ing was impractical. It was therefore necessary to find a safe and economical method of poisoning the fish. Since the literature on this subject seems to be quite meager, it is felt that a short note on our experiments might prove helpful to others who may have the same problem.

A solution of copper sulfate in the concentration of 8 pounds per million gallons of water was first tried. Whipple[1] states, in part, that carp are killed in a solution of 2.8 pounds of copper sulfate per million gallons of water, and catfish in 35 pounds of copper sulfate per million gallons of water. In our experiment, we began at the upper end of the stream and constructed a series of small dams, making a number of pools in which the concentration of copper sulfate could be fairly accurately estimated.

In the first of these pools a solution of 8 pounds of copper sulfate per million gallons of water was used. At the end of 55 minutes no fish seemed to be affected. The concentration was then increased up to 7,500 pounds per million gallons; still no lethal effects were observed even after three hours, nor did the fish seem distressed. In other pools where the same dosages were used no dead fish were found after 48 hours of exposure to the solution.

Chlorinated lime with a chloric content of 24 per cent. was next used. In a solution of 1 pound per 2,000 gallons of water, fish were killed in twenty minutes. In quiet water, a solution of chlorinated lime in the ratio of 1 pound per 5,000 gallons of water was effective, but after a longer time. In the running water, a solution of 1 pound per 2,000 gallons of water affected the fish after 10 minutes' exposure, and at the end of 20 minutes respiratory movements ceased. In still waters, a weaker solution was slower in action, but at the end of 48 hours practically all the fish were in a dying condition.

Our experiments show that in out-of-door conditions copper sulfate, even in high concentrations, proved ineffective, while a chlorinated lime solution of 1 pound per 2,000 gallons of water concentration killed the fish tested in 20 minutes or less.

WALTER W. AITKEN
IOWA FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

PUNISHMENT AND REWARD IN LEARNING

IN a recent article in SCIENCE[1] and in other papers,[2] Thorndike has called attention to the apparently anomalous influence of punishment on learning. He reports that when punishment follows an act, the underlying connection, instead of being weakened, is either unaffected or strengthened. This is contrary to expectation and to the results of other studies. Thorndike attaches great significance to these results, suggesting that from the psychological point of view, punishment is not the opposite of reward.[3] Thorndike and, later, Lorge[4] suggest that in such cases the connection derives enough strength from just functioning to offset the potential weakening influence of punishment.

It should be pointed out that in Thorndike's experiments and in this discussion "punishment" means merely telling the subject that he has made a wrong choice.

In a series of experiments[5] I find that the weakening influence of punishment is also offset by the strengthening influence of the medium which carries both punishment and reward. To inform a subject that he is right or wrong one must use some physical medium, such as sound or flashes of lights, or the like. I find that the application of the medium itself, (*e.g.*, when it is divorced from all information as to success or failure) has a definite strengthening influence. When the medium is made to carry information of failure, its strengthening influence is reduced, and when it indicates success, its strengthening influence is increased.

The various extents to which a bond is strengthened by the application of different conditions is illustrated graphically below.



Here O represents the extent to which a bond is strengthened when the associated act is followed by nothing whatever, M the amount of strengthening due to the application of the *medium alone,* M+P the amount of strengthening due to the application of the *medium conveying punishment,* and M+R the amount due to the application of the *medium conveying reward.*

From the above illustration it will be seen that with reference to O the gross influences of M+P and of M+R are in the same direction but of different extents, but that with reference to M the net influences of P and R are in opposite directions and may be of equal extent. That is to say, that when punishment and reward are corrected for the influence of the conveying medium they may (in these experiments) be considered as psychological opposites.

J. M. STEPHENS
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

[1] "The Microscopy of Drinking Water," 4th ed., 392, table 94, 1927.

[1] SCIENCE, 77: 173, February 10, 1933.

[2] "The Fundamentals of Learning," 1932; "Human Learning," 1931; "Comparative Psychology Monographs," 1931–32, 8, no. 4.

[3] "The Fundamentals of Learning," p. 313.

[4] *Jour. Exper. Psychol.*, 16, 177–207, 1933.

[5] The details of this series will appear in a future issue of the *Journal of Experimental Psychology.*