DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 335 TM 025 759

AUTHOR	Schafer, William D.; And Others
TITLE	Intersection Point Confidence Intervals as an Alternative to the Johnson-Neyman Technique.
PUB DATE	9 Apr 96
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996). Small print in tables may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Criteria; *Estimation (Mathematics); *Predictor Variables; *Regression (Statistics)
IDENTIFIERS	*Confidence Intervals (Statistics); *Johnson Neyman Technique

ABSTRACT

An alternative is proposed for the Johnson-Neyman procedure (P. O. Johnson and J. Neyman, 1936). Used when heterogeneous regression lines for two groups are analyzed, the Johnson-Neyman procedure is a technique in which the difference between the two linear regression surfaces for the criterion variate (Y) is estimated conditional on a realization of the predictor variate (X). The motivation of the alternate procedure is to estimate the point on the X variate at which two heterogeneous regression surfaces intersect. An expression of the standard error of the estimate provides, at a given level of alpha, a closed confidence interval for the point of intersection and open regions in the domain of X in which it may be stated with confidence that they do not span the point of intersection. The procedure is illustrated, and its accuracy evaluated through simulation. An advantage of the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure is primarily that it declares significant all differences between estimated regression surfaces that are larger than those in the nonsignificant region, should a significant region exist. Situations under which the Johnson-Neyman procedure is preferable are discussed. (Contains 7 tables and 10 references.) (SLD)

Intersection Point Confidence Intervals as an Alternative to the Johnson-Neyman Technique

William D. Schafer
C. Mitchell Dayton
Douglas A. Powell

University of Maryland at College Park

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention

April 9, 1996

New York City

Intersection Point Confidence Intervals as an Alternative to the Johnson-Neyman Technique

William D. Schafer, C. Mitchell Dayton, and Douglas A. Powell
University of Maryland at College Park

Our purpose is to investigate an alternative to the Johnson-Neyman procedure (Johnson & Neyman, 1936). Used when heterogeneous regression lines for two groups are analyzed, the Johnson-Neyman procedure is a technique in which the difference between the two linear regression surfaces for the criterion variate (Y) is estimated conditional on a realization of the predictor variate (X). Johnson and Neyman found a solution in the domain of X for two boundaries (if they exist) that partition X into ranges in which the difference is (or is not) significant at a given α level. Several researchers have studied and extended the Johnson-Neyman technique; Schafer and Wang (1991) presented a brief review of these investigations and cited several studies in which the Johnson-Neyman technique has been used for substantive research in education and psychology.

The motivation of the alternate procedure is to estimate the point on the X variate at which two heterogeneous regression surfaces intersect. An expression for the standard error of the estimate provides, at a given level of α, a closed confidence interval for the point of intersection and thus open regions in the domain of X in which it may be stated with confidence $(1 - \alpha)$ that they do not span the point of intersection. This approach has an advantage over the Johnson-Neyman procedure in the case where the latter procedure identifies a bounded region of X in which the estimated difference between the regression surfaces is found to be significant. The unbounded regions on either side of the bounded region will thus contain estimated differences between the regression surfaces that are larger than the largest difference in the "significant" region. However, in the alternate procedure, the confidence interval for the point of intersection always contains estimated differences, all of which are smaller than all of those in the region of X where it is estimated the intersection point does not lie. This has some intuitive appeal because larger estimated differences are always more likely to be declared significantly different than smaller differences. Balanced against this advantage is the disadvantage that the alternate procedure is not based on a confidence interval for the conditional difference between the regression surfaces (conditional on a value of X). However, the Johnson-Neyman procedure is based directly on estimating the magnitude of that conditional difference. As with the Johnson-Neyman procedure, of course, regions declared "significant" using the alternate procedure should be interpreted only in relation to the marginal distributions of X in the two groups.

This rationale for the alternate procedure was used by Graybill and Iyer (1994) to motivate the need for a method to identify a confidence interval for the point of intersection of two straight-line regression surfaces. However, although they do not give a source, the procedure they present (Graybill & Iyer, 1994, p. 452) actually is the Johnson-Neyman technique, which they note (Graybill & Iyer, 1994, p. 453) may reach unsatisfactory solutions for the reasons discussed above.

Details of the Alternate Procedure

Let $Y_{ij} = \alpha_j + \beta_j X_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}$ be the linear regression model for independent groups $j = 1, 2$ and a_j and b_j be least-squares estimates of α_j and β_j, respectively, and let n_j be the sizes of two independent samples from populations 1 and 2. Then the point of intersection of the two linear regression estimates in the population is:

$$\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{\beta_2 - \beta_1} \text{ which may be estimated by}$$

$$X_0 = \frac{a_1 - a_2}{b_2 - b_1} \tag{1}$$

(Graybill and Iyer, 1994, p. 451-2). In (1), the variances and covariances of a_j and b_j are known:

$$\mathrm{Var}(a_j) = \frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}\,\Sigma_i X_{ij}}{n_j SS_{X_j}}$$

$$\mathrm{Var}\,(b_j) = \frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}}{SS_{X_j}}$$

$$\mathrm{Cov}\,(a_j,b_j) = \frac{-\overline{X}_j \sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}}{SS_{X_j}}$$

where $\overline{X}_j$ = the mean of X for group j, $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}$ is the error variance for population j, and SS_{X_j} is the sum of squares of X for group j (Draper & Smith, 1981, pp. 82-3). Because the groups are independent, $\mathrm{Cov}(a_1,a_2) = \mathrm{Cov}(a_1,b_2) = \mathrm{Cov}(a_2,b_1) = \mathrm{Cov}(b_1,b_2) = 0$.

Formula (1) is a ratio of two random variates of the form $\frac{w_1}{w_2}$, with approximate variance (Kish, 1987, p. 133):

$$\mathrm{Var}\,(\tfrac{w_1}{w_2}) \doteq \tfrac{1}{w_2^2}\left(\mathrm{Var}(w_1) + (\tfrac{w_1}{w_2})^2\,\mathrm{Var}\,(w_2) - 2\,(\tfrac{w_1}{w_2})\,\mathrm{Cov}(w_1,w_2)\right). \tag{2}$$

Substituting the known variances and covariances into (2) and simplifying yields:

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}\,(X_0) = \frac{S_e^2}{(b_2-b_1)^2}\left(\frac{\Sigma_1 X^2}{n_1 SS_{X_1}} + \frac{\Sigma_2 X^2}{n_2 SS_{X_2}} + X_0^2\left(\frac{1}{SS_{X_1}}+\frac{1}{SS_{X_2}}\right) - 2X_0\left(\frac{\overline{X}_1}{SS_{X_1}} + \frac{\overline{X}_2}{SS_{X_2}}\right)\right) \tag{3}$$

in which S_e^2, the pooled error variance estimate for the two groups, has been used for σ_ϵ^2 and, for simplicity, $\Sigma_j X^2 = \Sigma_i X_{ij}^2$ for group j. Then, assuming normality and homoskedasticity of ϵ_{ij}, we use

$$X_0 \pm t_{(n_1+n_2-4,\,\frac{\alpha}{2})}\sqrt{\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}\,(X_0)} \tag{4}$$

where $t_{df,p}$ is the $100*p^{th}$ percentile of the t distribution to identify a $(1-\alpha)$ confidence interval for the abscissa of the point of intersection.

Accuracy of the Alternate Procedure

We have investigated the alternate procedure for α = .05 (.05) .95 where $X \sim N(\mu,36)$, $\beta_1 = 2$, $\beta_2 = -2$, and $\sigma_e^2=9$ for all eight combinations of $\mu_{X_1}=\mu_{X_2}=0$, 20, $n_1=n_2=30$, 300, and population point of intersection = 0, 20 with 10,000 replications each. The empirical mean and standard error of the sample point of intersection, the mean estimated standard error, and the theoretical standard error, found by substituting known parameters and expectations of sample statistics based on known parameters into (3), were also calculated. These results and the empirical Type I error rates (rates at which the population point of intersection was outside the associated confidence interval) appear in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Encouraged by the findings reported in Table 1, we performed an empirical study of the characteristics of the alternate procedure in relation to the Johnson-Neyman technique and a modified Johnson-Neyman procedure as proposed by Potthoff (1964). The latter two approaches were compared on Type I error rate by Chou and Huberty (1992) for two configurations of population regression parameters (equal slopes and intercepts, and heterogeneous slopes) and three additional factors: conditional distribution shape, conditional

variance ratio, and sample size ratio. Because these are very well-known techniques, their details are omitted; Chou and Huberty (1992) provide motivations and formulas for both and give several references.

