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The authors note that on page 10090, right column, first full paragraph in the Results section, “Following the training period, performance improved for both groups (Fig. 1), although it remained superior for native discriminations (main effect of native/nonnative, \( F_{(1,76)} = 934.01, P < .0001 \)). There was only a trend toward synesthetes to be more accurate than controls after training (\( F_{(1,76)} = 3.618, P = 0.061 \)), with no significant interaction between group and native vs. nonnative (\( F_{(1,76)} = 0.012, P = 0.91 \))” should instead appear as “Following the training period, performance improved for both groups (Fig. 1), although it remained superior for native discriminations (main effect of native/nonnative, \( F_{(1,76)} = 11.389, P = .001 \)). There was a trend for synesthetes to be more accurate than non-native contrast (see Fig. 1; interaction of group and native/nonnative, \( F_{(1,76)} = 3.082, P = 0.083 \), with no main effect of group (\( F_{(1,76)} = 0.013, P = 0.91 \)).” The online version has been corrected. The authors also note that Fig. 1 appeared incorrectly. The corrected figure and its legend appear below. The online version has been corrected.
Fig. 1. Mean proportion correct (±95% confidence interval) for detecting phonetic differences during the pretest and the posttest of Experiment 1a. Shown is the accuracy on different trials. During the pretest, synesthetes (dark bars) were more accurate than nonsynesthetes (light bars) in making the nonnative distinctions (Left), with no such advantage for native differences (Right). The asterisk indicates a significant between-group difference for the nonnative comparison by planned one-tailed t tests: *P < 0.05.
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