



# Corrigendum: Approval of Coercion in Psychiatry in Public Perception and the Role of Stigmatization

Sahar Steiger<sup>1,2</sup>, Julian Moeller<sup>1,2</sup>, Julia F. Sowislo<sup>1</sup>, Roselind Lieb<sup>2</sup>, Undine E. Lang<sup>1</sup> and Christian G. Huber<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University Psychiatric Clinics Basel, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland, <sup>2</sup> Division of Clinical Psychology and Epidemiology, Department of Psychology, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

**Keywords:** mental illness stigma, social distance, perceived dangerousness, coercive measures, population survey

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited and reviewed by:

Tilman Steinert,  
ZfP Südwürttemberg, Germany

### \*Correspondence:

Christian G. Huber  
christian.huber@unibas.ch

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Public Mental Health,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Psychiatry

**Received:** 23 February 2022

**Accepted:** 03 March 2022

**Published:** 22 March 2022

### Citation:

Steiger S, Moeller J, Sowislo JF,  
Lieb R, Lang UE and Huber CG (2022)  
Corrigendum: Approval of Coercion in  
Psychiatry in Public Perception and  
the Role of Stigmatization.  
Front. Psychiatry 13:881898.  
doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2022.881898

## A Corrigendum on

### Approval of Coercion in Psychiatry in Public Perception and the Role of Stigmatization

by Steiger, S., Moeller, J., Sowislo, J. F., Lieb, R., Lang, U. E., and Huber, C. G. (2022). *Front. Psychiatry* 12:819573. doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2021.819573

In the original article, there was an error in the number of participants.

A correction has been made to **Methods, Samples and Procedures**, paragraph two.

The original text “Data from 11,095 participants who had received the clinic vignette could not be entered in the current analyses, as rating approval of coercion for the fictitious character was differently operationalized in their questionnaire” has been changed to “Data from 1,095 participants who had received the clinic vignette could not be entered in the current analyses, as rating approval of coercion was differently operationalized in their questionnaire.”

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.

Copyright © 2022 Steiger, Moeller, Sowislo, Lieb, Lang and Huber. 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.