Table 11.7.2.2: Results from unpublished document cited in **Error! Reference source not found.**, showing Hillis and Berbaum attributed sample sizes for RRRC, FRRC and RRFC, last three columns for the two datasets. According to these results the VanDyke dataset indicates much larger sample sizes than the Franken dataset, which is the opposite conclusion to that evident from Table 11.7.2.1 and Table 11.9.1. The explanation for the discrepancy is the overestimate of the Franken dataset effect-size and the underestimate of the VanDyke dataset effect-size. J = 5

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dataset** | **d** | **RRRC** | **FRRC** | **RRFC** |
| VD | 0.03 | >2000 | 526 | >2000 |
|  | 0.05 | 833 | 191 | 933 |
| FR | 0.03 | 526 | 294 | 526 |
|  | 0.05 | 190 | 107 | 190 |

The values in Table 11.7.2.2 can be reproduced by the book code, *provided one uses the specified effect-sizes* in Table 11.7.2.2 *and* uses the appropriate PROPROC generated variance components (see footnote below on an R file for checking the book code vs. the values in the Hillis and Berbaum document). In the author's judgment, the differences are due to the effect-sizes for the Franken dataset in Table 11.7.2.2 being greatly in excess of the observed value (0.011) and well outside the confidence interval. In contrast, the value 0.03 in Table 11.7.2.2 is likely an underestimate of the VanDyke dataset postulated effect-size, where the observed effect size was 0.044.