

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

FILE COPY

4

AD-A197 089

LECTE

UL 2 2 1988

1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS

DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE:

DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING / CHG. RULE

4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

ONR TECHNICAL REPORT #88-4

5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)

6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

6b. OFFICE SYMBOL
(If applicable)

7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH (CODE 1142PT)

6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

660 S. Euclid, Box 8111, Neurology,
ST. LOUIS, MO 63110

7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

PERSONNEL & TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAMS
800 NORTH QUINCY STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-50008a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING
ORGANIZATION8b. OFFICE SYMBOL
(If applicable)

9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)

10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS

PROGRAM
ELEMENT NO.
61153NPROJECT
NO.
RR04206TASK
NO.
RR04206-0AWORK UNIT
ACCESSION NO.
NR442a554

11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)

Is Word Recognition automatic? - A cognitive-anatomical approach.

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

Michael I. Posner, Jennifer Sandson, Meena Dhawan & Gordon L. Shulman

13a. TYPE OF REPORT

TECHNICAL

13b. TIME COVERED

FROM 01MAY88 TO 01MAY89

14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)

May 30, 1988

15. PAGE COUNT

28

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES

FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP
05	10	

18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

It is generally accepted that two tasks will interfere to the extent that they require attention or involve shared non-attentional processing systems. We used anatomical data from studies of blood flow during lexical processing (Petersen, Fox, Posner, Mintun & Raichle, 1988) to generate hypotheses about the conditions under which an auditory shadowing task would interfere with three common visual priming tasks.

Data from blood flow studies suggest that visual priming involves automatic activation of a set of posterior visual areas that are not activated by auditory language processing. In accord with this account, we found no reduction in visual priming during simultaneous shadowing.

Cueing covert visual attention involves posterior parietal areas that are not involved in auditory shadowing. However, these posterior areas are part of a unified (over)

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT

☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS

21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL

Michael I. Posner

22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)

(314) 362-3317

22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

ONR 1142PT

19. (ABSTRACT continued)

attention system. In accord with this idea, cueing covert attention is greatly affected by simultaneous auditory shadowing.

Blood flow data indicate that semantic priming involves both an anterior attention system and an area of lateral frontal cortex. Both these areas can also be activated by auditory information. Our results suggest that semantic priming is greatly influenced by strategic factors that do not affect visual priming and is often reduced by auditory shadowing. The interaction of semantic priming with auditory shadowing depends little on the semantic character of the shadowing task (text versus nonsense) and thus appears to be large attentional.

We argue that a combined anatomical-cognitive approach provides a means for disambiguating the conditions under which interference between cognitive operations is likely to occur.

Is Word Recognition automatic?

A cognitive-anatomical approach¹

Michael I. Posner, Jennifer Sandson,
Meena Dhawan and Gordon L. Shulman

ONR Technical Report 88-4

Research sponsored by:

Personnel and Training Research Program
Psychological Science Division,
Office of Naval Research

Under Control Number:

N00014-86-K-0289

Contract Authority Number:

NR-442a554

Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any
purpose of the United States Government

Is word recognition automatic?
A cognitive-anatomical approach¹

Michael I. Posner, *Jennifer Sandson,**
Meena Dhawan and Gordon L. Shulman

* Now at the University of Oregon, Department of Psychology
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Reprints are available at this address.

** Now at the University of Maryland School of Medicine
Department of Neurology
Baltimore, MD 20201

Abstract


It is generally accepted that two tasks will interfere to the extent that they require attention or involve shared non-attentional processing systems. We used anatomical data from studies of blood flow during lexical processing (Petersen, Fox, Posner, Mintun & Raichle, 1988) to generate hypotheses about the conditions under which an auditory shadowing task would interfere with three common visual priming tasks.

Data from blood flow studies suggest that visual priming involves automatic activation of a set of posterior visual areas that are not activated by auditory language processing. In accord with this account, we found no reduction in visual priming during simultaneous shadowing.

Cueing covert visual attention involves posterior parietal areas that are not involved in auditory shadowing. However, these posterior areas are part of a unified attention system. In accord with this idea, cueing covert attention is greatly affected by simultaneous auditory shadowing.

Blood flow data indicate that semantic priming involves both an anterior attention system and an area of lateral frontal cortex. Both these areas can be also be activated by auditory information. Our results suggest that semantic priming is greatly influenced by strategic factors that do not affect visual priming and is often reduced by auditory shadowing. The interaction of semantic priming with auditory shadowing depends little on the semantic character of the shadowing task (text versus nonsense) and thus appears to be largely attentional.

We argue that a combined anatomical-cognitive approach provides a means for disambiguating the conditions under which interference between cognitive operations is likely to occur.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Dist	Special
A-1	

There is a long history in experimental psychology of using simultaneous dual task performance to determine the extent to which two tasks share limited cognitive resources (Kinsbourne & Hicks, 1978; Posner, 1978; 1982). The logic underlying dual task paradigms is as follows: (1) tasks will interfere to the extent that they require attention and (2) tasks will interfere when their component operations are similar. The first criterion suggests that two poorly learned tasks will interfere irrespective of content. The second suggests that even highly overlearned tasks will interfere when their content is related.

Both of these criteria can be subsumed under a single anatomical proposition (Kinsbourne & Hicks, 1978). That is, tasks will interfere to the extent that their operations occur within a single or heavily interconnected anatomical system. If selective attention is performed by an integrated system, it is clear that tasks requiring this system will interfere. If processing of similar content is done in shared anatomical areas, one would also expect more interference when contents are related.

A major contribution of cognitive science has been the development of paradigms which allow for the study of isolated internal operations rather than entire tasks. One such paradigm uses an initial stimulus as a prime to improve one or more aspects of the processing of a second target stimulus. Since the subject does not have to respond to the first stimulus, such priming may serve to isolate those components that are shared between prime and target. Thus, if the word 'doctor' is a prime for the target 'nurse', it is thought to improve target processing by activating appropriate areas of semantic memory. If the word 'doctor' is a prime for the visually identical stimulus 'doctor', target processing could also be facilitated through shared visual, phonological and semantic activations. The mechanisms of priming are unresolved. One controversy concerns the extent to which priming effects are attentional or automatic (Neely, 1977). A more recent controversy involves the degree to which facilitation results from mediating search strategies instead of the activation of common representations (Ratcliff & McKoon, in press). Despite these difficulties we try to use priming as a tool for isolating particular operations. The results of these efforts can also be used to evaluate the assumptions on which they are based.

Advances in imaging technology have recently yielded evidence concerning the anatomical systems activated by visual words in healthy subjects (Petersen et al., 1988). These studies have relied upon changes in blood flow when performing a series of three common lexical tasks, each differing from the next by a single processing operation (e.g. passive word presentation followed by word repetition). The operations involved in the tasks are similar to those in a typical priming paradigm. The results of the study are summarized in Figure 1.

INSERT FIG. 1

We used this anatomical data to generate hypotheses about the conditions under which an auditory/verbal task requiring attention would interfere with three common visual priming tasks. The three tasks are visual priming of a word (e.g. doctor - doctor), semantic priming a word (e.g. nurse - doctor), and cueing of visual spatial attention (e.g. a cue to attend to the left of the screen followed by a target to the left for a valid trial or to the right for an invalid trial).

The anatomical basis of the shared activations between cue and target in these three tasks can be inferred from Fig. 1. For example, the area most likely to mediate priming of visual features is the ventral occipital lobe (see areas called visual word forms, Fig. 1). Petersen, Fox, Miezin & Raichle (1988) suggest that these areas form a network for the development of visual word forms from visual features. We hypothesize that word primes activate these areas and that an identical prime will reactivate the same pathway within the network. In the PET study activation of the ventral occipital lobe was very similar, irrespective of whether subjects responded actively or passively to the input word, indicating that the areas are not part of the attentional system.

