

# INTL 601 Research Methods I

## Exercise #1

### Dataset: `gg_fake.dta`

This dataset contains **5,000 simulated observations of individual voters** and is designed to mimic a **field experiment on voter mobilization** in the spirit of Gerber & Green.

- **Y** is the outcome variable: **turnout** (1 = voted, 0 = did not vote).
- **Z** is the **randomized assignment** to be canvassed (1 = assigned, 0 = not assigned).
- **T** is the **actual treatment received** (1 = actually contacted, 0 = not contacted).  
Because of imperfect compliance, assignment (**Z**) affects contact (**T**) but does not determine it perfectly.

The dataset also includes several **pre-treatment covariates**: age, education (`educ`), past turnout (`pastvote`), partisan strength (`party_id`), and district competitiveness (`competitive`). The data are generated so that assignment (**Z**) influences contact (**T**), contact (**T**) increases the probability of turnout (**Y**), and the covariates affect both contact and turnout. This structure allows you to practice **OLS**, study **confounding and control variables**, and estimate **treatment effects**, intention to treat (**ITT**) in a controlled setting.

*Note: This is a simulated dataset for teaching purposes only.*

Load the data and show the main descriptive properties of this dataset.

What is: The turnout rate? The assignment rate? The contact rate? The contact rate among those assigned vs not assigned? Analyze the experiment using OLS and the basic difference-of-means test.

Use STATA's margins at ( $T=0$  1)). What are the predicted probabilities for  $T=0$  and  $T=1$ ? What is the difference? How does this relate to the regression coefficient?

Estimate the same OLS regression for the experiment now, including the control variables in the dataset (`age educ pastvote party_id competitive`). Report the new coefficient on **T**. Compare it to the first univariate result earlier. Did it change a lot or a little? By how much?

What is the marginal effect of **T**? How does it compare to the raw difference in means from the univariate result earlier? Explain **numerically** which control variable has the biggest association with **Y**? How can you see that from the regression output?

Estimate the following causal structure :

$Z \text{ (random assignment)} \rightarrow T \text{ (actual contact)} \rightarrow Y \text{ (turnout)}$

with other covariates also affecting **T** and **Y**. What does this model help us infer? What kind of questions does it allow us to answer? Think of direct and indirect effects.

Now **pretend** this is no longer a real experiment.

Generate a “targeted treatment” variable:

```
gen T_target = (runiform() < invlogit(-1 + 1.2*pastvote + 0.5*party_id))
```

A **targeted treatment variable** is a treatment indicator that is **not randomly assigned**, but instead is **given based on people’s characteristics**—that is, treatment is **targeted** to certain types of units. It’s a treatment given selectively to people who look more (or less) likely to benefit, respond, or achieve the outcome anyway.

What does the above-generated targeted treatment do?

Check:

```
tab T_target pastvote, row
```

Now estimate:

```
reg Y T_target
```

```
reg Y T_target age educ pastvote party_id competitive
```

Compare the coefficient on T\_target **with** and **without** controls. Which one is bigger? By how much? Now compare the coefficient on T from the real experimental treatment, and the coefficient on T\_target with no controls. Which one is more biased? How can you see this **in the numbers**? Explain using the results to which variable is doing most of the confounding here? (Hint: look at what predicts T\_target and what predicts Y.)