

10.18

Consider the data file *mroz* on working wives. Use the 428 observations on married women who participate in the labor force. In this exercise, we examine the effectiveness of a parent's college education as an instrumental variable.

- a. Create two new variables. *MOTHERCOLL* is a dummy variable equaling one if *MOTHEREDUC* > 12, zero otherwise. Similarly, *FATHERCOLL* equals one if *FATHEREDUC* > 12 and zero otherwise. What percentage of parents have some college education in this sample?

Ans.

母親受過大學教育 (*MOTHERCOLL* = 1) 的比例為 12.15%

父親受過大學教育 (*FATHERCOLL* = 1) 的比例為 11.68%

```
> mean(mroz_sub$mothercoll, na.rm = TRUE)
[1] 0.1214953
> mean(mroz_sub$fathercoll, na.rm = TRUE)
[1] 0.1168224
```

- b. Find the correlations between *EDUC*, *MOTHERCOLL*, and *FATHERCOLL*. Are the magnitudes of these correlations important? Can you make a logical argument why *MOTHERCOLL* and *FATHERCOLL* might be better instruments than *MOTHEREDUC* and *FATHEREDUC*?

Ans.

*EDUC* 與 *MOTHERCOLL* 的相關係數為 0.3595

*EDUC* 與 *FATHERCOLL* 的相關係數為 0.3985

相關係數的大小是否重要：父母是否上過大學與子女教育年數呈現中度正相關，顯示 *MOTHERCOLL* 與 *FATHERCOLL* 在統計上具備作為工具變數的「相關性條件 (Relevance)」。

為什麼 *MOTHERCOLL* 和 *FATHERCOLL* 可能更好：*MOTHERCOLL* 和 *FATHERCOLL* 是離散的二元變數，只揭示父母是否有大學經歷，資訊較粗略，較不容易直接影響工資，因此更有可能滿足工具變數的外生性條件 (Exogeneity)。

	educ	mothercoll	fathercoll
educ	1.0000000	0.3594705	0.3984962
mothercoll	0.3594705	1.0000000	0.3545709
fathercoll	0.3984962	0.3545709	1.0000000

- c. Estimate the wage equation in Example 10.5 using *MOTHERCOLL* as the instrumental variable. What is the 95% interval estimate for the coefficient of *EDUC*?

Ans.

*EDUC* 的 95% 信賴區間為 [-0.0012, 0.1533]

```
> confint(iv_model, "educ", level = 0.95)
                2.5 %      97.5 %
educ -0.001219763 0.1532557
```

- d. For the problem in part (c), estimate the first-stage equation. What is the value of the F-test statistic for the hypothesis that *MOTHERCOLL* has no effect on *EDUC*? Is *MOTHERCOLL* a strong instrument?

Ans.  $\hat{EDUC} = 12.0791 + 0.0562EXPER - 0.00196EXPER^2 + 2.5171MOTHERCOLL + \nu$

$H_0$ : *MOTHERCOLL* 係數 = 0      $H_1$ : *MOTHERCOLL* 係數  $\neq 0$

F統計量 = 63.563 > 10，拒絕  $H_0$ ，表明 *MOTHERCOLL* 對 *EDUC* 之間存在高度顯著的關係。

*MOTHERCOLL* 是強工具變數，可以可靠地用於 IV 估計。

```
Call:
lm(formula = educ ~ exper + exper2 + mothercoll, data = mroz_sub)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-7.4267	-0.4826	-0.3731	1.0000	4.9353

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	12.079094	0.303118	39.849	< 2e-16 ***
exper	0.056230	0.042101	1.336	0.182
exper2	-0.001956	0.001256	-1.557	0.120
mothercoll	2.517068	0.315713	7.973	1.46e-14 ***

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 2.133 on 424 degrees of freedom  
Multiple R-squared: 0.1347, Adjusted R-squared: 0.1285  
F-statistic: 21.99 on 3 and 424 DF, p-value: 2.965e-13

Linear hypothesis test:  
mothercoll = 0

Model 1: restricted model

Model 2: educ ~ exper + exper2 + mothercoll

	Res.Df	RSS	Df	Sum of Sq	F	Pr(>F)
1	425	2219.2				
2	424	1929.9	1	289.32	63.563	1.455e-14 ***

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

- e. Estimate the wage equation in Example 10.5 using *MOTHERCOLL* and *FATHERCOLL* as the instrumental variables. What is the 95% interval estimate for the coefficient of *EDUC*? Is it narrower or wider than the one in part (c)?

Ans.

*EDUC* 的 95% 信賴區間為 [0.0275, 0.1482]

與 10.18c 的比較：使用兩個工具變數的信賴區間更窄，這表明額外的工具變數確實提高了估計效率。

