

claim onset

Andrew Owsiak <aowsiak@uga.edu>

Thu 10/22/2020 6:19 AM

To: George Watson Williford <Williford@uga.edu>

 1 attachments (9 MB)

claimonset.pdf;

George,

Hope you're having a good week!

Two things:

- I never heard from you again about the research design on the paper with Krista.
- Attached are the comments on your claim onset paper. I think this is definitely the way to go.

On the paper:

- The main issues are: (i) organization, (ii) presentation of results, (iii) theory.
- Organization:
 - The results section seems odd. (i) It is not at all clear that a cure model is happening in T1-3. In fact, it sounds like you're going to show non-cure models, then cure models much later. This is complicated by the fact that the final table(s) show results contrary to the main findings. I see what you're doing, but either (a) start with the standard approach and then "correct it", or (b) set off the final table within its own section, and then do NOT return back to your prior discussion.
 - The opportunity/willingness frame does not work as constructed. People will see structure as opportunity and proximate as willingness. That's not how you're using the terms, and in fact, they seem mixed throughout the entire paper. I also do not see the point in separating them as you do in the results section. It forces you to abandon tables without a full explanation, only to return to them later, after readers have seen many other tables. This will be a major theoretical and organizational fix.
- Results:
 - Besides the organizational, you will need to spend much more time going through the results: main results/controls, significance *and* substance, presentation of substantive results in a way that readers find valuable, perhaps even a comparison of factors that matter most. The results section currently feels rushed. And in this draft, the conclusion seems almost as long as the results section, and we want that ratio to change, especially given all the tables.
 - The standard Cox model needs to be introduced, along with how it varies from your cure model.
 - I expect the cure model to have two stages, but does it? I cannot tell from the results/discussion.
- Theory:
 - Besides the organizational, we need formal hypotheses. It is not clear exactly what the hypotheses are. Once those are in place, develop the logic around them a bit more. Things that are not important will then move to control variable status (although we still need a brief justification for their inclusion in the research design section).
- The remaining comments are in text (attached).

Good work! Let me know if/when we need to talk again.

Andy

Andrew P. Owsiak, PhD

School of Public and International Affairs

Josiah Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor and Associate Professor

325 Candler Hall
202 Herty Drive
Athens, GA 30602-1492

p: [706-542-6705](tel:706-542-6705)

e: aowsiak@uga.edu

w: <http://andrewowsiak.org/>



11811-00-00001114