

AD-A061 819

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH LONDON (ENGLAND)
INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON APPLIED MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY (14TH) H--ETC(U)
SEP 78 J A ADAMS

F/G 5/10

UNCLASSIFIED

ONRL-C-9-78

NL

| OF |
AD
A061819



END
DATE
FILMED
2 79
DDC

AD A061819



LEVEL II
ONR LONDON CONFERENCE REPORT

12
NW

C-9-78

**OFFICE
OF NAVAL
RESEARCH**

| |
|--|
| FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON APPLIED MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY |
| JACK A. ADAMS |
| 13 September 1978 |

DDC FILE COPY

**BRANCH
OFFICE
LONDON
ENGLAND**

THIS REPORT IS ISSUED
FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES
ON THE UNDERSTANDING
THAT IT IS NOT A PART OF
THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE
AND WILL NOT BE CITED
ABSTRACTED OR REPRINTED

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 1 1978
D

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE AND SALE; ITS DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED.

78 11 13 159

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE | | READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------|--|------|---|-----|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|---------|--|--------------------------------|--|-------|-----------------------|----------|--|
| 1. REPORT NUMBER <u>14</u> ONRL-C-9-78 | 2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. <u>9</u> Conference Rept. | 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. TITLE (and Subtitle) <u>6</u> FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON APPLIED MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY (<u>1411</u>) | 5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. AUTHOR(s) <u>10</u> JACK A. ADAMS | 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| held 15-21 April 1978 Florence, Italy. | 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research, Branch Office, London Box 39, FPO NEW YORK 09510 | 10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS | 12. REPORT DATE <u>11</u> 13 September 78 | 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) <u>12</u> <u>16p.</u> | 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | <table border="1"> <tr><td colspan="2">ACCESSION for</td></tr> <tr><td>DTIC</td><td>White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>DDI</td><td>Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">UNANNOUNCED <input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">JUSTIFICATION.....</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">BY.....</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODE</td></tr> <tr><td>Dist.</td><td>AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL</td></tr> <tr><td><u>A</u></td><td></td></tr> </table> | | ACCESSION for | | DTIC | White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | DDI | Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/> | UNANNOUNCED <input type="checkbox"/> | | JUSTIFICATION..... | | BY..... | | DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODE | | Dist. | AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL | <u>A</u> | |
| ACCESSION for | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DTIC | White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DDI | Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNANNOUNCED <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JUSTIFICATION..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BY..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dist. | AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>A</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Military Psychology Leadership Authority Military Personnel | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Fourteenth International Symposium on Applied Military Psychology was held in Florence, Italy, 15-21 April 1978, with the government of Italy as host. The theme of the conference was "Crisis of Authority in Society, and Leadership". Thirty-six representatives of 13 countries were present. This conference report reviews the 16 formal presentations that were the substance of the symposium. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

78 11 13 159

JP

FOURTEENTH INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON APPLIED MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY

The research communication channels for military psychology in the West are kept open by the International Symposia on Applied Military Psychology. In 1963, under the sponsorship of the Office of Naval Research, a small group of American and European applied military psychologists met informally in the United States to consider research problems and exchange information. The meeting has evolved into annual symposia. The London Branch of the Office of Naval Research maintains the administrative continuity of the symposia series, with a different country being the host each year.

This year the 14th Symposium was hosted by the government of Italy at the Circolo Ufficiali, Via degli Arazzieri, Piazza San Marco, Florence, Italy, 17-21 April 1978. The conference planning and management were in the hands of M. Stracca, who co-chaired the meeting with J. Adams. The theme of the conference was "Crisis of Authority in Society, and Leadership."

Invitations were extended to 20 countries, 13 of which accepted, with a total of 36 participants at the meeting. Of these, 16 made formal presentations, and it was these presentations that were the substance of the Symposium. The format of this conference report will be a summary of each of the 16 presentations.

Belgium

A. Böhrer presented a paper entitled "Respect for Authority, Tradition, and Order as a Motive for becoming an Army Officer." In 1977 the psychological research section of the Belgian Army began a research program among the applicants of the students of the Royal Military School (Koninklijke Militaire School) on the motives for becoming an officer.

