



Corrigendum: Failing to get the gist of what's being said: background noise impairs higher-order cognitive processing

John E. Marsh^{1,2*}, Robert Ljung¹, Anatole Nöstl¹, Emma Threadgold³ and Tom A. Campbell^{4*}

¹ Department of Building, Energy, and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Sustainable Development, University of Gävle, Gävle, Sweden, ² School of Psychology, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire, UK, ³ Psychology, City University, London, UK, ⁴ Neuroscience Center, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

OPEN ACCESS

Edited and reviewed by:
Jerker Rönnerberg,
Linköping University, Sweden

***Correspondence:**
John E. Marsh
JEMarsh@uclan.ac.uk
Tom A. Campbell
tom.campbell@helsinki.fi

Specialty section:
This article was submitted to
Auditory Cognitive Neuroscience,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

Received: 31 January 2017
Accepted: 01 March 2017
Published: 28 March 2017

Citation:
Marsh JE, Ljung R, Nöstl A,
Threadgold E and Campbell TA (2017)
Corrigendum: Failing to get the gist of
what's being said: background noise
impairs higher-order cognitive
processing. *Front. Psychol.* 8:390.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00390

Keywords: noise, elaborative processing, false recall, semantic clustering, speech intelligibility

A corrigendum on

Failing to get the gist of what's being said: background noise impairs higher-order cognitive processing

by Marsh, J. E., Ljung, R., Nöstl, A., Threadgold, E., and Campbell, T. A. (2015). *Front. Psychol.* 6:548. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00548

ERROR IN TABLE

In the original article, there was a mistake in **Table 1** as published. Due to a tabulation error, the total number of critical lures recalled was reported incorrectly. The corrected **Table 1** appears below. The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way.

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 © 2017 Marsh, Ljung, Nöstl, Threadgold and Campbell. 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) or licensor 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.

TABLE 1 | Mean recall performance for the four recall measures as a function of two background conditions (no noise vs. noise) used in the study.

Dependent measure	No noise		Noise	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mean number of spoken words correctly recalled per list	10.45	0.67	8.78	0.58
Mean number of spoken words per theme correctly recalled per list	4.41	1.09	3.60	0.89
Mean number of themes correctly recalled per list	2.62	0.34	2.48	0.42
Total number of critical lures recalled	2.42	0.37	1.46	0.19
Thematic (Semantic)-clustering (<i>Z</i> scores)	2.43	0.20	1.95	0.16
Total number of critical lures recalled	2.42	0.37	1.46	0.19