Our current study replicates Chou and Huberty's (1992) conditions, adding the alternate procedure as a third approach. We also evaluated cases in which the X coordinate of the population point of intersection is outside the 99% high-density regions of the X distributions as well as the condition in which the point of intersection is at the equal means of X for the two groups (the condition studied by Chou & Huberty). As suggested by Chou and Huberty (1992) and studied by Chou and Wang (1992), we also included a "protected" version of these three procedures, in which a homogeneity of regression test is used as a precondition; if the homogeneity of regression test results in rejection, the above procedures are applied, but if the homogeneity of regression test does not result in rejection, the differences between the regression surfaces are compared using the usual test for homogeneity of intercepts. Thus, there were three configurations of slopes and intercepts and six procedures studied.

Simulation Procedures

Arbitrarily, the distribution of X was N(20,9) for each of two groups. These parameters imply that the interval from X_1=10 to X_2=30 ($z_1=-3.\overline{3}$ to $z_2=+3.\overline{3}$) is expected to contain over 99.9% of randomly sampled realizations of X. In each simulated experiment, n_1 and n_2 realizations of X were randomly sampled to form two groups and, for each X_{ij}, where i = case and j = group, Y_{ij} was formed according to: $Y_{i1}= \alpha_1 + \beta_1 X_{i1}+ \epsilon_{i1}$ for group 1 and $Y_{i2}= \alpha_2 + \beta_2 X_{i2}+ \epsilon_{i2}$ for group 2, where ϵ_{ij} was randomly sampled from $\phi(0,\sigma_j^2)$. This follows exactly the procedures used by Chou and Huberty (1992).

Three conditions were manipulated: (1) sample size at four levels; (n_1,n_2) = (25,25), (75,75), (17,47), (60,100); (2) conditional Y (i.e., expected ϵ_{ij}) variances at three levels; $(\sigma^2_{\epsilon_{i1}}, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_{i2}})$ = (18,54), (36,36), (54,18); (3) conditional Y distribution shape (i.e., ϕ) at eight levels; (skewness, kurtosis, description) = (0, −1, platykurtic), (.75, 0, moderately skewed), (0, 1, slightly leptokurtic); (0, 3.75, moderately leptokurtic), (.5, 3.75, slightly skewed and moderately leptokurtic), (1, 3.75, moderately skewed and moderately leptokurtic), (1.75, 3.75, highly skewed and moderately leptokurtic), (0, 0, normal).

The sample sizes were manipulated to represent two conditions of equality, large and small, and two conditions of inequality, large and small, chosen so that their harmonic mean was equal to the corresponding size for the equality condition. This differs from the conditions studied by Chou and Huberty (1992); they manipulated equal sample sizes at three levels: (10,10), (20,20), (30,30) and unequal sample sizes at two levels: (10,20), (10,30).

The conditional Y variances and the conditional Y distribution shapes were identical to those used by Chou and Huberty (1992). They chose the variances to set the average at 36 for each condition and the distribution shapes to follow those used by Olejnik and Algina (1987) in a study of Type I error rates and power of the analysis of covariance under heteroscedastic conditions. As in both these studies, they were manipulated using the procedure developed by Fleishman (1978).

The values of α_1, α_2, β_1 and β_2 were chosen to construct three configurations. In configuration (1), $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2$ formed two collinear regressions. In configuration (2), $\alpha_1 = 40$, $\alpha_2 = -40$, $\beta_1 = -2$, $\beta_2 = 2$ formed two regressions intersecting at X = 20, the mean of each of the two groups. In configuration (3), $\alpha_1 = 20$, $\alpha_2 = -20$, $\beta_1 = -2$, $\beta_2 = 2$ formed two regressions intersecting at X = 10, an uncommon value in each of the two groups. These three configurations were studied separately.

Each condition was studied with 3,000 replications. For each replication, six procedures were applied: the Johnson-Neyman procedure (Johnson & Neyman, 1936), the modified Johnson-Neyman procedure (Potthoff, 1964), and the intersection point confidence interval procedure, each with and without protection. In the protected version, if the hypothesis of homogeneity of regression surfaces was retained, the test for homogeneity of intercepts conditional on homogeneity of slopes was applied instead of any of the three procedures. It should

be noted that protected versions of the three procedures may be either more or less conservative (or powerful) than the unprotected versions since a significant region may be found for the intercepts test.

In configuration one, the outcome variable studied was existence of any region of significance. If any region existed, the outcome was considered a Type I error since condition one consists of two collinear surfaces.

Two outcome variables were retained for each replication in configurations two and three. If a region of significance existed and contained the point of intersection (X = 20 in configuration two or X = 10 in configuration three), the outcome was considered a Type I error [this event was called a Type III error by Chou & Huberty (1992)]. The other variable was the size of the region between X = 10 and X = 30 within which significant differences were declared. This variable ranges from zero to twenty and can be interpreted as an analog for power. In the protected version, if the test for homogeneity of intercepts was reached, the size of the region was either zero if nonsignificance was observed, or twenty if significance was observed.

All simulations were performed on a desktop computer using the Gauss programming language. When conditions were identical, consistency with the results of Chou and Huberty (1992) was evaluated as a check on our implementation (all results were comparable). Analyses of outcome variables were performed using SPSS on a mainframe computer. The authors are grateful to the University of Maryland Computer Science Center for providing mainframe support for this project.

Results are organized by configuration. Type I error rates were estimated at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance. Assuming a theoretical Type I error rate of .05, the standard error of an observed Type I error rate for n = 3,000 is .004. Thus, differences of .01 or greater between rates may be interpreted. Differences among region sizes were evaluated using multivariate analysis of variance for the within-subjects design.

Results

In configuration one, only Type I error rate was studied. Table 2 presents the observed Type I error rates for each cell in the simulation study.

Insert Table 2 About Here

For the conditions studied by Chou and Huberty (1992), our results for the unprotected Johnson-Neyman technique (Johnson & Neyman, 1936) and the unprotected modified Johnson-Neyman technique (Potthoff, 1964) appear not to be interpretably different from theirs. Interestingly, while the protected Johnson-Neyman technique appears more conservative than the unprotected Johnson-Neyman technique, the reverse appears true for the modified Johnson-Neyman technique. The Type I error rates for the unprotected intersection point confidence interval procedure were near 50% but for the protected version were virtually equivalent to the protected Johnson-Neyman Type I error rates. As expected on theoretical grounds (see Potthoff, 1964), the unprotected modified Johnson-Neyman technique provided Type I error rates closest to nominal. All techniques were notably liberal when larger sample sizes were associated with smaller conditional variances if these factors were unequal and were relatively unaffected by distribution shape. These findings are consistent with those of Chou and Huberty (1992).

Both Type I error rate and region size were studied for configurations two and three (linear regressions with heterogeneous slopes). The observed Type I error rates for configuration two (centered intersection point) are presented in Table 3. In this configuration, the population point of intersection was at the mean of the two populations on X. A Type I error was declared if a region of significance contained the point of intersection.

Insert Table 3 About Here

The Type I error rates of the protected and unprotected versions of each of the three procedures were virtually identical. Consistent with the findings of Chou and Huberty (1993), the modified Johnson-Neyman

technique was conservative and the original Johnson-Neyman technique was near its nominal value of .05. The intersection point confidence interval procedure also yielded Type I error rates comparable with the nominal value. Parallel results to those for configuration one were observed for conditional variances, sample sizes, and distribution shapes.

The multivariate analysis of variance on region size for configuration two provided a significant four-way interaction (Wilks's F = 18.187, df = 84, 575806, $p < .001$) between sample size configuration, conditional variance ratio, distribution shape, and method of analysis. Therefore, results are presented disaggregated for these factors and appear in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 About Here

In general, the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure yielded the larger significant regions, followed by the original Johnson-Neyman procedure. Differences in region size between these two procedures were slight. The smaller significant regions, as expected, were obtained from the modified Johnson-Neyman procedure. Virtually no differences were observed between the protected and unprotected versions of each of the three procedures. Across all conditions in the simulations, the average region sizes were 18.56 for the unprotected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure, 18.55 for the protected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure, 18.45 for both unprotected and protected original Johnson-Neyman techniques, and 17.96 for both unprotected and protected modified Johnson-Neyman techniques.

Type I error rates for configuration three (noncentered intersection point) are presented in Table 5. In this configuration, the population point of intersection was fixed at X = 10.

Insert Table 5 About Here

Again, the Type I error rates for the unprotected and protected versions of each of the three techniques were comparable. In general, the Type I error rates for the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure were not interpretably different from those of the original Johnson-Neyman procedure and neither was interpretably different from the nominal rate of .05. The Type I error rates for the modified Johnson-Neyman procedure were interpretably smaller than nominal.

As with configuration two, the multivariate analysis of region sizes for configuration three (noncentered intersection point) yielded a significant four-way interaction (Wilks's F = 10.706, df = 84, 575806, $p < .001$) between sample size configuration, conditional variance ratio, distribution shape, and method of analysis. Therefore, results are presented disaggregated for these factors and appear in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 About Here

The results for configuration three are noticeably different from those of configuration two. In configuration two, the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure yielded the larger regions of significance, but in configuration three, the regions of significance were generally larger for both the original and modified Johnson-Neyman techniques than for the intersection-point confidence-interval procedures. Over all conditions studied, the average significant interval sizes were 18.12 for both the unprotected and protected original Johnson-Neyman technique, 17.73 for the protected modified Johnson-Neyman technique, 17.72 for the unprotected original Johnson-Neyman technique, 17.59 for the protected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure, and 17.56 for the unprotected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure.

