

Assignment 4

1. Estimate model (1) using Panel Least Squares estimation method and PGLS assuming Heteroskedasticity, and test whether there exists Heteroskedasticity problem.

```
. xtgls y x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 x7, igls panels(heteroskedastic) nolog
```

Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression

Coefficients: **generalized least squares**

Panels: **heteroskedastic**

Correlation: **no autocorrelation**

```
Estimated covariances      =      255      Number of obs      =      1,275
Estimated autocorrelations =          0      Number of groups   =      255
Estimated coefficients     =          8      Time periods      =          5
Log likelihood             =    519.361     Wald chi2(7)     =    3850.64
                          =              =    Prob > chi2     =    0.0000
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.0834067	.0045748	18.23	0.000	.0744403	.0923732
x2	.0163976	.0032919	4.98	0.000	.0099456	.0228497
x3	-.3631261	.0505673	-7.18	0.000	-.4622362	-.264016
x4	.3191455	.1093883	2.92	0.004	.1047484	.5335426
x5	-.1093301	.0043601	-25.07	0.000	-.1178758	-.1007844
x6	.1361732	.0275038	4.95	0.000	.0822667	.1900797
x7	-.2282655	.0063087	-36.18	0.000	-.2406303	-.2159007
_cons	-.037658	.0426502	-0.88	0.377	-.1212509	.0459349

```
. est store het
```

```
. xtgls y x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 x7
```

Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression

Coefficients: **generalized least squares**
 Panels: **homoskedastic**
 Correlation: **no autocorrelation**

```
Estimated covariances      =          1      Number of obs      =      1,275
Estimated autocorrelations =          0      Number of groups   =      255
Estimated coefficients      =          8      Time periods      =          5
Log likelihood              = 209.4322     Wald chi2(7)      =      899.95
                          Prob > chi2      =      0.0000
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.0794732	.0093881	8.47	0.000	.0610728	.0978735
x2	.0183375	.0051421	3.57	0.000	.0082592	.0284158
x3	.0977707	.0526329	1.86	0.063	-.0053879	.2009293
x4	.0873838	.2186064	0.40	0.689	-.3410767	.5158444
x5	-.1076457	.0069214	-15.55	0.000	-.1212114	-.0940801
x6	-.1432493	.0186811	-7.67	0.000	-.1798637	-.106635
x7	-.2712849	.011995	-22.62	0.000	-.2947946	-.2477753
_cons	-.0107965	.0860341	-0.13	0.900	-.1794201	.1578272

```
. est store pgl
```

```
. local df=e(N_g)-1
```

```
. lrtest het, df('df')
```

```
Likelihood-ratio test          LR chi2(254)=    619.86
(Assumption: pgl nested in het) Prob > chi2 =    0.0000
```

As the p-value is lower than 0.05, H_0 is then rejected. Therefore, there exists heteroskedasticity.

- Estimate the above three models including Panel Least Squares model, Fixed effects model, and Random-effects model. Perform fixed effects tests and random effects test, also state null hypothesis of the tests. Then, determine the most appropriated model. Also, give explanation of the choosing criterion (perform the tests), and make interpretation of the estimated models.

```
. xtgls y x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 x7
```

Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression

Coefficients: **generalized least squares**

Panels: **homoskedastic**

Correlation: **no autocorrelation**

```
Estimated covariances      =          1      Number of obs      =      1,275
Estimated autocorrelations =          0      Number of groups   =       255
Estimated coefficients     =          8      Time periods      =         5
Log likelihood             =  209.4322     Wald chi2(7)      =      899.95
                          =              Prob > chi2      =      0.0000
```

