Discussion notes:

Slide 2

• It’s clear that winning candidates raised more money than losing candidates

* First graph shows only the IQR to make it easier to read, but the picture is the same (just a little bit of overlap)
* Second graph does not have outliers removed; shows that winning candidates generally raise a higher percentage of funds
  + There is some overlap when outliers aren’t removed
* It would have been interesting to look at the outliers (candidates who raised a lot and lost/raised just a little and won), but this was outside the scope of our analysis/ we didn’t think about it until it was too late

Slide 3

* High correlation between votes (i.e. winning) and % of race funds raised (the percentage of total funds in a race raised by the candidate)
  + Scatter plot just shows the data that resulted in this correlation; again would have been interesting to look more closely at outliers, see how they differ

Slide 4

* Candidates who raised a very low amount tended to lose, also tended not to be incumbents/ candidates who raised a high amount tended to win, be incumbents.
  + Most election winners were incumbents, most incumbents won reelection
  + Hard to separate effects of incumbent and winner

Slide 5

* Do industries that contribute more money to winning candidates see higher market caps?

Slide 6

* Cluster shows 33 winning senators from the 2014 elections
* Cluster shows the problem we ran into; everyone receives contributions from every industry, basically
  + Industries hedge their bets
  + Industry bins were too wide – nearly 100 opensecrets categories binned into 13 industries (3 of which we couldn’t even use because they aren’t on the stock market – Other, nonprofit, not publicly traded)
* In retrospect, it would have been interesting to pick a few companies from the opensecrets dataset, and see how their contributions relate to their market caps.