

Guideline on your final draft presentation

EE479

Introduction

- ❖ Objective of your paper
- ❖ Contribution of your paper- How are you answering the question? You should state whether you are testing a model, evaluating a program or a change in policy, and what data you are using.
- ❖ What are your main results? Explain briefly how your findings differ from previous work and what the implications of these findings are. If your analysis is inconclusive (which is fine!) be upfront about this and very briefly state why.

Literature review

- ❖ Discuss previous research that is directly relevant to your paper
- ❖ Discuss how your approach is different from what has been done before: Is it new data? A new model? A new identification strategy? Are you answering a question more broadly/specifically? Specifically comparing how you are improving on a previous paper is useful. You should think creatively in this section about issues of external validity: Are your findings relevant for a population/institutional environment that is different from previous work, and could this be the reason your findings differ?

Example on Literature reviews

| Paper title | Authors (Year of publication) | Journal | Methodology | Findings |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------|-------------|----------|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |
| 4. | | | | |

Theoretical Framework or Conceptual Framework

- ❖ The model should be simple and help illustrate the question you will be testing but should not be ad hoc. The form of the model should be appropriate to the problem. The easiest way to achieve this is to build on previous models that have been used to test this or related topics.
- ❖ In the end, you need an empirical model, so the theoretical model you develop must lead somehow to what you are testing. You will need to address how, say, the regression you are running is a linear form of an equation from your optimization problem. Be explicit about how the empirical model differs from the theoretical model, e.g. if you are unable to estimate certain parameters or if you need to assume a particular functional form.

Data Description

- The first should simply describe the name and source of the data you are using and the period it covers. Describe whether you have a panel, cross section or time series, what the unit of observation is and how many observations you have. Discuss limitations of the data such as missing variables, missing observations, survey response, small number of observations, etc. You may want to highlight the important limitations (e.g. those that you might address in a falsification or robustness check later) in the body of the paper and put the rest in a footnote. It is useful to think about what the ideal dataset would be for the hypothesis you want to test and compare your data to it.

Data Description

- The second section should present (relevant) descriptive statistics of the data. You should have a couple of tables with means and standard deviations for the variables you will be using in the analysis (all of the outcomes, independent variables and controls). You may want to present these descriptive statistics for different subgroups (e.g. treatment vs. control; attriters vs. non-attriters; pre vs. post, etc.). The names of the variables should be clear to the reader.

Number ↓
Table 1 Descriptive Statistics
Title ↓

Spanner head →

← *Rule*

Beneficiaries^a

← *Column head*

| Variable | Full Sample | High-Cost | Low-Cost |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Predicted home care costs | \$2927 (2351) | \$6224 (2070) | \$1828 (1056) |
| Medical care events | | | |
| Home health care | 12.59 (63.95) | 34.04 (104.52) | 5.45 (40.09) |
| Inpatient care | 0.373 (0.956) | 0.649 (1.239) | 0.281 (0.821) |
| Outpatient care | 3.74 (9.53) | 5.20 (11.91) | 3.25 (8.54) |
| Age | 72.02 (14.34) | 76.01 (15.37) | 70.69 (13.73) |
| Male | 0.43 | 0.29 | 0.48 |
| Married ^b | 0.47 | 0.33 | 0.52 |
| Body mass index | 25.38 (6.23) | 24.30 (8.43) | 25.73 (5.27) |
| Observations | 97,193 | 24,293 | 72,900 |

Stub {

Body (excludes stub)

Source note Source: Adapted from McKnight 2006, table 1, p. 301.

General note Note: Values are means, except for observations. Standard deviations in parentheses.

Specific notes {
^aPredicted.
^bProxy measures only. See text for explanation.

Methodology or Model Specification

- You should write out the basic econometric specification first and explain each of the variables and the parameters of interest. Why is this the correct specification for the question you wish to address? Was it derived from theory and has it been used in previous empirical work? Why are certain variables included and others not? Discuss whether you are using basic OLS, IV, etc. and why this is appropriate.
- You should be very clear about where identification is coming from and what assumptions you need to make in order to interpret the parameters as you wish to interpret them (e.g. discussing exclusion restrictions if you wish to interpret certain parameters as causal).
- After discussing the basic specification, write out any elaborations or additional tests you will perform and why.

Results

- You should present results in a way that develops your argument step-by-step. For example, you may want to present your main results first, then break those results down by subgroups and then perform robustness checks.
- Any tables with parameter estimates should clearly state which dependent variable you are using, which control variables are included and which specification you are testing. Just discuss the most interesting and important estimates in your discussion of the table. Make sure you report standard errors with your estimates. Just look at some economics journals for a good table format.

Results

Example

OLS Estimates of the Effect of Education on Wages

Table 1 OLS Estimates of the Effect of Education on Wages.
Dependent Variable: Log of Yearly Earnings, 1985–1995

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Years of Education | .091 (.001) | .031 (.003) | .086 (.002) | .027 (.005) |
| Ability Dummy | | .251 (.010) | | .301 (.010) |
| State Dummies Included? | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| No. of Observations | 35,001 | 35,001 | 19,505 | 18,505 |
| No. of Persons | 5,505 | 5,505 | 4,590 | 4,590 |
| Adjusted R ² | .50 | .55 | .76 | .79 |

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses. Data are from the Tennessee Second Grade Ability Survey and Wage Follow-up, and include individuals evaluated between 1962 and 1971. The “ability dummy” equals 1 if the individual’s second-grade teacher classified the individual as “able,” and 0 otherwise. Each regression also includes yearly dummies, ten one-digit industry and twenty Census-defined occupation dummies, labor market experience (defined as one’s age minus 6), experience squared, seniority on the current job, seniority squared, Census region of current residence, marital status, race, gender, and a dummy variable denoting whether the individual lives in a city of more than 100,000 persons. Columns 3 and 4 have fewer observations because the state of residence is not available for some individuals.

Results

- Interpret the magnitude of your parameter estimates in an economically meaningful way.
- Discuss whether the parameter estimates are statistically significant. If you don't get significance, why? Do you have enough data? Is your test strong enough to detect effects below a certain magnitude (power tests are great for this sort of thing)? Are the results still suggestive even if they are not estimated precisely?
- Compare your results to what others have found. You don't need to worry if you don't find anything significant as long as your methods are sound and you have interpreted the results well. Discuss why your results may differ from past research.

Conclusion and policy recommendation

- Summarize your findings and point out limitations of the results and possible extensions. This is a good place to speculate in a more casual manner about the implications of your results. In general, the conclusion should not contain any new results.