

## Assignment 12

### Poisson – Negative Binomial – Zero Inflated Poisson

#### The model

The generalized linear regression model can be stated as:

$$I_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \beta_3 x_{3i} + \beta_4 x_{4i} + u_i \quad (1)$$

and

$$\Pr(Y_i = y_i) = f(I_i)$$

where:  $I_i$  is index variables.

$y_i$  is counted number 0, 1, 2,...

$x_{ki}$  is independent variable  $k$ .

$f(\cdot)$  is either Poisson or Negative Binomial probability distribution function.

$u_i$  is disturbance term.

#### Requirements (using Data set file – assign12.dta ):

- 1 Estimate models for  $y_i$  assuming that the model is traditional linear regression model. Interpret your estimated result. (3)
- 2 Create histogram for  $y_i$ . Determine whether there is limitation of dependent variable in this case. If yes, what type of limitation is it? (1)
- 3 Estimate models for  $y_i$  assuming that the probability functions follow Poisson probability distribution. Perform GOF test and determine whether Poisson is appropriated in this case. Interpret the estimated result (sign and meaning (in term of incidence-rate ratios), overall test, individual test, pseudo  $R^2$ , marginal effects). (5)-(8)
- 4 Estimate models for  $y_i$  assuming that the probability functions follow Negative Binomial probability distribution. Determine whether Negative Binomial regression model is appropriated in this case. Interpret your estimated result (sign and meaning (in term of incidence-rate ratios), overall test, individual test, pseudo  $R^2$ , marginal effects).
- 5 Estimate models for  $y_i$  assuming that the model is Zero Inflated Poisson ( $x_{1i}$ ,  $x_{2i}$ , and  $x_{3i}$  are independent variables in Poisson model and  $x_{4i}$  is independent variable in Inflated (Logit) model). Interpret your estimated result. Determine which model (Linear regression model, Poisson, Negative Binomial, or ZIP) is the most appropriated model in this case? Why? (provide the tests)
- 6 According to the above (1-5), determine the most appropriated model for this case. Give explanation why? ZIP →

```

name: <unnamed>
log: C:\Users\Kang\Documents\ASS12.smcl
log type: smcl
opened on: 22 Apr 2021, 01:08:09

```

```

. use "C:\Users\Kang\Downloads\assign12 (1).dta", clear
. reg y x1 x2 x3 x4

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	232
Model	44.7298499	4	11.1824625	F(4, 227)	=	5.96
Residual	425.748598	227	1.87554449	Prob > F	=	0.0001
Total	470.478448	231	2.03670324	R-squared	=	0.0951
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0791
				Root MSE	=	1.3695

  

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1	.1016201	.0435073	2.34	0.020	.0158904 .1873499
x2	.1345044	.0462142	2.91	0.004	.0434407 .225568
x3	-.0748194	.0480457	-1.56	0.121	-.1694919 .0198531
x4	.1684563	.0688243	2.45	0.015	.0328401 .3040725
_cons	.9568064	.107007	8.94	0.000	.7459523 1.16766

2 . histogram y  
(bin=15, start=0, width=.3333333)  
*The limitation is the highly skewness which violate normality assumption*  
. poisson y x1 x2 x3 x4, nolog

3 Poisson regression

Number of obs	=	232
LR chi2(4)	=	43.33
Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Pseudo R2	=	0.0594

Log likelihood = -342.88107

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1	.0971474	.0306762	3.17	0.002	.0370231 .1572717
x2	.1293024	.0330916	3.91	0.000	.064444 .1941607
x3	-.0715533	.0342177	-2.09	0.037	-.1386187 -.0044879
x4	.1734482	.0507707	3.42	0.001	.0739395 .2729569
_cons	-.1284876	.0849064	-1.51	0.130	-.294901 .0379259

```

. estat gof

```

Deviance goodness-of-fit	=	409.4921
Prob > chi2(227)	=	0.0000
Pearson goodness-of-fit	=	423.3541
Prob > chi2(227)	=	0.0000

*reject the null hypothesis which implies that it is not poisson distributed.*

. poisson y x1 x2 x3 x4, ir nolog

```

Poisson regression                               Number of obs   =       232
                                                LR chi2(4)      =       43.33
                                                Prob > chi2     =       0.0000
Log likelihood = -342.88107                    Pseudo R2      =       0.0594
  
```

y	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	1.102023	.0338059	3.17	0.002	1.037717	1.170314
x2	1.138034	.0376594	3.91	0.000	1.066566	1.214291
x3	.9309467	.0318548	-2.09	0.037	.8705599	.9955222
x4	1.189399	.0603866	3.42	0.001	1.076742	1.313844
_cons	.8794245	.0746687	-1.51	0.130	.7446053	1.038654

. mfx

```

Marginal effects after poisson
y = Predicted number of events (predict)
  = .95621703
  
