

AD-A070 548

OREGON UNIV EUGENE DEPT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
IS TIME-SHARING A GENERAL ABILITY.(U)

F/6 5/5

UNCLASSIFIED

JUN 79 H L HAWKINS, E RODRIGUEZ, & M REICHER  
TR-3

N00014-77-C-0643

NL

| OF |  
AD  
A070548



DA070548

Unclassified

Security Classification of this Page (When Date Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		Read Instructions Before Completing Form
1. Report Number Technical Report No. 3	2. Govt Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog Number
4. Title (and Subtitle) Is Time-sharing a General Ability?	5. Type of Report & Period covered. 9 Technical Report	
7. Author(s) Harold L. Hawkins, Elizabeth Rodriguez and Gerald M. Reicher	8. Contract or Grant Number(s) 15 R0014-77-C-0643	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Department of Psychology University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403	10. Program Element, Project, Task, Area & Work Unit Nos. NR 150-407	
11. Controlling Office Name and Address Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217	12. Report Date 11 30 Jun 1979	
14. Monitoring Agency Name & Address (if different from Controlling Office) 14 TR-3	13. Number of pages 22	
15. Security Class. (of this report) Unclassified	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		
19. Key Words (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Time-sharing, dual-task performance		
20. Abstract (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) (Over)		

DD Form 1473  
1 Jan 73

Edition of 1 Nov 65 is obsolete  
S/N 0102-014-6601

Unclassified  
Security Classification of  
This Page (when date entered)

403 597

Abstract

The time-sharing ability of 18 students was measured under 8 separate dual-task (double-stimulation) conditions. Three task characteristics -- input modality (auditory or visual), output modality (vocal or manual) and task difficulty (easy or difficult) -- were systematically varied across conditions in an effort to manipulate the nature of the specific time-sharing demands imposed. Each condition contained two of these characteristics in common with 3 of the remaining 7 conditions, one of the characteristics in common with 3 others, and none in common with the last condition. Time-sharing efficiency was found to correlate across conditions that impose similar processing demands on the individual, but not across conditions imposing relatively dissimilar demands. We conclude on this basis that time-sharing performance is largely determined by several poorly correlated, task-specific subcapacities rather than by a single general capacity or ability.

ASSTANT SECRETARY	
SECRETARY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED JUSTIFICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
By _____	
Dist	A

Human factors researchers have long assumed that a general time-sharing ability is influential in tasks such as piloting, driving and air-traffic control where high rates of information exchange are required between the operator and the environment. This belief has prompted a substantial research investment over the past three decades in efforts to develop measures of time-sharing that will predict performance in such tasks (e.g., Melton, 1947; Trankell, 1959; North and Gopher, 1976; and Damos, 1978). Much of this research has been based on a single-channel model of human information processing capacity. In this view, one's time-sharing ability is largely determined by the capacity of a single (central) processing structure through which most input-output transactions must be funneled. If this idea is correct, any measurement procedure that accurately reflects the individual's central processing capacity should be broadly predictive of time-sharing performance across a wide range of criterion situations.

An alternative view is possible, however. It could be that time-sharing performance is governed not by a single general capacity, but by several more specific subcapacities, each associated with a particular structure within the information-processing sequence. If such subcapacities were to some extent independent of one another and if their relative contributions to overall performance were to vary across time-sharing situations, the development of a single general predictor could prove a more complex task than has previously been assumed. These issues are examined in the experiment described in the present report.

Evidence consistent with the view that time-sharing is based upon several structure-specific subcapacities rather than upon a single general capacity appears in work recently completed at the University of Oregon. Some of

this work has been reported elsewhere (Hawkins, Church and deLemos, 1978). Subjects were tested in a variant of the double-stimulation paradigm in which the subject is required on each trial to make a speeded choice reaction to each of two distinct stimuli. The Task 1 stimulus (stimulus 1) appeared at the beginning of each trial, while the Task 2 stimulus (stimulus 2) appeared either simultaneously with stimulus 1 or following a variable delay ranging up to 1200 msec. Subjects were instructed to maintain a relatively stable mean reaction time (RT) to Task 1 across all interstimulus intervals, and were able to do so. We take this result to imply that the full force of the time-sharing demands imposed by the task combination at the shortest ISIs is manifested in performance on Task 2. Characteristic data patterns are illustrated in Figure 1.-----

Insert Fig. 1 about here  
-----

The increase in RT to Task 2 at the shortest ISIs is called the psychological refractory period (PRP) effect. The presence of a PRP effect implies an inability to completely time-share the processing demands of the two tasks. In some of the studies, stimulus 1 and stimulus 2 were either input through the same input modality (visual-visual) or through different modalities (auditory-visual). In other studies responses to the two stimuli were emitted through the same output modality (left hand manual-right hand manual) or through different modalities (vocal-right hand manual). In all studies two levels of Task 2 difficulty were presented and subjects were observed over several days of practice. Three of the findings of these studies are especially relevant to the present report.

