Errata

On Guess and Coppock (2020), *British Journal of Political Science* 50(4)

This note lists eight corrections to "Does Counter-Attitudinal Information Cause Backlash? Results from Three Large Survey Experiments," published in the *British Journal of Political Science* 50(4), doi 10.1017/S0007123418000327. **None of them changes a conclusion of the paper.** The first is a table printed in place of another; three are participant counts that disagree with the article's own tables; three are Study 3 estimates restated in the text at a precision the tables do not show; and one is a cross-reference. The article's finding, that treatment effects across all three experiments run in the direction of the information rather than against it, is unaffected, and Figure 1 already plots the corrected Table 6 estimates rather than the ones that table prints.

A separate corrigendum, published at *British Journal of Political Science* 50(4), 1517, doi 10.1017/S0007123419000024, corrects the standard deviations of Table 1. That correction is not repeated here.

Every number in a corrected sentence below is computed from the deposited replication archive (10.7910/DVN/J7WNTM) at the time this document is rendered, including the numbers that were not wrong. The code and output supporting each correction are at github.com/active-maintenance-aec/guess_coppock_2020. Bold marks what has changed.

One published figure is deliberately absent from this list. The article reports that "93 per cent of subjects have a positive treatment effect estimate when exposed to positive information." The deposited BART script sets no seed, so that figure is a single unseeded draw and the right comparison is against the spread of draws rather than against a point. Refitting at ten seeds under a current sampler puts the proportion between 97.7 and 99.6 per cent, above the published figure in every run, which is a discrepancy worth recording but not a number that can be corrected to a value the analysis would reproduce. It is documented in the repository's report instead.

1. Table 6 reprints Table 5

Table 6, "Effects of information on favoring minimum wage raise," prints the contents of Table 5 rather than its own. Every cell is identical to Table 5's, and the column header inside Table 6 reads "Dependent variable: T2 Amount" where the table is captioned for the Favor outcome. The text is correct and the table is not: the deposited `GC_Study_2_analysis.R`

fits its Table 6 models on `favor_T2_recode`, and Figure 1's "Study 2: T2 Favor" panel plots the estimates below rather than the ones Table 6 prints. The corrected table follows.

Table 1: Table 6, corrected. Effects of information on favoring minimum wage raise. Dependent variable: T2 Favor. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. The information content of the Placebo condition is coded 0. Covariates include T1 Amount, T1 Favor, age, gender, ideology, party ID, and education. *p $<$ 0.1; **p $<$ 0.05; ***p $<$ 0.01

	Among opponents		Among moderates		Among proponents	
Pos. Info (0 to 1)	0.86***	0.77***	0.56***	0.55***	0.29***	0.35***
	(0.25)	(0.21)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.09)	(0.07)
Neg. Info (0 to 1)	–0.02	–0.13	–0.63***	–0.66***	–0.56***	–0.48***
	(0.25)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.18)	(0.16)
Condition: Placebo	0.70**	0.34	0.28	0.20	0.01	0.07
	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.19)	(0.17)
Constant	2.97***	1.72***	5.34***	3.11**	6.34***	2.64***
	(0.11)	(0.53)	(0.08)	(1.22)	(0.05)	(0.53)
Covariates	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
N	343	343	356	356	470	470
R^2	0.05	0.47	0.07	0.18	0.06	0.33

2. The Study 3 participant counts

> A total of **683** subjects participated in the main survey (287 proponents and **396** opponents).

Corrected:

> A total of **686** subjects participated in the main survey (287 proponents and **395** opponents).

The article's own Table 7 gives the six condition sizes as 117, 116, 112, 118, 121 and 102, which sum to 686, and Tables 8 and 9 report 395 opponents. The deposited Study 3 data hold 686 rows, of which 287 are proponents, 395 are opponents, and four carry no pre-treatment classification and so appear in Table 7 but in neither regression table.

3. The Study 2 participant count

> Of the 1,500 recruited to the main survey, **1,170** participated.

Corrected:

> Of the 1,500 recruited to the main survey, **1,169** participated.

The article's own Table 4 gives the seven condition sizes as 93, 162, 165, 195, 169, 192 and 193, which sum to 1,169, and the deposited Study 2 data hold 1,169 rows.

4. The Study 3 positive information estimate among opponents

> Focusing on the covariate-adjusted models, we estimate that a one-unit increase in positive information causes an average increase in support for capital punishment of 0.015 scale points among proponents and **0.068** scale points among opponents, neither of which is statistically significant.

Corrected:

> Focusing on the covariate-adjusted models, we estimate that a one-unit increase in positive information causes an average increase in support for capital punishment of 0.015 scale points among proponents and **0.074** scale points among opponents, neither of which is statistically significant.

The published sentence gives 0.068 for opponents. The specification the deposit fits, and which Table 8's fourth column reports, gives 0.074. Both round to the 0.07 that Table 8 prints, so the disagreement is visible only at the precision the text itself uses. Dropping race from the covariate set gives 0.086, so the published figure comes from neither specification.

5. The Study 3 negative information estimate among opponents

> Negative information has a strong negative effect among proponents (–0.326, $p < 0.01$), and a weakly negative effect among opponents (**–0.042**, $p = \mathbf{0.43}$).

Corrected:

> Negative information has a strong negative effect among proponents (–0.326, $p < 0.01$), and a weakly negative effect among opponents (**–0.040**, $p = \mathbf{0.46}$).

The published sentence gives –0.042 and $p = 0.43$. Table 8's own fourth column, and the deposited specification behind it, give –0.040 with $p = 0.46$. The estimate is not significant at any conventional level on either figure.

6. The Study 3 movement from Con Con to Pro Pro among opponents

> These estimates imply that moving from the Con Con condition to the Pro Pro condition would cause proponents to move $2 \cdot 0.015 + 2 \cdot 0.326 = 0.682$ scale points and opponents to move $2 \cdot \mathbf{0.068} + 2 \cdot \mathbf{0.042} = \mathbf{0.220}$ scale points.

Corrected:

> These estimates imply that moving from the Con Con condition to the Pro Pro condition would cause proponents to move $2 \cdot 0.015 + 2 \cdot 0.326 = 0.682$ scale points and opponents to move $2 \cdot \mathbf{0.074} + 2 \cdot \mathbf{0.040} = \mathbf{0.227}$ scale points.

The published sentence gives $2 \cdot 0.068 + 2 \cdot 0.042 = 0.220$. The arithmetic is right and the two inputs are the ones corrected in entries 4 and 5, so the total moves with them.

7. The cross-reference to the binary support results

> In **Table 2**, we turn to the binary gun control support dependent variable, which asks whether respondents support 'stricter gun control laws in the United States.'

Corrected:

> In **Table 3**, we turn to the binary gun control support dependent variable, which asks whether respondents support 'stricter gun control laws in the United States.'

Table 2 is the composite scale table, discussed in the preceding paragraph, which opens with the same words. The binary support models are Table 3.

8. The significance threshold in the Table 2 note

> *p $<$ 0.1; **p $<$ 0.05; ***p $>$ 0.01

Corrected:

> *p $<$ 0.1; **p $<$ 0.05; ***p $<$ 0.01

Three stars mark the most significant cells, not the least. Table 3's note, on the facing page, states the same threshold correctly. The starred cells are unaffected: the three-star coefficients in these tables have p-values of 0.0007 and below.