```
> confint(iv_model_both, "educ", level = 0.95)
                2.5 %      97.5 %
educ 0.02751845 0.1481769
```

- f. For the problem in part (e), estimate the first-stage equation. Test the joint significance of *MOTHERCOLL* and *FATHERCOLL*. Do these instruments seem adequately strong?

Ans.  $\hat{EDUC} = 11.89026 + 0.04915EXPER - 0.00145EXPER^2 + 1.74995MOTHERCOLL + 2.18661FATHERCOLL + \nu$

```
Call:
lm(formula = educ ~ exper + exper2 + mothercoll + fathercoll,
    data = mroz_sub)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-7.2152	-0.3056	-0.2152	0.7627	5.0620

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	11.890259	0.290251	40.965	< 2e-16 ***
exper	0.049149	0.040133	1.225	0.221
exper2	-0.001449	0.001199	-1.209	0.227
mothercoll	1.749947	0.322347	5.429	9.58e-08 ***
fathercoll	2.186612	0.329917	6.628	1.04e-10 ***

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 2.033 on 423 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.2161, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2086

F-statistic: 29.15 on 4 and 423 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Linear hypothesis test:

mothercoll = 0

fathercoll = 0

Model 1: restricted model

Model 2: educ ~ exper + exper2 + mothercoll + fathercoll

	Res.Df	RSS	Df	Sum of Sq	F	Pr(>F)
1	425	2219.2				
2	423	1748.3	2	470.88	56.963	< 2.2e-16 ***

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

$H_0$ : *MOTHERCOLL*係數 = 0, *FATHERCOLL*係數 = 0

$H_1$ : *MOTHERCOLL*係數  $\neq$  0, *FATHERCOLL*係數  $\neq$  0

F統計量 = 56.963 > 10，拒絕  $H_0$ ，表明 *MOTHERCOLL* 和 *FATHERCOLL* 對 *EDUC* 之間存在高度顯著的關係。*MOTHERCOLL* 和 *FATHERCOLL* 是強工具變數，可以可靠地用於 IV 估計。

- g. For the IV estimation in part (e), test the validity of the surplus instrument. What do you conclude?

Ans.

Sargan 檢定 p值 = 0.626 > 0.05：無法拒絕”所有工具變數都有效”的虛無假設。表明沒有證據顯示工具變數無效。支持工具變數的有效性。

```
Call:
ivreg(formula = lwage ~ educ + exper + exper2 | exper + exper2 +
      mothercoll + fathercoll, data = mroz_sub)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-3.07797	-0.32128	0.03418	0.37648	2.36183

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	-0.2790819	0.3922213	-0.712	0.47714
educ	0.0878477	0.0307808	2.854	0.00453 **
exper	0.0426761	0.0132950	3.210	0.00143 **
exper2	-0.0008486	0.0003976	-2.135	0.03337 *

Diagnostic tests:

	df1	df2	statistic	p-value
Weak instruments	2	423	56.963	<2e-16 ***
Wu-Hausman	1	423	0.519	0.472
Sargan	1	NA	0.238	0.626

---  
Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 0.6679 on 424 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-Squared: 0.153, Adjusted R-squared: 0.147

Wald test: 9.724 on 3 and 424 DF, p-value: 3.224e-06