First, we observed that when two simultaneous stimuli must share the same input modality (i.e. both stimuli were visual), time-sharing performance




Figure 1. Task 1 and Task 2 Reaction Time under conditions of double stimulation as a function of interstimulus interval.

is poor relative to cases in which separate input modalities were used (one stimulus auditory, one visual). This result implies the existence of capacity limitations during input processing. These limitations appear to be manifested when multiple inputs must be processed through a single modality, but not otherwise. This effect resembles a phenomenon that Treisman and Davies (1973) have called structural interference. Second, we observed that when two simultaneous or near-simultaneous responses share the same output modality (i.e., each task entails a manual response), time-sharing performance is poorer than when separate output modalities are used. This result implies the presence of capacity-limited operations during output processing. Third, we observed that early in training the response retrieval demands of multiple tasks are mutually interfering, implying that response retrieval, or related activities (Keele, 1973) are governed by capacity-limited operations at the early stages of learning. We found that the rate at which retrieval processes automate, or lose their capacity-limited character with practice, varies across tasks. Consequently, at any given point prior to the very highest levels of training, some task combinations were observed to manifest time-sharing limitations during retrieval, whereas others did not.

The first two of these effects clearly reflect limitations that are task-specific. The third effect varies with the difficulty of the response retrieval demands imposed by the task, and thus is task-specific to some degree.

Considered together these findings indicate that different subcapacities are invoked under different time-sharing conditions. The results give no hint, however, regarding whether these subcapacities are correlated, or for that matter, whether the role they play in determining time-sharing performance is very important.

Recent work by Sverko (1977) raises the possibility that the sub-capacities underlying time-sharing are both important and uncorrelated. Sverko tested 60 subjects on four information-processing tasks presented both singly and in all possible pair-wise combinations. The tasks were chosen because of their simplicity of administration and the fact that they presumably tap different psychomotor and mental functions. The tasks included rotary pursuit, visual choice reaction time, mental arithmetic and auditory discrimination. All task pairings were performed under instructions to assign equal priority to both tasks.

Sverko sought evidence for a general time-sharing ability using two separate procedures. First, the performance of subjects on each task under each condition (including both single and dual task conditions) was correlated with that on each task under all other conditions. The resulting inter-correlation matrix was then subjected to a principle component analysis. If a general time-sharing factor was manifested in the data five factors should have emerged, four task-specific factors and a general time-sharing factor. In fact, only four factors could be extracted, and these were clearly task-specific. Second, a total performance decrement score was calculated for each task pairing. This score is simply the sum of the proportionate performance loss on the two tasks when paired, relative to when they are carried out singly. The performance decrement score for each task pairing was then correlated with that for each other task pairing with the constraint that no common tasks appeared across pairings. The obtained correlation was essentially zero in all cases. While Sverko's procedure seems generally adequate, one potentially important problem exists with the study; although subjects were instructed to give equal emphasis to the two tasks time-shared under each condition, Sverko had no way to assess the extent to which this

instruction was followed. If performance on a given task does not vary as a linear function of the amount of one's capacity devoted to that task, and if the partition of capacity between tasks varied across conditions, this could have produced artifactually deflated correlations among conditions. Moreover, all of Sverko's tasks were continuous, and it is unknown how subjects interleaved the two tasks. Different tasks could have been interleaved differently by the same subject.

Accordingly, our purpose in the present study was to assess the relatedness of some of the time-sharing subcapacities we had previously identified, and to do so under conditions in which close experimental control can be exerted over the priorities assigned by subjects to component tasks. Subjects were tested under eight separate time-sharing conditions, some relatively similar to one another with respect to the specific subcapacities they are presumed to stress, and some relatively dissimilar. If time-sharing performance is dominated by a single general capacity or by correlated subcapacities, one would expect to see high correlations in time-sharing performance, both between conditions that are similar and those that are dissimilar. If performance is governed by uncorrelated subcapacities, correlations should occur between similar but not between dissimilar conditions.

#### METHOD

Subjects. The subjects were 10 men and 8 women drawn from the University of Oregon paid subject pool. None of the subjects had previously participated in a dual-task experiment. All reported normal or normal-corrected vision and none reported a hearing deficit.

Procedure. Subjects were tested for 1.5 to 2 h on each of two consecutive days. Practice was given on all experimental conditions at the

beginning of day 1. following practice on day 1 and beginning at the outset of day 2, subjects were tested for 84 trials under each of 8 time-sharing conditions. The order of the conditions was randomized across subjects and reversed across days within subjects.

Visual stimuli were displayed on a computer-controlled cathode ray tube situated in a small darkened subject cubicle. The subject was seated about 65 cm in front of the CRT display with the middle and index fingers of either the right hand or both hands (depending upon the condition) resting on piano-type response keys. Each trial began with the exposure of a fixation cross which remained in view in the center of the CRT screen for 500 msec. Under conditions in which two visual stimuli were presented, stimulus 1 appeared simultaneously with the offset of the fixation cross and .5 degrees to its left. Under conditions in which stimulus 1 was auditory, a pure 80 db(B) tone appeared binaurally over headphones, onsetting with offset of the fixation cross. Whether visual or auditory, stimulus 1 remained on for 500 msec. Following a stimulus onset asynchrony (SOA) of either 0, 50, 100, 200, 600, or 1200 msec, stimulus 2 appeared on the CRT screen .5 degrees to the right of the position that had been occupied by the fixation cross. When two visual stimuli were present, they subtended a visual angle of 1.6 degrees.

Under all conditions, instructions were to respond quickly and accurately and to treat Task 1 as primary. To facilitate the latter objective, verbal feedback concerning the pattern of Task 1 latencies was given following each trial block.

