

AD-A050 775

STANFORD UNIV CALIF SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HYPNOTIZABILITY AND SPEED OF CLOSURE.(U)

SEP 77 D F LOHMAN

N00014-75-C-0882

F/G 5/10

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

TR-6

| OF |  
AD  
A050775



END

DATE

FILMED

4-78

DDC

AD A 050775

AD No. ~~1~~  
DDC FILE COPY

12

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HYPNOTIZABILITY  
AND SPEED OF CLOSURE

DAVID F. LOHMAN

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 6  
APTITUDE RESEARCH PROJECT  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Sponsored by

Personnel and Training Research Programs  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research

and

Advanced Research Projects Agency

under

Contract No. N00014-75-C-0882

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any  
purpose of the United States Government.

SEPTEMBER 1977

DDC  
RECEIVED  
MAR 6 1978  
B

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HYPNOTIZABILITY  
AND SPEED OF CLOSURE

DAVID F. LOHMAN

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 6  
APTITUDE RESEARCH PROJECT  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Sponsored by  
Personnel and Training Research Programs  
Psychological Sciences Division  
Office of Naval Research  
and  
Advanced Research Projects Agency  
under  
Contract No. N00014-75-C-0882

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the author and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Office of Naval Research, the Advanced Research Projects Office, or the U. S. Government

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.  
Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for  
any purpose of the United States Government.

SEPTEMBER 1977

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 6	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The relationship between hypnotizability and speed of closure		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report #6
7. AUTHOR(s) David F./Lohman		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER TR-6
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS School of Education Stanford University Stanford, California		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-75-C-0882
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Psychological Sciences Division, ONR, 458		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 154-376
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE Sep 1977
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 35
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) UNLIMITED		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) UNLIMITED		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES This research was jointly sponsored by the Office of Naval Research and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Hypnotizability, speed of closure, corrections for restriction of range, aptitude-personality relationships, extreme groups designs.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Many trait theorists have argued against the artificial separation of ability and personality constructs. Hilgard contends that hypnotizability is a personality construct. Until recently, however, attempts to relate hypnotizability to other personal characteristics have yielded negative or inconclusive results. Thus, a report by Crawford of substantial correlations between hypnotizability and various speed-of-closure ability measures signalled an important breakthrough. An attempt to replicate those correlations on the		

DD FORM 1473  
1 JAN 73EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-014-6601

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

391 909



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

same population in the present study yielded markedly lower correlations. It is argued that non-proportional sampling techniques spuriously inflated the earlier reported correlations. Subsequent attempts to correct these correlations for the biases introduced by non-proportional sampling led to the development of a new technique to correct an inflated correlation. This procedure empirically modifies the distribution of scores to reflect the normative distribution. Implications of these techniques for correlational research using nonproportional or extreme groups designs are discussed. Finally, the relationship between hypnotizability and speed of closure is examined in the light of the corrected coefficients, and implications for future research are outlined.

ACCESSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL	
A	

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## PREFACE

The investigation reported herein is part of an ongoing research project aimed at understanding the nature and importance of individual differences in aptitude for learning. Information regarding this project and requests for copies of this or other technical reports should be addressed to:

Professor Richard E. Snow, Principal Investigator  
Aptitude Research Project  
School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

Beginning with Benet (see Wolf, 1973), numerous investigators have argued against the convenient, but artificial distinction between ability and personality constructs (Wechsler, 1958; Thurstone, 1944; Anastasi, 1967; Cronbach & Snow, 1977). There is now a large literature attesting to relationships between these two domains. Witkin's research on field independence is one good example of work that elaborates combined constructs (see, e.g., Witkin et al., 1962). Similarly, Smith (1964) summarizes a large number of studies on the relationships between spatial ability and various personality constructs. More recent ATI studies have also found numerous interactions between ability and personality constructs, and shown that their combination may be important in predicting learning outcomes in some instructional settings (Cronbach & Snow, 1977; Snow, 1976a).

But research seeking to explore such combinations faces a myriad of personality constructs based largely on work with multiscale self-report questionnaires. Many of these personality constructs are of doubtful validity and stability over time and situations, and there is as yet no agreed-upon theoretical model for organizing them comparable to that available for the ability domain. The best exploratory strategy for the present would seem to be to identify those few personality constructs that seem reasonably stable, adequately measured by multiple methods, and relevant at least conceptually to ability and learning constructs. Then, the approach used by Witkin, Smith, and others, of pursuing the various personality correlates of one stable ability construct, could also be applied in reverse; the various ability and learning correlates of such constructs could be elaborated, and the kinds of situations where they might be most relevant could be better judged.

Only a few personality constructs seem to be candidates for such treatment. One is anxiety, as pursued in the work of Spielberger (see, e.g., Gaudry & Spielberger, 1971). Another would be Eysenck's (1966) research on extraversion-introversion and neuroticism. A beginning in this direction has also been made on a construct called achievement via independence vs. achievement via conformity (Domino, 1971; Snow, 1976a, b).

Another construct worth consideration in this connection is hypnotic susceptibility. Hilgard (1968) regards hypnotic susceptibility as a



central, stable personality characteristic, and there has been a continuing search for correlations between measures of it and ability variables. Early results have been largely negative, however, (see Hilgard, 1968). Thus Crawford's (1976) recent demonstration of strong correlations between various speed of closure tests and hypnotic susceptibility measures represents an important advance.

Crawford (1976) reported correlations between the Stanford Hypnotic Susceptibility Scale: Form C (SHSS:C; Weitzenhoffer & Hilgard, 1962) and several cognitive tests. Of particular interest were the correlations with several closure tests, i.e., Closure Speed (Thurstone & Jeffrey, 1956), Street Gestalt Completion (Street, 1931) and Harshman Figures (Harshman, 1974). Two spatial ability tests (Paper Form Board; Surface Development), a verbal reasoning test (Nonsense Syllogisms) and a flexibility of closure test (Hidden Figures) were also included in her reference battery, all of which were drawn from the ETS Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors (French, Ekstrom & Price, 1963).

Crawford's correlation between SHSS:C and the sum of the three speed of closure tasks was .60 for males ( $N=22$ ), .49 for females ( $N=20$ ) and .56 for the total group ( $N=42$ ). The only other significant correlation occurred between Paper Form Board and SHSS:C for females ( $r=.39$ ,  $N=20$ ). The other three cognitive tests did not correlate significantly with SHSS:C.

The hypothesis implicit in this research is that hypnotizability is related to right cerebral hemisphere abilities or at least to a stylistic preference for right hemisphere processing. Evidence for right hemisphere involvement in tests that measure speed of closure derives primarily from investigations of brain damaged and split-brain patients. Several studies have shown that patients with right hemisphere damage perform significantly worse than patients with left hemisphere damage on visual closure tests (de Renzi & Spinnler, 1966; Warrington & James, 1967; Landsell, 1968; Newcombe & Russell, 1969). Similar investigations with commissurotomy patients have found that the left hand (by implication, the right hemisphere) of these patients is far superior in solving closure problems than the right hand (Nebes, 1971; 1972; 1973).

While there are obvious problems in attempting to generalize to normals from studies on brain damaged or commissurotomy patients, this evidence is at least suggestive of right hemisphere involvement in closure tasks.



Another line of work that relates hypnotizability to right hemisphere processing is the research on lateral eye movements (LEMs). Working on the assumption that the characteristic direction of lateral eye movements is indicative of contralateral hemispheric activation (Kinsbourne, 1974), Bakan (1969) found that "right movers" were less hypnotizable than "left movers". Gur and Reyher (1973) found that "left movers" performed better than "right movers" on an induction scale with passive-emotional style instructions that called for focusing on internal, subjective events; while "right movers" performed better on an induction scale phrased in an active intellectual style that called for focusing on external events.

Further, Gur and Gur (1974) found that the relationship between LEM's and hypnotizability was moderated by sex, handedness and possibly eyedness. They reported correlations of  $-.68$  and  $.58$  between scores on the SHSS:C and right LEM's for right handed males and left handed females, respectively. Similar correlations for right handed females ( $.14$ ) and left handed males ( $-.18$ ) were not significant. There also appeared to be a sex  $\times$  eyedness  $\times$  handedness interaction in the study by Gur and Gur, but the number of cases in each cell was too small to permit adequate analysis.

Crawford (1976) also obtained a negative correlation ( $-.36$ ) between right LEM's and the SHSS:C for right handed males. However, unlike the Gur and Gur (1974) result, the correlation for right handed females was also negative ( $-.41$ ).

