ECO 475 Homework 1

Tianhao Wang 1003907061

February 20, 2020

1

Given the truncation model as

$$y = \begin{cases} x^T \beta + \epsilon, & \text{if } L < y^* < U \\ NA, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, we can estimate β and σ^2 as follows.

Recall that

$$\begin{split} F_{\epsilon}(\epsilon = t | L < \epsilon < U) &= Pr(\epsilon \le t | L < \epsilon < U) \\ &= \frac{Pr(\epsilon \le t, L < \epsilon < U)}{Pr(L < \epsilon < U)} = \frac{\Phi(\frac{t}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L}{\sigma})}{\Phi(\frac{U}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L}{\sigma})}, \quad \forall \ t \in (L, U), \end{split}$$

and 0 otherwise. Thus, we have

$$f_{\epsilon}(\epsilon = t | L < \epsilon < U) = F'_{\epsilon}(\epsilon = t | L < \epsilon < U) = \frac{\phi(\frac{t}{\sigma})}{\sigma[\Phi(\frac{U}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L}{\sigma})]} \quad \forall \ t \in (L, U).$$

Then, we have 2 methods to consistently estimate β and σ^2 . ¹.

1. Method 1: NLLS.

$$E[y|x] = E[y^*|x, y^* \in (L, U)]$$

$$= E[x^T \beta + \epsilon | x, x^T \beta + \epsilon \in (L, U)]$$

$$= x^T \beta + E[\epsilon | \epsilon \in (L - x^T \beta, U - x^T \beta)].$$

 $^{^{1}}$ For grading purposes, please grade Method 1 only. For evaluation purposes, please evaluate Method 2, if you have extra time. Thank you!

Further, let $L^* = L - x^T \beta$ and $u^* = U - x^T \beta$ for notation convenience.

$$\begin{split} E[\epsilon|\epsilon \in (L^*,U^*)] &= \int_{L^*}^{U^*} \epsilon \cdot f_{\epsilon}(\epsilon|L^* < \epsilon < U^*) d\epsilon \\ &= \int_{L^*}^{U^*} \epsilon \cdot \frac{\phi(\frac{t}{\sigma})}{\sigma[\Phi(\frac{U^*}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L^*}{\sigma})]} d\epsilon \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{\Phi(\frac{U^*}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L^*}{\sigma})} \int_{L^*}^{U^*} \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma} \phi(\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma}) d\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma} \\ &= \frac{\sigma}{\Phi(\frac{U^*}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L^*}{\sigma})} \left(\phi(\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma})\right|_{\epsilon=U^*}^{L^*} = \sigma \frac{\phi(\frac{U^*}{\sigma}) - \phi(\frac{L^*}{\sigma})}{\Phi(\frac{U^*}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L^*}{\sigma})} \stackrel{def}{=} \sigma \lambda(\frac{L^*}{\sigma}, \frac{U^*}{\sigma}) \end{split}$$

Therefore,

$$E[y|x] = E[y^*|x, y^* \in (L, U)] = x^T \beta + \sigma \lambda (\frac{L^*}{\sigma}, \frac{U^*}{\sigma}).$$

$$(\widehat{\beta}_{NLLS}, \widehat{\sigma}_{NLLS}^2) = \underset{\boldsymbol{b}, \sigma^2}{\arg\min} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\boldsymbol{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \sigma \lambda(\cdot) - y_i)^2.$$

2. Method 2: MLE.

Given $F_{\nu}(y=t) = F_{\epsilon}(\epsilon = t - x^T \beta) = Pr(\epsilon \le t - x^T \beta)$, $\forall t \in (L, U)$, and 0 otherwise, we have

$$f(y=t|x) = \frac{\phi(\frac{t-x^T\beta}{\sigma})}{\sigma[\Phi(\frac{U}{\sigma}) - \Phi(\frac{L}{\sigma})]} \quad \forall \ t \in (L, U).$$

Therefore, we can do MLE via

$$(\widehat{\beta}_{MLE}, \widehat{\sigma}_{MLE}^2) = \underset{b, \sigma^2}{\operatorname{arg max}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln f(y_i | x_i).$$

Clearly, neither method would give a explicit solution via FOC of Lagrangian optimization. Fortunately, the solution does exists, refer to the textbook Chap.16.3.

