

GSERM - St. Gallen 2023

Analyzing Panel Data

June 13, 2023

Two-Way Variation

Two-way variation:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \gamma V_i + \delta W_t + u_{it}$$

where V_i don't vary over time (within a unit), and W_t don't vary across units (for a given time point).

Note that we can write:

$$\alpha_i = \sum(\gamma V_i)$$

and

$$\eta_t = \sum(\delta W_t).$$

So:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it} &= \mathbf{X}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \gamma V_i + \delta W_t + u_{it} \\ &= \mathbf{X}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \alpha_i + \eta_t + u_{it} \end{aligned}$$

One- and Two-Way “Unit Effects”

“Two-way” unit effects:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + \eta_t + u_{it}$$

“One-way” effects:


- Assuming $\alpha_i = 0$ (w.l.o.g):

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \eta_t + u_{it} \quad (\text{time})$$

- Assuming $\eta_t = 0$ (w.l.o.g):

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + u_{it} \quad (\text{units})$$

Intuition: One-Way Unit Effects



(One-Way) “Fixed” Effects

“Brute force” model fits:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it} &= \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta_{FE} + \alpha_i + u_{it} \\ &= \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta_{FE} + \alpha_1 I(i=1)_i + \alpha_2 I(i=2)_i + \dots + u_{it} \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, decompose:

$$\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i = \frac{\sum_{N_i} \mathbf{X}_{it}}{N_i}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i.$$

Yields:

$$Y_{it} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i\beta_B + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{it}\beta_W + \alpha_i + u_{it}$$

But!

$$\text{corr}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_i\beta_B, \alpha_i) = 1.0$$

Means that:

$$\begin{aligned}Y_{it}^* &= Y_{it} - \bar{Y}_i \\ \mathbf{X}_{it}^* &= \mathbf{X}_{it} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i\end{aligned}$$

gives:

$$Y_{it}^* = \mathbf{X}_{it}^* \beta_{FE} + u_{it}.$$

→ **A “Fixed Effects” Model is actually a “Within-Effects” Model.**

Standard F -test for

$$H_0 : \alpha_i = \alpha_j \forall i \neq j$$

versus

$$H_A : \alpha_i \neq \alpha_j \text{ for some } i \neq j$$

is $\sim F_{N-1, NT-(N-1)}$.

Running Example Data: WDI, 1960-2022

The World Development Indicators

- Cross-national country-level time series data
- $N = 215$ countries, $T = 73$ years (1960-2022) + missingness
- Variables:
 - Geography: land area, arable land
 - Population indicators
 - Demographics: Birth rates, life expectancy, etc.
 - Economics: GDP, inflation, trade, FDI, etc.
 - Governments: expenditures, policies, etc.
- Full descriptions are listed in the Github repo [here](#).

Data Summary

```
> describe(wdi,fast=TRUE,ranges=FALSE,check=TRUE)
```


	vars	n	mean	sd	se
IS03	1	13545	NaN	NA	NA
Year	2	13545	1991.00	18.18	0.16
Region	3	13545	NaN	NA	NA
country	4	13545	NaN	NA	NA
iso3c	5	13545	NaN	NA	NA
LandArea	6	12728	611322.13	1764229.22	15637.77
ArablePercent	7	11375	13.44	13.53	0.13
Population	8	13300	24919941.35	104042745.30	902165.02
PopGrowth	9	13084	1.77	1.78	0.02
RuralPopulation	10	13268	48.45	25.74	0.22
UrbanPopulation	11	13268	51.55	25.74	0.22
BirthRatePer1K	12	12937	28.02	13.08	0.12
FertilityRate	13	12779	3.91	2.00	0.02
PrimarySchoolAge	14	10699	6.14	0.62	0.01
LifeExpectancy	15	12766	64.63	11.29	0.10
AgeDepRatioOld	16	13300	10.62	6.93	0.06
CO2Emissions	17	5729	4.29	5.49	0.07
GDP	18	9843	245055369928.40	1121079127717.87	11299845990.78
GDPPerCapita	19	9843	11874.12	18895.82	190.46
GDPPerCapGrowth	20	9818	1.93	6.17	0.06
Inflation	21	8502	23.53	327.96	3.56
TotalTrade	22	8548	78.32	54.23	0.59
Exports	23	8548	36.49	28.94	0.31
Imports	24	8557	41.84	27.87	0.30
FDIIn	25	8406	5.50	45.06	0.49
AgriEmployment	26	5764	28.83	23.85	0.31
NetAidReceived	27	8907	473766874.40	900415366.59	9540632.60
MobileCellSubscriptions	28	10057	35.06	51.01	0.51
NaturalResourceRents	29	9211	6.84	11.06	0.12
MilitaryExpenditures	30	7393	2.75	3.21	0.04
GovtExpenditures	31	8197	16.26	8.17	0.09
HIVDeaths	32	4370	8137.20	24927.88	377.09
WomenBusLawIndex	33	9964	59.61	18.62	0.19
PaidParentalLeave	34	9964	0.11	0.31	0.00
ColdWar	35	13545	0.48	0.50	0.00

WDI's Women, Business and the Law Index (WBLI)


The basis for a 2021 World Bank [report](#)...

- Examines “the laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunity in 190 economies” from 1970-2022.
- An index comprising eight indicators “structured around women’s interactions with the law as they move through their careers: *Mobility, Workplace, Pay, Marriage, Parenthood, Entrepreneurship, Assets, and Pension.*”
- The WBL Index:
 - Theoretically ranges from 0 - 100
 - In practice: Lowest values ≈ 20
 - Higher values correspond to higher levels of women’s empowerment and greater opportunities and support for women, particularly in business
- “Better performance in the areas measured by the Women, Business and the Law index is associated with a more narrow gender gap in development outcomes, higher female labor force participation, lower vulnerable employment, and greater representation of women in national parliaments.”

