

- Tomasello, M. (1999). *The cultural origins of human cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tulving, E., & Thomson, D. M. (1973). Encoding specificity and retrieval processes in episodic memory. *Psychological Review*, 80, 352–373.
- Uleman, J. S. (1988). [Trait and gist inference norms for over 300 potential trait-implicating sentences]. Unpublished raw data.
- Uleman, J. S. (1999). Spontaneous versus intentional inferences in impression formation. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp. 141–160). New York: Guilford Press.
- Uleman, J. S., Newman, L. S., & Moskowitz, G. B. (1996). People as flexible interpreters: Evidence and issues from spontaneous trait inference. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 28, pp. 211–279). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wellman, H. (1990). *The child's theory of mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Received July 31, 2003

Revision received April 26, 2004

Accepted May 12, 2004 ■

Correction to Sagarin et al. (2002)

In the article “Dispelling the Illusion of Invulnerability: The Motivations and Mechanisms of Resistance to Persuasion,” by Brad J. Sagarin, Robert B. Cialdini, William E. Rice, and Sherman B. Serna (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2002, Vol. 83, No. 3, pp. 526–541), on p. 535, second column, in the third sentence of the *Demonstrated vulnerability treatment* section, all scale labels should have been included. The sentence should read as follows:

The initial question asked them to indicate how convincing they found the ad on a 7-point scale labeled *not at all convincing* (0), *somewhat convincing* (1), *fairly convincing* (2), *convincing* (3), *quite convincing* (4), *very convincing* (5), and *extremely convincing* (6).