

AD-A206 157

DT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

(4)

1a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Technical Report #89-1.	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Washington University	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research (Code 1142PT) Personnel & Training Research Programs	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 660 S. Euclid, Box 8111 Department of Neurology St. Louis, MO 63110		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-86-K0289	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		
	PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 61153N	PROJECT NO. RR04206	TASK NO. RR04206-OA
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) The Attention System of the Human Brain			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Michael I. Posner and Steven E. Petersen			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 7/1/88 TO 6/30/89	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) February 28, 1989	15. PAGE COUNT 25
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION			
17. COSATI CODES	18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP			
05 10			
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The concept of attention as central to human performance extends back to the start of experimental psychology (James, 1890), yet even a few years ago, it would not have been possible to outline in even a preliminary form a functional anatomy of the human attentional system. New developments in neuroscience (Hillyard & Picton, 1987; Raichle, 1983; Wurtz, Goldberg & Robinson, 1980) have opened the study of higher cognition to physiological analysis, and have revealed a system of anatomical areas that appear to be basic to the selection of information for focal (conscious) processing.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Michael I. Posner		22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (503) 686-4939	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ONR 1142 PT

DD FORM 1473, 26 MAR

22a. APP EDITION MAY BE USED UNTIL EXHAUSTED
ALL OTHER EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

DTIC
ELECTE
20 MAR 1989
S D
G E

(Submitted to the Annals of Neuroscience, 1989)

The Attention System of the Human Brain

ONR Technical Report #89-1

**Michael I. Posner
Department of Psychology
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403**

and

**Steven E. Petersen
Department of Neurology and Neurological Surgery
Washington University School of Medicine
660 S. Euclid, Box 8111
St. Louis, MO 63110**

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

INTRODUCTION

The concept of attention as central to human performance extends back to the start of experimental psychology, (James, 1890), yet even a few years ago, it would not have been possible to outline in even a preliminary form a functional anatomy of the human attentional system. New developments in neuroscience (Hillyard & Picton, 1987; Raichle, 1983; Wurtz, Goldberg & Robinson, 1980) have opened the study of higher cognition to physiological analysis, and have revealed a system of anatomical areas that appear to be basic to the selection of information for focal (conscious) processing.

The importance of attention is its unique role in connecting the mental level of description of processes used in cognitive science with the anatomical level common in neuroscience. Sperry (1988) describes the central role that mental concepts play in understanding brain function as follows:

"control from below upward is retained but is claimed to not furnish the whole story. The full explanation requires that one take into account new, previously nonexistent, emergent properties, including the mental, that interact causally at their own higher level and also exert causal control from above downward." (p. 609)

If there is hope of exploring causal control of brain systems by mental states, it must lie through an understanding of how voluntary control is exerted over more automatic brain systems. We argue that this can be approached through understanding the human attentional system at the levels of both cognitive operations and of neuronal activity.

As is the case for sensory and motor systems of the brain, our knowledge of the anatomy of attention is incomplete. Nevertheless, we can now begin to identify some principles of organization that allow attention to function as a unified system for the control of mental processing. Although many of our points are still speculative and controversial, we believe they constitute a basis for more detailed studies of attention from a cognitive-neuroscience viewpoint. Perhaps even more important for furthering future studies, multiple methods of mental chronometry, brain lesions, electrophysiology, and several types of neuroimaging have converged on common findings.

Three fundamental findings are basic to this chapter. First, the attention system of the brain is anatomically separate from the data processing systems that

perform operations on specific inputs even when attention is oriented elsewhere. In this sense, the attention system is like other sensory and motor systems. It interacts with other parts of the brain, but maintains its own identity. Second, attention is carried out by a network of anatomical areas. It is neither the property of a single center, nor is it a general function of the brain operating as a whole (Mesulam, 1981; Rizzolatti, Gentilucci & Matelli, 1985). Third, the areas involved in attention carry out different functions, and these specific computations can be specified in cognitive terms (Posner, Petersen, Fox & Raichle, 1988).

To illustrate these principles, it is important to divide the attention system into subsystems that perform different but interrelated functions. In this chapter, we consider three major functions that have been prominent in cognitive accounts of attention (Posner & Boies, 1971): (1) orienting to sensory events; (2) detecting signals for focal (conscious) processing, and (3) the maintenance of a vigilant or alert state.

For each of these subsystems, we adopt an approach that organizes the known information around a particular example. For orienting, we use visual locations as the model, because of the large amount of work done with this system. For detecting, we focus on reporting the presence of a target event. We think this system is a general one that is important for detection of information from sensory processing systems as well as information stored in memory. However the extant data concern primarily the detection of visual locations and processing of auditory and visual words. For alerting, we discuss situations in which one is required to prepare for processing of high priority target events (Posner, 1978).

For the subsystems of orienting, detecting and alerting, we review the known anatomy, the operations performed, and the relationship of attention to data processing systems (e.g. visual word forms, semantic memory) upon which that attentional subsystem is thought to operate. Thus for orienting, we review the visual attention system in relationship to the data processing systems of the ventral occipital lobe. For detecting, we examine an anterior attention system in relationship to networks that subserve semantic associations. For alerting, we examine arousal systems in relationship to the selective aspects of attention. Insofar as possible, we draw together evidence from a wide variety of methods, rather than arguing for the primacy of a particular method.

ORIENTING

Visual Locations

Visual orienting is usually defined in terms of the foveation of a stimulus (overt). Foveating a stimulus improves efficiency of processing targets in terms of acuity, but it is also possible to change the priority given a stimulus by attending to its location covertly without any change in eye or head position (Posner, 1988).

If a person or monkey attends to a location, events occurring at that location are responded to more rapidly (Eriksen & Hoffman, 1972; Posner, 1988), give rise to enhanced scalp electrical activity (Mangoun & Hillyard, 1987), and can be reported at a lower threshold (Bashinski & Bachrach, 1980; Downing, 1988). This improvement in efficiency is found within the first 150 msec after an event occurs at the attended location. Similarly, if people are asked to move their eyes to a target, an improvement in efficiency at the target location begins well before the eyes move (Remington, 1980). This covert shift of attention appears to function as a way of guiding the eye to an appropriate area of the visual field (Fischer & Breitmeyer, 1987; Posner & Cohen, 1984).

The sensory responses of neurons in several areas of the brain have been shown to have a greater discharge rate when a monkey attends to the location of the stimulus, than when the monkey attends to some other spatial location. Three areas particularly identified with this enhancement effect are the posterior parietal lobe (Mountcastle, 1978; Wurtz, Goldberg & Robinson, 1980), the lateral pulvinar nucleus of the posteroventral thalamus (Petersen, Robinson & Morris, 1987) and the superior colliculus. Similar effects in the parietal cortex have been shown in normal humans using positron emission tomography (Petersen, Fox & Raichle, 1988).

While brain injuries to any of these three areas in human subjects will cause a reduction in the ability to shift attention covertly (Posner, 1988), each area seems to produce a somewhat different type of deficit. Damage to the posterior parietal lobe has its greatest effect on the ability to disengage from an attentional focus to a target located in a direction opposite to the side of the lesion (Posner, 1988).

Patients with a progressive deterioration in the superior colliculus and/or surrounding areas also show a deficit in the ability to shift attention. In this case, the shift is slowed whether or not attention is first engaged elsewhere. This finding suggests that a computation involved in moving attention to the target is impaired. Patients with this damage also return to former target locations as readily as to fresh locations that have not recently been attended. Normal subjects and patients with parietal and other cortical lesions have a reduced probability of returning attention to already examined locations (Posner, 1988; Posner & Cohen, 1984). These two

deficits appear to be those most closely tied to the mechanisms involved with saccadic eye movements.

Patients with lesions of the thalamus and monkeys with chemical injections into the lateral pulvinar also show difficulty in covert orienting (Petersen, Robinson & Morris, 1987; Posner, 1988). This difficulty appears to be in engaging attention on a target on the side opposite the lesion so as to avoid being distracted by events at other locations. A study of patients with unilateral thalamic lesions showed slowing of responses to a cued target on the side opposite the lesion even when the subject had plenty of time to orient there. This contrasted with the results found with parietal and midbrain lesions, where responses are nearly normal on both sides once attention has been cued to that location. Alert monkeys with chemical lesions of this area made faster than normal responses when cued to the side opposite the lesion and given a target on the side of the lesion, as though the contralateral cue was not effective in engaging their attention (Petersen, Robinson & Morris, 1987). They were also worse than normal when given a target on the side opposite the lesion, irrespective of the side of the cue. It appears difficult for thalamic lesioned animals to respond to a contralateral target when another competing event is also present in the ipsilateral field (R. Desimone, personal communication). Data from normal human subjects required to filter out irrelevancies, showed selective metabolic increases in the pulvinar contralateral to the field required to do the filtering (LaBerge & Buchsbaum, 1988). Thalamic lesions appear to give problems in engaging the target location in a way that allows responding to be fully selective.

