

PROJECT TWO: STATA PROBLEM SET ANSWERS  
 Professor Lemke  
 Fall 2008

. \* PROBLEM ONE;

Contains data from wi\_data.dta

obs: 330  
 vars: 9 5 Feb 2005 20:10  
 size: 11,880 (99.9% of memory free)

variable name	type	format	label	variable label
bamin	int	%8.0g		Minimum Salary for teacher w BA
bamax	long	%12.0g		Maximum Salary for teacher w BA
mamin	long	%12.0g		Minimum Salary for teacher w MA
mamax	long	%12.0g		Maximum Salary for teacher w MA
enroll	long	%12.0g		District Enrollment
lunch	long	%12.0g		Percent Studs Rec Free Lunch
dropout	int	%8.0g		Percent Students Dropout
act	float	%9.0g		District Average ACT Score
totalexpend	long	%12.0g		Total District Expenditures

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
bamin	330	25719.98	1301.497	22293	30815
bamax	330	36851.16	3648.96	27572	48476
mamin	330	28724.04	1746.136	24393	36032
mamax	330	44219.98	4048.267	32975	57209
enroll	330	2436.37	6150.913	204	99814
lunch	330	622.5879	3954.44	21	70928
dropout	330	19.34545	159.9305	0	2862
act	330	22.01364	1.012278	17.7	25.2
totalexpend	330	1.82e+07	5.14e+07	1818099	8.53e+08

. \* PROBLEM TWO;

size	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Small	99	30.00	30.00
Medium	132	40.00	70.00
Large	99	30.00	100.00
Total	330	100.00	

variable name	type	format	label	variable label
size	float	%9.0g	sizes	3 size categories for districts
small	float	%9.0g		district <= 30th pctile in size
medium	float	%9.0g		district bw 30th & 70th pctile
large	float	%9.0g		district >= 70th pctile in size

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
size	330	2	.775773	1	3
small	330	.3	.4589535	0	1
medium	330	.4	.4906419	0	1
large	330	.3	.4589535	0	1

. \* PROBLEM THREE;

variable name	type	format	label	variable label
bamin	int	%8.0g		Minimum Salary for teacher w BA
baminz	float	%9.0g		bamin in \$1,000
bamax	long	%12.0g		Maximum Salary for teacher w BA
bamaxz	float	%9.0g		bamax in \$1,000
mamin	long	%12.0g		Minimum Salary for teacher w MA
maminz	float	%9.0g		mamin in \$1,000
mamax	long	%12.0g		Maximum Salary for teacher w MA
mamaxz	float	%9.0g		mamax in \$1,000
ppexp	float	%9.0g		District Per Pupil Expenditures
ppexpz	float	%9.0g		ppexp in \$1,000

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
bamin	330	25719.98	1301.497	22293	30815
baminz	330	25.71998	1.301497	22.293	30.815
bamax	330	36851.16	3648.96	27572	48476
bamaxz	330	36.85116	3.64896	27.572	48.476
mamin	330	28724.04	1746.136	24393	36032
maminz	330	28.72404	1.746136	24.393	36.032
mamax	330	44219.98	4048.267	32975	57209
mamaxz	330	44.21998	4.048267	32.975	57.209
ppexp	330	7377.191	875.6122	5807.12	12535.09
ppexpz	330	7.377191	.8756122	5.80712	12.53509

. \* PROBLEM FOUR;

. reg act ppexpz dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	330
Model	31.9967095	3	10.6655698	F( 3, 326) =	11.39
Residual	305.131947	326	.935987567	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.0949
				Adj R-squared =	0.0866
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE =	.96746

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
ppexpz	.0072515	.0642602	0.11	0.910	-.1191656 .1336685
dropout	-.1634897	.1551833	-1.05	0.293	-.4687767 .1417973
lunch	-.0233489	.0046311	-5.04	0.000	-.0324596 -.0142383
_cons	22.52049	.4595995	49.00	0.000	21.61633 23.42464

#### STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS

The only statistically significant predictors of ACT is lunch, which proxies for poverty, and it is statistically significant at even the 1% level.

#### INTERPRETATION OF COEFFICIENT ON PPEXPZ:

For every \$1,000 more spent per pupil, the district's average ACT score is expected to increase by 0.007 points. This is not a statistically significant effect, nor is it an economically significant effect. Notice from the summary statistics that ppexpz ranges from a minimum of over 5 to a maximum of under 13. Thus, ppexpz does not differ by more than 8 across any two districts, and consequently the greatest possible predicted difference in ACT scores is  $8 \times 0.007$ , which is less than 0.056 of a point. Thus, we are left with the conclusion that ACT scores do not depend on public school expenditures.

. \* PROBLEM FIVE;

. reg act bamin mamax enroll dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 330		
Model	48.1908753	5	9.63817505	F( 5, 324)	=	10.81
Residual	288.937781	324	.891783275	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.1429
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1297
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE	=	.94434

  

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
bamin	-.0000487	.0000493	-0.99	0.324	-.0001456	.0000483
mamax	.0000662	.0000171	3.88	0.000	.0000326	.0000998
enroll	-2.25e-06	.00001	-0.22	0.822	-.000022	.0000174
dropout	-.2587043	.168657	-1.53	0.126	-.5905054	.0730968
lunch	-.0173153	.0045258	-3.83	0.000	-.026219	-.0084116
_cons	20.81044	1.071905	19.41	0.000	18.70166	22.91921

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS

The maximum salary paid to a teacher with a masters degree and lunch are the only two statistically significant variables.

