

Erratum to: What is the role of trees and remnant vegetation in attracting people to urban parks?

D. F. Shanahan · B. B. Lin · K. J. Gaston ·
R. Bush · R. A. Fuller

Published online: 6 February 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

Erratum to: Landscape Ecol (2015) 30:153–165
DOI 10.1007/s10980-014-0113-0

In the original publication, Table 2 has been published incorrectly. The correct Table 2 is given below.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s10980-014-0113-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-014-0113-0).

D. F. Shanahan (✉) · R. A. Fuller
School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland,
St Lucia, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia
e-mail: danielleshanahan@gmail.com

B. B. Lin
CSIRO Climate Adaptation Flagship and CSIRO Marine
and Atmospheric Research, PMB 1, 107-121 Station
Street, Aspendale, VIC 3195, Australia

K. J. Gaston
Environment & Sustainability Institute, University of
Exeter, Penryn, Cornwall TR10 9EZ, UK

R. Bush
School of Population Health, University of Queensland,
Herston, Brisbane, QLD 4006, Australia

Table 2 Results from linear mixed models showing the correlation between difference in remnant vegetation cover between the visited and that closest to the visitor's home and a range of predictor variables

Model rank	Predictor variables coefficient (<i>t</i> -value)							ΔAIC	Akaike weight
	IRSD	Nature relatedness	Highest qualification	Gender (female = 2)	Park category	Age	Park area		
<i>Parameter estimate</i>	<i>-0.58[11]</i>	<i>2.58[0.82]</i>	<i>0.28[0.36]</i>	<i>-0.99[0.70]</i>	<i>-6.94[11]</i>	<i>0.03[0.08]</i>	<i>8.4e-7[11]</i>		
<i>[relative importance]</i>									
1	-0.58(-1.56)	2.61(1.38)		-1.06(-0.46)	-6.93(-4.81)		8e-7(12.55)	0	0.34
2	-0.58(-1.56)	2.61(1.38)		-1.06(-0.46)	-6.93(-4.81)		8e-7(12.55)	1.2	0.19
3	-0.58(-1.55)	2.55(1.36)			-6.81(-4.79)		8e-7(12.55)	1.7	0.15
4	-0.58(-1.55)	2.55(1.36)	0.28(0.55)		-6.93(-4.81)		8e-7(12.55)	2.87	0.08
5	-0.58(-1.55)			-0.83(-0.36)	-7(-4.85)		8e-7(12.43)	3.03	0.07
6	-0.58(-1.55)		0.27(0.52)	-0.75(-0.33)	-7(-4.87)		8e-7(12.63)	4.23	0.04
7	-0.58(-1.54)				-6.96(-4.84)		8e-7(12.51)	4.64	0.03
8	-0.58(-1.56)	2.51(1.32)		-1.15(-0.5)	-6.91(-4.78)	0.03(0.36)	8e-7(12.63)	5.05	0.03
9	-0.58(-1.54)		0.28(0.54)		7(-4.86)		8e-7(12.51)	5.82	0.02

The italicized values show the model averaged parameter estimate and the relative importance of each variable (measured using standardised summed Akaike weights). The table also show the models in the top 95 % set based on cumulative Akaike weight. The results for each predictor variable are shown in the columns (income is not included here as it did not appear in the top 95 % set), where the coefficient indicates the direction of the relationship between the predictor and response variable