

# ***Research question: causal effect of mother's smoking during pregnancy on birth weight of a child.***

Data is from the 1989 linked National Natality-Mortality Detail files, which contains a census of infant births and deaths. The data set contains all births in Pennsylvania in 1989.

These data were provided by Professor Douglas Almond, Kenneth Chay, and David Lee and are a subset of the data used in their paper "The Costs of Low Birth Weight," Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 2005, 120(3):1031-1083.

The file contains 3,000 observations on the variables described below

## **Variable Description**

### *Birthweight and Smoking*

<b>birthweight</b>	birth weight of infant (in grams)
<b>smoker</b>	indicator equal to one if the mother smoked during pregnancy and zero, otherwise.

### *Mother's Attributes*

<b>age</b>	age
<b>educ</b>	years of educational attainment (more than 16 years coded as 17)
<b>unmarried</b>	indicator =1 if mother is unmarried

### *This Pregnancy*

<b>alcohol</b>	indicator=1 if mother drank alcohol during pregnancy
<b>tripre1</b>	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 1st trimester
<b>tripre2</b>	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 2nd trimester
<b>tripre3</b>	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 3rd trimester
<b>tripre0</b>	indicator=1 if no prenatal visits
<b>nprevist</b>	total number of prenatal visits

```
summ birthweight nprevist
```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
birthweight	3000	3382.934	592.1629	425	5755
nprevist	3000	10.99167	3.672069	0	35

```
regress birthweight smoker, robust
```

Linear regression

Number of obs = 3000  
 F( 1, 2998) = 89.21  
 Prob > F = 0.0000  
 R-squared = 0.0286  
 Root MSE = 583.73

birthweight	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.Interval]
smoker	-253.2284	26.81039	-9.45	0.000	-305.797 -200.6597
_cons	3432.06	11.89053	288.64	0.000	3408.746 3455.374

*Birthweight* = 3432.06 - 253.2284 *smoker*  
 (11.89053) (26.81039)

*What could cause omitted variable bias?*

- *Alcohol consumption during pregnancy?*
- *Poor attention to health?*

*How would you argue for this?*

```
corr smoker alcohol nprevist  
(obs=3000)
```

		smoker	alcohol	nprevist
-----+-----				
smoker		1.0000		
alcohol		0.1209	1.0000	
nprevist		-0.1086	-0.0425	1.0000

regress birthweight smoker alcohol, robust

# Linear regression

```
Number of obs =      3000
F(  2,  2997) =      44.75
Prob > F       =      0.0000
R-squared       =      0.0288
Root MSE       =      583.77
```

			Robust			
birthweight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.interval]	
smoker	-250.8034	26.86935	-9.33	0.000	-303.4877 -198.1192	
alcohol	-57.60132	77.38742	-0.74	0.457	-209.339 94.13651	
_cons	3432.703	11.93957	287.51	0.000	3409.29 3456.114	

$$\begin{array}{lll} \textit{Birthweight} & = & 3432.70 \quad -250.8 \textit{ smoker} - 57.6 \textit{ alcohol} \\ & & (11.93) \quad (26.87) \quad (77.39) \end{array}$$
$$\text{Birthweight} = 3432.06 - 253.2 \text{ smoker}$$

$$(11.89) \quad (26.81)$$

```
regress birthweight smoker nprevist, robust
```

Linear regression

Number of obs = 3000  
 F( 2, 2997) = 89.16  
 Prob > F = 0.0000  
 R-squared = 0.0728  
 Root MSE = 570.39

-----						
	Robust					
birthweight	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.Interval]	
-----+-----						
smoker	-218.8294	25.98922	-8.42	0.000	-269.7879	-167.8709
nprevist	34.10394	3.608863	9.45	0.000	27.02784	41.18004
_cons	3050.527	43.69276	69.82	0.000	2964.857	3136.198

$$\text{Birthweight} = 3050.5 \text{ } (43.69) - 218.8 \text{ } (25.99) \text{ smoker} + 34.1 \text{ } (3.6) \text{ nprevist}$$

$$\text{Birthweight} = 3432.06 \text{ } (11.89) - 253.2 \text{ } (26.81) \text{ smoker}$$

