INTRODUCTION

In order to compare two sounds separated by some delay ($D$), it is of course necessary to memorize the first sound during the delay. Two modes of memory operation were distinguished by Durlach and Braida (1969). In one mode, called the “trace mode,” the sensation produced by the second sound is compared to the sensory trace left by the first sound. This comparison may benefit from an overt or covert rehearsal of the trace by the listener (Keller et al., 1995), but its accuracy will strongly depend on $D$. In the other memory mode, called the “context-coding mode,” the listener compares instead symbolic (e.g., verbal) representations of the two sounds; these representations result from a categorical evaluation of each sound’s relation to a general context of sounds (for instance the set of sounds used in an experiment). This memory mode will be generally less efficient than the trace mode if $D$ is short. However, given that categorical labels can be perfectly remembered for a long time, the context-coding mode can become the most efficient mode if $D$ is long.

The present study was concerned with the organization of auditory memory in the trace mode. Should this memory be viewed as a single “store” or is it composed instead of several stores with different properties? Some authors suggested that it includes two stores operating on a general context of sounds: a “short” store and a “long” store (Wickelgren, 1969; Cowan, 1984). Another hypothesis, on which we focused here, is that there is a set of stores or sub-stores which are specialized in the retention of different perceptual attributes of sound.

This hypothesis has already received some support from psychophysical studies of the interference effects produced by a sound on the sensory trace of a previous sound. In previous experiments from our laboratory (Semal and Demany, 1991, 1993; Semal et al., 1996), listeners were required to make same/different judgments on two periodic test sounds separated by a delay during which other periodic sounds (to be ignored) were presented. The differences to be detected were always differences in period, and thus pitch (but the listeners were not informed of that). It was found that discrimination of the test sounds strongly depended on the pitches of the intervening sounds—as observed before by Deutsch (1972)—but was essentially independent of the intervening sounds’ other perceptual attributes. Therefore, these data suggested there is a memory store specialized in the retention of pitch and deaf to any other auditory attribute. Starr and Pitt (1997) obtained analogous results from an experiment in which the differences between the test sounds were differences in timbre (spectral shape). In this case, performance strongly depended on the timbre of the intervening sounds, but not on their pitch, as though timbre (or at least a certain aspect of timbre) was memorized in a specialized store. Let us finally mention data from Botte et al. (1992) concerning memory for loudness. In this study, the test sounds and intervening sounds were pure tones at a constant frequency; only intensity was varied. It was found that intensity discrimination between the test tones was not determined by the intervening tones’ intensity distance to the test tones, but simply worsened monotonically as the intervening tones’ intensity increased. This is in marked contrast with the results of analogous experiments on pitch memory: Here, the crucial factor is the similarity in pitch between the test tones and intervening tones (Deutsch, 1972; Semal and Demany, 1991). The divergence suggests that pitch traces and loudness traces are maintained in separate stores.

Assume that pitch and loudness are indeed processed in separate memory stores. It could then be the case that, in the absence of any intervening stimulus, the trace of a pitch sensation does not fade away with time at the same rate as the trace of a loudness sensation. This would be strong evidence for a separation of stores. The decay of loudness traces (i.e.,
intensity discrimination) as a function of time was investigated by a number of authors (Kinchla and Smyzer, 1967; Berliner and Durlach, 1973; Berliner et al., 1977; Green et al., 1983; Botte et al., 1992; Liu et al., 1992). There are also some data about the temporal decay of pitch traces (i.e., frequency discrimination: Wolfe, 1886; Harris, 1952; Bachem, 1954; Rakowski, 1972). However, the methods used in these two sets of experiments were widely different. To the best of our knowledge, nobody has compared the decays of pitch and loudness traces using the same subjects and similar procedures. This was the aim of the present study.

Since we wished to investigate the trace mode of auditory memory, it was important to minimize the possible influence of context-coding processes. Several studies of intensity discrimination indicated that the efficiency of context coding decreases as the stimulus range increases (Berliner and Durlach, 1973; Braida and Durlach, 1988). This led us to incorporate a roving procedure in our 2IF-2AFC framework: From trial to trial, the period and/or intensity of the first (standard) stimulus were varied randomly within wide ranges. Generally speaking, avoiding the use of fixed standards hindered the formation of precise long-term memories in the course of the experiments (Harris, 1952).

