Time Perception: A Test of Weber's Law in Possums

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Masters of Social Science

at the

University of Waikato

By

RACHAEL ANNE LOCKHART

University of Waikato

2011

ABSTRACT

The performance of brushtail possums, *Trichosurus vulpecula,* was investigated in two experiments that used the peak procedure to investigate their ability to time. For Experiment 1 five possums lever pressed for food reinforcers on 3 different Fixed Interval (FI) schedules that included FI 15-s, FI 30-s and FI 60-s. The possums also experienced Peak Interval (PI) schedules that did not provide reinforcement for 20% of trials. The PI trials were 3 times longer than the FI schedule that was in effect on the other 80% of trials when responding was reinforced. Response rates increased to a maximum at about the time the responses were normally reinforced on FI trials and then decreased to a minimum at around 2 times the FI schedule duration that was in effect on a given condition. When relative response rates were plotted as a function of relative time the distributions generally superposed for the ascending, but not descending portions of the function. There was evidence of resurgence in response rates towards the end of the PI trials. The amount of resurgence appeared to be a function of the amount of experience animals had with the schedule and decreased across days, however, it was never eliminated. In Experiment 2, five possums lever pressed for food reinforcers on an FI 30-s schedule. Once again on 80% of trials responding was reinforced. For the other 20% of trials, responding was not reinforced and trials lasted either 3 (Experiment 2, Condition 1) or 10 (Experiment 2, Condition 2) times longer than the FI schedule that was in effect, and these extinction trials ended automatically when the specific time had passed. Resurgence was still evident at the end of the PI trials when they were 3 times longer than the FI, but decreased dramatically when they were 10 times longer than the FI that was in effect, resulting in the conclusion that that resurgence was dependent on the duration of the PI trials.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Lewis A. Bizo for his support and guidance throughout this experiment and his boundless assistance.

I would like to give a huge thank you to my Mum for all her love and support throughout my life. I thank her for always encouraging me to further my education and to be the best that I can be. She is the best mum I could have asked for. I wish to thank my partner Lawrence for always listening to my never ending possum stories and supporting me when I needed it the most. To Daniel, thanks for being a great brother and accepting my late night calls when I wanted someone to talk too.

I wish to thank all the staff and students at the lab who have helped me with technical support and the running of my experiment, especially Kristie.

Last but not least I want to thank my possums; I couldn't have done it without you!

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

For an animal to survive, it is vital that the animal has the ability to learn and store information about events that occur in space and time (Roberts, 1998). When a person is asked to estimate certain durations without the help of any timing device, it is common for people to estimate the duration by counting to help improve accuracy of time perception. Timing is seen as an critical aspect in the study of learning and therefore psychologists have dedicated a large amount of effort to research to better understand of how time controls behaviour (Machado, 1997). Numerous organisms can control their behaviour due to periodic changes within their environment without the need for different stimuli to mark the required changes (Lejeune & Wearden, 1991). It is common for people to observe behaviours from animals that suggest they have a sense of time such as dogs waiting at their bowl or cats howling to be feed at around the same time each day (Roberts, 1998).

Animals are continually required to adapt to a range of temporal changes which may vary from short to long durations requiring different mechanisms to discriminate and perceive temporal information (Fetterman & Killeen, 1992). At different times within a 24 hour period, animals may recognise a past cue that encourages them to become likely to perform certain behaviour at a particular time (Roberts, 1998). As well as being able to establish a time of day, it is common for animals to need to recognise a short period of time that may occur throughout the day. Roberts (1998) gives the example that foraging animals may need to stop in one specific location for a period to search for food. The intervals are timed by the animal in order to get sufficient time to collect food but also to prevent it from becoming prey for other animals (Roberts, 1998). It has been shown in numerous laboratory studies that animals are indeed sensitive to time and are exceptionally accurate at temporal discrimination (for a review see Grondin, 2001).

One way people have studied timing ability in the laboratory is to make use of time based schedules such as a Fixed Interval schedule (FI). On FI schedules the first response after the specified interval has passed is reinforced (Dews, 1970). One of the characteristics of performance on an FI schedule and is called the *Post-Reinforcement Pause* (PRP), which includes a period of non-responding from the time of the start of a trial to the time until the first response occurs within the same trial causing a scalloped pattern of responding (Wearden, 1985). Scalloping is an "upward concavity" of cumulative responses of separate intervals which shows an increasing response rate throughout an interval (Dews, 1970, pp. 43). At the beginning of the interval, responding is very low but starts to gradually increase towards the time of reinforcement (Roberts, 1998). A typical pattern of responding that develops on the FI schedules was described by Dews, (1970) and is shown in *Figure 1*.



Figure 1. Time as a fraction of interval as a function of rate as a fraction of terminal rate displaying the proportionate distribution of responding for intervals of 30, 300 and 3000-s. From "The Theory of Fixed-Interval Responding" by P. Dews (1970), in W.N. Schoenfeld (Eds.), *The Theory of Reinforcement Schedules* (pp. 43-61). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Peak Procedure

In the 1970's Catania originally devised a method that proved useful in investigating if animals were able to time the point at which reinforcers would normally be delivered on an FI schedule. This involved presenting trials longer than the FI schedule and not reinforcing responding on those longer trials which were run in extinction. Pigeons exposed to this procedure displayed a peak in response rates at the time they would normally be reinforced if the FI schedule had been in effect (Catania, 1970). Additionally, when the proportion of food trials was decreased from 90% to 10% of total trials, the peak response rate decreased, however, the change in percentage of reinforced to extinction trials, had no effect on peak time, suggesting that animals were capable of timing the point in time that reinforcement was normally available, and not simply responding progressively faster until reinforcer delivery. Catania's (1970) timing procedure was then subsequently further developed and named the *Peak Procedure* by Roberts (1981) and this procedure has now become a widely used method to study interval timing (eg., Church, Miller, Meck & Gibbon 1991; Kirkpatrick-Steger, Miller, Betti & Wasserman, 1996; Rakitin, Gibbon, Penney, Malapani, Hinton & Meck, 1998; Sanabria & Killeen, 2007).

Formally, in the peak procedure subjects are presented with a mixture of FI trials, where responses are reinforced, and Peak Interval (PI) trials, where the responses are not reinforced. PI trials are extended extinction trials that are longer than the regular FI trials and where the animal is allowed to keep responding past the time where reinforcers would normally be delivered on the FI schedule (Roberts, 1981). The peak procedure is useful as it shows an subject's sensitivity to time equally before and after the FI schedules has elapsed because the peak interval trials, that are running in extinction, are uninterrupted by the delivery of a reinforcer (Zeiler & Powell, 1994).

It was hypothesised by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996), that there are two sources of learning that occur during the peak procedure. The first source of learning is that the subject must learn to produce high response rates at the time of reinforcement during FI schedules. The second source of learning is to stop or decrease responding on a PI schedule once the expected time of reinforcement has passed (Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., 1996). Changes in response curves over time were analysed in a recent studied by Kaiser (2008) with rats. It was reported that while pre-peak responding remained stable throughout training, post-peak responding deceased over time. Kaiser (2008) also looked at the peak responding when the proportion of PI trials were high (50%) vs. low (10%) and concluded that a higher proportion of PI trials within a session resulted in a slower development of steady response performance of the peak procedure and that a decrease in post-peak responding was not simply due to exposure to extinction. If it were the result of extinction of responding at times other than those associated with reinforcement on the FI schedule, then one might expect that the peak interval performance would be better, characterised by steeper response gradients, when there were more extinction trials, rather than fewer.

When behaviour on an FI schedule is averaged over many trials, the response distribution displays a smooth function, however, when individual trials are analysed behaviour has been shown to display a low-high pattern of responding, which is often referred to as a “break-run” pattern (Schneider, 1969), whereas behaviour on a PI trial of the peak procedure shows a low-high-low pattern of responding (Church, Meck & Gibbon, 1994). Church et al. (1994)

found that the response rate varied throughout the run phase with response rates lower at the start and end of the phase and higher in the middle. It appears as though animals recognised a period of the trial where the probability of receiving a reinforcer for responding was high but also recognised periods of the trial where the probability of receiving a reinforcer for responding was low (Rakitin et al., 1998).

There are two main dependent measures that researchers typically take from the PI trials on the peak procedure. These are the *peak rate*, which is the maximum response rate from the function, and *peak time* which is the time during the trial where the peak rate occurs (Lejeune, Ferrara, Soffie, Bronchart & Wearden, 1998). There are also a number of other measures that can be taken into account such as *start time*, which is the time where the high rate responding starts, *stop time*, which is the time at where the high rate responding ends, and *run time* which is the difference between the start and stop times (Fetterman & Killeen, 1995). Balci, Gallistel, Allen, Frank, Gibson and Brunner (2009) conducted a study on the performance of timed responding on the peak procedure with rats. They found that the response distribution spread decreased over time with the decrease mainly occurring due to the rats terminating responding earlier (stop time) instead of by delaying the start time to responding.

Roberts, (1981) conducted a two part experiment where in Part 1 food was primed at 20 seconds for one stimulus and 40 seconds during the other stimulus. In Part 2 food trials had a probability of .8 in one condition and probability of .2 in another. Roberts (1981) found that the peak location of the curve fitted to his data was positioned nearly directly at the standard FI value and that the standard deviation of the fitted curve rose in proportion to the peak time as time was varied. Roberts (1981) also found that peak time and peak rate are independent measures. A typical pattern of responding that develops on the peak procedure was described by Roberts, (1981) and is shown in *Figure 2*. Typically responding increases gradually to a maximum peak at or near the time of expected reinforcement before responding decreases to a minimum and remains low until the end of the trial.



Figure 2. Mean responses per minute as a function of time into the trials on baseline trials. From "Isolation of an Internal Clock", by S. Roberts, (1981), in *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes,* 7(3), pp. 259 (with permission).

The orderliness of performance on the peak procedure commonly encourages model building (Sanabria & Killeen, 1997). When the peak procedure is analysed and the data is graphed there are aspects of the response distributions that can be measured and observed. An important aspect of the response distribution is that it is related to the concept of scalar timing. There have been a number of models "internal clocks". Currently there are three main theories of internal timing: the *Behavioural Theory of Timing (BeT)* (Killeen & Fetterman, 1988, MacEwan & Killeen, 1991), *Scalar Expectancy Theory (SET)* (Gibbon, 1977; Gibbon & Church, 1984), *Learning to Time* (Machado, 1997. Models around timing usually including a counter, a memory module that is used to estimate time to reinforcement which may be Gaussian distributed and a decision algorithm (Sanabria & Killeen, 2007).

SET (Gibbon, 1977, 1991; Gibbon & Church, 1984) BeT (Killeen & Fetterman, 1988, MacEwan & Killeen, 1991) and LeT (Machado, 1997) are three very different models that offer different accounts of timing that are used to measure and explain timing behaviour. SET is a cognitive explanation of timing that suggests several information-processing components to help explain the timing processes of learnt behaviour (Machado, 1997). SET is a theory that assumes that animals have the ability to create an expectancy of time to a reinforcer and that it is a moment to moment estimate used by animals that controls responding (Gibbon, 1977; Gibbon & Church, 1984). BeT is a theory that states that it is an animal's adjunctive behaviour that is used to judge time which it is believed are used as discriminative stimuli as to the passage of time (Killeen & Fetterman, 1988). LeT, derived from BeT, highlights the connection between behavioural states and the instrumental response itself (Machado &

Keen, 1999). The activation of behavioural states is directly related to the overall rate of reinforcement (Machado, 1997; Machado & Keen, 1999).

In 1981, Gibbon's further elaborated the scalar expectancy theory (Gibbon, 1977, 1991). The model is alike theoretically to an earlier model devised by Treisman (1963). *Figure 3* shows the information processing model devised by Gibbon and Church (1984).



Figure 3. The scalar property of timing information processing model devised by Gibbon and Church (1984). The model encounters three processes including clock, memory and decision making. Adapted from “Sources of Variance in an Information Processing Theory of Timing,” by J. Gibbon and R. Church (1984) (p.468), in *Animal Cognition*, by H. Roitblat, T. Bever, & H. Terrace (Eds.), Hillsdale, NJ :Erlbaum (with permission).

The pacemaker's main trait is to generate pulses (Church, 1984). At the onset of an FI trial, the pacemaker sends pulses that are exchanged through the switch into the accumulator. The working memory is the place where current information about reinforcement is stored (Church, 1984). The current pulses that are similar to previous experiences are matched up to a memory of some number of pulses that previously resulted in successful reinforcement that is stored in reference memory which only occurs if the number of pulses in working memory matches the number of pulses in reference memory (Church, 1984). The comparators job is to establish a response (Church, 1984). If this response is successful and reinforcement is received this process will be stored in the reference memory (Church, 1984).

Scalar Property of Timing

The scalar property of timing is a quantitative property of timing performance, which any model or account of an animal's timing performance needs to account for (Allan, 1998). The scalar property of timing entails two properties including mean accuracy and scalar variance. Firstly, mean accuracy is defined as the property that states that measures of timed behaviour must vary linearly (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). In this experiment for example a possums' estimate of real time (t) must on average be near to t. Secondly, scalar variance relates to the variability of behaviour surrounding the mean estimates of t (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). Scalar variance entails that the standard deviation calculated from the estimates of temporal intervals varies linearly with the mean estimates of those same intervals (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). The commonest way that scalar variance is observed is as a constant Weber fraction when Weber fractions are compared across intervals. Weber fractions are calculated as the ratio of the standard deviation and the mean of temporal estimates, and this is mathematically equivalent to the coefficient of variation (cv).

There are two characteristics involving the peak procedure that can be used to assess conformity to the scalar property of timing. The peak time is the first characteristic which is the time at which the responding on a given schedule peaks (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). The position at which responding peaks is measured by the using a curve fitting method where the peak location can be looked at with the critical time in mind. It has been found that if the peak location differs proportionally with the interval being estimated this then reveals conformity with the scalar property of timing (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). The second way to test for scalar timing is to use a method called superimposition (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006). Superimposition is observed response rate distributions are plotted as a function of relative time, such that across conditions that might require the animal to estimate or produce responses at different times, the functions fall on top of each other when performance from different duration are plotted on the same relative scale (Lejeune & Wearden, 2006).

Weber's Law

Weber's Law has proven to be a useful way of explaining the relationship between the size of a given stimulus and the degree of discrimination (Getty, 1975). The relativity of time perception is a concept that has revealed limitations on models such as the internal clock quite commonly in previous studies (Bizo, Chu, Sanabria, & Killeen, 2006). Throughout variable time, humans and animals have the ability to uphold a constant relative accuracy (Grondin, 2001). It is this relative accuracy that may be used to calculate the quantity of change in a stimulus that is needed in order to detect the amount of time. The amount of time is then divided by the size of the given stimulus which is superimposed, $\Delta S/S$, where ΔS is equal to the required amount of change needed to surpass the threshold and S is the size of the stimulus which is used for superimposing (Bizo, et al., 2006).

An ever-present finding in psychophysics is our capability to tell apart intensive stimuli (e.g., colour difference, size) by comparing it in proportion to the size of the stimuli being discriminated against (Fetterman & Killeen, 1992). This phenomenon is called *Weber's Law* which states that the increases in duration, ΔT, needed to generate a fixed but arbitrary level of discrimination is a fraction of the standard deviation (Getty, 1975). Weber's Law simply holds that error in judgements will grow in the same proportion to the mean of those judgements.

$$cv = \sigma / \mu \tag{1}$$

The Weber fraction (Eq. (1)) as displayed above has been shown to be successful at measuring and judging discriminability across diverse models, measurements and stimulus arrays. Weber fractions, also known as coefficients of variation, that express the standard deviations divided by the mean of judgements, should be constant. For Weber's Law to be applied, the ratio SD(T)/T, and the psychometric fraction needs to be constant (Getty, 1975).where SD is equal to the standard deviation and T is equal to time.

Research has shown that for rats, Weber's Law successfully holds for judgment of time (Gibbon & Church, 1984). It has also been found that for several experiments Weber's law also holds for pigeons. For example in 1968, Stubbs concluded that when birds were put on a two-choice task where they had to tell the difference between long and short durations, Weber's Law was evident.

Weber's Law has also been known to fail at very short durations and very long durations. It has been revealed firstly by Mach (see Boring, 1942) that time intervals between 16 ms and 8 ms did not apply to Weber's Law as it was revealed there was a maximum sensitivity at 375 ms. Others have also discovered maximum sensitivity including Drake and Botte (1993) that used intervals ranging from 100 to 1500 ms with a maximum sensitivity at 300-800 ms. Fraisse (1967) and Friberg and Sundberg (1995) used 600 and 500 ms respectively showing that Weber's Law does not apply for smaller durations indicating a maximum sensitivity (Grondin, 2001).

It has also been found that if the subjects used in an experiment are trained excessively, Weber's fraction instead transformed into a step function and standard deviation time predictions were invariant (Allan & Kristofferson 1974; Grondin, 2001). It was also found in humans that Webers law fails on the majority of studies where the stimuli are small in size (Fetterman & Killeen, 1992). It was found that the variability in the stimuli does not decrease at a proportional rate but instead seems to intersect the y axis at a value of nonzero (Fetterman & Killeen, 1992). Getty (1975), showed that the Weber's Law model failed to predict the more dramatic increases in standard deviations when the duration was larger than 2-s.

A solution to help accommodate for this problem was created by Getty, (1975); Killeen and Weiss, (1987) and Wearden, (2003) by generalising Weber's Law. Getty (1975), stated that the linear relationship should connect the variance with the size of the stimulus, not the standard deviation. The changeability of discriminating time may be broken down into component parts with one component that depends on the size of the stimulus during a trial and another component that is separate to the size (Bizo, et al., 2006). The generalised Weber's Law (Eq. (2)) can calculate performance on time discrimination tasks when the durations are less than 2-s (Getty, 1975)

$$\frac{\sigma\tau}{t} = \sqrt{w^2 + \frac{\sigma_r^2}{t^2}}\ , t > 0 \qquad (2)$$

Bizo, et al. (2006) conducted an experiment testing pigeons performance using a temporal production and categorization task to assess Weber's Law. Bizo, et al. (2006) found that Weber's fractions were more successfully described as a U-shaped function of stimulus strength rather than by the classic Weber's law which is flat or as by the generalised Weber's law which shows a reversed J shaped function when Weber's fraction is plotted as a function of stimulus strength.

Resurgence

Resurgence of responding after the initial peak on the peak procedure is less typically seen on the peak procedure. Resurgence is where response distributions are positively skewed and response rates increase to a second high towards the end of a PI trial. Even though there have been many studies that have used the PI procedure to study timing, "systematic divergences of temporal gradients from preciously Gaussian form" (pp 127) have not yet been theoretically explored and are therefore not completely understood (Sanabria & Killeen, 2007). These deviations were, however, acknowledged by Church et al., (1991) who labelled them as asymmetrical sources of temporal variance in performance on generalization tasks.

Sanabria and Killeen (2007) conducted an experiment on both rats and pigeons using 7 different Probe and FI trial (P/F) pairs including 15, 30 and 60-s FI schedules and 60, 120 and 240-s PI trials. Results showed that after 2F response rates show resurgence that was not a simple function of F as shown in *Figure 4,* the bottom two graphs. Sanabria and Killeen (2007) put a second Gaussian distribution centre on the next reinforcer which showed resurgence more clearly. This second Gaussian distribution was in proportion to its mean (Sanabria & Killeen, 2007). It was concluded that it was not only the reinforcement in the present trial that influenced response rate but also the succeeding reinforcer in the following trial (Sanabria & Killeen, 2007).

It has been suggested by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996) that the PI parameters such as the P/F ratio have an effect on the change in response resurgence, something not mentioned by Church et al., (1991). Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (1996), who studied resurgence with pigeons, reported that when P/F=4, response resurgence formed a second peak occurring at 3F as shown in *Figure 4,* the top and middle graph. Saulsgiver, McClure and Wynne's (2006), experiment also reported data that produced a second peak when pigeons preformed on a P/F=3. If the idea that the subjects track the end of trials or the oncoming reinforcement as stated by Church et al.,(1991) is in fact true, it doesn't explain why under certain other P/F ratios, responding decreases at the end of the trials. Sanabria and Killeen (2007) state that it is perhaps more fitting to say that the differences in results found by Saulsgiver et al. (2006) and Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (1996) are more so due to difference in experimental procedures, specifically interval marking cues. Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (2006) used the offset of a key light in a chamber that was normally illuminated as the cue for the end of a session.

Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996)



Sanabria and Killeen (2007)



Figure 4. Displays data from pigeon performing on a peak interval schedule showing the last 6 days. Response rates were in 1-s bins. The top and middle graphs are from Experiment 4 and displays results of 38+/304 and 38+/152 training phases, respectively. From "Cyclic Responding by Pigeons on the Peak Procedure," by K. Kirkpatrick-Steger, S.S. Miller, C.A. Betti, and E.A. Wasserman (1996) (p.132), in *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes*, 22, 447-460 (with permission). The bottom two graphs displays response rates from rats as a function of time taken from Experiment 1 from Sanabria and Killeen (2007). Probe trial and post probe trial data is shown where grey circle display response rates from trials lead by FI trials which have been shown as for comparison purposes. From "Temporal generalization accounts for response resurgence in the peak procedure," by F Sanabria and P Killeen (2007) (p.132), in *Behavioural Processes,* 74, 126-141 (with permission).

