Regression Results

Tuna Dökmeci

17. Dezember 2019

In the first step, we look at the baseline payments data, which contains information on household demographics as well as the treatment plans. There are a total of 1002 households in all sites. Eliminating households that are in rural sites and in Dauphin, then the households where the information on assignment cell changes during the experiment (46 families), and finally the households where the householder is a single male (44 households), we end up with 440 observations.

In the first place, we use the data called basepay.rds. This data is organized as cross-section. There is a variable indicating whether or not the household experienced a childbirth in the course of the experiment. Controls include the age of the female householder as a set of dummies, as well as the income bracket of the household, and the family size index (F, which were used to determine assignment to different treatment groups. We also control for whether or not the household has two householders or one, or whether the household in question is a single individual, the number of children present in the household at the beginning of the experiment. From the family composition data, we furthermore get information on whether or not the household has children living outside the house, and if so, how many.

The reason why I use the income bracket instead of variables on total income is twofold. First of all, while our dataset has 440 observations, information on total income in 1974 is available for only 353 households. This is because for some families, this variable is not reported and has NAs, which are ignored in the regression. Ignoring this variable does not change the results substantially, but because income was a determinant of the assignment to treatment cells, it needs to be included. That is why we control for income brackets instead. This is the last two digits of the assignment cell gives us information on the income bracket the household was in, and based on which they were stratified.

Below are the tables of logit regressions of the probability of having a child on whether or not the household was treated or the dummies of treatment plans, and a set of controls. Age is a dummy variable, and is categorized in eight groups. The reference group is 50 years or older.

Having a separate dummy for each age does not change the results. Family size index was used to determine assignment cells, and is a number that shows how many adults and children were living in the household. Because it is an arbitrary number and does not have a numerical meaning, it is also entered as a dummy in the regression. Likewise, we have two sets of dummies for the number of children living in and outside of the household. As there is a qualitative difference between having a one child or two or three, and because its effect on the probability of having another child is not likely not linear to the number of children a household already has, these variables also enter the regression as a dummy. I only report the whole set of controls in the first regression for the ease of reading, but they are always included.

The first table shows the effect of being treated as opposed to being in the control group. It is positive and significant at 90% level. In the second regression, we look at the separate effects of the treatment groups. Treatment plan 3 has positive effect at 95% significance level, and treatment plans 5, 7 and 8 have a positive effect at 90% level. Treatment plans 1, 2 and 4 do not seem to have an impact on the probability of having a child.

It might seem weird that the variable indicating whether or not a household has two householders present is negative, but it is worth noting that it is always significant and positive until we add family size index. These two variables are highly correlated, in fact, one of the three components of the family size index is whether or not a household has both a male and a female household present.

	Tabelle 1	lc
	Dependent variable:	
	Probability of experiencing birth	
Treated	0.763*	
	(0.441)	
Two householders present	−1.489*	
	(0.847)	
Age 15-19	3.334***	
	(0.860)	
Age 20-24	1.065**	

2

	(0.493)
Age 25-29	0.691
	(0.463)
Age 30-34	0.033
	(0.576)
Age 35-39	−0.542
	(0.968)
Age 40-44	−0.583
	(1.037)
Age 45-40	−1.037
	(1.206)
FSI110	0.418
	(0.646)
FSI114	−15.293
	(4,575.217)
FSI120	1.143*
	(0.683)
FSI123	−14.614
	(6,522.639)
FSI126	−15.766
	(2,124.903)
FSI130	0.058
	(1.170)

FSI136	2.460**
	(1.204)
FSI140	1.413
	(1.393)
FSI146	−15.178
	(3,746.801)
FSI152	−15.545
	(2,876.160)
FSI161	−15.598
	(6,522.639)
FSI162	−14.816
	(2,819.882)
FSI166	3.391*
	(1.840)
FSI172	−16.081
	(4,601.712)
FSI177	−16.058
	(6,522.639)
FSI178	−15.637
	(3,702.693)
FSI188	−15.671
	(6,522.639)

FSI192	20.518
	(6,522.639)
FSI193	−15.665
	(6,522.639)
FSI223	21.467
	(6,522.639)
FSI38	−1.019
	(1.263)
FSI71	−0.424
	(0.727)
FSI88	1.012*
	(0.547)
FSI97	0.630
	(1.347)
One child in the household	0.416
	(0.521)
Two children in the household	0.972
	(0.676)
Three children in the household	0.339
	(1.037)
Four children in the household	−17.585
	(4,605.586)
Income bracket 11	16.010

	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 12	16.592
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 13	16.945
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 14	15.806
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 15	15.964
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 21	16.539
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 22	16.561
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 23	16.151
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 24	15.942
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 25	14.668
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 31	15.609
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 32	15.429
	(2,727.228)

Income bracket 33	15.425
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 34	15.588
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 41	14.434
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 42	14.004
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 43	14.701
	(2,727.228)
Income bracket 44	−0.862
	(3,115.138)
Constant	−18.153
	(2,727.228)
Observations	440
Log Likelihood	−149.617
Akaike Inf. Crit.	411.233

Tabelle 2

	Dependent variable:
	Probability of experiencing birth
Treatment group 1	0.651
	(0.656)
Treatment group 2	−0.022
	(0.637)
Treatment group 3	1.308**
	(0.656)
Treatment group 4	0.306
	(0.636)
Treatment group 5	1.199*
	(0.622)
Treatment group 7	1.108*
	(0.593)
Treatment group 8	1.061*
	(0.624)
Observations	440
Log Likelihood	−146.366
Akaike Inf. Crit.	416.732
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01