The research instrument was a questionnaire of three parts. The first two were descriptive narratives of an army officer's life, and the third was a questionnaire on motive for an officer's life. The questionnaire contains 42 statements, 3 for each of 14 motives. The subject responded to each statement on a five-point scale. Incoming applicants were tested, as well as a sample of each class of the 4-5 year school.

The results were presented in terms of a time plot, on which motive score was plotted against school class. The highest motives were altruism and a desire for action, the lowest was material aim. All of the motives remained essentially constant over the time period except the feeling of independence, which increased steadily over the five years, and respect for authority which decreased steadily.

Canada

The Canadian delegation presented two papers. One was by J. Lafleur, entitled "Conflicting Perspectives on Canadian Forces Personnel Issues." The context of Lafleur's presentation was recruiting and retention of military personnel, and he said that there were three broad approaches that can be used by those who are concerned with stabilizing personnel of the Canadian Forces at an acceptable level: (1) Change the quality of recruits, (2) Change the organizational context, (3) Do nothing. Lafleur's discussion centered on the first two options.

The categorizing of personnel effectiveness in terms of individual characteristics or organizational attributes has two flaws, according to Lafleur. The first is to see personality and organization as independent variables. They interact, he said. A second is to ignore the limited scope for change in each category. One must face the limitations of the labor market and the prevailing social climate insofar as the quality of recruits is concerned. The traditional market for unskilled military manpower has shrunk considerably in the past decade, and soon it may become impossible to procure sufficient numbers of individuals who will both tolerate and perform adequately in a military environment as it is now structured. If, on the other hand, it is believed that the organization should be changed, then it should be kept in mind that organizational change has limits because of the goals of military systems. The risks involved in military ventures, and the need for commitment, make the military a unique occupation. Lafleur offered no solutions to personnel problems, but he believed that his analysis, if heeded, could prevent adoption of simplistic approaches with the expectation of easy solutions.

The other Canadian presentation was by C. Cotton who delivered a paper "Education and the Labor Market: A Crisis Point for Leadership in the West". An increasing proportion of youths are staying in school longer and taking specialized training before entering the labor market. The implications are two-fold for the military. First, the increased tenure of students in schools has reduced the numbers available to the military. Second, the character of the recruit market has changed as more and more potential recruits become better educated. A problem for the military is that the better educated recruits have an apparent intolerance to a military life. There are difficulties in recruiting the higher educated output of the educational system and, if they do enter the military, they are more likely to quit voluntarily because of discontent

C-9-78

with the traditional military lifestyle. The answer is not to insist on less educated recruits, for they have greater difficulty in meeting training demands and account disproportionately for attrition in training. Cotton believes that the long-term trend must be towards the recruitment of the more educated group which now numbers 60% of potential military recruits in Canada. Leaders must be made aware of these trends, and the difficulties that they imply.

Israel

The Israeli delegation had three members: G. Keinan, R. Lipshitz, and M. Nudelman, and each presented a paper.

Keinan's was entitled "Leadership at Sea—Its Characteristics and Means of Development." He said that naval leadership requires unique behavioral characteristics. Keinan listed six requirements of naval leadership:

1. Professional Skills. Command over personnel and technical skills are two broad domains in which an officer must have competence, and the amount of each domain varies with the technical specialty. A fighter pilot, for example, is required to show high technical skills, and yet he has virtually no command of personnel. Conversely, the infantry officer commands a number of personnel but has a relatively low requirement for technical skills. The naval commander has requirements for both.

2. The Ability to Act Independently. The naval commander operates an isolated fighting unit, with only radio contact with his superiors. A capability for independent action is required.

3. The Naval Commander as a Personal Model for Conduct. All military officers must demonstrate high standards of conduct, but the requirement is particularly critical for the naval commander for two reasons: First, the close proximity of personnel aboard ship means that the commander is observed personally, so his behavior must be exemplary at all times. Second, the isolated character of the naval fighting unit, and the interdependence of the elements within the unit, means high dependence upon the commander. A naval commander will be unable to exert the authority that is required if he does not maintain the highest standards of conduct.