	y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	x1	.0794732	.0093881	8.47	0.000	.0610728	.0978735
	x2	.0183375	.0051421	3.57	0.000	.0082592	.0284158
	x3	.0977707	.0526329	1.86	0.063	-.0053879	.2009293
	x4	.0873838	.2186064	0.40	0.689	-.3410767	.5158444
	x5	-.1076457	.0069214	-15.55	0.000	-.1212114	-.0940801
	x6	-.1432493	.0186811	-7.67	0.000	-.1798637	-.106635
	x7	-.2712849	.011995	-22.62	0.000	-.2947946	-.2477753
	_cons	-.0107965	.0860341	-0.13	0.900	-.1794201	.1578272

```
. est store pgl
```

```
. local df=e(N_g)-1
```

```
. lrtest het, df('df')
```

```
. xtreg y x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 x7, fe
```

```
Fixed-effects (within) regression
Group variable: crossid
```

```
Number of obs   =    1,275
Number of groups =    255
```

```
R-sq:
```

```
  within = 0.3772
  between = 0.1103
  overall = 0.1644
```

```
Obs per group:
```

```
   min =    5
   avg =    5.0
   max =    5
```

```
corr(u_i, Xb) = -0.2003
```

```
F(7,1013)      =    87.64
Prob > F       =    0.0000
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.1256447	.0180942	-6.94	0.000	-.161151	-.0901384
x2	.0123739	.008023	1.54	0.123	-.0033697	.0281176
x3	.0747825	.039773	1.88	0.060	-.0032643	.1528293
x4	.6493144	.2855092	2.27	0.023	.0890573	1.209572
x5	-.1104883	.0061097	-18.08	0.000	-.1224773	-.0984992
x6	-.1461423	.0141035	-10.36	0.000	-.1738178	-.1184669
x7	-.0951497	.0121853	-7.81	0.000	-.1190611	-.0712383
_cons	1.756067	.1658407	10.59	0.000	1.430636	2.081497
sigma_u	.22676694					
sigma_e	.11725953					
rho	.78902632	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

```
F test that all u_i=0: F(254, 1013) = 11.40
```

```
Prob > F = 0.0000
```

```
. est store fixed
```

```
. xtreg y x1 x2 x3 x4 x5 x6 x7, re
```

```
Random-effects GLS regression      Number of obs   =    1,275
Group variable: crossid          Number of groups =     255
```

```
R-sq:                               Obs per group:
    within = 0.3492                  min =          5
    between = 0.3404                 avg =         5.0
    overall = 0.3377                 max =          5
```

```
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)           Wald chi2(7)    =    663.43
                                           Prob > chi2     =    0.0000
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.0145018	.0133366	-1.09	0.277	-.040641	.0116375
x2	.0146948	.0064463	2.28	0.023	.0020604	.0273292
x3	.0985565	.0399464	2.47	0.014	.020263	.1768501
x4	.4693539	.2493856	1.88	0.060	-.0194329	.9581407
x5	-.1117985	.005959	-18.76	0.000	-.1234779	-.100119
x6	-.1541318	.014125	-10.91	0.000	-.1818163	-.1264472
x7	-.1494529	.0115006	-13.00	0.000	-.1719937	-.1269122
_cons	.7714573	.1226841	6.29	0.000	.5310009	1.011914
sigma_u	.15944933					
sigma_e	.11725953					
rho	.64900604	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

```
. est store random
```

. hausman fixed random

	— Coefficients —		(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) S.E.
	(b) fixed	(B) random		
x1	-.1256447	-.0145018	-.1111429	.0122284
x2	.0123739	.0146948	-.0023208	.0047765
x3	.0747825	.0985565	-.0237741	.
x4	.6493144	.4693539	.1799605	.1390048
x5	-.1104883	-.1117985	.0013102	.0013484
x6	-.1461423	-.1541318	.0079894	.
x7	-.0951497	-.1494529	.0543033	.0040273

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(7) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^(-1)](b-B)
 = 190.39
 Prob>chi2 = 0.0000
 (V_b-V_B is not positive definite)

Based on fixed effect, there exists fixed effects as the p-value is lower than 0.05. Then, with regard to Hausman test, ho is rejected as p-value is lower than 0.05. So, the fixed effect model is more appropriated.