These findings make two important points. First, they confirm the idea that anatomical areas carry out quite specific cognitive operations. Second, they suggest a hypothesis about the circuitry involved in covert visual attention shifts to spatial locations. The parietal lobe first disengages attention from its present focus, then the midbrain area acts to move the index of attention to the area of the target and the pulvinar is involved in reading out data from the indexed locations. Further studies of alert monkeys should provide ways of testing and modifying this hypothesis.

Hemispheric Differences

The most accepted form of cognitive localization, resulting from studies of split brain patients (Gazzaniga, 1970), is the view that the two hemispheres perform different functions. Unfortunately, in the absence of methods to study more detailed localization, the literature has tended to divide cognition into various dichotomies assigning one to each hemisphere. As we develop a better understanding of how

cognitive systems (e.g. attention) are localized, hemispheric dominance may be treated in a more differentiated manner.

Just as we can attend to locations in visual space, it is also possible to concentrate attention on a narrow area or to spread it over a wider area (Eriksen & Yeh, 1985). To study this issue, Navon (1978) formed large letters out of smaller ones. It has been found in many studies that one can concentrate attention on either the small or large letters and that the attended stimulus controls the output even though the unattended letter still influences performance. The use of small and large letters as a method of directing local and global attention turns out to be related to allocation of visual channels to different spatial frequencies. Shulman & Wilson (1987) showed that when attending to the large letters, subjects are relatively more accurate in the perception of probe grating of low spatial frequency and this reverses when attending to the small letters.

There is evidence from the study of patients that the right hemisphere is biased toward global processing (low spatial frequencies) and the left for local processing (high spatial frequencies) (Robertson & Delis, 1986; Sergent, 1987). Right hemisphere patients may copy the small letters but miss the overall form, while those with left hemisphere lesions copy the overall form but miscopy the constituent small letters. Detailed chronometric studies of parietal patients reveal difficulties in attentional allocation so that right hemisphere patients attend poorly to the global aspects and left hemisphere to the local aspects (Robertson, Lamb & Knight, 1988).

These studies support a form of hemispheric specialization within the overall structure of the attention system. The left and right hemisphere both carry out the operations needed for shifts of attention in the contralateral direction, but they have more specialized functions in the level of detail to which attention is allocated. It is likely that these hemispheric specializations are not absolute nor innate. Rather they are probably relative and emerge over time, perhaps in conjunction with the development of literacy.

The general anatomy of the attention system that we have been describing lies in the dorsal visual pathway that has its primary cortical projection area in V1 and extends into the parietal lobe (see figure 1). A major aspect of the study

INSERT FIG 1

of attention is to see how attention could influence the operations of other cognitive systems such as are involved in the recognition of visual patterns. The visual

pattern recognition system is thought to involve a ventral pathway, stretching from V1 to the infratemporal cortex. Anatomically, these two areas of the brain can be coordinated through the thalamus (pulvinar) (Petersen, Robinson & Morris, 1987), or through other pathways (Zeki & Shipp, 1988). Functionally, attention might be involved in various levels of pattern recognition, from the initial registration of the features to the storage of new visual patterns.

Pattern Recognition

VISUAL SEARCH All neurons are selective in the range of activation to which they will respond. The role of the attention system is to modulate this selection for those types of stimuli that might be most important at a given moment. To understand how this form of modulation operates, it is important to know how a stimulus would be processed without the special effects of attention. In cognition, unattended processing is called "automatic" to distinguish it from the special processing that becomes available with attention.

We have learned quite a bit about the automatic processing that occurs in humans along the ventral pathway during recognition of visual objects (Posner, 1988; Treisman & Gormican, 1988). Treisman has shown that search of complex visual displays for single features can take place in parallel with relatively little effect of the number of distractors. When a target is defined as a conjunction of attributes shared with distractors that are themselves heterogeneous (Duncan & Humphreys, in press), the search process becomes slow, effortful and serial.

We know from cognitive studies (LaBerge & Brown, 1988; Treisman & Gormican, 1988) that cueing people to locations influences a number of aspects of visual perception. Treisman has shown that when attempting to conjoin features, subjects use focal attention, and it has also been shown that spreading focal attention among several objects leads to a tendency for misconjoining features within those objects, regardless of the physical distance between them (Cohen & Ivry, 1989). Thus, attention not only provides a high priority to attended features, but does so in a way that overrides even the physical distance between objects within the focus of attention.

While these reaction time results are by no means definitive markers of attention, there is also evidence from studies with brain lesioned patients that support a role of the visual spatial attention system. These clinical studies examine the ability of patients to bisect lines (Riddoch & Humphreys, 1983), search complex visual patterns (Riddoch & Humphreys, 1987), or report strings of letters (Friedrich,

Walker & Posner, 1985; Sieroff, Pollatsek & Posner, 1988). Damage to the posterior parietal lobe appears to have specific influences on these tasks. Patients with right parietal lesions frequently bisect lines too far to the right and fail to report the left most letters of a random letter string (Sieroff, Pollatsek & Posner, 1988). However, these effects are attentional not in the recognition process itself. Evidence for this is that they can frequently be corrected by cueing the person to attend covertly to the neglected side (Riddoch & Humphreys, 1983; Sieroff, Pollatsek & Posner, 1988). The cues appear to provide time for the damaged parietal lobe to disengage attention and thus compensates for the damage. It is also possible to compensate by substituting a word for a random letter string. Patients who fail to report the left most letters of a random string will often do so correctly when it makes a word. If cues work by directing attention, they should also influence normal performance. Cues presented prior to a letter string do improve the performance of normals for nearby letters, but cues have little or no influence on the report of letters making words (Sieroff & Posner, 1988). Blood flow studies of normal humans show that an area of the left ventral occipital lobe is unique to strings of letters that are either words or orthographically regular nonwords (A. Snyder, S.E. Petersen, P.T. Fox, & M.E. Raichle, personal communication). This visual word form area (see Figure 1) appears to operate without attention, and this confirms other data that recognition of a word may be so automated as not to require spatial attention, while the related tasks of searching for a single letter, forming a conjunction, or reporting letters from a random string do appear to rely upon attention.

Studies of recording from individual cells in alert monkeys confirm that attention can play a role in the operation of the ventral pattern recognition system (Wise & Desimone, 1988). It appears likely that the pathway by which the posterior attention system interacts with the pattern recognition system is through the thalamus (Petersen, Robinson, & Morris, 1987). This interaction appears to require about 90 msec since cells in V4 begin to respond to unattended items within their receptive field, but shut these unattended areas off after 90 msec (Wise & Desimone, 1988). Detailed models of the nature of the interaction between attention and pattern recognition are just beginning to appear (Crick, 1984; LaBerge & Brown, 1988).

IMAGERY In most studies of pattern recognition, the sensory event begins the process. However, it is possible to instruct human subjects to take information from their long term memories and construct a visual representation (image) that they might then inspect (Kosslyn, 1988). This higher level visual function is called imagery. The importance of imagery as a means of studying mechanisms of high level vision has not been well recognized in neuroscience. When imagery can be

mployed as a means of studying vision, it allows more direct access to the higher levels of information processing without contamination from lower levels. There is now considerable evidence that some of the same anatomical mechanisms are used in imagery as are involved in some aspects of pattern recognition (Farah, 1988; Rosslyn, 1988). Patients with right parietal lesions, who show deficits in visual orienting of the type that we have described above, also fail to report the contralateral side of visual images (Bisiach, Luzzatti & Perani, 1981). When asked to imagine a familiar scene, they make elaborate reports of the right side but not the left. The parts of the image that are reported when facing in one direction are neglected when facing in the other. This suggests that the deficit arises at the time of scanning the image.

