

Lecture 20: Count Models

Sravani Vadlamani

QMB 3200: Advanced Quantitative Methods

11/19/2020

For the rest of the semester

| Date | Topic |
|--------|--|
| 19-Nov | Count Models |
| 24-Nov | Count Models - Stata/ Project Feedback |
| 01-Dec | Project |
| 03-Dec | Final Review |
| 08-Dec | Final Exam |

Count Data Models

- Used for modelling the count of things as a function of covariates. Counts are non-negative integers.

Examples

- Count of vehicles in a queue
- Number of defective entities
- Number of failures
- Number of
computers/cars/telephones/etc. in a
household

Why 'special' methodology?

- OLS regression can/will predict values that are negative and will also predict non-integer values
- There are a number of ways to model counts, but Poisson and negative binomial are 'popular'.
- Also, zero-inflated model can work under certain circumstances

Poisson Models

$$\Pr(Y = y_i) = \frac{EXP^{-\lambda_i} \lambda_i^{y_i}}{y_i!}; y = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

where; $E[y_i] = \lambda_i = EXP(\beta X_i)$

$$\ln(\lambda_i) = \beta' X_i$$

Expressions b/w Response and Predictors

- The expression shown is the log-linear form—there are others as well, but log-linear is most common.
- It is the *exp* portion of the expression that constrains the model forecasts to be positive.

Poisson Models

By substituting $E[y] = \text{EXP}(\beta X)$ in the expression, one easily obtains the likelihood function for all observations:

$$L(\beta) = \prod_i \frac{\text{EXP}[-\text{EXP}(\beta X_i)] [\text{EXP}(\beta X_i)]^{y_i}}{y_i!}$$

And the log-likelihood is simply:

$$LL(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n [-\text{EXP}(\beta X_i) + y_i \beta X_i - \text{LN}(y_i!)]$$

Poisson Model Elasticities

An elasticity is the estimate of the effect of a change in an independent variable on the dependent variable. The elasticity on the count of individual i for the k^{th} continuous independent variable is given as:

$$E_{x_{ik}}^{\lambda_i} = \frac{\partial \lambda_i}{\lambda_i} \times \frac{x_{ik}}{\partial x_{ik}} = \beta_k x_{ik}$$

So, if an elasticity was -5.4, then for a 1% increase in the variable would result in a 5.4% decrease in the expected frequency.

Why are elasticities useful?
i.e.,

why not just use coefficient
estimates?

Pseudo Elasticity

For a discrete variable the previous equation is not suitable.

$$E_{x_{ik}}^{\lambda_i} = \frac{EXP(\beta_k) - 1}{EXP(\beta_k)}$$

So, the pseudo elasticity for an indicator variable is computed as:

Review

1. What data are appropriate for Poisson models?
2. Why can't regression coefficients be used to reflect 'effect' of covariates?

Poisson Models, GOF Measures

Log-likelihood ratio test to compare restricted and unrestricted models

$$-2[LL(\beta_R) - LL(\beta_U)] \approx \chi^2(\alpha, df_U - df_R)$$

The sum of model deviances, G-square, is equal to zero for a model with perfect fit.

$$G^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \ln \left(\frac{y_i}{\hat{\lambda}_i} \right)$$

Poisson Models, GOF Measures

A measure similar to R-square is given as

$$R_p^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{y_i - \hat{\lambda}_i}{\sqrt{\hat{\lambda}_i}} \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{y_i - \bar{y}}{\sqrt{\bar{y}}} \right]^2}$$

Another measure of overall model fit is the ρ -square statistic.

$$\rho^2 = 1 - \frac{LL(\beta)}{LL(0)}$$

Poisson Models, GOF Measures

Because of the non-linearity of the conditional mean and heteroscedasticity in the regression, there is no 'true' equivalent of R-square.

Example 1: Intersection Accidents at two-lane rural roads in California and Michigan.

| Variable Abbreviation | Variable Description | Maximum / Minimum Values | Mean of Observations | Standard Deviation of Observations |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>State</i> | Indicator variable for state: 0 = California; 1 = Michigan. | 1 / 0 | 0.29 | 0.45 |
| <i>Accident</i> | Count of injury accidents over observation period | 13 / 0 | 2.62 | 3.36 |
| <i>AADT1</i> | Average annual daily traffic on major road | 33058 / 2367 | 12870 | 6798 |
| <i>AADT2</i> | Average annual daily traffic on minor road | 3001 / 15 | 596 | 679 |
| <i>Median</i> | Median width on major road in feet | 36 / 0 | 3.74 | 6.06 |
| <i>Drive</i> | Number of driveways within 250 feet of intersection center | 15 / 0 | 3.10 | 3.90 |

Resultant Model

So, the estimated model has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} E[y_i] &= \lambda_i = EXP(\beta X_i) \\ &= EXP\left(-0.83 + 0.00008(AADT1_i) + 0.0005(AADT2_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. -0.06(Median_i) + 0.07(Drive_i) \right) \\ &= EXP^{-0.83} EXP^{0.00008(AADT1)} EXP^{0.07(Drive)} \\ &= (0.436)(AADT1Factor).....(DriveFactor) \end{aligned}$$

The model is additive in the exponent or multiplicative on the expected value of y.

