Correction to: The Influence of Body Proportions on Perceived Gender of Robots in Latin America

Gabriele Trovato, Cesar Lucho, Friederike Eyssel,
and Jasmin Bernotat

Correction to:
Chapter "The Influence of Body Proportions on Perceived
Gender of Robots in Latin America" in: A. D. Cheok
and D. Levy (Eds.): *Love and Sex with Robots*, **LNCS 10715,**
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76369-9_12

The results section of the chapter was not correct. This has been now corrected.

Page 163:

Their mean age was 29 years (SD = 9.80)

should be

Their mean age was 29.04 years (SD = 9.79).

Page 163:

Internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) were 0.79 for agency; 0.92 for communion; 0.72 for benevolent sexism and 0.79 for hostile sexism.

should be

Internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) were for each stimulus: .83, .72, .83, .74, .77, .71 for agency; .90, .93, .89, .94, .94, .93 for communion. α was .72 for benevolent sexism and .79 for hostile sexism.

Page 164:

CHR and WHR are confirmed to be independent from each other ($G^2(2)$ = 0.2, p = .9).

should be

CHR and WHR are confirmed to be independent from each other ($G^2(2)$ = 0.2, p = .905).

Page 164:

and in C1 ($T(56) = -3.20$; $p = .002$). In case of C1, this is a case of mismatch with the use of pronouns.

should be

and in C1 ($t(55) = -3.11$; $p = .003$). In case of C1, this is a case of mismatch with the use of pronouns.

Page 165:

From Fig. 3 it is possible to notice that male ratings are higher for B1 and B2 and female higher for C1 and C2. Performing additional *t*-tests confirmed that stimuli with a high CHR correspond to higher male traits (in case of B1 and C1: $T(56) = -5.04$; $p < .001$).

should be

From Fig. 3 it is possible to notice that male ratings are higher for B1 and B2 and female higher for C1 and C2. Performing additional *t*-tests confirmed that stimuli with a high CHR correspond to higher male traits (in case of B1 and C1: $t(55) = -4.93$; $p < .001$).

Page 165:

The degree of attribution of female communion traits was negatively correlated both with familiarity with robots ($r(56) = -.27$; $p = .045$) and with familiarity with product design ($r(56) = -.30$; $p = .023$). Nothing significant was found between familiarity with robots and agency ($r(56) = -.02$; $p = .9$), and familiarity with product design and agency ($r(56) = -.08$; $p = .5$).

should be

The degree of attribution of female communion traits was negatively correlated both with familiarity with robots ($r(54) = -.27$; $p = .047$) and with familiarity with product design ($r(55) = -.30$; $p = .024$). Nothing significant was found between familiarity with robots and agency ($r(54) = -.003$; $p = .979$), and familiarity with product design and agency ($r(55) = .08$; $p = .552$).

Page 165:

Moreover, benevolent sexism was positively correlated with the attribution of communion-related traits to robots ($r(55) = 0.48$; $p < .001$) but not with agency-related traits ($r(55) = 0.20$; $p = .14$). Neither the correlations between communion and hostile sexism ($r(55) = 0.25$; $p = .06$) and agency and hostile sexism ($r(55) = 0.23$; $p = .08$) turned out statistically significant.

should be

Moreover, benevolent sexism was positively correlated with the attribution of communion-related traits to robots ($r(54) = .48$; $p < .001$) and with agency-related traits ($r(54) = .33$; $p = .013$). Neither the correlations between communion and hostile sexism ($r(54) = .23$; $p = .085$) and agency and hostile sexism ($r(54) = .25$; $p = .062$) turned out statistically significant.