Erratum

Page 9, the second to last paragraph:

> Dower et al. (2018) use religious polarization as an instrument for the frequency of unrest and argue that religious polarization could only impact collective action through its impact on representation in local institutions.

It should be:

> Dower et al. (2018) use religious polarization as an instrument for the frequency of unrest and argue that religious polarization could only impact representation in local institutions through collective action.

We apologize for the error misrepresenting the original paper.

Page 10, footnote 8:

> They are calculated by $F_{boot} = \hat{\tau}'_{2SLS}\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{boot}(\hat{\tau}_{2SLS})^{-1}\hat{\tau}_{2SLS}/p_z$, where p_z is the number of IVs and $\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{boot}(\hat{\tau}_{2SLS})$ is the estimated variance-covariance matrix based on a nonparametric bootstrap procedure, in which we repeatedly sample the rows of the data matrix with replacement.

It should be:

> They are calculated by $F_{boot} = \hat{\pi}'_{FS}\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{boot}(\hat{\pi}_{FS})^{-1}\hat{\pi}_{FS}/p_z$, where p_z is the number of IVs and $\hat{\mathbb{V}}_{boot}(\hat{\pi}_{FS})$ is the estimated variance-covariance matrix for the first-stage coefficients $\hat{\pi}_{FS}$ based on a nonparametric bootstrap procedure, in which we repeatedly sample the rows of the data matrix with replacement.

References

Dower, Paul Castañeda, Evgeny Finkel, Scott Gehlbach and Steven Nafziger. 2018. "Collective action and representation in autocracies: Evidence from Russia's great reforms." *American Political Science Review* 112(1):125–147.