ginally made. The mean repetition percentage for common responses was 65.46 (32.73/50), while the mean repetition percentage for uncommon responses was 31.86 (15.93/50).

References

- HALL, J. F. The reliability of free association responses. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 4, 79-80.
- HOUSTON, J. P., & MEDNICK, S. A. Creativity and the need for novelty. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1963, 66, 137-141.
- MALTZMAN, I. On the training of originality. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1960, 67, 229-242.

PALERMO, D. S., & JENKINS, J. J. *Word association norms*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1964.

THORNDIKE, E. L. *Selected writings from a connectionist's psychology*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1949.

Notes

1. This study was supported by a grant to the senior author from the University of Bridgeport Faculty Research Fund.
2. A report of the study was presented at the 1967 meeting of the Educational Research Association of New York State in Albany.
3. Now at Lyndon College.
4. Now with Dunlap and Associates; Darien, Connecticut.
5. Now at the University of Connecticut.

A Comment on Acoustic Data and Recognition in Short-Term Memory by D. Marcer University of Southampton, England

Pearthree, Gorfein, & Bennett (1967) report a method for selecting alternatives to be used in STM recognition studies, and conclude from their data that factors other than the acoustic coding of items play an important role in short-term retention.

This conclusion is based largely on the finding that the mean score in their recognition experiment was 0.7657 correct recognitions, while the "spell" scores had a mean proportion of 0.2660 correct. It is suggested here that the difference could be an artifact of the way in which the two scores were obtained.

The spell scores were based on the number of correctly decoded responses compared with the total number of responses to that syllable by all Ss. The method of obtaining the spell score responses was to play back continuously the tape recording of S's verbalizations of the stimuli with instructions for S to write each syllable as he decoded it from his pronunciation.

It seems reasonable to suggest that some form of recognition memory will be involved in this process. S will generate as many appropriate solutions as possible to the sound stimulus, and select the cor-

rect response from this array. In fact, this process is implied in the recognition study, where the array presented to the S consisted of stimuli drawn from the spell data.

In their report of the spell score experiment the authors do not give details of the interstimulus presentation time. However, their report that the tape played back continuously suggests it was short. If so, the possibility of S being able to generate all possible solutions to the verbalized stimulus, and then select his response would be greatly restricted. This would be especially so when compared with the recognition experiment, where solutions were presented to S, leaving the whole 10.5 sec recall period free for the selection of the appropriate response. It would be expected, therefore, that recognition scores would be greater than those obtained by the spell group, where S might not have time to include the correct response in his self-generated array from which a single response is made.

Reference

- PEARTHREE V., GORFEIN D. S., & BENNETT R. W. Acoustic data and recognition in short-term-memory, *Psychon. Sci.*, 1967, 8, 59-60.