

Report No. CG-D-15-94

AD-A283 206



1

Conspicuity of Aids to Navigation: Temporal Patterns for Flashing Lights

Kevin Laxar
and
Sandra L. Benoit

Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory
Groton, CT 06349



FINAL REPORT
MARCH 1993

DTIC
ELECTE
AUG 10 1994
S B D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

This document is available to the U.S. public through the
National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

Prepared for:

U.S. Coast Guard
Research and Development Center
1082 Shennecossett Road
Groton, CT 06340-6096

278

94-24992



and

U.S. Department Of Transportation
United States Coast Guard
Office of Engineering, Logistics, and Development
Washington, DC 20593-0001

94 8 08 072

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

NOTICE

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for its contents or use thereof.

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the Coast Guard Research & Development Center. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.



D. L. Motherway
D. L. Motherway
Technical Director, Acting
United States Coast Guard
Research & Development Center
1082 Shennecossett Road
Groton, CT 06340-6096

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. CG-D-15-94		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Conspicuity of Aids to Navigation: Temporal Patterns for Flashing Lights				5. Report Date March 1993	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
				8. Performing Organization Report No. R&DC 07/93	
7. Author(s) Kevin Laxar and Sandra L. Benoit		9. Performing Organization Name and Address Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory Groton, CT 06349			
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center 1082 Shennecossett Road Groton, Connecticut 06340-6096		10. Work Unit No. (TRAVIS)			
		11. Contract or Grant No. MIPR Z51100-1-E27A57			
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report			
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code			
15. Supplementary Notes Coast Guard R&D Center COTR: Dr. Marc Mandler, 203-441-2615					
16. Abstract <p>Mariners frequently have trouble picking out lighted aids to navigation in harbors and other areas that have a high density of background lights. The U.S. Coast Guard is seeking ways to enhance the conspicuity, or likelihood of being noticed, of these aids. Literature has shown that a flashing light is more conspicuous than a light that is not flashing. This investigation sought to improve conspicuity by finding the optimal flash characteristics for a light on a background of steady lights. Twenty observers searched for a flashing point source of light among backgrounds of steady lights of various numerosities on a computer controlled CRT screen. They indicated which of the five screen sectors contained the flashing target, and the computer recorded the accuracy and response time. Targets were flashed at the rates of 1, 2 and 3.85 Hz, each at duty cycles of 0.3, 0.5, and 0.8 (proportion of total time on). After a brief practice period, each observer completed 360 trials in a single one-hour session. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed significant effects of frequency, duty cycle, and background light density. Search time increased as the number of background lights increased. Conspicuity improved as frequency increased and as duty cycle decreased. The flash pattern that provides the greatest conspicuity consumes the least amount of electrical energy, an important consideration for an aid to navigation. The results can be used as guidelines for the flash characteristics of lighted aids to navigation.</p>					
17. Key Words aids to navigation conspicuity target detection flashing stimuli			18. Distribution Statement flash rate visual displays visual search vision		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED		20. SECURITY CLASSIF. (of this page) UNCLASSIFIED		21. No. of Pages	22. Price

METRIC CONVERSION FACTORS

Approximate Conversions to Metric Measures		Approximate Conversions from Metric Measures		
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
in	inches	* 2.5	centimeters	cm
ft	feet	30	centimeters	cm
yd	yards	0.9	meters	m
mi	miles	1.6	kilometers	km
AREA				
in ²	square inches	6.5	square centimeters	cm ²
ft ²	square feet	0.09	square meters	m ²
yd ²	square yards	0.8	square meters	m ²
mi ²	square miles	2.6	square kilometers	km ²
acres	acres	0.4	hectares	ha
MASS (WEIGHT)				
oz	ounces	28	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.45	kilograms	kg
	short tons (2000 lb)	0.9	tonnes	t
VOLUME				
tsp	teaspoons	5	milliliters	ml
tbsp	tablespoons	15	milliliters	ml
fl oz	fluid ounces	30	milliliters	ml
c	cups	0.24	liters	l
pt	pints	0.47	liters	l
qt	quarts	0.95	liters	l
gal	gallons	3.8	liters	l
ft ³	cubic feet	0.03	cubic meters	m ³
yd ³	cubic yards	0.76	cubic meters	m ³
TEMPERATURE (EXACT)				
°F	Fahrenheit temperature	5/9 (after subtracting 32)	Celsius temperature	°C
TEMPERATURE (EXACT)				
°C	Celsius temperature	9/5 (then add 32)	Fahrenheit temperature	°F

* 1 in = 2.54 (exactly).




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND.....	1
3. OBJECTIVE	3
4. METHOD.....	3
4.1 Observers.....	3
4.2 Apparatus and Display	4
4.3 Procedure.....	5
5. RESULTS.....	6
5.1 Response Time	6
5.2 Error Rate.....	9
6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	10
7. REFERENCES.....	11
APPENDIX A - SUMMARIZED DATA TABLES.....	A-1

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/ _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist.	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Stimulus display, showing the five search sectors.....	5
2. Mean response time for three duty cycles by number of background lights, collapsed across frequency.	7
3. Mean response time for three frequencies by number of background lights, collapsed across duty cycle.	8
4. Mean response time for three frequencies by duty cycle, collapsed across background.....	8
5. Mean response for three frequencies at three duty cycles by number of background lights.....	9

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	
1. Flash characteristics of target.....	4
2. Summary of ANOVA for response times.	6
3. Error frequency and percent by flash condition.	9
A-1. Figure 2 Support Data	A-1
A-2. Figure 3 Support Data	A-1
A-3. Figure 4 Support Data	A-2
A-4. Figure 5 Support Data	A-3
A-5. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Duty Cycle	A-4
A-6. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Duty Cycle (cont'd)	A-5
A-7. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Period	A-6
A-8. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Period (cont'd)	A-7
A-9. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Background	A-8
A-10. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Background (cont'd)	A-9

1. INTRODUCTION

Lights used by the U.S. Coast Guard as aids to navigation are typically point sources that are easily confused with the background clutter of lights on shore. The problem is especially severe along channels and in harbors, where the density of background lights is high (Worthey, 1988) but accurate navigation is most important. This problem is one of conspicuity of signals. Conspicuity refers to the likelihood that a stimulus will be noticed: "Conspicuous objects are easily noticed, whereas inconspicuous ones require as a rule considerable search time" (Engel, 1971).

