ADA 043525 AFOSR-TR- 77-1014	ANIATION RESEARCH LABORATORY           INSTITUTE OF AVIATION           UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
	TECHNICAL REPORT
<b>XA</b> .	INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE BRANIMIR SVERKO
AD NO.	ARL - 77 - 4 / AFOSR - 77 - 4 JANUARY 1977 DDC UCCOMPAND AUG 30 1977 AUG 30 1977 JUCCOMPAND B Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. PREPARED FOR AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC REBEARCH AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC REBEARCH AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (AFSC) NOTICE OF TRANSMITTAL TO DDC This technical report has been reviewed and is approved for public release IAW AFR 190-18 (7b). Distribution is unlimited. A. D. BLOSE Technical Information Officer

كغذ العلية على الاتحاد

€-

ŧ,



	1.7
	- 31
	- 5
	- 22
	7.5
	<b>C</b> <sub>2</sub>
	- 5
	-1 Y
	100
	1.0
	2.6
	1.5
	- 64
	B
	19 P
	2.5
	85
	B.S
	25
	-17
	÷.
	12.
	$\mathbf{r}$
	÷.,
	S
	Τ.
· · ·	SAL .
	÷.
- B	έT.
1.1	÷.
- No.	

# FOREWORD

The research reported herein was performed by Dr. Branimir Sverko during the spring of 1976 as a part of his year of studies and research as a Fullbright Scholar at the Aviation Research Laboratory. Dr. Sverko is Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Zagreb.

ACCESSION for	
NTIS DDC UNANNOUNCED JUSTIFICA'IO3	White Section 🖬 Buff Section 🔲
BY DISTRIBUTION/	AVAI! ABILITY CODES
A	-

Territor S

17

In the

Trave average

ì !

# INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

Ţ

1

Ability assessment is traditionally based on a "serial" approach, in which discrete sub-tests of a battery are administered one by one. Some authors have recently stressed the need for a "parallel" approach, in which two or more assessment tasks could be administered simultaneously. There is a belief that such an approach might be more appropriate, especially for predicting some complex skill -- such as flying -- which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and information overload.

Passey and McLaurin (1966), for example, suggested such an approach. After a comprehensive review of current aircrew selection procedures, they recommended several improvements. One of the recommendations was that the assessment battery "should permit the administration of more than one test concurrently to provide a more precise estimation of individual capacity" (p. 94). More recently, Waldeisen (1974) and Dannhaus and Halcomb (1975) emphasized this recommendation. They suggested again that the traditional, serial approach should be replaced by, or complemented with, the parallel one which is a better analogue of a complex realworld performance.

Inherent in these recommendations is the supposition that the ability structure underlying concurrent-task performance differs from the ability structure underlying solitary performance of the same task. Why should this be the case?

One possibility is that individuals consistently differ in some kind of "time-sharing ability" which, of course, should operate only under concurrent-task conditions, but not under single-task conditions. Some authors do accept, more or less explicitly, the notion of such an ability. This notion is implicit in all aviation-related research efforts which have used time-sharing tasks for assessment purposes. For example, Trankell (1959) used a tapping task time-shared with a problem-solving task to assess what he called "simultaneous capacity"; Damos (1972) used a cross-adaptive tracking task coupled with a secondary informationprocessing task to assess "residual attention"; and North and Gopher (1976) used an elaborate time-sharing performance measurement system to assess what is supposed to be an "unconfounded measure of subject attention capacity." All of these labels, apparently, refer to some more general characteristic of individual, which transcends the particular combination of tasks used to measure it. Yet, since this characteristic is supposedly elicited under time-sharing conditions, it can be equated with the notion of a general time-sharing ability, whatever the particular label attached to it.

There are also more explicit designations of time-sharing as an ability. Under the auspices of NASA, an integrated battery of tests was developed to measure the primary dimensions of perceptual-motor performance (Parker, <u>et al.</u>, 1965). Time-sharing, defined as "the ability to obtain and utilize information presented within more than a single visual display" (p. 14) was included in the eighteen abilities measured by the battery.

-2-

3

÷.

1

Levine, Romashko, and Fleishman (1973) also referred to time-sharing as an ability. In a study concerned with the evaluation of their ability classification system for integrating human performance data, they classified vigilance studies in terms of four abilities required by the tasks used. One of these abilities was time-sharing, defined as "ability to utilize information obtained by shifting between two or more channels of information." Finally, in a current effort to develop a battery of information-processing tasks, Pew and Adams (1975) planned out the use of time-shared tasks on the basis that the "ability to manage several concurrent activities has obvious relevance for pilot performance." (p. 21).

However, experimental evidence that demonstrates the existence of the general time-sharing ability is lacking, and the present study sought to provide such evidence. To support the notion of the time-sharing ability, one has to show that individual differences in time-sharing performance are both relatively unrelated to individual differences in single-task performance and invariant with different combinations of time-shared tasks. Accordingly, four different tasks were used in the present study; and subjects performed the tasks singly, one by one, as well as concurrently, in all possible two-task combinations. The performance obtained under solitary and concurrent conditions were intercorrelated, and factor analyzed in an attempt to ascertain whether a time-sharing factor, which would account for concurrent-task performance, could be identified.

-3-

The second

Trans-

......

and the second

# METHOD

-4-

### Tasks

The second se

3

1.

Four tasks which elicited different psychomotor and mental functions were selected for the study. All of them were relatively simple, i.e., they required little learning and, also, it was possible to score each task performance by only one performance measure. When administered concurrently, the tasks in general did not physically interfere one with another. Following is the description of the tasks.

<u>Rotary Pursuit Task (PR)</u>. This task measured a subject's proficiency in making coordinated rhythmical hand-movements. The subject's task was to manipulate a stylus with his right hand so as to maintain the contact between the point of the stylus and the round brass target embedded in a revolving bakelite disk. The apparatus employed has been described elsewhere (Melton, 1947). Time-on-target performance was recorded in units of .001 min. on a standard electric timer.

