	TAIR	DENA9	T T	1			!]		Jo#	

Table A-5 (continued)

			Score		T	8		T.	20	9	<u> </u>	T	Т-	-	1	 	T	T	ا ا	1.38
	10s		PXRXQ Sc		-	"	3	4	5	9	8	6	6	10	11	17	13	14	-	Average
#005	14 December 1981	В	<u> </u>	II	1	<u> </u>	<u></u>		<u> </u>				2	1 2	13	16	8	25]	Aveı
	14 D		Score	9	٣	6	2	6	"	•			က	13	m	7	. 6	9		Weighted
Υιewer:	Date:	Class:	Quality (Q)	3	6	}	4		_				-	4	-	4	1	8		Weig
ج .	Я	0	Rele- vance	3	8	8	3		က				က	5	8	2	3	2	14	
1												_							13	,
	ates		Target																12	
	Coordinates		¥	ocks	ocks				ocks				cks		cks				11	
	ပိ	4	Element	Sloping rocks	Sloping rocks			1	Sloping rocks				Sloping rocks	Peninsula	Sloping rocks				10	,
Hangö	<u> </u>		E	Slop	Slop	Bay	Bay		Slop				Slopi	Penin	Slopi	Trees	Bay	Trees	6	
	Method of Targeting:		A.	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0		-	1	1	1	-	7	∞	
	of T	 	Α									2							7	
Target:	ethod	Session:																	9	^
H	×	ŭ																	5	
ı	1	1	pt							·									7	~
			Conce	İ										ŭ					٣	-
			Transcript Concept											Land/water interfaces					2	,
12:46			Trans	ged							ey			r inte	50		lver		1	ıc
		Session:		Down jagged	Mcture 1		r l	E .	Picture 2	dn/	Deep valley	ure 3		/wate	Descending	ß	Winding river	le	0	~
를 :				Down	Pre	Flat	Water	Green	Pict	Down/up	Deep	Picture	Dоwn	Land	Desc	Trees	Wind	Jungle	Score	ots
Begin Time:	End Time:	Length of	Concept Number	-	83	8	4	2	9	7	o	6	9	=	12	13	14	15	Scc	# of Concepts
×	Ä	, i						1) J

Table A-5 (continued)

tion g hills g hills tion tion tion tion tion				get: Fernando de Noronha hod of Targeting: Coordi sion: 4	rernando de Targeting:	ting:		Noronha Coordinates 4	tes	1 1 1:	Vi	Viewer: Date: Class:	#002 14 December B	mber 1	1981	
ture 1 tt tt tr cen cen cen cen ture 2 ture 2 n/up p valley p valley cending cending cending cending cen ding river cen cen cen cen cen cen cen c	Transo	Transcript Concept	ept		Q	d,	Ø	lement of	Target	æ >	Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score	PxBxQ	Score	
Picture 1	wn jagged						H1118	/0			4	ဗ	10	0	٥	
Flat Water Crean						r-1	H1118		·		4	4	12	-	1	
Water 1 Ocean Green 1 Vegetation Picture 2 1 Hills Down/up 1 Hills Picture 3 2 1 Picture 3 2 1 Down 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Winding river 1 Vegetation Jungle 1 Vegetation	at					•							0	87	23	
Picture 2 Hills Down/up 1 Hills Down/up 1 Hills Down/up 1 Hills Down Down 1 Sloping hills Down Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Trees 1 Vegetation Docan Jungle 1 Vegetation Docan Doming river 1 Ocean Docan Doming river 1 Ocean Docan Doming river 1 Ocean Docan Doming river Docan	ter					-	Осев	ı			4	4	12	က	3	
Down/up 1 Hills Down/up 0 Hills Picture 3 2 2 Down 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Winding river 1 Vegetation Jungle 1 Vegetation	een			i			Vege	ation			2	3	9	4	Þ	
Down/up 1 Hills Picture 3 2 2 Picture 3 2 1 Down 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Winding river 1 Vegetation Jungle 1 Vegetation						п	H1118				4	1	4	S	2	
Deep valley 0	dn/um	i					H1118				4	1	4	9	9	
Down 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Vegeta	ep valley					0							0	&	7	
Down 1 Sloping hills Land/water interfaces 1 Island 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation					23									6	8	
Land/water interfaces 1 Island Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Winding river 1 Ocean Jungle 1 Vegetation	um					1	Slopi	ng hills			4	1	4	10	6	
Descending 1 Sloping hills Trees 1 Vegetation Winding river 1 Ocean Jungle 1 Ocean 1 Ocean	nd/water in	terfaces				_	Islaı	Ę			5	4	13	12	10	
Trees	scending						Slop	ng hills			4	1	4	15	11	-
Winding river 1 Ocean Jungle 1 Vegetation	ses					1	Veget	ation			2	5	6	16	12	
Jungle 1 2 2 7 6 0 10 11 12 13 1	nding river					1	0cea1	1			4	2	7	20	13	
0 0 7 2 3 7 6 0 0	ngle					-	Vege	ation			2	5	6	25	14	
T 71 11 01 6 0 7 0 6 h 6 7 1	0 1	2 3	7	5	9	7	6 8	10 1	1 12	13	14					
# of Concepts 2 4 1 2 3 2 1 1 2 1 2 1	2			2	-1	-	2	1	2	-		weı	weighted	Average	age	2.22

Table A-5 (continued)