Visualization (using panelView)




Categorical Variable Visualization



WBLI: Total Variation

```
> WDI<-pdata.frame(wdi)
> WBLI<-WDI$WomenBusLawIndex
> class(WBLI)
[1] "pseries" "numeric"


> describe(WBLI,na.rm=TRUE) # all variation
  vars    n  mean   sd median trimmed  mad   min  max range skew kurtosis   se
X1     1 9964 59.6 18.6   58.8    59.6 19.5 17.5 100  82.5 0.02   -0.57 0.19
```



WBLI: "Between" Variation

```
> describe(plm::between(WBLI,effect="individual",na.rm=TRUE)) # "between" variation
```


	vars	n	mean	sd	median	trimmed	mad	min	max	range	skew	kurtosis	se
X1	1	188	59.6	14.5	60.8	60.5	13.2	23.5	90.2	66.7	-0.49	-0.12	1.06



WBLI: “Within” Variation

```
> describe(Within(WBLI,na.rm=TRUE)) # "within" variation
```

	vars	n	mean	sd	median	trimmed	mad	min	max	range	skew	kurtosis	se
X1	1	9964	0	11.8	-1.08	-0.32	10.7	-45.7	56.9	103	0.25	0.39	0.12



A Regression Model

Regression model:

$$\text{WBLI}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Population Growth}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{Urban Population}_{it} + \beta_3 \text{Fertility Rate}_{it} + \beta_4 \ln(\text{GDP Per Capita})_{it} + \beta_5 \text{Natural Resource Rents}_{it} + \beta_6 \text{Cold War}_t + u_{it}$$

Descriptive Statistics:

	vars	n	mean	sd	min	max	range	se
WomenBusLawIndex	1	8100	60.69	18.95	17.50	100.00	82.50	0.21
PopGrowth	2	8100	1.65	1.54	-16.88	19.36	36.24	0.02
UrbanPopulation	3	8100	51.56	23.82	2.85	100.00	97.16	0.26
FertilityRate	4	8100	3.61	1.90	0.77	8.61	7.83	0.02
NaturalResourceRents	5	8100	7.04	10.77	0.00	88.59	88.59	0.12
ColdWar	6	8100	0.30	0.46	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.01
lnGDPPerCap	7	8100	8.29	1.44	5.04	11.64	6.60	0.02

Regression: Pooled OLS

```
> OLS<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+          log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,
+          data=WDI,model="pooling")
```

```
> summary(OLS)
Pooling Model
```

Call:

```
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
      FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
      ColdWar, data = WDI, model = "pooling")
```

Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100

Residuals:

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
-50.32	-8.50	1.05	9.20	43.83

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	60.4325	1.6861	35.8	< 2e-16 ***
PopGrowth	-2.3630	0.1306	-18.1	< 2e-16 ***
UrbanPopulation	-0.0587	0.0105	-5.6	0.000000022 ***
FertilityRate	-2.5215	0.1592	-15.8	< 2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	2.6533	0.1936	13.7	< 2e-16 ***
NaturalResourceRents	-0.3398	0.0155	-21.9	< 2e-16 ***
ColdWar	-10.9584	0.3715	-29.5	< 2e-16 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Total Sum of Squares: 2910000

Residual Sum of Squares: 1450000

R-Squared: 0.501

Adj. R-Squared: 0.501

F-statistic: 1354.19 on 6 and 8093 DF, p-value: <2e-16

"Fixed" (Within) Effects

```
> FE<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+         log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+         effect="individual",model="within")
```

```
> summary(FE)
```

Oneway (individual) effect Within Model

Call:

```
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
    FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
    ColdWar, data = WDI, effect = "individual", model = "within")
```

Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100

Residuals:

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
	-33.588	-5.063	-0.437	4.833	52.886

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)
PopGrowth	-0.0891	0.0955	-0.93	0.35085
UrbanPopulation	0.3062	0.0198	15.46	< 2e-16 ***
FertilityRate	-2.0328	0.1620	-12.55	< 2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	8.7230	0.2998	29.10	< 2e-16 ***
NaturalResourceRents	0.0647	0.0172	3.76	0.00017 ***
ColdWar	-6.8691	0.2959	-23.22	< 2e-16 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Total Sum of Squares: 1050000

Residual Sum of Squares: 492000

R-Squared: 0.532

Adj. R-Squared: 0.521

F-statistic: 1500.96 on 6 and 7907 DF, p-value: <2e-16

A Nicer Table

Table: Models of WBLI

	OLS	FE
Population Growth	-2.360*** (0.131)	-0.089 (0.095)
Urban Population	-0.059*** (0.010)	0.306*** (0.020)
Fertility Rate	-2.520*** (0.159)	-2.030*** (0.162)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	2.650*** (0.194)	8.720*** (0.300)
Natural Resource Rents	-0.340*** (0.015)	0.065*** (0.017)
Cold War	-11.000*** (0.372)	-6.870*** (0.296)
Constant	60.400*** (1.690)	
Observations	8,100	8,100
R ²	0.501	0.532
Adjusted R ²	0.501	0.521
F Statistic	1,354.000*** (df = 6; 8093)	1,501.000*** (df = 6; 7907)

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Time-Period Fixed Effects

The model is:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \eta_t + u_{it}$$

which is estimated via:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it}^{**} &= Y_{it} - \bar{Y}_t \\ \mathbf{X}_{it}^{**} &= \mathbf{X}_{it} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_t \end{aligned}$$

$$Y_{it}^{**} = \beta_{FE} \mathbf{X}_{it}^{**} + u_{it}.$$

Comparison: Unit vs. Time Fixed Effects

Table: FE Models of WBLI (Units vs. Time)