When normal subjects imagine themselves walking on a familiar route, blood flow studies show activation of the superior parietal lobe on both sides (Roland, 1985). Although many other areas of the brain are also active in this study, most of them are common to other verbal and arithmetical thoughts, but activation of the superior parietal lobe seems more unique to imagery. As discussed previously, the parietal lobe seems to be central to spatial attention to external locations. Thus, it appears likely that the neural systems involved in attending to an external location are closely related to those used when subjects scan a visual image.

POSTERIOR ATTENTION SYSTEM

In her paper on the topography of cognition, Goldman-Rakic (1988) describes the strong connections between the posterior parietal lobe and areas of the lateral and medial frontal cortex. This anatomical organization is appealing as a basis for relating what has been called involuntary orienting by Luria (1973), and what we have called the posterior attention system, to focal or conscious attention.

Cognitive studies of attention have often shown that detecting a target produces widespread interference with most other cognitive operations (Posner, 1978). It has been shown that monitoring many spatial locations or modalities produces little or no interference over monitoring a single modality, unless a target occurs (Duncan, 1980). This finding supports the distinction between a general alert state, and one in which attention is clearly oriented and engaged in processing information. In the alert but disengaged state, any target of sufficient intensity has little trouble in summoning the mechanisms that produce detection. Thus monitoring multiple modalities or locations produce only small amounts of interference. The importance of engaging the focal attention system in the production of widespread interference between signals supports the idea that there is a unified system

involved in detection of signals regardless of their source. As a consequence of detection of a signal by this system, we can produce a wide range of arbitrary responses to it. We take this ability to produce arbitrary responses as evidence that the person is aware of the signal.

Evidence that there are attentional systems common to spatial orienting as well as orienting to language comes from studies of cerebral blood flow during cognitive tasks. Roland (1985) has reported a lateral superior frontal area which is active both during tasks involving language and in spatial imagery tasks. However, these studies do not provide any clear evidence that such common areas are part of an attentional system. More compelling is evidence that midline frontal areas, including the anterior cingulate gyrus and the supplementary motor area, are active during semantic processing of words (Petersen, et al, 1988), and that the degree of blood flow in the anterior cingulate increases as the number of targets to be detected increases (Posner et al, 1988). Thus, the anterior cingulate seems to be particularly sensitive to the operations involved in target detection.

The anterior cingulate gyrus is one of the areas reported by Goldman-Rakic (1988) to have alternating bands of cells that are labelled by injections into the posterior parietal lobe and the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. These findings suggest that the anterior cingulate should be shown to be important in tasks requiring the posterior attention system as well as in language tasks. It has often been argued from lesion data that the anterior cingulate plays an important role in aspects of attention including neglect (Mesulam, 1980; Mirsky, 1987).

Does attention involve a single unified system, or should we think of its functioning as being executed by separate independent systems? One way to test this idea is to determine whether attention in one domain (e.g. language) affects the ability of mechanisms in another domain (e.g. orienting toward a visual location). If the anterior cingulate system is important in both domains, there should be a specific interaction between even remote domains such as these two. Studies of patients with parietal lesions (Posner, Inhoff, Freidrich & Cohen, 1987) showed that when they were required to monitor a stream of auditory information for a sound, they were slowed in their ability to orient toward a visual cue. The effect of the language task was rather different than engaging attention at a visual location because its effects were bilateral rather than being mainly on the side opposite the lesion. Thus, the language task appeared to involve some but not all of the same mechanisms that were used in visual orienting.

This result is compatible with the view that visual orienting involves separate but interconnected systems with those used for language processing. A similar result was found with normal subjects when they were given visual cues while shadowing an auditory message (Posner, Sandson, Dhawan & Shulman, 1989). Here, the effects of the language task were most marked for cues in the right visual field, as though the common system might have involved lateralized mechanisms of the left hemisphere. These findings fit with the close anatomical links between the anterior insula and the posterior parietal lobe on the one hand and language areas of the lateral frontal lobe on the other. They suggest to us a possible hierarchy of attention systems in which the anterior system can pass control to the posterior system when it is not occupied with processing other material.

A spotlight analogy has often been used to describe the selection of information from the ventral pattern recognition system by the posterior attention system (Treisman & Gormican, 1988). A spotlight is a very crude analogy but it does capture some of the dynamics involved in disengaging, moving and engaging attention. This analogy can be stretched still further to consider aspects of the interaction between the anterior attention system and the associative network shown to be active during processing of semantic associates and categories by studies of cerebral blood flow (Petersen et al, 1988).

INSERT FIG 2 ABOUT HERE

The temporal dynamics of this type of interaction between attention and semantic activation has been described in some detail (Posner, 1978; 1982).

ALERTING

An important attentional function is the ability to prepare and sustain alertness to process high priority signals. The relationship between the alert state and other aspects of information processing has been worked out in some detail for letter and word matching experiments (Posner, 1978). The passive activation of internal units representing the physical form of a familiar letter, its name, and even its semantic classification (e.g. vowel) appears to take place at about the same rate, whether subjects are alert and expecting a target, or whether they are at a lower level of alertness because the target occurs without warning. The alert state produces more rapid responding, but this increase is accompanied by a higher error rate. It is as though the build-up of information about the classification of the target occurs at the same rate regardless of alertness, but in states of high alertness, the selection of a response occurs more quickly, based upon a lower quality of

information, thus resulting in an increase in errors. These results led to the conclusion that alertness does not affect the build-up of information in the sensory or memory systems, but does affect the rate at which attention can respond to that stimulus (Posner, 1978).

Anatomical evidence has accumulated on the nature of the systems producing a change in the alert state. One consistent finding is that the ability to develop and maintain the alert state depends heavily upon the integrity of the right cerebral hemisphere (Heilman, Watson & Valenstein, 1985). This finding fits very well with the clinical observation that patients with right hemisphere lesions more often show signs of neglect and has sometimes led to an idea that all of spatial attention was controlled by the right hemisphere. However, the bulk of the evidence discussed below seems to associate right hemisphere dominance with tasks dependent upon the alert state.

Lesions of the right cerebral hemisphere cause difficulty with alerting. This has been shown using galvanic skin responses in humans and monkeys (Heilman, Watson, & Valenstein, 1985), and for heart rate responses to warning signals (Yokoyama, Jennings, Acles, Hood & Boller, 1987). Performance in vigilance tasks is also more impaired with right rather than left lesions (Coslett, Bowers & Heilman, 1987; Wilkins, Shallice & McCarthy, 1987). It has also been observed in split brain patients that vigilance is poor when information is presented to the isolated left hemisphere, but is relatively good when presented to the isolated right hemisphere (Dimond & Beaumont, 1973). In summary, it is as though the isolated right hemisphere contains the mechanism needed to maintain the alert state so that when lesioned, it reduces performance of the whole organism.

Studies of cerebral blood flow and metabolism involving vigilance tasks have also uniformly shown the importance of areas of the right cerebral hemisphere (Cohen, Semple, Gross, Holcomb, Dowling & Nordahl, 1988; Deutsch, Papanicolaou, Bourbon & Eisenberg, 1988; J. Pardo, P.T. Fox & M.E. Raichle, personal communication). Other attention demanding activity, for example, semantic tasks, and even imagery tasks, do not uniformly show greater activation of the right hemisphere (Petersen et al, 1988; Roland, 1985). Thus, blood flow and metabolic studies also argue for a tie between the right cerebral hemisphere and alerting. Some of these studies provide somewhat better localization. Cohen et al. found an area of the midfrontal cortex that appears to be the most active during their auditory discrimination task. This is an area also found to be active in both visual and somatosensory vigilance conditions (J. Pardo, et al, personal communication). It is of special interest that Cohen et al. report that the higher metabolic activation they

found in the right prefrontal cortex was accompanied by reduced activation in the anterior cingulate. If one views the anterior cingulate as related to target detection, this makes sense. In tasks where one needs to suspend activity while waiting for low probability signals, it is important not to interfere with detecting the external signal. Subjectively, one feels empty headed, due to the effort to avoid any thinking that will reduce the ability to detect the next signal.

