Something in the Air: Projection Bias and the Demand for Health Insurance

Tom Y. Chang, Wei Huang, and Yongxiang Wang*

October 2016

ABSTRACT

Using data on insurance contracts from one of China's largest insurance companies, we find that daily air pollution levels have a significant effect on the decision to purchase or cancel health insurance in a manner inconsistent with rational choice theory. A one standard deviation increase in daily air pollution leads to a 7.2% increase in the number of insurance contracts sold that day. Conditional on purchase, a one standard deviation decrease in air pollution during the cooling-off (i.e., cost-free cancelation) period relative to the order-date level increases the return probability by 4.0%. We explore a range of potential mechanism and find strong evidence for projection bias as the key driver of these results.

*Chang and Wang are with the University of Southern California, and Huang is with the University of International Business and Economics. We are grateful to Stefano DellaVigna, Cary Frydman, Ori Heffetz, Sendhil Mullainathan, Ted O'Donoghue, Josh Schwartzstein, Avanidhar Subrahmanyam, and participants at the Behavioral Economics Annual Meeting, China International Conference in Finance, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, LA Finance Day and USC for helpful suggestions.

1 Introduction

The important decisions that people make have lasting consequences and, as such, require people to predict the utility of their decisions in the future. Although standard economic theory assumes that individuals can accurately make such predictions, evidence from psychology and behavioral economics suggests that people exhibit systematic biases in predicting future utility (see DellaVigna (2009) for a review). One such bias, captured in such clichs as "sleep on it" or "never go grocery shopping on an empty stomach" is that current conditions have an oversized influence on intertemporal decision making.[1]

In this paper, we use transaction-level data from one of the largest insurance companies in China to examine the role that idiosyncratic variation in daily air pollution plays in an individual's decision to purchase or cancel health insurance. Although air pollution, which has an immediate and deleterious effect on one's health, is subject to high day-to-day variability, it is essentially essentially stationary during our study period. Since the health insurance policies we examine do not cover pre-existing conditions and have a 180-day waiting period before coverage begins, the value of the policy is a function of the premiums and the probability of illness in the future. And since premiums vary infrequently and are uniform across cities, daily air pollution levels should be a non-factor in a rational person's decision to purchase or cancel health insurance.

We instead find that both the purchase and cancelation of health insurance policies are significantly influenced by idiosyncratic variation in daily air pollution levels. Specifically, we find that, when air pollution is high, individuals are more likely to purchase insurance contracts. In addition, insurance contracts are more likely to be canceled if air pollution improves during the government-mandated 10-day "regret period," during which individuals can, without cost, cancel their insurance contracts. This cancelation effect is negatively related to air pollution during the cooling-off period and is driven by the change in air

[1] Empathy gaps (Loewenstein (2005); Ariely and Loewenstein (2006)), projection bias (Loewenstein, O'Donoghue, and Rabin (2003)), salience (Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer (2013, 2014); Koszegi and Szeidl (2013)), attribution bias (Haggag and Pope (2016)), and present bias (Laibson (1997); O'Donoghue and Rabin (1999, 2015)) are examples of mechanisms for why such might be the case.

pollution *relative* to the level at the time of purchase. That is, individuals are more likely to buy insurance when pollution is high and more likely to cancel it if air pollution levels improve during the cooling-off period relative to the date of purchase.

Controlling for seasonal and regional variation in sales patterns, we find that a one-standard deviation increase in the daily level of PM2.5 in a city, as measured by the Air Quality Index (AQI), leads to a 7% increase in the number of insurance contracts sold in that city that day. This effect of pollution on sales is non-linear, with measurable effects occurring only at AQI levels associated with adverse health effects. We also find that a one-standard deviation decrease in the AQI during the cooling-off period *relative* to the order date leads to a 4.1% increase in the share of insurance contract that are canceled. In contrast, AQI levels have no impact on either sales or cancelations of other insurance products that the company sells. In addition, the results of a distributed lag model show that pollution affects the aggregate level of insurance contracts sold, rather than changing the timing of insurance purchase.

We hypothesize that these results are driven by projection bias, as formalized in Loewenstein, O'Donoghue and Rabin (2003). Projection bias is the notion that individuals exaggerate the degree to which their future tastes will resemble their current tastes. In this context, the poor health brought on by high levels of air pollution causes individuals to overestimate the probability of poor health in the future. If such were the case, projection bias would lead to the prediction that, when air pollution is high, individuals would be more likely to purchase insurance contracts. In addition, because projection bias affects individuals when both the purchase and cancellation decisions are made, lower air pollution levels during the cooling-off period should lead to higher cancellation rates. Our results are consistent with both predictions.

We explore a range of alternative explanations for our results. We first consider a range of rational explanations, including learning broadly defined, and find then unable to fully explain our empirical results. We next consider a range of alternative psychological mechanisms. While several psychological mechanism can generate effects similar to projection bias, these mechanisms work through a mistaken beliefs channel. That is the current state has an overly large influence on one's actions by having an overly large influence on one's expectations about the future states of the world (e.g., higher temperatures increases one's belief in global warming). In contrast, under projection bias current conditions do not affect beliefs about the future states of the world, but rather one's expected utility in those states. To distinguish between projection bias and these alternative mechanisms, we ran a survey eliciting individual's beliefs about pollution in the future. Consistent with projection bias, but not mistaken belief based mechanisms, we find no evidence of any relationship between daily pollution levels and one's expectations regarding air pollution one year in the future.

Our results are important for several reasons. First, insurance is one of the world's largest industries, eclipsed only by real estate, finance, and government services. In 2014, insurance premiums in the United States exceeded $2 trillion, with $839 billion attributed to health insurance premiums in the private insurance market alone. Healthcare spending is also a huge part of the economy, accounting for 5.7% of China's GDP and 9% of the GDP for all Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries.[2] Further, given the ongoing debate regarding health insurance coverage, understanding how individuals make insurance decisions has important implications for generating effective policy in this domain. Our results provide strong empirical evidence on the importance of projection bias in the market for health insurance in China and, potentially, insurance markets more widely.

Second, although projection bias has received significant attention in both the economics and psychology literature, there is only some recent evidence that projection bias influences demand for real goods and services. The lack of empirical evidence from the field is largely due to the fact that detailed data on refunds or cancellations is required to distinguish projection bias from alternative mechanisms. The most convincing prior evidence of projection bias in a real-world market (Conlin, O'Donoghue and Volgelsang (2007)) is also the first paper to date to document such bias in a real-world context. Conlin et al. convincingly show

[2] http://www.oecd.org/els/health-systems/health-data.htm.

that catalog orders for weather-related clothing items are overinfluenced by the weather. They find that lower order-date temperature leads to an increase in the return probability for cold-weather items, but find only mixed evidence regarding the impact of return-date temperature on returns. Simonsohn (2009) and Busse, Pope, Pope and Silva-Risso (2014) show, respectively, that weather also affects college enrollment and the type of automobile purchased. Busse et al. conclude that their results are incompatible with the behavior of standard, rational agents but consistent with both projection bias and salience. To our knowledge, these are the only other papers to show evidence from the field that projection bias affects the demand for goods and services.[3]

Our results also document an unanticipated consequence of rising air pollution levels in the developing world. This finding contributes to a small but rapidly growing literature documenting the impact of air pollution on non-health outcomes: labor productivity (Graff Zivin and Neidell (2012), Chang, Graff Zivin, Gross, and Neidell (2014, 2016), Li, Liu and Salvo (2015)), student test scores (Lavy, Ebenstein, and Roth (2014)), and crime (Herrnstadt and Muehlegger (2015)).

