

LEVEL

ARI TECHNICAL REPORT
TR-79-A20

B

AD A021112

Selecting and Representing Information Structures for Battlefield Decision Systems

by

Albert N. Badre
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

June 1979


Grant DAHC19-77-G-0022

DDC FILE COPY

Prepared for



U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
for the BEHAVIORAL and SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22333



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

79 00 12 1

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

WILLIAM L. HAUSER
Colonel, US Army
Commander

Research accomplished under a grant
from the Department of the Army

Georgia Institute of Technology
School of Information and Computer Science

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-P, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

6-2

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TR-79-A20	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. 14/ART	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER 9
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) SELECTING AND REPRESENTING INFORMATION STRUCTURES FOR BATTLEFIELD DECISION SYSTEMS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Sept. 77-June 78
7. AUTHOR(s) Albert N. Badre		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Georgia Institute of Technology School of Information and Computer Science Atlanta, GA 30332		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 15 DAHC 19-77-G-0022/ML
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 16 2Q161102B74F
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) ---		12. REPORT DATE June 79
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 50
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		18a. 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 Technically monitored by E. M. Johnson and S. M. Halpin, Human Factors Technical Area, ARI		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Human Information Processing Cognition Information Display		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The objective of this research was to identify and apply experimental techniques for locating and evaluating data patterns and informational "chunks" which are meaningful to the battlefield commander in his decision-making tasks. The iden- tification of meaningful chunks of information is useful in specifying criteria for the development of decision-aiding algorithms that search for, classify, and display information. Two main tasks were used for collecting data about infor- mational chunks; reconstruction and copying. In the reconstruction task an ex- perimental run consisted of a successive number of trials. In each trial the		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

410 111 241

20. (continued)

participant first viewed a battlefield map scenario for either ten seconds or one minute; then it was removed and he was asked to reconstruct it. In the copying task, the participant was asked to copy the scenario as rapidly and accurately as he could. As the participant reconstructed or copied the unit symbols of each scenario, the experimenter recorded the order and time of symbol placements. Participants were 12 military officers, experts, and 12 students, novices to the battlefield task. Two entirely different criteria were used to partition the reconstructed scenarios into chunks of symbols. These were the interplacement times criterion (IPT), which is based on computing the average placement times for the copying task; and the sequence of tactically related symbols (sequential) derived from a predetermined set of tactically meaningful relations.

In general, the experts' performance was superior to that of the novices on accuracy of reconstruction both for structured scenarios representing likely battlefield situations and unstructured scenarios representing situations unlikely to occur on a real battlefield. Both the IPT and sequential techniques revealed that the experts' chunks were tactically meaningful with high frequency, while the novices' chunks were not. The basic element of a chunk for the expert was the tactical relation between two or more battlefield units rather than the battlefield unit itself. However, even the novice chunked by relating symbols in some meaningful way. There seems to be a direct relationship between the relational density of a chunk and the speed with which the information is processed. Chunk size in terms of relations was found to be related to battlefield expertise. Chunking frequency was directly related to time given for studying the battlefield situation, irrespective of expertise.

Army Project Number
2Q161102B74F

Decision Support

Technical Report TR-79-A20

SELECTING AND REPRESENTING INFORMATION STRUCTURES
FOR BATTLEFIELD DECISION SYSTEMS

Albert N. Badre
Georgia Institute of Technology

Stanley M. Halpin, Team Chief

Submitted by:
Edgar M. Johnson, Chief
HUMAN FACTORS TECHNICAL AREA

June 1979

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	
DBC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
	Avail and/or special

Approved by:

Frank J. Harris, Acting Director
Organizations and Systems
Research Laboratory

Joseph Zeidner, Technical Director
U.S. Army Research Institute for
the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Approved for open release; distribution unlimited.

FOREWORD

The Human Factors Technical Area is concerned with the human resource demands of the future battlefield for increased man-machine capability to acquire, transmit, process, disseminate, and utilize information. Research addresses both man-machine interface problems and person-to-person interactions within command and control centers and is concerned with such areas as topographic products and procedures, tactical symbology, user-oriented systems, information management, staff operations and procedures, and sensor systems integration and utilization.

Of special concern in decision support is the organization of data to facilitate its effective use. Improved availability of increasing amounts of information does not ensure effective utilization. Requisite to the design of "intelligent" decision-support systems are procedures for identifying, classifying, and ordering the display of "chunks" of information compatible with the capabilities and limitations of users. The present research provides an empirical technique for identifying and evaluating patterns of information which are meaningful to tactical users in the analysis of battlefield map positions. This effort represents one phase in the exploration of improved methods for rapidly and efficiently transferring information to users and provides part of the technological base required for effective design of the user-oriented systems.

Research in the area of information utilization and decision support is conducted both in-house and contractually. Efforts in this area are responsive to general requirements of Army Projects 2Q62722A765 and 2Q6374A774 and to special requirements of the US Army Combined Arms Combat Development Activity, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and the US Army Intelligence Center and School, Fort Huachuca, Ariz. This specific effort was conducted under Army Project 2Q161102B74F as basic research related to the above requirements.


JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director
Army Research Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
Locating and Valuating Data Patterns	2
Decision-Aiding in Ill-Defined Problem Situations	3
Experimental Research on Chunking	5
OBJECTIVES	9
METHOD	10
Subjects	10
Materials and Apparatus	10
Procedure	11
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	13
Data Collection	13
Accuracy of Recall	14
Chunking Frequency	16
Chunk Size	19
Chunk Content	26
Relation Latencies	31
CONCLUSIONS	38
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX I	43
APPENDIX II	47
APPENDIX III	49

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Percent of Symbol Placement Accuracy for Experts	15
2. Percent of Symbol Placement Accuracy for Novices	15
3. Battlefield Relations and Examples	21
4. Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Symbols Per IPT Chunk on the Structured and Unstructured Scenarios	24
5. Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Relations Per IPT Chunk on the Structured and Unstructured Scenarios	24
6. Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Symbols Per Sequential Chunk	25
7. Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Relations Per Sequential Chunk	25
8. Summary of Types of Symbols by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task	29
9. Summary of Types of Symbols by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task	30
10. Summary of Types of Relations by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task	32
11. Summary of Types of Relations by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task	33
12. Summary of Types of Relations by Sequential Chunk Ordinals for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task	34
13. Summary of Types of Relations by Sequential Chunk Ordinals for Experts on Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task	35

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
1. Unit Symbols Used in the Experiment	20
2. An Example of a Complete Set of Relations for a Structured Scenario	22
3. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task	27
4. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Unstructured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task	27
5. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Structured Scenario of the One Minute Task	28
6. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Unstructured Scenarios of the One Minute Task	28
7. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Structured Scenarios for Experts	36
8. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Structured Scenarios for Novices	36
9. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Unstructured Scenarios for Experts	37
10. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Unstructured Scenarios for Novices	37

Selecting and Representing Information Structures
for Battlefield Decision Systems

Albert N. Badre
Principal Investigator
Georgia Institute of Technology

INTRODUCTION

Current decision-aiding and information processing systems have the impressive capabilities to capture, store, and use vast amounts of information (e.g., Colas, 1975). The design however of "intelligent" decision-aiding systems such that they are effectively compatible with the user's information processing needs requires a thorough understanding of how the decision-maker processes information. In general, a decision-maker is said to process information in a problem situation when he engages in functions such as channeling, storing, retrieving, and evaluating information in order to use it.