*What regression do you prefer? Why?*

```
regress birthweight smoker nprevist tripre0 tripre1 tripre2 tripre3, r
note: tripre3 omitted because of collinearity
```

Linear regression

```
Number of obs =    3000
F(   5,  2994) =   37.19
Prob > F       =   0.0000
R-squared      =   0.0767
Root MSE      =  569.48
```

-----						
birthweight	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.Interval]	
-----+-----						
smoker	-219.4964	25.7869	-8.51	0.000	-270.0582	-168.9346
nprevist	33.8179	4.292605	7.88	0.000	25.40115	42.23465
tripre0	-416.6767	163.0092	-2.56	0.011	-736.298	-97.05544
tripre1	-115.7889	73.78332	-1.57	0.117	-260.46	28.88227
tripre2	-105.4244	74.30345	-1.42	0.156	-251.1154	40.26654
tripre3	0 (omitted)					
_cons	3167.192	70.54545	44.90	0.000	3028.869	3305.514
-----						

*What happens? Why?*



```
test trip1 trip2 trip3
```

```
( 1) trip1 = 0
```

```
( 2) trip2 = 0
```

```
( 3) trip3 = 0
```

```
F( 3, 2994) = 2.41
```

```
Prob > F = 0.0649
```

```
-----
```

```
test trip1 trip2 trip3 nprevist
```

```
( 1) trip1 = 0
```

```
( 2) trip2 = 0
```

```
( 3) trip3 = 0
```

```
( 4) nprevist = 0
```

```
F( 4, 2994) = 23.90
```

```
Prob > F = 0.0000
```



```
regress birthweight smoker nprevist unmarried, robust
```

Linear regression

```
Number of obs =    3000
F(   3,  2996) =    74.75
Prob > F       =    0.0000
R-squared      =    0.0886
Root MSE      =    565.61
```

-----						
birthweight	Robust					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
smoker	-176.2122	26.70666	-6.60	0.000	-228.5775	-123.847
nprevist	29.62307	3.58212	8.27	0.000	22.5994	36.64673
unmarried	-187.2587	27.66867	-6.77	0.000	-241.5102	-133.0071
_cons	3133.957	44.11278	71.04	0.000	3047.46	3220.452
-----						

```
. corr smoker unmarried
(obs=3000)
```

	smoker unmarr~d	
-----+-----		
smoker	1.0000	
unmarried	0.2377	1.0000

**Results of Regressions of Babies' weight at birth on  
Mothers' smoking, other actions and characteristics**

Dependent variable: birthweight

<b>Regressor</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>(5)</b>
Smoking	-253.2** (26.8)	-250.8** (26.9)	-218.8** (26.0)	-219.5** (25.8)	-176.2** (26.7)
Alcohol		-57.6 (77.4)			
Number of pre-natal visits			34.1** (3.6)	33.8** (4.3)	29.6** (3.6)
Dummies for Time of first visit	no	no	no	yes	no
Not married					-187.3** (27.7)
<b>Summary statistics</b>					
<i>Root MSE</i>	583.7	583.7	570.4	569.4	565.6
$\bar{R}^2$	0.028	0.028	0.073	0.077	0.089
<i>n</i>	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000
<i>F</i> -statistic testing coefficients on dummies for first visit ( <i>p</i> -value)				2.41 (0.65)	
<i>F</i> -statistic testing coefficients on dummies for first visit and number of visits ( <i>p</i> -value)				23.9** (0.00)	

The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the \*5% level or \*\*1% significance level using a two-sided test. Robust standard errors are given in parentheses under coefficients. All regressions include intercept