Digit Processing Task (DP). This was a ten-choice, self-paced serial reaction time task. The subjects had to respond to transilluminated digits, 0 through 9, which appeared in a random sequence on a small display located directly above a scrambled 10-button keyboard. As a digit appeared, the subject had to extinguish it by pressing the correspondingly numbered button with his left index finger. A digit remained illuminated until the correct button was pressed, and then a new digit immediately appeared. The number of digits extinguished per minute was the performance measure. <u>Mental Arithmetic Task (MA)</u>. The task was to count backwards by three's. Immediately prior to the trial, the subject was presented with a three-digit number from which he was to count backwards by three's, aloud and as rapidly as possible. His counting was tape-recorded. The number of correct counts per minute was the performance measure.

Auditory Discrimination Task (AD). This was a two-choice serial reaction time task requiring the subject to press the appropriate foot pedal in responses to tones differing in pitch. The subject had to press a pedal with his right or left foot depending on whether a high or a low tone was presented through a speaker. The tone remained on until a pedal was pressed. Then, after a 2-second delay, a new randomly selected tone was presented. Separate counters recorded the number of correct and incorrect responses, and cumulative reaction times were recorded by a Heathkit timer. However, since there were only a few incorrect responses, only the average reaction time was used as a performance measure.

# Subjects

Sixty right-handed female undergraduates of the University of Illinois served as subjects for the present study. At the time of experiment all of them were in good health, and without any verified sensory or motor deficiences. The subjects were naive as to the goals of this investigation, and none of them had any previous experience with any of the tasks used.

-5-

and the end of the second s The second sec

# Procedure

18

¢.

}

31

: [

During the experiment the subjects were seated behind a desk supporting all the apparatus. The digit-processing-task display was located ten inches to the left of the center of the pursuit-roter disk, both in front of the subject, and the loud speaker was embedded in the partition wall in front of the subject's face. The experimenter, with the recording equipment, was seated behind the partition wall.

The subjects, who were run one at a time, first practiced the tasks singly. Three one-minute practice trials were given for each of the tasks. Following the practice trials, the subjects performed the tasks singly as well as concurrently, in the following sequence of trials: 1. PR, alone; 2. DP, alone; 3. MA, alone; 4. AD, alone; 5. PR with DP; 6. MA with AD; 7. PR with MA; 8. DP with AD; 9. PR with AD; 10. DP with MA. Each of the trials within a sequence lasted for a minute and they were separated by one-minute rests. After the sequence was completed, the subjects were allowed a five-minute rest, and then the sequence was repeated twice. In that way each subject received thirty one-minute trials, or three trials per each task condition.

The subjects performed the dual-task combinations under the instruction of equal task priority. Prior to each dual-task trial they were reminded of the necessity to pay an equal amount of their attention to each of the two tasks performed concurrently.

-6-

# RESULTS

# Reliability of Subject's Performance

A REALING

Sixteen performance measures were obtained on each of the three sequences of trials: performance on each of the four tasks when performed singly as well as when performed concurrently with each of the other three tasks. Trial-to-trial reliabilities of these sixteen variables are shown in Table 1.

The first three columns of the Table 1 show the product-moment correlations of subjects' performance between the first and second trial, the second and third trial, and the first and third trial, respectively. The average reliabilities, computed by using Fisher's r to Z transformations, are shown in the fourth column. They range from .75 to .93, indicating that a high consistency of performance was obtained with the trials of only one minute in duration.

It will be seen, by comparing the single-task performance reliabilities (values underlined) with the dual-task performance reliabilities (values not underlined), that only a slight shrinkage of reliability occurred under the time-sharing conditions. High reliabilities of time-sharing performances indicate that the amount of attention allocated by a subject to one of a pair of concurrently performed tasks was very constant throughout the experiment.

	r <sub>1,2</sub>	<sup>r</sup> 2,3	<sup>r</sup> 1,3	rav
PR	0.86	0.87	0.73	0.83
PR(DP)	0.75	0.87	0.69	0.78
PR(MA)	0.80	0.82	0.71	0.78
PR(AD)	0.83	0.84	0.75	0.81
DP	0.85	0.88	0.79	0.84
DP (PR)	0.83	0.87	0.78	0.83
DP (MA)	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.82
DP (AD)	0.86	0.87	0.89	0.87
MA	0.91	0.94	0.90	0.92
MA(PR)	0.92	0.93	0.86	0.91
MA(DP)	0.90	0.92	0.86	0.90
MA (AD)	0.89	0.87	0.81	0.86
AD	0.92	0.94	0.92	0.93
AD(PR)	0.80	0.82	0.77	0.80
AD(DP)	0.70	0.82	0.70	0.75
AD (MA)	0.77	0.87	0.76	0.81

TRIAL-TO-TRIAL RELIABILITIES OF PERFORMANCE MEASURE

TABLE 1

Note:

N = 60.

PR denotes the solitary performance of the PR task; PR(DP), PR(MA), and PR(AD) denote the performance of the same task when performed concurrently with the tasks DP, MA, and AD, respectively. Accordingly, DP denotes the solitary performance of the DP task; DP(PR) denotes the performance of the same task when performed concurrently with the PR task; etc.

# 

が行う。ためたのである

Ĩ.

37

\*

# Time-sharing Decrements

The attempt to execute two tasks simultaneously usually yields a degradation in performance of at least one of the tasks. This degradation, i.e., lowered level of performance in dual-task conditions as compared with the performance levels of singly performed tasks, is known as time-sharing decrement. It is reasonable to expect that the "timesharing ability," if it exists, should be elicited primarily under high task-interference conditions which are indicated by the presence of pronounced time-sharing decrements. Figures 1 to 4 may be used to discern whether such decrements occurred in the present data.

The figures depict the mean performances of each of the tasks, summed beforehand across the three trials. The far left bar on each figure represents the single-task performance while the other three bars represent the time-sharing performances of the same task. It is evident that a decrement in performance, in some instances a very profound one, occurred under each time-sharing condition. Four separate, one-way, within-subject analyses of variance followed by Dunnett's <u>t</u>-statistic comparisons (Winer, 1971, p. 202) were performed to evaluate the significance of the timesharing decrements. The results of these analyses (presented in Figures 1 to 4) revealed that all decrements were statistically significant. Intercorrelations and Factor Analysis

Table 2 shows the product-moment correlations among the sixteen performance variables. In computing the correlations subjects' scoreon each trial were treated as separate observations to yield a total of 180 observations (60 Ss by 3 trials each). The correlations were then computed across these 180 observations. (An alternative analysis with

-9-



ų,

1

Figure 1. Mean Performance of the Rotary Pursuit Task (Time on target per minute in units of .001 min.) Overall significance of of differences among the above means: F(3,177) = 213.26, <u>p</u> < .001. Dunnett's <u>t</u> values for differences between the first mean (PR) and each of the remaining three means: 22.13, <u>p</u> < .001; 2.09, <u>p</u> <.05; and 2.75, <u>p</u> < .01; respectively.</p>



Figure 2. Mean Performance of the Digit Processing Task (Number of digits extinguished per minute). Overall significance of differences among the above means: F(3,177 = 1098.83, p < .001. Dunnett's <u>t</u> values for differences between the first mean (DP) and each of the remaining three means: 42.46, 49.41, and 13.41, respectively (all significant at p < .001).