Prof. Time.	. Method of Targeting:	of Tar	veet	ne: Coordinates	ğ	Date:	14 December 1981	iber 19	81
				ı			٩		
ength o	Length of Session:			4	3	Class:	٩		
Concept Number	Transcript Concept	a	<u>a</u>	Element of Target	Rele- vance (R)	Quality (Q)	Score	PXRXQ	Score
1	Down jagged		0				0	0	٥
2	Picture 1		1	Islands	4	ဗ	10	-	-
3	Flat		н	Area	4	က	10	83	8
4	Water		1	Lakes	5	4	13	က	အ
s	Green		0				0	4	4
9	Picture 2		1	Lake bottoms	5	1	ಬ	ß	2
7	Down/up		1	Lake bottoms	5	1	ro	9	9
8	Deep valley		-	Lake bottoms	5	1	2	6 0	7
6	Picture 3	7					·	6	8 0
10	Down		п	Lake bottoms	2	1	2	10	6
11	Land/water interfaces		1	Lakes	5	4	13	12	2
12	Descending		1	Islands	4	1	4	15	77
13	Trees		1	Trees	2	4	7	16	173
. 14	Winding river		1	Connected lakes	ß	83	6	20	13
15	Jungle		-	Trees	23	H	81	25	14

Table A-5 (concluded)

Weighted Average

40

(U) Two types of overall assessment were chosen to emphasize the versatility of the evaluation procedure, (1) a simple rank ordering based on weighted average scores, and (2) a concept-by-concept, non-parametric, statistical technique. Table A-6 shows the results of the first method, the rank ordering. For convenience, the correct matches are underlined.

Table A-6

(U) A RANK ORDERING OF WEIGHTED AVERAGES (U)

Session/Target	Inverness	Hangö	Fernando de Noronha	Punkaharju
2	4.13*	2.72	0.22	2.11
3	1.12	2.65	2.49	2.42
4	1.21	1.38	2.22	2.21
1	1.53	2.52	2.36	0.90

^{*}Scores computed with non-uniform target relevance factors.

- (U) From Table A-6, we see that there were 3 first-place matches and 1 fourth-place match. The probability of obtaining 3 of 4 possible first-place matches from chance fluctuations alone are less than 0.051. The point spread between the best match (Inverness) and the worst match (Punkaharju) are in qualitative agreement with a subjective "first look" at the quality of the transcripts as well.
- (U) The second analysis determines the significance of the difference between the correct concept/target matches and a control set of matches. All concept/target matches that are not the correct matches act as an internal control set. To avoid any invalid assumptions as to the correct parent distribution, a non-parametric statistical test, the Mann-Whitney U-Test, was chosen for the analysis.

Approved For Release 2000 66-ASSLF 50-0788R001800050001-8

- (U) It is beyond the scope of this report to review the details of the Mann-Witney U-Test; thus, only the results are quoted here. The probability that the set of correct concept/target matches is statistically indistinguishable from the control concept/target matches is less than 0.071.
- (U) There are a number of additional statistical procedures that could be used to analyze the results of this evaluation technique. The two cited above, however, represent a spread in complexity that demonstrates the internal consistency of the basic evaluation procedure. With only four similar RV sessions, the evaluation technique nearly reached the 0.05 level of statistical significance with each of the two statistical procedures, a result indicating a successful outcome with regard to the overall assessment procedure.

Appendix B

(U) SUMMARY OF EVALUATION TECHNIQUE (U)

Step	Action
1	Task coordinator defines the evaluation goal. He/she identifies target elements and assigns target element relevance factors as appropriate.
2	Analyst conceptualizes responses and prepares an RV assessment sheet for each response.
3	Repeated concepts are noted in the "D" column.
4	Copies of the sheets from Item 2 are made; one for each possible target used in the analysis.
	FOR EACH POSSIBLE RESPONSE/TARGET COMBINATION:
5	Identify a target element for each concept not marked in the "D" column; mark a l in the "p" column and write the target element and its relevance factor from Step l in the appropriate columns. (Write 0 and blanks if no element can be found.)
6	Using Table 3, assign a quality rating for all present $(p = 1)$ concept/element combinations.
7	Compute the score as follows:
	a. Calculate relevance (R) X quality (Q)
	b. Convert R X Q to an integer between 0 and 14 using the conversion table provided.
8	Enter the number of concepts that obtained each possible score in the space provided.
9	Calculate the weighted average using:
	$A_{k} = 0.357 \left[\Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} S_{j} / \Sigma f_{j} \sqrt{f_{j}} \right]$
	where: S, is the score and f, is the number of concepts that obtained score ${}^{\rm j}$
	$j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, 14$
10	For each response, rank order the weighted averages.

43

REFERENCES (U)

- 1. H. E. Puthoff and R. Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances: Historical Perspective and Recent Research," Proc. IEEE, Vol. 64, No. 3, pp. 329-354 (March 1976).
- 2. C. Scott, "On the Evaluation of Verbal Material in Parapsychology:
 A Discussion of Dr. Pratt's Monograph," <u>J. Soc. Psych. Res.</u>, Vol. 46,
 No. 752, pp. 79-90 (June 1972).
- 3. R. Targ, H. E. Puthoff, and E. C. May, "State of the Art in Remote Viewing Studies at SRI," Technical Session on Research in Psychoenergetics, Proc. 1977 IEEE International Conf. on Cybernetics and Society, Washington, D.C. (September 20, 1977).
- 4. S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, pp. 116-120 (McGraww-Hill, 1956).

44