

(4)

Toward a Model of Acquiring Procedures from Text

Susan Bovair and David E. Kieras

University of Michigan

**Technical Communication Program
Technical Information Design and Analysis Laboratory
2360 Bonisteel Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2108**

Technical Report No. 30 (TR-89/ONR-30)

May 1, 1989

This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research, Personnel and Training Research Programs, under Contract Number N00014-85-K-0138, Contract Authority Identification Number NR 667-543. Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

Unclassified
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.		
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) TR-89 / ONR-30			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION University of Michigan		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Cognitive Science Office of Naval Research (Code 1142CS) 800 N. Quincy Street		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Technical Communication Program Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2108			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Arlington, VA 22217		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-85-K-0138		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 61153N	PROJECT NO. RR04206	TASK NO. RR04206-0A
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Toward a Model of Acquiring Procedures from Text					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Susan Bovair and David E. Kieras					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) May 1, 1989	
15 PAGE COUNT 37					
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION To appear in Handbook of Reading Research, Vol. II, Barr, Kamil, Rosenthal and Pearson (Eds.). Longman (1990)					
17 COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Procedure Acquisition		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
05	10				
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The processes of acquiring procedures from text are important to understand for both practical and theoretical reasons. This paper outlines a theory of procedure acquisition that is based on empirical and theoretical work on the value of production-system representations for procedural knowledge. The key process in acquiring procedures from text is thus constructing an adequate set of production rules from the textual input. The existing empirical literature is interpreted and criticized within this framework. Two general conclusions are that the amount of research on text that is intended to convey procedures is much less than the topic deserves, and future research needs to more precisely distinguish the different processes involved in acquiring procedures from text.					
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS				21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Susan Chipman			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 696-4318		22c OFFICE SYMBOL

Toward a Model of Acquiring Procedures from Text

Susan Bovair and David E. Kieras
University of Michigan

ABSTRACT

The processes of acquiring procedures from text are important to understand for both practical and theoretical reasons. This paper outlines a theory of procedure acquisition that is based on empirical and theoretical work on the value of production-system representations for procedural knowledge. The key process in acquiring procedures from text is thus constructing an adequate set of production rules from the textual input. The existing empirical literature is interpreted and criticized within this framework. Two general conclusions are that the amount of research on text that is intended to convey procedures is much less than the topic deserves, and future research needs to more precisely distinguish the different processes involved in acquiring procedures from text.

Introduction

Understanding how procedures are acquired from text is of both practical and theoretical importance, whether the focus is on the mental processes involved in acquisition, or on how differences in the text affect these processes. From a practical point of view, understanding this process, termed *procedure acquisition* in this paper, is important because all of us follow procedures from written instructions frequently in our daily lives. We fill out forms, assemble children's toys, follow recipes, and are given instructions for using everything from frozen lasagna to home computers. In addition, following procedures is typically a part of our jobs. Sticht (1977) found that in the Navy, 75% of the reading on the job was what he called *reading to do*, where people read in order to carry out some task.



Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Avail and/or	
Dist	Special
A-1	

The Need for Research on Procedural Text

There is a body of practically-oriented research on the issue of how usable procedural text or instructions normally are, and whether they can be improved. This research makes clear the value of research on procedural text, and also shows the weakness of our current understanding.

Do people read instructions? One problem with procedural text in daily life is that people often do not read it when they should. Although many people normally read instructions, a sizable minority does not. For example, 75% of the subjects interviewed by Wright (1981) said that they would read all of the instructions for a video-cassette recorder or item of similar complexity, but this means that a quarter of the people would not. In addition, for most other consumer items, 30-40% of people said that they would not read any instructions. This means that at least a quarter of the people buying an item are likely not to read the instructions for it.

One reason that people do not read instructions may be because they do not feel that they need go to the trouble. If they think that there is an easier way to do the task, then they may not bother with the instructions. For example, Barnard, Wright, and Wilcox (1979) found that 30% of 200 undergraduates at Cambridge University filled out a simple one-question form the wrong way. They were asked to mark which one of three alternatives applied to them, but instead many deleted, marked through, the alternatives that did not apply. It seems more likely that these subjects simply did not read the instructions and instead guessed at how they should answer, than that they did read the instructions but were unable to understand them. Another example is the experiments by LeFevre and Dixon (1986) where subjects presented with instructions and an example that contradicted each other, ignored the instructions and followed the example. People may have learned from experience that instructions are often hard to understand and follow, and this may explain why they often prefer to use other strategies like guessing or following an example. Understanding the procedure acquisition process is not likely to be directly useful in motivating people to read instructions, but if it leads to an improvement in procedure instructions, then people may be more likely to read them.

Can people follow the instructions that they read? The problem of people not understanding the information they are given is a serious one. Kammann (1975) cites studies by the Bell Telephone Company that the instructions for dialing that are provided in the telephone book are correctly applied only 62% of the time. He suggests a rule of thumb: even when instructions are used, they are understood only about two-thirds of the time.

Wright (1981) has suggested that problems with understanding procedural text fall into three basic categories. The first is content; sometimes the information in the instructions is wrong. The second is presentation; the language and illustrations used in the instructions may be hard to understand. The third is structure; information may not be appropriately organized for the task. Thus, good procedural text has good content, presentation and structure, but it is not easy to specify how to determine that a piece of procedural text has these qualities. While a specific piece of procedural text can be improved, it may not be clear which improvements actually made a difference. For example, Falkner and Rose (1981) rewrote the FCC radio rules for recreational boaters into "clear English" and showed improvements in both the speed and accuracy of people's application of the rules. However, the fact that the rewritten rules were simply shorter, reducing the original 49 pages of material to 11, may have produced the better performance, rather than the new style of the material. In addition, even professional writers cannot always improve performance with a document. Duffy, Curran and Sass (1983) found

that new versions of technical prose prepared by three different technical writing companies failed to show improvement over the original.

Thus, even the community of practical technical writers cannot reliably improve a text, or specify how it would be done. The need for further research and theoretical development is painfully clear.

Theoretical Value of Studying Procedural Text

While understanding procedure acquisition has practical importance, procedural text and the processes of procedure acquisition have distinctive qualities that make them interesting to study from a theoretical viewpoint. One quality is that when reading instructions to carry out some task, a reader's processing of the text is likely to be different from the processing involved when reading stories. Kieras (1981) showed that the task that readers are required to perform can affect how they read a text, so that reading for comprehension involves different amounts and types of processing from reading to identify a main idea. Reading in order to be able to execute some procedure is also likely to have characteristic ways of processing. Another distinctive quality of procedural text is that problems in understanding can be revealed directly in performance. The reader must use the knowledge from the text in order to do something, and so examining what the reader does can be used to assess what the reader acquired.

There is a severely limited amount of research on procedure acquisition. This is surprising, given the practical importance and the theoretical interest of procedure acquisition. The lack of research in this area is unexpected and not easy to understand; it is an important area, instructions are frequently poorly written, and there is no reason to think that procedures are any less theoretically interesting than stories. The dearth of research means that rather than simply review existing literature, this paper will focus on theoretical analysis, and will try to outline a theory of procedure acquisition. The current lack of such a theory means that the sparse empirical research seems incoherent because studies cannot easily be related to each other or generalized to situations beyond those studied. Outlining of a model of the acquisition of procedures from text will be the first steps toward providing a perspective for existing work and will suggest where more research would be fruitful.

Scope of this Paper

In order to present a clear picture of the model, with its strengths and limitations, it is important to define procedure acquisition, and to specify what kinds of written material and what aspects of the procedure acquisition process the model is concerned with. The kind of text of interest is *procedural text*, which is text intended to convey a procedure. Procedural text may vary in its level of procedural detail, ranging from a complete detailed procedure that can be executed more or less directly from the text, through instructions that demand more inferences to be made by the reader, all the way to text that provides only general knowledge about the task and expects readers to infer the actual procedure by themselves. This paper will consider both text that presents incomplete procedures and so demands some inference, and text that attempts to provide a complete, detailed procedure. However, text that does not try to present an explicit procedure will not be considered in this paper because, in this case, the reader's task is problem-solving rather than procedure acquisition.

Because a reader's strategies and performance are different with different tasks, it is important to define what tasks are relevant. For the purposes of this discussion, procedure

acquisition tasks include (a) reading instructions and performing each step as it is read; (b) reading a whole procedure through and then remembering it long enough to perform it; and (c) reading a procedure and memorizing it for performance later. While instructions may be hard to follow simply because they are poorly written, the task itself may be difficult and complex; such a procedure may be hard to acquire however well the text is written. While procedure complexity certainly deserves study, the writer of procedural text typically has no control over it. Thus, the discussion in this paper will focus on effects of how procedural text is written and not on the effects of different kinds of procedures.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: First, the theoretical model will be described, first in overview, and then some of the theoretical properties of the processes in the model will be described in some detail. Second, using the model as a framework, the relevant studies in the research literature will be surveyed based on what processes in the model each study addresses. A brief conclusion will summarize further research directions and practical implications.

A Model of Procedure Acquisition

Our goal in this paper is to outline a model of procedure acquisition that constitutes the first steps toward a theory. The model has been suggested both by some research (such as Kieras & Bovair, 1986), and theoretical considerations (notably Anderson, 1983). In this paper, we will outline the model and describe it in more detail, and will then use it as a framework to interpret existing data. The model will also be used to identify gaps in our current understanding of procedure acquisition, and to suggest how such gaps may be filled.

