

5/Nov/17

Assignment - 9

ECON - Online

Piyush Kulkarni
pxk161130

Q.156 Sex worker characteristics can be treated
a) i) as time invariant for the period of data set as the period is very short. They are very less likely to change. They can be a part of individual effects.

ii) All variables are significant at 5%.

iii) Risk premium for no condom is approx 17%.
 $100 \times \exp(0.01702) - 1 = 18.55\%$

for Regular price is approx 3.7% higher

for Rich price is approx 8.2% higher

for alcohol — 11 — 5.6% lower

for bar — 11 — 29% higher

for street 11 — 45% higher

b) sign of alcohol changed (not significant)

estimates of all variables changed.

bar went to 46% from 29%, street

came down to 10% from 45%.

price is higher for attractive and educated sex workers, and lower for older.

premium for unprotected sex with attractive educated worker is approx = $0.138 + 0.276 + 0.216$
 $= 63\%$

$$100 \times \exp(\text{~~0.13~~ } 0.63) - 1 = 87.76\%$$

c) Hausman test is significant
therefore we conclude that at least one variable is correlated with individual random effects.
 \therefore We should use fixed effects

d) sometimes it could be possible that a certain sex worker could be the way that she won't prefer condoms or it could be that she wants more money which it could be her nature & she would have all clients with no condoms. this way it could be a characteristic of sex worker rather than a client. The alcohol variable is negative again. All the variables are significant now.

coefficients of all the variables changed.

$$0.17 + 0.33 + 0.29 = 0.79$$

the premium for unprotected sex with attractive educated worker is approx 79%.

$$100 \times (\exp 0.79 - 1) = 81\%$$

the premium reduced drastically.

- Q.15-10 i) deterrence increase crime rate drop
a) ii) wages in private sec \uparrow crime rate drop
~~iii~~ iii) pop density \uparrow crime rate increase
iv) % young male increase crime rate increase
expected

- ~~lprbarr~~ $\rightarrow -0.65 \rightarrow$ significant negative as
b) i) $\text{lprbconv} \rightarrow -0.41 \rightarrow$ significant \rightarrow -ve as expected
 $\text{lprbpris} \rightarrow 0.20 \rightarrow$ significant \rightarrow not as expected
should have been -ve
 $\text{lavgsen} \rightarrow -0.05 \rightarrow$ not significant \rightarrow -ve as
 $\text{lwmtg} \rightarrow 0.29 \rightarrow$ significant \rightarrow +ve ^{not expected} as expected

- ii) 1% increase in prob arrests decreases the crime rate by 65% keeping all things constant

- c)
- i) $\text{prbarr} \rightarrow -0.23 \rightarrow \text{significant} \rightarrow -ve \text{ as expected}$
 - ii) $\text{prbconv} \rightarrow -0.13 \rightarrow \text{significant} \rightarrow -ve \text{ as expected}$
 - iii) $\text{prbpris} \rightarrow -0.14 \rightarrow \text{significant} \rightarrow -''$
 - iv) $\text{prbargser} \rightarrow 0.018 \rightarrow \text{not significant} \rightarrow \text{not as expected}$
 - v) $\text{lwmtg} \rightarrow -0.16 \rightarrow \text{significant} \rightarrow \text{as expected}$

ii) 1% increase in prob arrest will reduce crime rate by 23%. This is significantly different from OLS prediction. This suggests there could be heterogeneity.

iii) 1% increase in prison sentence cause 0.018% increase in crime rate. However this is not statistically significant so we can say that this is not different from zero. We can say that longer ~~een~~ prison sentences have no effect on crime rate.

d) $H_0: \beta_1 - \beta_{90} = 0$
 $\checkmark H_1: \text{at least one of } \beta_1, \beta_{90} \neq 0$

$$\frac{106.814 - 16.149/89}{16.149/\sqrt{630-95}} = 33.74$$

$$F_{crit} = 1.287$$

We reject the null hypo. And conclude that there is individual specific county effects

e) i) Estimates changes significantly when time dummies are added. Also the signs of all time dummies are negative for OLS & +ve for fixed effects. Signs of ~~the~~ dummy & LPRBPRs are different.

ii) In previous question we have concluded that there is fixed effect. so comparing the significance with fixed effect model.

$$\frac{(16.149 - 14.383) / 6 - 1}{14.383 / 630 - 90 - 6 - 7} = \frac{0.3532}{0.0272} = 12.9$$

$$F_{crit} = 2.23$$

$$H_0: \rightarrow D_{82} - D_{87} = 0$$

$$\checkmark H_1: \text{At least one of } D_{82} - D_{87} \neq 0$$

we reject the null hypothesis. We conclude that year effects are important.

