

e-CONFIGURATION ANALYSIS CHECK-LIST FOR OBSERVED CONFIGURATIONS OF UNITS (observation value %); expecting value; chi-square; STANDARD α - ERROR PROBABILITY ~SPLIT-HALF VALIDITY
 elaborierte Konfigurations-Frequenz-Analyse Strichliste der Anzahl beobachteter Konfigurationen (Beobachtungswert %); Erwartungswert; Chi-Quadrat; Standard-Fehlerwahrscheinlichkeit ~ Halbierungscheck ob gültig
 analyse fréquentielle des configurations élaborée no. aux observations (o) en pourcent % ; expectation e ; chi carré ; (degr. of freedom; Freiheitsgrade ; df ~ 4 -1 ; 2-1)
 Distribution gleich/equal/égale

nr.	F dimensions of 4 configurations				Σ (o %)	e% = 6,25%	$\chi^2 = \Sigma (o-6,25)^2 : 6,25$	STANDARD α - ERROR PROBABILITY ~SPLIT-HALF VALIDITY				$\alpha; 1^{st/2} \sim 2^{nd/2}$	
	patterns of classified categories		stripe for each unit according to observed categories					(4-configurations) (df 3);	(2-configurations); (df3);	(df1);	(df1)		BIP row-validity
	(Gf)	(Au)	(Aw)	(Amb)	(no. RUN; RUN %)			$\alpha < 5\%$;	$\alpha < 1\%$	$\alpha < 5\%$	$\alpha < 1\%$		
01.	+	+	+	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~	▲	
02.	+	+	+	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
03.	+	+	-	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
04.	+	+	-	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
05.	+	-	+	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
06.	+	-	+	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
07.	+	-	-	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
08.	+	-	-	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
09.	-	+	+	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
10.	-	+	+	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
11.	-	+	-	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
12.	-	+	-	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
13.	-	-	+	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
14.	-	-	+	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
15.	-	-	-	+				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
16.	-	-	-	-				*7,81	**13,3	~	~		
SPLIT-HALF CHECK; 2x Halbierungs-Iteration (BIP):					percentage configuration patterns 1st & 2nd half	Σ (o%)	e% = 25%	(o-25) ² : 25	*5%; 3 df	**1%; 3 df	*5%; 1df	**1%; 1df	1. Hälfte ~ 2. Hälf.
					première moitié (1e m.)								1e m. ~ 2e m.
SHC 01.	+	+						●	~	~	*3,84	**6,64	
SHC 02.	+	-						~	~	~	*3,84	**6,64	
SHC 03.	-	+						~	~	~	*3,84	**6,64	
SHC 04.	-	-	●					~	~	~	*3,84	**6,64	●

Appendix: 6.3. algorithm to:
Elaborated configuration-frequency-
analysis, e-KFA

Algorithm after a hectographed
contribution in a seminary lesson on
social cognitions and behaviour at
psychological institute, university of the
Saar, Saarbrücken, summer-semester,
1975

by Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs, ©,
updated as English version
2014-11-02, 2015-02-26, 2016-02-10

At a first glance, e-KFA could remind
Cochran's Q-sort, yet is not.

KFA had been formulated by Krauth &
Lienert about 1971 to typologize and to
analyse by chi-square and binominal
distribution.

Critics on KFA (Konfiguration – Frequenz
-Analyse) had followed lexically (Clauss,

G. & al., 1976: Wörterbuch der
Psychologie. VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie,
Leipzig. Pahl-Rugenstein, Köln, 1976),
and described the problem to smaller or
larger number of checked persons or
items than about $N \sim 40$.

This numerical methodical KFA inherent
problem really can be avoided, if instead
of absolute number one calculated in
percentages, so one could also analyse
rather appropriately, both, smaller
samples than $N \sim 40$, or larger samples
than $N \sim 40$.

Author's KFA elaboration shows
examples, how to apply e-KFA in
psychology, and psychological field
research, and also as a practitioner's
method, without any electrical computer,
just by hand calculations to combinations
of hypotheses in any social and
psychological field.

Do it yourself !

1st you define your most possible to
observe terms, categories, or
dimensions, according to valid theories
&/or objective items.

2nd you take the amount (number) of
categories to form plus-minus (yes/no
answers or signatures as plus/minus)
combinatoric configuration-matrices. A
two configuration-matrix (KF) makes four
possible configurative combinations: (++;
+--; --; ---), a three KF shows eight
configurative combinations (+++; ++-; +-
+; +-+; -++; -+-; ---) etc. Above
algorithm sheet shows four
configurations with sixteen possible of
"yes" &/or "no" configurations of,
combinatorically, etc.

Why now KFA elaborated, behalf to
calculate in percentages? When 4-
configurations were by split half (bi-
partition) analysed after chi-square, only
significant values in row after split half
iteration were valid, thus a four-

configuration must be equally significant at least after chi-square BIP control in its both parts divided in two configurations. The lowest significance in row determines here the significance of all a four-configuration row.

Percentage calculation as appropriate to social and psychological data (always in mind that "nasty" scaling problem and of objectivity), claims percentages for numbers of observed data and to expecting values of a distribution as inference model.

When social data or psychological data in practice or social fields occur, that phantasm of normal or binominal distributions can even more appropriate and more rapidly be calculated by inference of equal distribution. Thus: 100% of postulated expecting inference (e) be to two-configurational percentage number observed (o) data, as 100% by 4 (number of possible combinations) = 25

% expectation value (e); for 3-configuration's observed percentages (o) and its possible combinations 100% by 8 = 12,5% (e); four configuration's e = 6,25 %; (100% : 16).

When one will look for errors of significance in one's statistical tables on chi square, degrees of freedom (df; FG) depend here on number of configurations: two-configurations make $2 - 1 = 1$ df; three-config. show $3-1 = 2$ df; and four-configurative calculations make subtract one from four and show three degrees of freedom at its table value for significance.

This appropriate and rather quick method to calculate shows very satisfying approximations to much more complicated factor analyses and also can be applied to control rapidly factor analyses by hand calculation without electronic computers, and also efficiently can be applied in social fields, on park

branches, and in practice, to bundle data and test its significance, without scaling and interpretation problems those problems typical to factor analysis of communality and rotation. Nevertheless one could bundle e-KFA results again by a factor analysis.

To rapid e-KFA percentages can be done inter-correlations to test reliability to its percentage results in rows (types/factors) and columns (factorial categories, items, dimensions), and an arithmetical (or geometrical by f. exampl. Mosier nomogram, 1942, in: Lienert, G.A., 1970: Testtheorie. Beltz, Weinheim) mean coefficient can describe consistency (as well as a communality) coefficient.

Literature: please, look in text (loc. cit.), and at author's WEB-site,

Terms:

Psychology, psycho-linguistics,
mathematical psychology,
structuralisme, algorithm to elaborated
configuration frequency analysis (e-
KFA), percentage chi-square, equal
distribution, benefit by method: smaller
and larger samples than $N = 40$ to
calculate, e-KFA is an approximation to
factor analysis; e-KFA "types" (factors)
can be further condensed by factor
analysis, when taking percentage types
as "variables" ; also to evaluate
Rorschach (Ro) systematics psycho-
linguistically.

144

Author and Copyright, © 1975 ff: DP Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs,
(Diplom-Psychologe, phil. & min. med. fac.), ev. KiR i.R., cum
facultate docendi; update 2016-02-18, ©



Decemseptimus comes Lofsensis,
Cleve, Mark, Ravenstijn-Blois, Schwarzenberg, Monts,
Brücker, etc., etc., etc.

