

Assignment 9 MN Logit & Ordered Logit Models

The model

In the study of problems of the business, the most serious problem was the price-war. The analysis is trying to estimate the model that determines factors that have impact on the degree of seriousness of the problem.

$$Prob(y_i=j|X) = f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$$

where: y_i is categorical data = 0 for no problem, = 1 for less serious, ..., and = 5 for very serious, and $i=1$ or 2.

x_1 is dummy variable = 0 for nonfamily firm and =1 for family firm.

x_2 is dummy variable = 0 for no brand and =1 for have own-brand name.

x_3 is dummy variable = 0 for low technology and =1 for high technology firm.

x_4 is log of the size of the firm.

Requirements: From data file – Assign09.dta:

- 1 Estimate the model using multinomial logit of y_i . Perform IIA test. Interpret your estimated result (overall test, individual test, pseudo R^2 , counted R^2).

```
. set more off
```

Multinomial Logit Model

```
. mlogit y x*, b(0)
```

```
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -228.64363
```

```
. . .
```

```
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -203.28337
```

```

Multinomial logistic regression              Number of obs   =           152
                                             LR chi2(20)         =           50.72
                                             Prob > chi2         =           0.0002
Log likelihood = -203.28337                  Pseudo R2          =           0.1109

```

```

-----
          y |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
0          | (base outcome)
-----+-----
1          |
      x1 |  -.1220175   1.086872    -0.11   0.911   -2.252248   2.008213
      x2 |  -2.016388   1.349482    -1.49   0.135   -4.661323   .6285484

```

	x3		1.253423	1.23587	1.01	0.310	-1.168837	3.675683
	x4		1.307279	.5491571	2.38	0.017	.2309504	2.383607
	_cons		-18.06503	8.062973	-2.24	0.025	-33.86817	-2.261896
-----+-----								
2								
	x1		.9699943	.991428	0.98	0.328	-.9731688	2.913157
	x2		-1.631037	1.27855	-1.28	0.202	-4.136949	.8748753
	x3		-1.034421	.9547311	-1.08	0.279	-2.905659	.836818
	x4		.2042703	.3925818	0.52	0.603	-.5651758	.9737165
	_cons		-.9022321	5.40243	-0.17	0.867	-11.4908	9.686336
-----+-----								
3								
	x1		-.4040394	.938099	-0.43	0.667	-2.24268	1.434601
	x2		-.9533924	1.222189	-0.78	0.435	-3.348838	1.442053
	x3		-.1658373	.8733107	-0.19	0.849	-1.877495	1.54582
	x4		.2174653	.3490812	0.62	0.533	-.4667212	.9016518
	_cons		-1.061943	4.802704	-0.22	0.825	-10.47507	8.351185
-----+-----								
4								
	x1		1.677905	.9300468	1.80	0.071	-.1449532	3.500763
	x2		-2.104352	1.212395	-1.74	0.083	-4.480602	.2718986
	x3		-1.209535	.8915675	-1.36	0.175	-2.956975	.5379055
	x4		.1831672	.3654684	0.50	0.616	-.5331376	.899472
	_cons		-.0171095	5.005591	-0.00	0.997	-9.827887	9.793669
-----+-----								
5								
	x1		1.832363	.8632903	2.12	0.034	.1403452	3.524381
	x2		-2.368735	1.168139	-2.03	0.043	-4.658246	-.079224
	x3		.0976971	.8455682	0.12	0.908	-1.559586	1.75498
	x4		.4905651	.3468626	1.41	0.157	-.189273	1.170403
	_cons		-4.204706	4.763082	-0.88	0.377	-13.54017	5.130762
-----+-----								

. est store mlogit

To find Counted R²

```
. predict zero one two three four five
(option pr assumed; predicted probabilities)
(73 missing values generated)

. gen yhat=0 if zero==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(152 missing values generated)

. replace yhat=1 if one==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(73 real changes made)

. replace yhat=2 if two==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(73 real changes made)

. replace yhat=3 if three==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(111 real changes made)

. replace yhat=4 if four==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(79 real changes made)

. replace yhat=5 if five==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(181 real changes made)

. tabulate y yhat
```

	yhat			
y	3	4	5	Total
-----+-----+-----				
0	6	0	23	29
1	3	0	11	14
2	5	1	21	27
3	12	1	20	33
4	5	2	28	35
5	7	2	78	87
-----+-----+-----				
Total	38	6	181	225

