

# Impact of Education Level Changes on Inequality

---

Andrea Assenza, Anshruta Thakur, Marlon Morales, Mauricio Vargas, Nikolaos Papadatos

Fall 2024



Overview

Introduction

Data Description

Methodology

Main Results

Conclusions

## Research Question

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit.

## Methodological Approach

Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis.

## Key Findings

Curabitur dictum gravida mauris.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

We define the random variable  $Y$  as the change in a specific outcome for U.S. natives,  $X$  as the Immigrant Inflow, and  $Z$  as the instrument for  $X$ . The sample  $\{Y_c, X_c, Z_c\}_{c=1}^{722}$  consists of 722 CZs across the United States.

Due to the potential endogeneity of  $X$ , the structural model is proposed as follows:

$$Y_c = \alpha + \beta X_c + \mathbf{W}'_c \gamma + u_c \quad (1)$$

$$X_c = \phi + \xi Z_c + \mathbf{W}'_c \theta + \nu_c \quad (2)$$

(3)

$$\mathbb{E}[u_c | X_c] \neq 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Cov}(X_c, Z_c) \neq 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[u_c | Z_c] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_c | Z_c] = 0 \quad (6)$$

Where  $W$  is a vector of controls.

This model is estimated using 2SLS, correcting inference for heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation with clustered robust standard errors, grouped by state.

We are interested in evaluating the relationship between the instrument  $Z$  and the endogenous variable  $X$ , specifically  $\text{Cov}(X_c, Z_c) \neq 0$ , given the control variables  $W$ . To do so, we use the auxiliary regression:

$$r_{X,c} = \psi r_{Z,c} + \omega_c \quad (7)$$

where  $r_{X,c}$  and  $r_{Z,c}$  are the orthogonal components of  $X$  and  $Z$ , respectively, defined as:

$$X_c = a_0 + \mathbf{W}'_c \mathbf{a}_1 + r_{X,c} \quad (8)$$

$$Z_c = b_0 + \mathbf{W}'_c \mathbf{b}_1 + r_{Z,c} \quad (9)$$



The null hypothesis that the instrument is irrelevant ( $\psi = 0$ ) is rejected if the  $F_{partial}$  statistic exceeds 10<sup>1</sup>. Alternatively, this can be tested using a  $\chi^2$  distribution with one degree of freedom<sup>2</sup>, as we have a single endogenous variable and a single instrument.

The  $F_{partial}$  statistic is defined as:

$$F_{partial} = \frac{R^2}{\frac{1-R^2}{n-1}} \quad (10)$$

where  $R^2$  is the coefficient of determination from the auxiliary regression 7, and  $n$  is the number of observations, which in this case is 722.

---

<sup>1</sup>Staiger & Stock (1997)

<sup>2</sup>Montiel Olea & Pflueger (2013)

# Main Results

## Instrumental Relevance

**Table 1:** First-Stage 2SLS Results Comparing Instruments (Standard Card Instrument vs. Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate)

		Endogenous Variable: Immigrant Inflow (1980-2008)					
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Partial F Statistic		8.9984	1.0693	0.1735	18.369	2.1906	9.9777
P-value		0.0027	0.3011	0.6770	0.0000	0.1389	0.0016
Constant		0.0504*** (0.0099)	0.0206*** (0.0069)	-0.3796*** (0.1408)	-0.0057 (0.0201)	-0.0027 (0.0225)	-0.4928*** (0.1571)
Share of employment among the foreign-born population in 1980			2.3616*** (0.5444)	1.2458** (0.6288)		1.6483*** (0.3625)	1.1985*** (0.3144)
Share of employment in manufacturing in 1980				-0.2307* (0.1301)			-0.2105 (0.1329)
Share of employment among women in 1980				0.6430 (0.3986)			0.7937* (0.3962)
Share of the college-educated population in 1980				0.0599 (0.3496)			0.0939 (0.3207)
Logarithm of total population in 1980				0.0181*** (0.0058)			0.0182*** (0.0071)
Standard Card Instrument		0.3602*** (0.1201)	-0.1460 (0.1412)	0.0555 (0.1333)			
Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate					0.0391*** (0.0091)	0.0129 (0.0087)	0.0226*** (0.0071)
R <sup>2</sup>		0.2347	0.3296	0.3977	0.1131	0.3331	0.4242
Partial R <sup>2</sup>		0.2347	0.0097	0.0012	0.1131	0.0148	0.0452

Notes:  $N = 741$ . Robust standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the state level. A Partial F-statistic below 10 is typically considered weak evidence of instrument relevance. The p-value is calculated using a  $\chi^2(1)$  distribution.

\*\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\* Significant at the 10 percent level.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

# Main Results

## Causal Effect on Native Population Outcomes

**Table 2:** 2SLS Results for Various Native Population Outcomes Using the *Predicted Immigrant Growth Rate* as an Instrument

Native Population Outcome	Growth Rate of Wages			Growth Rate of Unemployment			Growth Rate of NILF		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<b>Immigrant Inflow (1980-2008)</b>	-0.4294* (0.2326)	-1.7339 (1.4898)	-0.5402 (0.4442)	0.2260*** (0.0570)	0.7200 (0.4748)	0.5059*** (0.1547)	0.1127*** (0.0568)	0.3164 (0.2721)	0.4517** (0.1942)
Share of employment among the foreign-born population in 1980		3.2125 (2.6615)	0.6921 (0.7209)		-1.2165 (0.7735)	-0.6535*** (0.2469)		-0.5015 (0.4959)	-0.5164* (0.3047)
Share of employment in manufacturing in 1980			-0.4735** (0.1949)			0.1141 (0.0774)			0.1963** (0.0961)
Share of employment among women in 1980			2.4377*** (0.7215)			-0.1535 (0.2538)			0.0652 (0.3051)
Share of the college-educated population in 1980			-0.1724 (0.4267)			0.0028 (0.1527)			-0.1147 (0.1445)
Logarithm of total population in 1980			0.0143 (0.0140)			-0.0108** (0.004)			-0.0067 (0.0053)
Constant Term	1.1695*** (0.0264)	1.1783*** (0.0551)	0.1352 (0.2751)	-0.0222*** (0.0044)	-0.0256 (0.0167)	0.1297 (0.019)	-0.0693*** (0.0073)	-0.0707*** (0.0091)	-0.0578 (0.1360)

Notes:  $N = 741$ . Robust standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the state level.

\*\*\* Significant at the 1 percent level.

\*\* Significant at the 5 percent level.

\* Significant at the 10 percent level.

# Main Results

## Causal Effect on Native Population Outcomes

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

- Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