The PET study suggests that semantic tasks activate two additional areas (see semantic and anterior attention areas, Fig. 1). One of these is unique to semantic processing of language stimuli, whether visual or auditory, and lies in the left inferior prefrontal cortex. The second is in the anterior cingulate and appears related to the person's attention to the word. We believe semantic priming depends upon the prime activating items in the semantic network. If so, an auditory task might reduce facilitation either because it too draws upon the semantic network (e.g. story shadowing) or because it uses a shared attentional system.

Finally, a visual spatial cue appears to improve processing of a target because it draws attention to the target location (Posner & Presti, 1987). Data from patients with focal lesions suggest that this cueing effect depends upon two cortical areas. One of these is posterior and unique to vision (area 7) (see posterior attention, Fig. 1) and the other anterior is involved in both visual space and language processing (Posner & Inhoff, 1987). Our best candidate for the anterior area is the anterior cingulate described above. The reasons are twofold. First, we know that patients and normals who are processing language information show a reduced visual spatial cueing effect. Second, the only attentional area we have found in PET studies of word processing is in the anterior cingulate (Petersen, et al, 1988). It is known from studies of monkey anatomy that the anterior cingulate is one of many areas receiving input from both the posterior parietal lobe and the lateral prefrontal area (Goldman-Rakic, 1988). These two information sources are interdigitated within the anterior cingulate.

Thus we assume that the anterior cingulate is at least a part of the interaction between visual spatial and language attention.

How should these anatomical data influence cognitive models of divided attention? Suppose we subsume both cognitive criteria listed in our first paragraph under the common anatomical principle. Two mental operations will interfere when they require the same or highly connected anatomical areas. Thus all tasks that require attention will interfere because attention is a system of anatomically interconnected areas. For visual space this involves both the parietal lobe and anterior cingulate (among known areas) while for language it involves the anterior cingulate. The predictions for physical priming of identical stimuli are straightforward. The operations involved in visual priming should not be affected by auditory shadowing as visual priming involves only the visual word form system and auditory shadowing involves the more anterior region surrounded by dotted lines in Figure 1.

The predictions for semantic priming are much more complex. Potentially semantic priming and auditory shadowing have in common both the left inferior frontal area and the midline attentional area. However, there is evidence in cognition that a portion of semantic priming can occur without attention (e.g. Neely, 1977). Thus it is possible that semantic priming will not always use the attentional system required for shadowing. Second, shadowing may be isolated from semantics under some circumstances. A clear case for such isolation ought to be the repetition of nonsense words. PET data show little evidence of activation of the semantic area even when meaningful words are repeated (Petersen, et al, 1988).

In this paper we attempt to illustrate this joint anatomical-cognitive approach to understanding interference between tasks. The first section of the paper deals with visual priming under a variety of conditions. The second section deals with attentional cueing and the final section with semantic priming.

Visual Priming

Prototype Experiment

Visual and semantic priming stimuli were run within mixed blocks. The method for a prototype priming study (Experiment 1 in Table 6) is presented below. Variations in priming and shadowing stimuli were introduced throughout and will be addressed as they are encountered. Subjects were always native English speakers and were recruited from advertisements in local papers.

Method

Stimuli: Word list stimuli for Experiment 1 consisted of semantic, identity, unrelated and nonword pairs. Semantic pairs included: 20 good-instance category pairs (e.g. insect - fly); 20 poor-instance category pairs (e.g. ship - ferry); 20 highly associated pairs (e.g. salt - pepper) and 20 less highly associated pairs (e.g. wish - hope). The good and poor instance category pairs were selected on the basis of the Battig and Montague (1969) norms for instance dominance. Good instance targets had a mean category dominance rating of 365.8, as compared to 12.6 for the poor instance targets ($p < .001$). High and lower association pairs were obtained from established association norms (Palermo & Jenkins, 1964). High association pairs had a mean rating of 505.4 while the mean rating for the low association pairs was 98.6 ($p < .001$). Although frequency of occurrence (Kucera & Francis, 1967) was not significantly different across association pairs, high dominance targets had a significantly higher mean frequency than low dominance pairs. There were 40 identity pairs (e.g. train - train), 80 unrelated pairs (e.g. function - lace) and 200 nonword pairs (e.g. route - vorpre). In order to ensure that the effects of prime type would not be attributable to differences in frequency, unrelated pairs were constructed so as to contain the same target words as the categorical and associate pairs. Primes for the unrelated pairs did not differ in frequency from those for the semantically related pairs. Nonword and identity primes were also selected so as not to differ in frequency from those in the unrelated pairs.

In order to meet requirements for disk space, the 400 pair stimulus list was divided into two parts. One half of the items in each pair type were randomly assigned to each list.

The auditory tape used in the shadowing conditions was a reading by Gore Vidal of his novel Abraham Lincoln.

Procedure: Subjects received both word lists first in a no-shadowing and then in a shadowing condition. Each list was presented in a different random order for every subject. List order was counterbalanced such that one half the subjects received each list first.

Target stimuli were presented either a short or a long interval after the onset of the prime (SOA). SOA was randomly assigned to each item at every presentation. Prime stimuli were always initiated 500 msec after the onset of a fixation cross and remained on the screen for 300 msec. Target stimuli were initiated 400 msec after the onset of the prime in the short SOA condition and 900 msec after the onset of the prime in the long SOA condition. The fixation cross remained present throughout the duration of each trial. Primes appeared above and targets below the cross.

Subjects were instructed to fixate on the central cross and to attend to the second stimulus in each trial. Their task was to determine whether

that letter string was or was not a real English word. If the target was a real word, the correct response was to press the left key on the response panel with the index of the right hand (or the middle finger of the left hand). Nonword responses were registered by pressing the right key with the middle (index) finger of the same (dominant) hand. Subsequent trials were automatically triggered through the response key.

The shadowing task involved repetition of the auditory tape, allowing for minimal lag between the tape and the subject. Subjects practiced shadowing until they felt comfortable with the task. They were then instructed to again perform the lexical decision task while maintaining the speed and accuracy of their shadowing. No formal measure of shadowing performance was obtained.

Response accuracy and reaction times for the lexical decision task were stored by computer for later analysis.

Results

In this section we consider the results for visual primes and unrelated words from Experiment 1 and the subsequent priming studies. In section 3 we will consider the data obtained for various forms of semantic relationship.

Table 1 shows the means of the median RTs for the visually primed targets and targets following unrelated words when the lexical decision task is performed by itself (focal) and when it is time shared with shadowing the Lincoln story (divided). An analysis of variance of these values shows a significant priming effect, $F(1,11)=6.2$, $p<.02$ and no significant effect of the shadowing on the amount of visual priming, $F=1.08$.

INSERT TABLE 1

Extension Experiments

We have now run the visual priming condition as a part of six classification experiments (see Table 6 for a summary of the different tasks). It has frequently been noted that lexical decision tasks often allow the presence of a relationship between prime and target words to confound the lexicality judgment (Neely, Keele & Ross, 1986). This confound arises when the presence of such a relationship means that the target string must be a word. This type of confound might be particularly important for visual identity priming where the prime-target relation is especially obvious.

We used two different techniques (Experiments 3 and 6) to reduce the use of this type of strategy in our studies. In Experiment 3 we added

identical non-word pairs, thus precluding classifications based solely on a physical match. The amount of visual priming in this study is displayed in Table 2 (columns 2 and 3) for both word and non-word pairs. These data can be compared with column 1 which represents a straight replication of the prototype experiment with its confounding of relatedness and lexicality. It is clear that the visual priming is the same in the replication experiment as in the original and the new condition also gives essentially the same results.

Inspection of Table 2 also reveals that visual priming of non-words failed to produce significant facilitation in either the focal or divided conditions. Nonword visual matches, however, were only half as frequent as word visual matches. Although there are several possible explanations for the absence of visual nonword priming, the result further supports the idea that visual priming is somehow related to the lexicality of the target string and cannot be explained through a matching strategy.

A second way to eliminate the confound between relatedness and classification is to change from a lexical decision task to a semantic classification task. In Experiment 6 subjects were required to classify animal names into the categories 'predatory' or 'non-predatory'. The same related prime could thus occur for targets in both categories. As can be seen in column 4 of Table 2, the degree of physical priming was not reduced in this task.