	FE.Units	FE.Time
Population Growth	-0.089 (0.095)	-2.600*** (0.123)
Urban Population	0.306*** (0.020)	-0.060*** (0.010)
Fertility Rate	-2.030*** (0.162)	-1.560*** (0.154)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	8.720*** (0.300)	3.020*** (0.183)
Natural Resource Rents	0.065*** (0.017)	-0.378*** (0.015)
Cold War	-6.870*** (0.296)	
Observations	8,100	8,100
R ²	0.532	0.403
Adjusted R ²	0.521	0.399
F Statistic	1,501.000*** (df = 6; 7907)	1,088.000*** (df = 5; 8043)

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

The specification:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + u_{it}$$

...suggests that we can use an F -test to examine the hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \alpha_i = 0 \ \forall \ i$$

(and a similar test for $\eta_t = 0$ in the time-centered case).

Arguably better are Lagrange multiplier-based tests:

- Breusch-Pagan (1980)
- King and Wu (1997)
- See (e.g.) Croissant and Millo (2018, §4.1) for details

FE (Country) Model Tests

```
> pFtest(FE,OLS)
```

F test for individual effects

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
F = 83, df1 = 186, df2 = 7907, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

```
> plmtest(FE,effect=c("individual"),type=c("bp"))
```

Lagrange Multiplier Test - (Breusch-Pagan)

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
chisq = 51501, df = 1, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

```
> plmtest(FE,effect=c("individual"),type=c("kw"))
```

Lagrange Multiplier Test - (King and Wu)

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
normal = 227, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

Same For Time Effects

```
> pFtest(FE.Time,OLS)
```

F test for time effects

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
F = 23, df1 = 50, df2 = 8043, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

```
> plmtest(FE.Time,effect=c("time"),type=c("bp"))
```

Lagrange Multiplier Test - time effects (Breusch-Pagan)

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
chisq = 9131, df = 1, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

```
> plmtest(FE.Time,effect=c("time"),type=c("kw"))
```

Lagrange Multiplier Test - time effects (King and Wu)

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
normal = 96, p-value <2e-16  
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```


Fixed Effects: Interpretation

FE models are *subject-specific* models, that rely entirely on *within-unit* variability to estimate variable effects.

- This means that:

$$\hat{\beta}_k = \frac{\partial E(Y|\hat{\alpha})}{\partial X_k}$$

- That is, $\hat{\beta}_k$ is *the expected change in $E(Y)$ associated with a one-unit increase in observation i 's value of X_k*
- Key: *within-unit* changes in **X** are associated with *within-unit* expected changes in Y .
- In a linear model, the value of $\hat{\alpha}$ doesn't affect the value of that partial derivative...

Fixed Effects: Interpretation

Mummolo and Peterson (2018) note that:

“...because the within-unit variation is always smaller (or at least, no larger) than the overall variation in the independent variable, researchers should use within-unit variation to motivate counterfactuals when discussing the substantive impact of a treatment” (2018, 829).

Significance:

- Predictors **X** in FE models typically have both cross-sectional and temporal variation
- FE models only consider *within-unit* variation in **X** and *Y*
- As a result, the degree of actual/observed (within-unit) variation in predictors is almost always less – and sometimes significantly less – than if cross-sectional variation were also considered

Interpretation Example: Urban Population

UrbanPopulation – All Variation:

```
> with(WDI, sd(UrbanPopulation,na.rm=TRUE)) # all variation  
[1] 25.7
```

UrbanPopulation – “Within” Variation:

```
> WDI<-ddply(WDI, .(ISO3), mutate,  
+           UPMean = mean(UrbanPopulation,na.rm=TRUE))  
> WDI$UPWithin<-with(WDI, UrbanPopulation-UPMean)  
>  
> with(WDI, sd(UPWithin,na.rm=TRUE)) # "within" variation  
[1] 8.96
```

“While the overall variation in the independent variable may be large, the within-unit variation used to estimate β may be much smaller” (M & P 2018, 830).

Pros and Cons of “Fixed” Effects

Pros:

- Mitigates (Some) Specification Bias
- Simple + Intuitive
- Widely Used/Understood

Cons (see e.g. [Collischon and Eberl 2020](#)):

- Can't Estimate β_B
- Slowly-Changing \mathbf{X} s
- (In)Efficiency / Inconsistency (Incidental Parameters)
- Cannot Control for (e.g.) Time-Varying Heterogeneity
- Sensitivity to Measurement Error

“Between” Effects

From the equation above:

$$Y_{it} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \beta_B + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{it} \beta_W + \alpha_i + u_{it}$$

...we can derive a “Between Effects” model:

$$\bar{Y}_i = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \beta_B + u_{it}$$

This model:

- is essentially cross-sectional,
- is based on N observations,
- considers *only* between-unit (average) differences
- Interpretation:

$\hat{\beta}_B$ is the expected difference in Y between two units whose values on \bar{X} differ by a value of 1.0.