To test IIA

```

. qui mlogit y x* if y!=1 , b(0)
. est store mlogit1
. qui mlogit y x* if y!=2 , b(0)
. est store mlogit2
. qui mlogit y x* if y!=3 , b(0)
. est store mlogit3
. qui mlogit y x* if y!=4 , b(0)
. est store mlogit4
. qui mlogit y x* if y!=5 , b(0)
. est store mlogit5

. hausman mlogit mlogit1,allegs constant

```

Note: the rank of the differenced variance matrix (19) does not equal the number of coefficients being tested (20); be sure this is what you expect, or there may be problems

computing the test. Examine the output of your estimators for anything unexpected and possibly consider scaling your variables so that the coefficients are on a

similar scale.

---- Coefficients ----				
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	mlogit	mlogit1	Difference	S.E.
-----+-----				
2				
	x1	.9699943	.9262698	.0437245
	x2	-1.631037	-1.57383	-.0572063
	x3	-1.034421	-.9679021	-.0665185
	x4	.2042703	.2039257	.0003446
	_cons	-.9022321	-.9630944	.0608623
-----+-----				
3				
	x1	-.4040394	-.408268	.0042286
	x2	-.9533924	-.9436889	-.0097035
	x3	-.1658373	-.1574169	-.0084204
	x4	.2174653	.2145878	.0028775

	_cons		-1.061943	-1.033873	-.0280695	.6815408
-----+-----						
4						
	x1		1.677905	1.629302	.0486028	.1290677
	x2		-2.104352	-2.041595	-.0627569	.1060132
	x3		-1.209535	-1.122357	-.0871777	.1284415
	x4		.1831672	.1797913	.0033759	.0422583
	_cons		-.0171095	-.0465668	.0294574	.6384663
-----+-----						
5						
	x1		1.832363	1.787321	.0450417	.1269999
	x2		-2.368735	-2.317706	-.0510288	.0760812
	x3		.0976971	.1965112	-.0988141	.1130219
	x4		.4905651	.4902412	.000324	.0349907
	_cons		-4.204706	-4.281237	.0765307	.5495838
-----+-----						

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from mlogit

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

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^2(19) &= (b-B)' [(V_b-V_B)^{-1}] (b-B) \\ &= 0.71 \end{aligned}$$

Prob>chi2 = 1.0000

(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)

. hausman mlogit2 mlogit, alleq constant

Note: the rank of the differenced variance matrix (19) does not equal the number of coefficients being tested (20); be sure this is what you expect, or there may be problems

computing the test. Examine the output of your estimators for anything unexpected and possibly consider scaling your variables so that the coefficients are on a

similar scale.

---- Coefficients ----

	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	mlogit2	mlogit	Difference	S.E.

-----+-----				
1				
	x1	-.2627881	-.1220175	-.1407705
	x2	-1.967227	-2.016388	.0491607
	x3	1.42199	1.253423	.1685666
	x4	1.352602	1.307279	.0453231
	_cons	-18.83634	-18.06503	-.771306
-----+-----				
3				
	x1	-.4198932	-.4040394	-.0158538
	x2	-.8890144	-.9533924	.064378
	x3	-.129837	-.1658373	.0360002
	x4	.2090977	.2174653	-.0083676
	_cons	-1.017863	-1.061943	.0440796
-----+-----				
4				
	x1	1.704966	1.677905	.0270613
	x2	-2.024298	-2.104352	.080054
	x3	-1.164247	-1.209535	.0452881
	x4	.1519007	.1831672	-.0312665
	_cons	.3106285	-.0171095	.3277379
-----+-----				
5				
	x1	1.840991	1.832363	.0086281
	x2	-2.324036	-2.368735	.0446987
	x3	.1324245	.0976971	.0347274
	x4	.4649274	.4905651	-.0256377
	_cons	-3.915288	-4.204706	.2894183
-----+-----				

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from mlogit

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

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

$$\begin{aligned} \text{chi2}(19) &= (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^{-1}](b-B) \\ &= 0.47 \end{aligned}$$

Prob>chi2 = 1.0000

(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)

. hausman mlogit3 mlogit, alleqs constant

Note: the rank of the differenced variance matrix (19) does not equal the number of coefficients being tested (20); be sure this is what you expect, or there may be problems

computing the test. Examine the output of your estimators for anything unexpected and possibly consider scaling your variables so that the coefficients are on a

similar scale.