There is evidence that the maintenance of the alert state is dependent upon right hemisphere mechanisms, and also that it is closely tied with attention. These two facts both suggest the hypothesis that the norepinephrine (NE) system arising in the locus coeruleus may play a crucial role in the alert state. In a review of animal studies, Aston-Jones, Foote and Bloom (1984) argue that NE cells play a role in changes in arousal or vigilance. Moreover, Robinson (1985) has shown that lesions of the right cerebral hemisphere lead to depletion of NE on both sides, and that the effects are strongest with lesions near the frontal pole. These findings are consistent with the idea that NE pathways course through frontal areas, dividing as they go backward toward posterior areas. Thus, an anterior lesion would have a larger effect.

Recently, Morrison and Foote (1986) have studied the parts of the posterior visual system that are most strongly innervated by NE pathways. They find that in monkeys NE innervation is most strongly present in the posterior parietal lobe, pulvinar and superior colliculus. These are the areas related to the posterior attention system. Much weaker innervation was found in the geniculo-striate pathway and along the ventral pattern recognition pathway. These findings support the ideas that NE pathways provide the basis for maintaining alertness, and that they act most strongly on the posterior attention systems of the right cerebral hemisphere. In accord with these ideas, Posner et al. (1987) found that patients with right parietal lesions had much greater difficulty in maintaining their alertness in the absence of a warning signal than those with left parietal lesions or normal subjects did. Clark, Geffen & Geffen (1989) have found that manipulation of NE levels by drugs had specific effects on attention shifting.

In summary, alertness involves a specific subsystem of attention that acts on the posterior attention system to support visual orienting and probably also influences other attentional subsystems. Physiologically, this system depends upon the NE pathways that arise in the LC and which are more strongly lateralized in the right hemisphere. Functionally, activation of NE works through the posterior attention system to increase the rate at which high priority visual information can be

selected for further processing. This more rapid selection is often at the expense of lower quality information and produces a higher error rate.

CONSEQUENCES

Study of attention from a neuroscience viewpoint has been impeded because attention has been thought of as a vague, almost vitalistic capacity, rather than as the operation of a separate set of neural areas whose interaction with domain specific systems (e.g. visual word form, or semantic association) is the proper subject for empirical investigation. Even a crude knowledge of the anatomy of the selective attention system has a number of important consequences for research. It allows closer coordination between brain imaging studies, using human subjects and animal studies involving recording from individual cells. In the case of the posterior attention system, we have hypotheses about the connections between neural systems that can best be tested and expanded by studies designed to work out the connections at the cellular level. At higher levels, coordinated studies of PET and ERP imaging may tell us more details about communication between posterior visual word form systems and anterior semantics, and how attention is involved in this form of information transfer. A systems level analysis provides a framework for the more detailed studies that must follow.

A number of recent observations depend upon a better understanding of how attention relates to semantic activation. In the psychological literature, there is a continuing effort to understand the limits to automatic priming of semantic systems (Posner, 1982). In the study of sleep, we find challenging new hypotheses that tell us that during sleep, ongoing neural activity may be interpreted semantically by networks primed by daily activity (Hobson, 1988). Similarly, research on split brain subjects (Gazzaniga, 1970) has led to the idea of an interpreter system present in the left hemisphere that attempts to impose an explanation to the behavior of the self and others. Patients with lesions of the hippocampus, who show no memory that can be retrieved consciously, are able to demonstrate detailed storage by their performance (Squire, 1986). This implies that for memory, as for performance, the distinction between automatic and conscious processing marks different neural mechanisms.

Finally, there are many disorders of higher level cognition that are said to be due to deficits of attention. These include neglect, schizophrenia, closed head injury, and attention deficit disorder, among others. The concept of an attentional system of the brain with specific operations allocated to distinct anatomical areas allows new

approaches to these pathologies. One such example is the proposal that a core deficit in schizophrenia is a failure of the anterior attention system of the left hemisphere to impose the normal inhibitory pattern on the left lateralized semantic network (Early, Posner, Reiman & Raichle, 1989). This proposal provides specific ideas on integration at the level of neurotransmission, anatomy and cognition. Similar ideas may link attention deficit disorder to the right hemisphere mechanisms that control sustaining of attention. It seems apparent that a combined cognitive and anatomical approach may be useful in integrating the long separate physiological and psychosocial influences on psychopathology.

REFERENCE LIST

- Aston-Jones, G., Foote, S.L., Bloom, F.E. 1984. Anatomy and physiology of locus coeruleus neurons: functional implications. In Frontiers of Clinical Neuroscience, Vol. 2, ed. M.G. Ziegler. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- Bashinski, H.S., Bachrach, R.T. 1984. Enhancement of perceptual sensitivity as the result of selectively attending to spatial locations. Percept & Psychophys. 28:241-248.
- Bisiach, E., Luzzatti, C., Perani, D. 1981. Unilateral neglect, representational schema and consciousness. Brain. 102:757-765.
- Clark, C.R., Geffen, G.M., Geffen, L.B. In press. Catecholamines and the covert orienting of attention. Neuropsychol.
- Cohen, A. & Ivry, R. In press. Illusory conjunctions inside and outside the focus of attention. J. Exp. Psychol: Human Perc. & Perf.
- Cohen, R.M., Semple, W.E., Gross, M., Holcomb, H.J., Dowling, S.M. Nordahl, T.E. 1988. Functional localization of sustained attention. Neuropsych. Neuropsychol. and Behav. Neurol. 1:3-20.
- Coslett, H.B., Bowers, D., Heilman, K.M. 1987. Reduction in cerebral activation after right hemisphere stroke. Neurol. 37:957-962.
- Crick, F. 1984. Function of the thalamic reticular complex: the searchlight hypothesis. Proc. Nat. Acad. of Sci. 81:4586-4590.
- Deutsch, G., Papanicolaou, A.C., Bourbon, T., Eisenberg, H.M. 1988. Cerebral blood flow evidence of right cerebral activation in attention demanding tasks. Int. J. of Neurosci. 36:23-28.
- Dimond, S.J., Beaumont, J.G. 1973. Difference in the vigilance performance of the right and left hemisphere. Cortex, 9:259-265.
- Downing, C.J. 1988. Expectancy and visual-spatial attention effects on vision. J. Exp. Psychol: Hum Percep. and Perf. 14:188-197.
- Duncan, J. 1980. The locus of interference in the perception of simultaneous stimuli. Psychol Rev. 87: 272-300.

- Duncan, J., Humphreys, G.W. In press. Visual search and stimulus similarity. Psychol. Rev.
- Early, T., Posner, M.I., Reiman, E., Raichle, M.E. In press. Left striato-pallidal hyperactivity in schizophrenia. Psychiat. Develop.
- Eriksen, C.W., Hoffman, J.E. 1972. Temporal and spatial characteristics of selective encoding from visual displays. Percept. & Psychophys. 12:201-204.
- Eriksen, C.W. & Yeh, Y. 1985. Allocation of attention in the visual field. J. Exp. Psychol: Hum Percept & Perf. 11:583-597.
- Farah, M.J. 1988. Is visual imagery really visual? Overlooked evidence from neuropsychology. Psych. Rev. 95:307-317.
- Fischer, B., Breitmeyer, B. 1987. Mechanisms of visual attention revealed by saccadic eye movements. Neuropsychol 25 1A:73-84.
- Friedrich, F.J., Walker, J., Posner, M.I. 1985. Effects of parietal lesions on visual matching. Cog. Neuropsychol. 2:253-264.
- Gazzaniga, M.S. 1970. Brain bisected man. New York: Appleton. 171 pp.
- Goldman-Rakic, P.S. 1988. Topography of cognition: parallel distributed networks in primate association cortex. Ann Rev Neurosci 11:137-156.
- Heilman, K.M., Watson, R.T., Valenstein, E. 1985. Neglect and related disorders. In K.M. Heilman & E. Valenstein (eds) Clinical Neuropsychology. New York: Oxford. 243-293 pp.
- Hillyard, S.A., Picton, T.W. 1987. Electrophysiology of cognition. In F. Plum (ed) Handbook of physiology. Vol. 5, part 2. New York: Am Physiol Soc. 519-584 pp.
- Hobson, J.A. 1988. The dreaming brain. New York: Basic Books. 319 pp.
- James, W. 1890. Principles of psychology, Vol. 1. New York: Holt.
- Kahneman, D. 1973. Attention and effort. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 246 pp.
- Kosslyn, S.M. 1988. Aspects of a cognitive neuroscience of mental imagery. Science. 240:1621-1626.

