**Question 1**

**Please find a sample of the Kyrgyz survey**[**linked**](https://webcourses.ucf.edu/courses/1374377/files/83802695/download)**.**

Evaluate the outcome variable "q21" (Recall the events of March 2005. National demonstrations forced president Askar Akaev to resign. When this happened, how did you assess the future of Kyrgyzstan after his resignation? 1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good).

Immediately prior to "q21" respondents were assigned two endorsement experimental questions, randomly assigning either that "some political leaders" supported two topics ("r1" = 0) or that a nationalist leader (Melis Merzakhmatov for Kyrgyz or Kadyrjon Batyrov for Uzbeks) supported the two topics ("r1" = 1).

Evaluate the heterogeneous treatment effects of being primed with the name of a nationalist leader on feelings regarding the 2005 revolution across either "nationalism" **(DE, JH)** or "party\_support" **(CW, PO, YC)**.

**a) Write the regression model that tests the heterogeneous treatment effects.**

**b) In STATA, build a regression model that tests the heterogeneous treatment effects.**

**c) Interpret the coefficients of your findings.**

**Question 2**

**Return to the Kyrgyz Survey. Assess the extent to which there is attrition in answering "q21" and correct for it, if necessary.**

a) Build a regression model that shows whether or not there is attrition in answering the question on the 2005 revolution. Is there systematic attrition? How can you tell?

b) Use the imputation technique proposed by Horowitz and Manski (1998) ("mi" in STATA) to adjust for attrition. Do your results from question 2 still hold up after accounting for attrition? Show all coded work in your .do file.