Figure 3. Mean Performance of the Mental Arithmetic Task (Number of correct counts per minute). Overall significance of differences among the above means: F(3,177) = 224.31, p < .001. Dunnett's t values for differences between the first mean (MA) and each of the remaining three means: 9.42, 39.60, and 25.24, respectively (all significant at p < .001).





4. Mean Performance of the Auditory Discrimination Task (Average reaction time in milliseconds). Overall significance of differences among the above means: F(3,177) = 184.74, p < .001. Dunnett's t values for differences between the first mean (AD) and the remaining three means: -5.25, -16.00, and -20.94, respectively (all significant at p < .001).</p>

(Av of across-the-trials summed data, i.e., with N = 60, was also performed. The two analyses yielded essentially similar results.)

Ties

11

As can be seen, all of the intercorrelations are positive in sign, ranging in size from .897 to .019. The correlations of each task solitary performance with the same task time-sharing performances (i.e., the three far upper values of each of the columns 1, 5, 9, and 13) are among the largest correlations in Table 2. This indicates that individual differences in single-task performance are closely related to individual differences in time-sharing performances. Next to them, and approximately equal in size, are the correlations among the time-sharing performances of the same tasks (i.e., the correlations within each of the following groups of variables: 2, 3, and 4; 6, 7, and 8; 10, 11, and 12; and 14, 15, and 16). All of the remaining correlations are generally smaller in magnitude. Thus four taskspecific factors are suggested.

The matrix of Table 2 was next submitted to a principal component analysis (unities in the principal diagonal). Since four task-specific factors and, possibly, a general time-sharing factor were expected, five principal components (factors) were extracted in the first computer run; and subsequently rotated by the Binormamin method to a simple oblique solution. However, the examination of the eigen value summary table revealed only four eigen roots in excess of 1.00, with the first four principal components accounting for 78.63% of the total performance variance. The fifth principal component had an associated eigen root of only .66, and accounted for only 4.13% of the total variance. Thus, by the customary standards applied to such data, the fifth principal component could hardly be considered more than a trivial source of variance.

-12-

I

I

To the state of

A \*\*\* C.22 . .

-----• •

and all the second 

:::

1.111

1. i Ż

. . . .

