Guess and Different-Guess groups were 101.25 and 90.31.

Neither of the Different groups gave any first-list responses during second-list learning. Two interlist intrusions occurred in the Same-Guess condition and one in the Same-Learn condition. Although these frequencies are small they do agree with the supposition that more first-list response evocations will occur when the response class remains unchanged and with the assumption that the Guessing technique will result in at least as many evocations as the Learning technique.

The mean numbers of first-list responses recalled correctly by the Same-Learn, Different-Learn, Same-Guess and Different-Guess groups were 3.19, 6.69, 7.06 and 7.69. Both the Learn-Guess, $F=46.66$, $df=1/60$, $p<.01$, and the Same-Different, $F=33.41$, $df=1/60$, $p<.01$, main effects were significant. More important, the interaction was significant, $F=16.23$, $df=1/60$, $p<.01$. The configuration of the data suggested that the significant interaction might be due to the extremely poor recall in the Same-Learn condition. Accordingly, each of the four experimental means was compared with the Control mean (7.56) by a method described in Winer (1962, p. 89). These comparisons indicated that significant unlearning occurred in the Same-Learn condition ($p<.01$) but that none had appeared in any of the remaining conditions.

The principal finding of the experiment was that significant unlearning appeared only when the second task

involved new learning of similar materials. No unlearning occurred when the types of responses were different or when the second-list Guessing technique was applied. These findings suggest that neither the evocation of first-list responses nor new learning are sufficient, but that both are necessary, for the unlearning phenomenon to appear.

Of course there is the possibility that changing to a guessing task reduced first-list response evocation during second-list learning. If this were true then the lack of an unlearning effect in the Guessing condition could not be attributed to the importance of the new learning factor. Because of this possible confounding the results can only be suggestive.

References

- Bames, J. M., & Underwood, B. J. "Fate" of first-list associations in transfer theory. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1959, 58, 97-105.
Keppel, G., & Rauch, D. S. Unlearning as a function of second-list error instructions. *J. verbal Learn. verbal Behav.*, 1966, 5, 50-58.
Postman, L. Unlearning under conditions of successive interpolation. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1965, 70, 237-245.
Postman, L., Keppel, G., & Stark, K. Unlearning as a function of the relationship between successive responses classes. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1965, 69, 111-118.
Winer, B. J. *Statistical principles in experimental design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Note

1. This work was supported by a research grant (MH 11199-01 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service.

Erratum

HOATS, D. L., & GERJUOY, IRMA R. Associative symmetry with two conditions of perceptual organization. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 4 (10), 341-342.—Figure 1 was printed incorrectly. It should be rotated 90° counter-clockwise.