The discriminability of two stimuli separated by D is determined in part by memory limitations but also depends, more basically, on the precision of their sensory encoding, i.e., on “sensation noise” (Durlach and Braida, 1969). For a fair comparison between pitch and loudness trace decays, it is desirable to keep constant the contribution of sensation noise to discrimination performance. We assumed that when D is as short as 0.5 s, the amount of trace decay is negligible and discrimination performance is determined only by sensation noise. Therefore, the two experiments reported here included preliminary measurements intended to select frequency and intensity changes that were equally discriminable for D = 0.5 s. We then varied D and measured its effect on the discrimination of the corresponding changes.

The temporal decay of a pitch trace may depend on the salience of the initial pitch sensation, or more generally on the spectral properties of the stimulus eliciting the pitch sensation. Salient pitches are evoked by pure tones and by complex tones with harmonics that the auditory system is able to resolve. The pitch of complex tones consisting of unresolvable harmonics is less salient and may be extracted by a specific mechanism (Houtsma and Smurzynski, 1990; Carlyon, 1998). We used these three types of stimuli in experiment 1. Another potentially important factor was stimulus duration: It could be hypothesized that the trace of a long-duration sound decays less rapidly than the trace of a shorter one, all other things being equal. This led us to use very different stimulus durations in experiments 1 and 2.

I. EXPERIMENT I

A. Method

1. Subjects

Four listeners without any known hearing deficit served as subjects. Two of them were authors SC and LD; they had a long previous experience with psychoacoustic experiments. The remaining two listeners (MM and MY) were students without such experience. None of the subjects possessed absolute pitch, but each of them had an interest in music and played a musical instrument.

2. Tasks and stimuli

On each trial, two periodic stimuli separated by a silent delay D were presented. Both stimuli (“S1” and “S2”) had a total duration of 500 ms and were gated on and off with 10-ms sinusoidal amplitude ramps. There were four experimental conditions.

In condition INTENS, S1 and S2 were 1000-Hz pure tones differing in intensity. The direction of the intensity change was selected at random and the subject’s task was to indicate which stimulus was louder. The SPL of S1 was randomly selected between 40 and 80 dB.

In the remaining three conditions (FREQ-PURE, FREQ-RES, and FREQ-UNRES), the two stimuli had a constant SPL of 60 dB but different periods. The direction of this change was also a random variable and the subject had to indicate which sound was higher in pitch. The frequency or fundamental frequency (F0) of S1 was randomly selected between limits specified below, frequency being in each case scaled logarithmically.

In condition FREQ-PURE, the stimuli were pure tones and the frequency of S1 varied between 500 Hz and 2000 Hz.

In condition FREQ-RES, the stimuli were complex tones consisting of the first five harmonics of some F0. The F0 of S1 varied between 100 and 400 Hz. Given their low ranks, the harmonics of each tone were resolvable by the auditory system (see, e.g., Plomp, 1976, Chap. 1). They were synthesized at equal amplitudes and added in sine phase.

In condition FREQ-UNRES, the stimuli were bandpass-filtered trains of 50-μs clicks, and the F0 of S1 varied between 40 and 200 Hz. The cutoff frequencies of the filters (Stanford Research SR640 and SR645; attenuation rate: about 100 dB/oct) were set at 2860 and 5000 Hz. In order to mask auditory distortion products (Plomp, 1976, Chap. 2), the stimuli were mixed with a white noise that was low-pass filtered at 2860 Hz and presented at 55 dB SPL. The amplitude of the clicks was systematically varied as a function of F0, in order to maintain the overall SPL of the stimuli at 60 dB. Given that S1 had a maximum F0 of 200 Hz and that all stimuli were high-pass filtered at 2860 Hz, the power spectrum of the stimuli consisted of equal-amplitude consecutive harmonics with ranks always exceeding 13. Such harmonics are not resolvable by the auditory system (see, e.g., Houtsma and Smurzynski, 1990).

