



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Changiz Mohiyeddini,
Oakland University William Beaumont School
of Medicine, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE

Nichola Tyler
✉ nichola.tyler@vuw.ac.nz
Yvette Tinsley
✉ yvette.tinsley@vuw.ac.nz

RECEIVED 15 September 2024
ACCEPTED 30 September 2024
PUBLISHED 15 October 2024

CITATION

Kim R, Tyler N and Tinsley Y (2024)
Corrigendum: "Wading through the worst that
humanity does to each other": New Zealand
Crown prosecutors' experiences of working
with potentially traumatic material in the
criminal justice system.
Front. Psychol. 15:1496938.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1496938

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Kim, Tyler and Tinsley. 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: "Wading through the worst that humanity does to each other": New Zealand Crown prosecutors' experiences of working with potentially traumatic material in the criminal justice system

Rachel Kim¹, Nichola Tyler^{1*} and Yvette Tinsley^{2*}

¹School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand, ²Faculty of Law, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

KEYWORDS

vicarious trauma, potentially traumatic material, Crown prosecutors, legal professionals, lawyers, qualitative

A Corrigendum on

"Wading through the worst that humanity does to each other": New Zealand Crown prosecutors' experiences of working with potentially traumatic material in the criminal justice system

by Kim, R., Tyler, N., and Tinsley, Y. (2023). *Front. Psychol.* 14:1164696.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1164696

In the published article, there was an error in [Table 1](#). The labelling of the rows for gender were inverted. [Table 1](#) should read the same as the corresponding text under Section 3.2 participants - 7 male (36.8%) and 12 (63.2%) female participants. The corrected [Table 1](#) and its caption *Participant demographics* 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 Participant demographics.

Demographics	Category	<i>N</i>	%
Gender	Male	7	36.8
	Female	12	63.2
Ethnicity	Pākehā/European	16	84.2
	Māori	2	10.5
	Asian	1	5.3
Classification ¹	Junior	9	47.4
	Intermediate	4	21.1
	Senior	6	31.6
Provincial/urban	Provincial	12	63.2
	Urban	7	36.8

¹The full classification criteria for a junior, intermediate and principal prosecutor can be found in the Crown Solicitors: Terms of Office (2017).