4. Effective Processing of Multiple Channels of Information. A ship's commander receives information through a number of channels, often simultaneously, and the effective processing

of it is essential.

5. Effective and Rapid Decision Making. The ability to reach speedy and correct decisions is an essential attribute of all military commanders.

6. Adequate Treatment of Personnel Under Special Conditions. A ship is an isolated and crowded environment, and naval commanders must be sensitive to the health and morale problems that can arise.

Keinan discussed leadership training in the Israeli Navy. The naval officer is exposed to leadership training at several points in his career, particularly when he is a beginning naval cadet. Individuals who train to be navy officers are without prior experience as seamen, and so they have not been exposed to models of naval command. As cadets, they receive two leadership workshops that prepare them for the command role. The aims of the workshops are to increase the understanding of leadership, and to reduce anxiety about command responsibilities. An "open workshop" is unstructured and informal, with the purpose of acquainting the cadet with such command issues as authority and its uses, and conflict management. The "command and leadership workshop" is of a more advanced kind, with the intent of acquainting the cadet with theoretical concepts of leadership. An officer also has further opportunities for workshops in his post-cadet careers.

A second Israeli paper by R. Lipshitz was entitled "Notes on the Relationship Between Leadership Style and Leadership Role." It was Lipshitz's position that military commanders are more concerned with unit competence than the needs and problems of subordinates. As evidence for his position, he asked instructors of an artillery officers' school to identify attributes that distinguish good and bad battery commanders, and then to rank order the attributes in terms of importance. The most important attribute (out of 11) was performance under stress, and the least important was needs and problems of subordinates. Commanders are not indifferent to the needs of personnel, but they are in a system which is accomplishment oriented, and so attention to personnel problems is seen to be more a matter of social desirability than necessity. Because commanders are competence oriented, it is difficult to give them a concern for the welfare of subordinates without somehow tying it to goals of military achievement. An approach, with which Lipshitz intends to experiment, is to expand the commander's role in the recruiting and retention of personnel for voluntary service, and to show him directly that consideration for personnel is a variable in unit management.

The third Israeli paper by M. Nudelman was entitled "Officer's Image." The Israeli Defense Force has the image of an officer as a leader, whatever his technical specialty, and this conception of all officers having common attributes makes the psychologist's task of identifying and measuring them an easier one. Nudelman's presentation was concerned with the description of officer selection tests that are used and the development of rating scales for commanders to use in rating the efficiency of officers subordinate to them. Until six years ago, the method of officer selection was similar to that which Great Britain used. In this method the candidate underwent three days of testing. Paper and pencil tests were completed, a personality questionnaire was taken, and there was role playing and situational tests. During the entire period he was observed by a psychologist and a field officer. Research established that only the paper and pencil tests and an interview by the psychologist contributed to prediction of success in officer training school, and so today only three measures are used for officer selection. One is the Quality Group Scale, which is a composite score based on schooling, knowledge of Hebrew, general intelligence, and a personal interview. The second measure is a Sociometric Score. The third measure is a score developed by the staff of Nudelman's unit which requires a psychologist to rate officer candidates on seven scales, such as intelligence, leadership, decisiveness, etc., write a short description of a candidate's personality, and rate his probability of success both in the officer training school and after school and assignment to a unit. Using success in the officer training school as criterion, the Quality Group Scale and the Sociometric Score had validities in the range of 0.20-0.35, and the psychologist's evaluation had validities in the range of 0.40-0.55. One reason for these modest validity coefficients is the unreliability of the criterion. Consequently, Nudelman and his colleagues have been placing emphasis on development of an officer evaluation form that can be used in the field (not the school) and that can serve as a criterion measure for the validation of selection tests. The research has taken the form of constructing rating scales that require the evaluation of overt behaviors and do not call for judgmental observations. The officer will be evaluated on a large range of behaviors, and these will be elements of his main tasks as an officer. The rating scales, which are still under development, began with 40 behavioral scales, but statistical analysis has reduced this number. A substantial number of the 40 scales discriminated between good and bad officers. A factor analysis of the scales established five factors accounting for the variance: Decision-making ability and performance, motivation and personal example, handling of subordinates, stability and levelheadedness, and good judgment in performance. The factor of decision-making

ability and performance accounted for 75% of the variance.