---- Coefficients ----				
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	mlogit3	mlogit	Difference	S.E.
-----+-----				
1				
	x1	-.0345956	-.1220175	.087422
	x2	-1.944929	-2.016388	.0714583
	x3	1.008411	1.253423	-.2450125
	x4	1.173903	1.307279	-.1333753
	_cons	-16.06881	-18.06503	1.996222
-----+-----				
2				
	x1	.9993361	.9699943	.0293418
	x2	-1.54066	-1.631037	.0903772
	x3	-1.07311	-1.034421	-.0386898
	x4	.1708932	.2042703	-.0333771
	_cons	-.4976237	-.9022321	.4046085
-----+-----				
4				
	x1	1.712027	1.677905	.0341224
	x2	-1.984394	-2.104352	.1199581
	x3	-1.268538	-1.209535	-.0590035
	x4	.1397741	.1831672	-.0433931
	_cons	.5172055	-.0171095	.5343149
-----+-----				
5				

x1	1.81674	1.832363	-.0156229	.090417
x2	-2.242124	-2.368735	.1266108	.
x3	.0269395	.0976971	-.0707576	.1412581
x4	.4149522	.4905651	-.075613	.
_cons	-3.16993	-4.204706	1.034776	.

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from mlogit

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

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

$$\begin{aligned}\chi^2(19) &= (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^{-1}](b-B) \\ &= 2.04\end{aligned}$$

Prob>chi2 = 1.0000

(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)

. hausman mlogit4 mlogit, alleqs constant

Note: the rank of the differenced variance matrix (19) does not equal the number of coefficients being tested (20); be sure this is what you expect, or there may be problems

computing the test. Examine the output of your estimators for anything unexpected and possibly consider scaling your variables so that the coefficients are on a

similar scale.

---- Coefficients ----				
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	mlogit4	mlogit	Difference	S.E.
-----+-----				
1				
x1	.0295265	-.1220175	.151544	.
x2	-1.973401	-2.016388	.0429865	.1607527
x3	1.207552	1.253423	-.0458709	.1689117
x4	1.243142	1.307279	-.0641366	.
_cons	-17.20365	-18.06503	.861379	.
-----+-----				
2				
x1	1.014523	.9699943	.0445285	.

	x2		-1.652876	-1.631037	-.0218398	.1540759
	x3		-1.059433	-1.034421	-.0250125	.1199088
	x4		.205666	.2042703	.0013957	.
	_cons		-.9039178	-.9022321	-.0016857	.
-----+-----						
3						
	x1		-.3555477	-.4040394	.0484917	.
	x2		-.953488	-.9533924	-.0000956	.1279901
	x3		-.1864263	-.1658373	-.0205891	.1095678
	x4		.1988436	.2174653	-.0186217	.
	_cons		-.8040827	-1.061943	.2578602	.
-----+-----						
5						
	x1		1.917478	1.832363	.0851147	.0639035
	x2		-2.399049	-2.368735	-.0303146	.1991226
	x3		.0750429	.0976971	-.0226542	.1709826
	x4		.4760917	.4905651	-.0144735	.
	_cons		-4.002073	-4.204706	.2026339	.

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from mlogit

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

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

$$\begin{aligned} \text{chi2}(19) &= (b-B)' [(V_b-V_B)^{-1}] (b-B) \\ &= 1.97 \end{aligned}$$

Prob>chi2 = 1.0000

(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)

.

. hausman mlogit mlogit5, alleqs constant

Note: the rank of the differenced variance matrix (19) does not equal the number of coefficients being tested (20); be sure this is what you expect, or there may be problems

computing the test. Examine the output of your estimators for anything unexpected and possibly consider scaling your variables so that the coefficients are on a

similar scale.

