The findings of Geisler, van Bergeijk, and Frishkopf indicate separate origin for the simple and complex units in the bullfrog.\footnote{L. S. Frishkopf and M. H. Goldstein, Jr., "Responses to Acoustic Stimuli from Single I-nits in the Eighth Nerve of the Bullfrog," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 35, 1219-1228 (1963).}
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In a recent report of research on "Ratio Scales, Category Scales, and Variability in the Production of Loudness and Softness,"\footnote{S. S. Stevens and M. Guirao, "Subjective Scaling of Length and Area and the Matching of Length to Loudness and Brightness," J. Expil. Psychol. 69, 171 (1963).} we showed that the curvatures of the category scales for loudness and softness differ when these scales are plotted against their corresponding magnitude scales, although the variability observed in the magnitude productions of loudness and softness did not differ. These findings were viewed as conflicting with the "variability hypothesis," which attributes the nonlinear relation between category and magnitude scales to the growth of variability along the psychological continuum. The findings of some earlier research seemed to contradict this hypothesis. Now, an alternative interpretation of these findings is presented.
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The "variability hypothesis" attributes the nonlinear relation between category and magnitude scales to the growth of variability along the psychological continuum. The findings of some earlier research seemed to contradict this hypothesis. Now, an alternative interpretation of these findings is presented.

IN A RECENT REPORT OF RESEARCH ON "RATIO SCALES, CATEGORY SCALES, AND VARIABILITY IN THE PRODUCTION OF LOUDNESS AND SOFTNESS,"\footnote{S. S. Stevens and M. Guirao, "Subjective Scaling of Length and Area and the Matching of Length to Loudness and Brightness," J. Expil. Psychol. 69, 171 (1963).} we showed that the curvatures of the category scales for loudness and softness differ when these scales are plotted against their corresponding magnitude scales, although the variability observed in the magnitude productions of loudness and softness did not differ. These findings were viewed as conflicting with the "variability hypothesis," which attributes the nonlinear relation between category and magnitude scales to the growth of variability as we progress upward along the psychological continuum.\footnote{B. Schneider and H. Lane, "Ratio Scales, Category Scales, and Variability in the Production of Loudness and Softness," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 35, 1953-1961 (1963).}

S. S. Stevens has called our attention to an alternative interpretation of these findings that does not contradict the variability hypothesis. The findings that the variability of loudness and softness productions does not differ is in accord with the following hypothesis: an observer's estimate of the loudness or of the softness of a sound is controlled, in either case, by the sound's loudness; he merely makes a reciprocal transformation on the numbers assigned to the apparent magnitude before reporting "softness." The difference in concavity between the category scales for loudness and softness (relative to their respective magnitude scales) then becomes the result of an arbitrary transformation on the psychological scale of loudness. From this point of view, softness is just one of several possible transformations that an observer could be asked to make on the scale of loudness. An analogous interpretation applies to the relations between scales for shortness and length, smallness and largeness, dimness and brightness. In general, the differing concavities of the psychological scales associated with inverse pairs of attributes would be excluded from the domain of the variability hypothesis.

Time Requirements for the Tonal Function
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The "tonal-click phenomenon" in short tones, which has been investigated for normals by several experimenters, and in some detail by Doughty and Garner,\footnote{B. Schneider and H. Lane, "Ratio Scales, Category Scales, and Variability in the Production of Loudness and Softness," J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 35, 1953-1961 (1963).} was chosen as a possible technique for testing the time factor in these cases of perceptive confusion. Normal listeners will hear a 10-msec spurt of a 1000-cps frequency as a short tone, but if the duration is increased they reach a point where the stimulus is heard as a click, without tonal quality. In the present study, we have found some abnormal subjects requiring 200 or 300 msec to achieve a sensation of tone, reporting shorter durations as click, and two subjects who required a full second. One of the latter commented on a duration of 800 msec, "It's not a tone, but too long for a click; it sounds like static." So far in the pilot study, the Boomsliter-Creel test has been used on 41 candidates for surgery; on 23 we have pre- and post-operative scores. In all, to date, 205 tests have been made on 114 subjects.

Our present apparatus uses a standard Maico audiometer as...