DISCUSSION

The findings that for Problems 1-11 (1) the N group took significantly more time to answer than the LS group, and that (2) the H Ss took significantly less time to respond than the LS individuals indicate that: (1) saying "1" after an answer served as a reinforcing event, where a reinforcement is defined as an event that produces a significantly higher level of performance as compared to a control group that does not experience the event, and (2) three discriminably different levels of reinforcement were used, where different amounts of reward are defined in terms of whether or not they produce significantly different levels of performance.

The experiment failed to demonstrate positive incentive contrast effects with an increase in the amount of reinforcement. This result is consistent with most studies that have increased incentive magnitude with animal Ss (e.g., Ashida & Birch, 1964; Collier et al, 1961).

The findings that for Problems 12-15 the LS and MS groups each took significantly

longer to respond than the H individuals is in accord with many recent investigations with animals where decrements in the concentration of sucrose solutions do not lead to rapid performance decrements (e.g., Homzie & Ross, 1962; Ison & Glass, 1969; Rosen & Ison, 1965). These gradual decreases in performance suggest that, under some yet unspecified conditions, a reduction in incentive size with animals affects learning as distinct from motivational or performance variables. The gradual change in behavior in the present experiment suggests that an increase in reward magnitude with humans results in a change in some permanent excitatory mechanism as distinct from a more transitory motivational or performance factor.

It would appear that human Ss respond to an increase in reward magnitude as do some infrahuman organisms.

REFERENCES

- ASHIDA, S., & BIRCH, D. The effects of incentive shift as a function of training. *Psychonomic Science*, 1964, 1, 201-202.
COLLIER, G., KNARR, F. A., & MARX, M. H. Some relations between the intensive

Table 1
Summary of Experimental Procedure: Amount of Reward Received for Each Phase and Group

	N	LS	MS	H
Preshift	—	1	3	7
Postshift	—	7	7	7

properties of the consummatory response and reinforcement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1961, 62, 484-495.

CRESPI, L. P. Quantitative variations of incentive and performance in the white rat. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1942, 55, 467-517.

HOMZIE, M. J., & ROSS, L. E. Runway performance following a reduction in the concentration of a liquid reward. *Journal of Comparative & Physiological Psychology*, 1962, 65, 1029-1033.

ISON, J. R., & GLASS, D. H. "Classical" versus "instrumental" exposure to sucrose rewards and later instrumental behavior following a shift in incentive value. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1969, 79, 582-583.

ROSEN, A. J., & ISON, J. R. Runway performance following changes in sucrose rewards. *Psychonomic Science*, 1965, 2, 335-336.

WEINSTEIN, L. Negative incentive contrast with sucrose. *Psychonomic Science*, 1970, 19, 13-14.

ERRATUM

THORSHEIM, H. I. NLM strength and CVC-CVC response-time recall.—*Psychon. Sci.*, 1970, 20 (2), 101-102. The title should read as follows: NLM strength and response-term recall.