Time-sharing conditions. Eight time-sharing conditions were generated from the factorial combination of three binary variables. The three variables

were stimulus 1 modality (auditory or visual), response 1 modality (vocal or manual), and Task 2 difficulty (easy or difficult). The conditions are given in Table 1. Under all conditions Task 1 contained two stimulus

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

alternatives, each requiring a unique response. Task 1 visual stimuli consisted of the upper-case letters H and N. The auditory Task 1 stimuli were an 800 and a 1200 hz tone. Under conditions in which Task 1 entailed a manual response, one stimulus required a response by the middle finger of the subject's left hand, and the other stimulus required a left-hand index finger response. Under vocal conditions, subjects responded with the word "RED" to one stimulus and with "GREEN" to the other. Response latencies under vocal conditions were measured by means of a voice-activated switching circuit.

Under all conditions stimulus 2 was visual and response 2 was manual. In the easy form of Task 2, stimuli were the digits 2 and 3. Subjects were instructed to respond with the index finger of the right hand when 2 appeared and with the middle finger of the same hand when 3 appeared. The difficult form of Task 2 consisted of two 4:1 S-R mappings: the digits 2, 5, 6 and 9 required a response by the index finger of the right hand and the digits 3, 4, 7 or 8 required a response by the middle finger of that hand.

#### Results and Discussion

Mean reaction time (RT) and proportion incorrect responses were calculated for each subject at each of the 6 SOAs for Tasks 1 and 2 under the 8 experimental conditions. The results, averaged across subjects, are given in Table 2. Two features of these data should be pointed out.

Table 1

Relations among the eight time-sharing conditions.

	Stimulus 1 - Visual, Stimulus 2 - Visual	Stimulus 1 - Auditory, Stimulus 2 - Visual		
	Easy Task 2 (1:1 S-R mappings)	Difficult Task 2 (4:1 S-R mappings)	Easy Task 2 (1:1 S-R mappings)	Difficult Task 2 (4:1 S-R mappings)
Response 1 - Vocal, Response 2 - Manual	VEV	VDV	AEV	ADV
Response 1 - Manual, Response 2 - Manual	VEM	VDM	AEM	ADM

-----  
Insert Table 2 about here  
-----

First, RT to Task 1 remained relatively invariant across SOAs. Second, a substantial increase in Task 2 latency between the 1200 msec and the 0 msec SOA (the PRP effect) was obtained under all conditions. These results indicate that we were successful in our effort to focus the effects of time-sharing onto Task 2 performance.

Two separate measures of time-sharing performance were used to evaluate the theoretical issues raised in the introduction. The first of these was the PRP effect (see above) which, we assumed, would vary as the inverse of the individual's time-sharing effectiveness. Correlations in PRP magnitude were calculated between all possible pairings of the 8 conditions. These correlations, and split-half reliabilities for all conditions, appear in Table 3.

-----  
Insert Table 3 about here  
-----

The correlations are organized according to the number and type of attributes common to the two conditions correlated. It is clear from the table that substantially high correlations in PRP magnitude occur across these time-sharing conditions, even between those formally sharing no common attributes. These results indicate that PRP magnitude was influenced by a common factor across the 8 conditions. However, is time-sharing the common factor? It could be that the longer a person's RT to Task 1 the longer it will tend to be before full attention can be turned to processing stimulus 2, and hence the greater the delay in responding to that stimulus.

Table 2(a)

Mean reaction time and proportion errors (in parentheses) for stimulus 1 averaged across subjects at each SOA under each of the 8 time-sharing conditions.

Condition	<u>Stimulus 1</u>					
	Stimulus onset asynchrony (msec)					
	0	50	100	200	600	1200
AEM	631 (.049)	627 (.042)	630 (.064)	627 (.046)	623 (.032)	632 (.028)
ADM	640 (.038)	654 (.052)	638 (.028)	626 (.046)	615 (.028)	632 (.036)
VEM	538 (.050)	542 (.042)	533 (.030)	526 (.042)	528 (.028)	532 (.050)
VDM	556 (.036)	557 (.028)	543 (.030)	545 (.034)	550 (.028)	552 (.028)
AEV <sup>a</sup>	738	727	731	727	731	720
ADV <sup>a</sup>	761	775	707	779	760	762
VEV <sup>a</sup>	640	665	647	643	625	642
VDV <sup>a</sup>	652	648	653	645	667	662

<sup>a</sup>Vocal trials were spot monitored for errors during practice.

Error rate was found to be negligible or nonexistent for all subjects at this time.

Table 2(b)

Mean reaction time and proportion errors (in parentheses) for stimulus 2, averaged across subjects at each SOA under each of the 8 time-sharing conditions.

Stimulus 2  
Stimulus Onset Asynchrony (msec)

Condition	0	50	100	200	600	1200
AEM	1050 (.028)	1010 (.034)	950 (.050)	840 (.028)	521 (.036)	456 (.028)
ADM	1085 (.076)	1041 (.070)	982 (.071)	896 (.083)	776 (.083)	636 (.095)
VEM	781 (.048)	751 (.040)	703 (.030)	666 (.048)	469 (.064)	473 (.024)
VDM	979 (.091)	925 (.093)	876 (.058)	750 (.099)	649 (.077)	594 (.056)
AEV	985 (.051)	925 (.056)	842 (.048)	726 (.050)	584 (.080)	522 (.056)
ADV	1059 (.098)	1031 (.065)	980 (.079)	927 (.078)	717 (.085)	667 (.087)
VEV	938 (.073)	926 (.070)	825 (.071)	731 (.063)	533 (.050)	457 (.058)
VDV	1051 (.106)	1022 (.105)	961 (.109)	855 (.091)	691 (.113)	605 (.085)

Table 3

Correlation in the magnitude of the psychological refractory period (PRP) effect as a function of the number of characteristics shared by two conditions. Condition codes and split-half reliabilities are given in the top portion of the table. A correlation coefficient of .40 is significant at the .05 level.