The model of procedure acquisition to be outlined was first described in Kieras and Bovair (1986), and is illustrated in Figure 1. It distinguishes two major comprehension processes: the basic reading comprehension process, and a procedure comprehension process. The procedure comprehension process consists of three sub-processes: procedure construction, immediate transfer, and an acquisition monitor. Finally, there is a procedure interpreter that actually executes a procedure once its representation has been built. The model assumes that the basic reading comprehension process produces a propositional representation of the input text (cf. Kintsch 1974). Procedure comprehension processes then use the propositional representation to construct a correct representation of the procedure that can be executed by the interpreter. Once the interpreter can correctly execute the procedure, then knowledge compilation processes (Anderson, 1983) can begin to operate. Since knowledge compilation takes place after the procedure comprehension processes, they are not discussed in detail.




Figure 1: An outline of a process model for acquiring a procedure from text. Reproduced by permission from Kieras and Bovair (1986).

Knowledge Representation in the Model

Procedural and declarative knowledge. The model assumes a distinction between procedural and declarative knowledge, along the lines of Anderson (1976). Declarative knowledge consists of a network of propositions in the form of HAM or ACT structure (Anderson & Bower, 1973; Anderson 1976, 1983), while procedural knowledge is represented as production rules (Anderson 1976, 1983). Like propositions, production rules are a good representation for knowledge because they provide a modular representation consisting of discrete components that are of roughly the same "size", and can be counted, and used to make quantitative predictions. Examples of the use of production rules in this way may be found in Kieras and Bovair (1986), and Bovair, Kieras, and Polson (1988).

An example of procedure text and the corresponding production rules are shown in Tables 1 and 2 (cf. Kieras and Bovair, 1986). The syntax of the production rules in Table 2 is (*Name IF (condition) THEN (action)*), where the condition tests for information in working memory, and everything in the action part of the rule will be executed if the condition is satisfied. In Table 2, the first rule is named *Start*. Its condition will be satisfied if the goal to do the procedure is present in working memory, and the note that the procedure is being done is not present. If the condition of this rule is satisfied, then the action will be executed, resulting in the goal of doing the first step and the note that the procedure is being done being added to working memory. This changes working memory so that the condition of the first rule is no longer satisfied, but now the condition of the second rule in Table 2 is satisfied.

Table 1

Example procedure text

If the command is to do the X procedure, then

Step 1: Press the red button

Step 2: If the red light is on, set the selector to X.

Step 3: If the blue light is on, then the system is ready.

Step 4: If the white light is on and the green light is off, press the blue button.

Table 2

Production rules for example procedure

(Start IF ((GOAL DO X PROCEDURE)
 (NOT (NOTE DOING X PROCEDURE)))
 THEN ((ADD GOAL DO STEP ONE)
 (ADD NOTE DOING X PROCEDURE)))

(Step1 IF ((GOAL DO X PROCEDURE)
 (GOAL DO STEP ONE))
 THEN ((PRESS RED BUTTON)
 (DELETE GOAL DO STEP ONE)
 (ADD GOAL DO STEP TWO)))

(Step2 IF ((GOAL DO X PROCEDURE)
 (GOAL DO STEP TWO)
 (LOOK RED LIGHT ON))
 THEN ((SET SELECTOR TO X)
 (DELETE GOAL DO STEP TWO)
 (ADD DO STEP THREE)))

(Step3 IF ((GOAL DO X PROCEDURE)
 (GOAL DO STEP THREE)
 (LOOK BLUE LIGHT ON))
 THEN ((DELETE GOAL DO STEP THREE)
 (ADD DO STEP FOUR)
 (ADD NOTE SYSTEM READY))

(Step4 IF ((GOAL DO X PROCEDURE)
 (GOAL DO STEP FOUR)
 (NOTE SYSTEM READY)
 (LOOK WHITE LIGHT ON)
 (LOOK GREEN LIGHT OFF))
 THEN ((PRESS BLUE BUTTON)
 (DELETE GOAL DO STEP FOUR)
 (ADD GOAL FINISH)))

(Finish IF ((GOAL DO PROCEDURE)
 (GOAL FINISH)
 THEN ((DELETE GOAL FINISH)
 (DELETE GOAL DO PROCEDURE)
 (DELETE NOTE DOING PROCEDURE)))

Thus, each production rule modifies working memory in a way that "triggers" or *fires* the next rule in the sequence. To correctly represent a procedure, the production rules have to have a properly coordinated set of conditions and actions. Generating the correct set of rules from the input propositions is the job of the procedure comprehension process.

Acquiring a procedure from text is closely related to the process of acquiring procedures in general, which has been studied under the label of acquisition of *cognitive skill* (Anderson, 1981). Learning the procedures for a word processing program to the point where they can be executed rapidly and without effort is an example of the acquisition of a cognitive skill. Anderson (1976, 1983) proposed that there are three stages in the skill acquisition process, as had Fitts (1964) before him. The first is the *declarative stage* where a declarative representation of relevant knowledge is used by skill-independent production rules to produce behavior. In Anderson's model, knowledge of a procedure is assumed to be initially in declarative form. During this stage, the procedure can only be executed in a conscious, controlled way that often involves some degree of problem solving.

In Anderson's second stage, the *knowledge compilation stage*, the skill has been practiced enough that it can be executed with much less effort. At this stage the skill is represented as production rules with each step represented in a separate rule, and when given the initial goal and appropriate context information, the rules run with no pause for problem solving. The third stage is the *tuning stage*. With practice, the rules become more and more efficient, steps are collapsed into one another, and the procedure is executed rapidly and with little effort.

Our model of procedure acquisition concentrates on the declarative stage of skill acquisition where the text is translated into a *declarative representation* of the procedure. Although the later stages of skill acquisition are obviously important, they are assumed to be the result of practice and experience rather than reading the initial text, and therefore of less interest for this paper. Thus, the focus of this paper will be on the text, and how readers can generate a procedure from it, not on how people can remember a procedure over a long period of time, or how they improve in performance with practice. In this context, it is interesting to note that if we take Sticht's (1977) reading to-do tasks as being largely procedural, then much real-world procedure acquisition is also concerned with generating and immediately following a procedure from text, rather than memorizing the procedures; Sticht found that 80% of reading on the job is for tasks that the reader has already done before.

Declarative representations of procedures. The model assumes that a procedure is first represented in declarative form and becomes represented as production rules only after the procedure has been acquired and practiced. However, it is both possible and convenient to describe this declarative form as if it were a set of production rules. This characterization is possible because the content of a procedure can be represented in either form, and convenient because a set of production rules can be easily checked for completeness and correctness by trying to execute them. Thus, it is useful to think of the reader as constructing a declarative version of the production rules that are needed to execute the procedure. Once a complete and correct declarative representation of the procedure has been constructed, then the true procedural representation can be constructed. Thus, although the initial representation of a procedure is easily expressed as production rules, the actual representation is assumed to be declarative.

The main thrust of this assumption is one of maintaining theoretical traditions and clarity; it seems accepted that declarative representations can be constructed and manipulated by

complex, knowledge-driven, inferential processes, such as comprehension and problem-solving, while developing procedural knowledge is governed by more elementary, automatic mechanisms. If we assume that the reader temporarily represents a procedure as a declarative isomorph of the procedural production rules, it is easy to integrate standard theoretical reading mechanisms with standard theoretical cognitive skill mechanisms. Of course, other formats for the declarative representation of a procedure are possible; we have adopted production rule isomorphs only because of their formal adequacy and direct relationship to the assumed format of procedural knowledge. It would be worthwhile to construct a full simulation model of the procedure acquisition process to determine the viability of this representation and to explore alternatives.

Following the GOMS model of procedural knowledge proposed by Card, Moran, & Newell (1983), the model assumes that procedures are organized hierarchically, in terms of *goals* and subgoals. For each goal, there is a procedure, called a *method* for accomplishing the goal. A method consists of steps, which can be either elementary actions, termed *operators*, or can be assertions of subgoals that need to be accomplished. The mapping between GOMS models and production rules is provided by Bovair, Kieras, and Polson (1988), and all of the example procedures and methods used in this paper follow the conventions described.

Processes Involved in Learning Procedures from Text

Reading comprehension. The reading comprehension process in this model of procedure acquisition is assumed to be the same as for any other reading task, and consists of reading processes like those described in Just and Carpenter (1987a). Thus, this process will have problems with procedural text similar to those it would have with technical prose or narrative text. The reading comprehension process reads and processes the instructions one sentence at a time, parsing each sentence, and doing the basic referential and semantic analysis needed to create the propositional representation for each sentence in working memory. A typical referential analysis might involve simply attaching the label for a particular object to the appropriate concept. Thus, a knob might be referred to as *the tuning knob*, and this label must be attached to an instance of the concept KNOB. Note that for a procedure to be executed, the actual physical objects referred to must also be identified in the environment, so that the specified action can actually be performed. But it is not clear if identifying the external referent occurs during the reading comprehension process or if it occurs later.

Procedure comprehension processes. In our model, the procedure comprehension processes build a declarative representation of the procedure from the propositional representation of the procedure text. Procedure comprehension is similar to what Just and Carpenter (1987a) describe as text-level processes in reading comprehension, in which schemas are used to integrate the text; for example, in comprehending narrative text, such processes use inference to fill in the causal chain of events. While establishing the causal and temporal chain is particularly important in stories, it may also be an important part of constructing a procedure. The idea that there are procedure comprehension processes that take place after reading comprehension is somewhat similar to the distinction proposed by van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) between the processes that produce the text base and those that produce the situation model.

