
The authors wish to correct some errors in the reports of their analyses. These modifications do not change any previous interpretations. All previously significant findings are still significant, and all previously nonsignificant findings are still nonsignificant. Specific changes are noted below.

On page 475 (Study 1), in the “Results and Discussion” section, some information was incorrectly noted. The first sentence should have read:

> We found that participants who were told that the book was important judged it to be heavier (*M* = 1,523 g, *SD* = 691) than did participants who received no importance information (*M* = 1,047 g, *SD* = 584), *F*(1, 53) = 7.181, *p* = .01, η² = .12.

On page 476 (Study 2), the last two sentences of the paragraph that begins “Results and Discussion” should read:

> This analysis yielded a three-way interaction among information, perceptual input, and judgment type, *F*(2, 95) = 4.291, *p* = .016, η² = .08. No other interaction or main effects were significant (all *p* values > .50). All relevant means are depicted in Table 1.

On page 476, Table 1 incorrectly reported SEs instead of SDs for the “Value, euros” data. The following changes apply to the SD values in the bottom two rows of Table 1:

> For the “Looking at book” row, the values of 3.50, 3.62 and 3.89 should be replaced by 15.39, 13.62, and 13.76, respectively. Similarly, for the “Holding book” row, the values of 3.21, 3.06, and 3.40 should be replaced by 11.20, 13.61, and 16.27, respectively.

Finally, on page 477 (Study 2), the phrase “all *p* values > .32” should be replaced by “all *p* values > .26”