Finally, our results provides direct evidence in support of the hypothesis put forth in Loewenstein et al. (2003) that "cooling-off laws" might be effective "as devices for combating the effects of projection bias." Moreover, they suggest that the efficacy of cooling-off periods in combating projection bias is determined, in part, by autocorrelation in the driving state variable (i.e., if projection bias is caused by a slowly changing state variables, consumers would benefit from longer cooling-off periods.)

The paper proceeds as follows. The subsequent section presents a simple model of insurance orders and cancelations in the presence of projection bias. In Section 3, we review some basic information on the relationship between air pollution and health along with our empirical strategy. Section 4 describes the data used in the paper. Section 5 presents our empirical results on the effect of daily air pollution levels on the decision to purchase and cancel insurance contracts. Section 6 explores alternative mechanims for our

[3]Our paper also complements this existing literature by demonstrating projection bias using a non-weather state variation.

empirical findings. Section 7 concludes.

2 Projection Bias

Projection bias is the tendency for individuals to exaggerate the degree to which their future tastes will resemble their current tastes. Lowenstein, O'Donoghue and Rabin formalize this idea with a model in which an agent's utility is given by

$$\tilde{u}(c, s|s') = (1 - \alpha)u(c, s) + \alpha u(c, s'), \tag{1}$$

where s is a state variable that affects the utility of good c, s' is a person's current state, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is a measure of the projection bias exhibited by the agent. In this case, if agents have $\alpha = 0$, they accurately predict their utility from good c in state s. In contrast, if $\alpha > 0$, then they mis-predict their utility in state s as a convex combination of their true utility from c in state s and the utility that they would receive from c given their current state s'.

As illustrative example of the influence s' can have on the demand for health insurance, we can assume a simple utility function of the form

$$\tilde{u}(c_t, s|s') = (1 - \alpha)B(s) + \alpha B(s') - p, \tag{2}$$

where s' is a measure of how sick an individual is now, s is a measure of how sick an individual will be at some point in the future, $B(s)$ is non-zero, increasing function that represents the per-period benefit provided by the insurance policy, and p is the insurance premium.

Mapping this utility function to the case of health insurance choice is straightforward. Consider individuals who purchase health insurance I at time t with a policy period equal to T, and let s_τ represent their expected future health.[4] Conditional on purchase, they can,

[4]Note that the individuals expectations about their future health need not be correct, rather the model requires that their expectations about the future states of the world are unaffected by current conditions.

without cost, cancel their policy at time $t+1$ (e.g., the cooling-off period), with coverage to begin at time $t+2$ (i.e., after the "waiting period"). Their perceived utility from purchasing health insurance in period t is then given by

$$\tilde{U}^t(\tilde{u}_{t+2}, ..., \tilde{u}_{t+T}|s_t) = \sum_{\tau=2+t}^{T+t} \delta^{(\tau-t)}[(1-\alpha)B(s_\tau) + \alpha B(s_t)] - p. \tag{3}$$

This simple framework illustrates the influence that s_t can have on the demand for insurance. Although the current state s_t will have no effect on the perceived utility of rational agents ($\alpha = 0$), individuals who suffer from projection bias will value insurance more the sicker they are at present. Thus, for a given price p, demand will be higher on days when individuals feel unwell.

Next, consider the behavior of individuals during the cooling-off period ($t+1$) conditional on having purchased insurance at t. Again, if they are rational, their predicted utility will not be affected by their current health s_{t+1}; however, if they are affected by projection bias, then their predictions regarding the utility from insurance will be biased by their current health. They will then choose to cancel their insurance if $\delta\tilde{U}^t(c_{t+2}, ..., c_{t+T}|s_{t+1}) < 0$. Thus there will then be an $\underline{s} < s_t$ such that, if $s_{t+1} < \underline{s}$, they will cancel their insurance in period $t+1$. That is, individuals with projection bias will cancel their insurance if their sickness level during the time that they are making the decision to cancel their policy is sufficiently low *relative* to their purchase-day level.

These results generate a pair of testable predictions:

(1) Negative transitory health shocks (s_t) will increase contemporaneous demand for health insurance.

(2) If individuals feel healthier during the cooling off period *relative* to the order-date (i.e., $s_{t+1} < s_t$), they are (weakly) more likely to cancel their insurance policy.

We discuss the possible role of current conditions affecting peoples expectations (e.g., the mistaken beliefs channel) in section 6.

3 Air Pollution and Empirical Strategy

Our empirical strategy exploits the relationship between air pollution and human health. A large body of toxicological and epidemiological evidence suggests that exposure to air pollution harms health (see EPA (2004)). The health risks related to exposure to air pollution arise primarily from changes in pulmonary and cardiovascular functioning (Seaton et al., 1995) and can manifest in respiratory episodes, such as asthma attacks, and cardiovascular events, such as heart attacks (Dockery and Pope, 1994; Pope, 2000). Exposure to air pollution also leads to more subtle effects, such as changes in blood pressure, irritation in the ear, nose, throat, and lungs, and mild headaches (Ghio et al. (2000); Pope (2000); Auchincloss et al. (2008)). Figure 1 presents the air pollution levels, as expressed in AQI levels, and the relevant heath effects, as per the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Importantly for our empirical design, some responses to high levels of air pollution are immediate (e.g., watery eyes, scratchy throat, shortness of breath), while others can arise within a few hours after exposure.

Our empirical strategy for testing the predictions of projection bias is to use the daily air pollution levels in a city as a health shock to the city's population. Specifically we assume that AQI levels are negatively related to the contemporaneous aggregate health of the population of that city (e.g., the higher the air pollution level, the sicker the population), such that a city's daily AQI level serves as a proxy for the average contemporaneous health of its citizens (i.e., $AQI_t \sim s_t$).

Although day-to-day variation in AQI levels is quite high,[5] AQI levels generally follow a cyclical pattern and are correlated with other environmental factors more generally (e.g., weather). In Beijing, for example, AQI tends to be lower during the rainy season, when precipitation serves to wash away airborne pollutants, and higher in winter months, when people burn more fossil fuels for warmth (see Figure 2). Although, similar to current temperature, the current AQI level provides some additional information regarding the AQI levels one can expect in the near future, it provides essentially no additional information

[5]The within-city day-to-day correlation in AQI levels is less than 0.5.

about the AQI levels one should expect 180 days from now (e.g., the waiting period for the health insurance policies that we examine). For a rational agent, this would mean that the current AQI would not affect how much he or she values health insurance. In contrast, an agent with projection bias would, all else equal, value insurance more when the AQI is high, leading to a positive (negative) relationship between the AQI and demand (cancelations), as described in the previous section.

