

## Консультация к КР.

1. Пусть  $y_t^* = x_t' \beta + \varepsilon_t$ , где ошибки  $\varepsilon_t$  имеют плотность распределения  $f(x)$  и

$$y_t = \begin{cases} \alpha_1, & \text{если } y_t^* \leq \alpha_1 \\ y_t^*, & \text{если } \alpha_1 < y_t^* < \alpha_2 \\ \alpha_2, & \text{если } y_t^* \geq \alpha_2 \end{cases}$$

- а) Найдите распределение  $y_t$ .
- б) Найдите логарифмическую функцию правдоподобия для оценивания вектора  $\beta$ .
- в) Найдите  $(\partial E y) / (\partial x)$ .
2. Рассмотрим модель для панельных данных:

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{it} + \alpha_i + u_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

Обозначим  $\bar{y}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{it} = \alpha_i + u_{it}$ . Рассмотрим преобразованную модель:

$$y_{it} - \lambda \bar{y}_i = \beta_0(1 - \lambda) + \beta_1 (x_{it} - \lambda \bar{x}_i) + (\varepsilon_{it} - \lambda \bar{\varepsilon}_i).$$

- (а) Какие модели получаются при  $\lambda = 0$  и при  $\lambda = 1$ ?
- (б) Пусть  $\alpha_i \sim \text{i.i.d. } (0, \sigma_\alpha^2)$ ;  $u_{it} \sim \text{i.i.d. } (0, \sigma_u^2)$ ;  $\text{Cov}(\alpha_i, u_{it}) = 0$  для всех  $i$  и  $j$ .  
Определим

$$\lambda = 1 - \left[ \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\sigma_u^2 + T \sigma_\alpha^2} \right]^{1/2}.$$

Покажите, что  $\varepsilon_{it} - \lambda \bar{\varepsilon}_i$  имеет нулевое математическое ожидание, постоянную дисперсию и серийная корреляция отсутствует.

3. Рассмотрим модель с фиксированными эффектами:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

Случайные ошибки предполагаются независимыми и гетероскедастичными, то есть  $V(\varepsilon_{it}) = \sigma_i^2$ . Панель является несбалансированной, то есть каждому  $i$ -му субъекту в выборке соответствуют  $T_i$  наблюдений.

- (а) Покажите, что OLS и GLS оценки  $\alpha_i$  совпадают.
- (б) Пусть  $\sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n}$ ,  $n = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i$  — дисперсия взвешенной случайной ошибки. Покажите, что OLS оценка для  $\sigma^2$  является смещенной. Также

покажите, что смещение исчезает, если панель сбалансированная и случайные ошибки гомоскедастичны.

**Problem 1.**

The data set contains data on arrests during 1986 on 2,725 men born in California in 1960 or 1961. Each man in the sample was arrested at least once prior to 1986. We are interested in explaining what determines how often these men are arrested again in 1986. The following variables are available.

narr86	# times arrested, 1986
avgsen	average sentence length served for prior convictions (in months)
black	=1 if black
born60	=1 if born in 1960
durat	recent unemployment duration (in months)
hispan	=1 if Hispanic
inc86	legal income, 1986, \$100s
pcnv	proportion of prior convictions
ptime86	months in prison during 1986
qemp86	# quarters employed, 1986
tottime	time in prison since 18 (in months)

The variable *pcnv*, the proportion of arrests prior to 1986 that led to conviction, is a proxy for the likelihood of being convicted for a crime.

The variable *avgsen* is a proxy for the severity of punishment, if convicted.

The variable *ptime86* captures the incarcerative effect of crime: if an individual is in prison, he cannot be arrested for a crime outside of prison. Labour market opportunities are captured by *qemp86*.