2. BACKGROUND

Over 20 years ago, a working group (Benson, Brown, Douglas, Riney, Taylor, & Duntley, 1971) looked into the problem of conspicuity of navigation lights in harbors, and made two recommendations: first, that research be conducted to improve conspicuity, and second, that legal regulations be instituted that would control the lights that interfere with the conspicuity of navigation lights. The latter has never occurred. The present research supplements previous efforts that have addressed the first recommendation.

To summarize previous results, we see that conspicuity is, not surprisingly, dependent upon such physical characteristics of the target signal as size, luminance, contrast, flashing, movement, and distinctive spatial characteristics, and it is also affected by the characteristics of the surround, such as the number of distractors (Boersema, Zwaga, & Adams, 1989). A difference in size between target and background is more effective in increasing conspicuity than is a difference in luminance (Jenkins & Cole, 1982). And when mean size and luminance are held constant, an increase in the variability of the size of the background stimuli decreases the conspicuity of a given target (Cole & Jenkins, 1984). High density backgrounds cause less reduction in conspicuity of large targets than small ones (Mandler, 1989). Flashing lights have greater conspicuity than fixed lights (continuously on, or steady) (Mandler, 1989). Conspicuity increases with velocity; horizontal movement of a vertical line segment is more effective than horizontal movement of a horizontal line segment or a dot, and horizontal movement increases the conspicuity of a horizontal line and a dot equally (Mori, 1985).

In considering these findings for application to navigation lights, there are practical limits to their use. The size of navigation lights can be increased only to a very limited extent. For example, at a distance of only two nautical miles, a beacon subtending a visual angle of only 10 min arc would have to be 10.7 m (35 ft.) long. As noted above, there is usually no control over the clutter of background lights, and producing a moving beacon is expensive. Consequently, we must often be satisfied with small increments when making improvements in conspicuity.

One obvious method for improving conspicuity is to increase the luminance or contrast of a light compared with the background lights, but this too can be done only within rather narrow limits. Unless the lights are ashore, increasing their intensity often requires larger batteries and solar panels to provide the energy. The Coast Guard therefore desires signals with greater attention getting power without the consumption of more electrical power.

Literature suggests that another method for improving the conspicuity of a signal is to have it blink, or flash, which could also decrease power consumption. The following studies have

shown that flashing lights can be an effective attention getting device, although little research has been done to date on their use as navigation lights in harbors.

In a series of studies, Gerathewohl determined conspicuity by measuring the observer's speed of response to a light signal while performing visual and auditory distractor tasks. In one study (Gerathewohl, 1953), he found that conspicuity of a signal flashing at 1 Hz with a duty cycle (the proportion of time that the light is on during its total cycle) of 0.2 on a background of distractor lights was better than a steady signal, but only under low brightness contrast conditions. In a subsequent study, Gerathewohl (1954) found that at low contrast, conspicuity increased as frequency increased from 1 Hz to 4 Hz at a 0.5 duty cycle. At higher contrast levels, the frequency effect was not significant. In a third study Gerathewohl (1957) investigated the conspicuity of lights flashing at 0.33 Hz, 1 Hz, and 3 Hz at each of two flash durations, 0.1 sec and 0.2 sec. Increases in both frequency and contrast, but not duration, produced significant increases in conspicuity. At either high contrast or high frequency, a change in the other factor had little effect on conspicuity. The flash durations that were used confounded the effect of duty cycle.

Katchmar and Azrin (1956) studied the effectiveness of warning lights in a paired comparison paradigm. Subjects viewed a side-by-side pair of 1.8 deg diameter stroboscopic lights that flashed at 1 to 60 Hz and made judgments of which was the more effective warning signal. Maximum judged effectiveness was at 10 Hz. The effects of flash intensity, duty cycle, or background were not investigated.

As part of a display coding study, Smith and Goodwin (1971) compared search times for finding blinking versus non-blinking targets in CRT displays of alphanumeric items of four characters each. A 3 Hz flash rate at 0.5 duty cycle was used for the targets. A significant reduction in search time was found with blink coding for each of the three display densities tested, 20, 60, and 100 items.

Response time for observers to distinguish whether a large single light was flashing or steady was measured by Markowitz (1971). Flash rates ranged from 0.31 to 10 Hz, each at duty cycles of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8. As one would expect, he found that signals that gave flash information earlier after trial onset afforded faster response times, which decreased with increasing flash rate and lower duty cycle.

Connors (1975) studied the conspicuity of point source steady and flashing lights of several brightnesses seen against a simulated star background. She found that flashing lights were acquired more frequently and more quickly than steady lights, although no differences were found for the four flash rates used, 1 Hz through 4 Hz, all at a duty cycle of 0.5. Increasing target luminance consistently improved performance.

In their study of air traffic control displays, Thackray and Touchstone (1991) redundantly coded target shape with flashing and/or color and measured detection time. The targets flashed at 4 Hz with a duty cycle of 0.5, and the screen background contained numerous changing symbols. Results showed that flashing targets were detected significantly faster than the non-flashing or colored targets.

Laxar and Luria (1993) studied a range of flash rates and duty cycles in a task in which observers searched for a flashing annulus within a field of 49 steady annuli of the same size. Flash rates were 1, 2, and 4 Hz at each of five duty cycles, from 0.1 to 0.9. Results showed

that search time was significantly less with faster flash rates and lower duty cycles with the relatively large stimuli used in that study.

In a laboratory study to directly investigate a signal light's conspicuity on a background of lights, Mandler (1989) measured search time to find a small horizontal bar of light of various sizes within a background of point source lights on a CRT screen. Targets subtended 1.8 arc min in thickness and from 5.3 to 28.0 arc min in length, and were either fixed on, as were the background lights, or flashing at 1 Hz with a duty cycle of 0.3, the typical Quick Flashing characteristic of lighted aids to navigation. It was found that search time significantly increased (conspicuity was reduced) with smaller target lengths and as the number of background lights increased from 0 to 400 lights per display screen. A greater number of background lights markedly increased search time for small targets, but had minimal effect on the largest targets. Flashing targets showed increased conspicuity over fixed targets at the smaller lengths, but not at the greater lengths. In addition, the number of background lights reduced conspicuity of the fixed targets much more than of the flashing lights. It was suggested that flash patterns other than the one used here be studied in the future to see if reducing the time between flashes improves conspicuity.

In a field study associated with the above experiment, Mandler (1989) installed seven target lights, consisting of vertical bars of light from 5 to 14 min arc, on the waterfront of a harbor. Conspicuity was measured by the proportion of observers that correctly located a target within a set period of time from target onset. Targets that were larger or that were viewed against a lower density of background lights yielded a higher probability of detection. It was noted that background lights in a harbor are not all point sources, but that there are a great number of vertical and horizontal light sources caused by reflections off various surfaces. It was therefore suggested that targets with oblique orientations, as well, be examined in future studies to see if they afford increased conspicuity.

