Errata

On Green, Krasno, Coppock, Farrer, Lenoir and Zingher (2016), *Electoral Studies* 41

The maintained replication code behind these errata is at https://github.com/active-maintenance-aec/green_etal_2016 and is archived at Zenodo at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24168393, a DOI that always resolves to the latest version.

This note lists 23 corrections and one unresolved citation in "The effects of lawn signs on vote outcomes: Results from four randomized field experiments," published in *Electoral Studies* 41:143–150, doi 10.1016/j.electstud.2015.12.002, and its online appendix. **One correction changes printed estimates, and it changes neither the pooled results nor the paper's conclusions.** The Experiment 1 analysis adds vote shares together across merged precincts, which inflates the unadjusted spillover estimate from 0.7 to 3.7 percentage points. Two further corrections fix misdescribed covariates: the article calls its vote shares margins, and the appendix calls its margins vote shares. The rest are smaller matters of description, labelling, and reference, along with words dropped, doubled, or misspelled.

The first entry came from tracing the deposited analysis code, and its corrected values are computed from the deposited replication archive, doi 10.7910/DVN/K2TLDB, by the maintained analysis. The others came from reading the article and its appendix word by word, except the Ansolabehere and Iyengar pages, which came from Crossref. Each quotation was checked against an image of the published page. The figures in the notes to entries 2 and 5 are refit from the archive whenever this document is rendered with the archive present. The code supporting the maintained analysis is at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/green_etal_2016.

1. Experiment 1 adds vote shares together across merged precincts

Published, p. 147, Section 5.1 and Table 3; p. 148, Section 6, Table 7, and Figure 2; app. p. 7, Section D; app. p. 8, Table D.5:

> the estimated spillover effect is **3.7** percentage points (robust SE = **2.7**). … The estimated spillover effect **decreases** to **1.8** percentage points, and its standard error falls to **1.6** percentage points. Using randomization inference, we fail to reject the joint null hypothesis of no direct or indirect effects (p = **0.22**). … there is a **98.8** percent chance that lawn signs increase the vote share of the

> advertising candidate. … The estimated average interaction effect for the indirect treatment is **0.007**, with a standard error of 0.007.

Corrected:

> the estimated spillover effect is **0.7** percentage points (robust SE = **2.3**). … The estimated spillover effect **increases** to **1.9** percentage points, and its standard error falls to **1.7** percentage points. Using randomization inference, we fail to reject the joint null hypothesis of no direct or indirect effects (p = **0.20**). … there is a **98.7** percent chance that lawn signs increase the vote share of the advertising candidate. … The estimated average interaction effect for the indirect treatment is **0.009**, with a standard error of 0.007.