INSERT TABLE 2

Type of Shadowing

We examined two forms of shadowing in order to establish the generality of the results obtained so far. The experiments were similar to our prototype experiment except that the subject either did the visual task alone, shadowed a story, or a list of nonsense words. The basic idea was to vary the degree of semantic content of the shadowed message. In Table 3 we look at the amount of improvement from priming as a function of the type of shadowing. The story shadowing data is the mean of three experiments (Expts. 1, 2 & 3) and is compared with the nonsense shadowing values from Experiment 3. There is no effect of type of shadowing on the amount of visual priming.

INSERT TABLE 3

Discussion

It is clear that the facilitation due to visual priming is not reduced by performance of a secondary shadowing task. Significant visual priming was obtained over a range of primary and secondary task conditions. In particular, two lines of evidence suggest that visual priming does not depend upon the strategic use of a prime-target relation to indicate a "word" response. First, visual priming was not reduced by the addition (Experiment 3) of non-word pairs with an identity relation. Second, visual priming remained intact when the prime-target relation was rendered completely orthogonal to the required judgment (semantic classification task - Experiment 6). It thus seems that the prime itself must somehow affect the classification made to the target. One possible mechanism for this might involve an implicit classification of the prime. In cases of a prime-target match, the already selected response would simply be executed. This strategy, however, should apply equally to word and non-word targets and the nonword identity pairs in Experiment 3 (table 2) did not result in priming. The means by which a prime facilitates target classification thus remains unsolved.

As a whole these findings suggest that visual priming occurs as a result of activating a pathway in the ventral occipital lobe which is then reactivated more quickly when the target occurs (see Fig. 1). If the prime effect was mediated by semantics, one would expect to find clear interference from story condition of the divided attention task (see page). It also seems unlikely that the prime effect could be based on the phonological code of the word name, as PET results suggest this code is not activated unless the subject follows a very deliberate strategy that would not be available under dual task conditions (Posner, Petersen, Fox & Raichle, in press). Moreover, mediation of visual priming via a phonological route would surely be affected by the dual task. While visual primes could have their influence on any level, the combined anatomical-cognitive approach suggest that they operate specifically on the visual representation.

We thus conclude that activating the visual code is not affected by the dual task. Can we go a step further and conclude that the visual code activation is automatic? One could argue that visual code formation involves a kind of attention not used for auditory shadowing. The most likely candidate would be the visual spatial attention system located in the parietal lobe known to be important in some forms of feature integration. However, we can reject this possibility on several grounds. First, PET studies (Petersen, et al, 1988) show that the visual code is activated passively even when the subject is instructed not to attend to it. There is no evidence of activation in the parietal lobe under these conditions. Second, patients with lesions of the right parietal lobe who neglect the left side of many objects, including letter strings, show little or no loss for reading visual words, even when they occupy the same visual angle as the letter string (Sieroff, Pollatsek & Posner, 1988).

Third, normal subjects cued to the right side of a letter string show a marked increase in errors when report the first two letters, much like the right parietal patients, but they do not have this problem with words (Sieroff & Posner, 1988). These findings show that reading a single foveally-centered word activates the visual code without automatically using the visual attention system. Thus for both cueing and divided attention methods, we find true automaticity of visual code activation under the conditions of the present experiment. Our findings support the notion that mental operations will produce no interference when they use anatomically distinct neural systems.

Visual Spatial Attention

The cognitive processes underlying visual identity priming are relatively simple, requiring only the activation of lexical codes. It is possible that it is the simplicity of the task rather than the anatomy that allows for time sharing with shadowing. It was thus important to look for interference from the auditory shadowing task on an equally simple primary task previously shown to activate the attentional system.

One such task involves shifting attention to a cued location (Posner & Presti, 1987). We use a visual cue to draw the subject's attention to a particular spatial location. If the target occurs at that location response times will be faster than if it occurs at another location. Just as a comparison between identical and unrelated primes provides a measure of priming the visual code, so the difference between response times to cued and uncued locations provides a measure of the efficiency of a covert shift of attention to the cue.

Studies of patients with focal lesions suggest that the covert shifts of visual spatial attention brought about by visual cueing are performed by activations of the posterior parietal lobe (see Figure 1). PET studies confirm the importance of this area in attending to visual locations (Petersen, Fox, Miezin & Raichle, 1988). Unlike the ventral areas involved in visual word forms, the parietal area is part of a more general attention system, with both anterior and posterior components, that is also involved in attending to language (Posner, in press). We would expect that the shadowing task would involve the anterior attentional components of this system and thus produce interference with the covert shift of attention to the cue.

Previously in connection with studies of schizophrenia (Posner, Early, Reiman, Pardo & Dhawan, in press), we ran a control condition in which normal subjects performed a visual spatial attention task either alone or together with shadowing the Lincoln story. Because the previous experiment is reported only very briefly and for such a different purpose, we briefly describe the method and results below.

Method

In this experiment twenty normal subjects were run in three blocks of covert spatial orienting (see Posner & Presti, 1987 for a full description of the task). On each trial the subject was to respond as quickly as possible to a one degree target that occurred within one of two boxes located five degrees to the left or right of a fixation cross. We will consider two types of trials, valid and invalid. Within each block, there were 96 valid trials in which the target occurred within the cued box and 24 invalid trials in which the target occurred within the box on the opposite side of the cue. On the first and third block of spatial orienting trials the subjects shadowed the Lincoln story as described in Experiment 1. On the second block they performed the spatial orienting task alone.

Results

The results for a 100 and 800 msec cue to target intervals are shown in Table 4. We examined the 100 msec interval separately because this cue to target interval is too short for any eye movements. An ANOVA of the data shown in Table 4 produces a significant effect of attention condition (focal vs. divided), $F(1,19) = 26$, $p < .001$; cue condition (valid vs. invalid) $F(1,19) = 86$, $p < .001$ and an attention by cue by visual field interaction $F(1,19) = 5.5$, $p < .03$. The interaction with visual field indicates that there is no validity effect (advantage of valid over invalid RTs) for left visual field targets in the divided attention condition. The interaction with visual field is not present in the 800 msec cue to target interval data.

Discussion

Two features of these data are of interest. First, unlike visual priming, we find clear interference from auditory shadowing on the effectiveness of the cue. The advantage of validly cued targets over invalid ones is 42 millisecond in the focal condition and 22 millisecond in the divided condition. Second, there is a strong laterality effect. When a cue is in the right visual field (left hemisphere), followed by a target in the left visual field (right hemisphere), the shadowing task produces less interference than in any other condition. We believe that right visual field cues fail to attract attention when shadowing and thus produce a reduced validity effect in the divided attention conditions.

The data show that shadowing affects the orienting of visual spatial attention even though the posterior parietal area responsible for this form of attention has been shown not to be activated by repetition of single words. We believe that this interference occurs because the auditory shadowing task ties up the anterior attentional system (see Figure 1) which, as shown previously, controls the posterior visual spatial orienting system (Posner, Inhoff, Friedrich & Cohen, 1987). Performance of the

secondary task delays the command signal from the anterior to the posterior attention system and thus slows orienting to the cue. In agreement with the idea of a delayed command signal, we find that longer cue to target intervals (800 millisecon), equalize the validity effects for focal and divided attention conditions.

The powerful difference between shadowing effects on cues to the right and left hemisphere has not been previously reported. Apparently the divided attention condition delays the ability of cues to fully engage attention only when they occur in RVF (go directly to the left hemisphere). For this reason, invalid targets in the left visual field do not suffer as greatly from the secondary task as the other three conditions. This finding represents the first clear evidence that the anterior attention system is lateralized in organization. The remarkable specificity of the interference produced by shadowing to the operations of one side of the anterior attention system is persuasive evidence that divided attention is not a general phenomenon but extremely sensitive to the exact details of the anatomical interconnections. Thus a very simple mental operation in the ventral occipital lobe shows no interference from the shadowing task (exp. 1), while an equally simple cueing operation within the attention system shows dramatic interference in just one half of the visual field.

