

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

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

Mother's Attributes

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

This Pregnancy

alcohol	indicator=1 if mother drank alcohol during pregnancy
tripre1	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 1st trimester
tripre2	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 2nd trimester
tripre3	indicator=1 if 1st prenatal care visit in 3rd trimester
tripre0	indicator=1 if no prenatal visits
nprevist	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	Robust					[95% Conf. Interval]
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t		
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

$$\text{Birthweight} = 3432.06 - 253.2284 \text{ smoker}$$
$$(11.89053) \quad (26.81039)$$

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

birthweight	Robust					[95% Conf. interval]
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t		
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

Birthweight = 3432.70 -250.8 *smoker* - 57.6 *alcohol*
(11.93) (26.87) (77.39)

Birthweight = 3432.06 -253.2 *smoker*
(11.89) (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

birthweight	Robust					[95% Conf. Interval]
	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t		
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

$$\text{Birthweight} = 3050.5 - 218.8 \text{ smoker} + 34.1 \text{ nprevist}$$

(43.69) (25.99) (3.6)

$$\text{Birthweight} = 3432.06 - 253.2 \text{ smoker}$$

(11.89) (26.81)

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	Robust					
	Coef.	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?

```
regress birthweight smoker nprevist triprel tripre2 tripre3 , robust
```

Linear regression

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

birthweight	Robust					
	Coef.	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
triprel	300.8879	156.1035	1.93	0.054	-5.193062	606.9688
tripre2	311.2523	154.6024	2.01	0.044	8.114665	614.3899
tripre3	416.6767	163.0092	2.56	0.011	97.05544	736.298
_cons	2750.515	146.7299	18.75	0.000	2462.814	3038.217

```
test tripred tripred2 tripred3
```

```
( 1) tripred1 = 0  
( 2) tripred2 = 0  
( 3) tripred3 = 0
```

```
F( 3, 2994) = 2.41  
Prob > F = 0.0649
```

```
test tripred tripred2 tripred3 nprevist
```

```
( 1) tripred1 = 0  
( 2) tripred2 = 0  
( 3) tripred3 = 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

Regressor	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
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)
Summary statistics					
<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	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

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

```
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

wage	Robust					
	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

Robust						
wage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
<hr/>						
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)
Summary statistics					
<i>Root MSE</i>	3.37	3.19	3.26	3.08	2.96
<i>R</i> 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	Robust					
	Coef.	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