File 20080703.2220: (for the comlab student conference) Why study a failure? Statistical idea: the problem of nonignorable nonresponse. [1, 3, 2] WWII, British aircraft getting shot up over Berlin. Those German dudes, they were *good* at integrated air defence. The rest of the world didn't catch up with them for at least ten years. When you send out a normal survey, say asking a thousand people what flavour of ice cream they like, you expect a certain number of non-responses. They won't affect the results, right? Well, in some cases, wrong. Sometimes it's the responses you don't see that tell you more about the problem.

That's why I'm studying this problem: (hangs head) our project was one of the ones that didn't make it back.

References

[1] M. Mangel and F. J. Samaniego. Abraham Wald's work on aircraft survivability. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79:259–267, 1984.

[2] Howard Wainer. Eelworms, bullet holes, and Geraldine Ferraro: Some problems with statistical adjustment and some solutions. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 14(2):121–140, Summer 1989.

[3] Abraham Wald. A method of estimating plane vulnerability based on damage of survivors. Technical Report CRC 432, CRC, July 1980.