



Corrigendum: Spatial Continuity Effect vs. Spatial Contiguity Failure. Revising the Effects of Spatial Proximity Between Related and Unrelated Representations

Maik Beege^{1*}, Maria Wirzberger², Steve Nebel¹, Sascha Schneider¹, Nina Schmidt¹ and Günter Daniel Rey¹

¹ Faculty of Humanities, Technische Universität Chemnitz, Chemnitz, Germany, ² Max Planck Research Group "Rationality Enhancement", Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany

Keywords: split-attention effect, proximity, integration, spatial contiguity principle, spatial contiguity failure

A Corrigendum on

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:

Monika Akbar,
The University of Texas at El Paso,
United States

*Correspondence:

Maik Beege
maik.beege@phil.tu-chemnitz.de

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Digital Education,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Education

Received: 09 March 2020

Accepted: 06 April 2020

Published: 28 April 2020

Citation:

Beege M, Wirzberger M, Nebel S,
Schneider S, Schmidt N and Rey GD
(2020) Corrigendum: Spatial
Continuity Effect vs. Spatial Contiguity
Failure. Revising the Effects of Spatial
Proximity Between Related and
Unrelated Representations.
Front. Educ. 5:46.
doi: 10.3389/feduc.2020.00046

Spatial Continuity Effect vs. Spatial Contiguity Failure. Revising the Effects of Spatial Proximity Between Related and Unrelated Representations

by Beege, M., Wirzberger, M., Nebel, S., Schneider, S., Schmidt, N., and Rey, G. D. (2019). *Front. Educ.* 4:86. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2019.00086

In the original article, there was an error. By describing the results of experiment 1 with regard to the learning outcomes, we accidentally reported incorrect statistical data. We reported the correct conclusions in the results part (non-significant) but the data did not match this statement. The error occurred because we copied the data from another section and forgot to change the statistical values.

A correction has been made to the Experiment 1 section, subsection Results, sub-subsection Learning, paragraph 2:

“With respect to H1a, follow-up contrast analyses (high proximity: $\lambda = 1$; medium proximity: $\lambda = 1$; low proximity: $\lambda = 1$; separated condition: $\lambda = -3$) were conducted in order to test our postulated results pattern. In terms of retention, the results pattern could not be supported $t = 0.66$, $SE = 0.26$, $p = 0.51$, $r = 0.07$. In terms of transfer, the contrast analysis also revealed a non-significant result ($t = 1.47$, $SE = 0.15$, $p = 0.15$, $r = 0.15$). The separated condition did not generally score lower than the spatially integrated conditions.”

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.

Copyright © 2020 Beege, Wirzberger, Nebel, Schneider, Schmidt and Rey. 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.