# PROBLEM SET 5 Due back by Tuesday May 2.

Name: FARINA MARCO

Id: 191991

# **Instructions:**

- Make sure you are working on your problem set as each problem set is different.
- The answers to the questions of this problem set are to be given exclusively in the answer sheet
- The answers sheet MUST be printed and not photocopied. Photocopies will not be accepted.
- ullet Questions marked with the symbol ullet admit more than one correct answer
- Please fill the boxes in the answer sheet completely using a black pen as follows

Question 1: B C D E

- The answer sheet must not be creased or folded otherwise your problem set won't be graded.
- You can hand back your problem set at the END of class on May 2.



With a sample of 706 observations, we estimate the following model:

$$ln(hwage_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 age_i + \beta_2 age_i^2 + \beta_3 educ_i + \beta_4 yngkid_i + u_i$$

and obtain these results:

where *lhwage* is the logarithm of the hourly wage in euro, *age* is measured in years, *educ* is years of education and *yngkid* is a variable equal to 1 in case the person has a child younger than three years.

## **Question 1** What is the interpretation of $\beta_3$ ?

- A One year more of education is associated with a change of about 0.07% in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.
- B An increase of 1% in education is associated with a change of about 7% euros in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.
- C One year more of education is associated with a change of about 7% in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.
- D An increase of 1% in education is associated with a change of about 0.07 euros in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.
- E One year more of education is associated with a change of about 0.0007 in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.
- F One year more of education is associated with a change of about 0.07 euros in hourly wage, on average, ceteris paribus.

#### **Question 2** What is the interpretation of $\beta_4$ ?


- A If a person has one small kid more, he/she earns about 9.5% more per hour with respect to someone who does not have small kids, ceteris paribus.
- B If a person has one small kid more, he/she earns about 0.095 more per hour with respect to someone who does not have small kids, ceteris paribus.
- [C] If a person has small kids (; 3 years old), he/she earns about 9.5% more per hour with respect to someone who does not have small kids, ceteris paribus.
- D If a person has small kids (; 3 years old), he/she earns about 0.095 euros more per hour with respect to someone who does not have small kids, ceteris paribus.

## **Question 3** $\clubsuit$ Is $\beta_3$ statistically higher than 0.05 at 5%?

- A Yes, it is, since the t-value is larger than 1.64.
- B Yes, it is, since the t-value is smaller than 1.64.
- C No, it is not, since the t-value is smaller than 1.96.
- D No, it is not since the t-value is larger than 1.96.
- E None of these answers are correct.

### **Question 4** Is $\beta_1$ statistically significant?

- A We cannot check for this, it makes no sense.
- B It is not at 1% level
- C It is at 10% level.
- D It is not at 5% level.



$$\boxed{A} ln(hwage_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 age_i + \beta_2 ln(educ_i) + u_i$$

$$\boxed{\mathbf{B}} \ ln(hwage_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ln(age_i) + \beta_2 educ_i + u_i$$

$$\boxed{C} hwage_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 age_i + \beta_2 ln(educ_i) + u_i$$

$$\boxed{D} hwage_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ln(age_i) + \beta_2 educ_i + u_i$$

$$\boxed{E} ln(hwage_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 age + ln(\beta_2 educ_i) + u_i$$

Question 6 Keeping other variables fixed, at what age the logarithm of hourly wage is maximized?

- At about 56.3 years.
- B At about 0, but this makes no sense.
- C At about 93.3 years.
- D At about 46.7 years.

 $\mathbf{2}$ 

Let us define with Y the amount of cholesterol in mlg in the blood and with Med a dummy variable which takes the value of 1 for medication B and 0 for medication A, where A and B are two different medications that lower cholesterol. Female is a dummy variable which takes the value of 1 for females and 0 otherwise.

Consider the following regression:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times med + \beta_2 \times female + \beta_3 \times med \times female + u.$$

Question 7 What is the effect of using medication B with respect to no medication for men?

- A  $\beta_1$
- B None of the others.
- C  $\beta_0$
- $\boxed{\mathbf{D}}$   $\beta_0 + \beta_1$
- $\mathbb{E} \beta_1 \beta_0$

**Question 8** Suppose you use this model:  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times med + \beta_2 \times female + u$  In this case, what is the effect of medication B for man and women, respectively?

- $\boxed{\mathbf{A}}$   $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_1 + \beta_2$ .
- B None of the others.
- $\boxed{\mathbf{C}}$   $\beta_1$  for both genders.
- $\boxed{\mathbf{D}}$   $\beta_0 + \beta_1$  and  $\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_2$ .
- E  $\beta_1 \beta_0$  for both genders.



These data are taken from the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey survey conducted in 1996. These data were provided by Professor Harvey Rosen of Princeton University and were used in his paper with Craig Perry "The Self-Employed Are Less Likely Than Wage-Earners to Have Health Insurance. So What?" in Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Harvey S. Rosen, eds., Entrepeneurship and Public Po licy, MIT Press 2004.

Among the variables in the dataset, ins is a dummy equal to one if the interviewee has the insurance; selfemp is equal to one if the interviewee is a self-employed workers; gender is equal to one if the in dividual is a male; married is one if the individual is married; health is one if the individual reports to be in good health; educ is 0 if the person has no education, 1 if he/she achieved middle school diploma, 2 for the high school diploma, 3 for the bachelor degree, 4 for the master degree and 5 for the PhD; age is in years and age2 is the square of age.