Procedure comprehension consists of three major sub-processes. The first is the procedure construction process that takes the representation of the text and constructs the declarative form of production rules. The others are the *immediate transfer* process that checks

to see if newly constructed rules are already known, and the *acquisition monitor* process that monitors whether a new rule has been fully learned.

Procedure construction. Our model assumes that the *propositional* representation of the text is used to construct an executable propositional representation of the procedure, but our understanding of the procedure construction process is quite limited, and it is not clear just how this construction takes place or what stages might be involved. It is possible to describe a general outline of the process, but in order to work out the details, a simulation model would need to be built, and more research performed.

The assumptions of the model provide the framework within which procedure construction can be characterized. The theoretical problem is to determine how the production rules are constructed based on the information in the text. In other words, just how is text like that in Table 1 translated into rules like those in Table 2? Procedure construction involves heavy use of implicit information; for example, for each step in the procedure, the information about the goal, the current context, and the next step are all typically implicit but need to be explicitly encoded into the condition and action of a production rule. Problem-solving may be required to infer missing information and details of the actions to be performed if they are not stated explicitly.

We can elaborate on some of these construction processes. In deciding what the goal of a procedure is, the reader is likely to be influenced by a variety of cues in the procedure text. Sometimes the goal will be stated explicitly: *If the goal is to do the MA procedure, then . . .*, but it may be signaled more indirectly, as in Table 1, by means of a short lead-in phrase such as *if the command is to do the X procedure...* or a heading. In the absence of more specific statements of the goal of the procedure, readers may simply assume that the end-state of a procedure is the goal state.

The reader of procedural text must also generate rules that will perform the correct actions in the right order. The text may directly help the reader by using labels such as *Step 1:*, as in the Tables 1 and 2 example, in which the step labels are incorporated into the rule conditions and actions. Also, production rules can have several elementary actions in a single rule. This would mean that a statement such as *Press button A and press button B* would be translated into one rule with both button pushes in its action. On the other hand, a useful assumption for newly learned procedures is that there is only one such action to a rule (Bovair, Kieras & Polson, 1988). However, even when a single action is explicitly indicated in the procedure statement, there may be more than one step implied, and therefore more than one rule will need to be built. For example, Step 2 in Table 1 appears to correspond directly to a single production rule, as shown in Table 2. But it can also be interpreted as conveying two steps. The first is performing the actions to determine the state of the light (e.g., finding and looking at the light), while the second is setting the selector. This means that two production rules would need to be built to represent this step, one that checks the light and stores its state in working memory, and one that tests the state of the light, and acts accordingly.

In a further complication, what seems to be a single step may actually be a whole method rather than a single rule. For example, Dixon (1982) used statements like *The left knob should be turned in order to set the alpha meter to 20*. Apparently, this could easily be translated to:

(IF ((GOAL SET ALPHA METER TO 20)) THEN ((TURN LEFT KNOB)))

However, this simple translation is not correct, because simply turning the left knob will not get the meter set to 20; the knob must be turned while the meter is monitored. When the right value is reached, the knob turning is stopped; if the meter overshoots, then the knob is turned in the opposite direction, and so forth. This single statement seems more accurately characterized as the user having the goal of setting the meter, and executing a knob-turning and meter-monitoring method in order to accomplish that goal.

Immediate transfer. Based on the results in Kieras and Bovair (1986), there is an immediate transfer process that compares the representation of the current rule to the already known rules. If the current rule is new, then it must be maintained in working memory and encoded into long-term memory, which takes time. If the current rule is the same as, or very similar to, an existing rule, then at most small modifications of the existing rule will be required, and these take very little time. This immediate transfer process is responsible for large savings in the time to learn new procedures if they have steps in common with previously read or learned procedures (Kieras, Tibbits, & Bovair, 1984; Kieras & Bovair, 1986; Bovair, Kieras, & Polson, 1988).

Acquisition monitor. Finally, procedure comprehension also seems to involve an executive control process (Schumacher, 1987) that monitors the acquisition of the steps of the procedure. Kieras and Bovair (1986) had subjects learn procedures from a step-by-step, self-paced presentation, and found that the reading time for each step of a procedure remained high until the subject could execute the step without error. At this point, when the step is apparently learned, the reading time for the step decreases sharply. Thus the subject allocates more time to steps not yet acquired, and less time to acquired steps. This ability to allocate time between new and known material was also found by Johnson and Kieras (1983) who studied effects of prior knowledge on reading and recall of simple expository text, and found that subjects concentrated their time on the unknown information. The acquisition monitor process must be able to distinguish known from unknown steps to decide which information should be studied in more detail.

Executing and debugging procedures. Once the declarative version of a procedure has been constructed, then a procedure interpreter process accesses the representation and executes the procedure. This execution will succeed if the declarative representation has been correctly constructed. After this stage has been reached, the processes of skill acquisition that create a procedural knowledge representation of the procedure may begin.

Factors Affecting Performance in Acquiring Procedures from Text

Performance Measures

In assessing performance with procedural text, the task chosen will affect processing and thus performance measures. For example, there is some evidence that reading to execute a single step immediately may be different from reading to execute the whole procedure later (Dixon, 1982). There is also evidence that subjects asked to read procedural text for recall may read it differently from when they read for immediate execution (Dixon, 1982; Kintsch, 1986). The model outlined here suggests that tasks differ because they call different processes into play. If subjects are presented with procedural text to be recalled, they may simply memorize it as text, and not as a procedure, thus involving only the reading comprehension and text encoding processes. Procedures presented one step at a time for immediate execution of each step will involve both reading comprehension and procedure comprehension processes. However, the procedure comprehension stage will not need to integrate the procedure steps into a whole procedure, nor will the procedure have to be encoded into long-term memory.

If the concern is to assess how well procedural text allows the reader to actually perform the procedure, the best measures of success will be how quickly and accurately the reader can perform the procedure. In addition, reading time is a useful measure of both reading comprehension and procedure comprehension processes. Because verbal recall of a procedure may not involve much of the procedure comprehension processes, it has little value as a measure in the study of procedural text, in contrast to its role in much reading research. Measuring how well the procedures can be executed after a delay is a far more useful measure of retention.

Given the limited number of measures and tasks that are typically used in the study of procedural text, it may be difficult to distinguish the different processing stages that the model predicts from each other. For example, it may be hard to distinguish reading comprehension and procedure comprehension from each other, given that reading time reflects both processes. However, the syntactic complexity of the text should affect reading comprehension, while the complexity of the procedure should affect procedure comprehension, and so it may be possible to distinguish the procedures with an appropriately designed study.

Factors Affecting Reading Comprehension of Procedural Text

Reading comprehension effects in procedure acquisition are hard to assess by themselves because it is difficult to separate them from the effects of procedure comprehension, or even execution. One reason for this is that experiments are typically not designed to study reading comprehension of procedural text separately from the other stages, frequently using overall measures that include all three stages. Basic comprehension should not be a source of execution problems unless a procedure is so incomprehensibly written that it is hard to construct a complete procedure at all, and so execution measures are not likely to reveal much about the basic comprehension stage. Even when more direct measures of reading comprehension such as reading times are collected, they can be affected by both procedure comprehension and reading comprehension.

One way to alleviate our inability to distinguish basic comprehension from procedure comprehension is to make the reasonable assumption that procedural text has the same reading comprehension process and problems as other technical prose. Some factors that affect the comprehension of technical prose have been summarized by Kieras and Dechert (1985). One example that is well-known from the comprehension literature is that negatives are harder to comprehend than affirmatives; the same is true of procedural text. Jones (1966) investigated the use of the qualifying negative *except* on the performance of a task. In one experiment, subjects were given the command *Mark the numbers 1, 3, 4, 6, 7* for a long string of the digits 1 through 8, arranged randomly. Subjects seeing this command were faster and made fewer errors than subjects who saw the equivalent command *Mark all the numbers except 2, 5, 8*, although the number of items to be remembered is smaller. File and Jew (1973) gave airline passengers waiting for their flight some emergency instructions to be recalled which were presented in either written or oral form, were either affirmative or negative, and were either active or passive. Subjects tended to recall in an affirmative, active form, regardless of how the material had been presented, and their recall was better when the instructions had been presented in the affirmative form, but there was no difference between active and passive presentation.

While slower performance on instructions containing negations may be due to effects on reading comprehension, it may also be that it is more difficult to construct a procedure if it is presented in a negative form. One way to explain the results from a study by Wright and Wilcox (1979) is as procedure construction effects. They found that while affirmative forms were always better, two negations could sometimes produce faster and more accurate performance than one. Subjects were required to perform one of two tasks, and the instructions contained either zero, one, or two negations. In the single-button task, the subject was required to either respond by pressing a button or not respond at all, based on the instruction and a presented letter. For example, *Do not press if the letter is P* has a single negation, while *Do not press unless the letter is P* has two. In the two-button task, the subject had to choose between one button or another, such as, *Press the right-hand button if the picture is a circle; press the left-hand button if not*. Wright and Wilcox found that in the single-button task, two negations in the instructions produced faster, more accurate performance than only one, but that one negation was better than two in the two-button task. If these effects were due only to reading comprehension effects, both tasks should show the expected pattern that two negations were harder than one.

The Wright and Wilcox effects may be a result of the way negations in text are translated into production rules. A production rule with a negated *action* is impossible, because the action is only executed if the rule condition is met; so a statement with a single negation like *Do not press if the letter is P* cannot be translated into

IF ((letter present) (letter is P)) THEN (NOT (press)).

Rather, in order to be executed, it has to be transformed into

IF ((letter present) (NOT (letter is P))) THEN (press).

