

## ERRATUM

Re: Volume 41, Number 2 (March, 1984), pp. 169-182.

In the article, "Concurrent variable-interval schedule performance: Fixed versus mixed reinforcer durations," by Michael Davison and Ian Hogsden, the reinforcer columns L/S1 and L/S2 in the Appendix were accidentally reversed. Throughout the Appendix (pp. 181-182), the first reinforcer column should read L/S2 and the second, L/S1. This reversal affected part of the data analysis also. The revised Table 2 (p. 176) is:

<i>Bird</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>log c</i>	<i>VAC</i>
21	.38	1.46	-.32	.55
22	.50	1.25	-.04	.54
23	.78	.93	-.30	.79
24	1.44	.64	-.28	.74
25	.72	.90	.01	.55
26	.62	.59	-.04	.50
Mean	.74	.96	-.14	.61

With the reinforcer data columns corrected, the long equation on p. 179 also fits better than reported (a mean of .72 of the data variance accounted for). But since these proportions of data variance accounted for are still relatively low, the conclusions made by Davison and Hogsden remain unchanged: Neither Equation 4, nor the long equation on p. 179, described the data accurately, and the generalized matching law failed to account for the effects of variations in reinforcer durations on behavior allocation in concurrent schedules.