Subjects were tested individually in a double-walled soundproof booth (Gisol, Bordeaux), using TDH39 earphones through which the stimuli were delivered diotically. Responses were given by pressing one of two buttons on a response box, and feedback was provided immediately: Following each correct response, an LED located just above the corresponding button was turned on for 300 ms; no LED was turned on if the response was wrong.
3. Preliminary measurements

In each of the four conditions defined above, we first determined the amount of stimulus change—in dB or in cents—for which the probability of a correct response was 0.80 when $D$ was 0.5 s. These ‘‘thresholds’’ were measured with the adaptive procedure described by Kaernbach (1991). In a given daily session, four blocks of trials were run in each condition. At the outset of a block, the change from $S_1$ to $S_2$ (in dB or in cents) was large enough to make the task easy. Following each correct response, this change was divided by $1.5^{1/4}$. Following each incorrect response, it was multiplied by 1.5. This continued until 14 reversals had occurred in the variation of the change. The median of the changes used on all trials following the fourth reversal was taken as the threshold.

Subjects were trained until their performances appeared to be stable. This took five 1-h sessions for subjects LD and SC, and nine 1-h sessions for subjects MM and MY. For each condition and subject, the threshold value finally recorded was the median of the last 20 threshold measurements.

4. Assessment of memory decay

In this main part of the experiment, $D$ was varied and the previously measured thresholds were used as constant changes from $S_1$ to $S_2$. (The changes had a constant size, but of course their direction was still a random variable.) In a given daily session, subjects were tested in only one of the four conditions. Each session began with a warm up consisting of 50 trials with $D = 0.5$ s, and then comprised 16 blocks of 20 trials. From block to block, $D$ varied in a sawtooth manner, taking four possible values: 0.5, 2, 5, and 10 s. When $D$ was equal to 0.5 or 2 s, there was a pause of 1 s between each response and the onset of $S_1$ in the next trial. When $D$ was equal to 5 or 10 s, the pause had a duration of 5 s; 1 s before its end, a warning visual signal was produced by the LEDs of the response box.

From session to session, the four conditions were used alternately, four times each. Thus, for each subject, condition, and value of $D$, a total of 320 responses were collected. From these 320 responses, we computed four independent $d'$ statistics—one $d'$ per session—as well as the corresponding values of the response bias index $\beta$ (Green and Swets, 1974).

B. Results

Table I displays the thresholds determined by the preliminary measurements and then used as constant stimulus changes. Note that thresholds were much poorer in condition FREQ-UNRES than in conditions FREQ-PURE and FREQ-RES. This was predictable from the literature on frequency discrimination (e.g., Houtsma and Smurzynski, 1990).

Figure 1 shows the mean of the 16 $d'$ statistics obtained for each condition and value of $D$ in the main part of the experiment. For $D = 0.5$ s, $d'$ had an overall mean of 2.05. This $d'$ value is not very different from 1.68, the value expected from the threshold measurements under the assumption that, in these preliminary measurements, responses were unbiased—i.e., not affected by ‘‘time-order errors’’—(Macmillan and Creelman, 1991). Moreover, as we wished, $d'$ did not markedly vary with conditions for $D = 0.5$ s. In condition INTENS, $d'$ strongly decreased when $D$ was increased from 0.5 to 2 s, but $d'$ was not further reduced when $D$ was longer. The decline of $d'$ with $D$ appeared to be more gradual in the FREQ conditions. For each subject, the decline of $d'$ from $D = 0.5$ s to $D = 2$ s was smaller in each of the three FREQ conditions than in condition INTENS. An ANOVA in which sessions were used as the random factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>INTENS (dB)</th>
<th>FREQ-PURE (cents)</th>
<th>FREQ-RES (cents)</th>
<th>FREQ-UNRES (cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject LD</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1. $d'$ as a function of $D$ in the four conditions of experiment 1. Each data point represents the outcome of 1280 trials (4 sets of 80 trials for 4 subjects).
indicated that the effect of $D$ on $d^*$ did not significantly differ across the three FREQ conditions [$F(6,18)<1$], but was reliably different in condition INTENS [$F(3,9)=7.15$, $P=0.009$]. There was no significant three-way interaction between subjects, conditions, and $D$ [$F<1$ in each case]. Similar statistical tests were performed on the absolute values of $\log(\beta)$. Their outcomes were negative in each case. Thus the INTENS and FREQ conditions differed with regard to the effect of $D$ on $d^*$ but not with regard to the effect of $D$ on the magnitude of response bias.

C. Discussion

In the three FREQ conditions, very different stimuli were used. For instance, whereas the tones used in condition FREQ-PURE had pitches which were generally too high to be sung, more importantly, pitch was much less salient in condition FREQ-UNRES than in conditions FREQ-PURE and FREQ-RES. Yet, the three corresponding memory decays appeared to be similar. This suggests that the decay of a pitch memory trace is independent of the initial pitch sensation. However, this decay appears to differ from the decay of a loudness memory trace when one considers the results obtained in condition INTENS. Apparently, loudness traces decay more rapidly than pitch traces during the first two seconds following the stimulus.