4 Data

The data were obtained from four sources: a large Chinese company that sells a variety of insurance products, the U.S. State Department, and 15 Tianqi, a Chinese weather website, and an on-line survey. From the insurance company, we have detailed information on over one million insurance contracts. These contracts represent the universe of health insurance policies and include a subset of other insurance products sold by the firm to residents in a small number (n <5) large Chinese cities from 2012 through 2015.[6] For each insurance policy sold, the firm provided us with the date of purchase, city of residence, contract length, whether the insurance is for oneself or for someone else (e.g., a family member), and some basic demographic information for the person covered by the insurance policy. The firm also provided cancellation information for policies sold through the end of 2014.

Providing near-universal health insurance coverage has been a major goal of the Chinese government, and recent reforms have brought them close to this goal. As of 2009, approximately 90% of the population has health insurance through the government. This coverage is accomplished through three insurance programs: the Urban Employee Basic Medical Insurance (UEBMI), the Urban Resident Basic Medical Insurance (URBMI), and the New Rural Cooperative Medical System (NRCMS). The benefit level of the insurance provided through these programs, however, is quite low, both in terms of the share of expenses covered and the cap on total lifetime covered expenses. As such, the market for

[6] Due to the sensitive nature of the sales data, and to ensure the anonymity of the firm that provided the data, we cannot reveal the identities of the cities in our sample or provide disaggregated statistics on sales patterns for the various insurance products in our sample.

secondary private health insurance to help cover this gap is rapidly increasing in China, especially among China's growing middle class. This form of insurance is considered especially important to cover expenses due to significant adverse health events, such as cancer. The health insurance contracts in our data consist of this type of private health insurance.

For policies provided by the firm, there is a 180-day waiting period between the date of purchase and the effective start date of insurance coverage. In addition, there is a pre-existing condition clause that prevents the covered individual from receiving benefits if his or her illness is the result of a condition that existed before the date of purchase. Finally, these insurance contracts are subject to a law that requires a 10-day "regret period," during which consumers can cancel their insurance contracts without any penalty.

From the U.S. State Department, we have hourly measures of PM2.5, collected by air quality monitors located on U.S. Embassy compounds in the relevant cities. The PM2.5 level is expressed in terms of an AQI, following the U.S. EPA formula (EPA (2006)). The AQI values are designed to help inform health-related decisions by mapping pollution levels to round-number breakpoints that correspond to categories of health impact (see Figure 1).[7] While we cannot provide full details of the pollution levels in our sample, as they could be used to determine the identity of the cities in our sample, we can state that the mean daily AQI in our composite sample is 125.6, with a standard deviation of 98.4. Although this level of air pollution is typical for a large Chinese city, it would be considered quite high in the United States.[8]

Weather information was retrieved for each city in our sample from 15 Tianqi. These data included daily low and high temperatures, precipitation, and a dummy variable for snowfall. After merging the weather data with the AQI and order information by city and date, we dropped observations for city and date combinations for which AQI information was unavailable or appeared unreliable.[9] As shown in Table I, this left us with a sample

[7] See, for example, http://beijing.usembassy-china.org.cn/aqirecent3.html for more details on the U.S. State Department's air quality monitoring program in China.

[8] Although the statistics are not comparable, as different technologies are used to measure air pollution at different temporal resolutions, as an illustrative example, the EPA reports that the median AQIs in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Los Angeles, California, in 2015 were 46 and 77, respectively.

[9] Three city by date observations were deemed unreliable: one observation had an AQI of zero while two

of 579,303 insurance contracts sold across 2,577 city*days, with an average of 224.8 sold in each city each day. The mean contract in our sample is for a period of 31.6 years.[10] Approximately half of the time, an individual purchases insurance for him or herself. Otherwise, an individual purchases insurance for a family member (generally, a spouse or child). The average age of the covered individual is 25.4 years, and just over half of covered individuals are female. The cancellation rate during the 10-day government mandated cooling-off period is 2.8%.

Finally, we use data from a short on-line survey designed to test whether daily variation in air pollution has an effect on beliefs about pollution levels in the future. In addition to asking for some basic demographic information, the survey asked if whether they thought that air pollution in their city would be better, the same, or worse in a year's time. The survey was conducted in the summer of 2016 on WeChat, the dominant social media platform in China. Messages were sent to all the members of 5 large, randomly selected WeChat groups. The message said that in exchange for completing a brief survey, they would receive a "WeChat Hongbao" or virtual "red envelop" which contained a random gift of between 1 and 25 RMB. This was a relatively generous Hongbao, and generated a response rate of over 70%.[11]

5 Empirical Results

5.1 Effect of Air Pollution on Purchases

Our base specification for estimating the impact of air pollution on the sales of insurance contracts is then given by

$$Log(Insurance_{jt}) = \beta AQI_{jt} + X_{jt}\gamma + D_{jt} + \epsilon_{jt}, \tag{4}$$

observations had an AQI > 800.

[10]For the 25.3% of health insurance policies sold with what the firm refers to as "lifetime" contracts (i.e., policy period is for the life of the covered individual), the contract length was set to 85 years, the maximum length allowed for non-lifetime contracts.

[11]Of the 641 surveys sent out, 461 were successfully completed.

where $Insurance_{jt}$ is the number of insurance contracts sold by the firm to residents of city j on date t, AQI_{jt} is the high hourly AQI in city j over a two-day window that consists of date t and $t-1$. This allows for the purchase decision to have been made the day before purchase, which is possible because pollution tends to peak in the evening, when the firm is closed and unable to take customer orders.[12] The vector X_{jt} consists of a quadratic function of high temperature and dummy variables for precipitation and snowfall. D_{jt} are day-of-week, month-of-year by city, and year-by-city fixed effects, included to account for trends within the week and over time, respectively.

The main coefficient of interest is β, which captures the effect of air pollution on the demand for health insurance. The coefficient can be interpreted as the percentage change in the total number of insurance contract sold on a given day caused by a one-unit increase in the AQI.

The results of estimating Equation 4 are presented in Table II. Column 1 indicates that a one-unit increase in the daily AQI generates a 0.072% increase in daily sales, or that a one-standard deviation increase in the daily AQI leads to a 9.0% increase in daily sales. For column 2, we allow AQI to have a non-linear effect on sales by re-estimating Equation 4 with indicator variables that correspond to the different EPA categories for pollution levels in place of a linear measure of AQI (see Figure 1). The withheld category is an AQI of between 0 and 50, which corresponds to "Good" air quality. The results indicate that the effect of the AQI on sales become significant only when the AQI is higher than 150, corresponding to the level deemed "Unhealthy" by the EPA; the coefficient for "Moderate" levels of PM2.5 is small and statistically insignificant, while the coefficient for the "Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups" level of PM2.5 is approximately two-thirds as large as the coefficient for "Unhealthy" but not statistically significant at conventional levels. AQIs of 150 to 200 ("Unhealthy"), 200 to 300 ("Very Unhealthy"), and greater than 300 ("Hazardous") are associated with statistically significant increases in daily sales of 16.8%, 16.8%, and 23.4%, respectively, compared to days with an AQI of less than or equal to

[12] Using either the one-day AQI for date t or $t-1$ produces similar results.