- LaBerge, D., Brown, V. In press. Theory of attentional operations in shape identification. Psychol Rev.
- LaBerge, D. & Buchsbaum, M.S. 1988. Attentional filtering and the pulvinar. Program 29th Meeting, Psychonomics Society, (Abstract, p.4).
- Luria, A.R. 1973. The working brain. New York: Basic Books. 398 pp.
- Mangoun, G.R., Hillyard, S.A. 1987. The spatial allocation of attention as indexed by event-related brain potentials. Hum Factors, 29:195-211.
- Mesulam, M.M. 1981. A cortical network for directed attention and unilateral neglect. Ann Neurol. 10:309-325.
- Mirsky, A.F. 1987. Behavioral and psychophysiological markers of disordered attention. Environ Health Persp. 74:191-199.
- Morrison, J.H., Foote, S.L. 1986. Noradrenergic and serotonergic innervation of cortical, thalamic and tectal visual structures in old and new world monkeys. J Comp. Neurol. 243:117-128.
- Mountcastle, V.B. 1978. Brain mechanisms of directed attention. J. Roy Soc Med. 71:14-27.
- Navon, D. 1977. Forest before trees: the precedence of global features in visual perception. Cog. Psychol., 9:353-383.
- Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T., Miezin, F.M., Raichle, M.E. 1988. Modulation of cortical visual responses by direction of spatial attention measured by PET. Assoc. Res. Vision and Ophthal. p. 22 (Abstr.)
- Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T., Posner, M.I., Mintun, M., Raichle, M.E. 1988. Positron emission tomographic studies of the cortical anatomy of single word processing. Nature, 331:585-589.
- Petersen, S.E., Robinson, D.L., Morris, J.D. 1987. Contributions of the pulvinar to visual spatial attention. Neuropsychol, 25:97-105.
- Posner, M.I. 1978. Chronometric Explorations of Mind. Englewood Heights, NJ: Erlbaum. 271 pp.

- Posner, M.I. 1982. Cumulative development of attentional theory. Am Psychol. 32:53-64.
- Posner, M.I. 1988. Structures and functions of selective attention. In T.Boll & B. Bryant (eds) Master Lectures in Clinical Neuropsychology. Washington, DC: Amer Psych Assoc. 173-202 pp.
- Posner, M.I., Boies, S.J. 1971. Components of attention. Psychol Rev. 78:391-408.
- Posner, M.I., Cohen, Y. 1984. Components of performance. In H. Bouma & D. Bowhuis (eds) Attention and Performance X. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. 531-556 pp.
- Posner, M.I., Inhoff, A., Friedrich, F.J., Cohen, A. 1987. Isolating attentional systems: a cognitive-anatomical analysis. Psychobiol. 15:107-121.
- Posner, M.I., Petersen, S.E., Fox, P.T., Raichle, M.E. 1988. Localization of cognitive operations in the human brain. Science. 240:1627-1631.
- Posner, M.I., Sandson, J., Dhawan, M., Shulman, G.L. 1989. Is word recognition automatic? A cognitive-anatomical approach. J. Cog Neurosci. 1:50-60.
- Posner, M.I., Walker, J.A., Friedrich, F.J., Rafal, R.D. 1984. Effects of parietal lobe injury on covert orienting of visual attention. J. Neurosci. 4:1863-1874.
- Raichle, M.E. 1983. Positron emission tomography. Ann Rev Neurosci. 6:249-267.
- Remmington, R. 1980. Attention and saccadic eye movements. J. Exp. Psychol: Hum Percept & Perf. 6:726-744.
- Riddoch, M.J. & Humphreys, G.W. 1983. The effect of cueing on unilateral neglect. Neuropsychol. 21:589-599.
- Riddoch, M.J. & Humphreys, G.W. 1987. Perceptual and action systems in unilateral neglect. In M. Jeannerod (ed) Neurophysiological and Neuropsychological Aspects of Spatial Neglect. Amsterdam: North Holland. 151-181 pp.
- Rizzolatti, G., Gentilucci, M., Matelli, M. 1985. Selective spatial attention: one center, one circuit or many circuits. In M. Posner & O.S.M. Marin (eds) Attention and Performance XI. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. 251-265.
- Robertson, L., Delis, D.C. 1986. Part-whole processing in unilateral brain damaged patients: dysfunction of hierarchical organization. Neuropsychol. 24:363-370.

- Robertson, L., Lamb, M.R., Knight, R.T. 1988. Effects of lesions of temporal-parietal junction on perceptual and attentional processing in humans. J. Neurosci. 8(10):3757-3769.
- Robinson, R.G. 1985. Lateralized behavioral and neurochemical consequences of unilateral brain injury in rats. In Cerebral Lateralization in Nonhuman Species. New York: Academic Press. 135-156 pp.
- Roland, P.E. 1985. Cortical organization of voluntary behavior in man. Human Neurobiol. 4:155-167.
- Sergent, J. 1982. The balance of power: confrontation or cooperation? J. Exp. Psychol: Hum Percept & Perf. 8:253-272.
- Shulman, G.L., Wilson, J. 1987. Spatial frequency and selective attention to local and global structure. Perception. 16:89-101.
- Sieroff, E., Pollatsek, A., Posner, M.I. 1988. Recognition of visual letter strings following damage to the posterior visual spatial attention system. Cog Neuropsychol. 5:427-449.
- Sieroff, E. & Posner, M.I. 1988. Cueing spatial attention during processing of words and letter strings in normals. Cog Neuropsychol. 5:451-472.
- Sperry, R.L. 1988. Psychology's mentalist paradigm and the religion/science tension. Amer Psychol. 43:607-613.
- Squire, L.R. 1986. Mechanisms of memory. Science. 232:1612-1619.
- Treisman, A.M. & Gormican, S. 1988. Feature analysis in early vision: evidence from search asymmetries. Psychol Rev. 95:15-48.
- Wilkins, A.J., Shallice, T., McCarthy, R. 1987. Frontal lesions and sustained attention. Neuropsychol. 25:359-366.
- Wise, S.P. & Desimone, R. 1988. Behavioral neurophysiology: insights into seeing and grasping. Science. 242:736-741.
- Wurtz, R.H., Goldberg, M.E., Robinson, D.L. 1980. Behavioral modulation of visual responses in monkeys. Prog. in Psychobiol & Physiol Psychol. 9:42-83.

Yokoyama, K., Jennings, R., Ackles, P., Hood, P. & Boller, F. 1987. Lack of heart rate changes during an attention-demanding task after right hemisphere lesions. Neurol. 37:624-630.

Zeki, S. & Shipp, S. 1988. The functional logic of cortical connections. Nature. 335:311-317.

POSTERIOR ATTENTION SYSTEM




FIGURE 1

ANTERIOR ATTENTION SYSTEM




FIGURE 2

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Upper two drawings are the lateral (left) and medial (right) surfaces of the left hemisphere. Lower two drawings are the medial (left) and lateral (right) surfaces of the right hemisphere. The location of the posterior visual spatial attention system is shown on the lateral surface of each hemisphere as determined by blood flow studies (Petersen, Fox, Meizen & Raichel, 1988). The location of the visual word form area on the lateral surface of the left hemisphere is from unpublished work using PET by Snyder, S.E. Petersen, & M.E. Raichle, personal communication.

Figure 2. Upper two drawings are the lateral (left) and medial (right) surface of the left hemisphere. The lower two drawings are the medial (left) and lateral (right) surfaces of the right hemisphere. The semantic association area on the lateral aspect of the left hemisphere is determined by blood flow studies (Petersen, et al, 1988). The anterior attention area is also from blood flow studies (Petersen et al, 1988; Posner, et al, 1988).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by Office of Naval Research Contract N-0014-86-0289 and by the Center for Higher Brain Function of Washington University School of Medicine. Special appreciation to Drs. J. Pardo, P. Fox, M. Raichle and A. Snyder for allowing citation of ongoing experiments. Dr. Pardo contributed heavily to our analysis of the alerting literature. Drs. Mary K. Rothbart, Asher Cohen and Gordon Shulman were helpful in the presentation of this analysis.

