PS11

Bradley Rann

May 2023

1 Introduction

6 - The data is likely either MAR or MNAR because MCAR is extremely unlikely in any data set. There's likely a reason why wages are missing, and from a quick glance it looks like there are more missing wages from non college graduates in the data. So I believe it is likely MNAR.

7 - My results on B1 were pretty far off the mark, indicating that the veracity of these 3 imputation methods is pretty weak and other imputation methods might be considered instead.

9 - I don't believe that it's very realistic. I think the problem with that model is that union utility decreases because some of the factors that make it more favorable are gone, but I don't think that's a good look at reality. For the people in the union who are already in those roles, utility isn't actually decreasing for them at all.

	(1)
(Intercept)	0.909
	(0.116)
hgc	0.056
	(0.009)
college1	−0.091
	(0.107)
exper	0.015
	(0.006)
married1	−0.041
	(0.036)
kids	0.068
	(0.035)
union1	0.062
	(0.073)
Num.Obs.	1545
R2	0.035
R2 Adj.	0.031
AIC	3189.3
BIC	3232.0
Log.Lik.	−1586.626
F	9.243
RMSE	0.68

	Complete Case	Impute with Mean	Heckman Selection
(Intercept)	0.891	1.202	0.463
	0.891	1.202	20.553
	(0.112)	(0.076)	(0.122)
	(0.112)	(0.076)	(1.111)
hgc	0.058	0.035	−1.104
	0.058	0.035	0.092
	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.010)
	(0.009)	(0.006)	(0.066)
union	0.068		
	(0.073)		
college	−0.079		
	(0.106)		
exper	0.016	0.003	−0.506
	0.016	0.003	0.038
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.007)
	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.030)
union1		0.021	−1.113
		0.021	0.112
		(0.045)	(0.072)
		(0.045)	(0.213)
college1		−0.124	−0.565
		−0.124	0.090
		(0.048)	(0.100)
		(0.048)	(0.227)
married1			−2.275
			(0.162)
kids			0.495
			(0.114)
invMillsRatio			−0.714
			(0.059)
sigma			0.698
rho			−1.022
Num.Obs.	1545	2229	2229
R2	0.032	0.016	0.090
R2 Adj.	0.029	0.014	0.088
AIC	3190.2	3815.6	
BIC	3222.3	3849.9	
Log.Lik.	−1589.113	−1901.820	
F	12.600	9.162	
RMSE	0.68	0.57	0.66