This presentation reports: 1) the results of an attempt to replicate Crawford's (1976) reported correlation between hypnotizability and speed of closure; 2) the results of a reanalysis of Crawford's (1976) data; 3) a new procedure for correcting correlations for bias introduced by non-proportional sampling.<sup>1</sup>

#### Past Research on Closure Abilities

Since a major portion of this paper deals with the relationship between hypnotizability and tests purporting to measure abilities called "speed of closure" and "flexibility of closure" it is useful to examine the factor analytic research regarding these constructs. This work began with Thurstone's classic factor analytic study of visual perception (Thurstone, 1944). In that study, three closure factors were tentatively identified. The first was called

"speed and strength of closure", but was actually more representative of spatial ability and did not appear in subsequent studies using less exotic tests (Thurstone, 1951; Botzum, 1951; Pemberton, 1952a).

The second closure factor seemed to involve freedom from what the Gestalt psychologists called *Gestaltbindung*, i.e., the inability to break one gestalt in order to form another. Thurstone dubbed this factor "flexibility of closure." PMA Reasoning, Hidden Pictures and the Gottschaldt tests (the source for Witkin's Embedded Figures Test and the ETS Kit Hidden Figures test) loaded heavily on this factor. However, the test defining the factor was called Two-Hand Coordination. It required the subject to tap the corresponding quartile segments of two non-symmetrically labelled circles at the same time. Quartile number one was centered at nine o'clock on the first circle and at 12 o'clock on the second circle. The other three quartiles followed in clockwise succession on both circles. The dependent measure for the test was a ratio of the number of simultaneous taps in corresponding quartiles using both hands and the sum of taps in each quartile using each hand independently.

"Speed of perception" is actually a misnomer for the third closure factor as it implies an ability similar to another well defined perceptual factor (perceptual speed). Thus, Thurstone later changed the name of this factor to "speed of closure" (Thurstone, 1951). The Street test and Mutilated Words are two tests which have consistently defined or loaded highly on this factor. It seems to involve the ability to synthesize discrete visual elements into a meaningful picture.

Replication of Thurstone's flexibility and speed of closure factors was provided in studies by Botzum (1951) and Pemberton (1952a). In the Botzum study, the five tests loading highest on flexibility of closure (Copying, Gottschaldt Figures, Designs, Block Counting and Paper Puzzles) were the same ones which defined the flexibility of closure factor for Thurstone's (1951) study of mechanical aptitude. However, in both of these studies the factor took on more of a spatial-analytic character and less of the "breaking of *Gestaltbindung*" displayed in the original Thurstone (1944) study. Botzum's speed of closure factor was defined by the Street, Backward Writing and Mutilated Words tests.

Similarly, Pemberton's (1952a) speed of closure factor was defined by Mutilated Words, Hidden Pictures and Gestalt Completion (an adaptation of the Street test). Pemberton's flexibility of closure factor was similar to those obtained by Botzum (1951) and Thurstone (1951) with Concealed Figures (an adaptation of the Gottschaldt Figures) and Copying defining the factor, and several reasoning tests loading significantly.

A much later investigation by Hoffman, Guilford, Hoepfner and Doherty, (1968) suggests a slightly different interpretation for the closure speed factor. In that study, the closure speed (or CFU) factor was defined by a test called Close Ups, followed by Figure Completion (an adaptation of the Street test), Hidden Print and Mutilated Words. In the Close Ups test, the subject must correctly identify a close up picture of a common object, such as a keyhole, a chocolate chip or a buttonhole. This suggests that the central aspect of closure speed may be the ability to recognize (or generate the remainder of) a visual stimulus when given incomplete information, not the ability to "close" a set of stimulus fragments.

Although he never directly investigated the hypothesis, Thurstone (1944) conjectured that perceptual abilities (especially speed and flexibility of closure) might relate to personality traits. Carol Pemberton (1952b) later confirmed her mentor's suspicions. She found that individuals with high scores on tests which loaded heavily on flexibility of closure regarded themselves as analytic, interested in scientific and theoretical problems, independent, and socially retiring, with an express dislike for rigid systematization and routine. On the other hand, those with high scores on speed of closure regarded themselves as sociable, quick to react, self confident, artistic, neat and precise. Further, they expressed a strong dislike for logical and theoretical problems.

These findings are important for attempts to conceptualize a general dimension of analytic-articulated vs. global cognitive style (Witkin et al., 1962). However, the search for generalized factors of speed and flexibility of closure that might relate to this cognitive style dimension has met with little success. Messick and French (1975) found evidence - for a number of content-specific closure factors, but no evidence for independent general flexibility and speed of closure factors. In addition to reference factors, they obtained correlated first order closure factors



which they called flexibility of figural closure, speed of figural closure, verbal or symbolic closure, semantic closure, and a factor they tentatively labelled flexibility of grammatical closure. Second order factors labelled analytic functioning, figural closure, symbolic closure and semantic closure were also obtained. The second order figural closure factor combined the first order flexibility of perceptual closure and speed of perceptual closure factors.

Botzum (1951) also obtained a second order factor that combined the first order speed and flexibility of closure factors. However, flexibility of closure also loaded heavily on a second order spatial-analytic factor, while speed of closure had a large negative weight on a second order bipolar factor defined by first order factors for number, word fluency and verbal comprehension.

While Botzum's second order factors are indeed suggestive, the fact that first order factors for speed and flexibility of closure are correlated and thus define a second order factor in both the Messick and French (1975) and Botzum (1951) studies is troublesome for attempts to relate these factors to a general cognitive style dimension such as Witkin's (Witkin et al., 1962) or notions of cerebral laterality. While there are undoubtedly many reasons for this confusion, the following are likely candidates.

First, while the names of the factors have remained the same, their content has changed appreciably since the labels were first conferred by Thurstone (1944). Flexibility of closure was initially defined by tests which required breaking Gestaltbindung and also by Hidden Pictures and PMA Reasoning. In subsequent investigations, spatial ability tests gradually replaced the reasoning tests until, in the Messick and French (1975) study, they defined the factor. Thus, the factor has come to represent more of a spatial-analytic ability than Thurstone's flexibility of closure.

The major change in Thurstone's speed of closure factor has been an increase in the factorial complexity of the Street Gestalt, which usually defines the factor. Several investigators have found that the Street test has significant loadings on more than one factor (Pemberton, 1952a; Seibert & Snow, 19 ; Messick & French, 1975) and this has recently been shown also in some unpublished results from the Aptitude Project. In Thurstone's (1944) administration of the test, he used the number



of responses requiring three or more seconds as his dependent measure. Further, items were presented individually, with item exposure time and the distance between subject and picture controlled. Most subsequent investigations have employed a paper and pencil version of the Street Gestalt (or an adaptation of it) with total number right as the dependent measure. Exceptions to this general procedure are Crawford (1976), Seibert & Snow (1965) and the present investigation, where at least one closure speed test was presented on slides with item exposure held constant at 20 seconds per item. Paper and pencil adaptations of the Street Gestalt were also used in these studies.

While controlling item exposure time and distance between subject and test picture are improvements over paper and pencil administrations, the dependent measure is still unsatisfactory.

Logic and post-test strategy interviews with subjects conducted recently by the Aptitude Project suggest that different abilities and strategies are called into play if the picture does not "pop out" at the subject within the first few seconds. Interestingly, one of the factors that becomes involved is flexibility of closure, in Thurstone's (1944) original sense of breaking Gestaltbindung. Some subjects report that if they think they see something in one part of the picture (or even the whole picture) that they know is incorrect, they have difficulty shaking that idea and imposing some other gestalt on the picture. Other subjects report having no difficulty in generating and testing a number of different ideas about the whole picture or parts of it.

Finally, using total number correct as the dependent measure brings in other problems. The distribution is usually positively skewed, and internal consistency of the test when scored this way is quite low. Discussion of these problems will be taken up later.

In sum, then, the tests used in prior research, and in this investigation, to measure flexibility of closure and speed of closure are deficient in several respects. Other research is presently being conducted that will hopefully clarify these deficiencies and the nature of ability and strategic variables that contribute to performance on these and other tests.

Since the present study was undertaken in an effort to replicate and extend Crawford's findings on the relationship between hypnotizability and speed of closure using test data already in hand, the tests were administered in the same format that she and other investigators have em-

ployed. While these administration procedures are not optimal, resolution of methodological issues raised by Crawford's sampling procedure necessitated a comparable administration. Therefore, though undesirable in one sense, standard administration of the tests was mandatory for meaningful comparison between the results of the two studies.

#### Method

The subjects were a sample of 19 females and 14 males from a population of 123 Stanford undergraduates participating in a larger experimental project on information processing analyses of cognitive abilities (Snow, Lohman, Marshalek, Yalow & Webb, 1977). Extensive psychometric information was available on all subjects, including two of the closure speed tests, both spatial ability tests, and the Hidden Figures test used by Crawford. Most of the reference tests were administered during February and March of 1976. The testing procedures and results of this reference battery administration are discussed in detail elsewhere and so will not be repeated here (see Snow, Lohman, Marshalek, Yalow, & Webb, 1977).