Semantic Priming

Visual and semantic priming stimuli were run in mixed blocks as described for the prototype experiment. The RT for various semantic relationships and unrelated primes are shown in Table 5. Two facts are clear from the table and are confirmed by statistical analysis. The related trials are faster than unrelated trials (mean 48 msec). ANOVA shows a significant relatedness effect $F(1,11) = 5.4, p < .05$. The effect of relatedness is longest for highly associated pairs, next for low association pairs and is lacking for poor members of primed categories. Both the size and systematic nature of these activations suggest that priming occurred in the focal condition. The large percentage of semantically and physically related pairs was probably sufficiently salient to encourage the conscious or unconscious use of same type of strategy in lexical decision. One such strategy, which often produces large priming effects, is the active prediction of the target on the basis of the prime. In accordance with this possibility, we obtain a large reduction of the priming effect in the divided attention condition. There is no significant priming under divided attention conditions except for the high association pairs. The interaction between attention condition and semantic priming is significant $F(1,11) = 8.7, p < .02$. Thus shadowing tends to reduce or abolish semantic priming while not reducing visual priming under identical circumstances within the same experiment (see Table 1). The error rates in this study are small but they tend to follow the pattern of the reaction time data.

INSERT TABLE 5

The six experiments displayed in Table 6 all yielded significant visual priming of words. Significant semantic priming was obtained in all five lexical decision tasks but not in the one semantic classification task. In three of the experiments, the priming effect was reduced by some form of divided attention. This was significant in two studies. In two other lexical decision studies, there was a significant priming effect (although small) that was not affected by shadowing (see Table 7).

INSERT TABLES 6, 7

Our studies were not designed to determine the exact factors responsible for the extent of semantic priming. As indicated by a vast and complex literature, semantic priming is influenced by a number of strategic factors that include percentage of related primes, interval between prime and target, backward association between target and prime, and many others. These factors were not controlled in our experiments and appear to be responsible for the variability of semantic priming in our data. Despite this, significant priming was obtained for all focal tasks except semantic classification. This may be due to the greater difficulty of this particular semantic classification task or to its success in eliminating the presence or absence of a prime-target relationship as a strategic factor.

The shift from lexical decision to semantic classification did not, however, reduce visual priming. Moreover, semantic priming during lexical decision was not greatly influenced by the percentage or type of visual identity pairs in the stimulus list. The presence of nonword identity primes, intended to reduce the confound between the presence of a prime-target relationship and a "word" decision, also failed to eliminate semantic priming.

Usually the factors that influence semantic priming are said to be of two types, automatic and strategic (Posner & Snyder, 1975). The larger priming effects of Exp. 1 and 2 may reflect greater use of strategic factors. Shadowing reduced semantic priming significantly in both studies. In contrast, both priming and divided attention had smaller effects in Exp. 3-5. We conclude that divided attention can reduce semantic priming. However, there may be a component of the priming that is unaffected by the divided attention task and thus could be said to be automatic.

If we examine Exp. 3, 4 & 5 where different forms of shadowing were used, we see that nonsense shadowing has as large or larger an effect on the priming task as story shadowing. This suggests that it is not the

semantic character of the secondary task, but rather its use of attention that influences the degree of semantic priming. We know from PET data that repeating meaningful words activates the anterior attention system, but we have no evidence that it affects the left lateralized semantic system. Thus we cannot be sure that story shadowing actually has an effect on the semantic area. Subjects were, however, aware of the meaning of the text and able to answer questions about it asked after the experiments.

In short, semantic priming is like visual spatial attention and unlike visual priming in involving the attention system. We expect there may be a component of semantic priming that is automatic and is not affected by shadowing, but we have not yet demonstrated that clearly.

Conclusion

We have attempted in this paper to lay out a combined cognitive and anatomical approach to aspects of visual word recognition. We used cognitive techniques (priming) to obtain pure measures of visual activation, visual attention and semantic activation. We have shown that the visual activation component is simply not influenced by a difficult divided attention task that is perfectly adequate to provide interference with overall reaction time, visual spatial orienting and aspects of semantics. This seems to be strong confirmation that the visual word form activation is "automatic". First, we have shown elsewhere that it is automatic in the sense that it is unaffected by lesions or activation of the posterior attention system (Sieroff, et al, 1988a,b). Second, we have shown that it is automatic in the sense that the degree of blood flow in this system is not affected by the subject's passive versus active task state (Petersen, et al, 1988). Third, in this paper we show that it is automatic in that it perfectly time shares with the divided attention task. These findings support the assumption that an operation that occurs automatically in an area of the brain not used by the secondary task will show no interference. These data indicate that visual word forms can be computed even though the person is engaged in other activity and are compatible with many findings in the reading literature (Rayner & Pollatsek, 1987).

In contrast to the results for visual priming, visual attention is greatly affected by simultaneous shadowing. This occurs despite the fact that cueing appears on the surface to be just as simple as visual priming and clearly involves no language. The clear interference of shadowing on the speed of visual orienting is remarkable evidence in favor of a unified attention system which in different anatomical areas involves visual spatial (posterior) and language (anterior) information. The interaction between the two support the anatomical (Goldman-Rakic, 1988) and cognitive (Posner, Inhoff, et al, 1987) evidence that the anterior system relates prefrontal (semantic) and parietal (visual spatial) information. Moreover, the lateralized affects of shadowing on visual cueing suggest that the anterior attention system is lateralized. It is consistent with the idea

that the left anterior cingulate provides information to the left parietal lobe needed to engage attention to a cue in the right visual field.

One of the most remarkable aspects of these data is the clear separation between semantic and visual priming. Although the two prime types were mixed within the same block and task, they produced quite different patterns of facilitation. This cognitive result is compatible with several lines of anatomical evidence that visual word forms and semantic information are processed in separate areas. First, as discussed previously, our PET results (Petersen, et al, 1988) show visual word forms to activate an occipital region and semantic processing to activate a region in the frontal lobe. Second, event-related potential data (Rugg, 1987) show a posterior distribution for visual priming and an anterior distribution for semantic priming.

From a cognitive perspective, anatomical separation of initial visual word form and semantic computations does not necessarily imply that visual and semantic priming occur in those same regions. Afterall, a visual identity prime also has a semantic identity. The role of semantic analysis in lexical decision, both whether it occurs at all and if it does at what stage in processing, remains controversial. While the use of pronounceable nonwords has been shown to encourage semantic analysis (James, 1975), it remains possible that other information is important in semantic priming. Our data, however, strongly suggest that the two forms of priming have a separate anatomical as well as a separate functional basis. This result augers well for the use of these two forms of priming as a tool for assaying the relative intactness of the ventral occipital lobe and prefrontal cortex in patients with various psychiatric and neurological disorders.

Our results for semantic priming are not as definitive as for visual priming although we see no reason that they cannot be made so through better control of priming techniques. Our results do show clearly that semantic priming can be affected by a secondary auditory shadowing task. Since the PET data do not show that repetition of meaningful single words activates the semantic area, the two tasks may share only the anterior attentional system. The present data show only that semantic priming is reduced by shadowing under some conditions and suggest that the reduction is, as the PET data would predict, mediated by the shared attention system. This last point is supported by the finding that shadowing a meaningful story produced no greater interference on a lexical decision task than shadowing nonsense.

There does appear to be a portion of the semantic priming effect that is immune to attentional interference (Experiments 5 and 6). The cognitive literature suggests that this portion may reflect the automatic activation often reported after very short prime-target intervals. A number of tasks are available to pursue the issue of automatic activation. Moreover, the PET data suggest auditory tasks that involve semantic classification do


activate the semantic area. The study of the relationship between the non-attentional components of semantic priming and the anterior semantic system through interference in a dual task paradigm remains a promising area for future research.

The study advances our goal of developing joint constraints from cognitive and anatomical studies. The operation of the ventral occipital lobe in obtaining the visual word form appears to be automatic. However, this is clearly not the case for all operations performed in this area. While single foveally-centered words can be reported by parietal patients, they have great difficulty in visual search and nonword reports. Thus the operations that take place within a given area can be either automatic or attended. The use of cueing and divided attention techniques can clarify this issue.

