

First Printing Errata for *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*

Paul M. Kellstedt and Guy D. Whitten
Department of Political Science
Texas A&M University

January 19, 2010

- Page 2: Last sentence before bullet points reads “We have this written this book...” when it should read “We have written this book...”
- Page 20: There should be a vertical space between the end of exercise 3 and the text that begins “For Exercises 4 and 5...”
- Page 27: Four lines from the bottom, “Guallist” should be “Gaullist”
- Page 51, Figure 3.1. The first un-boxed text from the top reads “Stop and reformulate your theory unit ...” when it should read “Stop and reformulate your theory until ...”
- Page 57, first full sentence: “the answer to our first question” should be “the answer to our fourth question”
- Page 69, last paragraph: Second sentence reads “It means, most important, that ...” when it should read “It means, most importantly, that ...”
- Page 85, Exercise 4: the parenthetical reference “especially, Sections 3.2 and 3.3” should be “especially, Sections 3.3 and 3.4”
- Page 104, first sentence of second paragraph in section 6.1: “it is essential understand” should be “it is essential to understand”
- Page 128, there is a mathematical error that flows throughout this section. The initial mistake is that “ $= \sqrt{\frac{336.8096}{1003}} = 0.58$ ” at the bottom of this page should be “ $= \sqrt{\frac{221.8756}{1003}} = 0.47$ ”
- Page 129, first notation: “ $\sigma_Y = \frac{0.58}{\sqrt{1004}} = 0.018$ ” should be “ $\sigma_Y = \frac{0.47}{\sqrt{1004}} = 0.015$ ”

- Page 129, second notation: “ $\hat{Y} \pm 2 \times \sigma_{\hat{Y}} = 0.33 \pm (2 \times 0.018 = 0.33 \pm 0.036)$ ” should be “ $\hat{Y} \pm 2 \times \sigma_{\hat{Y}} = 0.33 \pm (2 \times 0.015 = 0.33 \pm 0.03)$ ”
- Page 129, below the second notation: “or between 0.294 and 0.366, which translates into being 95% confident that the population value of Bush approval is between 29.4% and 36.6%.” should be “or between 0.30 and 0.36, which translates into being 95% confident that the population value of Bush approval is between 30% and 36%.”
- Page 131, first notation: “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.58}{\sqrt{2500}} = 0.0116$ ” should be “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.47}{\sqrt{2500}} = 0.0094$ ”
- Page 131, below the first notation: “which is less than two-thirds the size of out actual standard errors of 0.018. You can do the math and see that going two standard errors of 0.011 in either direction produces a narrower interval than going two standard errors of 0.018.” should be “which is less than two-thirds the size of out actual standard errors of 0.015. You can do the math and see that going two standard errors of 0.009 in either direction produces a narrower interval than going two standard errors of 0.015.”
- Page 131, second notation: “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.58}{\sqrt{400}} = 0.029$ ” should be “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.47}{\sqrt{400}} = 0.0235$ ”
- Page 131, below second notation: “which, when doubled to get our 95% confidence interval, would leave a plus-or-minus 0.058 (nearly 6%) in each direction.” should be “which, when doubled to get our 95% confidence interval, would leave a plus-or-minus 0.047 (nearly 5%) in each direction.”
- Page 131, third notation: “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.58}{\sqrt{64}} = 0.0725$ ” should be “ $\sigma_{\hat{Y}} = \frac{0.47}{\sqrt{64}} = 0.05875$ ”
- Page 131, below third notation: “which, when doubled to get our 95% confidence interval, would leave a rather hefty plus-or-minus 0.145 (or 14.5%) in each direction. In this circumstance, we would guess that Bush approval in the population was 33%, but we would be 95% confident that it was between 18.5% and 47.5%” should be “which, when doubled to get our 95% confidence interval, would leave a rather hefty plus-or-minus 0.1175 (or 11.75%) in each direction. In this circumstance, we would guess that Bush approval in the population was 33%, but we would be 95% confident that it was between 21.25% and 44.75%”
- Page 143, just above the equation: The last sentence reads “His formula for the χ statistic is” should read “His formula for the χ^2 statistic is”
- Page 145. The first sentence in Section 8.4.2 concludes “... a limited independent variable.” It should conclude “... a categorical independent variable.”
- Page 152, Figure 8.4: In the lower-right quadrant, the text box “(+ -) =” should read “(+ -) = -”

- Page 154. In the first of the equations with numbers (instead of letters), the terms beneath the square root in the denominator are inverted. It reads “ 36.86×30.68 ” when it should read “ 30.68×36.86 ”
- Page 161: The last sentence in the first paragraph reads “Thus we think about the values of about our ...” when it should read “Thus we think about the values of our ...”
- Page 161, paragraph below first equation: A sentence reads “As such, Y_i and X_i are values are ...” when it should read “As such, Y_i and X_i are values that are ...”
- Page 163: The sentence between the two equations includes the phrase “... value of each the ...” when it should read “... value of the ...”
- Page 173: The quotient of the last equation reads “4.06” when it should be “4.07”
- Page 192, Figure 10.2: The caption includes the phrase “... X and Y are correlated with Z ...” when it should read “... X and Z are correlated with Y ...”
- Page 209: The second-to-last sentence includes the phrase “... effect of religion identification...” when it should read “... effect of religious identification...”
- Page 219: The last part of the title for Table 11.7 “in 2004” is half in the shaded area and half not in the shaded area. It should all be in the shaded area.