Formatted Model Output

| Independent Variable | Estimated Parameter | <i>t</i> -statistic |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Constant | -0.826 | -3.57 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Major Road | 0.0000812 | 6.90 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Minor Road | 0.000550 | 7.38 |
| Median width in feet | - 0.0600 | - 2.73 |
| Number of driveways with 250 feet of intersection | 0.0748 | 4.54 |
| Number of observations | 84 | |
| Restricted Log likelihood (constant term only) | -246.18 | |
| Log likelihood at convergence | -169.26 | |
| Chi-squared and associated <i>p</i> -value | 153.85 | <0.0000001 |
| R_p -Squared | 0.4792 | |
| G^2 | 176.5 | |

Model Elasticities

| Independent Variable | Elasticity |
|---|------------|
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Major Road | 1.045 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Minor Road | 0.327 |
| Median width in feet | -0.228 |
| Number of driveways with 250 feet of intersection | 0.232 |

Major road traffic has approximately 3 x the effect on crashes than does minor road traffic. Increasing the median width 1% decreases expected crash count by .22. Driveways nearby increase crashes.

Poisson Model Restriction

- The Poisson distribution has one parameter, λ , which represent the distribution mean and variance.
- Often in real data the variance is not equal to the mean (e.g. statistically), and the Poisson model is not appropriate for the count process.
- We say that there is 'extra' heterogeneity across the Poisson means.

Over-dispersion

- Over-dispersion ($\text{VAR}[Y] > E[Y]$) occurs in the following conditions:
- A Poisson process over an interval whose length is random rather than fixed
- Inter-subject variability (each individual has Poisson process with mean Z as a random variable. In this case we assume $E(Z) = \lambda$ and $\text{VAR}(Z) = \lambda / \phi$, where ϕ is larger or smaller than one.

Over-dispersion (cntd.)

- When over-dispersion occurs we should change the model to accommodate it.
- We can:
 - assume the overdispersion is gamma distributed across means—resulting in a negative binomial model (or Poisson-gamma model)
 - assume the overdispersion is normally distributed (Poisson-normal model)

Poisson & Negative Binomial Models

$VAR(Y_i) = \sigma^2 E(Y_i)$; where

$\sigma^2 =$ dispersion parameter

$\sigma^2 > 1$ (overdispersion)

$\sigma^2 < 1$ (underdispersion)

Negative Binomial Models

$$\lambda_i = EXP(\beta'x_i + \varepsilon_i)$$

where;

EXP^{ε_i} is gamma distributed with mean = 1
and variance α

Negative Binomial Model

The model has an additional parameter alpha, such that:

$$VAR(y_i) = E[y_i] \{1 + \alpha E(Y_i)\}$$

When $\alpha = 0$, the model “collapses” to the Poisson model. The over-dispersion rate is given by:

$$\frac{VAR(y_i)}{E[y_i]} = \{1 + \alpha E(Y_i)\}$$

Test for Overdispersion

A test by Cameron and Trevedi (1990). It is based on the assumption that under the Poisson model $(y_i - E[y_i])^2 - E[y_i]$ has mean zero.

$$H_0 : \text{VAR}[y_i] = E[y_i]$$

$$H_A : \text{VAR}[y_i] = E[y_i] + \alpha g(E[y_i])$$

Test for Overdispersion

To conduct this test, a simple linear regression is estimated where Z_i is regressed on W_i , where,

$$Z_i = \frac{(y_i - E(y_i))^2 - y_i}{E(y_i)\sqrt{2}}$$
$$W_i = \frac{g(E(y_i))}{\sqrt{2}}$$

After running the regression $Z_i = b_i W_i$ with $g(E[y_i]) = \lambda$ and $g(E[y_i]) = \lambda$, if b is statistically significant in both cases, then H_0 is rejected for the particular function g .

Negative Binomial Model

| Independent Variable | Estimated Parameter | <i>t</i> -statistic |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Constant | -0.931 | -2.37 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Major Road | 0.0000900 | 3.47 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Minor Road | 0.000610 | 3.09 |
| Median width in feet | - 0.0670 | - 1.99 |
| Number of driveways with 250 feet of intersection | 0.0632 | 2.24 |
| Overdispersion parameter, α | 0.516 | 3.09 |
| Number of observations | 84 | |
| Restricted Log likelihood (constant term only) | -169.26 | |
| Log likelihood at convergence | -153.28 | |
| Chi-squared and associated <i>p</i> -value | 31.95 | <0.0000001 |

Poisson Model

| Independent Variable | Estimated Parameter | <i>t</i> -statistic |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Constant | -0.826 | -3.57 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Major Road | 0.0000812 | 6.90 |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic on Minor Road | 0.000550 | 7.38 |
| Median width in feet | - 0.0600 | - 2.73 |
| Number of driveways with 250 feet of intersection | 0.0748 | 4.54 |
| Number of observations | 84 | |
| Restricted Log likelihood (constant term only) | -246.18 | |
| Log likelihood at convergence | -169.26 | |
| Chi-squared and associated <i>p</i> -value | 153.85 | <0.0000001 |
| <i>R_p</i> -Squared | 0.4792 | |
| <i>G</i> ² | 176.5 | |

Review

- Describe ‘over-dispersion’
- How does the negative binomial model arise?
- Are there other models for over-dispersion that could be used?