Errata

On Coppock (2025), *Political Science Quarterly*

The maintained replication code behind these errata is at https://github.com/active-maintenance-aec/coppock_2025 and is archived at Zenodo at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24168326, a DOI that always resolves to the latest version.

This note lists two corrections to "The Effects of Party Cues Are Not the Effects of Partisanship," published in *Political Science Quarterly*, advance access 2 April 2025, doi 10.1093/psquar/qqaf037. Page numbers are those of the advance access version. **Neither changes a conclusion of the review.** The first corrects the direction of the estimates as two sentences describe them in Study 2, one of the review's five experiments. The review's argument concerns what the experiments manipulate, and it does not rest on that direction.

The review has no deposit of its own. The survey estimates below come from the book's data, recomputed in this note's repository: the authors' UNC Dataverse release, and for Study 2 the 2014 survey file in the project's own archive. Figure 1's published values were read from the marks in the article's PDF. Panels (a), (c), and (e) reproduce from those data, using specifications inferred from the marks themselves, and panel (b) reproduces using the review's own script.

1. The first two sentences on Study 2 state the reverse of the third and of Figure 1(b)

Published, p. 2, Figure 1(b); p. 3, the paragraph on Study 2:

> When their party controls 60 percent of seats (compared with 40 percent), Republicans prefer a candidate who is more conservative. When their party controls 60 percent of seats (compared with 40 percent), Democrats prefer a candidate who is less liberal. Surprisingly (to me at least), subjects of both parties want more moderate candidates when the Republicans are in the majority and more extreme candidates when the Democrats are in the majority.

Corrected:

> When their party controls 60 percent of seats (compared with 40 percent), Republicans prefer a candidate who is **less conservative**. When their party controls 60 percent of seats (compared with 40 percent), Democrats prefer a candidate who is **more liberal**. Surprisingly (to me at least), subjects of both parties want more moderate candidates when the Republicans are in the majority and more extreme candidates when the Democrats are in the majority.

Figure 1(b) comes from the book's 2014 survey, in which the seat shares were randomized (question 58), and reproduces within rounding from the review's own script, which is in the project's files and was not deposited. Its scale runs from 1 = Extreme Republican to 5 = Extreme Democrat. Moving from a Democratic to a Republican majority changes Republicans' preference by 0.212 (95% interval -0.005 to 0.429) and Democrats' by -0.121 (95% interval -0.319 to 0.076). So under their own party's majority Republicans lean toward the moderate end and Democrats toward the liberal end, as the third sentence and the figure say. The first two sentences state the reverse, and the correction reverses their direction so that all three sentences agree with the figure. Both intervals cover zero, so none of the three directions is distinguishable from no effect. The same design in the 2018 survey (question 401), which the review does not plot, gives the signs of the first two sentences, Republicans -0.049 (95% interval -0.248 to 0.151) and Democrats 0.212 (95% interval -0.006 to 0.429), and those intervals cover zero too.

2. A dropped verb in the description of Study 3

Published, p. 3, the paragraph on Study 3:

> here the authors ask subjects how much they like various foods and the treatments are whether they given no cue or are told the food is one of President Trump's or President Obama's favorites.

Corrected:

> here the authors ask subjects how much they like various foods and the treatments are whether they **are** given no cue or are told the food is one of President Trump's or President Obama's favorites.