---- Coefficients ----				
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	$\sqrt{\text{diag}(V_b - V_B)}$
	mlogit	mlogit5	Difference	S.E.
-----+-----				
1				
	x1	-.1220175	-.1485919	.0265744
	x2	-2.016388	-2.34891	.3325224
	x3	1.253423	1.214949	.0384741
	x4	1.307279	1.440948	-.1336696
	_cons	-18.06503	-19.70723	1.6422
-----+-----				
2				
	x1	.9699943	.8102007	.1597936
	x2	-1.631037	-1.804572	.1735351
	x3	-1.034421	-1.056176	.0217556
	x4	.2042703	.2541214	-.0498511
	_cons	-.9022321	-1.386087	.4838551
-----+-----				
3				
	x1	-.4040394	-.4484998	.0444605
	x2	-.9533924	-1.067195	.113803
	x3	-.1658373	-.2305792	.0647419
	x4	.2174653	.2442322	-.0267669
	_cons	-1.061943	-1.284649	.2227059
-----+-----				
4				
	x1	1.677905	1.478476	.1994286
	x2	-2.104352	-2.278957	.174605
	x3	-1.209535	-1.24603	.0364958
	x4	.1831672	.2456624	-.0624952
	_cons	-.0171095	-.6496392	.6325297
-----+-----				

b = consistent under H_0 and H_a ; obtained from mlogit

B = inconsistent under H_a , efficient under H_0 ; obtained from mlogit

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

```
chi2(19) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^(-1)](b-B)
          = 0.92
Prob>chi2 = 1.0000
(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)
```

From the Huasman test, it illustrates that the IIA property is being held since the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

According to the overall test (LR Test), p-value=0.0002 < 0.05, so all independent variables, altogether, can significantly explain the degree of seriousness problem of the price-war.

From the individual test, it suggests that "log of size of the firm" can significantly explain the difference between the firm having no problem and less serious problem; while "the state of being a family firm" and "Having its own brand-name" can significantly explain the different between the firm having no problem and very serious problem.

Pseudo $R^2 = 0.1109$ which is quite low.

Counted $R^2 = (12+2+78)/225 = 0.4089$. It implies that the model correctly predict the dependent variable 40.89%.

2 Estimate the model using order logit of y_i . Interpret your estimated result (overall test, individual test, pseudo R^2 , counted R^2).

Order Logit Model

```
. ologit y x*
```

```
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -228.64363
```

```
. . .
```

```
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -216.23748
```

```
Ordered logistic regression           Number of obs   =           152
                                     LR chi2(4)         =           24.81
                                     Prob > chi2        =           0.0001
Log likelihood = -216.23748           Pseudo R2       =           0.0543
```

```
-----+-----
              y |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
              x1 |    1.26067   .3475145     3.63   0.000    .5795538    1.941786
              x2 |   -.8530234   .3508641    -2.43   0.015   -1.540705   -.1653424
              x3 |    .2068371   .3398536     0.61   0.543   -.4592637    .8729379
              x4 |    .1261028   .1511501     0.83   0.404   -.1701459    .4223515
-----+-----
              /cut1 |   -.8807685   2.139511                -5.074134    3.312597
              /cut2 |   -.0328063   2.126237                -4.200155    4.134542
              /cut3 |    .6557008   2.118367                -3.496223    4.807624
              /cut4 |    1.48964    2.117389                -2.660365    5.639646
              /cut5 |    2.283969   2.124223                -1.879432    6.447371
-----+-----
```

```
. drop yhat zero one two three four five
```

Counted R^2

```
. predict zero one two three four five
```

```
(option pr assumed; predicted probabilities)
```

```
(73 missing values generated)
```

```
. gen yhat=0 if zero==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
```

```
(152 missing values generated)
```

```
. replace yhat=1 if one==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(73 real changes made)

. replace yhat=2 if two==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(73 real changes made)

. replace yhat=3 if three==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(86 real changes made)

. replace yhat=4 if four==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(73 real changes made)

. replace yhat=5 if five==max(zero,one,two,three,four,five)
(212 real changes made)
```

```
. tabulate y yhat
```

	yhat		
y	3	5	Total
-----+-----+-----			
0	2	27	29
1	0	14	14
2	3	24	27
3	4	29	33
4	2	33	35
5	2	85	87
-----+-----+-----			
Total	13	212	225

According to the overall test (LR Test), p-value= 0.0001 < 0.05, so all independent variables, altogether, can significantly explain the degree of seriousness problem of the price-war.