The close relationship between the anterior attention system and the semantic system (see Fig. 1) seems to us to be of particular importance. We have argued elsewhere that difficulties in the anterior attention system can lead to bizarre abnormalities in thought and language found in schizophrenia (Early, Posner & Reiman, submitted). A closer look at the types of operations that can be computed automatically within this system and those that require attention may be fundamental to an understanding of higher level disturbances of cognition.

Figure Caption

A summary of data from PET studies of visual and auditory words (Petersen, et al, 1988). The areas on the lateral portions of the cortex (a) and on the medial portion (b) that are involved in visual word forms (triangles), semantic analysis (circles), anterior attention (squares), or posterior attention (hexagons). For lateralized activation solid indicates left hemisphere and open indicates right hemisphere. The hemisphere of midline activations is not known. The areas thought to be activated by repeating auditory words (shadowing) are surrounded by a dotted area.



¹ This research was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research by Contract N-00014-86-0289 and by the McDonnell Center for Higher Brain Function. Portions of these studies were presented to the Psychonomics Society, November, 1987.

Table 1

Mean Reaction Times (msec) for Identity and Unrelated Pairs

	Identity	Unrelated	Priming Unrelated-Identity
Focal	641	693	52
Divided	667	738	71

Table 2

Amount of visual priming (msec) as a function of type
of task and the presence of nonword primes.

	Lexical Decision			Semantic Class
	words only (Exp. 2)	words mixed (Exp. 3)	nonwords mixed (Exp. 3)	words only (Exp. 6)
Focal	54	54	7	87
Divided	84	81	20	76

Table 3

Visual priming (msec) as a function of the type of secondary task

No Task	Shadow Story	Shadow Nonsense
62	80	65

Table 4

Mean RT (msec) as a function of cue and attention conditions

	Valid Trials		Invalid Trials		Validity Effect
	Visual Field of Target				Invalid-Valid
	100 millisec*				
	Left	Right	Left	Right	
Focus	353	349	397	391	42
Divided	452	441	459	479	22
Increased RT from Dual Task	99	92	62	88	
	800 millisec*				
Focus	304	304	334	333	30
Divided	401	409	430	438	29
Increased RT from Dual Task	97	105	96	105	

* Cue to Target Interval

Table 5

Mean of the median RTs in millisec for targets following various types of primes for focal and divided attention conditions

	High	Low	Good	Poor	
	Assoc.	Assoc.	Instance	Instance	Unrelated
Focal	608	628	653	691	693
Divided	690	712	745	773	738

Table 6

Survey of Prime Conditions in Six Priming Experiments

Exp.	Task	#Ss	Intervals	Total Trials	% Rel Primes	# Visual Primes	Semantic Primes	Unrelated Primes
1	Lex. Dec.	12	100 600	400	30	40	80	80
2	Lex. Dec.	24	100 600	480	25	40	80	120
3	Lex. Dec.	12	100 600	240	31	30*	30	30
4	Lex. Dec.	12	300	180	17		30	30
5	Lex. Dec.	12	300	240	25	30	30	30
6	Semantic Class.	11	100 600	142	50	24	46	72

* In addition, there were 16 nonword visual identity primes and 14 nonword primes that were not visually identical.

Table 7

Amount of semantic priming (msec) in six experiments for
focal and divided attention conditions.

Exp.	Task	Attention Condition		
		Focal	Shadow Story	Shadow Nonsense
1.		48 [*]	6 ^{***}	
2.		39 [*]	13	
3.		20 ^{**}	21	-6 ^{***}
4.		23 [*]	13	26
5.		17 [*]	19	22
6.		19	13	

* Signifies a significant semantic priming effect in the focal condition

** Significant interaction between priming and attention condition

*** Signifies a significant reduction in the amount of priming under the
specified divided attention condition

References

- Battig, W.F. & Montague, W.E. (1969) Category norms for verbal items in 56 categories. *J. Exp. Psychol. Monogr.* 80, 1-46.
- Early, T.S., Posner, M.I. & Reiman, E.M. Hyperactivity of the left striato-pallidal projection: An integrated model of multileveled pathology in schizophrenia. Submitted.
- Friedrich, F.J., Walker, J.A. & Posner, M.I. Effects of parietal lesions on visual matching: Implications for reading errors. *Cog. Neuropsychol.* 1985, 2:250-264.
- Goldman-Rakic, P.S. Topography of cognition: Parallel distributed networks in primate association cortex. *Ann. Rev. Psychol.* 1988, 11:137-156.
- James, C.T. (1975) The role of semantic information in lexical decisions. *J. Exp. Psychol.: Human Percept. & Perf.* 1, 130-136.
- Kinsbourne, M. & Hicks, H.E. Functional cerebral space: a model for overflow, transfer and interference effects in human performance. In J. Requin (ed.) *Attention and Performance VII*, 1978.
- Kucera, H. & Francis, W.N. (1967) *Computational analysis of present-day American English*. Providence, R.I.:Brown University Press.
- Neely, J.H. (1977) Semantic priming and retrieval from lexical memory. *J. Exp. Psychol.: General*, 106, 226-254.
- Neely, J., Keele, D. & Ross, K. (1986) Retrospective postlexical processes produce the proportion effect in semantic priming. Paper to Psychonomics Society, New Orleans.
- Palermo, D.J. & Jenkins, J.J. (1964) *Word association norms - grade school through college*. Minneapolis, MN:University of Minnesota Press.
- Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T., Posner, M.I., Mintun, M. & Raichle, M.E. (1988) Positron emission tomographic studies of the cortical anatomy of single-word processing. *Nature*, 331:585-589.
- Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T., Miezin, F.M. & Raichle, M.E. (1988) Modulation of cortical visual responses by direction of spatial attention measured by PET. *ARVO*.
- Posner, M.I. *Chronometric Explorations of Mind*. Hillsdale, N.J.:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.

- Posner, M.I. Cumulative development of attentional theory. *American Psychologist*, 1982, 32:53-64.
- Posner, M.I., Early, T.S., Reiman, E.M., Pardo, P.J. & Dhawan, M. (1988) Asymmetries in hemispheric control of attention in schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, in press.
- Posner, M.I., Inhoff, A., Friedrich, F.J. & Cohen, A. Isolating attentional systems: a cognitive-anatomical analysis. *Psychobiology*, 1987, 15, 107-121.
- Posner, M.I., Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T. & Raichle, M.E. Localization of cognitive operations in the human brain. *Science*, in press.
- Posner, M.I. & Presti, D. Selective attention and cognitive control. *Trends in Neuroscience*, 1987, 10, 12-17.
- Posner, M.I. & Snyder, C.R.R. Facilitation and inhibition in the processing of signals. *Attention & Performance V*. New York:Academic Press, 1975, 669-681.
- Posner, M.I., Walker, J.A., Friedrich, F.J. & Rafal, R.D. How do the parietal lobes direct covert attention? *Neuropsychologia*, 1987, 25A, 135-146.
- Ratcliff, R. & McKoon, G. A retrieval theory of priming in memory. *Psychol. Rev.*, in press.
- Rayner, K. & Pollatsek, A. (1987) Eye movements in reading: a tutorial review. In Coltheart, M. (ed.) *Attention and Performance XII*, Hillsdale N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Rugg, M.D. (1987) Dissociation of semantic priming, word and nonword repetition effects by event-related potentials. *Quart. J. Exp. Psychol.*, 39A, 123-148.
- Sieroff, E. & Posner, M.I. (1988) Cueing spatial attention during processing of words and letter strings in normals. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, in press.
- Sieroff, E., Pollatsek, A. & Posner, M.I. (1988) Recognition of visual letter strings following injury to the posterior visual spatial attention system. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, in press.

