, AD-A155 564	CONCEPTUR BOULDER	ALIZING IN	ASSEMBLY	TASKS(U) COLORA P BAGGET	DO UNI T et a	V AT IL.	1/3	
UNCLASSIFIED	HPK 85 10					F/G 5	10	NL	
									7. 74.
							END 1 ML N		
ŀ									



ŧ

۰.

And the second

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A NSTITUTE OF COGNITIVE SCIENCE



AD-A155 564

CONCEPTUALIZING IN ASSEMBLY TASKS

Patricia Baggett Psychology Department University of Colorado and Andrzej Ehrenfeucht Computer Science Department University of Colorado

Technical Report No. 139

Institute of Cognitive Science University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado 80309

April, 1985

This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Science Division, Office of Naval Research, under contract Nos. N00014-78-C-0433, NR 157-422; N00014-84-C-0112, NR 667-533; and N00014-85-K-0060, NR 702-001

06

7

85

DTIC

ELECTE

B

.

02

7



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

	REPORT DOCU	MENTATION PAGE	
REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION		16 RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
Unclassified		None	
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT	
DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEE	DULE	Visc : Distribution Unlimite	d stribution
PERFORMING OBGANIZATION REPORT NUM	BER(S)	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NU	MBER(S)
NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	66 OFFICE SYMBOL	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
Department of Psychology	(if applicable)		
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
Lampus BOX 345			
Boulder, CO 80309			
NAME OF FUNDING (SPONSOPING	Bh OFFICE SYMPOL	9 PROCHREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICAT	
ORGANIZATION	(If applicable)	S PROCOREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATI	
Office of Naval Research		1	
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
Personnel & Training Resear	rch Programs	PROGRAM PROJECT 16 TASK	16 WORK UNIT
Uttice of Naval Research (Code 442PT)	N00014-85-K- ND 70	2-001
AFIINGTON, VA 22217 TITLE (Include Security Classification)			
Conceptualizing in Assembly	y Tasks (unclass	ified)	
DERSONIAL ALITHOR/S			
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzo	ej Ehrenfeucht		
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzi a TYPE OF REPORT 13b TIME	covered	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15.	PAGE COUNT
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrz a type of REPORT Interim FROM_	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15. 1985 April 5	PAGE COUNT
2 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy 3a TYPE OF REPORT Interim 5. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15. 1985 April 5 57-422 and N00014-84-C-0112 NR	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrz a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014	ej Ehrenfeucht covered 1983 to 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 15. 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify it tion, mental organization, hier	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional functing: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS CONCEPTUALIZAT Structure of a	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify in tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrz a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funcing: N0001 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 11 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asso	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify in tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This name gives a method	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify in tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical concents	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessar This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into a	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18 SUBJECT TERMS Conceptualizat structure of a learning, asso y and identify by block to determine a Subassemblies	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify in tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person'
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funcing: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS Conceptualizat structure of a learning, asso y and identify by block to determine a Subassemblies, su es used in consti	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessar This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into se equence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block d to determine a subassemblies, su es used in consti ceptualizations,	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessat This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into se equence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a subassemblies, su es used in consti ceptualizations, ing a typical con	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that er structural
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessar This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance that	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18 SUBJECT TERMS Conceptualizations structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a Subassemblies, su es used in consti- ceptualizations, ing a typical con- an those present	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify in tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance that onceptualizations are derived	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asso y and identify by block d to determine a subassemblies, su es used in consti ceptualizations, ing a typical con an those present d from objects bu	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person' en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessar This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance that Onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or n ar these conceptualizations	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizations structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a subassemblies, su es used in constitutions, ing a typical con- an those present d from objects bu- ninority instruct	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure personted in the instructions	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessat This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance that onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or r ar these conceptualizations are ypical instructions vield two	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a subassemblies, su es used in constructions, ing a typical con- an those present from objects bu- ninority instructions are from those pro- pical conceptual	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure resented in the instructions. izations, and importantly, peop	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying le studying
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: N00014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance the onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or r ar these conceptualizations a ypical instructions also vie	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18 SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizations structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a Subassemblies, su es used in consti ceptualizations, ing a typical constitution ceptualizations, ing a typical constitution ceptualization ceptuali	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h nceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure resented in the instructions. izations, and importantly, peop eptualizations, although they a	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person's en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying le studying re significantly
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance the onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or r ar these conceptualizations are ypical instructions also yid ess typical than those from the patricia Baggett and Andrzy State of the second second ar these from the second secon	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizations structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block d to determine a subassemblies, su es used in constit ceptualizations, ing a typical con- an those present d from objects bu- ninority instruct are from those pro- bical conceptualizations are from those pro- are from	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h nceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure resented in the instructions. izations, and importantly, peop eptualizations, although they a ions. From the theoretical con	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person' en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying le studying re significantly struct of
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessal This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present: nd functional performance that onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or r ar these conceptualizations are ypical instructions yield typical or r ar these conceptualizations also yiel ess typical than those from the	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block to determine a subassemblies, su es used in constit ceptualizations, ing a typical con- an those present of from objects but ninority instruct are from those pro- bical conceptual eld typical conce- typical instruct	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure resented in the instructions. izations, and importantly, peop eptualizations, although they a ions. From the theoretical con	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person' en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying le studying re significantly struct of
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Patricia Baggett and Andrzy a TYPE OF REPORT Interim SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Additional funding: NO0014 COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessat This paper gives a method bject its breakdown into sequence of requests for piece hether, given a group of cond ssembly instructions present nd functional performance that onceptualizations are derived ho first studied typical or the ar these conceptualizations a ypical instructions yield typical or the ar these conceptualizations also yield ess typical than those from the DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACE DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACE	ej Ehrenfeucht COVERED 1983 TO 1985 4-78-C-0433 NR 1 18. SUBJECT TERMS conceptualizat structure of a learning, asse y and identify by block d to determine a subassemblies, su es used in constructions, ing a typical construction an those present d from objects but ninority instruction are from those pro- bical conceptualion eld typical conceptualion eld typical conceptualion eld typical conceptualion typical instruction typical instruction T	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985 April 5 57-422 and NO0014-84-C-0112 NR (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify if tion, mental organization, hier an object, cluster analysis, pr embly, instructional design number) person's hypothetical conceptu ubsubassemblies, and so on f ructing it. A technique is giv there is a typical one. The h neceptualization will yield bett ing a minority one is supported uilt from memory (and incorrect tions. A new distance measure resented in the instructions. izations, and importantly, peop eptualizations, although they a ions. From the theoretical con	PAGE COUNT 28 667-533 by block number) archical ocedural alization of an rom the person' en to determine ypothesis that er structural experimentally ly) by people determines how People studying le studying re significantly struct of

SAMPAN NGARAN PARAMAN NAMANAN PARAMANAN

conceptualizations and the methods of measuring them a practical principle, and a way to implement it, are found. The principle: When a single set of procedural instructions is designed, it should present the conceptualization that the majority of people to be instructed by it bring to the situation naturally.





Conceptualizing in Assembly Tasks

Patricia Baggett Psychology Department University of Colorado

and

Andrzej Ehrenfeucht Computer Science Department University of Colorado

Page 2 Conceptualizing

Conceptualizing in Assembly Tasks

Abstract

This paper gives a method to determine a person's hypothetical conceptualization of an object -- its breakdown into subassemblies, subsubassemblies, and so on -- from the person's sequence of requests for pieces used in constructing it. A technique is given to determine whether, given a group of conceptualizations, there is a typical one. The hypothesis that assembly instructions presenting a typical conceptualization will yield better structural and functional performance than those presenting a minority one is supported experimentally. Conceptualizations are derived from objects built from memory (and incorrectly) by people who first studied typical or minority instructions. A new distance measure determines how far these conceptualizations are from those presented in the instructions. People studying typical instructions yield typical conceptualizations, and importantly, people studying minority instructions also yield typical conceptualizations, although they are significantly less typical than those from typical instructions. From the theoretical construct of conceptualizations and the methods of measuring them a practical principle, and a way to implement it, are found. The principle: When a single set of procedural instructions is designed, it should present the conceptualization that the majority of people to be instructed by it bring to the situation naturally.

Page 3 Conceptualizing

Conceptualizing in Assembly Tasks

The statement that behavior is based on an underlying mental organization or conceptualization is not controversial. But a major problem is to infer the conceptualization from behavior, and to show that the conceptualization is psychologically valid. This study gives a method to derive a person's hypothetical conceptualization of an object he or she is building from a sequence of behaviors--requests for pieces used in constructing the object.

It also gives a method to determine, from a group of sequences from different people, or from the same person on different trials, how similar the conceptualizations are. The analysis allows us to determine, from a group of conceptualizations, whether there is a "typical" one. We say what it means for a conceptualization to be presented in instructions. We test the hypothesis that instructions which present a typical conceptualization performance will vield better than those presenting a minority conceptualization. Finally, we analyze the conceptualizations derived from objects built from memory by people who first study either typical or minority instructions. The question in this last analysis is, when a studied, particular conceptualization is how well wi11 that conceptualization still be manifested in the object built later from memory?

Research on inducing conceptual structure from a person's sequential output or from stimulus input combined with subject output is long and varied. Reitman and Rueter (1980) presented a review of several studies and some techniques used. We give only a brief summary here. Bousfield (1953), Bushke (1976), and Reitman and Rueter (1980) studied clustering in recall as a measure of mental organization. Chunking, including temporal parameters, in Go (Reitman, 1976), chess (Chase & Simon, 1973), and electronics (Egan & Schwartz, 1979) has been viewed as indicating what units are stored in memory. Pauses in verbal input (Wickelgren, 1967; Bower & Winzenz, 1969) and output (Chafe, 1977; Bower & Springston, 1970; McLean & Gregg, 1967) have been used to infer memory structure.

Our method also uses sequence information, namely, order of request of pieces in an assembly task. Our underlying hypothesis is as follows. When a person is asked to build an object, from memory or using a model as a guide, the person conceptualizes the object as consisting of subassemblies, subsubassemblies, and so on, and groups his or her requests for pieces according to the conceptual division. This notion is not new. For example, the research, using verbal material, of Monk (1976) and Reitman & Rueter (1980) is based on the idea that subjects chunk the material and recall all elements of one chunk before proceeding to the next.

To our knowledge, our research is new in that: (1) it describes in precise detail how to derive a hypothetical conceptualization from sequence information in an assembly task, which is primarily nonverbal; (2) it gives a method to determine whether different conceptualizations are uniform; (3) it presents a test of the hypothesis that "typical" procedural instructions result in better performance than minority ones; and (4) it gives a technique for comparing the conceptualization presented in instructions to the conceptualization manifested in a subject's performance from memory

Page 4 Conceptualizing

after studying the instructions. As mentioned above, the question this analysis can answer is, how close in conceptualization is what goes in to what comes out?

The Technique

Here are the experimental methods for finding an individual person's conceptualization, for determining whether subjects conceptualize uniformly, and for choosing the most typical conceptualization for a population of subjects. The methods require extensive programming. (See Perry, Note 4.) Variants of some of these methods are given in Baggett (1983) and Baggett and Perrig-Chiello (Note 3).

1. Finding the natural conceptualization of an individual.

We give here a technique to find how people divide an object into subassemblies (how they conceptualize it) from the order in which they request the parts in constructing the object. The assumption we are making can be illustrated by a simple example. If, in selecting four pieces, A, B, C, and D, to build a column A-B-C-D, the person requests A and B, and then D and C, we expect that in a division into two parts, the person has the concepts AB and CD.

