hence, $E(1/y) > E(1/x)$.

Note, of course, that homogeneity of variance is a sufficient condition, and not a necessary one. Yet, this finding tells us that, if the ordering after inversion is not as expected, then homogeneity of variance does not hold. Since this is an assumption of analysis of variance, we are being warned. Of course ANOVA is relatively robust with respect to departures from this assumption, but it is not totally immune, and so finding this reversal is a strong hint not to use ANOVA.

The justification for trimming comes from the homogeneity theorem. Heterogeneity of variance can come from one of two sources. The first is a couple of outliers which artificially inflate the variance in one sample. Trimming clearly gets rid of this sort of contaminant and thus equalizes the variance. A second possibility is for the two samples to come from populations which truly have different variances. If this is true, then techniques which require homogeneity are doomed from the start. Trimming in this case will still work, but the amount of trimming necessary may be very severe. Obviously, trimming until the resulting trimmed distributions are nonoverlapping will result in the desired effect, but this may be so severe that the user is better off utilizing the various types of rank procedures designed for such problems.

REFERENCE NOTE

1. Wainer, H., & Reiser, M. *Assessing the efficacy of visual*

displays. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association in Boston, Mass., August 23, 1976.

REFERENCES

- ANDREWS, D. F., BICKEL, P. J., HAMPEL, F. R., HUBER, P. J., ROGERS, W. H., & TUKEY, J. W. *Robust estimates of location*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- FODOR, J. A., & GARRETT, M. Some syntactic determinants of sentential complexity. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 1967, 2, 289-296.
- FOSS, D. J., & LYNCH, R. H. Decision processes during sentence comprehension: Effects of surface structure on decision times. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 1969, 5, 145-148.
- HAKES, D. T., & FOSS, D. J. Decision processes during sentence comprehension: Effects of surface structure reconsidered. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 1970, 8, 413-416.
- KENDALL, M. G., & STUART, A. *The advanced theory of statistics* (Vol. 1, 3rd ed.). Hafner, 1969.
- MERRELL, M. The relationship of individual growth to average growth. *Human Biology*, 1931, 3, 37-70.
- STERNBERG, S. The discovery of processing stages: Extensions of Donder's method. *Acta Psychologica*, 1969, 30, 276-315.
- SVANBERG (1821). In Czuber, E., *Theorie der beobachtungsfehler*. Leipzig, 1891.
- WAINER, H. Robust statistics: A survey and some prescriptions. *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 1976, 1, 285-312.

(Received for publication October 19, 1976;
revision received November 23, 1976.)

ERRATUM

Marmurek, H. H. C. Processing letters in words at different levels. *Memory & Cognition*, 1977, 5 (1), 67-72. Page 68, Materials section: Visual angles should be specified in minutes rather than in degrees.