(see Fig. 1). This lower rating of "goodness," which approaches accepted levels of significance, may be occasioned by S's lower level of familiarity with the stimulus due to the omission of one of the aural sources of input (i.e., hearing E pronounce the word). Although the presence of this input source appears to enhance the ratings of the individual stimuli, it does not seem to attenuate the more general exposure-frequency effect.

Indirect evidence for the exposure-frequency effect was found in the comparison of individual words when used at low or high levels of exposure frequency. Although an overall t test indicated a significant difference, two words failed to be rated "better" in the high-frequency conditions than in the low-frequency conditions. The reason for this may have been an insufficient number of Ss. An unexpectedly small number were

available to the E (12 per condition), so that only one-sixth as many Ss participated in the present study as did in each of Zajonc's three studies. The same reason may provide a partial explanation for the more serious problem of the failure to reach accepted levels of significance between the replication and control conditions. This occurred in both the analysis of variance and the comparison of individual stimulus words in each condition. A replication of the present study may clear up this problem.

Future research into this effect may be directed toward the contribution of various combinations of input to S, and the weight of such inputs in determining where, on the "goodness" scale, the exposure-frequency effect will fall.

REFERENCES

BECKNELL, J. C., JR., WILSON, W. R., &

BAIRD, J. C. The effect of frequency of presentation on the choice of nonsense syllables. *Journal of Psychology*, 1963, 56, 165-170.

JOHNSON, R. C., THOMSON, C. W., & FRINKE, G. Word values, word frequencies, and visual duration thresholds. *Psychological Review*, 1960, 67, 332-342.

ZAJONC, R. B. The attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 1968, 9(2, Part 2), 1-27.

NOTES

1. This research was carried out while the author was a psychological trainee during the Summer Training Programme 1969 of the Psychology Department, Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, Hamilton, Ontario. Gratitude is hereby expressed to those staff members who cooperated in the execution of the project.

2. A special note of gratitude is expressed to Prof. Richard V. Thysell of the Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo, who provided editorial comment and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

ERRATUM

ELLIS, H. D. Illusions, aftereffects and iconic memory. *Psychonomic Science*, 1969, 17, 328-329.—P. 329, Fig. 1. The illusions have the wrong labels. They are labeled correctly in the figure to the right.

Hering Illusion

Zöllner Illusion