

Sprouse, J., C. T. Schütze, and D. Almeida. 2013. A comparison of informal and formal acceptability judgments using a random sample from Linguistic Inquiry 2001-2010. *Lingua* 134: 219-248.

TABLE CORRIGIENDA

A comparison of informal and formal acceptability judgments using a random sample from *Linguistic Inquiry* 2001-2010

Jon Sprouse, Carson T. Schütze, Diogo Almeida

The following tables unfortunately contained errors in the published paper. Corrections are in red.

Table 3: Categorized results of statistical tests for ME. Significant p -values are defined at $p < .05$ in each direction; marginal p -values are defined at $p \leq .1$ in each direction. Significant Bayes factors are defined at $BF > 3$ in each direction; marginal Bayes factors are defined at $BF > 1$ in each direction.

	one-tailed	two-tailed	LME	Bayes factor
significant in the opposite direction	--	2	2	2
marginal in the opposite direction	--	0	0	0
non-significant in the opposite direction	--	0	0	0
non-significant in the predicted direction	10	9	16	13
marginal in the predicted direction	1	2	3	2
significant in the predicted direction	137	135	127	131

Table 4: Categorized results of statistical tests for LS.

	one-tailed	two-tailed	LME	Bayes factor
significant in the opposite direction	--	2	1	2
marginal in the opposite direction	--	0	1	0
non-significant in the opposite direction	--	3	3	3
non-significant in the predicted direction	11	6	11	10
marginal in the predicted direction	0	1	3	1
significant in the predicted direction	137	136	129	132

Table 5: Categorized results of statistical tests for FC.

	one-tailed	two-tailed	ML	Bayes factor
significant in the opposite direction	--	3	4	3
marginal in the opposite direction	--	0	0	0
non-significant in the opposite direction	--	1	0	1
non-significant in the predicted direction	7	4	3	5
marginal in the predicted direction	2	1	1	0
significant in the predicted direction	139	139	140	139

Table 6: Convergence rates (in percentage) between each analysis and the informal results reported in *Linguistic Inquiry 2001-2010*. In cells with slashes (/) the percentage on the left assumes that marginal results are non-significant; the percentage on the right assumes that marginal results are significant. All rates are estimate based on random sampling, resulting in a margin of error of 5.3%-5.8%.

Task	directionality	one-tailed	two-tailed	LME/ML	Bayes factor
ME	99	93	91/93	86/88	89
LS	97	93	92/93	87/89	89/90
FC	97	94/95	94/95	95	94

Table 7: The eight phenomena that led to divergent results between informal and formal methods based on the forced-choice task and a mixed logit analysis. We report the mixed logit analysis for FC, and the linear mixed effects models and two-tailed *t*-tests for ME and LS, where 0 indicates a null result ($p > .1$), - indicates a sign-reversal ($p < .05$), + indicates a significant result in the same direction as the informal result ($p < .05$), and parentheses indicate a marginal effect ($.05 \leq p \leq .01$) in the direction indicated by the symbol inside the parentheses. For convenience, all divergent analyses are shaded **[the shading is the correction]**. All statistical tests are two-tailed. A lowercase *g* in the items column indicates that we created the control condition based on the discussion in the text.

Year	(First) Author	Items	FC	ME		LS	
			ML	LME	<i>t</i> -test	LME	<i>t</i> -test
2004	Hazout	67c/67a	-	-	-	-	-
2003	Phillips	93b/92b	-	-	-	(-)	-
2002	Fox	69a/69b	0	0	0	0	0
2004	Richards	17b/17a	0	0	0	0	0
2001	López	10a/9a	-	0	0	0	0
2004	Bhatt	94a/94b	-	0	+	0	0
2010	Haegeman	18a/g	0	0	0	+	+
2003	Bošković	3e/4e	(+)	0	0	0	0

Table 10: The divergent items from the threshold analysis. On the left hand side items are identified by the code volume.issue.first-author.example.judgment, where “g” stands for grammatical (no diacritics). The right hand side indicates whether the divergent items in the threshold analysis participated in a divergent result in the pairwise analysis presented in section 3. Items that participated in pairwise phenomena that replicated in the correct direction are marked with a +. Items that participated in a pairwise null result are marked with a 0. Items that participated in a pairwise sign reversal are marked with a –. Items that participated in marginal results in either direction are marked with parentheses. For convenience, all divergent analyses are shaded. All statistical tests are two-tailed.

