



208

*SELECTIVE ATTENTION ABILITIES
OF EXPERIENCED SONAR OPERATORS*

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 10 1993
S A D

L. L. Merrill


L. J. Lewandowski

D. A. Kobus

D. E. Braun

Report No. 92-38

93-18335



63 8 9

003

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.

NAVAL HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER
P.O. BOX 85122
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92186-5122

NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND
BETHESDA, MARYLAND



Selective Attention Abilities
of
Experienced Sonar Operators*

L. L. Merrill, L. J. Lewandowski+,
D. A. Kobus, and D. E. Braun

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

Cognitive Performance and Psychophysiology Department
Naval Health Research Center
P. O. Box 85122
San Diego, CA 92138-9174

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

+Syracuse University
Department of Psychology
Syracuse, New York

* Portions of this report were presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Boston, Massachusetts, August 1990.

Report No. 92-38, supported by the Naval Medical Research Development Command, Department of the Navy, under research Work Unit 62233N-NM33P0.005-6003. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy of the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense nor the U. S. Government.

Summary

Problem: Sonarmen listen to and interpret complex auditory and visual signals for thousands of hours over a period of years. It is unknown whether experienced sonarmen develop expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception that can be measured with the Stroop Color-Word Test (SCWIT).

Objective: To determine whether experienced sonarmen obtain expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception. SCWIT is easily administered and would provide a convenient and practical method of assessing current performance and performance potential.

Approach: This study compared experienced and inexperienced sonar operators on performance of the SCWIT to determine whether experienced sonarmen obtain expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception that may generalize to other tasks.

Results: A first experiment found group differences in one of two sessions favoring experienced operators. A second experiment of four sessions, with samples similar in state anxiety and memory scores, found no significant difference between experienced and inexperienced operators in SCWIT speed or accuracy.

Conclusions: The findings suggest that any expertise experienced sonar operators develop is likely to be content and context specific and that the SCWIT is not sensitive to this specific expertise.

Several studies recently have reported that older, more experienced sonar operators perform somewhat differently than younger, less experienced operators and comparison subjects on a variety of cognitive and personality measures. For example, Kobus, Beeler, and Stashower (1987) and Kobus and Stashower (1988) found that experienced operators have a significantly different distribution of brain electrical activity, recorded during a selective attention task, than nonexperienced operators, and suggested that these results may represent differences between automatic and controlled cognitive processes. Merrill (1990) suggested that experienced operators display significantly different brain activity and that activity may be associated with practiced attentional and evaluative processes. Further, Kobus, Lewandowski, and Flood (1987) administered a battery of cognitive and personality tests to experienced operators and trainees. They found that experienced operators had better perceptual-organizational abilities, greater attention to visual details and less anxiety (state) than inexperienced subjects.

In a similar study that controlled for the confound of age and experience, Lewandowski, Kobus, Flood, and Hoyer (1988) reported that experienced operators outperformed comparison subjects on a sonar simulation task regardless of age. They also found these operators to display a more "reflective" cognitive style, spending more time on visual search tasks and performing with greater accuracy. Overall, these studies cautiously suggest that experienced operators perform better than average, and superior to less experienced peers, on tasks requiring visual attention, perception and organization, particularly when the visual information is embedded in a distracting background.

These findings raise a question as to whether sonar experience might enhance operators' visual perceptual/cognitive abilities. Research has shown that highly practiced and automatized functions can enhance cognitive abilities related to a person's domain of expertise (Bedard & Chi, 1992). Studies on "expert cognition" (Glaser, 1986) have investigated such diverse functions as memory of chess players, reading and comprehension, medical diagnosis and other mental activities which require learning and experience. For the sonar operator the expert domain seems to involve the process of selectively attending to visual and/or auditory signals embedded in a noise background. If this is so, the research question then becomes, does sonar experience enhance operators' general selective attention ability?