This experiment attempted to replicate Roberts (1981) general method to produce peak procedure data. The Common brushtail possum, *Trichosurus vulpecula,* were chosen as experimental subjects to assess time perception across a range of durations due to the fact little is known about their ability to time. Experiment 1 aimed to explore the performance and learning of possums on the peak procedure and to explore resurgence and why it occurs at the end of a trial. It was earlier shown by Church. et al. (1991) with rats that when the duration of empty trials were variable in time, response resurgence was almost non-existent. Church et al. (1991) suggested that the asymmetries shown in the response distributions might have indicated that their subjects were anticipating the end of a trial (Church et al., 1991). Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996) in one experiment in one condition explicitly reinforced responding at the end of the PI, effectively scheduling a multiple FI FI schedule and found, as one might expect, that response rates increased at the end of the longer FI. In the present experiment, the end of the PI trials was made contingent on the production of a response but otherwise was not reinforced with any other scheduled consequence except the end of the trial and the start of the intertribal interval (ITI). The expectation in the present experiment was that if the possums were timing both the delivery of reinforcement on FI trials and the end of the trial that performance of the PI trials would be characterized by an increase is response rates to a peak at the time the animal would be reinforced had the FI been in effect, followed by a decrease in response rates before response rates then increased a second time toward a second peak at the end of the trial.

EXPERIMENT 1

The peak procedure was used by Roberts, (1981) to investigate the timing ability of rats. This experiment partially replicated Roberts (1981) and aimed to explore timing abilities in non-human subjects (possums) using the peak procedure. The present experiment specifically assessed the possum's ability to time stimuli that was on an FI schedule of 15, 30 and 60-s. Experiment 1 also aimed to explore resurgence in attempt to explain why this phenomena occurs at the end of a trial. It has previously been suggested that response rates increases at the end of PI trials because animals are anticipating the end of the trial (Rakitin et al., 1998). In the present experiment the end of the trial was made contingent on a response, and it was expected that if the animals were anticipating the end of the trial then response rates would increase towards the end of the PI trials.

METHOD

The subjects were 3 male (Subjects 3, 4 and 6) and 3 female (Subjects 1, 2 and 5) common brushtail possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) to begin. Subject 3 died during the first condition of Experiment 1. All possums were wild caught and ranged in ages from approximately 4 years to 7 years old at the start of Experiment 1 as shown in *Table 1*. Subject 6 was experimentally naïve. Subject 5 had previous experience with matching-to-sample schedules of reinforcement (Cameron, 2009) and Subjects 1, 2 and 4 had previously participated in an experiment investigating their auditory thresholds (Osugi, 2008).

The possums were maintained on a reverse day/night cycle with a red light on from 10:00 am until 10:00 pm. Experimental sessions were scheduled to start at 10:30 am 7 days a week. Their body weights were maintained at a level so that they were still motivated to work for food. On the days when animals were exposed to experimental sessions the possums received food reinforcers (wheat and cocoa pops) that were supplemented with a portion of food (typically apple or carrot, and dock leaves) that was given to them after they had completed an experimental session. On the days that the possum did not work in the experiment they received extra possum pellets in order to replace the food they would have received in the experimental session. The possums were weighed weekly and their post-feed amounts were adjusted as required to keep the possums at a stable body weight.

Table 1.

The subject, sex of possum, the mean weight during experimental procedures, previous experimental experience, approximate age of subject and method of attainment.

Subject	Sex	Weight (grams)	Previous Experimental History	Age (years)
Subject 1	F	3596	Auditory thresholds (Osugi, 2008)	7
Subject 2	F	2994	Auditory thresholds (Osugi, 2008)	6
Subject 4	M	3351	Auditory thresholds (Osugi, 2008)	4
Subject 5	F	3382	Matching-to-Sample (Cameron, 2009)	6
Subject 6	M	3406	None	6

Apparatus

Throughout the experiment the possums lived in their individual home cages. Their home cages contained a nest box at the top of their wire cage as well as an open area below. The possums had continuous access to water in their home cages. A response panel containing 3 response levers and a light which was mounted on the front wall of the cage. The light was illuminated during the experimental sessions. The possum had to press and then release a lever for a response to be recorded. A centrally located opening provided 3-s access to cocoa puffs and wheat which were delivered as reinforcers for lever pressing during the experiment. A diagram of the cage is shown below in Figure 5.



Figure 5. Diagram of the operant chamber response panel. The levers were slotted into the corresponding holes according to the FI schedule in effect.



Figure 6. Two photograph of the cages and response panel used in the experiments

Magazine Training and Lever Shaping

Subject 6 who was experimentally naive received 1 session of magazine training on a Fixed Time schedule (FT) 30-s before being shaped by the method of successive approximations to respond on the center lever. Once the possum made 10 responses to the lever, it then experienced one session of exposure to a continuous reinforcement schedule (CRF) on each lever prior to starting the FI training. The other five possums, who had previous experimental experience, were given one sessions experience to the CRF schedule on each lever to ensure each animal would respond to each lever prior to the start of the FI training. The CRF sessions ended after 60 reinforcer deliveries.

Fixed-Interval Training

During the FI training phase the first response after the target interval was reinforced with 3 seconds access to food. Trials were separated by a 6-s ITI during which the light above the lever was turned off. There were of 100 trials per session. Initially an FI 15-s schedule was in effect for all possums. After 7 sessions, Subject 5 started training on the peak procedure with an FI 15-s and PI trials of 45-s. The remaining possums then moved onto an FI 30-s training schedule for 7 sessions. Subject 1 and Subject 4 then started peak procedure training with an FI 30-s and PI trials of 90-s. The FI was then doubled to a FI 60-s schedule for the two remaining possums, Subject 6 and Subject 2 before they started peak procedure training with an FI 60 and PI trials of 180-s

Peak Procedure

After all possums had completed at least 6-7 sessions of training at their given FI schedules, the peak procedure training began. *Table 2* displays the condition order for the three FI durations for each individual possums for Experiment 1. The possums experienced 75 trials when the peak procedure was in effect. The order of FI trials and PI trials were pseudo randomly arranged such that PI trials were never consecutive and there were never more than 4 FI trials in a row.

The proportion of FI to PI trials was kept constant: with 80% of trials being reinforced FI trials and 20% of trials being PI trials, which were run in extinction. During the FI trials the possums were reinforced following the first response after the FI duration had elapsed. When PI trials occurred, the possum's responses were not reinforced and the trials were 3 times longer than the FI trials. The light above the lever remained on throughout both FI and PI trials. An experimental session ended after 75 trials or after 2 hours had elapsed, whichever occurred first. Each possum experienced each of the three FI/PI intervals and the order of conditions and the number of sessions each animal experienced in each condition is given in Table 2.

Table 2. *The condition order of FI schedules in Experiment 1 for individual possums and the number of experimental sessions each animal experienced in each condition.*

Subject	Condition Order (FI durations)	No. of FI 15 Peak Procedure Sessions	No. of FI 30 Peak Procedure Sessions	No.FI 60 Peak Procedure Sessions
Subject 1	30, 15, 60	52	36	45
Subject 2	60, 30, 15	45	52	29
Subject 4	30, 15, 60	52	36	45
Subject 5	15, 60, 30	42	45	52
Subject 6	60, 30, 15	45	52	29

RESULTS

Peak Procedure Testing

Responses rates were calculated from response totals for the last 10 days of each PI condition for individual possums. Response rates were calculated in 5, 10 and 20-s bins respectively for PI trials when either an FI 15-s, FI 30-s, or FI 60-s schedule was in effect on the reinforced trials. This was done to keep the bin size proportional to the FI value. Responses per second as a function of time for individual possums during PI trials are displayed in *Figure 7.* On all three PI conditions response rates usually increased to a peak at or near the time of expected reinforcement, before decreasing to a minimum at a time that was around twice the FI duration that was in effect on any given condition. Response rates then increased to a second high at the end of the PI trial for the majority of subjects. The data from Subject 2s and 5 showed that the rate of responding on PI trials increased as the FI duration increased. The data from Subject 6 showed that the responses per second on PI trials remained relatively even across all three FI durations. The data from Subject 1 displayed the highest responses per second on PI trials occurred during an FI 15-s schedule followed by an FI 60-s schedule and FI 30-s schedule, respectively. The data from Subject 4 showed on PI trials responses per second was at its highest point during an FI 30-s schedule followed by an FI 60-s schedule and FI 15-s schedule, respectively.

Relative response rates were calculated by dividing response rates by the peak response rate for each condition and for each possum, and these were then plotted against relative time for the PI 15, 30, 60-s schedule trials and are displayed in *Figure 8*. The relative response rate distributions superimpose which is consistent with the scalar property of timing.



Figure 7. Response per second plotted as a function of time (s) for individual possums displaying data from peak interval trials. Responding was aggregated in 5, 10 and 20-s bins for the FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedules for individual possums, respectively.



Figure 8. Relative response rate plotted as a function of relative time for individual possums displaying data from peak interval trials. Responding was aggregated in 5, 10 and 20-s bins for the FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedules respectively, for individual possums. The order of conditions is indicated with a 1, 2 or 3 for each animal. The grey vertical line is drawn to show the position of the FI schedules on the x-axis.

Figure 9 shows the time (s) against the relative response rates for Day 1 and then the remaining days grouped into the first, second and last third of sessions for subjects in 1-s bins for each PI condition. The data shows the improvement in performance from the first day through the subsequent first, second and last third of experimental sessions on each PI schedule.

During Day 1 on all the PI conditions the relative response rates did not produce a smooth peak curve with the relative response rate peaking after the expected time of reinforcement and remaining high and unstable thereafter. The relative response rates increased and decreased a numerous amounts of times. During the first third of sessions on all the PI conditions relative response rates increased to a maximum peaking before or just after the time of expected reinforcement on the FI schedule in effect. Thereafter relative response rates decreased slightly to a minimum at about twice the duration of the FI schedule before increasing to a second high at the end of the PI trials. On the second third on all PI conditions relative response rates increased to a maximum peaking at or just after the time of expected reinforcement on the FI schedule in effect. A narrower peak had begun to emerge with relative response rates decreasing to a minimum at about twice the FI schedule duration. Relative response rates then began to rise again to a second high towards the end of the PI trials. For the last third of sessions on all PI conditions the relative response rate increased to a maximum and peaked just after the expected time of reinforcement on the FI schedule in effect. Thereafter the relative response rate decreased to a minimum at about two times the FI duration producing a symmetrical narrow peak before the relative response rate increased again to a second high at the end of the PI trials.



Figure 9. Total response rates plotted as a function of time intervals for possums displaying data from peak interval trials. Responding was aggregated in 1-s bins. The data shows displays Day 1 and then the remaining days in thirds (1/3, 2/3, 3/3) during Experiment 1 for the FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedules.

The mean, standard deviation and Weber's fractions were calculated for individual possums across all PI conditions for Experiment 1. The calculations were measured across the peak curve from 0-s to 60-s using the formula for Weber's fraction given in Equation 1

The mean of the peaks of the PI trials for the 15, 30 and 60-s conditions where 16.79 s, 34.53 s and 68.92 s, respectively as displayed in *Table 3*. Standard deviations increased across all possums as the FI durations increased. The average standard deviations for an FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedule were 6.34 s, 12.37 s and 27.06 s, respectively. Weber's fractions did not reveal a significant variation in scores across the three FI schedules as well as across individual possums. The average Weber fractions for the FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedule across all 5 subjects were 0.38, 0.36 and 0.40 respectively. A one way repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there were no significant differences between Weber's fractions for the 3 conditions $F(1,12) = 0\ 604$, $p= 0.562$). A between subjects effect size calculation for Weber's fractions revealed that there was no significant differences for the three conditions $R^2 = 0.091$.

Table 3. The mean and standard deviation (SD) and Weber's Fractions for the performance of individual possums on Peak Interval trials during Experiment 1 on FI 15, 30 and 60-s schedules.

	Mean			**SD**			**Weber's Fractions**		
Subject	FI 15	FI 30	FI 60	FI 15	FI 30	FI 60	FI 15	FI 30	FI 60
Subject 1	13.41	36.58	71.64	4.16	11.45	26.69	0.31	0.31	0.37
Subject 2	17.87	35.47	67.44	7.08	15.26	32.55	0.40	0.43	0.48
Subject 4	19.64	33.20	64.35	7.05	12.76	23.42	0.36	0.38	0.36
Subject 5	16.69	35.90	72.28	7.65	11.87	27.31	0.46	0.33	0.38
Subject 6	16.36	31.49	68.90	5.74	10.49	25.32	0.35	0.33	0.37

DISCUSSION

During the peak procedure testing, possums were presented with a mixture of FI trials and PI trials and their performance was consistent with previous studies which have investigated peak procedure performance with pigeons and rats (e.g., Church, et al., 1994; Roberts, 1981; Sanabria & Killeen, 2007). It appears possums are able of timing reinforcer delivery on FI schedules. Relative rates of responding for the three durations that were tested, 15, 30 and 60-s, superimposed when plotted as a function of relative time.

Over time, with repeated exposure to the three schedules, performance on the peak procedure improved, and can be seen in *Figure 9* when performance early in the condition is compared with performance at the end of the same condition. Additionally, there was a clear increase in responding towards the end of the PI trials which suggest that the possums were anticipating the end of the PI trials. This also suggests that performance on the peak procedure is not simply the product of exposure to the FI trials alone, but rather is a function of experience of both FI and PI trials together (Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., 1996). The idea that both the FI and PI schedules to be repeatedly presented to subjects draws attention to the role learning takes in the peak procedure. Machado (1997) compared FI schedules to PI schedules in regards to the associate strength and behaviour states assumed to be associated with responding on the two trial types is shown in *Figure 10*. According to Machado (1997) during an FI schedule the associate strength increases in the same proportion as the behaviour state whereas during the PI trials the associate strength increases to a maximum at the peak and then decreases to zero on extinction trials. The differences in learning behaviour on the FI trials and PI trials occurs due to the later states in the peak procedure becoming active during the PI trials.



Figure 10. Associative Strength as a function of Behavioural State showing the distribution of associative values. The data shows a FI 20-s interval with PI trials of 160-s with a 80% probability of a reinforced trial similar to the present experiment. From “Learning the Temporal Dynamics of Behavior,” A Machado (p.250), in *Psychological Review,* 104, 241-265 (with permission).

This second source of learning, as mentioned by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (1996), is the ability to stop responding during a PI trial after the expected time of reinforcement has passed. In the present experiment this appeared to develop slowly over sessions in all PI conditions as the peak function became more symmetrical about the time to reinforcement. In the present study response rates before the peak remained similar throughout each PI condition over multiple sessions. Response rates after the peak decreased further over time as also found by Kaiser (2008). However, it also became apparent that the possums did not learn to completely stop responding after reaching a minimum response rate as described by Balci et al., (2009) with an increase of responses reaching a second high at the end of the trial. An explanation for this may be due to minimal FI and PI training before the beginning of Experiment 1 where the subjects failed to develop a “memory representation” of the delay to reinforcement before the PI trial testing began (Balci et al., 2009).

The peak procedure can be trained in a couple of ways. One is to first expose the animals the FI schedule before introducing the PI trials, and the other is to present both the FI and PI trials from the beginning of training. When the latter method is used, the two sources of learning cannot be seen as separate as the subjects are learning about both schedules at the same time (Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., 1996). On the other hand the two sources of learning can be separated and analysed independently when the subject is exposed to only FI schedules at the beginning of training and then adding the PI schedules after a given time (Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., 1996).

Church et al. (1991) found that when the end of PI trials were made variable that response resurgence disappearing. During Experiment 1 trial termination was contingent on a response, which added some variability to the end of the trial. However, response rates slowed considerably on the PI trials which suggest that it isn't variability of PI trials duration that matters, but rather the presence of absence of a contingency for responding at the end of the PI trials, and it is that contingency that attenuates the frequency of responding at the end of the PI trials.

A secondary increase in the peak function occurred after the dip in responding which occurred at about twice the duration of the FI trials. Response resurgence was not a function of a specific FI duration as the possums experience three different FI schedules (15, 30 and 60-s) as shown in *Figure* 8 and *Figure 9*. Resurgence in responding occurred for the all of FI's showing an increase in responding to a second high towards the end of the PI trial on all conditions when the data was divided into thirds as well as for the majority of individual possum data. The exception was Subject 1's data on an FI 15-s where responding decreased in a symmetrical pattern after the expected time of reinforcement creating a normal peak.

The 5 possums showed a constant timing accuracy over the three FI durations in Experiment 1. There was no evidence of a significant decrease in timing accuracy as the FI durations increased in time from 15-s to 30-s and 60-s according to the Weber's fraction data. The mean and standard deviation increased reliably for all possums as the FI duration increased.

EXPERIMENT 2

The results from Experiment 1 showed that response rates peaked at about the time of reinforcement delivery and decreased to a minimum at about two times the FI duration. Thereafter response rates increased for a second time near the end of the non-reinforced test trials, a phenomena known as resurgence. The aim of Experiment 2 was to partially replicate Sanabria and Killeen's (2007) as well as Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (1996) who have recently tried to explain why resurgence and the second peaks occur. This experiment measured the effect of extended PI trials on resurgence which ended automatically after the given duration had passed and no longer required a response as they did in Experiment 1. It was expected that response rates would be lower at the end of the PI trials in Experiment 2 that in Experiment 1. Also it was expected that response rates would be lower at the end of the PI trials that were 10 times rather than 3 time longer than the FI schedule. Additionally it was expected that some rippling or multiple peaks might be observed on the PI trials that were 10 times longer than the FI schedule.

METHOD

Subjects

The same five possums that were used in Experiment 1 were used in Experiment 2.

Apparatus

The apparatus was the same as used in Experiment 1.

Procedure

The procedure was the same as used in Experiment 1 with some modifications to the experimental program that changed the way PI trials ended and the duration of the PI used in the two conditions. The procedure used to train the animals in Experiment 2 is described below.

Fixed-Interval Training

The possums began with FI training for Condition 1. This involved reinforcing the first response on an FI 30-s schedule with 3-s access to cocoa puffs. Trials were separated by a 6-s ITI during which the light above the lever was turned off. There were a maximum of 100 trials per training session with reinforcement given on all trials. After 10 sessions of training the possums were then moved onto the peak procedure training.

Condition 1, Peak Procedure

During the peak procedure the possums were exposed to mix of FI and PI trials that were presented in a pseudorandom fashion. There were 75 trials, and 80% of those were FI 30-s, and 20% of trials were PI trials that were 90-s long and did not require a response to end the trial. The peak procedure method in Experiment 2 was the same as used Experiment 1 with the only difference being that the trials would end automatically when the PI trials had timed out without the requirement of a response. The possums experienced 14 sessions on the peak procedure during Condition 1.

After the possums completed Condition 1 the possums received 13 sessions of training on an FI 30-s schedule. The FI training for Condition 2 was the same as Condition 1. The possums were then moved onto the peak procedure trial with an FI 30-s.

Condition 2, Peak Procedure

The peak procedure training for Condition 2 was the same as for Condition 1 except that now the PI trials were 300-s in duration rather than 90-s as they were in Condition 1. Once again PI trials ended automatically when the PI had timed out without the requirement of a response. The possums experienced 28 days in Condition 2.

RESULTS

FI 30-s Training

Figure 11 shows the total response rate as a function of time on the FI 30-s schedule that was used during training. The response rates were calculated and presented in 5-s bins for individual possums. At the beginning of a trial an initial pause was displayed which was followed on by responding that increased gradually with the total response rates peaking around 30-s.



Figure 11. Total response rates plotted against time class intervals for individual possums during FI training for Condition 1. Responding was aggregated in 1-s bins for the FI 30-s schedule for individual possums.



Figure 12. Total responses plotted as a function of time (s) for individual possums displaying data from peak interval trials for the last 5 days of Condition 1. Responding was aggregated in 5s bins for the FI 30-s schedule, for individual possums respectively.

Peak Procedure Testing

Total responses were plotted as a function of time for individual possums for Condition 1 as shown in *Figure 12*. The data was plotted in 5-s bins for the last 5 days (Days 10-14). Overall the total responses on an PI 90-s schedule during Condition 1 increased to a maximum after the expected time of reinforcement before decreasing to a minimum at around two times (60-s) the duration of the FI schedule. Total responses then began to increase to a second high at the end of the PI trials for the majority of subjects. Total responses for Subject 1 and Subject 5 remains relatively low revealing a slight ripple effect at around three times the FI schedule duration.

Total responses as a function of time for individual possums during PI trials are displayed in *Figure 13*. Total responses are displayed in 5-s bins for the last five days of Condition 2 (Days 24-28). During PI trials, total responses increased steeply peaking at or around the expected time of reinforcement. Total responses then decreased to a minimum at around two times the FI duration (30-s). For Subjects 1, 4 and 5 total responses remain low thereafter with Subject 5 showing a ripple effect towards the end of the trial similar to that reported by Sanabria and Killeen (2007). For Subject 2 and 6 total responses increased gradually to a second high beginning about 2 times and 5 times the FI schedule duration, respectively.



Figure 13. Total Responses as a function of time (s) for individual possums on an FI 30 schedule displaying data from peak interval trials during Condition 2. Responding was aggregated in 5-s bins for the last 5 days where the PI trial was extended to 10 times the FI duration.

Table 4:

The mean, standard deviation (SD) and Weber's Fractions for the performance of individual possums on Peak Interval trials during conditions 1 and 2 of Experiment 2 on FI 30 schedules.

	Mean		**SD**		**Weber's Fractions**	
Subject	COND 1	COND 2	COND 1	COND 2	COND 1	COND 2
Subject 1	36.67	33.51	9.17	8.64	0.25	0.26
Subject 2	34.61	33.70	11.99	12.28	0.35	0.36
Subject 4	33.02	31.77	13.00	10.36	0.39	0.33
Subject 5	37.62	36.70	11.21	10.18	0.30	0.28
Subject 6	28.28	29.87	9.92	9.48	0.35	0.32

The mean, SD and Weber's fractions were calculated for Experiment 2 for each individual possum as shown in *Table 4*. The mean in Condition 1 was higher for the majority of possums than in Condition 2 with Subject 6 being the exception. The average mean for Condition 1 and Condition 2 was 34.04 and 33.11, respectively. Overall the standard deviation was higher for the possums in Condition 1 than Condition 2 with the exception of Subject 2's data which displayed a higher standard deviation in Condition 2. The average standard deviation for Condition 1 was 11.058 and for Condition 2 was lower at 10.188. The data for Subject 1 and Subject 2 shows a higher Weber's fraction during Condition 2 whereas the data for Subject 4, Subject 5and Subject 6 show a higher Weber's fractions during Condition 1. The average Weber's fractions for Condition 1 and Condition 2 were 0.328 and 0.31, respectively. A one way repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there were no significant differences between Weber's fractions for the 3 conditions $F (1,8) = 0$ 358, $p= 0.566$). A between subjects effect size calculation for Weber's fractions revealed that there was no significant differences for the three conditions $R^2 =$ 0.043.