Discussion

In the case of collinear regression surfaces, only the unprotected modified Johnson-Neyman technique yielded Type I error rates close to nominal. The common sequential procedures studied here as protected versions of each of the Johnson-Neyman procedures yielded, in general, smaller Type I error rates for the

original Johnson-Neyman procedure and slightly larger Type I error rates for the modified Johnson-Neyman procedure The Type I error rates for the protected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure were comparable with those of the protected original Johnson-Neyman procedure. The Type I error rates for the unprotected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure were unacceptably large, but the population in the case of collinear regression surfaces contains more than one intersection point. Such a configuration implies that an estimated point of intersection is accurate no matter where it is located. It would be interesting to study the location of the regions of significance identified by the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure for collinear regression surfaces to observe whether they tend to be found in dense or sparse regions of the covariate (X).

An advantage of the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure is primarily that it declares significant all differences between estimated regression surfaces that are larger than those in the nonsignificant region, should a significant region exist. It also yields larger regions for populations in which the intersection point is at (or near) the means of the groups. In such a population, the interaction between groups and covariate (X) is disordinal, and perhaps, therefore, of more interest to researchers than populations such as our configuration three, in which the intersection point is outside the most common region of the covariate. However, for configuration three, the significant region size was smallest for the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure. This result suggests that researchers who suspect an ordinal interaction would be better advised to choose the Johnson-Neyman procedure for analysis.

In an effort to explore the behavior of the unprotected intersection-point confidence-interval procedure further in cases such as configuration three, in which the population point of intersection is in a sparse region of the covariate (X), we conducted a series of simulations in which all conditions were as in configuration three with the exceptions that the slopes were varied from $\pm.1$ to $\pm.7$ by $\pm.2$ for the two groups and intercepts were chosen to fix the population point of intersection at X=10. Sample sizes were 25, 75, 150, 250, 500, 1000, and 2000. Only normal conditional error distributions were studied and each combination was studied with 1000 replications. We observed the Type I error rate at the α=.05 level, and compared the theoretical and average estimated standard errors with the observed standard error for each combination. It should be noted that the variance of the estimated intersection point [formula (3)] contains the difference between the slopes in the denominator, and thus conditions in which the slopes are similar may prove difficult for the intersection-point confidence-interval procedure (approaching our configuration one, in which collinear regression surfaces were studied). Results appear in Table 7.

Insert Table 7 About Here

For small absolute values of slopes and for small sample sizes, the intersection-point confidence interval technique appears too liberal and formula (3) yields standard errors that are too small when expectations are used as substitutions and too large when used with sample data. When slopes were $\pm.1$, even with sample sizes set at 2,000, unacceptable results were found. For slopes of $\pm.3$ and $\pm.5$, acceptable results appear to occur for sample sizes of 500 or more. For slopes of $\pm.7$, sample sizes of at least 250 seem to be sufficient to yield reasonably useful results.

With differences in slopes on the order of about $\pm.3$ or more and relatively large sample sizes (at least 500 in each group), the intersection-point confidence interval approach seems at least tentatively to be a viable alternative to the Johnson-Neyman technique, particularly when disordinal interactions are expected. But routine application of the intersection-point confidence interval technique seems inappropriate. Estimation becomes problematic when slopes are similar and the protected original Johnson-Neyman technique provided reasonably acceptable results across all three configurations we studied.

Two directions for further research would appear to be helpful. First, a way to estimate the standard error of an intersection point that is resistant to small sample sizes and near-parallel regression surfaces would be helpful. Second, more sensitive region size comparisons would result from studying conditions with less

power, such as by increasing the conditional error variance or decreasing the sample sizes from those used in this study.

References

Chou, T. & Huberty, C. J. (1992). The robustness of the Johnson-Neyman technique. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Chou, T. & Wang, L. S. (1992). Making simultaneous inferences using Johnson-Neyman technique. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Draper, N. R. & Smith, H. (1981). Applied regression analysis (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fleishman, A. I. (1978). A method for simulating non-normal distributions. Psychometrika, 43, 521-531.

Graybill, F. A. & Iyer, H. K. (1994). Regression analysis: Concepts and applications. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.

Johnson, P. O. & Neyman, J. (1936). Tests of certain linear hypotheses and their applications to some educational problems. Statistical Research Memoirs, 1, 57-93.

Kish, L. (1987). Statistical design for research. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Olejnik, S. F & Algina, J. (1987). An analysis of statistical power for parametric ancova and rank transform ancova. Communications in Statistics - Part A - Theory and Methods, 16, 1923-1949.

Potthoff, R. F. (1964). On the Johnson-Neyman technique and some extensions thereof. Psychometrika, 29, 241-256.

Schafer, W. D. & Wang, Y. Y. (1991). Graphical description of Johnson-Neyman outcomes for linear and quadratic regression surfaces. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Table 1. Empirical Type I Error Rates for 10,000 Replications, Mean Points of Intersection, Standard Errors, and Theoretical Standard Errors for Selected Type I Error Rates, Parameters and Sample Sizes.

	n_j=	30	30	30	30	300	300	300	300
	Int=	0	0	20	20	0	0	20	20
α	μ_X=	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20
.05		.0427	.0515	.0491	.0404	.0487	.0509	.0505	.0506
.10		.0948	.0856	.0876	.0916	.0974	.1016	.0987	.1047
.15		.1466	.1277	.1325	.1452	.1479	.1537	.1492	.1554
.20		.1967	.1764	.1772	.1966	.1986	.2018	.2010	.2039
.25		.2473	.2277	.2248	.2473	.2492	.2501	.2517	.2515
.30		.2950	.2783	.2774	.3006	.3021	.2986	.3030	.2990
.35		.3432	.3281	.3337	.3506	.3490	.3486	.3532	.3466
.40		.3939	.3805	.3856	.4012	.4007	.3978	.4021	.3963
.45		.4479	.4326	.4374	.4550	.4537	.4488	.4498	.4419
.50		.4992	.4688	.4889	.4984	.5022	.4978	.4982	.4962
.55		.5497	.5373	.5411	.5472	.5540	.5495	.5480	.5498
.60		.6007	.5901	.5919	.5969	.6034	.6009	.6001	.6024
.65		.6530	.6407	.6454	.6461	.6548	.6486	.6537	.6500
.70		.7058	.6931	.6923	.6963	.7042	.6973	.7049	.6999
.75		.7565	.7446	.7448	.7482	.7551	.7463	.7550	.7498
.80		.8043	.7969	.7950	.7994	.8051	.7963	.8037	.8032
.85		.8545	.8492	.8477	.8506	.8516	.8461	.8550	.8515
.90		.9023	.9025	.8984	.9036	.9012	.8991	.9009	.9017
.95		.9539	.9496	.9465	.9532	.9500	.9485	.9485	.9527
Mean Int:		.0043	-.4009	20.4382	19.9975	-.0006	-.0345	20.0318	20.0004
SE(Int):		.4106	2.9556	2.9917	.4095	.1230	.8380	.8358	.1239
Mean Est. SE:		.4113	3.0619	3.0798	.4122	.1233	.8368	.8366	.1233
Theor. SE:		.3939	2.6555	2.6555	.3939	.1227	.8270	.8270	.1227

Notes:

1. n_j is the size of each of the two groups
2. Int is the population point of intersection
3. μ_X is the mean of X for each of the two groups
4. α is the theoretical Type I error rate (used to obtain the percentiles of t)
5. Mean Int is the mean of the 10,000 observed sample points of intersection (X_0)
6. SE(Int) is the standard deviation of the 10,000 observed sample points of intersection
7. Mean Est. SE is the average of the 10,000 standard errors of X_0, each computed by the proposed formula: formula (3)
8. Theor. SE is the standard error of X_0 based on parameters and expectations of sample statistics substituted into the proposed formula: formula (3)

