

ERRATUM

## Erratum to: Moral Foundations and Attitudes Towards the Poor

Michelle Low<sup>1</sup> · Ma. Glenda Lopez Wui<sup>2</sup>

Published online: 22 March 2017  
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2017

### Erratum to: Curr Psychol DOI 10.1007/s12144-015-9333-y

This erratum is written in reference to two reporting errors found. The first reporting error is specifically in reference to the participants. 185 adult Americans had volunteered to participate in the study. In terms of political affiliation, 33.5% of participants identified as Democrat, 12.4% identified as Republican, 25.4% as Independents, and 28.6% as “Others”, “No answer”, or “No preference.” However, due to the lack of responses in some of the scales of interest in this study, participants who identified as Independents and “Others”, “No answer”, or “No preference” were dropped from the analysis. This resulted in a sample size of 83 participants (73.5% Democrats and 26.5% Republicans).

The second reporting error is specifically in reference to the result section. Additional analysis revealed a significant

score difference in attitudes towards the poor between participants who identified as Democrats ( $M = 4.02$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ) and those who identified as Republicans ( $M = 3.31$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ );  $t(81) = -2.72$ ,  $p = .01$ .

After reviewing these errors, results remained entirely consistent with those reported in the published article. While these reporting mistakes did not place our findings in jeopardy, we sincerely regret the error.

**Table 2** Hierarchical regression analysis predicting attitudes towards the poor

	Standardized beta coefficient	Standard error
Step 1		
Age	0.08	0.01
Gender	0.14	0.18
Political affiliation	-0.09	0.06
R <sup>2</sup> change	0.04	
Step 2		
Age	0.04	0.01
Gender	-0.04	0.16
Political affiliation	-0.03	0.05
Harm	0.46**	0.10
Fairness	0.07	0.11
Ingroup	-0.06	0.11
Authority	-0.17	0.11
Purity	0.10	0.08
R <sup>2</sup> change	0.31**	
Total R <sup>2</sup> change	0.35	

Higher scores on the scaled variables reflect stronger endorsements of that foundation.

Political affiliation: 1 for Democrat, 2 for Republican.

\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .001$

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12144-015-9333-y>

✉ Michelle Low  
lowmiche@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, United States

<sup>2</sup> National University of Singapore, Singapore, Singapore