3. OBJECTIVE

As an extension of Mandler's (1989) investigations, the present studies were conducted with the objective of determining the conspicuity of lights of various flash characteristics and spatial configurations against backgrounds of small lights. In the first experiment, described here, the conspicuity of a small light on backgrounds of various numbers of steady lights was determined for nine different flash patterns. Response time to find a target was taken as a measure of conspicuity. This study was conducted to determine the optimal flash patterns for use on aids to navigation and in ensuing investigations of the conspicuity of various spatial configurations of lights, to be reported subsequently.

4. METHOD

4.1 Observers

Twenty volunteers served in this experiment, six men and fourteen women, nine of whom were paid subjects and the remainder laboratory staff. Their ages ranged from 21 to 62 years, with a median age of 32 years. All had normal visual acuity or were corrected for the eye-to-screen viewing distance. Most had experience as psychophysical observers.

4.2 Apparatus and Display

Stimuli were presented on a high resolution (1024 x 768 pixels) 48.3 cm (19 inch) color display driven by a Hewlett-Packard Series 9000 Model 320 computer. All stimuli were white in color. Each pixel on the display subtended approximately 2.0 arc min at the 61 cm viewing distance. Observers sat in a chair facing the screen, with their head position maintained by a chin-forehead rest. Targets were single flashing pixels, 2 arc min per side. On any given trial they were flashed in one of nine flash patterns, combinations of three frequencies, 1 Hz, 2 Hz, and 3.85 Hz, and three duty cycles, approximately 0.3, 0.5, or 0.8. The actual timings are given in Table 1, and were constrained by the 20 ms clock interval of the computer system.

Table 1. Flash characteristics of target.

Frequency (Hz)	Duration On (ms)	Duration Off (ms)	Total Period (ms)	Duty Cycle
3.85	80	180	260	0.31
2.0	160	340	500	0.32
1.0	300	700	1000	0.30
3.85	120	140	260	0.46
2.0	240	260	500	0.48
1.0	500	500	1000	0.50
3.85	200	60	260	0.77
2.0	400	100	500	0.80
1.0	800	200	1000	0.80

Background lights, always fixed on, were square and either 2 or 4 arc min per side. At these subtenses all stimuli looked like points of light.

The target was placed randomly within the search area, a rectangle 35 cm wide x 10 cm high (32 deg x 9.5 deg), which was divided into five equal-size sectors. Observers searched for the target and indicated the sector in which the target was found by pressing one of five corresponding response buttons on a keypad. The computer recorded the response time and sector chosen.

Four levels of background, 0, 50, 200, or 400 lights per display screen, were presented in random order. These lights were placed randomly within the search area such that each light was at least 12 arc min (6 pixels) from its nearest neighbor. This separation minimized the effects of spatial summation, by which nearby lights can summate and produce an area that appears brighter than the individual lights. Target lights were also randomly placed on the screen, and were at least 12 arc min from any background light. An example of a stimulus display is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1.
Stimulus display, showing the five search sectors.

The luminances of the stimuli were set so that the target light and the two sizes of background lights had the same average level of detectability. This was done to help ensure that the conspicuity of a target was purely a function of its flash pattern and not confounded by brightness. To do this, the mean brightness threshold, the average luminance to just detect the light, was measured beforehand in a group of 10 observers. In separate sessions, thresholds were determined by means of a modified staircase procedure using 1-second stimulus exposures. For the experiment, the luminance for all targets was 13 cd/m^2 , 30 times the single pixel threshold. The luminances of the background lights were randomly set at between 23 and 47 times their respective thresholds so that their mean luminances (13 cd/m^2 for the single pixel and 5 cd/m^2 for the 2×2 pixels) were 30 times their thresholds, just as the targets were. The luminance of the screen without any target or background lights was approximately 0.04 cd/m^2 , equivalent to a scene illuminated with a full moon. Luminance levels were measured with a Spectra Prichard Photometer, Model 1980 (Photo Research Division, Kollmorgen Corp.)

4.3 Procedure

Instructions were presented and the observer was seated in a darkened room for five minutes to adapt to the low level of screen luminance. After 36 practice trials to familiarize the observer with the task, the experiment was begun. The session consisted of 360 trials, combinations of 3 frequencies \times 3 duty cycles \times 4 background densities \times 10 repetitions (blocks).

At the start of each trial, a tone sounded to alert the observer. The background lights and target came on the screen simultaneously and the observer started searching for the target. When the target was found, the observer pressed the key corresponding to the sector in which it was located, and the computer recorded the sector chosen and the response time to the nearest 20 ms. If an incorrect sector was chosen, the computer sounded a tone to inform the observer, and that trial was rerun later in the session. If the target was not found in 20 seconds, the background lights were extinguished and the target remained on the screen for several seconds to inform the observer of its location. The trial was then terminated and a response time of 20 seconds was recorded. The experimental session took approximately 55 minutes to complete.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Response Time

Mean response times (RT) of all 20 observers were calculated for each experimental condition in each of the 10 blocks of trials. The means were then subjected to a logarithm₁₀ transformation to bring the RT distributions closer to normal distributions. This is often done on RT data to reduce skewness and make the variances of the distribution homogeneous, as required for subsequent parametric analyses.

A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) with main effects of duty cycle, frequency, background, (summarized in Tables A-5 through A-10 in Appendix A) and block was computed on the log mean RT data from the 20 observers. All main effects were significant. Table 2 summarizes the results of this ANOVA.

Table 2. Summary of ANOVA for response times.

Source	df	F
Duty Cycle (D)	2, 38	97.7**
Frequency (F)	2, 38	158.0**
Background (B)	3, 57	176.3**
Block	9, 171	2.2 *
D x F	4, 76	12.1**
D x B	6, 114	34.5**
F x B	6, 114	40.3**
D x F x B	12, 228	5.8**

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.001$

Figure 2 shows the response time by duty cycle for the four background densities. In this figure, as well as in Figures 3 and 4, each data point represents the mean of 600 observations. At a background of 0 (no background lights) RT for all duty cycles was -0.13 log sec (0.74 sec, typical for choice RT). With any number of background lights present, however, RT increased markedly, and showed slight increases from 50 to 400 lights. Duty cycles of 0.3 and 0.5 produced very similar RTs, whereas the 0.8 duty cycle produced much longer RTs, and was the source of the significant Duty Cycle x Background interaction. Tabular summaries of the data gathered during the experiments are provided in Tables A-1 through A-3 in Appendix A.