50. Taken together, these results indicate that the air pollution in one's immediate vicinity increases demand for health insurance, and that this increase in demand effect occurs only when air pollution has reached levels associated with noticeable and immediate health effects.

5.2 Robustness checks

A concern is that our results are affected by an unobservable that is correlated with both pollution and demand for insurance. While the highly localized, high frequency nature of our observations make this less likely, we provide additional checks to address such concerns. First to the extent that air pollution is correlated across our cities, air pollution could be proxying for a unobserved regional or national factor. To address this concern, we first re-run the regression in column with an additional term that captures the pollution in the other cities in our sample. To do this, we first match each city to its closest neighbor, then regress that city's daily sales against both that city's pollution and the pollution of the matched city. The results of this regression are shown in column 3. We see that controlling for the AQI of the nearest city slightly reduces the size of the coefficient from 0.00072 to 0.00066 and that the coefficient for other city's AQI is both small and statistically insignificant. This results indicates that demand for health insurance is affected by only local, and not regional idiosyncratic variation in air pollution levels.

Next we re-run our main regression with the number of non-health insurance contracts sold by the company as the dependent variable. This category consists primarily of term life and personal accident insurance. The result of this analysis is presented in column 4. Here, in contrast to column 1, the coefficient of interest is small and statistically insignificant, indicating both that air pollution is not a significant driver of demand for other insurance products sold by the firm and that air pollution is not serving as a proxy for an unobserved variable that drives demand for insurance products, more generally. This indicates that for an unobservable factor to be driving our results it must not only be geographically and temporally localized, but also very limited in scope affecting only the demand for health insurance contracts.

5.3 Effect of PM2.5 on cancelations

We next examine the effect of air pollution on insurance cancelations. For this analysis, we start with the base regression specification

$$Cancel_{ijt} = f(AQI_{ijt}, ..., AQI_{ij,t+11})\beta + C_i b + X_{jt}\gamma + D_{jt} + \epsilon_{jt}, \quad (5)$$

where $Cancel_{ijt}$ is a dummy variable that equals 1 if individual i in city j cancels an insurance contract purchased on date t within 11 days of purchase.[13] We drop observations if the policy was canceled within 24 hours of purchase (212 same-day cancellations, 466 next-day cancellations), as, in such cases, there is considerable overlap in the AQI level during the time that the purchase and cancellation decisions are made.[14] AQI_{ijt} is the previously used measure of air pollution on the date of purchase, and $(AQI_{ij,t+1,...,ij,t+11})$ are the 11 daily leads of the pollution variable. C_i includes controls for policy characteristics: the age and gender of the policyholder, whether the insurance was purchased for oneself or another family member, and the length of the insurance contract period in years. As before, X_{jt} is a vector of weather variables, and D_{jt} are day-of-week, and city specific month and year fixed effects designed to capture trends both within a week and over time. Standard errors are clustered on city*date.

We use four different specifications to capture the effect of pollution during the cooling-off period (CoP) on cancellation rates. Our first specification directly tests the prediction that projection bias's effect on cancellations operates via differences in the AQI during the times when the purchase and cancellation decisions are made. Specifically we replace AQI with a measure of the *change* in AQI during the cooling off period relative to order-date

[13] Although the legally mandated cooling-off period is 10 days, the firm does not appear to strictly enforce the 10-day rule. Consequently, a significant number of cancellations occur 11 days after purchase. Limiting the analysis to a 10-day post-purchase period generates similar results.

[14] Including these observations does not materially affect the regression results.

AQI (Relative AQI). That is we run the regression

$$Cancel_{ijt} = \beta(Relative\ AQI_{ijt}) + C_i b + X_{jt}\gamma + D_{jt} + \epsilon_{jt}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$Relative\ AQI_{ijt} = (\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \frac{1}{11} AQI_{ij,t+\tau} - AQI_{ijt}). \tag{7}$$

That is we measure the effect of the average AQI during the CoP normalizing the order-date AQI to zero.

The second specification includes separate controls for both the level of the order-date AQI and the average AQI during the CoP ($AQI_{CoP} = \sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \frac{1}{11} AQI_{ij,t+\tau}$). This specification is essentially identical to that used in Conlin et al. (2007) as their test of projection bias. In cases for which one or more of the daily pollution measures during the CoP were not available, the AQI_{CoP} was calculated with the exclusion of the missing value.

The third specification is a variant on the second specification but replaces the *CoP AQI* with the 11 leads of pollution as separate regressors and then sums the 11 resulting coefficients. That is, we replace AQI_{CoP} with $\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \beta_\tau AQI_{ij,t+\tau}$ and report $\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \beta_\tau$ as the effect of pollution during the CoP on insurance cancellations. We drop from this regression the 9% of contracts for which one of the lead pollution measures was missing.[15] Subject to the linear functional form assumption, $\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \beta_\tau$ provides us with a measure of the cumulative effect of daily pollution during the CoP on cancellations.

For our final specification, we utilize a dummy variable to indicate whether air pollution during the cooling off period is *lower* than on the purchase date. In this case, $f(AQI_{ijt+1,...,ijt+11})$ is an indicator variable equal to 1 if $AQI_{CoP} < AQI_{order-date}$.

Table IV presents the estimated marginal effects at the sample mean associated with the probit regressions of our four variants of Equation 5. Column 1 presents the results of

[15] Replacing missing observations with a value interpolated from the nearest two non-missing observations produces essentially identical regression results.

regressing Relative AQI on cancellations so that the coefficient of interest represents the effect of AQI during the CoP normalized, such that order-date AQI=0. We find a negative and statistically significant relationship between Relative AQI and cancellations, indicating that *decreases* in AQI relative to order-date AQI leads to *increases* in the probability of cancellation. Specifically, for every one-unit (standard deviation) decrease in the AQI relative to order-date AQI, the probability of cancellation increases by 0.001% (0.10%). Given the baseline cancellation rate of 2.52%, this corresponds to a 0.040% (3.97%) increase in the cancellation rate.

When we include both order-date AQI and the average AQI during the CoP as regressors (Column 2), we find that higher order-date AQI leads to a positive and statistically significant increase in cancellations, whereas CoP AQI has the opposite effect. Specifically, we find that a one-unit (standard deviation) increase in order-date AQI leads to a 0.0087% (0.087%) increase in the probability of cancellation. In contrast, the coefficient for our measure of air pollution levels during the CoP is negative and statistically significant, with a one-unit CoP AQI decreasing the probability of cancellation by 0.024%. These results indicate that individuals are more likely to cancel their insurance policy if they purchased on a high-pollution day or experienced low pollution during their cooling-off period.

