

of the stabilized form of IRT distributions obtained with these schedules see Malott & Cumming (1964). It can be seen that the mode of the IRT distribution was initially at a low value and, after several sessions, stabilized slightly above the lower bound of the reinforcement interval. In most cases, the interquartile range was initially below the lower bound; but in every case, it eventually stabilized so that the third quartile was considerably above the lower bound and the first quartile was near the lower bound. The duration of the transition phase for these measures was a negative function of the lower bound. The probability of short IRTs decreased from a high to an intermediate value and stabilized more rapidly than the other measures. This result serves to illustrate the point that the transition phase may be different for different response measures; although one measure may have stabilized, another may still be in transition. It is difficult to specify the exact point at which stability was obtained; however, an examination of Fig. 1 indicates that it has been attained by session four for the 4 sec. lower bound group, session eight for the 8 sec. group, and session 16 for the 16 sec. group. It is hoped that these values

may serve, at least, as a rough guide in conducting future experiments in this area. These values should be of more general interest since the presence of the upper bound on the interval of reinforced IRTs probably had no effect on the IRT distributions; for Malott & Cumming (1964) have shown that the steady state distributions obtained with reinforcement interval widths equal to the lower bound are the same as distributions obtained with no upper bound.

References

- CUMMING, W. W., & SCHOENFELD, W. N. Behavior stability under extended exposure to a time-correlated reinforcement contingency. *J. exp. Anal. Behav.*, 1960, 3, 71-82.
- HODOS, W. A simple method for the description of interresponse time distributions. *J. exp. Anal. Behav.*, 1963, 6, 90.
- MALOTT, R. W., & CUMMING, W. W. Schedules of interresponse time reinforcement. *Psychol. Rec.*, 1964, 14, 211-252.
- SIDMAN, M. *Tactics of scientific research*. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Notes

1. This research was supported by Public Health Service Grant MH-06911-01.
2. Now at Denison University, Granville, Ohio.

Reply

The "unspecified 1965 pretraining conditions" to which Battig refers merely involved a gradual increase in the ratio requirement from FR 1 to FR 50 over a 2-day period. As for the 1964 pretraining procedure, it is unlikely that secondary reinforcing properties could have been attached to a stimulus which was associated exclusively with extinction, i.e., the TO stimulus.

(See page 250 for comment by W. F. Battig)

The reader is invited to refer to the specific details of this discrimination procedure (*J. exp. Anal. Behav.*, 1964, 7, 1-8). In any case, the fact that the 1964 results were replicated when the discrimination training procedure was not used seems to rule out a secondary reinforcement interpretation.

Donald M. Thompson
University of Virginia