It has been demonstrated that sonar operators are better performers on sonar-like task than nonoperators (Lewandowski, et al., 1988), however, we do not know if this superiority is due to enhanced selective attention abilities or merely due to the amount of practice. There is no unbiased way to compare performance between experienced and inexperienced operators on tasks already familiar to the sonar operator. A fair comparison would employ a novel task that assesses selective attention ability, yet is not biased in favor of the sonar operator. Operator superiority on a more "generic" test of selective attention would argue for the development of certain information processing strengths as a result of their job experience.

The Stroop Color-Word Test (SCWIT; Stroop, 1935) has been used for just such a purpose (Dyer, 1973). The SCWIT requires subjects to name the incongruent color of ink with which a word is printed and to ignore semantic content. Color words in congruent ink color (e.g., the word RED printed in red ink) produces faster color-naming responses than color words in incongruent in (e.g., the word RED printed in green ink). This slowing of response has been labeled the "Stroop interference effect." The effect is predicated on response competition, whereby word reading must be suppressed in order to be successful at color naming. Certain elements of this task are similar to sonar operation in that competing and distracting signals must be filtered from visual information containing target stimuli. In this sense, both tasks require selective attending to essential versus unessential visual information, and both need to be performed in a fast and automatic fashion. Based on these similarities, the Stroop was considered to reflect some of the same abilities required in sonar operation, and thus could be used to assess selective attention. Importantly, the Stroop task content was removed enough from sonar operation to make it novel regardless of the subjects previous experience.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether selective attention ability, as assessed by SCWIT performance, is differentially influenced by sonar training and experience. The rationale was that significant sonar experience would create a specialized domain of expertise in the operator along the line of enhanced visual attention, and that this expertise would generalize to other selective attention tasks (i.e., SCWIT). Therefore, the present study compared groups of experienced and inexperienced operators on the SCWIT. Because attention can be easily affected by extraneous variables, thus lowering test reliability, subjects were administered the task twice, and retest reliability was computed. It was expected that all subjects would perform slightly better in the second session due to practice (Reisberg, Baron, & Kemler, 1980). It was also hypothesized that experienced operators would perform the SCWIT faster and with fewer errors than the inexperienced subjects.

The utility of an instrument that assesses selective attention similar to that required in sonar should not be underestimated. Recently, Kobus and Lewandowski (1992) found that most of the 538 sonar operators surveyed listed "attention ability" as the factor most critical to sonar operation. It may be that selective attending, the ability to perform well despite information interference, is a common characteristic among successful sonar operators. A brief test of this characteristic could be of assistance in assessing the performance of prospective and experienced sonarmen.

Method

Subjects

Thirty-two U. S. Navy men were recruited from the Anti-Submarine Warfare School (ASW), San Diego, California, as volunteer subjects. Two groups were formed based on experience level.

The experienced group consisted of 16 subjects who had two or more years of sonar operational experience ($M = 3.22$), they ranged in age from 20 to 23 years ($M = 21.75$). The inexperienced group consisted of 16 subjects with no sonar operational experience or training although they had been selected for training; they ranged in age from 19 to 24 years ($M = 20.75$). Each subject's hearing and visual acuity was self-reported as within normal limits.

Materials

A color-only version of the SCWIT similar to one used by Comalli, Wapner and Werner (1962) was administered to each subject. A sheet of white 8 1/2 by 11 paper was printed with 10 rows of 10 color-words each. Three words denoting color were used: RED, BLUE and GREEN. All words were printed with an incongruent color (their color did not match their lexical representation). The 100 color words were randomly presented in ten rows of ten words each.

Procedure

Subjects completed the SCWIT in a quiet, empty classroom. The test was administered on two occasions with two weeks separating the sessions. Subjects were instructed to verbalize the color of ink in which each word was printed as quickly as possible. They were told not to correct themselves if they made a mistake but to continue to the next word. Subjects were told to begin identifying the colors at the top left-hand corner and to proceed from left to right. To verify subject comprehension of the task, each subject was given 10 practice words to read. Next, the test sheet was placed in front of the subject and a tape recorder was used to record verbal responses. An experimenter timed the length of each session with a stopwatch. The taped responses were scored for number of errors.