From the individual test, it illustrates that only the dummy variables of being a family firm and having its own brand-name can significantly explain the degree of seriousness of the price-war problem. Moreover, none of the cuts is significant.

Pseudo R^2 = 0.0543 which is very low.

Counted R^2 = $(4+85)/225 = 0.3956$. It implies that the model correctly predict the dependent variable 39.56%.

3 From (a) and (b), compare the two models. Perform order logit test. Which model is more appropriated in this case? Why?

Test Ordered Logit

```
. gen y01 = y>0
. gen y12 = y>1
. gen y23 = y>2
. gen y34 = y>3
. gen y45 = y>4
. qui logit y01 x*
. est store logit01
. qui logit y12 x*
. est store logit12
. qui logit y23 x*
. est store logit23
. qui logit y34 x*
. est store logit34
. qui logit y45 x*
. est store logit45
. suest logit01 logit12 logit23 logit34 logit45
```

Simultaneous results for logit01, logit12, logit23, logit34, logit45

Number of obs = 152

		Robust				
		Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----						
logit01_y01						
x1		1.097122	.9033857	1.21	0.225	-.6734812 2.867725
x2		-1.82336	1.135405	-1.61	0.108	-4.048713 .4019928
x3		-.3069072	.803698	-0.38	0.703	-1.882126 1.268312
x4		.3527502	.3544918	1.00	0.320	-.3420409 1.047541
_cons		-1.099312	4.856106	-0.23	0.821	-10.6171 8.418481
-----+-----						
logit12_y12						

```

      x1 |   1.264527   .5825003    2.17   0.030    .1228478    2.406207
      x2 |  -.7792338   .604258   -1.29   0.197   -1.963558    .4050901
      x3 |  -.8053988   .6052151   -1.33   0.183   -1.991599    .380801
      x4 |  -.2074297   .3082284   -0.67   0.501   -.8115462    .3966868
    _cons |   5.389609   4.422033    1.22   0.223   -3.277416   14.05663
-----+-----
logit23_y23 |
      x1 |    .864886   .4721274    1.83   0.067   -.0604667    1.790239
      x2 |  -.6170464   .4658079   -1.32   0.185   -1.530013    .2959203
      x3 |  -.0281734   .4629933   -0.06   0.951   -.9356237    .8792769
      x4 |  -.0449685   .2176813   -0.21   0.836   -.4716161    .3816791
    _cons |   1.899683   3.086536    0.62   0.538   -4.149816    7.949182
-----+-----
logit34_y34 |
      x1 |   1.679889   .4359289    3.85   0.000    .8254838    2.534294
      x2 | -1.051402   .4339843   -2.42   0.015   -1.901996   -.2008088
      x3 |  -.1154448   .4385046   -0.26   0.792   -.974898    .7440085
      x4 |   .0623465   .1817055    0.34   0.732   -.2937897    .4184826
    _cons |  -.4960081   2.567482   -0.19   0.847   -5.52818    4.536164
-----+-----
logit45_y45 |
      x1 |   1.213482   .3980963    3.05   0.002    .4332271    1.993736
      x2 |  -.8226954   .3994092   -2.06   0.039   -1.605523   -.0398677
      x3 |   .672316   .4147506    1.62   0.105   -.1405801    1.485212
      x4 |   .2113165   .1907187    1.11   0.268   -.1624853    .5851183
    _cons | -3.847181   2.713683   -1.42   0.156   -9.165902    1.471539
-----+-----
. test [logit01_y01]x1 = [logit12_y12]x1 = [logit23_y23]x1 = [logit34_y34]x1 = [logit45_y45]x1

( 1)  [logit01_y01]x1 - [logit12_y12]x1 = 0
( 2)  [logit01_y01]x1 - [logit23_y23]x1 = 0
( 3)  [logit01_y01]x1 - [logit34_y34]x1 = 0
( 4)  [logit01_y01]x1 - [logit45_y45]x1 = 0

      chi2( 4) =      6.95
      Prob > chi2 =      0.1384 > 0.05