“Between” Effects

```
> BE<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+         log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+         effect="individual",model="between")
```

```
> summary(BE)
Oneway (individual) effect Between Model
```

```
Call:
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
    FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
    ColdWar, data = WDI, effect = "individual", model = "between")
```

```
Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100
Observations used in estimation: 187
```

```
Residuals:
    Min. 1st Qu.  Median 3rd Qu.    Max.
-30.892  -6.245   0.909   8.222  22.558
```

```
Coefficients:
                Estimate Std. Error t-value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)      57.5438    10.4874   5.49 0.000000137 ***
PopGrowth        -5.8141     1.0423  -5.58 0.000000088 ***
UrbanPopulation  -0.0420     0.0553  -0.76  0.44838
FertilityRate     -0.3862     1.1364  -0.34  0.73439
log(GDPPerCapita) 2.6886     1.1516   2.33  0.02066 *
NaturalResourceRents -0.3323  0.0913  -3.64  0.00036 ***
ColdWar          -11.9779    5.1223  -2.34  0.02047 *
```

```
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
Total Sum of Squares:    45000
Residual Sum of Squares: 18700
R-Squared:      0.584
Adj. R-Squared: 0.57
F-statistic: 42.1563 on 6 and 180 DF, p-value: <2e-16
```

A Nicer Table (Again)

Table: Models of WBLI

	OLS	FE	BE
Population Growth	-2.360*** (0.131)	-0.089 (0.095)	-5.810*** (1.040)
Urban Population	-0.059*** (0.010)	0.306*** (0.020)	-0.042 (0.055)
Fertility Rate	-2.520*** (0.159)	-2.030*** (0.162)	-0.386 (1.140)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	2.650*** (0.194)	8.720*** (0.300)	2.690** (1.150)
Natural Resource Rents	-0.340*** (0.015)	0.065*** (0.017)	-0.332*** (0.091)
Cold War	-11.000*** (0.372)	-6.870*** (0.296)	-12.000** (5.120)
Constant	60.400*** (1.690)		57.500*** (10.500)
Observations	8,100	8,100	187
R ²	0.501	0.532	0.584
Adjusted R ²	0.501	0.521	0.570
F Statistic	1,354.000*** (df = 6; 8093)	1,501.000*** (df = 6; 7907)	42.200*** (df = 6; 180)

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

“Random” Effects

Model:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + u_{it}$$

with:

$$u_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \eta_{it}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E(\alpha_i) &= E(\lambda_t) = E(\eta_{it}) &= 0, \\ E(\alpha_i \lambda_t) &= E(\alpha_i \eta_{it}) = E(\lambda_t \eta_{it}) &= 0, \\ E(\alpha_i \alpha_j) &= \sigma_\alpha^2 \text{ if } i = j, \text{ 0 otherwise,} \\ E(\lambda_t \lambda_s) &= \sigma_\lambda^2 \text{ if } t = s, \text{ 0 otherwise,} \\ E(\eta_{it} \eta_{js}) &= \sigma_\eta^2 \text{ if } i = j, \text{ } t = s, \text{ 0 otherwise,} \\ E(\alpha_i \mathbf{X}_{it}) &= E(\lambda_t \mathbf{X}_{it}) = E(\eta_{it} \mathbf{X}_{it}) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If those assumptions are met, we can consider the “two-way variance components” model where:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(u_{it}) &= \text{Var}(Y_{it}|\mathbf{X}_{it}) \\ &= \sigma_{\alpha}^2 + \sigma_{\lambda}^2 + \sigma_{\eta}^2 \end{aligned}$$

If we assume $\lambda_t = 0$, then we get a model like:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + \eta_{it}$$

with total error variance:

$$\sigma_u^2 = \sigma_{\alpha}^2 + \sigma_{\eta}^2.$$

“Random” Effects: Estimation

The model above will violate the standard OLS assumptions of uncorrelated errors, because the (compound) “errors” u_{it} within each unit share a common component α_i .

Consider the within- i variance-covariance matrix of the errors \mathbf{u} :

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i') \equiv \mathbf{\Sigma}_i &= \sigma_\eta^2 \mathbf{I}_T + \sigma_\alpha^2 \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}' \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\eta^2 + \sigma_\alpha^2 & \sigma_\alpha^2 & \cdots & \sigma_\alpha^2 \\ \sigma_\alpha^2 & \sigma_\eta^2 + \sigma_\alpha^2 & \cdots & \sigma_\alpha^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_\alpha^2 & \sigma_\alpha^2 & \cdots & \sigma_\eta^2 + \sigma_\alpha^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming conditional independence across units, we then have:

$$\text{Var}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{\Omega} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{\Sigma}_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{\Sigma}_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathbf{\Sigma}_N \end{pmatrix}$$

“Random” Effects: Estimation

We can then show that:

$$\Sigma^{-1/2} = \frac{1}{\sigma_\eta} \left[\mathbf{I}_T - \left(\frac{\theta}{T} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}' \right) \right]$$

where

$$\theta = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{T\sigma_\alpha^2 + \sigma_\eta^2}}$$

is an unknown quantity to be estimated.

Starting with an estimate of $\hat{\theta}$, calculate:


$$\begin{aligned} Y_{it}^* &= Y_{it} - \hat{\theta} \bar{Y}_i \\ X_{it}^* &= X_{it} - \hat{\theta} \bar{X}_i, \end{aligned}$$

then estimate:

$$Y_{it}^* = (1 - \hat{\theta})\alpha + X_{it}^* \beta_{RE} + [(1 - \hat{\theta})\alpha_i + (\eta_{it} - \hat{\theta} \bar{\eta}_i)]$$

and iterate between the two processes until convergence.

