



Prabin Bahadur Khadka <pbk232@nyu.edu>

some advice

David McKenzie <dmckenzie@worldbank.org>
To: Prabin Bahadur Khadka <pbk232@nyu.edu>

Tue, Nov 20, 2018 at 7:03 PM

Hi Prabin,

I took a quick look through and here are some short comments:

- It seems from Figure 1 that you are planning on not trying to interview those who stop treatment (your treatment sample drops to 42 and then XX). It is very important that you try to interview everyone every round, regardless of whether or not they drop out of treatment status.
- In your regressions:
 - I would use randomization pair dummies instead of region fixed effects - since your randomization was stratified by pair (see Bruhn and McKenzie)
 - You will get more power by using Ancova than Difference-in-differences (see McKenzie, 2012)
- I think it is way too optimistic to consider doing heterogeneity analysis – or if you are to do this, just focus on heterogeneity in one single dimension (existing extremism attitudes) – otherwise by time you deal with the already low power for heterogeneity analysis, and then multiple testing, you will have no ability to detect anything.
- Once you get the baseline data, and perhaps first phone follow-up, you should then have enough data to do some reasonably informed power calculations, which might be useful for thinking about what you can realistically hope to detect, and what the gains are from pooling together multiple rounds. The Declare Design software that some of the political scientists at Yale and Columbia have developed (Copock, Humphreys etc.) may be useful to try out then.

David

From: Prabin Bahadur Khadka <pbk232@nyu.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 7:23 AM
To: David McKenzie <dmckenzie@worldbank.org>
Subject: some advice

[External]

[Quoted text hidden]