No-diacritic items below the threshold		Results from pairwise analyses					
ME	LS	ME		LS		FC	
		LME	<i>t</i> -test	LME	<i>t</i> -test	ML	sign
32.1.Martin.77.g	--	+	+	+	+	+	+
32.3.Fanselow.58c.g	32.3.Fanselow.58c.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
32.4.López.9a.g	32.4.López.9a.g	0	0	0	0	–	–
33.1.Fox.49b.g	33.1.Fox.49b.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
33.1.Fox.69b.g	33.1.Fox.69b.g	0	0	0	0	0	0
34.1.Phillips.96a.g	34.1.Phillips.96a.g	0	+	+	+	+	+
34.1.Phillips.92b.g	--	–	–	(–)	–	–	–
34.4.Bošković.4c.g	34.4.Bošković.4c.g	0	+	0	+	+	+
34.4.Bošković.4d.g	34.4.Bošković.4d.g	0	0	0	0	+	+
34.4.Bošković.4e.g	34.4.Bošković.4e.g	0	0	0	0	(+)	0
35.1.Bhatt.94b.g	35.1.Bhatt.94b.g	0	+	0	0	–	0
35.3.Hazout.67a.g	35.3.Hazout.67a.g	–	–	–	–	–	–
38.2.Hornstein.4b.g	38.2.Hornstein.4b.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
--	38.3.Haddican.39.g	+	+	0	(+)	+	+
41.1.Müller.14c.g	41.1.Müller.14c.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
41.3.Landau.10a.g	41.3.Landau.10a.g	0	0	0	0	+	+
41.3.Rezac.3b1.g	41.3.Rezac.3b1.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
41.4.Bruening.9c.g	41.4.Bruening.9c.g	0	(+)	0	0	+	+
41.4.Haegeman.18a.g	41.4.Haegeman.18a.g	0	0	+	+	0	0
41.4.Haegeman.4c.g	41.4.Haegeman.4c.g	+	+	+	+	+	+
Asterisked items above the threshold		Results from pairwise analyses					
ME	LS	ME		LS		FC	
		LME	<i>t</i> -test	LME	<i>t</i> -test	ML	sign
32.1.Martin.65b.*	32.1.Martin.65b.*	+	+	+	+	+	+
32.2.Stroik.4b.*	32.2.Stroik.4b.*	+	+	0	+	0	(+)
33.1.den Dikken.5b.*	33.1.den Dikken.5b.*	+	+	+	+	+	+
33.2.Bowers.7b.*	33.2.Bowers.7b.*	+	+	0	+	+	+
34.1.Fox.26.*	--	+	+	+	+	+	+
34.4.Bošković.3a.*	34.4.Bošković.3a.*	+	+	0	0	+	+
34.4.Haegeman.2a.*	34.4.Haegeman.2a.*	+	+	+	+	+	+
35.3.Richards.17b.*	35.3.Richards.17b.*	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	38.4.Kallulli.9b.*	+	+	+	+	+	+
38.4.Kallulli.10b.*	38.4.Kallulli.10b.*	+	+	+	+	+	+

Appendix B

Item ID	Magnitude estimation			Likert scale			Forced choice		
	LME	<i>t</i> -test	Bayes	LME	<i>t</i> -test	Bayes	ML	sign test	Bayes
35.3.Hazout.67c.*	.01	.01	9.E+01	.05	.01	2.E+01	.03	.01	1.E+01
34.1.Phillips.93b.?*	.02	.01	8.E+01	.07	.01	8.E+00	.01	.01	7.E+10
33.1.Fox.69a.*	.46	.38	1.E-01	.65	.51	1.E-01	.54	.62	1.E-01
35.3.Richards.17b.*	.58	.47	1.E-01	.81	.73	8.E-02	.26	.48	2.E-01
32.4.López.10a.*	.93	.85	8.E-02	.71	.49	1.E-01	.01	.01	1.E+01
35.1.Bhatt.94a.*	.12	.04	7.E-01	.22	.16	2.E-01	.05	.19	3.E-01

[rest of table is correct]