- **b.** Estimate the model  $LIQUOR_{it} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 INCOME_{it} + u_i + e_{it}$  using random effects. Construct a 95% interval estimate of the coefficient on INCOME. How does it compare to the interval in part (a)?
- **c.** Test for the presence of random effects using the LM statistic in equation (15.35). Use the 5% level of significance.
- **d.** For each individual, compute the time averages for the variable *INCOME*. Call this variable *INCOMEM*. Estimate the model  $LIQUOR_{it} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 INCOME_{it} + \gamma INCOMEM_i + c_i + e_{it}$  using the random effects estimator. Test the significance of the coefficient  $\gamma$  at the 5% level. Based on this test, what can we conclude about the correlation between the random effect  $u_i$  and *INCOME*? Is it OK to use the random effects estimator for the model in (b)?

```
b.
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
   (Swamy-Arora's transformation)
Call:
plm(formula = liquor ~ income, data = liquor, model = "random")
Balanced Panel: n = 40, T = 3, N = 120
Effects:
                var std.dev share
idiosyncratic 0.9640 0.9819 0.571
individual
              0.7251 0.8515 0.429
theta: 0.4459
Residuals:
     Min.
            1st Qu.
                      Median
                               3rd Ou.
                                           Max.
-2.263634 -0.697383 0.078697 0.552680 2.225798
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error z-value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 0.9690324 0.5210052 1.8599 0.0628957 .
           income
Signif. codes: 0 '*** 0.001 '** 0.01 '* 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Total Sum of Squares:
                        126.61
Residual Sum of Squares: 112.88
R-Squared:
               0.1085
Adj. R-Squared: 0.10095
Chisq: 14.3618 on 1 DF, p-value: 0.00015083
```

## Lagrange Multiplier Test - (Breusch-Pagan)

data: liquor ~ income
chisq = 20.68, df = 1, p-value = 5.429e-06
alternative hypothesis: significant effects

d.

```
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
  (Swamy-Arora's transformation)
plm(formula = liquor ~ income + INCOMEM, data = liquor, model = "random")
Balanced Panel: n = 40, T = 3, N = 120
Effects:
                var std.dev share
idiosyncratic 0.9640 0.9819 0.571
individual 0.7251 0.8515 0.429
theta: 0.4459
Residuals:
    Min. 1st Qu.
                    Median 3rd Qu.
                                           Max.
-2.300955 -0.703840 0.054992 0.560255 2.257325
Coefficients:
           Estimate Std. Error z-value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 0.9163337 0.5524439 1.6587 0.09718 .
income 0.0207421 0.0209083 0.9921 0.32117
INCOMEM
           0.0065792 0.0222048 0.2963 0.76700
Signif. codes: 0 '*** 0.001 '** 0.01 '* 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Total Sum of Squares:
Residual Sum of Squares: 112.79
R-Squared:
           0.10917
Adj. R-Squared: 0.093945
Chisq: 14.3386 on 2 DF, p-value: 0.00076987
```

## t test of coefficients:

```
Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 0.9163337 0.5657538 1.6197 0.1080
income 0.0207421 0.0194273 1.0677 0.2879
INCOMEM 0.0065792 0.0206317 0.3189 0.7504
```

- **d.** Reestimate the model in part (a) with school random effects. Compare the results with those from parts (a) and (b). Are there any variables in the equation that might be correlated with the school effects? Use the LM test for the presence of random effects.
- e. Using the *t*-test statistic in equation (15.36) and a 5% significance level, test whether there are any significant differences between the fixed effects and random effects estimates of the coefficients on *SMALL*, *AIDE*, *TCHEXPER*, *WHITE\_ASIAN*, and *FREELUNCH*. What are the implications of the test outcomes? What happens if we apply the test to the fixed and random effects estimates of the coefficient on *BOY*?
- **f.** Create school-averages of the variables and carry out the Mundlak test for correlation between them and the unobserved heterogeneity.