As a post hoc test of the differences among the four background means, the Peritz technique (Martin & Toothaker, 1989), a refinement of the Newman-Keuls procedure, was used. This showed that all means were significantly different from each other ($p < 0.01$) except for the 200 and 400 lights. The Peritz test also showed that the duty cycles of 0.3 and 0.5 were not significantly different from each other, but were both significantly different from the 0.8 duty cycle ($p < 0.01$).




Figure 2.
Mean response time for three duty cycles by number of background lights, collapsed across frequency.

Figure 3 presents the three frequencies as a function of background. The Peritz test indicated that the means for all three frequencies were significantly different from each other ($p < 0.01$). The 3.85 Hz frequency, however, fell between the other two, a result that was unexpected. We then examined the significant Duty Cycle x Frequency interaction, as illustrated in Figure 4. We see that, generally, RT increases with both duty cycle and frequency, but because the 3.85 Hz frequency at the 0.8 duty cycle produces the longest RT of all, the mean RT for that frequency was pulled above that of 2 Hz.




Figure 3.
Mean response time for three frequencies by number of background lights, collapsed across duty cycle.




Figure 4.
Mean response time for three frequencies by duty cycle, collapsed across background.

The triple interaction of Duty Cycle x Frequency x Background is illustrated in Figure 5. Here, each data point represents the mean of 200 observations. RTs for duty cycles of 0.3 and 0.5 at frequencies of 2 Hz and 3.85 Hz are substantially faster than the rest, with the 0.8 duty cycle at the 3.85 Hz frequency slower than the rest.

RT means showed a small (12%) increase over blocks during the experimental session, suggesting a slight fatigue effect. There was no interaction of block with flash characteristics, however.

Prior to these analyses, the data were examined to determine the frequency of time-outs, trials in which the observer could not find the target and for which a search time of 20 sec was assigned. The time-out rate was extremely low, only 14 out of the 7200 trials. Interestingly, all were at the 0.8 duty cycle. Since they were so infrequent and approximately equally distributed across flash frequency and background density, their effect was negligible on the means reported here.




Figure 5. Mean response for three frequencies at three duty cycles by number of background lights.

5.2 Error Rate

Errors, trials on which the observer indicated the wrong sector as containing the target, were rerun later in that block so that all observers had an RT score for every trial. The computer kept track of the errors, however. The error rate was low, 2.5%, with the highest number of errors occurring at the 0.8 duty cycle and at the flash frequency of 1 Hz. Table 3 gives the error frequencies by flash condition.

Table 3. Error frequency and percent by flash condition.

Frequency (Hz)	Duty Cycle			Total
	0.3	0.5	0.8	
1.0	24	27	34	85 (48%)
2.0	12	16	14	42 (24%)
3.85	12	3	35	50 (28%)
Total	48 (27%)	46 (26%)	83 (47%)	177 (100%)

While error rate was nearly evenly distributed across the three background light conditions, even the 0 background condition showed errors, evidence of the observers trying to minimize their RTs. This may have been the cause of many of the errors, especially at the 1 Hz frequency, where observers may have been trying to "jump the gun."

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results obtained in this study are in keeping with those found previously by Gerathewohl (1954, 1957) and by Laxar and Luria (1993), which indicate that conspicuity improves with an increase in frequency and with a decrease in duty cycle. Both of these studies were quite different than the one reported here, however. Gerathewohl had observers indicate the appearance of a relatively large light stimulus in a known location while performing auditory and visual distractor tasks. In his study of flash characteristics (Gerathewohl, 1957), frequency was confounded with duty cycle, so that conclusions about the optimal duty cycle can not be drawn.

In the Laxar and Luria (1993) experiment, the stimuli used were large (0.23 deg to 1.26 deg) annuli, very different from the small points of light seen along a shoreline. In addition, only one small number (49) of background stimuli were used, rather than the high numerosity typically encountered in a marine navigation setting.

The results of the present study show that when there are no background lights, conspicuity of a flashing light as measured by search time is virtually the same for the nine flash patterns tested. With the presence of background lights, however, it is clear that duty cycles of 0.3 and 0.5 afford superior conspicuity to the 0.8 duty cycle (Figure 2). This result is fortunate in regard to electrical energy requirements, an important consideration for an aid for navigation. The duty cycle that is most conspicuous also consumes the least energy, since the light is on for the smallest proportion of time.

Figure 4 shows that for duty cycles of both 0.3 and 0.5, the 3.85 Hz frequency yields slightly faster search times than the 2 Hz, both of which are much faster than the 1 Hz. Figure 5 shows that this holds true over all densities of background lights. The reason for the unusually long search time for the 3.85 Hz frequency at a duty cycle of 0.8 can be seen in Table 1. Here, we see that the light is on for 200 ms and off for only 60 ms during its cycle. Evidently, that 60 ms off time was too short to be readily perceived by the observers. This condition produced not only the longest search times, to the point of causing the only time-outs in the experiment, but also produced the highest error rate, as shown in Table 3. The timing of the stimuli on the display screen was verified by measurements using a fast-response photodiode and oscilloscope. They indicated that the appearance of the stimuli was not influenced by artifacts due to computer timing or persistence of the display screen phosphors.

We conclude that for maximum conspicuity of a lighted aid to navigation used against a background of small steady lights, a higher frequency, such as 4 Hz, and a lower duty cycle, such as 0.3 should be used. With the use of different experimental apparatus, this study could be extended to include higher frequencies and lower duty cycles, as suggested by the Katchmar and Azrin (1956) study, which found that stroboscopic flashes of 10 Hz were judged better warning signals.

