



# Corrigendum: Exploring the Role of Action Consequences in the Handle-Response Compatibility Effect

Elisa Scerrati<sup>1\*</sup>, Stefania D'Ascenzo<sup>2</sup>, Luisa Lugli<sup>2</sup>, Cristina Iani<sup>3,4</sup>, Sandro Rubichi<sup>1,4</sup> and Roberto Nicoletti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Education and Humanities, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy, <sup>2</sup> Department of Philosophy and Communication, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy, <sup>3</sup> Department of Surgery, Medicine, Dentistry and Morphological Sciences With Interest in Transplant, Oncology and Regenerative Medicine, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy, <sup>4</sup> Center for Neuroscience and Neurotechnology, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited and reviewed by:

Dimitrios Kourtis,  
University of Stirling, United Kingdom

### \*Correspondence:

Elisa Scerrati  
elisa.scerrati@unimore.it;  
elisa.scerrati@unibo.it  
orcid.org/0000-0002-4042-6140

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Cognitive Neuroscience,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Human Neuroscience

**Received:** 30 July 2021

**Accepted:** 03 August 2021

**Published:** 15 September 2021

### Citation:

Scerrati E, D'Ascenzo S, Lugli L, Iani C, Rubichi S and Nicoletti R (2021) Corrigendum: Exploring the Role of Action Consequences in the Handle-Response Compatibility Effect. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 15:750105. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2021.750105

**Keywords:** handle-response compatibility, response-effect compatibility, common coding of intention and action, ideomotor theory, affordance

## A Corrigendum on

**Exploring the Role of Action Consequences in the Handle-Response Compatibility Effect** by Scerrati, E., D'Ascenzo, S., Lugli, L., Iani, C., Rubichi, S., and Nicoletti, R. (2020). *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 14:286. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2020.00286

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. There was a **missing reference of Kourtis and Vingerhoets (2015)**. The corrected **Table 1** appears below.

In the original article, there was an error. The authors mistakenly reported as evidence a hypothetical interpretation offered by Kourtis and Vingerhoets (2015) of their neurophysiological results. A correction has been made to **Introduction, Paragraph 2:**

Evidence in favor of the H-R compatibility effect was initially provided by Tucker and Ellis (1998) who showed that judging the upright or inverted position of depicted graspable objects was influenced by the orientation of the object's handle. That is, responses were faster when the position of the handle and the responding hand were spatially aligned as compared to when they were not. This result was replicated across different tasks (e.g., Tipper et al., 2006; Saccone et al., 2016), stimuli (e.g., Pellicano et al., 2010; Pappas, 2014; Iani et al., 2018; Scerrati et al., 2019, 2020), populations (e.g., Dekker and Mareschal, 2013), response devices (e.g., Bub and Masson, 2010), and response modes (e.g., Phillips and Ward, 2002; Cho and Proctor, 2010; Proctor et al., 2017; Bub et al., 2018; for a review see Proctor and Miles, 2014; for a recent meta-analysis see Azaad et al., 2019).

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

**TABLE 1** | Prior known tests of the Handle–Response (H–R) compatibility effect showing null and/or reversed effects.

Source, Study	N	Stimuli	Task	H-R compatibility effect
Bub and Masson (2010)				
2	54	Beer mugs/Teapots	Color-judgement	Null
Cho and Proctor (2011)				
4	32	Door-handles	Color/Orientation judgement	Null
Cho and Proctor (2013)				
1	40	Door-handles	Shape-judgement	Null
6	20	Door-handles	Diagonal orientation judgement	Null
Kostov and Janyan (2012)				
1	37	Frying pans, Jugs, Saucepans	Orientation judgement	Null
Loach et al. (2008)				
2	20	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Null
Pellicano et al. (2020)				
1	20	Passive Torches	Length judgement	Null
2	20	Passive Torches	Length judgement	Null
3	20	Passive Torches	Size judgement	Null
Saccone et al. (2016)				
2	25	Mostly common elongated tools	Color-judgement	Null
Song et al. (2014)				
1	32	Passive Torches	Orientation judgement	Null
Symes et al. (2005)				
3	33	Mostly common elongated tools	Color-judgement	Null
Tipper et al. (2006)				
1	32	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Null
Yu et al. (2014)				
2A	30	Mostly common elongated tools	Orientation judgement	Null
2B	30	Mostly common elongated tools	Orientation judgement	Null
3A	30	Mostly common elongated tools	Orientation judgement	Null
Cho and Proctor (2011)				
1	64	Teapots	Color/Orientation judgement	Reversed
Cho and Proctor (2013)				
2	80	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Reversed
3	20	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Reversed
4	60	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Reversed
5	20	Door-handles	Color-judgement	Reversed
Loach et al. (2008)				
1	20	Door-handles	Texture judgement	Reversed
Kostov and Janyan (2015)				
2	58	Frying pans, saucepans bowls/plates	Orientation judgement	Reversed
3	51	Frying pans, saucepans bowls/plates	Orientation judgement	Reversed
Kourtis and Vingerhoets (2015)				
	29	Mostly common elongated tools	S-R compatibility	Reversed
Pellicano et al. (2010)				
1	20	Torches	Color judgement	Reversed
Pellicano et al. (2020)				
2	20	Active Torches	Length judgement	Reversed
3	20	Active Torches	Size judgement	Reversed
Proctor et al. (2017)				
1	20	Frying pans	Orientation judgement	Reversed
Yu et al. (2014)				
1A	32	Mostly common elongated tools	Artifact/Natural	Reversed
1B	32	Mostly common elongated tools	Artifact/Natural	Reversed
1C	32	Mostly common elongated tools	Artifact/Natural	Reversed