Hypnotizability scores on the 33 subjects included in this study were obtained in one of two group administrations of a ten item adaptation of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility (HGSHS; Shor & Orne, 1962). Administration was part of a separate testing program conducted during the fall of 1975 and winter of 1976.

#### Results

Total and within-sex correlations between the HGSHS and various tests in the reference battery are given in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

The column labelled "Factor" identifies the factor or factors on which the particular test had significant loadings. These factors were obtained from a principal components analysis of the scores of the full sample of 123 Stanford students, and included all the tests in Tables 1 and 2 with entries in the factor column, plus Uses for Things and Film Memory III. Seven factors were retained and rotated to a varimax criterion. The sixth and seventh factors were singletons, defined by Uses for Things and Film Memory III, so factor scores were computed only for the first five factors. (For further information on the test intercorrelations and factor analysis, and a comparable analysis in a sample of 241 high school students, see

Table 1

Correlations of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility  
with Various Cognitive Measures

Test	Factor	Total N=33	Male N=14	Female N=19
Sex		18		
Eyedness		-01	38	-35
Handedness		05	-07	15
Auditory Letter Span	IV	-05	06	-09
Visual Number Span	IV	-08	-01	-19
Identical Pictures	III,V	02	21	-10
Finding A's	V	-25	-37	-13
Number Comparison	V	11	-23	30
Street Gestalt	III	34	57	10
Picture Completion		06	03	-07
Harshman Figures	III	14	29	-07
Paper Folding	II,III	-06	-26	15
Form Board	III	05	-08	27
Surface Development	II,III	-06	-02	-13
Embedded Figures		09	01	25
Hidden Figures	II	-04	-03	-27
Necessary Arithmetic Operations	II	-06	-29	08
Thurstone Letter Series	II	-14	-01	-25
Terman Concept Mastery	I	-18	-28	-28
Word Transformations <sup>a</sup>	I	-28	-18	-40
Camouflaged Words <sup>a</sup>	I,IV	-38	-41	-39
Word Beginnings and Endings	I,IV	-15	15	-51
SAT Verbal	I	-04	10	-20
SAT Quantitative	II	02	06	-07
Adv. Raven Progressive Matrices		08	17	07
Uses for Things		39	47	33
Matching Familiar Figures		-29	-10	-47
Marks Imagery Questionnaire (VVIQ) <sup>b</sup>		09	00	44
Marks Imagery Test <sup>b</sup>		-15	-16	-08
Conry Picture Memory Test <sup>c</sup>		-23	-16	-24
Film Memory III <sup>d</sup>		02	02	01

<sup>a</sup>Guilford, 1967

<sup>b</sup>Marks, 1973

<sup>c</sup>Conry and Lohman, 1977

<sup>d</sup>Seibert and Snow, 1965

Note: Decimal points omitted



Snow, Lohman, Marshalek, Yalow, & Webb, 1977.) Correlations of HGSHS with these factors and with the subtests of the WAIS are given in Tables 2 and 3 respectively.

---

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

---

Because of the small sample size, (especially for the within-sex correlations) and the number of correlations involved, these results must be regarded as merely suggestive. However, a number of points are worth noting. First, sex appeared to be a moderating variable in a number of correlations. Eyedness (measured on a scale of 2 = strong right to -2 = strong left) correlated positively with the HGSHS for males and negatively for females. The Street test showed high positive correlation for males but a negligible correlation for females. On the other hand, the Marks Vividness of Visual Imagery Questionnaire (Marks, 1973) correlated positively with the HGSHS for females but showed no relationship with hypnotizability for males. Other variables giving strong differential correlations were: Word Beginnings and Endings ( $r=.51$  for females,  $.15$  for males); the information subtest of the WAIS ( $r=-.44$  for males,  $-.05$  for females); and the digit symbol subtest of the WAIS ( $.39$  for males,  $.11$  for females).

Other findings worth noting are (1) a positive correlation between Uses for Things and the HGSHS for both males and females (2) a strong negative correlation between total time to solution on Matching Familiar Figures (Kagan, 1965) and the HGSHS; and positive correlations between the Picture Completion and Object Assembly subtests of the WAIS and hypnotizability.

On a more general level, the usual finding that hypnotizability is not related to general mental ability was replicated: the correlation between the HGSHS and the full scale WAIS score was  $.04$  for males and  $.07$  for females. Going down the ability hierarchy one step, there were small positive correlations between hypnotizability and the WAIS performance scale scores, but slightly negative correlations with the WAIS verbal scale scores. A closer examination of the WAIS performance subtest correlations shows that this overall correlation was due primarily to the correlations of Picture Completion and Object Assembly with hypnotizability. These two subtests had their highest loadings on Factor III (Spatial



Table 2  
Correlations of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic  
Susceptibility with Ability Factors<sup>a</sup>

Factor	Total N=33	Males N=14	Females N=19
I Verbal-Crystalized Ability	-21	-11	-37
II Fluid-Spatial Analytic	-07	-23	-03
III Spatial Vis-Closure Speed	24	29	18
IV Memory Span	-08	-05	-15
V Perceptual Speed	-11	-03	-06

<sup>a</sup>The factors came from a separate analysis on 123 Stanford students (Snow, Lohman, Marshalek, Yalow, & Webb, 1977).

Note: Decimal points omitted.

Table 3

Correlations of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic  
Susceptibility with WAIS Subtests<sup>a</sup>

Subtest	Factor	Total N=33	Males N=14	Females N=19
Verbal Subtests				
Information	I	-17	-44	-05
Comprehension	I	01	-04	16
Arithmetic	II	06	23	-12
Similarities	(I)	-23	-11	-29
Digit Span	IV	-07	-12	00
Vocabulary	I	-05	15	-19
Performance Subtests				
Digit Symbol	V	21	39	11
Picture Completion	III	39	35	44
Block Design	II	-02	-16	-04
Picture Arrangement	(V)	-15	-15	-14
Object Assembly	III	28	27	30
Total Scores				
Verbal Scale Score		-13	-09	-13
Performance Scale Score		22	20	25
Full Scale Score		04	04	07

<sup>a</sup>The factors came from a separate analysis on the full sample of 123 Stanford students.

Note: Decimal points omitted.

Visualization, Visual Closure), the only factor which correlated positively with the HGSHS. The Harshman Figures and Street Gestalt were the tests loading highest on Factor III. Thus Crawford's contention that hypnotizability is related to speed of closure received some additional, albeit weak, support. The other four ability factors all had small negative correlations with HGSHS.

An interesting hint of sex differences emerged in the correlations with the factor scores. Factor I (verbal-crystallized ability) had a higher negative correlation with hypnotizability for females than males ( $-.37$  vs  $-.11$ ) while Factor II (fluid-spatial analytic ability) showed the reverse pattern--a higher negative correlation for males than females ( $-.23$  vs  $-.03$ ). Admittedly, these correlations and differences are small. However, the factor scores are based on a large number of tests and hence are much more reliable than any of the individual test scores. Thus, the small differentials here are as suggestive as much larger differentials in the raw score correlations.

Finally, a rather remarkable set of correlations between the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the HGSHS are presented in Table 4. In general, these correlations were much higher than those reported by Hilgard and Lauer (1962) for the same instruments. The obvious difference between this study and Hilgard's is sample size, so the high correlations obtained here may result from the anomalies of this sample. However, the fact that the correlations remain when computed within-sex argues against a casual dismissal on the basis of sample size.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

Finally, and most importantly, the results of this investigation are compared with those obtained by Crawford (1976). The unique characteristics of these two studies motivate this comparison: both were carried out on the same population (Stanford undergraduates); good estimates of intercorrelation among the reference tests for 123 students from this population were available, and a good estimate of the distribution of HGSHS scores in this population was available for 241 Stanford undergraduates. Thus, only the correlations between the hypnotizability measures and the common reference tests were particularly questionable, being based on 22



Table 4

Correlations of the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic  
Susceptibility with the California Psychological Inventory

Scale	Total N=33	Males N=14	Females N=19
1. Dominance	23	31	14
2. Capacity for Status	38	57	27
3. Sociability	44	46	44
4. Social Presence	40	70	09
5. Self-Acceptance	29	35	17
6. Sense of Well-being	29	21	42
7. Responsibility	14	29	14
8. Socialization	-20	-22	-12
9. Self-Control	10	07	25
10. Tolerance	42	56	37
11. Good Impression	30	26	44
12. Communality	-07	-16	-06
13. Achievement via Conformance	24	14	30
14. Achievement via Independence	48	58	41
15. Intellectual Efficiency	41	58	33
16. Psychological Mindedness	49	49	51
17. Flexibility	48	43	51
18. Femininity	15	30	18

Note: Decimals omitted

males and 20 females in the Crawford study and 14 males and 19 females in the present study.

