

Panel Data

w. Vicente Royuela Mora
Universitat de Barcelona

Complementary course notes

Thor Donsby Noe *

November 14, 2018

*Department of Economics, University of Copenhagen, Øster Farimagsgade 5, DK-1353 Copenhagen K, Denmark (e-mail: jwz766@alumni.ku.dk)

CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction 3
- 2 Fixed Effects estimators 3
 - 2.1 Simultaneous equations models with exogenous explanatory variables 3
 - 2.2 The fixed effects model 3
 - 2.3 Within and between estimators 3
 - 2.4 Effects of group and time 3
- 3 Random effects estimator 3
 - 3.1 The random effects model 4
 - 3.2 The generalized least squares estimation 4
 - 3.3 Feasible Generalized Lest squares (unkown) 4
- 4 Fixed effects vs. random estimator 4
 - 4.1 The Breush Pagan test 4
 - 4.2 The Hausman test 4
 - 4.3 Long run vs. short run effects 5
- 5 Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation in panel data 5
 - 5.1 Heteroskedasticity in FE model 5
 - 5.2 Heteroskedasticity in RE model 5
 - 5.3 Autocorrelation in the FE model 5
 - 5.4 Autocorrelation in the RE model 5
- 6 Incomplete/unbalanced panels 5
- 7 Dynamic panels 5

1 INTRODUCTION

Example macro panel data:
Maddison, 2007, and IFS

- Formatting data
- Descriptive statistics
- Graphs
- Maps

2 FIXED EFFECTS ESTIMATORS

2.1 Simultaneous equations models with exogenous explanatory variables

Four different models:

M1: $\alpha \neq, \beta \neq$. Estimation individual by individual (GLS).

M2: $\alpha =, \beta =$. Equal constant terms and slopes (presence of homogeneity).

M3: $\alpha \neq, \beta =$. Equal slopes, different constant terms.

M4: $\alpha =, \beta \neq$. Equal constant terms, different slopes.

Choosing between them using

Test for Homogeneity:

- Estimate the extended/unrestricted model.
- Estimate the restricted model.

- H_0 : Homogeneity (the unrestricted is not better than the restricted).
Reject H_0 if the F-value is higher than the critical value of the F-distribution.

$$F = \frac{(SSR_R - SSR_{UR})/r}{SSR_{UR}/df}$$

In ML we maximize the probability.

In OLS we don't care about the variance.

2.2 The fixed effects model

α_i is a parameter capturing the individual effect (time-invariant!).

$$y_{it} = i\alpha_i + X_{it}\beta + \varepsilon_{it}$$

$$\Rightarrow y = \begin{bmatrix} i & X \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} + \varepsilon$$

Leasy Squares Dummy Variables (LSDV):

- FE model: All variables are within-transformed e.g the deviations from the mean.

Test the homogeneity analysis:

$$H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_M$$

2.3 Within and between estimators

The overall variance: Weighted variation between the within-variance and between-variance.

2.4 Effects of group and time

3 RANDOM EFFECTS ESTIMATOR

- 3.1 The random effects model
- 3.2 The generalized least squares estimation
- 3.3 Feasible Generalized Lest squares (unkown)

4

4 FIXED EFFECTS VS. RANDOM ESTIMATOR

	No endogeneity	Endogeneity
R.E.	Consist. & Efficient	Inconsistent
F.E.	Consist. but inefficient	Consist. but ineff.

Table 1: Endogeneity problems

4.1 The Breush Pagan test

Mundlak regression:

4.2 The Hausman test

Including both RE and BE.

- FE - β^{FE}
- FE - β^{RE}
- $(\beta^{FE} - \beta^{RE})?$

$$y_{it} + (x_{it} - \bar{x}_i)\beta^w + \bar{x}_i\beta^b + \psi_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Is just an instrumental regression!
Standard errors are unreliable and R^2 is lower.

Problems:

- Hausman assumptions
- We cannot use "fixed" variables (no time variation).

- FE: We capture anything permanent for any individual in α_i
 - Get rid of anything permanent.
 - Good for controlling.
 - We don't know what the individual effects mean though!

The Mundlak estimation:

→ Allows joint estimation F.E. / BE

- Diff(FE-BE) → estimate 'pseudo' Hausman test.
- Allows for including 'fixed' variables (with no time-variation)

- Mundlak: We 'only' capture anything permanent considered in \bar{x}_i

Increasing the data set (information)

RE:

$$y_{it} + x_{it}\beta + \psi_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

- Hausman test: Is likely to find endogeneity though the difference in coefficients is very small.

4.3 Long run vs. short run effects

Baltagi & Griffin (1984) "Short and Long Run Effects in Pooled Models".

- Between est. \rightarrow LR effect.
- Within est. \rightarrow SR effect.

- OLS and RE \rightarrow average of SR & LR effect.

Inequality and growth

- Positive in the SR
- Negative in the LR

5 HETEROSKEDASTICITY AND AUTOCORRELATION IN PANEL DATA**5.1 Heteroskedasticity in FE model**

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + x_{it}\beta + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (5.1)$$

Heteroscedasticity over time: σ_ε^2

5.3 Autocorrelation in the FE model

In eq. 5.1 it can be that

$$\varepsilon_{it} = V_{it} + \theta V_{it-1}$$

$$\rightarrow \text{AR}(1) \rightarrow \varepsilon_{it} = \rho_1 \varepsilon_{it-1} + v_{it}$$

Assumption: Everyone is homogenous in their autocorrelation parameter.

Consistency can come from either a high number of N or T.

5.2 Heteroskedasticity in RE model

$$y_{it} = x_{it}\beta + \zeta_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (5.2)$$

Heteroscedasticity over individuals: σ_ζ^2

Heteroscedasticity over time: σ_ε^2

5.4 Autocorrelation in the RE model

We need to start with the FE estimation

\rightarrow To get a consistent estimate of ρ .

- Proceed to estimate either a FE or RE model.

6 INCOMPLETE/UNBALANCED PANELS

Incomplete panels are similar to heteroscedasticity issues.

- Some issues can be fixed with weighting observations.

- For some procedures we will need complete panels though.

7 DYNAMIC PANELS

Autocorrelation in y_{it} .

GMM estimation.

$$y_{it} = \alpha y_{it-1} + \alpha_{it}\beta + \dots$$