“Random” Effects: An Alternative View



Random Effects

```
> RE<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+         log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+         effect="individual",model="random")
```

```
> summary(RE)
```

```
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
(Swamy-Arora's transformation)
```

```
Call:
```

```
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
      FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
      ColdWar, data = WDI, effect = "individual", model = "random")
```

```
Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100
```

```
Effects:
```

	var	std.dev	share
idiosyncratic	62.19	7.89	0.4
individual	94.85	9.74	0.6

theta:

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
	0.371	0.876	0.888	0.880	0.888	0.888

```
Residuals:
```

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
	-33.8	-5.4	-0.5	0.0	5.7	44.0

```
Coefficients:
```

	Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	Pr(> z)
(Intercept)	3.1144	2.5564	1.22	0.223
PopGrowth	-0.1835	0.0974	-1.88	0.060 .
UrbanPopulation	0.1881	0.0186	10.09	<2e-16 ***
FertilityRate	-2.3476	0.1618	-14.51	<2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	7.1058	0.2839	25.03	<2e-16 ***
NaturalResourceRents	0.0342	0.0172	1.99	0.047 *
ColdWar	-8.1682	0.2908	-28.08	<2e-16 ***

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
Total Sum of Squares: 1100000
```

```
Residual Sum of Squares: 531000
```

```
R-Squared: 0.516
```

```
Adj. R-Squared: 0.516
```

```
Chisq: 8389.06 on 6 DF, p-value: <2e-16
```

A Nicer Table (Yet Again)

Table: Models of WBLI

	OLS	FE	BE	RE
Population Growth	-2.360*** (0.131)	-0.089 (0.095)	-5.810*** (1.040)	-0.184* (0.097)
Urban Population	-0.059*** (0.010)	0.306*** (0.020)	-0.042 (0.055)	0.188*** (0.019)
Fertility Rate	-2.520*** (0.159)	-2.030*** (0.162)	-0.386 (1.140)	-2.350*** (0.162)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	2.650*** (0.194)	8.720*** (0.300)	2.690** (1.150)	7.110*** (0.284)
Natural Resource Rents	-0.340*** (0.015)	0.065*** (0.017)	-0.332*** (0.091)	0.034** (0.017)
Cold War	-11.000*** (0.372)	-6.870*** (0.296)	-12.000** (5.120)	-8.170*** (0.291)
Constant	60.400*** (1.690)		57.500*** (10.500)	3.110 (2.560)
Observations	8,100	8,100	187	8,100
R ²	0.501	0.532	0.584	0.516
Adjusted R ²	0.501	0.521	0.570	0.516
F Statistic	1,354.000*** (df = 6; 8093)	1,501.000*** (df = 6; 7907)	42.200*** (df = 6; 180)	8,389.000***

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

“Random” Effects: Testing

Intuition:

- RE models require that $\text{Cov}(X_{it}, \alpha_i) = 0$.
- FE models do not.

This means that:

Model	Reality	
	$\text{Cov}(X_{it}, \alpha_i) = 0$	$\text{Cov}(X_{it}, \alpha_i) \neq 0$
Fixed Effects	Consistent, Inefficient	Consistent, Efficient
Random Effects	Consistent, Efficient	Inconsistent

The Hausman Test

Hausman test (FE vs. RE):

$$\hat{W} = (\hat{\beta}_{\text{FE}} - \hat{\beta}_{\text{RE}})'(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\text{FE}} - \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\text{RE}})^{-1}(\hat{\beta}_{\text{FE}} - \hat{\beta}_{\text{RE}})$$

$$W \sim \chi_k^2$$

Null: The RE model is consistent ($\text{Cov}(X_{it}, \alpha_i) = 0$).

Issues:

- Asymptotic
- No guarantee $(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\text{FE}} - \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\text{RE}})^{-1}$ is positive definite
- A general specification test...

Hausman Test Results

Hausman test (FE vs. RE):

```
> phtest(FE, RE) # ugh...
```

Hausman Test

```
data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...  
chisq = 10835, df = 6, p-value <2e-16
```

alternative hypothesis: one model is inconsistent

Practical “Fixed” vs. “Random” Effects

Factors to consider:

- “Panel” vs. “TSCS” Data
- Nature of the Data-Generating Processes
- Importance of Non-Time-Varying Covariate Effects
- Dimension/Location of the Variance in the Data (N vs. T)

Connections: Hierarchical Linear Models

HLM Starting Points

Begin by considering a two-level “nested” data structure, with:

$$\begin{aligned} i &\in \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \text{ indexing first-level units, and} \\ j &\in \{1, 2, \dots, J\} \text{ indexing second-level groups.} \end{aligned}$$

A general two-level HLM is an equation of the form:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \mathbf{X}_{ij}\beta_j + u_{ij} \tag{1}$$

where β_{0j} is a “constant” term, \mathbf{X}_{ij} is a $NJ \times K$ matrix of K covariates, β_j is a $K \times 1$ vector of parameters, and $u_{ij} \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0, \sigma_u^2)$ is the usual random-disturbance assumption.

Each of the $K + 1$ “level-one” parameters is then allowed to vary across Q “level-two” variables \mathbf{Z}_j , so that:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \mathbf{Z}_j\gamma_0 + \varepsilon_{0j} \quad (2)$$

for the “intercept” and

$$\beta_{kj} = \gamma_{k0} + \mathbf{Z}_j\gamma_k + \varepsilon_{kj} \quad (3)$$

for the “slopes” of \mathbf{X} . The ε s are typically assumed to be distributed multivariate Normal, with parameters for the variances and covariances selected by the analyst. Substitution of (2) and (3) into (1) yields:

$$Y_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \mathbf{Z}_j\gamma_0 + \mathbf{X}_{ij}\gamma_{k0} + \mathbf{X}_{ij}\mathbf{Z}_j\gamma_k + \mathbf{X}_{ij}\varepsilon_{kj} + \varepsilon_{0j} + u_{ij} \quad (4)$$

The form is essentially a model with “saturated” interaction effects across the various levels, as well as “errors” which are multivariate Normal.

Model Assumptions

- Linearity / Additivity
- Normality of u s
- Homoscedasticity
- Residual Independence:
 - $\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{\cdot j}, u_{ij}) = 0$
 - $\text{Cov}(u_{ij}, u_{i\ell}) = 0$

Model Fitting

- MLE
- “Restricted” MLE (“RMLE”)
- Choosing:
 - MLE is biased in small samples, especially for estimating variances
 - RMLE is not, but prevents use of LR tests when the models do not have identical fixed effects
 - In general: RMLE is better with small sample sizes, but MLE is fine in larger ones

Note that if we specify:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \varepsilon_{0j}$$

and

$$\beta_{kj} = \gamma_{k0}$$

we get:

$$Y_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \mathbf{X}_{ij}\gamma_{k0} + \varepsilon_{0j} + u_{ij}$$

which is the RE model above (formally, a “one-level random-intercept” HLM).

In addition:

- HLMs can be expanded to 3- and 4- and higher-level models
- One can include cross-level interactions...

HLMs are widely used in education, psychology, ecology, etc. (less so in economics, political science). Also, there are many, many excellent [books](#), [websites](#), etc. that address HLMs

Random Effects Remix (using lmer)