Table 2. Type I Error Rates for Collinear Regression Surfaces

Conditions				Procedure					
Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Error Distribution Skew.	Kurt.	Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J - N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J - N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
25:25	18:54	0.000	-1.000	0.15	0.05	0.51	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.750	0.000	0.14	0.05	0.51	0.09	0.07	0.09
		0.000	1.000	0.14	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.000	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.500	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.49	0.10	0.07	0.10
		1.000	3.750	0.15	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.08	0.11
		1.750	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.000	0.000	0.14	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.07	0.10
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	0.15	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.750	0.000	0.15	0.06	0.52	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.000	1.000	0.14	0.05	0.52	0.10	0.08	0.11
		0.000	3.750	0.15	0.06	0.49	0.11	0.09	0.11
		0.500	3.750	0.15	0.06	0.49	0.10	0.08	0.10
		1.000	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.52	0.10	0.07	0.10
		1.750	3.750	0.17	0.06	0.51	0.12	0.09	0.12
		0.000	0.000	0.16	0.07	0.50	0.11	0.09	0.11
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	0.16	0.05	0.50	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.750	0.000	0.13	0.05	0.52	0.09	0.07	0.09
		0.000	1.000	0.14	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.07	0.10
		0.000	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.11
		0.500	3.750	0.16	0.07	0.50	0.11	0.09	0.11
		1.000	3.750	0.15	0.06	0.50	0.11	0.08	0.11
		1.750	3.750	0.14	0.04	0.48	0.09	0.07	0.10
		0.000	0.000	0.15	0.06	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.10
75:75	18:54	0.000	-1.000	0.16	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.750	0.000	0.15	0.05	0.49	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.000	1.000	0.15	0.04	0.49	0.10	0.07	0.10
		0.000	3.750	0.19	0.07	0.49	0.13	0.10	0.13
		0.500	3.750	0.18	0.07	0.50	0.13	0.10	0.13
		1.000	3.750	0.16	0.06	0.50	0.11	0.09	0.11
		1.750	3.750	0.17	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.09	0.11
		0.000	0.000	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.10	0.08	0.10
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	0.19	0.07	0.47	0.13	0.11	0.13
		0.750	0.000	0.16	0.06	0.49	0.11	0.09	0.11
		0.000	1.000	0.15	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.09	0.11
		0.000	3.750	0.21	0.09	0.50	0.15	0.12	0.15
		0.500	3.750	0.22	0.09	0.51	0.15	0.12	0.15
		1.000	3.750	0.17	0.06	0.48	0.12	0.09	0.12
		1.750	3.750	0.17	0.07	0.50	0.12	0.09	0.12
		0.000	0.000	0.17	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.08	0.11
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	0.16	0.06	0.51	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.750	0.000	0.14	0.04	0.51	0.09	0.07	0.09
		0.000	1.000	0.15	0.05	0.50	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.000	3.750	0.16	0.06	0.50	0.11	0.08	0.11
		0.500	3.750	0.18	0.07	0.50	0.13	0.10	0.13
		1.000	3.750	0.15	0.06	0.49	0.10	0.08	0.10
		1.750	3.750	0.14	0.04	0.49	0.09	0.07	0.09
		0.000	0.000	0.14	0.05	0.51	0.10	0.07	0.10

Table 2 continued. Type I Error Rates for Collinear Regression Surfaces

Conditions				Procedure					
Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Error Distribution Skew.	Kurt.	Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J - N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J - N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
17:47	18:54	0.000	-1.000	0.10	0.03	0.47	0.06	0.05	0.06
		0.750	0.000	0.12	0.04	0.49	0.08	0.06	0.08
		0.000	1.000	0.18	0.07	0.52	0.13	0.10	0.13
		0.000	3.750	0.23	0.11	0.54	0.18	0.14	0.18
		0.500	3.750	0.20	0.09	0.53	0.15	0.12	0.15
		1.000	3.750	0.21	0.08	0.54	0.15	0.11	0.15
		1.750	3.750	0.13	0.05	0.49	0.08	0.07	0.08
		0.000	0.000	0.13	0.05	0.47	0.09	0.07	0.09
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	0.03	0.00	0.37	0.02	0.01	0.02
		0.750	0.000	0.04	0.01	0.39	0.02	0.02	0.02
		0.000	1.000	0.06	0.01	0.43	0.04	0.02	0.04
		0.000	3.750	0.09	0.02	0.44	0.06	0.04	0.06
		0.500	3.750	0.08	0.03	0.44	0.05	0.04	0.05
		1.000	3.750	0.07	0.02	0.44	0.05	0.04	0.05
		1.750	3.750	0.06	0.02	0.41	0.04	0.03	0.04
		0.000	0.000	0.06	0.02	0.42	0.04	0.03	0.04
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	0.26	0.13	0.55	0.20	0.16	0.20
		0.750	0.000	0.27	0.13	0.58	0.21	0.17	0.21
		0.000	1.000	0.33	0.18	0.60	0.25	0.21	0.25
		0.000	3.750	0.37	0.22	0.61	0.30	0.25	0.30
		0.500	3.750	0.37	0.22	0.61	0.30	0.26	0.30
		1.000	3.750	0.35	0.20	0.59	0.27	0.23	0.27
		1.750	3.750	0.28	0.14	0.57	0.22	0.18	0.22
		0.000	0.000	0.30	0.15	0.55	0.23	0.19	0.23
60:100	18:53	0.000	-1.000	0.14	0.04	0.48	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.750	0.000	0.14	0.05	0.51	0.09	0.07	0.09
		0.000	1.000	0.17	0.06	0.51	0.11	0.09	0.12
		0.000	3.750	0.22	0.10	0.51	0.17	0.14	0.17
		0.500	3.750	0.22	0.10	0.50	0.16	0.13	0.16
		1.000	3.750	0.19	0.07	0.51	0.14	0.11	0.14
		1.750	3.750	0.15	0.05	0.48	0.10	0.08	0.10
		0.000	0.000	0.14	0.05	0.50	0.09	0.07	0.09
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	0.09	0.03	0.43	0.06	0.05	0.06
		0.750	0.000	0.10	0.03	0.46	0.06	0.05	0.06
		0.000	1.000	0.09	0.03	0.47	0.06	0.05	0.06
		0.000	3.750	0.16	0.06	0.46	0.11	0.10	0.11
		0.500	3.750	0.16	0.05	0.45	0.10	0.09	0.10
		1.000	3.750	0.12	0.04	0.46	0.08	0.06	0.08
		1.750	3.750	0.10	0.03	0.46	0.07	0.05	0.07
		0.000	0.000	0.09	0.03	0.45	0.06	0.04	0.06
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	0.21	0.10	0.54	0.16	0.13	0.16
		0.750	0.000	0.22	0.09	0.54	0.16	0.13	0.16
		0.000	1.000	0.25	0.12	0.57	0.18	0.14	0.18
		0.000	3.750	0.29	0.14	0.57	0.22	0.18	0.22
		0.500	3.750	0.25	0.12	0.53	0.19	0.16	0.20
		1.000	3.750	0.25	0.12	0.54	0.19	0.15	0.19
		1.750	3.750	0.22	0.10	0.53	0.15	0.13	0.16
		0.000	0.000	0.22	0.10	0.54	0.16	0.13	0.16

Table 3. Type I Error Rates for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions				Procedure					
Samples	Variances	Distribution Shape		Unprot. Johnson	Unprot. Potthoff	Unprot. Intersec.	Protected Johnson	Protected Potthoff	Protected Intersec.
N1:N2	V1:V2	Skew.	Kurt.	Neyman	J-N	Pt. C. I.	Neyman	J-N	Pt. C. I.
25:25	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.06	.02	.04	.06	.02	.04
		0.750	0.000	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.000	1.000	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.000	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.500	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1.000	3.750	.07	.02	.05	.07	.02	.05
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.000	0.000	.05	.01	.03	.05	.01	.03
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.06	.02	.04	.06	.02	.04
		0.750	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	1.000	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		0.000	3.750	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		0.500	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		1.000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1.750	3.750	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.07	.02	.05	.07	.02	.05
		0.750	0.000	.06	.02	.04	.06	.02	.04
		0.000	1.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		0.500	3.750	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		1.000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.000	0.000	.07	.02	.04	.07	.02	.05
75:75	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.750	0.000	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		0.500	3.750	.09	.03	.08	.09	.03	.08
		1.000	3.750	.07	.02	.07	.07	.02	.07
		1.750	3.750	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.08	.03	.07	.08	.03	.07
		0.750	0.000	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	3.750	.11	.04	.11	.11	.04	.11
		0.500	3.750	.09	.03	.09	.09	.03	.09
		1.000	3.750	.07	.03	.07	.07	.03	.07
		1.750	3.750	.08	.03	.07	.08	.03	.07
		0.000	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.07	.03	.06	.07	.03	.06
		0.750	0.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		0.500	3.750	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		1.000	3.750	.07	.02	.07	.07	.02	.07
		1.750	3.750	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05