Distribution List

DR. PHILLIP L. ACKERMAN UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. ALAN BADDELEY - MRC APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY UNIT 15 CHAUCER ROAD CAMBRIDGE CB2 2EF ENGLAND	DR. TYRONE CASHMAN AMER. SOC. OF CYBERNETICS 3428 FREMONT AVE. SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55408	DR. GARY ASTON-JONES DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, NYU 1069 MAIN BLDG. WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. PAT CARPENTER CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. LEON COOPER BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912
DR. BETH ADELSON DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE TUFTS UNIVERSITY MEDFORD, MA 02155	DR. JAMES BALLAS GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20057	DR. ALPHONSE CHAPANIS 8415 BELLONA LANE SUITE 210-BUXTON TOWERS BALTIMORE, MD 21204	DR. LYNN A. COOPER LEARNING R&D CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. WAYNE GRAY ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARMY HUMAN ENG. LAB ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND MD 21005	DR. HAROLD BAMFORD NAT. SCIENCE FDN. 1800 G STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550	DR. PAUL R. CHATELIER OUSDRE PENTAGON WASH. D.C. 20350-3000	PHIL CUNNIFF COMMANDING OFFICER CODE 7532, NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE ENGINEERING KEYPORT, WA 98145	DA. BERT GREEN JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHARLES & 34TH ST. BALTIMORE, MD 21218	DR. HAROLD HAWKINS ONR - CODE 1142PT 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
DR. ROBERT AHLERS CODE N711 HUMAN FACTORS LABORATORY NAVAL TRAINING SYSTEMS CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. ISAAC BEJAR EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, NJ 08450	MR. RAYMOND E. CHRISTEL AFHRL/IMOE BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	BRIAN DALLMAN 3400 TTWITGXS LOWRY AFB, CO 80130-5000	DR. JAMES G. GREENO UNIVERSITY OF CALIF. BERKELEY, CA 94720	PROF. JOHN R. HAYES CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. JOHN ALLEN DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. ALYVAH BITTNER NAVAL BIODYNAMICS LAB. NEW ORLEANS, LA 70189	DR. DAVID E. CLEMENT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	LT. JOHN DEATON ONR CODE 125 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. WILLIAM GREENOUGH UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. JOAN I. HELLER 505 HADDON ROAD OAKLAND, CA 94606
DR. EARL A. ALLUISTI HQ AFHRL (AFSC) BROOKS AFB TX 78235	DR. JOHN BLAHA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. CHARLES CLIFTON TOBIN HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. STANLEY DEUTSCH COMMITTEE ON HUMAN FACTORS NAT'L ACAD. OF SCIENCE 2101 CONSTITUTION AVE. WASHINGTON, DC 20418	DR. STEPHEN GROSSBERG CTR. FOR ADAPT. SYSTEMS ROOM 244, BOSTON UNIV. 111 CUMMINGTON STREET BOSTON, MA 02215	DR. STEPHANIE DOAN CODE 6011 NAVAL AIR DEV. CTR. WARRINSTER, PA 18974-5000
DR. JAMES ANDERSON BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	SUE BOGNER, ARMY RES. INST. ATTN: PERUSF 5001 EISENHOWER AV. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333-5600	ASST. CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RES. DEV., TEST & EVAL. NAVAL EDUC. & TR. COM. (N-5) NAS PENSACOLA, FL 32508	DR. R. K. DISMUKES ASSOC. DIR. FOR LIFE SCI. AFOSR BOLLING AFB WASHINGTON, DC 20332	DR. HENRY M. HALFF HALFF RESOURCES, INC. 4918 33RD ROAD, NORTH ARLINGTON, VA 22207	DR. EMANUEL DONCHIN UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820
DR. NANCY S. ANDERSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742	DR. GORDON H. BOWER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MICHAEL COLES UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. DANIEL GOPHER IND. ENG. & MANAGEMENT TECHNION HAIFA 32000 ISRAEL	MR. RALPH DUSEK ARD COPORATION 5457 TWINS KNOLLS RD. SUITE 400 COLUMBIA, MD 21045	MR. RALPH DUSEK ARD COPORATION 5457 TWINS KNOLLS RD. SUITE 400 COLUMBIA, MD 21045
DR. ED AIKEN NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92151-6800	MR. DONALD C. BURG GENERAL PHYSICS CORP. 10650 HICKORY RIDGE RD. COLUMBIA, MD 21044	DR. ALLAN M. COLLINS BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 50 MOULTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. SHERRIE GOTT AFHRL/IMODJ BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	DR. FORD EBNER BROWN UNIV. MED. SCHOOL ANATOMY DEPT. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. FORD EBNER BROWN UNIV. MED. SCHOOL ANATOMY DEPT. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARI 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. GAIL CARPENTER NORTHEASTERN UNIV. DEPT. OF MATH. SCI. 360 HUNTINGTON AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02115	DR. STANLEY COLLYER OFFICE OF NAVAL TECH. CODE 222 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	JORDAN GRAFMAN, PH.D. 2021 LYTONSVILLE ROAD SILVER SPRING, MD 20910	PROF. EDWARD HAERTEL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. JEFFREY ELMAN UCSD DEPT. OF LING. C-008 LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. RICHARD H. GRANGER DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE UNIV. CALIF. AT IRVINE IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. RONALD HAMBLETON PROF. OF EDUC. & PSYCH. UNIV. OF MASS AMHERST HILLS HOUSE AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. WILLIAM EPSTEIN UNIV. OF WISCONSIN BROGDEN PSYCH. BLDG. 1203 W. JOHNSON ST. MADISON, WI 53706	DR. LEE GILES AFOSR BOLLING AFB WASHINGTON, DC 20332	DR. EARL HUNT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF WASHINGTON SEATTLE, WA 98105	DR. RUTH KANFER UNIV. OF MIN. - ELLIOTT HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455
DR. STEVEN GRANT DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, NYU 1009 MAIN BUILDING WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK NY 10003	DR. CHERYL HAMEL NTSC ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. K. ANDERS ERICSSON UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. EUGENE E. GLOYE ONR DETACHMENT 1030 E. GREEN PASADENA, CA 91106-2485	DR. ED HUTCHINS, UCSD INTELLIGENT SYSTMS GROUP INST. FOR COG. SCI (C015) LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. MILTON S. KATZ ARMY RES. INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
DR. JEROME FELDMAN UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. ROCHESTER, NY 14617	DR. P. HELMERSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094 OSLO 3, NORWAY	COL DENNIS W. JARVI COMMANDER AFHRL BROOKS, AFB 78235-5601	DR. JOSEPH GOGUEN COMP. SCI LABORATORY SRI INTERNATIONAL 333 RAVENSWOOD AVE. MENLO PARK, CA 94025	DR. ALICE ISEN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MARYLAND CATONSVILLE, MD 21228	DR. DEMETRIOS KARIS GRUMMAN AEROSPACE CORP. MS C04-14 BETHPAGE, NY 11714
DR. PAUL FELTOVICH SIU SCH. OF MEDICINE MED. EDUC. DEPT. P.O. BOX 3926 SPRINGFIELD, IL 62708	DR. STEVEN HILLYARD DEPT. OF NEUROSCI. UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. JOSEPH E. JOHNSON ASST. DEAN-GRAD. STUDIES COLLEGE OF SCI. & MATH UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. LLOYD HUMPHREYS UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 603 E. DANIEL STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. DAVID KRANTZ 2 WASHINGTON SQ. VILLAGE APT. #151 NEW YORK, NY 10012	DR. CLAYTON LEWIS UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF COMP. SCI. CAMPUS BOX 430 BOULDER, CO 80309
DR. CRAIG I. FIELDS ARPA 1400 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON, VA 22209	DR. GEOFFREY HINTON COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. UNIV. OF TORONTO 10 KINGS COLLEGE RD. TORONTO, CANADA M5S 1A4	CDR TOM JONES ONR CODE 125 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. WENDY KELLOGG IBH T.J. WATSON RES. CTR. P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HTS., NY 10598	DR. DAVID R. LAMBERT NAVAL OCEAN SYS. CTR. CODE 441T 371 CATALINA BLVD. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. BOB LLOYD DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208
DR. GAIL FLEISCHAKER MARGULIS LAB BIOLOGICAL SCI. CTR. 2 CUMMINGTON STREET BOSTON, MA 02215	DR. JIM HOLLAN INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS GRP. INST. FOR COG. SCIENCE UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	MR. DANIEL B. JONES US NUCLEAR REG. COMM. DIV. OF HUMAN FACTORS SAFETY WASHINGTON, DC 20555	DR. STEVEN W. KEELE DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON EUGENE, OR 97403	DR. PAT LANGLEY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF INFO. & COMP. SCI. IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. FREDERIC M. LORD EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541
DR. JANE M. FLINN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4000 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. JOHN HOLLAND UNIV. OF MICHIGAN 2313 EAST ENGINEERING ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DOUGLAS H. JONES THATCHER JONES ASSOC. P.O. BOX 6640 10 TRAFALGAR COURT LAWRENCEVILLE, NY 08648	DR. MARCY LANSMAN UNIV. OF N. CAROLINA THE L.L. THURSTONE LAB. DAVIE HALL 013A CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. GARY LYNCH UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOLOGY OF LEARNING & MEMORY IRVINE, CA 92717	
DR. MICHEL GALLAGHER UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. MELISSA HOLLAND ARMY RES. INST. FOR THE BEH. & SOCIAL SCIENCES 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. JANE JORGENSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO INST. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094, BLINDERN OSLO, NORWAY	DR. DENNIS KIBLER UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF INFO. & COMP. SCI. IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. DON LYON P.O. BOX 44 HIGLEY, AZ 85336	
DR. R. EDWARD GEISELMAN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES, CA 90024	DR. JAMES HOWARD DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY HUMAN PERFORMANCE LAB. CATHOLIC UNIV. OF AMERICA WASHINGTON, DC 20064	DR. MARCEL JUST CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. JILL LARKIN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. WILLIAM L. HALOY CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR. NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA, FL 32508	
DR. DON GENTNER CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROCESSING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. KEITH HOLYOAK UNIV. OF MICHIGAN HUMAN PERFORMANCE CTR. 330 PACKARD ROAD ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DANIEL KAHNEMAN UNIV. OF BR. COL. PSYCH. #154-2053 MAIN MALL VANCOUVER, BR. COLUMBIA CANADA V6T 1X7	DR. ROBERT LAWLER INFORMATION SCIENCES, FRL GTS LABORATORIES, INC. 40 SYLVAN ROAD WALTHAM, MA 02254	DR. EVANS MANDES DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030	