Contracting to the local

i

# TABLE 2

# INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PERFORMANCE MEASURES (N-180)

1. PR 2. PR (DP) . 677 3. PR (AD) . 674 . 590 4. PR (AD) . 842 . 707 . 718 5. DP . 420 . 375 . 292 . 423 6. DP (PR) . 366 . 018 . 188 . 262 . 469 7. DP (MA) . 338 . 330 . 334 . 397 . 447 . 339 8. DP (AD) . 421 . 343 . 334 . 434 . 788 . 557 . 555 9. Ma . 297 . 259 . 481 . 316 . 331 . 190 . 363 . 349 . 897 10. MA (PR) . 387 . 339 . 326 . 140 . 235 . 349 . 897 11. MA (DP) . 247 . 278 . 426 . 339 . 336 . 349 . 897 12. M(AD) . 325 . 294 . 480 . 336 . 349 . 897 13. AD . 351 . 325 . 234 . 438 . 182 . 402 . 489 . 358 . 346 . 283 . 3326 14. AD (PR) . 366 . 413 . 373 . 402 . 559 . 550 . 556 . 354 . 351 . 444 . 739 15. AD (MA) . 366 . 413 . 373 . 402 . 529 . 401 . 635 . 364 . 361 . 313 . 362 . 660 . 719 16. AD (MA) . 364 . 360 . 468 . 411 . 399 . 188 . 557 . 559 . 467 . 439 . 386 . 530 . 634 . 712 . 715 . 715		1	2	æ	4	5	9	٢	က	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
RR (DF)         .671           RR (MA)         .674         .590           RR (MJ)         .842         .707         .718           PF (1)         .842         .707         .718           PF (1)         .842         .707         .718           PF (1)         .846         .188         .262         .469           PF (MJ)         .336         .330         .334         .397         .447         .339           PF (MJ)         .421         .343         .397         .447         .339         .334         .339         .334         .339         .334         .339         .334         .339         .334         .349         .867         .555           A(DT)         .421         .349         .363         .349         .897         .897         .897           A(PT)         .387         .334         .431         .190         .363         .349         .897           A(PT)         .387         .339         .334         .893         .346         .894         .804           A(PT)         .387         .447         .293         .349         .897         .444         .739           A(PT)         .392	l. PR																
RP (MA)         .674         .590           ?R (AD)         .842         .707         .718           ?R (AD)         .842         .707         .718           ?P (PR)         .366         .018         .188         .262         .469           ?P (MA)         .338         .330         .334         .397         .447         .339           ?P (MA)         .338         .330         .334         .331         .190         .361           ?P (MA)         .338         .330         .334         .331         .190         .363         .326           PP (AD)         .421         .334         .331         .190         .363         .326           A (PR)         .387         .330         .324         .881         .881           A (PR)         .387         .331         .190         .363         .326           A (PR)         .387         .381         .801         .801         .801           A (PR)         .387         .331         .190         .326         .301         .801           A (PR)         .387         .381         .804         .801         .801         .804           A (DP)         .3	2. PR(DF																
R(AD)         842         707         718           P         .420         .375         .292         .423           P(PR)         .366         .018         .188         .262         .469           P(MA)         .338         .330         .334         .397         .447         .339           P(MA)         .338         .330         .334         .47         .339         .334           P(MD)         .421         .344         .788         .567         .555         .567           A         .297         .239         .481         .310         .324         .190         .363           A(PR)         .387         .330         .324         .190         .363         .326           A(PR)         .310         .526         .389         .324         .897           A(PR)         .317         .207         .293         .301         .801           A(DP)         .325         .294         .140         .235         .301         .801           A(AD)         .325         .294         .183         .363         .363         .332           A(PR)         .335         .294         .801         .804	3. PR (MA	-	•														
P         440         375         292         443           P(PR)         .366         .018         .188         .262         .469           P(Ma)         .338         .334         .397         .447         .339           P(Mb)         .421         .34         .397         .447         .339           P(Mb)         .421         .344         .434         .788         .567         .555           A         .297         .259         .481         .311         .190         .363         .349         .897           A         .297         .259         .481         .316         .331         .190         .363         .349         .897           A(PP)         .387         .330         .324         .183         .363         .349         .897           A(PP)         .247         .278         .264         .140         .235         .301         .801           A(PP)         .325         .294         .480         .353         .302         .301         .804           A(AD)         .325         .294         .140         .235         .301         .801         .839           D         .321         <	4. PR(AD		-	.718													
PP (PR)         .366         .018         .188         .262         .469           PP (MA)         .333         .334         .397         .447         .339           PP (MA)         .338         .330         .334         .493         .339           PP (AD)         .421         .334         .447         .339           A         .297         .334         .434         .788         .567         .555           A         .297         .259         .481         .316         .331         .190         .363         .326           A         .787         .259         .481         .316         .331         .190         .363         .326           A         .188         .567         .353         .349         .897         .897           A         .187         .278         .326         .183         .804         .804           A         .180         .353         .301         .801         .804         .804           A         .181         .424         .273         .271         .429         .332         .332           A         .315         .294         .813         .804         .804	5. DP		•	.292													
PP (MA).338.330.334.397.447.339PP (AD).421.334.434.788.567.555A.297.259.481.316.331.190.363.326A.297.259.481.316.331.190.363.326A (PR).387.330.526.389.324.183.363.349.897A (PR).247.278.424.260.264.140.235.301.801.839A (AD).325.294.480.336.350.241.418.854.834.804D.351.325.421.397.418.182.402.489.358.346.733D(PR).399.335.430.438.444.273.504.577.429.438.332D(PR).365.413.373.492.529.401.635.364.313.362.660.719D(PP).366.413.373.492.259.401.635.364.313.362.660.719D(PR).364.366.411.399.188.525.509.467.361.713.712.715D(M).364.366.411.399.188.525.509.467.361.513.712.712.715	6. DP(PR		_	.188	.262	.469											
PP (AD)       .421       .343       .434       .788       .567       .555         ch       .297       .259       .481       .316       .331       .190       .363       .326         ch (PR)       .387       .330       .526       .389       .324       .183       .363       .349       .897         ch (PR)       .387       .330       .526       .389       .324       .183       .363       .349       .897         ch (PR)       .247       .278       .424       .260       .241       .421       .418       .891       .891         ch (AD)       .325       .294       .480       .336       .350       .241       .421       .418       .804         d)       .325       .294       .480       .336       .441       .273       .402       .489       .358       .346       .283       .332         d)       .399       .335       .430       .571       .493       .332       .444       .739         d)       .365       .266       .411       .393       .356       .436       .332       .444       .739         d)       .364       .364       .364 <td< td=""><td>7. DP (MA</td><td>-</td><td>•</td><td>.334</td><td>.397</td><td>.447</td><td>.339</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	7. DP (MA	-	•	.334	.397	.447	.339										
IA.297.259.481.316.331.190.363.326IA (PR).387.330.526.389.324.183.363.349.897IA (DP).247.278.424.260.264.140.235.301.801.839IA (AD).325.294.480.336.341.421.418.854.834.804ID.325.294.480.336.341.421.418.854.834.804ID.351.325.421.397.418.182.402.489.358.346.233ID (PR).399.335.430.438.444.273.504.527.429.438.351.444.739ID (PR).365.266.413.373.492.259.401.635.364.313.362.660.719ID (DP).364.360.461.399.188.525.509.467.439.386.712.715	8. DP(AD		-	. 334	.434	.788	.567	.555									
IA (PR).387.330.526.389.324.183.363.349.897IA (DP).247.278.424.260.264.140.235.301.801.839IA (AD).325.294.480.336.350.241.421.418.854.834.804ID.351.325.294.480.336.350.241.421.418.854.834.804ID.351.325.421.397.418.182.402.489.358.346.283.332ID (PR).399.335.430.438.444.273.504.527.429.438.351.444.739ID (DP).365.266.411.399.188.525.509.467.439.362.660.719ID (MA).364.360.468.411.399.188.525.509.467.439.364.530.660.719	9. MA	.297			.316	.331	.190	.363	.326								
(A (DP).247.278.424.260.264.140.235.301.801.839(A (AD).325.294.480.336.350.241.421.418.854.834.804(D.351.325.421.397.418.182.402.489.358.346.283.332(D.351.325.421.397.418.182.402.489.358.346.283.332(D (PR).399.335.430.438.444.273.504.527.429.438.351.444.739(D (DP).365.266.413.373.492.259.401.635.364.313.362.660.719(D (MA).364.360.468.411.399.188.525.509.467.439.386.530.640.719	.0. MA (PR					.324	.183	.363	.349	.897							
(A(D)       .325       .294       .480       .336       .350       .241       .421       .418       .854       .834       .804         D       .351       .325       .421       .397       .418       .182       .402       .489       .358       .346       .283       .332         D(PR)       .399       .335       .430       .418       .182       .402       .489       .358       .346       .283       .332         D(PR)       .399       .335       .430       .444       .273       .504       .527       .429       .438       .351       .444       .739         D(PR)       .365       .266       .413       .373       .492       .259       .401       .635       .364       .313       .362       .660       .719         D(MA)       .364       .360       .467       .439       .365       .560       .712	1. MA(DP		.278			.264	.140	.235	.301	.801	.839						
D       .351       .325       .421       .397       .418       .182       .402       .489       .358       .346       .283       .332         D(PR)       .399       .335       .430       .438       .444       .273       .504       .527       .429       .438       .351       .444       .739         D(PR)       .395       .266       .413       .373       .492       .259       .401       .635       .364       .313       .362       .660       .719         D(MA)       .364       .364       .313       .362       .660       .719	2. MA (AD	-	.294	.480		.350	.241	.421	.418	.854	.834	.804					
D(PR) .399 .335 .430 .438 .444 .273 .504 .527 .429 .438 .351 .444 .739 D(DP) .365 .266 .413 .373 .492 .259 .401 .635 .364 .361 .313 .362 .660 .719 D(MA) .364 .360 .468 .411 .399 .188 .525 .509 .467 .439 .386 .530 .634 .712	3. AD	.351	.325	.421	.397	.418	.182	.402	.489	.358	.346	.283	.332				
.365 .266 .413 .373 .492 .259 .401 .635 .364 .361 .313 .362 .660 .719 .364 .360 .468 .411 .399 .188 .525 .509 .467 .439 .386 .530 .634 .712	4. AD (PR		•	.430	.438	444.	.273	.504	.527	.429	.438	.351	444.	.739			
.364 .360 .468 .411 .399 .188 .525 .509 .467 .439 .386 .530 .634 .712	5. AD(DP	-		.413	.373	.492	.259	.401	.635	.364	.361	.313	.362	.660	.719		
	6. AD (MA		.360	.468	.411	.399	.188	.525	.509	.467	.439	.386	.530	.634	.712	.715	
	Notes:																

