Freitag, A et al 2016 Correction: Strategies Employed by Citizen Science Programs to Increase the Credibility of their Data. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 1(2): 12, pp. 1–4, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/cstp.91

CORRECTION

Correction: Strategies Employed by Citizen Science Programs to Increase the Credibility of their Data

Amy Freitag*, Ryan Meyer† and Liz Whiteman†

This article details a correction to: Freitag, A., Meyer, R. & Whiteman, L., (2016). Strategies Employed by Citizen Science Programs to Increase the Credibility of Their Data. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*. 1(1), 2. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.6

Correction

After publication of Freitag, A., Meyer, R. & Whiteman, L., (2016) it was brought to light that a small number of data errors and definitions were incorrect or required clarity. These errors do not compromise the central purpose and conclusions of the paper, with all other content remaining valid. The authors take responsibility for the occurrence of the errors. Details of the required corrections are below, along with the relevant page number of the original publication.

Table 1

Errors were present within the original **Table 1** (p. 4–5) concerning the "Beach Watch" data (row 1) and the resulting "% employing strategy" (bottom row). The corrected **Table 1** is presented below.

Definitions

Two of the "credibility strategy" definitions (p. 6–7) required minor edits to provide clarification. The corrected text is given below.

– For the section "In the field" point 2 should read:

2. **In-person oversight** – Many data errors happen in the field. To address this, some projects designate staff, science partners, or "expert" volunteers to directly oversee data collection (indicated as a "yes" in the table if in-person oversight is always part of volunteer data collection).

– For the section "In the office," point 5 should read:

5. **Quality assurance protocol** – For some topics, standard quality assurance protocols are a required part of scientific practice in order to calibrate methods, technology, and practice over time. For citizen science, these protocols also certify volunteer capability in addition to the methods. "Yes" in the table indicates that a QA protocol, broadly recognized as an accepted standard, is available and required.

* Virginia Sea Grant, US

† California Ocean Science Trust, US

Corresponding author: Amy Freitag (afreitag33@gmail.com)

Reference

Freitag, A., Meyer, R. and Whiteman, L., 2016. Strategies Employed by Citizen Science Programs to Increase the Credibility of Their Data. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 1(1): 2. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.6

	Credibility-building Strategies												total	Context for Strategies				
	early actions			in the field				in the office										
	prior expertise	training	science advising	ranking system	in-person oversight	re-training	technological aids	Validation of observations	cross comparison	publication	management use	Quality assurance		sole source of data?	institutional affiliation	size of volunteer pool	group vs. individual	time commitment
Beach Watch	N	H	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**8**	Y	Y	L	G	M
BeachCOMBERS	N	H	Y	N	N	optional	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**6**	Y	Y	M	G	M
Beachkeepers	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	**1**	Y	N	L	G	L
Black Oystercatcher Monitoring	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	**4**	Y	N	M	G	M
Blue Water Task Force	N	L	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	**7**	N	N	L	G	M
CA King Tides	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	**1**	Y	N	L	I	L
CCFRP	N	L	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	Y	L	G	M
CWC (First Flush)	N	M	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	**5**	N	N	M	G	L
CWC (Urban Watch)	N	M	Y	N	maybe	optional	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	**7**	N	N	S	G	L
Elkhorn Slough (otters)	Y	L	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	**7**	N	Y	S	G	M
Elkhorn Slough (algae)	Y	L	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	**5**	N	Y	S	G	M
Elkhorn Slough (nestboxes)	N	M	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	**3**	N	Y	S	I	H
Elkhorn Slough (shorebirds)	Y	L	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	Y	M	G	L
Grunion Greeters	N	M	Y	N	maybe	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	**5**	N	Y	L	G	M

iNaturalist	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	**5**	N	Y	L	I	L
Jellywatch	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	n/a	Y	Y	N	**6**	Y	Y	L	I	L
Leatherback Watch	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	y	N	Y	**6**	N	N	S	I	L
Lighthawk	Y	N	Y	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y	n/a	n/a	Y	Y	n/a	**5**	Y	N	S	I	M
LiMPETS	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**8**	N	Y	M	G	M
Marine Debris Action Teams	N	M	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	Y	M	G	M
Marine Debris Tracker	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	**4**	N	Y	L	I	L
Monterey Bay NMS VMP	N	M	Y	N	maybe	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	**7**	N	Y	L	G	H
Morro Bay NEP VMP	N	L	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	Y	M	I	M
MPA Watch	N	L	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	n/a	N	N	N	**4**	Y	N	M	I	H
Phytoplankton Monitoring Program	N	M	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	Y	M	I	L
REEF	N	L	Y	Y	N	optional	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**8**	N	N	L	I	L
Reef Check CA	Y	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	**10**	N	N	L	G	H
Seabird Protection Network	N	L	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	**6**	N	N	L	G	M
Shorebird Monitoring (Morro Bay)	N	L	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	**5**	N	N	M	G	L
SPLASH	N	L	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	**6**	Y	N	L	I	L
													average:					
% employing strategy	**20**	**73**	**83**	**23**	**40**	**20**	**47**	**50**	**40**	**83**	**87**	**17**	**5.6**					

Table 1: Summary of credibility-building strategies and related context of 30 citizen science groups working in the Central Coast of California. Symbols in each column are explained in detail in the text, but each activity column was either Y/N for yes or no regarding whether the activity exists within the project or H/M/L/N for high/medium/low/no indicating the level of the activity. Each context column is Y/N for yes or no in answer to the question, S/M/L for small/medium/large depicting the size of a program component, or G/I for group or individual activity.

How to cite this article: Freitag, A, Meyer, R and Whiteman, L 2016 Correction: Strategies Employed by Citizen Science Programs to Increase the Credibility of their Data. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 1(2): 12, pp. 1–4, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/cstp.91

Submitted: 25 November 2016 **Accepted:** 25 November 2016 **Published:** 08 December 2016

]u[*Citizen Science: Theory and Practice* is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by Ubiquity Press.

OPEN ACCESS