**Summary statistics:**

	avgsen	black	born60	durat	hispan	inc86	pcnv	ptime86	qemp86	tottime
Mean	0.632	0.161	0.363	2.251	0.218	54.97	0.358	0.387	2.309	0.839
Median	0	0	0	0	0	29	0.25	0	3	0
Maximum	59.2	1	1	25	1	541	1	12	4	63.4
Minimum	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Std. Dev.	3.508	0.368	0.481	4.607	0.413	66.63	0.395	1.950	1.610	4.607

**Tabulation of narr86**

Value	Count	Percent	Cumulative Count	Cumulative Percent
0	1970	72.29	1970	72.29
1	559	20.51	2529	92.81
2	121	4.44	2650	97.25
3	42	1.54	2692	98.79
4	12	0.44	2704	99.23
5	13	0.48	2717	99.71
6	4	0.15	2721	99.85
7	1	0.04	2722	99.89
9	1	0.04	2723	99.93
10	1	0.04	2724	99.96
12	1	0.04	2725	100.00
Total	2725	100.00	2725	100.00

Three models were estimated:

Dependent Variable: NARR86>0

**MODEL 1**

Method: ML - Binary Probit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	-0.323473	0.057875	-5.589133	0.0000
PCNV	-0.553008	0.071956	-7.685374	0.0000
AVGSEN	0.003730	0.007684	0.485502	0.6273

PTIME86	-0.081029	0.018028	-4.494518	0.0000
QEMP86	0.010286	0.024660	0.417109	0.6766
INC86	-0.004832	0.000686	-7.045535	0.0000
BLACK	0.467772	0.072006	6.496325	0.0000
HISPAN	0.288913	0.065449	4.414352	0.0000
Mean dependent var	0.277064	S.D. dependent var		0.447631
S.E. of regression	0.428541	Akaike info criterion		1.094808
Sum squared resid	498.9705	Schwarz criterion		1.112160
Log likelihood	-1483.677	Hannan–Quinn criter.		1.101080
Restr. log likelihood	-1608.184	Avg. log likelihood		-0.544468
LR statistic (7 df)	249.0143	McFadden R-squared		0.077421
Probability(LR stat)	0.000000			
Obs with Dep=0	1970	Total obs		2725
Obs with Dep=1	755			

## MODEL 2

Method: ML - Ordered Logit (Quadratic hill climbing)

Included observations: 2725

Number of ordered indicator values: 11

	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
PCNV	-0.826305	0.121661	-6.791867	0.0000
AVGSEN	0.009250	0.012395	0.746213	0.4555
PTIME86	-0.132007	0.030301	-4.356456	0.0000
QEMP86	0.004806	0.041021	0.117167	0.9067
INC86	-0.008754	0.001267	-6.907944	0.0000
BLACK	0.797965	0.114772	6.952618	0.0000
HISPAN	0.533740	0.108032	4.940569	0.0000

### Limit Points

LIMIT_1:C(8)	0.518862	0.094332	5.500371	0.0000
LIMIT_2:C(9)	2.213780	0.111413	19.87008	0.0000
LIMIT_3:C(10)	3.242495	0.143630	22.57529	0.0000
LIMIT_4:C(11)	4.085995	0.193895	21.07326	0.0000
LIMIT_5:C(12)	4.544892	0.234307	19.39718	0.0000
LIMIT_6:C(13)	5.518044	0.363691	15.17233	0.0000
LIMIT_7:C(14)	6.213840	0.507219	12.25080	0.0000
LIMIT_9:C(15)	6.502190	0.583614	11.14125	0.0000
LIMIT_10:C(16)	6.908442	0.712230	9.699735	0.0000
LIMIT_12:C(17)	7.602260	1.003628	7.574779	0.0000

Akaike info criterion	1.582839	Schwarz criterion		1.619710
Log likelihood	-2139.618	Hannan–Quinn criter.		1.596166
Restr. log likelihood	-2269.057	Avg. log likelihood		-0.785181
LR statistic (7 df)	258.8775	LR index (Pseudo-R2)		0.057045
Probability(LR stat)	0.000000			

Dependent Variable: NARR86

## MODEL 3

Method: ML/QML - Poisson Count (Quadratic hill climbing)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	z-Statistic	Prob.
C	-0.616217	0.063618	-9.686227	0.0000
PCNV	-0.401797	0.084783	-4.739146	0.0000
AVGSEN	0.005603	0.007437	0.753388	0.4512
PTIME86	-0.093507	0.020314	-4.603135	0.0000
QEMP86	-0.037305	0.028907	-1.290529	0.1969
INC86	-0.008127	0.001037	-7.833997	0.0000
BLACK	0.661036	0.073871	8.948584	0.0000
HISPAN	0.501855	0.073884	6.792448	0.0000
R-squared	0.075108	Mean dependent var		0.404404