A statement containing two negative elements like *Do not press unless the letter is P* can be

simply recoded into an affirmative form and then directly translated into

IF ((letter present) (letter is P)) THEN (press).

Simply recoding the whole statement into the affirmative form may be relatively easy, compared to moving the negation from the action to the condition. However, this may only be true for the single-button task; in the two-button task, the subject may attempt to construct a rule for each button, and this may remove the advantage for the double negative.

Although procedural text may have reading comprehension problems similar to those of other technical prose, such as difficulty with negative forms, it is likely to have characteristic reading comprehension problems as well. For example, procedural text seems to be especially prone to problems with reference. Wright (1981) suggests that people make errors with phrases used to qualify numbers, such as *at least*, or *not more than* because they seem to concentrate on the number and disregard the qualifier. Such problems may arise either because of the difficulty of establishing the meaning of such open-ended terms, or the difficulty of building a procedure with them. Fisher (1981) analyzed the errors made on functional literacy tests, which are in large part tests of ability to use procedural text. For example, an item on such a test might be: *Look at the program for a Business Administration course. Circle the term in which the subject "Salesmanship" is given.* Fisher found that 20% of the errors made on such items could be interpreted as a result of the reader failing to take into account a word, part of a word, or phrase in the instructions. For example, subjects might be given *lieutenant-general* in the instructions but circle examples of *general* in the material. Also, 16% of the errors were a result of the subjects giving more information than was requested, as when they are given *fruit dishes* and they circle both *fruit* and *vegetable* dishes. As Just and Carpenter (1987b) point out, these results suggest that a total of 36% of the errors may be a result of interpreting a referent too broadly. Just and Carpenter (1987b) have suggested that errors due to referential difficulties in procedural text could arise because the vocabulary used in procedural text is more likely to contain unknown terms, and these may lead to semantic and referential problems. For example, if the components are novel in an assembly task, the user may not know what a referent looks like. The presence of unknown terms may also explain why subjects interpret referents too broadly; for example, they may not know the difference between *lieutenant-general* and *general*, and assume that they are different names for the same thing. Such problems may be obscured in ordinary reading tasks and materials, but are unavoidable in procedural tasks, where subjects have to demonstrate their understanding overtly.

Factors Affecting Procedure Comprehension

Knowledge required for procedure acquisition. Instructions typically do not spell out a procedure in the detail needed to actually construct and execute it. Readers must therefore try to infer these details from other knowledge. In many situations, a subject must build a procedure that includes many details of exactly what must be done that are usually not included in the instructions. For example, consider a step from the Smith and Goodman (1984) assembly task *Now you are to wrap one end of the wire around one of the short bolts.* Before readers can actually carry this step out, they must find a short bolt and pick it up, then decide how to wrap the wire, and then select the part of the bolt where the wire should be wrapped.

The physical objects involved in the procedure can be a source of knowledge about how to perform various actions; how to operate a control is often suggested by the shape of the control,

and the labels can suggest when to operate it. Instructions usually assume that the reader has at least some appropriate domain knowledge; for example, readers are usually assumed to know what a child's wagon looks like, or how to use a screwdriver, or turn a knob. If the objects and the prior knowledge support the required inferences, then inferring the necessary details will be quick, and constructing and executing the procedure will be easy. But if the knowledge is not available, then readers must try to fill in the gaps by engaging in problem-solving, with varying levels of success. For example, although detailed procedures are often called "recipes", actual cooking recipes assume knowledge of cooking methods and equipment. If a reader does not know how to execute the *simmer* method, then the chicken cacciatore is likely to end up burnt. A direction like *add the softened butter* may cause problems for the cooking novice, because he or she has to try to figure out how to get the butter softened before executing the adding step. Because readers vary so much in their knowledge, even procedures that appear well-specified may still demand major problem-solving efforts by some readers. For example, although the procedures used in Kieras and Bovair (1986) were intended to provide all the executable detail, some subjects thought that the lights on the control panel were push buttons, and became very confused when pushing them had no effect.

If readers have the appropriate background knowledge, they may still be able to construct a correct procedure even when the propositional representation derived from the instructional text is defective. For example, in a study by Mohammed and Swales (1984), subjects used the manufacturer's instructions to set the time and the alarm on a digital alarm clock. Their subjects were either native or non-native speakers of English with either a science or a non-science background. The striking result was that non-native speakers with a science background were faster than native speakers of English with a non-science background. This result implies that it is not basic comprehension that is critical in using instructions but the ability to infer the details needed to construct correct procedures.

If knowledge needed to infer some detail used in constructing a procedure is not available, then the reader may not be able to do some step in the procedure. The problem may be identified at any stage in the process of procedure acquisition. For example, if a step in some procedure requires a reader to *Degauss the CRT* then the reader must know how to degauss something, what the CRT is, and where to find it. When does the reader find out that he or she does not have this knowledge? The reader may be able to tell either during reading, because these words are unfamiliar, or during procedure construction, when he or she cannot construct a degaussing method from the instructions. But the reader may have to wait until procedure execution for it to become clear that how to degauss the CRT is not apparent from the execution context. For example, there is no push button on the device labeled *CRT Degauss*. Thus, frequently the reader may recognize a lack of knowledge in the reading comprehension or procedure comprehension stages, but sometimes the procedure must be executed in order for problems to become obvious.

Thus, the execution stage is the last chance to map the text onto the world, and so problems found here tend to be those that were not anticipated during procedure construction, and they may not be solvable by rereading the instructions. For example, readers may find that they do not know where a particular knob is. In addition, determining the correct sequence of steps is typically done during procedure construction, but if the text does not specify the order of steps, and the reader does not have the knowledge needed to infer it, then the correct order may have to be determined during execution by trial and error.

Supporting inferences needed to construct an executable procedure. In the absence of useful cues from the physical objects, or appropriate background knowledge, the reader of

procedural text may be able to make the proper inferences if the text itself contains the necessary information. Wright (1981) gives the example of a patient who has to decide, for example, how faithfully to follow the prescription orders given by the doctor or pharmacist, and how to interpret instructions such as "take two tablets a day". Providing information about the consequences of not following the orders, or about what the drug is supposed to do may help the patient make these decisions. Thus, whenever a reader must make inferences in order to construct a procedure, providing an explanation may help the inference processes.

While readers may not be able to make the correct inferences because of lack of knowledge, they also may not realize that the inferences they are making are incorrect. Evidence for this comes from a study by Kieras, Tibbits, and Bovair (1984) who compared experts and novices in a device operation task. The instructions were either presented in a linear step-by-step form or in a hierarchical menu where making a menu choice gave the reader the appropriate step-by-step instructions. The hierarchical menu resulted in faster, more accurate performance if the subject was familiar with the device, but step-by-step instructions were better if the device was unfamiliar. With step-by-step instructions, lack of knowledge is not a problem because relatively few inferences are needed, but the hierarchical menu system apparently tempted subjects to try to infer parts of the instructions, and their lack of knowledge sometimes lead them astray.

Explanatory material that can be used to support inferences in procedure construction can be divided into two main types. The first can be described as *how-it-works* information about components of the system and their relationships, while the second is *goal structure* information that explains why the steps are done in terms of what is accomplished. For example, in directions for assembling an electrical device, information about how electric circuits work is *how-it-works* information (Smith and Goodman, 1984). An example of goal structure information is if the reader is directed to assemble two float devices and a small connector bar and then it is explained that this is done in order to make the base of a crane (Konoske and Ellis, 1986).

The helpfulness of a *how-it-works* explanation was demonstrated by Kieras and Bovair (1984), who found that subjects given a mental model of a device performed better during step-by-step training of the operating procedures for the device, compared to subjects who received only the procedure training. This experiment required the subjects to read through all the steps in the procedure before attempting to execute them from memory, and subjects were both faster and more accurate when they were given the mental model. In addition, the mental model was especially useful to subjects who were required to infer the operating procedures. The advantage for the mental model may be attributed to an improvement in memory for the procedures, due to these subjects being able to reconstruct the procedure by inference from the *how-it-works* knowledge. But, the model may have also helped subjects infer the procedure so that they did not need to spend as much time on procedure construction. In addition, a similar study by Smith and Spoehr (1985) found that per-syllable reading times for instruction steps were faster for subjects given a device model, suggesting that the explanation benefited reading comprehension or procedure comprehension or both.

The value of goal structure information was shown by Smith and Goodman (1984). They provided subjects with instructions for a circuit assembly task that were either step-by-step directions with little explanation (the *linear* condition), or that had additional explanatory material. This material was either pure goal structure knowledge (the *structural* condition), or a mixture of goal structure and *how-it-works* information (the *functional* condition). They

found that reading time and errors were worst for step-by-step instructions, and that the structural condition showed the best recall and transfer to a similar circuit, with the functional condition close behind. This implies that the goal structure information is the most useful for procedure construction, although clearly these results are too sketchy to resolve the issue of the merits of goal structure versus how-it-works information. Konoske and Ellis (1986) performed similar experiments in which they provided subjects with step-by-step instructions for the assembly of a model crane that seems to have been either with no explanation, or with goal structure explanations. Subjects with goal structure information performed better both initially and after one month. However, in one experiment, the subjects were Navy personnel with mechanical experience, and for these subjects, there was no advantage for the explanatory information. This suggests that subjects who have the requisite domain knowledge benefit less from explanatory material.