DR. RONALD KNOLL BELL LABORATORIES MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974	DR. ALAN M. LESGOLD LEARNING R&D CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	DR. SANDRA P. MARSHALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SAN DIEGO STATE UNIV. SAN DIEGO, CA 92182	DIRECTOR, TRAINING LAB. NPRDC (CODE 05) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. TOM MORAN XEROX PARC 3333 COVOTE HILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304	DAIRA PAULSON CODE 52-TRAINING SYSTEMS NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800
DR. SYLVAN KORNBLUM UNIV. OF MICHIGAN MENTAL HEALTH RES. INST. 205 WASHTEAW PLACE ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. JIM LEVIN DEPT. OF EDUC. PSYCH. 210 EDUCATION BUILDING 1310 SOUTH SIXTH STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820-6990	DR. RICHARD E. MAYER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	DIR. HUMAN FACTORS & & ORGANIZATIONAL SYS. LAB NPRDC (CODE 07) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	MR. MELVIN D. MONTEMERLO NASA HEADQUARTERS RTE-4 WASHINGTON, DC 20546	DR. HAROLD F. O'NEIL, JR. SCHOOL OF EDUC. WPH 801 DEPT. OF EDUC., PSYCH. & TECHNOLOGY, USC LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-0031
DR. STEPHEN KOSSLYN HARVARD UNIVERSITY 1236 WILLIAM JAMES HALL 33 KIRKLAND ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. JOHN LEVINE LEARNING R&D CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	JAMES MCBRIDE, PSYCH. CORP C/O HARCOURT, BRACE, JAVANOVICH, INC. 1250 WEST 6TH STREET SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	FLEET SUPPORT OFFICE, NPRDC (CODE 301) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. WILLIAM MONTAGUE NPRDC CODE 13 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. MICHAEL OBERLIN NAVAL TRAINING SYS. CTR. CODE 711 ORLANDO, FL 32813-7100
DR. KENNETH KOTOVSKY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY COMM. COLLEGE OF ALLEGHENY 800 ALLEGHENY AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15233	DR. MICHAEL LEVINE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY 210 EDUCATION BLDG. UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CHAMPAIGN, IL 61801	DR. JAY MCCLELLAND DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	COMMANDING OFFICER NAVAL RES. LAB. CODE 2627 WASHINGTON, DC 20390	ONR, CODE 1142PT 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000 (6 COPIES)	DR. STELLAN OHLSSON LEARNING R&D CTR. UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. RANDY MUMAW PROGRAM MANAGER TRAINING RES. DIVISION 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. JAMES MCMICHAEL ASST. FOR MPT RES., DEV. AND STUDIES, OP 01B7 WASHINGTON, DC 20370	SPEC. ASST. FOR MARINE CORP MATTERS ONR CODE 00MC 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JAMES L. MCGAUGH CTR. FOR NEUROBIOLOGY OF LEARNING & MEMORY IRVINE, CA 92717	DR. JESSE ORLANSKY INST. FOR DEFENSE ANALYSIS 1801 N. BEAUREGARD ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22311	DIR., RES. PROG., ONR 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
DR. ALLEN MUNRO BEH. TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES - USC 1445 S. ELENA AVE., 4TH FL. REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DR. GAIL MCKOON, CAS/ PSYCHOLOGY, KRESGE #230 NORTHWESTERN UNIV. 1859 SHERIDAN ROAD EVANSTON, IL 60201	DR. GLEN OSGA NOSC, CODE 41 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	ONR, CODE 1133 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. MARTHA POLSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CAMPUS BOX 346 UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER, CO 80309	MR. RAYMOND C. SIDORSKY ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
DIR., MANPOWER & PERS. LAB. NPRDC (CODE 06) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. JOE MCLACHLAN NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. JUDITH ORASANU ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	MATHEMATICS GROUP, ONR CODE 1111MA 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. STEVEN E. POLTROCK MCC 9430 RESEARCH BLVD. ECHELON BLDG. #1 AUSTIN, TX 78759-4509	DR. HERBERT A. SIMON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. RICHARD NISBETT UNIV. OF MICHIGAN INST. FOR SOC. RES. ROOM 5761 ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. GEORGE A. MILLER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GREEN HALL, PRINCETON PRINCETON, NJ 08540	DR. ROBERT F. PASHAK DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	ONR - CODE 1141NP 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. LAUREN RESNICK LEARNING R&D CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ZITA M. SIMUTIS INSTRUCTIONAL TECH. SYSTEMS AREA, ARI 5001 EISENHOWER ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
DR. MARY JO NISSEN UNIV. OF MINNESOTA N218 ELLIOTT HALL MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. BARBARA MEANS HUMAN RES. RES. ORG. 1100 SOUTH WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	"90F. SEYMOUR PAPERT J.C.-109 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	ONR, CODE 1142 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. FRED REIF PHYSICS DEPARTMENT UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, CA 94720	DR. H. WALLACE SINAIO MANPOWER RES. & ADV. SERV. SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION 801 N. PITT STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
DEPUTY TECHNICAL DIRECTOR NPRDC CODE 01A SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. ROBERT MISLEVY EDUCATION TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541	DIR. TECH. PROGRAMS ONR CODE 13 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	ONR, CODE 1142EP 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JAMES A. REGGIA UNIV. OF MD SCH. OF MED. DEPARTMENT OF NEUROLOGY 22 S. GREENE STREET BALTIMORE, MD 21201	DR. DEREK SLEMAN STANFORD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD, CA 94305

