the generalization decrement hypothesis, though a main effect difference would be more convincing. The significant groups difference in extinction confirmed the second hypothesis. The equivalence of Groups S and R-C was not surprising. SPRC is conditioned on all trials except the first in PRC training since SPRC is present on N-1 acquisition trials and is always associated with immediate reward. With 50 percent reward, SN is conditioned to the instrumental response on only half the acquisition trials at best. Thus PRC training should generate maximum resistance to extinction with a relatively small number of trials.

The discrepancy between Fehrer and Cogan is apparently due to the difference in number of extinction trials given. Fehrer gave 12 trials; Cogan gave 50. There seems to be an initial difference in resistance

to extinction with both regular 100 percent and PRC groups reaching the same lower asymptote rapidly. Over a long extinction series, then, no difference would be expected.

References

- Capaldi, E. J., & Poynor, H. Aftereffects and delay of reward. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1966, 71, 80-88.
 Cogan, Dennis C. Post-reinforcement delay in extinction: a failure to replicate. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 6, 343-344.
 Fehrer, Elizabeth. Effects of reinforcement and of pre- and post-reinforcement delays on learning and extinction. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1956, 52, 167-176.

Note

1. This research was supported in part by Public Health Service Research Grant MH 11694-01 from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Erratum

HOMMEL, L. S., & ALTMAN, H. B. Resistance to extinction following exposure to a complex situation. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 6 (9), 415-416.—Page 416, paragraph 3 should read as follows: "groups (P vs. C: $t=2.319$, $df=12$, $p<.05$; P vs. N: $t=2.373$, $df=12$, $p<.05$; C vs. N: $t=4.762$, $df=12$,"