Evidence of the organizing value of goal information is provided by Dixon (1987a) who had subjects draw pictures using components described in the instructions; for example, *This will be a picture of a wagon. Draw a long rectangle with two circles underneath.* He found that when information about what the picture will be is presented first, the directions are read faster. When the presentation order is reversed, Dixon suggests that readers buffer the information about the picture components until they find the organizing goal information, and try to guess the relations between the component steps. The guessing hypothesis is supported by the fact that most of the reading time difference comes when reading the components, and that the size of the effect is related to how difficult it is to guess relationships between components presented by themselves.

Another view of explanatory material proposed by Reder (Reder, Charney and Morgan, 1986) is that it consists of *elaborations*, such as examples that provide specific instances of a procedure, and analogies that try to relate the new procedure to one the reader already knows. A study by Reder *et al.* (1986) suggests that providing such elaborations in a procedural text only helps during reading if readers do not know what task they will be asked to perform. In this study, subjects read general information on computers and computer commands, and then did tasks that required issuing several commands in sequence. Subjects were either provided with elaborations in the text or not, and were told what the tasks would be either before or after reading. If the task instructions were given after reading, the time per task and the efficiency (measured by the total number of commands issued, and the number of commands compared to the minimum required) was best for the elaborated manual. If task instructions were given first, it did not matter if the text contained elaborations or not. This is consistent with the interpretation that the elaborations helped subjects remember the information required to construct later-specified procedures; if the readers knew the procedure specifications prior to reading, they could apparently select the relevant material for encoding while reading, meaning that the elaborations are less useful. In a second experiment, where the elaborations were divided into elaborations of command syntax and of computer concepts, syntax elaboration showed improved performance, but the conceptual elaboration did not. This second experiment provides more support for the idea that it is goal structure information like command syntax that helps, not the general conceptual how-it-works information. Note that this is consistent with the point argued in Kieras and Bovair (1988), that the explanatory material has to support the inference of specific procedures to be useful.

Examples seem to be especially important in procedural text. An example provides an instance of a complete, executable procedure, and it may be far more efficient to translate the example into a procedure, and modify it where necessary, than to build a whole new procedure

from the text. This may explain the result from a study by LeFevre and Dixon (1986) who found that when subjects were asked to answer series completion or classification questions given an example and instructions that contradicted each other, they followed the example. However, conclusions drawn from this study must be limited because the example and test problems used were both pictorial while the instructions were in the form of text. Subjects may prefer the pictorial example because it is in the same modality as the test problem and so seems simpler. However, most users of computer reference manuals would probably testify to the extreme usefulness of examples compared to descriptive text; this is clearly a topic in desperate need for further research.

In addition to being presented early in the instructions, goals need to be clearly signaled to the reader by being explicit. Dixon, Faries and Gabrys (1988) have shown that readers who are relatively unfamiliar with the task to be performed are more affected by text form than readers familiar with the task. Using recipes as their instructions, they found that explicit forms such as *soften the butter* rather than implicit ones like *blend the softened butter . . .* were read more quickly, and were more likely to be remembered by subjects unfamiliar with cooking. The explicit form may signal to low-knowledge readers that they need to do something to get the butter softened, and that the statement is in fact the goal of a method and therefore important. With the implicit form, they may not realize this.

Procedure Construction

Importance of procedure construction. Constructing a procedure from the representation of the text is perhaps the single most important step in acquiring a procedure. Holland, Rose, Dean and Dory (1985) attempted to characterize good instructions compared to poor ones for the tasks of tying a necktie or assembling a model car. They found that the good and bad instructions could not be distinguished by text characteristics likely to affect reading comprehension such as length of text or length of sentences; indeed, some of the best instructions had the most complex syntax and sentence structure. The important differences between good and bad instructions seemed to be those of content; in particular, poor instructions omitted important details like the orientation of parts in the assembly task, and often included the wrong level of detail. For example, in the task of tying a necktie, it is useful to be told how the tie should look after each step, but details of the exact positions of the hands are confusing.

Organizing information to aid procedure construction. One important issue is how to present the information so that a procedure can be constructed as efficiently as possible. There are many potential organizations for presenting procedures, and the preferred ones must be those that facilitate the construction process. Spoehr, Morris and Smith (1983) have pointed out that the organization of information may be studied at two levels: the *micro-level* where the contents of a single step are the focus, and the *macro-level* where the focus is on understanding how the steps can be best organized.

With regard to macro organization, our model assumes that procedures are organized hierarchically with the hierarchy determined by the goal structure. This implies that instructions should have a hierarchical structure. Gordon, Munro, Rigney and Lutz (1978) looked at the structure of stories, instructions, and definitions using their own analyses of the text structure of each type of text. They defined rewrite rules to express the text structure for each type of text, and generated the corresponding tree diagrams. They found that definitions have little structure, while stories and instructions are hierarchical, with stories having a more hierarchical structure than instructions. This structure difference may arise because

stories have both a strong temporal and causal structure, while procedures may have less causal structure. Gordon, *et al.* found that the degree of structure appears to be important for how well the text is remembered, as the strongly constrained stories are recalled best and the unconstrained definitions recalled the least. The intermediate level of structure observed for instructions seems to suffice for short procedures, but long ones impose a greater load on memory and their recall is poor.

A hierarchical structure for procedures in memory is also suggested by Graesser (1978), who studied memory for common procedures, such as how to wash a car, or catch a fish. One group of subjects generated the procedures from their own knowledge, another group answered *why?* questions about them, and the third group listened to the procedures and tried to recall them. It is important to note that although subjects listened to the procedures before recalling them, such very familiar procedures were clearly not acquired or learned in the usual sense, and so this study actually examined the structure of already-known procedures. Graesser scaled the hierarchy and relational density using the answers to the *why?* questions, and found that statements higher in the hierarchy, related to many other statements, were better recalled. If procedures are stored in memory in hierarchical form, as this work suggests, then presenting them in this form may assist in the process of constructing the procedure.

A relatively well-researched aspect of organization is the order in which elements of a procedure are presented. The best order may be the one where the procedure elements are presented in the order in which they are used in executing the procedure; this idea is what Dixon (1982) calls the *use-order principle*. At the level of the complete procedure, this seems obvious; if the steps of a procedure are not presented in the order in which they are to be executed, then the reader will have to put them into the correct order, and this may well be difficult, as suggested by results reported in Kieras (1985). But the use-order principle may also hold at the level of individual steps. A step will be easier to construct if its elements are presented in the order in which they are used in the task.

There are several studies of micro-organization effects. Smith and Spoehr (1985) found that reading a procedure step in an assembly task is faster when information about the action, actor and object in the step is presented first rather than orientation, location or modality. In this case, the actor, action and object information probably is needed first, while the orientation, location and modality provide the details of the operations to be performed. Dixon (1982) presented single steps in various orders of their action or condition components, which he labeled in a somewhat confusing manner. A "condition" could be a "consequence" of the action, as in *Turn the knob so that the meter reads 20* or an "antecedent" of the action, as in *If the blue light is on, press the button*. He found that for both types of "condition," presenting the action first produces faster reading than putting the "condition" first. On the other hand, Spoehr, Morris and Smith (1983) using the same meter-setting task, distinguished more clearly Dixon's types, into the forms *antecedent condition*, *action*, and *consequent of the action*. They used all six possible orders of antecedent condition, action, and consequent, and found that the order antecedent, action, consequent was read the fastest. Dixon (1982) argued that his result supports the idea that actions are of primary importance in building a procedure, while Spoehr, Morris and Smith argued that their result supports the use order principle. The reader first has to determine whether to do something, then what to do, and then what the final state should be (when to stop turning the knob). Spoehr, Morris and Smith suggest that one reason for the difference between their results and those of Dixon (1982) is that his results averaged the antecedent-first and consequent-first conditions, giving an apparent advantage to the action-first condition. The nature of the task to be performed may also affect the preferred

order; for example, Dixon (1987b) has found that when subjects were looking for a particular light to be either on or off, then action-second sentences were read faster than action-first. He also found that while action-first pairs are generally read faster if the task is to execute the step, while antecedent-action pairs are read faster if the task is verbal recall.

One possible problem with these studies of micro-level order is differences in comprehensibility produced by the order manipulations. For example, in the Spoehr, Morris and Smith (1983) study, the order of the components is confounded with comprehensibility of the instructions; *So that the gamma meter reads 20 if the sigma indicator is on turn the right knob* seems rather more difficult to read than *If the indicator is on turn the right knob so that the gamma meter reads 20*, not because of the use order issues, but due to violations of normal English sentence structure.

The apparently contradictory results on micro-level order present a confusing picture; the optimum order is not clear, nor is it clear why the results can be so different for apparently similar tasks. Perhaps conceptualizing the task differently might help. In performing a task from instructions, the reader must construct a procedure with the steps in the correct order for execution. Thus, presenting the steps in their execution order, according to the use order principle, should help the reader to construct the procedure, leading to shorter reading times, and possibly fewer errors and shorter execution times as well. But labeling parts of the procedure with arbitrarily-defined labels, such as antecedent, action, or consequent, does not seem a particularly useful way to think about the content of the instructions. As discussed above, there may be several production rules that need to be built for a single condition or consequent; so it is not obvious that steps conforming to such labels will be related in a simple way to how they are used in constructing a procedure.

Immediate Transfer and Acquisition Monitor Processes

Immediate transfer. As described by Kieras and Bovair (1986), the immediate transfer process can be responsible for large savings in the time to acquire new procedures. But it is not clear if the content or organization of the procedural text would affect these savings. The transferability of steps depends on their similarity, which is basically determined by the procedures themselves, rather than how they are presented. But, it is possible that the instructions could help transfer by emphasizing the similarity of steps or hinder it by obscuring the similarity.