Crawford (1976) reported correlations between the SHSS:C and the following tests: (1) Closure Speed (Thurstone & Jeffrey, 1966), (2) fourteen slides from Street Gestalt (Street, 1931), (3) twenty-two slides of the Harshman Figures (Harshman, 1974), (4) Paper Form Board, Surface Development, Hidden Figures, and Nonsense Syllogisms from the ETS Kit (French, Ekstrom & Price, 1963). All of the above tests except Closure Speed and Nonsense Syllogisms were included in the present study. Only those tests common to both investigations will be considered further.

Although Crawford reported correlations between the SHSS:C and the various tests, HGSHS scores were also available for all her subjects. Further, the SHSS:C and HGSHS correlated .95 in her sample (a value considerably higher than the .59 reported by Evans and Schmeidler, 1966). Since the HGSHS was used in the present study, and HGSHS and SHSS:C correlated so highly in the Crawford study, correlations between the HGSHS and the reference tests in the two studies were compared. Crawford's original correlations between the reference tests and SHSS:C are reproduced in Table 5 along with her unreported correlations with the HGSHS. Correlations with the HGSHS from this study are also listed in Table 5 for comparison.

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

In general, correlations between the various reference tests and the HGSHS in the Crawford study are slightly lower than the corresponding correlations with the SHSS:C, although the differences are minimal. However, the differences between the HGSHS and reference test correlations in the Crawford study and the present investigation are substantial (comparing columns one and three in Table 5). For example, the most stable correlations in the table are those for the total sample ( $N=42$  for the Crawford study and  $N=33$  for the present study), and here the correlations reported by Crawford are consistently higher than those obtained in the present investigation.

Why the differences? The most obvious explanation is sampling error. However, the fact that there is a consistent difference between the correlations suggests that factors other than sampling error may be involved.

Table 5

Correlations between Hypnotizability and Tests Common to  
Crawford (1976) and the Present Investigation

Test	Crawford (1976)		Present study
	HGSHS	SHSS:C	HGSHS
Total Correlations	N=42	N=42	N=33
Harshman Figures	32	40	14
Street Gestalt	48	53	34
Hidden Figures	12	13	-04
Form Board	12	16	05
Surface Development	17	22	-06
Females	N=20	N=20	N=19
Harshman Figures	30	32	-07
Street Gestalt	43	42	10
Hidden Figures	29	34	-27
Form Board	26	39	27
Surface Development	29	38	-13
Males	N=22	N=22	N=14
Harshman Figures	34	47	29
Street Gestalt	55	66	57
Hidden Figures	01	-02	-03
Form Board	01	-07	-08
Surface Development	07	07	-02

Note: Decimals omitted



The most important difference was in sampling techniques. Crawford selected 14 low (SHSS:C score 0-3), 14 medium (SHSS:C score 4-8) and 14 high (SHSS:C score 9-12) hypnotizable subjects; whereas in the present study the sampling was more or less random.

The second important difference was in test length. Crawford used only one form of the ETS Kit tests (Hidden Figures, Paper Form Board and Surface Development), whereas both forms of these tests were used in the present study. Crawford also used 14 slides from the Street test, while this study used only 11.

#### Methodological Considerations

The most striking difference between the two studies lies in their sampling procedures. The effect of non-proportional sampling in the Crawford study is seen in Figure 1, where distributions of HGSHS scores from the Crawford study and the present study are superimposed on the distribution of HGSHS scores for 241 Stanford undergraduates. The normative curve shows the bimodal character typically obtained with the HGSHS and other hypnotizability scales (Hilgard, 1968). The distribution for 33 cases in the present study approximates this curve rather well, considering the sample size. On the other hand, the curve for the Crawford data reflects her sampling procedure, and the proportion of observations with extreme scores (0, 1, 9, 10) is inflated.

---

Insert Figure 1 about here

---

The effect of this sort of non-proportional sampling procedure on the correlation of hypnotic susceptibility with other variables is reflected in its effect on the sample variance.

Table 6 shows the means and variances for the two studies and the normative group.

---

Insert Table 6 about here

---

The mean for the present study is slightly higher than the reference mean, while the variances are almost identical. The mean for the Crawford study is also close to the reference mean (5.4 compared with 5.3) but the variance is double that for the reference group. It is known that inflating the




Figure 1. Distributions of Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility scores for a normative Stanford sample (N = 241), Crawford, 1976 (N = 42), and the present study (N = 33).

Table 6

Means and Variances of Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic  
Susceptibility Scores

Group	N	Mean	Variance
Normative <sup>a</sup>	241	5.3	6.34
Present study	33	5.9	6.27
Crawford (1976)	42	5.4	12.82

<sup>a</sup>Based on the results of administration of this scale to 241 Stanford undergraduates.



observed score variance also inflates the covariance, and hence, the correlation with any other variable.

The degree of inflation in the correlations may be estimated by applying the traditional correction for restriction in range to the inflated correlation. Although this correction is usually used to estimate the correlation in an unrestricted sample from a correlation obtained in a restricted sample (Cronbach, 1971; Gulliksen, 1950), it may also be applied where the reverse is needed, as in the present case.

The correction formula for the case where the variance of the variable subject to explicit selection is known for both groups is given by Gulliksen (1950):

$$R_{xy} = \frac{S_x r_{xy}}{\sqrt{S_x^2 r_{xy}^2 + s_x^2 - s_x^2 r_{xy}^2}} \quad (1)$$

Where:

$R_{xy}$  = the corrected correlation between x and y

$r_{xy}$  = the observed correlation between x and y

$s_x$  = the variance of the selection variable in the selected sample

$S_x$  = the variance of the selection variable in the unselected sample

In addition to the usual assumptions of classical test theory, the derivation of this formula assumes that:

- a) the regression of x on y is the same in the "restricted" and "unrestricted" groups, i.e., the mean y is the same for a given x.
- b) the variance of y for a given x is constant at all levels of x, and equivalent in the "restricted" and "unrestricted" groups.

Taken together, these assumptions imply that the error of measurement is constant across all levels of x and the same in both the "restricted" and "unrestricted" samples. These assumptions are not ordinarily unreasonable. However, if the bivariate distribution departs significantly from normality, or either of the measures are particularly unreliable, the unrestricted correlation estimated by Formula 1 will be seriously biased. The coefficient will also be in error if any variable correlated with y (other than x) is used to screen one population and not the other.

Bivariate normality was checked by examining the scatter plots with HGSHS in both studies. There were a number of questionable plots, particularly the plots of Word Transformations and the Street test with

HGSHS in the present study, and the *Street, Harshman Figures, and Paper Form Board* plots in the Crawford study. Good estimates of the reliabilities for most of the tests were available from administrations of the tests to 123 Stanford undergraduates and 241 high school students. Reliabilities for the tests common to both studies are presented in Table 7. These coefficients are based on the combined high school and Stanford samples ( $N = 364$ ). Coefficient alpha for the Street test was particularly low (.38), primarily because the first five items were too easy. Although a test-retest coefficient for this test would undoubtedly be higher, the error variance in the test is substantial. Hence, the assumption that the error variance is constant at all levels of hypnotizability in the regression of Street on HGSHS, and the same in both the "restricted" and "unrestricted" groups is highly unlikely.

---

Insert Table 7 about here

---

Finally, selection bias may be operating in both studies. Subjects who volunteer for hypnosis research are known to differ from non-volunteers in a number of ways and especially in hypnotizability. Volunteers are usually more hypnotizable than non-volunteers (Hilgard, 1968). The fact that subjects were paid participants in both experiments, and that Crawford deliberately selected an equal number of low, medium and high hypnotizables in an effort to insure that low hypnotizables would be adequately represented mitigates this complaint. Nevertheless, it is still possible that subjects who agree to participate in an experiment (especially an experiment on hypnosis) differ systematically from those who refuse to participate even when paid. If any of these differences correlate with performance on the reference tests, and if they were operative in the selection of one group and not the other, then formula (1) will again give a biased estimate of the correlation.

Since there were so many uncertainties about the possibility of satisfying the assumptions underlying the correction for restriction in range (Formula 1), an alternative procedure which assumed only that cases within each interval were randomly sampled was investigated. The procedure involved weighing the cases in each of Crawford's sampling intervals in order to make the distribution of HGSHS scores in her sample more like the normative HGSHS distribution for Stanford students shown in Figure 1.

Table 7

Internal Consistency and Parallel Forms Reliabilities  
for Tests

Test	alpha <sup>a</sup>	Parallel Forms	
		half test <sup>c</sup>	full test <sup>d</sup>
Street Gestalt	38 <sup>b</sup>		
Harshman Figures	79		73
Hidden Figures	75	58	76
Surface Development	90	84	91
Form Board	80	69	82
Picture Completion	78	54	70

Note. All reliability estimates based on a combined sample of 241 high school students and 123 Stanford undergraduates except Picture Completion N = 106.