The Experiment 1 analysis computes each precinct's vote shares and then sums its columns across the precincts merged for assignment, so the four merged units carry the sum of two shares: their outcomes are 0.658, 0.802, 0.894, and 0.739 where the shares of their summed votes are 0.328, 0.398, 0.433, and 0.367, and their covariates reach 1.171. All four units are in the adjacent group, which is why the unadjusted spillover estimate is the number that moves most. The corrected values take the merged units' shares from their summed vote counts, by the deposited script's own definitions, which return the deposited value for every other unit. The direct effect in Table 3 stays at 0.025 in both models, the pooled estimates in Table 7 stay at 0.017 and 0.015 with standard errors of 0.007 and 0.006, and the paper's conclusions stand. The vote margin and turnout results use counts and are unaffected. The printed tables report the deposited objects faithfully, so the error is in the analysis rather than in their transcription. Every printed cell that moves follows. Table 3, Model 1: Adjacent 0.037 to 0.007, Adjacent SE 0.027 to 0.023, R2 0.031 to 0.021. Table 3, Model 2: Adjacent 0.018 to 0.019, Constant 0.015 to -0.017, Adjacent SE 0.016 to 0.017, Constant SE 0.031 to 0.046, R2 0.823 to 0.741. Table 7, Experiment 1: Adjacent 0.018 to 0.019, Adjacent SE 0.016 to 0.017. Table D.5, Experiment 1: Constant 0.159 to 0.150, Assigned Lawn Signs 0.031 to 0.027, Adjacent to Lawn Signs 0.021 to 0.023, Past Party Support 0.027 to 0.017, Assigned * Support 0.031 to 0.019, Adjacent * Support 0.011 to 0.021, Constant SE 0.110 to 0.104, Adjacent to Lawn Signs SE 0.014 to 0.016, Past Party Support SE 0.042 to 0.026, Assigned * Support SE 0.030 to 0.019, Adjacent * Support SE 0.025 to 0.017, R2 0.829 to 0.752. Figure 2, Agnostic, Update 1: posterior mean 0.022 to 0.023. Figure 2, Agnostic, Update 2: posterior mean 0.019 to 0.020, pr(ATE>0) 0.895 to 0.894. Figure 2, Agnostic, Update 4: pr(ATE>0) 0.988 to 0.987. Figure 2, Optimist, Update 1: posterior mean 0.027 to 0.028. Figure 2, Optimist, Update 2: posterior mean 0.024 to 0.025. Figure 2, Skeptic, Update 1: pr(ATE>0) 0.768 to 0.765. Figure 2, Skeptic, Update 2: pr(ATE>0) 0.754 to 0.751. Figure 2, Skeptic, Update 3: pr(ATE>0) 0.977 to 0.976.

2. The covariates described as vote margins are vote shares

Published, p. 147, Section 4 and the notes to Tables 3, 4, and 5; p. 148, the note to Table 6:

> in addition to past presidential vote **margin**. … The covariates included the vote **margin** for Barack Obama in the 2008 presidential election … and for the Democratic congressional candidates … Covariates: congressional vote **margin** '06, '08, '10 and presidential vote **margin** '08. … Covariates: registered democrats and mayoral vote **margin** '05 and '09. … Covariates: gubernatorial vote **margin** '09 and presidential vote **margin** '12. … Covariates: gubernatorial vote **margin** '02, '06, '10 and presidential vote **margin** '00, '04, '08.

Corrected:

> in addition to past presidential vote **share**. … The covariates included the vote **share** for Barack Obama in the 2008 presidential election … and for the Democratic congressional candidates … Covariates: congressional vote **share** '06, '08, '10 and presidential vote **share** '08. … Covariates: registered democrats and mayoral vote **share** '05 and '09. … Covariates: gubernatorial vote **share** '09 and presidential vote **share** '12. … Covariates: gubernatorial vote **share** '02, '06, '10 and presidential vote **share** '00, '04, '08.

The models behind Tables 3 to 6 adjust for past vote shares, and the printed estimates are those models' estimates, so this correction changes no estimate. Refitting each Model 2 on the deposited data reproduces the printed constant and R^2 with past vote shares and not with the deposit's vote margin variables (constant, then R^2). Table 3 prints 0.015 and 0.823; vote shares give 0.015 and 0.823, and vote margins give 0.399 and 0.550. Table 4 prints 0.287 and 0.253; vote shares give 0.287 and 0.253, and vote margins give 0.614 and 0.257. Table 5 prints 0.780 and 0.825; vote shares give 0.780 and 0.825, and vote margins give 0.367 and 0.716. Table 6 prints 0.532 and 0.172; vote shares give 0.532 and 0.172, and vote margins give 0.566 and 0.076.

3. The introduction reports vote margins where the results are vote shares

Published, p. 144, Section 1:

> electoral results from all four studies taken together suggest that the signs significantly increased advertising candidates' vote **margins**.

Corrected:

> electoral results from all four studies taken together suggest that the signs significantly increased advertising candidates' vote **shares**.

The pooled results in Table 7 and the abstract are in vote shares.

4. Covariates raise one of Table 4's standard errors, not both

Published, p. 147, Section 5.2:

> Ironically, controlling for covariates increases **our estimated standard errors**.

