The suggestion that frustration-increment and generalization-decrement effects should be based upon comparisons with performance measures of unchanged Ss at the new levels of the changed independent variable is well-taken. The major weakness of the study in question (Kimmel & McGinnis, 1966) is in the fact that such comparisons could not adequately be made. Thus, our conclusions vis a vis frustration and generalization-decrement *are*, as Ludvigson and McHose aptly noted, not conclusively supported by our data. Rather than being firmly supported conclusions, they are more appropriately described as tentative suggestions. As such, they stand in great need of more adequate empirical examination. It was our feeling that the novelty of the experimental technique and its potential applicability to the study of delay-induced frustrative nonreward were a sufficient basis for publication.

The reason why our study failed to provide the kind

of comparative data that Ludvigson and McHose rightly demand is apparent from inspection of our Fig. 1. In the left frame, showing log running time during training, it appears that asymptotic values were being approached by both the 2 and 4 sec. groups. We were misled by pilot data and by the present data, both of which suggested that 10 training trials (following shaping) would suffice to produce stable base lines for the very comparisons Ludvigson and McHose suggest. Obviously, as is indicated in the second and third panels, considerable additional performance-change occurred in the unchanged subgroups with further days of training. What must be done, it seems, is to give substantially more training prior to testing on shifted delay times. Only when stable asymptotes exist prior to testing can the tentative conclusions we offered be conclusively stated. We are in full agreement with Ludvigson and McHose and appreciate their comment.