Italy

The Italian representatives presented four papers. The first was by M. Stracca, G. Chiari, and M. Antonioli entitled "Investigation on the Adjustment to Military and Social Life in Young Recruits of the Italian Army and Navy." The study was carried out on newly conscripted men. Evidence of maladjustment was sought for five areas: Family, school, work, drugs, and military life. Evidence of maladjustment ran 4-5% for family, 24-32% for school, 7-10% for work, 4-15% for drugs, and 19-38% for military life. The data do not allow direct inferences about causes of maladjustment, but the investigators suggested that a major cause of maladjustment to military life was separation from family and work at a time when social and economic gratification were being obtained. They believe that the military can ease adjustment to military life by the use of counseling personnel, better use of free time, proximity to city of origin, and more compatible job placement. A follow-up study will be conducted to determine correlations with desertion, suicide attempts, and actual suicide.

M. Fioravanti presented a paper entitled "Attitudes and Adjustments to the Compulsory Military Service in a Group of Draftees of a Combat Unit." Four questionnaires were administered to 140 enlisted men at the beginning of their military services: The Compulsory Military Service Attitude Questionnaire, Mood Adjective Checklist, Manifest Anxiety Scale, and the Cornell Index. The Compulsory Military Service Attitude Questionnaire was developed by Fioravanti to measure attitudes toward military service in relation to the military environment of the recruit. The Mood Adjective Checklist was administered once a week for five weeks to provide a longitudinal measure of mood changes. The Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Cornell Index were hypothesized to be correlated with adjustment success. The results for the Compulsory Military Service Attitude Questionnaire was that military service causes only a minority of recruits to have strong feelings for or against the military. Most draftees accept military service even though they found no positive aspects to it. The Mood Adjective Checklist showed an increase in aggression over the first five weeks of military life, and a decrease of skepticism, social affection, and vigor. Thirty-six of the recruits were admitted to a military hospital for reasons other than injury or accident, and the Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Cornell Index were found to discriminate these subjects from others. These recruits were found to be more oriented toward

C-9-78

physical complaints and health, and more anxious, than the others. Their attitude towards fellow recruits was less friendly.

Two further papers by the Italian group presented 1968 research. M. Cirone presented a paper "Military Community and Sociometrics Leadership in Isolated Small Groups." He administered various psychodiagnostic and sociometric tests to 60 Alpine soldiers on garrison and patrol duty in the eastern Alps. A paper by I. Testa entitled "Influence of the Mass Media on the Concept of Authority" discussed how the mass media can bias opinions of the public.

The Netherlands

The Dutch participants presented two papers. The paper by H. Visser was concerned with a model of an organization. He saw an organization as beset by three forces, and the leadership of an organization should be concerned about maintaining their equilibrium. The three forces are outside organizations, public opinion, and internal forces. Internally, he saw an organization defined by the consequences of paternalistic or authoritarian leadership. Paternalistic leadership provides facilitation of organizational processes and creates a good working climate. Authoritarian leadership has a tendency to create dissatisfaction, resistance, and rebellion. No evidence for these ideas was given.

E. Warlicht presented a paper entitled "Military Associations in The Netherlands." Military associations in The Netherlands can be traced to the turn of the century. The first in the navy was established in 1897, followed by one for noncommissioned Army officers in 1898. The first for officers was established in 1900. Authorized public employee associations, including trade-union-like organizations of the armed forces, have had formal status with respect to the government since 1919 when a Royal decree established a central committee for formal consultation. An executive order in 1921 stipulated that no decisions on regulations affecting the legal status of military personnel could be taken without prior consultation with military associations. This executive order was enacted into the Military Servants Act in 1931, and it gave the consultation system a statutory base. In 1975 an association of military conscripts became a fully accepted partner in the system. At present, a total of 11 associations have status in the consultation system: Two officers' associations (one for the Navy, the other for the Army and Air Force); five enlisted men's associations organized by service, rank, and religious affiliation; a military police association; a reserve officer's association; and two conscript