```
> AltRE<-lmer(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+             log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar+(1|IS03),
+             data=WDI)

> summary(AltRE)
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
Formula: WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate +
        log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents + ColdWar + (1 | IS03)
Data: WDI
```

REML criterion at convergence: 57477

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-4.262	-0.644	-0.066	0.624	6.595

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.
IS03	(Intercept)	347.3	18.64
Residual		62.3	7.89

Number of obs: 8100, groups: IS03, 187

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-10.9001	2.9106	-3.74
PopGrowth	-0.1166	0.0954	-1.22
UrbanPopulation	0.2655	0.0193	13.76
FertilityRate	-2.1365	0.1608	-13.29
log(GDPPerCapita)	8.1586	0.2925	27.90
NaturalResourceRents	0.0558	0.0171	3.27
ColdWar	-7.3293	0.2918	-25.12

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	PpGrwt	UrbnPop	FrtltR	l(GDPP	NtrlRR
PopGrowth	0.041					
UrbanPopltn	-0.199	0.004				
FertilityRt	-0.402	-0.272	0.433			
lg(GDPPPrCp)	-0.757	-0.049	-0.282	0.105		
NtrlRsrcRnt	-0.018	-0.080	-0.021	-0.099	0.005	
ColdWar	-0.114	0.043	0.214	-0.432	0.112	0.062

Q: Are They The Same? [A: More Or Less]

Table: RE and HLM Models of WBLI

	RE	AltRE
Population Growth	-0.184* (0.097)	-0.117 (0.095)
Urban Population	0.188*** (0.019)	0.266*** (0.019)
Fertility Rate	-2.350*** (0.162)	-2.140*** (0.161)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	7.110*** (0.284)	8.160*** (0.292)
Natural Resource Rents	0.034** (0.017)	0.056*** (0.017)
Cold War	-8.170*** (0.291)	-7.330*** (0.292)
Constant	3.110 (2.560)	-10.900*** (2.910)
Observations	8,100	8,100
R ²	0.516	
Adjusted R ²	0.516	
Log Likelihood		-28,739.000
Akaike Inf. Crit.		57,495.000
Bayesian Inf. Crit.		57,558.000
F Statistic	8,389.000***	

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

For more, see [here](#).

HLM with Country-Level Random β s for ColdWar

```
> HLM1<-lmer(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+           log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar+(ColdWar|IS03),
+           data=WDI,control=lmerControl(optimizer="bobyqa"))

> summary(HLM1)
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
Formula: WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate +
          log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents + ColdWar + (ColdWar | IS03)
Data: WDI
Control: lmerControl(optimizer = "bobyqa")
```

REML criterion at convergence: 54105

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-4.454	-0.533	0.006	0.536	7.995

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
IS03	(Intercept)	583.7	24.16	
	ColdWar	141.0	11.88	-0.18
Residual		37.6	6.13	

Number of obs: 8100, groups: IS03, 187

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value
(Intercept)	-28.03144	3.32446	-8.43
PopGrowth	-0.25074	0.07768	-3.23
UrbanPopulation	0.33793	0.02247	15.04
FertilityRate	-4.07247	0.17329	-23.50
log(GDPPerCapita)	10.51642	0.32562	32.30
NaturalResourceRents	0.00695	0.01490	0.47
ColdWar	-2.41568	1.02418	-2.36

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	PpGrwt	UrbnPop	FrtltR	l(GDPP	NtrlRR
PopGrowth	0.051					
UrbanPopltn	-0.147	-0.015				
FertilityRt	-0.485	-0.194	0.480			
lg(GDPPPrCp)	-0.712	-0.056	-0.369	0.184		
NtrlRsrcRnt	0.011	-0.059	0.058	-0.040	-0.068	
ColdWar	-0.083	-0.001	0.052	-0.114	-0.001	0.010

```
> anova(AltRE,HLM1)
```

```
refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)
```

```
Data: WDI
```

```
Models:
```

```
AltRE: WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate +  
      log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents + ColdWar + (1 | IS03)
```

```
HLM1: WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate +  
      log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents + ColdWar + (ColdWar | IS03)
```

	npqr	AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	Chisq	Df	Pr(>Chisq)
AltRE	9	57478	57541	-28730	57460			
HLM1	11	54113	54190	-27046	54091	3369	2	<2e-16 ***

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
> VarCorr(HLM1)
```

Groups	Name	Std.Dev.	Corr
IS03	(Intercept)	24.16	
	ColdWar	11.88	-0.18
Residual		6.13	

Random Coefficients

```
> Bs<-data.frame(coef(HLM1)[1])
```

```
> head(Bs)
```

	IS03..Intercept.	IS03.PopGrowth	IS03.UrbanPopulation	IS03.FertilityRate
AFG	-17.42	-0.251	0.338	-4.07
AGO	-9.73	-0.251	0.338	-4.07
ALB	-11.40	-0.251	0.338	-4.07
ARE	-101.67	-0.251	0.338	-4.07
ARG	-49.50	-0.251	0.338	-4.07
ARM	-23.39	-0.251	0.338	-4.07

