



Fig. 2. Mean error compared for field-dependent and field-independent Ss as a function of conditions with the reference rod at 15 deg.

The main effects for S groups and reference rod position were not significant. Pair comparisons of all conditions were statistically significant ($p < .05$) except in the case of the visual settings.

The data shows that visual settings were significantly more accurate than tactual settings regardless of the reference modality. The intermodal V-T condition produced significantly greater errors than all other conditions, indicating that a visual reference has a considerable influence on a tactual setting.

Figure 2 shows the mean errors of the subject groups in all the conditions with the reference rod at 15 deg. Although there was not a statistically significant difference between the groups, the trend of the data show that the field-dependent Ss produced greater errors for the tactual settings only. If field-dependence is simply an adherence to prevailing stimulus input then the visual settings should have been influenced also by the inaccurate (15-deg) input.

DISCUSSION

The results of this experiment support earlier findings concerning the superiority of the visual modality. The settings made visually were consistently better than the tactual settings and cross-modal inputs did not significantly effect the visual

settings. On the other hand, the data show that not only were tactual settings more inaccurate but that visual reference, accurate or not, increased this error. It seems that the mediating processes involved in translating visual information into tactual outputs detracted from the accuracy of the tactual modality working alone. This is consistent with Legge's (1965) study cited above. Contrary to Legge, however, the T-V intermodal condition was the most accurate. It appears that nonvertical tactual reference information was recognized as such and exerted no influence on the visual settings.

The conditions with the reference rod at 15 deg from the vertical were expected to produce the greatest difference between the subject groups. In the visual settings there was a similarity in performance of the field-dependent and field-independent Ss. This similarity could be accounted for by the fact that the Ss were not compelled by a visual "field." In the Witkin situations of tilting room, rod and frame, and embedded figures a visual figure-ground relationship was involved. In the present conditions the visual situation was more one of multiple figures than of figure-ground which could account for the different results reported here.

The present findings, therefore, are consistent with previous research suggesting that the visual modality plays a dominant role in verticality judgments. The nature of the intermodal interaction between visual and tactual modalities, however, needs further investigation to determine if there is a consistent way in which they interact.

REFERENCES

- CASHDAN, S. Visual and haptic form discrimination under conditions of successive stimulation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1968, 76, 221-224.
- LEGGE, D. Analysis of visual and proprioceptive components motor skill by means of drug. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1965, 56, 243-254.
- ROCK, I., & VICTOR, J. Vision and touch. *Science*, 1964, 143, 594-600.
- WITKIN, H. A., DYK, R. B., FATERSON, H. F., GOODENOUGH, D. R., & KARP, S. A. *Psychological differentiation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.
- WITKIN, H. A., & ASCH, S. E. Studies in space orientation: III. Perception of the upright in the absence of a visual field. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1948a, 38, 603-614.
- WITKIN, H. A., & ASCH, S. E. Studies in space orientation: IV. Further experiments on the perception of the upright with displaced visual fields. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1948b, 38, 762-782.

ERRATA

ROECKELEIN, JON E. Simplicity as a principle in tactual form perception. *Psychonomic Science*, 1968, 13 (4), 195-196.—On page 196, 1st column, the 23rd line should read ". . . "complex" stimuli as "simple" less often than did Group 2 . . ."

HILL, J. H., & LIEBERT, R. M. Effects of consistent or deviant modeling cues on the adoption of a self-imposed standard. *Psychonomic Science*, 1968, 13 (4), 243-244.—Lines 3-5 of the Discussion on page 244 are incorrect. They should read, ". . . quite precise adherence to the stringent standard. In keeping with the direct instruction which they received and the models whom they saw, Ss in these groups self-administered . . ."