The method used is to have a person ask for pieces one at a time and to record the order of request. (If two or more pieces in the object are identical, they must be made distinct in some way--for example, marked with numbers--so that the exact order of request of each piece in the final product can be determined.) The data are easy to gather, even for complex objects. We have data from an object (the one shown in Figure 1)

Insert Figure 1 about here

consisting of 80 pieces, but we think that substantially more pieces can be easily handled. The data analysis is straightforward. It consists of three parts:

a. An object for assembly is represented by an abstract graph whose nodes represent pieces and whose edges (links) represent connections. (This representation can be used on any assembled object, not just pieces from the Fischer-Technik assembly kit used here.) The graph of the object in Figure 1 is given in Figure 2. Nodes in Figure 2 are numbered 1 to 80 to correspond to specific pieces in the object.

Insert Figure 2 about here

b. A distance between connected nodes on the graph is introduced, based on how close together the requests for the two pieces are. For example, if a person requests piece 1 fifth and 4 second, the distance between pieces 1 and 4 is 15-2 = 3.

Page 5 Conceptualizing

c. A cluster analysis is performed, and the clusters are used as hypothetical conceptual units of the assembler. The method of clustering that we use is as follows. Each node is put in a cluster with its closest connected neighbor. An example is given in Figure 3 by the dotted lines in the figure. Then each cluster is put in a higher-order cluster with its closest connected neighbor. These are the solid lines in the figure. This process is continued until all clusters fall into the same higher-order cluster. The analysis was done on a VAX 11/780 under the UNIX operating system, using a programming package written by Perry (Note 4).

The method yields a hierarchical tree, which is the hypothetical natural conceptualization of the object by an individual.

2. Finding whether different people conceptualize uniformly.

Here we give a method to determine how different are the conceptualizations of different people, and of one person on different trials. Are they minor variants of the same conceptualization, or do they form different categories?

a. We first restrict ourselves to comparing conceptualizations in which the final products built are identical. This means that the underlying abstract graphs (as in Figure 2) and the actual pieces used are the same. For example, when adults use a physical model as a guide in building, they typically copy it perfectly and thus construct identical objects.

As in (1) above, the subject is required to request each piece separately, and the sequence of requests is recorded. A person's conceptualization of the object is derived from the order of request using a computer program (Perry, Note 4).

Each conceptualization (tree) becomes a point in a space in which its distance from every other point is calculated. The distance between conceptualizations is described in Appendix 1. A cluster analysis is performed on the space of points. (This cluster analysis is the same as that given in (1) above.) Those points occurring in the same first-order cluster are assumed to be variants of the same conceptualization. If a majority of conceptualizations fall into one first-order cluster, we assume that most subjects conceptualize uniformly. We then define the most typical conceptualization as that conceptualization in the majority cluster which has the smallest average distance to all other conceptualizations in its cluster.

b. Now suppose we want to compare conceptualizations in which the final products built are different, that is, the trees have different leaves. (This will usually be the case, for example, when subjects are building a complex object from memory. They don't do it perfectly, and each person's product is unique.)

The method is the same as above, but the distance between conceptualizations is different. It is given in Appendix 2, together with a complete simple example.

Page 6 Conceptualizing

Using the Technique

In the experiments reported below, we attempted to determine whether our method of measuring conceptualization was reasonable. In Experiment I. we derived conceptualizations from 47 trials of subjects building the object in Figure 1 from a model, and we determined whether conceptualization was uniform. We also derived the most typical conceptualization and a minority conceptualization maximally distant from it. In Experiment II we prepared two videotapes, one showing assembly of the object using the typical conceptualization and the other showing the minority conceptualization. Subjects watched one or the other videotape and then built the object from memory. The hypothesis was that performance from memory should be better for those viewing the typical tape, because it matches their "natural" conceptualization. In extended data analysis in Experiment II, we examined conceptualizations in the objects built from memory from those who watched the typical versus the minority tape. We assessed the subject's conceptualization, as a function of the conceptualization presented in the original instructions, to discover how well the presented conceptualization was manifested in a person's performance.

EXPERIMENT I

Method

Subjects. Twenty-one students (11 female, 10 male) from the Psychology 100 subject pool at the University of Colorado participated as part of a course requirement. One participated in a one-hour session, fourteen in two one-hour sessions (48 hr apart) and six in three one-hour sessions (also 48 hr apart).

<u>Materials</u>. Fischer-Technik 50 assembly kits were used. Each kit contains 48 different and 120 total red, grey, silver, and black plastic and metal pieces. The largest is 90 x 45mm (3.54in x 1.77in) and the smallest 5mm² (.2in²). The model shown in Figure 1 was the object to be built. It consists of 80 pieces and 104 physical connections.

Procedure. Subjects were tested for either one, two, or three sessions. They were told that in each session they would build an object from an assembly kit, using a model as a guide. In session 1, they filled out a questionnaire indicating sex, major, and familiarity with Fischer-Technik and with Lego and other building kits. The experimenter explained that they would ask for each piece, by name or by pointing, as they built. To familiarize them with the names beforehand, subjects first did a matching task. A box with one of each of the 48 different pieces in the kit, and sheets with the 48 names, were placed before them. They were instructed to They were told that this was not a place each piece by its correct name. test, and if they were not sure about a match, they could ask the experimenter. (The names, selected using a schema given in Baggett and Ehrenfeucht (1982) and Baggett (1983), were short and easily matched (96correctly in a previous experiment) with their physical referents.) The experimenter checked the matches and corrected errors. Pieces were placed back in the box.

Subjects were then given a folder containing color photos of the pieces and their names, and the box of pieces. The object to be built was brought

Page 7 Conceptualizing

into view and set before them. Subjects were allowed to handle it, make it function, and disassemble parts if they wanted. They built the object, asking for pieces one at a time as they went. They used the folder and the box of pieces in deciding which pieces they wanted. The experimenter recorded the sequence of requests, and handed the subject the requested pieces.

Subjects returning for sessions two and three built the object a second and third time, using an identical procedure but with no matching task.

to a set of the

Results and Discussion

The 47 orders of request made by people building the object in Figure 1 were analyzed using the cluster analysis program of Perry (Note 4). As described in Appendix 1, each conceptualization (tree) became a point in a space, and its distance from every other tree was computed. A cluster analysis was performed on the space of 47 points. Six first-order clusters were found. The largest contained 33 trees, or 70%, and the remaining five contained 3, 3, 3, and 2 respectively. We interpreted the result to mean that 70% of the conceptualizations were minor variants of one another. There were five other different conceptualizations, which were not variants of those in the majority cluster. The average session number for the 33 trees in the majority cluster was 1.82, while the average session number for the 14 others was 1.35. Thus in later sessions people tended to become more uniform.

We define the most typical conceptualization as that one among the majority group of conceptualizations which had the smallest average distance from the others in its group. The most typical conceptualization for the majority group came in session 2 and was from a female subject. She was a nonscience major who rated her experience with Lego and similar assembly kits as one on a scale of 0 to 3. The conceptualization is shown in Figure 2. It will be referred to in the rest of this paper as the typical conceptualization.

Insert Figures 3 and 4 about here

We selected the conceptualization from the remaining 14 which was maximally distant from the typical one. It is shown in Figure 4 and will be referred to as the minority conceptualization. This conceptualization was given in session 1 by a male engineering major who rated his familiarity with assembly kits as 2 on a 0 to 3 scale. It came from the smallest cluster, with only two trees.

The result of Experiment I agrees with that found in Baggett, 1983. In the earlier study, about 80% of trials assembling an object different from the one used here (54 pieces, 58 connections) clustered together. If these findings of a large uniformity in conceptualization generalize, this means that in individualized instruction, just one set of instructions can cover a large majority of subjects.

Page 8 Conceptualizing

EXPERIMENT II

The goal of Experiment II was to determine how performance would vary as a function of the conceptualization (typical vs. minority) presented in instructions. The theoretical hypothesis was that typical should be better than minority.

We wanted the instructions to be in the form of narrated videotapes. Our first concern was how to find good names for the object, its subassemblies, and subsubassemblies, as indicated in Figures 3 and 4, to be used in the narration. This required an experiment, IIa.

Experiment IIa

Finding Names for Subassemblies

Method

Subjects. Twenty four subjects from the Psychology 100 subject pool at the University of Colorado participated as part of a course requirement. They were randomly divided into two 12-member groups.

Materials. The physical object shown in Figure 1 was used, together with its physical breakdown into subassemblies (the solid lines in Figures 3 and 4) and its further physical breakdown into subsubassemblies (the dotted lines in Figures 3 and 4).

Procedure. Subjects were assigned to one of two groups. Group one built the object according to the conceptual breakdown in Figure 3 (the typical one), and then named the 3 subassemblies, the 11 subsubassemblies, and the whole object. Group two did the same for the minority conceptualization, containing 4 subassemblies and 14 subsubassemblies.

As in Experiment I, subjects first matched pieces with names, and they built by requesting pieces one by one. They were instructed that they had to build the object broken down into the subassemblies lying before them, and that they could build the various subassemblies in any order. The experimenter recorded the order of request, to enforce the conceptual subdivision.

After building, they were asked to name the whole object, each subassembly, and each subsubassembly. It was explained that the best names would be selected and used in the narration to our planned instructional videotape. An answer sheet was provided. It contained blanks with numbers corresponding to numbers on each of the physical subassemblies. The sessions lasted approximately one hour.

Results and Discussion

Using the naming schema given in Baggett and Ehrenfeucht (1982) and improved in Baggett (1983) we selected the most frequently generated name for the object and for each subassembly. (This same schema had been used earlier to derive names for pieces in the kit.) The names are given in Figure 5 for the typical conceptualization and in Figure 6 for the minority

Page 9 Conceptualizing

Insert Figures 5 and 6 about here

one. The average length of a name for the 15 nodes in the typical tree is 2.0; for the minority tree (with 18 nodes) it is 2.16. The object's name, based on the naming schema, is lift.

Experiment IIb.

How the conceptualization in instructions influences conceptualization and performance in assembly

Method

Subjects. Fifty-eight subjects from the Psychology 100 subject pool at the University of Colorado participated as part of a course requirement. They were divided into two 29-member groups, each with 13 females and 16 males. Group assignment was as random as possible, with the constraint that groups contain particular numbers of males and females.

Materials. Two narrated videotapes showing assembly of the lift were prepared. They were shot and edited by James Otis, a professional filmmaker at the University of Colorado. Mr. Otis was given the two conceptualizations shown in Figures 3 and 4, together with the actual orders of request which gave rise to the conceptualizations. He prepared two videotapes of approximately equal length (23 min for typical, 22 min for minority). His constraints were that the conceptualizations presented should be those he was given, and the order of assembly in each case should follow the order of request of the original subject whose conceptualization he was given. The 3/4 in videotapes were narrated by the author. Names for subassemblies came from Experiment IIa. The typical videotape contained 1598 words; the minority contained 1483. When shots were similar in the two tapes, as much as possible the narration was kept identical.

The videotapes presented the conceptualizations top-down breadth first. That is, first the lift was shown (and a demonstration of how it functions was given). Then, in the typical case, the three subassemblies were shown and assembled into a lift. Then the five subsubassemblies of the first subassembly were shown and assembled into the first subassembly, etc. Finally the individual pieces of the first subsubassembly were put together to make it, etc. The minority conceptualization was filmed similarly. The actress for both videotapes was Cynthia Russell. Only her hands and arms were shown. The shots were over her shoulder, and the background was a constant medium blue.