Results

Mean SCWIT speed and error scores for each group and both sessions are presented in Table 1. The length of time it took the subjects to complete each session was analyzed by means of a 2 x 2 (Group x Session) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with Session as a within-subject factor. No effect of Group was found. A main effect of Session was statistically significant ($F(1,30) = 9.39, p < .05$). As predicted, subjects took significantly longer to complete the task in the first session ($M = 89.03$ seconds) when compared to the second session ($M = 78.50$ seconds). A Group by Session interaction was found that approached statistical significance ($F(1,30) = 3.52, p = .07$). Exploration of this trend indicated that the inexperienced group took longer to complete the task in the first session, whereas performance was similar for both groups in the second session.

A 2 x 2 (Group x Session) MANOVA was performed on the error rate data with Session as a within-subject factor. A main effect of Session was found ($F(1,30) = 30.19, p < .05$). Subjects made more errors in the first session ($M = 4.03$) than in the second session ($M = 2.00$). There

was a significant Group by Session interaction ($F(1,30) 4.50, p < .05$). These results paralleled the results of the speed-of-response measure. The inexperienced subjects made more errors in the first session; however, in the second session performance was similar for both groups.

Table 1

Mean SCWIT Speed and Error Scores for Each Group and Session

Group	Session 1		Session 2	
	Speed <u>M (SD)</u>	Errors <u>M (SD)</u>	Speed <u>M (SD)</u>	Errors <u>M (SD)</u>
Exp	85.69(22.4)	2.81(3.4)	78.75(15.6)	2.19(1.9)
Inexp	92.38(13.2)	5.25(3.9)	78.25(13.1)	1.81(1.8)

Test-retest Pearson product-moment correlations revealed a significant correlation for speed ($r(32) = .79, p < .001$, but not for errors ($r(32) = .16, p = .19$, two-tailed) which indicates that speed, but not error rate, was reliable from session to session. Pearson correlations were computed between speed and errors for Session One, $r(32) = .15, p = .20$, two-tailed, and Session Two, $r(32) = .25, p = .09$. These low correlations suggested little trade-off between speed and error rate, but rather, showed a slight relation between making errors and slowing performance.

Discussion

The results of the study are mixed. Inexperienced operators appeared to perform more slowly and with more errors in the first session than experienced operators, however, these differences diminished in the second session. The data from this experiment have not answered the question of whether operator experience influences selective attention ability. Had we run just one session we may have concluded prematurely that experienced operators possessed superior selective attention. After two sessions the picture appears to change. The question becomes whether there are truly reliable group differences, or whether initial effects were due to other variables (i.e., anxiety, cognitive differences, too few sessions).

Experiment 2

Based upon the mixed findings of the first experiment it seemed appropriate to repeat the study with several modifications. The most important change was to increase the number of test sessions to clarify the reliability of any group differences between operators with and without experience. Harbeson et al. (1982) suggested that Stroop performance does not asymptote until approximately four sessions, and so the second experiment employed four sessions. A stable finding in support of the hypothesis would show consistent speed and accuracy and advantages for experienced operators across sessions.

We also reasoned that the initial performance of the experienced group may be due to variables such as cognitive abilities or lower state anxiety (Lewandowski et al., 1988). Therefore, in the second experiment additional measures of short-term memory and state anxiety were included. Any group differences on these measures could be partialled out of the Stroop analysis, yielding a more pure comparison on the measure of selective attention.

Method

Subjects

Thirty-six men from the Anti-Submarine Warfare School (ASW) and the Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California were recruited as volunteer subjects. Subjects were selected with and without sonar experience. The inexperienced group consisted of 18 subjects who had no operational sonar, radar, air-traffic control or related experience or training. Their ages ranged from 21 to 41 years ($M = 29.00$, $SD = 6.60$). The experienced group consisted of 18 subjects who had 2 or more years of operational sonar experience ($M = 6.31$, $SD = 2.18$). Their ages ranged from 24 to 35 years ($M = 28.17$, $SD = 3.22$). All subjects' hearing and visual acuity were within normal limits (or corrected to normal) as indicated by self-report.

