JOP strategy

Consider streamlining results

* Present persistent effects as the main results now
  + Just tested – most main effects work with instantaneous effects; placebos also work as intended
    - But note that each placebo picks up a different number of years
* Instantaneous effects only when necessary…
  + For mechanism, persistent effects are weaker, so maybe show only instantaneous effects

Dealing with small sample size

* Explain clearly that small size comes with two problems
  + Inference is not valid
  + Estimate is vulnerable to small variation in the control and treatment groups, including variation induced by coding errors, measurement errors, and thus is no longer stable
* Show clearly that neither problem is fatal here
  + Randomization inference already accounts for inference
  + To show that the results are stable, I slightly perturb the sample by adding or dropping provinces to the control groups and re-estimate the main results
    - Four procedures
      * Adding the one province that saw heavy defeats to the set of treatment provinces
      * Dropping one of the treatment provinces
      * Adding one control provinces from the pool of provinces that saw neither defeats of any kind nor close wins
      * Dropping one of the control provinces
    - If the small sample size is really the problem, then these procedures should likely lead to estimates that are very different, even worse no longer supports my theory
    - I find the opposite
      * [SHOW DIAGRAM FOR RANGE OF ESTIMATES]: effect are still positive
      * Majority of new estimates are still statistically significant, although a few dropped from the .05 to the .1 level
      * Over the long run (persistent effects) pretty much all the estimates are statistically significant

Be clear what the losers’ vote shares would help achieve

* Explain clearly that losers’ vote shares are necessary to identify both close losers AND close winners
  + Although for close winners there are \*some\* information to identify them but this is not straightforward
* For 2016, the strategy primarily helped filter out clear winners
  + Out of 15 close wins, 7 are won with vote shares just above 60, and thus would not be counted under the 60 percent threshold
    - i.e. we will have been missing 5 control provinces
  + It does filter out one province with a clear loser
* For 2007 and 2011, not having data on losers’ vote shares means that we
  + Overcount treated provinces
  + Mis-measure control provinces in potentially both directions
  + Violation of placebo is evidence that these effects are already compromising our analysis