



Apr 10th, 2:35 PM - 3:35 PM

A Reevaluation of Capaldi and Miller's "Counting in Rats: Its Functional Significance and the Independent Cognitive Processes That Constitute It"

Malory Wodka

Illinois Wesleyan University

James Dougan, Faculty Advisor

Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/jwprc>

 Part of the [Psychiatry and Psychology Commons](#)

Wodka, Malory and Dougan, Faculty Advisor, James, "A Reevaluation of Capaldi and Miller's "Counting in Rats: Its Functional Significance and the Independent Cognitive Processes That Constitute It"" (2010). *John Wesley Powell Student Research Conference*. 30.

<http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/jwprc/2010/posters2/30>

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by The Ames Library, the Andrew W. Mellon Center for Curricular and Faculty Development, the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. It has been accepted for inclusion in Digital Commons @ IWU by the faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Poster Presentation P58

**A REEVALUATION OF CAPALDI AND MILLER'S "COUNTING IN RATS:
ITS FUNCTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND THE INDEPENDENT COGNITIVE
PROCESSES THAT CONSTITUTE IT"**

Malory Wodka and James Dougan*
Psychology Department, Illinois Wesleyan University

In 1988, Capaldi and Miller ran a series of runway experiments investigating how rats count reinforcing events by using two randomly alternating sequences of trials in which a rat can potentially predict that a nonreinforced trial will always follow after two consecutive reinforced trials. Capaldi measured the time a rat took to reach the goal box of the runway to determine whether the rat expected to be reinforced upon reaching the goal box. The present study attempts to replicate, and hopefully improve upon, Capaldi and Miller's first of seven sub-experiments within their study. To eliminate potential error caused by differences in handling the rats prior to reinforced trials compared to nonreinforced trials, the present study utilized a closed circuit runway in which rats are not handled between trials. Furthermore, to make the previous study's results clearer, the original runway design was adapted to a y-maze which provided a greater potential number of reinforcers to be delivered per sequence of trials.