	IS03.log.GDPPerCapita.	IS03.NaturalResourceRents	IS03.ColdWar
AFG	10.5	0.00695	-3.36
AGO	10.5	0.00695	-13.82
ALB	10.5	0.00695	-6.53
ARE	10.5	0.00695	-2.60
ARG	10.5	0.00695	-22.73
ARM	10.5	0.00695	-2.83


```
> mean(Bs$IS03..Intercept.)
```

```
[1] -28
```


```
> mean(Bs$IS03.ColdWar)
```

```
[1] -2.42
```


Random Intercepts (Plotted)



Random Slopes for CoIdWar (Plotted)



Scatterplot: Random Intercepts and Slopes



Separating Within and Between Effects

Recall that we can decompose the variance of our regression model as:

$$Y_{it} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i \beta_B + (\mathbf{X}_{it} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_i) \beta_W + u_{it} \quad (5)$$

This raises the possibility of fitting the model in (5) directly...

- Simple to estimate (via OLS or other)
- Relatively easy interpretation
- Easy to test $\hat{\beta}_B = \hat{\beta}_W$

Example data: Separate effects for within- and between-country *Natural Resource Rents*...

Combining Within- and Between-Effects

Table: BE + WE Model of WBLI

	WEBE.OLS
Population Growth	-2.150*** (0.128)
Urban Population	-0.044*** (0.010)
Fertility Rate	-2.270*** (0.157)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	2.620*** (0.190)
Within-Country Nat. Resource Rents	0.094*** (0.028)
Between-Country Nat. Resource Rents	-0.507*** (0.018)
Cold War	-11.500*** (0.365)
Constant	60.000*** (1.650)
Observations	8,100
R ²	0.521
Adjusted R ²	0.520
Residual Std. Error	13.100 (df = 8092)
F Statistic	1,256.000*** (df = 7; 8092)

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

Two-Way Unit Effects

Our original decomposition considered “two-way” effects:

$$Y_{it} = \mathbf{X}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \alpha_i + \eta_t + u_{it}$$

This implies that we can use (e.g.) an F -test to examine the hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \alpha_i = \eta_t = 0 \quad \forall i, t$$

...that is, whether adding the (two-way) effects improves the model's fit.

We can also consider the partial hypotheses:

$$H_0 : \alpha_i = 0 \quad \forall i$$

and

$$H_0 : \eta_t = 0 \quad \forall t$$

separately.

Two-Way Effects: Good & Bad

The Good:

- Addresses both time-invariant, unit-level heterogeneity and cross-sectionally-invariant, time-point-specific heterogeneity
- May be “fixed” or “random” ...
- Two-way FE is equivalent to differences-in-differences when $X \in \{0, 1\}$ and $T = 2$ (more on that later)

The (Potentially) Bad:

- Ability to control for unobserved heterogeneity depends on (probably invalid) functional form assumptions (Imai and Kim 2020)
- FE *requires* predictors that vary both within and between both units and time points
- RE requires the (additional) assumption that $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}_{it}, \eta_t) = \text{Cov}(\alpha_i, \eta_t) = 0$
- Two-way effects models ask a *lot* of your data (effectively fits $N + T + k$ parameters using NT observations)

Example: Two-Way Fixed Effects

```
> TwoWayFE<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+               log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+               effect="twoway",model="within")
```

```
> summary(TwoWayFE)
Twoways effects Within Model
```

```
Call:
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
     FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
     ColdWar, data = WDI, effect = "twoway", model = "within")
```

```
Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100
```

```
Residuals:
```

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
	-32.011	-4.038	0.268	4.151	43.093

```
Coefficients:
```

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)
PopGrowth	-0.2496	0.0799	-3.13	0.0018 **
UrbanPopulation	0.0363	0.0173	2.10	0.0359 *
FertilityRate	1.2291	0.1477	8.32	< 2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	1.7450	0.2764	6.31	0.00000000029 ***
NaturalResourceRents	0.0258	0.0149	1.73	0.0838 .

```
---
```

```
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
Total Sum of Squares:    343000
```

```
Residual Sum of Squares: 337000
```

```
R-Squared:    0.0155
```

```
Adj. R-Squared: -0.0148
```

```
F-statistic: 24.7792 on 5 and 7857 DF, p-value: <2e-16
```

Two-Way Effects: Testing

```
> # Two-way effects:

> pFtest(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+       log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+       effect="twoway",model="within")

F test for twoways effects

data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...
F = 110, df1 = 236, df2 = 7857, p-value <2e-16
alternative hypothesis: significant effects

> plmtest(TwoWayFE,c("twoways"),type=("kw"))

Lagrange Multiplier Test - two-ways effects (King and Wu)

data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...
normal = 191, p-value <2e-16
alternative hypothesis: significant effects

> # One-way effects in the two-way model:

> plmtest(TwoWayFE,c("individual"),type=("kw"))

Lagrange Multiplier Test - (King and Wu)

data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...
normal = 227, p-value <2e-16
alternative hypothesis: significant effects

> plmtest(TwoWayFE,c("time"),type=("kw"))

Lagrange Multiplier Test - time effects (King and Wu)

data:  WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation + FertilityRate + ...
normal = 96, p-value <2e-16
alternative hypothesis: significant effects
```