Column 3 presents a repeat of this analysis, but the average CoP AQI is replaced by a disaggregated daily measure of daily AQI, shows essentially the same pattern of results as seen in Column 2: higher order-date AQI leads to a positive and statistically significant increase in cancellations, whereas the aggregate effect of daily air pollution levels during the CoP is negative and statistically significant.[16]

Finally, in Column 4, the analysis shown in Column 2 is repeated but with a dummy variable for whether the average of daily AQI is lower during the CoP relative to purchase-date AQI. Unlike what is seen in Columns 2 and 3, here we find that order-date AQI no longer predicts an increased probability of cancellation. Instead, we find that the effect of air pollution on cancellations depends solely on whether air pollution is lower during

[16] We reject at a p-value < 0.01 that the sum of the individual lead coefficients is equal to zero.

the period in which the purchaser can decide to cancel his or her policy relative to the order-date. Specifically, if $AQI_{CoP} < AQI_{order-date}$, the probability that a contract is canceled increases by 0.19%, representing a 7.25% increase in the cancellation rate. This result suggests that, as predicted by our model, the impact of air pollution on cancellation rates is driven by *relative* differences and not absolute levels. That is, the AQI during the time the decision to cancel is made matters only in how it differs from the AQI that the decision maker faced when making the decision to purchase insurance in the first place.

5.4 Effect of PM2.5 on cancelations of non-health insurance contracts

We next examine whether pollution has an effect on the cancellation of non-health insurance policies. To the extent that health shocks do not affect the valuation of other forms of insurance, our model would predict that air pollution should not influence whether an individual cancels other types of insurance policies sold by the firm. We test for such a differential effect by re-estimating the values in Column 1 of Table III for all insurance contracts, interacting *Relative AQI* with a dummy variable for non-health insurance policies. The results of this regression are presented in Table IV.

Column 1 includes the same controls as does the regressions in Table III, while Column 2 includes interaction terms between the weather controls, contract characteristics, and a dummy variable for non-health insurance policies to allow those characteristics to have differential effects for health vs. other insurance policies. This second specification allows the various control variables to have differential effects on the different insurance products. For both specifications, the main effect of the difference in AQI between the order-date and the CoP remains negative and statistically significant. The interaction term, however, is positive, statistically significant, and only slightly smaller in magnitude than the main effect. Thus, the marginal effect for other insurance types has a magnitude close to zero and is statistically insignificant with p-values of 0.54 and 0.46 for Columns 1 and 2, respectively.

5.5 Effect of air pollution on insurance contract characteristics

We next examine the effect on pollution on the characteristics of the insurance contracts purchased. It is important to note that the price of an insurance contract is not individually negotiated. Instead pricing is set at the company level, and is adjusted infrequently. As such the price is unrelated to either idiosyncratic variation in daily air pollution levels or the demand for insurance. Thus any relationship between insurance contract characteristics and the AQI would indicate that air pollution affects either the composition of who purchases insurance or what kinds of insurance features are valued more by individuals due to pollution.

To determine whether pollution affects the characteristics of insurance policies sold, we estimate the following equation:

$$C_{ijt} = \beta AQI_{jt} + X_{jt}\gamma + D_{jt} + \epsilon_{jt}. \tag{8}$$

Here, the dependent variable C_{ijt} is a characteristic of insurance plan i sold in city j on date t. As in Equation 4, AQI_{jt} is a measure of the high AQI in city j on date t, X_{jt} consists of a quadratic function of high temperature and dummy variables for precipitation and snowfall, and D_{jt} are day-of-week, month-of-year*city, and year*city fixed effects.[17] All standard errors are clustered at the city*date level.

The results of estimating Equation 8 are presented in Table V. Columns 1 and 2 present the results from an OLS regression for which the dependent variable is the log of the term length of the insurance contract or the log of the age of the covered individual, respectively. Columns 3 to 5 present the estimated marginal effects at the sample means from a probit regression, where C_{ijt} is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the purchaser and covered individuals are the same (3), if the covered individual is female (4), or if the purchaser is female (5). For Column 5, the sample is limited to those insurance contracts for which the purchaser is the same as the covered individual, as those are the only cases for which we

[17] Adding additional controls for contract characteristics other than the dependent variable generates effectively identical results.

can determine the gender of the purchaser.

In all cases, β is small and, with the exception of Column 4 (the covered individual's gender), statistically insignificant. For Columns 1, 2, 3, and 5, given that the standard errors are at least an order or magnitude smaller than the effect sizes shown in Table II, we can rule out the AQI having an economically meaningful effect on these contract characteristics. Further, although the coefficient for Column 4 is statistically significant, the effect size itself is quite small, with a one-unit (standard deviation) increase in AQI causing a 0.007% (0.88%) increase in the share of contracts that insure females off a baseline of 55%. Overall, these results suggest that, although air pollution significantly increases the demand for insurance, it does not appear to meaningfully change either the characteristics of the insurance contracts nor the composition of who buys insurance.

6 Alternative Mechanisms

Our two main empirical findings are that 1) higher air pollution leads to greater demand for health insurance, and 2) cancelation rates are higher if air pollution levels during the cooling off period are lower than that on the order-date. These results are consistent with the predictions of projection bias as discussed above. In this section we explore several alternative hypotheses that might explain our findings.

6.1 Learning and Inattention

Perhaps the most obvious alternative explanation for the increase in the sales of health insurance policies on high pollution days involve learning, broadly defined. The biggest obstacle to such explanations is the fact that, as discussed in section 3 and illustrated by Figure 1, today's pollution contains essentially no additional information about pollution six months in the future (when the insurance policy takes effect).

One type of learning that addresses this critique is learning by inattentive individuals (see Schwartzstein (2014) for a recent example). For example, if many individuals are unaware of the relationship between air pollution and health, and high pollution days cause individuals to learn about the deleterious effects of air pollution on their future heath, such learning could increase their demand for insurance. While such a mechanism is consistent with the increase in sales on high pollution days, it is harder to reconcile with the increase in cancellation if pollution drops post-purchase. That is while an increase in awareness about the connection between air pollution and health will lead to an increase in demand for health insurance, unless low air pollution levels causes people to "unlearn" this connection, it cannot lead to increases in cancelations.

Alternatively high pollution may cause an individual to learn something about their own, or family member's health. Since in the policies we study pre-existing conditions are not covered, and the policy itself does not take effect until 6 months after purchase, high levels of air pollution can generate increased demand if it induces learning about an undiagnosed long-run or chronic condition. Then as with learning about pollution or the pollution-health connection more generally, while such a mechanism is compatible with the increase in demand on high pollution days, it is much harder to reconcile with the cancellation results.

A key prediction of many models of inattentive learning is that while high levels of pollution would be correlated with higher sales, such sales would simply represent shifts in the timing of insurance purchases, and not true increases in demand (e.g. harvesting). That is everyone who buys insurance would have purchased it eventually, and high pollution day simply moves forward the timing of the purchase.

