



# Corrigendum: Reading Single Words Aloud With Monocular Presentation: The Effect of Word Frequency

Serje Robidoux<sup>1</sup> and Derek Besner<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ARC Centre of Excellence for Cognition and its Disorders, Department of Cognitive Science, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia, <sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology Cognition and Perception Unit, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

**Keywords:** visual word recognition, binocular reading, reading aloud, word frequency, monocular reading, Bayesian analysis

## A corrigendum on

**Reading Single Words Aloud With Monocular Presentation: The Effect of Word Frequency** by Robidoux, S., and Besner, D. (2018). *Front. Commun.* 3:16. doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2018.00016

In the original article, there was an error. An error in the script used to analyse the experiment in Robidoux and Besner (2018) led to an overstatement of the directional evidence against the Jainta et al. (2017) account for that data. When adjusting the general Bayes factor for the directional prediction made by Jainta et al.'s account, we stated that "...the evidence favoring the null model over the Jainta et al. account increases from 12.6 to 46.0 times," where in fact the evidence increases to 23.0 times. Reasoning and conclusions for the study are not affected by the correction. Revised analysis scripts have been uploaded to the original location (<https://osf.io/t9dux/>), and the original analysis script contains a prominent warning.

A correction has been made to *The Experiment, Results, Paragraph 1*:

The model predicted means are summarized (along with percentage errors) in **Table 1**. The experiment provided strong evidence for the null model (no interaction) over the interactive alternative model ( $BF_{01} = 12.6 \pm 2.36\%$ ). That is, the evidence strongly favored the view that the word frequency effect was equivalent in both the monocular and binocular reading conditions. In fact, from **Table 1** it is apparent that if there *were* an interaction, it would go in the wrong direction—monocular reading produced a slightly *larger* word frequency effect. The implication is that the evidence for the form of the interaction reported by Jainta and colleagues is specific to their eye movement paradigm rather than general to other measures (such as reading aloud, as here). When the Bayes factor is corrected for this directional prediction, the evidence favoring the null model over the Jainta et al. account increases from 12.6 to 23.0 times<sup>1</sup>.

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.

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited and reviewed by:

Niels Janssen,  
Universidad de La Laguna, Spain

### \*Correspondence:

Derek Besner  
dbesner@uwaterloo.ca

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Language Sciences,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Communication

**Received:** 04 July 2018

**Accepted:** 16 July 2018

**Published:** 06 August 2018

### Citation:

Robidoux S and Besner D (2018)  
Corrigendum: Reading Single Words  
Aloud With Monocular Presentation:  
The Effect of Word Frequency.  
*Front. Commun.* 3:33.  
doi: 10.3389/fcomm.2018.00033

<sup>1</sup>The BayesFactor package in R does not allow directly specifying a one-tailed prior. To correct for the direction of the predicted effects, we followed Richard Morey's advice here: <http://bayesfactor.blogspot.com/2015/01/multiple-comparisons-with-bayesfactor-2.html> and adjusted the  $BF_{10}$  for the proportion of the posterior distribution that was consistent with the Jainta et al. data. See the scripts and data for details.

## REFERENCES

Jainta, S., Nikolova, M., and Liversedge, S. (2017). Does text contrast mediate binocular advantages in reading? *J. Exp. Psychol. Hum. Percept. Perform.* 43, 55–68. doi: 10.1037/xhp0000293

**Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

*Copyright © 2018 Robidoux and Besner. 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.*