

‘Does Exposure to Inequality Move Public Opinion? Policy Feedback to Homelessness’

Jacob Brown & Adrian Pietzrak

Discussant comments

Guillermo Toral (IE University)

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**
 - Not only people abstain from NIMBY'ism, but actually vote more and do so in support of more pro-homeless spending

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**
 - Not only people abstain from NIMBY'ism, but actually vote more and do so in support of more pro-homeless spending
 - This has important implications for other dimensions of policymaking in urban settings

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**
 - Not only people abstain from NIMBY'ism, but actually vote more and do so in support of more pro-homeless spending
 - This has important implications for other dimensions of policymaking in urban settings
- The paper does so with an **impressive quasi-experimental research design that combines block and individual level data** to address two common problems in this kind of research:

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**
 - Not only people abstain from NIMBY'ism, but actually vote more and do so in support of more pro-homeless spending
 - This has important implications for other dimensions of policymaking in urban settings
- The paper does so with an **impressive quasi-experimental research design that combines block and individual level data** to address two common problems in this kind of research:
 - Issues of ecological inference

Contributions

- The paper produces **evidence of a policy strategy that addresses homelessness with respect being politically sustainable**
 - Not only people abstain from NIMBY'ism, but actually vote more and do so in support of more pro-homeless spending
 - This has important implications for other dimensions of policymaking in urban settings
- The paper does so with an **impressive quasi-experimental research design that combines block and individual level data** to address two common problems in this kind of research:
 - Issues of ecological inference
 - Indirect measures of policy support (e.g., surveys, vote for incumbents)

Points for discussion

- Theory

Points for discussion

- Theory
- Validating the design

Points for discussion

- Theory
- Validating the design
- Testing out mechanisms

Points for discussion

- Theory
- Validating the design
- Testing out mechanisms
- Smaller suggestions

Theory

- The **treatment is theorized as exposing residents to inequality** and thus leading to updates on vulnerable populations or changes in local conditions, but other interpretations seem plausible:

Theory

- The **treatment is theorized as exposing residents to inequality** and thus leading to updates on vulnerable populations or changes in local conditions, but other interpretations seem plausible:
 - Treatment could be making people update their beliefs about the state's capacity to effectively address the issue.

Theory

- The **treatment is theorized as exposing residents to inequality** and thus leading to updates on vulnerable populations or changes in local conditions, but other interpretations seem plausible:
 - Treatment could be making people update their beliefs about the state's capacity to effectively address the issue.
 - Treatment could be changing what people associate with homelessness.

Theory

- The **treatment is theorized as exposing residents to inequality** and thus leading to updates on vulnerable populations or changes in local conditions, but other interpretations seem plausible:
 - Treatment could be making people update their beliefs about the state's capacity to effectively address the issue.
 - Treatment could be changing what people associate with homelessness.
- The paper would be stronger with **a more forceful story of what the treatment is actually doing and why voters are reacting in the documented direction**

Theory

- The **treatment is theorized as exposing residents to inequality** and thus leading to updates on vulnerable populations or changes in local conditions, but other interpretations seem plausible:
 - Treatment could be making people update their beliefs about the state's capacity to effectively address the issue.
 - Treatment could be changing what people associate with homelessness.
- The paper would be stronger with **a more forceful story of what the treatment is actually doing and why voters are reacting in the documented direction**
- Policy and campaigning implications can be dramatically different

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:
 - Examining **whether imbalances** across treated and control blocks **vary with time**

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:
 - Examining **whether imbalances** across treated and control blocks **vary with time**
 - Examining **whether imbalances vary with the spatial bandwidth**

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:
 - Examining **whether imbalances** across treated and control blocks **vary with time**
 - Examining **whether imbalances vary with the spatial bandwidth**
 - Examine **individual correlates of propensity to move** when exposed to a facility

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:
 - Examining **whether imbalances** across treated and control blocks **vary with time**
 - Examining **whether imbalances vary with the spatial bandwidth**
 - Examine **individual correlates of propensity to move** when exposed to a facility
 - Examine **effects of facilities established closer to 2024**

Validating the design

- There are **3 potential sources of selection bias**:
 - People to neighborhoods
 - Facilities to locations
 - People moving away from locations with facilities
- Some **ideas to further validate the design**:
 - Examining **whether imbalances** across treated and control blocks **vary with time**
 - Examining **whether imbalances vary with the spatial bandwidth**
 - Examine **individual correlates of propensity to move** when exposed to a facility
 - Examine **effects of facilities established closer to 2024**
 - A **sensitivity analysis** to examine whether movers could explain your block-level results

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?
 - Homeowners (or places with more homeownership) vs not

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?
 - Homeowners (or places with more homeownership) vs not
- **Qualitative evidence** would add value:

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?
 - Homeowners (or places with more homeownership) vs not
- **Qualitative evidence** would add value:
 - Evidence of how facilities' locations were chosen?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?
 - Homeowners (or places with more homeownership) vs not
- **Qualitative evidence** would add value:
 - Evidence of how facilities' locations were chosen?
 - How did the 2024 campaign go? How was the proposition discussed? Any evidence of differential campaigning?

Testing out mechanisms

- **Is this self-interested, altruistic, or updating on state capacity?**
 - Are effects stronger in more walkable locations?
 - Spillover effects to other pro-poor policy initiatives?
 - Vote for the incumbent?
 - Differential turnout in this vs other referenda / elections?
 - Differential turnout effects across other types of voters?
 - Homeowners (or places with more homeownership) vs not
- **Qualitative evidence** would add value:
 - Evidence of how facilities' locations were chosen?
 - How did the 2024 campaign go? How was the proposition discussed? Any evidence of differential campaigning?
 - Were there campaigns by neighbors opposing the establishment of these facilities?

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**
- Engage more with the **gap between your results as those from field experiments** (e.g. Sands' work)

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**
- Engage more with the **gap between your results as those from field experiments** (e.g. Sands' work)
- Are the facilities which you do not manage to geolocate **systematically different?**

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**
- Engage more with the **gap between your results as those from field experiments** (e.g. Sands' work)
- Are the facilities which you do not manage to geolocate **systematically different?**
- Why are **standard errors** clustered at the shelter level?

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**
- Engage more with the **gap between your results as those from field experiments** (e.g. Sands' work)
- Are the facilities which you do not manage to geolocate **systematically different?**
- Why are **standard errors** clustered at the shelter level?
- Examine effects on the **variance of support**, on top of its mean?

Smaller suggestions

- Add in the appendix results with some of the **more recent DiD estimators**
- Add another estimation for results in Table 5 using a **binned measure of distance**
- Engage more with the **gap between your results as those from field experiments** (e.g. Sands' work)
- Are the facilities which you do not manage to geolocate **systematically different?**
- Why are **standard errors** clustered at the shelter level?
- Examine effects on the **variance of support**, on top of its mean?
- **Align axes of all plots** to facilitate comparisons