

November 7, 1942

My dear Riddell,

As I told you I expected to do, I asked Miss Lucka to repeat on your second 500 cases the same ~~ix~~ calculations as she had carried out on your first. This she has done: on the sheet marked "A" are listed 31 eye colour classes which in the new material have more than two occupants. These correspond with the ~~26~~³ classes in the first 500. The time difference between men and women is now only 11.343 years, though in the same direction as before.

I have not the least doubt that the second 500 differ significantly^y from the first, though I have not expressly tested this. What I wanted to test was whether the order assigned to different colour classes, or at least to those 40 which appear in both lists, was or was not significantly alike.

Using as weights for each class the sum of reciprocals of the numbers of persons occurring in it in the two series, Miss Lucka finds, as shown in sheet "B", a value of t about 2.9 for 38 degrees of freedom, which is very clearly significant. On the ~~other hand,~~^{whole they} those colour classes which were associated with age in the first series are still associated with age in the second, so that the main phenomenon is most clearly confirmed.

With respect to spots, I notice that the last 10 in Miss Lucka's list are all spotted, while of the first 10 only two are. The central 11 have five spotted and six unspotted. Beyond this I am rather relieved to find colour class 600 is now nearly in the middle of the series, instead of very early as it was before. On the other

hand 100 and 200, which were central, are now rather early.

I have hesitated till now to treat the whole 1000 as a single sample, for fear of the consequences of making the date heterogeneous; but, as they do give independent testimony in agreement on a number of the main points, I am inclined ~~to~~ now to see how the two lots go together.

You might send back these sheets after copying what you want ~~from~~ from them.

Yours sincerely,

2 sheets