

Erratum to: Masculinity and suicidal thinking

Jane Pirkis¹ · Matthew J. Spittal¹ · Louise Keogh² · Tass Mousaferiadis³ · Dianne Currier⁴

Published online: 15 September 2017
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany 2017

Erratum to: Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol (2017) 52:319–327
DOI 10.1007/s00127-016-1324-2

In the original publication there was an error in the calculation of scores for a number of the CMNI subscales and consequently the overall scale score. Recalculating the scores did not alter the substantive finding, and largely resulted in only small adjustments to estimates. Tables 1 and 2 are revised to show the corrected values, and revisions to the text reflecting these changes are noted.

Consequently the following updates to the text also apply:

Page 319: Abstract, results section: (AOR 1.33; 95% CI 1.25–1.42).

Page 322, para 7: “Average” in terms of conformity to masculine norms (mean 27.0; SD 6.5).

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:10.1007/s00127-016-1324-2.

✉ Dianne Currier
dianne.currier@unimelb.edu.au

¹ Centre for Mental Health, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

² Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

³ Independent Men’s Health Consultant, Melbourne, Australia

⁴ Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

Page 322, para 7: They showed below average conformity on some factors [e.g., playboy (mean 1.6; SD 1.4)] but above average on others [e.g. pursuit of status (mean 3.2; SD 1.1)].

Page 322, para 8: Table 2 shows the results of the logistic regression analysis. In the univariate analysis, the masculinity factors of playboy, power over women, violence and emotional control and self-reliance conferred risk for suicidal thinking, and risk-taking and pursuit of status were protective against it. After controlling for each of the other factors on the CMNI-22 and for the other covariates, three masculinity factors remained significant, namely self-reliance (AOR 1.33; 95% CI 1.25–1.42), heterosexual

Table 1 Factor scores on the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI, 22)

Factor ^a	Mean	SD
Work	2.6	1.2
Dominance	2.4	1.1
Risk-taking	2.7	1.2
Heterosexual presentation	2.8	1.6
Power over women	1.2	1.0
Emotional control	3.1	1.4
Playboy	1.6	1.4
Violence	2.3	1.5
Pursuit of status	3.2	1.1
Winning	2.4	1.1
Self-reliance	2.6	1.2
Total score	27.0	6.5

^a Each factor scored from 0 (lowest conformity) to 6 (highest conformity)

Table 2 Logistic regression model for suicidal ideation

	Unadjusted OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value	Adjusted OR	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
Conformity to masculine norms ^a						
Work	1.01	(0.96, 1.06)	0.669	1.02	(0.96, 1.09)	0.448
Dominance	1.01	(0.96, 1.07)	0.635	1.00	(0.93, 1.08)	0.965
Risk-taking	1.02	(0.97, 1.07)	0.366	0.99	(0.93, 1.05)	0.766
Heterosexual presentation	0.98	(0.94, 1.01)	0.226	0.94	(0.89, 0.99)	0.011
Power over women	1.10	(1.04, 1.16)	0.001	1.05	(0.97, 1.14)	0.236
Emotional control	1.11	(1.07, 1.16)	<0.001	0.98	(0.93, 1.04)	0.496
Playboy	1.18	(1.13, 1.23)	<0.001	1.02	(0.96, 1.07)	0.554
Violence	1.10	(1.06, 1.15)	<0.001	1.04	(0.98, 1.09)	0.164
Pursuit of status	0.81	(0.77, 0.85)	<0.001	0.91	(0.85, 0.99)	0.019
Winning	1.01	(0.96, 1.06)	0.756	1.00	(0.93, 1.08)	0.920
Self-reliance	1.63	(1.56, 1.71)	<0.001	1.33	(1.25, 1.42)	<0.001
Age						
18, 34	1.14	(1.02, 1.29)	0.027	1.09	(0.92, 1.28)	0.325
35, 55	1.00			1.00		
Region						
Major cities	1.00			1.00		
Inner regional areas	1.20	(1.04, 1.37)	0.010	0.93	(0.78, 1.12)	0.444
Outer regional areas	0.99	(0.85, 1.15)	0.883	0.85	(0.70, 1.03)	0.102
Socioeconomic status						
1 (greatest disadvantage)	1.00			1.00		
2	0.84	(0.71, 0.99)	0.037	1.05	(0.84, 1.32)	0.643
3	0.66	(0.56, 0.78)	<0.001	0.96	(0.77, 1.20)	0.734
4	0.63	(0.53, 0.75)	<0.001	1.03	(0.82, 1.29)	0.810
5 (least disadvantage)	0.45	(0.37, 0.54)	<0.001	0.75	(0.58, 0.96)	0.022
Employment status						
Employed or out of workforce	1.00			1.00		
Unemployed	2.67	(2.28, 3.13)	<0.001	1.15	(0.92, 1.44)	0.209
Marital status						
Never married/widowed/divorced/separated	2.38	(2.12, 2.67)	<0.001	1.40	(1.19, 1.65)	<0.001
Married/de facto	1.00			1.00		
Social support ^b						
	0.97	(0.97, 0.98)	<0.001	0.98	(0.98, 0.98)	<0.001
Stressful life events ^c						
Any life event in past 12 months	3.42	(3.02, 3.87)	<0.001	1.89	(1.62, 2.21)	<0.001
No life events in past 12 months	1.00			1.00		
Alcohol use						
Not harmful/hazardous	1.00			1.00		
Harmful/hazardous	1.63	(1.44, 1.85)	<0.001	1.42	(1.23, 1.65)	<0.001
Depression						
Not treated in past 12 months	1.00			1.00		
Treated in past 12 months	6.92	(6.10, 7.85)	<0.001	4.80	(4.10, 5.61)	<0.001
GP use						
No visit to a GP in past 12 months	1.00			1.00		
Visit to a GP in past 12 months	1.23	(1.05, 1.44)	0.010	1.22	(0.99, 1.52)	0.067

^a Per 1 unit increase on the CMNI, 22

^b Per 1 unit increase on the MOS, SS

^c Refers to the following life events: serious personal injury, illness or surgery; break, up of a serious relationship/divorce/separation; serious conflict with a family member; difficulty finding a job; legal troubles or involvement in a court case; and major loss or damage to personal property

presentation (AOR 0.94; 95% CI 0.89–0.99) and status seeking (AOR 0.91; 95% CI 0.85–0.99).

Page 322, para 9: These were not being married or in a de facto relationship (AOR 1.40; 95% CI 1.19–1.65).

Page 324, para 1: 12 months (AOR 1.89; 95% CI 1.62–2.21), using alcohol at harmful/hazardous levels (AOR 1.42; 95% CI 1.23–1.65), and having experienced symptoms of depression in the previous 12 months (AOR 4.80; 95% CI 4.10–5.61). Residing in an area of the least socio-economic disadvantage was protective (AOR 0.75; 95% CI 0.58–0.96), as was having relatively high levels of social support (AOR 0.98; 95% CI 0.98–0.98).

Page 324, para 2: This had no bearing on the findings; self-reliance remained the only masculinity factor that was associated with increased suicidal thinking (AOR 1.33; 95% CI 1.25–1.42).

Page 324, para 4: Using these dichotomised factor scores, self-reliance remained the only factor that was significantly associated with increased suicidal thinking (AOR 1.75; 95% CI 1.50–2.04). When we treated *T*-scores above 75 as reflecting extreme conformity, the same finding was true; self-reliance alone stood out (AOR 1.75; 95% CI 1.50–2.04).