Corrected:

> Ironically, controlling for covariates increases **the estimated standard error of the direct effect**.

In Table 4, the direct effect's standard error rises from 0.054 to 0.057 and the adjacent effect's falls from 0.046 to 0.045.

5. The notes to Tables C.1 to C.4 describe margin covariates as vote shares

Published, app. pp. 5–6, the notes to Tables C.1, C.2, C.3, and C.4:

> Column 2 covariates: Congressional Vote **Share** '06, '08, '10 and Presidential Vote **Share** '08. … Column 2 covariates: Registered Democrats and Mayoral Vote **Share** '05 and '09. … Column 2 covariates: Gubernatorial Vote **Share** '09 and Presidential Vote **Share** '12. … Column 2 covariates: Gubernatorial Vote **Share** '02, '06, '10 and Presidential Vote **Share** '00, '04, '08.

Corrected:

> Column 2 covariates: Congressional Vote **Margin** '06, '08, '10 and Presidential Vote **Margin** '08. … Column 2 covariates: Registered Democrats and Mayoral Vote **Margin** '05 and '09. … Column 2 covariates: Gubernatorial Vote **Margin** '09 and Presidential Vote **Margin** '12. … Column 2 covariates: Gubernatorial Vote **Margin** '02, '06, '10 and Presidential Vote **Margin** '00, '04, '08.

The mirror of entry 2: the vote margin models adjust for past vote margins, and the printed estimates are those models' estimates, so this correction changes no estimate. Refitting each table's column 2 on the deposited data reproduces the printed constant and R^2 with past vote margins and not with past vote shares (constant, then R^2). Table C.1 prints -60.879 and 0.666; vote shares give -183.440 and 0.148, and vote margins give -60.879 and 0.666. Table C.2 prints -30.993 and 0.501; vote shares give -116.141 and 0.455, and vote margins give -30.993 and 0.501. Table C.3 prints -256.773 and 0.652; vote shares give 542.690 and 0.412, and vote margins give -256.773 and 0.652. Table C.4 prints -19.087 and 0.627; vote shares give -220.707 and 0.203, and vote margins give -19.087 and 0.627.

6. Table 5 omits its R^2 label

Published, p. 147, Table 5:

> 0.094 0.825

Corrected:

> **R^2** 0.094 0.825

The row's two values sit under a blank stub. Tables 3, 4, and 6 print the label on the same row. The values themselves are correct.

7. The heading of Section 3.4 reverses its siblings' form

Published, p. 145, Section 3.4:

> 3.4. **Treatment: experiment 4**

Corrected:

> 3.4. **Experiment 4: treatment**

Sections 3.1 to 3.3 are headed "Experiment 1: treatment" and so on.

8. Section D's only table is numbered D.5

Published, app. p. 8:

> Table **D.5**:

Corrected:

> Table **D.1**:

The numbering continues from Tables C.1 to C.4 across a change of section. No Tables D.1 to D.4 exist, and neither the appendix nor the article cites the table by number.

9. "though" for "through"

Published, p. 148, Section 5.5:

> We interpret this null finding on turnout to mean that any positive impact on vote share operates primarily **though** a persuasion mechanism, not through mobilization.

Corrected:

> We interpret this null finding on turnout to mean that any positive impact on vote share operates primarily **through** a persuasion mechanism, not through mobilization.

10. A dropped verb in Section 6

Published, p. 148, Section 6:

> the experimental evidence has largely displaced the prior views that these observers in advance of these studies.

Corrected:

> the experimental evidence has largely displaced the prior views that these observers **held** in advance of these studies.

11. A dropped article in Section 3.3

Published, p. 145, Section 3.3:

> The sign was designed to highlight the fact that the opposing candidate was Democratic fundraiser before becoming a candidate for higher office.

Corrected:

> The sign was designed to highlight the fact that the opposing candidate was **a** Democratic fundraiser before becoming a candidate for higher office.

