



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Geoff Anthony Lindsay,
University of Warwick, United Kingdom

*CORRESPONDENCE
André Kunz
✉ andre.kunz@phzh.ch

RECEIVED 01 November 2023
ACCEPTED 14 November 2023
PUBLISHED 29 November 2023

CITATION
Kunz A, Luder R and Kassis W (2023)
Corrigendum: Beliefs and attitudes toward
inclusion of student teachers and their contact
with people with disabilities.
Front. Educ. 8:1331867.
doi: 10.3389/feduc.2023.1331867

COPYRIGHT
© 2023 Kunz, Luder and Kassis. 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: Beliefs and attitudes toward inclusion of student teachers and their contact with people with disabilities

André Kunz^{1*}, Reto Luder¹ and Wassilis Kassis²

¹Centre for Inclusion and Health in Schools, Zurich University for Teacher Education, Zurich, Switzerland, ²School of Education, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland, Windisch, Switzerland

KEYWORDS

attitudes, contact, inclusion, teaching, teacher education

A corrigendum on
[Beliefs and attitudes toward inclusion of student teachers and their contact with people with disabilities](#)

by Kunz, A., Luder, R., and Kassis, W. (2021). *Front. Educ.* 6:650236.
doi: 10.3389/feduc.2021.650236

In the published article, there was an error in [Table 1](#) as published. In [Table 1](#), the values (N, M, SD) at measurement time t0 for the three subscales of EFI-L had been incorrectly copied in. The corrected [Table 1](#) and its caption appear below.

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.

TABLE 1 Mean values of the relevant scales at the time of measurement t0 and t1 (N = 443).

Scales t0/t1	Rating scale	N t0	M t0	SD t0	N t1	M t1	SD t1
Efficacy for student engagement	1–9	441	6.31	0.86	442	6.46	0.84
Efficacy for classroom management	1–9	443	6.52	0.94	443	6.62	0.88
SACIE-R sentiments	1–4	441	1.94	0.52	441	1.93	0.51
SACIE-R attitudes	1–4	443	2.95	0.52	441	3.05	0.53
SACIE-R concerns	1–4	442	2.64	0.58	442	2.75	0.62
TEIP efficacy in using inclusive instructions	1–6	433	4.55	0.52	425	4.64	0.55
TEIP efficacy in collaboration	1–6	411	4.51	0.74	406	4.55	0.71
TEIP efficacy in managing behavior	1–6	434	4.52	0.56	427	4.53	0.57
EFI-L performance-related support in inclusive settings	1–6	416	3.76	0.76	412	3.93	0.75
EFI-L personal willingness and ability for inclusive teaching	1–6	417	3.89	0.96	411	3.83	0.99
EFI-L social inclusion in the classroom	1–6	420	4.47	0.76	410	4.56	0.80