

- nonwords: The role of test appropriateness. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, *13*, 164-171.
- PAIVIO, A., YUILLE, J. C., & MADIGAN, S. A. (1968). Concreteness, imagery, and meaningfulness values for 925 nouns. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Monographs*, *76* (1, Pt. 2).
- RABINOWITZ, J. C., & CRAIK, F. I. M. (1986). Specific enhancement effects associated with word generation. *Journal of Memory & Language*, *25*, 226-237.
- SCHWARTZ, M. (1971). Subject-generated versus experimenter-supplied mediators in paired-associate learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *87*, 389-395.
- SLAMECKA, N. J., & FEVREISKI, J. (1983). The generation effect when generation fails. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior*, *22*, 153-163.
- SLAMECKA, N. J., & GRAF, P. (1978). The generation effect: Delineation of a phenomenon. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning & Memory*, *4*, 592-604.
- SLAMECKA, N. J., & KATSAITI, K. T. (1987). The generation effect as an artifact of selective displaced rehearsal. *Journal of Memory & Language*, *26*, 589-607.
- WATKINS, M. J., & SECHLER, E. S. (1988). Generation effect with an incidental memorization procedure. *Journal of Memory & Language*, *27*, 537-544.

#### NOTES

1. Although we know from previous research that the size of the generation effect is insensitive to whether generation succeeds or fails, reviewers of this manuscript asked whether subjects were actually gener-

ating or were merely waiting for feedback to occur. The editor suggested that we conduct a control experiment. Douglas Needham, in our lab, gave subjects 80 unrelated words, all of which were fragmentary during their initial appearance. For one group of 12 subjects, all 80 complete words appeared as feedback; for these subjects, yes/no recognition against 80 new items had a hit rate of .691. For another group of 13 subjects, only 40 of the fragments were followed by feedback; the other 40 remained fragmentary. Because feedback was unpredictable, these subjects could not simply wait for feedback. The hit rate for the 40 words that received feedback was .694, and the hit rate for the 40 that received no feedback was .656 (overall  $MS_e$  was 0.0124). Because recognition was about the same when feedback was perfectly predictable as it was when feedback occurred but was unpredictable, we need not worry about whether subjects actually generated at study.

2. We gave typed versions of the pure generation list and the mixed lists to a total of 150 subjects who had participated in other experiments but had time left in their hour. The mean completion rate for the fragments was .974 for the pure list and .975 for the mixed list. Hence the items are easy to generate successfully. The same subjects then freely recalled the words. The subjects with a mixed list recalled more generated than read items (.221 > .123), with mean recall for unmixed generators at .149; for the interaction between item sets and condition,  $F(1,148) = 36.9$ ,  $MS_e = 0.0074$ ,  $d = .028$ .

3. A total of 38 subjects from other experiments were given a typed version of this list; they completed an average of 93% of the targets correctly.

(Manuscript received October 1, 1990;  
revision accepted for publication February 27, 1991.)

## Notices and Announcements

### Research Conference on Employees, Eldercare, and the Worksite Sponsored by the National Institute on Aging July 1991

The Behavioral and Social Research (BSR) program of the National Institute on Aging held a Research Conference on Employees, Eldercare, and the Worksite in New York City, July 25, 1991. Sponsored in collaboration with the New York Business Group on Health, the meeting brought together scientific researchers, individuals from the private sector, and those involved in the aging network of service providers.

Scientific presentations reviewed what is known about the burdens and contributions of those caregivers, often middle-aged women, who also have a role as paid workers. Representatives from unions and corporations discussed specific programs in the worksite to ease the strains of combining work and family responsibilities. Practical and methodological problems in conducting aging research at the worksite were identified, and recommendations were made for a future agenda for NIA in studying elder care and the workplace.

For additional information contact Dr. Katrina W. Johnson, Behavioral and Social Research, National Institute on Aging, Building 31, Room 5C32, Bethesda, MD 20892 (phone, 301-496-3136; FAX, 301-402-0051).