

MLaE: Whether WFH affect well-being

Boyu Chen, Yihuai Chang

2023-05-29

Research Motivation

- ▶ Under the pandemic, there were many inconveniences.
- ▶ We try to figure out how working from home affect workers' well-being.
- ▶ Our assumption is that working from home has negative impact on workers' well-being, since they might feel socially isolated.

Literature

- ▶ Marco Bertoni, Danilo Cavapozzi et al. (2022), "Remote Working and Mental Health During the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic"

Data Source

IPUMS Time Use 2021

- ▶ D_i : Distance working binary variable
- ▶ Y_i : Well-being ladder (0-10)
- ▶ X_i : Control variables, including statefip, age, gender, have kids, occupation, earning per week, race, fullpart.
- ▶ # of observations: 3,281, # of variables: 94

Assumptions

- ▶ We assume that unconfoundedness is satisfied, which is:

$$(Y_{i(0)}, Y_{i(1)}) \perp D_i | X_i$$

- ▶ The sparsity assumption holds

Model

Model

Poisson regression

Because our Y is a count data, we use poisson regression with double machine learning to specify our treatment effect.

Recall: Poisson

- ▶ poisson pdf:
 - ▶ If $Y \sim \text{poisson}(\lambda)$, then $f(y) = \frac{\lambda^y e^{-\lambda}}{y!}$
- ▶ poisson regression: let $\lambda_i = E(y_i|X_i) = \exp(X_i' \beta)$,
 - ▶ The conditional pdf is $f(y_i|X_i) = \frac{\exp(X_i' \beta)^{y_i} e^{-\exp(X_i' \beta)}}{y_i!}$
 - ▶ The log-likelihood is
$$\ell(\beta|y_i, X_i) = y_i(X_i' \beta) - \exp(-X_i' \beta) - \ln(y_i!)$$
 - ▶ The poisson regression LASSO criterion is

$$\min_{\beta, \gamma} Q(\beta, \gamma|X, Y) = -n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\beta|y_i, X_i) + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|$$

XPOSSION

Cross-fit partialing-out lasso Poisson regression, the model is:

$$E(y|D, X) = \exp(D\alpha + X^T\beta)$$

where

- ▶ y is the dep. variable.
- ▶ D is treatment, which is a scalar.
- ▶ X is the control variable matrix, which is a $n \times p$ matrix.
- ▶ β is a $p \times 1$ vector.

XPOLPR algorithm

Step 1

Randomly Partition the sample to K folds.

Step 2

Define two sets:

- ▶ I_k : the obs. in fold k
- ▶ IC_k : the obs. not in fold k

XPOLPR algorithm

Step 3

Run Double Selection poisson lasso For $k = 1, \dots, K$

1. Run poisson lasso for the following model

$$y = \exp(D\alpha_k + X'\beta_k)$$

and we get the non-zero covariates, denoted by $\tilde{X}_{k,y}$.

2. Run poisson regression for the following model

$$y = \exp(D\alpha_k + \tilde{X}'_{k,y}\beta_k)$$

and we get the estimated coefficients $\tilde{\alpha}_k$ and $\tilde{\delta}_k$.

XPOLPR algorithm

3. For the obs. $i \in I_k$, fill in the prediction for the high-dimensional component using the out-of-sample estimate $\tilde{\delta}_k$.

$$\tilde{s}_i = \tilde{X}'_{k,y,i} \tilde{\delta}_k$$

4. Using the observations $i \in IC_k$, perform a linear lasso of D on X using observation-level weights, w_i .

$$w_i = \exp'(D_i \tilde{\alpha}_k + \tilde{s}_i)$$

Denote the selected controls by \tilde{X}_k .

XPOLPR algorithm

5. Using the observations $i \in IC_k$, fit a linear regression of D on \tilde{X}_k , and denote the coefficient estimates by $\hat{\gamma}_k$.
6. For each observation $i \in I_k$, fill in the instrument

$$z_i = D_i - \tilde{X}_{k,i} \hat{\gamma}'_k$$

XPOLPR algorithm

Step 4

Compute the point estimates $\hat{\alpha}$ by solving the following sample-moment equations.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{y_i - \exp(D_i \alpha' + \tilde{\epsilon}_i)\} z_i = 0$$

XPOLPR algorithm

Step 5

Variance estimation is estimated by

$$\hat{Var}(\hat{\alpha}) = n^{-1} \hat{J}_0^{-1} \hat{\Psi} (\hat{J}_0^{-1})'$$

where

$$\hat{\Psi} = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\Psi}_k$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_k = n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_k} \hat{\psi}_i \hat{\psi}_i'$$

$$\hat{\psi}_i = \{y_i - \exp(d\hat{\alpha} + \hat{s}_i)\} z_i$$

$$\hat{J}_0 = K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (n_k^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_k} \hat{\psi}_i^{\alpha})$$

$$\hat{\psi}_i^{\alpha} = \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}_i}{\partial \hat{\alpha}}$$

analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	mean	standard deviation
well being	7.286	1.780
WFH	0.253	0.435
age	44.265	13.552
female	0.486	0.500
have child	0.437	0.496
married	0.527	0.499
earnings per week	1277.225	793.090
fulltime job	1.134	0.341
observations	3281	