Therefore, the next step I would do is to estimate β and σ^2 via MATLAB etc, where function argmax and argmin are built in.

2

(a) The result of β_{probit} is as follows.

Under the model given by

$$y_i = I(y_i^* \ge 0) = I(x_i^T \beta_{probit} \ge \epsilon_i),$$

the coefficients above are unique only up to a multiplicative constant.

Therefore, given the normalized variance of ϵ_i as 1, the interpretation of the coefficients is that the coefficient β_j represent the effect on y^* of a one unit change in the value of x_j (or v.s. if x_j is discrete), which identify the direction and significant level of x_j affects on y via function $I(\cdot)$.

Meanwhile, given the p-value of β_j , we rejected the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_j = 0$ at 95% confidence level for $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, but failed to reject it for $j \in \{0\}$.

	estimate	Std. Error	t-statistic	p-value	Sig
$\overline{\beta_0}$	-0.9246	0.4803	-1.925	0.05422	
eta_1	2.0117	0.5230	3.846	0.00012	***
eta_2	-3.3239	0.7008	-4.743	2.10e-06	***
eta_3	2.6569	0.5627	4.722	2.34e-06	***
eta_4	0.9050	0.2630	3.441	0.00058	***
eta_5	-2.3806	0.5334	-4.463	8.07e-06	***
β_6	0.3098	0.1505	2.059	0.03950	*

Table 1: Probit Model Regression Result

(b) On average, the change in probability of opening a new KFC store at the location from having a McDonald near by versus not having one is -0.4265715.

On average, the change in probability of opening a new KFC store at the location from increasing 1% distance to the nearest KFC distribution center is -0.3081857.

(c) The result of β_{logit} is as follows.

	estimate	Std. Error	t-statistic	p-value	Sig
$\overline{\beta_0}$	-1.5653	0.8618	-1.816	0.069343	
eta_1	3.4151	0.9587	3.562	0.000367	***
eta_2	-5.7684	1.3219	-4.364	1.28e-05	***
eta_3	4.6095	1.0646	4.330	1.49e-05	***
eta_4	1.5441	0.4804	3.214	0.001308	**
eta_5	-4.1066	0.9933	-4.134	3.56e-05	***
β_6	0.5346	0.2733	1.956	0.050501	

Table 2: Logit Model Regression Result

under the model given by

$$y_i = I(y_i^* \ge 0) = I(x_i^T \beta_{logit} \ge \epsilon_i).$$

The coefficients above are unique only up to a multiplicative constant.

Therefore, given the normalized variance of ϵ_i as $\frac{\pi^2}{3}$, the interpretation of the coefficients is that the coefficient β_j represent the effect on y^* of a one unit change in the value of x_j (or v.s. if x_j is discrete), which identify the direction and significant level of x_j affects on y via function $I(\cdot)$.

Meanwhile, given the p-value of β_j , we rejected the hypothesis H_0 : $\beta_j = 0$ at 95% confidence level for $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, but failed to reject it for $j \in \{0, 6\}$.

Average Marginal Effect:

On average, the change in probability of opening a new KFC store at the location from having a McDonald near by versus not having one is -0.4268979.

On average, the change in probability of opening a new KFC store at the location from increasing 1% distance to the nearest KFC distribution center is -0.3063677.

(d) They are not very different.

$$\frac{\widehat{\beta}_{logit}}{||\widehat{\beta}_{logit}||} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.16669782\\ 0.36370490\\ -0.61432465\\ 0.49089839\\ 0.164444449\\ -0.43734583\\ 0.05693174 \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} -0.16997129\\ 0.36981207\\ -0.61102532\\ 0.48841960\\ 0.16636517\\ -0.43763177\\ 0.05695797 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{\widehat{\beta}_{probit}}{||\widehat{\beta}_{probit}||}$$

3 Appendix

- For code detail, refer to my Github.
- For STATA output of dofile, refer to the next page.