Table 3 continued Type I Error Rates for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt.	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
17:47	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.750	0.000	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.10	.04	.09	.10	.04	.09
		0.500	3.750	.09	.03	.08	.09	.03	.08
		1.000	3.750	.07	.02	.06	.07	.02	.06
		1.750	3.750	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.000	0.000	.04	.01	.03	.05	.02	.03
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.01	.00	.01	.01	.00	.01
		0.750	0.000	.02	.00	.01	.02	.00	.01
		0.000	1.000	.01	.00	.01	.01	.00	.01
		0.000	3.750	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.500	3.750	.03	.01	.02	.03	.01	.02
		1.000	3.750	.02	.00	.01	.02	.00	.01
		1.750	3.750	.02	.01	.02	.02	.01	.02
		0.000	0.000	.03	.01	.02	.03	.01	.02
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.11	.05	.09	.11	.05	.09
		0.750	0.000	.12	.04	.10	.12	.04	.10
		0.000	1.000	.14	.06	.13	.14	.06	.13
		0.000	3.750	.18	.09	.17	.18	.10	.17
		0.500	3.750	.16	.08	.15	.18	.08	.15
		1.000	3.750	.17	.08	.16	.17	.08	.16
		1.750	3.750	.12	.05	.10	.12	.05	.10
		0.000	0.000	.13	.05	.10	.13	.06	.10
60:100	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.750	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	3.750	.09	.04	.09	.09	.04	.09
		0.500	3.750	.10	.03	.09	.10	.03	.09
		1.000	3.750	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		1.750	3.750	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	0.000	.04	.01	.04	.04	.01	.04
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.750	0.000	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.000	1.000	.03	.01	.03	.03	.01	.03
		0.000	3.750	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		0.500	3.750	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		1.000	3.750	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		1.750	3.750	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	0.000	.03	.01	.02	.03	.01	.02
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.09	.03	.09	.09	.03	.09
		0.750	0.000	.07	.03	.07	.07	.03	.07
		0.000	1.000	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		0.000	3.750	.11	.05	.10	.11	.05	.10
		0.500	3.750	.12	.05	.11	.12	.05	.11
		1.000	3.750	.11	.05	.10	.11	.05	.10
		1.750	3.750	.08	.03	.08	.08	.03	.08
		0.000	0.000	.09	.04	.08	.09	.04	.08

Table 4. Significant Region Sizes for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew.	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
25:25	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.74	16.95	17.94	17.74	16.95	17.94
				StdDe	0.83	1.40	0.50	0.83	1.40	0.50
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.90	17.20	18.06	17.90	17.20	18.06
				StdDe	0.64	1.15	0.44	0.64	1.15	0.44
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.19	17.63	18.29	18.19	17.63	18.29
				StdDe	0.46	0.74	0.36	0.46	0.74	0.36
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.36	17.87	18.44	18.36	17.87	18.44
				StdDe	0.44	0.64	0.36	0.44	0.64	0.36
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.30	17.79	18.39	18.30	17.79	18.39
				StdDe	0.54	0.83	0.39	0.54	0.83	0.39
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.26	17.73	18.36	18.26	17.73	18.35
				StdDe	0.68	0.92	0.42	0.68	0.90	0.62
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.00	17.34	18.15	18.00	17.34	18.15
				StdDe	0.68	1.14	0.49	0.68	1.14	0.49
		0.000	0.000	Mean	16.71	15.29	17.38	16.71	15.32	17.24
				StdDe	2.59	3.80	1.20	2.70	3.77	2.24
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.58	16.72	17.84	17.58	16.72	17.83
				StdDe	1.10	1.68	0.63	1.10	1.68	0.80
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.82	17.08	18.01	17.82	17.08	18.01
				StdDe	0.89	1.42	0.51	0.89	1.42	0.60
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.25	17.72	18.34	18.25	17.72	18.34
				StdDe	0.42	0.62	0.34	0.42	0.62	0.34
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.47	18.03	18.53	18.47	18.03	18.53
				StdDe	0.40	0.59	0.31	0.48	0.59	0.45
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.45	17.99	18.51	18.45	17.99	18.51
				StdDe	0.37	0.53	0.32	0.37	0.53	0.32
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.36	17.87	18.44	18.36	17.87	18.44
				StdDe	0.42	0.61	0.35	0.42	0.61	0.35
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.93	17.21	18.11	17.92	17.21	18.10
				StdDe	0.98	1.59	0.62	1.03	1.59	0.81
		0.000	0.000	Mean	16.70	15.32	17.38	16.68	15.33	17.19
				StdDe	2.79	3.84	1.37	2.90	3.84	2.52
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.92	17.24	18.07	17.92	17.24	18.07
				StdDe	0.58	0.96	0.42	0.58	0.96	0.42
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.98	17.33	18.12	17.98	17.33	18.12
				StdDe	0.65	1.06	0.44	0.71	1.06	0.55
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.14	17.56	18.25	18.14	17.56	18.25
				StdDe	0.62	0.91	0.46	0.62	0.91	0.52
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.21	17.65	18.32	18.21	17.65	18.32
				StdDe	0.67	0.99	0.46	0.67	0.99	0.56
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.20	17.63	18.31	18.20	17.63	18.31
				StdDe	0.65	1.09	0.46	0.65	1.09	0.46
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.17	17.60	18.29	18.17	17.60	18.28
				StdDe	0.67	1.02	0.46	0.71	1.02	0.56
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.06	17.43	18.20	18.06	17.43	18.20
				StdDe	0.73	1.22	0.51	0.73	1.22	0.51
		0.000	0.000	Mean	16.64	15.24	17.33	16.62	15.28	17.15
				StdDe	2.88	3.97	1.60	3.05	3.93	2.64

Table 4 continued. Significant Region Sizes for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
75:75	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.87	18.57	18.89	18.87	18.57	18.89
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.93	18.65	18.95	18.93	18.65	18.95
				StdDe	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.16	0.12
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.05	18.80	19.06	19.05	18.80	19.06
				StdDe	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.10
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.12	18.90	19.13	19.12	18.90	19.13
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.10
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.11	18.88	19.12	19.11	18.88	19.12
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.09	18.85	19.10	19.09	18.85	19.10
				StdDe	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.11
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.97	18.71	18.99	18.97	18.71	18.99
				StdDe	0.15	0.20	0.14	0.15	0.20	0.14
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.55	18.14	18.60	18.55	18.14	18.60
				StdDe	0.34	0.49	0.29	0.34	0.49	0.29
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.82	18.50	18.84	18.82	18.50	18.84
				StdDe	0.16	0.20	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.15
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.90	18.61	18.92	18.90	18.61	18.92
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.08	18.84	19.09	19.08	18.84	19.09
				StdDe	0.10	0.13	.09	0.10	0.13	.09
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.18	18.97	19.19	19.18	18.97	19.19
				StdDe	.09	0.11	.09	.09	0.11	.09
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.17	18.95	19.18	19.17	18.95	19.18
				StdDe	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.10
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.13	18.91	19.14	19.13	18.91	19.14
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.10
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.96	18.68	18.98	18.96	18.68	18.98
				StdDe	0.17	0.22	0.16	0.17	0.22	0.16
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.57	18.17	18.81	18.57	18.17	18.61
				StdDe	0.36	0.51	0.30	0.36	0.51	0.30
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.93	18.65	18.95	18.93	18.65	18.95
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.97	18.70	18.98	18.97	18.70	18.98
				StdDe	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.12
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.03	18.78	19.04	19.03	18.78	19.04
				StdDe	0.12	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.11
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.06	18.82	19.08	19.06	18.82	19.08
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.06	18.81	19.07	19.06	18.81	19.07
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.05	18.80	19.06	19.05	18.80	19.06
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.99	18.72	19.00	18.99	18.72	19.00
				StdDe	0.15	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.19	0.14
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.56	18.16	18.61	18.56	18.16	18.61
				StdDe	0.36	0.52	0.31	0.36	0.52	0.31