<u>Procedure</u>. Subjects were run individually in a single session lasting from just over an hour to 2-1/2 hours. They first filled out a questionnaire identical to the one used in Experiment I. They were told that they would watch a videotape showing assembly of an object from an assembly kit, and that afterwards they would be asked to build the object from memory. They were further told that the videotape was narrated, so that pieces would be named. To give them a headstart on recognizing pieces and their names, they were told, they would first do the same matching task required in Experiments I and IIa. The experimenter checked their matches as before and corrected errors. The experimenter explained that not every piece in the kit would occur in the object, and some pieces would occur more than once.

Subjects then positioned their chairs in front of a 15" color television set at a distance they selected, and then the appropriate videotape (typical or minority) was shown. Subjects had the option for the room's light to be on or off. (The room was without windows.) And they could adjust the volume to their preferred level.

When the tape was finished, the experimenter turned off the equipment and told the subject about requesting pieces one at a time (as in the previous two experiments). As before, a folder with pieces' photos and their names was beside the subject, together with a collection of one of each of the 48 different pieces. (The lift contains 24 different and 80 total pieces. Thus the subject could choose pieces for the memory trial that did not occur in the actual lift.)

The experimenter explained that there was no time limit, that the subject, after asking for a piece, did not have to use it, and that the objective was to build a lift as similar to the one in the videotape as possible. The time the first piece was requested was recorded, together with the time the subject indicated he or she was ready to stop. The experimenter recorded the order of request of each piece.

Results and Discussion

Measuring Performance in the Products Build from Memory

We first assessed how similar the lifts built from memory were to the original lift. One measure we used was based on structure. Namely, how similar in structure was a memorial lift to the original? This was operationalized as follows. An abstract graph of each lift was drawn. As in Figure 2, it contained nodes and links, indicating the pieces present and how they were physically connected. We counted the number of <u>correct</u> <u>connections</u> in the lift (104 were possible) and used this as our structural <u>measure</u>. Subjects were not penalized for incorrect connections, and correct connections could be wrongly oriented and still receive full credit. Our second measure was functionality. Namely, did the lift built from memory contain a handle which, if turned, caused a lifting device to travel up and down a tower? Subjects' lifts were given either full credit or no credit for functionality. Table 1 presents the structural and functional results, divided by gender of subject and videotape viewed.

Page 11 Conceptualizing

Lesserer La

Table 1

Average number of correct connections in lifts built from memory (104 possible) and number functional (in parentheses), as a function of gender of subject and videotape viewed.

Videotape Viewed

Minority	lypical
27.4	37.2
(0 of 13 functional)	(4 of 13 functional)
42.3	52.6
(10 of 16 functional)	(15 of 16 functional)
35.6	45.7
(10 of 29 functional)	(19 of 29 functional)
	Minority 27.4 (0 of 13 functional) 42.3 (10 of 16 functional) 35.6 (10 of 29 functional)

Note: There were 16 males and 13 females in each group.

gender

A 2x2 between subjects ANOVA was performed on the structural and functional scores. For structure, there was a main effect of gender (F(1.54)=11.6, p<.01) and a main effect of videotape viewed (F(1,54)=5.13, p<.05), and no interaction (F<1). $(MS_{error}=283.9.)$ For functionality, the same two main effects held, again with no interaction. (For gender, F(1,54)=40.9; for videotape viewed, F(1,54)=10.0; and for gender x videotape, F<1. $MS_{error}=.14.$)

Time to work during the memory trial and total number of pieces requested were also analyzed, each in a 2x2 ANOVA. Table 2 presents the means, again by gender and by videotape viewed. For time to work, neither of the main effects nor the interaction reached significance. For number of pieces requested, males requested significantly more than females $(F(1.54)=10.3, p<.01, MS_{error}=212.4)$, while there were no other significant effects.

Table 2

Average time to work during the memory trial (in min) and number of pieces requested (in parentheses) (there are 80 in the original lift), as a function of gender of subject and videotape viewed.

Videotape Viewed

		Minority	Typical
condon	fe male	65.4 min (62.3 pieces)	64.6 min (65.5 pieces)
gender	male	55.4 min (73.9 pieces)	59.4 min (78.6 pieces)
	weighted mean	59.9 min (68.7 pieces)	61.8 min (72.7 pieces)

Page 12 Conceptualizing

7

1

The results are straightforward to interpret. First, males outperformed females on three of four measures in assembly from memory: structure, functionality, and number of pieces requested. The effects of most interest in the study were the main effects of videotape viewed, regardless of gender, for structure and functionality. Namely, subjects in general perform better in terms of both similarity of structure and functionality when they first view a videotape presenting a typical, rather than a minority conceptualization of the object to be assembled. And this better performance is not accompanied by a longer time to work; this was not significantly different for those viewing the typical vs. the minority videotape.

On questionnaires given at the beginning of the experimental session, subjects were asked to rate how much they had played with Lego, erector sets, or other assembly kits, using a scale of 0 (never), 1 (once or twice), 2 (fairly frequently), and 3 (lots). The means of these subjective ratings are given in Table 3. We note that the ratios of the male to female familiarity ratings (1.75/1.08=1.62) for minority; 1.69/1.15=1.47 for typical) are similar to the ratios of the male-to-female structural scores (42.3/27.4=1.54) for minority; 52.6/37.2=1.41 for typical). Thus, one interpretation of the large gender differences in performance is that they arise from a difference in previous experience with similar tasks. In a later study (Baggett, Note 2) we will show an instructional design change that causes the gender difference to disappear.

Table 3

Mean rating of how much subjects had played with assembly kits, on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (lots).

videotape viewed

	minority	typical
female	1.08	1.15
male	1.75	1.69

That typical instructions give better performance than minority ones is not really surprising. The typical conceptualization was defined as the one with the smallest average distance from those in a majority cluster containing 70% of the conceptualizations. Thus it was closest to the way most people conceptualized the task naturally. Let us assume that most of those instructed prepared their conceptual divisions by breaking down the lift into parts and subparts in a particular way at the beginning of the videotape (as the object's functionality was demonstrated). Then when the actual breakdown was presented, those whose already-prepared structure matched it had less to learn and no interference from two different potentially competing structures, the memorial one and the actual one.

One indication that the typical conceptualization better matched that of the majority of the subjects tested comes from the standard deviations in

Page 13 Conceptualizing

the structural scores. For the typical videotape, the female s.d. = 9.3, and the male s.d. = 18.2. For the minority, the s.ds. were 12.5 and 20.7 respectively. This means there was a larger range of scores for minority than typical instructions. For an occasional subject, perhaps the minority instructions fit his or her natural conceptualization, so that performance was especially high, and such scores inflated the minority standard deviations.

We do not know how stable conceptualization, as measured here, is. At this point it is an empirical but unanswered question.

Measuring Conceptualization in the Products built from Memory

The following question now arises. People built lifts from memory after viewing one of two videotapes. Each lift was completely unique. The order in which it was built, and the final graph, indicating the pieces used and how they were connected, was constructed. Can we determine what conceptualization was manifested in each lift built from memory? In particular, we want to know about conceptualizations from those viewing the typical versus the minority videotape. Are they closer to the conceptualization presented in the typical or the minority videotape?

The question is interesting because, if we can answer it, we will be able to assess whether people manifested the conceptualization given in their instructions, even if it did not match their natural one.

The analysis required is a variant of the analysis used above. Every lift built from memory, and the lifts built in the two videotapes (called the perfect typical and the perfect minority lifts) represent trees. Every memorial lift's distance from the perfect typical and the perfect minority is calculated. The question is whether the lifts built by the people viewing the typical videotape are closer to the typical than the minority conceptualization, and similarly, whether the lifts built by those viewing the minority videotape are closer to the minority than the typical conceptualization.

A new problem here is how to compute distances between trees whose end leaves do not consist of the same pieces. The distance that we use is given in Appendix 2. Again, the programming package of Perry (Note 4) was used.

We computed the following distances:

(1) distance (perfect typical, perfect minority) = 321.

(2) distance (conceptualization of each of 58 subjects, perfect typical)

(3) distance (conceptualization of each of 58 subjects, perfect minority)

Thus we knew, for each subject, his or her distance from the perfect typical and minority. We rescaled the line from minority to typical to run from -100 to 100. We project each subject's conceptualization down on this line and ask where it hits. We call the score an x-score. The schema is illustrated in Figure 7. The predictions of course are that, if viewers

Page 14 Conceptualizing

Insert Figure 7 about here

follow their instructions perfectly, then the mean x-score of the people viewing the typical videotape ought to be about 100, and the mean x-score of those viewing the minority videotape ought to be about -100.

The results are in Table 4. A 2x2 between groups ANOVA (gender x videotape) on the x-scores yielded only one significant effect, a main effect of videotape viewed, F(1.54)=5.30, p<.05, $MS_{error} = 2792$. The x-scores of those viewing the typical videotape are not significantly less than 100 by a one-sample t-test (t(29df)=2.04). And those of people viewing the minority videotape have two important properties. First, they are significantly less than those of people viewing the typical videotape (t(56df)=2.48, p<.02). Second, they are far removed from the x-score of the minority videotape (statistics not necessary; -100 is significantly less than 51.2).

Table 4

Mean x-score as a function of videotape viewed and gender of subject.

videotape viewed

	minority	typical
fe male	60.6	85.0
male	43.6	83.5
weighted mean	51.2	84.2

Note. The x-score of the perfect typical lift was 100; the x-score of the perfect minority lift was -100.

The results of the conceptualization analysis tell us that typical instructions reinforce typical performance. Minority instructions do not reinforce a minority conceptualization. We do not know the reason for this. We do not know if such instructions are ignored, or whether they compete with a person's natural conceptualization. In the former case, a subject might think that the minority instructions are unnatural, and that his or her best strategy might be to block them out as much as possible and put together the lift in a natural way. In the latter case the subject might try to learn the minority conceptualization and find that, during the memory trial, he or she is actually working with two competing conceptualizations. Our experiment cannot decide between these alternatives.

Our major practical result is that performance on an assembly task is better when the conceptualization presented in instructions agrees with the one that people naturally bring to the task. As already mentioned, the result is not surprising. The main value of the work is theoretical and methodological. Namely:

- a. We specify precisely what it means to say that a set of instructions contains a conceptualization.
- b. We specify how to find out how different people, given an object to build, conceptualize the object.
- c. We specify how to determine if people in (b) who build the same object have basically the same conceptualizations (variants of each other) or substantially different ones.
- d. We specify what it means to say that an object has a natural, or typical, conceptualization.
- e. We can measure how conceptualization in assembly, even on imperfectly built objects, varies with the conceptualization presented in instructions.
- f. We give a blueprint for designing instructions so that the natural conceptualization is presented in them.

There are other ways that instructions might be improved. For example, individualized instructions might best be designed to match a specific person's idiosyncratic conceptualization. Or it might be that there are several different typical conceptualizations (for example, engineers' conceptualizations might be substantially different from novices'), and people should be instructed, based on subject variables, via those typical instructions that are judged best. Other improvements in videotaped instructions might come through changing narration, or through changing shot sequences based on ideas of visual cohesion and short term memory load (see Baggett, Note 2).

We hope that the methodology, theoretical approach, and practical results presented here will be useful to researchers and practitioners in a variety of situations involving sequences of behaviors. Our approach is currently being extended (Baggett, Note 1) to include actions and other elements, in the more general context of any procedural task.

Page 16 Conceptualizing

Footnote

This research was supported by Office of Naval Research contracts #NO0014-78-C-0433, NO0014-84-C-0112, and NO0014-85-K-0060. We wish to thank James Otis for shooting the videotapes used as stimulus materials, R.M. Perry for his programming package used in the data analysis, and Gabriela Jaramillo, Ken Johnson, Sharon Kaplan, Paul Perales, Cynthia Russell, Pete Tegner, and Lynn Wallick, student assistants who helped run subjects and prepare data for analysis. Some of the results were reported at the twentyfourth and twenty-fifth annual meetings of the Psychonomics Society, 1983 and 1984. This work is Technical Report No. 139 of the Institute of Cognitive Science.

