$p < .01$), as was the interaction between the main effects ($F=4.78$, $df=2/52$, $p < .025$). In order to determine the source of the interaction, F tests were run between the preference scores of the experimental and control groups at each of the three dimension conditions. The difference between the experimental and control groups in the preference scores for color was significant ($F=9.34$, $df=1/26$, $p < .001$). The difference between the experimental and control groups in the form preference scores was not significant ($F < 1$), nor was the difference in the size preference scores significant ($F=1.45$, $df=1/26$, $p > .10$).

Discussion

When compared with the relevant control condition, the Ss in the experimental group showed a significant preference for the imprinted object over the test object when the two objects differed only in color. The experimental group did not show any significant preference for the imprinted object when the two objects differed only in form or size.

The present results indicate that when a multi-dimensional stimulus is presented as an imprinting object only one aspect of the stimulus gains control over the following behavior. The results of the present experiment are consistent with the results obtained by Cofoid & Honig (1961), which showed that changes in the imprinted object's color produced a stimulus generalization gradient in imprinting. The present results are also similar to results obtained with other species and tasks in which color is found to be a dominant cue. These include studies on stimulus

generalization in pigeons (Baron, 1965), discrimination learning in monkeys (Warren, 1953, 1954), and preference tests in young children (Suchman & Trabasso, 1966).

References

- BARON, M. R. The stimulus, stimulus control and stimulus generalization. In D. I. Mostofsky, (Ed.) *Stimulus Generalization*. Stanford, Stanford Univ. Press, 1965 (Pp. 62-71).
- COFOID, DIANNE A., & HONIG, W. K. Stimulus generalization in imprinting. *Science*, 1961, 134, 1692-1694.
- GREY, P. H. The releasers of imprinting: differential reactions to color as a function of maturation. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1961, 54, 597-601.
- GUITON, P. Socialization and imprinting in brown leghorn chicks. *Anim. Behav.*, 1959, 7, 26-34.
- JAYNES, J. Imprinting: the interaction of learned and innate behavior: I. Development and generalization. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1956, 49, 201-206.
- JAYNES, J. Imprinting: the interaction of learned and innate behavior: IV. Generalization and emergent discrimination. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1958, 51, 238-242.
- LINDQUIST, E. F. *Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1953.
- SLUCKIN, W. *Imprinting and early learning*. Chicago, Aldine, 1965.
- SLUCKIN, W., & TAYLOR, K. F. Imprinting and short-term retention. *Brit. J. of Psychol.*, 1964, 55, 181-187.
- SUCHMAN, R. G., & TRABASSO, T. Color and form preference in young children. *J. exp. child Psychol.*, 1966, 3, 177-187.
- WARREN, J. M. Additivity of cues in visual pattern discrimination by monkeys. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1953, 46, 484-486.
- WARREN, J. M. Perceptual dominance in discrimination learning by monkeys. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1954, 47, 290-292.

Note

1. This research was supported in part by United States Public Health Service Grant MH 14154-01 to the first author.

Erratum

Patten, R.L., & Rudy, J.W. The Sheffield omission training procedure applied to the conditioning of the licking response in rats. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1967, 8 (11), 463-464—In the third line of the second paragraph, second column, page 363, the quantity "35 dB" should read "74 dB (re 0.0002 dynes/cm²)."