But as a prerequisite to a more complete specification of how the information is processed and used effectively, it is necessary to know how the problem data is represented and aggregated into meaningful informational structures. Research in artificial intelligence and information processing, psychology strongly suggests that the way the problem data is represented has a direct bearing on the effectiveness with which it is used to select efficient solution procedures (Amarel, 1971; Newell & Simon, 1972; Badre, 1974).

BACKGROUND

Locating and Valuating Data Patterns. Generally, it may be assumed that there is a direct relationship between the competence of a problem solver, his representation of the given problem data, and, due to his representation, the heuristic procedure that he selects to solve the problem. The heuristics that he selects consist in part of the procedure he uses to define his evaluation function. The particular procedure that he chooses in turn is dependent on the specific information he uses to assign values to problem state descriptors. It may be further assumed that the more competent problem solvers tend to select, organize, and evaluate the data of a problem in specialized ways that lead them to select better heuristics for a given class of problems than the less competent ones. Accordingly, in order to develop effective decision-aiding heuristic programs, it is necessary to select user-compatible evaluation functions. The selection of such evaluation functions requires the identification of information structures, data patterns, or state descriptors which contain or constitute the parameters likely to be considered by the decision-maker in valuating his alternative problem states.

In order to prescribe how a user-compatible decision-aiding program should select pertinent data patterns for use by the decision-maker, it is necessary to identify the data patterns that are meaningful to that decision-maker. In fact, it is not sufficient to specify how in general decision-makers aggregate and represent task information. Rather, in order to write algorithms that are relatively effective in locating pertinent data patterns and organizing them into manageable

data frames, it is necessary to determine what are the pertinent informational structures and state parameters that decision-makers of different levels of skill and experience are likely to process. This in turn requires a specification of the primitive data elements and how they may be combined to form potential relationships and meaningful patterns.

Decision-Aiding in Ill-Defined Problem Situations. Computer programs have been developed to aid or model the human decision-maker in various problem solving tasks. For example, Zobrist and Carlson (1973) describe an advice-taking program for chess. In the advice-taking portion of the program, the system's main function is to scan a board position, then recognize and list the various "important" relations and patterns among pieces. Other systems have been developed to aid the organic chemist in analyzing mass spectrograms and to support the clinician in diagnosis and therapy (Buchanan, Sutherland, and Feigenbaum, 1969; Davis, Buchanan, and Shortliffe, 1977). Slamecka, Camp, Badre, and Hall (1977) have developed a pilot system that aids the clinician in his information gathering and aggregate data analysis tasks.

The levels of success and usefulness of various decision systems seem to vary as a function of the type and complexity of the problem for which they are designed (Donovan, 1976). While many of the artificial intelligence decision systems for well-defined problems have led to some useful applications, the success of other systems developed for ill-defined and dynamic problems has been limited.

Ill-defined problems are those where either: (a) the problem-space is enormously large that an explicit structural representation of the problem, e.g., graph or tree, cannot be effectively constructed prior to specifying an optimal solution path, such as in chess; or (b) the statement of the problem is incomplete, such as in clinical medicine. Problem statements are considered complete when they contain (explicitly or implicitly) a complete description of the initial state, the set of goal states, and the set of operators for transforming initial to goal states.

The main drawback of programs developed to aid or model the decision-maker in ill-defined decision situations has been the lack of reliance of the programmer on empirical validation techniques in selecting state descriptors that are (1) decision-maker compatible, and (2) different as a function of the competence level of the decision-maker. Instead, reliance on intuitiveness may be seen in the development of many of the computer programs for games of tactics and strategy such as chess (Newborn, 1975; Frey, 1977). With a few exceptions such as Samuel's checkers' program (1967), most programs that were designed to assist or model the decision-maker in ill-defined tactical decision situations have been relatively unsuccessful in performing at expert levels. The reason is that the selection of successful tactics depends on how the evaluation function is generated, which is based on, among other factors, the material value. The material value is directly related to the selection and scoring of key data units such as patterns. The selection and scoring of these data units have usually depended on either the programmer's

intuitiveness and ability or the unvalidated verbal reports of experts. It is therefore necessary to identify an empirically reliable and replicable methodology for isolating, describing, and weighting the data units which constitute the elements of a state descriptor for a given problem and a given level of skill.

Experimental Research on Chunking. The underlying thesis of the experimental research on chunking is that when problem solvers process information from a given problem scenario, they do so in terms of well-formed structures and chunks; the content and size of such chunks as well as their perceived interrelationships are directly related to the problem solver's level of expertise. The leading research questions stemming from the chunking conjecture have been: (a) what constitutes the contents of a chunk for a given problem scenario and a given class of problem solvers; and (b) what is a valid experimental technique for identifying the boundaries of chunks?

The significance of determining chunk contents may be illustrated by considering the development of chess programs to both assist and play chess. Here, the procedure for defining evaluation functions for board positions consists of assigning numerical values to various components of a position such as material, area control, and mobility. It is generally assumed that in defining the evaluation function for a board position, material value should be a primary factor; and in order to generate material scores, the program should rely on fixed values assigned to individual pieces. This particular procedure for generating material scores of a given position makes the assumption

that when a player defines an evaluation function for a given board position, he relies heavily on the values of individual chess pieces. While this assumption is intuitively appealing, there is some indication from chess memory experiments that the competent player engages in chunking the individual pieces into recognizable patterns (Chase and Simon, 1973; DeGroot, 1966; Charness, 1976; Dirlan, 1972; Frey and Adelman, 1976). This possibility gives rise to the alternative assumption that the competent player generates material scores by assigning values to chess patterns or relations among pieces rather than to chess pieces.

In the last few years, it has become increasingly apparent that research had to be done on how information is chunked and represented as the basis for defining the evaluation functions. Chase and Simon (1973) and later Reitman (1976) developed various techniques for studying the informational chunking question. Their approach was to compare the characteristics of chunks formulated by experts with those formulated by novices. The results of this research seem to support the conjecture that the expert problem solver structures his data and chunks his information differently than does the novice. His chunking is different with respect to both chunk size and chunk content. This difference seems to diminish as the information in the problem scenario becomes less coherent. More generally, experimental results have shown that the contents of a chunk may be rule-governed. A chess player may for example use criteria that are either chess meaningful such as forks and pins, or geometrically and spatially based such as linearity and locality, or chessmen characterized

classifications such as all Rooks and all Bishops. Chase and Simon's results seem to indicate that those among other rules are used by the player in defining relations or patterns. What is not clear is how do these various relations interact to constitute a recall or perceptual chunk. In addition, Bower (1972), Bower and Winzenz (1969), and Restle and Brown (1970), have shown that in general perceptual, learning, and recall chunks are rule-based.

