Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 109–110, 1996 0892-3310/96

Precognitive Remote Perception: Replication of Remote Viewing

R. D. NELSON, B. J. DUNNE, Y. H. DOBYNS, R. G. JAHN

Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research, School of Engineering and Applied Science, C-131, Princeton University, NJ 08544

The following brief description of the Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR) Remote Perception program has been prepared at the invitation of the Editor[1], in order to augment this special report section of the Journal with information about another substantial database of experiments relevant to those of SRI and SAIC. Given Utts' attention to the importance of replication (Section 3.4), and Hyman's challenge of interlaboratory consistency (Point #3 of his Introduction and Point #2 of his "Suggestions for Future Research"), we submit that the PEAR program has obtained the largest extant body of experimental data that meets their criteria for interlaboratory replication. In point of fact, both the PEAR remote perception program, and the prior studies of Dunne and Bisaha on which it was originally based, were undertaken as formal replications of the SRI experiments of Puthoff and Targ.

Although the PEAR program has accumulated several hundred experimental trials, its primary goal has been to develop a sophisticated analytical judging methodology to replace the human judging process, and thereby to facilitate more precise quantitative assessment of results and their correlation with various experimental parameters. In our basic procedure, the "free response" of the percipient is encoded using a list of 30 binary descriptor questions, allowing algorithmic comparison with the target, similarly encoded by the agent at the scene. For randomly assigned targets, further comparison can be made with an encoding by the person who prepared the target pool. The analysis proceeds by constructing a square matrix of scores calculated by comparing each perception against all targets in the given dataset. The properly matched trials (on the main diagonal of the matrix) can be assigned statistical merit by comparison with the distribution of off-diagonal, mismatched scores, which has sufficiently Gaussian characteristics to allow robust parametric statistical tests.

Beyond the primary experimental question of the degree of anomalous acquisition of information, several other issues have been explored, among them the correlation of analytical and human judge scores, the efficacy of different scoring algorithms and descriptor sets, *ex post facto* vs. participant encoded descriptions, agent chosen versus randomly assigned targets, single vs. multi-

[1]Editor's Note: To be followed by a detailed, peer-reviewed article in the future.

ple percipients, variations among individual agent and percipient pairs, and the relationship of scores to the distance and time intervals separating the perception and the target.

The results in all phases of this experimental program are quite consistent with those of their SRI predecessors and with the more contemporary SAIC studies. Overall they show average effect sizes well within the range described by Utts (Sections 3.4, 4.2, and 4.3). For example, for the entire 336 trials comprising the formal PEAR database, the effect size (composite Z-score normalized by the square root of the number of trials) is 0.347 ± 0.055. When these are separated into randomly assigned vs. volitionally chosen target subsets, the 125 randomly assigned targets show an effect size of 0.516 ± 0.089, and the 211 volitional targets an effect size of 0.244 ± 0.069. Assessment of individual performance indicates that the overall yield is an accumulation of small contributions from the majority of the participant pairs, rather than from a few outstanding efforts.

Among the more interesting findings is parametric evidence that the degree of anomalous information transfer is unaffected by spatial and temporal separations. Regression modeling indicates a significant mean shift, but no evidence for a decline of scoring with increasing distance, up to several thousand miles. Similarly, there is no evidence that scoring is related to positive or negative temporal separations of the perception effort and the target visit, up to as much as a few days. The precognitive subset of these data, consisting of about 75% of the independent trials, seems particularly important to the postulation of viable theoretical models, and has been emphasized throughout.

Thus, these databases, comprising one of the largest accumulations of relevant experiments performed under consistent and well controlled experimental protocols, have already provided robust evidence that the findings in the SRI/SAIC Remote Viewing experiments can be replicated in independent, but essentially similar designs. For more details, consult the following references:

Dobyns, Y. H., B. J. Dunne, R. G. Jahn, R. D. Nelson (1992). Response to Hansen, Utts, and Markwick: Statistical and methodological problems of the PEAR remote viewing experiments. *J. Parapsychology*, 56, 2, 115.Dunne, B. J. and J. P. Bisaha (1979). Precognitive remote viewing in the Chicago area: a replication of the Stanford experiment. *J. Parapsychology*, 43, 1, 17.

Dunne, B. J., R. G. Jahn, R. D. Nelson (1983). Precognitive remote perception. *PEAR Tech. Report 83003.*

Dunne, B. J., Y. H. Dobyns, and S. M. Intner (1989). Precognitive remote perception III: Complete binary database with analytical refinements. *PEAR Tech. Report 89002.*

Jahn, R. G. (1982). The persistent paradox of psychic phenomena: An engineering perspective. *Proceedings IEEE*, 70, 2, 136.

Jahn, R. G. and B. J. Dunne (1986). On the quantum mechanics of consciousness, with application to anomalous phenomena. *Foundations of Physics*, 16, 8, 721.

Jahn, R. G. and B. J. Dunne (1987). *Margins of reality: The role of consciousness in the physical world.* New York, Harcourt Brace.

Jahn, R. G., B. J. Dunne, R. D. Nelson (1987). Engineering anomalies research. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 1,1, 21.

Jahn, R. G., B. J. Dunne, E. G. Jahn (1980). Analytical judging procedure for remote perception experiments. *J. Parapsychology*, 44, 3, 207.