12. A dropped preposition in Section 5.4

Published, p. 148, Section 5.4:

> The randomization inference test shows that we cannot reject the null hypothesis no direct or indirect effects (p = 0.77).

Corrected:

> The randomization inference test shows that we cannot reject the null hypothesis **of** no direct or indirect effects (p = 0.77).

13. A dropped noun in the description of Experiment 2

Published, app. p. 2:

> The 2013 Albany Democratic was held September 10, 2013.

Corrected:

> The 2013 Albany Democratic **primary** was held September 10, 2013.

14. McAuliffe is misspelled twice

Published, app. p. 2:

> The Democratic candidate was experienced businessman and fundraiser Terry **McAullife**, also a longtime Clinton ally … In the end, **McAullife** won with 48% of the vote

Corrected:

> The Democratic candidate was experienced businessman and fundraiser Terry **McAuliffe**, also a longtime Clinton ally … In the end, **McAuliffe** won with 48% of the vote

The paragraph's last sentence and the article spell the name correctly.

15. DeFilippo is misspelled once

Published, app. p. 3:

> The top two vote-getters were Eichelberger and **Defilippo**, who will proceed to the general election in November 2015.

Corrected:

> The top two vote-getters were Eichelberger and **DeFilippo**, who will proceed to the general election in November 2015.

The appendix prints "Vince DeFilippo" on p. 2.

16. A dropped word in the Experiment 2 randomization protocol

Published, app. p. 4:

> when the t-ratio for the treatment indicator was less 1.0, the randomization was accepted into our final set of permissible randomizations.

Corrected:

> when the t-ratio for the treatment indicator was less **than** 1.0, the randomization was accepted into our final set of permissible randomizations.

17. A dropped preposition in the Experiment 4 randomization protocol

Published, app. p. 4:

> In this case, we ran 3 regressions treatment assignment on covariates, where each regression only considered two treatment conditions at a time.

Corrected:

> In this case, we ran 3 regressions **of** treatment assignment on covariates, where each regression only considered two treatment conditions at a time.

18. A plural for a single experiment

Published, app. p. 7, Section D:

> In **experiments** 1, we used 2008 Democratic presidential vote share.

Corrected:

> In **experiment** 1, we used 2008 Democratic presidential vote share.

19. A doubled word in a table note

Published, app. p. 8, the note to Table D.5:

> Covariates for each experiment are listed in **in** Tables 3-6.

Corrected:

> Covariates for each experiment are listed in Tables 3-6.

20. A table title misspells Heterogeneous

Published, app. p. 8, the title of Table D.5:

> **Heterogenous** Effects by Past Party Support

Corrected:

> **Heterogeneous** Effects by Past Party Support

The heading of Section D, on p. 7, spells the word correctly.

The reference list

21. The Bedolla and Michelson reference misspells its publisher

Published, p. 150, refs:

> Yale **Univeristy** Press, New Haven.

Corrected:

> Yale **University** Press, New Haven.

22. The Sommer reference prints its title twice

Published, p. 150, refs:

> Sommer, B., 1979. Front yard signs as predictors of election outcome **front yard signs as predictors of election outcome**. Polit. Methodol. 6 (2), 237–240.

Corrected:

> Sommer, B., 1979. Front yard signs as predictors of election outcome. Polit. Methodol. 6 (2), 237–240.

23. The Ansolabehere and Iyengar reference prints no pages

Published, p. 150, refs:

> Polit. Commun. 11 (4).

Corrected:

> Polit. Commun. 11 (4), **413**–**430**.

Crossref, doi 10.1080/10584609.1994.9963048, gives the article's pages as 413 to 430.

24. A citation with no entry in the appendix's references

Published, app. p. 2:

> several pro-hydraulic fracturing groups and the New York Chamber of Commerce (Joint Landowners Coalition of New York, Inc, 2012).

The appendix's references, on p. 9, list only Esch (2012) and Niedt (2012). We have not located the cited source, so there is no entry to supply and this item corrects nothing.