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[ 95% C.I. ]		X
x1	.092894	.02882	3.22	0.001	.036403	.149385	-.317697
x2	.1236411	.0308	4.01	0.000	.063277	.184005	.812709
x3	-.0684205	.03246	-2.11	0.035	-.13204	-.004801	-.818103
x4	.1658541	.04736	3.50	0.000	.073022	.258686	-.28275

4

. nbreg y x1 x2 x3 x4, nolog

```

Negative binomial regression                     Number of obs   =       232
                                                LR chi2(4)      =       21.24
Dispersion = mean                               Prob > chi2     =       0.0003
Log likelihood = -317.49278                    Pseudo R2      =       0.0324
  
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.1285534	.0506934	2.54	0.011	.0291962	.2279106
x2	.151011	.0506477	2.98	0.003	.0517434	.2502785
x3	-.0672859	.0481376	-1.40	0.162	-.1616339	.0270621
x4	.1726312	.0707035	2.44	0.015	.034055	.3112075
_cons	-.1435596	.1177204	-1.22	0.223	-.3742874	.0871682
/lnalpha	.0479945	.2389531			-.4203449	.5163339
alpha	1.049165	.2507012			.6568202	1.675872

Likelihood-ratio test of alpha=0: chibar2(01) = 50.78 Prob>=chibar2 = 0.000

Overdispersion Test

:  $H_0: \alpha = 0$

reject the null hypothesis which implies that it is negative binomial model

However, the individual's test P-value, some are not significant which means that it is not <sup>negative</sup> binomial model.

```
. nbreg y x1 x2 x3 x4, ir nolog
```

```
Negative binomial regression          Number of obs   =      232
LR chi2(4)                            =      21.24
Dispersion = mean                      Prob > chi2     =      0.0003
Log likelihood = -317.49278            Pseudo R2      =      0.0324
```

y	IRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	1.137182	.0576476	2.54	0.011	1.029627	1.255973
x2	1.163009	.0589037	2.98	0.003	1.053105	1.284383
x3	.9349279	.0450052	-1.40	0.162	.8507526	1.027432
x4	1.188428	.084026	2.44	0.015	1.034641	1.365072
_cons	.8662692	.1019776	-1.22	0.223	.6877792	1.09108
/lnalpha	.0479945	.2389531			-.4203449	.5163339
alpha	1.049165	.2507012			.6568202	1.675872

```
Likelihood-ratio test of alpha=0:  chibar2(01) = 50.78 Prob>=chibar2 = 0.000
```

```
. mfx
```

```
Marginal effects after nbreg
y = Predicted number of events (predict)
= .94607122
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[ 95% C.I. ]		X
x1	.1216207	.04796	2.54	0.011	.02763	.215611	-.317697
x2	.1428671	.04796	2.98	0.003	.048862	.236872	.812709
x3	-.0636573	.04556	-1.40	0.162	-.152956	.025642	-.818103
x4	.1633214	.06686	2.44	0.015	.032269	.294374	-.28275

5) . zip y x1 x2 x3 x4, inflate( x4) vuong

```
Fitting constant-only model:
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -355.48956
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -321.8304
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -317.80147
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -317.79274
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -317.79274
```

```
Fitting full model:
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -317.79274
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -311.40478
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -311.22574
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -311.22548
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -311.22548
```

```
Zero-inflated Poisson regression          Number of obs   =      232
Nonzero obs                              =      106
Zero obs                                  =      126
```

```
Inflation model = logit                  LR chi2(4)      =      13.13
Log likelihood = -311.2255                Prob > chi2     =      0.0106
```

	y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
<b>y</b>							
	x1	.0962618	.0402556	2.39	0.017	.0173622	.1751613
	x2	.0954378	.0373253	2.56	0.011	.0222815	.168594
	x3	-.0672218	.0358764	-1.87	0.061	-.1375383	.0030946
	x4	.0877817	.0527928	1.66	0.096	-.0156904	.1912537
	_cons	.4349837	.1120917	3.88	0.000	.2152881	.6546793
<b>inflate</b>							
	x4	-.2232387	.1282354	-1.74	0.082	-.4745754	.028098
	_cons	-.3696851	.1945938	-1.90	0.057	-.7510819	.0117117

Vuong test of zip vs. standard Poisson:  $z = 3.71$   $Pr>z = 0.0001$

*It reject the null hypothesis. It implies that zero-inflated poisson model,*

. mfx

Marginal effects after zip

y = Predicted number of events (predict)  
= .96133901

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[ 95% C.I. ]		X
x1	.0925402	.03814	2.43	0.015	.017789	.167291	-.317697
x2	.0917481	.03511	2.61	0.009	.022937	.160559	.812709
x3	-.064623	.03433	-1.88	0.060	-.131909	.002663	-.818103
x4	.1753718	.06213	2.82	0.005	.053599	.297145	-.28275

```
. log close
name: <unnamed>
log: C:\Users\Kang\Documents\ASS12.smcl
log type: smcl
closed on: 22 Apr 2021, 01:50:41
```

⑥ Zero-inflated poisson model is the most appropriated model as it has significant z-test on all variables while others model fail to meet evaluation.

2

