Correction to Levine et al. (2010)

In the article "What Counts in the Development of Young Children's Number Knowledge?" by Susan C. Levine, Linda Whealton Suriyakham, Meredith L. Rowe, Janellen Huttenlocher, and Elizabeth A. Gunderson (*Developmental Psychology*, 2010, Vol. 46, No. 5, pp. 1309–1319), a coding error resulted in incorrect item-level data being reported on the point-to-*x* task (not the children's overall performance on this task) in Table 2 and in the section of the Results headed Point-to-*X* Task Performance (second column, p. 1314). All findings reported as significant in that section remain significant, but there are slight changes in the *t* statistics and *p* values reported.

In the first paragraph in the section, the correct average score for knowledge of cardinal meanings of the number words, as indexed by performance on the point-to-*x* task at age 46 months, was 12.55 (range 6.0–16.0; $SD = 2.96$). The correct *t* statistic concerning children's greater performance level when the target was the higher number of the pair was $t(43) = 2.48$, $p < .05$.

In the second paragraph in the section, there is an example illustrating children's greater performance on items involving a target and a distractor that were one digit apart. In this example, the average percentage correct should have been given as 93% for 1 versus 2, as 73% for 3 versus 4, and as 53% for 5 versus 6. The correlation between item numerosity and percentage correct was significant at $r = .96$, $p < .05$.

An additional adjustment in the second paragraph involves the finding that children performed better when at least one of two choice sets was a small number (1–3) than when both choice sets were greater than or equal to 4. Specifically, the percentage of time that the children answered correctly when the lower number in a pair was less than or equal to 3 should have been given as 83% ($SD = 20.2$). The percentage of the time that the children answered correctly when the lower number in a pair was greater than 3 should have been given as 64% ($SD = 25.5$). The correct *t* statistic showing that this difference in performance levels on the lower and higher numerosity items was highly significant was $t(43) = 5.04$, $p < .001$ (see corrected Table 2 for the percentage of children who answered each item correctly).

Table 2

Corrected Percentage of Children Responding Correctly to Each Item on the Point-to-X Task

Item	Target	Percentage correct
1 vs. 2	1	95
1 vs. 2	2	91
2 vs. 3	2	**82**
2 vs. 3	3	89
2 vs. 4	2	**86**
2 vs. 4	4	82
3 vs. 4	3	**73**
3 vs. 4	4	**73**
3 vs. 5	3	**77**
3 vs. 5	5	**95**
3 vs. 6	3	**73**
3 vs. 6	6	**84**
4 vs. 5	4	66
4 vs. 5	5	**82**
5 vs. 6	5	**32**
5 vs. 6	6	75
Total		78

Note. $N = 44$. Corrected percentages are shown in bold. Items were presented in a single random order, either forward or backward, and the location of the target numerosity (left vs. right) was counterbalanced across children.