In condition INTENS, $d^*$ took similar values, close to 1.0, for $D=2, 5$, and 10 s. A reasonable interpretation of this plateau is that, for $D=2$ s, listeners memorized loudness in the “context-coding” mode, which is more resistant to the passage of time than the “trace” mode (Durlach and Braida, 1969). In intensity discrimination tasks, the context-coding mode can be more efficient than the trace mode if the interstimulus interval ($D$) is long and if the overall intensity range is small (Berliner and Durlach, 1973). Here, $S1$ varied within a 40-dB range. This is a wide range in so far as the total dynamic range of the auditory system is barely three times larger. Within 40 dB, however, there are only 22 steps of 1.8 dB (the average threshold for condition INTENS, cf. Table I). By contrast, the 2-oct ranges used in conditions FREQ-PURE and FREQ-RES included more than 300 steps of 7.4 or 6.2 cents (the average thresholds for these two conditions). On this basis, it is reasonable to think that context coding was more profitable in condition INTENS than in conditions FREQ-PURE or FREQ-RES. In condition FREQ-UNRES, on the other hand, the average threshold was only 30 times smaller than the range of $S1$; yet, the effect of $D$ on $d^*$ was much more similar to the effect observed in the other two FREQ conditions than to the effect observed in condition INTENS. Hence, it is clear that the form of the decays was not determined only by the “perceptual size” of the stimulus ranges.

Nonetheless, the $S1$ stimuli used in condition INTENS had a variable SPL but a fixed frequency whereas the reverse was true for the FREQ conditions. One could imagine that this difference biased in some way the main outcome of experiment 1. In order to demonstrate quite convincingly that pitch traces do not decay in the same manner as loudness traces, it is of course desirable to compare these decays using identical sets of $S1$ stimuli. This is what we did in experiment 2. Another important novelty of experiment 2 was that its stimuli were ten times shorter than those of experiment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>INTENS (dB)</th>
<th>FREQ (cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject LD</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. EXPERIMENT 2

A. Method

Four listeners with normal audiograms participated in this experiment. Two of them were again authors SC and LD. The remaining two listeners (VL and EB) were students with no previous psychoacoustic experience but a strong interest in (popular) music.

The method was basically similar to that used in experiment 1. However, all stimuli were pure tones and had a total duration of 50 ms rather than 500 ms; they were gated on and off with 5-ms sinusoidal amplitude ramps. Subjects were tested in only two conditions: $S1$ and $S2$ could differ from each other in SPL (condition INTENS) or in frequency (condition FREQ). On each trial, for both conditions, the frequency of $S1$ was randomly selected between 1000 and 2500 Hz (using again a logarithmic frequency scale), and its SPL was randomly selected between 42 and 88 dB.

Preliminary threshold measurements were performed as before, the two new conditions being presented alternately. In the main part of the experiment, again, we used the measured thresholds as constant changes from $S1$ to $S2$. Only one condition was presented throughout each experimental session, and the two conditions alternated from session to session. A total of 320 trials were run for each subject, condition, and value of $D$. The corresponding data were analyzed exactly like those of experiment 1.

B. Results and discussion

The measured thresholds are displayed in Table II. They were larger than those obtained in conditions INTENS and FREQ-PURE of experiment 1—an expected result since the stimuli were ten times shorter.

The four upper panels of Fig. 2 show the $d^*$’s obtained in the main part of the experiment for each subject. The means across subjects are presented in the bottom panel. Clearly, the overall results are very similar to those obtained in experiment 1. For $D=0.5$ s, $d^*$ was close to 2.0 in both conditions. In condition INTENS, $d^*$ markedly decreased when $D$ was increased to 2 s, but was approximately constant for $D=2, 5$, and 10 s. In condition FREQ, by contrast, $d^*$ declined continuously with $D$ (or, in the case of subject LD, did not decline at all). From $D=0.5$ s to $D=2$ s, $d^*$ varied much more in condition INTENS than in condition FREQ for three
subjects; however, this was not true for the fourth subject (EB). An ANOVA confirmed the existence of a significant interaction between $D$ and the condition factor [$F(3,9) = 6.18, P = 0.014$]. A similar statistical test performed on $|\log(\beta)|$ rather than $d'$ yielded a negative result [$F(3,9) = 1.10, P = 0.399$].