/___ /__ (R /__ / /___/ /___/ ____/ Statistics/Data Analysis

Copyright 1985-2017 StataCorp LLC

StataCorp

4905 Lakeway Drive

College Station, Texas 77845 USA

 800-STATA-PC
 http://www.stata.com

 979-696-4600
 stata@stata.com

979-696-4601 (fax)

Special Edition

22-student Stata lab perpetual license:

Serial number: 401506229836 Licensed to: Map and Data

University of Toronto

Notes:

Unicode is supported; see help unicode_advice.

2. Maximum number of variables is set to 5000; see help-set_maxvar.

running C:\Users\MDW620-CAF\Documents\profile.do ...

1 . do "C:\Users\MDW620-CAF\Documents\Tianhao.do"

2 . use C:\Users\MDW620-CAF\Downloads/hw1data.dta, clear

3

4 . logit y i.x1 i.x2 i.x3 x4 x5 x6

Logistic regression Number of obs = 120 LR chi2(6) = 108.18

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.6536

120

Log likelihood = -28.672342

У	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1.x1	3.415127	.9586819	3.56	0.000	1.536145	5.294109
1.x2	-5.768404	1.321964	-4.36	0.000	-8.359406	-3.177402
1.x3	4.609453	1.064614	4.33	0.000	2.522848	6.696058
x 4	1.544106	.4804108	3.21	0.001	.602518	2.485694
x5	-4.106603	.9933383	-4.13	0.000	-6.053511	-2.159696
x 6	.5345794	.2733479	1.96	0.051	0011727	1.070331
_cons	-1.565264	.8618573	-1.82	0.069	-3.254473	.1239449

5 . margin, dydx(i.x2)

Average marginal effects Number of obs =

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y), predict()

dy/dx w.r.t. : 1.x2

		Delta-method Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1.x2	4268979	.0440885	-9.68	0.000	5133099	3404859

Note: dy/dx for factor levels is the discrete change from the base level.

6 . margin, dydx(x5)

Average marginal effects Number of obs 120 =

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y), predict()

dy/dx w.r.t. : **x5**

		Delta-method Std. Err.		P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
x5	3063677	.0407848	-7.51	0.000	3863045	226431

8 . probit y i.x1 i.x2 i.x3 x4 x5 x6

Iteration 0: log likelihood = -82.760511 Iteration 1: log likelihood = -30.299996 Iteration 2: log likelihood = -28.400517 Iteration 3: log likelihood = -28.336254
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -28.336104
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -28.336104

Probit regression

Number of obs = 120 LR chi2(6) = 108.85 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R2 = 0.6576

Log likelihood = -28.336104

У	Coef.	Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1.x1 1.x2	2.011708 -3.323863	.5337449	3.77	0.000	.9655868 -4.721861	3.057828
1.x3	2.656909	.5679074	4.68	0.000	1.543831	3.769987
x4 x5	.9049947 -2.380636	.2688554 .550527	3.37 -4.32	0.001 0.000	.3780479 -3.459649	1.431941 -1.301623
x6 _cons	.3098398 9246096	.1558339 .4787586	1.99 -1.93	0.047 0.053	.004411 -1.862959	.6152687 .0137399

Note: 8 failures and 3 successes completely determined.

9 . margin, dydx(i.x2)

Number of obs = 120 Average marginal effects

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : 1.x2

		Delta-method Std. Err.	Z	P> z	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1.x2	4265715	.0432721	-9.86	0.000	5113833	3417598

Note: dy/dx for factor levels is the discrete change from the base level.

Tianhao Wang H.M.1 Thursday February 20 10:52:54 2020 Page 3

10 . margin, dydx(x5)

Number of obs = 120 Average marginal effects

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : x5

	dy/dx	Std. Err.			-	Interval]
x5	3081857	.0412259	-7.48	0.000	3889869	2273845

11 . end of do-file

12 .