Correction to: Is it still worth it? Applying expectancy-value theory to investigate the intraindividual motivational process of forming intentions to drop out from university

Theresa Schnettler¹ · Julia Bobe² · Anne Scheunemann¹ · Stefan Fries¹ · Carola Grunschel³

Published online: 8 September 2020

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2020

Correction to: Motivation and Emotion (2020) 44:491–507
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-020-09822-w>

The author would like to correct the errors in the publication of the original article. The corrected details are given below.

- (a) Page 498: “Out of the total sample ($N=326$), $n=225$ ” should be changed to: “Out of the total sample ($N=326$), $n=224$ ”.
- (b) Page 498: “and at least $n=49$ students answered only at T1” should be corrected to: “and at least $n=48$ students answered only at T1”
- (c) Page 498: “A one-way ANOVA revealed no significant mean differences between the initial sample at T1 and those who left the current study at T2 or T3 regarding dropout intention, $F(2, 325)=.59$, $p=.56$, expectancy, $F(2, 325)=.71$, $p=.49$, intrinsic value, $F(2, 325)=.05$, $p=.95$, attainment value $F(2, 325)=1.18$, $p=.31$, utility value $F(2, 325)=2.98$, $p=.05$, and study cost, $F(2, 325)=.12$, $p=.89$.” should be corrected to: “A one-way ANOVA revealed no significant mean differences between the initial sample at T1 and those who left the current study at T2 or T3 regarding dropout intention,

$F(2, 323)=0.62$, $p=.54$, expectancy, $F(2, 323)=0.65$, $p=.52$, intrinsic value, $F(2, 323)=0.14$, $p=.87$, attainment value $F(2, 323)=0.51$, $p=.60$, utility value $F(2, 323)=3.05$, $p=.05$, and study cost, $F(2, 323)=0.66$, $p=.52$.”

- (d) Page 498: There are minor errors in Table 1 regarding the reported descriptive mean values of dropout intention. The corrected values are given below.
- (e) Page 500: The minor errors in the reported descriptive mean values of dropout intention (d) affected also the intercorrelations between dropout intention and the time varying variables at all measurement times in Table 2. We conveniently present the corrected correlations in Table 2.
- (f) Page 501: The minor errors in the reported descriptive mean values of dropout intention (d) affected also the intercorrelations between dropout intention and the time invariant variables at all measurement times in Table 3. We conveniently present the corrected correlations in Table 3.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-020-09822-w>.

✉ Theresa Schnettler
theresa.schnettler@uni-muenster.de

¹ Department of Psychology, Bielefeld University, P.O. Box 1001 31, Universitätsstraße 25, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany

² Psychology Department, Paderborn University, Paderborn, Germany

³ Department of Educational Psychology, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of all variables at all measurement times

Measure	T1		T2		T3	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dropout intention	2.28	1.23	2.50	1.32	2.63	1.50

The scale of dropout intention ranges from 1–7, all others from 1–4

Table 2 Intercorrelations of all time varying variables at all measurement times

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Dropout intention T1	–	.72*	.61*	-.49*	-.46*	-.39*	-.54*	-.49*	-.34*	-.24*	-.22*	-.17*	-.22*	-.25*	-.17*	.40*	.32*	.29*
2. Dropout intention T2		–	.74*	-.46*	-.54*	-.47*	-.37*	-.52*	-.49*	-.18*	-.32*	-.25*	-.14*	-.28*	-.21*	.25*	.41*	.35*
3. Dropout intention T3			–	-.29*	-.39*	-.45*	-.21*	-.38*	-.55*	-.14*	-.19*	-.36*	-.09	-.19*	-.21*	.15*	.25*	.37*

* $p < .05$ **Table 3** Intercorrelations of all time invariant variables with dropout intention at all measurement times

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	–	.16*	.12*	.13*	.52*	-.04	-.14*	-.15*
2. Gender (0 = female)		–	-.06	.26*	.09	-.14*	-.13*	-.02
3. GPA			–	-.11*	.04	.21*	.08	.19*
4. Major (0 = laws)				–	.11*	.02	.10	.11
5. Semester					–	-.01	-.14*	-.15*
6. Dropout intention T1						–	.72*	.61*
7. Dropout intention T2							–	.74*
8. Dropout intention T3								–

* $p < .05$

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.