Notes:

N = 180 since the correlations were computed over a string of subject-by-trial observations. Reaction-time scores of the AD-task were beforehand multiplied by -1. For explanation of the abbreviations see the note below Table 1.

oli alla alla

, idaetae

Accordingly, an additional four-factor solution, using the Binormamin rotation again, was also obtained. The rotated factor loadings of the five-factor solution and of the four factor solution are presented in Table 3 and Table 5, respectively. The among-factor correlations are shown in Table 4 and Table 6, respectively.

Neither matrix of rotated factor loadings provides evidence for a general time-sharing factor. The first factor is clearly a factor specific to MA-task performance. <u>Both</u> solitary performance and time-sharing performances of the MA task load <u>equally</u> high on the first factor, with most of the remaining variables being essentially uncorrelated with the factor. The same is true for the second factor as well as for the third factor which are clearly the factors specific to the performances of the PR task and AD task, respectively.

The interpretation of the fourth factor is, however, less clear cut. From the four-factor solution, it may be interpreted as a factor specific to the DP-task performance, but with the DP (MA) variable loading scarcely on the factor. This variable defines its own, fifth factor in the fivefactor solution. Thus, there is a tendency for DP-task performance to define two factors instead of one. A possible interpretation for this tendency may be as follows. Note that the two factors associated with the DP-task performance are defined primarily with the variables DP (PR) and DP (MA), respectively. Also note, from Figures 1 to 4, that the most severe time-sharing decrements are associated with these two variables as well. This indicates that a high information load was involved when DP task was performed with either the PR task or the MA task. Under such

-14-

TABLE	3
-------	---

Ţ

.

1

;

.

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS: A FIVE-FACTOR SOLUTION

			FA	СТО	R	<u>, ,,,,,,,</u> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
¥۷.	ariable	I	II	τII	IV	V
1.	PR	05	. <u>94</u>	02	.23	13
2.	PR(DP)	06	. <u>87</u>	12	24	.28
3.	PR(MA)	.23	. <u>77</u>	.18	04	23
4.	PR(AD)	06	. <u>93</u>	.02	.07	01
5.	DP	02	.07	.04	. <u>51</u>	.45
6.	DP(PR)	.03	.01	08	.96	06
7.	DP (MA)	.03	04	03	02	. <u>93</u>
8.	DP(AD)	03	01	.20	. <u>54</u>	.42
9.	MA	. <u>94</u>	04	.02	.01	.03
10.	MA(PR)	. <u>92</u>	.09	03	.01	.00
11.	MA(DP)	. <u>96</u>	02	03	.01	06
12.	MA (AD)	. <u>89</u>	04	03	.04	.15
13.	AD	07	.05	• <u>94</u>	07	06
14.	AD(PR)	.02	.01	. <u>86</u>	02	.04
15.	AD(DP)	05	04	. <u>93</u>	.10	06
16.	AD (MA)	.10	01	. <u>75</u>	16	.19

Note: The loadings in excess of .50 have been underlined.

# TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS AMONG FACTORS

Factor	II	III	IV	v
I	. 41	. 46	.23	. 38
II		.48	.28	.48
III			.38	.58
IV				. 39

TABLE S	5
---------	---

ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS: A FOUR-FACTOR SOLUTION

Variable			FAC	T O R	
va:		I	II	III	IV
1.	PR	05	. <u>91</u>	11	.17
2.	PR(DP)	04	.91	.01	11
3.	PR (MA)	.22	. <u>74</u>	.08	13
4.	PR (AD)	06	. <u>93</u>	01	.08
5.	DP	01	.09	.15	. <u>72</u>
6.	DP (PR)	.02	05	21	. <u>95</u>
7.	DP (MA)	.07	05	. 34	.39
8.	DP(AD)	02	.00	.31	• <u>74</u>
۶.	MA	. <u>94</u>	04	.03	.01
.0	MA(PR)	. <u>93</u>	.09	03	.00
1.	MA(DP)	. <u>96</u>	03	05	03
2.	MA (AD)	. <u>90</u>	03	.03	.09
.3.	AD	08	.02	. <u>92</u>	07
.4.	AD(PR)	.02	01	• <u>87</u>	.02
5.	AD(DP)	06	08	. <u>89</u>	.11
6.	AD (MA)	.11	.00	• <u>85</u>	06

Note: The loadings in excess of .50 have been underlined.

TABLE	6
-------	---

CORRELATIONS AMONG FACTORS

Factor	II	III	IV
I	.41	. 48	.31
II		.51	. 39
III			.46

-16-

とない

A contract of

Transa

; :

conditions of severe task interference, subjects might not have been able to satisfactorily follow the instruction of equal task priorities; some of the subjects might have favored one or the other of two concurrent tasks.<sup>\*</sup> Such differences in the allocation policy are likely to introduce an additional, uncontrollable source of variance in the performance of tasks involved, and hence cause artificial, variable-specific factors to appear. These are the limitation of any time-sharing paradigm requiring subjects to allocate their attention "equally" between two concurrent tasks. Nevertheless, it is clear that none of the factors which made appearance is by any means a general time-sharing factor.