Table 4 continued. Significant Region Sizes for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
17:47	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.62	16.75	17.86	17.81	16.75	17.84
				StdDe	0.85	1.55	0.50	0.97	1.56	0.75
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.84	17.12	18.02	17.84	17.12	18.01
				StdDe	0.75	1.17	0.47	0.83	1.17	0.71
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.24	17.69	18.33	18.24	17.69	18.33
				StdDe	0.48	0.80	0.35	0.48	0.80	0.35
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.45	17.98	18.52	18.45	17.98	18.52
				StdDe	0.44	0.79	0.33	0.44	0.79	0.33
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.42	17.94	18.49	18.42	17.95	18.49
				StdDe	0.47	0.78	0.38	0.45	0.77	0.36
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.31	17.81	18.41	18.32	17.82	18.41
				StdDe	0.73	0.97	0.58	0.67	0.91	0.52
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.93	17.22	18.11	17.92	17.22	18.10
				StdDe	0.91	1.55	0.53	0.99	1.55	0.76
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.67	15.29	17.34	16.68	15.35	17.21
				StdDe	2.63	3.70	1.43	2.73	3.66	2.31
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.23	16.12	17.57	17.23	16.12	17.57
				StdDe	0.95	1.80	0.51	0.95	1.80	0.60
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.52	16.63	17.77	17.52	16.63	17.77
				StdDe	0.77	1.27	0.45	0.77	1.27	0.55
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.06	17.45	18.18	18.06	17.45	18.18
				StdDe	0.42	0.75	0.32	0.42	0.75	0.32
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.35	17.86	18.43	18.35	17.86	18.43
				StdDe	0.50	0.65	0.30	0.50	0.65	0.45
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.31	17.80	18.40	18.31	17.80	18.40
				StdDe	0.46	0.73	0.32	0.46	0.73	0.32
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.21	17.66	18.31	18.21	17.66	18.31
				StdDe	0.45	0.72	0.35	0.45	0.72	0.35
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.67	16.81	17.90	17.67	16.81	17.90
				StdDe	0.81	1.55	0.51	0.81	1.55	0.51
		0.000	0.000	Mean	16.21	14.39	17.11	16.18	14.42	16.90
				StdDe	2.77	4.20	1.23	2.96	4.18	2.45
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.05	17.42	18.20	18.05	17.42	18.19
				StdDe	0.77	1.25	0.48	0.82	1.25	0.58
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.19	17.62	18.30	18.19	17.62	18.30
				StdDe	0.64	1.01	0.45	0.64	1.01	0.45
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.42	17.94	18.50	18.42	17.95	18.50
				StdDe	0.61	0.91	0.45	0.60	0.90	0.42
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.54	18.10	18.61	18.54	18.11	18.60
				StdDe	0.60	0.93	0.45	0.65	0.91	0.54
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.48	18.02	18.56	18.49	18.03	18.56
				StdDe	0.86	1.29	0.67	0.93	1.24	0.82
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.47	18.01	18.55	18.47	18.01	18.55
				StdDe	0.67	1.05	0.45	0.67	1.05	0.45
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.24	17.70	18.36	18.25	17.71	18.35
				StdDe	0.92	1.25	0.61	0.89	1.22	0.76
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.10	16.01	17.60	17.12	16.08	17.52
				StdDe	2.57	3.50	1.56	2.69	3.45	2.28

Table 4 continued. Significant Region Sizes for Centered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
60:100	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.84	18.54	18.87	18.84	18.54	18.87
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.91	18.62	18.93	18.91	18.62	18.93
				StdDe	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.16	0.12
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.06	18.82	19.08	19.06	18.82	19.08
				StdDe	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.10
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.15	18.93	19.16	19.15	18.93	19.16
				StdDe	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.10
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.14	18.92	19.15	19.14	18.92	19.15
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.10
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.11	18.88	19.12	19.11	18.88	19.12
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.97	18.70	18.98	18.97	18.70	18.98
				StdDe	0.15	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.19	0.14
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.56	18.16	18.61	18.56	18.16	18.61
				StdDe	0.31	0.42	0.27	0.31	0.42	0.27
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.72	18.38	18.75	18.72	18.38	18.75
				StdDe	0.16	0.21	0.15	0.16	0.21	0.15
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.82	18.51	18.85	18.82	18.51	18.85
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.03	18.77	19.04	19.03	18.77	19.04
				StdDe	0.10	0.12	.09	0.10	0.12	.09
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.16	18.94	19.17	19.16	18.94	19.17
				StdDe	.09	0.11	.08	.09	0.11	.08
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.14	18.92	19.15	19.14	18.92	19.15
				StdDe	0.10	0.12	.09	0.10	0.12	.09
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.09	18.86	19.10	19.09	18.88	19.10
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.10
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.89	18.60	18.91	18.89	18.60	18.91
				StdDe	0.17	0.21	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.16
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.48	18.05	18.53	18.48	18.05	18.53
				StdDe	0.33	0.45	0.29	0.33	0.45	0.29
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.98	18.71	19.00	18.98	18.71	19.00
				StdDe	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.11
		0.750	0.000	Mean	19.02	18.77	19.03	19.02	18.77	19.03
				StdDe	0.11	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.11
		0.000	1.000	Mean	19.10	18.87	19.11	19.10	18.87	19.11
				StdDe	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11
		0.000	3.750	Mean	19.15	18.93	19.16	19.15	18.93	19.16
				StdDe	0.14	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.18	0.13
		0.500	3.750	Mean	19.14	18.92	19.15	19.14	18.92	19.15
				StdDe	0.13	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.13
		1.000	3.750	Mean	19.13	18.90	19.14	19.13	18.90	19.14
				StdDe	0.13	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.13
		1.750	3.750	Mean	19.05	18.80	19.08	19.05	18.80	19.06
				StdDe	0.14	0.19	0.14	0.14	0.19	0.14
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.65	18.28	18.69	18.65	18.28	18.69
				StdDe	0.34	0.46	0.30	0.34	0.46	0.30

Table 5. Type I Error Rates for Noncentered Intersection Point.

Conditions				Procedure					
Samples	Variances	Distribution Shape		Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
N1:N2	V1:V2	Skew	Kurt						
25:25	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.04	.01	.07	.04	.01	.07
		0.750	0.000	.05	.02	.06	05	.02	.06
		0.000	1.000	.05	.02	.06	05	.02	.06
		0.000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		0.500	3.750	.04	.02	.04	.04	.02	.04
		1.000	3.750	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		1.750	3.750	.05	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.05	.02	.07	.06	.03	.08
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.05	.01	.07	.05	.02	.07
		0.750	0.000	.05	.02	.07	.05	.02	.07
		0.000	1.000	.05	.01	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.500	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1 000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.07	.05	.01	.07
		0.000	0.000	.05	.02	.07	.07	.04	.09
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.05	.02	.07	.05	.02	.07
		0.750	0.000	.05	.01	.06	.05	.01	.06
		0.000	1.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.500	3.750	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		1.000	3.750	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		1.750	3.750	.05	.02	.06	.05	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.04	.01	.06	.06	.03	.09
75:75	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.05	.01	.06	.05	.01	.06
		0.750	0.000	.05	.01	.06	.05	.01	.06
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	05
		0.000	3.750	.05	02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		0.500	3.750	.06	.02	.05	06	.02	.05
		1.000	3.750	.05	.02	.04	.05	.02	.04
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.06	.05	.01	.06
		0.000	0.000	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.750	0.000	.05	.02	.06	.05	.02	.06
		0.000	1.000	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		0.000	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.500	3.750	.06	.01	.04	.06	.01	.04
		1.000	3.750	.04	.02	.04	.04	.02	.04
		1.750	3.750	.04	.01	.05	.04	.01	.05
		0.000	0.000	.05	.02	.06	.05	.02	.06
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.06	.02	.07	.06	.02	.07
		0.750	0.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
		0.000	1.000	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		0.000	3.750	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		0.500	3.750	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		1.000	3.750	.05	.01	.04	.05	.01	.04
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.05	.05	.01	.05
		0.000	0.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05

Table 5. Type I Error Rates for Noncentered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Conditions Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Distribution Shape Kurt	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
17:47	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.03	.01	.05	.03	.01	.05
		0.750	0.000	.04	.01	.06	.04	.01	.06
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.06	.06	.02	.06
		0.000	3.750	.08	.03	.07	.08	.03	.07
		0.500	3.750	.08	.03	.06	.08	.03	.06
		1.000	3.750	.07	.03	.06	.07	.03	.06
		1.750	3.750	.04	.02	.06	.04	.02	.06
		0.000	0.000	.05	.02	.06	.07	.04	.08
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.01	.00	.02	.01	.00	.02
		0.750	0.000	.01	.00	.02	.01	.00	.02
		0.000	1.000	.02	.00	.02	.02	.00	.02
		0.000	3.750	.03	.00	.02	.03	.00	.02
		0.500	3.750	.03	.01	.03	.03	.01	.03
		1.000	3.750	.03	.01	.03	.03	.01	.03
		1.750	3.750	.02	.00	.04	.02	.00	.04
		0.000	0.000	.02	.00	.04	.03	.02	.06
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.10	.04	.10	.10	.04	.10
		0.750	0.000	.11	.05	.09	.11	.05	.09
		0.000	1.000	.14	.07	.11	.14	.07	.11
		0.000	3.750	.14	.08	.13	.14	.08	.13
		0.500	3.750	.16	.08	.13	.16	.09	.14
		1.000	3.750	.14	.07	.12	.14	.07	.12
		1.750	3.750	.12	.05	.11	.12	.05	.11
		0.000	0.000	.12	.05	.11	.12	.07	.13
60:100	18:54	0.000	-1.000	.04	.01	.05	.04	.01	.05
		0.750	0.000	.04	.01	.05	.04	.01	.05
		0.000	1.000	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		0.000	3.750	.07	.03	.06	.07	.03	.06
		0.500	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		1.000	3.750	.06	.02	.05	.06	.02	.05
		1.750	3.750	.05	.01	.06	.05	.01	.06
		0.000	0.000	.05	.02	.05	.05	.02	.05
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	.02	.00	.03	.02	.00	.03
		0.750	0.000	.02	.00	.03	.02	.00	.03
		0.000	1.000	.03	.01	.02	.03	.01	.02
		0.000	3.750	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		0.500	3.750	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		1.000	3.750	.04	.01	.03	.04	.01	.03
		1.750	3.750	.03	.01	.04	.03	.01	.04
		0.000	0.000	.03	.01	.03	.03	.01	.03
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	.07	.03	.07	.07	.03	.07
		0.750	0.000	.07	.03	.08	.07	.03	.08
		0.000	1.000	.10	.04	.09	.10	.04	.09
		0.000	3.750	.10	.04	.10	.10	.04	.10
		0.500	3.750	.09	.04	.08	.09	.04	.08
		1.000	3.750	.09	.04	.08	.09	.04	.08
		1.750	3.750	.07	.02	.08	.07	.02	.08
		0.000	0.000	.08	.03	.09	.08	.03	.09

Table 6 Region Sizes for Noncentered Intersection Point.