We undertook experiment 2 with the idea that, perhaps, the memory trace of a short tone decays more rapidly than the memory trace of a long tone. The results did not support this idea since they were very similar to those of experiment 1. Concerning the INTENS conditions of both experiments, one can argue that it was a priori impossible to observe a faster decay in experiment 2 if, as soon as $D$ was equal to 2 s, performance reached a plateau determined by context-coding processes: To be able to demonstrate a difference in decay, we should have used at least one $D$ value between 0.5 and 2 s. However, no such objection is possible concerning the FREQ conditions. It is important to note that because $D$ was defined as the duration of the silence separating $S_2$ from $S_1$, differences in stimulus duration were associated with differences in onset-to-onset intervals. From experiment 1 to experiment 2, these intervals were reduced by 450 ms (500–50 ms). Thus they were almost halved when $D$ was equal to 0.5 s. The fact that this big relative change did not

---

**FIG. 2.** $d'$ as a function of $D$ in the two conditions of experiment 2. Four upper panels: results obtained from each of the four subjects. Bottom panel: mean results.
III. GENERAL DISCUSSION

In both experiments, we found that the effect of \( D \) on \( d' \) was not the same in conditions FREQ and INTENS. The difference was largest when \( D \) varied from 0.5 to 2 s, and for these small values of \( D \) what the difference reveals is almost certainly a divergence in the memory decay of sensory traces: Apparently, the memory decay of a loudness trace is more rapid than the memory decay of a pitch trace. In the INTENS conditions, it is likely that context coding was operative as soon as \( D \) was equal to 2 s since \( d' \) did not decline when \( D \) was longer. But this would only mean that our results underestimated the rate of trace decay for loudness, and thus the divergence between loudness decay and pitch decay.

Three previous papers (Berliner and Durlach, 1973; Berliner et al., 1977; Green et al., 1983) reported experiments in which intensity discrimination (of pure tones) was measured as a function of inter-stimulus interval (i.e., \( D \)) with a roving procedure. Unfortunately, these three papers do not give a consistent picture of the memory decay of loudness traces. The results obtained by Berliner and his colleagues for wide ranging ranges agree rather well with our data. They found that discrimination performance sharply decreases when \( D \) increases up to 2.5 s, and that for longer values of \( D \) an almost constant performance level is achieved thanks to context-coding processes (discrimination performance becomes similar to identification performance). By contrast, according to the results of Green et al., performance does not decrease more between \( D = 0.5 \) s and \( D = 2 \) s than between \( D = 2 \) s and \( D = 8 \) s. Making sense of this discrepancy (ignored by Green et al.) is not easy. It may be significant that whereas Berliner and the present investigators measured \( d' \) as a function of \( D \) for fixed intensity changes, Green et al. measured instead, as a function of \( D \), the values of intensity changes yielding a fixed \( d' \).

Concerning frequency discrimination, the literature as a whole suggests that discrimination performance declines rather slowly with \( D \). Harris (1952) performed on an enormous number of listeners an experiment which was analogous to that of Green et al. His stimuli were pure tones and the frequency of the first tone presented on each trial was roved between 950 and 1050 Hz. For \( D = 0.1, 1, 3, \) and 7 s, the measured discrimination thresholds increased by only 29% (from 4.2 Hz to 5.4 Hz). In the experiment of Green et al., on the other hand, the measured thresholds increased by as much as 250% (from 2.4 dB to 6 dB) when \( D \) varied from 0.5 s to 8 s. Therefore, our main finding does not come as a big surprise in the light of previous research. Note that a parallel can be drawn between this finding and the outcome of a recent study on visual short-term memory (Magnussen et al., 1996). It was found by Magnussen et al. that the spatial frequency of a sinusoidal luminance grating was better memorized than its contrast. In the terminology proposed by Stevens (1966), loudness and perceived contrast are “prothetic” percepts whereas pitch and the perceptual correlate of spatial frequency are “metathetic” percepts. There might be a general law according to which the trace of a metathetic percept decays less rapidly than the trace of a prothetic percept.