7. REFERENCES

- Benson, W., Brown, J. L., Douglas, C. A., Riney, J., Taylor, J. H., & Duntley, S. Q. (1971). *The effects of background lighting on the usefulness of navigation lights*. Washington, DC: USCG Office of Research and Development.
- Boersema, T., Zwaga, H. J. G., & Adams, A. S. (1989). Conspicuity in realistic scenes: An eye-movement measure. *Applied Ergonomics*, 20, 267-273.
- Cole, B. L., & Jenkins, S. E. (1984). The effect of variability of background elements on the conspicuity of objects. *Vision Research*, 24, 261-270.
- Connors, M. M. (1975). *Conspicuity of target lights: The influence of flash rate and brightness* (Report No. NASA TN D-7961). Moffett Field, CA: NASA Ames Research Center.
- Engel, F. L. (1971). Visual conspicuity, directed attention and retinal locus. *Vision Res.* 11, 563-576.
- Gerathewohl, S. J. (1953). Conspicuity of steady and flashing light signals: Variation of contrast. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 43, 567-571.
- Gerathewohl, S. J. (1954). Conspicuity of flashing light signals of different frequency and duration. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 48, 247-251.
- Gerathewohl, S. J. (1957). Conspicuity of flashing light signals: Effects of variation among frequency, duration, and contrast of the signals. *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, 47, 27-29.
- Jenkins, S. E., & Cole, B. L. (1982). The effect of variability of background elements on the conspicuity of objects. *Vision Research*, 22, 1241-1252.
- Katchmar, L. T., & Azrin, N. H. (1956). *Effectiveness of warning lights as a function of flash rate* (Technical Memorandum No. 23). Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: U. S. Army Human Engineering Laboratory.
- Laxar, K., & Luria, S. M. (1993). *Flashing stimuli and viewing discomfort*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Mandler, M. B. (1989). *Conspicuity of aids to navigation: Extended light sources* (Report No. RD&C 03/89). Groton, CT: U.S. Coast Guard Research and Development Center.
- Markowitz, J. (1971). Optimal flash rate and duty cycle for flashing visual indicators. *Human Factors*, 13, 427-433.
- Martin, S. A., & Toothaker, L. E. (1989). PERITZ: A FORTRAN program for performing multiple comparisons of means using the Peritz Q Method. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 21, 465-472.

Mori, T. (1985). Visual conspicuity of a moving dot, horizontal line segment or vertical segment. *Vision Research*, 25, 1083-1088.

Smith, S. L., & Goodwin, N. C. (1971). Blink coding for information display. *Human Factors*, 13, 283-290.

Thackray, R. I., & Touchstone, R. M. (1991). Effects of monitoring under high and low taskload on detection of flashing and coloured radar targets. *Ergonomics*, 34, 1065-1081.

Worthey, J. A. (1988). *Lights of New York Harbor* (Report No. NBSIR 88-3807). Gaithersburg, MD: National Bureau of Standards.

APPENDIX A - SUMMARIZED DATA TABLES

Table A-1. Figure 2 Support Data

OBS	Duty Cycle	No. Background Lights	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	0.3	0	600	600	0.40	2.46	0.7396	0.2386	-0.13100
2	0.3	50	600	600	0.52	7.22	1.3931	0.9476	0.14398
3	0.3	200	600	600	0.50	11.38	1.442	1.0741	0.15963
4	0.3	400	600	600	0.56	11.10	1.5058	1.1657	0.17777
5	0.3	0	600	600	0.36	3.94	0.7366	0.2602	-0.13277
6	0.3	50	600	600	0.54	6.40	1.4196	0.8756	0.15217
7	0.3	200	600	600	0.54	10.14	1.5522	1.2145	0.19095
8	0.3	400	600	600	0.52	8.54	1.5642	1.1234	0.19429
9	0.3	0	600	600	0.40	2.82	0.7336	0.2248	-0.13454
10	0.3	50	600	600	0.58	20.00	2.2359	2.1509	0.34945
11	0.3	200	600	600	0.58	20.80	2.6219	2.9740	0.41862
12	0.3	400	600	600	0.58	20.00	2.6943	2.8445	0.43045

Table A-2. Figure 3 Support Data

OBS	Period (msec)	No. Background Lights	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	260	0	600	600	0.42	3.94	0.7326	0.2460	-0.13513
2	260	50	600	600	0.52	20.00	1.6281	2.0784	0.21168
3	260	200	600	600	0.50	20.00	1.7833	2.4857	0.25122
4	260	400	600	600	0.52	20.00	1.9017	2.5700	0.27914
5	500	0	600	600	0.36	2.76	0.7358	0.2368	-0.13324
6	500	50	600	600	0.56	10.90	1.4552	1.0619	0.16292
7	500	200	600	600	0.56	20.38	1.6100	1.7737	0.20683
8	500	400	600	600	0.56	20.00	1.6814	1.6644	0.22567
9	1000	0	600	600	0.38	2.82	0.7414	0.2419	-0.12995
10	1000	50	600	600	0.62	7.22	1.9854	1.0611	0.29345
11	1000	200	600	600	0.64	20.80	2.2250	1.6723	0.34733
12	1000	400	600	600	0.72	11.10	2.1813	1.4527	0.33872

Table A-3. Figure 4 Support Data

OBS	Duty Cycle	Period (msec)	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	0.3	260	800	800	0.42	7.48	1.0475	0.6407	0.02015
2	0.3	500	800	800	0.42	10.12	1.1553	0.7607	0.06269
3	0.3	1000	800	800	0.40	11.38	1.6093	1.3114	0.20664
4	0.5	260	800	800	0.44	6.28	1.0516	0.7221	0.02185
5	0.5	500	800	800	.036	8.36	1.1653	0.7226	0.06644
6	0.5	1000	800	800	0.38	10.14	1.7376	1.3082	0.23995
7	0.8	260	800	800	0.40	20.38	1.7913	2.0928	0.25317
8	0.8	500	800	800	0.42	20.00	2.4352	3.3600	0.38653
9	0.8	1000	800	800	0.40	20.80	1.9878	1.46828	0.29637