Page 17 Conceptualizing

Reference Notes

- Baggett, P. A multimedia knowledge representation for an "intelligent" computerized tutor. Talk given at ONR contractors' meeting on Instructional Technology for Advanced Training Systems, Atlanta, January 1985.
- Baggett, P. How sequencing and visual cohesion in videotaped procedural instructions influence performance. In progress, 1985.
- Baggett, P., & Perrig-Chiello, P. A method to analyze how children and adults conceptualize and build in an assembly task. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1985.
- Perry, R.M. Computer Techniques for Cluster Analysis. Technical Report, Computer Science Department, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, 1983.

Page 18 Conceptualizing

References

- Baggett, P. Four principles for designing instructions. <u>IEEE Transactions</u> on Professional Communication, 1983, PC-26(3), 99-105.
- Baggett, P., & Ehrenfeucht, A. How an unfamiliar thing should be called. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1982, 11, 437-445.
- Bousfield, W. The occurrence of clustering in recall of randomly arranged associates. Journal of General Psychology, 1953, 30, 149-165.
- Bower, G., & Winzenz, D. Group structure, coding, and memory for digit series. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1969, 80(2, pt. 2).

- Bushke, H. Learning is organized by chunking. <u>Journal of Verbal Learning</u> and Verbal Behavior, 1976, 15, 313-324.
- Chafe, W. Creativity in verbalization and its implications for the nature of stored knowledge. In R. Freedle (Ed.), <u>Discourse Production and</u> Comprehension, Vol. 1. New Jersey: Ablex, 1977. Pp. 41-55.
- Chase, W., & Simon, H. The mind's eye in chess. In W. Chase (Ed.), <u>Visual</u> Information Processing. New York: Academic Press, 1973. Pp. 215-281.
- Egan, D., & Schwartz, B. Chunking in recall of symbolic drawings. <u>Memory</u> and Cognition, 1979, 7(2), 149-158.
- McLean, R., & Gregg, L. Effects of induced chunking on temporal aspects of serial recitation. <u>Journal of Experimental Psychology</u>, 1967, <u>74</u>, 455-459.
- Monk, A. A new approach to the characterization of sequential structure in multi-trial free recall using hierarchical grouping analysis. British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 1976, 29, 1-18.
- Reitman, J. Skilled perception in Go: Deducing memory structures from inter-response times. <u>Cognitive Psychology</u>, 1976, <u>8</u>, 336-356.
- Reitman, J., & Rueter, H. Organization revealed by recall orders and confirmed by pauses. Cognitive Psychology, 1980, 12, 554-581.
- Wickelgren, W. Rehearsal grouping and hierarchical organization of serial position cues in short-term memory. <u>Quarterly Journal of Experimental</u> Psychology, 1967, 19, 97-102.

Page 19 Conceptualizing

Appendix 1

There are two steps in the cluster analysis for a group of conceptualizations which we used in Experiment I. Both use the computer program of Perry (Note 4).

1. Find the distance between all pairs of conceptualizations. The distance between conceptualizations on trials T_i and T_j is the sum (over all 104 connected pairs of pieces in the lift) of the differences in height in a conceptualization necessary to put a connected pair in the same cluster. Here is an example. Consider a pair of connected pieces p_1 and p_2 . Suppose they are placed in the conceptualizations T_j and T_j as shown in Figure 8.

Insert Figure 8 about here

In conceptualization T_j , p_1 and p_2 are in the same first-order cluster; the height is 1. In conceptualization T_j , p_1 and p_2 are in the same second-order cluster (dotted); the height is 2. The distance between the pair of pieces (p_1 , p_2) in conceptualizations T_j and T_j is the difference in heights, 2-1 = 1. The distance between T_j and T_j is the sum (over all 104 pairs) of these distances.

2. Do a cluster analysis on the space of all pairs of conceptualizations with distances defined from step 1. A cluster analysis is done on the conceptualizations with each one put in a cluster with its closest neighbor.

Page 20 Conceptualizing

Appendix 2

This section gives the technique for determining how different conceptualizations (hierarchical trees) from different people are. Each tree becomes a point in a space, and its distance from every other point is calculated. A cluster analysis (the one given in Appendix 1) is performed on the points in the space.

Let us take two conceptualizations X and Y and see how their distance apart is calculated. The method applies even if the graphs and the pieces used in X and Y are different.

X consists of a set, some subsets, some subsubsets, etc. We first make a list of all of these sets as follows. Each set contains each of 48 different pieces with some multiplicity. Each set can thus be described as a vector with 48 co-ordinates. Suppose x_i , a subset of X, contains one piece number 3 and two pieces number 4. (See Figure 4 for the meaning of the piece numbers.) Then x_i can be represented as $(0,0,1,2,0,\ldots,0,0)$. Such a representation is given for all subsets of X, and for all subsets of Y.

For each set x_{i} in X_{i} we find a set in Y that is minimally distant from it, using the Euclidean 1 norm (the sum of the absolute values of the differences of the co-ordinates). Similarly, for each set y_{i} in Y we find a set in X that is minimally distant from it. The distance from X to Y is:

> distance (X,Y) = \sum min (distance (x_i, each y_j)) all sets x_i in X

> > \sum min (distance (y_j, each x_j)). all sets y_i in Y

This metric is only one of many possible ones. We chose it because it allows us to find distances between conceptualizations of objects which are not identical.

In our analysis, we calculated the following distances (a) distance (perfect typical, perfect minority) = 321

(b) distance (conceptualization of each of 58 subjects, perfect typical)

(c) distance (conceptualizations of each of 58 subjects, perfect minority)

(Our analysis was done using a programming package written by Perry (1983).)

To be more concrete about how the distance between trees is calculated, we give a complete simplified example. Suppose four different pieces, A, B, C, and D, are available for building. Suppose there are 2 pieces C available, and one each of A, B, and D. Person S selects as follows. First a piece C is taken. Piece A is taken second and joined to C. Piece B is

Page 21 Conceptualizing

S'

selected third. Piece C' (identical to C) is taken fourth and joined to B. Finally C' is joined to C. The tree structure of S can be represented as ((AC) (C'B)).

Person S' selects piece D first. Second is piece A and third is C. When C is taken, it is connected to A. The C and D are connected. The tree structure of S' is ((D) (A C)). We want to find the distance between the two conceptualizations.

ĩ

The conceptualizations of S and S' consist of sets, subsets, etc., as explained above. We first make a list of the sets in S and in S', and represent them as vectors:

S

elements in set elements in set vector vector (1, 1, 2, 0) (1, 0, 1, 0) (0, 1, 1, 0) (1, 0, 1, 1)(1, 0, 1, 0)(0, 0, 0, 1)ABCC' ACD AC AC B C' D A (1, 0, 0, 0)Α (1, 0, 0, 0)B С (0, 0, 1, 0)(0, 1, 0, 0)С (0, 0, 1, 0)**C'** (0, 0, 1, 0)

For each set in S and S' we find a set in the opposite conceptualization that is closest to it, and we record the distance apart of the 2 sets:

a set S (represented as a vector)	a set in S' closest to it	distance apart
(1, 1, 2, 0) (1, 0, 1, 0) (0, 1, 1, 0) (1, 0, 0, 0) (0, 1, 0, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0)	(1, 0, 1, 0) (1, 0, 1, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0) (1, 0, 0, 0) (0, 0, 0, 1) (0, 0, 1, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0)	2 0 1 0 2 0 0 total 5
a set in S'	a set in S closest to it	distance apart
(1, 0, 1, 1) (1, 0, 1, 0) (0, 0, 0, 1) (1, 0, 0, 0) (0, 0, 1, 0)	(1, 0, 1, 0) (1, 0, 1, 0) (1, 0, 0, 0) (1, 0, 0, 0) (0, 0, 1,)	1 0 2 0 0 0 total 3

The distance between conceptualizations S and S' is 5 + 3 = 8.

Page 22 Conceptualizing

Figure Captions

- 1. An object made from the Fischer-Technik assembly kit. It consists of 80 pieces and 104 physical connections.
- An abstract graph of the object in Figure 1. Nodes represent pieces and links physical connections. Nodes are numbered 1 to 80 to indicate specific pieces in the object. Some of these pieces are noted in Figure 1.
- 3. The most typical conceptualization (division into sub- and subsubassemblies) of the object in Figure 1. Derivation of this conceptualization is given in the text.
- 4. A minority conceptualization of the object in Figure 1. Among 47 trials, it is maximally distant from the typical conceptualization in Figure 3.
- 5. Names for the sub- and subsubassemblies in the typical conceptualization, as derived in Experiment IIa.
- 6. Names for the sub- and subsubassemblies in the minority conceptualization, as derived in Experiment IIa.
- 7. For each subject's conceptualization in Experiment IIb, we calculated its distance from the conceptualizations (perfect typical and perfect minority) shown in the videotapes. We projected each conceptualization down on the line from perfect minority to perfect typical, scaled from 100 to 100. This projection was called an x-score. The mean x-score for those viewing the typical videotape was 84.2. For those viewing the minority videotape, it was 51.2.

8. An example of clustering. It is explained in Appendix 2.

Page 23 Conceptualizing



C





Figure 2



i. A

مرائعة العنائم بالمرام



Figure 4





_



. • ____

In conceptualization T_i:



In conceptualization T_i :





Friday. April 5, 1985 8:36 am

Saggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly Tesks"

Dr. Al Meyrowitz Cflice of Nuval Mesearch Code 4.3 Sin W. Quincy Arlington, VA 22217-5000

^^. Ardrew R. Molner Sffice of Scientific and Engineering

The second and Education The trial Science Foundation

Tr Killtam Montague NESDI Frim Ny Sar Dropri CA 92152 Mandquarters, Marthe Corps [04] WFL-10 #AShirgtor, DC 20390

(n. Allen Minro Sana Lonal Tauminingy Lationator Lat 146 Elana Aut. Salordo Perch. CA 90277 Effector Testribution Pepartment Ment Vilitary Personnel Command Ment Vilitary 20370 Huid. HPM Cperations Branch And Miltary Personnel Command Address A Address A Address Address

Hackington, DC 20370

Assistant for Evaluation. Analysis, and MIS Vausi Vilitary Personnel Command

Walhington, DC 20370

Spec. Asst. for Pasearch. Experi-- ntal & Ac four Programs Visal Terbeius Truining Command (2016-2016) Vision (15) Multington TN 20054

Program Manager for Manpower, Personnel. and Training MAVMAT 0722 Arlington, VA 22217-5000 Assistant for Planning MANTRAPERS NAVOP 0186 Washington, DC 20370

Head Workforce Information Section NAVOP 140F Washington, DC 20370 Head Minpover, Personnel, Training and Reserve Team MAVOP 914D SA578, The Pentagon Mishington, DC 20350 Leadership Management Education and Training Project Officer Naval Medical Command (Code 05C) Washington, DC 20372

Mr. Bill Meale HQ ATC/TTA Randolph AFB. TX 78148 Technical Director Mavy Health Rosearch Center P.O. Box 85122 San Diego, CA 92138 Dr. Richard E. Wisbett University of Michigan Instluef for Social Research Room 5.261 Ann Arbor, MI 48139 Dr. Donald A. Norman Institute for Cognitive Science University of Collfornia La Jolla, CA 92033

