

Odor discrimination and recognition memory as a function of familiarization.

C. JEHL, J.-P. ROYET, & A. HOLLEY—

(J.-P.R.) Lab. de Physiol. Neurosens., Univ. Claude-Bernard-Lyon 1, 43, Bd du 11 nov. 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cdx., France; royet@neurosens.univ-lyon1.fr

Spatial and temporal factors determine audio-visual interactions in human saccadic eye movements.

M.A. FRENS, A.J. VAN OPSTAL, & R.F. VAN DER WILLIGEN—

(M.A.F.) Dept. of Med. Physics & Biophysics, Univ. of Nijmegen, P.O. Box 9101, 6500 HB Nijmegen, The Netherlands; maarten@mbfys.kun.nl

Are microsaccades responsible for the gap effect?

A. KINGSTONE, R. FENDRICH, C.M. WESSINGER, & P.A. REUTER-LORENZ—

(A.K.) Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2E9; alan@psych.ualberta.ca

Erratum

Chan, T.-C. Haptic perception of partial-rod lengths with the rod held stationary or wielded. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 1994, **55**(5), 551-561—On page 557, 2nd column, 10 lines from the bottom, the results should read:

A significant difference was found in both cases [$F(1,28) = 10.8$, $p < .01$ for the 80-cm rod; $F(1,28) = 8.425$, $p < .01$ for the 50-cm rod].

Also, on page 558, Table 3 should read:

Table 3
Mean Perceived Whole and Partial Lengths by Wielding the Rod in Experiment 3

Attachment Conditions	Static Torque $N_s(N \cdot m)$	Moment of Inertia I ($kg \cdot m^2$)	Perceived Forward Length (m)	Perceived Whole Length (m)	Perceived Length Ratio Q'
50-cm rod					
No attachment	0.0000	0.00096	0.073	0.154	2.07
In front	0.0041	0.00123	0.120	0.185	1.60
Front end	0.0154	0.00479	0.155	0.224	1.37
Rear	-0.0041	0.00123	0.055	0.963	3.44
Rear end	-0.0154	0.00479	0.055	0.209	4.22
80-cm rod					
No attachment	0.0000	0.00362	0.088	0.190	2.13
In front	0.0039	0.00386	0.127	0.228	1.55
Front end	0.0249	0.01361	0.211	0.292	1.45
Rear	-0.0039	0.00386	0.082	0.235	3.18
Rear end	-0.0249	0.01361	0.061	0.306	4.47