There appears a trend effect. Looking at fixed effect model, we can say that 83-85 are not significant. Also their values are pretty small. Coefficients of 86 & 87 are quite large and also significant.

iii) OLS

1% increase in manufacturing wages results in 0.0159% increase in crime which does not make any sense. Also this result is not significant.

OLS says $\ln wmtg$ does not affect crime rate significantly.

FE

1% increase in manufacturing wages decreases crime rate by 0.57%. This is what we expect and result is significant at 0.1% also.

f) wages should be increased. Factors affecting crime as prob of conviction, prob arrest, should be increased. P_{I+} appears that prison term does not affect crime rate.

```

> library(plm)
> library(haven)
> library(lme4)
> mexican <- read_dta("D:/Class Notes/Fall 17 Classes/ECON/Data_sets/mexican.dta")
> View(mexican)
>
>
> # ----- Fixed effect with client char and othe char -----
>
> modelfe <- plm (lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom + bar + street,
+               data = mexican, index = c("id", "trans"), model = "within")
> summary(modelfe)
Oneway (individual) effect within Model

Call:
plm(formula = lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom +
     bar + street, data = mexican, model = "within", index = c("id",
"trans"))

Balanced Panel: n=754, T=4, N=3016

Residuals :
    Min. 1st Qu.  Median 3rd Qu.    Max.
-2.8400 -0.0385   0.0000   0.0200   1.6600

Coefficients :
              Estimate Std. Error t-value Pr(>|t|)
regular      0.037219   0.016849   2.2090 0.0272770 *
rich         0.082636   0.020528   4.0254 5.875e-05 ***
alcohol     -0.056856   0.026139  -2.1751 0.0297261 *
nocondom     0.170282   0.025817   6.5957 5.256e-11 ***
bar          0.298455   0.134450   2.2198 0.0265299 *
street       0.455159   0.130465   3.4887 0.0004946 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Total Sum of Squares:    111.72
Residual Sum of Squares: 107.6
R-Squared:                0.03688
Adj. R-Squared: -0.28715
F-statistic: 14.3978 on 6 and 2256 DF, p-value: 3.5477e-16
> 100*(exp(.1702)-1)
[1] 18.55419
>
> # ----- Random Effects with all char -----
>
> modelre <- plm (lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom +
+               bar + street +
+               age + attractive + school,
+               data = mexican, index = c("id", "trans"), model = "random" )
> summary(modelre)
Oneway (individual) effect Random Effect Model
(Swamy-Arora's transformation)

Call:
plm(formula = lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom +
     bar + street + age + attractive + school, data = mexican,
     model = "random", index = c("id", "trans"))

Balanced Panel: n=754, T=4, N=3016

Effects:
              var std.dev share
idiosyncratic 0.04776 0.21854  0.14

```

```
individual    0.29335 0.54162 0.86
theta: 0.8022
```

Residuals :

```
   Min. 1st Qu.  Median 3rd Qu.    Max.
-3.0400 -0.1030 -0.0104  0.0949  1.7800
```

Coefficients :

```
      Estimate Std. Error t-value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)  5.9102833  0.1302847 45.3644 < 2.2e-16 ***
regular      0.0236131  0.0161865  1.4588  0.1447
rich         0.1160405  0.0200370  5.7913 7.706e-09 ***
alcohol      0.0149458  0.0249582  0.5988  0.5493
nocondom     0.1389512  0.0250293  5.5515 3.078e-08 ***
bar          0.4642233  0.0998789  4.6479 3.498e-06 ***
street       0.1030499  0.1010661  1.0196  0.3080
age          -0.0257618  0.0027521 -9.3607 < 2.2e-16 ***
attractive    0.2768010  0.0602084  4.5974 4.455e-06 ***
school       0.2161133  0.0453175  4.7689 1.941e-06 ***
```

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

Total Sum of Squares: 167.72

Residual Sum of Squares: 149.08

R-Squared: 0.11113

Adj. R-Squared: 0.10847

F-statistic: 41.7573 on 9 and 3006 DF, p-value: < 2.22e-16

```
> 0.138+0.276+.216
```

```
[1] 0.63
```

```
> 100*(exp(0.63)-1)
```

```
[1] 87.76106
```

```
>
```

```
> # H Test
```

```
>
```

```
> phtest(modelfe, modelre)
```

Hausman Test

data: lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom + bar + street

chisq = 155.95, df = 6, p-value < 2.2e-16

alternative hypothesis: one model is inconsistent

```
>
```

```
> # ----- No condom Endogenous -----
```

```
>
```

```
> modelrenc <- pht(lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom +
+                   + bar + street +
+                   age + attractive + school | age + attractive + school ,
+                   data = mexican, model = "ht")
```

```
>
```

```
> summary(modelrenc)
```