```

```
. test [logit01_y01]x2 = [logit12_y12]x2 = [logit23_y23]x2 = [logit34_y34]x2 = [logit45_y45]x2
```

```
( 1)  [logit01_y01]x2 - [logit12_y12]x2 = 0
( 2)  [logit01_y01]x2 - [logit23_y23]x2 = 0
( 3)  [logit01_y01]x2 - [logit34_y34]x2 = 0
( 4)  [logit01_y01]x2 - [logit45_y45]x2 = 0
```

```
chi2( 4) = 3.24
Prob > chi2 = 0.5186 > 0.05
```

```
. test [logit01_y01]x3 = [logit12_y12]x3 = [logit23_y23]x3 = [logit34_y34]x3 = [logit45_y45]x3
```

```
( 1)  [logit01_y01]x3 - [logit12_y12]x3 = 0
( 2)  [logit01_y01]x3 - [logit23_y23]x3 = 0
( 3)  [logit01_y01]x3 - [logit34_y34]x3 = 0
( 4)  [logit01_y01]x3 - [logit45_y45]x3 = 0
```

```
chi2( 4) = 8.55
Prob > chi2 = 0.0734 > 0.05
```

```
. test [logit01_y01]x4 = [logit12_y12]x4 = [logit23_y23]x4 = [logit34_y34]x4 = [logit45_y45]x4
```

```
( 1)  [logit01_y01]x4 - [logit12_y12]x4 = 0
( 2)  [logit01_y01]x4 - [logit23_y23]x4 = 0
( 3)  [logit01_y01]x4 - [logit34_y34]x4 = 0
( 4)  [logit01_y01]x4 - [logit45_y45]x4 = 0
```

```
chi2( 4) = 7.47
Prob > chi2 = 0.1130 > 0.05
```

```
.
```

According to the ordered logit test, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, the ordered logit should be applied. Therefore, The ordered logit model is more appropriated in this case.

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(0))
```

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=0)$, `predict(outcome(0))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method					
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----							
x1		-.049448	.0394996	-1.25	0.211	-.1268658	.0279698
x2		.0953594	.0625156	1.53	0.127	-.027169	.2178878
x3		.0128947	.0388471	0.33	0.740	-.0632443	.0890336
x4		-.0202353	.0163353	-1.24	0.215	-.0522519	.0117814

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(0)) at((median))
```

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=0)$, `predict(outcome(0))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		-.049448	.0394996	-1.25	0.211	-.1268658 .0279698
x2		.0953594	.0625156	1.53	0.127	-.027169 .2178878
x3		.0128947	.0388471	0.33	0.740	-.0632443 .0890336

```

x4 | -.0202353 .0163353 -1.24 0.215 -.0522519 .0117814
-----

```

```

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(1))

```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y==1), predict(outcome(1))

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

```

-----

```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----						
x1		-.0770801	.0429311	-1.80	0.073	-.1612236 .0070633
x2		-.0090692	.0417711	-0.22	0.828	-.0909391 .0728007
x3		.0862353	.0585697	1.47	0.141	-.0285593 .2010298
x4		.0558661	.02814	1.99	0.047	.0007127 .1110196

```

-----

```

```

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(1)) at((median))

```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : Pr(y==1), predict(outcome(1))

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

```

-----

```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----						
x1		-.0770801	.0429311	-1.80	0.073	-.1612236 .0070633
x2		-.0090692	.0417711	-0.22	0.828	-.0909391 .0728007
x3		.0862353	.0585697	1.47	0.141	-.0285593 .2010298

```
x4 | .0558661 .02814 1.99 0.047 .0007127 .1110196
```

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(2))
```

```
Average marginal effects          Number of obs      =          152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==2), predict(outcome(2))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t.   : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		-.010222	.0443173	-0.23	0.818	-.0970824 .0766384
x2		.0162247	.0506471	0.32	0.749	-.0830418 .1154912
x3		-.0705732	.048277	-1.46	0.144	-.1651944 .0240479
x4		-.0146586	.0203981	-0.72	0.472	-.0546381 .0253209