. \* PROBLEM SIX;

. reg act baminz mamaxz enroll dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 330		
Model	48.1908778	5	9.63817555	F( 5, 324)	=	10.81
Residual	288.937779	324	.891783267	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.1429
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1297
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE	=	.94434

  

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0486525	.0492948	-0.99	0.324	-.1456309	.0483259
mamaxz	.0662345	.01708	3.88	0.000	.0326329	.0998361
enroll	-2.25e-06	.00001	-0.22	0.822	-.000022	.0000174
dropout	-.2587044	.168657	-1.53	0.126	-.5905054	.0730967
lunch	-.0173153	.0045258	-3.83	0.000	-.026219	-.0084116
_cons	20.81044	1.071905	19.41	0.000	18.70166	22.91921

DISCUSSION CONCERNING RESCALING:

Absolutely nothing changes between the two sets of regression results in problems 5 and 6 including the r-squared and adjusted r-squared except that the coefficient estimates, standard errors, and confidence intervals on baminz and mamaxz in problem six are 1000 times greater than their counterparts on bamin and mamax in problem five. Notice that the t-statistics and p-values associated with these variables are the same across regression. This must be the case, as rescaling variables can have no meaningful effect on the results and interpretations.

. \* PROBLEM SEVEN;

. reg act baminz mamaxz enroll enrollsq dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	330
Model	61.9559048	6	10.3259841	F( 6, 323) =	12.12
Residual	275.172751	323	.851928023	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.1838
				Adj R-squared =	0.1686
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE =	.923

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0579365	.0482361	-1.20	0.231	-.152833	.03696
mamaxz	.0465065	.0174004	2.67	0.008	.012274	.080739
enroll	.000086	.000024	3.58	0.000	.0000387	.0001332
enrollsq	-1.02e-09	2.53e-10	-4.02	0.000	-1.51e-09	-5.19e-10
dropout	-.3146059	.1654307	-1.90	0.058	-.6400637	.0108519
lunch	-.0148302	.0044665	-3.32	0.001	-.0236173	-.006043
_cons	21.71985	1.071828	20.26	0.000	19.6112	23.8285

DISCUSSION OF THE SQUARED ENROLLMENT TERM:

As the coefficient estimates on enrollment squared is negative, the predicted shape of enrollment on ACT is an inverted U-shaped parabola. In particular, the predicted effect of enrollment on ACT scores is that ACT scores increase with enrollment but at a decreasing rate until it reaches a maximum at  $0.000086 \div (2 \times 1.02e-09) = 42,157$ . After this size of district, increased enrollment has a negative predicted effect on ACT score and increasingly so.

. \* PROBLEM EIGHT;

. reg act baminz mamaxz small medium large dropout lunch;

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0561791	.0484584	-1.16	0.247	-.1515131	.0391548
mamaxz	.0376336	.0185962	2.02	0.044	.0010486	.0742186
small	-.5264869	.1741813	-3.02	0.003	-.86916	-.1838137
medium	-.5030562	.1381464	-3.64	0.000	-.7748366	-.2312758
large	(dropped)					
dropout	-.4081188	.1551283	-2.63	0.009	-.7133082	-.1029294
lunch	-.0149708	.004566	-3.28	0.001	-.0239536	-.0059881
_cons	22.63049	1.142073	19.82	0.000	20.38365	24.87733

. reg act baminz mamaxz small large dropout lunch;

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0561791	.0484584	-1.16	0.247	-.1515131	.0391548
mamaxz	.0376336	.0185962	2.02	0.044	.0010486	.0742186
small	-.0234307	.1355342	-0.17	0.863	-.2900718	.2432105
large	.5030562	.1381464	3.64	0.000	.2312758	.7748366
dropout	-.4081188	.1551283	-2.63	0.009	-.7133082	-.1029294
lunch	-.0149708	.004566	-3.28	0.001	-.0239536	-.0059881
_cons	22.12744	1.098737	20.14	0.000	19.96585	24.28902

DISCUSSION:

Compared to a comparable medium district, a small district is expected to score 0.0234 points lower on its average ACT score; however this effect is not statistically significant. Similarly, a large district is expected to score 0.503 points higher on its average ACT score compared to a comparable medium sized district; and this effect is statistically significant.

Moreover, these results can be used to determine that a large district is expected to score 0.5264 points higher on its average ACT score compared to a comparable small district. This is found by subtracting -0.0234 from 0.503. This effect is also readily apparent in the following regression, which omits small and includes medium in the model.

