Presenting Results

EC200

Notes

- Sign up for your presentation slot by **Friday Nov 19**
  - Just one Friday slot left! Just one Wednesday slot left!
  - If you do not sign up, I'll assign you

- Assignment details now available

- Sample elements (proposal, presentation, papers, etc) in **gated resources**

Data: key subsections

- Description of the data
  - What are the source(s) (cite, include in references)?
  - What years/areas/etc are you including? (ie, what is the frame)
  - Are there any restrictions you are imposing? (age, work status, etc)
  - Did you make any additional modifications?
- Descriptive statistics
  - Table + write-up
  - What should the reader know in order to interpret your results?

Empirical specification

See a handy template!

Results

- Table of results
  - `outreg2` to make nice results
    - You can make *beautiful* results w/ `esttab` and LaTeX. But no need to go overboard
  - Report only variables of interest
- Discussion of results
  - Discuss those variables of interest
  - Economic vs. statistical significance
- Summary of discussion
  - Separate paragraph or embedded
  - What does it all mean?

Good results, bad results

- Circle all the problems with the results
- Write a really bad sentence to interpret the results.

Good discussion bad discussion

The coefficient on treatment 1 is -0.571, and it statistically significant

Considering fsec_1, the coefficient on treatment 2 is biggest and has three stars, indicating that it is the most important treatment.

Because female equals -0.0472, being female does not affect fsec_1

Good discussion bad discussion

All treatments improve food security, reducing the number of days households had to reduce portion sizes at meals by 0.6 to 0.7 days per week. These individual point estimates are all statistically significant at the 1-percent level, although do not see evidence that the impacts are significantly different from each other.

Even the group livelihood treatment improves food security, and recipients reduced portion sizes at 0.6 fewer days relative to a control group mean of 2.0 days, a 30% reduction.

Or flip it, because this is confusing!