Director, Training Laboratory NPRDC (Code 05) Son Diego, CA 92152

Director, Nanpower and Personnel Laboratory MPRDC (Code O6) San Diego. CA 92152 Director Humen Factors A Organizational Systems Lab. NPRDC (Code 07) San Diego, CA 92152

Fleet Support Office NPRDC (Code 301) San Diego, CA 92152

Library

Code P201L Mavy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 Technical Director Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 Commanding Officer Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390 Dr. Harry F. O'Nell, Jr. Training Research Lab Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 2233 Dr. Stellen Ohlsson Learning R & D Center University of Pittsburgh 393 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, PA 1521 Director Technology Programs Office of Naval Research 600 North Quincy Street Arlington, VM 22217-5000 Director Research Programs Office of Naval Research 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Methematics Group Office of Nevel Research Code 411MA

800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000 Office of Naval Research Code 433 800 M. Ouincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5090 Psychulogical Sciences Division Code 442 Office of Naval Peseerch

Office of Naval Feseerch 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Research Code 442EP 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5099

Group Psychology Program Code 4±277P

Code ut75P Office of Navel Research 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Pesearch

Code 442PT BCO N. Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5090 (6 Copies) Special Assistant for Marine Corps Matters Code 100M

Office of Maval Research 800 M. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217 5000

Paychologist ONR Branch Office 1020 East Green Street Pasadena. CA 91101 Commanding Officer Arry Research Institute ATTN: PERI-BR (Dr. J. Orasanu) 5001 Eisenbower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333

بتعثمته فيمتحكم فيستري ولايعت فالمتستشيق فتسفا

Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly lanks"

Friday, Acril 5, 1995

∎ 15 G

(,

í

Friday, April 5, 1985 6:36 🛲

Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly fasks"

Dr. Prederick Mayes-Roth Teknowledge 525 University Ave. Palo Alto. CA 94301 D-. Joan I. Weller Graduate Group in Science and Mathematics Education e'n School of Education University of California E-ricity. CA 34;20

Pr. (1m Hollan Code 51 Siry Personsel R & D Center San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. John Holland University of Michigan 2313 East Engineering Ann Arbor. Mi 19109 **ilsse Moiland Armitsan Institutes for Research 1955 Thomas Jefferson St., Md Lashington, DC 2007

C-, Keith Holyouk Triversity of Michigan H.Lan Performance Center 317 Peckard Road Ann Arber, MI 40109 Pr. Earl Nunt Department of Payehology University of Mashington Feattle, NA 90105 Cr. Ed Mutchins Navy Personnel **ReD Center** San Diego, CA 92152 Dr. Zachary Jacobaon Pureau of Venegement Consulting Priceurier Avenue West Citawa, Cntario X1A 055 Citawa, Cntario X1A 055 Cataba

Dr. Marcel Just Carnegle Mellon University Department of Psychology Schenley Park Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Milton S. Katz Aray Research Institute 5001 Eisenhouer Avenue Alexandrie, VA 22333

Dr. Steven W. Keele Department of Psychology Univgrally of Oregon Eugene. OR 97403 Maj John Keene ADP Systems Branch C3 Development Center (D104) MCDEC Quantico, VA 22134

Dr. Norman J. Kerr Chief of Neval Education and Training Code OOA2

Haval Air Station Pensecols. FL 32508 Dr. David Kleras University of Michigan Technical Communication College of Engineering Duilding 1223 E. Engineering Duilding Ann Arbor. NI 40109

Ann Arbor. NI 40109 Dr. Peter Kinceid Training Analysis & Evaluation Group Dept. of the Mavy

Dr. Walter Kintach Department of Psychology University of Colorado Boulder, CO 80302

Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Mazie Knerr Program Manager Training Research Diviaion Humato 1100 S Mashington Alexandria. VA 22319 Dr. Janet L. Kolodner Georgia Institute of Technology School of Information & Atlanta. (A 30332

Dr. Stophen Kosslyn Harverd University 1236 William James Hall 33 Kirkland St. Combridge, MA 02138 Dr. Pat Lengley University of California Department of Information and Computer Science Irvine, CA 92717 Dr. Warcy Lansman University of Morth Carolina The L. L. Thurstone Lab. Davie Mall Ont Chapel Hill, MC 27519

Dr. Jill Larkin Carnegie-Mellon Univeraity Department of Psychology Pittaburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Alem M. Leagold Learning Rib Canter University of Pittaburgh Fittaburgh, PA 15260 Dr. Jim Levin University of California Laboratory for Camparative Human Cognition D003A La Jolla, CA 92093 Dr. Michael Levine Department of Educational Paychology 210 Education Bidg. University of Illinois Chempsign, 1L 61801

Dr. Clayton Levis University of Colorado Department of Computer Science Genpus Box 430 Boulder, CO 80309 Science and Technology Division Library of Congress Washington, DC 20540

Dr. Charlotte Linde SRI international 333 Pavenaryod Avenue Menic Park, CA 94025

Dr. Don Lyon P. O. Box 44 Higley AZ 85236 Dr. William L. Maloy (02) CHET

Maval Air Station Pensacola: FL 32508

Dr. Sandra P. Marshall Department of Psychology University of California Santa Barbara, CA 93136

Dr. Richard E. Mayer Department of Psychology University of California Santa Barbara. CA 93105 Dr. Jay McClelland Depertment of Paychology Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. Kathleen McKeoun Columbia University Department of Computer Science New York, NY 10027

Dr. **Joe Malachien** Mavy Personnal M&D Center San Diego. CA 92152 Dr. James MeMichael Navy Personnel NiD Center San Diego, Ca 92152

Dr. Berbers Neans Human Resources Research Organization 1100 South Mashington

Alexandria. VA 22314 Dr. Arthur Melmed 724 Brown

U. S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20208

eriduy. April 2. 1902 Beggett & Ehrenfeucht, "Conceptualizing in essembly Tasks"

fridey, April 5, 1985 8-36 am

ĩ

Friday. April 5. 1985 7:54 am

Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in Assembly Tasks"

Office of the Chlef of Yaval Operations Research Development Å Studies Branch Å Studies Branch Hashington, DC 20350 Dr. Allan M. Collins Bolt Berarek & Newman, Inc. En Voulton Street Cambridge, MA 22138 Dr. Stanley Coilyer Cffice of Naval Technology PCC N. Guincy Street Arlington, VA 22217

Dr. Lymn A. Gooper Learning Più Cinter V University of Piùtaburgh 2009 NH ra Street Piùtaburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Lee Cronbach 16 Laburnur Poud Attertor, CA 64705 Dr. Nory Cross Depictment of Education Debic Uteracy Initiative. Room 4145 212 Maryland Almue, SM Wessington, DC 20202

CTP:MuStraw.Hill Library 2500 Garden Plad Wonterey, CA 93940 CDM Mike Curran Office of Kaval Research 320 M. Quincy St. Code 270 Arthstor VA 22217

Pryan Callmon Lowry AFB, CO 80230 Dr. Charles E. Davis Personnel and Training Research Office of Naval Research Britert Brington, VA 22217-5000 Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Defense Technical Information Center Cemeron Station, Bidg 5 Alexandria, VA 22314 Attn: TC Attn: TC Dr. Thomas M. Duffy Department of English Carragie-Mellon University Schenley Park Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Edward E. Eddowes CMATRA N301 Naval Air Station Corpus Christi. TX 78419 Dr. John Ellis Navy Personnel R&D Center San Diego. CA 92252 Dr. Jeffrey Elman University of California Department of Linguistics La Jolla, CA 92093 Dr. Richard Elster Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower) Washington, DC 20350

Dr. Susan Embretson University of Kansas Psychology Department Lawrence, KS 66045 ERIC Facility Acquisitions 4333 Rugby Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014 Dr. K. Anders Ericsson University of Colorado Department of Psychology Boulder, CO 80309 Edward Esty Department of Education, OERI 900 19th St., MM Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Beatrice J. Farr U. S. Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenbower Avenue

Alexandrie. VA 22333 Dr. Marshell J. Farr 2220 North Vernon Street Arlington. VA 22207

Mr. Wallace Feurzeig Educational Technology Bolt Brenank & Newman 10 Moulton St. Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Craig I. Fields ARPA 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209

Dr. Gerhard Fischer Llebiggasse 5/3 A 1010 Vienna

USTRIA

Dr. Linda Flower Carnegie-Meilon University Department of English Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. Ken Forbus Department of Computer Science University ox Illinois Champaign. IL 61820

Dr. Jude Franklin Code 7510 Navy Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375

Dr. John R. Frederiksen Bolt Beranek & Newman 50 Moulton Street Cambridge, MA 02138 Dr. Michael Genesereth Stanford University Department of Computer Science Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Dedre Gentner University of Illinois Department of Psychology 603 E. Daniel St. Champalgn. 11 61920

Dr. Pobert Glaser Leaning Russarch & Development Center University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Pittsburgh, PA 15260 Dr. Marvin D. Glock 217 Stone Hall

217 Stone Mall Cornell University Ithaca, NY 14853 Dr. Joseph Goguen SRI International 333 Ravensword Avenue Menlo Park, CA 94925

Dr. Sherrie Gott AFHRL/MODJ Brooks AFB, TX 78235 Dr. James G. Greeno University of California Berkeley. CA 94720

Dr. Henry M. Halff Halff Resources. Inc. 4918 33rd Road, North Arlington. VA 22207 William E. Martung Product Manager for PEAM Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Elschlower Ave.

Alexandria, VA 22333 Prof. John R. Hayus Carnegie-Mellon University

Department of Psychology

Schenley Park Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. Barbara Hayes-Roth

Department of Computer Science Stanford University Stanford, CA 95:05 Friday. April 5. 1985 8:36 🛲

C

1

Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly Tasks"

Fridey, April 5, 1985 7:54 em

Buggett & Ehrenfeucht, "Conceptualizing in Assembly Tasks"

Personnel Analysis Division AF/NPIA

Dr. Alam Baddeley Medical Research Council Applied Pychology Unit 15 Chaucer Road Cambridge CB2 22F ENCLAND

ir Force Numun Resources Lab SC250. The Pentagon Washington, DC 20330

Brooks AFB, TX 78235 AFHRL/MPD

Life Sciences Directorate Molling Air Force Base Washington, DC 20332 of Scientific Research Air Force Office

Dr. Eva L. Beker, Director

UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation

185 Moore Nall

SCA

Los Angeles. CA 90024

University of Colorado Department of Psychology

Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Patriols Beggett

Muran Factors Laboratory MAVTRAEQUIPCEN Srlanio, FL 32813 P. Bobert Miers Code N711

Kavy Personnel RSD Center 5an Diego. CA 92152 Dr. Ed Alken

Dr. Willim E. Alley Pronks AFB, TX 78235 AFHRL/NUT

attn: Arthur S. Blaiwea Maval Training Equipment Conter

Code N711

Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Nick Bond

Box 114, Yale Station New Haven, CT 06520

Tale University

Dr. John Black

Prooks AFB, TX 78235 Dr. Earl A Alluist HD. AFHRL (AFSC)

Carregie-Mellon University Pittsturgh, PA 15213 Department of Psychology Cr. John N. Anderson

Aray Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences SCOI Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333 fechnical Director

Dr. Gordon N. Bower Department of Psychology Stanford University

Stanford, CA 94306

Dr. Richard Braby

NAVTRAEQUIPCEN

Special Assistant for Projects 50900. The Pentagon Washington, DC 20350 Cross(Mark)

Orlando, FL 32813 Dr. Robert Breaux

Drlando, FL 32813 MAVTRAEQUIPCEN Code N-095R

Dr. John S. Brown XENOX Pelo Alto Research Center

3333 Coyote Road Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. Bruce Buchenan Department of Computer Solence Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Patricia A. Butler NIE Mail Stop 1806 Washington, DC 20208 1200 19th St., MM