Adjusted R-squared	0.072725	S.D. dependent var	0.859077
S.E. of regression	0.827249	Akaike info criterion	1.657495
Sum squared resid	1859.353	Schwarz criterion	1.674846
Log likelihood	-2250.337	Hannan-Quinn criter.	1.663767
Restr. log likelihood	-2441.921	Avg. log likelihood	-0.825812
LR statistic (7 df)	383.1683	LR index (Pseudo-R2)	0.078456
Probability(LR stat)	0.000000		

(a) (6 points) Use each of three models to estimate probability to be unarrested,  $P_0$ , in 1986 for the two men, with values of the variables:  $avgsen = 0$ ,  $inc86 = 50$ ,  $pcnv = 0.1$ ,  $p_{time86} = 0$ ,  $qemp86 = 3$ , one of which is white and another is black.

(b) (6 points) Use each of three models to estimate marginal effect of income,  $\frac{\partial P_0}{\partial inc86}$  for the black man in 1).

(c) (4 points) Comment the models results. Which variables affect the crime (number of arrests)? Discuss some findings that you think are interesting.

(d) (4 points) Discuss shortly limitations and advantages of these models. Which model(s) is more appropriate to that problem in your opinion?

## Problem 2.

По панели 78 российских регионов за 9 лет оценивается три спецификации модели для миграции в зависимости от лагов следующих переменных: человеческого капитала ( $L1x1$ ), уровня безработицы ( $L1x2$ ), логарифма среднедушевого дохода ( $L1x3$ ), численности студентов на душу населения ( $L1student\_pc$ ), коэффициента Джини ( $L1gini$ ), доли молодого населения ( $L1young$ ), доли пожилого населения ( $L1old$ ). В модели также учтен временной эффект в виде набора дамми переменных на года ( $year7$ - $year10$ ).

Прокомментируйте, какая модель:

- сквозная (pooled) регрессия;
- модель с фиксированными эффектами;
- модель со случайными эффектами

должна быть выбрана в данном случае. В своих рассуждениях приводите в подтверждение результаты соответствующих тестов, в каждом из тестов опишите основную и альтернативную гипотезы. Ниже приведены результаты оценивания моделей сквозной регрессии, с индивидуальными эффектами — фиксированными и случайными — а также результаты тестов на выбор спецификации модели.

## Модель 1.

```
. reg net_mig_all L1* year2007-year2010
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 702		
Model	20210.316	12	1684.193	F( 12, 689) = 44.41		
Residual	26131.1163	689	37.9261485	Prob > F = 0.0000		
				R-squared = 0.4361		
				Adj R-squared = 0.4263		
Total	46341.4324	701	66.1076068	Root MSE = 6.1584		

  

net_mig_all	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
L1x1	-.075536	.0555915	-1.36	0.175	-.184685	.0336131
L1x2	-1.679025	.7732123	-2.17	0.030	-3.19716	-.16089
L1x3	6.087226	1.488182	4.09	0.000	3.165311	9.009142
L1x4	2.756517	1.136344	2.43	0.016	.5254044	4.98763
L1student_pc	.1215523	.0195059	6.23	0.000	.0832542	.1598504
L1gini	-12.1918	11.55797	-1.05	0.292	-34.88487	10.50128
L1young	1.266557	.1590198	7.96	0.000	.954335	1.578778
L1old	1.722642	.1046239	16.47	0.000	1.517222	1.928061
year2007	-.0010123	.8082426	-0.00	0.999	-1.587926	1.585902
year2008	-1.468292	.8146773	-1.80	0.072	-3.06784	.1312557
year2009	-1.661877	.8457649	-1.96	0.050	-3.322463	-.0012914
year2010	-3.477737	.9235795	-3.77	0.000	-5.291105	-1.664369
_cons	-60.8354	6.263506	-9.71	0.000	-73.13325	-48.53755

## Модель 2.

