The data after the last error seem unequivocal. The continued decrease in latency over a sequence of trials could not be attributed to replacement of guesses by learned recalls. The guessing probability is too low.

It is clear that the ability of the S to respond correctly is a function of the length of time allowed for him to respond. In a learning experiment with fixed anticipation interval, relative frequencies of correct responses will not be independent of latency. The decision of the E as to when an S has formed an association under such conditions is arbitrary and difficult to reconcile with an assumption that associations are formed in an all-or-none manner.

A reasonable integration of frequency and latency data may require a distinction between implicit occurrence of a response and the S's decision to vocalize the response. The frequency data in an experiment where unlimited time is given for recall may reflect the S's ability to recognize the response that is correct when it occurs to him, as well as the likelihood that he thinks of the correct response. The latency data after the last error would then reflect speed of occurrence of the correct response after the S has learned to recognize it when it occurs. Speed of occurrence appears to be a measure of strength of an association which changes gradually over trials. Recognition of what is correct or erroneous does not seem to be entirely dependent on speed of occurrence. The failure to find systematic changes in latency before the last error. (Cf. Millward, 1964) may in part be due to interference effects from erroneous responding (Peterson & Brewer, 1963).

References

MILLWARD, R. Latency in a modified paired-associate learning experiment. *J. verbal Learn. verbal Behav.*, 1964, 3, 309-316.
 PETERSON, L. R., & BREWER, C. L. Confirmation, correction, and contiguity. *J. verbal Learn. verbal Behav.*, 1963, 1, 365-371.

Note

1. This research was facilitated by National Science Foundation Grant GB 704.

Erratum

JENKINS, J. J., & FOSS, D. J. An experimental analysis of pseudomediation. *Psychon. Sci.*, 1965, 2, 99-100. The Editor regrets that, due to an error in his office, Table 1 (referred to near the top of column 1 on page 100) was omitted from the article. It is reproduced below.

Table 1. Means and Pairwise t-Tests of Criterion Measures for Each Learning Stage

Stage	Group	NC	C-1	C-2	C-2s
I	Experimental	10.55	13.55	15.60	16.05
	Control	12.55	12.35	14.85	16.10
	t-value	2.58*	1.28	.78	.05
II	Experimental	13.35	10.25	12.10	13.00
	Control	19.30	7.30	9.40	10.95
	t-value	6.72**	6.08**	4.67**	2.76**
III	Experimental	15.70	9.25	10.95	11.75
	Control	15.35	9.55	12.25	14.00
	t-value	.34	.47	1.92	2.92**

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level