Materials

Experiment 2 used the same Stroop test used in Experiment 1. The Digit Span subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-R; Wechsler, 1981) was used as a check of short-term memory, a cognitive variable that may have favored one group. The State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger, 1983) was administered to determine whether inexperienced subjects were more test-anxious than experienced operators.

Procedure

The procedure was similar to that in Experiment 1, with the exception of four test sessions at two-week intervals and two additional measures, Digit Span and STAI. The procedure was identical for each session except that the trait portion of the STAI was only administered in the first session. The order of testing for each session was STAI, SCWIT and Digit Span.

Results

To determine the retest reliability of the SCWIT the speed and error measures were subjected to Pearson correlations between sessions (Table 2). As can be seen in Table 2, speed, but not error rate, was reliable over sessions. The correlation between speed and error rate was computed over sessions in order to determine whether a relationship existed between the two measures and no significant correlations were found. The low error-rate correlations may be attributed to the small number of errors and the truncated range which limited the variance among subjects.

Table 2

SCWIT Correlations Over Sessions
(two-tailed)

Sessions	Speed		Errors	
	r	p	r	p
1 & 2	.80	.00	.56	.00
2 & 3	.71	.00	.16	.36
3 & 4	.85	.00	.25	.15

SCWIT Speed

Table 3 shows group means for SCWIT speed (in seconds). SCWIT completion time did not differ significantly between groups, $F(1,34) = .08$, $p < .78$, and thus, there was no support for the hypothesis of enhanced attention abilities for experienced subjects. There was a significant effect of session ($F(3,102) = 98.52$, $p < .01$). Mean times of the entire sample decreased in from session one to session four.

Table 3

SCWIT Speed Scores for Both Groups (in seconds)

Session	Inexperienced		Experienced	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	93.8	12.3	94.3	14.0
2	83.1	13.6	82.6	09.9
3	76.6	11.2	75.5	11.9
4	73.8	09.7	70.9	10.9

SCWIT Errors

Mean group error scores per session are listed in Table 4. The groups did not differ significantly in number of SCWIT errors, $F(1,34) = 1.55$, $p < .22$, again refuting the notion of attention enhancement. There was, however, a significant effect of session ($F(3,102) = 6.76$, $p < .01$). The sample means for sessions one through four were 3.9 (SD = 4.2), 2.1 (SD = 3.1), 1.4 (SD = 1.5), and 1.8 (SD = 2.8), respectively.

Table 4

SCWIT Error Scores for Each Group

Session	Inexperienced		Experienced	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	3.1	3.5	4.7	4.8
2	1.8	2.6	2.5	3.5
3	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.5
4	1.4	2.2	2.2	3.3

State-Trait Anxiety

Mean STAI scores for both groups are presented in Table 5. No significant difference was found between the groups for the state or trait anxiety measures. A significant effect of Session was found for the state measure ($F(3,102) = 4.42, p < .01$), suggesting that state anxiety decreased as test sessions (familiarity) increased. There was no Group by Session interaction.

Table 5

STAI Scores for Both Groups

		Inexperienced		Experienced	
Scale	Session	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Trait	1	34.2	7.0	32.7	6.0
State	1	34.1	8.2	36.6	7.2
	2	32.9	0.4	31.7	7.1
	3	30.9	8.8	30.5	8.8
	4	32.4	10.3	31.4	6.8

WAIS-R Digit Span

Mean scores for the digits forward and backward tasks are presented in Table 6. No significant group effects or interactions were found. A significant effect of session was found for the digits forward ($F(3,102) = 4.80, p < .01$) and digits backward ($F(3,102) = 9.50, p < .01$). Both groups appeared to benefit from practice.