## REFERENCES

- Azaad, S., Laham, S. M., and Shields, P. (2019). A meta-analysis of the object-based compatibility effect. *Cognition* 190, 105–127. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2019.04.028
- Bub, D. N., and Masson, M. E. (2010). Grasping beer mugs: on the dynamics of alignment effects induced by handled objects. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 36, 341–358. doi: 10.1037/a0017606
- Bub, D. N., Masson, M. E., and Kumar, R. (2018). Time course of motor affordances evoked by pictured objects and words. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 44, 53–68. doi: 10.1037/xhp0000431
- Cho, D. T., and Proctor, R. W. (2010). The object-based Simon effect: grasping affordance or relative location of the graspable part? *J. Exp. Psychol.* 36, 853–861. doi: 10.1037/a0019328
- Cho, D. T., and Proctor, R. W. (2011). Correspondence effects for objects with opposing left and right protrusions. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 37, 737–749. doi: 10.1037/a0021934
- Cho, D. T., and Proctor, R. W. (2013). Object-based correspondence effects for action-relevant and surface-property judgments with keypress responses: evidence for a basis in spatial coding. *Psychol. Res.* 77, 618–636. doi: 10.1007/s00426-012-0458-4
- Dekker, T. M., and Mareschal, D. (2013). Object processing for action across childhood. *Br. J. Dev. Psychol.* 31, 425–435. doi: 10.1111/bjdp.12017
- Iani, C., Ferraro, L., Maiorana, N. V., Gallese, V., and Rubichi, S. (2018). Do already grasped objects activate motor affordances? *Psychol. Res.* 83, 1363–1374. doi: 10.1007/s00426-018-1004-9
- Kostov, K., and Janyan, A. (2012). The role of attention in the affordance effect: can we afford to ignore it? *Cogn. Process.* 13, 215–218. doi: 10.1007/s10339-012-0452-1
- Kostov, K., and Janyan, A. (2015). Reversing the affordance effect: negative stimulus–response compatibility observed with images of graspable objects. *Cogn. Process.* 16, 287–291. doi: 10.1007/s10339-015-0708-7
- Kourtis, D., and Vingerhoets, G. (2015). Perceiving objects by their function: an EEG study on feature saliency and prehensile affordances. *Biol. Psychol.* 110, 138–147. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsycho.2015.07.017
- Loach, D., Frischen, A., Bruce, N., and Tsotsos, J. K. (2008). An attentional mechanism for selecting appropriate actions afforded by graspable objects. *Psychol. Sci.* 19, 1253–1257. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02234.x
- Pappas, Z. (2014). Dissociating Simon and affordance compatibility effects: Silhouettes and photographs. *Cognition* 133, 716–728. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2014.08.018
- Pellicano, A., Iani, C., Borghi, A. M., Rubichi, S., and Nicoletti, R. (2010). Simon-like and functional affordance effects with tools: the effects of object perceptual discrimination and object action state. *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.* 63, 2190–2201. doi: 10.1080/17470218.2010.486903
- Pellicano, A., Iani, C., Maiorana, N. V., Horoufchin, H., Rubichi, S., Lugli, L., et al. (2020). Correspondence effect driven by salient visual asymmetries in integral object stimuli. *Psychol. Res.* 84, 728–742. doi: 10.1007/s00426-018-1079-3
- Phillips, J. C., and Ward, R. (2002). SR correspondence effects of irrelevant visual affordance: time course and specificity of response activation. *Vis. Cogn.* 9, 540–558. doi: 10.1080/13506280143000575
- Proctor, R. W., Lien, M. C., and Thompson, L. (2017). Do silhouettes and photographs produce fundamentally different object-based correspondence effects? *Cognition* 169, 91–101. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2017.08.009
- Proctor, R. W., and Miles, J. D. (2014). Does the concept of affordance add anything to explanations of stimulus–response compatibility effects? *Psychol. Learn. Motiv.* 60, 227–266. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-12-800090-8.006-8
- Saccone, E. J., Churches, O., and Nicholls, M. E. (2016). Explicit spatial compatibility is not critical to the object handle effect. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 42, 1643–1653. doi: 10.1037/xhp0000258
- Scerrati, E., Iani, C., Lugli, L., Nicoletti, R., and Rubichi, S. (2020). Do my hands prime your hands? *The hand-to-response correspondence effect. Acta Psychol.* 203:103012. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2020.103012
- Scerrati, E., Iani, C., Lugli, L., and Rubichi, S. (2019). Is there an action potentiation effect with two-handles objects? *Giornale italiano di Psicologia* 46, 987–996.
- Song, X., Chen, J., and Proctor, R. W. (2014). Correspondence effects with torches: grasping affordance or visual feature asymmetry? *Q. J. Exp. Psychol.* 67, 665–675. doi: 10.1080/17470218.2013.824996
- Symes, E., Ellis, R., and Tucker, M. (2005). Dissociating object-based and space-based affordances. *Vis. Cogn.* 12, 1337–1361. doi: 10.1080/1350628044000445
- Tipper, S. P., Paul, M. A., and Hayes, A. E. (2006). Vision-for-action: the effects of object property discrimination and action state on affordance compatibility effects. *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* 13, 493–498. doi: 10.3758/bf03193875
- Tucker, M., and Ellis, R. (1998). On the relations between seen objects and components of potential actions. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 24, 830–846. doi: 10.1037/0096-1523.24.3.830
- Yu, A. B., Abrams, R. A., and Zacks, J. M. (2014). Limits on action priming by pictures of objects. *J. Exp. Psychol.* 40, 1861–1873. doi: 10.1037/a0037397

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2021 Scerrati, D'Ascenzo, Lugli, Iani, Rubichi and Nicoletti. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.