In order to be able to determine the contents of a chunk, Chase and Simon (1973) developed an empirical technique to identify chunk boundaries. The subjects in their experiments are asked to reconstruct and copy chess positions after viewing them for a few seconds. In the reconstruction task an experimental run consists of a successive number of trials. In each trial the subject is first shown a diagram of a chess position. He is allowed to study the diagram for a prespecified amount of time after which it is removed and he is asked to reconstruct it. As the subject is reconstructing the position, the experimenter records both the order and time of placement. In the copying task the subject is given the same position diagram as in the reconstruction task as well as a blank diagram. He is asked to copy the position on the blank diagram as rapidly and as accurately as he can. Again the experimenter records time and order of piece placement as the subject is copying the position. Then the average inter-placement time (IPT) is computed based on the recorded data. The IPT is then used to partition the reconstructed positions into chunks. If two pieces are placed at or below the IPT, they belong to the same chunk; otherwise, they are members of two different chunks. Reitman's results

on the game of GO (1976) show that the inter-placement times used by Chase and Simon for defining chunk boundaries seem to be reliable only for patterns that can be partitioned linearly and sequentially. However, in the case of nested chunks the inter-response time measure does not apply with consistency. While many questions remain unanswered, the techniques that were introduced provide a basis for further research on informational chunking in various decision problems. The battlefield situation is one such problem.

In summary, the results of studies on chess, GO, and other games of tactics and strategy, as well as the more general results of research on organizational factors in memory indicate three main points. First, the skilled problem solver is able to process larger amounts of problem data than does the novice even though there does not seem to be a difference between the two on memory capacity. This difference in recall is related to the amount of prior experience with the given problem domain. Second, the organization of visually presented information affects the ability to recall that information. Randomly organized information reduces the superior ability of the expert to the level of ability held by a novice. The lack of typical organization of information may suppress the expert's ability to chunk the presented information. Third, the number of chunks used in representing the problem data may decrease as the amount of experience of a person increases. While this conclusion seems to be true for general cognitive organization, it was not true of the Chase and Simon results. As a person gains experience the nature of the representation of information changes from many specific chunks to a few generic ones. The reduction in the number of chunks represented may facilitate the organization and recall of information.

OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of this study was to identify and consider experimental techniques for locating and valuating data patterns and informational chunks that are meaningful to the tactical decision-maker in tasks such as the analysis of battlefield map positions. This objective is motivated by the long range need to (1) identify for a given class of problem situations the informational characteristics that constitute the basis for generating effective evaluation functions, and (2) relate the designation of meaningful units of information to the design of user-compatible data modules and data-searching and combining algorithms for tactical decision systems. More specifically, the objectives were as follows:

1. To compare the performance of battlefield experts with that of novices on the accuracy of recalling both coherent and noncoherent battlefield map positions;
2. To identify and apply experimental techniques for locating and distinguishing between the informational chunks that are formulated by the battlefield decision maker;
3. To identify the likely basic units that constitute the semantic contents of formulated chunks for specific battlefield maps;
4. To determine the comparative sizes of the average chunks for novices and experts;

5. To determine the comparative chunking frequency of novices and experts for a given battlefield scenario;
6. To determine the effect on recall, chunk size, chunk unit, and chunking frequency of varying the length of time given for viewing, processing, and assimilating the information.

METHOD

Subjects. Twenty-four subjects were selected to participate in the experiment. They came from two main groups: Twelve subjects were selected from a pool of military officers at Fort Benning, Georgia. The other 12 subjects came from Georgia Tech students who have never been exposed to battlefield situations or war games. The Georgia Tech subjects were paid \$2.50 per hour for participating in the experiment. In choosing these two extremes of the subject population, we were able to make comparisons between two categories that are sufficiently distant with regard to experience with the given task.

Materials and Apparatus. The materials used in the experiment consisted of 12 reduced battlefield map displays. The maps were selected on the basis of four categories of structuring. The first category contains three structured maps; ones that come out of real battlefield situations. The second category contains three maps that were semistructured in that while, in general, the situation is plausible, it is not likely to occur with frequency. The third category contains three unstructured maps; they are unstructured in that the occurrence of such situations is not possible on a real

battlefield. The fourth category contains the same three maps as in the first category with the addition of the unit designators to each of the unit symbols. Map examples are provided in Appendix I. A slide projector was used to present the maps for viewing by the subjects. For the time recordings, a sound synchronizer with a cassette beeper (the Wollensack 255) was used. Rubber stamps of each of the nine battlefield unit symbols for both the red and blue colors were made available. The subjects used the rubber stamps when reconstructing and copying the battlefield map unit symbols (see Figure 1 for a complete listing of unit symbols). A digit-span test was used in order to test for differences in short-term memory capacity between subjects in the two groups. The digit-span test is an expanded version of the test that comes out of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale .

Procedure. The same procedure applied to all 24 subjects. Each subject first was briefed on the overall objectives of the study (see Appendix II). Afterwards, the experimenter begins with the following instructions:

This is an experiment in human information processing not a test of your ability. On the table before you is a packet of sheets with a diagram of a battlefield background outlined on each sheet. On the screen in front of you, you will be shown a slide of a battlefield situation map. After ten seconds of viewing, I will

remove the slide and your task will then be to reconstruct battlefield positions as accurately as you can on the diagram in front of you, using the rubber stamps placed to your right and left. Each of the red and blue symbols on the slides has a corresponding red or blue stamp. To remove a symbol, merely put a slash through it. To replace a symbol, put a slash through it, and then place the appropriate symbol somewhere next to it. You may have as much time as you need to reconstruct the position. Do you have any questions.

One pre-test slide was used for practice. After the instruction and one practice trial, the subject viewed a slide for ten seconds after which he was given as much time as he needed to reconstruct the position. The order of presenting slides to the subject was counterbalanced. After the subject completed the task for all 12 slides, he underwent a second reconstruction task using the same 12 slides with the only difference being that he was allowed a viewing time of one minute. The second reconstruction task was followed by a one-minute rest period after which the subject underwent the copying task.

The procedure for the copying task began with the following instructions:

In this task you will be given the same 12 slides. You are asked to copy the information from the diagram on the screen onto the sheet in front of you by placing symbols in the appropriate locations as accurately and

as rapidly as you can. This procedure will be repeated for each of four slides.

The digit-span test was administered following the completion of the copying task. At the completion of the experiment each subject was asked to complete a biographical information questionnaire (see Appendix III). The entire experiment took one hour per subject to complete.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Collection. There were essentially two kinds of data that were collected for both the reconstruction and copying tasks. These were symbol placement times and order of symbol placements. In the first case, one of two experimenters recorded the times of the placement of a symbol on a blank diagram by pressing a time key on the sound synchronizer-cassette at the beginning of each symbol placement. This procedure went on until the subject discontinued to place the symbols. This same experimenter also kept time for the ten-seconds and one-minute presentations in the reconstruction tasks. For the copying task, in addition to recording the symbol placement times, the experimenter recorded the times for the beginning and end of a glance to the diagram from which the subject was copying. The second type of data collected was the order in which the symbols were placed on the blank diagrams. This data was collected by the second experimenter who stood behind the subject and recorded the ordinals by using a blank diagram and writing the ordinal number in the location corresponding to that used by the subject to stamp the symbol.