To assess whether the increase in demand associated with daily pollution is driven by intertemporal, we estimate a distributed lag model. Specifically we re-run Equation 4 with N daily lags of AQI and weather added to the estimating equation:

$$Log(Insurance_{jt}) = \beta AQI_{jt} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{N} \beta_\tau AQI_{j,t-\tau} + \sum_{\tau=0}^{N} X_{j,t-\tau}\gamma_\tau + D_j, + \epsilon_{jt}. \tag{9}$$

As before $Insurance_{jt}$ is the number of insurance contracts sold by the firm to residents of city j on date t, while $AQI_{j,t-\tau}$ and $X_{j,t-\tau}$ are lagged measures of AQI and weather in city j relative to date t. Including lagged pollution variables in our regression allows us to test whether pollution in the days leading up to (or following) the day of purchase affects the impact of contemporaneous pollution on purchase decisions. For example, a negative coefficient on the fifth-day-lagged pollution measure would indicate both that high pollution five days prior leads to lower sales for the current day and that high pollution *today* leads to lower sales five days in the future. The sum of the lagged coefficients are then a measure of the extent to which the current period effect is due to intertemporal substitution and how much is an increase in aggregate total demand for insurance. Thus, if the increase in demand that we measured in the previous section is due to displacement, the sum of $k \leq N$ coefficients for the lagged pollution variable will be equal in magnitude to the current period coefficient β and of opposite sign.[18]

Figure 3 presents the results of this analysis through a plot of the estimated coefficients on current and lagged API along with 95% confidence intervals from estimating Equation 9 for a period of six weeks ($N = 42$). As shown in the figure, although the current period pollution has a large, positive, and statistically significant impact on the demand for health insurance contracts. The current-day pollution coefficient β in this regression equals 0.00081, with a standard error of 0.00024, a value that is slightly larger than the coefficient of 0.00072 in Table II.

In contrast the coefficients for the lagged pollution are smaller and never statistically significant. Moreover, that most coefficients tend to be positive, even if not statistically significantly so, suggests that high pollution in the recent past leads to higher insurance sales for the current day. Indeed testing the null hypothesis that the sum of the coefficients for first k lags is equal to the negative of the current-day coefficient β, we find that we can reject the null hypothesis with a p-value < 0.001 for k equal to 7,14,21,28,35 or 42 days. These results indicate that the increase in daily sales generated by air pollution can be interpreted as an increase in the aggregate demand for insurance rather than a change in

[18] See Jacob, Lefgren and Moretti (2007), Deschenes and Moretti (2009) and Busse, Pope, Pope and Silva-Risso (2014) for a more detailed discussion of the methodology used here.

intertemporal substitution across days.

To be clear, while the cancelation results are incompatible with some models of inattentive learning, we cannot definitely say that inattentive learning does not have a a role in driving the increase in demand on high pollution days. Rather the empirical results rules out the possibility that learning by inattentive individuals is the *only* mechanism at work.

6.2 Mistaken Beliefs

Another possibility explanation for our results is that high pollution today causes individuals to *mistakenly* believe that air pollution will be higher in the future. To the extent that such beliefs are overly sensitive to current conditions, it could generate both the increase in demand for health insurance on high pollution days and the increase in cancellations conditional on (relatively) low pollution days. Indeed recent studies have shown that belief in global warming is affected by recent outdoor temperatures (e.g., Li, Johnson and Zaval (2011))

Although such explanations would predict current conditions having an overly large impact on the demand, they operate through a fundamentally different channel than projection bias. For example under the mistaken belief channel, a cold day causes individuals to mistakenly believe that there will be more cold days in the future. In contrast according to projection bias, a cold day causes individuals to mistakenly believe they will receive higher utility from a cold weather coat on non-cold days.

To differentiate between these two channels, we ran an on-line survey designed to elicit individual's beliefs regarding pollution in their city of residence in the future. Since this pattern of mistaken beliefs (i.e., current conditions have an outsized influence) has been attributed to several different psychological mechanism (e.g., recency bias, availability bias, limited recall), such a test cannot distinguish between these different mechanisms. Rather the results can be interpreted as evidence for or against any mechanism that operates via affecting the beliefs about future pollution.

The survey asked for basic demographic information (age, gender, years in current city) as well as the following question: “Do you think that a year from now air pollution where you currently live will be 1) better, 2) the same, 3) worse.” Of the 461 respondents, 98 thought that air pollution would be better in a year, 289 though that it would be the same, and 77 thought it would get worse. The survey data was then merged with air pollution and weather data for the city of the respondent on the day the survey was completed.

The results of the survey analysis are presented in Table 6. Columns 1 and 2 present the result of a ordered probit analysis (better, the same, worse) with and without controls respectively. Columns 3 and 4 present the result of a probit analysis where the dependent variable equals one if the respondent said that she felt pollution would be worse in a year. Across all four specifications, we find no relationship between AQI and one’s beliefs about air pollution in a year’s time. In contrast, gender, temperature and tenure in one’s current city of residence are all significantly correlated with the probability that the survey respondent fells pollution will be worse in a year’s time. This result is consistent with projection bias under which current conditions do not affect beliefs about future states, only one’s expected utility in those states. But they serve as direct evidence against any explanation for our findings that rely on current pollution levels overly-affecting one’s beliefs about future pollution levels.

7 Conclusion

Our main empirical findings are that 1) transiently higher levels of air pollution leads to greater demand for health insurance, and 2) cancelation rates are higher if air pollution levels during the cooling off period are lower than that on the order-date. These effects are limited to health insurance contracts, with air pollution levels having no analogous effects on other insurance products sold by the firm. We also find that the increase in daily demand for health insurance engendered by daily air pollution levels represents an increase in total demand for insurance, and not the result of temporal displacement of purchases. Finally we find that current pollution levels do not affect individual expectations regarding pollution in the future.

These results show that transitory conditions can have an oversized, and significant impact on real world product markets in a way that is difficult to reconcile with rational choice theory. In addition by ruling out a mistaken beliefs based channel, the results point strongly to projection bias as mechanism driving these results. To the extent that this result can be generalized to other settings, our results suggest that projection bias may be an important driver of demand for real goods and services. More directly, our results suggests that policy makers need to take into account the fact that an individual's current health can have an oversized influence on their demand for health insurance when designing and regulating health care insurance markets.

References

Ariely, D. and G. Loewenstein, (2006). "The Heat of the Moment: The Effect of Sexual Arousal on Sexual Decision Making," *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making,* 19(2), 87-98.

Auchincloss A., A. Diez Roux, J. Dvonch, P. Brown, R. Barr, M. Daviglus, D. Goff, J. Kaufman, and M. O'Neill, (2008). "Associations Between Recent Exposure to Ambient Fine Particulate Matter and Blood Pressure in the Multi-ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis (MESA)." *Environmental Health Perspectives,* 116(4), 486-491.

Bordalo, P., N. Gennaioli, and A. Shleifer, (2013). "Salience and Consumer Choice," *Journal of Political Economy,* 121(5), 803-843.

Bordalo, P., N. Gennaioli, and A. Shleifer, (2014). "Memory, Attention and Choice," *Working Paper.*

Busse, M., J. Pope, D. Pope, and J. Silva-Risso (2015). "The Psychological Effects of Weather on Car Purchases," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1): 371-414.

Chang, T., J. Graff Zivin, T. Gross, and M. Neidell, (2014). "Particulate Pollution and the Productivity of Pear Packers," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, forthcoming.

Chang, T., J. Graff Zivin, T. Gross, and M. Neidell, (2016). "The Effect of Pollution on Office Workers: Evidence from Call Centers in China," *Working Paper.*

Conlin, M., T. O'Donoghue, and T. Vogelsang, (2007). "Projection Bias in Catalog Orders," *American Economic Review*, 97(4): 1217-1249.