(Washington Univ. /Posner /2/81)

DR PHILLIP L. ACAERMAN UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. ALAN BADDELEY - MRC APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY UNIT 15 CHAUCER ROAD CAMBRIDGE CB2 2EF ENGLAND	DR. TYRONE CASHMAN AMER. SOC. OF CYBERNETICS 3228 FREMONT AVE. SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55408	DR. GARY ASTON JONES DEPT. OF NEUROLOGY, NYU 1009 MAIN BLDG. WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. PAT CARPENTER CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. LEON CHINHUA BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912
DR. BETH ANDERSON DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE FLYNN UNIVERSITY MELFORD, MA 02145	DR. JAMES BAJJAS GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY WASHINGTON, D.C. 20057	DR. ALPHONSE CHAPAVIS 8115 BELLOWS LANE SUITE 210-BUXTON TOWERS BALTIMORE, MD 21204	DR. LYNN A. COOPER LEARNING R&D CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 1939 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. WAYNE GRAY ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. HAROLD HAWKINS ONR - CODE 1142PT 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARMY HUMAN ENG. LAB ABEDEEN PROVING GROUND MD 21005	DR. HAROLD RAMFORD NAT. SCIENCE FDN. 1800 G STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20450	DR. PAUL R. CHATELIER OUTSPE PENTAGON WASH. D.C. 20330-2000	MR. RAYMOND E. CHRISTEL AFURLMOF BRODAS AFB, TX 78235	DR. BRIAN DALLMAN 3400 TTWITZLS LOWRY AFB, CO 80130-5000	DR. JOHN R. HAYES CARNEGIE-MELLON (NW) DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHEVENLY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. ROBERT AHLLERS CODE: VJII HUMAN FACTORS LABORATORY NAVAL TRAINING SYSTEMS CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32815	DR. ISAAC BEJAR EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, NJ 08540	DR. DAVID E. CLEMENT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. JOHN DEATON ON CODE 123 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. WILLIAM GREENOUGH UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. JOANN HELPER SUS HAMPTON ROAD OAKLAND, CA 94616
DR. JOHN ALLEN DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. CHARLES CLIFFTON TOBIN HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. R. K. DISMUKES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN FACTORS NAT'L. ACAD. OF SCIENCE 2101 CONSTITUTION AVE. WASHINGTON, DC 20418	DR. STANLEY DEUTSCH CTR. FOR ADAPT. SYSTEMS ROOM 244, BOSTON UNIV. 111 CUMMINGTON STREET BOSTON, MA 02115	DR. STEPHEN GROSSBERG HQ AFHRL (AFSC) BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	DR. STEPHANIE HOAN CODE 6021 NAVAL AIR DEV. CTR. WARMINGSTER, PA 16974-5000
DR. EARL A. ALLIUSI HQ AFHRL (AFSC) BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	DR. JOHN BLAHAK DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	SUE BOGNER, ARMY RES. INST. ATTN: PER-SF 5001 EISENHOWER AV. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22331-5600	AST. CHIEF OF STAFF FOR RES., DEV., TEST & EVAL. NAVAL EDUC. & TR. COM. (N-5) NAS PENSACOLA, FL 32508	DR. RENEY M. HALFF HALFF RESOURCES, INC. #1813 BIRD ROAD, NORTH ARLINGTON, VA 22207	DR. EMANUEL DONCHIN UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820
DR. JAMES ANDERSON BROWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR NEURAL SCI. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. GORDON H. POWER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MICHAEL COLES UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. DANIEL COPIER IND. ENG. & MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE HAIFA, 31200 ISRAEL	DR. NANCY P. HALFF HALFF RESOURCES, INC. #1813 BIRD ROAD, NORTH ARLINGTON, VA 22207	MR. RALPH J. SEK ARD CORPORATION 3457 TWINN AVOLLS RD. SUITE 400 COLUMBIA, MD 21045
DR. NANCY S. ANDERSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742	DR. ALAN M. COLLINS GENERAL PHYSICS CORP. 1040 HICKORY RIDGE RD. COLUMBIA, MD 21044	DR. SHERRIE GOTTL AFHRL/MODI BROOKS AFB, TX 78235	DR. MUHAMMAD K. HABIB UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF BIOSTATISTICS CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. FRED KERNER BROWN UNIV. MED. SCHOOL ANATOMY DEPT. PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. JEFFREY ELMAN UCSD DEPT. OF LING. C-008 LA JOLLA, CA 92093
DR. ED AIKEN NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CENTER SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-4800	DR. GAIL CARPENTER, ARI NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV. DEPT. OF MATH. 501A 340 HUNTINGTON AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02115	DR. STANLEY COLLYER OFFICE OF NAVAL TECH. CODE 222 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	JORDAN GRAFMAN, PH.D. 2214 LYTTLESTON ROAD SILVER SPRING, MD 20910	PROF. EDWARD HAERTEL SCHOOL OF EDUCATION STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94305	
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR, ARI SUN FIVE/HIGHWEEK AGENCIES ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333					

(Washington Univ. / Posner / 2/89)

DR. LEE GILES AFOSR BOLLING AFB WASHINGTON, DC 20332	DR. EARL HUNT DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF WASHINGTON SEATTLE, WA 98105	DR. RUTH KANFER UNIV. OF MASS. ELLIOTT HALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. RICHARD H. GRANGER DEPT. OF COMP. SCIENCE UNIV. CALIF. AT IRVINE IRVINE, CA 92117	DR. RONALD HAMILTON PROF. OF EDUC. & PSYCH. UNIV. OF MASS AMHERST HILLS HOUSE AMHERST, MA 01003
DR. EUGENE F. GLOVE ONR DETACHMENT 1030 E. GREEN PASADENA, CA 91104-2445	DR. ED HUTCHINS, UCSD INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS GROUP INST. FOR COG. SCI. (ECDIS) LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. MILTON S. KAIZ ARMY RES. INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313	DR. STEVEN GRANT DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, NYU 1009 MAIN BUILDING W. WASHINGTON SQUARE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. CHERYL HAMEL ATSC 1009 MAIN BUILDING ORLANDO, FL 32813
DR. JOSEPH GOGUEN CAMP. SCI. LABORATORY SRI INTERNATIONAL 311 RAVENSWOOD AVE. MENLO PARK, CA 94025	DR. ALICE ISEN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF MARYLAND CATONSVILLE, MD 21228	DR. JEROME FELDMAN UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. ROCHESTER, NY 14627	DR. P. HELMERSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094 OSLO, N. NORWAY	COL DENNIS W. JARV COMMANDER AFHRL BROOKS, AFB 78225-5601
DR. LLOYD HUMPHREYS UNIV. OF ILLINOIS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 601 E. DRAKE STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	DR. CLAYTON LEWIS UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF COMP. SCI. CAMPUS BOX 410 BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. PAUL FELTOVICH SIU SCH. OF MEDICINE MED. EDUC. DEPT. P.O. BOX 3926 SPRINGFIELD, IL 62708	DR. STEVEN HILLIARD DEPT. OF NEUROSCI. UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. JOSEPH JOHNSON ASST. DEAN-GRAD. STUDIES COLLEGE OF SCI. & MATH UNIV. OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208
DR. WENDY KELLOGG P.O. BOX 118 YORKTOWN HTS., NY 10598	DR. BOB LLOYD DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. CRAIG J. FIELDS ARPA 1400 WILSON BLVD. ARLINGTON, VA 22209	DR. GEOFFREY HINTON COMP. SCIENCE DEPT. UNIV. OF TORONTO 10 KING'S COLLEGE RD. TORONTO, CANADA M5S 1A4	CDR TOM JONES ONR CODE 125 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000
DR. STEVEN W. KEELER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON EUGENE, OR 97403	DR. FREDERIC M. LORD EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541	DR. GAIL FLEISCHAKER MARGULIS LAB BIOLOGICAL SCI. CTR. 2 COMMUNION STREET BOSTON, MA 02115	DR. JIM HOLLAN INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS GRP. INST. FOR COG. SCIENCES UCSD LA JOLLA, CA 92093	MR. DANIEL B. JONES US NUCLEAR REG. COMM. DIV. OF HUMAN FACTORS SAFETY WASHINGTON, DC 20585
DR. MARCY LANSMAN UNIV. OF N. CAROLINA THE L.L. THURSTONE LAB. DAVID WALL OJA CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. GARY LYNCH UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOLOGY OF LEARNING & MEMORY IRVING, CA 92117	DR. JANE M. FLINN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGIA MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. JOHN HOLLAND UNIV. OF MICHIGAN 2313 EAST ENGINEERING ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DOUGLAS H. JONES THATCHER JONES ASSOC. P.O. BOX 66-60 10 TRAFALGAR COURT LAWRENCEVILLE, NJ 08643
DR. DENNIS KUBLER UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF INFO. & COMP. SCI. IRVINE, CA 92117	DR. JILL LARKIN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. MICHELLE GALLAGHER UNIV. OF NORTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514	DR. MELISSA HOLLAND ARMY RES. INST. FOR HHS BEH. & SOCIAL SCIENCES 5001 EISENHOWER AVE VIB ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313	DR. JANE JORGENSEN UNIVERSITY OF OSLO INST. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOX 1094, BLINDERN OSLO, NORWAY
DR. DAVID KIERAS UNIV. OF MICH. TECH. COMM. COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING 1215 E. ENGINEERING BLDG. ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. WILLIAM J. HALOY CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR. NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA, FL 32508	DR. R. EDWARD GEISELMAN DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA LOS ANGELES, CA 90024	DR. JAMES HOWARD DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY HUMAN PERFORMANCE LAB. CATHOLIC UNIV. OF AMERICA WASHINGTON, DC 20064	DR. MARCEL JUST CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. UNIV. OF BR. COLUMBIAN SCHELEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. DAVID LAHN CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHELEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. EVANS MANDÉS DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. DON GENTNER CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROCESSING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA I.J. JOLLA, CA 92093	DR. KEITH HOLYOAK UNIV. OF MICHIGAN HUMAN PERFORMANCE CTR. 310 PACKARD ROAD ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. DANIEL KAHNEMAN UNIV. OF BR. COLUMBIAN #114-2053 MAIN MAIL VANCOUVER, BR. COLUMBIAN CANADA V6T 1Z7