According to Kieras and Bovair (1986), the transfer process is quite limited; subjects can transfer steps that are either the same, or that have only a single minor point of difference in their goal. This implies that the transfer process may be quite sensitive to differences in how the procedure is written. For example, using different terms to refer to the same object may hamper the transfer process. Foltz, Davies, and Polson (1988) found that simply changing the name of a procedure from *Delete* to *Erase* produced a failure to transfer. Because of a small change in how the procedure was described, readers treated a procedure as new that in fact was virtually the same as a previously learned one.

Acquisition monitor. The work by Kieras & Bovair (1986) mentioned above is one of the few pieces of evidence for the acquisition monitor process. Readers spend more time reading a step that has not been acquired, and less on a step that they have just learned. However, these results provide no indication of how the acquisition monitor process occurs or what might affect it. Another piece of evidence for the process is the result described above that in tying a necktie

it helps to tell the reader how a tie should look after every step (Holland, Rose, Dean & Dory 1985), which suggests that the acquisition monitor can use such information to check for correct acquisition of the procedure steps.

Factors Affecting Execution of Procedures

Some instructions may allow more efficient, faster-executing, procedures to be generated than others. The work by Wright and Wilcox (1979) mentioned above is a possible example. In that study, instructions for a button-pushing task were sometimes easier with two negations than one. As discussed above, this result could be due to differences in the ease of constructing the procedures. But an execution time effect of number of negations is also possible. For example, Dixon (1987b) found that execution is faster if subjects must check to see if a light is *on* than if it is *off*, although reading times are similar.

Another potentially important factor in the execution of procedures is how well they can be remembered. If a procedure is easier to remember, then it is likely to be easier and faster to execute. A memory failure means that the reader will have to try to reconstruct the procedure through inference or trial and error, and this will take longer and produce more errors. Thus, assisting memory for a procedure by supporting reconstruction should result in improved execution performance. An example of this can be found in the mental model work of Kieras and Bovair (1984) mentioned above. Subjects who were provided with a mental model of the device executed the procedures faster and with fewer errors both immediately and after a week. The mental model may have helped retention by enabling reconstruction of steps that had been forgotten. A similar advantage for providing a model was found by Smith and Spoehr (1985) in an experiment where subjects performed a step immediately after reading it. Subjects provided with a model showed a small increase in execution accuracy.

Facilitation of retention and recall may explain some of the results obtained by Eylon and Reif (1984). Subjects were given information and training on deriving an argument in physics. Subjects who were given the goal structure of the arguments were better able to recall the argument than subjects who were simply given the steps without information about the goals. If the goal structure was presented as a deductive hierarchy, subjects recalled better on deductive problems, but if the goals were based on a historical organization they recalled better on historical problems. Thus the explicit presentation of the goal structure facilitated the recall of procedures. Smith and Goodman (1985) found a related effect of explanatory material on transfer to new procedures. Subjects given information about the goals had better execution accuracy on a transfer task than subjects given only linear step-by-step instructions.

Comparison to Non-textual Instructions

There are important aspects of procedural text and instructions that are outside the scope of the model. For example, Booher (1975) found differences in performance between pictorial and text presentation for the same procedure, but the model can explain this difference only in very general terms. One of the interesting differences in performance between pictorial and text presentation is that time to complete a procedure such as *Set the power switch to ON position on the control panel. Check that power indicator illuminates.* was faster when presented with a picture consisting of a series of icons, but fewer errors are made with text. In particular, pictures were better for presenting static objects, while text was better for presenting the actual actions to be taken. Booher's results suggest that part of the difference between text and pictorial procedures may lie in the procedure comprehension stage; the

pictorial presentation may result in faster performance because fewer inferences may need to be made in order to generate the procedure. For example, Stone and Glock (1981) found that one advantage of pictures is that they help eliminate orientation errors. However, the fact that text is better than pictures (Booher, 1975) for action steps implies that certain types of information are difficult to extract from a picture, causing errors. This may be why both Booher (1975) and Stone and Glock (1981) found that pictures and text together result in the best performance.

The flowchart is another visual form of presentation for procedures; it usually produces better performance than text. A flowchart may help procedure construction because only relevant information needs to be processed, and it may help execution because it relieves memory load. Kammann (1975) found that multi-branch flowcharts are both faster and have fewer errors than text. In addition, performance with multi-branch flowcharts is better than for binary flowcharts. Because Kammann measured only total time to do the task, no distinction can be drawn between construction and execution effects. Wright and Reid (1973) found that an algorithm presented as a flowchart produced fewer errors than prose. Holland and Rose (1981) compared performance with text versions of instructions such as *If you are a parent or a homeowner, and not both under 26 or a veteran, mark Box A*, to that with two algorithmic versions, one being a flowchart, the other being a verbal version in list form such as

- (1) *If you are a parent, then go to (2), otherwise skip to the next question,*
- (2) *If you are a homeowner then go to (3).*

Performance with prose presentation was the worst both in terms of response time (which included both reading and execution time) and accuracy, while an algorithm presented as a flowchart was the best, having a particular advantage on the more difficult problems.

Conclusions

Future Research Needs

The most fundamental need in future research on acquiring procedures from text is simply an urgent need for much more research on this type of text. The new research should use more refined paradigms that allow the stages and processes involved to be isolated; studies using gross measures such as the total time to perform a task are simply not very informative.

With regard to the model outlined here, there are many issues at each stage of the model that need to be addressed. For example, the distinction between reading and procedure comprehension needs to be further clarified. While the surface form of the text can be considered separately from the form of the procedure, it may serve as an important cue to guide procedure construction. One important issue is how the procedure content is signaled or conveyed in English; several possible cues were discussed as part of the procedure construction process, and it is important to establish the roles such cues play. For example, the work discussed here suggests that identifying the goal structure is important in building a procedure; it could act like a macrostructure (Kintsch & van Dijk, 1978) in ordinary comprehension. Also, since the theme of a paragraph can be signaled to readers by initial mention (Kieras, 1980), initial mention may also signal the top-level goal of a procedure.

Another problem that needs more work is the apparent difficulty of reference in procedural text. The problems pointed out by Fisher (1981), Wright (1981), and Just and Carpenter (1987b), such as interpreting a referent too broadly by ignoring qualifiers, are potentially serious, and yet there is little known about why people have such problems and what improvements to procedural text could prevent referential problems.

Practical Applications of Current and Future Research

Both the work described here and potential future research has important and useful practical implications. For example, one conclusion that can be drawn from the work described here is that the procedure comprehension stage, and in particular the procedure construction process, is the critical one. This implies that writers of procedural text should concentrate on ensuring that the procedure construction goes smoothly.

For example, procedural text should above all be correct and should provide all the steps of a procedure. It is probably wise to assume that the reader has less knowledge rather than more, and provide some detail. Readers can typically ignore details that they already know (Kieras, Tibbits & Bovair, 1984), although some types of detail, such as the actual position of the hands in operation tasks, are likely to be confusing (Holland, Rose, Dean & Dory, 1985). However, if important details are missing, readers may not be able to infer them without extensive problem-solving. Providing a goal structure organization for the text is likely to be helpful (Graesser, 1978; Eylon & Reif, 1984), as will explanations that provide information directly useful in constructing the procedure, such as an effective mental model. (Kieras & Bovair, 1984).

References

- Anderson, J. R. (1976). *Language, memory and thought*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Anderson, J.R. (Ed.). (1981). *Cognitive skills and their acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, J. R. (1987). Skill Acquisition: compilation of weak-method problem solutions. *Psychological Review*, **94**, 192-210.
- Anderson, J. R., & Bower, G. H. (1973). *Human Associative Memory*. Washington, DC: Winston.
- Barnard, P. J., Wright, P., & Wilcox, P. (1979). Effect of response instructions and question style on the ease of completing forms. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, **52**, 209-266.
- Booher, H. R. (1975). Relative comprehensibility of pictorial information and printed words in proceduralized instructions. *Human Factors*, **17**, 266-277.
- Bovair, S., Kieras, D. E., & Polson, P. G. (1988). *The acquisition and performance of text editing skill: a production system analysis*. (Technical Report No. 28). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Card, S. K., Moran, T. P., & Newell, A. (1983). *The psychology of human-computer interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dixon, P. (1982). Plans and written directions for complex tasks. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, **21**, 70-84.
- Dixon, P. (1987a). The processing of organizational and component step information in written directions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, **26**, 24-35.
- Dixon, P. (1987b). The structure of mental plans for following directions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, **13**, 18-26.
- Dixon, P. (1987c). Actions and procedural directions. In R. S. Tomlin (Ed.) *Coherence and grounding in discourse. Typological studies in language*, Vol. 11. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Dixon, P., Faries, J., & Gabrys, G. (1988). The role of explicit action statements in understanding and using written directions. Unpublished manuscript.

