ERRATUM

Cotton, S., & Grosjean, F. (1984). The gating paradigm: A comparison of successive and individual presentation formats (*Perception & Psychophysics*, 35(1), 41-48—On page 47, the last paragraph and part of the second-to-last paragraph of the article were misplaced. The last 10 lines in column 1 actually belong at the end of the article, in column 2—after “We have been able to show, therefore, that repetition does not have a facilitative effect on subjects’.”

We regret this error and extend our apologies to the authors and the readers.

The complete text for page 47 should correctly read as follows:

tion as it did not fit the sentence “Margaret told the . . .”; nor was FACT proposed in the SC condition because it did not fit the sentence “John entered the . . .”

The frequency garden path occurs when a target word is a low-frequency word and subjects propose a high-frequency word that is appropriate both to the acoustic-phonetic information and, in context, to the semantic/syntactic information. In Figure 5, we present the candidates for the low-frequency target word TRAWLER. Subjects in both experiments proposed TRAIN, TRUCK, and TROLLEY. These words are all higher frequency words than the target word, they begin with the correct initial consonant cluster /tr/, and they are appropriate to the sentence “Stephen worked on a . . .”

The semantic garden path occurs when the semantic content of the context sentence leads the subject to propose a particular erroneous candidate. An example of this is shown in Figure 6. The context sentence “He walked into a . . .” led subjects in both studies to almost unanimously propose BAR instead of the target word BOG.

If we tabulate all the garden paths in the two experiments (in which a garden path is a particular erroneous candidate proposed by four or more subjects at one or more gates), we find that there are 65% shared paths in the NC condition and 72% shared

paths in the SC condition—another indication of the similarity of the two presentation formats.

CONCLUSION

We have replicated in this study the results of Grosjean’s original (1980) study with respect to both the number of subjects guessing the target words correctly and the error patterns obtained. As for the confidence ratings, we have shown that it is only at the early gates and in context that the presentation format has any effect. At later gates and in isolation, the ratings are similar. In addition, subjects become more confident of their guesses as they hear more of the word, irrespective of the presentation format.

We have been able to show, therefore, that repetition does not have a facilitative effect on subjects’ performance in the successive presentation format and can conclude that both the successive and individual presentation formats yield similar results.

There are, however, two major advantages to the successive presentation format of the gating paradigm: the ease of stimulus presentation and preparation, and the ability to call on a much smaller subject pool. These two advantages make the successive presentation format the more useful of the two approaches.