increment in water ingestion relative to the schedule condition without shock.

Lick burst length was determined for each animal for the last 2 days of each condition. In the FR-20 group, a lengthening of the lick burst during the shock condition occurred for all four animals, whereas an increase in total frequency of lick bursts was obtained in only one subject. This particular FR-20 animal (Subject 105) seemed to increase both lick burst length and frequency, relative to those response measures for the schedule condition without shock in Phases 2 and 4. Similarly, FR-80 animals also seemed to increase lick burst length when subjected to the shock conditions. In addition, they were more likely to increase the frequency with which lick bursts were initiated. Analysis of the data also indicated no difference between groups in the number of food pellet deliveries followed by at least one lick burst, indicating that the higher frequency of drinking in the FR-80 group was a result of an increased number of drinking bouts within the interpellet interval.

In addition, the number of shocks earned by each subject did not differ appreciably across groups, indicating that the greater amount of drinking in FR-80 subjects compared to FR-20 subjects was not attributable to a difference in total electric shocks received. By observation, it was noted that, initially, shock interrupted drinking; but as the water intakes stabilized, the animals drank through the shock delivery, although they were noticeably still affected by the shock, as indicated by their laying their ears back, becoming suddenly tense, etc. It appears that an electric shock (which is considered to be punishing at the .1-mA level; Cohen, 1968), will, when its application is made contingent on the occurrence of a schedule-induced behavior, increase the intensity of that behavior. In the case of SIP, the application of a mildly aversive electric shock contingent on postpellet licking resulted in an increase in response intensity as indicated by increased water intake. This increase in water intake seems to be produced by an energization of responding along one or both of two dimensions of the drinking response, including increases in lick burst length and lick burst frequency. These results corroborate and extend the results reported by Galantowicz and King (1975) for .1-mA lick-contingent shock. These studies considered together appear to lend further support to the emotional explanation for SIP.

REFERENCES

COHEN, P. S. Punishment: The interactive effects of delay and intensity of shock. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 1968, **11**, 789-799.

GALANTOWICZ, E. P., & KING, G. D. The effects of three levels of lick-contingent footshock on schedule-induced polydipsia. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 1975, **5**, 113-116.

KING, G. D. The enhancement of schedule-induced polydipsia by preschedule noncontingent shock. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 1974, **3**, 46-48.

MILLER, R. E., MIRSKY, I. A., CAUL, W. F., & SAKATA, T. Hyperphagia and polydipsia in socially isolated rhesus monkeys. *Science*, 1969, **165**, 1027-1028.

MOYER, K. E. Effect of experience with emotion provoking stimuli on water consumption in the rat. *Psychonomic Science*, 1965, **2**, 251-252.

SEGAL, E. F., & ODEN, D. L. Determinants of polydipsia in rats: A reply to Stein. I. Emptying the water bottle. *Psychonomic Science*, 1965, **2**, 201-202.

SEGAL, E. F., & ODEN, D. L. Effects of drinkometer current and of footshock on psychogenic polydipsia. *Psychonomic Science*, 1969, **14**, 13-15.

ULRICH, R. E., & CRAINE, W. H. Persistence of shock-induced aggression. *Science*, 1964, **143**, 971-973.

(Received for publication July 10, 1975.)

ERRATUM

White, K. G., & Silver, A. B. Cerebral hemispheres serve as two channels for visual information. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1975, 6, 51-52. The last sentence of the first paragraph on page 52 should read: "Thus, in the situation where a grid pattern was directed to one hemisphere, and a CVC was simultaneously directly to the other, identification was more accurate when spatial stimuli were processed by the right (spatial) hemisphere and verbal stimuli were processed by the left (verbal) hemisphere than when spatial and verbal stimuli were processed by "inappropriate" hemispheres."