From the fact that pitch traces and loudness traces do not decay at the same rate, it seems natural to infer that they are not retained in one and the same sensory store. We mentioned in the Introduction that previous psychophysical experiments already provided evidence for an autonomous processing of pitch (and of a certain aspect of timbre) in auditory memory. Let us point out here that there are also physiological data supporting the hypothesis of multiple and specialized auditory stores. When a listener is presented with a series of identical tones followed by a different tone, the different tone elicits an event-related brain potential called the “mismatch negativity” or MMN (Naatanen et al., 1978). This brain potential is supposed to reflect a preattentive change detection based on a comparison between memory traces (see Schröger, 1997, for a recent review). According to Giard et al. (1995), the scalp topographies of the MMNs elicited by pure tones deviating from a repeated standard by either frequency, intensity, or duration vary with the type of stimulus deviance. Thus the corresponding MMNs originate from at least partly distinct neural populations (in the auditory cortex). Another remarkable fact is that the MMN obtained in response to a two-dimensional change in frequency and spatial location, or frequency and duration, or duration and intensity, is equal to the sum of the MMNs elicited by its one-dimensional components, exactly as if each of the combined one-dimensional components elicited its own MMN (see, e.g., Levänen et al., 1993). Disappointingly, however, a similar summation does not seem to occur for combined changes in frequency and intensity (Wolff and Schröger, 1995).

Our main finding is consistent with the idea that the mnemonic processing of pitch and loudness are completely separate, but it is also consistent with a more subtle hypothesis. Assume that the architecture of auditory memory, in what Durlach and Braida (1969) called its “trace” mode, consists of: (1) an all-purpose “short” store retaining global “echoic” traces during a limited time; (2) a set of specialized stores permitting each a longer retention of a single auditory attribute. It could then be the case that only the short store is available for the retention of loudness, whereas one of the specialized stores is devoted to pitch. (Of course, some categorical information on loudness could nonetheless be kept for a long time by means of context-coding processes.) Lü et al. (1992) assessed psychophysically the decay of a loudness trace and found that it had the same lifetime—about 2 s—as the decay of the neural activation produced by the stimulus in the primary auditory cortex (this neural activation being assessed by magnetoencephalography). One
may speculate on this basis that the neural site of the short store is the primary auditory cortex while the specialized stores are located elsewhere.

Finally, let us come back on the fact that for one of the six listeners tested in the present study (subject EB, experiment 2), we found no evidence that pitch traces decay less rapidly than loudness traces. It is worthy to note that EB was probably the subject who ranked last in terms of musical practice. This suggests that a correlation might exist between pitch memory and musical experience—a suggestion already made by Pechmann and Mohr (1992). An interesting goal of future research would be to determine if indeed trace decay in auditory memory is correlated with musical experience, and more strongly for pitch traces than for loudness traces.
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1This assumption is consistent with the results of Harris (1952) concerning frequency discrimination, as well as those of Kinchla and Smyzer (1967) and Green et al. (1983) concerning intensity discrimination. It is not consistent, however, with data reported by Berliner and Durlach (1973) and Berliner et al. (1977); According to these authors, for relatively long tone bursts (>500 ms), intensity discrimination worsens significantly as soon as D exceeds 0. Berliner et al. (1977) mention that, “for reasons unknown to [them]” (p. 1579), their results for fixed standard tones are very different from those obtained by Kinchla and Smyzer (1967). In the present study, we thought that it was not desirable to set D below 0.5 s because two problems may arise if D is very small and the stimuli are rather short: (1) the weak stimulus may have a deleterious “forward-masking” effect on the second one (Jaroszewski and Rakowski, 1976; Zeng and Turner, 1992); (2) the formation of an accurate memory trace of the first stimulus may not be complete when the second stimulus is presented (Wickelgren, 1969; Masarso, 1975).

2For subject MM, during the final experimental session run in each of the three FREQ conditions, the stimulus change was smaller than the threshold indicated in Table I; we respectively used changes of 5.7, 3.0, and 70.0 cents in conditions FREQ-PURE, FREQ-RES, and FREQ-UNRES. These deliberate decreases of the stimulus changes were intended to avoid ceiling effects for D = 0.5 s; Apparently, MM did not reach her maximum level of performance in the preliminary experimental phase.

3The feedback provided on each trial allowed the subjects to reduce or eliminate their “natural” responses biases. For this reason, the obtained values of β were of little interest by themselves.