(Washington Univ./Preston/2/89)

DR. RONALD KNOLL BELL LABORATORIES MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974	DR. ALAN W. LEGOLD LEARNING & AD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	DR. SANDRA P. MARSHALL DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SAN DIEGO STATE UNIV. SAN DIEGO, CA 92182	DR. JIM LEVIN DEPT. OF EDUC. PSYCH 210 EDUCATION BUILDING 1310 SOUTH SIXTH STREET CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820-4990	DR. RICHARD E. MAYER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY U.V.A. OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	DIR. HUMAN FACTORS & A. ORGANIZATIONAL SY. LAB NPRDC (CODE 07) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	MR. MELVIN D. MONTEMARLO NASA HEADQUARTERS KTF-4 WASHINGTON, DC 20546	DR. HAROLD F. O'NEIL, JR. SCHOOL OF EDUC. WPH 801 DEPT. OF EDUC., PSYCH & TECHNOLOGY, USC LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-0611
DR. STEPHEN KORNBLUM UNIV. OF MICHIGAN MENTAL HEALTH RES. INST. 265 WASHINGTON PLACE ANN ARBOR, MI 48106	DR. STEPHEN KORNBLUM HARVARD UNIVERSITY 1236 WILLIAM JAMES HALL 33 KIRKLAND ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. JOHN LEVINE LEARNING & AD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH, PA 15260	DR. MICHAEL LEVINE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY 210 EDUCATION BLDG. UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS CHAMPAIGN, IL 61801	DR. JAY MCCLELLAND DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	COMMANDING OFFICER NAVAL RES. LAB. CODE 2627 WASHINGTON, DC 20390	DR. STELLAN OHLASSON LEARNING READER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSTBL/RCH, PA 15213	DR. STELLAN OHLASSON LEARNING READER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3939 O'HARA STREET PITTSTBL/RCH, PA 15213
DR. RANDY MULAW PROGRAM MANAGER TRAINING RES. DIVISION 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. RANDY MULAW ASST. FOR MFT RES. DEV. AND STUDIES OP 0187 WASHINGTON, DC 20317	DR. GAIL MCKOON, CASI PSYCHOLOGY, KRASKE #210 NORTHWESTERN UNIV. 1855 S. ALENA AVE., 7TH FL. REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DR. JAMES MCMICHAEL ASST. FOR MFT RES. DEV. AND STUDIES OP 0187 WASHINGTON, DC 20317	DR. GLEN OSGA NO. 202, CODE 44 800 N. QUINCY ST. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	ONR, CODE 1113 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JESSE ORLANSKY INST. FOR DEFENSE ANALYSIS 1801 N. BEAVERGD ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22311	DR. RAYMOND C. SIDORAY ARMY RESEARCH Hq. 5001 EISENHOWER, R.R. 11 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22311
DR. ALLEN MUNRO BEH. TECHNOLOGY LABORATORIES - USC 1445 S. ALENA AVE., 7TH FL. REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DIR. MANPOWER & PERS. LAB. NPRDC (CODE 06) SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. JOE MCLACHLAN NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. ROBERT F. PASNAK DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIV E FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. MARTHA POLSON CODE 1113 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. MARTHA POLSON CODE 1113 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. STEVEN E. POLTROCK MCC 9400 RESEARCH BLVD. ECHELON BLDG. B1 AUSTIN, TX 78759-4509	DR. RICHARD A. SIMON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCIENTIFIC PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
DR. RICHARD NISBETT UNIV. OF MICHIGAN INST. FOR SOC. RES. ROOM S161 ANN ARBOR, MI 48109	DR. MARY JO NISSSEN HUMAN RES. RES. ORG. N218 ELLIOTT HALL MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455	DR. GEORGE A. MILLER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GREEN HALL, PRINCETON PRINCETON, NJ 08540	PROF. SEYMOUR PAPER JOE-109 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	ONR, CODE 1113 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	ONR, CODE 1113 800 N. QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. LAUREN RESICK LEARNING & AD CENTER UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH 3919 O'HARA STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ZITA M. SIMUTIS INSTRUCTIONAL TECH. SYSTEMS AREA, ARI 5001 EISENHOWER ST. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22311
DR. ROBERT MISLEVY EDUCATION TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541	DEPUTY TECHNICAL DIRECTOR NPRDC CODE 01A SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. BARBARA MEANS HUMAN RES. RES. ORG. 1100 SOUTH WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DIR. TECH. PROGRAMS ONR CODE 11 800 NORTH QUINCY ST. ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	ONR, CODE 1142EP 800 N. QUINCY STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000	DR. JAMES A. REGGIS UNIV. OF MD SCH. OF MED. 22 S. GREENE STREET BALTIMORE, MD 21201	DR. H. WALLACE SINAIKO MANPOWER RES. & ADV. SERV. SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE 801 N. PITT STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. JAMES A. REGGIS UNIV. OF MD SCH. OF MED. 22 S. GREENE STREET BALTIMORE, MD 21201

(Washington Univ./Posner/2/34)

