Correction to: Sex Differences in Response to Deception Across Mate-Value Traits of Attractiveness, Job Status, and Altruism in Online Dating

Jessica Desrochers¹ · Megan MacKinnon¹ · Benjamin Kelly¹ · Brett Masse² · Steven Arnocky¹

Published online: 29 November 2021

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: Archives of Sexual Behavior

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-01945-6>

The following ocrrections should be noted to the article “Sex Differences in Response to Deception Across Mate-Value Traits of Attractiveness, Job Status, and Altruism in Online Dating” (<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-021-01945-6>)

- (1) In the Method Section for Study 1 under the heading “Sociosexual Orientation” it currently states:

“The SOI-R consists of nine items, with 3 items per component, scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*.”

There was an error in describing the anchoring of the scaling. Accordingly, the section should read:

“The SOI-R consists of 9 items, with 3 items per component, scored on a 5-point scale, with different scaling anchors for each component. The behavior component had a scaling of 1 = 0, 2 = 1, 3 = 2-3, 4 = 4-7, and 5 = 8 or more. The attitude component’s scaling was anchored from 1 = *totally disagree* to 5 = *totally agree*. The desire component had a scaling of 1 = *never*, 2 = *very seldom*, 3 = *about once a month*, 4 = *about once a week*, and 5 = *nearly every day*.”

- (2) In the Method Section for Study 2 under the heading “Deception” it currently states:

“After reading the scenario (see supplementary materials, Appendices B, C, and D), participants were asked two (continuous) follow-up questions. “How upset would this dishonesty make you?” was anchored from 1 = *not at all upset* to 7 = *very upset*. “How likely would you be to cancel your date?” was anchored from 1 = *I would cancel* to 7 = *I would cancel the date*.”

There was an error regarding the direction of the scaling for one of the items, and a grammatical error regarding an anchor for the other item. Accordingly, the section should read:

“After reading the scenario (see supplementary materials, Appendices B, C, and D), participants were asked two (continuous) follow-up questions. “How upset would this dishonesty make you?” was anchored from 1 = *Very upset* to 7 = *Not at all upset*. “How likely would you be to cancel your date?” was anchored from 1 = *I would keep the date* to 7 = *I would cancel the date*. A third question asking about likelihood of keeping the date was included as an attention check but was not analyzed.”

- (3) The reversal of the item about degree of upset over dating deception did not alter the finding regarding a potential sex difference, which was null for this item. It does, however, suggest that the reported non-significant trend was opposite to what was reported in-text.

Specifically, where we wrote:

“There was a trend towards a main effect of sex, $F(1, 353) = 3.61$, $p = .058$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$, where men ($M = 3.44$) were more upset than women ($M = 3.16$) about the dishonesty in general.”

Should have read:

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-01945-6>.

✉ Steven Arnocky
stevena@nipissingu.ca

¹ Department of Psychology, Nipissing University, North Bay, ON P1B 8L7, Canada

² Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

“There was a trend towards a main effect of sex, $F(1, 353) = 3.61$, $p = .058$, $\eta^2 = .01$, where men ($M = 3.44$) were less upset than women ($M = 3.20$) about the dishonesty in general (given that lower scores on this item reflected more upset)”

- (4) In the Results section for Study 2 under the How Likely Would You Cancel the Date header it currently states:

“When examining the interactions for each of the moderators, none of the interaction were significant: mate value by condition ($b = -.25$ SE = .14 $t = -1.85$ $p = .06$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -5.2, UL = .02), SOI-R by condition ($b = -.19$ SE = .14 $t = -1.34$ $p = .018$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.47, UL = .09), sex by mate value ($b = -.007$ SE = .22 $t = -.03$ $p = .97$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.44, UL = .43) nor sex x SOI-R ($b = -.14$ SE = .24 $t = -.60$ $p = .55$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.62, UL = .33).”

There is a typing error in reporting the p-value for the SOI-R by condition interaction. This typing error does not

change the interpretation of the results and all other statistical values are correct. Accordingly, this section should now read:

“When examining the interactions for each of the moderators, none of the interaction were significant: mate value by condition ($b = -.25$ SE = .14 $t = -1.85$ $p = .06$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -5.2, UL = .02), SOI-R by condition ($b = -.19$ SE = .14 $t = -1.34$ $p = .18$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.47, UL = .09), sex by mate value ($b = -.007$ SE = .22 $t = -.03$ $p = .97$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.44, UL = .43) nor sex x SOI-R ($b = -.14$ SE = .24 $t = -.60$ $p = .55$, 95% confidence intervals: LL = -.62, UL = .33).”

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.