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew.	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
25:25	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.37	16.87	16.40	17.37	16.87	16.42
				StdDe	1.04	0.99	0.96	1.04	0.99	0.83
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.49	17.01	16.62	17.49	17.01	16.64
				StdDe	0.99	0.94	0.92	0.99	0.94	0.81
		0.000	1.000	Mean	17.79	17.33	17.09	17.79	17.33	17.09
				StdDe	0.95	0.91	0.80	0.95	0.91	0.80
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.00	17.56	17.38	18.00	17.56	17.38
				StdDe	0.90	0.88	0.83	0.90	0.88	0.83
		0.500	3.750	Mean	17.95	17.51	17.33	17.95	17.51	17.33
				StdDe	0.90	0.88	0.86	0.90	0.88	0.85
		1.000	3.750	Mean	17.90	17.45	17.25	17.90	17.45	17.25
				StdDe	0.94	0.92	0.89	0.94	0.92	0.89
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.62	17.14	16.82	17.62	17.14	16.83
				StdDe	0.99	0.96	0.94	0.99	0.96	0.91
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.13	16.58	15.45	17.15	16.61	15.75
				StdDe	1.25	1.20	2.15	1.27	1.25	1.54
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.30	16.79	16.23	17.30	16.79	16.25
				StdDe	1.10	1.04	1.01	1.10	1.05	0.94
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.46	16.97	16.53	17.46	16.97	16.53
				StdDe	1.01	0.97	0.84	1.01	0.97	0.84
		0.000	1.000	Mean	17.84	17.39	17.18	17.84	17.39	17.18
				StdDe	0.92	0.89	0.80	0.92	0.89	0.79
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.12	17.71	17.60	18.12	17.71	17.60
				StdDe	0.87	0.85	0.79	0.87	0.85	0.79
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.12	17.69	17.56	18.12	17.69	17.56
				StdDe	0.86	0.83	0.79	0.86	0.83	0.79
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.01	17.57	17.41	18.01	17.57	17.41
				StdDe	0.89	0.87	0.81	0.89	0.87	0.81
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.61	17.13	16.78	17.61	17.13	16.76
				StdDe	0.96	0.92	0.95	0.96	0.92	0.90
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.11	16.56	15.42	17.13	16.60	15.75
				StdDe	1.18	1.13	2.19	1.21	1.19	1.46
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.50	17.01	16.65	17.50	17.01	16.65
				StdDe	1.01	0.96	0.81	1.01	0.96	0.80
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.60	17.11	16.78	17.60	17.11	16.78
				StdDe	0.99	0.95	0.83	0.99	0.95	0.83
		0.000	1.000	Mean	17.76	17.29	17.01	17.76	17.29	17.02
				StdDe	0.94	0.91	0.87	0.94	0.91	0.84
		0.000	3.750	Mean	17.90	17.45	17.19	17.90	17.45	17.21
				StdDe	0.97	0.95	1.04	0.97	0.95	0.93
		0.500	3.750	Mean	17.85	17.40	17.17	17.85	17.40	17.17
				StdDe	0.97	0.95	0.95	0.97	0.95	0.95
		1.000	3.750	Mean	17.86	17.40	17.13	17.86	17.40	17.13
				StdDe	1.00	0.98	1.03	1.00	0.98	1.03
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.66	17.19	16.85	17.66	17.19	16.86
				StdDe	1.04	1.02	1.11	1.04	1.02	1.05
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.13	16.58	15.53	17.16	16.65	15.84
				StdDe	1.33	1.30	2.23	1.37	1.36	1.65

Table 6 continued. Region Sizes for Noncentered Intersection Point.

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
75.75	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.33	17.99	18.05	18.33	17.99	18.05
				StdDe	0.69	0.67	0.62	0.69	0.67	0.62
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.44	18.11	18.18	18.44	18.11	18.18
				StdDe	0.66	0.65	0.60	0.66	0.65	0.60
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.67	18.37	18.46	18.67	18.37	18.46
				StdDe	0.61	0.60	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.58
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.79	18.51	18.61	18.79	18.51	18.61
				StdDe	0.58	0.58	0.56	0.58	0.58	0.56
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.81	18.52	18.62	18.81	18.52	18.62
				StdDe	0.59	0.59	0.57	0.59	0.59	0.57
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.75	18.48	18.55	18.75	18.46	18.55
				StdDe	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.61	0.60	0.59
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.49	18.17	18.24	18.49	18.17	18.24
				StdDe	0.66	0.64	0.61	0.66	0.64	0.61
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.12	17.73	17.67	18.12	17.73	17.67
				StdDe	0.82	0.80	0.74	0.82	0.80	0.74
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.28	17.92	17.97	18.28	17.92	17.97
				StdDe	0.72	0.70	0.65	0.72	0.70	0.65
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.38	18.05	18.11	18.38	18.05	18.11
				StdDe	0.67	0.65	0.61	0.67	0.65	0.61
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.68	18.38	18.48	18.68	18.38	18.48
				StdDe	0.59	0.58	0.56	0.59	0.58	0.56
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.90	18.64	18.75	18.90	18.64	18.75
				StdDe	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.55	0.55	0.53
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.89	18.62	18.73	18.89	18.62	18.73
				StdDe	0.55	0.55	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.54
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.81	18.52	18.63	18.81	18.52	18.63
				StdDe	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.57	0.56	0.54
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.47	18.15	18.22	18.47	18.15	18.22
				StdDe	0.65	0.63	0.60	0.65	0.63	0.60
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.12	17.72	17.66	18.12	17.72	17.66
				StdDe	0.81	0.78	0.71	0.81	0.78	0.71
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.39	18.06	18.14	18.39	18.06	18.14
				StdDe	0.66	0.65	0.61	0.66	0.65	0.61
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.48	18.16	18.24	18.48	18.16	18.24
				StdDe	0.65	0.64	0.61	0.65	0.64	0.61
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.59	18.29	18.37	18.59	18.29	18.37
				StdDe	0.61	0.60	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.58
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.69	18.39	18.49	18.69	18.39	18.49
				StdDe	0.63	0.62	0.61	0.63	0.62	0.61
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.71	18.41	18.50	18.71	18.41	18.50
				StdDe	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.62	0.61	0.60
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.69	18.39	18.48	18.69	18.39	18.48
				StdDe	0.64	0.64	0.63	0.64	0.64	0.63
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.52	18.20	18.29	18.52	18.20	18.29
				StdDe	0.66	0.65	0.62	0.66	0.65	0.62
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.13	17.74	17.68	18.13	17.74	17.68
				StdDe	0.88	0.87	0.84	0.88	0.87	0.84

Table 6 continued. Region Sizes for Noncentered Intersection Point.