- Duffy, T. M., Curran, T. E., & Sass, D. (1983). Document design for technical job tasks: An evaluation. *Human Factors*, 25, 143-160.
- Eylon, B. & Reif, F. (1984). Effects of knowledge organization on task performance. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(1), 5-44.
- Felker, D. B. & Rose, A. M. (1981). The evaluation of a public document: The case of FCC's marine radio rules for recreational boaters. (Technical report No. 11). American Institutes for research, Washington, DC: Document Design Project.
- Fitts, P. M. (1964). Perceptual-motor skill learning. In A. W. Melton (Ed.), *Categories of Human Learning*. New York: Academic Press.
- File, S. E., & Jew, A. (1973). Syntax and the recall of instructions in a realistic situation. *British Journal of Psychology*, 64, 65-70.
- Fisher, D. L. (1981). Functional literacy tests: A model of question-answering and an analysis of errors. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 16, 418-448.
- Foltz, P. E., Davies, S. E., Polson, P. G., & Kieras, D. E. (1988). Transfer between menu systems. *Proceedings of the CHI 1988 conference on human factors in computing systems*. Washington, DC: ACM.
- Gordon, L., Munro, A., Rigney, J. W., & Lutz, K. A. (1978). *Summaries and recalls for three types of texts*. (Technical Report No. 85). Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Graesser, A. C. (1978). How to catch a fish: the memory and representation of common procedures. *Discourse Processes*, 1, 72-89.
- Holland, M., & Rose, A. (1981). *A comparison of prose and algorithms for presenting complex instructions*. (Technical report No. 17). Washington, DC: Document Design Project.
- Holland, V. M., Rose, A. M., Dean, R. A., & Dory, S. L. (1985). *Processes involved in writing effective procedural instructions*. (Technical Report No. 1). Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Johnson, W. & Kieras, D. E. (1983). Representation-saving effects of prior knowledge in memory for simple technical prose. *Memory and Cognition*, 11, 456-466.
- Jones, S. (1966). The effect of a negative qualifier in an instruction. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 5, 497-501.
- Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1987a). *The psychology of reading and language comprehension*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1987b). Unpublished chapter draft.
- Kamman, R. (1975). The comprehensibility of printed instructions and the flowchart alternative. *Human Factors*, 17, 90-113.

- Kieras, D. E. (1980). Initial mention as a signal to thematic content in technical passages. *Memory and Cognition*, 8(4), 345-353.
- Kieras, D.E. (1985). *Improving the comprehensibility of a simulated technical manual*. (Tech. Rep. No. 20, TR-85/ONR-20). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Technical Communication. (DTIC AD A157482)
- Kieras, D. E. (1981). Component processes in the comprehension of simple prose. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20, 1-23.
- Kieras, D. E., & Bovair, S. (1984). The role of a mental model in learning to operate a device. *Cognitive Science*, 8, 255-273.
- Kieras, D. E., & Bovair, S. (1986). The acquisition of procedures from text: A production-system analysis of transfer of training. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 25, 507-524.
- Kieras, D. E. & Dechert, C. (1985). *Rules for comprehensible technical prose: A survey of the psycholinguistic literature*. (Technical report No. 24). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Kieras, D. E., Tibbits, M., & Bovair, S. (1984). *How experts and nonexperts operate electronic equipment from written instructions*. (Technical Report No. 14, UARZ/DP/TR-83/ONR-14). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.
- Kintsch, W. (1974). *The representation of meaning in memory*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kintsch, W. (1986). Learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 3(2), 87-108.
- Kintsch, W. & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review*, 85, 363-394.
- Konoske, P. J., & Ellis, E. G. (1986). *Cognitive factors in learning and retention of procedural tasks*. (Technical report No. NPRDC 87-14). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- LeFevre, J., & Dixon, P. (1986). Do written instruction need examples? *Cognition and Instruction*, 3(1), 1-30.
- Mohammed, M. A. H., & Swales, J. M. (1984). Factors affecting the successful reading of technical instructions. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 2, 206-217.
- Reder, L. M., Charney, D. H., & Morgan, K. I. (1986) The role of elaborations in learning a skill from an instructional text. *Memory & Cognition*, 14(1), 54-78.
- Schumacher, G. M. (1987). Executive control studying. In B.K. Britton and S.M. Glynn (Eds.) *Executive control processes in reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Smith, E.E. & Goodman, L. (1984). Understanding written instructions: the role of an explanatory schema. *Cognition and Instruction*, 14, 359-396.
- Smith, E.E. & Spoehr, K.T. (1985). *Basic processes and individual differences in understanding and using instructions*. (BBN Report No. 3029). Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek & Newman.
- Spoehr, K.T., Morris, M.E., & Smith, E.E. (1983). *Comprehension of instructions for operating devices*. (BBN Report No. 5712). Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek & Newman.
- Sticht, T.G. (1977). Comprehending reading at work. In M.A. Just & P.A. Carpenter (Eds.) *Cognitive processes in comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stone, D.E. & Glock, M.D. (1981). How do young adults read directions with and without pictures? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 419-426.
- Wright, P. (1981). "The instructions clearly state. . ." Can't people read? *Applied Ergonomics*, 12, 131-141.
- Wright, P. & Reid, F. (1973). Written information: some alternatives to prose for expressing the outcomes of complex contingencies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 160-166.
- Wright, P., & Wilcox, P. (1979). When two no's nearly make a yes: A study of conditional imperatives. In P. A. Kolars, M. E. Wrolstad, & H. Bouma (Eds.), *Processing of visible language*. New York: Plenum.

Defense Technical Information Center

Cameron Station, Bldg. 5
Alexandria, VA 22314
Attn: TC
(12 copies, DTIC cards)

Office of Naval Research,
Code 1142CS
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
(6 copies)

Dr. Edith Ackermann
Media Laboratory
E15-311
20 Ames Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Robert Ahlers
Code N711
Human Factors Laboratory
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert M. Aiken
Computer Science Department
038-24
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Dr. John R. Anderson
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Stephen J. Andriole, Chairman
Department of Information Systems
and Systems Engineering
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Prof. John Annett
University of Warwick
Department of Psychology
Coventry CV4 7AL
ENGLAND

Dr. James D. Baker
Director of Automation and Research
Allen Corporation of America
209 Madison Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Meryl S. Baker
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Thomas G. Bever
Department of Psychology
University of Rochester
River Station
Rochester, NY 14627

Dr. Gautam Biswas
Department of Computer Science
Box 1686, Station B
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235

Dr. Arthur S. Blawies
Code N712
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Jeff Bonar
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Lyle E. Bourne, Jr.
Department of Psychology
Box 345
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

LT COL Hugh Burns
AFHRL/IDI
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Robert Calfee
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Joseph C. Campione
Center for the Study of Reading
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Joanne Capper, Director
Center for Research into Practice
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Jaime G. Carbonell
Computer Science Department
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. John M. Carroll
IBM Watson Research Center
User Interface Institute
P.O. Box 704
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. Ruth W. Cheabay
CDEC, Hamburg Hall
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Fred Chang
Pacific Bell
2600 Camino Ramon
Room 3S-450
San Ramon, CA 94583

Dr. Charles Clifton
Tobin Hall
Department of Psychology
University of
Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Stanley Collier
Office of Naval Technology
Code 222
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Kenneth B. Cross
Anacapa Sciences, Inc.
P.O. Drawer Q
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

Dr. Gary Czichon
Intelligent Instructional Systems
Texas Instruments AI Lab
P.O. Box 660246
Dallas, TX 75266

Brian Dallman
Training Technology Branch
3400 TCHTW/TTGXC
Lowry AFB, CO 80230-5000

Margaret Day, Librarian
Applied Science Associates
P.O. Box 1072
Butler, PA 16003

Dr. Sharon Derry
Florida State University
Department of Psychology
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Thomas E. DeZern
Project Engineer, AI
General Dynamics
PO Box 748/Mail Zone 2646
Fort Worth, TX 76101

Dr. Ronna Dillon
Department of Guidance and
Educational Psychology
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dr. J. Stuart Donn
Faculty of Education
University of British Columbia
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC CANADA V6T 1Z5

Dr. Thomas M. Duffy
Communications Design
Center, 160 BH
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Pierre Duguel
Organization for Economic
Cooperation and Development
2, rue Andre-Pascal
75016 PARIS
FRANCE

Dr. Richard Duran
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. John Ellis
Navy Personnel R&U Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92252

ERIC Facility Acquisitions
4350 East-West Hwy., Suite 1100
Bethesda, MD 20814-4475

Dr. K. Anders Ericsson
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Campus Box 345
Boulder, CO 80309-0345

Dr. Debra Evans
Applied Science Associates, Inc.
P. O. Box 1072
Butler, PA 16003

Dr. Beatrice J. Farr
Army Research Institute
PERI-IC
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Consultant
Cognitive & Instructional Sciences
2520 North Vernon Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. Elizabeth Fennema
Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin
225 North Mills Street
Madison, WI 53706

CAPT J. F. Finelli
Commandant (G-PTE)
U.S. Coast Guard
2100 Second St., S.W.
Washington, DC 20593

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald
University of New England
Department of Psychology
Armidale, New South Wales 2351
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Michael Flanigan
Code 52
NPRDC
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. J. D. Fletcher
Institute for Defense Analyses
1601 N. Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Linda Flower
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of English
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Barbara A. Fox
University of Colorado
Department of Linguistics
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Norman Frederiksen
Educational Testing Service
(05-R)
Princeton, NJ 08541

Department of Humanities and
Social Sciences
Harvey Muell College
Claremont, CA 91711

Dr. Robert M. Gagne
1456 Mitchell Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Dr. Philip Gillis
Army Research Institute
PERI-II
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Mr. Lee Gladwin
305 Davis Avenue
Leesburg, VA 22075

Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research
& Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Marvin D. Glock
101 Homestead Terrace
Ithaca, NY 14856

Dr. Sam Glucksberg
Department of Psychology
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Dwight J. Goehring
ARI Field Unit
P.O. Box 5787
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5011