Oneway (individual) effect Hausman-Taylor Model

Call:

```
pht(formula = lnprice ~ regular + rich + alcohol + nocondom +
+bar + street + age + attractive + school | age + attractive +
+school, data = mexican, model = "ht")
```

T.V. exo :

T.V. endo : regular, rich, alcohol, nocondom, bar, street

T.I. exo : age, attractive, school

T.I. endo :

Balanced Panel: n=754, T=4, N=3016

Effects:

	var	std.dev	share
idiosyncratic	0.04757	0.21810	0.106
individual	0.40161	0.63373	0.894
theta:	0.8304		

Residuals :

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
-3.02000	-0.10200	-0.00211	0.09280	1.69000

Coefficients :

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	6.2216480	0.1679867	37.0366	< 2.2e-16 ***
regular	0.0372192	0.0168547	2.2082	0.0272280 *
rich	0.0826358	0.0205352	4.0241	5.719e-05 ***
alcohol	-0.0568559	0.0261481	-2.1744	0.0296768 *
nocondom	0.1702820	0.0258257	6.5935	4.296e-11 ***
bar	0.2984554	0.1344948	2.2191	0.0264810 *
street	0.4551593	0.1305083	3.4876	0.0004874 ***
age	-0.0328104	0.0032309	-10.1552	< 2.2e-16 ***
attractive	0.3309315	0.0690810	4.7905	1.664e-06 ***
school	0.2943199	0.0525102	5.6050	2.083e-08 ***

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

Total Sum of Squares: 1543.7

Residual Sum of Squares: 143.46

F-statistic: 3259.82 on 9 and 3006 DF, p-value: < 2.22e-16

> .17+.33+.29

[1] 0.79

> 100*(exp(0.79-1))

[1] 81.05842

> # -----Problem 15.10 Crime Rate -----

>

> library(haven)

> crime <- read_dta("D:/Class Notes/Fall 17 Classes/ECON/Data_sets/crime.dta")

> view(crime)

>

> # -----OLS -----

>

> crimereg <- lm(lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen + lwmfg, data = crime)

> summary(crimereg)

Call:

lm(formula = lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen +
lwmfg, data = crime)

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-1.54913	-0.24408	0.02184	0.26066	2.22985

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-6.08610	0.36536	-16.658	< 2e-16 ***
lprbarr	-0.65658	0.04035	-16.274	< 2e-16 ***
lprbconv	-0.44658	0.02774	-16.098	< 2e-16 ***
lprbpris	0.20823	0.07267	2.865	0.0043 **
lavgsen	-0.05863	0.06060	-0.967	0.3337
lwmfg	0.29206	0.06190	4.718	2.94e-06 ***

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

Residual standard error: 0.4137 on 624 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.4824, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4783
F-statistic: 116.3 on 5 and 624 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

```
> anova(crimereg)
```

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: lcrmrte

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)	
lprbarr	1	41.760	41.760	243.9602	< 2.2e-16	***
lprbconv	1	52.223	52.223	305.0826	< 2.2e-16	***
lprbpris	1	1.718	1.718	10.0391	0.001607	**
lavgsen	1	0.053	0.053	0.3113	0.577096	
lwmfg	1	3.811	3.811	22.2624	2.937e-06	***
Residuals	624	106.814	0.171			

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

```
>
> # -----Fixed Effects -----
```

```
> crimefe <- plm(lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen + lwmfg, data = crime,
+               index = c("county"), model = "within")
```

```
> summary(crimefe)
```

Oneway (individual) effect within Model

Call:

```
plm(formula = lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen +
     lwmfg, data = crime, model = "within", index = c("county"))
```

Balanced Panel: n=90, T=7, N=630

Residuals :

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
-0.99500	-0.07760	-0.00202	0.07890	1.08000

Coefficients :

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)	
lprbarr	-0.231271	0.037648	-6.1429	1.582e-09	***
lprbconv	-0.137803	0.022187	-6.2110	1.058e-09	***
lprbpris	-0.143137	0.039303	-3.6418	0.000297	***
lavgsen	0.018281	0.030950	0.5907	0.554994	
lwmfg	-0.166641	0.055267	-3.0152	0.002690	**

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

Total Sum of Squares: 17.991

Residual Sum of Squares: 16.149

R-Squared: 0.10238

Adj. R-Squared: -0.05533

F-statistic: 12.2044 on 5 and 535 DF, p-value: 3.2267e-11

```
>
> qf(0.95,89,535)
```

```
[1] 1.287491
```

```
> # -----OLS with Pop density, %young male and time dummies -----
```

```
> crimereg2 <- lm(lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen + lwmfg +
+               ldensity + lpctymle +
+               d82 + d83 + d84 + d85 + d86 + d87, data = crime)
```

```
> summary(crimereg2)
```