# Correlations of "Total Decrement Scores"

As a means of controlling of individual differences in task-specific abilities while attempting to assess time-sharing ability, concurrent task performance is customarily scored relative to solitary task performance levels (e.g., North and Gopher, 1975; Parker, 1964; Sterky and Eysenck, 1965). In attempting such an analysis on the present data, the following formula was used: D = (S - T)/S, where S = solitary task performance, T = timesharing performance of the same task, and D = time-sharing decrement score reflecting the percentage of solitary task performance lost under timesharing conditions.

-17-

That this probably occurred is also indicated by the failure of DP-task performance to correlate with either PR- or MA-task performance under concurrent conditions (i.e.,  $r_{6-2}$  and  $r_{11-7}$ , in Table 2, amount only .018 and .234, respectively), while the solitary performances of the same pairs of tasks correlated substantially higher (i.e.,  $r_{5-1}$  and  $r_{4-5}$  are .420 and .331, respectively). Such a reduction in correlation under concurrent conditions did not occur in the remaining four pairs of tasks.

After all individual D values had been computed, they were summed across two concurrently performed tasks to yield "total decrement scores" for each particular dual-task combination. Since there were six dualtask combinations, six total decrement variables were obtained and then intercorrelated among themselves.

However, most of the correlations thus computed were "spurious" in the sense that they were computed between dual-task combinations having one task in common. (For example, the correlation of total decrement scores between the dual-task combinations PR-DP and PR-MA is a "spurious" one, since both combinations involve PR-task performance.) In fact, twelve out of fifteen correlations computed had a task in common, and hence are not presented here. The remaining three correlations, which are obtained between dual-task combinations having no task in common, are presented in Table 8.

11

# TABLE 8

# CORRELATIONS BETWEEN "TOTAL DECREMENT SCORES" OF DIFFERENT DUAL-TASK COMBINATIONS

Dual-task Combinations Correlated			Correlation Coefficent
RP-DP	with	MA-AD	.060
RP-MA	with	DP-AD	068
RP-AD	with	DP-MA	.056

As can be seen, the "total decrement scores" are essentially uncorrelated, providing clear evidence that individual differences in time-sharing decrements are not consistent across different dual-task combinations. Again, evidence to support the existence of the "time-sharing ability" was not found.

-18-

# DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

37

The conclusions of two recent studies appear to be at variance with results presented above. The first study is by Waldeisen (1974) who found that solitary performance of two tasks (a four choice discriminationmatching task and a velocity estimation task) failed to correlate significantly with their concurrent performances. This result led him to conclude that "the ability measured by the discrete, serial conditions was different from the ability measured by the simultaneous conditions." Such a conclusion does not seem warranted by the present-study data. As already noted, a task's solitary performance correlated substantially with its time-sharing performances. Also, the comparison of solitary with time-sharing performances, in terms of obtained factor loadings, revealed differences which are not sufficiently large to support Waldeisen's conclusion, at least in the case of the PR, MA, and AD tasks. The exception to this conclusion observed in the case of DP-task performance is probably due, as already explained, to subjects' failure to divide their attention equally between two concurrent tasks. This same interpretation may be relevant for Waldeisen's data as well.

The second study is by Parker (1964) who claimed the identification of a "time-sharing ability factor." The purpose of his study was to describe complex tracking performance in terms of a number of more basic abilities. Six abilities believed to underlie the tracking proficiency were hypothesized; one of them was the "time-sharing ability." Fifteen tests constructed to

-19-

measure the hypothesized abilities were factor analyzed and seven factors interpreted; one as the "time-sharing ability factor." However, out of three time-sharing tests included in the battery, only two of them defined the factor, while the third time-sharing test was essentially uncorrelated with the factor. Thus, by the customary standards that at least three tests should converge to define a factor, Parker's data may be also interpreted as not showing clear evidence for the time-sharing factor.

The results of the present study are generally consistent with the results obtained by McQueen (1917), as long as 60 years ago. Around the turn of the century, when the concept of attention dominated psychological studies, many psychologists believed that individuals consistently differ in the "power of distributing the attention." Since this "power" was assumed to be general, McQueen undertook an investigation to test this assumption. His subjects, 40 elementary-school children, performed a number of psychomotor and mental tasks, both singly and concurrently. After having analysed the results by a correlational method, McQueen concluded that the supposed general "power" did not exist. Indeed, we should pay more heed to work done by our predecessors; our contemporary concern with the time-sharing "ability" seems to be but another attempt to deal with the distribution-ofattention "power."

11

In conclusion, the existence of a general time-sharing ability is not confirmed. In general, the ability to perform a task under time-sharing conditions seems most closely related to the ability to perform the same task on its own. Consequently, the notion of "time-sharing ability" as well as recommendations for replacing the traditional, serial approach to ability assessment by the parallel one, are not supported.

-20-

## REFERENCES

1

1

1.

Damos, D. L. Cross-adaptive measurement of residual attention to predict pilot performance. Savoy, Ill.: University of Illinois, Institute of Aviaiton, Aviation Research Laboratory, TR ARL-72-25/AFOSR-72-12, October 1972.

- Dannhaus, D. M. and Halcomb, C. G. Methodology for the prediction of complex skill performance. <u>Proceedings of Human Factors Society 19th Annual</u> Meeting: Dallas, Texas, October, 1975.
- Levine, J. M., Romashko, T., and Fleishman, E. A. Evaluation of an abilities classification system for integrating and generalizing human performance research findings: an application to vigilance tasks. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Applied Psychology</u>, 1973, <u>58</u> (2), 149-157.
- McQueen, E. N. The distribution of attention. <u>The British Journal of</u> <u>Psychology</u>, Monograph Supplements, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1917.
- Melton, A. W. (Ed.) Apparatus tests. Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Program Research Report No. 4. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947.
- North, R. A. and Gopher, D. Measures of attention as predictors of flight performance. <u>Human Factors</u>, 1976, 18 (1), 1-14.
- Parker, J. F., Jr. Use of an engineering analogy in the development of tests to predict tracking performance. The Matrix Corporation, Office of Naval Research, Contract Nonr-3065(00), February, 1964.