Table A-4. Figure 5 Support Data

OBS	Duty Cycle	Flash On	Period (msec)	No. Bkgnd Lights	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	0.3	80	260 4 Hz	0	200	200	0.42	2.44	0.7399	0.2335	-0.13083
2	0.3	80		50	200	200	0.52	3.22	1.0931	0.5307	0.03866
3	0.3	80		200	200	200	0.50	7.46	1.1159	0.7603	0.04763
4	0.3	80		400	200	200	0.56	6.64	1.2410	0.7709	0.09377
5	0.5	120	260 4 Hz	0	200	200	0.44	3.94	0.7445	0.2993	-0.12814
6	0.5	120		50	200	200	0.54	5.52	1.1078	0.7085	0.04446
7	0.5	120		200	200	200	0.54	5.72	1.1379	0.7145	0.05610
8	0.5	120		400	200	200	0.52	6.28	1.2161	0.8267	0.08497
9	0.3	160	500 2 Hz	0	200	200	0.42	2.02	0.7478	0.2459	-0.12621
10	0.3	160		50	200	200	0.56	3.98	1.2110	0.6783	0.08314
11	0.3	160		200	200	200	0.56	4.98	1.2561	0.6909	0.09902
12	0.3	160		400	200	200	0.56	10.12	1.4063	1.0400	0.14808
13	0.8	200	260 4 Hz	0	200	200	0.42	1.72	0.7134	0.1936	-0.14667
14	0.8	200		50	200	200	0.58	20.00	2.6833	3.2466	0.42867
15	0.8	200		200	200	200	0.58	20.00	3.0962	3.8615	0.49083
16	0.8	200		400	200	200	0.58	20.00	3.2480	3.9616	0.51162
17	0.5	240	500 2 Hz	0	200	200	0.36	2.76	0.7267	0.2651	-0.13864
18	0.5	240		50	200	200	0.60	4.54	1.2569	0.5997	0.09930
19	0.5	240		200	200	200	0.64	8.36	1.3085	0.8559	0.11677
20	0.5	240		400	200	200	0.60	6.32	1.3689	0.8186	0.13637
21	0.3	300	1000 1 Hz	0	200	200	0.40	2.46	0.7312	0.2371	-0.13596
22	0.3	300		50	200	200	0.62	7.22	1.8752	1.2665	0.27305
23	0.3	300		200	200	200	0.64	11.38	1.9606	1.4162	0.29239
24	0.3	300		400	200	200	0.72	11.10	1.8702	1.4833	0.27189
25	0.8	400	500 2 Hz	0	200	200	0.40	1.48	0.7329	0.1945	-0.13496
26	0.8	400		50	200	200	0.78	10.90	1.8977	1.5094	0.27823
27	0.8	400		200	200	200	0.76	20.38	2.2654	2.7588	0.35514
28	0.8	400		400	200	200	0.76	20.00	2.2691	2.4629	0.35585
29	0.5	500	1000 1 Hz	0	200	200	0.38	1.56	0.7385	0.2091	-0.13165
30	0.5	500		50	200	200	0.90	6.40	1.8942	1.0467	0.27743
31	0.5	500		200	200	200	0.90	10.14	2.2102	1.5905	0.34443
32	0.5	500		400	200	200	0.88	8.54	2.1077	1.3463	0.32381
33	0.8	800	1000 1 Hz	0	200	200	0.40	2.82	0.7544	0.2756	-0.12240
34	0.8	800		50	200	200	1.24	6.44	2.1268	0.8825	0.32773
35	0.8	800		200	200	200	1.16	20.80	2.5041	1.9322	0.39865
36	0.8	800		400	200	200	1.02	7.62	2.5659	1.4450	0.40924

Table A-5. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Duty Cycle

OBS	SUBJ	Duty Cycle	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	1	0.3	120	120	0.42	3.52	0.8833	0.5273	-0.05389
2	1	0.5	120	120	0.44	6.64	0.9965	0.8615	-0.00152
3	1	0.8	120	120	0.40	4.42	1.1602	0.7295	0.06453
4	2	0.3	120	120	0.46	11.10	1.7130	1.6509	0.23376
5	2	0.5	120	120	0.38	5.88	1.6512	1.2274	0.21780
6	2	0.8	120	120	0.48	12.44	2.6112	2.3224	0.41684
7	3	0.3	120	120	0.50	4.32	1.1225	0.6582	0.05019
8	3	0.5	120	120	0.52	5.34	1.2125	0.8282	0.08368
9	3	0.8	120	120	0.54	11.56	1.8918	1.6495	0.27688
10	4	0.3	120	120	0.40	2.60	0.7683	0.3223	-0.11447
11	4	0.5	120	120	0.36	3.48	0.8982	0.5251	-0.04663
12	4	0.8	120	120	0.40	3.86	1.1272	0.5957	0.05200
13	5	0.3	120	120	0.48	2.48	0.7948	0.2738	-0.09974
14	5	0.5	120	120	0.46	1.60	0.8052	0.2580	-0.09410
15	5	0.8	120	120	0.46	8.88	1.1308	0.8983	0.05339
16	6	0.3	120	120	0.76	9.02	2.0013	1.3022	0.30131
17	6	0.5	120	120	0.74	8.54	2.1035	1.4003	0.32294
18	6	0.8	120	120	0.72	20.00	4.5250	3.8862	0.65562
19	7	0.3	120	120	0.52	7.22	1.3813	1.0028	0.14029
20	7	0.5	120	120	0.52	5.90	1.5002	1.0075	0.17615
21	7	0.8	120	120	0.56	10.38	2.3565	1.9423	0.37227
22	8	0.3	120	120	0.60	6.66	2.0098	1.2939	0.30315
23	8	0.5	120	120	0.66	10.14	2.0710	1.6039	0.31618
24	8	0.8	120	120	0.60	20.00	3.7870	3.6224	0.57830
25	9	0.3	120	120	0.46	3.54	1.1695	0.5601	0.06800
26	9	0.5	120	120	0.48	6.30	1.2442	0.7319	0.09489
27	9	0.8	120	120	0.50	3.92	1.5023	0.7499	0.17676
28	10	0.3	120	120	0.54	3.02	1.0855	0.4160	0.03583
29	10	0.5	120	120	0.50	3.28	1.1582	0.4942	0.06378
30	10	0.8	120	120	0.62	3.14	1.3900	0.6066	0.14301

Table A-6. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Duty Cycle (cont'd)

OBS	SUBJ	Duty Cycle	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
31	11	0.3	120	120	0.58	11.38	2.2223	1.8686	0.34680
32	11	0.5	120	120	0.58	8.36	2.4288	1.8438	0.38539
33	11	0.8	120	120	0.62	20.80	5.6823	5.9055	0.75452
34	12	0.3	120	120	0.56	2.80	0.9550	0.3032	-0.02000
35	12	0.5	120	120	0.48	3.04	1.0152	0.4122	0.00855
36	12	0.8	120	120	0.58	3.44	1.2660	0.5923	0.10243
37	13	0.3	120	120	0.56	4.06	1.0638	0.4883	0.02686
38	13	0.5	120	120	0.54	3.94	1.0403	0.4326	0.01716
39	13	0.8	120	120	0.52	3.82	1.2073	0.4932	0.08182
40	14	0.3	120	120	0.50	4.52	1.0090	0.5209	0.00389
41	14	0.5	120	120	0.48	5.28	1.0895	0.5699	0.03723
42	14	0.8	120	120	0.48	5.48	1.3887	0.8208	0.14261
43	15	0.3	120	120	0.44	6.80	1.3165	0.8928	0.11942
44	15	0.5	120	120	0.54	6.88	1.3630	0.9540	0.13450
45	15	0.8	120	120	0.54	13.14	2.2200	1.9748	0.34635
46	16	0.3	120	120	0.52	6.48	1.1688	0.7831	0.06774
47	16	0.5	120	120	0.48	2.96	1.0450	0.4803	0.01912
48	16	0.8	120	120	0.48	4.14	1.3870	0.6862	0.14208
49	17	0.3	120	120	0.56	7.46	1.2643	0.7495	0.10185
50	17	0.5	120	120	0.50	4.64	1.2478	0.6559	0.09614
51	17	0.8	120	120	0.52	8.12	1.6348	1.0810	0.21346
52	18	0.3	120	120	0.66	6.92	1.5018	0.9472	0.17661
53	18	0.5	120	120	0.66	5.30	1.5002	0.8797	0.17615
54	18	0.8	120	120	0.64	20.00	2.4453	2.2920	0.38833
55	19	0.3	120	120	0.52	3.96	1.0905	0.6103	0.03763
56	19	0.5	120	120	0.48	4.98	1.0490	0.6168	0.02078
57	19	0.8	120	120	0.52	7.88	1.5407	1.2601	0.18772
58	20	0.3	120	120	0.44	3.50	0.8922	0.4477	-0.04954
59	20	0.5	120	120	0.48	3.02	0.9438	0.4216	-0.02512
60	20	0.8	120	120	0.44	3.16	1.1745	0.5980	0.06985