Two-Way Fixed Effects via 1m

```
> TwoWayFE.BF<-lm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+
+               FertilityRate+log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+
+               factor(IS03)+factor(Year),data=WDI)
>
> summary(TwoWayFE.BF)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
    FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
    factor(IS03) + factor(Year), data = WDI)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-32.01	-4.04	0.27	4.15	43.09

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-14.7211	2.4598	-5.98	2.3e-09 ***
PopGrowth	-0.2496	0.0799	-3.13	0.00178 **
UrbanPopulation	0.0363	0.0173	2.10	0.03594 *
FertilityRate	1.2291	0.1477	8.32	< 2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	1.7450	0.2764	6.31	2.9e-10 ***
NaturalResourceRents	0.0258	0.0149	1.73	0.08380 .
factor(IS03)AGO	29.5316	1.9500	15.14	< 2e-16 ***
factor(IS03)ALB	52.2820	1.9857	26.33	< 2e-16 ***
factor(IS03)ARE	-3.2022	2.4748	-1.29	0.19572
.				
.				
.				
factor(Year)1977	4.2415	0.8950	4.74	2.2e-06 ***
factor(Year)1978	4.9507	0.8955	5.53	3.3e-08 ***

[reached getOption("max.print") -- omitted 43 rows]

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 6.55 on 7857 degrees of freedom

(5445 observations deleted due to missingness)

Multiple R-squared: 0.884, Adjusted R-squared: 0.881

F-statistic: 248 on 242 and 7857 DF, p-value: <2e-16

Example: Two-Way Random Effects

```
> TwoWayRE<-plm(WomenBusLawIndex~PopGrowth+UrbanPopulation+FertilityRate+
+               log(GDPPerCapita)+NaturalResourceRents+ColdWar,data=WDI,
+               effect="twoway",model="random")
```

```
> summary(TwoWayRE)
Twoways effects Random Effect Model
(Swamy-Arora's transformation)
```

```
Call:
plm(formula = WomenBusLawIndex ~ PopGrowth + UrbanPopulation +
      FertilityRate + log(GDPPerCapita) + NaturalResourceRents +
      ColdWar, data = WDI, effect = "twoway", model = "random")
```

Unbalanced Panel: n = 187, T = 1-52, N = 8100

Effects:

	var	std.dev	share
idiosyncratic	42.925	6.552	0.31
individual	95.295	9.762	0.69
time	0.429	0.655	0.00

theta:

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
id	0.443	0.897	0.907	0.900	0.907	0.907
time	0.300	0.355	0.398	0.379	0.405	0.408
total	0.293	0.354	0.397	0.378	0.404	0.407

Residuals:

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
	-63.5	-6.8	2.1	0.2	10.9	32.6

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z-value	Pr(> z)
(Intercept)	19.33798	0.33990	56.9	<2e-16 ***
PopGrowth	-0.22014	0.01210	-18.2	<2e-16 ***
UrbanPopulation	0.13185	0.00239	55.1	<2e-16 ***
FertilityRate	-0.80004	0.02101	-38.1	<2e-16 ***
log(GDPPerCapita)	4.94340	0.03709	133.3	<2e-16 ***
NaturalResourceRents	0.02749	0.00220	12.5	<2e-16 ***
ColdWar	-11.94828	0.04882	-244.8	<2e-16 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Total Sum of Squares: 2910000
Residual Sum of Squares: 2020000
R-Squared: 0.322
Adj. R-Squared: 0.322
Chisq: 222859 on 6 DF, p-value: <2e-16

Table: Models of WBLI

	OLS	FE	BE	RE	TwoWayFE	TwoWayRE
Population Growth	-2.360*** (0.131)	-0.089 (0.095)	-5.810*** (1.040)	-0.184* (0.097)	-0.250*** (0.080)	-0.220*** (0.012)
Urban Population	-0.059*** (0.010)	0.306*** (0.020)	-0.042 (0.055)	0.188*** (0.019)	0.036** (0.017)	0.132*** (0.002)
Fertility Rate	-2.520*** (0.159)	-2.030*** (0.162)	-0.386 (1.140)	-2.350*** (0.162)	1.230*** (0.148)	-0.800*** (0.021)
ln(GDP Per Capita)	2.650*** (0.194)	8.720*** (0.300)	2.690** (1.150)	7.110*** (0.284)	1.750*** (0.276)	4.940*** (0.037)
Natural Resource Rents	-0.340*** (0.015)	0.065*** (0.017)	-0.332*** (0.091)	0.034** (0.017)	0.026* (0.015)	0.027*** (0.002)
Cold War	-11.000*** (0.372)	-6.870*** (0.296)	-12.000** (5.120)	-8.170*** (0.291)		-11.900*** (0.049)
Constant	60.400*** (1.690)		57.500*** (10.500)	3.110 (2.560)		19.300*** (0.340)
Observations	8,100	8,100	187	8,100	8,100	8,100
R ²	0.501	0.532	0.584	0.516	0.016	0.322
Adjusted R ²	0.501	0.521	0.570	0.516	-0.015	0.322

* p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

“Fixed Effects Individual Slope” models

- Cite: Bruederl, Josef, and Volker Ludwig. 2015. “Fixed-Effects Panel Regression.” In *The Sage Handbook of Regression Analysis and Causal Inference*, Eds. Henning Best and Christof Wolf. Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 327-357.
- FE + unit-level slopes for (some / all) predictor variables
- Equivalent to including $N - 1$ interactions between a predictor \mathbf{X} and each of the α_i s
- Also can test for homogeneity of estimated slopes (Hausman-like test)
- See the `feisr` R package, and its accompanying vignette, or `xtfeis` in Stata

Unit Effects Models: Software

R :

- the `plm` package; `plm` command
 - Fits one- and two-way FE, BE, RE models
 - Also fits first difference (FD) and instrumental variable (IV) models
- the `fixest` package; fast/scalable FE estimation for OLS and GLMs
- the `panelr` package (various commands)
- the `lme4` package; command is `lmer`
- the `nlme` package; command `lme`
- the `Paneldata` package

Stata : `xtreg`

- option `re` (the default) = random effects
- option `fe` = fixed (within) effects
- option `be` = between-effects
- Stata `package` `fect` = two-way models