<u>Code Condition Reliability</u>			<u>Code Condition Reliability</u>		
1	AEM	.927	5	VEM	.960
2	ADM	.945	6	VDM	.849
3	AEV	.921	7	VEV	.912
4	ADV	.967	8	VDV	.765

No Common Characteristic

$r_{1-8}$	=	.691
$r_{2-7}$	=	.494
$r_{3-6}$	=	.709
$r_{4-5}$	=	.435
Mean $r^a$	=	.592

One Common Characteristic

<u>Input</u>	<u>Output</u>	<u>Difficulty</u>
$r_{1-4} = .777$	$r_{1-6} = .388$	$r_{1-7} = .499$
$r_{2-3} = .744$	$r_{2-5} = .386$	$r_{2-8} = .416$
$r_{5-8} = .396$	$r_{3-8} = .697$	$r_{3-5} = .692$
$r_{6-7} = .391$	$r_{4-7} = .428$	$r_{4-6} = .522$
Mean $r^a = .608$	.488	.540

Two Common Characteristics

<u>Input-Output</u>	<u>Input-Difficulty</u>	<u>Output-Difficulty</u>
$r_{1-2} = .624$	$r_{1-3} = .713$	$r_{1-5} = .462$
$r_{3-4} = .712$	$r_{2-4} = .669$	$r_{2-6} = .499$
$r_{5-6} = .777$	$r_{5-6} = .632$	$r_{3-7} = .720$
$r_{7-8} = .522$	$r_{6-8} = .340$	$r_{4-8} = .440$
Mean $r^a = .659$	.568	.562

<sup>a</sup>Mean r was obtained by transforming each r to z, calculating mean z, then transforming back to r.

In other words, the delay in stimulus 2 processing which constitutes the PRP effect could be determined in large measure by how slow the person is to Task 1.

We evaluated this possibility by correlating the magnitude of the PRP effect with Task 1 latency at the shortest SOA. A correlation of .815 was obtained, indicating that those who were fastest on Task 1 indeed showed the smallest interference effect on Task 2. This result is consistent with the idea that the high correlations shown in Table 3 are an artifact of overall quickness. The possibility remains, however, that quick individuals are also good at time-sharing. To separate these two possibilities we developed a measure of time-sharing effectiveness that is not confounded by the individual's overall quickness. The measure, time-sharing efficiency ( $e_{ts}$ ), is defined as the amount of Task 2 processing, in msec, per msec of Task 1 processing. That is,

$$e_{ts} = \frac{RT_{21200} - (RT_{20} - RT_{10})}{RT_{10}},$$

where  $RT_{10}$  is the response latency to Task 1 at the 0 SOA,  $RT_{21200}$  is the response latency to Task 2 at the 1200 msec SOA, and  $RT_{20}$  is the Task 2 latency at 0 SOA. Were no PRP effect present -- that is, should  $RT_2$  not elevate at the shortest asynchrony -- the value of  $e_{ts}$  would be 1.00. If the PRP effect were to equal  $RT_{10}$ , as though no Task 2 processing took place prior to response 1, the value of  $e_{ts}$  would be .00. The measure will show a negative value should the PRP effect exceed Task 1 latency.

In an initial attempt to validate  $e_{ts}$  as a measure of time-sharing effectiveness, we looked at its behavior across conditions that should predictably differ in time-sharing difficulty. Three comparisons were of special interest: (1) between visual-visual and auditory-visual conditions;

(2) between manual-manual and vocal-manual conditions; and (3) between conditions containing the easier and those containing the more difficult Task 2. Table 4 shows the results of this analysis. Each  $e_{ts}$  entry

-----  
Insert Table 4 about here  
-----

represents the mean of four conditions: for instance, the visual-visual conditions consisted of VEV, VDV, VEM and VDM. The obtained pattern of results is consistent with what one would expect if  $e_{ts}$  is measuring time-sharing effectiveness. Efficiency is slightly lower when the same input modality is used by both tasks than when different modalities are used (c.f. Treisman, 1969; Hawkins, Church & deLemos, 1978), and is slightly lower when the same output modality is used by both tasks than when separate modalities are used (c.f. McLeod, 1978). Efficiency is also lower when the easier form of Task 2 is used. This counter-intuitive result is expected on the basis of prior data (Karlin and Kestenbaum, 1969; Hawkins, Church & deLemos, 1978), which indicate that an easy second task shows a larger PRP effect than does a difficult one. Data of this form have been interpreted by Keele (1973) through the assumption that much of the increased reaction time which the difficulty of the second task induces is due to processes that are time-consuming but automatic. As a result, the longer-lasting task is actually better able to be time-shared.

