Table 2
Sign Test Results (z) for All Adjacent Cube
Pairs for Each Group

Cube Pair	Experimental Group		
	Visual	Lift	Control
Steel-Brass	3.15*	1.66*	.19
Brass-Aluminum	4.63*	.93	.50
Aluminum-Mahogany	.56	3.51*	.56
Mahogany-Balsa Wood	4.26*	1.66*	.19

* $p < .05$

approximation form (z), are presented in Table 2.

From the Kendall analysis it is apparent that Ss in the visual and lift groups were statistically consistent in their respective rankings, while the control group exhibited only the expected random agreement in ordering. And, as was predicted, the ordering of cubes from heaviest to lightest for the visual group was steel, brass, aluminum, mahogany, and balsa wood; and for the lift group this order was precisely reversed. Only one adjacent cube pair in each of these conditions failed to produce

significantly different weight judgments: the aluminum-mahogany pair in the visual group and the brass-aluminum pair in the lift group. It is fair to assume that objects identical in size and weight and made of many other materials, e.g., cardboard, granite, or plastic, would also be differentially judged as to weight.

The subjective reports of Ss after the completion of the task reflect even more strongly, perhaps, the nature of this so-called density-weight illusion. No S in the lift group indicated that he suspected the cubes were all of the same weight as he lifted them, and most Ss expressed disbelief when told this by the E. A number of the Ss were permitted to manipulate the weights after the experiment in a casual attempt to assess the intellectual contribution to the illusion. The phenomenon did not appear to diminish with repeated lifting, despite knowledge of the objective weight of the cubes.

The phenomenological similarity of the

present results to those of the size-weight illusion should be mentioned. In both instances it is nearly impossible for Ss to believe that objects weighing the same could feel so different when lifted.

REFERENCES

- CRUTCHFIELD, R. S., WOODWORTH, D. G., & ALBRECHT, R. E. *Perceptual performance and the effective person*. San Antonio: Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center, 1955.
- HARSHFIELD, S. P., & SHAUMBURG, G. Judgment of weight as a function of brightness. Unpublished paper, California State College, Long Beach, California, 1964.
- MONROE, M. The apparent weight of color and correlated phenomena. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1925, 36, 192-206.
- PAYNE, M. C. Apparent weight as a function of hue. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1961, 74, 101-105.

ERRATUM

DRUCKMAN, D. Position change in cognitive conflict as a function of the cue-criterion relationship and the initial conflict. *Psychonomic Science*, 1970, 20 (2), 91-93.—Page 93, column 3: The sentence beginning with Summers (1968) should not have brackets around it. Page 92: column 2: the last line of the column was omitted; it should read "breakdown by cue discrepancy."