Main Result

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...
Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin
Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	3,281
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	20
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	3.80
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0513

wbladder	Robust				
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
distance_work	.9794901	.0104156	-1.95	0.051	.9592871 1.000119

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos [select controls](#) for model estimation. Type [lassoinfo](#) to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: gender

male:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

note: female dropped because it is constant

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

note: female dropped because it is constant

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,686
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	21
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	4.33
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0375

wbladder	Robust					
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
distance_work	.9677906	.0152292	-2.08	0.037	.9383974	.9981044

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos [select controls](#) for model estimation. Type [lassoinfo](#) to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: gender

female:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

note: female dropped because it is constant

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

note: female dropped because it is constant

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,595
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	17
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	0.35
	Prob > chi2	=	0.5548

wbladder	IRR	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
distance_work	.9914048	.0144921	-0.59	0.555	.9634039	1.02022

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos [select controls](#) for model estimation. Type [lassoinfo](#) to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: have children or not

have children:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

note: hh_child dropped because it is constant

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

note: hh_child dropped because it is constant

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,433
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	13
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	0.33
	Prob > chi2	=	0.5628

wbladder	Robust					[95% Conf. Interval]
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z		
distance_work	.9914021	.0147933	-0.58	0.563	.9628277	1.020825

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos `select controls` for model estimation. Type `lassoinfo` to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: have children or not

do not have any child:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

note: hh_child dropped because it is constant

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

note: hh_child dropped because it is constant

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,848
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	18
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	4.24
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0396

wbladder	Robust					
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
distance_work	.9700444	.0143347	-2.06	0.040	.9423518	.9985507

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos [select controls](#) for model estimation. Type [lassoinfo](#) to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: marital status

married:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,728
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	18
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	1.01
	Prob > chi2	=	0.3161

wbladder	Robust					
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
distance_work	.9880929	.0118057	-1.00	0.316	.9652229	1.011505

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos `select controls` for model estimation. Type `lassoinfo` to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Subgroup: marital status

not married:

Cross-fit fold 10 of 10 ...

Estimating lasso for wbladder using plugin

Estimating lasso for distance_work using plugin

Cross-fit partialing-out	Number of obs	=	1,553
Poisson model	Number of controls	=	94
	Number of selected controls	=	17
	Number of folds in cross-fit	=	10
	Number of resamples	=	1
	Wald chi2(1)	=	4.03
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0447

wbladder	Robust				
	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
distance_work	.9644475	.0173882	-2.01	0.045	.9309622 .9991371

Note: Chi-squared test is a Wald test of the coefficients of the variables of interest jointly equal to zero. Lassos [select controls](#) for model estimation. Type [lassoinfo](#) to see number of selected variables in each lasso.

Robustness Check: PSM

Variable	Sample	Treated	Controls	Difference	S.E.	T-stat
wbladder	Unmatched	7.21980676	7.31010309	-.090296329	.071507743	-1.26
	ATT	7.21980676	7.40398551	-.184178744	.103629524	-1.78

Note: S.E. does not take into account that the propensity score is estimated.

psmatch2: Treatment assignment	psmatch2: Common support On support	Total
Untreated	2,425	2,425
Treated	828	828
Total	3,253	3,253

Robustness Check: DML

```
. qddml wbladder $D ($X), kfolds(2) model(partial) cmd(rlasso) reps(5)  
minimum Python version required is 2.7
```

DDML estimation results:

spec	r	Y learner	D learner	b	SE
opt 1	1	Y2_rlasso	D1_reg	-0.115	(0.081)
opt 2	2	Y2_rlasso	D1_reg	-0.135	(0.081)
opt 3	3	Y2_rlasso	D1_reg	-0.127	(0.081)
opt 4	4	Y2_rlasso	D1_reg	-0.095	(0.081)
opt 5	5	Y2_rlasso	D1_reg	-0.110	(0.081)

opt = minimum MSE specification for that resample.

Mean/med.	Y learner	D learner	b	SE
mse mn	[min-mse]	[mse]	-0.117	(0.082)
mse md	[min-mse]	[mse]	-0.115	(0.082)

Median over min-mse specifications

$y-E[y|X] = \text{Y2_rlasso}$

Number of obs = 3281

$D-E[D|X,Z] = \text{D1_reg}$

wbladder	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
distance_work	-.1151211	.0822525	-1.40	0.162	-.2763332	.0460909

Summary over 5 resamples:

D eqn	mean	min	p25	p50	p75	max
distance_work	-0.1166	-0.1352	-0.1274	-0.1151	-0.1098	-0.0953

Conclusion

- ▶ It seems that working from home will reduce the distance workers' well-being.
- ▶ We will further examine whether if distance workers' exercise time, sleep time and social time are significantly different to control group.