Having established that  $e_{ts}$  exhibits a measure of construct validity, we then determined the extent to which its value correlates across the 8 conditions of the experiment. These correlations and split-half reliabilities for conditions are given in Table 5. It is readily apparent that the

-----  
Insert Table 5 about here  
-----

**Table 4**

Time-sharing efficiency as a function of  
input, output and difficulty level.

Condition	$e_{ts}$	Significance Level
Manual (Task 1)	.253	p < .02
Vocal (Task 1)	.356	
Visual (Task 1)	.281	p < .10
Auditory (Task 1)	.328	
Easy (Task 2)	.257	p < .05
Difficult (Task 2)	.352	

Table 5

Correlation in time-sharing efficiency,  $e_{ts}$ , as a function of the number of characteristics shared by two conditions. Condition codes and split-half reliabilities are given in the top portion of the table. A correlation coefficient of .40 is significant at the .05 level.

Code	Condition	Reliability	Code	Condition	Reliability
1	AEM	.855	5	VEM	.883
2	ADM	.668	6	VDM	.789
3	AEV	.892	7	VEV	.866
4	ADV	.927	8	VDV	.663

<u>No Common Characteristic</u>	
$r_{1-8}$	= .087
$r_{2-7}$	= .205
$r_{3-6}$	= .147
$r_{4-5}$	= .181
Mean $r^a$	= .154

<u>One Common Characteristic</u>		
<u>Input</u>	<u>Output</u>	<u>Difficulty</u>
$r_{1-4} = .654$	$r_{1-6} = .417$	$r_{1-7} = .184$
$r_{2-3} = .483$	$r_{2-5} = .338$	$r_{2-8} = .192$
$r_{5-8} = .129$	$r_{3-8} = .180$	$r_{3-5} = .357$
$r_{6-7} = .520$	$r_{4-7} = .097$	$r_{4-6} = .365$
Mean $r^a = .465$	.263	.276

<u>Two Common Characteristics</u>		
<u>Input-Output</u>	<u>Input-Difficulty</u>	<u>Output-Difficulty</u>
$r_{1-2} = .738$	$r_{1-3} = .564$	$r_{1-5} = .575$
$r_{3-4} = .411$	$r_{2-4} = .605$	$r_{2-6} = .423$
$r_{5-6} = .739$	$r_{5-7} = .520$	$r_{3-7} = .320$
$r_{7-8} = .520$	$r_{6-8} = .079$	$r_{408} = .239$
Mean $r^a = .621$	.461	.424

<sup>a</sup>Mean  $r$  obtained by transforming  $r$  to  $z$ , calculating mean  $z$ , then transforming back to  $r$ .

measure correlates reasonably well across many of the conditions that impose the same types of time-sharing demands. However, when different demands are imposed by a pair of conditions, little or no correlation is observed.

We interpret these results as demonstrating that time-sharing performance is governed by a number of poorly-correlated, task-specific subcapacities, rather than by a single, general capacity or by a set of correlated subcapacities. An individual who performs well in one time-sharing situation will not necessarily perform well in another unless the two situations stress the same set of subcapacities.

How well does this conclusion accord with the literature on time-sharing? While reports supposing the existence of a general time-sharing ability are numerous, we are aware of only three studies in which the supposition has actually been tested. One of these was the Sverko (1977) study, which we have discussed previously. A second was reported over 60 years ago by McQueen (1917). McQueen tested elementary school children on a variety of psychomotor and cognitive tasks, presented both singly and concurrently. Using correlational methods, McQueen was unable to find any evidence whatsoever for a general ability to time share, or as he put it, to "distribute attention" across multiple tasks. The third study was by Jennings and Chiles (1977) whose results have been interpreted as favoring the existence of a general time-sharing ability. A close examination of their results, however, indicates that while they may have identified a time-sharing factor, this factor is not general across the tasks they studied. Rather, what they have uncovered appears to be a task-specific subability, perhaps along the lines of those evidenced in the present study. The procedure used by Jennings and Chiles, like that of Sverko, was to factor analyze

the results of a set of tasks when these were carried out singly and in combination. One of the factors extracted from the analysis showed high loadings for two different low-signal density, visual monitoring tasks when these were performed concurrently with other tasks, but not when they were carried out singly. However, because no other tasks, including 2-dimensional tracking, loaded on this factor under concurrent conditions, the factor is clearly quite specific to a particular class of monitoring tasks.

Data that seem to provide at least indirect support for the idea of a general time-sharing ability have appeared in several studies examining the relationship between measured time-sharing and piloting performance (Melton, 1947; Trankell, 1959; Gopher and North, 1976; Damos, 1978). Even though the nature of the time-sharing predictor tasks differed substantially across these four studies, all obtained statistically reliable correlations. However, it is understandable that these results might be obtained even though time-sharing is not a general ability factor. Piloting is a highly complex task in which information input through visual, auditory, tactile and vestibular channels must be transformed, integrated and acted upon through a variety of output modalities. Consequently, at one time or another piloting probably taxes, and is influenced by, most of the subcapacities implicated in time-sharing. By the same reasoning, one would not expect that correlations between any single time-sharing measure and piloting performance would be substantial (and indeed they are not) for no single measure is apt to reflect all the subcapacities relevant to piloting. Thus a potentially useful selection strategy is to test candidates on a battery of tasks tapping a variety of time-sharing subcapacities. A multiple regression analysis of the data obtained from such an effort could both enhance the predictive

power of one's measurement procedures and lend insights into the relative contributions of the various time-sharing subcapacities in determining performance in the criterion situation.

