Errata

On Coppock, Green, and Porter (2026), *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*

The maintained replication code behind these errata is at https://github.com/active-maintenance-aec/coppock_green_porter_2026 and is archived at Zenodo at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24168353, a DOI that always resolves to the latest version.

This note lists corrections to "Americans can imagine changing partisan affiliation: evidence from hypothetical scenarios," published in the *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 21(1): 26-48, doi 10.1108/QJPS-02-2025-0026. Entries 5 and 6 are notes on claims the authors have yet to rule on, and they carry no corrected text. No other entry changes a conclusion of the article. Bold marks each change. Passages separated by a slash are separate sentences or labels. The analysis is in the repository `coppock_green_porter_2026`.

1. The evaluation index

Published, pp. 38-39:

> A partisan evaluation index that averages together the following 12 outcomes / FT Mike Pence (reversed), vote preference

Corrected:

> A partisan evaluation index that averages together the following **14** outcomes / FT Mike Pence (reversed), **FT Democratic Party, FT Republican Party (reversed),** vote preference

The cleaned data's index equals the mean of these 14 items exactly in both studies, and p. 41 says 14. The pre-analysis plan lists 12, so this is also a departure from the plan. With the listed 12 items, Study 2's Pro-Democratic estimate is 0.010 (SE 0.005), against 0.010 with 14.

2. Study 1's sample

Published, p. 33:

> In Study 1, we recruited 988 respondents

Corrected:

> In Study 1, we recruited **995** respondents

Figure 2(a) enrolls 334, 334, and 327, and the cleaned data and the rerun from raw exports both hold 995. The 988 comes from the pre-analysis plan.

3. A percentage point or less

Published, p. 42:

> with estimates of a percentage point or less

Corrected:

> with estimates of **1.1 percentage points** or less

The largest of Study 1's four index estimates is 0.011 in Figure 7's own label. The sentence's meaning does not change.

4. Two of the Gallup swings

Published, p. 44:

> and 2003–2009 (10.7 points) / 1977–1985 (−18.7 points), 1965–1968 (−10.5 points) and 1993–2002 (−9.4 points)

Corrected:

> and 2003–2009 (**10.8** points) / 1977–1985 (−18.7 points), 1965–1968 (−10.5 points) and **1997–2003 (-11.0 points)**

The 10.7 subtracts two rounded values, and the difference itself is 10.77. The script's own search within 40 quarters returns the 1997–2003 fall, from 1997q3 to 2003q4, and it is larger than the second. The printed 1993–2002 span is a true difference between its two quarters and is not among the largest. The comparison the sentence supports is unchanged.

5. Two Study 2 index effects and the one-sided test

Published, p. 43, with the test on p. 39:

> Figure 7 shows that in Study 2, the effects on these post-treatment outcomes were also null

Recorded as a note, for the authors to rule on. Page 39 sets a one-sided cutoff of 0.025 in the pro-Democratic direction. The deposit's script applies the lower tail to every Pro-Democratic row, which is that direction for party ID (1 = Strong Democrat) and the opposite one for the two 0-1 indexes, where higher is more Democratic. Its Study 2 one-sided p-values on those indexes read 0.981 and 0.989. In the stated direction they are 0.0188 (evaluation, 0.010, SE 0.005) and 0.0109 (identification, 0.010, SE 0.004), both below the cutoff. Neither survives correction across the 96 tests (Benjamini-Hochberg 0.435), and the estimates are about 0.01 on a 0-1 scale. Party ID stays null. Figure 7's numbers are unchanged. Separately, the Study 1 script matches a label it has already renamed, so all 24 of its Pro-Democratic one-sided p-values are missing. With that repaired, the same page's "one significant result" among subgroups still holds, at 0.009.

6. Near 100% power

Published, p. 43:

> this, despite achieving near 100% power for the estimated effect sizes from Study 1

Recorded as a note, for the authors to rule on. The pre-analysis plan's near-100% figure is a design-stage simulation under its own outcome model, which I did not rerun. Study 2's realized standard errors on party ID are 0.024 and 0.023, which give about 0.53 and 0.59 power against 0.05 at the two-sided 0.05 level, the same as a one-sided 0.025 test up to a negligible tail. Page 33's "to ensure near 100% power" describes the design and is not in question.

