



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

*CORRESPONDENCE
Li-Jun Ji
✉ lijunji@queensu.ca

SPECIALTY SECTION
This article was submitted to
Cultural Psychology,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

RECEIVED 21 December 2022
ACCEPTED 19 January 2023
PUBLISHED 07 February 2023

CITATION
Vaughan-Johnston T, Imtiaz F, Lee A and Ji L-J
(2023) Corrigendum: Age differences in
leadership positions across cultures.
Front. Psychol. 14:1129019.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129019

COPYRIGHT
© 2023 Vaughan-Johnston, Imtiaz, Lee and Ji.
This is an open-access article distributed under
the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s) and the
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic practice.
No use, distribution or reproduction is
permitted which does not comply with these
terms.

Corrigendum: Age differences in leadership positions across cultures

Thomas Vaughan-Johnston^{1,2}, Faizan Imtiaz³, Albert Lee⁴ and Li-Jun Ji^{1*}

¹Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada, ²Department of Psychology, Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom, ³Department of Psychology, Towson University, Towson, MD, United States, ⁴School of Social Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Singapore

KEYWORDS

leadership, aging, culture, cultural tightness, business, politics

A corrigendum on Age differences in leadership positions across cultures

by Vaughan-Johnston, T., Imtiaz, F., Lee, A., and Ji, L.-J. (2021). *Front. Psychol.* 12:703831.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.703831

In the published article, there was an error in [Table 2](#). For “Prioritizing Male Leadership,” the *a*-path was stated as 0.70***, *b*-path as -0.84, indirect effect as -0.59 [-1.73, 0.50], and direct effect as 6.39 [2.56, 10.22]; those values are corrected to 0.39***, -0.68, -0.27 [-2.19, 1.60], and 6.07 [1.94, 10.20], respectively. For “Prioritizing Male Wages,” the *a*-path/*b*-path were stated as -0.34***/-2.48, but are corrected to 0.34***/2.48, respectively. For “Veneration of Elderly,” the *a*-path/*b*-path were stated as -0.24***/-2.37, but are corrected to 0.24***/2.37, respectively. The corrected [Table 2](#) and its caption appear below.

In the published article, there was also an error in the text. A correction has been made to **Results**, *Preregistered Linear Modeling Tests*, paragraph 2. This sentence previously stated:

“That is, compared to Western countries, Eastern countries tended to prioritize male over female leadership (but male wages less), valued the utilitarian benefits of science more (with less belief that science undermines morality), venerated the elderly less, had more desire to be distanced both from sexually stigmatized groups and from cultural minority groups, and were culturally tighter.”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“That is, compared to Western countries, Eastern countries tended to prioritize male over female leadership and wages, valued the utilitarian benefits of science more (with less belief that science undermines morality), venerated the elderly more, had more desire to be distanced both from sexually stigmatized groups and from cultural minority groups, and were culturally tighter.”

The authors apologize for this error and state that it does not change the primary scientific conclusions of the article. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

TABLE 2 Indirect effects from culture contrast to political leader age (Study 2).

Mediator	<i>a</i> -path (culture contrast to mediator)	<i>b</i> -path (mediator to leader age)	Indirect effect (<i>a</i> X <i>b</i>)	Direct effect	<i>n</i> for analysis
Prioritizing Male Leadership	0.39***	-0.68	-0.27 [-2.19, 1.60]	6.07 [1.94, 10.20]	261
Prioritizing Male Wages	0.34***	2.48	0.85 [-0.31, 2.02]	4.96 [1.13, 8.79]	261
Science/Utilitarianism	0.44***	-1.09	-0.48 [-1.52, 0.50]	6.29 [2.50, 10.07]	261
Science/Core Values	-0.49***	0.97	-0.47 [-1.43, 0.43]	6.28 [2.49, 10.07]	261
Veneration of Elderly	0.24***	2.37	0.57 [-0.23, 1.40]	5.23 [1.48, 8.99]	261
Distance/Sexually Stigmatized	0.25***	3.18	0.81 [-0.48, 2.15]	5.68 [1.64, 9.72]	249
Distance/Culture	0.07***	8.44	0.63 [0.00, 1.45]	5.18 [1.45, 8.91]	261
Cultural Tightness	16.31***	0.06**	1.02 [0.28, 1.84]	9.00 [5.75, 12.25]	440

** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Values in square brackets refer to 95% confidence intervals.