<sup>a</sup> A lower bound estimate on reliability. Negatively biased for speeded tests.

<sup>b</sup> This estimate is for the ten item test used in this study. An estimate for the 14 item test used by Crawford (1976) obtained by applying the Spearman-Brown formula to this estimate is .46.

<sup>c</sup> The correlation of part 1 of a test with part 2 of the same test.

<sup>d</sup> The part 1, part 2 correlation stepped up by Spearman-Brown.



In the first simulation, the proportion of cases in the normative distribution of HGSHS scores was determined for each of the sampling intervals used to select the subjects (i.e., 0 - 3, 4 - 8, 9 - 12). Integer multipliers were then derived for the Crawford sample, and each case in the sampling interval was multiplied by that integer. Correlations were then recomputed on this weighted sample. Computationally, this merely involved duplicating the appropriate computer cards, changing the number of cases parameter, and rerunning the correlation program. The percent of cases in the original, weighted, and normative samples for each interval are shown in Table 8. The percent of cases in each of the weighted sample intervals approximates those in the normative sample rather closely.

---

Insert Table 8 about here

---

The fact that there were no subjects with scores of four or eight on the HGSHS in this sample, and that these scores fell precisely on the selection boundaries complicates the weighting process. Should these points be considered part of the medium hypnotizability group? Or should they be omitted altogether from the weighting scheme? If they are included in the range of the medium group, then the multiplier is five (as in Table 8), and the effective N is 112; if not, the multiplier is three, and the percentages are as shown in Table 9, with an effective N of 84. Finally, if sampling intervals are ignored and the number of cases for each HGSHS score are weighted separately so as to mirror the normative distribution as closely as possible, the weightings are as shown in Table 10, with an effective N of 117.

---

Insert Tables 9 and 10 about here

---

Table 11 shows the correlations between HGSHS and the reference tests for each of these three weighting schemes, along with the correlations originally reported by Crawford (N = 42) and those obtained by applying the correction for restriction of range (Formula 1) to her correlations. The second weighting scheme, in which the medium hypnotizability group was defined as scores from five to seven (effective N of 84) produced correlations most similar to those obtained from Formula 1.

Table 8

Number and Percent of Cases in each Interval for Original,  
Weighted and Normative Samples for Weighting Scheme #1

Interval	Original N <sup>a</sup>	Multiplier	Effective N	Percent	Norm Percent <sup>b</sup>
0 - 3	14	2	28	25.0	26.1
4 - 8	14	5	70	62.5	61.8
9 - 10	14	1	14	12.5	12.0
Total	42		112	100.0	99.9

<sup>a</sup>Crawford (1976)

<sup>b</sup>Based on HGSHS scores for 241 Stanford undergraduates

Table 9

Number and Percent of Cases in each Interval for Original,  
Weighted and Normative Samples for Weighting Scheme #2

Interval	Original N <sup>a</sup>	Multiplier	Effective N	Percent	Norm Percent <sup>b</sup>
0 - 3	14	2	28	33.3	35.4
5 - 7	14	3	42	50.0	48.3
9 - 10	14	1	14	16.7	16.3
Total	42		84	100.0	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Crawford (1976)

<sup>b</sup>Based on scores for 241 Stanford undergraduates on the HGSHS, omitting scores of 4 and 8.



Table 10

Number and Percent of Cases for each Score in Original,  
Weighted and Normative Samples for Weighting Scheme #3

Score	Original N <sup>a</sup>	Multiplier	Effective N	Percent	Norm Percent <sup>b</sup>
0	4	1	4	3.4	2.9
1	6	1	6	5.1	3.3
2	3	3	9	7.7	6.2
3	1	21	21	17.9	13.7
4	0	-	0	0.0	14.5
5	9	3	27	23.1	16.6
6	4	4	16	13.7	10.0
7	1	14	14	12.0	9.1
8	0	-	0	0.0	11.6
9	6	2	12	10.2	7.1
10	8	1	8	6.8	5.0
Total	42		117	99.9	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Crawford (1976)

<sup>b</sup>Based on HGSHS scores for 241 Stanford undergraduates.

Defining the medium group to include scores of four and eight (effective N of 112) produced slightly lower correlations, with the largest discrepancy being in the correlation of the HGSHS with the Street test. Given the low alpha for this test, and the questionable plots, this result is hardly surprising. In this case, the correlation obtained from the weighting scheme is undoubtedly a better estimate than that obtained through the application of the correction formula.

---

Insert Table 11 here

---

In general, however, the degree of concurrence between the results of the weighting schemes and the correction formula are indeed remarkable. This suggests that, for correlations of this magnitude, violation of the assumptions underlying Formula 1 must be rather substantial before any truly noticeable effect on the resulting correlation occurs. Larger correlations would be more sensitive to assumption violations.

The weighting schemes also had systematic effects on the variance estimates. The variance of HGSHS scores decreased with increases in the effective N, but did not quite reach the normative value of 6.34, even when each score was weighted individually as in the third scheme. For the reference tests, however, variances tended to increase with increases in the effective N. Again, the third weighting scheme (N = 117) produced some anomalies. This is hardly surprising considering the fact that some cases were weighted far more than others. Because of this, the other weighting schemes seem preferable; less reliance is put on any one score, and the assumption that scores within a range were randomly sampled is more tenable than the assumption that one or two scores at a particular level were randomly sampled.

Integer values were used in all the weightings, more out of convenience than necessity. The computational routines employed would have required an unequal weighting of the cases within an interval if non-integer weights had been employed. This is effectively what was accomplished by weighting each level separately (N = 117), and the results were trivially different from those obtained by the second integer weighting scheme (N = 112).

Table 11

Original and Adjusted Correlations between the HGSHS  
and Reference Tests

Test	Crawford (1976)	Weighting Scheme			Corr. for R.R. <sup>a</sup>
		1	2	3	
Harshman Figures	32	22	26	27	23
Street Gestalt	48	27	35	28	36
Form Board	12	07	08	17	09
Surface Development	17	08	09	19	12
Hidden Figures	12	06	07	15	09
Closure Speed Test	43	30	35	41	32
Sum of Closure Tests <sup>b</sup>	47	30	36	37	35
Effective N	42	112	84	117	

<sup>a</sup>Correlation in column 1 after correction for "restriction" of range by Formula 1.

<sup>b</sup>Direct sum of each student's scores on the Street, Harshman Figures and Closure Speed tests as reported in Crawford (1976).

Note: Decimal points omitted



### Discussion

The most important conclusion of this investigation is that the relationship between speed of closure and hypnotizability is not of the magnitude originally reported by Crawford. Nevertheless, there does seem to be a correlation here worth pursuing. It appears that the relationship is moderated by sex. The correlation between hypnotizability and speed of closure was much higher for males than for females in both Crawford's study and the present investigation. However, there were only 22 males in the Crawford study and 14 in the present study. The Street Gestalt had particularly high correlations with the HGSHS score for males in both studies. On the other hand, correlations with the Harshman Figures test were much lower. This suggests that the high correlation between the Street Gestalt and the HGSHS may be an artifact of the unreliability of the Street test. However, it may also indicate that the Street test is a better measure of some aspect of closure speed than the Harshman Figures.

Some further comments are in order on the nature of the speed of closure tasks employed in these studies and the magnitude of the correlation that can reasonably be expected to occur when using them. It was noted earlier that the tests are factorially complex and that administration procedures have undergone subtle but significant changes since Thurstone (1944) first used them to isolate a factor he called "speed of closure". Changing the dependent measure from "number of responses requiring three or more seconds" to "total number correct" introduces other ability and strategic variables. Of particular importance is the possibility that flexibility of closure may influence performance, since in both Crawford's study and the present investigation one of the tests (Hidden Figures) which usually defines or loads heavily on this factor had no relationship (and possibly a negative relationship) with hypnotizability. Thus, correlation between the speed of closure measures and hypnotizability would be attenuated by flexibility of closure when using the tests in this way. Using response latency in addition to correctness as a continuous dependent measure would be preferable to Thurstone's (1944) technique, since calculating within-person regressions no longer carries the computational burden it did in Thurstone's day.

Lack of control over item exposure time and response latency for individual items are serious limitations in the usual paper and pencil version of the Street, or adaptations of it. Distance between the subject and the stimulus display is also left uncontrolled by such a technique, and distance has been found to be a critical determinant of item difficulty. Within the bounds of visual acuity, increasing the distance between the subject and the stimulus (or, conversely, decreasing the size of the image) reduces item difficulty.

Finally, intercorrelations among these various speed of closure tests (Street, Harshman Figures, Gestalt Completion and Picture Completion) are quite low, considering the fact that they are essentially all parallel forms of the same test. For example, in an administration of these tests to 123 Stanford students, the Street test and Harshman Figures correlated .61, the Street and Picture Completion .43, and the Harshman Figures and Picture Completion .56. The first correlation is inflated by both method and occasion variance, since both were slide presentations on the same testing session. The latter two correlations are across method and occasion, as the Picture Completion is a paper and pencil test that was administered in a separate testing session approximately two months later.