Accuracy of Recall. A symbol is considered to be placed accurately if all its three properties, value, color, and location, are preserved with respect to the originally presented scenario-map. Tables 1 and 2 show the percent accuracy of recall of both novices and experts for the ten seconds (Task I) and the one minute (Task II) viewing times on the four scenario conditions. Using a mixed design which is a mixture of simple randomized and treatment by subject designs (Lindquist, 1953), a two-way analysis of variance of subject group x type of scenario on Task I revealed significant main effects for subject groups with $F(3,66) = 36.278$, $P < .001$, for scenario types with $F(1,22) = 17.314$, $P < .001$, and for groups x scenario types interaction with $F(3,66) = 2.824$, $P < .05$. Significant main effects were also obtained on Task II for subject groups with $F(3,66) = 35.842$, $P < .001$, for scenario types with $F(1,22) = 5.965$, $P < .05$, and groups x scenario types interaction with $F(3,66) = 2.627$, $P < .05$. In spite of the fact that there was no significant difference on the digit span test scores (novices 7.9 digits and experts 7.1 digits), it is clear from Tables 1 and 2 that the experts' performance is superior to that of the novices on the unstructured scenarios of Tasks I and II as well as on the structured scenarios of Task I. However, the same is not true of the structured scenarios of Task II. This finding may be explained by the possibility that a one-minute exposure time permits the subject to encode and memorize the location of a greater number of symbols up to an asymptotic level on the structured scenarios. However, the reason that performance differential becomes significant on the unstructured scenarios is that when the structured scenario is

Table 1

Percent of Symbol Placement Accuracy for Experts

Structure Type	Ten Seconds Task	One Minute Task
Structured	45.25	68.75
Structured with unit designator	47.34	75.69
Semi-Structured	36.84	70.33
Unstructured	22.69	40.63

Table 2

Percent of Symbol Placement Accuracy for Novices

Structure Type	Ten Seconds Task	One Minute Task
Structured	26.66	62.15
Structured with unit designator	30.90	69.79
Semi-Structured	26.07	44.33
Unstructured	15.62	24.65

destroyed, many of the non-tactical information structures that were available to the novice as mnemonic aids were also destroyed. There are many information structures that can be encoded and used as mnemonics by a subject who knows nothing about tactical operations. For example, all symbols of the same color and the same type that are placed adjacent to each other in a formation may be encoded quite easily as one chunk of information. Even though such a chunk may contain or constitute a tactical relation (see Table 3 for a complete list of tactical relations used in this experiment), a novice to the battlefield situation need not know the tactical components of such a chunk in order to use it in recalling a group of symbols. Accordingly, when such non-battlefield meaningful chunks were no longer available in the unstructured scenarios, the novices exhibited significantly lower performances than did the experts on the unstructured scenarios thus accounting for the interaction effects. The experts' performance did not drop as low as did the novices' between structured and unstructured scenarios on the second task because the unstructured scenarios still contained a fair number of battlefield meaningful relations (an average of 100 relations for unstructured scenarios compared with 300 for structured ones) which the expert could use for chunking.

Chunking Frequency. Two entirely different criteria were used to partition the reconstructed scenarios into chunks of symbols and relations between symbols. These were the inter-placement times criterion (IPT) and the sequence of tactically related symbols criterion (sequential). In order to compute the IPT, several assumptions

were made. First, in the copying task, it was assumed that successive glances to the slide from which symbols are being copied define the boundary of chunks. That is, the symbols that were placed on the response diagram between two glances to the slide are referred to as the within-glance symbols and considered to constitute a chunk. Second, the average IPT was computed for the within-glance symbols of each subject and used to define the chunk boundaries in the reconstruction task. Symbols placed successively at or below the computed IPT were assumed to belong to the same chunk; those falling above the computed IPT were considered to come from two different chunks, hence defining a chunk-boundary in the reconstruction task. The IPT was computed for this experiment at exactly one second.

The sequential criterion for chunking used the predetermined battlefield relations (see Table 3) to partition the successively placed symbols of the reconstructed scenarios into chunks. A sequence of successively reconstructed symbols constitutes a chunk, if each symbol in the sequence, except the first one, is related to at least one other previously placed symbol in the same sequence. Once a symbol is found that is not related to any of the previously placed symbols in the sequence, then a discontinuity in the relatedness of the sequence occurs, defining the boundary of a chunk and making the interrupting symbol the first in a new chunk. The rationale for devising the sequential definition of chunking is to give an alternative to the IPT time constraint. The conjecture is that time may be an artificial constraint that is not a major factor in the expert's chunking behavior. But rather a meaningful development of the scenario by the expert is

much more likely to be associated with the careful reconstruction of tactical semantics in the battlefield situation irrespective of time. A Pearson correlation test revealed no significant correlation between the IPT and sequential chunks on size, type of relation, or type of piece contained in a chunk. Evidently the two criteria for chunking represent two entirely different definitions of a chunk.


The reconstructed scenarios of both novices and experts were segmented into chunks using both the IPT and sequential criteria for chunking on the ten seconds and one minute tasks. The hypothesis being explored here is that the number of chunks per scenario condition will remain constant at about the short term capacity, 7 ± 2 , on the ten seconds task irrespective of the structuredness of the scenario for both groups. However, with the opportunity to rehearse the information for a longer time period, the number of chunks per scenario will increase on the one minute task. In calculating the mean number of chunks, only chunks with two or more symbols were included in the computation. A three-way analysis of variance on tasks, groups, and scenario types indicated a significant effect for tasks with $F(1,211) = 42.684$, $P < .001$ for IPT chunks and with $F(1,211) = 6.814$, $P < .01$ for sequential chunks. A significant scenario type effect was obtained with $F(3,211) = 4.595$, $P < .005$ for IPT chunks and $F(3,211) = 6.180$, $P < .005$ for sequential chunks. However, no significant effects were obtained for groups.

The results indicate that the average number of IPT chunks per scenario increases for both groups from the ten seconds task to the one minute task by about two chunks. This finding suggests that availability

of time to rehearse increases the number of recalled chunks. Unlike the findings of Chase and Simon (1973), these results show that the number of IPT chunks is not necessarily related to battlefield expertise. Rather, the number of chunks is related to the amount of time given for viewing the scenario irrespective of expertise.

Chunk Size. In order to determine the average size of a chunk, two different categories of chunk content were used: Symbols and relations. The chunk element that was more likely to be common and useful to both the novices and the experts was the individual symbol. There were a total of nine such symbols given in Figure 1. The tactical relation was used as a basic unit of chunk content and size in order to determine the extent to which experts chunk by relating symbols. Since the novice cannot chunk by battlefield meaningful relations, the relation-based chunk was used primarily to compare the expert's chunk size and content on the various scenarios for both IPT and sequential chunking over the ten seconds and one minute tasks. Table 3 gives a complete list of the battlefield relations used in the experiment. Figure 2 is an example of a set of relations for one of the structured scenarios.