associations. Membership in these union-like organizations is approximately 77,000, or 75% of the active duty military. This percentage is high relative to the civilian sector in which trade unions control a membership of 35-40% of the working population. The Ministry of Defence has a compulsory obligation to consult about every government proposal for planned changes in the legal position of military personnel. The military associations have the formal right to advise on the proposals, and they have the right to propose changes in the legal status of personnel. The Minister of Defence, however, has no obligation to execute any proposal from an association, but he is obliged to explain his action in writing. The unions therefore have an advisory role. Lastly, military associations have no right to strike. (For additional information on military trade unions, see the recent book by E.S. Krendel and B. Samoff (editors), *Unionizing the Armed Forces*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1977.)

Sweden

The Swedish psychologists gave two papers. A. Weibull presented one entitled "Problems in the Work Situation of Command." Her data resulted from interviews with sixty commanders in four different Army units. Her data established a conflict between those commanders who represent a traditional military viewpoint that requires a strong trust in authority, and an ideology that emphasizes understanding, working together, and mistrust of authority. She found that a substantial number of the commanders interviewed have started to doubt the military system. Reasons for this differ, but the biggest group of doubters said that the democratization of the defense forces is incompatible with the demands that war can make. For them, war is the reference point, and anything which weakens the capability for war is unacceptable. They believe that military life should be more demanding. Another group of commanders, smaller than the first, is in favor of democratization of the armed forces, in direct contrast to the first group, and they are equally frustrated. They find little support for their views among many of their peers and their own commanders.

G. Frenzel-Norlin described the operations of the Division of Behavioural Sciences, National Defence Research Institute (NDRI), in a paper entitled "Research in the Division of Behavioural Sciences." Until 1974, research on military psychology in Sweden was carried out in a separate institute, called the Institute of Military Psychology, but in 1974 it became part of the NDRI. The NDRI is responsible for all military research in biological, chemical, medical, and psychological domains; it has 5 departments

with about 1500 employees. The Division of Behavioural Sciences is conducting research on what they call group-oriented training (presumably a more democratic classroom atmosphere), job satisfaction, job analysis, and flight safety. Their future research will concern a common career plans for officers. All officers will start as conscripted personnel and advance from that basepoint. A school common to all officers will be founded. Another area of future research will be entry of women into the armed forces.

United States of America

The two presentations of the United States of America described research organizations of the US Navy. R. Hayles described the structure of the Office of Naval Research (ONR), Arlington, VA, of which he is a staff member. The ONR is devoted to contract support of basic and mission-oriented research in all of the sciences, psychology included. The Psychological Sciences Division is directed by G. Bryan, and it has 3 programs: The Personnel and Training Research Program is concerned with training methods, educational technology, psychometrics, and performance evaluation. The Organizational Effectiveness Program supports research on leadership, management, intergroup relations, personnel turnover, and retention. The Engineering Psychology Program covers such areas as auditory and visual perception, decision-making, man-machine system interfaces, and computer-based techniques such as command and control systems.

R. Penn described the research activities of the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, CA, with J. Regan as technical director. The Navy Personnel Research and Development Center has the single largest number of research psychologists of any unit in the US Navy. It is primarily responsible for applied research in the behavioral sciences, as distinct from the more basic research direction of the ONR. The research is carried out both by in-house and contract personnel. Penn described several major research projects of the organization. Among them was the recruiting and assimilation of women into the US Navy.

C-9-78

Appendix A

Names and Addresses of Conferees

Belgium

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Arnold Böhrrer | Sectie Psychologisch Onderzoek Centrum Recruitering en Selectie Kazerne Klein Kasteeltje 1000 Brussels Belgium |
| Roger Champion | Centre de Psycho-sociologie Militaire (CPsyM) Quartier Reine Elisabeth Rue d'Evere 1140 Brussels Belgium |

Canada

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Charles Cotton | Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit 1107 Avenue Road Toronto, Ontario Canada M5N 2E4 |
| C.R. Jean Lafleur | Director Personnel Applied Research National Defence Headquarters 101 Bye Ottawa, Ontario Canada |
| Terry J. Prociuk | Military Leadership and Management Dept. Royal Military College of Canada Kingston, Ontario Canada K762W3 |

