Fig. 2. Average activity rate during last acquisition day and extinction sessions.

There were no significant changes in the size of the response after Day 1, as measured by activity either during the entire CS or during 2 sec segments. Fig. 1 shows also that the form of the response remained virtually unchanged after the introduction of PR. There was little evidence for the development of inhibition of delay even on Day 15 (Fig. 2).

During extinction the response dropped off quite rapidly. A *t* test of the increases above the baseline rate of Days 15 and 16 shows the decline to be significant ($t = 4.05$, $df = 7$, $p < .01$). The second extinction day showed no further decline (Fig. 2) indicating that the conditioned response was effectively extinguished during Day 16.

Discussion

The lack of inhibition of delay under PR supports the interpretation stated above. The present data are another example of a parallel between the patterns of activity during a CS for noncontingent food delivery and that of an instrumental response under an analogous reward schedule.

These results do not unequivocally support the condi-

tioned excitement position, however. As an alternative it could be claimed that some (unspecified) behavior was learned by adventitious instrumental contingencies in the Pavlovian reward situation. The pattern of recorded activity would then show only that behavior and be entirely irrelevant to any conditioning process.

However, the extremely rapid extinction of the increased CS activity under PR argues against any major influence from instrumental factors. Although no direct statistical comparison can be made, resistance to extinction after training under almost identical conditions with 100% reward (Zamble, 1967) was somewhat greater. Slivka & Bitterman (1966) used a similar measure with pigeons and found the same lack of greater resistance to extinction under PR. Since increased resistance to extinction after training with PR seems not to occur in classical conditioning as it does in instrumental situations, the evidence thus favors viewing the present effect as the result of a Pavlovian process.

References

- GOODRICH, K. P. Performance in different segments of an instrumental response chain as a function of reinforcement schedule. *J. exp. Psychol.*, 1959, 57, 57-63.
- SLIVKA, R. M., & BITTERMAN, M. E. Classical appetitive conditioning in the pigeon. Partial reinforcement. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1966, 4, 181-2.
- SHEFFIELD, F. D. Relation between classical conditioning and instrumental learning. In W. Prokasy (Ed.) *Classical Conditioning*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965. Pp. 302-322.
- SHEFFIELD, F. D., & CAMPBELL, B. A. The role of experience in the "spontaneous" activity of hungry rats. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1954, 47, 97-100.
- ZAMBLE, E. Classical conditioning of excitement anticipatory to food reward. *J. comp. physiol. Psychol.*, 1967, 63, 526-529.

Notes

1. This research was supported by National Science Foundation Grant GB-04404. The author was a NSF Predoctoral Fellow.
2. Now at Institute for Cognitive Studies, Rutgers University, Newark, N. J.

Erratum

Davis, S. F., & North, A. J. The effect of varied reinforcement training on behavior following incentive reduction. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1967, 9 (7A), 395-396.—On page 395, right-hand column, fifth line from the bottom, beginning with "At terminal acquisition" and ending with "respectively," the text should be changed to read: "At terminal acquisition, Group VR differed significantly from Group C ($t = 1.929$, $df = 31$, $p < .05$). From incentive reduction Trial Block 2 through Trial Block 6 Group VR differed significantly from Group LR ($t = 2.259$, 2.289, 2.889, 2.346, 2.22; $df = 31$, $p < .05$, .05, .01, .05, .05, respectively)."