A two way analysis of variance on symbols and relations per chunk for groups by scenario types revealed significant group effects with $F(1,48) = 5.447$, $P < .05$ for IPT relations on the structured scenarios of the ten seconds task. Group effects were not significant for symbols on the ten seconds task. Similar effects were obtained for sequential relations and symbols on both tasks. Also a significant group effect was obtained for the IPT symbols of the one minute task



- 0 Armored Battalion
- 1 Artillery Battery
- 2 Artillery Battalion
- 3 Cavalry Squadron
- 4 Mechanized Battalion
- 5 Mechanized Division
- 6 Mechanized Brigade Headquarters
- 7 Mechanized Division Headquarters
- 8 Mechanized Regiment Headquarters


FIGURE 1. Unit Symbols Used in the Experiment

Table 3
Battlefield Relations and Examples

	NAME	EXAMPLE*	SCENARIO
A	Front to Back	1 - 3	Structured
A2	Front to Front	13 - 11	Structured
B	Side to Side	2 - 4	Structured
B2	Lateral	9 - 11	Structured
C	Combat Support	3 - 9	Structured
D	Massing	16 - 19	Structured
E	Command	1 - 19	Structured
F	Face to Face	11 - 14	Structured
G	Counter Battery	3 - 22	Structured
H	Direct Support	3 - 14	Structured
I	Armored Cavalry near Headquarters	22 - 24	Structured - II

*The examples are given in the form n-m where n and m are the numbers of the related symbols in the indicated scenario found in Appendix I.

Double lines = Red
Single Line = Blue



2. 4B, 9H, 11H, 22G
3. 22G, 13H, 17H, 18H, 4B, 7A
4. 22G, 2B, 3B, 11H, 13H, 17H, 18H
5. 22G, 18H, 19H, 7B
6. 9C, 11C, 9A, 11A
7. 5B, 22G, 17H, 18H, 19H
8. 10A, 12A, 10C, 12C, 12D, 10D
9. 14F, 11B
10. 8D, 12BD, 13A, 15A, 15D
11. 9B, 13B, 14F
12. 8D, 10DB, 15D, 15A, 16A
13. 11B, 14F, 17B, 20A2
14. 11F, 13F, 9F, 20B, 24E
15. 17C, 18C, 16B, 10D, 12D, 16D, 18D, 17D, 18A, 17A
16. 15B, 18C, 19C, 18A, 15D
17. 20F, 18B, 13B, 15D
18. 17B, 19B, 21F, 15D
19. 18B, 21F
20. 17F, 14B, 21B, 24E, 13F, 14B
21. 20B, 19F, 18F, 24E
22. 23H, 23B, 21H, 20H, 14H, 5G, 7G, 3G, 4G, 2G, 24E
23. 21C, 20C, 14C, 22B, 24E
24. 23E, 21E, 20E, 14E, 22E

The symbol whose number is in the first column is in relation to the symbols following it by the relations indicated. For relation name see Table 3.

Example: Piece 1 is related to Piece 2 by relation E; to Piece 3 by relations A and E, etc.

FIGURE 2. An Example of a Set of Relations for a Structured Scenario

with $F(1,10) = 15.885$, $P < .005$. Those results state that for the IPT ten seconds task and the sequential one minute task, while there were no significant differences in the number of symbols per chunk on the structured scenarios, significant differences were present for the number of relations per chunk. This finding suggests that in chunking, when given a structured battlefield scenario, for the same number of symbols, a greater number of relations exists between the expert's chunked symbols than between the same number of symbols of a novice's chunk. Evidently, experience leads to more relation-meaningful chunks. The significant effect on symbols and lack of it on relations for Task II is an exception to the above finding. It suggests that IPT chunking is not as sensitive to the relational content of chunks as is sequential chunking. On the other hand, when you consider that there are no significant differences on either symbols or relations per chunk for the unstructured scenarios of both tasks, under both criteria of chunking, it is clear that there is a direct relationship between the level of coherence of a scenario and the capacity of the decision maker to encode it and represent it meaningfully.

Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 show the means and ranges for structured and unstructured scenarios of IPT and sequential chunking. It is evident from inspecting the means that the expert's sequential chunk size both in terms of relations and symbols is invariably larger for the structured than the unstructured scenarios. For IPT chunking, the exception is on the ten seconds task. Again, the consistency of the sequential results may be an indication that the sequential definition of chunking is more representative of the expert's chunking behavior.

Table 4

Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Symbols
Per IPT Chunk on the Structured and Unstructured Scenarios

Scenario Type	Ten Seconds Task		One Minute Task	
	Experts	Novices	Experts	Novices
Structured	2.09 (1-5)	1.66 (1.09-3.20)	2.86 (1.00-3.48)	1.42 (1.00-1.60)
Unstructured	2.70 (1.57-4.50)	3.27 (1.38-3.50)	1.40 (1.28-2.50)	1.46 (1.20-1.60)

Table 5

Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of
Relations Per IPT Chunk on the Structured and
Unstructured Scenarios

Scenario Type	Ten Seconds Task		One Minute Task	
	Experts	Novices	Experts	Novices
Structured	1.33 (0-5)	0.81 (0 -2.38)	0.62 (0 -2.00)	0.60 (0.31-1.50)
Unstructured	0.72 (0 -4.00)	0.45 (0 -7.50)	0.14 (0 -0.28)	0.13 (0 -0.31)

Table 6
Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Symbols
Per Sequential Chunk

Scenario Type	Ten Seconds Task		One Minute Task	
	Experts	Novices	Experts	Novices
Structured	2.88 (1.50-9.50)	1.73 (1.07-4.75)	5.00 (1.67-9.50)	5.48 (1.64-11.00)
Unstructured	1.50 (1.09-5.00)	2.27 (1.40-6.30)	1.88 (1.14-3.60)	1.60 (1.20-1.80)

Table 7
Averages and Range of Averages for the Number of Relations
Per Sequential Chunk

Scenario Type	Ten Seconds Task		One Minute Task	
	Experts	Novices	Experts	Novices
Structured	5.78 (0.69-13.50)	4.48 (0.06-14.75)	3.01 (0-3.50)	1.92 (0.36-5.23)
Unstructured	1.30 (0-3.17)	1.41 (0-7.5)	1.00 (0-2.00)	0.98 (0.3.00)

In order to examine in greater depth the extent to which chunk size is related to expertise a breakdown of chunk size by the ordinal of the successively placed chunk was completed. In order to obtain the average number of symbols per chunk ordinal, the symbols for a given ordinal were summed and divided by the number of subjects that had symbols for that ordinal. Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 compare novices with experts on chunk size as a function of chunk ordinal for IPT chunks. The sequential chunk results indicated similar trends. The figures show that chunk size is related to battlefield expertise only for the first few chunk ordinals. The experts seem to exhibit larger chunks on the first few ordinals of all scenarios for both tasks. The two groups are similar in that for both the chunk size is inversely related to chunk ordinal on the structured and unstructured scenarios of the ten seconds task. The curve for the one minute task is much less steep. The reason for this difference between the two tasks may be in part due to the greater amount of interference on the ten seconds task. Such interference effects have been repeatedly demonstrated in short-term memory research. Also, the one minute task may involve more problem solving which takes longer time and hence decreases and regulates the size of an IPT chunk. The curve steepness for the size of sequential chunks is greater than that of the IPT chunks for the one minute task.