Table 6

WAIS-R Digit Span Scores for Both Groups

		Inexperienced		Experienced	
Task	Session	<u>M</u> Score	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u> Score	<u>SD</u>
Digits Forward	1	09.2	2.3	09.2	2.1
	2	10.1	1.8	09.6	2.4
	3	10.3	1.7	09.7	2.0
	4	09.9	1.8	10.6	1.9
Digits Backwards	1	07.4	1.6	06.7	2.0
	2	08.2	2.2	07.3	2.4
	3	08.6	2.0	08.1	2.5
	4	08.9	2.2	08.1	2.2

Discussion

The results of this experiment indicate that experienced operators do not demonstrate superior selective attention abilities that generalize to other tasks such as the SCWIT. Their superior ability to selectively attend to stimuli may be limited to the specific tasks that they perform as part of their duties and thus may be the result of practice. Kobus et al. (1987) have suggested that experienced operators score significantly higher on tests of visual perceptual ability. This ability, however, does not seem to be related to performance of the SCWIT wherein the verbalization of the distracting stimulus (words) must be suppressed in favor of the target stimulus (colors).

Although the SCWIT may be an index of selective attention ability, it does not distinguish experienced operators from inexperienced subjects. Our results show a distribution of SCWIT speed and accuracy that place both subject groups within the same population. In fact, Experiment 2 found the groups to be very similar on all variables, including the memory and anxiety measures. It appeared that we had a fair comparison of two matched samples with the exception of sonar experience, and that experience did not produce expertise on the Stroop task.

SCWIT speed but not accuracy was shown to be a reliable measure over sessions. Our test-retest reliability coefficients for speed are comparable to those reported in other studies (Harbeson et al., 1982; Jensen, 1965; Jensen & Rohwer, 1966). Therefore, if a genuine difference had existed between groups, it would have been documented by the speed measure. The use of error scores to test the hypothesis is questionable. Retest reliability estimates were rather low and unstable. Regarding error scores, no other report of the test-retest reliability was found in the literature. Accuracy from session to session may not be significantly correlated because of the small number of errors that most of the subjects committed. The small error range also may have contributed to the nonsignificant correlations between speed and errors within sessions. Low error rates might suggest that the SCWIT was not difficult enough to put a strain on attentional resources, and therefore it may not be a sensitive test for detecting the specialized attentional abilities of sonarmen.

Based on our Stroop data collected for different samples across multiple sessions, it appears essential that investigators employ repeated testings and sample replication; otherwise they run the risk of making Type I errors in interpretation. At the same time, it is important that a valid hypothesis is not erroneously rejected. In this study a 10 second difference between groups would have had an 81% chance of being detected. The results, however, showed not only was the difference less than 10 seconds but that the difference on the error measure was opposite from the hypothesized direction.

It appears that the Stroop task is not a valuable tool for assessing the performance of personnel who would be good sonar operators. In this study there were no differences on the Stroop between experienced and inexperienced operators, with similar amounts of variance within each group. It may be that the Stroop task is sufficiently different from a sonar task and novel for all subjects, thus yielding equivalent performances. Another difference between the Stroop task and sonar is the duration of each and the types of attention required. Sonar operation requires long watches (4 to 6 hours) of sustained attention to a variety of auditory and visual stimuli embedded in noise. The Stroop task requires approximately 90 seconds of focused attention on static visual stimuli with two features (color and color names). The requirements of the Stroop task may be too far removed from those in sonar to expect an advantage for

experienced (expert) sonarmen.

Research in the area of "expert cognition" (Glaser, 1986) has suggested that persons who are highly experienced/practiced in a particular skill (i.e., chess, radiology) are able to maintain high levels of performance of the skill throughout age. Therefore, even older experts, who may show declines in certain cognitive or motor tasks, do not evidence a decline in performance of the specialized skill (Bedard & Chi, 1992 for review). Such findings suggest that the development of an expertise which is resilient to aging effects and other forms of degradation, is relegated to a narrow content or skill domain. It may be that such an expertise is confined to the sonar task itself and does not generalize to other tangential tasks such as the Stroop. To capture the expertise of sonarmen, investigators may need to develop simulations or a test battery that contains the essential ingredients of sonar (e.g., vigilance, sustained attention, signal sensitivity).