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I
17:47	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.30	16.79	16.24	17.30	16.79	16.25
				StdDe	1.00	0.94	0.95	1.00	0.95	0.89
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.43	16.93	16.46	17.43	16.94	16.48
				StdDe	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.89
		0.000	1.000	Mean	17.84	17.39	17.16	17.84	17.39	17.16
				StdDe	0.97	0.94	0.90	0.97	0.94	0.84
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.10	17.69	17.56	18.10	17.69	17.56
				StdDe	0.93	0.92	0.86	0.93	0.92	0.86
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.07	17.64	17.52	18.07	17.64	17.52
				StdDe	0.94	0.94	0.87	0.94	0.94	0.87
		1.000	3.750	Mean	17.99	17.55	17.37	17.99	17.55	17.38
				StdDe	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.98	0.97	0.90
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.59	17.10	16.73	17.59	17.10	16.74
				StdDe	0.98	0.94	1.03	0.98	0.94	0.94
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.16	16.59	15.38	17.18	16.63	15.72
				StdDe	1.23	1.18	2.29	1.26	1.25	1.53
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	16.96	16.42	15.63	16.96	16.42	15.64
				StdDe	0.94	0.87	0.97	0.94	0.87	0.93
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.14	16.63	16.00	17.14	16.63	16.00
				StdDe	0.87	0.81	0.88	0.87	0.81	0.88
		0.000	1.000	Mean	17.64	17.17	16.83	17.64	17.17	18.83
				StdDe	0.84	0.80	0.77	0.84	0.80	0.77
		0.000	3.750	Mean	17.98	17.54	17.37	17.98	17.54	17.37
				StdDe	0.82	0.79	0.76	0.82	0.79	0.76
		0.500	3.750	Mean	17.95	17.51	17.31	17.95	17.51	17.31
				StdDe	0.79	0.76	0.75	0.79	0.76	0.75
		1.000	3.750	Mean	17.84	17.39	17.14	17.84	17.39	17.14
				StdDe	0.86	0.83	0.81	0.86	0.83	0.81
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.29	16.79	16.24	17.29	16.79	16.25
				StdDe	0.86	0.61	0.97	0.86	0.81	0.93
		0.000	0.000	Mean	16.79	16.22	14.91	16.84	16.29	15.18
				StdDe	1.03	0.98	1.89	1.11	1.09	1.53
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	17.70	17.23	16.95	17.70	17.23	16.96
				StdDe	1.08	1.06	0.92	1.08	1.06	0.91
		0.750	0.000	Mean	17.85	17.39	17.18	17.85	17.39	17.19
				StdDe	1.06	1.06	0.94	1.06	1.06	0.93
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.10	17.69	17.56	18.10	17.69	17.58
				StdDe	1.05	1.07	1.04	1.05	1.07	0.95
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.25	17.85	17.78	18.25	17.85	17.80
				StdDe	1.01	1.04	1.07	1.01	1.04	0.97
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.21	17.81	17.73	18.21	17.81	17.75
				StdDe	1.05	1.09	1.14	1.05	1.09	1.03
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.20	17.79	17.70	16.20	17.79	17.71
				StdDe	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.08	1.09	1.05
		1.750	3.750	Mean	17.94	17.49	17.27	17.94	17.49	17.30
				StdDe	1.09	1.11	1.23	1.09	1.11	1.05
		0.000	0.000	Mean	17.51	16.98	16.09	17.53	17.02	16.43
				StdDe	1.34	1.34	2.37	1.35	1.38	1.51

Table 6 continued. Region Sizes for Noncentered Intersection Point

Conditions Samples N1:N2	Variances V1:V2	Distribution Shape Skew.	Kurt.	Region Size	Procedure Unprot. Johnson Neyman	Unprot. Potthoff J-N	Unprot. Intersec. Pt. C. I.	Protected Johnson Neyman	Protected Potthoff J-N	Protected Intersec. Pt. C. I.
60:100	18:54	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.31	17.96	18.01	18.31	17.96	18.01
				StdDe	0.67	0.65	0.61	0.67	0.65	0.61
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.41	18.08	18.14	18.41	18.08	18.14
				StdDe	0.65	0.63	0.60	0.65	0.63	0.60
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.69	18.39	18.49	18.69	18.39	18.49
				StdDe	0.63	0.63	0.60	0.63	0.63	0.60
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.85	18.57	18.68	18.85	18.57	18.68
				StdDe	0.59	0.59	0.57	0.59	0.59	0.57
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.83	18.55	18.66	18.83	18.55	18.66
				StdDe	0.59	0.59	0.57	0.59	0.59	0.57
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.78	18.49	18.59	18.78	18.49	18.59
				StdDe	0.62	0.62	0.60	0.62	0.62	0.60
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.49	18.16	18.24	18.49	18.16	18.24
				StdDe	0.64	0.63	0.60	0.64	0.63	0.60
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.14	17.74	17.68	18.14	17.74	17.68
				StdDe	0.82	0.80	0.73	0.82	0.80	0.73
	36:36	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.12	17.76	17.76	18.12	17.76	17.76
				StdDe	0.66	0.63	0.59	0.66	0.63	0.59
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.27	17.92	17.96	18.27	17.92	17.96
				StdDe	0.61	0.58	0.54	0.61	0.58	0.54
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.63	18.32	18.40	18.63	18.32	18.40
				StdDe	0.57	0.55	0.53	0.57	0.55	0.53
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.89	18.61	18.71	18.89	18.61	18.71
				StdDe	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.51
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.83	18.54	18.65	18.83	18.54	18.65
				StdDe	0.54	0.53	0.52	0.54	0.53	0.52
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.74	18.45	18.55	18.74	18.45	18.55
				StdDe	0.55	0.54	0.52	0.55	0.54	0.52
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.35	18.02	18.07	18.35	18.02	18.07
				StdDe	0.61	0.59	0.56	0.61	0.59	0.56
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.00	17.59	17.48	18.00	17.59	17.48
				StdDe	0.76	0.73	0.67	0.76	0.73	0.67
	54:18	0.000	-1.000	Mean	18.49	18.17	18.26	18.49	18.17	18.26
				StdDe	0.67	0.66	0.62	0.67	0.66	0.62
		0.750	0.000	Mean	18.55	18.24	18.34	18.55	18.24	18.34
				StdDe	0.67	0.67	0.63	0.67	0.67	0.63
		0.000	1.000	Mean	18.75	18.45	18.56	18.75	18.45	18.56
				StdDe	0.66	0.67	0.63	0.66	0.67	0.63
		0.000	3.750	Mean	18.83	18.55	18.66	18.83	18.55	18.66
				StdDe	0.65	0.66	0.63	0.65	0.66	0.63
		0.500	3.750	Mean	18.82	18.54	18.65	18.82	18.54	18.65
				StdDe	0.64	0.65	0.62	0.84	0.65	0.62
		1.000	3.750	Mean	18.78	18.50	18.61	18.78	18.50	18.61
				StdDe	0.66	0.67	0.64	0.66	0.67	0.64
		1.750	3.750	Mean	18.61	18.31	18.41	18.61	18.31	18.41
				StdDe	0.68	0.68	0.65	0.68	0.68	0.65
		0.000	0.000	Mean	18.24	17.86	17.85	18.24	17.86	17.85
				StdDe	0.90	0.90	0.84	0.90	0.90	0.84

Table 7. Type I Error Rates and Intersection Point Standard Errors for Various Sample Sizes and Slopes.

Type I Error Rates (alpha = .05)

	Slopes (+ and -) of the Two Groups			
Sample Sizes	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
25	.367	.190	.117	.088
75	.264	.105	.082	.065
150	.204	.085	.065	.077
250	.158	.074	.059	.049
500	.132	.053	.043	.056
1000	.101	.053	.046	.051
2000	.090	.058	.032	.047

Theoretical Standard Error (Substitutions into Formula 3)

	Slopes (+ and -) of the Two Groups			
Sample Sizes	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
25	30.14	10.05	6.03	4.31
75	17.17	5.72	3.43	2.45
150	12.10	4.03	2.42	1.73
250	9.36	3.12	1.87	1.34
500	6.61	2.20	1.32	.94
1000	4.67	1.56	.93	.67
2000	3.30	1.10	.66	.47

Observed Standard Error (of 1,000 Observed Intersection Points)

	Slopes (+ and -) of the Two Groups			
Sample Sizes	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
25	216.33	4254.67	232.11	34.89
75	141.75	276.86	43.01	3.31
150	826532.68	1184.44	3.32	1.99
250	452.92	5.79	2.40	1.43
500	150.05	2.40	1.43	.99
1000	83.11	1.72	.93	.68
2000	21.60	1.14	.65	.47

Average Estimated Standard Error (Across 1,000 Sample Estimates Using Formula 3)

	Slopes (+ and -) of the Two Groups			
Sample Sizes	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
25	212507.77	47025218.00	100251.75	539.10
75	55423.29	116920.87	1471.44	3.90
150	2944301000000.00	1377867.90	3.90	2.04
250	583595.62	10.73	2.43	1.47
500	46737.98	2.85	1.46	.99
1000	6343.37	1.75	.96	.68
2000	409.99	1.16	.68	.48

TM 025759

AERA April 8-12, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Intersection Point Confidence Intervals as an Alternative to the Johnson-Neyman Technique	
Author(s): William D. Schafer C. Mitchell Dayton Douglas A. Powell	
Corporate Source: University of Maryland	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

☑	Sample sticker to be affixed to document	Sample sticker to be affixed to document	☐
Check here Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."	"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."	**or here** Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.
	Level 1	**Level 2**	

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: William D. Schafer	Position: Associate Professor
Printed Name: William D. Schafer	Organization: University of Maryland
Address: EDMS - College of Education University of Maryland College Park MD 20742-1115	Telephone Number: (301) 405-3628
	Date: 4/30/96

CUA

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education, O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064
202 319-5120

February 27, 1996

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA[1]. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a written copy of your presentation.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can drop off the copies of your paper and Reproduction Release Form at the **ERIC booth (23)** or mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 1996/ERIC Acquisitions
The Catholic University of America
O'Boyle Hall, Room 210
Washington, DC 20064

This year ERIC/AE is making a **Searchable Conference Program** available on the AERA web page (http://tikkun.ed.asu.edu/aera/). Check it out!

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

---

[1]If you are an AERA chair or discussant, please save this form for future use.