Internal consistency of the tests is also quite low (see Table 7 and Guilford & Lacey, 1947 for comparable intercorrelations and internal consistency estimates). In large part, these coefficients reflect the fact that the Street test and the Picture Completion tests were too easy. This is shown graphically in the total score distributions for these tests in Figure 2. However, the meager internal consistency coefficients may also reflect other uncontrolled sources of item variation in the tests. In addition to the factors already mentioned, variables such as the number of picture parts presented, distances between them, and object familiarity all float freely in these tests. Lumping these factors together under the title of "item difficulty" does not clarify matters. Factorially designed tests, where these and other dimensions are varied systematically would greatly improve our understanding of these measures and the psychological processes they reflect. Factorially designed experiments with factorially designed tests would also yield a breakdown of the total test




Figure 2. Distributions of total scores on the Street Gestalt (N = 122), Harshman Figures (N = 123), and Picture Completion (N = 105) tests.



variance into the design components, and thus allow proper disattenuation of the resulting correlations.

---

Insert Figure 2 about here

---

As Cronbach (1971; see also Cronbach, Gleser, Nanda, & Rajaratnam, 1972), has pointed out, one is rarely interested in the observed correlations in theoretical work. The real question of interest is what is the relationship between hypnotizability and speed of closure ability, not what is the relationship between this particular test of hypnotic susceptibility and these particular tests that in part measure something we call "speed of closure". Disattenuating correlations for error of measurement has been considered suspect in some circles, primarily because the procedure has been misunderstood and misapplied too often in the past. The sources of this confusion are twofold: (1) uncritical application of the correction without regard for the assumptions involved, (2) inadequate estimates of the variance components entering the reliability estimate, given the universe of generalization. The latter error can lead to misleading or impossible results, as when a disattenuated coefficient greater than one is obtained. The correlations presented here were not disattenuated for precisely these reasons. On the other hand proper application of disattenuation procedures could greatly facilitate understanding of the relationships involved.

Finally, latency and correctness of response should not be confounded as they are in a time limit test where total number correct is used as the dependent measure. Speed and power appear to be largely independent aspects of performance, particularly in the visuo-spatial domain (Tate, 1948; Egan, 1976). It would appear that the most promising univariate dependent measure for closure speed tests would be the speed of correct responses, not the total number of correct responses. Nevertheless, both aspects of performance should be measured and related to the facets of the factorially designed test.

#### Summary

Many trait theorists have argued against the artificial separation of ability and personality constructs. However, attempts to relate the highly stable trait of hypnotizability to either personality or ability constructs have been particularly unsuccessful (Hilgard, 1968). Thus

the report by Crawford (1976) of substantial correlations between hypnotizability and various speed of closure measures signalled an important breakthrough.

An attempt to replicate those correlations on the same population in the present study yielded markedly lower correlations. A closer inspection of Crawford's study revealed that non-proportional sampling had spuriously inflated the earlier reported correlations. Application of the traditional correction for restriction of range to Crawford's data yielded correlations quite similar to those obtained in the present investigation.

However, possible violation of several of the assumptions which underpin the traditional correction prompted the development of a new technique to correct an inflated correlation. The procedure assumes only that cases within a sampling interval were randomly sampled from that interval. Scores within each interval are weighted in order to modify empirically the distribution of scores to reflect the normative distribution.

Application of this technique to Crawford's data yielded correlations quite similar to those obtained when the traditional correction for restriction of range was applied. It was concluded that, especially for small correlations, violation of the assumptions for the traditional correction must be quite severe before any noticeable effect on the corrected correlation occurs.

Finally, it was argued that there probably is a significant relationship between closure speed and hypnotizability although not of the magnitude reported by Crawford. It appears that the relationship is much higher for males than for females, although the within sex sample sizes in both studies were too small to permit adequate analysis.

Future research in this area would profit from a clarification of the psychological processes involved in closure speed. Factorially designed tests, in which item exposure is controlled and stimulus features are systematically manipulated would constitute an important first step in this direction. Using both latency and correctness as dependent variables in such an analysis is also strongly recommended.

#### Footnote

1. The author is indebted to Dr. Helen Joan Crawford for permission to reanalyze her data, and for supplying the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility scores for the students participating in this study.



## References

- Anastasi, A. Psychology, psychologists, and psychological testing. American Psychologist, 1967, 22, 297-306.
- Bakan, P. Hypnotizability, laterality of eye movement and functional brain asymmetry. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 927-932.
- Botzum, W. A. A factorial study of reasoning and closure factors. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 361-386.
- Conry, R. & Lohman, D. F. Characteristics of a facet-designed measure of memory for pictures. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.
- Crawford, H. J. Is hypnotizability a "right hemisphere" function?: Cognitive mode correlates of hypnotizability. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Los Angeles, April, 1976.
- Cronbach, L. J. Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational Measurement (2nd ed.). Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Cronbach, L. J., Gleser, G. C., Nanda, H., & Rajaratnam, N. The dependability of behavioral measurements. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. Aptitudes and instructional methods. New York: Irvington, 1977.
- Domino, G. Interactive effects of achievement orientation and teaching style on academic achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1971, 62, 427-431.
- Egan, D. E. Accuracy and latency scores as measures of spatial information processing. Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory report No. 1224, Pensacola, Florida, 1976.
- Evans, F. J., & Schmeidler, D. Relationship between the Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility and the Stanford Hypnotic Susceptibility Scale: Form C. International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, 1966, 14, 333-343.
- Eysenck, H. J. Personality and experimental psychology. Bulletin, British Psychological Society, 1966, 19, 1-28.
- French, J. W., Ekstrom, R. B., & Price, L. A. Kit of reference tests for cognitive factors. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1963.
- Gaudry, E., & Spielberger, C. D. Anxiety and educational achievement. New York: Wiley, 1971.

- Guilford, J. P. The nature of human intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Guilford, J. P., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.). Printed classification tests. Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology research reports No. 5, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.
- Gulliksen, H. Theory of mental tests. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1950.
- Gur, R. C., & Gur, R. E. Handedness, sex, and eyedness as moderating variables in the relationship between hypnotic susceptibility and functional brain asymmetry. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1974, 83, 635-643.
- Gur, R., & Reyner, J. Relationship between style of hypnotic induction and direction of lateral eye movements. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1973, 82, 499-505.
- Harshman, R. Harshman Figures. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of California at Los Angeles, 1974.
- Hilgard, E. R. The experience of hypnosis. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968.
- Hilgard, E. R., & Lauer, L. W. Lack of correlation between the California Psychological Inventory and hypnotic susceptibility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 331-335.
- Hoffman, K., Guilford, J. P., Hoepfner, R., & Doherty, W. A factor analysis of the figural-cognition and figural-evaluation abilities. Reports from the Psychological Laboratory at the University of Southern California, No. 40, Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1968.
- Kagan, J. Individual differences in the resolution of response uncertainty. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 154-160.
- Kinsbourne, M. Lateral interactions in the brain. In M. Kinsbourne & W. L. Smith (Eds.), Hemispheric disconnection and cerebral function. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.
- Landsell, H. Effect of extent of temporal lobe ablations on two lateralized deficits. Physiology and Behavior, 1968, 3, 271-273.
- Marks, D. F. Visual imagery differences in the recall of pictures. British Journal of Psychology, 1973, 64 (1), 17-24.
- Messick, S., & French, J. W. Dimensions of cognitive closure. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1975, 10, 3-16.
- Nebes, R. D. Superiority of the minor hemisphere in commissurotomed man for the perception of part-whole relations. Cortex, 1971, 7, 333-349.

- Nebes, R. D. Dominance of the minor hemisphere in commissurotomed man on a test of figural unification. Brain, 1972, 95, 633-638.
- Nebes, R. D. Perception of spatial relationships by the right and left hemispheres of commissurotomed man. Neuropsychologia, 1973, 11, 285-289.
- Newcombe, F., & Russell, W. Dissociated visual perception and spatial deficits in focal lesions of the right hemisphere. Journal of Neurological Neurosurgical Psychiatry, 1969, 32, 73-81.
- Pemberton, C. The closure factors related to other cognitive processes. Psychometrika, 1952a, 17, 267-288.
- Pemberton, C. The closure factors related to temperament. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1952b, 10, 159-175.
- de Renzi, E., & Spinnler, H. Visual recognition in patients with unilateral cerebral disease. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1966, 142, 515-525.
- Seibert, W. F., & Snow, R. E. Studies in cine-psychometry I: Preliminary factor analysis of visual cognition and memory (Final report). Lafayette, Indiana: Audio Visual Center, Purdue University, July 1965.
- Shor, R. E. & Orne, E. C. Harvard Group Scale of Hypnotic Susceptibility. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.
- Smith, I. M. Spatial Ability. London: University of London Press, 1964.
- Snow, R. E. Research on aptitudes: A progress report. Technical Report No. 1. Aptitude Research Project, School of Education, Stanford University, 1976(a).
- Snow, R. E. Theory and method for research on aptitude processes: A prospectus. Technical Report No. 2. Aptitude Research Project, School of Education, Stanford University, 1976(b).
- Snow, R. E., Lohman, D. F., Marshalek, B., Yalow, E., & Webb, N. Correlational analyses of reference aptitude constructs. Technical Report No. 5. Aptitude Research Project, School of Education, Stanford University, 1977.
- Street, R. F. A gestalt completion test. Teachers College, Columbia University theses, No. 4, 1931.
- Tate, M. W. Individual differences in speed of response in mental test materials of varying degrees of difficulty. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1948, 8, 353-374.



