

Milestone 7

Prachi Naik

4/16/2020

Contents

1	Abstract	1
2	Introduction	1
3	Literature Review	2
4	Paper Review	2
5	Replication	3
6	Extension	4
7	Tables and Figures	4
8	Appendix	4

1 Abstract

Enos, Kaufman, and Sands (2019) show that the 1992 Los Angeles Riot— one of the most well-known and documented instances of political violence in recent American history— caused a significant liberal shift in policy support at the polls due to the increased mobilization of Black and White voters, a mobilization that has endured over a decade later. The replication attempted in this project _____. Using _____ this project sought to _____. The findings were _____. This matters because _____.

2 Introduction

The first paragraph is a review of the paper you are replicating. Flesh out the details. Tell us about the data and the model. Place it within the relevant literature, via a key citation or two. Highlight implications and caveats. Again, it is hard to summarize a 25 page paper in a paragraph. Do your best. Note that the paper’s own abstract is often a useful guide.

The second paragraph provides more details on your replications. Mention that you used R, and provide an citation to R in your bibliography. (See citation().) Cite the location from which you got the data and

code for your replication. (This might be to the Dataverse, a webpage or “personal communication” with the author.) Provide a footnote with a link to your repo.

The third and fourth paragraphs are more flexible. Indeed, they might be only one paragraph or they might be several. What did you do? What did you find?

The final paragraph is different between the introduction and the conclusion. In the introduction, it may not even exist! (We don’t want to be overly didactic here. There are many ways to write a great paper.) Or it may just provide a roadmap to the rest of the paper. In the conclusion, the last paragraph is where you get to speculate: What does it all mean? What should we research next?

3 Literature Review

After the introduction, you will have a literature review, not dissimilar from the one in the paper you are replicating. (You do not get to assume that we have read the paper you are replicating. We haven’t. So, if something is worth understanding about the literature, then you need to tell us, and in your own words.) You also need to closely review any relevant literature that has come out since the paper was published. (We will take off points if a simple Google scholar search brings up a relevant article which you should have mentioned.) Of course, if a lot of time has passed and/or this is a particularly active area of research, there may be dozens of relevant articles. You can’t review them all. Pick the most important ones, especially those written by the same authors and/or using the same data and/or performing an analysis similar to your own extension.

– race imputations: don’t throw away the uncertainty of the race! Maintain the probability. doing causal inference on corrupt data according to Rahul. – ecological inference model to take precinct vote down to racialized individual level. imputation algorithm hidden in appendix b. – focus on figure 1: data hidden for what percentage of white voters voted liberal. – changes in policy support by distance from the riot: (Because the salience of an event often varies with a subject’s proximity to that event (Latane’ 1981), if changes in policy support were caused by the riot, then we would expect these changes to be correlated with distance from the riot.) "Furthermore, as shown below, our estimates exhibit a spatial pattern that is consistent with a distinct effect of the riot itself, rather than amore generalmedia effect.We also do not see changes in policy support in other parts of California that, while exposed to the beating and trial through media, were not proximate to the riot. Therefore, we believe that the effects we measure are likely attributable to the riot itself, not other associated events (???)

4 Paper Review

Directions: This can be its own section or it can be folded into the literature review. In the abstract, you gave a one sentence summary of the original paper. In the introduction (and conclusion), you gave (different!) one paragraph summaries of that paper. Here you provide a summary in whatever level of detail you think is appropriate. This section could also be folded into the replication section discussed below. But, wherever you put, you must have a one or two page summary of the original paper, highlighting all the details most relevant to your replication efforts and/or to your extension.

Start of my summary: This paper seeks to answer a longstanding question in political science: though violent protests are undoubtedly eye-catching and dramatic, do they actually have an effect on political behavior? Focusing on the 1992 LA “Race Riots” (also commonly called the “Rodney King Riots”), one of the most high profile events of political violence in recent years, Enos and his colleagues found that the riot caused a significant liberal shift in policy support at the polls for issues said to have motivated the riots themselves. For the purposes of their inquiry, the authors defined these issues generally as the racialized (mis)allocation of public goods, within which support for education emerged as the ballot referenda of interest. To estimate the effect of the riot, the authors measured the difference in support for ballot initiatives focused on k-12 education (thought to be closely associated with African Americans) against the difference in support for

ballot initiatives focused on university funding (less associated with African Americans) in the June 1990 election and the June 1992 election. By “effect of the riot,” authors are referring to a “bundled treatment” encapsulating the effect of a riot through various channels such as media coverage, interpersonal experiences of trauma or psychological effects, public statements by politicians, and changing property values, to name a few (???). Support for other university-level education policies were not considered “public goods”


Throughout the paper, the researchers use geocoded data analysis to investigate the source of this shift and trace it back to the mobilization of African American and Liberal White voters following the LA Riots. The “policy shifts” referenced here are actually local shifts in referendum voting on public goods targeted at urban dwelling racial minorities after the 1992 riots. These policies were put on the ballot before the riots erupted. Though the riot itself was a nonrandom event, the release of the video of police officers brutalizing an unarmed Black man (Rodney King) that ultimately triggered the riot was considered by the researchers to be unrelated to the election timeline. The researchers conducted a difference-in-difference analysis of pre and post riot policy voting to control for secular trends in policy support. They further explored the validity of this causal claim by examining the spatial correlation between how much support for a certain policy changed based on how far from the epicenter of those voters were. Ultimately, they found that the closer voters were to the epicenter of the riots, the more likely they were to vote for policies that provided liberal relief to minority urban communities

5 Replication

Difference in Differences for All Voters:

Some Evidence that the Riot Influenced Political Opinions

The change in support for public schools across precincts between 1990 and 1992, net the change in support for universities



Data Source: Ryan Enos from Harvard Dataverse

6 Extension

For my extension, I plan to conduct a permutation test as a quantitative evaluation of the hypothesis that there is a difference in effect for Black vs White voters using the fewest possible assumptions about underlying distributions. King et al also recommend this approach of using statistical simulation to capture a more holistic and realistic picture of uncertainty (???)

7 Tables and Figures

Forthcoming

8 Appendix