sequences and the small decrements obtained with nonreinforcement sequences in the last half of training indicate changing parameters.

From the framework of a two-operator, linear operator model (Bush & Mosteller, 1951), there are two possibilities: Either the incremental-decremental parameters are approaching zero or the limit of the operator applied on nonreinforced trials is increasing, gradually approaching the limit of the operator applied on reinforced trials. Regardless of which, or both, two consequences are apparent: A two-operator, linear operator model with static parameter values is, at best, an approximate description of the data.

In a more general context, Prokasy & Allen (in press) noted that the sequential behavior observed in differential eyelid conditioning is sufficiently similar to that of intermittent reinforcement to suggest that intermittent reinforcement is a special case of differential conditioning in which the CS+ and CS- are indistinct. This position receives additional support from the present study. Response latency decreased following successive reinforced trials, and did not change following successive nonreinforced trials. Prokasy and Allen found a parallel effect with sequences of CS+ and CS- trials in differential conditioning.

Finally, the data raise questions about the general adequacy of the construct of inhibition of delay to account for latency data. Pavlov (1927, p. 235) reported that with continued training the salivary CR increased in latency. In contrast, CR latency in humans (Ebel & Prokasy, 1964) and rabbits (Gormezano, Schneidman, Deaux, & Fuentes, 1962)

decreases over trials. Also, response latency decreases with successive reinforcements (Prokasy & Allen, in press; this study) and remains constant with successive nonreinforcements. None of these outcomes with the eyelid reflex support the construct of inhibition of delay.

REFERENCES

- BUSH, R. R., & MOSTELLER, F. A model for stimulus generalization and discrimination. *Psychological Review*, 1951, 58, 413-423.
- EBEL, H. C., & PROKASY, W. F. Classical eyelid conditioning as a function of sustained and shifted interstimulus intervals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1963, 65, 52-58.
- HIGGINS, J. D. The effects of transition probability of reinforcement in intermittent reinforcement schedules in human eyelid conditioning. *Psychonomic Science*, 1968, 12, 69-70.
- GORMEZANO, I., SCHNEIDERMAN, N., DEAUX, E., & FUENTES, I. Nictitating membrane: Classical conditioning and extinction in the albino rabbit. *Science*, 1962, 138, 33-34.
- PROKASY, W. F., & ALLEN, C. K. Instructional sets in human differential eyelid conditioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, in press.
- PROKASY, W. F., CARLTON, R. A., & HIGGINS, J. D. Effects of nonrandom intermittent reinforcement schedules in human eyelid conditioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1967, 74, 282-288.
- PAVLOV, I. P. *Conditioned reflexes*. Translated by G. V. Anrep. London: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- SPENCE, K. W. The nature of discrimination learning in animals. *Psychological Review*, 1936, 43, 437-449.

NOTE

1. This study was supported by funds from NSF Grant 5627 and by funds provided by the University of Utah Research Committee. The aid of George E. Armstrong and of Betty Jean Smith is gratefully acknowledged.

ERRATUM

STANDING, L. G., & HABER, R. N. Visual search and memory under degraded and masked presentation. *Psychonomic Science*, 1968, 13 (2), 81-82.—On page 82, in the correction formula, the equals (=) sign following the term Pg $n/4$ should have been a minus (−) sign.