

Correction to Shallcross et al. (2013)

In the article “Getting better with age: The relationship between age, acceptance, and negative affect” by Amanda J. Shallcross, Brett Q. Ford, Victoria A. Floerke, and Iris B. Mauss (*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 104, No. 4, pp. 734–749. doi: 10.1037/a0031180) skin conductance level (SCL) was processed incorrectly during the data reduction step, and SCL values used for the original analyses were thus incorrect. The original results indicated that age predicted SCL reactivity to a stressor, that acceptance predicted SCL reactivity to a stressor, and that acceptance mediated the link between age and SCL reactivity. The correct results indicate that age marginally predicts SCL reactivity ($r = -.12$, $p = .065$) and that acceptance does not predict SCL reactivity ($r = -.04$, $p = .496$). Thus mediation is not tenable for SCL.

The overall conclusions of the article remain. Age was associated with increased acceptance and lower anger and anxiety (but not sadness) across measurement modalities and time points. Further, acceptance statistically mediated the relationship between age on the one hand and anger and anxiety on the other hand. These results are consistent with the idea that age is associated with lower anger and anxiety but not sadness, and that acceptance may be a pathway in the link between age and lower negative affect. These conclusions are not altered by the incorrect SCL results.

A complete list of corrected results and conclusions is below. Changes are shown in bold except where the change consists of dropping mention of physiological reactivity (SCL).

On p. 738, the first sentence of Footnote 3 should read:

“When somatic movement was not controlled for, the relationships between physiological reactivity, age and acceptance all remained **unchanged**.”

On p. 739, under Results, the section beginning on Line 4 of Paragraph 2 should read:

“With regard to affective reactivity to the laboratory stress induction (T2), age was negatively correlated with anger and anxiety reactivity but not sadness reactivity. **Age was marginally negatively correlated with physiological reactivity.**”

On p. 739, under Results, the section beginning on Line 5 of Paragraph 3 should read:

“Acceptance statistically mediated links between age on the one hand and cross-sectional trait anger (T1; Figure 1A), cross-sectional trait anxiety (T1; Figure 1B), anger reactivity (T2; Figure 1C), anxiety reactivity (T2; Figure 1D), daily anger (T3; Figure 1F), and daily anxiety (T3; Figure 1G) on the other hand⁷. Acceptance marginally mediated the link between age and prospective trait anxiety (T4 controlling for T1; Figure 1H; p of Sobel’s $z = .054$). Full mediation was found for all measures except prospective trait anxiety, where acceptance was a partial mediator. **Mediation was not tenable for physiological reactivity because acceptance was not related to physiological reactivity (T2; Figure 1E).**”

On p. 740, Table 2, Row 11, descriptive statistics and correlations with physiological reactivity should be changed to the following:

Descriptive statistics (Columns 1 and 2):

Physiological reactivity $N = 257$; $M(SD) = .66 (.61)$

Simple correlations (Columns 3 and 4):

Physiological reactivity and age ($r = -.12$)

Physiological reactivity and acceptance ($r = -.04$)

Regression with age and acceptance as simultaneous predictors (Columns 5, 6, and 7):

Physiological reactivity with age —

Physiological reactivity with acceptance —

Sobel’s $z = —$

On p. 741, Table 3, correlations with physiological reactivity (Variable 7) should be changed to the following:

Physiological reactivity with T1 trait anger ($r = -.12$)

Physiological reactivity with T1 trait anxiety ($r = -.03$)

Physiological reactivity with T1 trait sadness ($r = -.02$)

Physiological reactivity with T2 anger reactivity ($r = .02$)

Physiological reactivity with T2 anxiety reactivity ($r = -.01$)

Physiological reactivity with T2 sadness reactivity ($r = .01$)

Physiological reactivity with T3 daily anger ($r = -.04$)

Physiological reactivity with T3 daily anxiety ($r = -.03$)

Physiological reactivity with T3 daily sadness ($r = -.11$)

Physiological reactivity with T4 trait anger ($r = -.11$)

Physiological reactivity with T4 trait anxiety ($r = -.15^*$)

Physiological reactivity with T4 trait sadness ($r = -.01$)

Physiological reactivity with prospective (T4 controlling for T1) trait anger ($r = -.12$)

Physiological reactivity with prospective (T4 controlling for T1) trait anxiety ($r = -.15^*$)

Physiological reactivity with prospective (T4 controlling for T1) trait sadness ($r = .03$)

On p. 741, Footnote 8, Lines 10 and 11, should read:

“T2 physiological reactivity ($r = -.11$, $p = .087$)”

The sentence on p. 741/742 (Column 2, beginning on Line 5 of Paragraph 2) should read:

“The finding that age was **marginally** inversely associated with physiological reactivity, in particular, further substantiates the present results because skin conductance level (SCL) has been found to correlate with anger and anxiety but not sadness.”

Figure 1 (Panel E) on p. 742 should reflect the changes below. Numbers represent standardized betas. The second beta represents values when predictors were entered into the regression model simultaneously.

Correlation between age and physiological reactivity ($beta = -.12^\ddagger$; $beta = .11^\ddagger$)

Correlation between acceptance and physiological reactivity ($beta = -.04$; $beta = -.03$)

The sentence on p. 743 (beginning on Line 7 under the heading “Age, Acceptance, and Negative Affect,”) should read:

“Across measurement modalities (i.e., trait assessments, experiential responding to a laboratory stress induction, and daily diaries), acceptance statistically mediated the relationship between age on the one hand and anger and anxiety on the other hand.”

The sentence on p. 745 (beginning on Line 16 of Paragraph 3) should read:

“Second, our results replicate across a wide range of methods, including daily diaries, which control for important confounds such as recall bias.”