We estimate two models:

$$Pr(ins = 1|X) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times selfemp + \beta_2 \times married + \beta_3 \times gender + \beta_4 \times health + \beta_5 \times gender * health + \beta_6 \times educ + \beta_7 \times age + \beta_8 \times age^2$$

#### Coefficients:

	Estimate S	td. Error t	value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	0.2974634	0.0580248	5.13	0.000003
selfemp	-0.1742361	0.0141740	-12.29	< 2e-16
married	0.1181062	0.0094187	12.54	< 2e-16
gender	-0.0232270	0.0343575	-0.68	0.49903
health	0.0744310	0.0247243	3.01	0.00262
genderxhealth	-0.0206248	0.0353131	-0.58	0.55920
educ	0.0529807	0.0029210	18.14	< 2e-16
age	0.0105315	0.0027482	3.83	0.00013
age2	-0.0000788	0.0000333	-2.37	0.01796

Heteroskadasticity robust standard errors used

$$Pr(ins = 1|X) = \Phi(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \times selfemp + \beta_2 \times married + \beta_3 \times gender + \beta_4 \times health + \beta_5 \times gender * health + \beta_6 \times educ + \beta_7 \times age + \beta_8 \times age^2)$$
 (II)

#### Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z )
(Intercept)	-0.844932	0.195991	-4.31	0.000016
selfemp	-0.651923	0.046842	-13.92	< 2e-16
married	0.455241	0.034845	13.06	< 2e-16
gender	-0.040238	0.111653	-0.36	0.71856
health	0.300503	0.082988	3.62	0.00029
genderxhealth	-0.124880	0.116613	-1.07	0.28422
education	0.226139	0.012852	17.60	< 2e-16
age	0.029150	0.009899	2.94	0.00323
age2	-0.000162	0.000126	-1.29	0.19821

**Question 9** What is the interretation of  $\beta_6$  in model (I)?

- A It does not have a proper interpretation.
- B Increasing years of education by one, makes the individual 5.3% more likely to have an insurance, holding all other things constant.
- C Increasing years of education by one, on average, makes the individual 5.3% more likely to have an insurance, *ceteris paribus*.
- D Increasing a person's education level by one, on average, makes he/she 5.3% more likely to have an insurance, *ceteris paribus*.



## Question 10 Is being married significantly linked to having an insurance under model (I)?

- $\boxed{\mathbf{A}}$  No, since the coefficient  $\beta_2$  is not significant.
- B Yes, since the model includes the variable "married".
- C It depends on the values of all other covariates.
- $\boxed{\mathrm{D}}$  Yes, since the coefficient  $\beta_2$  is significant.

Question 11 Does increasing level of education have a significant impact on the probability to buy an insurance at 5% level under model (I)?

- A Yes, since the model includes the variable "educ".
- B It depends on the values of all other covariates.
- $\boxed{\mathbf{C}}$  No, since the coefficient  $\beta_6$  is not significant.
- $\boxed{\mathrm{D}}$  Yes, since the coefficient  $\beta_6$  is significant.

Question 12 Does increasing level of education have a significant impact on the probability to buy an insurance at 5% level under model (II)?

- $\boxed{\mathbf{A}}$  Yes, since the coefficient  $\beta_6$  is significant.
- B It depends on the values of all other covariates.
- C Yes, since the model includes the variable "educ".
- $\square$  No, since the coefficient  $\beta_6$  is not significant.

## Question 13 . Under model (II), which of the following statements are true?

- A We cannot possibly know whether education level has an effect on the probability of having an insurance.
- B On average, self employment has a negative effect on the probability of having an insurance, ceteris paribus.
- C We cannot interpret directly the estimated coefficients in terms of magnitude.
- D The probability of having an insurance for a married person is, on average, 45.5% higher than for other people, *ceteris paribus*.
- E None of these answers are correct.

## Question 14 . Under model (I), which of the following statements are true?

- A higher education is associated, on average, with an higher probability of having an insurance, ceteris paribus.
- B If the person is a female, the effect of good health on the probability to have an insurance is  $\beta_4 + \beta_5$ .
- C We cannot interpret the estimated coefficients in terms of magnitude.
- D Statistically speaking, having a good health has the same impact on the probability of having an insurance for male and female, holding other factors constant.
- |E| None of these answers are correct.



**Question 15** What is the effect of education on the z-score?

- A change in the level of education is linked with an increase of the z-score of about 0.22, ceteris paribus.
- B An increase of one year in education is linked with an increase of the z-score of about 22%, ceteris paribus.
- C A change in the level of education is linked with an increase of the z-score of about 0.22, ceteris paribus.
- $\boxed{\mathrm{D}}$  An increase of one year in education is linked with an increase of the z-score of about 0.22%, ceteris paribus.

Question 16 What is the estimated probability that a 24 years old non-educated non-self-employed single female who is not in good health and with middle school diploma will buy insurance coverage?

- A Approximately 0.5.
- B More than 95%.
- C I cannot say because the model is nonlinear.
- $\boxed{\mathrm{D}}$  Less than 5%.



- Answers must be given exclusively on this sheet: answers given on the other sheets will be ignored.
- This sheet MUST be printed out and not photocopied. Photocopies will not be accepted.
- Please fill the boxes below completely using a black pen.
- Do not crease or fold.
- Due back: Tuesday, May 2 (right after class)

Question 1:	$A \mid \mid$	В	C	D	$ \mathbf{E} $	F
-------------	---------------	---	---	---	----------------	---

Question 2: A B C D

Question 3: A B C D E

Question 4: A B C D

Question 5: A B C D E

Question 6: A B C D

Question 7: A B C D E

Question 8:  $\boxed{A} \boxed{B} \boxed{C} \boxed{D} \boxed{E}$ 

Question 9: A B C D

Question 10: A B C D

Question 11: A B C D

Question 12: A B C D

Question 13: A B C D E

Question 14: A B C D E

Question 15: A B C D

Question 16: A B C D