Denmark

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Erik Kousgaard | Militoerpsykologisk Tjeneste Christianshavns Voldgade 8 1424 København Denmark |
| Bent Rieneck | Militoerpsykologisk Tjeneste Christianshavns Voldgade 8 1424 København Denmark |

C-9-78

Federal Republic of Germany

Klaus Puzicha

Streitkräfteamt
Abteilung I
Dezernat Wehrpsychologie
Rosenburg
5300 Bonn
Germany

Martin Rauch

Bundesministerium der Verteidigung
P II 4
P.O. Box 1380
53 Bonn
Germany

France

Jacques Brémond

Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches
Psychologiques Air (CERPAIR)
Base Aérienne 272
78210 Saint-Cyr-L'Ecole
France

Varret Jean

Ecole de l'Arme Blindée
49400 Saumur
France

Israel

Meir Nudelman

Head of Psychological Diagnostic Branch
M.P.O.B. 2718, I.D.F.
Israel

Giora Keinan

M.P.O.B. 1068, I.D.F.
Israel

Raanan Lipshitz

Military P.O.B. 2718, I.D.F.
Israel

Italy

Massimo Antonoioli

Istituto di Psicologia
Universita Cattolica
Roma, Italy

C-9-78

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Gabriele Chiari | Nucleo Psicologia LEVADIFE Piazzale Adenauer 3 00100 Roma Italy |
| Massimo Cirone | Presidente CML DIFESAN 00100 Roma Italy |
| Mario Fioravanti | Institute of Psychology Faculty of Medicine University of Rome Rome, Italy |
| Giovanni Graziani | Centro di Psicologia Applicata dell'Arma dei Carabinieri Via Legnano 00100 Roma Italy |
| Marcello Muscara | MARINFERM Ministero Difesa-palaxxo Manna 00100 Roma Italy |
| Lorenzo Pacelli | Ministero dell'Interno Roma, Italy |
| Massimiliano Stracca | Nucleo di Psicologia LEVADIFE ple Adenauer, 3 00100 Roma Italy |
| Ignazio Testa | Nucleo Psicologia LEVADIFE Viale Adenauer 3 Roma, Italy |
| Antonio Tricarico | Comando Generale Scuole Aeronautica Militare Guidonia Roma, Italy |

C-9-78

The Netherlands

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Henk Visser | Bureau Sociaal-Weten-Schappelijk ONDERZOEK Ministerie van Defensie (Marine) Lange Voorhout 7 Den Haag The Netherlands |
| Eric E. Warlicht | Meidoornstraat 16 2351 NJ Leiderdorp The Netherlands |

Norway

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Ivar Fløistad | Forsvarets Psykologitjeneste Oslo MIL, Oslo 1 Norway |
|---------------|---|

Spain

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Francisco Morales Belda | Seccion de Psicologia y Psicotecnia, Jefe Direccion de Ensenanza Naval (Diena) Departamento de Personal (Deper) Cuartel General de la Armada c/Montalban-No. 8 Madrid 14 Spain |
| Antonio Velez Catalan | Seccion de Psicologia Direccion de Ensenanza Naval Cuartel General de la Armada Madrid 14 Spain |

Sweden

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Gunnel Frenzel-Norlin | FOA 55 S-65180 Karlstad Sweden |
| Alise Weibull | FOA 55 Karolinen S-65180 Karlstad Sweden |

C-9-78

Switzerland

Urs Bauman

Fliegerärztliches Institut
8600 Dübendorf
Switzerland

United States of America

Jack A. Adams

Office of Naval Research
US Navy
223 Old Marylebone Road
London NW1 5TH
UK

Robert Hayles

Office of Naval Research
800 North Quincy Street
Code 452
Arlington, Virginia 22217
U.S.A.

William Helme

US Army Research & Standardization
Group, (Europe)
223 Old Marylebone Road
London-NW1 5TH
UK

Robert Penn

Navy Personnel
Research & Development Center (NPRDC)
San Diego, California 92152
U.S.A.