

## Erratum for Glynn and Quinn (2011)

### Why Process Matters for Causal Inference

doi:10.1093/pan/mpr021

Adam N. Glynn and Kevin M. Quinn

*Political Analysis* 19(3):273–86.

In the pages of this journal, Glynn and Quinn (2011a) suggests that the typical parametric and semi-parametric approaches to causal inference yield impossibly high estimates of election day registration (EDR), one of the most scrutinized forms of convenience voting. After consulting their replication materials, available in the journal's public Dataverse collection (hdl: 1902:1/15920; Glynn and Quinn [2011b]), I identified an unfortunate oversight in their coding.

Glynn and Quinn mistakenly code Michigan as an EDR state and Maine as a control state in their data set. The state variable in the Current Population Survey (CPS) data set is *GESTFIPS* (or alternatively, *GESTCEN*); the authors create an EDR variable and assign a value of 1 to the states with *GESTFIPS* codes of 16, 27, 26, 33, 55, and 56. Referencing the 2004 CPS codebook, these values correspond to Idaho, Minnesota, Michigan, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. As evidenced by the authors' commentary within their code, they actually intended to include Maine and omit Michigan to reflect the true collection of states that offered EDR in 2004.

I reproduce the authors' findings exactly when I retain the coding error (Table A1 of the Supplementary Materials). Table 1 presents the original and adjusted parametric estimates of the ATC for each of the nine logit models that Glynn and Quinn specify. Across the nine models, the flawed coding induces a bias of 1.9 percentage points in the ATC. And for all but the final (most parsimonious) model, the original exceeds the adjusted ATC. Table A2 presents the full set of results using the proper coding.

This table presents the point estimates for the effect that EDR would have on African Americans in non-EDR states in 2004, using nine different logit specifications. The first column gives the results reported in Table 2 of Glynn and Quinn (2011a); the second column gives the adjusted results after fixing an error in the coding of EDR states; the third column reports the proportion of

**Table 1** Bias in ATC estimates induced by coding error

|         | <i>Original coding (%)</i> | <i>Correct coding (%)</i> | <i>Bias</i> |
|---------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Model 1 | 12.9                       | 11.0                      | 14.7        |
| Model 2 | 12.9                       | 10.9                      | 15.5        |
| Model 3 | 12.9                       | 10.7                      | 17.1        |
| Model 4 | 13.2                       | 9.7                       | 26.5        |
| Model 5 | 13.3                       | 11.2                      | 15.8        |
| Model 6 | 12.7                       | 8.9                       | 29.9        |
| Model 7 | 13.1                       | 9.5                       | 27.5        |
| Model 8 | 9.7                        | 9.5                       | 2.1         |
| Model 9 | 9.6                        | 10.9                      | –13.5       |

*Authors' note:* Replication data for: Erratum: Glynn and Quinn (2011) are available from the *Political Analysis Dataverse* at, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7910/DVN/FSNGNP>. Supplementary materials for this article are available on the *Political Analysis* Web site.

the original estimate that is directly attributable to the coding error. Explicitly, Michigan is mistakenly labeled as an EDR state and Maine as a control state in the original paper. For the full set of results, as well as the bootstrapped standard errors of the ATC, reference Tables A1 and A2 of the Supplementary Materials online.

**Allyson Pellissier**  
*allyson.pellissier@gmail.com*

## References

- Current Population Survey. 2004. Voting and Registration Supplement Technical Documentation (November). Census Bureau. <https://cps.ipums.org/cps/resources/codebooks/cpsnov04.pdf>.
- Glynn, Adam N., and Kevin M Quinn. 2011a. Why process matters for causal inference. *Political Analysis* 19(3):273–86.
- . 2011b. Replication data for: Why process matters for causal inference. IQSS Dataverse Network [Distributor] V1 [Version]. <http://hdl.handle.net/1902.1/15920>.