- Thurstone, L. L. A factorial study of perception. Psychometric Monographs, No. 4, University of Chicago Press, 1944.
- Thurstone, L. L. An analysis of mechanical aptitude. Psychometric Laboratory Report No. 62, University of Chicago, 1951.
- Thurstone, T. G. & Jeffrey, T. E. Closure speed test. Psychometric Laboratory, University of North Carolina, 1956.
- Warrington, E., & James, M. Disorders in visual perception in patients with localized cerebral lesions. Neuropsychologia, 1967, 5, 253-256.
- Wechsler, D. The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence. (4th ed.) Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1958.
- Weitzenhoffer, A. M. & Hilgard, E. R. Stanford Hypnotic Susceptibility Scale, Form C. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1962.
- Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Faterson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A. Psychological differentiation. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Wolf, Theta H. Alfred Binet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

### Navy

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 4 Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director<br>Personnel & Training Research Programs<br>Office of Naval Research (Code 458)<br>Arlington, VA 22217             | 1 Chairman, Leadership & Law Dept.<br>Div. of Professional Development<br>U.S. Naval Academy<br>Annapolis, MD 21402                                  |
| 1 ONR Branch Office<br>495 Summer Street<br>Boston, MA 02210<br>Attn: Dr. James Lester   | 1 Scientific Advisor to the Chief<br>of Naval Personnel (Pers Or)<br>Naval Bureau of Personnel<br>Room 4410, Arlington Annex<br>Washington, DC 20370 |
| 1 ONR Branch Office<br>1030 East Green Street<br>Pasadena, CA 91101<br>Attn: Dr. Eugene Gloye  | 1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting<br>Provost & Academic Dean<br>U.S. Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940  |
| 1 ONR Branch Office<br>536 S. Clark Street<br>Chicago, IL 60605<br>Attn: Dr. Charles E. Davis  | 1 Mr. Maurice Callahan<br>NODAC (Code 2)<br>Dept. of the Navy<br>Bldg. 2, Washington Navy Yard<br>(Anacostia)<br>Washington, DC 20374                |
| 1 Dr. M. A. Bertin, Scientific Director<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Scientific Liaison Group/Tokyo<br>American Embassy<br>APO San Francisco 96503 | 1 Office of Civilian Personnel<br>Code 342/02 WAP<br>Washington, DC 20390<br>Attn: Dr. Richard J. Niehaus  |
| 1 Office of Naval Research<br>Code 200<br>Arlington, VA 22217  | 1 Office of Civilian Personnel<br>Code 263<br>Washington, DC 20390   |
| 6 Commanding Officer<br>Naval Research Laboratory<br>Code 2627<br>Washington, DC 20390   | 1 Superintendent (Code 1424)<br>Naval Postgraduate School<br>Monterey, CA 93940  |
| 1 Director, Human Resource Management<br>Naval Amphibious School<br>Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek,<br>Norfolk, VA 23521                        | 1 Mr. George N. Graine<br>Naval Sea Systems Command<br>SEA 047C12<br>Washington, DC 20362  |
| 1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr., MSC, USN<br>4024<br>Naval Air Development Center<br>Warminster, PA 18974   | 1 Chief of Naval Technical Training<br>Naval Air Station Memphis (75)<br>Millington, TN 38054<br>Attn: Dr. Norman J. Kerr                            |
| 1 Commanding Officer<br>U.S. Naval Amphibious School<br>Coronado, CA 92155   | 1 Principal Civilian Advisor<br>for Education and Training<br>Naval Training Command, Code 00A<br>Pensacola, FL 32508<br>Attn: Dr. William L. Maloy  |
| 1 Commanding Officer<br>Naval Health Research Center<br>San Diego, CA 92152<br>Attn: Library   | 1 Dr. Alfred F. Smode, Director<br>Training Analysis & Evaluation Group<br>Department of the Navy<br>Orlando, FL 32813                               |

- 1 Chief of Naval Education and Training Support (01A)  
Pensacola, FL 32509
- 1 Capt. H. J. Connery, USN  
Navy Medical R&D Command  
NNMC, Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 01  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 306  
San Diego, CA 92152  
Attn: Dr. James McGrath
- 5 A. A. Sjöholm, Head, Technical Support  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
Code 201  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152  
Attn: Library
- 1 Capt. D. M. Gragg, MC, USN  
Head, Section on Medical Education  
Uniformed Services Univ. of  
the Health Sciences  
6917 Arlington Road  
Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 LCDR J. W. Snyder, Jr.  
F-14 Training Model Manager  
VF-124  
San Diego, CA 92025
- 1 Dr. John Ford  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. Worth Scanland  
Chief of Naval Education & Training  
NAS, Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 Dr. Richard A. Pollak  
Academic Computing Center  
U.S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Army

- 1 Technical Director  
U.S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral & Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Armed Forces Staff College  
Norfolk, VA 23511  
Attn: Library
- 1 Commandant  
U.S. Army Infantry School  
Fort Benning, GA 31905  
Attn: ATSH-I-V-IT
- 1 Commandant  
U.S. Army Institute of Administration  
Attn: EA  
Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216
- 1 Dr. Beatrice Farr  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Frank J. Harris  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Ralph Dusek  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Leon Nawrocki  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Joseph Ward  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Milton S. Katz, Chief  
Individual Training & Performance  
Evaluation Technical Area  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333



- 1 Col. G. B. Howard  
U.S. Army  
Training Support Activity  
Fort Eustis, VA 23604
- 1 Col. Frank Hart, Director  
Training Management Institute  
U.S. Army, Bldg. 1725  
Fort Eustis, VA 23604
- 1 HQ USAREUE & 7th Army  
ODCSOPS  
USAREUR Director of GED  
APO New York 09403
- 1 ARI Field Unit - Leavenworth  
P.O. Box 3122  
Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027
- 1 DCDR, USAADMINCEN  
Bldg. #1, A310  
Attn. AT21-OED Library  
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216
- 1 Dr. Edgar Johnson  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. James Baker  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

#### Air Force

- 1 Research Branch  
AFMPC/DPMYP  
Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 AFHRL/AS (Dr. G. A. Eckstrand)  
Wright-Patterson AFB  
Ohio 45433
- 1 Dr. Ross L. Morgan (AFHRL/ASR)  
Wright-Patterson AFB  
Ohio 45433
- 1 Dr. Marty Rockway (AFHRL/TT)  
Lowry AFB  
Colorado 80230
- 1 Instructional Technology Branch  
AFHRL  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

- 1 Dr. Alfred R. Fregly  
AFOSR/NL, Building 410  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332
- 1 Dr. Sylvia R. Mayer (MCIT)  
HQ Electronic Systems Division  
LG Hanscom Field  
Bedford, MA 01730
- 1 Air University Library  
AUL/LSE 76-443  
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112
- 1 Dr. T. E. Cotterman  
AFHRL/ASR  
Wright Patterson AFB  
Ohio 45433
- 1 Dr. Donald E. Meyer  
U.S. Air Force  
ATC/XPTD  
Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 Dr. Wilson A. Judd  
McDonnell-Douglas Astronautics Co. East  
Lowry AFB  
Denver, CO 80230
- 1 Dr. William Strobie  
McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Co. East  
Lowry AFB  
Denver, CO 80230

#### Marine Corps

- 1 Director, Office of Manpower  
Utilization  
HQ, Marine Corps (Code MPU)  
BCB, Building 2009  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky  
Scientific Advisor (Code RD-1)  
HQ, U.S. Marine Corps  
Washington, DC 20380
- 1 AC/S, Education Programs  
Education Center, MCDEC  
Quantico, VA 22134

Coast Guard

- 1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief  
Psychological Research Branch (G-P-1/62)  
U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters  
Washington, DC 20590

Other DoD

- 1 Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.  
Advanced Research Projects Agency  
Cybernetics Technology, Room 623  
1400 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22209

- 1 Dr. Robert Young  
Advanced Research Projects Agency  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209