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(2)) at((median))
```

```
Average marginal effects          Number of obs      =          152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==2), predict(outcome(2))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t.   : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		-.010222	.0443173	-0.23	0.818	-.0970824 .0766384
x2		.0162247	.0506471	0.32	0.749	-.0830418 .1154912
x3		-.0705732	.048277	-1.46	0.144	-.1651944 .0240479

```
x4 | -.0146586 .0203981 -0.72 0.472 -.0546381 .0253209
```

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(3))
```

```
Average marginal effects          Number of obs    =          152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==3), predict(outcome(3))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t.   : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.189127	.0587973	-3.22	0.001	-.3043675	-.0738865
x2	.1043358	.0651863	1.60	0.109	-.023427	.2320986
x3	.0071591	.0574438	0.12	0.901	-.1054288	.1197469
x4	-.0209355	.0234814	-0.89	0.373	-.0669581	.0250872

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(3)) at((median))
```

```
Average marginal effects          Number of obs    =          152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==3), predict(outcome(3))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t.   : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.189127	.0587973	-3.22	0.001	-.3043675	-.0738865
x2	.1043358	.0651863	1.60	0.109	-.023427	.2320986
x3	.0071591	.0574438	0.12	0.901	-.1054288	.1197469

x4		- .0209355	.0234814	-0.89	0.373	- .0669581	.0250872
----	--	------------	----------	-------	-------	------------	----------

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(4))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=4)$, `predict(outcome(4))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method					
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----							
x1		.077112	.0601692	1.28	0.200	-.0408174	.1950415
x2		-.0337673	.0612127	-0.55	0.581	-.1537419	.0862073
x3		-.1532631	.0608112	-2.52	0.012	-.2724508	-.0340753
x4		-.0312193	.0263643	-1.18	0.236	-.0828923	.0204538

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(4)) at((median))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=4)$, `predict(outcome(4))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.077112	.0601692	1.28	0.200	-.0408174	.1950415
x2	-.0337673	.0612127	-0.55	0.581	-.1537419	.0862073
x3	-.1532631	.0608112	-2.52	0.012	-.2724508	-.0340753

```

x4 | -.0312193 .0263643 -1.18 0.236 -.0828923 .0204538
-----

```

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(5))
```

```
Average marginal effects      Number of obs      =      152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==5), predict(outcome(5))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

```

-----

```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		.2487651	.0737675	3.37	0.001	.1041835 .3933467
x2		-.1730834	.0790483	-2.19	0.029	-.3280153 -.0181515
x3		.1175473	.0846921	1.39	0.165	-.0484461 .2835406
x4		.0311825	.0375786	0.83	0.407	-.0424701 .1048351

```

-----

```

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(5)) at((median))
```

```
Average marginal effects      Number of obs      =      152
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
Expression      : Pr(y==5), predict(outcome(5))
```

```
dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4
```

```

-----

```

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		.2487651	.0737675	3.37	0.001	.1041835 .3933467
x2		-.1730834	.0790483	-2.19	0.029	-.3280153 -.0181515
x3		.1175473	.0846921	1.39	0.165	-.0484461 .2835406