DR. JAMES PAULSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY P.O. BOX 751 PORTLAND, OR 97207	DR. LYNN REIDER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. EDWARD E. SMITH BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 50 MOULTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. KATHRYN SPOHR BROWN UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. K. TATSUOKA CERL 153 ENGINEERING RES. LAB. URBANA, IL 61801	DR. HOWARD WAINER DIV. OF PSYCH. & EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541
DR. PETER POLSON UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. MARK D. RECKASE ACT P.O. BOX 168 IOWA CITY, IA 52243	DR. ALFRED F. SMODE SENIOR SCIENTIST CODE 07A NAVAL TRAINING SYS. CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. ROBERT STERNBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY YALE UNIVERSITY BOX 11A, YALE STATION NEW HAVEN, CT 06520	DR. MARTIN A. TOLCOTT 3001 VEAZEY TERR., NW APT. 1617 WASHINGTON, DC 20008	DR. GIL RICARD MAIL STOP C04-14 GRUMMAN AEROSP. CORP. BETHPAGE, NY 11714
DR. JAMES W. PELLEGRINO UC - SANTA BARBARA DEPT. OF PSYCH. SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	DR. MARY C. POTTER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY MIT (E-10-03J) CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. ROBERT F. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030	JAMES J. STASZEWSKI CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ROBERT TSUTAKAWA UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI DEPT. OF STATISTICS 222 MATH SCIENCES BLDG. COLUMBIA, MO 65211	DR. DAVID RUMELHART CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROC. UNIV. OF CALIF. LA JOLLA, CA 92093
DR. NANCY PENNINGTON UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO GRAD. SCH. OF MED. 1101 E. 58TH ST. CHICAGO, IL 60637	DR. JOSEPH PSOTKA ATTN: PERI-1C ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. LINDA B. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405	DR. DOUGLAS TOWNE BEHAVIORAL TECH. LABS 1845 S. ELENA AVENUE REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DR. ZITA E. TYER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	
DR. RAY PEREZ ARI (PERI-II) 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. KARL PRIBRAM STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 401 - JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. RICHARD E. SNOW DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MAURICE TATSUOKA 220 EDUCATION BLDG. 1310 S. SIXTH ST. CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	HQ - US MARINES CODE MPI - 20 WASHINGTON, DC 20380	DR. ANDREW M. ROSE AM. INST. FOR RES. 1055 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007
DR. STEVEN PINKER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY E10-018 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. DANIEL REISBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY NEW SCHOOL FOR SOC. RES. 65 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. TED STEINKE DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. RICHARD F. THOMPSON STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 401 - JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. WM. B. ROUSE SEARCH TECH., INC. 25-B TECHNOLOGY PKIATL. MORCROSS, GA 30092	
DR. SAUL STERNBERG UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 3815 WALNUT STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104	DR. STEVE SUOMI NIH BLDG. 31 ROOM B18-15 BETHESDA, MD 20205	DR. MICHAEL I. TURVEY HASKINS LABORATORY 270 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	MR. BRAD STIMPSON NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6000	DR. E. L. SALTZMAN HASKINS LABORATORIES 270 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	
DR. ELLIOT SOLOWAY YALE UNIVERSITY COMPUTER SCI. DEPT. P.O. BOX 2158 NEW HAVEN, CT 06520	DR. H. SWAMINATHAN LAB. OF PSYCHOMETRIC & EVALUATION RESEARCH UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. DAVID VALE ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS CORP. 2233 UNIVERSITY AVE. SUITE 310 ST. PAUL, MN 55114	DR. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF TENNESSEE KNOXVILLE, TN 37916	DR. DAVID J. WEISS N660 ELLIOTT HALL UNIV. OF MINNESOTA 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	
DR. ALBERT STEVENS BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC. 10 MOULTON ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. JOHN TANGNEY AFOSR/INL BOLLING AFB, DC 20332	DR. KURT VAN LEHN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. DONALD RUBIN STAT. DEPT., HARVARD SCIENCE CTR., RM. 608 1 OXFORD STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. JOE YASATUNE AFRL/RLT LOWRY AFB, CO 80230	
DR. PAUL J. STICHA TRAINING RES. DIV. HUMRRO 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		DR. JERRY VOGT NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR. CODE 51 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. ERNST Z. ROTHKOPF AT&T BELL LABORATORIES ROOM 2D-456 600 MOUNTAIN AVENUE MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974	DR. SHIH SUNG WEN JACKSON STATE UNIV. 1335 J. R. LYNCH ST. JACKSON, MS 39217	

DR. MICHAEL J. SAMET
PERCEPTONICS, INC.
4371 VAREL AVENUE
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91364

DR. ARTHUR SAMUEL
YALE UNIVERSITY
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
BOX 11A, YALE STATION
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

DR. ROGER SCHANK
YALE UNIVERSITY
COMP. SCI. DEPARTMENT
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER
LEARNING RAD CTR.
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
3939 O'HARA STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

DR. MICHAEL G. SHAFITO
ONR CODE 1142PT
800 N. QUINCY STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. JANET SCHOFIELD
LEARNING RAD CENTER
UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

DR. ROBERT J. SEIDE,
US ARMY RES. INST.
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22133

CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR.
LIAISON OFFICE
AIR FORCE HUMAN RES. LAB.
OPERATIONS TRAINING DIV.
WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224

DR. DONALD A. NORMAN
INST. FOR COG. SCI.
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. MICHAEL J. ZYDA
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
CODE 51CK
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5100

DR. ROBERT A. WISHER
U.S. ARMY INST. FOR THE
BEH. & SOC. SCIENCES
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22133

DR. MARTIN F. WISKOFF
NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

MR. JOHN H. WOLFE
NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

GEORGE WONG, BIOSTATISTICS
MEMORIAL SLOAN-KETTERING
CANCER CENTER
1275 YORK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10021

DR. DONALD WOODWARD
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
CODE 1141NP
800 NORTH QUINCY STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. WALLACE WULFECK, III
NAVY PERS. RAD CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

MR. CARL YORK
SYSTEM DEV. FDN.
181 LYTTON AVENUE
SUITE 210
PALO ALTO, CA 94301

DR. DAVID NAVON
INST. FOR COGNITIVE SCI.
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. ROBERT SASMOR
ARMY RES. INSTITUTE
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22133

DEFENSE TECH. INFO. CTR.
CAMERON STATION, BLDG. 5
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
ATTN: TC

DR. KEITH WESCOURT
FMC CORPORATION
CENTRAL ENG. LABS.
1165 COLEMAN AVE., BOX 580
SANTA CLARA, CA 95052

DR. NORMAN M. WEINBERGER
UNIV. OF CALIF.
CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOL.
OF LEARNING & MEMORY
IRVINE, CA 92717

DR. DOUGLAS WETZEL
CODE 12
NAVY PERS. RAD CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

DR. BARBARA WHITE
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.
10 MOULTON ST.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02238

DR. BARRY WHITSEL
UNIV. OF NC
DEPT. OF PHYSIOLOGY
MEDICAL SCHOOL
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514

DR. CHRISTOPHER WICKENS
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIV. OF ILLINOIS
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820

DR. STEVEN ZORNETZER
ONR, CODE 1140
800 N. QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. MICHAEL I. POSNER
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
EUGENE, OR 97403

CAPT. P. MICHAEL CURRAN
ONR, CODE 125
800 N. QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. MARSHALL J. FARR
2530 NORTH VERNON ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22207

DR. JAIME CARBONELL
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV.
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

J. D. FLETCHER
9931 CORSICA STREET
VIENNA, VA 22180

DR. JOHN R. FREDERIKSEN
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN
50 MOULTON STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

DR. JOEL DAVIS
ONR, CODE 1141NP
800 NORTH QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. HANS-WILLI SCHROIFF
INST. FUER PSYCHOLOGIE
DER RWTH AACHEN
JAEGERSTRASS ZWISCHEN 17 U. 19
5100 AACHEN, WEST GERMANY

DR. BETH WARREN
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.
50 MOULTON STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

ERIC FACILITY ACQUISITIONS
4831 RUGBY AVENUE
BETHESDA, MD 20814

END

DATE

FILMED

DTIC

10-88