

1. |

- a. For this pooled OLS regression, we are going to use three dependent variables vio (violent crime rate per 100,000), rob (robbery rate per 100,000), and mur (murder rate per 100,000). We will use the following regression formulas. Results can be seen in Table 1.

i.  $\text{vio}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + e_{it}$

ii.  $\text{rob}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + e_{it}$

iii.  $\text{mur}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + e_{it}$

- b. Now using the same data but performing a random-effect regression we use the following formulas. Results can be seen in Table 2.

i.  $\text{vio}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

ii.  $\text{rob}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

iii.  $\text{mur}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

- c. Now using the same data but performing a fixed-effect regression we use the following formulas. Results can be seen in Table 3

i.  $\text{vio}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

ii.  $\text{rob}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

iii.  $\text{mur}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{shall}_{it} + b_2 \text{year}_{it} + b_3 \text{avginc}_{it} + b_4 \text{pm1029}_{it} + b_5 \text{density} + b_6 \text{pop} + a_i + e_{it}$

- d. For regressions a, we find a large effect and a high significance for most of our regressors especially for murder rate. This contrasts with our random regression which have no statistical significance and our fixed effect regression which shows very little statistical significance. Based on these results it is likely our pooled OLS regression and our random effect regression gives us inconsistent estimators.

- e. The results for our Hausman test can be seen in Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. Based on these results all our tests reject the null hypothesis of being consistent. Based on this all our results are inconsistent. The requirements for using the Hausman test is that the data be homoscedastic and not be serially correlated.

2. |

- a. Our three regression results from the following equations can be seen in Table 7

i.  $\text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \text{drinkage21}_{it} + b_3 \text{drinkage21}_{it} * \text{speed70}_{it} + a_i + e_{it}$

ii.  $\text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \text{drinkage21}_{it} + b_3 \text{drinkage21}_{it} * \text{speed70}_{it} + a_i + \lambda_t + e_{it}$

iii.  $\text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \text{drinkage21}_{it} + b_3 \text{drinkage21}_{it} * \text{speed70}_{it} + a_i + \lambda_t + \eta_{it} + e_{it}$

b. Using the comparison seen in Table 8 and our previous results we can conclude that speed limit has no significant effect on DUI. In our results in part A we see that drinking age \* Speed 70 has no statistical significance. Based on these two results we conclude that lowering the speed limit has no significant effect on DUI.

c. Results can be seen in Table 9

$$\text{i. } \Delta \text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \Delta \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \Delta \text{drinkingage}_{21it} + b_3 \Delta (\text{drinkingage}_{21it} * \text{speed70}_{it}) + e_{it}$$

$$\text{ii. } \Delta \text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \Delta \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \Delta \text{drinkingage}_{21it} + b_3 \Delta (\text{drinkingage}_{21it} * \text{speed70}_{it}) + \Delta \lambda_t + e_{it}$$

$$\text{iii. } \Delta \text{Fatalityrate}_{it} = b_0 + b_1 \Delta \text{sb\_usage}_{it} + b_2 \Delta \text{drinkingage}_{21it} + b_3 \Delta (\text{drinkingage}_{21it} * \text{speed70}_{it}) + \Delta \lambda_t + \eta_i + e_{it}$$

d. To test for strict exogeneity we compare our coefficients from our FE and FD regressions. For our first regression given that they are significantly different from each other and cannot be explained by sampling variability we conclude that strict exogeneity is violated. For our model two and three our coefficients are not as significantly different meaning there is possibility for strict exogeneity to hold but given that they are different we cannot make any definite conclusions without further analysis.

Appendix:

Table 1:

	1a1 b/se	1a2 b/se	1a3 b/se
shall	-112.532*** (16.48)	-21.219*** (4.92)	-1.685*** (0.24)
year	8.071*** (2.17)	-3.607*** (0.77)	0.238*** (0.04)
avginc	4.553 (3.32)	7.342*** (1.35)	-0.315*** (0.08)
pm1029	4.388 (7.49)	-8.088** (2.49)	0.790*** (0.16)
density	163.993*** (10.64)	95.515*** (5.79)	4.445*** (0.50)
pop	21.519*** (1.36)	11.247*** (0.71)	0.256*** (0.02)
constant	-474.248 (289.73)	425.900*** (97.01)	-24.009*** (5.69)
R-sqr	0.610	0.770	0.607
dfres	1166	1166	1166
N	1173.0	1173.0	1173.0
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001			

Table 2:

	1b1 b/se	1b2 b/se	1b3 b/se
shall	-8.581 (20.48)	8.761 (7.40)	-0.277 (0.38)
year	-1.822 (4.15)	-1.077 (1.11)	-0.339 (0.23)
avginc	6.975 (13.20)	-4.268* (2.15)	1.060 (0.84)
pm1029	-27.389* (12.17)	-4.711 (4.22)	-0.454 (0.49)
density	52.118*** (3.94)	94.432*** (2.27)	0.965*** (0.14)
pop	12.610* (5.97)	7.936* (3.12)	-0.161 (0.21)
constant	931.150* (459.94)	317.355 (164.00)	30.771 (18.11)
R-sqr			
dfres			
N	1173.0	1173.0	1173.0
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001			