Another example

## *Return to education example:*

```
regress wage educ female, robust
```

Linear regression

```
Number of obs =      526  
F(   2,   523) =     69.10  
Prob > F       =     0.0000  
R-squared      =     0.2588  
Root MSE      =     3.1855
```

wage	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
educ	.5064521	.0598956	8.46	0.000	.3887867	.6241176
female	-2.273362	.2702033	-8.41	0.000	-2.804179	-1.742545
_cons	.6228168	.7286843	0.85	0.393	-.8086909	2.054324

$$Wage = 0.62 + 0.506 \text{ Educ} - 2.27 \text{ Female}$$

```
regress wage educ female, robust
```

Linear regression

```
Number of obs =      526
F(   2,   523) =    69.10
Prob > F       =    0.0000
R-squared      =    0.2588
Root MSE      =    3.1855
```

wage	Robust					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
educ	.5064521	.0598956	8.46	0.000	.3887867	.6241176
female	-2.273362	.2702033	-8.41	0.000	-2.804179	-1.742545
_cons	.6228168	.7286843	0.85	0.393	-.8086909	2.054324

---

```
regress wage educ, robust
```

Linear regression

```
Number of obs =      526
F(   1,   524) =    78.09
Prob > F       =    0.0000
R-squared      =    0.1648
Root MSE      =    3.3784
```

	Robust					
wage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
educ	.5413593	.0612596	8.84	0.000	.4210146	.6617039
_cons	-.9048516	.7254795	-1.25	0.213	-2.330057	.5203539

```
correlate educ female
(obs=526)
```

	educ	female
educ	1.0000	
female	-0.0850	1.0000

- *Can omitting Female cause an Omitted Variable Bias?*  
*Why?*
- *What other factors can cause OVB?*
- *Can Experience cause OVB?*

```
correlate educ exper
(obs=526)
```

	educ	exper
educ	1.0000	
exper	-0.2995	1.0000

regress wage educ exper, robust

Linear regression

Number of obs = 526  
F( 2, 523) = 50.32  
Prob > F = 0.0000  
R-squared = 0.2252  
Root MSE = 3.257

wage	Robust					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
educ	.6442721	.0651869	9.88	0.000	.5162117	.7723324
exper	.0700954	.0109943	6.38	0.000	.048497	.0916938
_cons	-3.390539	.8648747	-3.92	0.000	-5.089595	-1.691484

# Results of Regressions of Hourly Earnings on Years of Education and Worker Characteristics

Dependent variable: Hourly earnings

Regressor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Years of education	.54** (.061)	.51** (0.06)	0.64** (0.065)	0.59** (0.061)	0.57** (0.057)
Female		-2.27** (0.27)			-1.81** (0.25)
Experience			0.07** (0.010)	0.02* (0.010)	0.025* (0.009)
Tenure				0.169** (0.029)	0.141** (0.027)
Intercept	-.90 (.72)	0.62 (0.72)	-3.39 (0.86)	-2.87 (0.80)	-1.57 (0.83)
<b>Summary statistics</b>					
<i>Root MSE</i>	3.37	3.19	3.26	3.08	2.96
$\bar{R}^2$	0.165	0.25	0.23	0.31	0.36
<i>n</i>	526	526	526	526	526
<i>F</i> -statistic testing coefficients on Tenure and Experience 0 ( <i>p</i> -value)					26.86 (0.000)

The individual coefficient is statistically significant at the \*5% level or \*\*1% significance level using a two-sided test. Standard errors are given in parentheses under coefficients.

reg wage educ female exper tenure,robust

Linear regression

Number of obs = 526  
F( 4, 521) = 44.57  
Prob > F = 0.0000  
R-squared = 0.3635  
Root MSE = 2.9576

-----						
wage	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
educ	.5715048	.0612172	9.34	0.000	.4512418	.6917677
female	-1.810852	.254156	-7.12	0.000	-2.310149	-1.311556
exper	.0253959	.0098057	2.59	0.010	.0061323	.0446594
tenure	.1410051	.027955	5.04	0.000	.0860867	.1959234
_cons	-1.567939	.8259341	-1.90	0.058	-3.190509	.0546317
-----						

test exper=tenure=0

- ( 1) exper - tenure = 0
- ( 2) exper = 0

F( 2, 521) = 26.86  
Prob > F = 0.0000