```

-----

```

x4 | .0311825 .0375786 0.83 0.407 -.0424701 .1048351

Marginal Effect at mean and median of Ordered Logit model

. ologit y x*, nolog

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs	=	152
	LR chi2(4)	=	24.81
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0001
Log likelihood = -216.23748	Pseudo R2	=	0.0543

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1	1.26067	.3475145	3.63	0.000	.5795538 1.941786
x2	-.8530234	.3508641	-2.43	0.015	-1.540705 -.1653424
x3	.2068371	.3398536	0.61	0.543	-.4592637 .8729379
x4	.1261028	.1511501	0.83	0.404	-.1701459 .4223515
/cut1	-.8807685	2.139511			-5.074134 3.312597
/cut2	-.0328063	2.126237			-4.200155 4.134542
/cut3	.6557008	2.118367			-3.496223 4.807624
/cut4	1.48964	2.117389			-2.660365 5.639646
/cut5	2.283969	2.124223			-1.879432 6.447371

. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(0))

Average marginal effects	Number of obs	=	152
Model VCE	: OIM		

Expression : Pr(y==0), predict(outcome(0))

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

| Delta-method

		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1		-.0681609	.0273944	-2.49	0.013	-.121853	-.0144688
x2		.0461206	.0233188	1.98	0.048	.0004166	.0918247
x3		-.0111831	.0186422	-0.60	0.549	-.0477211	.0253549
x4		-.006818	.0084411	-0.81	0.419	-.0233623	.0097263

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(0)) at((median))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=0)$, `predict(outcome(0))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.0681609	.0273944	-2.49	0.013	-.121853	-.0144688
x2	.0461206	.0233188	1.98	0.048	.0004166	.0918247
x3	-.0111831	.0186422	-0.60	0.549	-.0477211	.0253549
x4	-.006818	.0084411	-0.81	0.419	-.0233623	.0097263

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(1))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=1)$, `predict(outcome(1))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method				
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----					

x1		-.0599322	.0226362	-2.65	0.008	-.1042983	-.015566
x2		.0405527	.0197166	2.06	0.040	.0019088	.0791965
x3		-.009833	.0162697	-0.60	0.546	-.041721	.022055
x4		-.0059949	.0073186	-0.82	0.413	-.0203391	.0083493

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(1)) at((median))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=1)$, `predict(outcome(1))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method					
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1		-.0599322	.0226362	-2.65	0.008	-.1042983	-.015566
x2		.0405527	.0197166	2.06	0.040	.0019088	.0791965
x3		-.009833	.0162697	-0.60	0.546	-.041721	.022055
x4		-.0059949	.0073186	-0.82	0.413	-.0203391	.0083493

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(2))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

```
Expression      : Pr(y==2), predict(outcome(2))
```

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.0614076	.0202331	-3.04	0.002	-.1010639	-.0217514
x2	.0415511	.0188187	2.21	0.027	.004667	.0784351

x3	-.0100751	.0166518	-0.61	0.545	-.0427121	.0225619
x4	-.0061425	.007391	-0.83	0.406	-.0206285	.0083435

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(2)) at((median))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=2)$, `predict(outcome(2))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.0614076	.0202331	-3.04	0.002	-.1010639	-.0217514
x2	.0415511	.0188187	2.21	0.027	.004667	.0784351
x3	-.0100751	.0166518	-0.61	0.545	-.0427121	.0225619
x4	-.0061425	.007391	-0.83	0.406	-.0206285	.0083435

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(3))
```

Average marginal effects Number of obs = 152

Model VCE : OIM

Expression : $\Pr(y=3)$, `predict(outcome(3))`

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

	Delta-method					
	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	-.0649197	.0193261	-3.36	0.001	-.1027982	-.0270412
x2	.0439275	.0192343	2.28	0.022	.006229	.081626
x3	-.0106513	.017627	-0.60	0.546	-.0451996	.0238969
x4	-.0064938	.0078483	-0.83	0.408	-.0218763	.0088886

Model VCE : OIM

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method				
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1		-.0206373	.0127601	-1.62	0.106	-.0456467 .004372
x2		.0139641	.0092144	1.52	0.130	-.0040958 .032024
x3		-.003386	.0059659	-0.57	0.570	-.0150789 .008307
x4		-.0020643	.0027613	-0.75	0.455	-.0074764 .0033478

```
. margins, dydx(*) predict(outcome(5))
```

Model VCE : OIM

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method					
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1		.2750578	.0661191	4.16	0.000	.1454667	.4046489
x2		-.1861159	.0724194	-2.57	0.010	-.3280553	-.0441766
x3		.0451285	.073977	0.61	0.542	-.0998638	.1901208
x4		.0275136	.032782	0.84	0.401	-.0367379	.0917651

Model VCE : OIM

dy/dx w.r.t. : x1 x2 x3 x4

		Delta-method					
		dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1		.2750578	.0661191	4.16	0.000	.1454667	.4046489
x2		-.1861159	.0724194	-2.57	0.010	-.3280553	-.0441766
x3		.0451285	.073977	0.61	0.542	-.0998638	.1901208
x4		.0275136	.032782	0.84	0.401	-.0367379	.0917651