d.

```
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
   (Swamy-Arora's transformation)
plm(formula = readscore ~ small + aide + tchexper + boy + white_asian +
   freelunch, data = pdata, model = "random")
Unbalanced Panel: n = 79, T = 34-137, N = 5766
Effects:
                var std.dev share
                      27.41 0.829
idiosyncratic 751.43
individual
             155.31
                      12.46 0.171
theta:
  Min. 1st Qu. Median
                          Mean 3rd Qu.
                                          Max.
0.6470 0.7225 0.7523 0.7541 0.7831 0.8153
Residuals:
  Min. 1st Qu. Median
                          Mean 3rd Qu.
                                          Max.
-97.483 -17.236 -3.282
                         0.037 12.803 192.346
Coefficients:
             Estimate Std. Error z-value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 436.126774 2.064782 211.2217 < 2.2e-16 ***
                                  7.0777 1.466e-12 ***
small
             6.458722
                        0.912548
aide
             0.992146
                        0.881159
                                   1.1260
                                             0.2602
tchexper
             0.302679
                        0.070292
                                  4.3060 1.662e-05 ***
boy
             -5.512081
                        0.727639 -7.5753 3.583e-14 ***
white_asian
             7.350477
                        1.431376
                                  5.1353 2.818e-07 ***
                        0.874676 -16.6740 < 2.2e-16 ***
freelunch
           -14.584332
Signif. codes: 0 '*** 0.001 '** 0.01 '* 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Total Sum of Squares:
                        6158000
Residual Sum of Squares: 4332100
               0.29655
R-Squared:
Adj. R-Squared: 0.29582
Chisq: 493.205 on 6 DF, p-value: < 2.22e-16
```

## Lagrange Multiplier Test - (Breusch-Pagan)

data: readscore  $\sim$  small + aide + tchexper + boy + white\_asian + freelunch chisq = 6677.4, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16 alternative hypothesis: significant effects

e.

## Hausman Test

data: readscore  $\sim$  small + aide + tchexper + boy + white\_asian + freelunch chisq = 13.809, df = 6, p-value = 0.03184 alternative hypothesis: one model is inconsistent

	Variable	FivedEffects	RandomEffects
	vai table	ILXEULITECUS	
small	small	6.4902305	6.4587216
aide	aide	0.9960875	0.9921460
tchexper	tchexper	0.2855668	0.3026787
boy	boy	-5.4559412	-5.5120812
white_asian	white_asian	8.0280192	7.3504772
freelunch	freelunch	-14.5935724	-14.5843317

```
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
  (Swamy-Arora's transformation)
Call:
plm(formula = readscore ~ small + aide + tchexper + boy + mean_small,
   data = pdata_mundlak, model = "random")
Unbalanced Panel: n = 79, T = 34-137, N = 5766
Effects:
               var std.dev share
idiosyncratic 796.81 28.23 0.816
individual
            180.18 13.42 0.184
theta:
  Min. 1st Qu. Median
                        Mean 3rd Qu.
                                      Max.
0.6607 0.7338 0.7625 0.7642 0.7922 0.8232
Residuals:
   Min. 1st Qu.
                 Median
                           Mean 3rd Qu.
                                            Max.
-102.015 -17.987 -3.061
                           0.006
                                 12.871 200.677
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error z-value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 441.604664 6.704992 65.8621 < 2.2e-16 ***
small
            aide
            0.779373 0.907281 0.8590
                                        0.3903
           tchexper
           -5.408528    0.749182    -7.2192    5.228e-13 ***
boy
mean_small -24.837652 21.532911 -1.1535
                                        0.2487
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Total Sum of Squares:
                      6048700
Residual Sum of Squares: 4593400
R-Squared:
              0.2406
Adj. R-Squared: 0.23994
```

Chisq: 130.024 on 5 DF, p-value: < 2.22e-16