Table A-7. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Period

OBS	SUBJ	Period (msec)	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	1	260	120	120	0.42	3.02	0.7985	0.4244	-0.09773
2	1	500	120	120	0.40	4.42	0.8753	0.5577	-0.05784
3	1	1000	120	120	0.44	6.64	1.3662	0.9534	0.13551
4	2	260	120	120	0.48	12.44	1.8770	2.1839	0.27346
5	2	500	120	120	0.46	6.32	1.5330	1.0417	0.18554
6	2	1000	120	120	0.38	11.10	2.5653	1.9483	0.40914
7	3	260	120	120	0.52	11.56	1.3022	1.3736	0.11468
8	3	500	120	120	0.50	4.16	1.1532	0.6207	0.06190
9	3	1000	120	120	0.52	8.54	1.7715	1.3096	0.24834
10	4	260	120	120	0.42	3.86	0.8052	0.5059	-0.09410
11	4	500	120	120	0.36	2.76	0.8877	0.4140	-0.05173
12	4	1000	120	120	0.40	3.48	1.1008	0.5717	0.04171
13	5	260	120	120	0.46	8.88	0.8687	0.8209	-0.06113
14	5	500	120	120	0.46	1.18	0.7817	0.1834	-0.10696
15	5	1000	120	120	0.50	3.52	1.0805	0.5168	0.03362
16	6	260	120	120	0.82	20.00	3.0668	3.6720	0.48669
17	6	500	120	120	0.72	14.62	2.6205	2.3795	0.41838
18	6	1000	120	120	0.74	9.02	2.9425	1.9031	0.46872
19	7	260	120	120	0.52	10.38	1.5463	1.6996	0.18929
20	7	500	120	120	0.52	7.30	1.5157	1.1459	0.18061
21	7	1000	120	120	0.58	7.22	2.1760	1.3719	0.33766
22	8	260	120	120	0.62	20.00	2.8670	3.5524	0.45743
23	8	500	120	120	0.62	11.36	2.2295	1.7386	0.34821
24	8	1000	120	120	0.60	10.14	2.7713	1.8817	0.44268
25	9	260	120	120	0.50	3.60	1.1117	0.5630	0.04599
26	9	500	120	120	0.46	3.92	1.2270	0.5787	0.08884
27	9	1000	120	120	0.52	6.30	1.5773	0.8383	0.19791
28	10	260	120	120	0.54	2.12	1.0382	0.3079	0.01628
29	10	500	120	120	0.50	3.12	1.1078	0.4401	0.04446
30	10	1000	120	120	0.56	3.28	1.4877	0.6555	0.17252

Table A-8. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Period (cont'd)

OBS	SUBJ	Period (msec)	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
31	11	260	120	120	0.58	20.00	3.9310	5.1684	0.59450
32	11	500	120	120	0.58	20.38	3.2370	3.8735	0.51014
33	11	1000	120	120	0.62	20.80	3.1655	2.6991	0.50044
34	12	260	120	120	0.58	3.18	0.9298	0.3619	-0.03161
35	12	500	120	120	0.58	2.16	0.9840	0.3028	-0.00700
36	12	1000	120	120	0.48	3.44	1.3223	0.5946	0.12133
37	13	260	120	120	0.52	3.94	0.9745	0.3936	-0.01122
38	13	500	120	120	0.54	4.06	1.0563	0.4925	0.02379
39	13	1000	120	120	0.62	3.06	1.2807	0.4870	0.10745
40	14	260	120	120	0.52	4.96	1.1048	0.6650	0.04328
41	14	500	120	120	0.48	2.88	1.0218	0.4273	0.00937
42	14	1000	120	120	0.50	5.48	1.3605	0.8142	0.13370
43	15	260	120	120	0.56	13.14	1.7205	1.9979	0.23565
44	15	500	120	120	0.44	7.20	1.2965	0.7741	0.11277
45	15	1000	120	120	0.52	6.88	1.8825	1.1633	0.27473
46	16	260	120	120	0.56	4.98	1.0542	0.6257	0.02292
47	16	500	120	120	0.50	2.82	1.0112	0.3740	0.00484
48	16	1000	120	120	0.48	6.48	1.5355	0.8204	0.18625
49	17	260	120	120	0.50	8.12	1.3200	1.0619	0.12057
50	17	500	120	120	0.52	4.96	1.2497	0.6434	0.09681
51	17	1000	120	120	0.54	4.64	1.5773	0.8096	0.19791
52	18	260	120	120	0.64	20.00	1.8327	2.2385	0.26309
53	18	500	120	120	0.68	6.58	1.6607	1.0896	0.22029
54	18	1000	120	120	0.66	6.92	1.9540	1.1320	0.29092
55	19	260	120	120	0.48	7.88	1.2463	1.2115	0.09562
56	19	500	120	120	0.50	3.28	1.0350	0.5217	0.01484
57	19	1000	120	120	0.50	5.26	1.3988	0.8267	0.14576
58	20	260	120	120	0.44	3.16	0.8332	0.3719	-0.07925
59	20	500	120	120	0.46	2.48	0.9287	0.4096	-0.03212
60	20	1000	120	120	0.48	3.50	1.2487	0.6162	0.09646