DISCUSSION

The training data from Condition 1 is displayed in *Figure 11.* A slight pause, known as a PRP, was evident after the reinforcement was given, as can be seen at the beginning of the trials, where responses thereafter began to increase at a steady, increasing rate until the next reinforcer is available. All subjects responded at high rates at the time of reinforcement during FI schedules.

During the peak procedure, the subjects experienced an FI 30-s schedule where PI trials were extended to either 3 or 10 times the FI duration. Some response resurgence was still observed for all subjects at the end of the trials. It would appear that the absence of a response contingency had a minimal effect on the amount of response resurgence occurring at the end of the trial. Response rates still increasing during Condition 1 for a second time for all subjects as displayed in *Figure 12.* For subjects 2, 4 and 6 response resurgence increased markedly to a second high after reaching a minimum at 2 times the FI schedule duration.

Condition 2 further explored resurgence with trials ending automatically after the FI duration passed as in Condition 1. In order to decrease response resurgence further the PI trials were extended to 10 the FI schedule duration. The end of the trial was not contingent on a response requirement and ended automatically after the required duration had passed.

The extended PI trials to 10 times rather than 3 times the FI duration did, when compared to the first two experiments, have an effect on response resurgence occurring at the end of the trial. *Figure 12* displays a narrow symmetrical peak function that increases to a maximum about 2 times the FI duration in effect before decreasing to a minimum where responses remained relatively level thereafter. This shows that resurgence times and the delivery of responses towards the end of the trial were in fact responsive to changes in the PI trial duration as also seen in Sanabria and Killeen (2007) with pigeons and rats who found that for PI trials that were 1 to 8 times longer than the FI that responding decreased at the end of the trial. A condition where the ratio was doubled was also conducted by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996) to a fixed interval/Probe trial ratio of 1/8 in Experiment 1b where only a gradual increase of responses occurred towards the end of the trial, similar to the data produce in the present experiment.

A slight *rippling* effect was seen in Condition 2 as reported by Sanabria and Killeen (2007) for pigeons in the F=60-s, P=240-s (4F). Experimental conditions in this study were more similar to Sanabria and Killeen (2007) by using more noticeable cues such as in this experiment where the illumination and termination of a bright orange lever light in a continuously dark room was used throughout. It is possible that a rippling effect was produced by the possums due to the longer PI trials of ten times the FI duration in this study showing cue tracking may have been inhibited.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Possums were studied using a time perception task in which they experienced FI and PI schedules with the set durations of 15, 30 and 60-s. The present study contributes new information regarding time perception in possums, particularly relating to resurgence. During PI trials there was an increase in response rate peaking at or just after the expected time of reinforcement before response rates decreased to a minimum at around 2 times the given FI duration. For the majority of possums during Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, Condition 1 responses then began to increase to a second high near the end of the PI trial displaying response resurgence. When the PI trials were extended to 10 times the FI duration during Experiment 2, Condition 2 response resurgence decreased dramatically suggesting extended PI trials over time will reduce the occurrence of resurgence at least for possums.

One weakness in the design of this research is the same 5 subjects were used all experiments. This, however, was an unavoidable constraint due to no other naive animals were available at the time the experiments were run. This means an alternative explanation for the decrease in resurgence over time may be due to learning from previous experiments. It would have been interesting to see if the performance of naive animals in Experiment 2 would have shown the same level of resurgence, and whether the rippling would have been more pronounced on the longer PI trials.

The response rates and total responses during a PI schedule displayed a low-high-low-high pattern during Experiment 1 and the majority of Experiment 2, Condition 1 however showed more of a low-high-low pattern during Experiment 2, Condition 2. This may suggest that the extended PI trials contributed towards the animal showing a period where the possibility of reinforcement was low.

It has been shown with rats and pigeon by Roberts (1981) and Church et al. (1994) that peak rate (the maximum rate of responding) and peak time (the time at which peak rate occurs) are independent measures. Machado (1997) states that changes in motivational variables will not affect the learning process as peak rate can be modified without altering peak time. The width of the peak function shows the amount of variability in timing showing an increase in proportion to the FI duration (Rakitin et al., 1998) concluding the data is consistent with scalar property of timing theory which requires a constant Weber's fraction as shown in the top panel of *Figure 14*. Overall the data showed relative conformity of Weber's Law across PI conditions. This concludes that possums do have the ability to tell apart intensive stimuli by comparing each duration in proportion to the duration of the other FI schedules being discriminated against. Measures of mean, standard deviation and Weber's fractions changed over time with the average mean across experiments showing the possum's responses moved closer to the expected time of reinforcement.

Overall, relative response rates increased peaking at or just after the time of expected reinforcement. Relative responses then decreased to a minimum in a monotonic, symmetrical pattern at around 2 times the FI duration in effect. Towards the end of the trial during both Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, Condition 1 responses increased steeply for a second time displaying response resurgence.

The relative response rate as a function of relative time for all experiments is shown in the bottom panel of *Figure 14*. The relative response rates are calculated from the last third of session days.

Graph 1



Graph 2



Figure 14. Graph 1 displays the mean total responses plotted as a function of time (s) showing the width of the peaks during last third of Experiment 1 averaged across animals. Graph 2 displays the mean relative response rate plotted as a function of relative time showing the last third during Experiment 1, Experiment 2. Responding was aggregated in 5-s bins for FI 30-s schedules for possums. Experiment 1 is shown by the filled in triangles, Experiment 2, Condition 1 is shown by the empty white circles and Experiment 2, Condition 2 is shown by the filled in circles.

The absence of a response requirement in Experiment 2 initially decreased on resurgence, as shown in the bottom panel of *Figure 14. R*esponse resurgence during the last third of days, however, was at a higher relative response rate at the end of the trial when the end of a trial was not contingent on a response during Experiment 2 than when a response was required during Experiment 1. This might have happened because the same animals were used in Experiment 2 as in Experiment 1 and insufficient time was given for previous patterns of responding to extinguish. If further experiments were conducted naive animals would be used in each experiment and condition to eliminate carryover from previous experiments.

Response resurgence failed to appear as a second peak in the present experiment as reported by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996) where a 1:4 FI: PI ratio was conducted with pigeons. It was described by Machado (1997) that if behaviour does not achieve a steady state then response rate will increase to a second high on PI trials due to subjects still having some form of association from FI trials present. A 1:3 ratio was used in Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, Condition 1 and as stated by Leak and Gibbon (1995) FI schedule intervals that are less than 4F do not produce second peaks. The difference in interval marking cues may explain why a second peak was not produced during this study as concluded by Sanabria and Killeen (2007), but also the extended PI trials did not generate or maintain a cyclical response pattern as stated by Kirkpatrick-Steger et al., (1996). To clarify this issue, further studies replicating Kirkpatrick-Steger et al. (1996) with possums using an FI/PI ratio of 1:4 in attempt to achieve the second peak may be beneficial.

When PI trials were extended to 10 times the FI schedule duration response resurgence significantly decreased. The data from Experiment 2, Condition 2, shown in the bottom panel of *Figure 14*, displays a narrow symmetrical curve that decreased after the peak where responses remained relatively level thereafter. This shows that resurgence times and the delivery of responses towards the end of the trial were in fact responsive to changes in the PI trial duration.

An important conclusion from these experiments is that possums do have the ability to time using the peak procedure. The present experiment tested only PI trials that 3 and 10 times longer than the FI schedule in effect. It is clear that further research is required to investigate the role of response contingency and response contiguity with the end of the PI trials in producing the increase of responding at the end of the PI trials.

REFERENCES

Allan, L. G. (1998). The influence of the scalar timing model on human timing research. *Behavioural Processes, 44*, 101-117.

Allan, L. G., & Kristofferson, A. B. (1974). Judgements about the duration of brief stimuli, *Perception and Psychophysics, 15*, 434-440.

Balci, F., Gallistel, C. R., Allen, B. D., Frank, K. M., Gibson, J. M., & Brunner, D. (2009). Acquisition of peak responding: What is learned?. *Behavioural Processes, 80*, 67-75.

Boring, E. G. (1942). *Sensation and perception in the history of experimental psychology.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bizo, L. A, Chu, J. Y. M., Sanabria, F., & Killeen, P. R. (2006). The failure of Weber's law in time perception and production. *Behavioural Processes, 71*, 201-210.

Cameron, K. (2009). *Effect of stimulus and response separation on brushtail possum behaviour in a MTS task* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

Catania, A. C. (1970). Reinforcement schedules and psychophysical judgments: A study of some temporal properties of behavior. In: Schoenfeld, W.N. (Ed.), *The Theory of Reinforcement Schedules (*pp. 1-42). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

Cheng, K., & Roberts, W. A. (1991). Three psychophysical principles of timing in pigeons. *Learning and Motivation, 22*, 112-128.

Church, R. M. (1978). The internal clock. In S.H. Hulse, H. Fowler, & W.K. Honig (Eds.). *Cognitive processes in animal behaviour* (pp. 227-310). Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.

Church, R. M. (1984). Properties of the internal clock. In J. Gibbon & L. Allan (Eds.), *Timing and time perception* (pp. 566-582). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.

Church, R. M, Meck, W. H, & Gibbon, J. (1994). Application of scalar timing theory to individual trials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 20*, 135-

Church, R. M., Miller, K. D., Meck, W. H., & Gibbon, J. (1991). Symmetrical and asymmetrical sources of variance in temporal generalization. *Animal Learning & Behavior*, *19*, 207–214.

Dews, P. B. (1970). The Theory of Fixed-Interval Responding. In W.N. Schoenfeld (Eds.), *The Theory of Reinforcement Schedules* (pp. 43-61). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Drake, C., & Botte, M. C. (1993). Tempo sensitivity in auditory sequences: Evidence for multiple-look model. *Perception and Psychophysics, 54*, 277-286.

Fetterman, J. G., & Killeen, P. R. (1992). Time discrimination in Columba livia and Homo sapiens. *Journal of Experiment Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 18*, 80-94.

Fetterman, J. G., & Killeen, P. R. (1995). Categorical scaling of time: Implications for clock-counter models. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 21*, 43-63.

Fraisse, P. (1967). Time and rhythm perception. In E. Carterette & M. Friedman (Eds.), *Handbook of Perception,* (Vol. 8, pp 203-254). New York: Academic Press.

Friberg, A., & Sundberg, J. (1995). Time discrimination in a monotonic, isochronic sequence. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 98,* 2524-2531.

Getty, D. J. (1975). Discrimination of short temporal intervals: A comparison of two models. *Perception and Psychophysics,* 18, 1-8.

Gibbon, J. (1977). Scalar expectancy theory and Weber's Law in animal timing. *Psychological Review, 84,* 279-325.

Gibbon, J. (1991). Origins of scalar timing. *Learning and Motivation, 22*, 3-38.

Gibbon, J., & Church, R. M. (1984). Sources of variance in an information processing theory of timing. In H. L. Roitblat., T. G. Bever., & H. S. Terrace (Eds.), *Animal Cognition* (pp. 465-488). Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Grondin, S. (2001). From physical time to the first and second moments of psychological time. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*, 22-44.

Kaiser, D. H. (2008). The proportion of fixed interval trials to probe trials affects acquisition of the peak procedure fixed interval timing task. *Behavioural Processes*, *77*, 100-108.

Killeen, P. R., & Fetterman, J. G. (1988). A behavioral theory of timing. *Psychological Review, 95,* 274-295.

Killeen, P. R., & Weiss, N. A. (1987). Optimal timing and the Weber function. *Psychological Review, 94,* 455-468.

Kirkpatrick-Steger, K., Miller, S. S., Betti, C. A.,Wasserman, E. A. (1996). Cyclic responding by pigeons on the peak timing procedure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 22*, 447–460.

Leak, T. M., & Gibbon, J. (1995). Simultaneous timing of multiple intervals: Implications of the scalar property. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 21,* 3-19.

Lejeune, H., Ferrara, A., Soffie, M., Bronchart, M., & Wearden, J.H., (1998). Peak procedure performance in young adult and aged rats: Acquisition and adaptation to a changing temporal criterion. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 51B*, 193-217.

Lejeune, H., & Wearden, J.H. (1991). The comparative psychology of fixed interval responding: Some quantitative analyses. *Learning and Motivation,* 22, 84-111.

Lejeune, H., & Wearden, J. H. (2006). Scalar properties of animal timing: Conformity and violations. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 59,* 1875-1908.

MacEwen, D., & Killeen, P. R. (1991). The effects of rate and amount of reinforcement on the speed of the pacemaker in pigeons' timing behavior, *Animal Learning & Behavior, 19*, 164-170.

Machado, A. (1997). Learning the temporal dynamics of behavior. *Psychological Review, 104*, 241-265.

Machado, A., & Keen, R. (1999). Learning to time (LeT) or scalar expectancy theory (SET)? A critical test of two models of timing. *Psychological Science, 10*, 285-290.

Meck, W. H. (1983). Selective adjustment of the speed of internal clock and memory processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology : Animal Behavior Processes, 9*, 171-201.

Rakitin, B. C., Gibbon, J., Penney, T. B., Malapani, C., Hinton, S. C., & Meck, W. H. (1998). Scalar expectancy theory and peak-interval timing in humans. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 24,* 15-33.

Roberts, S. (1981). Isolation of an internal clock. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes, 7*, 242-268.

Roberts, W. A. (1998). *Principles of animal cognition.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Salsgiver, K. A., McClure, E. A., Wynne, C. D. L. (2006). Effects of damphetamine on the behaviour of pigeons exposed to the peak procedure. *Behavioural Processes, 71*, 268-285.

Sanabria, F., & Killeen, P. R. (2007). Temporal generalization accounts for response resurgence in the peak procedure. *Behavioural Processes, 74*, 126-141.

Schneider, B. A. (1969). A two-state analysis of fixed-interval responding in the pigeon. *Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 12*, 677-687.

Stubbs, A. (1968). The discrimination of stimulus duration by pigeons. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 11*, 223-238.

Treisman, M. (1963). Temporal discrimination and the indifference interval: Implications for a model of the "internal clock". *Psychological Monographs, 77*, 1-31.

Wearden, J. H. (1985). The power law and Weber's Law in fixed-interval postreinforcement pausing: A scalar timing model. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 37B*, 191-211.

Wearden, J. H. (2003). Applying the scalar timing model to human time psychology: progress and challenges. In H. Helfrich (Eds.), *Time and Mind II: Information-processing perspectives,* (pp. 21-39). Cambridge, MA: Hogrefe and Huber.

Zeiler, M. D., & Powell, D. G. (1994). Temporal control in fixed-interval schedules. *Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 61*, 1-9.

APPENDIX A

The raw data for all 5 possums for FI training and Peak Procedure trials.

SUBJECT 1

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
1	1 7 10	15.0	2.0	1105.6	187.0	52.0	1800.1
1	2 7 10	15.0	2.0	1361.9	321.0	100.0	2683.6
1	3 7 10	15.0	2.0	1677.4	192.0	100.0	2780.9
1	4 7 10	15.0	2.0	6302.5	145.0	88.0	7200.0
1	5 7 10	15.0	2.0	5761.1	198.0	100.0	6823.7
1	6 7 10	15.0	2.0	4166.2	193.0	100.0	5222.3
1	7 7 10	15.0	2.0	6179.0	191.0	92.0	7200.0
1	8 7 10	30.0	1.0	4632.3	415.0	83.0	7200.0
1	9 7 10	30.0	1.0	5020.4	526.0	100.0	6863.1
1	10 7 10	30.0	1.0	5756.7	372.0	90.0	7200.0
1	11 7 10	30.0	1.0	5757.9	273.0	89.0	7200.0
1	12 7 10	30.0	1.0	7184.8	1.0	1.0	7200.0
1	13 7 10	30.0	1.0	6698.8	103.0	38.0	7200.0

EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	14 7 10	30.0	1.0	787.5	84.0	24.0	7200.0	3872.4	147.0	6.0
1	15 7 10	30.0	1.0	2073.1	131.0	41.0	7200.0	534.2	151.0	10.0
1	16 7 10	30.0	1.0	4352.9	77.0	36.0	7200.0	346.9	68.0	9.0
1	17 7 10	30.0	1.0	6185.8	42.0	20.0	7200.0	230.9	33.0	5.0
1	18 7 10	30.0	1.0	4593.7	53.0	34.0	7200.0	327.9	39.0	8.0
1	19 7 10	30.0	1.0	1367.3	48.0	33.0	7200.0	377.1	48.0	9.0
1	20 7 10	30.0	1.0	511.5	18.0	10.0	7200.0	6160.8	16.0	3.0
1	21 7 10	30.0	1.0	7193.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	22 7 10	30.0	1.0	6296.8	12.0	8.0	7200.0	64.7	10.0	2.0
1	23 7 10	30.0	1.0	4123.3	61.0	21.0	7200.0	189.4	28.0	5.0
1	24 7 10	30.0	1.0	889.2	43.0	13.0	7200.0	5726.8	11.0	4.0
1	25 7 10	30.0	1.0	5494.6	50.0	29.0	7200.0	472.4	54.0	8.0
1	26 7 10	30.0	1.0	1390.6	104.0	43.0	7200.0	906.8	54.0	11.0
1	27 7 10	30.0	1.0	5135.3	58.0	24.0	7200.0	169.8	55.0	6.0
1	28 7 10	30.0	1.0	476.5	57.0	20.0	7200.0	160.9	32.0	6.0
1	29 7 10	30.0	1.0	654.0	106.0	30.0	7200.0	210.5	93.0	8.0
1	30 7 10	30.0	1.0	975.3	57.0	26.0	7200.0	199.1	38.0	6.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	31 7 10	30.0	1.0	7193.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	1 8 10	30.0	1.0	150.2	8.0	5.0	7200.0	60.0	16.0	1.0
1	2 8 10	30.0	1.0	475.3	13.0	7.0	7200.0	53.0	21.0	1.0
1	3 8 10	30.0	1.0	275.2	30.0	11.0	7200.0	89.0	30.0	3.0
1	4 8 10	30.0	1.0	208.0	38.0	10.0	7200.0	79.8	36.0	2.0
1	5 8 10	30.0	1.0	2499.8	25.0	12.0	7200.0	87.0	15.0	2.0
1	6 8 10	30.0	1.0	523.2	38.0	12.0	7200.0	94.8	37.0	3.0
1	7 8 10	30.0	1.0	816.3	67.0	27.0	7200.0	903.7	48.0	6.0
1	8 8 10	30.0	1.0	3102.9	53.0	30.0	7200.0	366.8	59.0	8.0
1	9 8 10	30.0	1.0	1296.7	73.0	26.0	7200.0	163.8	60.0	6.0
1	10 8 10	30.0	1.0	6728.6	21.0	10.0	7200.0	88.1	24.0	3.0
1	11 8 10	30.0	1.0	6132.3	28.0	16.0	7200.0	290.8	26.0	4.0
1	12 8 10	30.0	1.0	1083.2	145.0	37.0	7200.0	235.7	114.0	9.0
1	13 8 10	30.0	1.0	2018.1	219.0	60.0	5272.2	471.9	129.0	14.0
1	14 8 10	30.0	1.0	440.5	31.0	14.0	7200.0	6412.1	24.0	4.0
1	15 8 10	30.0	1.0	645.5	80.0	25.0	7200.0	177.2	83.0	6.0
1	16 8 10	30.0	1.0	582.0	115.0	28.0	7200.0	3141.8	91.0	7.0
1	17 8 10	30.0	1.0	5717.4	121.0	29.0	7200.0	191.0	96.0	7.0
1	18 8 10	30.0	1.0	509.5	147.0	28.0	7200.0	171.8	117.0	7.0
1	19 8 10	15.0	2.0	3646.5	155.0	60.0	5596.0	264.0	171.0	15.0
1	20 8 10	15.0	2.0	1023.0	136.0	60.0	2732.3	273.0	117.0	15.0
1	21 8 10	15.0	2.0	762.2	143.0	56.0	7200.0	252.2	137.0	15.0
1	22 8 10	15.0	2.0	697.4	101.0	45.0	7200.0	195.5	85.0	12.0
1	23 8 10	15.0	2.0	812.6	123.0	60.0	5402.1	274.8	100.0	15.0
1	24 8 10	15.0	2.0	732.8	186.0	60.0	2610.7	192.8	124.0	15.0
1	25 8 10	15.0	2.0	694.2	175.0	60.0	2597.7	180.0	138.0	15.0
1	26 8 10	15.0	2.0	877.1	167.0	60.0	2567.5	220.4	145.0	15.0
1	27 8 10	15.0	2.0	5539.2	147.0	57.0	7200.0	291.1	99.0	14.0
1	28 8 10	15.0	2.0	5675.3	153.0	51.0	7200.0	274.1	95.0	13.0
1	29 8 10	15.0	2.0	850.1	149.0	60.0	2601.8	260.7	113.0	15.0
1	30 8 10	15.0	2.0	729.2	198.0	60.0	2534.2	235.8	146.0	15.0
1	31 8 10	15.0	2.0	827.3	182.0	60.0	2462.6	245.3	117.0	14.0
1	1 9 10	15.0	2.0	3590.5	167.0	60.0	5365.3	308.8	125.0	15.0
1	2 9 10	15.0	2.0	829.3	170.0	60.0	2460.3	237.9	124.0	14.0
1	3 9 10	15.0	2.0	865.8	142.0	60.0	4091.6	1657.6	102.0	15.0
1	4 9 10	15.0	2.0	830.6	168.0	60.0	2549.9	228.0	115.0	15.0
1	5 9 10	15.0	2.0	702.4	194.0	60.0	2576.5	229.0	126.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	6 9 10	15.0	2.0	888.6	160.0	60.0	2618.6	229.2	99.0	14.0
1	7 9 10	15.0	2.0	817.3	163.0	60.0	2651.2	270.6	100.0	15.0
1	8 9 10	15.0	2.0	736.4	175.0	60.0	2627.1	235.0	97.0	15.0
1	9 9 10	15.0	2.0	755.1	199.0	60.0	2480.1	237.5	133.0	15.0
1	10 9 10	15.0	2.0	945.0	148.0	60.0	3195.1	287.2	101.0	15.0
1	11 9 10	15.0	2.0	909.3	191.0	60.0	2623.6	230.6	131.0	15.0
1	12 9 10	15.0	2.0	836.6	158.0	60.0	2537.7	217.9	109.0	15.0
1	13 9 10	15.0	2.0	741.2	197.0	60.0	2419.0	220.0	138.0	15.0
1	14 9 10	15.0	2.0	2942.5	240.0	60.0	4622.6	216.1	170.0	15.0
1	15 9 10	15.0	2.0	795.2	176.0	60.0	2967.7	745.4	127.0	15.0
1	16 9 10	15.0	2.0	831.5	185.0	60.0	2458.1	200.7	120.0	14.0
1	17 9 10	15.0	2.0	835.8	146.0	60.0	4268.0	2005.7	98.0	15.0
1	18 9 10	15.0	2.0	767.1	187.0	60.0	2389.4	199.3	125.0	14.0
1	19 9 10	15.0	2.0	737.4	225.0	60.0	2573.8	222.7	128.0	15.0
1	20 9 10	15.0	2.0	754.2	250.0	60.0	2493.6	210.6	167.0	15.0
1	21 9 10	15.0	2.0	854.8	245.0	60.0	3075.8	207.0	118.0	15.0
1	22 9 10	15.0	2.0	597.6	322.0	60.0	2523.4	222.1	169.0	15.0
1	23 9 10	15.0	2.0	654.1	291.0	60.0	2541.6	236.2	155.0	15.0
1	24 9 10	15.0	2.0	702.2	245.0	60.0	2730.7	215.7	76.0	14.0
1	25 9 10	15.0	2.0	618.7	307.0	60.0	2628.1	193.8	178.0	15.0
1	26 9 10	15.0	2.0	674.5	253.0	60.0	2718.3	167.7	151.0	15.0
1	27 9 10	15.0	2.0	874.4	199.0	60.0	2684.0	225.5	113.0	15.0
1	28 9 10	15.0	2.0	653.4	253.0	60.0	2550.2	175.9	131.0	15.0
1	29 9 10	15.0	2.0	616.1	284.0	60.0	2575.3	167.0	166.0	15.0
1	30 9 10	15.0	2.0	708.5	266.0	60.0	2505.8	184.4	195.0	14.0
1	1 10 10	15.0	2.0	735.8	221.0	60.0	2715.8	178.1	145.0	14.0
1	2 10 10	15.0	2.0	670.2	258.0	60.0	2556.3	202.4	132.0	15.0
1	3 10 10	15.0	2.0	714.9	246.0	60.0	2668.9	178.0	151.0	15.0
1	4 10 10	15.0	2.0	707.1	220.0	60.0	2590.0	220.9	115.0	14.0
1	5 10 10	15.0	2.0	795.3	200.0	60.0	2997.3	303.1	128.0	15.0
1	6 10 10	15.0	2.0	734.8	206.0	60.0	2840.6	213.0	123.0	15.0
1	7 10 10	15.0	2.0	860.7	152.0	60.0	2738.0	259.9	108.0	15.0
1	8 10 10	15.0	2.0	818.8	222.0	60.0	2845.1	216.1	129.0	15.0
1	9 10 10	15.0	2.0	933.4	175.0	60.0	2949.9	202.3	117.0	15.0
1	10 10 10	15.0	2.0	939.2	168.0	60.0	2684.7	211.4	98.0	14.0
1	11 10 10	60.0	3.0	958.9	414.0	56.0	7200.0	230.4	294.0	13.0
1	12 10 10	60.0	3.0	1000.1	296.0	55.0	7200.0	234.5	252.0	14.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	13 10 10	60.0	3.0	820.5	275.0	56.0	7200.0	220.3	236.0	14.0
1	14 10 10	60.0	3.0	915.0	265.0	57.0	7200.0	300.1	180.0	14.0
1	15 10 10	60.0	3.0	892.7	316.0	58.0	7200.0	323.6	201.0	14.0
1	16 10 10	60.0	3.0	1101.9	267.0	55.0	7200.0	237.4	208.0	14.0
1	17 10 10	60.0	3.0	737.6	317.0	52.0	7200.0	219.2	227.0	13.0
1	18 10 10	60.0	3.0	835.1	279.0	56.0	7200.0	323.4	222.0	14.0
1	19 10 10	60.0	3.0	938.8	267.0	56.0	7200.0	273.7	196.0	14.0
1	20 10 10	60.0	3.0	1139.4	257.0	58.0	7200.0	281.5	196.0	14.0
1	21 10 10	60.0	3.0	1416.9	209.0	55.0	7200.0	365.4	162.0	14.0
1	22 10 10	60.0	3.0	1066.7	295.0	56.0	7200.0	310.0	235.0	14.0
1	23 10 10	60.0	3.0	1389.9	213.0	52.0	7200.0	444.4	158.0	13.0
1	24 10 10	60.0	3.0	1569.9	137.0	42.0	7200.0	414.2	119.0	11.0
1	25 10 10	60.0	3.0	2655.9	94.0	44.0	7200.0	571.0	85.0	11.0
1	26 10 10	60.0	3.0	4272.9	35.0	22.0	7200.0	776.3	34.0	6.0
1	27 10 10	60.0	3.0	2204.3	129.0	51.0	7200.0	543.4	133.0	12.0
1	28 10 10	60.0	3.0	1976.5	187.0	55.0	7200.0	495.7	139.0	13.0
1	29 10 10	60.0	3.0	1686.3	190.0	54.0	7200.0	414.0	167.0	14.0
1	30 10 10	60.0	3.0	1480.9	224.0	57.0	7200.0	456.2	185.0	14.0
1	31 10 10	60.0	3.0	1083.8	390.0	58.0	7200.0	269.3	214.0	14.0
1	1 11 10	60.0	3.0	1252.5	263.0	56.0	7200.0	385.1	227.0	15.0
1	2 11 10	60.0	3.0	1652.6	211.0	54.0	7200.0	424.3	173.0	14.
1	3 11 10	60.0	3.0	1711.1	213.0	56.0	7200.0	471.8	206.0	14.0
1	4 11 10	60.0	3.0	1490.9	234.0	57.0	7200.0	426.5	181.0	14.0
1	5 11 10	60.0	3.0	1696.4	251.0	56.0	7200.0	393.5	237.0	14.0
1	6 11 10	60.0	3.0	1780.4	222.0	57.0	7200.0	488.3	176.0	14.0
1	7 11 10	60.0	3.0	2096.3	206.0	56.0	7200.0	449.4	184.0	14.0
1	8 11 10	60.0	3.0	2048.2	244.0	57.0	7200.0	464.1	221.0	14.0
1	9 11 10	60.0	3.0	1962.8	213.0	54.0	7200.0	530.6	163.0	13.0
1	10 11 10	60.0	3.0	2201.1	194.0	54.0	7200.0	447.0	188.0	14.0
1	11 11 10	60.0	3.0	1872.6	253.0	54.0	7200.0	440.2	220.0	14.0
1	12 11 10	60.0	3.0	1918.3	251.0	57.0	7200.0	566.7	182.0	14.0
1	13 11 10	60.0	3.0	2172.5	279.0	56.0	7200.0	529.5	237.0	14.0
1	14 11 10	60.0	3.0	1877.1	290.0	57.0	7200.0	480.7	252.0	14.0
1	15 11 10	60.0	3.0	2072.6	281.0	57.0	7200.0	442.2	241.0	14.0
1	16 11 10	60.0	3.0	2179.6	365.0	57.0	7200.0	434.9	302.0	14.0
1	17 11 10	60.0	3.0	1969.8	357.0	57.0	7200.0	624.5	279.0	14.0
1	18 11 10	60.0	3.0	1888.9	407.0	57.0	7200.0	580.4	365.0	14.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	19 11 10	60.0	3.0	2116.4	339.0	57.0	7200.0	656.3	276.0	14.0
1	20 11 10	60.0	3.0	2152.1	257.0	55.0	7200.0	642.6	217.0	14.0
1	21 11 10	60.0	3.0	2899.6	142.0	49.0	7200.0	644.4	136.0	12.0
1	22 11 10	60.0	3.0	6379.1	8.0	8.0	7200.0	209.3	4.0	2.0
1	23 11 10	60.0	3.0	6268.7	13.0	13.0	7200.0	508.2	6.0	3.0
1	24 11 10	60.0	3.0	6564.3	9.0	6.0	7200.0	147.1	22.0	1.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	25 11 10	20.0	2.0	5515.4	282.0	100.0	6780.6			
1	26 11 10	20.0	2.0	3601.2	199.0	100.0	4814.4			
1	27 11 10	20.0	2.0	6114.8	118.0	81.0	7200.0			
1	28 11 10	20.0	2.0	6054.4	229.0	93.0	7200.0			
1	29 11 10	20.0	2.0	6036.0	271.0	97.0	7200.0			
1	30 11 10	20.0	2.0	2069.0	101.0	60.0	6263.3	552.2	200.0	14.0
1	1 12 10	20.0	2.0	1423.3	132.0	60.0	5834.4	336.0	235.0	15.0

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
1	2 12 10	30.0	2.0	2772.6	237.0	100.0	5315.5
1	3 12 10	30.0	2.0	4008.9	308.0	100.0	6230.8
1	4 12 10	30.0	2.0	5457.7	129.0	77.0	7200.0
1	5 12 10	30.0	2.0	3256.3	245.0	100.0	5009.7
1	6 12 10	30.0	2.0	2548.2	459.0	100.0	4483.5
1	7 12 10	30.0	2.0	5888.3	302.0	95.0	7200.0
1	8 12 10	30.0	2.0	5920.1	256.0	98.0	7200.0
1	9 12 10	30.0	2.0	3450.3	281.0	100.0	4841.7
1	10 12 10	30.0	2.0	6490.4	129.0	66.0	7200.0
1	11 12 10	30.0	2.0	3849.3	332.0	100.0	5251.5

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	12 12 10	30.0	2.0	1708.6	156.0	60.0	4617.2	561.9	169.0	15.0
1	13 12 10	30.0	2.0	1345.8	348.0	60.0	3966.1	283.1	259.0	15.0
1	14 12 10	30.0	2.0	1243.1	313.0	60.0	4068.2	345.4	249.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	15 12 10	30.0	2.0	1452.9	264.0	60.0	4056.8	366.1	196.0	15.0
1	16 12 10	30.0	2.0	1382.1	264.0	60.0	4007.2	378.4	227.0	14.0
1	17 12 10	30.0	2.0	4323.7	64.0	49.0	7200.0	1285.4	24.0	12.0
1	18 12 10	30.0	2.0	7008.7	5.0	5.0	7200.0	133.7	1.0	1.0
1	19 12 10	30.0	2.0	7184.8	1.0	1.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	20 12 10	30.0	2.0	6972.6	8.0	8.0	7200.0	81.4	6.0	1.0
1	21 12 10	30.0	2.0	1987.8	126.0	60.0	5092.6	457.3	107.0	14.0
1	22 12 10	30.0	2.0	4303.4	98.0	54.0	7200.0	1126.8	32.0	13.0
1	23 12 10	30.0	2.0	2229.7	135.0	60.0	4624.6	558.5	95.0	15.0
1	24 12 10	30.0	2.0	3848.6	83.0	36.0	7200.0	2127.5	57.0	9.0
1	25 12 10	30.0	2.0	1539.6	213.0	60.0	4218.6	394.2	162.0	15.0

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
1	3 1 11	30.0	2.0	5851.1	127.0	57.0	7200.0
1	4 1 11	30.0	2.0	6685.2	99.0	41.0	7200.0
1	5 1 11	30.0	2.0	6873.5	63.0	24.0	7200.0
1	6 1 11	30.0	2.0	6465.6	203.0	60.0	7200.0
1	7 1 11	30.0	2.0	7133.7	10.0	6.0	7200.0
1	8 1 11	30.0	2.0	2886.4	384.0	100.0	4356.0
1	9 1 11	30.0	2.0	6528.9	128.0	58.0	7200.0
1	10 1 11	30.0	2.0	3965.8	227.0	100.0	5127.8
1	11 1 11	30.0	2.0	6065.4	272.0	91.0	7200.0
1	12 1 11	30.0	2.0	6320.3	164.0	74.0	7200.0
1	13 1 11	30.0	2.0	3786.1	281.0	100.0	5029.6
1	14 1 11	30.0	2.0	6358.9	143.0	78.0	7200.0
1	15 1 11	30.0	2.0	6225.8	194.0	88.0	7200.0

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
1	16 1 11	30.0	2.0	5837.9	17.0	14.0	7200.0	189.5	66.0	4.0
1	17 1 11	30.0	2.0	5723.0	28.0	17.0	7200.0	223.6	59.0	4.0
1	18 1 11	30.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7200.0	7194.0	0.0	0.0
1	19 1 11	30.0	2.0	7194.0	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	20 1 11	30.0	2.0	7193.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

1	20	1	11	30.0	2.0	7193.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	21	1	11	30.0	2.0	371.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	6815.9	1.0	1.0
1	22	1	11	30.0	2.0	5398.6	30.0	17.0	7200.0	193.8	85.0	5.0
1	23	1	11	30.0	2.0	1600.8	114.0	44.0	7200.0	371.2	193.0	12.0
1	24	1	11	30.0	2.0	1976.7	116.0	54.0	7200.0	421.1	123.0	13.0
1	25	1	11	30.0	2.0	2080.3	101.0	52.0	7200.0	683.7	129.0	14.0
1	26	1	11	30.0	2.0	3603.8	94.0	37.0	7200.0	216.6	111.0	9.0
1	27	1	11	30.0	2.0	1913.3	216.0	56.0	7200.0	444.4	241.0	14.0
1	28	1	11	30.0	2.0	1934.7	168.0	58.0	7200.0	410.5	202.0	14.0
1	29	1	11	30.0	2.0	3625.6	55.0	36.0	7200.0	374.1	47.0	9.0
1	30	1	11	30.0	2.0	3377.9	87.0	40.0	7200.0	311.7	123.0	10.0
1	31	1	11	30.0	2.0	1662.3	169.0	54.0	7200.0	461.8	235.0	13.0
1	1	2	11	30.0	2.0	3291.5	53.0	30.0	7200.0	477.7	44.0	8.0
1	2	2	11	30.0	2.0	1670.6	3.0	3.0	7200.0	5496.1	0.0	0.0
1	3	2	11	30.0	2.0	2439.8	134.0	50.0	7200.0	373.1	151.0	13.0
1	4	2	11	30.0	2.0	1570.3	194.0	54.0	7200.0	408.6	179.0	14.0
1	5	2	11	30.0	2.0	1962.1	127.0	53.0	7200.0	452.8	170.0	13.0
1	6	2	11	30.0	2.0	1786.6	154.0	54.0	7200.0	390.3	130.0	13.0
1	7	2	11	30.0	2.0	1453.6	218.0	57.0	7200.0	405.3	227.0	14.0
1	8	2	11	30.0	2.0	1732.7	196.0	53.0	7200.0	371.3	183.0	14.0
1	9	2	11	30.0	2.0	1533.6	172.0	53.0	7200.0	410.2	181.0	14.0
1	10	2	11	30.0	2.0	1684.5	176.0	59.0	7200.0	370.0	218.0	14.0
1	11	2	11	30.0	2.0	2342.6	10.0	10.0	7200.0	4359.0	9.0	3.0
1	12	2	11	30.0	2.0	6887.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	10.7	5.0	1.0

SUBJECT 2

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
2	2 7 10	15.0	2.0	5208.7	517.0	73.0	7200.0
2	3 7 10	15.0	2.0	466.5	817.0	100.0	2549.5
2	4 7 10	15.0	2.0	554.5	698.0	100.0	2685.2
2	5 7 10	15.0	2.0	502.0	799.0	100.0	2532.0
2	6 7 10	15.0	2.0	522.5	887.0	100.0	2497.2
2	7 7 10	15.0	2.0	561.8	822.0	100.0	2490.6
2	8 7 10	30.0	1.0	3413.6	522.0	81.0	7200.0
2	9 7 10	30.0	1.0	1095.8	1137.0	100.0	4142.5
2	10 7 10	30.0	1.0	2733.2	1020.0	100.0	5724.8
2	11 7 10	30.0	1.0	4035.0	804.0	100.0	7028.9
2	12 7 10	30.0	1.0	1979.9	781.0	100.0	6037.8
2	13 7 10	30.0	1.0	1941.1	794.0	100.0	4413.7
2	14 7 10	60.0	3.0	582.5	1652.0	89.0	7200.0
2	15 7 10	60.0	3.0	1455.7	1626.0	98.0	7200.0
2	16 7 10	60.0	3.0	1996.7	1830.0	100.0	7079.8
2	17 7 10	60.0	3.0	2687.0	1993.0	100.0	7017.8
2	18 7 10	60.0	3.0	2957.6	1753.0	100.0	7078.2
2	19 7 10	60.0	3.0	4782.1	782.0	68.0	7200.0
2	20 7 10	60.0	3.0	3587.7	1390.0	99.0	7200.0

EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	21 7 10	60.0	3.0	1164.2	595.0	58.0	7200.0	343.7	637.0	15.0
2	22 7 10	60.0	3.0	1115.8	565.0	59.0	7200.0	371.3	540.0	15.0
2	23 7 10	60.0	3.0	944.8	587.0	59.0	7200.0	282.5	493.0	15.0
2	24 7 10	60.0	3.0	1097.8	657.0	58.0	7200.0	324.5	566.0	15.0
2	25 7 10	60.0	3.0	1370.4	729.0	59.0	7200.0	478.1	676.0	15.0
2	26 7 10	60.0	3.0	1233.4	541.0	59.0	7200.0	313.2	502.0	15.0
2	27 7 10	60.0	3.0	1266.9	505.0	57.0	7200.0	457.2	367.0	14.0
2	28 7 10	60.0	3.0	1207.0	501.0	58.0	7200.0	404.8	373.0	14.0
2	29 7 10	60.0	3.0	876.7	337.0	53.0	7200.0	377.4	242.0	13.0
2	30 7 10	60.0	3.0	1267.5	439.0	57.0	7200.0	417.3	366.0	14.0
2	31 7 10	60.0	3.0	1016.1	526.0	49.0	7200.0	300.4	422.0	12.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	1 8 10	60.0	3.0	1243.6	726.0	60.0	7044.0	259.7	632.0	14.0
2	2 8 10	60.0	3.0	1223.6	658.0	60.0	6985.2	412.8	500.0	14.0
2	3 8 10	60.0	3.0	1062.6	624.0	57.0	7200.0	382.6	458.0	14.0
2	4 8 10	60.0	3.0	745.9	508.0	57.0	7200.0	221.6	367.0	14.0
2	5 8 10	60.0	3.0	685.9	465.0	56.0	7200.0	111.7	397.0	15.0
2	6 8 10	60.0	3.0	742.2	569.0	57.0	7200.0	192.2	505.0	15.0
2	7 8 10	60.0	3.0	891.4	516.0	50.0	7200.0	104.1	461.0	12.0
2	8 8 10	60.0	3.0	422.4	569.0	56.0	7200.0	157.7	488.0	14.0
2	9 8 10	60.0	3.0	486.7	685.0	59.0	7200.0	122.9	574.0	15.0
2	10 8 10	60.0	3.0	678.4	559.0	58.0	7200.0	195.3	511.0	15.0
2	11 8 10	60.0	3.0	1712.9	269.0	39.0	7200.0	189.9	204.0	10.0
2	12 8 10	60.0	3.0	1429.4	134.0	28.0	7200.0	510.1	103.0	6.0
2	13 8 10	60.0	3.0	438.1	698.0	60.0	7044.6	132.0	542.0	14.0
2	14 8 10	60.0	3.0	711.9	783.0	60.0	7154.2	152.9	696.0	15.0
2	15 8 10	60.0	3.0	862.1	763.0	60.0	7154.0	256.8	682.0	15.0
2	16 8 10	60.0	3.0	789.1	755.0	57.0	7200.0	275.3	685.0	15.0
2	17 8 10	60.0	3.0	679.5	286.0	29.0	7200.0	149.0	172.0	7.0
2	18 8 10	60.0	3.0	1317.6	682.0	59.0	7200.0	388.1	632.0	15.0
2	19 8 10	30.0	1.0	3331.1	292.0	44.0	7200.0	189.3	301.0	12.0
2	20 8 10	30.0	1.0	3926.3	155.0	27.0	7200.0	1794.9	85.0	6.0
2	21 8 10	30.0	1.0	2119.2	65.0	14.0	7200.0	1234.1	29.0	3.0
2	22 8 10	30.0	1.0	3862.4	100.0	23.0	7200.0	1902.8	64.0	5.0
2	23 8 10	30.0	1.0	3936.0	38.0	4.0	7200.0	3010.5	9.0	2.0
2	24 8 10	30.0	1.0	446.3	602.0	60.0	3909.9	144.5	521.0	15.0
2	25 8 10	30.0	1.0	474.0	498.0	60.0	3934.2	134.7	421.0	15.0
2	26 8 10	30.0	1.0	660.7	534.0	60.0	3937.7	154.4	437.0	15.0
2	27 8 10	30.0	1.0	559.3	577.0	60.0	3794.3	151.9	446.0	14.0
2	28 8 10	30.0	1.0	739.2	482.0	60.0	3847.9	209.3	373.0	14.0
2	29 8 10	30.0	1.0	702.9	551.0	60.0	3806.9	215.1	412.0	14.0
2	30 8 10	30.0	1.0	649.2	622.0	60.0	3889.0	219.7	490.0	15.0
2	31 8 10	30.0	1.0	919.2	463.0	60.0	3949.2	239.1	401.0	15.0
2	1 9 10	30.0	1.0	873.8	460.0	60.0	3916.2	262.7	405.0	15.0
2	2 9 10	30.0	1.0	775.4	617.0	60.0	3832.1	170.1	506.0	14.0
2	3 9 10	30.0	1.0	735.4	581.0	60.0	3896.6	185.6	531.0	15.0
2	4 9 10	30.0	1.0	679.1	603.0	60.0	3919.9	240.0	502.0	15.0
2	5 9 10	30.0	1.0	670.1	737.0	60.0	3858.9	225.9	637.0	15.0
2	6 9 10	30.0	1.0	661.8	661.0	60.0	3789.8	218.8	474.0	14.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	7 9 10	30.0	1.0	879.5	506.0	60.0	3830.3	223.2	446.0	14.0
2	8 9 10	30.0	1.0	676.0	635.0	60.0	3797.6	185.4	499.0	14.0
2	9 9 10	30.0	1.0	652.4	635.0	60.0	3874.1	203.3	515.0	15.0
2	10 9 10	30.0	1.0	656.3	713.0	60.0	3909.6	166.5	622.0	15.0
2	11 9 10	30.0	1.0	681.2	711.0	60.0	3884.3	159.2	686.0	15.0
2	12 9 10	30.0	1.0	772.4	614.0	60.0	4050.3	177.1	517.0	15.0
2	13 9 10	30.0	1.0	734.0	484.0	60.0	3932.9	236.4	427.0	15.0
2	14 9 10	30.0	1.0	645.6	631.0	60.0	3774.4	222.1	464.0	14.0
2	15 9 10	30.0	1.0	686.5	757.0	60.0	3863.4	143.6	626.0	15.0
2	16 9 10	30.0	1.0	734.0	710.0	60.0	3854.6	217.9	631.0	15.0
2	17 9 10	30.0	1.0	735.6	731.0	60.0	3902.9	278.6	564.0	15.0
2	18 9 10	30.0	1.0	817.3	577.0	60.0	3862.8	273.1	527.0	15.0
2	19 9 10	30.0	1.0	703.8	806.0	60.0	3859.6	228.3	700.0	15.0
2	20 9 10	30.0	1.0	825.0	759.0	60.0	3773.8	213.2	626.0	14.0
2	21 9 10	30.0	1.0	4495.2	208.0	32.0	7200.0	1099.5	145.0	8.0
2	22 9 10	30.0	1.0	927.0	639.0	60.0	3884.2	224.1	638.0	15.0
2	23 9 10	30.0	1.0	4097.4	160.0	31.0	7200.0	192.6	165.0	8.0
2	24 9 10	30.0	1.0	921.6	544.0	60.0	3874.7	317.5	496.0	15.0
2	25 9 10	30.0	1.0	3688.4	299.0	42.0	7200.0	1656.5	303.0	10.0
2	26 9 10	30.0	1.0	2382.8	688.0	60.0	6064.8	968.4	477.0	15.0
2	27 9 10	30.0	1.0	963.3	576.0	60.0	3921.4	286.3	526.0	15.0
2	28 9 10	30.0	1.0	992.3	491.0	60.0	3843.8	249.4	522.0	15.0
2	29 9 10	30.0	1.0	864.2	622.0	60.0	3862.9	268.2	505.0	15.0
2	30 9 10	30.0	1.0	975.5	557.0	60.0	3902.5	235.9	506.0	15.0
2	1 10 10	30.0	1.0	3358.7	452.0	59.0	7200.0	915.7	404.0	14.0
2	2 10 10	30.0	1.0	881.6	577.0	60.0	3904.7	250.6	429.0	15.0
2	3 10 10	30.0	1.0	902.7	595.0	60.0	3924.3	302.2	451.0	15.0
2	4 10 10	30.0	1.0	928.3	544.0	60.0	3867.3	284.0	474.0	15.0
2	5 10 10	30.0	1.0	3860.2	224.0	31.0	7200.0	906.3	180.0	8.0
2	6 10 10	30.0	1.0	4450.3	53.0	16.0	7200.0	1432.8	39.0	4.0
2	7 10 10	30.0	1.0	4347.7	193.0	29.0	7200.0	1139.1	97.0	8.0
2	8 10 10	30.0	1.0	849.2	603.0	60.0	3898.3	306.5	431.0	15.0
2	9 10 10	30.0	1.0	891.7	600.0	60.0	3883.4	200.8	483.0	15.0
2	10 10 10	30.0	1.0	800.5	687.0	60.0	3873.3	241.4	621.0	15.0
2	11 10 10	15.0	2.0	335.9	450.0	60.0	2284.5	107.0	388.0	15.0
2	12 10 10	15.0	2.0	246.4	558.0	60.0	2288.4	68.6	456.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	13 10 10	15.0	2.0	260.0	543.0	60.0	2307.6	72.7	426.0	15.0
2	14 10 10	15.0	2.0	274.7	476.0	60.0	2313.3	83.9	402.0	15.0
2	15 10 10	15.0	2.0	289.7	415.0	60.0	2253.5	51.2	330.0	14.0
2	16 10 10	15.0	2.0	324.0	415.0	60.0	2275.0	70.1	337.0	14.0
2	17 10 10	15.0	2.0	248.7	395.0	60.0	2233.4	80.7	291.0	14.0
2	18 10 10	15.0	2.0	270.9	333.0	60.0	2295.4	84.2	311.0	15.0
2	19 10 10	15.0	2.0	262.8	345.0	60.0	2329.2	65.2	323.0	15.0
2	20 10 10	15.0	2.0	275.9	345.0	60.0	2325.0	45.8	278.0	15.0
2	21 10 10	15.0	2.0	251.6	357.0	60.0	2307.3	71.0	302.0	15.0
2	22 10 10	15.0	2.0	247.5	325.0	60.0	2295.2	85.6	227.0	14.0
2	23 10 10	15.0	2.0	211.5	365.0	60.0	2349.6	79.4	264.0	15.0
2	24 10 10	15.0	2.0	327.0	323.0	60.0	2323.3	77.1	270.0	15.0
2	25 10 10	15.0	2.0	265.0	307.0	60.0	2378.6	72.0	224.0	15.0
2	26 10 10	15.0	2.0	269.7	314.0	60.0	2314.5	87.3	248.0	15.0
2	27 10 10	15.0	2.0	278.8	329.0	60.0	2315.7	122.4	256.0	15.0
2	28 10 10	15.0	2.0	311.7	307.0	60.0	2325.7	107.6	251.0	15.0
2	29 10 10	15.0	2.0	355.2	256.0	60.0	2380.4	81.7	217.0	15.0
2	30 10 10	15.0	2.0	281.8	316.0	60.0	2251.5	78.3	224.0	14.0
2	31 10 10	15.0	2.0	392.5	237.0	60.0	2389.2	113.3	205.0	15.0
2	1 11 10	15.0	2.0	414.6	250.0	60.0	2401.4	100.0	209.0	15.0
2	2 11 10	15.0	2.0	424.5	229.0	60.0	2349.4	101.1	182.0	14.0
2	3 11 10	15.0	2.0	311.2	293.0	60.0	2257.6	69.4	206.0	14.0
2	4 11 10	15.0	2.0	279.2	269.0	60.0	2369.1	78.9	231.0	15.0
2	5 11 10	15.0	2.0	401.9	242.0	60.0	2416.6	152.1	179.0	15.0
2	6 11 10	15.0	2.0	454.8	239.0	60.0	2381.9	109.8	192.0	15.0
2	7 11 10	15.0	2.0	370.3	252.0	60.0	2376.6	92.8	172.0	15.0
2	8 11 10	15.0	2.0	340.8	258.0	60.0	2337.9	115.0	190.0	15.0
2	9 11 10	15.0	2.0	309.1	281.0	60.0	2336.5	94.9	186.0	15.0
2	10 11 10	15.0	2.0	310.9	290.0	60.0	2363.4	86.5	203.0	15.0
2	11 11 10	15.0	2.0	375.1	271.0	60.0	2284.5	90.2	162.0	14.0
2	12 11 10	15.0	2.0	415.8	271.0	60.0	2332.7	99.2	201.0	15.0
2	13 11 10	15.0	2.0	321.9	320.0	60.0	2314.9	103.0	208.0	15.0
2	14 11 10	15.0	2.0	354.3	283.0	60.0	2349.0	95.5	201.0	15.0
2	15 11 10	15.0	2.0	338.1	308.0	60.0	2307.1	75.4	222.0	15.0
2	16 11 10	15.0	2.0	296.4	383.0	60.0	2334.6	125.3	194.0	15.0
2	17 11 10	15.0	2.0	336.7	372.0	60.0	2300.9	87.3	254.0	15.0
2	18 11 10	15.0	2.0	352.8	346.0	60.0	2310.2	102.9	247.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	19 11 10	15.0	2.0	350.0	374.0	60.0	2280.0	79.4	293.0	15.0
2	20 11 10	15.0	2.0	320.9	386.0	60.0	2294.9	108.0	261.0	15.0
2	21 11 10	15.0	2.0	457.4	272.0	60.0	2324.4	128.9	199.0	14.0
2	22 11 10	15.0	2.0	446.0	341.0	60.0	2326.7	119.4	239.0	14.0
2	23 11 10	15.0	2.0	384.8	348.0	60.0	2293.0	90.8	256.0	14.0
2	24 11 10	15.0	2.0	509.0	285.0	60.0	2356.5	125.8	193.0	14.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	25 11 10	20.0	2.0	732.3	634.0	100.0	3228.0			
2	26 11 10	20.0	2.0	816.9	600.0	100.0	3175.0			
2	27 11 10	20.0	2.0	966.6	526.0	100.0	3165.4			
2	28 11 10	20.0	2.0	1028.7	480.0	100.0	3184.0			
2	29 11 10	20.0	2.0	1054.9	645.0	100.0	3040.1			
2	30 11 10	20.0	2.0	558.4	307.0	60.0	5011.8	160.9	853.0	15.0
2	1 12 10	20.0	2.0	583.1	320.0	60.0	5009.1	156.2	926.0	15.0

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
2	2 12 10	30.0	2.0	1238.9	797.0	100.0	4053.2
2	3 12 10	30.0	2.0	1599.4	593.0	100.0	4192.9
2	4 12 10	30.0	2.0	1304.8	757.0	100.0	4094.9
2	5 12 10	30.0	2.0	1445.7	730.0	100.0	4066.1
2	6 12 10	30.0	2.0	1465.6	803.0	100.0	4038.4
2	7 12 10	30.0	2.0	1572.5	741.0	100.0	4045.3
2	8 12 10	30.0	2.0	1985.7	598.0	100.0	4085.6
2	9 12 10	30.0	2.0	1925.8	652.0	100.0	4121.6
2	10 12 10	30.0	2.0	1909.2	566.0	100.0	4138.0
2	11 12 10	30.0	2.0	1878.1	597.0	100.0	4135.8

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	12 12 10	30.0	2.0	827.9	512.0	60.0	3876.6	256.7	403.0	15.0
2	13 12 10	30.0	2.0	1046.1	408.0	60.0	3889.0	283.3	418.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
2	14 12 10	30.0	2.0	1013.9	439.0	60.0	3904.0	292.9	447.0	15.0
2	15 12 10	30.0	2.0	1019.0	474.0	60.0	3910.5	326.3	402.0	15.0
2	16 12 10	30.0	2.0	976.1	447.0	60.0	3885.4	304.5	368.0	15.0
2	17 12 10	30.0	2.0	824.0	487.0	60.0	3943.0	295.4	306.0	15.0
2	18 12 10	30.0	2.0	951.9	499.0	60.0	3778.9	237.0	415.0	14.0
2	19 12 10	30.0	2.0	834.5	462.0	60.0	3790.1	223.6	321.0	14.0
2	20 12 10	30.0	2.0	924.0	483.0	60.0	3950.0	213.7	278.0	14.0
2	21 12 10	30.0	2.0	901.6	412.0	60.0	3837.9	241.2	244.0	14.0
2	22 12 10	30.0	2.0	1014.4	393.0	60.0	3894.8	286.2	267.0	15.0
2	23 12 10	30.0	2.0	992.2	387.0	60.0	3878.2	255.0	276.0	15.0
2	24 12 10	30.0	2.0	1158.7	308.0	60.0	3925.0	270.1	229.0	15.0
2	25 12 10	30.0	2.0	1027.5	379.0	60.0	3909.8	308.1	286.0	15.0

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
2	3 1 11	30.0	2.0	1904.6	420.0	100.0	4574.2
2	4 1 11	30.0	2.0	2359.4	396.0	100.0	4211.5
2	5 1 11	30.0	2.0	2352.6	443.0	100.0	4395.6
2	6 1 11	30.0	2.0	2048.2	507.0	100.0	4159.1
2	7 1 11	30.0	2.0	2036.8	539.0	100.0	4077.3
2	8 1 11	30.0	2.0	2144.8	473.0	100.0	4106.5
2	9 1 11	30.0	2.0	5257.1	541.0	78.0	7200.0
2	10 1 11	30.0	2.0	2038.1	501.0	100.0	4404.1
2	11 1 11	30.0	2.0	1930.1	673.0	100.0	4099.3
2	12 1 11	30.0	2.0	2058.5	518.0	100.0	4092.6
2	13 1 11	30.0	2.0	2112.9	477.0	100.0	4114.5
2	14 1 11	30.0	2.0	2290.0	431.0	100.0	4113.7
2	15 1 11	30.0	2.0	2355.7	412.0	100.0	4205.6

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI	
2	16 1 11	30.0	2.0	914.3	365.0	60.0	6750.6	273.3	1019.0	14.0	0.0
2	17 1 11	30.0	2.0	821.6	455.0	59.0	7200.0	262.1	1139.0	15.0	0.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI	
2	18 1 11	30.0	2.0	676.0	461.0	60.0	7171.4	232.0	1327.0	15.0	0.0
2	19 1 11	30.0	2.0	814.6	448.0	60.0	7153.2	199.3	1233.0	15.0	0.0
2	20 1 11	30.0	2.0	617.0	517.0	60.0	7064.7	229.9	1375.0	15.0	0.0
2	21 1 11	30.0	2.0	581.9	533.0	60.0	6816.1	184.5	1133.0	14.0	0.0
2	22 1 11	30.0	2.0	621.2	529.0	60.0	7078.8	157.4	1149.0	15.0	0.0
2	23 1 11	30.0	2.0	857.0	325.0	56.0	7200.0	308.8	541.0	13.0	0.0
2	24 1 11	30.0	2.0	1290.1	262.0	50.0	7200.0	428.1	430.0	13.0	0.0
2	25 1 11	30.0	2.0	1103.3	197.0	45.0	7200.0	223.8	429.0	11.0	0.0
2	26 1 11	30.0	2.0	765.0	418.0	60.0	7115.8	185.8	890.0	15.0	0.0
2	27 1 11	30.0	2.0	702.4	511.0	60.0	6736.1	130.1	968.0	14.0	0.0
2	28 1 11	30.0	2.0	694.5	459.0	60.0	7052.8	166.6	860.0	15.0	0.0
2	29 1 11	30.0	2.0	854.1	424.0	60.0	7096.8	283.3	648.0	15.0	0.0
2	30 1 11	30.0	2.0	807.1	284.0	53.0	7200.0	307.3	629.0	13.0	0.0
2	31 1 11	30.0	2.0	1002.1	404.0	60.0	7070.1	364.2	855.0	15.0	0.0
2	1 2 11	30.0	2.0	925.4	420.0	60.0	7060.4	311.9	751.0	15.0	0.0
2	2 2 11	30.0	2.0	786.0	408.0	57.0	7200.0	196.1	658.0	14.0	0.0
2	3 2 11	30.0	2.0	879.2	339.0	58.0	7200.0	229.3	796.0	15.0	0.0
2	4 2 11	30.0	2.0	793.0	368.0	60.0	7128.6	291.1	746.0	15.0	0.0
2	5 2 11	30.0	2.0	971.1	349.0	60.0	7095.6	239.9	706.0	15.0	0.0
2	6 2 11	30.0	2.0	1096.2	358.0	60.0	7138.9	324.4	801.0	15.0	0.0
2	7 2 11	30.0	2.0	1026.4	387.0	60.0	7048.7	285.7	779.0	15.0	0.0
2	8 2 11	30.0	2.0	972.3	415.0	60.0	7080.4	336.1	785.0	15.0	0.0
2	9 2 11	30.0	2.0	1046.9	422.0	60.0	7102.0	284.4	812.0	15.0	0.0
2	10 2 11	30.0	2.0	1146.0	348.0	59.0	7200.0	255.1	652.0	14.0	0.0
2	11 2 11	30.0	2.0	1063.0	330.0	60.0	7129.7	342.9	755.0	15.0	0.0
2	12 2 11	30.0	2.0	860.1	410.0	60.0	6823.4	294.4	595.0	14.0	0.0

SUBJECT 4

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date		FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
4	1	7 10	15.0	2.0	861.4	342.0	66.0	1800.1
4	2	7 10	15.0	2.0	1487.7	775.0	100.0	3564.6
4	3	7 10	15.0	2.0	2609.8	660.0	100.0	4558.5
4	4	7 10	15.0	2.0	364.3	1085.0	100.0	2491.9
4	5	7 10	15.0	2.0	730.8	692.0	100.0	2795.3
4	6	7 10	15.0	2.0	577.3	846.0	100.0	2589.5
4	7	7 10	15.0	2.0	450.0	975.0	100.0	2547.0
4	8	7 10	30.0	1.0	349.1	1795.0	100.0	4086.1
4	9	7 10	30.0	1.0	506.9	2093.0	100.0	4019.6
4	10	7 10	30.0	1.0	568.6	1975.0	100.0	3968.6
4	11	7 10	30.0	1.0	695.4	2041.0	100.0	4051.7
4	12	7 10	30.0	1.0	1948.7	1702.0	100.0	5914.2
4	13	7 10	30.0	1.0	1414.6	1232.0	100.0	4779.3

EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date		FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	14	7 10	30.0	1.0	216.8	1261.0	60.0	3862.3	52.7	1074.0	15.0
4	15	7 10	30.0	1.0	301.9	1100.0	60.0	3899.5	96.3	910.0	15.0
4	16	7 10	30.0	1.0	249.8	1414.0	60.0	3848.7	101.0	1093.0	15.0
4	17	7 10	30.0	1.0	249.7	1206.0	60.0	3864.0	88.6	1035.0	15.0
4	18	7 10	30.0	1.0	328.5	1195.0	60.0	3900.8	129.0	891.0	15.0
4	19	7 10	30.0	1.0	273.4	1410.0	60.0	3846.9	99.2	1087.0	15.0
4	20	7 10	30.0	1.0	294.3	1507.0	60.0	3868.5	75.2	1141.0	15.0
4	21	7 10	30.0	1.0	254.5	1641.0	60.0	3836.5	72.2	1245.0	15.0
4	22	7 10	30.0	1.0	394.1	1668.0	60.0	3844.4	106.7	1276.0	15.0
4	23	7 10	30.0	1.0	414.4	1541.0	60.0	3845.7	117.2	1399.0	15.0
4	24	7 10	30.0	1.0	342.9	1714.0	60.0	3868.1	81.5	1366.0	15.0
4	25	7 10	30.0	1.0	356.3	1711.0	60.0	3826.7	138.0	1330.0	15.0
4	26	7 10	30.0	1.0	375.0	1831.0	60.0	3823.3	122.3	1412.0	15.0
4	27	7 10	30.0	1.0	472.3	1737.0	60.0	3732.9	100.0	1350.0	14.0
4	28	7 10	30.0	1.0	323.0	1902.0	60.0	3837.2	130.4	1390.0	15.0
4	29	7 10	30.0	1.0	385.7	1797.0	60.0	3866.9	114.7	1412.0	15.0
4	30	7 10	30.0	1.0	367.9	1627.0	60.0	3818.2	193.9	1267.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	31 7 10	30.0	1.0	526.3	1528.0	60.0	3727.0	116.3	1385.0	14.0
4	1 8 10	30.0	1.0	428.3	1673.0	60.0	3815.1	185.9	1507.0	15.0
4	2 8 10	30.0	1.0	478.2	1737.0	60.0	3808.2	159.1	1299.0	15.0
4	3 8 10	30.0	1.0	402.4	2007.0	60.0	3808.8	168.6	1551.0	15.0
4	4 8 10	30.0	1.0	455.9	1916.0	60.0	3804.6	118.8	1631.0	15.0
4	5 8 10	30.0	1.0	458.7	1902.0	60.0	3712.5	172.3	1504.0	14.0
4	6 8 10	30.0	1.0	554.4	1828.0	60.0	3837.9	151.9	1454.0	15.0
4	7 8 10	30.0	1.0	602.1	1821.0	60.0	3829.7	202.2	1411.0	15.0
4	8 8 10	30.0	1.0	615.8	1746.0	60.0	3832.4	175.2	1366.0	15.0
4	9 8 10	30.0	1.0	738.2	1447.0	60.0	3923.8	227.1	1149.0	15.0
4	10 8 10	30.0	1.0	1652.7	1135.0	60.0	5089.6	376.5	792.0	15.0
4	11 8 10	30.0	1.0	689.3	1254.0	60.0	4624.4	189.4	955.0	15.0
4	12 8 10	30.0	1.0	751.2	1221.0	60.0	4083.9	175.1	912.0	15.0
4	13 8 10	30.0	1.0	624.9	1756.0	60.0	3810.9	220.7	1252.0	15.0
4	14 8 10	30.0	1.0	581.9	1378.0	60.0	3861.0	223.7	1073.0	15.0
4	15 8 10	30.0	1.0	664.4	1158.0	60.0	3956.3	170.8	950.0	15.0
4	16 8 10	30.0	1.0	637.8	1142.0	60.0	4052.2	170.4	828.0	15.0
4	17 8 10	30.0	1.0	572.7	1790.0	60.0	3926.8	171.8	1224.0	15.0
4	18 8 10	30.0	1.0	687.1	1485.0	60.0	3782.0	165.3	1190.0	14.0
4	19 8 10	15.0	2.0	570.0	426.0	60.0	2370.1	282.4	287.0	15.0
4	20 8 10	15.0	2.0	890.9	273.0	60.0	2554.6	273.2	306.0	15.0
4	21 8 10	15.0	2.0	510.2	385.0	60.0	2438.8	187.0	303.0	15.0
4	22 8 10	15.0	2.0	586.1	337.0	60.0	2385.7	155.3	333.0	15.0
4	23 8 10	15.0	2.0	509.7	398.0	60.0	2386.3	244.0	267.0	15.0
4	24 8 10	15.0	2.0	312.3	382.0	60.0	2309.8	117.6	315.0	15.0
4	25 8 10	15.0	2.0	412.7	446.0	60.0	2283.5	166.1	333.0	15.0
4	26 8 10	15.0	2.0	495.1	429.0	60.0	2324.1	177.7	350.0	15.0
4	27 8 10	15.0	2.0	515.5	446.0	60.0	2355.3	200.3	323.0	15.0
4	28 8 10	15.0	2.0	448.4	442.0	60.0	2317.3	166.2	351.0	15.0
4	29 8 10	15.0	2.0	585.9	402.0	60.0	2377.0	197.9	325.0	15.0
4	30 8 10	15.0	2.0	451.4	409.0	60.0	3718.4	174.1	320.0	15.0
4	31 8 10	15.0	2.0	513.1	431.0	60.0	2357.1	226.0	281.0	15.0
4	1 9 10	15.0	2.0	635.7	383.0	60.0	2424.3	208.6	241.0	15.0
4	2 9 10	15.0	2.0	655.0	382.0	60.0	2368.2	161.0	284.0	14.0
4	3 9 10	15.0	2.0	501.4	431.0	60.0	2392.7	183.2	272.0	15.0
4	4 9 10	15.0	2.0	569.2	356.0	60.0	2367.8	105.2	304.0	15.0
4	5 9 10	15.0	2.0	481.3	447.0	60.0	2314.8	140.7	319.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	6 9 10	15.0	2.0	322.4	503.0	60.0	2307.1	167.2	321.0	15.0
4	7 9 10	15.0	2.0	180.2	607.0	60.0	2304.2	50.7	397.0	15.0
4	8 9 10	15.0	2.0	323.2	439.0	60.0	2337.9	124.5	301.0	15.0
4	9 9 10	15.0	2.0	321.4	474.0	60.0	2318.3	101.5	297.0	15.0
4	10 9 10	15.0	2.0	195.1	499.0	60.0	2304.3	55.2	321.0	15.0
4	11 9 10	15.0	2.0	217.6	541.0	60.0	2297.1	43.7	341.0	15.0
4	12 9 10	15.0	2.0	352.5	403.0	60.0	2328.2	140.8	278.0	15.0
4	13 9 10	15.0	2.0	323.4	442.0	60.0	2307.3	143.1	261.0	15.0
4	14 9 10	15.0	2.0	408.0	382.0	60.0	2282.8	114.7	254.0	14.0
4	15 9 10	15.0	2.0	363.3	403.0	60.0	2318.8	120.2	254.0	15.0
4	16 9 10	15.0	2.0	316.5	447.0	60.0	2336.4	85.8	283.0	15.0
4	17 9 10	15.0	2.0	308.4	372.0	60.0	2323.1	70.5	255.0	15.0
4	18 9 10	15.0	2.0	282.7	387.0	60.0	2355.8	102.4	274.0	15.0
4	19 9 10	15.0	2.0	3433.0	200.0	60.0	5568.6	510.4	142.0	15.0
4	20 9 10	15.0	2.0	407.0	377.0	60.0	2309.2	132.1	207.0	14.0
4	21 9 10	15.0	2.0	306.6	425.0	60.0	2298.9	141.5	253.0	15.0
4	22 9 10	15.0	2.0	312.5	395.0	60.0	2322.7	92.7	289.0	15.0
4	23 9 10	15.0	2.0	185.4	475.0	60.0	2279.7	68.6	327.0	15.0
4	24 9 10	15.0	2.0	278.1	402.0	60.0	2303.5	133.3	274.0	15.0
4	25 9 10	15.0	2.0	273.0	423.0	60.0	2285.7	51.7	350.0	15.0
4	26 9 10	15.0	2.0	232.4	471.0	60.0	2229.0	62.8	319.0	14.0
4	27 9 10	15.0	2.0	247.2	415.0	60.0	2335.2	122.5	246.0	15.0
4	28 9 10	15.0	2.0	230.8	465.0	60.0	2297.0	93.7	340.0	15.0
4	29 9 10	15.0	2.0	250.8	431.0	60.0	2298.7	106.3	278.0	15.0
4	30 9 10	15.0	2.0	313.1	412.0	60.0	2346.3	46.8	331.0	15.0
4	1 10 10	15.0	2.0	358.3	395.0	60.0	2257.5	92.9	268.0	14.0
4	2 10 10	15.0	2.0	334.7	415.0	60.0	2328.8	114.5	273.0	15.0
4	3 10 10	15.0	2.0	325.7	398.0	60.0	2312.3	115.2	303.0	15.0
4	4 10 10	15.0	2.0	235.0	397.0	60.0	2306.0	74.9	323.0	15.0
4	5 10 10	15.0	2.0	271.5	415.0	60.0	2299.8	123.0	299.0	15.0
4	6 10 10	15.0	2.0	360.6	362.0	60.0	2287.6	106.3	286.0	14.0
4	7 10 10	15.0	2.0	180.2	496.0	60.0	2281.0	36.3	348.0	15.0
4	8 10 10	15.0	2.0	756.6	375.0	60.0	2757.9	63.6	267.0	15.0
4	9 10 10	15.0	2.0	219.6	443.0	60.0	2288.9	70.4	342.0	15.0
4	10 10 10	15.0	2.0	225.6	444.0	60.0	2285.0	93.6	335.0	15.0
4	11 10 10	60.0	3.0	651.5	1921.0	60.0	7197.3	209.7	1566.0	15.0
4	12 10 10	60.0	3.0	746.4	1927.0	60.0	7186.7	144.5	1512.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	13 10 10	60.0	3.0	682.4	2285.0	60.0	7052.1	212.7	1736.0	15.0
4	14 10 10	60.0	3.0	636.9	1936.0	60.0	7057.4	171.9	1449.0	15.0
4	15 10 10	60.0	3.0	895.7	1511.0	60.0	7190.8	155.9	1227.0	15.0
4	16 10 10	60.0	3.0	651.4	1830.0	60.0	7118.4	225.3	1314.0	15.0
4	17 10 10	60.0	3.0	588.9	1791.0	60.0	7037.5	165.7	1358.0	15.0
4	18 10 10	60.0	3.0	636.4	1566.0	60.0	6851.1	172.6	1223.0	14.0
4	19 10 10	60.0	3.0	923.3	1389.0	60.0	7026.3	265.6	1165.0	15.0
4	20 10 10	60.0	3.0	664.9	1580.0	60.0	7057.2	219.5	1164.0	15.0
4	21 10 10	60.0	3.0	814.3	1413.0	60.0	6841.0	211.1	991.0	14.0
4	22 10 10	60.0	3.0	693.3	1640.0	60.0	6993.0	141.7	1277.0	15.0
4	23 10 10	60.0	3.0	834.3	1390.0	59.0	7200.0	255.2	1151.0	15.0
4	24 10 10	60.0	3.0	877.5	1298.0	60.0	7173.4	349.5	1047.0	15.0
4	25 10 10	60.0	3.0	938.3	1378.0	60.0	6845.6	290.2	1019.0	14.0
4	26 10 10	60.0	3.0	1044.7	1498.0	60.0	6825.0	227.7	1130.0	14.0
4	27 10 10	60.0	3.0	1230.8	1542.0	60.0	7028.0	260.6	1197.0	15.0
4	28 10 10	60.0	3.0	1083.4	1416.0	60.0	7025.4	351.6	1107.0	15.0
4	29 10 10	60.0	3.0	1306.4	1405.0	60.0	7058.7	368.9	1055.0	15.0
4	30 10 10	60.0	3.0	1204.2	1491.0	60.0	7067.1	368.9	1072.0	15.0
4	31 10 10	60.0	3.0	959.2	1536.0	60.0	7006.1	313.7	1183.0	15.0
4	1 11 10	60.0	3.0	1112.6	1566.0	60.0	7015.1	302.7	1243.0	15.0
4	2 11 10	60.0	3.0	1146.7	1498.0	60.0	7000.5	315.5	1160.0	15.0
4	3 11 10	60.0	3.0	1027.3	1353.0	60.0	7035.3	385.6	1098.0	15.0
4	4 11 10	60.0	3.0	1173.8	1502.0	60.0	7044.8	316.2	1074.0	15.0
4	5 11 10	60.0	3.0	1245.1	1380.0	60.0	7039.9	305.1	1061.0	15.0
4	6 11 10	60.0	3.0	1212.2	1349.0	60.0	7029.1	446.2	1046.0	15.0
4	7 11 10	60.0	3.0	1080.0	1275.0	60.0	7076.3	374.3	948.0	15.0
4	8 11 10	60.0	3.0	1111.1	1421.0	60.0	6855.6	343.5	1035.0	14.0
4	9 11 10	60.0	3.0	1216.3	1607.0	60.0	6827.9	391.9	1047.0	14.0
4	10 11 10	60.0	3.0	1206.6	1510.0	60.0	6837.7	376.4	1043.0	14.0
4	11 11 10	60.0	3.0	1066.8	1594.0	60.0	6835.8	353.9	1034.0	14.0
4	12 11 10	60.0	3.0	1125.0	1487.0	60.0	7051.6	350.0	1056.0	15.0
4	13 11 10	60.0	3.0	1286.6	1565.0	60.0	7035.9	383.0	1025.0	15.0
4	14 11 10	60.0	3.0	1351.4	1701.0	60.0	6984.9	364.8	1359.0	15.0
4	15 11 10	60.0	3.0	1329.6	1633.0	60.0	7011.7	493.8	1123.0	15.0
4	16 11 10	60.0	3.0	1424.8	1565.0	60.0	7023.4	402.5	1226.0	15.0
4	17 11 10	60.0	3.0	1192.7	1573.0	60.0	7086.2	417.4	1049.0	15.0
4	18 11 10	60.0	3.0	1292.0	1526.0	60.0	7007.2	428.2	1124.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	19 11 10	60.0	3.0	1374.6	1250.0	60.0	7080.9	433.6	1022.0	15.0
4	20 11 10	60.0	3.0	1432.3	1271.0	60.0	7021.8	465.8	1012.0	15.0
4	21 11 10	60.0	3.0	1193.6	1461.0	60.0	7006.9	447.5	1019.0	15.0
4	22 11 10	60.0	3.0	1580.6	1131.0	60.0	7086.6	388.4	980.0	15.0
4	23 11 10	60.0	3.0	1366.5	1303.0	60.0	7064.0	342.3	913.0	15.0
4	24 11 10	60.0	3.0	1368.3	1320.0	60.0	7169.2	471.0	911.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	25 11 10	20.0	2.0	713.1	611.0	100.0	3114.0			
4	26 11 10	20.0	2.0	3187.4	509.0	100.0	5710.6			
4	27 11 10	20.0	2.0	3115.7	459.0	100.0	6333.7			
4	28 11 10	20.0	2.0	1257.7	474.0	100.0	3448.1			
4	29 11 10	20.0	2.0	1892.4	451.0	100.0	4490.3			
4	30 11 10	20.0	2.0	2638.4	45.0	16.0	7200.0			
4	1 12 10	20.0	2.0	2198.4	54.0	28.0	7200.0			

FI TRAINING – EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
4	2 12 10	30.0	2.0	2520.3	331.0	71.0	7200.0
4	3 12 10	30.0	2.0	5018.9	233.0	59.0	7200.0
4	4 12 10	30.0	2.0	4870.4	221.0	65.0	7200.0
4	5 12 10	30.0	2.0	3985.3	371.0	95.0	7200.0
4	6 12 10	30.0	2.0	1798.0	798.0	100.0	4729.0
4	7 12 10	30.0	2.0	3468.1	276.0	49.0	7200.0
4	8 12 10	30.0	2.0	4794.5	360.0	97.0	7200.0
4	9 12 10	30.0	2.0	2206.0	480.0	100.0	4851.6
4	10 12 10	30.0	2.0	1967.9	463.0	100.0	4500.8
4	11 12 10	30.0	2.0	1583.2	820.0	100.0	4203.4

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	12 12 10	30.0	2.0	712.5	779.0	60.0	3855.4	203.8	778.0	15.0
4	13 12 10	30.0	2.0	889.9	431.0	60.0	3801.1	237.8	399.0	14.0
4	14 12 10	30.0	2.0	1166.8	344.0	60.0	4217.7	244.9	292.0	14.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	15 12 10	30.0	2.0	1333.4	267.0	60.0	4265.2	352.7	269.0	15.0
4	16 12 10	30.0	2.0	871.1	626.0	60.0	3803.7	273.3	517.0	14.0
4	17 12 10	30.0	2.0	904.4	592.0	60.0	3903.5	240.1	444.0	15.0
4	18 12 10	30.0	2.0	948.6	399.0	60.0	4030.4	286.4	318.0	15.0
4	19 12 10	30.0	2.0	589.7	695.0	60.0	3861.7	202.2	558.0	15.0
4	20 12 10	30.0	2.0	863.2	522.0	60.0	3793.1	186.9	429.0	14.0
4	21 12 10	30.0	2.0	778.7	574.0	60.0	3846.0	299.5	400.0	15.0
4	22 12 10	30.0	2.0	714.1	570.0	60.0	3894.3	224.1	449.0	15.0
4	23 12 10	30.0	2.0	634.7	664.0	60.0	3883.9	210.2	431.0	15.0
4	24 12 10	30.0	2.0	638.8	659.0	60.0	3838.9	187.8	505.0	15.0
4	25 12 10	30.0	2.0	477.1	773.0	60.0	3854.7	157.4	531.0	15.0

FI TRAINING – EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
4	3 1 11	30.0	2.0	5276.2	405.0	80.0	7200.0
4	4 1 11	30.0	2.0	1769.2	891.0	100.0	4612.7
4	5 1 11	30.0	2.0	1173.0	1359.0	100.0	3992.7
4	6 1 11	30.0	2.0	1709.4	1085.0	100.0	4374.1
4	7 1 11	30.0	2.0	1873.2	1138.0	100.0	4329.2
4	8 1 11	30.0	2.0	1488.5	1118.0	100.0	4014.9
4	9 1 11	30.0	2.0	1884.3	886.0	100.0	4301.7
4	10 1 11	30.0	2.0	2485.1	803.0	100.0	5038.3
4	11 1 11	30.0	2.0	1637.5	1150.0	100.0	4136.0
4	12 1 11	30.0	2.0	1622.9	1216.0	100.0	4297.2
4	13 1 11	30.0	2.0	1582.2	966.0	100.0	4003.5
4	14 1 11	30.0	2.0	1988.5	787.0	100.0	4088.4
4	15 1 11	30.0	2.0	1732.2	1033.0	100.0	4202.1

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	16 1 11	30.0	2.0	850.9	545.0	60.0	7012.4	211.6	1496.0	15.0
4	17 1 11	30.0	2.0	810.5	502.0	60.0	6996.4	234.5	1349.0	15.0
4	18 1 11	30.0	2.0	804.0	570.0	60.0	7008.2	265.6	1446.0	15.0
4	19 1 11	30.0	2.0	789.2	638.0	60.0	7009.4	232.4	1621.0	15.0
4	20 1 11	30.0	2.0	779.8	552.0	60.0	6977.7	219.6	1227.0	15.0

Sub	Date			FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
4	21	1	11	30.0	2.0	789.1	578.0	60.0	7012.2	233.0	1228.0	15.0
4	22	1	11	30.0	2.0	713.2	594.0	60.0	6988.2	222.2	1152.0	15.0
4	23	1	11	30.0	2.0	783.6	612.0	60.0	7028.5	188.8	1362.0	15.0
4	24	1	11	30.0	2.0	738.9	610.0	60.0	6999.0	214.3	1034.0	15.0
4	25	1	11	30.0	2.0	783.0	606.0	60.0	6690.8	232.7	1126.0	14.0
4	26	1	11	30.0	2.0	893.6	593.0	60.0	7093.9	249.3	1046.0	15.0
4	27	1	11	30.0	2.0	705.9	678.0	60.0	6991.6	227.5	988.0	15.0
4	28	1	11	30.0	2.0	717.6	711.0	60.0	6690.9	232.6	969.0	14.0
4	29	1	11	30.0	2.0	826.3	589.0	60.0	7010.4	240.3	975.0	15.0
4	30	1	11	30.0	2.0	767.6	604.0	60.0	7014.8	229.1	960.0	15.0
4	31	1	11	30.0	2.0	816.6	539.0	60.0	7057.6	253.8	1011.0	15.0
4	1	2	11	30.0	2.0	761.1	555.0	60.0	6683.6	209.8	819.0	14.0
4	2	2	11	30.0	2.0	5131.1	201.0	20.0	7200.0	66.7	366.0	5.0
4	3	2	11	30.0	2.0	723.8	601.0	60.0	7000.3	219.5	829.0	15.0
4	4	2	11	30.0	2.0	693.1	616.0	60.0	6997.5	268.6	784.0	15.0
4	5	2	11	30.0	2.0	985.4	408.0	60.0	7127.7	458.7	530.0	15.0
4	6	2	11	30.0	2.0	1188.9	445.0	57.0	7200.0	372.3	456.0	14.0
4	7	2	11	30.0	2.0	713.2	641.0	60.0	6744.9	222.5	727.0	14.0
4	8	2	11	30.0	2.0	1133.4	577.0	58.0	7200.0	266.8	541.0	15.0
4	9	2	11	30.0	2.0	1908.1	278.0	51.0	7200.0	267.7	365.0	13.0
4	10	2	11	30.0	2.0	1651.4	265.0	51.0	7200.0	677.0	266.0	13.0
4	11	2	11	30.0	2.0	1902.0	265.0	51.0	7200.0	563.0	327.0	12.0
4	12	2	11	30.0	2.0	1492.5	424.0	60.0	7182.1	354.7	564.0	14.0

SUBJECT 5

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date			FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
5	1	7	10	15.0	2.0	304.0	871.0	63.0	1800.1
5	2	7	10	15.0	2.0	348.7	1716.0	100.0	2808.3
5	3	7	10	15.0	2.0	1558.5	1802.0	100.0	3521.5
5	4	7	10	15.0	2.0	369.6	2018.0	100.0	3018.3
5	5	7	10	15.0	2.0	634.2	2203.0	100.0	2704.2
5	6	7	10	15.0	2.0	795.5	2263.0	100.0	2788.9
5	7	7	10	15.0	2.0	1033.5	2028.0	100.0	2888.0

EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date			FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	8	7	10	15.0	2.0	320.8	1080.0	60.0	2319.5	60.6	962.0	15.0
5	9	7	10	15.0	2.0	309.5	963.0	60.0	2217.3	39.8	845.0	14.0
5	10	7	10	15.0	2.0	273.2	1131.0	60.0	2288.0	64.3	905.0	15.0
5	11	7	10	15.0	2.0	281.1	1179.0	60.0	2401.7	44.6	851.0	15.0
5	12	7	10	15.0	2.0	531.6	1218.0	60.0	2536.8	72.6	976.0	15.0
5	13	7	10	15.0	2.0	206.8	1337.0	60.0	2281.4	66.4	958.0	15.0
5	14	7	10	15.0	2.0	225.5	1312.0	60.0	2237.2	70.9	997.0	15.0
5	15	7	10	15.0	2.0	271.4	1305.0	60.0	2244.2	83.9	966.0	15.0
5	16	7	10	15.0	2.0	235.2	1302.0	60.0	2233.1	75.3	999.0	15.0
5	17	7	10	15.0	2.0	284.9	1171.0	60.0	2245.1	79.9	895.0	15.0
5	18	7	10	15.0	2.0	343.8	1070.0	60.0	2244.7	95.7	861.0	15.0
5	19	7	10	15.0	2.0	245.7	1320.0	60.0	2192.7	76.8	864.0	14.0
5	20	7	10	15.0	2.0	305.3	1141.0	60.0	2228.0	111.5	869.0	15.0
5	21	7	10	15.0	2.0	461.3	1138.0	60.0	2770.4	71.8	883.0	15.0
5	22	7	10	15.0	2.0	251.6	1278.0	60.0	2231.5	63.7	836.0	15.0
5	23	7	10	15.0	2.0	211.5	1427.0	60.0	2233.0	74.1	942.0	15.0
5	24	7	10	15.0	2.0	249.5	1316.0	60.0	2237.8	82.2	904.0	15.0
5	25	7	10	15.0	2.0	306.9	1208.0	60.0	2230.5	72.4	1034.0	15.0
5	26	7	10	15.0	2.0	311.3	1210.0	60.0	2235.9	83.5	931.0	15.0
5	27	7	10	15.0	2.0	369.3	1079.0	60.0	2239.1	70.4	905.0	15.0
5	28	7	10	15.0	2.0	286.1	1305.0	60.0	2180.8	59.9	976.0	14.0
5	29	7	10	15.0	2.0	291.1	1283.0	60.0	2238.0	90.3	910.0	15.0
5	30	7	10	15.0	2.0	296.2	1308.0	60.0	2226.0	97.8	927.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	31 7 10	15.0	2.0	267.8	1399.0	60.0	2228.8	75.5	1034.0	15.0
5	1 8 10	15.0	2.0	278.7	1338.0	60.0	2234.8	46.8	1002.0	15.0
5	2 8 10	15.0	2.0	252.8	1366.0	60.0	2228.6	62.3	898.0	15.0
5	3 8 10	15.0	2.0	218.0	1501.0	60.0	2329.4	47.7	1019.0	15.0
5	4 8 10	15.0	2.0	249.0	1394.0	60.0	2177.0	79.6	825.0	14.0
5	5 8 10	15.0	2.0	489.1	1284.0	60.0	2413.3	81.4	868.0	15.0
5	6 8 10	15.0	2.0	322.7	1278.0	60.0	2240.0	88.9	896.0	15.0
5	7 8 10	15.0	2.0	303.1	1250.0	60.0	2240.3	100.2	831.0	15.0
5	8 8 10	15.0	2.0	300.3	1245.0	60.0	2223.7	87.4	880.0	15.0
5	9 8 10	15.0	2.0	257.1	1293.0	60.0	2237.6	111.7	747.0	15.0
5	10 8 10	15.0	2.0	328.2	1140.0	60.0	2254.3	85.4	712.0	15.0
5	11 8 10	15.0	2.0	363.3	1090.0	60.0	2225.3	101.4	829.0	15.0
5	12 8 10	15.0	2.0	261.4	1293.0	60.0	2229.7	71.0	944.0	15.0
5	13 8 10	15.0	2.0	206.4	1497.0	60.0	2541.1	37.5	887.0	15.0
5	14 8 10	15.0	2.0	315.9	1189.0	60.0	2257.9	108.5	698.0	15.0
5	15 8 10	15.0	2.0	212.0	1395.0	60.0	2253.3	59.4	769.0	15.0
5	16 8 10	15.0	2.0	285.3	1221.0	60.0	2224.9	80.5	713.0	15.0
5	17 8 10	15.0	2.0	270.9	1304.0	60.0	2261.3	74.6	713.0	15.0
5	18 8 10	15.0	2.0	279.1	1207.0	60.0	2301.5	70.5	704.0	15.0
5	19 8 10	60.0	3.0	494.9	1825.0	56.0	7200.0	89.9	1287.0	14.0
5	20 8 10	60.0	3.0	472.6	1820.0	57.0	7200.0	106.9	1189.0	14.0
5	21 8 10	60.0	3.0	405.7	2053.0	60.0	6910.7	124.1	1465.0	14.0
5	22 8 10	60.0	3.0	312.3	1714.0	53.0	7200.0	92.5	1212.0	13.0
5	23 8 10	60.0	3.0	369.7	1743.0	58.0	7200.0	116.6	1320.0	14.0
5	24 8 10	60.0	3.0	692.1	1543.0	58.0	7200.0	109.9	1249.0	14.0
5	25 8 10	60.0	3.0	350.7	2081.0	57.0	7200.0	106.5	1449.0	15.0
5	26 8 10	60.0	3.0	514.8	1778.0	58.0	7200.0	96.1	1407.0	15.0
5	27 8 10	60.0	3.0	398.5	2285.0	57.0	7200.0	119.2	1842.0	15.0
5	28 8 10	60.0	3.0	475.9	2241.0	59.0	7200.0	115.8	1673.0	15.0
5	29 8 10	60.0	3.0	419.0	2020.0	58.0	7200.0	118.2	1649.0	14.0
5	30 8 10	60.0	3.0	524.2	1651.0	56.0	7200.0	167.9	1502.0	15.0
5	31 8 10	60.0	3.0	427.5	2303.0	60.0	7075.0	107.9	1907.0	15.0
5	1 9 10	60.0	3.0	577.9	2127.0	59.0	7200.0	133.9	1740.0	14.0
5	2 9 10	60.0	3.0	463.7	2258.0	60.0	7046.0	120.7	1787.0	15.0
5	3 9 10	60.0	3.0	529.7	1677.0	58.0	7200.0	124.0	1591.0	14.0
5	4 9 10	60.0	3.0	522.0	1970.0	59.0	7200.0	218.1	1619.0	15.0
5	5 9 10	60.0	3.0	752.3	1626.0	59.0	7200.0	142.7	1435.0	15.0

Sub	Date			FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	6	9	10	60.0	3.0	468.0	2173.0	60.0	6901.0	128.0	1662.0	14.0
5	7	9	10	60.0	3.0	495.5	2063.0	60.0	7174.5	118.6	1768.0	15.0
5	8	9	10	60.0	3.0	510.9	2560.0	60.0	7176.1	177.7	2172.0	15.0
5	9	9	10	60.0	3.0	753.5	2420.0	60.0	6903.6	134.4	1952.0	14.0
5	10	9	10	60.0	3.0	853.8	2009.0	58.0	7200.0	296.5	1837.0	14.0
5	11	9	10	60.0	3.0	880.1	2172.0	60.0	6962.3	181.6	1761.0	14.0
5	12	9	10	60.0	3.0	1083.3	1597.0	59.0	7200.0	401.8	1322.0	14.0
5	13	9	10	60.0	3.0	1233.3	1678.0	57.0	7200.0	269.1	1706.0	15.0
5	14	9	10	60.0	3.0	1084.4	1670.0	58.0	7200.0	253.3	1604.0	15.0
5	15	9	10	60.0	3.0	1295.0	1776.0	60.0	7142.4	462.7	1505.0	15.0
5	16	9	10	60.0	3.0	685.6	2232.0	60.0	7108.7	323.1	1902.0	15.0
5	17	9	10	60.0	3.0	1330.3	1775.0	60.0	7045.6	247.1	1655.0	14.0
5	18	9	10	60.0	3.0	1585.3	1701.0	58.0	7200.0	360.4	1620.0	15.0
5	19	9	10	60.0	3.0	1347.9	1970.0	57.0	7200.0	349.3	2069.0	15.0
5	20	9	10	60.0	3.0	1313.3	1852.0	60.0	7141.5	439.0	1831.0	15.0
5	21	9	10	60.0	3.0	1061.7	2072.0	60.0	7144.5	430.6	1881.0	15.0
5	22	9	10	60.0	3.0	1120.6	1847.0	59.0	7200.0	257.5	1878.0	15.0
5	23	9	10	60.0	3.0	1444.5	1433.0	52.0	7200.0	414.1	1436.0	13.0
5	24	9	10	60.0	3.0	1347.4	1897.0	58.0	7200.0	577.4	1702.0	14.0
5	25	9	10	60.0	3.0	1619.1	1393.0	55.0	7200.0	363.3	1558.0	14.0
5	26	9	10	60.0	3.0	1759.9	1425.0	60.0	7175.9	359.9	1261.0	14.0
5	27	9	10	60.0	3.0	1427.0	1661.0	59.0	7200.0	411.4	1771.0	15.0
5	28	9	10	60.0	3.0	1518.6	1767.0	60.0	7122.8	432.9	1691.0	15.0
5	29	9	10	60.0	3.0	1295.9	1596.0	60.0	7182.3	440.5	1818.0	15.0
5	30	9	10	60.0	3.0	1481.0	1840.0	59.0	7200.0	389.3	1795.0	15.0
5	1	10	10	60.0	3.0	1412.4	1673.0	60.0	7156.2	370.8	1751.0	15.0
5	2	10	10	60.0	3.0	1415.5	1864.0	60.0	7111.3	519.2	1774.0	15.0
5	3	10	10	60.0	3.0	1094.1	2119.0	60.0	6876.4	302.6	1874.0	14.0
5	4	10	10	60.0	3.0	1477.0	1876.0	60.0	7141.4	369.7	1984.0	15.0
5	5	10	10	60.0	3.0	979.2	1467.0	43.0	7200.0	250.9	1378.0	10.0
5	6	10	10	60.0	3.0	1446.8	2019.0	60.0	6806.2	364.9	1926.0	14.0
5	7	10	10	60.0	3.0	1413.2	1897.0	60.0	6867.7	487.8	1839.0	14.0
5	8	10	10	60.0	3.0	3412.4	1026.0	38.0	7200.0	308.5	1109.0	10.0
5	9	10	10	60.0	3.0	1460.2	1799.0	60.0	7098.9	435.6	1973.0	15.0
5	10	10	10	60.0	3.0	1572.8	1802.0	60.0	7059.5	397.0	1832.0	14.0
5	11	10	10	30.0	1.0	439.6	1771.0	60.0	3819.5	106.0	1273.0	14.0
5	12	10	10	30.0	1.0	464.5	1816.0	60.0	3880.8	128.1	1450.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	13 10 10	30.0	1.0	348.5	2221.0	60.0	3839.6	103.0	1669.0	15.0
5	14 10 10	30.0	1.0	430.0	2172.0	60.0	3830.2	104.0	1743.0	15.0
5	15 10 10	30.0	1.0	395.7	1826.0	60.0	3748.5	87.0	1285.0	14.0
5	16 10 10	30.0	1.0	572.0	1626.0	60.0	3857.8	123.1	1169.0	15.0
5	17 10 10	30.0	1.0	361.3	1870.0	60.0	3878.5	177.1	1168.0	15.0
5	18 10 10	30.0	1.0	573.8	1772.0	60.0	3861.1	116.1	1481.0	15.0
5	19 10 10	30.0	1.0	632.0	1716.0	60.0	3968.6	454.0	1163.0	15.0
5	20 10 10	30.0	1.0	787.4	1494.0	60.0	3769.0	149.6	1217.0	14.0
5	21 10 10	30.0	1.0	772.4	1710.0	60.0	3758.0	204.0	1310.0	14.0
5	22 10 10	30.0	1.0	927.4	1655.0	60.0	4009.6	132.6	1460.0	15.0
5	23 10 10	30.0	1.0	1557.4	1140.0	60.0	4812.7	261.8	1146.0	15.0
5	24 10 10	30.0	1.0	778.9	1627.0	60.0	4745.4	257.3	1133.0	15.0
5	25 10 10	30.0	1.0	884.0	1536.0	60.0	3954.4	260.1	1056.0	14.0
5	26 10 10	30.0	1.0	833.3	1871.0	60.0	3966.2	273.6	1261.0	15.0
5	27 10 10	30.0	1.0	985.8	1502.0	60.0	4082.9	194.7	1250.0	15.0
5	28 10 10	30.0	1.0	2122.0	1329.0	60.0	5345.0	379.2	900.0	15.0
5	29 10 10	30.0	1.0	3184.5	745.0	60.0	6874.5	615.3	680.0	15.0
5	30 10 10	30.0	1.0	1131.7	1248.0	60.0	4308.5	223.6	1037.0	15.0
5	31 10 10	30.0	1.0	1015.7	1151.0	60.0	4157.4	253.2	983.0	15.0
5	1 11 10	30.0	1.0	1279.5	860.0	60.0	4241.1	348.8	974.0	15.0
5	2 11 10	30.0	1.0	1696.3	602.0	60.0	4845.3	408.1	713.0	15.0
5	3 11 10	30.0	1.0	1033.2	1085.0	60.0	4367.3	304.5	858.0	15.0
5	4 11 10	30.0	1.0	1309.5	1124.0	60.0	4267.7	285.6	1105.0	15.0
5	5 11 10	30.0	1.0	1322.2	872.0	60.0	4734.0	361.1	984.0	15.0
5	6 11 10	30.0	1.0	1300.7	1058.0	60.0	4361.2	274.1	1066.0	15.0
5	7 11 10	30.0	1.0	1119.7	1113.0	60.0	4093.2	468.5	756.0	15.0
5	8 11 10	30.0	1.0	949.0	1284.0	60.0	4010.9	218.8	1080.0	15.0
5	9 11 10	30.0	1.0	1039.5	1125.0	60.0	4091.4	421.2	865.0	15.0
5	10 11 10	30.0	1.0	1087.5	1086.0	60.0	4095.5	333.8	934.0	15.0
5	11 11 10	30.0	1.0	848.7	1703.0	60.0	4121.3	254.8	1125.0	15.0
5	12 11 10	30.0	1.0	1015.3	1489.0	60.0	4093.2	331.2	911.0	14.0
5	13 11 10	30.0	1.0	1021.0	1418.0	60.0	4023.4	361.4	1053.0	15.0
5	14 11 10	30.0	1.0	945.6	1818.0	60.0	4013.7	283.4	1240.0	15.0
5	15 11 10	30.0	1.0	911.8	1639.0	60.0	3934.5	262.2	1052.0	15.0
5	16 11 10	30.0	1.0	950.6	1561.0	60.0	4043.6	280.8	1111.0	15.0
5	17 11 10	30.0	1.0	1172.9	1324.0	60.0	4263.4	262.9	988.0	15.0
5	18 11 10	30.0	1.0	922.4	1552.0	60.0	4135.3	316.8	1051.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	19 11 10	30.0	1.0	927.7	1533.0	60.0	4326.5	303.7	978.0	15.0
5	20 11 10	30.0	1.0	1100.3	1175.0	60.0	3931.7	219.6	992.0	14.0
5	21 11 10	30.0	1.0	835.8	1648.0	60.0	4017.3	321.2	1094.0	15.0
5	22 11 10	30.0	1.0	1293.3	1380.0	60.0	4262.9	303.1	1100.0	15.0
5	23 11 10	30.0	1.0	918.6	1549.0	60.0	4019.8	277.5	1059.0	15.0
5	24 11 10	30.0	1.0	963.0	1540.0	60.0	4091.4	237.8	932.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	25 11 10	20.0	2.0	1076.3	1773.0	100.0	3127.2			
5	26 11 10	20.0	2.0	4204.1	1164.0	100.0	5977.8			
5	27 11 10	20.0	2.0	4952.5	259.0	45.0	7200.0			
5	28 11 10	20.0	2.0	5778.4	923.0	87.0	7200.0			
5	29 11 10	20.0	2.0	6254.5	493.0	62.0	7200.0			
5	30 11 10	20.0	2.0	172.4	3.0	3.0	7200.0	74.9	2.0	0.0
5	1 12 10	20.0	2.0	7194.0	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FI TRAINING – EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	2 12 10	30.0	2.0	6753.4	122.0	18.0	7200.0			
5	3 12 10	30.0	2.0	6544.7	375.0	29.0	7200.0			
5	4 12 10	30.0	2.0	5057.6	639.0	64.0	7200.0			
5	5 12 10	30.0	2.0	6310.6	458.0	37.0	7200.0			
5	6 12 10	30.0	2.0	6199.3	685.0	51.0	7200.0			
5	7 12 10	30.0	2.0	3000.4	1135.0	93.0	7200.0			
5	8 12 10	30.0	2.0	6295.9	442.0	56.0	7200.0			
5	9 12 10	30.0	2.0	6327.2	526.0	47.0	7200.0			
5	10 12 10	30.0	2.0	6704.8	263.0	30.0	7200.0			
5	11 12 10	30.0	2.0	6201.1	490.0	59.0	7200.0			

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	12 12 10	30.0	2.0	1255.3	731.0	60.0	3875.4	266.3	614.0	14.0
5	13 12 10	30.0	2.0	4582.4	1007.0	54.0	7200.0	390.8	612.0	14.0
5	14 12 10	30.0	2.0	1227.0	939.0	60.0	3993.6	273.6	685.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	15 12 10	30.0	2.0	1320.7	753.0	60.0	4046.7	409.7	540.0	15.0
5	16 12 10	30.0	2.0	1070.3	1292.0	60.0	3981.8	339.4	843.0	15.0
5	17 12 10	30.0	2.0	1150.4	1129.0	60.0	4131.1	275.3	884.0	15.0
5	18 12 10	30.0	2.0	3808.2	660.0	60.0	6487.3	609.8	456.0	15.0
5	19 12 10	30.0	2.0	1129.8	851.0	56.0	7200.0	304.3	644.0	14.0
5	20 12 10	30.0	2.0	4646.1	356.0	41.0	7200.0	384.9	346.0	11.0
5	21 12 10	30.0	2.0	1122.7	541.0	40.0	7200.0	268.7	508.0	11.0
5	22 12 10	30.0	2.0	4225.9	318.0	34.0	7200.0	1848.1	288.0	9.0
5	23 12 10	30.0	2.0	5907.0	298.0	30.0	7200.0	141.1	206.0	7.0
5	24 12 10	30.0	2.0	2127.3	270.0	36.0	7200.0	205.1	268.0	9.0
5	25 12 10	30.0	2.0	5180.6	796.0	40.0	7200.0	419.0	315.0	9.0

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	3 1 11	30.0	2.0	6941.7	51.0	11.0	7200.0			
5	4 1 11	30.0	2.0	3471.8	1033.0	55.0	7200.0			
5	5 1 11	30.0	2.0	3010.0	907.0	70.0	7200.0			
5	6 1 11	30.0	2.0	5588.6	713.0	52.0	7200.0			
5	7 1 11	30.0	2.0	6311.7	518.0	62.0	7200.0			
5	8 1 11	30.0	2.0	6276.7	552.0	62.0	7200.0			
5	9 1 11	30.0	2.0	6158.5	571.0	61.0	7200.0			
5	10 1 11	30.0	2.0	5728.6	1068.0	83.0	7200.0			
5	11 1 11	30.0	2.0	5652.7	1245.0	94.0	7200.0			
5	12 1 11	30.0	2.0	6122.2	847.0	69.0	7200.0			
5	13 1 11	30.0	2.0	5403.1	1734.0	91.0	7200.0			
5	14 1 11	30.0	2.0	6077.1	874.0	71.0	7200.0			
5	15 1 11	30.0	2.0	6267.9	833.0	54.0	7200.0			

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	16 1 11	30.0	2.0	2578.9	337.0	32.0	7200.0	2146.2	912.0	8.0
5	17 1 11	30.0	2.0	3281.5	409.0	42.0	7200.0	206.9	1287.0	10.0
5	18 1 11	30.0	2.0	3699.1	522.0	33.0	7200.0	154.2	786.0	9.0
5	19 1 11	30.0	2.0	3545.5	424.0	36.0	7200.0	245.4	701.0	9.0
5	20 1 11	30.0	2.0	3098.2	275.0	36.0	7200.0	240.8	605.0	9.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
5	21 1 11	30.0	2.0	2085.6	774.0	50.0	7200.0	289.7	1342.0	13.0
5	22 1 11	30.0	2.0	2218.8	643.0	52.0	7200.0	317.0	708.0	12.0
5	23 1 11	30.0	2.0	3142.2	561.0	38.0	7200.0	182.9	932.0	10.0
5	24 1 11	30.0	2.0	3294.0	674.0	36.0	7200.0	173.1	1008.0	9.0
5	25 1 11	30.0	2.0	2895.6	903.0	41.0	7200.0	202.6	1193.0	11.0
5	26 1 11	30.0	2.0	2707.5	968.0	44.0	7200.0	207.8	1459.0	11.0
5	27 1 11	30.0	2.0	2370.0	1017.0	47.0	7200.0	240.7	1653.0	12.0
5	28 1 11	30.0	2.0	3279.8	719.0	39.0	7200.0	183.6	793.0	10.0
5	29 1 11	30.0	2.0	2036.0	1055.0	49.0	7200.0	239.8	1533.0	13.0
5	30 1 11	30.0	2.0	2927.8	237.0	37.0	7200.0	225.7	547.0	9.0
5	31 1 11	30.0	2.0	1832.1	89.0	24.0	7200.0	3619.0	78.0	5.0
5	1 2 11	30.0	2.0	2155.9	778.0	52.0	7200.0	310.0	878.0	13.0
5	2 2 11	30.0	2.0	3028.4	458.0	40.0	7200.0	291.9	1042.0	10.0
5	3 2 11	30.0	2.0	2693.6	557.0	32.0	7200.0	1521.0	522.0	9.0
5	4 2 11	30.0	2.0	2616.8	744.0	45.0	7200.0	297.0	1641.0	11.0
5	5 2 11	30.0	2.0	2363.4	969.0	47.0	7200.0	245.1	1269.0	12.0
5	6 2 11	30.0	2.0	2695.1	634.0	45.0	7200.0	254.1	1239.0	11.0
5	7 2 11	30.0	2.0	1698.5	1060.0	55.0	7200.0	253.6	1933.0	13.0
5	8 2 11	30.0	2.0	2947.4	697.0	41.0	7200.0	205.2	1526.0	11.0
5	9 2 11	30.0	2.0	1762.7	864.0	53.0	7200.0	300.7	1475.0	14.0
5	10 2 11	30.0	2.0	1784.4	740.0	53.0	7200.0	392.9	1849.0	14.0
5	11 2 11	30.0	2.0	1009.5	952.0	60.0	7093.4	275.8	1937.0	15.0
5	12 2 11	30.0	2.0	2907.9	409.0	44.0	7200.0	248.1	516.0	11.0

SUBJECT 6

FI TRAINING - EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT
6	1 7 10	15.0	2.0	105.4	830.0	72.0	1800.1
6	2 7 10	15.0	2.0	193.1	1453.0	100.0	2449.2
6	3 7 10	15.0	2.0	336.6	1373.0	100.0	2450.2
6	4 7 10	15.0	2.0	363.1	1275.0	100.0	2440.2
6	5 7 10	15.0	2.0	535.5	1185.0	100.0	2484.1
6	6 7 10	15.0	2.0	458.0	1123.0	100.0	2450.9
6	7 7 10	15.0	2.0	375.2	1349.0	100.0	2435.7
6	8 7 10	30.0	1.0	937.1	2102.0	100.0	4175.9
6	9 7 10	30.0	1.0	1928.0	2093.0	100.0	4704.9
6	10 7 10	30.0	1.0	1334.1	2178.0	100.0	3949.3
6	11 7 10	30.0	1.0	1746.9	1678.0	100.0	4075.3
6	12 7 10	30.0	1.0	1730.6	2202.0	100.0	4347.2
6	13 7 10	30.0	1.0	2303.6	1647.0	100.0	4659.4
6	14 7 10	60.0	3.0	2391.7	2686.0	91.0	7200.0
6	15 7 10	60.0	3.0	2415.6	2888.0	99.0	7200.0
6	16 7 10	60.0	3.0	3131.4	3281.0	100.0	7116.4
6	17 7 10	60.0	3.0	3154.9	3478.0	100.0	7126.8
6	18 7 10	60.0	3.0	3660.3	2885.0	100.0	7102.4
6	19 7 10	60.0	3.0	3517.1	3008.0	100.0	7079.4
6	20 7 10	60.0	3.0	3467.4	3018.0	100.0	7031.2