Navy Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Dr. Richard Cantone Code 7510

Dr. Jeime Carbonell Carnegie-Mellon University Department of Psychology Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Comst Guard G-PTE 2100 Second St... S.W. Washington, DC 20593 Mr. Jim Carey

Carnegie-Mellon University Department of Paychology Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. Pat Carpenter

APO San Francisco. CA 96503

Department of Paychology University of Colorado

Dr. Lyle Bourne

Boulder, CO 80309

Office of Naval Research Liaison Office. Far East

Washington, DC 20370 Dr. Nobert Carroll NAVOP 115

Navy Personnel N&D Center San Diego, CA 92152 Dr. Fred Chang

Carnegie Mellon University Schenley Park Department of Psychology Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. Davida Charney

Computer Science Department Dr. Eugene Chernlak Brown University

Learning N & D Center University of Pittsburgh Providence. RI 02912 Dr. Michelene Chi

Pittsburgh, PA 15213 3939 O'Hara Street

Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217-5000 800 N. Quincy St. Dr. Susan Chipman Code 412PT

Computer Science Department Dr. William Clancey Stanford University Stanford, CA 9#306

Center for Mavel Analysis 2000 North Beaurgard Street Manpower Support and Readiness Program Alexandria, VA 22311 Di rector

Scientific Advisor to the DCMO (HT) Center for Naval Anulysis 2000 Morth Beaurgard Street Alexandria, VA 22311

Air Force Muman Resource Laboratory Operations Training Division Williams AFB, AZ 85228 Chief of Maval Education and Training Lisison Office

Assistant Chief of Staff Test. and Evaluation Research, Development. Naval Education and

Training Command (N-5) MAS Pensacola. FL 32508

Friday. April 5. 1985 7:54 am

Bacgett & Chrenfeucht, "Conceptualiting in Assembly Teaks"

•

. . .

Friday, April 5, 1985 8:37 am

Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly Tasks"

Prof. Srymour Papert 276-103 Masschusetts Institute of Technology 2mbridge, MA 02139 2m. Deuglas Pearse

E TE4 Rig TCOO Scansview. Cmtarlo Canala Pellegrino University of California, Sarta Parbara Dipartment of Psychology

Santa Barabara, CA 93106 Er, Nancy Pennington Priversity of Chicago

ritinsity of Chicado Graduate Cchicado Graduate Cchical of Rusiness Tit E. Ath St. Chicago, IL 67517

Military Assistant for Training and Personnel Technology VSD (P & E) VVD 30123, The Pentason

hudrington, CC 20101 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USM (Ph.D) 2227 (4442)

115 Pansacola, FL 32508 >>. Tjeerd Plomp Tinnte University of Technology >pt. of Education Pion AE ENSCHEDE Pion AE NAUCHEDE

THE NETHERLANDS D- Martha Polson Department of Psychology Tels Net 346 Telsestry of Colorado

staticy of colorado Souther, Co Engla Dr. Peter Polson Catvesty of Calorado Department of Psychology

Cepartment of Psychology Feulder. CO 803C9

Dr. Steven E. Poltrock MCC 9430 Research Blvd, Echelon Bldg 01 Austin, TX 78759 Dr. Joseph Psotka ATTM: PERI-IC Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhover Ave. Alexandria, VA 22333 Dr. Lynne Reder Department of Psychology Carnegie-Mellon University Schenley Park Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Dr. James A. Reggla University of Maryjand School of Medicine and Mospital Separtment of Neurology 22 South Greene Street Baltimore, MD 21201

Dr. Fred Reif Physics Department University of California Berkeley, CA 94720 Dr. Lauren Reanick Learning R & D Center University of Pittsburgh 3939 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, PA 1521

Dr. Gil Ricard Code N711 MAVTRAEQUIPCEM Orlando, FL 32813 Dr. Mary S. Riley Program in Cognitive Science Center for Human Information Processing University of California La Jolla, CA 92093

William Rizzo Code 712 NAVTRAEQUIPCEN Drlando. FL 32813

Dr. Andrew M. Rose American Institutes for Research 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., NV Mashington, DC 20047

Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf Rell Laboratories Murrsy Hill, NJ 0797# Dr. Williem B. Rouse Georgia Institute of Technology School of Industrial & Systems Enginering Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. David Rumelhart Center for Human Information Processing Univ. of California

La Jolla, CA 92093 Dr. Michael J. Samet Perceptronics, Inc

rerceptronics, inc 6271 Variel Avenue Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Dr. Robert Sasmor Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Stool Elsenhower Avenue Alerandria, VA 22333

Dr. Roger Schank Tale University Para University Parament of Computer Science P.O. Box 2158 Mew Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Alan Schoenfeld University of California Department of Education Brrkeley. CA 94720

Dr. Judah L. Schwartz MIT 20C-120

Dr. Judy Segal NIE

Cambridge, MA 02139

1200 19th Street N.W. Mail Stop 1806

Dr. Robert J. Seidel US Army Research Institute 5001 Eisenhouer Ave. Alemandria, VA 2233 Dr. Rensay W. Selden National Institute of Education 1200 19th St., NA Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Michael G. Shafto ONR Code 442PT 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington. VA 22217-5730 Dr. Sylvia A. S. Shafin Mutional Institute of Education 1200 19th Street Mail Stop 1856 Washingtor DC 20208

Dr. Ted .rtliffe Computer Science Department Stanford University Stanford. CA 34205

Dr. Robert S. Siegler Carregie Mellon University Department of Psychology Schenley Park Pittsburgh, Pa 15213

Dr. Zite M Simutis. Chief Instructional Technology Systems Area ARI

5rd1 Elsenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 2233 Dr. H. Wallace Sinalko Manpower Research and Advisory Services Smithsonian Institution 801 North Pitt Street Alexandria, VA 22314 Dr. Edward E. Smith Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc. 50 Moulton Street Cambridge, MA 02138

Friday, April 5, 1985 8:37 am

C

۰.

Deggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualizing in assembly Tasks"

