subjects construct just to inferred sets in performing their task. If they were doing that, we would not find a high correlation between their judgments of complexity and C within each set of stimuli. It follows that subjects can perform a much finer division of the set of all partitions of the square. How they perform this and similar tasks remains a central puzzle of pattern-recognition research, which Vitz and Todd's approach does not seem to have solved.

REFERENCES

- GARNER, W. R. *The processing of information and structure*. New York: Halstead-Wiley, 1974.
 GREEN, D. M., & LUCE, R. D. Counting and timing mechanisms in auditory discrimination and reaction time. In D. H. Krantz, R. C. Atkinson, R. D. Luce, & P. Suppes (Eds.), *Contemporary*

- developments in mathematical psychology* (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Freeman, 1974.
 TERWILLIGER, R. F. Pattern complexity and affective arousal. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1963, 17, 387-395.
 VITZ, P. C. Affect as a function of a stimulus variation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1966, 71, 74-79.
 VITZ, P. C., & TODD, T. C. A model of the perception of simple geometric figures. *Psychological Review*, 1971, 78, 207-228.

NOTES

1. We are grateful to Paul C. Vitz for supplying the program.
2. This would change the model from a *counting* model to a *timing* or *clocking* model (for a discussion of the difference, see Green & Luce, 1974, pp. 386-393).

(Received for publication January 10, 1975;
 revision received May 20, 1975.)

ERRATUM

Lappin, Joseph S., & Preble, Laurence D. A Demonstration of Shape Constancy. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 1975, 5, 439-444. The table on page 441 was incorrect. The correct table appears below.

Table 1
 The Correspondences of Judged Angles With Actual Projective and Objective Angles

	Judgment Condition	Actual Angle	Subjects								Average
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absolute Deviation (Degrees)†	Upright, Objective	Projective	17.8	22.5	16.1	16.9	15.0	19.2	16.7	17.2	17.7
		Objective	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
	Upright, Projective	Projective	9.4	8.6	5.6	10.3	12.8	6.4	11.7	6.1	8.9
		Objective	*			**		**	**		
	Inverted, Objective	Projective	19.4	12.5	14.4	16.1	15.0	18.3	15.6	12.8	15.5
		Objective	12.2	13.6	8.9	5.6	8.3	5.0	7.2	10.0	8.8
	Inverted, Projective	Projective	17.8	19.4	13.6	12.5	15.8	16.7	15.8	17.2	16.1
		Objective	**	**				**	**	**	
	Inverted, Projective	Projective	55.6	5.0	10.3	8.6	9.7	7.8	6.4	7.8	7.6
		Objective	16.7	14.7	10.8	13.9	13.6	16.7	13.1	15.6	14.4
r ²	Upright, Objective	Projective	**		*	*	**	**			
		Objective	7.8	10.3	11.9	8.3	12.5	7.8	9.2	11.1	9.9
	Upright, Projective	Projective	.00	.03	.03	.01	.08	.01	.00	.00	.02
		Objective	.40	.62	.72	.28	.23	.77	.36	.72	.52
	Inverted, Objective	Projective	.00	.27	.08	.02	.12	.02	.05	.13	.09
		Objective	.31	.28	.37	.77	.62	.82	.65	.43	.53
	Inverted, Projective	Projective	.00	.00	.15	.13	.02	.00	.02	.00	.04
		Objective	.79	.77	.34	.54	.33	.63	.64	.65	.59
	Inverted, Projective	Projective	.03	.09	.31	.17	.18	.03	.21	.06	.14
		Objective	.58	.48	.22	.58	.35	.62	.41	.35	.45

[†]Deviation expected by chance: 19.4 deg

* $p < .05$, t ratio, with 35 df

** $p < .01$, t ratio, with 35 df