Notes and Comment

Addendum to Wheeler, Stout, and Miller (2004)

DANIEL S. WHEELER, STEVEN C. STOUT, and
RALPH R. MILLER
State University of New York, Binghamton, New York

In reviewing our notes, we have found that an idea that we presented in Wheeler, Stout, and Miller (2004) was not properly attributed. Specifically, on p. 346 we state that super-latent inhibition in a conditioned taste aversion (CTA) preparation can be viewed as an instance of spontaneous recovery from counterconditioning. In a CTA preparation, all CS exposures are technically reinforced because water can serve as an effective US for a thirsty rat. Thus, latent inhibition may be viewed as a counterconditioning situation in which the taste CS is initially paired with fluid, and later paired with illness. Following this logic, superlatent inhibition may be explained as spontaneous recovery of appetitively conditioned responding when a long retention interval is interposed after aversive counterconditioning. Although we did cite Garcia (1989),

who has suggested that liquid CSs are USs in a CTA preparation, and Bouton and Peck (1992), who found spontaneous recovery after counterconditioning, we failed to cite a personal communication from Gonzalo De la Casa (October 17, 2002) that integrated these two ideas to explain super-latent inhibition in a CTA preparation.

REFERENCES

- BOUTON, M. E., & PECK, C. A. (1992). Spontaneous recovery in cross-motivational transfer (counterconditioning). *Animal Learning & Behavior*, **20**, 313-321.
- GARCIA, J. (1989). Food for Tolman: Cognition and cathexis in concert. In T. Archer & L.-G. Nilsson (Eds.), *Aversion, avoidance and anxiety: Perspectives on aversively motivated behavior* (pp. 45-86). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- WHEELER, D. S., STOUT, S. C., & MILLER, R. R. (2004). Interaction of retention interval with CS-preexposure and extinction effects: Symmetry with respect to primacy. *Learning & Behavior*, **32**, 335-347.

(Accepted January 29, 2006)