Chunk Content. One of the main objectives of this study was to identify the most likely basic units that constitute the semantic contents of formulated chunks for specific battlefield maps. For a detailed understanding of the likely constituents of a chunk, both symbols and relations were examined by chunk ordinal. Tables 8 and 9 give summaries of types of symbols per IPT ordinal for both the ten seconds and one minute tasks on structured scenarios. Sequential and IPT chunks for types of symbols were fairly similar for structured




FIGURE 3. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task.




FIGURE 4. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Unstructured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task.




FIGURE 5. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Structured Scenario of the One Minute Task.




FIGURE 6. Chunk Size by Chunk Ordinal for Unstructured Scenarios of the One Minute Task.

Table 8

Summary of Types of Symbols by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts
on Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task

Symbol Type*	Chunk Ordinals [†]														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Red 0	COL	19.37	28.32	17.65	17.64	10.00	23.32	21.22	16.66	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	19.15	19.15	12.77	12.77	4.26	8.31	14.89	4.26	4.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 1	COL	4.35	7.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.66	25.00	50.00	33.33	0.00	0.00
	ROW	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	12.50	12.50	12.50	0.00	0.00
Red 2	COL	17.39	17.31	3.61	2.93	5.00	0.00	18.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	36.36	22.73	4.35	4.35	4.35	0.00	27.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 3	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 4	COL	19.07	17.31	18.10	50.00	75.00	52.94	33.33	41.66	33.33	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	11.39	6.33	6.33	21.52	18.99	11.39	13.92	8.33	2.53	1.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 5	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 6	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 7	COL	0.00	0.00	14.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.02	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 8	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 0	COL	2.16	4.20	3.61	2.93	0.00	0.00	6.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	16.67	16.67	16.67	16.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 1	COL	2.16	7.41	0.00	2.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	100.00
	ROW	16.67	33.33	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	16.67
Blue 2	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 3	COL	2.16	0.00	3.61	2.93	0.00	0.00	3.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	25.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 4	COL	28.27	17.68	25.34	14.71	0.00	17.65	12.13	33.33	16.66	50.00	50.00	33.33	100.00	0.00
	ROW	27.66	10.64	14.89	10.64	0.00	6.38	8.51	8.51	2.13	4.26	2.13	2.13	2.13	0.00
Blue 5	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 6	COL	4.36	0.00	0.00	3.89	10.00	3.89	3.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	25.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	25.00	12.50	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 7	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 8	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of symbol see Figure 1.

†Chunks of one or more symbols.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the symbols that were placed
on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the symbols of the given type that were placed,
the row value represents the percent placed on the
given ordinal.

Table 9

Summary of Types of Symbols by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts
on Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task

Symbol Type *	Chunk Ordinals +														
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Red 0	COL	0.00	23.00	28.57	46.15	50.00	15.38	42.85	42.85	11.11	0.00	16.66	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	10.71	7.14	21.43	14.29	7.14	21.43	10.71	3.57	0.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 1	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 2	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.38	25.00	38.46	0.00	28.57	55.55	40.00	33.33	25.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.70	8.70	21.74	0.00	8.70	21.74	17.39	8.70	4.35	0.00	0.00
Red 3	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 4	COL	28.38	23.08	14.29	30.77	25.00	38.46	42.85	14.28	0.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	13.33	10.00	3.33	13.33	8.67	16.67	20.00	3.33	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 5	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 6	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Red 7	COL	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	7.69	0.00	0.00	11.11	10.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	16.67	16.67	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00
Red 8	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 0	COL	7.10	13.39	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.19	0.00	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00
	ROW	12.50	25.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	12.50
Blue 1	COL	14.19	0.00	0.00	7.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	16.67	25.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	33.33	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	16.67	16.67	0.00	0.00
Blue 2	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 3	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 4	COL	42.58	38.45	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.19	14.28	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
	ROW	37.50	31.25	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.25	6.25	0.00	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.25
Blue 5	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 6	COL	7.10	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	50.00	0.00
	ROW	20.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	0.00	20.00	0.00
Blue 7	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Blue 8	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of symbol see Figure 1.

+Chunks of one or more symbols.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the symbols that were placed on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the symbols of the given type that were placed, the row value represents the percent placed on the given ordinal.

scenarios. Since the chunk content results may lead to actual display and presentation applications, it was considered that structured scenarios would be the only useful ones for those results. Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13 give summaries of relation type frequencies by chunk ordinal. For any given entry in all of the tables, a column value represents the percent frequency with which the named type of symbol is present as part of the reconstructed symbols on that ordinal. The row value represents the percent frequency associated with that ordinal for all symbols of the named type that were placed on the reconstructed scenario. The same row and column definitions apply to the relation types. For example, on Table 10, consider the front to back relation of chunk ordinal 1. The values read as follows: Col = 6.61% of the relations that were placed on the first ordinal were front to back type relations; Row = of all front to back relations placed, 40% of them were placed on the first ordinal.

Relation Latencies. A major theme of this study is that there is a direct relationship between the speed and ease with which information is assimilated and represented and the coherence of the presented information. Likewise the coherence with which the subject views and organizes his information is likely to be reflected in the speed with which he processes the information. In order to examine the conjecture that speed of processing is related to the coherence with which information is organized and represented by the subject, it was assumed that a chunk with a greater number of relations is more coherently organized than one with less number of relations. Accordingly, the number of relations for a chunk should be inversely proportional to the average IPT for a chunk. Figures 7, 8, 9, and 10 show that in general

Table 10

Summary of Types of Relations by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on
Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task

Relation Type*		Chunk Ordinals +								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A	COL	7.32	0.00	7.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.92	0.00	0.00
	ROW	42.86	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	42.86	0.00	0.00
A2	COL	14.63	0.00	14.29	14.29	10.00	0.00	1.64	0.00	0.00
	ROW	40.00	0.00	13.33	33.33	6.67	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00
B	COL	14.63	50.00	7.14	0.00	10.00	0.00	11.48	0.00	0.00
	ROW	30.00	25.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	35.00	0.00	0.00
B2	COL	14.63	10.00	7.14	17.14	30.00	20.00	8.20	100.00	0.00
	ROW	24.00	4.00	4.00	24.00	12.00	8.00	20.00	4.00	0.00
C	COL	0.00	0.00	14.29	11.43	0.00	20.00	32.79	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	7.14	14.29	0.00	7.14	71.43	0.00	0.00
D	COL	4.88	40.00	35.71	34.29	50.00	50.00	21.31	0.00	0.00
	ROW	4.35	8.70	10.87	26.09	10.87	10.87	28.26	0.00	0.00
E	COL	0.00	0.00	7.14	8.57	0.00	10.00	16.39	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	6.67	20.00	0.00	6.67	66.67	0.00	0.00
F	COL	9.76	0.00	0.00	5.71	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.00	0.00
	ROW	57.14	0.00	0.00	28.57	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00
G	COL	9.76	0.00	7.14	8.57	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.00	0.00
	ROW	44.44	0.00	11.11	33.33	0.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	0.00
H	COL	21.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I	COL	2.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of relation see Table 3.

+Chunks of two or more symbols.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the relations that were placed on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the relations of the given type that were placed, the row value represents the percent placed on the given ordinal.

