achieve significance until the first two trials were considered together, this can be justified by the reiteration that what is being measured is learning, and, therefore, any learning-dependent trends may take several trials to emerge.

Postman and G. Keppel (Eds.), *Norms of word association*. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
Mednick, S. A. The associative basis of the creative process. *Psychological Review*, 1962, 69, 220-232.

REFERENCES

Jenkins, J. J. The 1952 Minnesota word association norms. In L.

(Received for publication September 10, 1973.)

ERRATA

Levine, D. M., Wachspress, S., McGuire, P., & Mayzner, M. S. Visual information processing of numerical inputs. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 1973, 1, 404-406. (1) Subjects section—"New Uouk University" should be "New York University." (2) Apparatus section—"ARS-33 Teletype" should be "ASR-33 Teletype." (3) Results and Discussion section, Paragraph 1—Last two sentences should read: "The ANOVA showed clearly that Factor A (processing ability) was moderately significant ($F = 10.77$, $df = 1/6$, $p < .025$), while Factors B (on-time) and C (numbers) were highly significant ($F = 37.6$, $df = 4/24$, $p < .001$, and $F = 14.29$, $df = 9/54$, $p < .001$, respectively). One interaction term, i.e., B by C, was also significant ($F = 2.094$, $df = 36/216$, $p < .001$)." (4) Same section, last paragraph—Third sentence should read: "For this sample of eight Ss, W was highly significant (0.677 ; $\chi^2 = 48.744$, $df = 9$, $p < .001$)."