Table A-9. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Background

OBS	SUBJ	No. Bkgnd Lights	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
1	1	0	90	90	0.40	0.94	0.5533	0.1014	-0.25704
2	1	50	90	90	0.54	4.42	1.1184	0.6861	0.04880
3	1	200	90	90	0.50	4.34	1.1749	0.7599	0.07000
4	1	400	90	90	0.56	6.64	1.2067	0.8833	0.08160
5	2	0	90	90	0.38	1.56	0.6478	0.2265	-0.18856
6	2	50	90	90	0.70	8.76	2.1698	1.6441	0.33642
7	2	200	90	90	0.72	7.76	2.2693	1.6932	0.35589
8	2	400	90	90	0.74	12.44	2.8802	2.3006	0.45942
9	3	0	90	90	0.50	1.04	0.7007	0.1262	-0.15447
10	3	50	90	90	0.70	7.82	1.6302	1.1374	0.21224
11	3	200	90	90	0.74	11.56	1.7753	1.6418	0.24927
12	3	400	90	90	0.72	5.70	1.5296	0.9484	0.18458
13	4	0	90	90	0.36	2.76	0.5527	0.2930	-0.25751
14	4	50	90	90	0.52	3.22	0.9969	0.4502	-0.00135
15	4	200	90	90	0.52	3.86	1.1098	0.6315	0.04524
16	4	400	90	90	0.52	2.78	1.0656	0.4290	0.02759
17	5	0	90	90	0.46	2.82	0.5956	0.2460	-0.22505
18	5	50	90	90	0.58	3.52	0.9678	0.3812	-0.01421
19	5	200	90	90	0.62	3.52	0.9851	0.3786	-0.00652
20	5	400	90	90	0.58	8.88	1.0927	0.9353	0.03850
21	6	0	90	90	0.72	2.46	1.1353	0.3215	0.05511
22	6	50	90	90	0.98	20.00	3.0507	2.5693	0.48440
23	6	200	90	90	0.90	20.00	3.3962	3.2435	0.53099
24	6	400	90	90	1.02	16.08	3.9242	2.9801	0.59375
25	7	0	90	90	0.52	1.54	0.7156	0.1499	-0.14533
26	7	50	90	90	0.68	7.22	1.8087	1.0573	0.25737
27	7	200	90	90	0.72	7.30	2.1744	1.4316	0.33734
28	7	400	90	90	0.74	10.38	2.2853	1.9396	0.35894
29	8	0	90	90	0.60	1.50	0.9342	0.2420	-0.02956
30	8	50	90	90	0.94	10.88	2.7802	1.9996	0.44408
31	8	200	90	90	0.96	20.00	3.3567	2.9472	0.52591
32	8	400	90	90	0.92	20.00	3.4193	3.0216	0.53394
33	9	0	90	90	0.46	1.34	0.7240	0.1448	-0.14026
34	9	50	90	90	0.72	3.60	1.5056	0.6918	0.17771
35	9	200	90	90	0.68	6.30	1.4833	0.7995	0.17123
36	9	400	90	90	0.68	3.92	1.5084	0.6123	0.17852
37	10	0	90	90	0.50	1.80	0.7756	0.1760	-0.11036
38	10	50	90	90	0.66	3.02	1.3431	0.4645	0.12811
39	10	200	90	90	0.70	2.72	1.2973	0.4860	0.11304
40	10	400	90	90	0.62	3.28	1.4289	0.6084	0.15500

Table A-10. Mean LOG RTs of Correct Responses by Background (cont'd)

OBS	SUBJ	No. Bkgnd Lights	No. Observations	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	STD Deviation	LOGRT Mean
41	11	0	90	90	0.58	1.66	0.8851	0.2161	-0.05301
42	11	50	90	90	0.74	20.00	3.6100	3.0768	0.55751
43	11	200	90	90	0.82	20.80	4.9542	5.1508	0.69497
44	11	400	90	90	0.86	20.00	4.3287	4.4955	0.63636
45	12	0	90	90	0.48	1.10	0.7213	0.1119	-0.14188
46	12	50	90	90	0.70	3.18	1.2098	0.4816	0.08271
47	12	200	90	90	0.66	3.44	1.2133	0.5683	0.08397
48	12	400	90	90	0.72	2.76	1.1704	0.3895	0.06833
49	13	0	90	90	0.52	3.94	0.8091	0.3687	-0.09200
50	13	50	90	90	0.66	2.60	1.1222	0.3597	0.05007
51	13	200	90	90	0.70	4.06	1.2722	0.5763	0.10456
52	13	400	90	90	0.64	3.06	1.2118	0.4363	0.08343
53	14	0	90	90	0.48	1.34	0.6873	0.1563	-0.16285
54	14	50	90	90	0.64	4.52	1.2747	0.6558	0.10541
55	14	200	90	90	0.64	5.28	1.3327	0.7015	0.12473
56	14	400	90	90	0.68	5.48	1.3549	0.7427	0.13191
57	15	0	90	90	0.44	1.84	0.7762	0.2106	-0.11003
58	15	50	90	90	0.62	10.04	1.7749	1.2719	0.24917
59	15	200	90	90	0.60	7.20	1.9949	1.5667	0.29992
60	15	400	90	90	0.64	13.14	1.9867	1.7484	0.29813
61	16	0	90	90	0.48	1.18	0.7242	0.1563	-0.14014
62	16	50	90	90	0.64	3.24	1.3269	0.5875	0.12284
63	16	200	90	90	0.62	6.48	1.3700	0.8653	0.13672
64	16	400	90	90	0.68	4.98	1.3800	0.6429	0.13988
65	17	0	90	90	0.50	1.74	0.7498	0.1657	-0.12505
66	17	50	90	90	0.68	4.54	1.4411	0.6636	0.15869
67	17	200	90	90	0.86	7.46	1.6289	0.9120	0.21189
68	17	400	90	90	0.76	8.12	1.7096	1.0680	0.23289
69	18	0	90	90	0.54	1.20	0.8102	0.1160	-0.09141
70	18	50	90	90	0.82	20.00	2.1391	2.1346	0.33023
71	18	200	90	90	0.82	11.34	2.0896	1.4910	0.32006
72	18	400	90	90	0.89	6.92	2.2242	1.3762	0.34717
73	19	0	90	90	0.48	1.16	0.6358	0.1083	-0.19668
74	19	50	90	90	0.50	4.98	1.3064	0.7378	0.11608
75	19	200	90	90	0.68	7.88	1.4407	0.9483	0.15857
76	19	400	90	90	0.66	7.26	1.5240	1.1746	0.18298
77	20	0	90	90	0.44	1.06	0.5980	0.1024	-0.22330
78	20	50	90	90	0.54	3.50	1.0813	0.4806	0.03395
79	20	200	90	90	0.60	3.16	1.1364	0.5197	0.05553
80	20	400	90	90	0.60	3.00	1.1982	0.5519	0.07853

[BLANK]