Dr. Susan R. Goldman
Dept. of Education
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Mr. Harold Goldstein
University of DC
Department Civil Engineering
Bldg. 42, Room 1k2
4200 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. Sherrie Gott
AFHRL/MOMJ
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5601

Dr. T. Govindaraj
Georgia Institute of
Technology
School of Industrial
and Systems Engineering
Atlanta, GA 30332-0205

Dr. Wayne Gray
Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
NNEX
500 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, NY 10604

H. William Greenup
Dep Asst C/S, Instructional
Management (E03A)
Education Center, MCCDC
Quantico, VA 22134-5050

Dr. Dik Gregory
Admiralty Research
Establishment/AXB
Queens Road
Teddington
Middlesex, ENGLAND TW110LN

Michael Habon
DOFNIER GMBH
P.O. Box 1420
D-7990 Friedrichshafen 1
WEST GERMANY

Dr. Henry M. Half
Half Resources, Inc.
4918 33rd Road, North
Arlington, VA 22207

Mr. H. Hamburger
Department of Computer Science
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Cheryl Hamel
NTSC, Code 711
Orlando, FL 32813

Janice Hart
Office of the Chief
of Naval Operations
OP-111J2
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20350-2000

Dr. Wayne Harvey
Center for Learning Technology
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02160

Dr. James Hiebert
Department of Educational
Development
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

Dr. James E. Hoffman
Department of Psychology
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711

Dr. Melissa Holland
Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Ms. Julia S. Hough
110 W. Harvey Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Dr. Steven Hunka
3-104 Educ. N.
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA T6G 2G5

Dr. Janet Jackson

Dr. Janet Jackson
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Biologisch Centrum, Vleugel D
Kortlaan 30, 9751 NN Haren
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. Daniel B. Jones
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
NRR/ILRB
Washington, DC 20555

Mr. Paul L. Jones
Research Division
Chief of Naval Technical Training
Building East-1
Naval Air Station Memphis
Millington, TN 38054-5056

**Mr. Roland Jones
Mitro Corp., K-203
Burlington Road
Bedford, MA 01730**

Dr. Ruth Kanfer
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Elliott Hall
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455

**Dr. Michael Kaplan
Office of Basic Research
U.S. Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600**

Dr. Milton S. Katz
European Science Coordination
Office

U.S. Army Research Institute
Box 65
FPO New York 09510-1500

Dr. Frank Keil
Department of Psychology
228 Urts Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14850

Dr. Wendy Kellogg
IBM T. J. Watson Research Ctr.
P.O. Box 704
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Dr. Thomas Kilmon
AFHRL/OT
Williams AFB, AZ

**Dr. J. Peter Kincaid
Army Research Institute
Orlando Field Unit
c/o PM TRADE-E
Orlando, FL 32813**

**Dr. Gary Kress
628 Spazler Avenue
Pacific Grove, CA 93950**

Dr. Pat Langley
University of California
Department of Information
and Computer Science
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. Robert W. Lawler
Matthews 118
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. John Levine
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Matt Lewis
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

**Dr. Doris K. Little
Software Productivity Consortium
1880 Campus Commons Drive, North
Reston, VA 22091**

Dr. Charlotte Linde
Structural Semantics
P.O. Box 707
Palo Alto, CA 94320

Dr. Jack Lochhead
University of
Massachusetts
Physics Department
Amherst, MA 01003

Vern M. Malec
NPRDC, Code 52
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. William L. Maloy
Code 04
NETPMSA
Pensacola, FL 32509-5000

Dr. Elaine Marsh
Naval Center for Applied Research
in Artificial Intelligence
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 5510
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. James L. McClelland
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Kathleen McKeown
Columbia University
Department of Computer Science
450 Computer Science Building
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Joseph C. McLachlan
Code 52
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6000

Dr. James McMichael
Technical Director
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Arthur Melmed
Education Laboratory
New York University

New York, NY 10003

Dr. D. Michie
The Turing Institute
George House
36 North Hanover Street
Glasgow G1 2AD
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Vittorio Midoro
CNR-Istituto Tecnologie Didattiche
Via all'Opera Pia 11
GENOVA-ITALIA 16145

Dr. George A. Miller
Dept. of Psychology
Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Jason Millman
Department of Education
Roberts Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Lynn Misselt
HQM-222
Control Data Corporation
Box O
Minneapolis, MN 55440

Dr. Andrew R. Mohar
Appl. of Advanced Technology
Science and Engr. Education
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

**Dr. William Montague
NPRDC Code 13
San Diego, CA 92152-6800**

Dr. Allen Munro
Behavioral Technology
Laboratories - USC
1845 S. Elena Ave., 4th Floor
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

**Dr. William R. Murray
FMC Corporation
Central Engineering Labs
1205 Coleman Avenue
Box 580
Santa Clara, CA 95052**

Dr. Harold F. O'Neill, Jr.
School of Education - WPH 801
Department of Educational
Psychology & Technology
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. Siellan Ohlsson Learning R & D Center University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260	Dr. Peter Polson University of Colorado Department of Psychology Boulder, CO 80309-0315	Nuria Sebastian Dep. Psicologia Basica Univ. Barcelona Adolf Florensa s.n. 08028 Barcelona SPAIN	Dr. Elliot Soloway Yale University Computer Science Department P.O. Box 2158 New Haven, CT 06520
Dr. James B. Olsen WCAT Systems 1875 South State Street Orem, UT 84058	Dr. Mary C. Potter Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences MIT (E-10-039) Cambridge, MA 02139	Dr. Judith W. Segal OERI 555 New Jersey Ave., NW Washington, DC 20208	Linda B. Sorisio IBM-Los Angeles Scientific Center 1601 Wilshire Blvd., 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025
Dr. Judith Orasanu Basic Research Office Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	Dr. Joseph Psotka ATTN: PERI-IC Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333-5600	Dr. Robert J. Seldel US Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333	Dr. Marian Stearns SRI International 333 Ravenswood Ave. Room B-5124 Menlo Park, CA 94025
Dr. Jesse Orlansky Institute for Defense Analyses 1801 N. Beauregard St. Alexandria, VA 22311	Dr. J. Wesley Reglan AFHRL/IDI Brooks AFB, TX 78235	Dr. Randall Shumaker Naval Research Laboratory Code 5510 4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20375-5000	Dr. Thomas Sticht Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, Inc. P.O. Box 6640 San Diego, CA 92106
Dr. Glenn Onga NOSC, Code 441 San Diego, CA 92152-6800	Dr. Charles M. Reigeluth 330 Huntington Hall Syracuse University Syracuse, NY 13244	Dr. Zita M. Simulits Chief, Technologies for Skill Acquisition and Retention ARI 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	Dr. David E. Stone Computer Teaching Corporation 1713 South Neil Street Urbana, IL 61820
Dr. Okchoon Park Army Research Institute PERI-2 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333	Mr. William A. Rizzo Code 71 Naval Training Systems Center Orlando, FL 32813	Dr. Derek Sleeman Computing Science Department The University Aberdeen AB9 2FX Scotland UNITED KINGDOM	Dr. Patrick Suppes Stanford University Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences Stanford, CA 94305 4115
Dr. Roy Pea Institute for Research on Learning 2550 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304	Dr. Linda G. Roberts Science, Education, and Transportation Program Office of Technology Assessment Congress of the United States Washington, DC 20510	Ms. Gail K. Slemmon LOGICON, Inc. P.O. Box 85158 San Diego, CA 92138-5158	Dr. M. Marlin Taylor DCIEM Box 2000 Downsview, Ontario CANADA M3M 3B9
Dr. C. Perrino, Chair Dept. of Psychology Morgan State University Cold Spring La.-Hillen Rd. Baltimore, MD 21239	Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf AT&T Bell Laboratories Room 2D-456 600 Mountain Avenue Murray Hill, NJ 07974	Dr. Robert Smillie Navy Personnel R&D San Diego, CA 92152-6800	Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke FMC Corporation Central Engineering Labs 1205 Coleman Avenue, Box 580 Santa Clara, CA 95052
Dr. Nancy N. Perry Naval Education and Training Program Support Activity Code-047 Building 2435 Pensacola, FL 32509-5000	Dr. Janet W. Scholfield 816 LRDC Building University of Pittsburgh 3939 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, PA 15260	Dr. Alfred F. Smode Code 7A Research and Development Dept. Naval Training Systems Center Orlando, FL 32813-7100	Dr. Douglas Towne Behavioral Technology Labs University of Southern California 1845 S. Elena Ave. Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Dept. of Administrative Sciences Code 54 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5026			

Dr. Paul T. Twohig
Army Research Institute
ATTN: PERI-RL
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Kurt Van Lehn
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Frank L. Vichio
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Jerry Vogt
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Thomas A. Warm
Coast Guard Institute
P. O. Substation 18
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Dr. Beth Warren
BBN Laboratories, Inc.
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Douglas Wetzel
Code 51
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Barbara White
BBN Laboratories
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Marsha R. Williams
Appl. of Advanced Technologies
National Science Foundation
SEEMORISE
1600 G Street, N.W., Room 635-A
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Robert A. Wisher
U.S. Army Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Frank B. Witthrow
U.S. Department of Education
Room 504D, Capitol Plaza
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Merlin C. Wiltrock
Graduate School of Education
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Mr. Paul T. Wohlg
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
ATTN: PERI-RL
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Masoud Yazdani
Dept. of Computer Science
University of Exeter
Prince of Wales Road
Exeter EX44PT
ENGLAND

Frank R. Yekovich
Dept. of Education
Catholic University
Washington, DC 20064

Dr. Joseph L. Young
National Science Foundation
Room 320
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20550