References

- Bedard, J., & Chi T. H. (1992). Expertise. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1(4), 135-139.
- Comalli, P., Wapner, S., & Werner, H. (1962). Interference effects of stroop color-word test in childhood, adulthood, and aging. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 100, 47-52.
- Dyer, F. (1973). The stroop phenomena and its use in the study of perceptual, cognitive, and response processes. Memory and Cognition, 1, 106-120.
- Glaser, R. (1986). On the nature of expertise. In F. Klix and H. Hagendorf (eds.), Human Memory and Cognitive Abilities (pp. 915-928). New York: Elsevier Science Publishers.
- Harbeson, M., Krause, M., Kennedy, R., & Bittner, A. (1982). The stroop as a performance evaluation test for environmental research. The Journal of Psychology, 111, 223-233.
- Jensen, A. R. (1965). Scoring the stroop test. Acta Psychologica, 24, 398-408.
- Jensen, A., Rohwer, W. (1966). The stroop color-word test: A review. Acta Psychologica, 25, 36-93.
- Kobus, D., Beeler, M., & Stashower, K. (1987). Electrophysiological effects of experience during an auditory task. NHRC Technical Report 87-2. Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.
- Kobus, D., & Lewandowski, L. (1992). Critical factors in sonar operation: A survey of experienced operators. NHRC Technical Report 92-30. Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.

- Kobus, D., Lewandowski, L., & Flood, M. (1987). Cognitive and personality characteristics of experienced sonar operators. NHRC Technical Report 87-15. Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.
- Kobus, D., & Stashower, K. (1988). A further investigation of experience and task difficulty on the event-related potential. NHRC Technical Report 88-30. Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.
- Lewandowski, L., Kobus, D., Flood, M., & Hoyer, W. (1988). The effects of age and experience on sonar performance. Technical Report 88-29. Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.
- Merrill, L. (1990). The effect of sonar experience on the event-related brain potential. Doctoral dissertation. University Microfilms, INC., Ann Arbor, MI.
- Reisberg, D., Baron, J., & Kessler, D. (1980). Overcoming stroop interference: The effects of practice on distractor potency. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 6, 140-150.
- Schneider, W., & Shiffrin, R. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search, and attention. Psychological Review, 84, 1-66.
- Stroop, R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 18, 643-662.
- Spielberger, C. (1983). Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory. Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc. Palo Alto, CA.
- Wechsler, D. (1981). Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. New York, NY: The Psychological Corporation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)

2. REPORT DATE
MAY 93

3. REPORT TYPE AND DATE COVERED
Final

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Selective Attention Abilities of Experienced Sonar Operators

5. FUNDING NUMBERS
Program Element: 62233N-
Work Unit Number: NM33PO.005-
6003

6. AUTHOR(S) Lex L. Merrill, Lawrence J. Lewandowski,
David A. Kobus, and Daniel E. Braun

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Naval Health Research Center
P. O. Box 85122
San Diego, CA 92186-5122

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION
Report No. 92-38

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Naval Medical Research and Development Command
National Naval Medical Center
Building 1, Tower 2
Bethesda, MD 20889-5606

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING
AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared in collaboration with Lawrence J. Lewandowski, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. Other authors are at the Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA.

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

Problem: Sonarmen listen to and interpret complex auditory and visual signals for thousands of hours over a period of years. It is unknown whether experienced sonarmen develop expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception that can be measured with the Stroop Color-Word Test (SCWIT).

Objective: To determine whether experienced sonarmen obtain expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception.

Approach: This study compared experienced and inexperienced sonar operators on performance of the SCWIT to determine whether experienced sonarmen obtain expertise in the area of visual selective attention and perception that may generalize to other tasks.

Results: A first experiment found group differences in one of two sessions favoring experienced operators. A second experiment of four sessions, with samples similar in state anxiety and memory scores, found no significant difference between experienced and inexperienced operators in SCWIT speed or accuracy.

Conclusions: The findings suggest that any expertise experienced sonar operators develop is likely to be content and context specific and that the SCWIT is not sensitive to this specific expertise.

14. SUBJECT TERMS

attention; perception; expertise; selection

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

15

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT

Unclassified

18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

Unclassified

19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT

Unclassified

20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT

Unlimited