DR. JAMES PAULSON DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY P.O. BOX 351 PORTLAND, OR 97207	DR. LYNN REEDER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV. SCHENLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. EDWARD E. SMITH BOLT BEARNEK & NEWMAN, INC. 50 MULINTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. KATHRYN SPOEHR BROWN UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY PROVIDENCE, RI 02912	DR. K. TATSUOKA CERL 252 ENGINEERING RES. LAB. URBANA, IL 61801	DR. HOWARD VAINER DIV. OF PSYCH. & EDUC. TESTING SERV. PRINCETON, NJ 08541
DR. PETER POLSON UNIV. OF COLORADO DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BOULDER, CO 80309	DR. MARK D. RECKASE ACT P.O. BOX 168 IOWA CITY, IA 52243	DR. ALFRED F. SMOKE SENIOR SCIENTIST CODE 07A NAVAL TRAINING SY. CTR. ORLANDO, FL 32813	DR. ROBERT STERNBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY YALE UNIVERSITY BOX 11A, YALE STATION NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	DR. MARTIN A. TOLCOTT 3001 BRAZELTON TERR., NW APT. 1617 WASHINGTON, DC 20008	DR. GIL RICHARD MAIL STOP C04-14 GRUMMAN AEROSP. CORP. BETHPAGE, NY 11714
DR. JAMES W. PELLEGRINO LC - SANTA BARBARA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SANTA BARBARA, CA 93106	DR. MARY C. POTTER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY MIT (E-10-021) CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. ROBERT F. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIV. 4400 UNIVERSITY DR. FAIRFAX, VA 22030	JAMES J. STASZEWSKI CARNegie-MELLON UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHEINLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. ROBERT TSUTAKAWA UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI DEPT. OF STATISTICS 212 MATH SCIENCES BLDG. COLUMBIA, MO 65211	DR. DAVID RUMELHART CENTER FOR HUMAN INFORMATION PROC. UNIV. OF CALIF. LA JOLLA, CA 92093
DR. NANCY PENNINGTON UNIV. OF CHICAGO GRAD. SCH. OF MED. 1101 E. 57TH ST. CHICAGO, IL 60637	DR. JOSEPH PSOTKA ATTN: PERI-C ARMY RESEARCH INST. 5001 EISENHOWER AVE. ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. LINDA B. SMITH DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405	DR. DOUGLAS TOWNE BEHAVIORAL TECH. LABS 1405 S. ELENA AVENUE REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277	DR. ZITA E. TYER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY 4400 UNIVERSITY DRIVE FAIRFAX, VA 22030	DR. ANDREW M. ROSE AM. INST. FOR RES. 1655 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20007
DR. RAY PERRONE ARI (PERI-II) 5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333	DR. KARL PRIBRAM STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 401, JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. RICHARD E. SNOW DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD UNIVERSITY STANFORD, CA 94306	DR. MAURICE TATSUOKA 220 EDUCATION BLDG. 1101 S. SIXTH ST. CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820	HQ - US MARINES CODE IMPL-3D WASHINGTON, DC 20430	DR. WM. B. ROUSE SEARCH TECH., INC. 25-B TECHNOLOGY PK/ATL. NOVOCROSS, GA 30092
DR. STEVEN PINKER DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY E10-018 MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139	DR. DANIEL REISBERG DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY NEW SCHOOL FOR SOC. RES. 65 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10003	DR. TED STEINER DEPT. OF GEOGRAPHY UNIV. OF S. CAROLINA COLUMBIA, SC 29208	DR. RICHARD F. THOMPSON STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY BLDG. 401-JORDAN HALL STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. AMOS TVERSKY STANFORD UNIVERSITY DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY STANFORD, CA 94305	DR. E. L. SALTMAN HASKINS LABORATORIES 210 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510
DR. SAUL STEINBERG UNIV. OF PENNSYLVANIA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY 3435 WALNUT STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104	DR. STEVE SHOMU NIH BLDG. 31 ROOM B2B-15 BETHESDA, MD 20205	DR. MICHAEL J. TURVEY HASKINS LABORATORY 270 CROWN STREET NEW HAVEN, CT 06510	MR. BRAD STAPSON NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. JAMES TWEEDALE TECHNICAL DIRECTOR NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800	DR. T. B. SHERIDAN DEPT. OF MECH. ENG. MIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
DR. ELLIOT SOLOWAY YALE UNIVERSITY COMPUTER SCI. DEPT. P.O. BOX 2158 NEW HAVEN, CT 06520	DR. H. SWAMINATHAN LAB OF PSYCHOMETRIC & EVALUATION RESEARCH UNIV. OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST, MA 01003	DR. DAVID VALE ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS CORP. 2133 UNIVERSITY AVE. SUITE 310 ST. PAUL, MN 55114	DR. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY UNIV. OF TENNESSEE KNOXVILLE, TN 37916	DR. DONALD RUBIN STAT. DEPT., HARVARD SCIENCE CTR., RM. 408 OXFORD STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02133	DR. DAVID J. WEISS N66 ELLIOTT HALL UNIV. OF MINNESOTA 75 E. RIVER ROAD MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455
DR. ALBERT STEVENS BOLT BEARNEK & NEWMAN, INC. 18 MULINTON ST. CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138	DR. KURT VAN LEHN CARNegie-MELLON UNIV. DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY SCHEINLEY PARK PITTSBURGH, PA 15213	DR. JERRY VOIGT NAVY PERSONNEL RAD CTR. CODE 51 SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-4400	DR. HEATHER WILD NAVAL AIR DEV. CENTER CODE 601 WARMINGSTER, PA 16974-5000	DR. ERNST Z. ROTKOFF ATT& T BELL LABORATORIES ROOM 2D-456 600 MOUNTAIN AVENUE MURRAY HILL., NJ 07974	DR. SHIH SUNG WEN JACKSON STATE UNIV. 1335 J.R. LYNCH ST. JACKSON, MS 39217
DR. PAUL J. STICHA TRAINING RES. DIV. NUMBERO 1100 S. WASHINGTON ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	DR. JOHN TANGNEY AFOSR/NL BOLLING AFB, DC 20332				

(Washington Univ./Posner/2/89)

DR. JAIME CARBONELL
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV.
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213

DR. JOEL DAVIS
ONR, CODE 1141NP
800 NORTH QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

J. D. FLETCHER
9931 CORSICA STREET
VIENNA, VA 22180

DR. HANS-WILLY SCHROIFF
INST. FUER PSYCHOLOGIE
DER RWTH AACHEN
JAEGERSTRASS ZWISCHEN 17 U. 19
5100 AACHEN, WEST GERMANY

DR. BETH WARREN
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.
50 MOULTON STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

DR. JOHN R. FREDERIKSEN
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN
50 MOULTON STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

DR. MICHAEL J. SAMET
PERCEPTRONICS, INC.
6271 VARIEL AVENUE
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91364

DR. ROBERT A. WISHER
U.S. ARMY INST. FOR THE
BEH. & SOC. SCIENCES
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

DR. KEITHER WESCOURT
FMC CORPORATION
CENTRAL ENG. LABS.
1185 COLEMAN AVE., BOX 580
SANTA CLARA, CA 95052

DR. ARTHUR SAMUEL
YALE UNIVERSITY
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
BOX 11A, YALE STATION
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

DR. MARTIN F. WISKOFF
NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

DR. NORMAN M. WEINBERGER
UNIV. OF CALIF.
CTR. FOR THE NEUROBIOL.
OF LEARNING & MEMORY
IRVINE, CA 92717

DR. ROGER SCHANK
YALE UNIVERSITY
COMP. SCI. DEPARTMENT
NEW HAVEN, CT 06520

MR. JOHN H. WOLFE
NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

DR. DOUGLAS WETZEL
CODE 12
NAVY PERS. R&D CTR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

DR. WALTER SCHNEIDER
LEARNING R&D CTR.
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
3939 O'HARA STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

GEORGE WONG, BIOSTATISTICS
MEMORIAL SLOAN-KETTERING
CANCER CENTER
1275 YORK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY

DR. BARBARA WHITE
BOLT BERANEK & NEWMAN, INC.
10 MOULTON ST.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02238

DR. MICHAEL G. SHAFTO
ONR CODE 1142PT
800 N. QUINCY STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. DONALD WOODWARD
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH
CODE 1141NP
800 NORTH QUINCY STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. BARRY WHITSEL
UNIV. OF NC
DEPT. OF PHYSIOLOGY
MEDICAL SCHOOL
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514

DR. JANET SCHOFIELD
LEARNING R&D CENTER
UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

DR. WALLACE WULFECK, III
NAVY PERS. R&D CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152-6800

DR. CHRISTOPHER WICKENS
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIV. OF ILLINOIS
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61802

DR. ROBERT J. SEIDEL
US ARMY RES. INST.
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

DR. STEVEN ZORNETZER
ONR, CODE 1140
800 N. QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

CHIEF OF NAVAL ED. & TR.
LIAISON OFFICE
AIR FORCE HUMAN RES. LAB.
OPERATIONS TRAINING DIV.
WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224

DR. DAVID NAVON
INST. FOR COGNITIVE SCI.
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. MICHAEL I. POSNER
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY
EUGENE, OR 97403

DR. DONALD A. NORMAN
INST. FOR COG. SCI.
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA
LA JOLLA, CA 92093

DR. ROBERT SASMOR
ARMY RES. INSTITUTE
5001 EISENHOWER AVE.
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333

CAPT. P. MICHAEL CURRAN
ONR, CODE 125
800 N. QUINCY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22217-5000

DR. MICHAEL J. ZYDA
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
CODE 512K
MONTEREY, CA 93943-5100

DEFENSE TECH. INFO. CTR.
CAMERON STATION, BLDG. 5
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
ATTN: TC

DR. MARSHALL J. FARR
2520 NORTH VERNON ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22207