- 12 Defense Documentation Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Attn: TC

- 1 Military Assistant for Human Resources  
Office of the Director of Defense  
Research & Engineering  
Room 3D129, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

- 1 Director, Management Information  
Systems Office  
OSD, M&RA  
Room 3B917, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Other Government

- 1 Dr. Vern Urry  
Personnel R&D Center  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
1900 E Street NW  
Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Science Education Dev. & Res.  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. Marshall S. Smith  
Associate Director  
NIE/OPEPA  
National Institute of Education  
Washington, DC 20208

- 1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director  
Memory & Cognitive Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

- 1 Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko, Director  
Manpower Research & Advisory Services  
Smithsonian Institution  
801 N. Pitt Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

- 1 Dr. James M. Ferstl  
Employee Development: Training  
Technologist  
Bureau of Training  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
Washington, DC 20415

- 1 William J. McLaurin  
Room 301  
Internal Revenue Service  
2221 Jefferson Davis Hwy.  
Arlington, VA 22202

Miscellaneous

- 1 Dr. John R. Anderson  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
New Haven, CT 06520

- 1 Dr. Scarvia B. Anderson  
Educational Testing Service  
Suite 1040  
3445 Peachtree Road NE  
Atlanta, GA 30326

- 1 Professor Earl A. Alluisi  
Dept. of Psychology  
Old Dominion University  
Norfolk, VA 23508

- 1 Dr. Daniel Alpert  
Computer-Based Education  
Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

- 1 Ms. Carole A. Bagley  
Applications Analyst  
Minnesota Educational  
Computing Consortium  
1925 Sather Ave.  
Lauderdale, MN 55113

- 1 Mr. Samuel Ball  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Gerald V. Barrett  
University of Akron  
Dept. of Psychology  
Akron, OH 44325
- 1 Dr. John Brackett  
SofTech  
460 Totten Pond Road  
Waltham, MA 02154
- 1 Dr. Robert K. Branson  
1A Tully Bldg.  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306
- 1 Dr. John Seeley Brown  
Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Dr. Victor Bunderson  
Institute for Computer Uses in  
Education  
355 EDLC  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 84601
- 1 Dr. Ronald P. Carver  
School of Education  
University of Missouri-Kansas City  
5100 Rockhill Road  
Kansas City, MO 64110
- 1 Don Ely, Director  
ERIC Clearinghouse on Information  
Resources  
School of Education  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse, NY 13210
- 1 Century Research Corporation  
4113 Lee Highway  
Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark  
College of Arts & Sciences  
University of Rochester  
River Campus Station  
Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Dr. Allan M. Collins  
Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Dr. John J. Collins  
Essex Corporation  
201 N. Fairfax St.  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Donald Dansereau  
Dept. of Psychology  
Texas Christian University  
Fort Worth, TX 76129
- 1 Dr. Rene V. Dawis  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Ruth Day  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 Dr. John D. Carroll  
Psychometric Lab  
Davie Hall 013A  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 1 ERIC Facility-Acquisitions  
4833 Rugby Avenue  
Bethesda, MD 20014
- 1 Dr. John Eschenbrenner  
McDonnell Douglas Astronautics  
Company-East  
P.O. Box 30204  
St. Louis, MO 80230
- 1 Major I. N. Evonic  
Canadian Forces Personnel  
Applied Research Unit  
1107 Avenue Road  
Toronto, Ontario, CANADA
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Dept. of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850



- 1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman  
Advanced Research Resources  
Organization  
8555 Sixteenth Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20910
- 1 Dr. Larry Francis  
University of Illinois  
Computer-Based Educational  
Research Lab  
Champaign, IL 61801
- 1 Dr. Frederick C. Frick  
MIT Lincoln Laboratory  
Room D 268  
P.O. Box 73  
Lexington, MA 02173
- 1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 Dr. Vernon S. Gerlach  
College of Education  
146 Payne Bldg. B  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85281
- 1 Dr. Robert Glaser, Co-Director  
University of Pittsburgh  
R&D Center  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. M. D. Havron  
Human Sciences Research, Inc.  
7710 Old Spring House Road  
West Gate Industrial Park  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Dr. Duncan Hansen  
School of Education  
Memphis State University  
Memphis, TN 38118
- 1 CDR Mercer  
CNET Liaison Officer  
AFHRL/Flying Training Div.  
Williams AFB, AZ 85224
- 1 HumRRO/Western Division  
27857 Berwick Drive  
Carmel, CA 93921  
Attn: Library
- 1 HumRRO/Columbus Office  
Suite 23, 2601 Cross Country Drive  
Columbus, GA 31906
- 1 HumRRO/Ft. Knox Office  
P.O. Box 293  
Fort Knox, KY 40121
- 1 Dr. Lawrence B. Johnson  
Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc.  
Suite 502  
2001 S Street NW  
Washington, DC 20009
- 1 Dr. Arnold F. Kanarick  
Honeywell, Inc.  
2600 Ridgeway Pkwy.  
Minneapolis, MN 55413
- 1 Dr. Roger A. Kaufman  
203 Dodd Hall  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL 32306
- 1 Dr. Steven W. Keele  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403
- 1 Dr. David Klahr  
Dept. of Psychology  
Carnegie-Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Mr. W. E. Lassiter  
Data Solutions Corp.  
Suite 211, 6849 Old Dominion Drive  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie  
Human Factors Research, Inc.  
6780 Corton Drive  
Santa Barbara Research Park  
Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Dr. William C. Mann  
University of So. California  
Information Sciences Institute  
4676 Admiralty Way  
Marina Del Rey, CA 90291

- 1 Dr. Leo Munday  
Houghton Mifflin Co.  
P.O. Box 1970  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Dr. Donald A. Norman  
Dept. of Psychology C-009  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093
- 1 Mr. A. J. Pesch, President  
Eclectech Associates, Inc.  
P.O. Box 178  
N. Stonington, CT 06359
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo  
2431 N. Edgewood Street  
Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Kenneth A. Polcyn  
PCR Information Sciences Co.  
Communication Satellite Applications  
7600 Old Springhouse Rd.  
McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Dr. Steven M. Pine  
N 660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 East River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee  
R-K Research & System Design  
3947 Ridgemont Drive  
Malibu, CA 90265
- 1 R. Dir. M. Rauch  
P II 4  
Bundesministerium der Verteidigung  
Postfach 161  
53 Bonn 1, GERMANY
- 1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney  
University of So. California  
Behavioral Technology Laboratories  
3717 South Grand  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose  
American Institutes for Research  
1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW  
Washington, DC 20007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman  
Dept. of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase  
Educational Psychology Dept.  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
12 Hill Hall  
Columbia, MO 65201
- 1 Dr. Robert J. Seidel  
Instructional Technology Group, HumRRO  
300 N. Washington St.  
Alexandria, VA 22314
- 1 Dr. Persis Sturgis  
Dept. of Psychology  
California State University-Chico  
Chico, CA 95926
- 1 Mr. Dennis J. Sullivan  
c/o Canyon Research Group, Inc.  
32107 Lindero Canyon Road  
Westlake Village, CA 91360
- 1 Mr. Walt W. Tornow  
Control Data Corporation  
Corporate Personnel Research  
P.O. Box 0--HQNO60  
Minneapolis, MN 55440
- 1 Dr. Benton J. Underwood  
Dept. of Psychology  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, IL 60201
- 1 Dr. Carl R. Vest  
Battelle Memorial Institute  
Washington Operations  
2030 M Street NW  
Washington, DC 20036
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss  
Dept. of Psychology  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Keith Wescourt  
Dept. of Psychology  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Claire E. Weinstein  
Educational Psychology Dept.  
University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, TX 78712

- 1 Dr. Anita West  
Denver Research Institute  
University of Denver  
Denver, CO 80201
- 1 Mr. Thomas C. O'Sullivan  
TRAC  
1220 Sunset Plaza Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90069
- 1 Dr. Earl Hunt  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98105
- 1 Dr. Thomas G. Sticht  
Assoc. Director, Basic Skills  
National Institute of Education  
1200 - 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Prof. Fumiko Samejima  
Dept. of Psychology  
Austin Peay Hall 304C  
University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN 37916
- 1 Dr. William S. Vaughan  
W. V. Associates  
3308 Dodge Park Road  
Landover, MD 20785
- 1 Dr. Meredith Crawford  
5605 Montgomery Street  
Chevy Chase, MD 20015
- 1 Dr. Nicholas A. Bond  
Dept. of Psychology  
Sacramento State College  
6000 Jay Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819
- 1 Dr. James Greeno  
Learning R&D Center  
University of Pittsburgh  
3939 O'Hara Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Frederick Hayes-Roth  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90406
- 1 Dr. Robert Sternberg  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 Dr. Walter Schneider  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 1 Dr. Richard B. Millward  
Dept. of Psychology  
Hunter Lab  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912