Correction

Correction: Kazungu et al. Household-Level Determinants of Participation in Forest Support Programmes in the Miombo Landscapes, Zambia. *Sustainability* 2021, *13*, 2713

Moses Kazungu [1,2,*] **, Eliza Zhunusova** [1] **, Gillian Kabwe** [3] **and Sven Günter** [1,2]

[1] Institute of International Forestry and Forest Economics, Thünen Institute,
21031 Hamburg-Bergedorf, Germany; eliza.zhunusova@thuenen.de (E.Z.); sven.guenter@thuenen.de (S.G.)

[2] Ecosystem Dynamics and Forest Management in Mountain Landscapes, Technical University of Munich,
D-85354 Freising, Germany

[3] Plant and Environmental Sciences Department, School of Natural Resources, Copperbelt University,
Kitwe 10101, Zambia; gkabwe@yahoo.co.uk

* Correspondence: moses.kazungu@thuenen.de; Tel.: +49-40-73962-347; Fax: +49-40-73962-399

The authors would like to make the following corrections about the published paper [1]. The changes are as follows:

(1) In the results section, Table 2, the standard errors were supposed to be reported in parentheses, which are missing in the original Table 2. Because of the missing parentheses, the values of standard errors appear negative. There is another typo: "EU" should be replaced by word ''AEU'' in Table 2. Authors would like to correct all standard error values and typos, so we need to replace the original Table 2:

Table 2. Logistic regression results of determinants of participation in Forest Support (FS) programmes.

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effect (dy/dx)
Socio-demographic factors		
Age of head of household (Years)	0.006	0.001
	−0.005	−0.001
Male-headed household (Yes = 1; No = 0)	0.236	0.052
	−0.19	−0.041
Household head attained above primary education (Yes = 1; No = 0)	−0.339 **	−0.074
	−0.169	−0.037
Household size (Adult equivalent units-EU)	0.035	0.008
	−0.037	−0.008
Economic factors		
Land holding size (ha)	−0.031 *	−0.007
	−0.016	−0.003
Livestock income (%)	-5.80×10^{-5}	-1.27×10^{-5}
	(4.97×10^{-5})	(1.09×10^{-5})
Subsistence forest income (unprocessed forest products) (%)	−0.018 ***	−0.004
	−0.005	−0.001
Charcoal income (processed forest products) (%)	−0.012 ***	−0.003
	−0.004	−0.001
Cash crop income (%)	−0.023 ***	−0.005
	−0.005	−0.001
Capture fish income (%)	−0.264 ***	−0.058
	−0.065	−0.014
Non-farm income (%)	−0.019 ***	−0.004
	−0.007	−0.001

Table 2. *Cont.*

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effect (dy/dx)
Access factors		
Walking distance from household to main road (minutes)	−0.004 *** −0.001	−0.001 0
Walking distance from household to public forestland (km)	−0.310 *** −0.051	−0.068 −0.011
Household in landscapes with protected forest area (Yes = 1; No = 0)	0.620 *** −0.141	0.136 −0.031
Constant	0.878 ** −0.435	
LR X^2 (14)	197.56	
Prob> X^2	0	
McFadden's R^2	0.13	
Log-likelihood	−639.88	
Observations	1123	1123

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Standard errors in parentheses.

with

Table 2. Logistic regression results of determinants of participation in Forest Support (FS) programmes.

Variables	Coefficients	Marginal Effect (dy/dx)
Socio-demographic factors		
Age of head of household (Years)	0.006 (0.005)	0.001 (0.001)
Male-headed household (Yes = 1; No = 0)	0.236 (0.190)	0.052 (0.041)
Household head attained above primary education (Yes = 1; No = 0)	−0.339 ** (0.169)	−0.074 (0.037)
Household size (Adult equivalent units-AEU)	0.035 (0.037)	0.008 (0.008)
Economic factors		
Land holding size (ha)	−0.031 * (0.016)	−0.007 (0.003)
Livestock income (%)	$−5.80 \times 10^{-5}$ (4.97×10^{-5})	$−1.27 \times 10^{-5}$ (1.09×10^{-5})
Subsistence forest income (unprocessed forest products) (%)	−0.018 *** (0.005)	−0.004 (0.001)
Charcoal income (processed forest products) (%)	−0.012 *** (0.004)	−0.003 (0.001)
Cash crop income (%)	−0.023 *** (0.005)	−0.005 (0.001)
Capture fish income (%)	−0.264 *** (0.065)	−0.058 (0.014)
Non-farm income (%)	−0.019 *** (0.007)	−0.004 (0.001)
Access factors		
Walking distance from household to main road (minutes)	−0.004 *** (0.001)	−0.001 (0.000)
Walking distance from household to public forestland (km)	−0.310 *** (0.051)	−0.068 (0.011)
Household in landscapes with protected forest area (Yes = 1; No = 0)	0.620 *** (0.141)	0.136 (0.031)
Constant	0.878 ** (0.435)	
LR X^2 (14)	197.56	
Prob > X^2	0.000	
McFadden's R^2	0.13	
Log-likelihood	−639.88	
Observations	1123	1123

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Standard errors in parentheses.

(2)   In Table A1, column three (share of the sample (%)) was inconsistent and did not correspond with the means calculated. Authors would like to correct the nine parts with inconsistent values, so we need to replace the original Table A1:

Table A1. Absolute household income in the study area.

Source of Income	Mean [a] (SD)	Share of the Sample (%)
Forest subsistence income (unprocessed products)	2630.7 (2677.2)	33.0 (21.0)
Charcoal income (processed forest product)	2224.0 (6690.9)	11.8 (21.3)
Crop income, subsistence	1457.5 (1482.9)	19.6 (15.7)
Crop income, cash	1928.5 (3237.7)	17.2 (18.5)
Livestock income	834.1 (1556.1)	8.9 (13.6)
Capture fish income	37.2 (114.1)	0.7 (2.6)
Off-farm income	211.5 (425.6)	3.4 (7.0)
Non-farm income	374.2 (806.9)	5.5 (11.4)
Total household income	9697.7 (9770.2)	100

[a] Income is calculated as net values in Zambian kwacha (ZMW). At the time of data collection (2017–2019), 1 USD = 10.13 ZMW [109]. Standard Deviation (SD) in parentheses.

with

Table A1. Absolute household income in the study area.

Source of Income	Mean [a] (SD)	Share of the Sample (%)
Forest subsistence income (unprocessed products)	2630.7 (2677.2)	27.1 (15.8)
Charcoal income (processed forest product)	2224.0 (6690.9)	22.9 (39.4)
Crop income, subsistence	1457.5 (1482.9)	15.0 (8.7)
Crop income, cash	1928.5 (3237.7)	19.9 (19.1)
Livestock income	834.1 (1556.1)	8.6 (9.2)
Capture fish income	37.2 (114.1)	0.4 (0.7)
Off-farm income	211.5 (425.6)	2.2 (2.5)
Non-farm income	374.2 (806.9)	3.9 (4.8)
Total household income	9697.7 (9770.2)	100

[a] Income is calculated as net values in Zambian kwacha (ZMW). At the time of data collection (2017–2019), 1 USD = 10.13 ZMW [109]. Standard Deviation (SD) in parentheses.

The authors and the editorial office would like to apologize for any inconvenience caused to the readers and state that the scientific conclusions are unaffected. The original article has been updated.

Reference

1.   Kazungu, M.; Zhunusova, E.; Kabwe, G.; Günter, S. Household-Level Determinants of Participation in Forest Support Programmes in the Miombo Landscapes, Zambia. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 2713. [CrossRef]