

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

ScienceDirect

Journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/cortex](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cortex)

## Corrigendum

## Corrigendum to “An in-depth cognitive examination of individuals with superior face recognition skills” [Cortex 82 (2016) 48–62]

Anna K. Bobak<sup>a</sup>, Rachel J. Bennetts<sup>a</sup>, Benjamin A. Parris<sup>a</sup>,  
Ashok Jansari<sup>b</sup> and Sarah Bate<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Psychology, Bournemouth University, UK

<sup>b</sup> Department of Psychology, Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

The authors regret that some of the values in Tables 2–4 were rounded up incorrectly in the original article. The corrected values are in the tables below. While this omission does not change the conclusions, it is nonetheless an issue for colleagues who wish to calculate the individuals' scores in detail. The authors would also like to note that the CFPT inversion index in Table 4 was expressed in raw scores rather than the

number of standard deviations away from the mean. This has now been corrected.

Please also note, the Corresponding Author for this article has now changed to Dr Sarah Bate.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

**Table 2 – Results from the object-processing tasks administered in Study 1. All values for SR participants are expressed in the number of SDs away from the control mean.**

	Controls			Super-Recognisers					
	Mean	SD	N	CH	DF	JN	GK	CW	TP
Matching test (d'):									
Faces upright	2.05	.44	21	1.61	2.86*	3.30*	.07	1.14	1.75
Faces inverted	1.01	.58	21	-.41	-.47	-.69	-.53	-.84	-.59
Face inversion effect	1.04	.61	21	1.56	2.51*	3.03*	.56	1.62	1.82
Hands upright	1.99	.66	21	1.55	-.35	.47	1.12	.08	-.12
Hands inverted	1.89	.55	21	.38	.71	.89	2.22*	-1.05	-.29
Hand inversion effect	.10	.46	21	2.67*	-1.35	-.39	-1.04	1.37	.17
Houses upright	2.80	.60	21	1.18	.02	.18	.67	-1.83	1.02
Houses inverted	2.58	.74	21	1.92	.24	.32	-4.36*	-.30	1.04
House inversion effect	.20	.51	21	-1.39	-.33	-.25	7.12*	-1.73	-.31
CCMT <sup>a</sup> :									
Females	50.44/72	7.15	93	–	–	.64	–	–	–
Males	57.43/72	8.33	60	-.17	.91	–	-.65	.43	1.63

\* Indicates participant significantly differed to controls using Crawford et al.'s (2010) modified t-tests for single-case comparisons ( $p < .05$ ).

<sup>a</sup> Cambridge Car Memory Test (test and norms from Dennett et al., 2012) – performance varies according to gender on this test.

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.05.003>.

\* Corresponding author. Department of Psychology, Faculty of Science and Technology, Poole House, Bournemouth University, Fern Barrow, Poole BH12 5BB, UK.

E-mail addresses: [abobak@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:abobak@bournemouth.ac.uk) (A.K. Bobak), [sbate@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:sbate@bournemouth.ac.uk) (S. Bate).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2017.02.001>

0010-9452/© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

**Table 3 – Results from the tasks administered in Study 2. All values for SR participants are expressed in the number of SDs away from the control mean.**

	Controls			Super-Recognisers					
	Mean	SD	N	CH	DF	JN	GK	CW	TP
<i>Perception of facial identity</i>									
Matching test (upright faces, d):	2.05	.44	21	1.61	2.86*	3.30*	.07	1.14	1.75
CFPT <sup>a</sup> :									
Upright	35.93	14.96	58	-.66	-1.60	-1.06	-1.33	-1.33	-1.06
Inverted	61.76	11.38	58	.55	-1.21	.20	-1.56	-.33	-1.74

\* Indicates participant significantly differed to controls using Crawford et al.'s (2010) modified t-tests for single-case comparisons ( $p < .05$ ).

<sup>a</sup> Cambridge Face Perception Test (Duchaine et al., 2007), lower score indicates better performance.

**Table 4 – Results from the configural processing tests described in Study 3. All values for SR participants are expressed in the number of SDs away from the control mean.**

	Controls			Super-Recognisers					
	Mean	SD	N	CH	DF	JN	GK	CW	TP
Navon task (global bias index <sup>a</sup> )	.90	.1	28	.45	.64	-2.82*	.45	.73	-.09
CFPT (inversion index <sup>b</sup> )	.96	.78	58	1.35	2.61*	1.59	1.21	2.17*	.18
Matching test (faces inversion effect <sup>c</sup> )	1.04	.61	21	1.56	2.51*	3.03*	.56	1.62	1.82
Composite task (composite effect <sup>d</sup> ):									
Faces upright	314.4	368.12	29	-.70	-.03	.45	-.68	-.70	2.46*
Faces inverted	3.36	213.46	29	-.21	-.01	.08	.57	-1.98	.05
Dogs upright	-24.00	164.21	29	-.46	1.89	-.88	1.58	-.84	-2.24
Dogs inverted	-38.10	173.83	29	.94	.40	-.81	-.87	-1.14	2.41

\* Indicates participant significantly differed to controls using Crawford et al.'s (2010) modified t-tests for single-case comparisons ( $p < .05$ ).

<sup>a</sup> Test from Navon (1977), global bias index from Duchaine et al. (2007).

<sup>b</sup> Inversion index = (upright-inverted)/upright (calculated using total errors in the upright and inverted condition; Russell et al., 2009).

<sup>c</sup> Inversion effect =  $d'$  (upright) -  $d'$  (inverted).

<sup>d</sup> Composite effect = IE (misaligned) - IE (aligned) (Robbins & McKone, 2007).