Table 11

**Summary of Types of Relations by IPT Chunk Ordinal for Experts on
Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task**

Relation Type*		Chunk Ordinals +												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
A	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
A2	COL	33.33	28.57	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	40.00	40.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
B	COL	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	16.67	7.69	0.00	100.00	33.33	16.67	0.00	0.00
	ROW	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20.00	10.00	0.00	20.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.00
B2	COL	33.33	28.57	0.00	20.00	25.00	0.00	15.38	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	20.00	20.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
C	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D	COL	0.00	28.57	0.00	60.00	50.00	25.00	53.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	11.76	0.00	17.65	11.76	17.65	41.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	100.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	50.00	0.00
F	COL	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
G	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
H	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of relation see Table 3.

+Chunks of two or more symbols.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the relations that were placed on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the relations of the given type that were placed, the row value represents the percent placed on the given ordinal.

Table 12

**Summary of Types of Relations by Sequential Chunk Ordinals for
Experts on Structured Scenarios of the Ten Seconds Task**

Relation Type*		Chunk Ordinals ⁺										
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
A	COL	6.98	8.61	6.67	11.36	0.00	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	19.35	41.94	19.35	16.13	0.00	0.00	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
A2	COL	6.98	1.99	5.56	4.55	1.33	10.53	6.67	12.50	50.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	26.09	13.04	21.74	8.70	4.35	8.70	8.70	4.35	4.35	0.00	0.00
B	COL	11.63	11.92	13.33	6.82	6.67	5.26	3.33	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	19.61	35.29	23.53	5.88	9.80	1.96	1.96	0.00	1.96	0.00	0.00
B2	COL	16.28	5.30	5.56	15.91	9.33	36.84	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	28.00	16.00	10.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
C	COL	22.09	25.17	11.11	2.27	40.00	0.00	33.33	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	17.43	34.86	9.17	0.92	27.52	0.00	9.17	0.92	0.00	0.00	0.00
D	COL	25.58	28.48	27.78	54.55	17.33	36.84	3.33	37.50	0.00	0.00	100.00
	ROW	15.83	30.94	17.99	17.27	9.35	5.04	0.72	2.16	0.00	0.00	0.72
E	COL	4.65	13.25	15.56	0.00	6.67	0.00	23.33	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	7.84	39.22	27.45	0.00	9.80	0.00	13.73	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	COL	4.65	3.97	0.00	2.27	6.67	10.53	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	20.00	30.00	0.00	5.00	25.00	10.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
G	COL	0.00	1.32	1.11	0.00	1.33	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	33.33	16.67	0.00	16.67	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
H	COL	0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	10.67	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I	COL	1.16	0.00	0.00	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of relation see Table 3.

+Chunks of two or more symbols.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the relations that were placed on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the relations of the given type that were placed, the row value represents the percent placed on the given ordinal.

Table 13

**Summary of Types of Relations by Sequential Chunk Ordinals for
Experts on Structured Scenarios of the One Minute Task**

Relation Type*		Chunk Ordinals ⁺											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
A	COL	6.61	10.00	7.50	0.00	7.69	0.00	5.26	13.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67
	ROW	40.00	10.00	15.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	5.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
A2	COL	7.44	10.00	10.00	0.00	3.85	0.00	5.26	4.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	50.00	11.11	22.22	0.00	3.56	0.00	5.56	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
B	COL	4.13	15.00	5.00	0.00	7.69	100.00	0.00	21.74	0.00	0.00	100.00	33.33
	ROW	22.73	13.64	9.09	0.00	9.09	9.09	0.00	22.73	0.00	0.00	4.55	9.09
B2	COL	5.76	10.00	5.00	0.00	15.38	0.00	21.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	36.84	10.53	10.53	0.00	21.05	0.00	21.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
C	COL	29.75	0.00	37.50	0.00	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	69.23	0.00	28.85	0.00	1.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D	COL	30.58	35.00	7.50	0.00	61.54	0.00	52.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	50.68	9.59	4.11	0.00	21.92	0.00	13.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E	COL	8.26	10.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	39.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
	ROW	28.57	5.71	28.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.86	25.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.57
F	COL	7.44	10.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	75.00	16.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
G	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	21.74	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
H	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I	COL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	ROW	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

*For name of relation see Table 3.

+Chunks of two or more relations.

Col. value = The percent frequency of the relations that were placed on the given ordinal were of the type named.

Row value = Of all the relations of the given type that were placed, the row value represents the percent placed on the given ordinal.




FIGURE 7. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Structured Scenarios for Experts.




FIGURE 8. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Structured Scenarios for Novices.




FIGURE 9. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Unstructured Scenarios for Experts.




FIGURE 10. Number of Relations in an IPT Chunk by Average IPT for Chunk on Unstructured Scenarios for Novices.

as the number of relations goes up, processing inter-placement time goes down for both novices and experts on the structured scenarios. While this trend is still true for the unstructured scenarios, the variance between the two tasks is greater for the structured than for the unstructured scenarios. Also the difference between the two groups is greater for the structured than for the unstructured scenarios, suggesting that processing speed is dependent on both the coherence of the chunk and the coherence of the display. Thus both chunk coherence and display coherence may be measured by the relative number of relations each contains. The fact that novices exhibited similar trends is based on the possibility that they used relations between symbols which are coterminous with battlefield relations but not necessarily tactically meaningful.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study has provided an experimental technique by which to locate and value the informational chunks which are meaningful to the tactical decision maker in the analysis of battlefield map positions. Tactically meaningful relations tended to emerge as the basic elements of an expert's chunk. Even the novice was chunking by relating symbols in some meaningful way. One indication of this finding is that there seems to be a direct relationship between the relational density of a chunk and the speed with which the information is processed. While chunk size in terms of relations was related to battlefield expertise, no such relationship was found for chunking frequency. Chunking frequency was more directly related to time given

for studying the battlefield map irrespective of expertise. Those findings need to be validated for varying display conditions and more dynamic battlefield scenarios.

Acknowledgements:

I wish to thank the following persons for their participation and helpful assistance on this research project: Ms. Elaine Acree and Mr. Timothy Cope of the Georgia Institute of Technology; Dr. Edgar Johnson, Dr. Stanley M. Halpin, and CPT. David Candler of the Army Research Institute.


