Question 3

Imagine that the Trump campaign had selected 30% of respondents in our survey to receive multiple mailers (campaign materials delivered by mail) containing negative information about Clinton. They hire you to tell them whether or not it was effective. The bad news is that the campaign did not choose people at random to send the mailer, but rather targeted them based on demographic characteristics. The good news, however, is we had a panel survey where we measured attitudes towards Clinton *before* and *after* the mailers were delivered.

Below is the result of a regression model where we include the covariates "Received Mailers" (0=Did not receive mailers, 1=Received mailers), "Wave 2" (0=Attitude measured before mailers sent, 1=Attitudes measured after mailers sent), and the interaction of these two variables.

- What was the causal effect of the mailers on attitudes towards clinton?
- What is the key assumption necessary for this causal claim to be valid? Give an example of how it could be violated.

1. The causal effect was that voters were influenced by the receiving of these mailers

Outcome variable is thermometer rating of Clinton

Intercept	36.00
	(5.44)
Received Mailers	8.09
	(2.49)
Wave 2 (measured after mailers sent)	−10.53
	(7.06)
Received Mailers × Wave 2	−3.57
	(0.88)
R-squared: 0.35	

Stand. errors are in parentheses.

2. The key assumption is that voters receiving these mailers did not already have knowledge about the information given on clinton in these mailers.