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**f. Random Effects vs. Fixed Effects**

**Comparing Random Effects vs. Fixed Effects Estimates**

Looking at the coefficients in Table 15.10, the largest differences between RE (column 5) and FE (column 3) are:

* EXPER: 0.0986 (RE) vs 0.0575 (FE)
* EXPER²: -0.0023 (RE) vs -0.0012 (FE)

The Hausman test compares FE estimates from column (3) with RE estimates from column (5). We use column (3) rather than (4) because the Hausman test is based on the standard FE estimator without robust standard errors.

**Conducting the Hausman Test**

To perform the Hausman test using equation (15.36), let’s calculate the t-statistic for each coefficient:

**For EXPER:**

* Difference in coefficients: bFE - bRE = 0.0575 - 0.0986 = -0.0411
* Standard errors: se(bFE) = 0.0330, se(bRE) = 0.0220
* Denominator: √[se(bFE)² - se(bRE)²] = √[(0.0330)² - (0.0220)²] = √[0.001089 - 0.000484] = √0.000605 = 0.0246
* t-statistic: -0.0411/0.0246 = -1.67

**For EXPER²:**

* Difference in coefficients: bFE - bRE = -0.0012 - (-0.0023) = 0.0011
* Standard errors: se(bFE) = 0.0011, se(bRE) = 0.0007
* Denominator: √[se(bFE)² - se(bRE)²] = √[(0.0011)² - (0.0007)²] = √[0.00000121 - 0.00000049] = √0.00000072 = 0.00085
* t-statistic: 0.0011/0.00085 = 1.29

**For SOUTH:**

* Difference in coefficients: bFE - bRE = -0.3261 - (-0.2326) = -0.0935
* Standard errors: se(bFE) = 0.1258, se(bRE) = 0.0317
* Denominator: √[se(bFE)² - se(bRE)²] = √[(0.1258)² - (0.0317)²] = √[0.01583 - 0.00101] = √0.01482 = 0.1217
* t-statistic: -0.0935/0.1217 = -0.77

**For UNION:**

* Difference in coefficients: bFE - bRE = 0.0822 - 0.1027 = -0.0205
* Standard errors: se(bFE) = 0.0312, se(bRE) = 0.0245
* Denominator: √[se(bFE)² - se(bRE)²] = √[(0.0312)² - (0.0245)²] = √[0.000973 - 0.000600] = √0.000373 = 0.0193
* t-statistic: -0.0205/0.0193 = -1.06

**Joint Test:**

For the joint chi-square test with 4 degrees of freedom (corresponding to the 4 slope coefficients), we would calculate: χ² = Σ(t²) = (-1.67)² + (1.29)² + (-0.77)² + (-1.06)² = 2.79 + 1.66 + 0.59 + 1.12 = 6.16

The critical value for χ²(4) at 5% significance level is 9.49.

**Conclusion**

Since our calculated χ² = 6.16 < 9.49, we fail to reject the null hypothesis at the 5% level. This suggests that the random effects estimator is appropriate for this model, as there is not sufficient evidence of systematic differences between the fixed effects and random effects estimates.

This result indicates that the unobserved individual effects (ui) are likely uncorrelated with the explanatory variables, making the random effects estimator valid and more efficient than the fixed effects estimator for this particular application.
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The random effects model reveals that school-level heterogeneity accounts for 17.1% of the total variance in reading scores, with the remaining 82.9% being idiosyncratic variance within schools. The coefficient estimates are very similar to the fixed effects model, with small classes increasing reading scores by 6.46 points, being white/Asian associated with a 7.35 point advantage, and free lunch eligibility reducing scores by 14.58 points. The Lagrange Multiplier test strongly rejects the null hypothesis of no random effects (test statistic = 81.715, p < 2.2e-16), providing compelling evidence that random effects are statistically necessary and that the simple pooled OLS model is inadequate. This confirms that school-specific unobserved heterogeneity significantly affects student reading performance and must be accounted for in the analysis.

Several variables are likely correlated with school effects, particularly **free lunch eligibility** and **race/ethnicity** due to residential segregation and socioeconomic sorting across schools, and potentially **teacher experience** if experienced teachers systematically select into certain types of schools. Only the experimental variables (small class size and teacher aide) should be uncorrelated with school effects since they were randomly assigned within schools.
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For the BOY variable, the random effects standard error is **larger** than the fixed effects standard error, making se\_fe^2 - se\_re^2 negative. This violates the theoretical assumption that fixed effects should have larger standard errors than random effects.

The BOY coefficient cannot be tested using this individual t-test approach because the theoretical condition (FE variance > RE variance) is violated. This suggests the overall **joint Hausman test** is more appropriate.

Based on the individual coefficient Hausman tests at the 5% significance level, **no significant differences** were found between fixed effects and random effects estimates for any of the testable variables (SMALL, AIDE, TCHEXPER, WHITE\_ASIAN, FREELUNCH), with TCHEXPER showing the largest difference but still marginally insignificant (p = 0.053).

This suggests that for these specific variables, the random effects assumption of zero correlation with school effects appears reasonable, indicating consistency between the two modeling approaches and supporting the validity of using either estimator for these coefficients.
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The Mundlak test was conducted to examine whether Random Effects or Fixed Effects estimation is more appropriate by testing for correlation between unobserved school effects and the regressors. The test involved augmenting the regression model with school-level averages of all time-varying variables and testing their joint significance.

The OLS Mundlak test yielded an F-statistic of 21.00 with a p-value < 2.2e-16, strongly rejecting the null hypothesis that the school averages are jointly equal to zero. This highly significant result indicates substantial correlation between unobserved school-level heterogeneity and the explanatory variables, violating the key assumption required for Random Effects consistency. The coefficients on the school averages show meaningful variation (ranging from -50.21 for boy\_bar to 9.19 for aide\_bar), further confirming that school-level characteristics are systematically related to the regressors.

Therefore, the Mundlak test conclusively supports the use of Fixed Effects estimation over Random Effects, as the latter would produce inconsistent estimates due to the correlation between unobserved school effects and the regressors.
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Based on the confidence intervals, the **Random Effects model provides more precise and statistically significant results** than the First Differences model. While the First Differences estimate (0.0297) includes zero in its confidence interval [-0.0284, 0.0879] suggesting no significant effect, the Random Effects model shows a significant positive relationship (0.0266) with a confidence interval [0.0128, 0.0403] that doesn't include zero.

c. CONCLUSION

Reject H0 at 5% level. Random effects are present - use RE instead of pooled OLS.

# Honda (default) - matches equation (15.35)

lm\_test <- plmtest(model\_pooled, effect = "individual")

Lagrange Multiplier Test for Random Effects:
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CONCLUSION: Fail to reject H0: γ = 0 at 5% level.

The coefficient on INCOMEM is not statistically significant.

No evidence of correlation between the random effect ui and INCOME.

It is OK to use the random effects estimator for the model in part (b).
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**Summary:**
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