REFERENCES

- Amarel, S. Representations and modeling of problems of program formation. In B. Meltzer and D. Michie (eds), Machine Intelligence, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971.
- Badre, A. N. Information processing approaches to problem-solving, Research 1973/74: Annual Progress Report, School of Information & Computer Science, Georgia Tech, pp. 30-32, 1974.
- Bower, Gordon H. A selective review of organizational factors in memory. In E. Tulving and W. Davidson (eds), Organization of Memory, New York, N.Y., Academic Press, 1972.
- Bower, G. H. & Winzenz, D. Group structure, coding, and memory for digit series, Journal of Experimental Psychology Monographs, Vol. 80, No. 2, Part 2, pp. 1-17, 1969.
- Buchanan, B. et al, Heuristic DENDRAL: A program for generating explanatory hypotheses in organic chemistry, Machine Intelligence 4, New York: American Elsevier, 1969.
- Charness, Neil, Memory for chess positions: Resistance to interference, Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, Vol. 2, No. 6, 1976.
- Chase, W. G. & Simon, H.A. The mind's eye in chess. In W. G. Chase (ed), Visual Information Processing, New York: Academic Press, 1973.
- Colas, J. N. G-2 SIMTOS: A Research Vehicle for the Study of Tactical Intelligence Information Processing and Decision-Making, Vol. I & II Essex Corporation, July 1975.
- Davis, R. et al. Production rules as a representation for a knowledge based consultation program, Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 8, 1977.
- deGroot, A. Perception and memory versus thought: Some old ideas and recent findings. In B. Kleinmuntz (ed), Problem Solving, New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Dirlan, David K. Most efficient chunk sizes, Cognitive Psychology, Vol. 3, 1972.
- Donovan, J.J. Database system approach to management decision support, ACM Transactions on Decision Systems, Vol. 1, No. 4, December 1976.
- Frey, Peter W. (ed) Chess Skill in Man and Machine, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- Frey, Peter W. & Ademan, Peter Recall memory for visually presented chess positions, Memory and Cognition, Vol. 4, No. 5, 1976.


- Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., pp. 266-273, 1953.
- Newborn, M. Computer Chess, New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Newell, A. & Simon, H. A. Human Problem Solving, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Reitman, J. S. Skilled perception in GO: Deducing memory structures from inter-response times, Cognitive Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 336-356, July 1976.
- Rastla, F. & Brown E. Organization of serial pattern learning. In G. H. Bower (ed), The Psychology of Learning and Motivation, Vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Samuel, A. L. Some studies in machine learning using the game of checkers II. Recent progress, IBM Journal of Research and Development, Vol. 11, No. 6, 1967.
- Slamecka, V., Camp, H., Badre, A. N., and Hall, D. MARIS: A knowledge system for internal medicine, Journal of Information Management and Processing, Vol. 13, pp. 273-276, 1977.
- Zobrist, A. L. & Carlson, F. R., Jr. An advice-taking chess computer, Scientific American, Vol. 228, pp. 92-105, 1973.

A collection of 24 numbered sketches of various electronic components, arranged on a page with a large curved line on the left. The components are: 1. A rectangular component with a cross-hatch pattern. 2. A rectangular component with a central circle. 3. A rectangular component with a central circle. 4. A rectangular component with a central circle. 5. A rectangular component with a central circle. 6. A rectangular component with a central circle. 7. A rectangular component with a central circle. 8. A rectangular component with a central circle. 9. A rectangular component with a central circle. 10. A rectangular component with a central circle. 11. A rectangular component with a central circle. 12. A rectangular component with a central circle. 13. A rectangular component with a central circle. 14. A rectangular component with a central circle. 15. A rectangular component with a central circle. 16. A rectangular component with a central circle. 17. A rectangular component with a central circle. 18. A rectangular component with a central circle. 19. A rectangular component with a central circle. 20. A rectangular component with a central circle. 21. A rectangular component with a central circle. 22. A rectangular component with a central circle. 23. A rectangular component with a central circle. 24. A rectangular component with a central circle.


APPENDIX I
STRUCTURED II MAP SCENARIO



APPENDIX I
SEMI-STRUCTURED MAP SCENARIO



APPENDIX I
UNSTRUCTURED MAP SCENARIO



APPENDIX II



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ORGANIZATIONS AND SYSTEMS RESEARCH LABORATORY
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22333

PERI-CS

17 March 1978

TO: Army Research Institute Participants

SUBJECT: Selecting and Representing Information Structures for
Battlefield Decision Systems

1. Recent Army policy has been to reduce the "tooth-to-tail ratio" in organizational and personnel alignments. Part of this policy has included various methods of computerizing functions that formerly required many soldiers. Specifically, the Army Research Institute is addressing Command and Control systems [e.g. Tactical Operations System (TOS), Standoff Target Acquisition System (SOTAS), Computerized Artillery Support (TACFIRE) and Battlefield Exploitation and Target Acquisition (BETA)].

2. The one facet of the myriad of challenges in developing such systems, that you will address today is the rapid and comprehensible display of tactical information for Command Decision Making.

3. The objective of the proposed research is to identify and apply experimental techniques for locating and valuating data patterns and informational chunks which are meaningful to the battlefield commander in his decision-making tasks. The identification of meaningful chunks of information is useful in specifying criteria for the development of decision-aiding algorithms that search for, classify, and display information. Also, a designation of the size and content of a meaningful chunk has a direct bearing on the design specifications of data frames for battlefield information systems.

The main drawback of systems developed to aid the decision-maker in his information processing activities has been the reliance of the programmer on his own intuitiveness or the unvalidated reports of experts as to how the task-information should be represented and structured. Accordingly, the plan is to develop and test a set of experimental techniques that may be used to specify how the battlefield decision-maker represents and structures the data of his problem.

APPENDIX II (cont'd)

PERI-OS

SUBJECT: Selecting and Representing Information Structures for
Battlefield Decision Systems

The Experimental techniques to be used here follow in part from a well established line of research on human problem-solving and cognition to study how experts organize and chunk the information in a problem. In this experiment you will be faced with a problem-environment; you then will be asked to manipulate various object-symbols in this environment through tasks such as reconstructing or copying the symbols. The scientists will record certain key data then analyze the collected data to determine the characteristics of a chunk.

4. There are no right or wrong answers. You, along with other participants representing all levels of Command and Staff, are the experts that will aid in the design of the Command and Control Systems for the U. S. Army.

D. M. Candler
D. M. CANDLER
CPT, GS
R&D Coordinator

APPENDIX III

PERI-OS

17 March 1978

TO: ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

SUBJECT: Selecting and Representing Information Structures for
Battlefield Decision Systems

1. Unique findings in data gathering are sometimes attributable to unique experience or educational backgrounds. To assist in validating data the following Biographic Information is requested.

2. In accordance with guidance concerning the Privacy Act, it is requested that you not put your name or social security number on these forms or any of the experiment information. Data from the experiment is associated with Bio-Data by Participant number only. No information associating participant name to participant number is used for analysis or any other purpose.

Biographical Information Participant # _____

Rank _____ Years of Military Service _____ Age _____

OPMS Specialty Title _____

OPMS Alternate Specialty Title _____

Years of College/Degree _____

Years of Graduate School/Degree _____

Have you attended:

_____ Officer Advanced Course (Branch: _____)	Year _____
_____ Army Command & General Staff College (Ft. Leavenworth)	Year _____
_____ National War College (Ft. McNair)	Year _____
_____ Army War College (Carlisle Barracks)	Year _____
_____ Tactical Map Exercises in West Germany	Year _____

APPENDIX III (cont'd)

Please summarize your military experience in tactical units chronologically in the spaces below:

(Please check () before year those assignments which included combat experience.)

()	<u>Year</u>	<u>Position Type</u> (Cdr, S1, S2, S3, S4, etc)	<u>Unit Type & Level</u> (e.g., Mech Co)	<u>Duration</u> (Months)	<u>Location</u>
-----	-------------	--	---	-----------------------------	-----------------

3. Your participation in this research is appreciated and important to the development of command and control systems.

D.M. Candler
D.M. CANDLER
CPT, GS
R&D Coordinator