```
. xtreg net_mig_all L1* year2007-year2010, fe
```

Fixed-effects (within) regression	Number of obs	=	702
Group variable: region	Number of groups	=	78
R-sq: within = 0.2129	Obs per group: min	=	9
between = 0.4225	avg	=	9.0
overall = 0.3924	max	=	9
corr(u_i, Xb) = 0.2382	F(12,612)	=	13.79
	Prob > F	=	0.0000

net_mig_all	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
L1x1	-.0600761	.0461687	-1.30	0.194	-.1507444	.0305921
L1x2	-1.695126	.6243793	-2.71	0.007	-2.921312	-.4689405
L1x3	7.313121	1.470259	4.97	0.000	4.425756	10.20049
L1x4	4.384781	.5188239	8.45	0.000	3.36589	5.403672
L1student_pc	.0735784	.0311219	2.36	0.018	.0124598	.1346971
L1gini	-30.41007	12.19753	-2.49	0.013	-54.36415	-6.455984
L1young	1.366945	.2380267	5.74	0.000	.8994971	1.834393
L1old	1.335605	.2752427	4.85	0.000	.7950704	1.87614
year2007	.4974565	.423644	1.17	0.241	-.3345157	1.329429
year2008	-.6770634	.5033005	-1.35	0.179	-1.665469	.3113422
year2009	-.6682617	.5620948	-1.19	0.235	-1.77213	.4356069
year2010	-2.148101	.6736989	-3.19	0.002	-3.471143	-.8250588
_cons	-49.47221	8.73733	-5.66	0.000	-66.631	-32.31343

  

sigma_u	6.0222964
sigma_e	2.6959466
rho	.83305546 (fraction of variance due to u_i)

  

F test that all u_i=0:	F(77, 612) =	38.74	Prob > F = 0.0000
------------------------	--------------	-------	-------------------

  

```
. est store fe
```

### Модель 3.

```
. xtreg net_mig_all L1* year2007-year2010, re
```

```
Random-effects GLS regression           Number of obs   =       702
Group variable: region                 Number of groups  =       78
R-sq:  within = 0.2104                  Obs per group: min =       9
      between = 0.4562                      avg =      9.0
      overall = 0.4258                      max =       9
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian           Wald chi2(12)    =     225.25
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)              Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
```

net_mig_all	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
L1x1	-.0512574	.04406	-1.16	0.245	-.1376134	.0350985
L1x2	-1.698741	.602328	-2.82	0.005	-2.879282	-.5181995
L1x3	6.720255	1.358439	4.95	0.000	4.057763	9.382746
L1x4	4.308914	.5173729	8.33	0.000	3.294882	5.322946
L1student_pc	.085199	.0255655	3.33	0.001	.0350915	.1353065
L1gini	-24.92428	11.29259	-2.21	0.027	-47.05735	-2.791216
L1young	1.28032	.194049	6.60	0.000	.8999912	1.660649
L1old	1.641813	.1616724	10.16	0.000	1.324941	1.958685
year2007	.2547917	.3985384	0.64	0.523	-.5263292	1.035913
year2008	-1.077568	.4439989	-2.43	0.015	-1.94779	-.2073465
year2009	-1.145741	.4851141	-2.36	0.018	-2.096548	-.1949351
year2010	-2.738704	.5645497	-4.85	0.000	-3.845201	-1.632207
_cons	-56.10931	7.501452	-7.48	0.000	-70.81188	-41.40673
sigma_u	5.6929442					
sigma_e	2.6959466					
rho	.81682103	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

```
. est store re
```

```
. xttest0
```

Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian multiplier test for random effects

```
net_mig_all[region,t] = Xb + u[region] + e[region,t]
```

Estimated results:

	Var	sd = sqrt(Var)
net_mig~1	66.10761	8.130658
e	7.268128	2.695947
u	32.40961	5.692944

Test: Var(u) = 0

```
chi2(1) = 1808.88
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

```
. hausman fe re
```

---- Coefficients ----				
	(b) fe	(B) re	(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) S.E.
L1x1	-.0600761	-.0512574	-.0088187	.0137937
L1x2	-1.695126	-1.698741	.0036144	.1644702
L1x3	7.313121	6.720255	.5928663	.5624094
L1x4	4.384781	4.308914	.0758666	.0387748
L1student_pc	.0735784	.085199	-.0116206	.0177475
L1gini	-30.41007	-24.92428	-5.485783	4.610537
L1young	1.366945	1.28032	.0866249	.1378465
L1old	1.335605	1.641813	-.3062076	.2227568
year2007	.4974565	.2547917	.2426649	.1436711
year2008	-.6770634	-1.077568	.4005049	.2370156
year2009	-.6682617	-1.145741	.4774796	.2839276
year2010	-2.148101	-2.738704	.5906032	.3676327

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from xtreg

B = inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from xtreg

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

```
chi2(12) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^(-1)](b-B)
          = 6.54
Prob>chi2 = 0.8863
```