Parker, J. F., Jr., Reilly, R. E., Dillon, R. F., Andrews, T. G., and Fleishmen, E. A. Development of tests for measurement of primary perceptual-motor performance. NASA CR-335, December 1965.

\* \*

1

.

- Passey, G. E. and McLaurin, W. A. Perceptual-psychomotor tests in aircrew selection: historical review and advanced concepts. Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, PRL-TR-66-4, 1966.
- Pew, R. W. and Adams, M. J. Development of procedures for assignment of subjects in ASUPT experiments: Background and data collection plan. Cambridge: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman Inc., Rep. No. 3204, November 1975.
- Sterky, K. and Eysenck, H. J. Pursuit rotor performance as a function of different degrees of distraction. Life Sciences, 1965, 4, 889-897.
- Trankell, A. The psychologist as an instrument of prediction. <u>Journal</u> of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, 170-175.
- Waldeisen, L. E. The assessment of complex, human, perceptual-psychomotor abilities. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1974). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1974, 35, 1954-B.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

-22-

ARL-77-4/A FOSR-77-4 AUTHOR/J Branimi Sverko France of Aviation NAME AND ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 Aviation Gresearch and ADDRESS Aviation Controlling are and ADDRESS Automotive and ADDRESS AUTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) Building AFB, D.C. 20332 AUDITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) Building AFB, D.C. 20332 AUDITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) Building AFB, D.C. 20332 AUDITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) Building AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) AUDITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) AUDITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (1706) ADDRESS(Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by biock number) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ASUPPLEMENTARY NOTES AUTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by biock number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial MATTACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial MATTACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial MATTACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) ADTACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) ADTACT (Conti	SCOURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Enternd)	DEAD INCOM
AFOSR-TR- 77-1014 THE ( and Swalling) INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE INTETIM AUTHOR/) Branimir Sverko - *GATAMUNG ORGANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 - Contraction office Ande And DAGDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 - Contraction office Ande And DAGDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 - Contraction office Ande And DAGDRESS Aris Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 2032 - VONTORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS( <i>il allineit lem Controlling</i> ( Thee) - Distribution Statement (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the shered entered in Black 20, Il different from Report) - DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT		BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
TITLE (we Scattley)       5. TYPE OF REPORT & PENIOD COVERT         INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE       Intertia         * AUTHOR(*)       5. PERFORMING ONG. REPORT NUMBER         * AUTHOR(*)       6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)         Branimir Sverko       5. ACONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)         * CONTRACT OR GRANITATION NAME AND ADDRESS       6. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)         Aviation Research Laboratory       6.1102F         Institute of Aviation       2313/A4         * Controling office Avia to Doress       7. Report Date         Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)       1. Report Date         Bolling AFB, D.C. 2032       1. Report Date         21. NONTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(I different Hem Controlling * Tree)       1. NUMBER OF PAGES         * OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Autreet entered in Black 20, If different from Report)       1. SECURITY CLASS, (of this report)         * OISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the states of entered in Black 20, If different from Report)       1. Distribution Statement (of the states)         * SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Factor Analysis       1. Security Statement (of the states)         * SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       Factor Analysis       1. Security, some authors stressed         * NUMBES (Continue on reverse ide If necessary and Identify by black number)       1. The traditional aproach to ability and skill assessment		3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE INCUIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE Interim AUTHOR(7) Branimir Sverko Franching ONDANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Filings, Savoy, Illing 61874 Contractume of file and ADD ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Filings, Savoy, Illing 61874 Contractume of file and ADD ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of File of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 2032 The REPORT NUMBER ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling ( 'I'se) CostRubuy Control Name And ADDRESS ADDRESS(If different from Statement (of the source) of the source		
AUTHOR(a)     AUTHOR(a)     Brandmir Sverko     ARL-77-4/A FOSR-77-4     ARL-77-4/A FOSR-77-4     ARL-77-4/A FOSR-77-4     CONTACT ON GRANTIATION NAME AND ADDRESS     Aviation Research Laboratory     Institute of Aviation     Performing ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS     Aviation Research Laboratory     Institute of Aviation     University of Tilinois, Sayoy, Illinois 61874     Contractual and Price Name AND ADDRESS     Ar Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)     Solling AFB, D.C. 2032     Institute of FACE Name AND ADDRESS     Author Office Name     Author Office Name And ADDRESS     Author Office Name     Author     Author Office Name     Author Of		77 <b>.</b>
ARL-77-4/AFOSR-77-4 AUTHOR/0 Branimir Sverko Fremonium Organization HAME AND ADDRESS Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Illinois, Sayoy, Illinois 61874 Contraction Greee and and Noness Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make AND ADDRESS Autor Force of fice of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make AND ADDRESS Autor Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make AND ADDRESS Autor Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 Toorrect Make & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 AMONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling (* Iffer) Distribution statement for file Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. Distribution statement for file abdirect entered in Black 20, If different from Report) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors METACY (Continue on reverse dide Uncersery and Identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recordly, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one ansessment task slimultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more approprise, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent	INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TIME-SHARING PERFORMANCE	
Branimir Sverko       F44620-76-C-0009         PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS       ID         Aviation Research Laboratory       Institute of Aviation         Institute of Aviation       2313/A4         University of Tilinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874       2313/A4         Controctution office Name And Address       ID         Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)       January 1977         Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332       ID         ANDRITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controlling ('Tree)       ID         NUMPTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controlling ('Tree)       ID         NUMPTORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(// different from Controlling ('Tree)       ID         SECURITY CLASS. (of mis report)       ID         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.       ID         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.       Supplementary Notes         Supplementary Notes       Factor Analysis         Time-Sharing Performance       Time-Sharing Ability Factor         Dual-Task Performance       Complex Skill Assessment employed serial         Human Factors       Address stress and threads and skill assessment employed serial         Multinuma Factors       The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial         Mistract (Continue on reveres bide if	`	
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS AVIATION Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation University of Tilinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 L controluing office NAME AND ADDRESS AVIATION CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS L CONTROLING OFFICE NAME A ADDRESS(II dillerent from Controlling ( 'Ince) L NUMBER OF PAGES L CONTROLING AGENCY NAME A ADDRESS(II dillerent from Controlling ( 'Ince) L SECURITY CLASS. (of this Report) Unclassified L CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. L CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, II different from Report) L SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES L CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL L CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL L CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL L CONTROL OF		
Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation       61102F         Institute of Aviation       2313/A4         University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874       12. REPORT DATE         Controlling Office NAME AND ADDRESS       13. REPORT DATE         Alf Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         I. MONITORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ("New)       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         I. MONITORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ("New)       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         I. MONITORING AGENEY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ("New)       14. REPORT DATE         J. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report)       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE         J. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Black 20, If different from Report)       14. Streeverthered for the ebetract entered in Black 20, If different from Report)         . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       11. Supplementary Notes       11. Streeverthered for analysis         Individual Differences       Factor Analysis       11. August 20. If different form Report)         . SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES       11. August 20. If differences       11. August 20. If differences         Mastractor       11. Streeverthere <t< td=""><td>Branimir Sverko</td><td>F44620-76-C-0009</td></t<>	Branimir Sverko	F44620-76-C-0009