Call:

```
lm(formula = lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen +
     lwmfg + ldensity + lpctymle + d82 + d83 + d84 + d85 + d86 +
     d87, data = crime)
```


Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-1.28650	-0.21313	0.00437	0.22888	2.34934

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	-3.67693	0.46621	-7.887	1.42e-14 ***
lprbarr	-0.42453	0.04191	-10.129	< 2e-16 ***
lprbconv	-0.28270	0.02879	-9.819	< 2e-16 ***
lprbpris	0.08771	0.06935	1.265	0.2064 .
lavgsen	-0.10834	0.05774	-1.876	0.0611 .
lwmfg	0.01598	0.07049	0.227	0.8208 .
ldensity	0.30521	0.02737	11.152	< 2e-16 ***
lpctymle	0.15907	0.08405	1.893	0.0589 .
d82	-0.01757	0.05737	-0.306	0.7595 .
d83	-0.06686	0.05786	-1.156	0.2483 .
d84	-0.11935	0.05855	-2.039	0.0419 *
d85	-0.10563	0.05998	-1.761	0.0787 .
d86	-0.06574	0.06117	-1.075	0.2829 .
d87	-0.01011	0.06166	-0.164	0.8699 .

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

Residual standard error: 0.3743 on 616 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.5818, Adjusted R-squared: 0.573

F-statistic: 65.92 on 13 and 616 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

> anova(crimereg2)

Analysis of Variance Table

Response: lcrmrte

	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
lprbarr	1	41.760	41.760	298.0358	< 2.2e-16 ***
lprbconv	1	52.223	52.223	372.7064	< 2.2e-16 ***
lprbpris	1	1.718	1.718	12.2644	0.0004951 ***
lavgsen	1	0.053	0.053	0.3803	0.5376831 .
lwmfg	1	3.811	3.811	27.1970	2.513e-07 ***
ldensity	1	18.906	18.906	134.9301	< 2.2e-16 ***
lpctymle	1	0.482	0.482	3.4419	0.0640403 .
d82	1	0.147	0.147	1.0510	0.3056790 .
d83	1	0.002	0.002	0.0176	0.8943704 .
d84	1	0.362	0.362	2.5838	0.1084748 .
d85	1	0.395	0.395	2.8191	0.0936548 .
d86	1	0.202	0.202	1.4438	0.2299904 .
d87	1	0.004	0.004	0.0269	0.8698694 .
Residuals	616	86.313	0.140		

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

>

> # ---- Fixed effects with time dummies ----

>

```
> crimefe2 <- plm(lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen + lwmfg +
+                 ldensity + lpctymle +
+                 d82 + d83 + d84 + d85 + d86 + d87, data = crime,
+                 index = c("county"), model = "within")
>
```

> summary(crimefe2)

Oneway (individual) effect within Model

Call:

```
plm(formula = lcrmrte ~ lprbarr + lprbconv + lprbpris + lavgsen +
    lwmfg + ldensity + lpctymle + d82 + d83 + d84 + d85 + d86 +
    d87, data = crime, model = "within", index = c("county"))
```

Balanced Panel: n=90, T=7, N=630

Residuals :

Min.	1st Qu.	Median	3rd Qu.	Max.
-0.89900	-0.06760	0.00507	0.06630	1.11000

Coefficients :

	Estimate	Std. Error	t-value	Pr(> t)	
lprbarr	-0.195152	0.036704	-5.3169	1.562e-07	***
lprbconv	-0.111339	0.021730	-5.1238	4.210e-07	***
lprbpris	-0.097665	0.038424	-2.5418	0.011315	*
lavgsen	-0.023962	0.031460	-0.7617	0.446594	
lwmmfg	-0.576232	0.132950	-4.3342	1.753e-05	***
ldensity	0.769416	0.337740	2.2781	0.023118	*
lpctymle	1.246045	0.434638	2.8669	0.004312	**
d82	0.025280	0.027297	0.9261	0.354811	
d83	0.021608	0.035170	0.6144	0.539217	
d84	0.012070	0.042636	0.2831	0.777209	
d85	0.058874	0.052797	1.1151	0.265310	
d86	0.158618	0.065225	2.4319	0.015353	*
d87	0.278223	0.077213	3.6033	0.000344	***

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

Total Sum of Squares: 17.991

Residual Sum of Squares: 14.383

R-Squared: 0.20051

Adj. R-Squared: 0.045771

F-statistic: 10.167 on 13 and 527 DF, p-value: < 2.22e-16

>

> qf(.95,5,527)

[1] 2.23112