Institute for the formation of the	Baggett & Ehrenfeucht. "Conceptualising in assembly Tas Dr. Alfred F. Swode Dr. David Stone Series Strate Dr. David Stone Series Strate Settare. Inc. Cree FB Sale Strate Vasal Training Equipment Center RAJ Software. Inc. Cree FB Suite 161 Cree FB Dr. John Tangnay Sale University Boolling AFB. DC 20332 Cree FB Dr. Martin M. Taylor Sale University Bolling AFB. DC 20332 Cree FB Dr. Martin M. Taylor PL. Richard Sorensen Dr. Martin M. Taylor D. Sos 2130 Dr. Martin M. Taylor P.O. Sos 2130 Dr. Martin M. Taylor P.O. Sos 2130 Dr. Martin M. Taylor D. Sos 2132 Dr. Martin M. Taylor P.O. Sos 2132 Dr. Martin M. Taylor D. Sos 2152 Dr. Martin M. Taylor D. Sos 2100 Dr. Martin M. Taylor Crossetter Dr. Martin M. Taylor Dr. Not 2000 Dr. Martin M. Taylor Dr. Martin T. Spechr Dr. Acnue, Dr. Dr. Martin M. Taylor Dr.	Baggett & Bhrenfeucht, "Co	
Multicle MedMulticle MedMulticle MedMulticle MedMulticle MedCorres	Dr. Alfred F. Smode Dr. David Stone Scribt Scientist 3420 East Shee Bird. Cree TB 3420 East Shee Bird. Susal Training Equipment Center 3420 East Shee Bird. State University Bolling AFB. DC 20332 F. Elliot Soloway Bolling AFB. DC 20332 F. Bithard Screeen Bolling AFB. DC 20332 F. Bithard Screeen Bolling AFB. DC 20332 F. Bithard Soreneen Bon 2000 F. Bithard Soreneen Bon 2000 Sortene Bon 2000 Sortene Bon 2000 Townstew, Ontario Bon 2000 Sortene Br. Perry W. Thorndyte F. Kathryn T. Spoehr FMC Corporation Frychology Department Photodian Frychology Department 1185 Coleman Arenue. Doi From University 11800 Milson Bird. Froutherset Associate Frederick Steinhelser Prington. W 22209 <th></th> <th>onceptualizing in assembly Tasks"</th>		onceptualizing in assembly Tasks"
Constraint Constraint <td>Cree 19 Another Stree Bird. Cree 19 Suite 161 Cree 10 Flaid Equipment Center Suite 161 Floenix, A2 Cree 10 Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Fl</td> <td>Dr. Keith T. Wescourt MC Crementan</td> <td>Cmdr. Joe Young wo wrscow</td>	Cree 19 Another Stree Bird. Cree 19 Suite 161 Cree 10 Flaid Equipment Center Suite 161 Floenix, A2 Cree 10 Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Tale University Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Floid Fl	Dr. Keith T. Wescourt MC Crementan	Cmdr. Joe Young wo wrscow
Visit Full of Boline State Mater Nills Mater Nills Mater Nills Mater Nills Visit Full of Bolines Fr. Boline	Sural Training Equipment Center Suite 161 C-lando, FL 3513 Proenix, A2 85028 Traie University PossyML Take University POSSYML Popertaent of Computer Science Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. Jake University Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. Destreamt of Computer Science Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. Destreamt of Computer Science Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. State University Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. State University Polling AFB, DC 20332 P. Stateman Poling AFB, DC 20332 P. Stateman Poling AFB, DC 20332 P. Kathryn T. Spochr Prery W. Thorndyte P. Kathryn T. Spochr Preventer Ing Labi P. Kathryn T. Spochr Preventer Ing Labi P. Kathryn T. Spochr Preventer Ing Labi Providence, HI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Prevence Associate Preventer Ing Labi Prevence Associate Partin A. Toloot Prevence Associate	Central Engineering Labe	ATTN: MEPCT-P
Transmission Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Tr. Elliot SolowayDr. John TangneyTale UniversityDen JuneTale UniversityDen Lucker ScienceP.O. Sor 2158Dr. Martin M. TaylorYew Haven, CT 06520Dr. Martin M. TaylorVew Haven, CT 06520Dr. Nartin M. TaylorSin Diego, CA 92152Dr. Nartin LaborationCount UniversityProcessionFrychologyHilngton, M. 2209PrinserickDr. Martin A. ToloottPrinserickDr. Martin A. ToloottCinnegion, PC 20505Dr. Martin A. ToloottCinnegion, PC 20505Dr. Aval NasserCinnegion, PC 20505Dr. Aval NasserCinnegion, PC 20505Dr. Aval NasserCinnegion, PC 20505Dr. Aval Nasser	1185 Coleman Ave., Box 580 %. Sente Clare, CA 95052	. 2500 Green Bay Road North Chicago, 1L 60064
Construction Construction<	Tale University AF58/ML Tale University Bolling AFB, DC 20332 F.O. Surgerson DC. Nartin M. Taylor P.O. Surgerson DC 2000 F. Richard Sorenson DC 2000 Tay Personnel RAD Center DC 2000 Cir Niego, CA 92152 DC 2000 Providence, NI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Preserve Associate DN 11400 Preserve Associate DA 1000 Prese	Dr. Douglas Wetzel	Dr. Joseph L. Toung
Constrained Entropy Research Role Entro	P. C. Son Science Bolling AFB, DC 20332 P. O. Son 215 (C. Son 2000 Vew Haven, CT 06520 DC, Martin M. Taylor DC. Richard Sorenson DC. Richard Sorenson DC. Richard Sorenson DC. Rethryn T. Spoehr C. Rathryn T. Spoehr Prycholsy Department C. Rathryn T. Spoehr Prycholsy Department Prycholsy Department Prycholsy Department Prycholsy Department Prycholsy Department Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Martin A. Tolootk Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Pr. Prederick Steinheiser Pr. Pr. Prederick Steinheiser Pr.	Code 12	Meacry & Cognitive
or formed (C) Constant (C) Description D	The Waven. CT 00520 Dr. Martin W. Taylor Dr. Michard Sorensen Dr. Richard Sorensen Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Dr. Kathryn T. Spoehr Frychology Department Frychology Department Frychology Department Frovidence, MI 02912 Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Department Frovidence, MI 02912 Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Department Frovidence, MI 02912 Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Ball Frovidence, MI 02912 Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Ball Frovidence, MI 02912 Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Halon Bird, Fritsburgh, Pa 15213 Major Jack Thorpe Critesburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Critesburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Critesburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Critesburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Crites Dr. Percence Fritsburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Crites Dr. Protocott Fritsburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Crites Dr. Protocott Crites Dr. Raval Messero Fritsburgh, Dr. 20505 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Crites Dr. Protocott Fritsburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. 20505 Dr. 20505 Dr. 2000 M. Quincy 34.	Navy Personnel M&D Center Sen Diego. CA 92152	Processes Mational Science Poundation
Telense Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""> <th< td=""><td>Dr. Richard Sorensen Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Rithryn T. Spoehr Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frycholosy Department E-oum University Prycholosy Department E-oum University Prycholosy Department E-oum Liss Coleman Avenue, Boi Prycholosy Department 1185 Coleman Avenue, Boi Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, RI 02912 Major Jack Thorpe Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Major Jack Thorpe Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209</td><td></td><td>Washington, DC 20550</td></th<></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Dr. Richard Sorensen Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Firsonnel RAD Center Doumsview, Omtarlo Sur Rithryn T. Spoehr Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frycholosy Department E-oum University Prycholosy Department E-oum University Prycholosy Department E-oum Liss Coleman Avenue, Boi Prycholosy Department 1185 Coleman Avenue, Boi Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, RI 02912 Major Jack Thorpe Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Major Jack Thorpe Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printsburgh, Pa 15213 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209 Prittsburgh, Pa 15213 Printspingon, Pa 2209		Washington, DC 20550
	 'wy Personnel RAD Center 'uy Personnel RAD Center Carbing Labi Ferry W. Thorndyke Ferry W. Thorndyke Ferry W. Thorndyke Frychology Department Frychology Department Frychology Department Frychology N. Thorndyke Frychology N. Solence Frisburgh, Pa 15213 Frychology N. Artin A. Tolcott Frisburgh, Pa 15213 Frisburgh, Pa 15213<td>IntelliGenetics</td><td>Dr. Steven Zornetzer</td>	IntelliGenetics	Dr. Steven Zornetzer
5.1 Place, G. 63:32 C.M.M. Mail Allowed State C.M.M. Control of State Contro of State Control of Control of State	Cir Niego, CA 92152 CANADA Er, Kathryn T. Spoehr Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frychology Department Erown University Prychology Department FNC Corporation Prychology Department Entral Engineering Labit Prychology Department Major Jack Thorpe Providence, NI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, NI 02912 Major Jack Thorpe Printegravity Matin A. 701001 Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printegravity Printing O	124 University Avenue	Office of Maval Research
C. Indiverts Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	Cr. Kathryn T. Spoehr Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke Frown University FMC Corporation Prycholosy Department End Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Providence, RI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Jones J Stassevski Major Jack Thorpe Pricegle-Mellon University Major Jack Thorpe Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Martin A. Tolcott Pritsburgh, Pa 15213 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Can 030 Dr. Martin A. Tolcott	Palo Alto. CA 98301	Code # #0 BDD M Cutance \$*
State of the former o	E-Jum UniversityFWC CorporationFrychology DepartmentCentral Engineering LabuFrychology DepartmentCentral Engineering LabuFrovidence, NI 029121185 Coleman Avenue, BoiFrovidence, NI 02912Santa Clara, CA 95052Fromes J. StasseuskiNajor Jack ThorpaFromes J. Stasseuski	Dr. Robert A. Wisher	Arlington, VA 22217-5000
Fryeroncy ParameterFryeroncy ParameterMark Colleman Arenes, and ansa Citas, cl 19932Suit Citas, cl 19932Free NotestaNotestaNotestaNotestaFree	Frychology Department Central Engineering Labor Frovidence, MI 02912 1185 Coleman Avenue, Bor Frovidence, MI 02912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 France J Stasseuski Major Jack Thorpe Crimegie-Mellon University MAPA MAPA France of Pythology 1400 Milaon Bivd, Pittsburgh, PA 15213 Marin A. Tolcott Cr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott CiA 932 Office of Maral Research Fishington, DC 20505 S00 M. Quincy St.	U.S. Army Institute for the	
Total Processes Total Processes Total Processes Total Processes Mark Total Mark Total Mark Total Total Mark Mark Total Mark Total Total Mark Mark Total	Tovicence, M. 12912 THO Solution Avenue, BO Trovicence, M. 12912 Santa Clara, CA 95052 Santa S	Dehavioral and Social Sciences	
Treat J. Statistical Sector Association Extrement of Presentation Extrement of Administrement Sciences Presentation Extrement of Presentation Extrement	<pre>/************************************</pre>	560 Alexandria. VA 22313	
Transaction allocations Ways Description Transaction allocations Malor Jack Theorea Malor Jaconal Jacona Jaconal Jaconal Jaco	Fisterich Astociate Major Jack Thorpe Connegie-Melion University DARPA BIV Connegie-Melion University 1400 Milson BIV Firtsburgh, Pa 15213 'Arlington, Wa 2209 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Cr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Cr. Stess Office of Naval Research '2 Ames Office of Naval Research St. Shington, DC 20505 Bio N. Quincy St.		
Consistent for a section billerant by an universarie of a section billerant bill	<pre>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>></pre>	Dr. Nartin P. Wiskoff	
Contraction Milington, M. 2209 Pristburgh, M. 1980 W. 1980 Pristburgh, M. 1980 W. 1980 Pristburgh, M. 1980 W. 1980 P. Nartin A. 101001 W. 2000 P. Nartin A. 101001 W. 2001 P. Nartin A. 101001 W. 2000 P. Nartin A. 101001 W. 10100 P. Martin A. 101001 W. 10100 P. Martin A. 10000 M. 11 Matt P. Martin A. 10000 M. 11 Matt P. Martin A. 10000 M. 10000 P. Martin A. 20100 M. 10000 P. Martin A. 20100<	Fractioner of raysmology Arlington, VA 22209 Pittsburgh, Pa 15213 'Arlington, VA 22209 Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott Cia DRD Cia DRD '2 Ames Office of Maval Researc '2 Ames Office of Maval Researc '2 Ames Office of Maval Researc '2 Ames Office of Maval Researc	Navy Personnel R & D Center	
Preservici Steinweiser Pr. Wertin A. Tolcott D. Frenk Nithweiser 7. Naves. 2. Office al Steinweise Division 2. S. Office al Steinweise Division 2. S. Office al Steinweise Division 7. Naves. 2. Naves. 0018. Others Steinweise Division 2. S. Office al Steinweise Division 2. S. Office al Steinweise Division 7. Naves. 0018. Others Steinweise Division 2. Sono 0018. Others Steinweise 2. Sono 7. Naves. 078. Other Steinweise 2. Steinweise 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Naves. 078. Other Steinweise 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Naves. 078. Other Steinweise 2. Steinweise 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Naves. 1. Stein 1. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Naves. 1. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Naves. 1. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 2. Sono 7. Sono	Pr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott C.A DRD 72 Kaes Office of Maral Researc 72 Kaes Office of Maral Researc K.Shington, DC 20505 800 M. Quincy St.	- 25126 WD 'OBETA LAR	