#### Reference Note

Hawkins, H. L., Church, M., and deLemos, S. Time-sharing is not a unitary ability. University of Oregon Technical Report (No. 2), prepared for the Office of Naval Research under Contract N0014-77-C-0643, 1978.

## References

- Damos, D. Residual attention as a predictor of pilot performance. Human Factors, 1978, 20, 435-440.
- Jennings, A.E. and Chiles, W. D. An investigation of time-sharing ability as a factor in complex performance. Human Factors, 1977, 19, 535-547.
- Keele, S. W. Attention and Human Performance. Pacific Palisades, Ca: Goodyear, 1973.
- McLeod, P. Does probe RT measure central processing demand? Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1978, 30, 83-89.
- McQueen, E. N. The distribution of attention. British Journal of Psychology, Monograph Supplements, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1917.
- Melton, A. W. (Ed.) Apparatus tests - Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Program Research Report No. 4. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.
- North, R. A. and Gopher, D. Measures of attention as predictors of flight performance. Human Factors, 1976, 8, 1-12.
- Sverko, B. Individual differences in time-sharing performance. Acta Instituti Psychologici, 1977, 79, 17-30.
- Trankell, A. The psychologist as an instrument of prediction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, 170-183.
- Treisman, A. M. and Davies, A. Divided attention to ear and eye. In Kornblum, S. (Ed.), Attention and Performance IV. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Navy	Navy
1 Dr. Ed Aiken Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152	1 CDR Wade Helm PAC Missile Test Center Point Mugu, CA 93041
1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting Provost & Academic Dean U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1 LCDR Charles W. Hutchins Naval Air Systems Command 444 Jefferson Plaza # 1 1411 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 20360
1 MR. MAURICE CALLAHAN Pers 23a Bureau of Naval Personnel Washington, DC 20370	1 CDR Robert S. Kennedy Naval Aerospace Medical and Research Lab Box 29407 New Orleans, LA 70189
1 DR. PAT FEDERICO NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92152	1 Dr. Norman J. Kerr Chief of Naval Technical Training Naval Air Station Memphis (75) Millington, TN 38054
1 CDR John Ferguson, MSC, USN Naval Medical R&D Command (Code 44) National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD 20014	1 CHAIRMAN, LEADERSHIP & LAW DEPT. DIV. OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402
1 Dr. John Ford Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152	1 Dr. William L. Maloy Principal Civilian Advisor for Education and Training Naval Training Command, Code 00A Pensacola, FL 32508
1 Dr. Richard Gibson Bureau of Medicine and Surgery Code 513 Navy Department Washington, DC 20372	1 CAPT Richard L. Martin USS Francis Marion (LPA-249) FPO New York, NY 09501
1 CAPT. D.M. GRAGG, MC, USN HEAD, SECTION ON MEDICAL EDUCATION UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIV. OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES 6917 ARLINGTON ROAD BETHESDA, MD 20014	2 Dr. James McGrath Navy Personnel R&D Center Code 306 San Diego, CA 92152
1 LT Steven D. Harris, MSC, USN Code 6041 Human Factors Engineering Division Crew Systems Department Naval Air Development Center Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974	1 DR. WILLIAM MONTAGUE LRDC UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

Navy	Navy
1 Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Amphibious School Coronado, CA 92155	1 Psychologist ONR Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210
1 Commanding Officer Naval Health Research Center Attn: Library San Diego, CA 92152	1 Psychologist ONR Branch Office 536 J. Clark Street Chicago, IL 60605
1 Naval Medical R&D Command Code 44 National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD 20014	1 Office of Naval Research Code 200 Arlington, VA 22217
1 CAPT Paul Nelson, USN Chief, Medical Service Corps Code 7 Bureau of Medicine & Surgery U. S. Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20372	1 Office of Naval Research Code 441 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
1 DR. RICHARD J. NIEHAUS CODE 301 OFFICE OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL NAVY DEPT WASHINGTON, DC 20390	5 Personnel & Training Research Programs (Code 458) Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217
1 Library Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152	1 Psychologist OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH BRANCH 223 OLD MARYLEBONE ROAD LONDON, NW, 15TH ENGLAND
6 Commanding Officer Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390	1 Psychologist ONR Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, CA 91101
1 OFFICE OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL (CODE 26) DEPT. OF THE NAVY WASHINGTON, DC 20390	1 Scientific Director Office of Naval Research Scientific Liaison Group/Tokyo American Embassy APO San Francisco, CA 96503
1 JOHN OLSEN CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION & TRAINING SUPPORT PENSACOLA, FL 32509	1 Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Research, Development, and Studies Branch (OP-102) Washington, DC 20350