7. The ANES year

Published, p. 34:

> showed them the distribution of party ID as measured in the 2016 ANES

Corrected:

> showed them the distribution of party ID as measured in the **2022** ANES

Both fielded instruments say "In a 2022 survey", and the appendix's Section C.1 reproduces that text and says "in 2022".

8. When the scenarios were fielded

Published, p. 27:

> In the spring of 2024, we asked participants

Corrected:

> In **August 2023 and February 2024**, we asked participants

The raw exports' start dates put Study 1 in August 2023, apart from four interviews, and all of Study 2 in February 2024.

9. Labels in Figure 2

Published, p. 37, Figure 2:

> (b): 5 Pro-Democratic Hypotheticals / 5 Status Quo Hypotheticals / 5 Pro-Republican Hypotheticals. (a): 5 Pro-Status Quo Hypotheticals

Corrected:

> (b): **6** Pro-Democratic Hypotheticals / **6** Status Quo Hypotheticals / **6** Pro-Republican Hypotheticals. (a): 5 **Status Quo** Hypotheticals

Page 36 says Study 2 added a sixth scenario, and its data hold six. Only the labels change.

10. Labels in Table B.3

Published, app. Table B.3, three rows:

> Org 2 vs Org 2

Corrected:

> Org 2 vs **Org 1**

The rows report the `Z:orgorg2` interaction, and line 222 of the field script mistypes the label. Only the label changes.

11. A column missing from Table A.2

Published, app. Table A.2:

> Charisma / Social Identity / Performance / Issues / Generic / Placebo

Corrected:

> Charisma / Social Identity / Performance / Issues / Generic / **Negative Partisanship (148, 270, 428, 789, 1500, 429, 894)** / Placebo

The table's script sums five video indicators, so the cells of each row do not reach dose times N. The twelfth ad, Negative Partisanship, is the sixth video in these studies. The added cells run down the table's nonzero doses. They are dose times N less the printed five, and they equal the count of that video in `video_all` for Studies 3 and 5. Study 4's `video_all` does not identify it, so Study 4's two cells rest on the subtraction alone. The printed cells stand.

12. Wording, main text

Published, pp. 34, 35, 38, 39, 44, and 45:

> the fact that respondents snap back to their earlier partisan identity after the hypotheticals suggest / call up the National Guuard / Marjorie Taylor Green (twice) / For Republicans in this study, the Guns hypothetical / Goren and Chap, 2017 / ruminating on hypothetical scenarios, even those that respondents find plausible, are insufficient

Corrected:

> the fact that respondents snap back to their earlier partisan identity after the hypotheticals **suggests** / call up the National **Guard** / Marjorie Taylor **Greene** (twice) / For **the pro-Republican hypotheticals** in this study, the Guns hypothetical / Goren and **Chapp**, 2017 / ruminating on hypothetical scenarios, even those that respondents find plausible, **is** insufficient

The fielded instruments read Guard. Crossref gives the family name Chapp.

13. Wording, references

Published, pp. 46-48:

> "Short-term forces and partisan-ship" / "Where to place sensi-tive questions? / a field experiment with ffox nnews viewers / Goren, P. and Chap, C. / Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., Petty, R.E. and Cacioppo, J.T.

Corrected:

> "Short-term forces and **partisanship**" / "Where to place **sensitive** questions? / a field experiment with **Fox News** viewers / Goren, P. and **Chapp**, C. / Petty, R.E.** and** Cacioppo, J.T.

14. Wording, appendix

Published, app. Sections A to C:

> treatment views encountered / We used a placebo-controlled designs / the response rates by save and condition / a few more demographic variable / Outcomes were assess via telephone survey / Marjorie Taylor-Green / The results are shows in Figure C.7 / The entries in TableC.5 / the basic patten we obtained

Corrected:

> treatment **videos** encountered / We used **placebo-controlled designs** / the response rates by **wave** and condition / a few more demographic **variables** / Outcomes were **assessed** via telephone survey / Marjorie Taylor **Greene** / The results are **shown** in Figure C.7 / The entries in **Table C.5** / the basic **pattern** we obtained