



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY

Antonio P. Gutierrez de Blume,
Georgia Southern University, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE

Helen M. Ernst
✉ helen.ernst@ezw.uni-freiburg.de

RECEIVED 17 August 2025

ACCEPTED 27 August 2025

PUBLISHED 15 September 2025

CITATION

Ernst HM, Prinz-Weiß A, Wittwer J and Voss T
(2025) Correction: Discrepancy between
performance and feedback affects
mathematics student teachers' self-efficacy
but not their self-assessment accuracy.
Front. Psychol. 16:1687589.
doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1687589

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Ernst, Prinz-Weiß, Wittwer and Voss.
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.

Correction: Discrepancy between performance and feedback affects mathematics student teachers' self-efficacy but not their self-assessment accuracy

Helen M. Ernst^{1*}, Anja Prinz-Weiß ², Jörg Wittwer¹ and Thamar Voss¹

¹Department of Educational Science, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany, ²Department of Psychology, University of Education Karlsruhe, Karlsruhe, Germany

KEYWORDS

self-assessment, self-efficacy, feedback, SRL, student teachers, metacognitive monitoring

A Correction on

Discrepancy between performance and feedback affects mathematics student teachers' self-efficacy but not their self-assessment accuracy

by Ernst, H. M., Prinz-Weiß, A., Wittwer, J., and Voss, T. (2025). *Front. Psychol.* 15:1391093. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1391093

In the published article, there was an error. When the feedback conditions were introduced in the methods section of Study 2, they were interchanged. Specifically, the negative condition was labeled as *positive*, and the positive condition was labeled as *negative*. This error occurred only once. The feedback conditions were labeled correctly in the other paragraphs and the interpretation of the feedback conditions was clearly pointed out subsequently.

A correction has been made to **Study 2, Method, Measures**, Paragraph 1. This sentence previously stated:

"To be able to examine pronounced effects between the feedback valences, we created three distinct categories of feedback instead of observing feedback-performance discrepancy as a continuous variable: participants were randomly assigned to one of three feedback conditions: *positive* (i.e., performance score minus 2 or a minimum of 0), *negative* (i.e., performance score plus 2 or a maximum of 5) and *correct* (i.e., performance score)."

The corrected sentence appears below:

"To be able to examine pronounced effects between the feedback valences, we created three distinct categories of feedback instead of observing feedback-performance discrepancy as a continuous variable: participants were randomly assigned to one of three feedback conditions: *negative* (i.e., performance score minus 2 or a minimum of 0), *positive* (i.e., performance score plus 2 or a maximum of 5) and *correct* (i.e., performance score)."

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.