EXPERIMENT 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	21 7 10	60.0	3.0	2279.9	1034.0	56.0	7200.0	414.7	1466.0	13.0
6	22 7 10	60.0	3.0	1215.4	1700.0	59.0	7200.0	381.8	1601.0	14.0
6	23 7 10	60.0	3.0	1002.1	2024.0	59.0	7200.0	284.6	1780.0	15.0
6	24 7 10	60.0	3.0	1084.5	1778.0	56.0	7200.0	330.2	1632.0	14.0
6	25 7 10	60.0	3.0	1603.2	1849.0	60.0	7109.7	383.9	1571.0	15.0
6	26 7 10	60.0	3.0	2045.8	1613.0	60.0	7057.7	475.2	1670.0	15.0
6	27 7 10	60.0	3.0	1701.9	1798.0	59.0	7200.0	452.9	1370.0	14.0
6	28 7 10	60.0	3.0	1888.4	1517.0	57.0	7200.0	368.3	1424.0	14.0
6	29 7 10	60.0	3.0	2000.4	1915.0	58.0	7200.0	407.4	1555.0	14.0
6	30 7 10	60.0	3.0	2381.1	1209.0	44.0	7200.0	1403.4	908.0	12.0

Sub	Date			FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	31	7	10	60.0	3.0	625.9	641.0	21.0	7200.0	180.6	592.0	6.0
6	1	8	10	60.0	3.0	1803.6	1867.0	57.0	7200.0	436.5	1454.0	15.0
6	2	8	10	60.0	3.0	1616.7	2035.0	56.0	7200.0	344.8	1403.0	14.0
6	3	8	10	60.0	3.0	1391.7	2019.0	51.0	7200.0	431.8	1348.0	13.0
6	4	8	10	60.0	3.0	1562.5	1747.0	58.0	7200.0	442.4	1246.0	14.0
6	5	8	10	60.0	3.0	1730.3	1936.0	59.0	7200.0	447.5	1541.0	14.0
6	6	8	10	60.0	3.0	1793.5	1625.0	58.0	7200.0	481.4	1345.0	14.0
6	7	8	10	60.0	3.0	1679.5	418.0	32.0	7200.0	2959.2	412.0	8.0
6	8	8	10	60.0	3.0	3113.5	1468.0	41.0	7200.0	305.2	1212.0	10.0
6	9	8	10	60.0	3.0	1618.2	1952.0	57.0	7200.0	376.6	2493.0	15.0
6	10	8	10	60.0	3.0	1728.2	2079.0	60.0	6924.1	432.2	1900.0	14.0
6	11	8	10	60.0	3.0	1892.5	1747.0	57.0	7200.0	550.3	1583.0	14.0
6	12	8	10	60.0	3.0	1854.5	2059.0	59.0	7200.0	491.4	1910.0	15.0
6	13	8	10	60.0	3.0	1901.8	2145.0	60.0	7166.7	459.2	1763.0	15.0
6	14	8	10	60.0	3.0	1427.3	2509.0	60.0	6997.7	447.4	2664.0	15.0
6	15	8	10	60.0	3.0	1662.8	2289.0	60.0	6964.4	451.7	1880.0	14.0
6	16	8	10	60.0	3.0	1810.8	1994.0	60.0	6981.4	353.3	1752.0	14.0
6	17	8	10	60.0	3.0	1512.6	2006.0	60.0	6810.9	455.5	1807.0	14.0
6	18	8	10	60.0	3.0	1840.9	1771.0	60.0	7000.1	389.8	1529.0	14.0
6	19	8	10	30.0	1.0	575.3	1383.0	60.0	3850.9	154.3	1448.0	15.0
6	20	8	10	30.0	1.0	636.9	1204.0	60.0	3841.2	130.4	1263.0	15.0
6	21	8	10	30.0	1.0	787.2	1219.0	60.0	3841.1	190.7	1228.0	15.0
6	22	8	10	30.0	1.0	745.9	1306.0	60.0	3842.9	236.9	1267.0	15.0
6	23	8	10	30.0	1.0	740.7	1378.0	60.0	3839.1	237.4	1299.0	15.0
6	24	8	10	30.0	1.0	893.2	1164.0	60.0	3872.0	194.5	1239.0	15.0
6	25	8	10	30.0	1.0	842.5	1376.0	60.0	3828.2	238.5	1375.0	15.0
6	26	8	10	30.0	1.0	950.3	1234.0	60.0	3815.3	286.7	1258.0	15.0
6	27	8	10	30.0	1.0	924.3	1225.0	60.0	3811.0	278.5	1275.0	15.0
6	28	8	10	30.0	1.0	794.1	1379.0	60.0	3817.8	217.5	1319.0	15.0
6	29	8	10	30.0	1.0	770.8	1318.0	60.0	3833.5	244.1	1209.0	15.0
6	30	8	10	30.0	1.0	807.6	1338.0	60.0	3814.2	230.7	1192.0	15.0
6	31	8	10	30.0	1.0	727.3	1283.0	60.0	3827.8	220.2	1083.0	15.0
6	1	9	10	30.0	1.0	805.7	1367.0	60.0	3717.6	219.6	998.0	14.0
6	2	9	10	30.0	1.0	770.7	1370.0	60.0	3826.0	253.5	950.0	15.0
6	3	9	10	30.0	1.0	696.3	1372.0	60.0	3985.4	272.4	758.0	15.0
6	4	9	10	30.0	1.0	548.5	1541.0	60.0	3832.5	218.2	885.0	15.0
6	5	9	10	30.0	1.0	612.0	1614.0	60.0	3846.9	178.9	1011.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	6 9 10	30.0	1.0	685.0	1466.0	60.0	3905.7	185.2	1100.0	15.0
6	7 9 10	30.0	1.0	635.2	1627.0	60.0	3971.5	198.9	1136.0	15.0
6	8 9 10	30.0	1.0	684.8	1549.0	60.0	3819.0	224.2	978.0	15.0
6	9 9 10	30.0	1.0	738.0	1537.0	60.0	3898.2	207.0	1053.0	15.0
6	10 9 10	30.0	1.0	819.1	1527.0	60.0	3785.5	186.2	844.0	14.0
6	11 9 10	30.0	1.0	1356.0	382.0	60.0	4681.0	266.2	238.0	14.0
6	12 9 10	30.0	1.0	581.6	1628.0	60.0	3845.1	136.3	1348.0	15.0
6	13 9 10	30.0	1.0	7193.9	0.0	0.0	7200.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
6	14 9 10	30.0	1.0	559.1	1839.0	60.0	3888.0	178.2	1273.0	15.0
6	15 9 10	30.0	1.0	528.3	1596.0	60.0	3889.7	110.3	1047.0	15.0
6	16 9 10	30.0	1.0	604.9	1769.0	60.0	3933.9	181.8	1056.0	15.0
6	17 9 10	30.0	1.0	718.5	1621.0	60.0	4025.2	200.4	949.0	15.0
6	18 9 10	30.0	1.0	630.4	1680.0	60.0	3943.2	156.8	945.0	15.0
6	19 9 10	30.0	1.0	649.5	1710.0	60.0	4071.9	163.0	875.0	15.0
6	20 9 10	30.0	1.0	412.4	1884.0	60.0	4021.6	213.8	954.0	15.0
6	21 9 10	30.0	1.0	791.8	1745.0	60.0	4002.4	180.8	997.0	15.0
6	22 9 10	30.0	1.0	621.8	1708.0	60.0	3887.0	161.0	947.0	15.0
6	23 9 10	30.0	1.0	594.6	1655.0	60.0	3942.5	210.5	1053.0	15.0
6	24 9 10	30.0	1.0	463.3	1954.0	60.0	3825.7	163.5	1178.0	15.0
6	25 9 10	30.0	1.0	642.5	1627.0	60.0	3907.5	251.3	806.0	15.0
6	26 9 10	30.0	1.0	723.9	1497.0	60.0	3926.0	170.5	792.0	15.0
6	27 9 10	30.0	1.0	692.6	1433.0	60.0	3869.0	227.2	881.0	15.0
6	28 9 10	30.0	1.0	500.0	1902.0	60.0	3836.1	115.3	1143.0	15.0
6	29 9 10	30.0	1.0	703.5	1584.0	60.0	3879.6	234.8	1081.0	15.0
6	30 9 10	30.0	1.0	702.3	1514.0	60.0	3958.4	304.1	776.0	15.0
6	1 10 10	30.0	1.0	816.4	1454.0	60.0	4078.5	273.9	773.0	15.0
6	2 10 10	30.0	1.0	692.9	1655.0	60.0	3944.8	195.8	868.0	15.0
6	3 10 10	30.0	1.0	824.2	1326.0	60.0	3960.8	198.6	782.0	15.0
6	4 10 10	30.0	1.0	662.3	1621.0	60.0	3850.6	165.4	924.0	15.0
6	5 10 10	30.0	1.0	712.4	1552.0	60.0	3889.8	210.3	795.0	14.0
6	6 10 10	30.0	1.0	844.7	1391.0	60.0	3962.8	177.5	958.0	15.0
6	7 10 10	30.0	1.0	659.9	1573.0	60.0	3778.0	207.4	824.0	14.0
6	8 10 10	30.0	1.0	4101.4	1244.0	59.0	7200.0	238.8	815.0	15.0
6	9 10 10	30.0	1.0	691.7	1487.0	60.0	3922.4	236.4	807.0	15.0
6	10 10 10	30.0	1.0	686.7	1569.0	60.0	3883.0	207.2	730.0	15.0
6	11 10 10	15.0	2.0	462.8	452.0	60.0	2294.6	128.9	540.0	15.0
6	12 10 10	15.0	2.0	290.3	638.0	60.0	2253.7	109.3	628.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	13 10 10	15.0	2.0	428.9	574.0	60.0	2258.4	104.2	488.0	15.0
6	14 10 10	15.0	2.0	425.2	625.0	60.0	2391.5	108.5	413.0	15.0
6	15 10 10	15.0	2.0	403.5	717.0	60.0	2270.5	129.5	537.0	15.0
6	16 10 10	15.0	2.0	398.9	702.0	60.0	2332.9	110.7	405.0	14.0
6	17 10 10	15.0	2.0	323.6	916.0	60.0	2460.9	87.5	538.0	15.0
6	18 10 10	15.0	2.0	250.6	959.0	60.0	2213.7	85.7	478.0	14.0
6	19 10 10	15.0	2.0	267.7	831.0	60.0	2306.5	96.7	490.0	15.0
6	20 10 10	15.0	2.0	1872.9	835.0	60.0	3821.4	114.3	433.0	15.0
6	21 10 10	15.0	2.0	298.5	852.0	60.0	2256.5	136.1	408.0	15.0
6	22 10 10	15.0	2.0	314.3	805.0	60.0	2269.4	97.5	476.0	15.0
6	23 10 10	15.0	2.0	403.7	784.0	60.0	2718.1	95.9	472.0	15.0
6	24 10 10	15.0	2.0	297.4	819.0	60.0	3109.5	100.9	453.0	15.0
6	25 10 10	15.0	2.0	317.5	799.0	60.0	2285.4	95.7	408.0	15.0
6	26 10 10	15.0	2.0	475.4	738.0	60.0	2379.9	126.1	432.0	15.0
6	27 10 10	15.0	2.0	323.1	869.0	60.0	2219.2	98.5	377.0	14.0
6	28 10 10	15.0	2.0	304.9	911.0	60.0	2283.2	107.5	474.0	15.0
6	29 10 10	15.0	2.0	362.8	771.0	60.0	2309.8	94.2	436.0	15.0
6	30 10 10	15.0	2.0	269.1	933.0	60.0	2256.2	106.3	408.0	15.0
6	31 10 10	15.0	2.0	327.0	804.0	60.0	2213.2	69.8	404.0	14.0
6	1 11 10	15.0	2.0	271.0	911.0	60.0	2190.6	87.6	418.0	14.0
6	2 11 10	15.0	2.0	272.3	913.0	60.0	2762.2	593.5	464.0	15.0
6	3 11 10	15.0	2.0	258.1	859.0	60.0	2281.8	96.3	479.0	15.0
6	4 11 10	15.0	2.0	1644.8	745.0	60.0	3595.0	106.2	401.0	15.0
6	5 11 10	15.0	2.0	387.2	682.0	60.0	2557.1	97.5	375.0	14.0
6	6 11 10	15.0	2.0	283.7	813.0	60.0	2209.7	67.9	422.0	14.0
6	7 11 10	15.0	2.0	244.5	954.0	60.0	2246.5	111.5	408.0	14.0
6	8 11 10	15.0	2.0	282.4	864.0	60.0	2249.3	118.1	403.0	15.0
6	9 11 10	15.0	2.0	268.3	814.0	60.0	2261.5	132.0	325.0	15.0
6	10 11 10	15.0	2.0	283.2	791.0	60.0	2262.3	85.8	411.0	15.0
6	11 11 10	15.0	2.0	237.9	776.0	60.0	2259.8	89.5	386.0	15.0
6	12 11 10	15.0	2.0	255.3	817.0	60.0	2255.8	114.2	339.0	15.0
6	13 11 10	15.0	2.0	172.7	911.0	60.0	2258.6	94.9	376.0	15.0
6	14 11 10	15.0	2.0	305.9	750.0	60.0	2254.2	84.1	420.0	15.0
6	15 11 10	15.0	2.0	272.8	791.0	60.0	2250.4	141.6	351.0	15.0
6	16 11 10	15.0	2.0	456.3	635.0	60.0	2290.4	96.1	389.0	15.0
6	17 11 10	15.0	2.0	320.9	745.0	60.0	2241.7	96.7	307.0	14.0
6	18 11 10	15.0	2.0	273.8	816.0	60.0	2263.0	82.8	395.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	19 11 10	15.0	2.0	316.7	779.0	60.0	2274.4	112.0	325.0	15.0
6	20 11 10	15.0	2.0	280.3	793.0	60.0	2300.5	77.0	383.0	15.0
6	21 11 10	15.0	2.0	247.2	840.0	60.0	2268.8	114.4	407.0	15.0
6	22 11 10	15.0	2.0	298.7	773.0	60.0	2276.9	61.9	422.0	15.0
6	23 11 10	15.0	2.0	248.5	744.0	60.0	2292.5	83.7	411.0	15.0
6	24 11 10	15.0	2.0	1460.7	663.0	60.0	3527.7	105.8	329.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	25 11 10	20.0	2.0	969.6	1301.0	100.0	2964.5			
6	26 11 10	20.0	2.0	825.1	1538.0	100.0	3032.6			
6	27 11 10	20.0	2.0	990.8	1313.0	100.0	2938.1			
6	28 11 10	20.0	2.0	957.1	1437.0	100.0	2940.7			
6	29 11 10	20.0	2.0	916.5	1464.0	100.0	2929.7			
6	30 11 10	20.0	2.0	388.1	1049.0	60.0	5213.1	136.8	1985.0	15.0
6	1 12 10	20.0	2.0	506.1	868.0	60.0	5073.0	190.9	1130.0	15.0

FI TRAINING – EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	2 12 10	30.0	2.0	998.8	2509.0	100.0	4078.7			
6	3 12 10	30.0	2.0	1087.2	2444.0	100.0	3927.6			
6	4 12 10	30.0	2.0	1140.9	2456.0	100.0	3929.1			
6	5 12 10	30.0	2.0	1355.9	2223.0	100.0	3931.0			
6	6 12 10	30.0	2.0	1441.2	2018.0	100.0	3931.9			
6	7 12 10	30.0	2.0	1345.7	2139.0	100.0	3932.3			
6	8 12 10	30.0	2.0	1425.1	2253.0	100.0	3947.6			
6	9 12 10	30.0	2.0	1336.6	2313.0	100.0	3932.8			
6	10 12 10	30.0	2.0	1495.7	2016.0	100.0	3938.6			
6	11 12 10	30.0	2.0	1451.0	2145.0	100.0	3930.5			

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 1

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	12 12 10	30.0	2.0	675.7	1491.0	60.0	3799.7	190.0	1031.0	15.0
6	13 12 10	30.0	2.0	726.4	1440.0	60.0	3810.1	202.6	931.0	15.0
6	14 12 10	30.0	2.0	787.5	1337.0	60.0	3817.0	236.4	816.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	15 12 10	30.0	2.0	614.8	1648.0	60.0	3797.3	224.6	909.0	15.0
6	16 12 10	30.0	2.0	691.8	1614.0	60.0	3800.7	211.3	852.0	15.0
6	17 12 10	30.0	2.0	698.5	1524.0	60.0	3802.7	185.6	931.0	15.0
6	18 12 10	30.0	2.0	711.3	1436.0	60.0	3813.6	224.8	885.0	15.0
6	19 12 10	30.0	2.0	658.4	1563.0	60.0	3797.1	226.5	739.0	15.0
6	20 12 10	30.0	2.0	838.6	1437.0	60.0	3968.0	161.0	692.0	15.0
6	21 12 10	30.0	2.0	618.6	1581.0	60.0	3804.5	184.2	768.0	15.0
6	22 12 10	30.0	2.0	576.7	1588.0	60.0	3709.2	175.2	658.0	14.0
6	23 12 10	30.0	2.0	540.0	1668.0	60.0	3802.7	205.3	654.0	15.0
6	24 12 10	30.0	2.0	670.3	1519.0	60.0	3702.9	178.8	729.0	14.0
6	25 12 10	30.0	2.0	593.4	1598.0	60.0	3805.8	217.5	683.0	15.0

FI TRAINING – EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	3 1 11	30.0	2.0	1521.8	1789.0	100.0	3945.9			
6	4 1 11	30.0	2.0	1710.7	1772.0	100.0	3940.8			
6	5 1 11	30.0	2.0	1683.6	1856.0	100.0	4036.6			
6	6 1 11	30.0	2.0	1695.1	1433.0	100.0	3998.4			
6	7 1 11	30.0	2.0	2113.3	1464.0	100.0	4137.7			
6	8 1 11	30.0	2.0	1586.1	1964.0	100.0	3936.8			
6	9 1 11	30.0	2.0	1480.9	2111.0	100.0	3945.5			
6	10 1 11	30.0	2.0	1666.0	1801.0	100.0	3941.4			
6	11 1 11	30.0	2.0	1756.7	1820.0	100.0	3928.8			
6	12 1 11	30.0	2.0	1719.4	1827.0	100.0	3929.5			
6	13 1 11	30.0	2.0	1671.8	1880.0	100.0	3959.5			
6	14 1 11	30.0	2.0	1586.4	1975.0	100.0	3937.0			
6	15 1 11	30.0	2.0	1556.0	2081.0	100.0	3943.3			

EXPERIMENT 2, CONDITION 2

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	16 1 11	30.0	2.0	1162.8	1028.0	59.0	7200.0	240.3	1772.0	15.0
6	17 1 11	30.0	2.0	980.1	1168.0	60.0	7111.7	272.6	1155.0	15.0
6	18 1 11	30.0	2.0	874.0	1179.0	60.0	7030.8	276.1	1342.0	15.0
6	19 1 11	30.0	2.0	1198.8	1059.0	58.0	7200.0	249.9	1272.0	14.0
6	20 1 11	30.0	2.0	1173.5	800.0	60.0	7166.9	247.0	1621.0	15.0

Sub	Date	FI	Lever	PRP	Rsp	Rfts	TT	PPRP	Rsps	PI
6	21 1 11	30.0	2.0	1057.6	965.0	60.0	7085.3	252.6	1785.0	15.0
6	22 1 11	30.0	2.0	1125.1	980.0	60.0	7025.7	278.2	1862.0	15.0
6	23 1 11	30.0	2.0	1111.3	1211.0	59.0	7200.0	298.9	2506.0	15.0
6	24 1 11	30.0	2.0	956.3	1141.0	60.0	7148.6	259.1	1904.0	15.0
6	25 1 11	30.0	2.0	1528.2	880.0	52.0	7200.0	229.3	1298.0	14.0
6	26 1 11	30.0	2.0	1056.2	952.0	60.0	7093.5	305.2	2032.0	15.0
6	27 1 11	30.0	2.0	1118.1	1060.0	60.0	7180.1	236.9	1877.0	15.0
6	28 1 11	30.0	2.0	862.0	1240.0	60.0	7007.8	243.0	1864.0	15.0
6	29 1 11	30.0	2.0	721.0	1258.0	60.0	6722.9	199.8	1091.0	14.0
6	30 1 11	30.0	2.0	924.8	1275.0	60.0	7135.7	259.2	1439.0	15.0
6	31 1 11	30.0	2.0	774.5	1234.0	60.0	6968.6	240.5	1499.0	15.0
6	1 2 11	30.0	2.0	1033.8	1072.0	60.0	6840.0	238.5	1358.0	14.0
6	2 2 11	30.0	2.0	4367.2	487.0	26.0	7200.0	145.3	642.0	7.0
6	3 2 11	30.0	2.0	1039.8	1115.0	60.0	7145.2	213.4	1320.0	15.0
6	4 2 11	30.0	2.0	952.1	992.0	60.0	6663.0	296.5	1527.0	14.0
6	5 2 11	30.0	2.0	1002.5	1024.0	60.0	7013.8	207.6	1519.0	15.0
6	6 2 11	30.0	2.0	981.1	866.0	60.0	6684.8	234.2	1166.0	14.0
6	7 2 11	30.0	2.0	994.4	982.0	60.0	7000.0	251.9	917.0	15.0
6	8 2 11	30.0	2.0	844.7	1042.0	60.0	6970.0	228.9	1402.0	15.0
6	9 2 11	30.0	2.0	911.7	1032.0	60.0	7008.0	292.0	941.0	15.0
6	10 2 11	30.0	2.0	940.4	938.0	60.0	6992.8	250.1	1186.0	15.0
6	11 2 11	30.0	2.0	972.1	999.0	60.0	6766.1	231.9	1120.0	14.0
6	12 2 11	30.0	2.0	708.0	1040.0	60.0	6999.5	283.3	1006.0	15.0