Aviation Research Laboratory Institute of Aviation       61102F         Institute of Aviation       2313/A4         University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874       2313/A4         . CONTROLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS       12. REPORT DATE         Aft Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)       January 1977         Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332       22         A NONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ("Neo)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE         A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report)       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE         A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, II different from Report)       14. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)       15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)       14. Supplementary Notes         Main Factors       Time-Sharing Performance       Time-Sharing Ability Factor         Dual-Task Performance       Complex Skill Assessment       Illuman Factors         ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if increasery and identify by block number)       The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete pres	PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
University of Illinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 ControlLing of Filinois, Savoy, Illinois 61874 ControlLing of File Name And Address All Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 C. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ("Theo) I. SECURITY CLASS. (of this experi) Unclassified Is- DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. C. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Black 20, II different from Report) Individual Differences Time-Sharing Performance Individual Differences Time-Sharing Performance Ime-Sharing Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse idde II necessary and Identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the meed for a approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the meed for an approach to ability in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals FORM tare	*	
CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS     Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NL)     Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332     In MUMBER OF PAGES         22     MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ( 'Itco)         15. SECURITY CLASS. (of the report)     Unclassified         15. DECLASSIFIED         Unclassified         1		2313/A4
Air Force Office of Scientific Research (NL) Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332 A MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ( 'I'ce) A MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ( 'I'ce) A MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from Controlling ( 'I'ce) A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, II different from Report) Approved for public release: factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors MESTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals		12. REPORT DATE
Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332       13. NUMBER OF PAGES         22       22         A. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II dillerent from Controlling ( 'lice)       15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)         Unclassified       15. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING         15. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)       10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this destract entered in Block 20, II different from Report)         Approved for public release:       distribution unlimited.         A. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, II different from Report)         B. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES         KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side II necessary and Identify by Slock number)         Individual Differences       Factor Analysis         Time-Sharing Performance       Time-Sharing Ability Factor         Dual-Task Performance       Complex Skill Assessment         Human Factors       Still increases and identify by Slock number)         The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial         discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed         the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one         assessment tasks isultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might         be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and         Coverload. Inherent		
Unclassified 15. DESTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors MESTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals		22
15e. DECLASS/FICATION/DOWNGRADING         SCHEDULE         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.         Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         ADDISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abatract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)         Individual Differences         Factor         Time-Sharing Performance         Time-Sharing Performance         Complex Skill Assessment         Human Factors         ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed	4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & AUDRESS(II different from Controlling ( 'lice)	15. SECURITY CLASS, (of this report)
Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. Approved for public release: distribution unlimited. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Supplementary notes KEV WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals		15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)      SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES      KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)      Individual Differences Factor Analysis     Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors      MESTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)      The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one     assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill,     such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and     overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	
KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         Individual Differences       Factor Analysis         Time-Sharing Performance       Time-Sharing Ability Factor         Dual-Task Performance       Complex Skill Assessment         Human Factors       NestRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)         The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial         discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed         the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one         assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might         be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill,         such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and         overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	Approved for public release: distribution unlimite	ed.
Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals		
Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetract entered in Block 20, if different from	
Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Factor Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assessment Human Factors The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract entered in Block 20, if different from 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	
The traditional approach to ability and skill assessment employed serial discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20, if different from 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)	
discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recently, some authors stressed the need for an approach which would permit administration of more than one assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief that such approach might be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of some complex skill, such as flying, which is likely to involve simultaneous performance and overload. Inherent in this belief is the supposition that individuals	7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract entered in Block 20, if different from 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assess	n Report) y Factor
N FORM 1470	7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract entered in Block 20, if different from 8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assess	n Report) y Factor
D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE Unclassified	A DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the observant entered in Block 20, 11 different from S. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Individual Differences Factor Analysis Time-Sharing Performance Time-Sharing Ability Dual-Task Performance Complex Skill Assess Human Factors ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The traditional approach to ability and skill discrete presentations of assessment tasks. Recent the need for an approach which would permit administ assessment task simultaneously. There is a belief be more appropriate, especially in the prediction of such as flying, which is likely to involve simultant	y Factor sment assessment employed serial tly, some authors stressed stration of more than one that such approach might of some complex skill, neous performance and

. . . . . .

... ...

「日本山村湯」

. . . .

1.692

۱,

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

20. consistently differ in some kind of "timesharing ability." But this has not been proved so far, and the present research is an attempt to test this supposition.

Four tasks were used: (1) The rotary pursuit task (subject's task was to keep the point of a stylus on a round brass target inserted in a rotating disc); (2) The digit processing task (a ten-choice self-paced serial reaction time task requiring subject to press the appropriate buttons on the keyboard in response to digits which appear on the adjacent display); (3) The mental arithmetic task (backward counting by threes); and (4) The auditory discrimination task (a two-choice serial reaction time task requiring subject to press the appropriate foot pedal in response to tones differing in pitch).

Sixty subjects performed the tasks several times singly, one by one, as well as concurrently, in all possible two-task combinations. Sixteen scores were obtained for every subject: his performance on each task when performed singly, as well as when performed concurrently with each of three other tasks. These 16 variables were intercorrelated and the resulting matrix of intercorrelations was submitted to a factor analysis. Only task-specific factors were identified. No evidence for a time-sharing factor, which would account for concurrent task performances, was found. Thus, the notion of "time-sharing ability" was not supported.

# Unclassified