DellaVigna, S. (2009). "Psychology and Economics: Evidence from the Field," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47, 315-372.

Deschenes, O. and E. Moretti, (2009). "Extreme Weather Events, Mortality, and Migration," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 91(4), 659-681.

Dockery D. W., and C. A. Pope, (1994). "Acute Respiratory Effects of Particulate Air Pollution." *Annual Review of Public Health,* 15, 107-113.

Environmental Protection Agency (2004). Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter. National Center for Environmental Assessment. Research Triangle Park, NC

Ghio, A., C. Kim, and R. Devlin, (2000). "Concentrated Ambient Air Particles Induce Mild Pulmonary Inflammation in Healthy Human Volunteers." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine,* 162, 981-988.

Haggag, K, and D. Pope, (2016). "Attribution Bias in Consumer Choice," *Working Paper.*

Herrnstadt, E., and E. Muehlegger, (2015). "Air Pollution and Criminal Activity: Evidence from Chicago Microdata," *NBER Working Paper*, No. 21787.

Jacob, B., L. Lefgren, and E. Moretti, (2007). "The Dynamics of Criminal Behavior:

Evidence from Weather Shocks," *The Journal of Human Resources*, 42(3), 489-527.

Koszegi, B. and A. Szeidl, (2013). "A Model of Focusing in Economic Choice," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 128(1), 53-107.

Laibson, D., (1997). "Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 112(2), 443-477.

Li, T., H Liu, and A. Salvo, (2015). "Severe Air Pollution and Labor Productivity," *Working Paper.*

Lavy, V., A. Ebenstein, and S. Roth, (2014). "The Impact of Short Term Exposure to Ambient Air Pollution on Cognitive Performance and Human Capital Formation," *NBER Working Paper,* No. 20468.

Loewenstein, G.,(2005). "Hot-Cold Empathy Gaps and Medical Decision Making," *Health Psychology,* 24(4S): S49-S56.

Loewenstein, G., T. O'Donoghue, and M. Rabin, (2003). "Projection Bias in Predicting Future Utility," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 118: 1209-1248.

Neidell, M. and J. Graff Zivin, (2012). "The Impact of Pollution on Worker Productivity," *American Economic Review*, 102(7): 3652-3673.

O'Donoghue, T. and M. Rabin, (1999). "Doing It Now or Later," *American Economic Review,* 89(1): 103-124.

O'Donoghue, T. and M. Rabin, (2015). "Present Bias: Lessons Learned and To Be Learned," *American Economic Review,* 105(5): 273-279.

Pope, C., (2000). "Epidemiology of Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Human Health: Biologic Mechanisms and Who's at Risk?" *Environmental Health Perspectives,* 108(4), 713-723.

Schwartzstein , J., (2014). "Selective Attention and Learning" *Journal of the European Economic Association,* 12(6), 1423-1452.

Seaton, A., W. MacNee, K. Donaldson, and D. Godden, (1995). "Particulate air pollution and acute health effects." *Lancet* 8943: 176-178.

Simonsohn, U., (2010). "Weather to go to College," *Economic Journal*, 120(543), 270-280.

Thatcher, T. and D. Layton, (1995). "Deposition, Resuspension, and Penetration of Particles within a Residence." *Atmospheric Environment,* 29(13), 1487-1497.

Air Quality Index (AQI)	PM2.5 Health Effects Statement	PM 2.5 Cautionary Statement
Good (0-50)	PM2.5 air pollution poses little or no risk.	None
Moderate (51-100)	Unusually sensitive individuals may experience respiratory symptoms.	Unusually sensitive people should consider reducing prolonged or heavy exertion.
Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (101-150)	Increasing likelihood of respiratory symptoms in sensitive individuals, aggravation of heart or lung disease and premature mortality in persons with cardiopulmonary disease and the elderly.	People with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children should reduce prolonged or heavy exertion.
Unhealthy (151-200)	Increased aggravation of heart or lung disease and premature mortality in persons with cardiopulmonary disease and the elderly; increased respiratory effects in general population.	People with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children should avoid prolonged or heavy exertion; everyone else should reduce prolonged or heavy exertion.
Very Unhealthy (201-300)	Significant aggravation of heart or lung disease and premature mortality in persons with cardiopulmonary disease and the elderly; significant increase in respiratory effects in general population.	People with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children should avoid all physical activity outdoors. Everyone else should avoid prolonged or heavy exertion.
Hazardous (301-500)	Serious aggravation of heart or lung disease and premature mortality in persons with cardiopulmonary disease and the elderly; serious risk of respiratory effects in general population.	Everyone should avoid all physical activity outdoors; people with heart or lung disease, older adults, and children should remain indoors and keep activity levels low.

Figure 1. U.S. EPA Guide to AQI



Figure 2. Daily PM2.5 levels as measured by the U.S. Embassy in Beijing.



Figure 3. Coefficient values and 95% confidence intervals for the effect of contemporaneous and lagged AQI/100 on daily insurance sales.

Table I
Summary Statistics

	Mean	*Std. Dev.*	*Min*	*Max*	*Obs.*
		Date Characteristics			
AQI $PM_{2.5}$	125.6	98.4	0.04	731	2,577
Temperature	19.4	9.4	-6	39	2,577
Rain	0.049	0.215	0	1	2,577
Snow	0.014	0.119	0	1	2,577
Sales per Day	224.8	509.1	0	9313	2,577
		Contract Characteristics			
Contract Length (Years)	54.7	31.6	1	85.0	579,303
Purchased for Oneself	0.47	0.50	0	1	579,303
Age (Years)	25.4	15.5	0.79	66.1	579,303
Female	0.55	0.50	0	1	579,303
Canceled	0.028	0.17	0	1	414,064

Notes: The demographic variables associated with the health insurance contracts are for the insured, and not the purchaser of insurance.

Table II
The Effect of Pollution on Insurance Sales

Dependent Variable: Log(Number of Contracts Sold)

Insurance Type	Health			Other
$AQI_{PM2.5}$	0.00072**		0.00066**	-0.00013
	(0.00019)		(0.00020)	(0.00023)
$AQI_{PM2.5}$ 50-100		0.0116		
		(0.0715)		
$AQI_{PM2.5}$ 100-150		0.1147		
		(0.0759)		
$AQI_{PM2.5}$ 150-200		0.1681*		
		(0.0825)		
$AQI_{PM2.5}$ 200-300		0.1680*		
		(0.0849)		
$AQI_{PM2.5}$ 300+		0.2340*		
		(0.0996)		
Other City $AQI_{PM2.5}$			0.00007	
			(0.00023)	
Temperature	-0.0191	-0.0189+	-0.0196+	0.0221*
	(0.0111)	(0.0111)	(0.0119)	(0.0224)
Temperature^2	0.0008**	0.0008**	0.0009**	-0.0006*
	(0.0072)	(0.0003)	(0.0003)	(0.0003)
Rain	-0.0391	-0.0355	-0.0363	0.1006
	(0.0755)	(0.0756)	(0.0763)	(0.0658)
Snow	-0.2059	-0.1943	-0.2078	-0.2639
	(0.1700)	(0.1707)	(0.2242)	(0.1677)
Adjusted R-squared	0.481	0.481	0.478	0.483
Observations	2,573	2,573	2,453	2,573

Notes: All columns present the results from ordinary least square regressions. For city j, "Other City $AQI_{PM2.5}$" is the $AQI_{PM2.5}$ of its nearest neighbor. Insurance type "Other" consists of personal accident and term-life insurance policies. All regressions included dummy variables for day of week, city*month and city*year. Standard errors are clustered on date.
+ significant at 10%, * significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%.

