

## REFERENCES

- BROWN, P. L., & JENKINS, H. M. (1968). Auto-shaping of the pigeon's key-peck. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, **11**, 1-8.
- CHARNOV, E. L. (1976). Optimal foraging: The marginal value theorem. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **9**, 129-136.
- DAVEY, G. C. L., & CLELAND, G. G. (in press). Food anticipation and lever-directed activities in rats. *Learning and Motivation*.
- DAVEY, G. C. L., OAKLEY, D. A., & CLELAND, G. G. (1981). Auto-shaping in the rat: Effects of omission on the form of the response. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, **36**, 75-91.
- HEARST, E. (1979). Classical conditioning as the formation of interstimulus associations: Stimulus substitution, parasitic reinforcement and auto-shaping. In A. Dickinson & R. A. Boakes (Eds.), *Mechanisms of learning and motivation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- HOLLIS, K. L. (1982). Pavlovian conditioning of signal-centered action patterns and autonomic behavior: A biological analysis of function. In J. S. Rosenblatt, R. A. Hinde, C. Beer, & M. C. Busnel (Eds.), *Advances in the study of behavior* (Vol. 12). New York: Academic Press.
- JENKINS, H. M., BARRERA, F. J., IRELAND, C., & WOODSIDE, B. (1978). Signal-centered action patterns of dogs in appetitive classical conditioning. *Learning and Motivation*, **9**, 272-296.
- KREBS, J. R. (1978). Optimal foraging: Decision rules for predators. In J. R. Krebs & N. B. Davies (Eds.), *Behavioral ecology: An evolutionary approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- RESCORLA, R. A. (1967). Pavlovian conditioning and its proper control procedure. *Psychological Review*, **74**, 71-80.
- TIMBERLAKE, W. (1983). The functional organization of appetitive behavior: Behavior systems and learning. In M. D. Zeiler & P. Harzem (Eds.), *Advances in analysis of behavior* (Vol. 3): *Biological factors in learning*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- WASSERMAN, E. A. (1980). Response evocation in auto-shaping: Contributions of cognitive and comparative-evolutionary analyses to an understanding of directed action. In C. M. Locurto, H. S. Terrace, & J. Gibbon (Eds.), *Auto-shaping and conditioning theory*. New York: Academic Press.

(Manuscript received for publication December 13, 1983.)

## ERRATUM

Calef, R. S., Metz, R. A., Atkinson, T. L., Pellerzi, R. C., Taylor, K. S., & Geller, E. S. (1984). "Acquisition of running in the straight alley following experience with response-independent food" [*Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, **22**(1), 67-69]—On page 69, part of the paragraph in progress at the beginning of column 1 was misprinted—after "Hence, Group NC may have learned to approach in the presence of frustration-eliciting stimuli." We regret this error and extend our apologies to the authors and readers. The complete text for the partial paragraph in question (that is, the first 17 lines of page 69) should be:

pate food in the goal cup of the operant chamber. If an approach response in the operant chamber was followed by no food, frustration may have occurred and become conditioned to the chamber cues. Conditioned frustration (rf-sf) elicited by the chamber cues may occasionally have been followed by reward in the goal cup. Hence, Group NC may have learned to approach in the presence of frustration-eliciting stimuli. According to Amsel's (1972) persistence theory, learning to approach in the presence of aversive stimuli (rf-sf) should cause subjects to persist in the presence of any disrupting stimuli, whether those stimuli are novel stimuli elicited by an apparatus during the acquisition of a new response or rf-sf during extinction. Hence, rats receiving response-independent food should have acquired the running response faster in the present study than did the control rats because of the generalization of learning to persist in the presence of a disruptive stimulus, and should have shown more resistance to extinction in the Calef et al. study.