



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Gladys Sunzuma,
Bindura University of Science
Education, Zimbabwe

*CORRESPONDENCE
Markus Reiser
✉ markus.reiser@ph-weingarten.de

RECEIVED 07 October 2024
ACCEPTED 10 October 2024
PUBLISHED 22 October 2024

CITATION
Reiser M, Binder M and Weitzel H (2024)
Corrigendum: Design as a learning
opportunity in biology lessons—a
cross-domain STEM approach and its impact
on biological subject knowledge.
Front. Educ. 9:1507343.
doi: 10.3389/educ.2024.1507343

COPYRIGHT
© 2024 Reiser, Binder and Weitzel. 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) 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: Design as a learning opportunity in biology lessons—a cross-domain STEM approach and its impact on biological subject knowledge

Markus Reiser^{1*}, Martin Binder² and Holger Weitzel¹

¹Department of Biology, Weingarten University of Education, Weingarten, Germany, ²Technical Education, Weingarten University of Education, Weingarten, Germany

KEYWORDS

integrated STEM-education, learning biology, design-based learning, crossdomain, conceptual knowledge

A Corrigendum on

Design as a learning opportunity in biology lessons—a cross-domain STEM approach and its impact on biological subject knowledge

by Reiser, M., Binder, M., and Weitzel, H. (2024). *Front. Educ.* 9:1462822.
doi: 10.3389/educ.2024.1462822

In the published article, there was an error. There was a misformulation of a conclusion. A correction has been made to the **Discussion**, paragraph 5. This sentence previously stated:

“Concerning Q3, it can be stated that the pupils who followed the Design approach understood the concepts of the ‘actionist principle’ and the ‘antagonist principle’ better than those of the other approaches, especially concerning the measurement time T2.”

The corrected sentence appears below:

“Concerning Q3, it can be stated that the students who followed the Design approach understood the concepts of the “actionist principle,” “antagonist principle,” and “muscles stretching over joints” better than the participants in the Reconstruction approach. And that the “actionist” concept was better understood compared to the Biology approach. This is particularly evident in the long-term comparison at measurement time T2.”

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. 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.