. reg act baminz mamaxz medium large dropout lunch;

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0561791	.0484584	-1.16	0.247	-.1515131	.0391548
mamaxz	.0376336	.0185962	2.02	0.044	.0010486	.0742186
medium	.0234307	.1355342	0.17	0.863	-.2432105	.2900718
large	.5264869	.1741813	3.02	0.003	.1838137	.86916
dropout	-.4081188	.1551283	-2.63	0.009	-.7133082	-.1029294
lunch	-.0149708	.004566	-3.28	0.001	-.0239536	-.0059881
_cons	22.104	1.08092	20.45	0.000	19.97747	24.23054

. \* PROBLEM NINE;

ANSWER #1.

The best explanation is that we are statisticians, who value statistical significance. In particular, the estimated coefficient on bamin, which is consistently negative, is, more importantly, consistently statistically insignificant. Thus, the correct conclusion is that there is no effect of bamin on ACT. But to say that it has a negative effect would be wrong.

The question then becomes, why is it that bamin has no effect but mamax does matter? One possible answer is union power, which is not controlled for in the regression. In particular, consider that some districts have stronger unions than others. Moreover, unions want to give their bargained wage increases to their most entrenched members. This means giving more money at the higher-end of the salary schedule (i.e., to those teachers with Masters degrees). Next, if these expensive salary schedules are observed by teachers, teachers will have an incentive to pursue the most highly paying jobs (though they won't receive the high paying salaries for several years). Finally, if district administrators can evaluate good vs. bad teaching, they will be able to fire the bad teachers and hire the good teachers as the lucrative pay schedule will be attractive to all teachers.

ANSWER #2.

Another (less attractive) explanation for why minimum BA salary is coming in negative and maximum MA salary is coming in positive is not that spending more on new teachers is unproductive and spending more on veteran teachers is productive; rather, the best explanation is probably model mis-specification. In particular, OLS doesn't produce great results when two or more variables are highly correlated. The problem is that the effect of bamin and mamax are so highly related, that OLS can produce wildly wrong guesses at the true effect of each. Put differently, OLS struggles to separately identify the true effect of each.)

. \* PROBLEM TEN;

. reg act baminz medium large dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 330		
Model	56.6691734	5	11.3338347	F( 5, 324)	=	13.09
Residual	280.459483	324	.865615688	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.1681
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1553
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE	=	.93038

  

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
baminz	-.0067322	.042047	-0.16	0.873	-.0894518	.0759873
medium	.1078645	.1295672	0.83	0.406	-.1470347	.3627637
large	.6996199	.1524466	4.59	0.000	.3997097	.9995302
dropout	-.3976226	.1557804	-2.55	0.011	-.7040914	-.0911538
lunch	-.0160799	.0045546	-3.53	0.000	-.0250401	-.0071196
_cons	22.43021	1.073927	20.89	0.000	20.31746	24.54296

. reg act mamaxz medium large dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 330		
Model	59.0283121	5	11.8056624	F( 5, 324)	=	13.75
Residual	278.100344	324	.858334395	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.1751
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1624
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	Root MSE	=	.92646

  

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
mamaxz	.0267631	.0160678	1.67	0.097	-.0048472	.0583735
medium	.0327229	.1353688	0.24	0.809	-.2335897	.2990356
large	.5271935	.1742727	3.03	0.003	.1843445	.8700424
dropout	-.3935447	.1547002	-2.54	0.011	-.6978883	-.0892011
lunch	-.0153746	.0045551	-3.38	0.001	-.0243359	-.0064134
_cons	21.13878	.6897213	30.65	0.000	19.78188	22.49568

DISCUSSION:

Even when bamin is included by itself, the effect is still negative and statistically insignificant. This is what makes the second answer to question 9 unappealing.

. \* PROBLEM ELEVEN;

. reg act baminz payincz medium large dropout lunch;

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	330
Model	60.1807212	6	10.0301202	F( 6, 323) =	11.70
Residual	276.947935	323	.857423948	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	337.128656	329	1.02470716	R-squared =	0.1785
				Adj R-squared =	0.1632
				Root MSE =	.92597

act	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
baminz	-.0185455	.0422527	-0.44	0.661	-.1016708 .0645798
payincz	.0376336	.0185962	2.02	0.044	.0010486 .0742186
medium	.0234307	.1355342	0.17	0.863	-.2432105 .2900718
large	.5264869	.1741813	3.02	0.003	.1838138 .86916
dropout	-.4081188	.1551283	-2.63	0.009	-.7133082 -.1029294
lunch	-.0149708	.004566	-3.28	0.001	-.0239536 -.0059881
_cons	22.104	1.08092	20.45	0.000	19.97747 24.23054

#### DISCUSSION:

Although there remains no evidence that starting salaries matter, there is evidence that annual pay increases are positively related to test scores. In particular, a district that has a \$10,000 greater gap between its starting BA salary and maximum MA salary compared to a comparable district is expected to have an average ACT score that is 0.376 points higher. (Notice that as I used a change of \$10,000, I need to multiply the coefficient on payincz by 10.)

If I were going to report these results in a paper, I would report the results using baminz and payincz, because the coefficient estimates are larger and therefore easier to decipher immediately. For example, if bamin and payinc were used, the coefficients would be -0.00001854 and 0.0000376. This highlights that you want to choose your units of measurement to help your reader.