Navy	Navy
1 Scientific Advisor to the Chief of Naval Personnel (Pers-Or) Naval Bureau of Personnel Room 4410, Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20370	1 Dr. Richard Sorensen Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152
1 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USNR (Ph.D) Code L51 Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laborat Pensacola, FL 32508	1 CDR Charles J. Theisen, JR. MSC, USN Head Human Factors Engineering Div. Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974
1 DR. RICHARD A. POLLAK ACADEMIC COMPUTING CENTER U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402	1 W. Gary Thomson Naval Ocean Systems Center Code 7132 San Diego, CA 92152
1 Roger W. Remington, Ph.D Code L52 NAMRL Pensacola, FL 32508	1 Dr. Ronald Weitzman Department of Administrative Sciences U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940
1 Dr. Bernard Rimland Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152	1 DR. H.M. WEST III DEPUTY ADCNO FOR CIVILIAN PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING RM. 2625, ARLINGTON ANNEX WASHINGTON, DC 20370
1 Mr. Arnold Rubenstein Naval Personnel Support Technology Naval Material Command (08T244) Room 1044, Crystal Plaza #5 2221 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 20360	
1 A. A. SJOHOLM TECH. SUPPORT, CODE 201 NAVY PERSONNEL R& D CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92152	
1 Mr. Robert Smith Office of Chief of Naval Operations OP-987E Washington, DC 20350	
1 Dr. Alfred F. Smode Training Analysis & Evaluation Group (TAEG) Dept. of the Navy Orlando, FL 32813	

Army	Air Force
1 HQ USAREUE & 7th Army ODCSOPS USAAREUE Director of GED APO New York 09403	1 Air Force Human Resources Lab AFHRL/PED Brooks AFB, TX 78235
1 DR. RALPH CANTER U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	1 Air University Library AUL/LSE 76/443 Maxwell AFB, AL 36112
1 DR. RALPH DUSEK U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	1 CDR. MERCER CNET LIAISON OFFICER AFHRL/FLYING TRAINING DIV. WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224
1 Dr. Myron Fischl U.S. Army Research Institute for the Social and Behavioral Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1 Dr. Roger Pennell AFHRL/TT Lowry AFB, CO 80230
1 Dr. Michael Kaplan U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	1 Personnel Analysis Division HQ USAF/DPXXA Washington, DC 20330
1 Dr. Beatrice J. Farr Army Research Institute (PERI-OK) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1 Research Branch AFMPC/DPMYP Randolph AFB, TX 78148
1 Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr. ATTN: PERI-OK 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	1 Dr. Marty Rockway (AFHRL/TT) Lowry AFB Colorado 80230
1 Dr. Frederick Steinheiser U. S. Army Reserch Institute 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	1 Jack A. Thorpe, Capt, USAF Program Manager Life Sciences Directorate AFOSR Bolling AFB, DC 20332
	1 Brian K. Waters, LCOL, USAF Air University Maxwell AFB Montgomery, AL 36112

Marines

CoastGuard

- 1 Director, Office of Manpower Utilization 1  
HQ, Marine Corps (MPU)  
BCB, Bldg. 2009  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 MCDEC  
Quantico Marine Corps Base  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 DR. A.L. SLAFKOSKY  
SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR (CODE RD-1)  
HQ, U.S. MARINE CORPS  
WASHINGTON, DC 20380

Mr. Richard Lanterman  
PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH (G-P-1/62)  
U.S. COAST GUARD HQ  
WASHINGTON, DC 20590

Other DoD

- 1 Dr. Stephen Andriole  
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY  
1400 WILSON BLVD.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
- 12 Defense Documentation Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Attn: TC
- 1 Dr. Dexter Fletcher  
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY  
1400 WILSON BLVD.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
- 1 Military Assistant for Training and  
Personnel Technology  
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense  
for Research & Engineering  
Room 3D129, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301
- 1 Mr. Fredrick W. Suffa  
MPP (A&R)  
2B269  
Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301

Civil Govt

- 1 Dr. Susan Chipman  
Basic Skills Program  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde  
Personnel R&D Center  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
1900 EStreet NW  
Washington, D.C. 20415
- 1 Dr. Joseph I. Lipson  
Division of Science Education  
Room W-638  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. John Mays  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Science Education Dev.  
and Research  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko  
Program Director  
Manpower Research and Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 North Pitt Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Thomas G. Sticht  
Basic Skills Program  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 C.S. WINIEWICZ  
U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
REGIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST  
230 S. DEARBORN STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

Civil Govt

- 1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director  
Memory & Cognitive Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi  
HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Dr. John R. Anderson  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 DR. MICHAEL ATWOOD  
SCIENCE APPLICATIONS INSTITUTE  
40 DENVER TECH. CENTER WEST  
7935 E. PRENTICE AVENUE  
ENGLEWOOD, CO 80110
- 1 1 psychological research unit  
Dept. of Defense (Army Office)  
Campbell Park Offices  
Canberra ACT 2600, Australia
- 1 Dr. Alan Baddeley  
Medical Research Council  
Applied Psychology Unit  
15 Chaucer Road  
Cambridge CB2 2EF  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. Gerald V. Barrett  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Akron  
Akron, OH 44325
- 1 Dr. Nicholas A. Bond  
Dept. of Psychology  
Sacramento State College  
600 Jay Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819
- 1 Dr. Lyle Bourne  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80302
- 1 Dr. John S. Brown  
XEROX Palo Alto Research Center  
3333 Coyote Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Bruce Buchanan  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. John B. Carroll  
Psychometric Lab  
Univ. of No. Carolina  
Davie Hall 013A  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 1 Charles Myers Library  
Livingstone House  
Livingstone Road  
Stratford  
London E15 2LJ  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. William Chase  
Department of Psychology  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Micheline Chi  
Learning R & D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. John Chiorini  
Litton-Mellonics  
Box 1286  
Springfield, VA 22151
- 1 Dr. William Clancey  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Allan M. Collins  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, Ma 02138

