



Correction to: Item-specific control of attention in the Stroop task: Contingency learning is not the whole story in the item-specific proportion-congruent effect

Giacomo Spinelli¹ · Stephen J. Lupker¹

Published online: 16 March 2020

© The Psychonomic Society, Inc. 2020

Correction to: Memory & Cognition

<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-019-00980-y>

The original publication included the following errors which were left uncorrected in the proofing process: 1) in the last paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence “adaptation to conflict may have been the only option at their disposal in those conditions” should have been “adaptation to conflict frequency”, etc.; 2) in the second paragraph of the Materials, the examples provided for low-contingency and high-contingency incongruent items in the MI set (i.e., BLUE in green and BLUE in white, respectively), should have been reversed (i.e., BLUE in white and BLUE in green, respectively); 3) in Table 1, the word in the last column, “YELLOW”, should have been “WHITE”; 4) in Table 3, the first “High contingency MI items” column should have been under RTs, not error rates; 5) in the Results, MSE values were incorrectly reported.

The original article has been corrected.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-019-00980-y>

✉ Giacomo Spinelli
gspinel@uwo.ca

✉ Stephen J. Lupker
lupkerlupker@uwo.ca

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 5C2, Canada