Urban Micro-Insurance Project Evaluation: Pre-Analysis Plan

Update and Addendum

Matthieu Chemin[1], Johannes Haushofer[2], and Chaning Jang[3]

February 22, 2016

[1]Department of Economics, McGill University Leacock Building-419, 55 Sherbrooke St. West, Montreal, QC H3A 2T7, Canada. matthieu.chemin@mcgill.ca

[2]Department of Psychology, Princeton University, 427 Peretsman-Scully Hall, Princeton, NJ 08540, US. haushofer@princeton.edu

[3]Department of Psychology, Princeton University, 407 Peretsman-Scully Hall, Princeton, NJ 08540, US. cjang@princeton.edu

A Current status of analysis

We registered a *pre-analysis plan* with the AEA Social Science Registry on 2 March 2015 that outlined the design, outcomes of interest, and econometric approach for studying the effect of micro health insurance provision and unconditional cash transfers with the Urban Micro-Insurance Project. Since then, we have conducted the analysis specified in Section 5 of that pre-analysis plan using the outcomes listed in Section 6. In Section 5.6 we describe several procedures for correcting potential selection bias in our sample. We adjusted for this by modeling the sample selection process (Heckman 1979) and by bounding our parameter of interest for the entire sample and for the sub-sample with a valid national ID at baseline (Horowitz and Manski 1998; Horowitz and Manski 2000; Lee 2009). In addition to the specified analysis, we estimated treatment effects using propensity score matching as an additional robustness check. We report these results in the final paper and in the online appendix.

B Additional analysis with Lee bounds

In this section, we outline an additional implementation of the Lee (2009) bounds that uses baseline covariates to tighten the interval estimates. Lee recommends constructing bounds conditional on levels of available baseline covariates instead of trimming from the overall distribution. Group specific bounds are then averaged to obtain narrower overall bounds.

We used respondents' weekly income as the baseline covariate since we expect that income correlates with insurance take-up and thus selection into endline. We will discretize income and construct narrow Lee (2009) bounds conditional on the 3rd tertile, 2nd tertile, and the 1st tertile further partitioned into 3 subdivisions (for a total of 5 groups). We will report the tightened interval estimates for the effect of insurance and cash transfers alongside the overall bounds.

References

Heckman, James J. 1979. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica* 47 (1): 153–61.

Horowitz, Joel L., and Charles F. Manski. 1998. "Censoring of outcomes and regressors due to survey nonresponse: Identification and estimation using weights and imputations." *Journal of Econometrics* 84 (1): 37–58 (May).

———. 2000. "Nonparametric Analysis of Randomized Experiments with Missing Covariate and Outcome Data." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 95 (449): 77–84 (March).

Lee, David S. 2009. "Training, Wages, and Sample Selection: Estimating Sharp Bounds on Treatment Effects." *The Review of Economic Studies* 76 (3): 1071–1102 (July).