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Meredith Crawford  
Department of Engineering Administration  
George Washington University  
Suite 805  
2101 L Street N. W.  
Washington, DC 20037
- 1 Dr. Ruth Day  
Center for Advanced Study  
in Behavioral Sciences  
202 Junipero Serra Blvd.  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 MAJOR I. N. EVONIC  
CANADIAN FORCES PERS. APPLIED RESEARCH  
1107 AVENUE ROAD  
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA
- 1 Dr. Ed Feigenbaum  
Department of Computer Science  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Richard L. Ferguson  
The American College Testing Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Dept. of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Donald Fitzgerald  
University of New England  
Armidale, New South Wales 2351  
AUSTRALIA
- 1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman  
Advanced Research Resources Organ.  
Suite 900  
4330 East West Highway  
Washington, DC 20014
- 1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
Bolt Beranek & Newman  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138

## Non Govt

- 1 DR. ROBERT GLASER  
LRDC  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
3939 O'HARA STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
- 1 DR. JAMES G. GREEMO  
LRDC  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
3939 O'HARA STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Barbara Hayes-Roth  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90406
- 1 Dr. Frederick Hayes-Roth  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90406
- 1 Dr. James R. Hoffman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19711
- 1 Library  
HumRRO/Western Division  
27857 Berwick Drive  
Carmel, CA 93921
- 1 Dr. Earl Hunt  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98105
- 1 Mr. Gary Irving  
Data Sciences Division  
Technology Services Corporation  
2811 Wilshire Blvd.  
Santa Monica CA 90403
- 1 DR. LAWRENCE B. JOHNSON  
LAWRENCE JOHNSON & ASSOC., INC.  
SUITE 502  
2001 S STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20009

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Walter Kintsch  
Department of Psychology  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, CO 80302
- 1 Dr. David Kieras  
Department of Psychology  
University of Arizona  
Tuscon, AZ 85721
- 1 Mr. Marlin Kroger  
1117 Via Goleta  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
- 1 LCOL. C.R.J. LAFLEUR  
PERSONNEL APPLIED RESEARCH  
NATIONAL DEFENSE HQS  
101 COLONEL BY DRIVE  
OTTAWA, CANADA K1A 0K2
- 1 Dr. Alan Lesgold  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
- 1 Dr. Robert A. Levit  
Manager, Behavioral Sciences  
The BDM Corporation  
7915 Jones Branch Drive  
McClean, VA 22101
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
6780 Cortona Drive  
Santa Barbara Research Pk.  
Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Dr. Richard B. Millward  
Dept. of Psychology  
Hunter Lab.  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 82912
- 1 Richard T. Mowday  
College of Business Administration  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Allen Munro  
Univ. of So. California  
Behavioral Technology Labs  
3717 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Donald A Norman  
Dept. of Psychology C-009  
Univ. of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093
- 1 Dr. Melvin R. Novick  
Iowa Testing Programs  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Dr. Jesse Orlansky  
Institute for Defense Analysis  
400 Army Navy Drive  
Arlington, VA 22202
- 1 Dr. Robert Pachella  
Department of Psychology  
Human Performance Center  
330 Packard Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
- 1 Dr. James A. Paulson  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207
- 1 Mr. A. J. Pesch, President  
Eclectech Associates, Inc.  
P. O. Box 178  
N. Stonington, CT 06359
- 1 MR. LUIGI PETRULLO  
2431 N. EDGEWOOD STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22207
- 1 DR. PETER POLSON  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
BOULDER, CO 80302

## Non Govt

- 1 DR. DIANE M. RAMSEY-KLEE  
R-K RESEARCH & SYSTEM DESIGN  
3947 RIDGEMONT DRIVE  
MALIBU, CA 90265
- 1 MIN. RET. M. RAUCH  
P II 4  
BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG  
POSTFACH 161  
53 BONN 1, GERMANY
- 1 Dr. Peter B. Read  
Social Science Research Council  
605 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10016
- 1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase  
Educational Psychology Dept.  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
12 Hill Hall  
Columbia, MO 65201
- 1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose  
American Institutes for Research  
1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW  
Washington, DC 20007
- 1 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf  
Bell Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
- 1 Dr. David Rumelhart  
Center for Human Information Processing  
Univ. of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093
- 1 PROF. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE, TN 37916
- 1 DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820

Non Govt

- 1 DR. ROBERT J. SEIDEL  
INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY GROUP  
HUMRRO  
300 N. WASHINGTON ST.  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Richard Snow  
School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Robert Sternberg  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 DR. ALBERT STEVENS  
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.  
50 MOULTON STREET  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138
- 1 DR. PATRICK SUPPES  
INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN  
THE SOCIAL SCIENCES  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan  
Laboratory of Psychometric and  
Evaluation Research  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003
- 1 Dr. Brad Simpson  
Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka  
Computer Based Education Research  
Laboratory  
252 Engineering Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. John Thomas  
IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
- 1 DR. PERRY THORNDYKE  
THE RAND CORPORATION  
1700 MAIN STREET  
SANTA MONICA, CA 90406
- 1 Dr. Douglas Towne  
Univ. of So. California  
Behavioral Technology Labs  
3717 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. J. Uhlner  
Perceptronics, Inc.  
6271 Variel Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
- 1 Dr. Benton J. Underwood  
Dept. of Psychology  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, IL 60201
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 DR. SUSAN E. WHITELY  
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044