

Introductory Applied Econometrics
Midterm examination

1. (5 points) For each of the following estimated equations of weekly wage (in \$) on education (in years):

- (a) $\widehat{wage} = 300 + 8 \text{ education}$
- (b) $\widehat{wage} = 150 + 100 \log(\text{education})$
- (c) $\widehat{\log(wage)} = 5 + .08 \text{ education}$
- (d) $\widehat{\log(wage)} = 3 + 1.2 \log(\text{education})$

Interpret in a sentence the relationship between education and wage. What is the estimated effect of an increase in education from 10 to 11 years on the wage (in \$ value or in %)?

2. (5 points) Using the Kenyan Demographic and Health Survey 2003, we found the following mean and standard deviation for the education of women raised rural and in urban areas respectively:

	Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Raised in rural areas	education	727	6.690509	4.152626	0	20
Raised in urban areas	education	236	8.411017	4.608563	0	20

Do the data given in the previous question provide statistical evidence at the 1% significance level that the average education of the women raised in urban areas is higher than the average education of the women raised in rural areas? (To answer this question, call D the difference in mean education of the two groups; suggest an estimator \hat{D} for D and for the standard error of \hat{D} ; and then use the 5 steps for hypothesis testing that we followed in class.)

3. (5 points) Using data from a large number of Mexican communities, we estimated the following two models:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{deforestation} &= 9.48 + 25.9 \text{ boundary} \\ \text{deforestation} &= -66.63 + 20.1 \text{ boundary} + 12.9 \log(\text{totalpop}) \end{aligned}$$

where deforestation is area deforested over 10 years (in ha), boundary is a dummy variable indicating the ejido has boundary problem and totalpop is the total population of the community.

How does the introduction of the $\log(\text{totalpop})$ affect the estimated parameter on boundary? What can you infer about the correlation between boundary and $\log(\text{totalpop})$?

4. (15 points) In order to estimate the following model of emission by power plants:

$$\log(CO_2) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(Q) + \beta_2 OLD + u$$

You collect information from 110 firms on carbon dioxide emission (CO_2), their level of production (Q), and a dummy variable that is equal to 1 for firms whose generator is older than 15 years (OLD) and zero otherwise. The estimated equation is the following:

$$\widehat{\log(CO_2)} = 2.54 + 0.924 \log(Q) + 0.210 OLD \quad R^2 = 0.253$$

(0.52) (0.042) (0.097)

(standard errors in parentheses)

- a. What is the economic interpretation of the true parameters β_1 and β_2 ?
- b. Construct a 95% confidence interval for β_1 . Give an interpretation.
- c. Test the hypothesis $\beta_1 = 1$ against $\beta_1 \neq 1$ at the 5% significance level. What is the *economic* interpretation of your result?

5. (20 points) Using data from the 2006 Indian DHS survey of 976 women—which includes a measure of autonomy of the women surveyed (a scale from 0-10, 10 being the most autonomous), the age when married (*marr_age*), current age (*curr_age*), a dummy for husband’s education greater than primary school (*husb_educ*), and a dummy for an urban location—we estimate the following model:

$$(1) \quad \text{autonomy} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{marr_age} + \beta_2 \text{curr_age} + \beta_3 \text{husbedu} + \beta_4 \text{urban} + u$$

- Using the Stata output from model 1 below, what is the p-value for the test that husband’s education has no effect on the autonomy of the women? Interpret your results.
- Calculate and interpret the R-squared for this estimation.
- We now re-estimate the model without the two age variables (model 2 below). Comparing the two estimated models, test that both marriage age and current age do not have an effect on women’s autonomy (i.e. do a joint test of significance on the two parameters).
- Fully interpret the result on the role of husband education on the women’s autonomy from the estimation of model 2. (Hint: use the value of the intercept to help you interpret the size of the effect)

Model 1 `. reg autonomy marr_age curr_age husb_educ urban`

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	949.690268	4	237.422567	Number of obs = 976		
Residual	15809.3097	971	16.2814724	F(4, 971) = 14.58		
Total	16759	975	17.1887179	Prob > F = 0.0000		
				R-squared = 0.0528		
				Adj R-squared = 0.0528		
				Root MSE = 4.035		

autonomy	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
marr_age	.0329975	.0400423	0.82	0.410	-.045582	.1115769
curr_age	.1129321	.0265058	4.26	0.000		
husb_educ	.5356327	.2834984	1.89		-.0207074	1.091973
urban	1.192164	.2735485	4.36	0.000	.6553492	1.728978
_cons	.3844601	.7484315	0.51	0.608	-1.084269	1.85319

Model 2 `. reg autonomy husb_educ urban`

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	486.726699	2	243.363349	Number of obs = 976		
Residual	16317.306	975	16.7356985	F(2, 975) = 14.54		
Total	16804.0327	977	17.1996241	Prob > F = 0.0000		
				R-squared = 0.0290		
				Adj R-squared = 0.0270		
				Root MSE = 4.0909		

autonomy	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
husb_educ	.5590007	.2734715	2.04	0.041	.0223403	1.095661
urban	1.250604	.2747828	4.55	0.000	.7113701	1.789838
_cons	3.928316	.2236928	17.56	0.000	3.489341	4.367291