



Correction to: Meaning guides attention during scene viewing, even when it is irrelevant

Candace E. Peacock^{1,2} · Taylor R. Hayes¹ · John M. Henderson^{1,2}

Published online: 18 March 2019
© The Psychonomic Society, Inc. 2019

Correction to: Atten Percept Psychophys.

<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1607-7>

Peacock, C. E., Hayes, T. R., & Henderson, J. M. (2019). Meaning guides attention during scene viewing, even when it is irrelevant. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 81(1), 20–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1607-7>

A minor coding error slightly affected a few originally reported values. The error only affected two tertiary analyses in one experiment (the brightness search experiment) and did not affect the primary analyses of either experiment or change the main conclusions of the paper. The error specifically concerned the temporal and saccade amplitude analyses of the unbiased maps in the brightness search task. The overall pattern of results remained the same in these analyses, but a few comparisons became nonsignificant, though the majority of the comparisons remained significant.

Overall scene analyses

Brightness rating task There was an advantage of meaning over saliency for the unbiased maps (linear: $t(78) = 8.05$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI = [0.15, 0.24]; semi-partial: $t(78) = 9.14$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI = [0.15, 0.24]).

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-018-1607-7>

✉ Candace E. Peacock
cepeacock@ucdavis.edu

¹ Center for Mind and Brain, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

² Department of Psychology, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

Brightness search task Using the unbiased maps, meaning accounted for 22% of the overall variance in attention ($M = 0.22$, $SD = 0.11$) whereas saliency explained only 12% of the variance ($M = 0.12$, $SD = 0.10$) for the linear correlations, $t(78) = 4.00$, $p = 0.001$, 95% CI = [0.05, 0.15]. Similarly, for the semi-partial correlations, meaning accounted for 16% of the total variance in attention ($M = 0.16$, $SD = 0.11$) whereas saliency explained only 6% of the variance ($M = 0.06$, $SD = 0.06$), $t(78) = 4.98$, $p < 0.001$, 95% CI = [0.06, 0.14].

Fixation by fixation analyses

Brightness search task For the unbiased linear correlations, meaning accounted for 5%, 6%, and 4% of the variance and saliency accounted for 2%, 5%, and 8% of the variance in attention in the first 3 fixations. Turning to the semi-partial correlations, meaning accounted for 5%, 5%, and 3% of the variance and saliency accounted for 2%, 4%, and 7% of the variance in attention in the first 3 fixations. Meaning produced a unique but not a linear advantage over saliency for the first fixation (linear FDR $p = 0.08$; unique FDR $p < 0.05$) with all other fixations nonsignificant (linear and semi-partial FDR $p > 0.05$).

Saccade amplitude analyses

Brightness search task When using the unbiased maps, meaning produced a linear advantage over saliency for saccade amplitude deciles 1, 2 and 5 (FDR $p < 0.05$) but not deciles 3, 4, 6 through 10 (FDR $p > 0.05$) and a unique advantage over saliency for saccade amplitude deciles 1, 2, 4 through 6, and 8 (FDR $ps < 0.05$) but not deciles 3, 7, 9 or 10 (FDR $p > 0.05$).

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.