C.A. Prederick Stelnheiter Dr. Martin A. Tolsont U. S. Ortlage of Kauerton C.A. 910 Waryington, K. 2003 Waryington, K. 2003 T. Shargion, K. 2005 Waryington, K. 2002 Waryington, K. 2002 T. Shargion, K. 2005 Waryington, K. 2002 Waryington, K. 2002 T. Shargion, K. 2005 Maria Research Waryington, K. 2002 T. Shargion, K. 2005 Maria Research Waryington, K. 2002 Prevention Prevention Waryington, K. 2003 Privation Waryington, K. 2003 Maria Research Privation Waryington, K. 2003 Maria Research Privation Waryington, K. 2003 Maria Research Privation Maria Research Maria Research Privating	Cr. Frederick Steinheiser Dr. Martin A. Tolcott CiA 03D 2 A mes 2 A mes 2 A mes 2 A mes 3 00 M. Quincy St.	Dr. Frank Withrow	
C.A. 7090 C.A. 7090 Meryland Are. SM C.A. 7090 Free Stances bytation Meanington, DC 20202 C.A. 1000 Meryland Are. SM Menington, DC 20202 Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2217-5000 Meryland Are. SM Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2217-5000 Meryland Bio Center Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2000 Merker, III Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker, III Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker, III Develst Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker, III Dist Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker, III Dist Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker, III Dist Sternberg Frilington, IX 2010 Merker </td <td>CIA DRD Psychological Sciences [2 Ares Office of Maval Research 2. Shington, DC 20505 800 M. Quincy St.</td> <td>U. S. Offloe of Education</td> <td></td>	CIA DRD Psychological Sciences [2 Ares Office of Maval Research 2. Shington, DC 20505 800 M. Quincy St.	U. S. Offloe of Education	
X.: Shington, IC 2050 Office of Neval Reservch Washington, IC 2050 X.: Shington, IC 20505 60014, Outron St. Frington, W. 22217-5000 Mr. John N. Wolfe Pr.: Interviewer Frington, W. 22217-5000 Mr. John N. Wolfe Mr. John N. Wolfe Start Hiversity Frinkton Bray Personnel NLO Ensington, K. 2022 Start Hiversity Frinkton Bray Personnel NLO Ensity Start Hiversity Frinkton Bray Personnel NLO Ensity Start Hiversity Bray Personnel NLO Ensity Ensity Start Starm Bray Personnel NLO Ensity Ensity Dr. Albert Stevens Frith Bray Personnel NLO Ensity Dr. Albert Stevens Frith Ensity Ensity Dr. Albert Stevens Frith Ens	¹² Ares Office of Maval Research K.Shington, DC 20505 800 M. Quincy St.	vision we want the set of the set	
X. Jhington. K 2005 000 N. Quincy St. Yer Jington. V 22217-5000 Nr. John N. Jolfa Pr. Deter Sternberg Nr. John N. Jolfa Pr. Proter Sternberg Pr. Ington. V 22217-5000 Pr. Instruction Nr. John N. Jolfa Train Privation Nr. John N. Jolfa Pr. Instruction Nr. John N. Jolfa Pr. Instruction Nr. Juleco. C. A. 2017 Pr. Instruction Nr. Juleco. C. A. 2017 Pr. Albert Sternberg Pr. Wallace Multick, III Soit Berane, Inc. Jago Ten N. Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Job Ten N. Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Multick Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Multick Oution St. Pr. Job Ten N. Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Math. Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Job Ten N. Soit Berane, Jac Pr. Math. Diso, Los Ca 99104 Pr. Job Ten N. Diso, Los Ca 99104 Pr. Job Ten N. Diso, La Scietter Pr.	W.shington, PC 20505 BOO M. Quincy St.	Washington, DC 20202	
Dr. Dotter Standerg Dr. Dudias Towne Towner of Sychology Dr. Dudias Towne Sen Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dudias Towne Sen Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dudias Towne Sen Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dudias Towne Sen Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dr. Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dr. Diego, CA 92152 Towner of Sychology Dr. Dr. Dr. Pr. Name Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. Dr. <td>ANDA ADAAAA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA</td> <td></td> <td></td>	ANDA ADAAAA AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA		
Transmitter of Paychology Dr. Duglas foure Transmitter of Paychology Dr. Duglas four terminic Dr. Jabert Stevens Dr. Kurt Van Lehn Dr. Jabert Stevens Dr. Kurt Van Lehn Dr. Jabert Stevens Dr. Duglas for terminic Dr. Pul J Stehn Marcen Dr. Pathologon Stehn Marcen Marcen Dr. Pul	Dr. Bobert Stershere	Mark Pertanal MLD Feater	
Tile furicersityBenericial fectinology LabsTile furicersityBenericial fectinology LabsTile furicesityBenericial fectinology LabsFirst Haven, CT 0550Redondo Beach, CA 90271First Haven, CT 0550Redondo Beach, CA 90271First Haven, JacBernerk Haven, JacFirst Haven, JacDr. Albert StevensFirst Haven, JacDr. Albert StevensFirst Haven, JacJ333 Copote MUI RoadSoit Bernerk A Reman, JacDr. Abert StevensFirst Haven, JacJ333 Copote MUI RoadDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenFirst HavenDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenBert Manne, CashringtonDr. Beth WarrenHurstonDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenMajor Frest, Bertington, Dr. 2030Havan, JacMajor Frest, Marine CorpsCode HF-201Major Presence JuristonDr. Paul J. StichsDiger Meriastrative SciencesSoirice StatistDiferentistDr. Paul J. StichsDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentistDr. Beth MarcenDiferentist <td< td=""><td>Centration Parchology Dr. Douglas Towne</td><td>San Diero, CA 92152</td><td></td></td<>	Centration Parchology Dr. Douglas Towne	San Diero, CA 92152	
Set 114Tale Station1045.5. Elena Ave.Net van LehNedondo Beach. CA 90277Dr. Vallace Malfack, IIIDr. Albert StavensNr. Kurt Van LehSan Diego. CA 92152Dr. Albert StavensNr. Kurt Van LehDr. Joe TranueDr. Albert StavensNr. Kurt Van LehDr. Joe TranueDr. Albert StavensNr. Kurt Van LehDr. Joe TranueDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor Frank Tohannen, USMCDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor Frank Tohannen, USMCDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor StreetDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor Frank Tohannen, USMCDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor Frank Tohannen, USMCDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor Frank Tohannen, USMCDr. Paul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenNajor StreetTaining Fesearch DivisionSo Moulton StreetWallor, Dr. 203B0Major Karsinger BaylonNeary Fraomel ND. ContNainistrative SciencesDr. Tohas StichtNaval PosterenNaval PosterenNavy Personnel ND CenterNoldery CA 9330Ne. ContNavy Personnel ND CenterNoldery CA 9330Ne. ContNava Personnel ND CenterNoldery CA 9330Ne. CanadomNava Personnel ND CenterNoldery CA 9330Ne. CanadomNava Personnel ND Cen	Tale University Behavioral Technology L		
Ford Haven, CT 70520 Nedondo Beach, CA 90277 New Personnel MD Center Dr. Albert Stevens Dr. Kurt Van Lehn San Diego, CA 92152 Dr. Albert Stevens Dr. Kurt Van Lehn San Diego, CA 92152 Dr. Duoiton St. Tron Nouton St. Dr. Joe Taatuke Dr. Paio Alto, CA 9903 Dr. Van Lehn Dr. Joe Taatuke Dr. Paio Alto, Saff Scientist Dr. Paio Alto, CA 9903 Dr. Yuti Readown, USMC Dr. Paul J. Stichs Dr. Beth Warren Dr. Paio Alto, CA 99103 Dr. Paul J. Stichs Dr. Beth Warren Dr. Paio Alto, CA 99103 Dr. Paul J. Stichs Dr. Beth Warren Dr. Paio Alto, CA 90230 Dr. Paul J. Stichs Dr. Beth Warren Dr. Paio Alto, CA 99103 Dr. Paul J. Stichs Dr. Paio Alto, CA 90100 Badourters, Nari Ocrpa Saining Fesearch Division Dr. Manine Corpa Dr. 20380 Mainistrative Sciences Nashington, DC 20380 Mainistrative Sciences Narandria, VA 22314 Roger Meisasinger Baylom Nashington, DC 20380 Dr. Jonas Sticht Naval Personnel Robol Dr. Arenue School Dr. Jonas Sticht Notery, CA 9930 Naval Personnel Robol Dr. Jonas Sticht Notery, CA 99300 Naval Personnel Robol	But 11A Tale Station 1845 S. Elena Ave.	Dr. Wallace Mulfeck, III	
Dr. Albert Stevens Dr. Kurt Van Lehn Dr. Joe Yaastuk Kenam, Jno. Dr. Bein Alto, St. 3333 Goyote Mill Moad Carbridge, Ha 02236 Paio Alto, CA 94304 Dr. Paul J. Stleha Dr. Beth Warren Mashington Code HPI-20 Mashington Dr. 20380 Mashington Dr. 20380 Maya Stleh System Dereview May Personnel MS Canter Navenue May Personnel MS Canter System	Kow Haven, CT 76520 Redondo Beach. CA 90277	Navy Personnel R4D Center Sen Diago CA 02152	
D: Leranek & Hewaen, Jno.Xerox PAICDr. Joe Yaastuke0 Moulton St.3333 Coyote M11 MoadBrML/LMT0 Moulton St.3333 Coyote M11 MoadLowry AFB. CO 80230 '0 Moulton St.Paio Alto, CA 94304Lowry AFB. CO 80230 'Dr. Paul J. StichaDr. Beth WarrenMajor Frank Yohannan, USMCDr. Paul J. StichaDr. SteratetMajor Frank Yohannan, USMCSmining Feserch DivisionSo Moulton StreetMajor Frank Yohannan, USMCTranonResearch DivisionSo Moulton StreetTranonResearch DivisionDr. 20380TiCO S. WashingtonMashington, Dr. 20380Aitona StichtMauliaitarture SciencesMay Personnel RAD CenterMauniaitarture SciencesMay Personnel RAD CenterMoulerey, Cu 93940Dr. Tomas StichtMoulterey, Cu 93940May Personnel RAD CenterMaulaitarture SciencesDivisionStichtMoulterey, Cu 93940Dr. Tomas StichtMoulterey, Cu 93940Dr. Tomas StichtMoulterey, Cu 93940Dr. Tomas StichtMoulterey, Cu 93940DivisionPaio Alto, Ca 98301DivisionPaio Alto, Ca 98301	Dr. Albert Stevens Dr. Kurt Yan Lehn		
"O Multon St. 333 Coyote Mill Moad AFMHL/LMT Canbridge HM 02238 Paio Alto, CA 94304 Lowry AFB. CO 80230 Dr. Paul J. Sticha Dr. Beth Warren Major Frank Yohannan, USMC Dr. Paul J. Sticha Dr. Beth Warren Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Major Frank Yohannan, USMC S-ning Feaserch Division Staten Beranek 4 Neuman, Inc. Manilistrative Sciences ITO S. Mashington Roz 20380 Mr. Carl York Norterek 2003 ITO S. Mashington Roz 20300 Mr. Carl York Norterek 2003 ITO S. Mashington Roz 22314 Roz 22314 Staten Fork Dr. 700033 Sticht Novelue Novelue Novelue May Personnel RAD Center Monterey, CA 93940	Boit Beranek & Newman, Jne. Xerox PANC	Dr. Joe Tasatuke	
Carbridge. N4 02238Paio Alto, CA 94304Lowry Ar8. CO 00230Dr. Paul J. StichaDr. Beth WarrenBoft Beranek A Neuman, Inc.Sriter Staff ScientistBoft Beranek A Neuman, Inc.Major Frank Tohannan, USNCSriter Staff ScientistBoft Beranek A Neuman, Inc.Major Frank Tohannan, USNCSriter Staff ScientistBoft Beranek A Neuman, Inc.Major Frank Tohannan, USNCSriter Staff ScientistBoft Beranek A Neuman, Inc.Major Frank Tohannan, USNCTraining Research DivisionBoft Beranek A Norly Beranek A Nor	10 Noulton St. 3333 Coyote Will Road	AFHRL/LAT	
Dr. Faul J. StichsDr. Beth WarrenMajor Frenk Tohannan, USMCSanicr Staff ScientistBoft Beranck A Neman, Inc.Major Frenk Tohannan, USMCSaning Research DivisionBoft Beranck A Neman, Inc.Madquarters, Marine CorpsGodd HPI-20)Codd HPI-20)Washington, DC 20380HurnpoCambridge, MA 02138Mr. Carl YorkHickandria, VA 22314Roger Meissinger BaylonMr. Carl YorkDr. Jonnas StichtNaval Postgraduate SchoolSale Alto, CA 94301Dr. Jonnas StichtMonterey, CA 93940Paio Alto, CA 94301	Cambridge. Mt 02238	LOWLY AFB. CO 80230	
S-nicr Staff Scientist Boft Beranek & Newan, Inc. Hendquarters, Marine Corps (-ranoing Research Division Street Huranoing Research Division Cambridge, Ma O2136 Huranoria, VA 22318 Aiexandria, VA 22318 Dr. Thomas Sticht May Personnel R4D Center Marington, DC 20380 Mr. Carl York Mr.	Dr. Paul J. Stiche Dr. Beth Warren	Major Frank Tohannan, USMC	
Training Research Division 50 Moulton Street (code NTi_20) Hurbo Cambridge, MA 02136 Washington, DC 20380 Hurbo Cambridge, MA 02136 Washington, DC 20380 1100 S. Washington Roger Veissinger Baylon Wr. Carl York Newaria, VA 22318 Roger Veissinger Baylon Mr. Carl York Dr. Thomas Sticht Naval Postgraduate School 181 Lytton Avenue May Personnel RHD Center Monterey, CA 93940 Paio Alto, CA 94301	Sauler Staff Scientist Boft Beranek & Newman,	G. Headquarters, Marine Corps	
Hur Room Cambridge, MA 02136 waanington, W. 20300 Cambridge, MA 02136 wasnington Wr. Carl York Roger Veissinger Baylon Alexandria, VA 22314 Roger Veissinger Baylon System Development Foundation Dr. Thomas Sticht Navel Postgraduate School 181 Lytton Avenue Monterey, CA 93940 Paio Alto, CA 94301	Training Research Division 50 Moulton Street	(Code MPI-20)	
rucu S. Washingkon Alexandria, VA 22314 Roger Veissinger Baylon Der Thomas Sticht Naval Postgraduate School 181 Lytton Avenue Mavy Personnel R4D Center Monterey, CA 93940	Hurthate Ma 02138		
Dr. Thomas Sticht Noval Postgraduate School Stences System Development Foundation Dr. Thomas Sticht Naval Postgraduate School 181 Lytton Avenue Mavy Personnel R4D Center Monterey. CA 93940	110 S. Washington Aferandria VA 2218 Aferandria VA 2218	Mr. Carl York	
Dr. Thomas Sticht Naval Postgrøduate School 181 Lytton Avenue Mavy Personnel M3D Center Monterey. CA 93940	Department of Administration	sive Sciences System Development Foundation	
Mavy Personnel RiD Center Monterey. CA 93940 Paio Alto, CA 94301	Dr. Thomas Sticht Naval Postgraduate Scho	181 Lytton Avenue	
	Mavy Personnel RiD Center Monterey, CA 93940	Palo Alto, CA 94301	

Ċ

END

C

FILMED

8-85

DTIC