Table III
The Effect of Pollution on Cancelations

Dependent Variable: Indicator equal to 1 if contract is canceled				
% of Contracts canceled	2.62%	2.62%	2.55%	2.62%
Relative AQI	-0.00110**			
	(0.00041)			
Order-date AQI		0.00087*	0.00100*	0.00003
		(0.00044)	(0.00048)	(0.00053)
CoP AQI		-0.00243**		
		(0.0092)		
$\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \beta_{AQI,\tau}$			-0.00236**	
			(see notes)	
1(CoP AQI<Order-date AQI)				0.1929*
				(0.0866)
Log(Term Length)	-0.487**	-0.486**	-0.482**	-0.487**
	(0.175)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.0325)
Log(Age)	0.365**	0.365**	0.337**	0.366**
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.032)
Self	1.060**	0.058**	1.026**	1.059**
	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.078)	(0.076)
Female	0.125**	0.125*	0.106+	0.123*
	(0.057)	(0.057)	(0.058)	(0.056)
Adj. R-squared	0.050	0.050	0.052	0.050
Observations	405,599	405,599	375,841	405,599

Notes: For each column, the dependent variable is whether an insurance contract is canceled during the cooling-off period. All coefficients represent the marginal effects from a probit regression. *Relative AQI* is the average AQI during the cooling off period minus the order date AQI. *CoP AQI* is the mean value of $AQI\ PM_{2.5}$ during the cooling off period ($\frac{1}{11}\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} AQI_{\tau}$). $\sum_{\tau=1}^{11} \beta_{AQI,\tau}$ is the sum of the coefficients for the 11 daily leads of the pollution variable $AQI_0\ PM_{2.5}$. We can reject at p-value=0.003 that the sum of these coefficients is greater than zero. For legibility, all coefficients and standard errors have been multiplied by 100. All regressions included controls for temperature, temperature squared, rain, snow, and dummy variables for day of week, city*month and city*year. Column 3 includes additional controls for the 11 daily leads of temperature, temperature squared, rain and snow. Standard errors are clustered on city*date.
+ significant at 10%, * significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%.

Table IV
Cancelations Including Non-Health Insurance

Dependent Variable: Indicator equal to 1 if contract is canceled		
% of Contracts canceled	5.36%	5.36%
Relative AQI	-0.00286**	-0.00264**
	(0.00082)	(0.00079)
(Relative AQI)(Other)*	0.00257**	0.00229**
	(0.00078)	(0.00076)
Other	0.02618**	-0.00856**
	(0.00078)	(0.00320)
Log(Term Length)	-0.742**	-0.943**
	(0.034)	(0.031)
Log(Term Length)*Other		0.348**
		(0.056)
Log(Age)	0.514**	0.583**
	(0.041)	(0.057)
Log(Age)*Other		-0.102+
		(0.058)
Self	2.148**	1.829**
	(0.098)	(0.119)
Self*Other		0.632**
		(0.161)
Female	0.282**	0.198*
	(0.063)	(0.095)
Female*Other		0.119
		(0.101)
Adj. R-squared	0.059	0.060
Observations	890,247	890,247

Notes: For each column, the dependent variable is whether an insurance contract is canceled during the cooling-off period. All coefficients represent the marginal effects from a probit regression. *Relative AQI* is the average AQI during the cooling off period minus the order date AQI. For legibility, all coefficients and standard errors have been multiplied by 100. All regressions included controls for temperature, temperature squared, rain, snow, and dummy variables for day of week, city*month and city*year. Column 2 includes interactions of the *Other* dummy with the controls for temperature, temperature squared, rain, and snow. Standard errors are clustered on city*date. + significant at 10%, * significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%.

Table V
Pollution and Insurance Contract Characteristics

	Term Length	*Age*	*Self Purchase*	*Female*	*Female & Self*
AQI $PM_{2.5}$	0.00001	0.00004	0.00007	0.00007*	0.00002
	(0.00006)	(0.00007)	(0.00006)	(0.00003)	(0.00005)
Temperature	-0.0024	-0.0102	-0.0015	-0.0038+	-0.0072*
	(0.0036)	(0.0044)	(0.0034)	(0.0020)	(0.0032)
Temperature^2	0.0002*	0.0002*	-0.0000	0.0001*	0.0002*
	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)	(0.0000)	(0.0001)
Rain	-0.0230	-0.0050	0.0253	0.0099	-0.0011
	(0.0214)	(0.0253)	(0.0185)	(0.0122)	(0.0186)
Snow	-0.0785	-0.0210	0.0484	0.0526*	0.0308
	(0.0511)	(0.0594)	(0.0407)	(0.0262)	(0.0400)
Adj. R-squared	0.052	0.009	0.010	0.000	0.004
Observations	579,303	579,303	579,303	579,303	274,102

Notes: Columns 1 and 2 present the results from ordinary least square regressions, and columns 3 through 5 present marginal effects based on a probit model. The dependent variable for columns 1 and 2 are the log of the contract term and the log of the age of the person covered by the health insurance contract. For columns 3 through 5, the dependent variable is a dummy equal to 1 if (3) the insurance was purchased for oneself, (4) the insurance was purchased for a female, and (5) the insurance was purchase by a female. The sample size is smaller for column (5) because the sample was limited to insurance purchased for oneself as those are the only cases for which we can identify the gender of the purchaser. All regressions included dummy variables for day of week, city*month and city*year. Standard errors are clustered on city*date.
+ significant at 10%, * significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%.

Table VI
The Effect of Pollution on Beliefs

Dependent Variable: Pollution is getting Better=1, Same=2, Worse=3

	Ordered Probit		Probit (Worse=1)	
AQI	-0.00256	-0.00231	-0.00083	-0.00033
	(0.00158)	(0.00191)	(0.01996)	(0.00255)
Age		-0.0038		-0.0158
		(0.0091)		(0.0119)
Female		0.1626		0.3380*
		(0.1290)		(0.1553)
Temperature (high)		-0.0167		-0.0437*
		(0.0185)		(0.0226)
Temperature (low)		0.0100		0.0198
		(0.0255)		(0.0333)
Years in Current City		0.0099+		0.0156*
		(0.0050)		(0.0068)
Pseudo R-squared	0.003	0.029	0.000	0.050
Observations	461	461	461	461

Notes: The results are from a multi-city on-line survey in China. The dependent variable is in response to a question about pollution "a year from now" while the key dependent variable is the AQI for the city of the respondent on the day the survey was completed. Columns 3 and 4 show the results of a Probit regression where responses of "Better" or "Same" were coded as 0, while responses of "Worse" were coded as 1. All regressions use robust standard errors.
+ significant at 10%, * significant at 5%, ** significant at 1%.