

8 October 1932.

Dr. A.R. Clapham,
Dept. of Botany,
The University,
OXFORD.

My dear Clapham:

Thanks for your letter and offprint, which is a model of clarity. Yes, I felt from a good deal of evidence that the advantages of the familiarity, to some, of the moment notation, was outweighed by the facts that even for the second degree one practically always must use $(n-1)$, although many people who do so still feel that they are using the moment series; while for the 3rd. degree and higher the advantages of the χ series begin to tell heavily.

If your 2 x 2 table can be regarded as a double dichotomy of a normal surface then undoubtedly the correlation may be estimated from the tetrachoric tables, which have I think, now been completed. The error is of course greater than with the same number of pairs of measurements, but not unreasonably so if the dichotomies are nearly central, and there is no other objection to using the method for small samples. This is a case where the number of frequency classes is only one more than the

number of parameters, so that all consistent statistics are necessarily efficient, since the observations are reproducible from them. I see no meaning in contingency coefficients. But — an invariable question — are you sure you want a measure of association?

Yours sincerely,