

**L**inkedIn Profile +49-176-8466-3399

**♀** 53119 Bonn, Germany

GitHub: Olowookere-O-O

✓ olowookereolawale1993@gmail.com

# 1 Formatting results task

|                         | (1)             | (2)                 | (3)            |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|
|                         | Attendance Rate | Grade Point Average | Height (in cm) |
| Treatment               | 12.41***        | 0.000803            | 0.483*         |
|                         | (65.48)         | (0.03)              | (2.26)         |
| Constant                | 25.05***        | 5.010***            | 129.9***       |
|                         | (187.27)        | (250.38)            | (859.94)       |
| $\mathbb{R}^2$          | 0.094           | 0.000               | 0.000          |
| Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | 0.094           | 0.000               | 0.000          |
| Observations            | 41309           | 41309               | 41309          |

Notes The table presents OLS estimates in all models. Roburst standard errors are reported in parenthesis

Level of Significance: \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001

### 2 Econometrics knowledge task

- Name of method: Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD)
- Assumptions
  - Continuity of eligibility index: This requires the index being exploited as a proxy for randomnization should not jump, smooth at the cut-off point.
  - Comparability of units around the cut-off point
- Evaluation of RDD assumption
  - Visualization of eligibility index
  - Covariates comparison
  - Falsification outcomes
  - Adjustment in bandwidth selection

### Answer C.

Disparity in gender between the two groups (treatment and control) could create selection bias, particularly if gender affects level of altruism.

#### Answer D.

• Non-comparability of treatment and control group, potentially causing selection bias.

## 3 Result interpretation task

The table presents regression results on the impact of a scholarship (treatment) on three outcome variables: worked hours, average grades, and stress level.

- Worked Hours: All other things being equal, students who received scholarship, on average, have a reduction of 268.95 hours in worked hours, significant at (p < 0.01). The R<sup>2</sup> and adjusted R<sup>2</sup> values of 0.176 indicate that the model explains 17.6% of the variance in worked hours. This suggests a moderate effect of the scholarship on reducing the need for work hours.
- Average Grades: Other things being equal, those who received scholarship, on average, have an increase of 9.99 points in average grade (p < 0.01). The model's R<sup>2</sup> of 0.029 implies that only 2.9% of the variation in grades is explained by the treatment, indicating a relatively weak effect.
- Stress Level: Other things being equal, those who received scholarship do not experience a significant reduction in stress level (coefficient = -0.03), with no statistically significant effect (p > 0.05). The R<sup>2</sup> is effectively 0, suggesting that the model does not explain any variation in stress levels.