



Corrigendum: Extending decision making competence to special populations: a pilot study of persons on the autism spectrum

Irwin P. Levin^{1*}, Gary J. Gaeth², Megan Foley-Nicpon³, Vitaliya Yegorova⁴, Charles Cederberg³ and Haoyang Yan⁵

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA, ² Department of Marketing, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA, ³ Department of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA, ⁴ Department of Social Work, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, USA, ⁵ Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Keywords: decision making, persons on the autism spectrum, risk taking, perception of social norms, framing effects

A corrigendum on

Extending decision making competence to special populations: a pilot study of persons on the autism spectrum

by Levin, I. P., Gaeth, G. J., Foley-Nicpon, M., Yegorova, V., Cederberg, C., and Yan, H. (2015). *Front. Psychol.* 6:539. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00539

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Andrew M. Parker,
RAND Corporation, USA

Reviewed by:

Fabio Del Missier,
University of Trieste, Italy

*Correspondence:

Irwin P. Levin
irwin-levin@uiowa.edu

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to
Cognition,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Psychology

Received: 19 May 2016

Accepted: 13 June 2016

Published: 12 July 2016

Citation:

Levin IP, Gaeth GJ, Foley-Nicpon M, Yegorova V, Cederberg C and Yan H (2016) Corrigendum: Extending decision making competence to special populations: a pilot study of persons on the autism spectrum. *Front. Psychol.* 7:971. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00971

In the original article we discovered that the code for scoring self-endorsement of social norms was inadvertently reversed for the ASD and Control groups. This led to errors in Table 2 and three incorrect statements in the text.

In Table 2, the control value for “Self-endorsement of Social norms (0–1)” and the control and *t*-values for “Difference between self-endorsement and perceived others’ endorsement of Social norms (0–1)” were incorrect. A corrected Table 2 is below:

TABLE 2 | T-test results comparing ASD participants with “controls” on Social Measures.

	ASD (N = 15)	Control	t-value (p)
Self-endorsement of Social norms (0–1)	0.38 (0.26)	0.39 (0.20) (N = 174)	0.18 (>0.10)
Perception of others’ endorsement of Social norms (0–100)	35.69 (17.12)	42.20 (14.11) (N = 174)	1.69 (0.0938)
Difference between self-endorsement and perceived others’ endorsement of Social norms (0–1)	0.02 (0.22)	–0.03 (0.17) (N = 174)	1.09 (0.28)

In the “Results” section, sub-section “Between-group Comparisons,” the last paragraph should now read:

Table 2 focuses on behavioral and social measures: components of Recognizing Social Norms where for each of a series of socially-undesirable acts, participants rate their personal likelihood of saying it is okay to perform each act and estimate the percentage of their peers who would say it is okay. Overall, participants with ASD, compared to controls, gave comparable personal endorsements of behaviors that violate social norms. They also tended to give lower ratings of others’ endorsements of these behaviors but this effect failed to reach statistical significance. At the individual item level,

participants in the ASD group gave significantly lower ratings than controls for keeping things that don't belong to you, not holding the door open for someone, not being punctual, and not returning calls. Given that participants in the ASD group were as consistent in self-other judgments as controls, their perceptions of others' undesirable behaviors warrants further study.

In the "Discussion" section, sub-section "Summary of Key Results" RQ1 should now read:

Consistent with theory of mind notions that persons on the autism spectrum have difficulties perceiving social cues, individuals in the ASD group tended to be less likely to perceive others as endorsing undesirable social behaviors. The latter was

especially true of those with the poorest social functioning. Interestingly, individuals in the ASD group showed a significantly greater degree of coherence between personal endorsements and perceptions of others.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2016 Levin, Gaeth, Foley-Nicpon, Yegorova, Cederberg and Yan. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor 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.