Table 3:

	1c1 b/se	1c2 b/se	1c3 b/se
shall	-4.349 (20.60)	10.251 (7.51)	-0.007 (0.32)
year	1.425 (2.74)	0.681 (1.17)	-0.218* (0.11)
avginc	-2.686 (6.90)	-8.311* (3.49)	0.765 (0.45)
pm1029	-20.651* (10.02)	-1.956 (4.32)	-0.156 (0.19)
density	-220.303*** (16.55)	51.585*** (11.75)	-14.973*** (0.93)
pop	10.592 (6.99)	-0.349 (3.18)	-0.446 (0.30)
constant	774.256* (351.06)	228.424 (149.41)	26.308*** (7.25)
R-sqr	0.193	0.040	0.295
dfres	50	50	50
N	1173.0	1173.0	1173.0

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 4:

	Coefficients			
	(b) fe_vio	(B) re_vio	(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) Std. err.
shall	-4.349308	-8.581308	4.232	1.682945
year	1.42478	-1.822223	3.247003	.5953309
avginc	-2.686343	6.97511	-9.661453	1.362451
pm1029	-20.65137	-27.38912	6.737753	1.503426
density	-220.3029	52.11817	-272.421	27.33049
pop	10.59238	12.61003	-2.01765	3.649897

b = Consistent under H0 and Ha; obtained from xtreg.  
B = Inconsistent under Ha, efficient under H0; obtained from xtreg.

Test of H0: Difference in coefficients not systematic

$\chi^2(5) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^{-1}](b-B)$   
= 110.27  
Prob >  $\chi^2$  = 0.0000

Table 5:

	Coefficients			
	(b) fe_rob	(B) re_rob	(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) Std. err.
shall	10.25076	8.761407	1.48935	1.111845
year	.6811256	-1.077104	1.758229	.3517464
avginc	-8.310881	-4.26825	-4.042631	.7983535
pm1029	-1.955505	-4.711253	2.755747	.9268223
density	51.58466	94.43171	-42.84705	14.11875
pop	-.349054	7.93578	-8.284834	2.015557

b = Consistent under H0 and Ha; obtained from xtreg.  
B = Inconsistent under Ha, efficient under H0; obtained from xtreg.

Test of H0: Difference in coefficients not systematic

$\chi^2(5) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^{-1}](b-B)$   
= 44.11  
Prob >  $\chi^2$  = 0.0000

Table 6:

	Coefficients		(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) Std. err.
	(b) fe_mur	(B) re_mur		
shall	-.0066966	-.2766634	.2699668	.0852201
year	-.2183879	-.3392672	.1208793	.0254853
avginc	.7653751	1.060399	-.2950237	.0577867
pm1029	-.1559347	-.4539376	.298003	.068866
density	-14.97313	.9648073	-15.93793	.9483222
pop	-.4461263	-.1612998	-.2848265	.1390948

b = Consistent under H0 and Ha; obtained from **xtreg**.  
B = Inconsistent under Ha, efficient under H0; obtained from **xtreg**.

Test of H0: Difference in coefficients not systematic

chi2(5) = (b-B)'[(V\_b-V\_B)^(-1)](b-B)  
= 344.37  
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000  
(V\_b-V\_B is not positive definite)

Table 7:

	2a1 b/se	2a2 b/se	2a3 b/se
sb_useage	-0.0173*** (0.0008)	-0.0036* (0.0015)	-0.0028* (0.0013)
drinkage21	0.0006 (0.0008)	-0.0007 (0.0007)	-0.0010 (0.0006)
dk_spd	-0.0002 (0.0005)	0.0005 (0.0005)	0.0006 (0.0004)
constant	0.0283*** (0.0008)	0.0255*** (0.0009)	0.7800*** (0.1428)
R-sqr	0.576	0.736	0.840
dfres	50	50	50
N	556.0	556.0	556.0

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 8:

	reg2b1 b/se	reg2b2 b/se	reg2b3 b/se
speed65=0 # speed7~0	0.0000 (.)	0.0000 (.)	0.0000 (.)
speed65=0 # speed7~1	0.0000 (.)	0.0000 (.)	0.0000 (.)
speed65=1 # speed7~0	-0.0057*** (0.0004)	-0.0006 (0.0009)	0.0003 (0.0011)
speed65=1 # speed7~1	-0.0082*** (0.0006)	-0.0003 (0.0013)	0.0021 (0.0016)
constant	0.0255*** (0.0002)	0.0272*** (0.0005)	-0.5094*** (0.0782)
R-sqr	0.425	0.697	0.796
dfres	48	48	48
N	676.0	676.0	676.0

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001

Table 9:

	reg2c1 b/se	reg2c2 b/se	reg2c3 b/se
D.sb_useage	-0.005510*** (0.001007)	-0.002439 (0.001358)	-0.002347 (0.001390)
D.drinkage21	-0.000352 (0.000507)	-0.000881 (0.000640)	-0.000956 (0.000681)
D.dk_spd	0.000121 (0.000296)	-0.000101 (0.000380)	-0.000156 (0.000468)
R-sqr	0.059	0.222	0.132
dfres	50	50	50
N	497.0	497.0	497.0
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001			