

APPENDIX (continued)

Item	Homophonic Pair	Experiment 1	Experiment 2
Duct	Ducked	40	90
Pact	Packed	80	90
Bard	Barred	20	60
Wade	Weighed	50	80
Baste	Based	20	50
Condition 3 (same morphological structure; inflected item)			
Cited	Sighted	100	80
Waived	Waved	100	90
Buries	Berries	70	90
Dyed	Died	90	100
Flees	Fleas	90	90
Heeled	Healed	60	80
Guerrillas	Gorillas	80	70
Floured	Flowered	70	80
Lutes	Loots	90	60
Peddled	Pedalled	40	30
Reigned	Rained	90	100
Peaked	Peeked	50	60
Whines	Wines	100	100
Yokes	Yolks	60	70
Rapped	Wrapped	60	90
Manors	Manners	100	100

APPENDIX (continued)

Item	Homophonic Pair	Experiment 1	Experiment 2
Condition 4 (same morphological structure; uninflected item)			
Carat	Carrot	100	100
Feat	Feet	100	100
Meddle	Medal	20	60
Flair	Flare	60	50
Sleigh	Slay	100	100
Storey	Story	100	100
Clime	Climb	100	100
Maize	Maze	100	100
Blew	Blue	100	100
Raze	Raise	80	100
Flaw	Floor	80	100
Gambol	Gamble	100	80
Stake	Steak	100	100
Wring	Ring	100	100
Urn	Earn	70	80
Knead	Need	100	100

(Manuscript received June 1, 1983;  
revision accepted for publication October 28, 1983.)

ERRATUM

Becklen, R., and Cervone, D. (1983). Selective looking and the noticing of unexpected events. (*Memory & Cognition*, 11(6), 601-608.—On page 605, in the paragraph in progress near the top of column 2, the group designations provided with the statistics are incorrect. The complete sentence in question should read: "However, if noticers and nonnoticers are compared within each treatment group separately, adequate justification is found for increasing power by combining the groups into FULL and PARTIAL conditions, as was done with the noticing-rate data [noticers vs. nonnoticers, Group T:  $t(21) = .60$ , n.s.; Group E:  $t(19) = .94$ , n.s.; Group K:  $z = 2.12$ ,  $p < .02^2$ ; Group KI:  $t(18) = 2.41$ ,  $p < .03$ ]."