Correction to: satisfied or not? exploring the interplay of individual, country and international organization characteristics for negotiation success

Diana Panke¹ · Gurur Polat¹ · Franziska Hohlstein¹

Published online: 18 June 2021

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: The Review of International Organizations (2021) 16:403–429
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-020-09386-x>

Apart from Table 1, the tables and figures are labelled incorrectly and/or misplaced in the printed article. This erratum provides the Tables and Figures with their correct labels and indicates where in the printed article they should have been located.

Table 2 depicts the regression results. It should have been placed on page 418 or on page 419 (instead of page 414).

Figure 1 provides information on the extent of individual outcome satisfaction in 49 IOs. It is printed on page 417 (with no label at all), but should have been placed on page 408.

The text printed directly below the Graph printed on p. 417 refers to Fig. 4 from the online appendix and should not have been included in the text of the article at all.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-020-09386-x>.

✉ Diana Panke
Diana.Panke@politik.uni

¹ Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Belfortstr. 20, 79085 Freiburg, Germany

Table 2 Regression Analysis

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Workload	0.234*** (0.071)	0.192** (0.061)			
Flexibility	0.578*** (0.075)	0.569*** (0.068)	0.613*** (0.077)	0.575*** (0.075)	0.613*** (0.077)
GDP	0.044 (0.029)	0.021 (0.023)	0.061* (0.028)	0.053 (0.029)	0.061 (0.028)
Government Effectiveness	-0.052 (0.075)	-0.001 (0.068)	0.017 (0.075)	-0.026 (0.074)	0.017 (0.075)
IO Size	-0.004** (0.001)	-0.002* (0.001)			
Consensus Rule			0.001 (0.102) 1.130* (0.516)		1.129 (0.513)
Interruptions of Debates	-1.994** (0.767)			-1.501* (0.749)	
Extent of Arguing	0.478 (0.317)	0.183 (0.225)		0.413 (0.297)	
Extent of Bargaining			-0.385 (0.165)		-0.385 (0.165)
1 2	1.819 (1.306)	-0.657 (0.976)	-2.145 (0.627)	0.934 (1.279)	-2.144 (0.652)
2 3	3.200 (1.296)	0.739 (0.976)	-0.723 (0.627)	2.305 (1.268)	-0.723 (0.625)
	5.082*** (1.321)	2.675** (0.989)	1.196 (0.641)	4.173** (1.288)	1.197 (0.625)
3 4	5.082*** 7.667***	2.675 5.155***	1.196 3.766***	4.173** 6.713***	1.197 3.766***
4 5	7.667*** (1.321)	5.155*** (0.989)	3.766*** (0.641)	6.713*** (1.288)	3.766*** (0.639)
Log Likelihood	-856.186	-1083.959	-851.009	-868.340	-851.009
AIC	1736.373	2189.918	1724.018	1756.681	1722.018
BIC	1791.139	2242.646	1774.2014	1802.376	1767.642
Num. obs	709	892	708	713	708
Group (IOs)	32	49	38	32	38

IO random effect with * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Satisfaction Least 2 3 4 Most

100%
75%
50%
25%
0%

AC
AIPO
CAN
CD
CERN
GLAC
GLO
EPA
EPO
EU
EURO
FAC
FAO
GFC
IAEA
ICAO
ICCAT
ICES
IFAD
ILO
IMF
IMO
ITOM
ITTO
IWC
INAC
NASCO
NC
NEAFC
NPIC
OAS
OECD
OIE
OLAF
OPANL
OPIC
OSCE
OSPD
OSR
UNEP
UNESCO
UNFCCC
UNHCR
UNICEF
UNICRI
UNPO
WHO
WFP
WMO

Fig. 2 Levels of outcome satisfaction over 49 IOs

Figure 3 depicts the marginal plots for *high* outcome satisfaction and should have been printed either on page 421 instead of page 418. Moreover, on page 418, Fig. 3 is incorrectly labelled as Fig. 2.

Fig. 3 The marginal plots on high outcome satisfaction (HI 1–6)

The graph printed on page 419 of the article is incorrectly labelled as Fig. 3. It displays the marginal plots on *moderate* outcome satisfaction, which is indeed Fig. 4 from the online appendix.

Fig. 4 The marginal plots on moderate outcome satisfaction

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