

Assignment 4

From the data set `assign4.dta`:

The study on bankruptcy firm employs the following regression model.

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

The log-likelihood function of this model is as follows:

$$\ln L = \begin{cases} \ln \Phi(z_i) & \text{if } y_i = 1 \\ \ln \Phi(-z_i) & \text{if } y_i = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where: y_i = 1 for bankruptcy firm and 0 otherwise.

x_{1i} = Debt coverage ratio of firm i

x_{2i} = Liquidity ratio of firm i

x_{3i} = Profitability index of firm i

x_{4i} = Solidity ratio of firm i

Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ = Logistic probability distribution function. $\Phi(z_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-z_i}}$

From the given data set (`assign8-2.dta`):

- Estimate the above models using MLE with Newton-Ralphson algorithm.
- Perform hypothesis testing whether $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 0$ using LR-test and Wald test.
- Estimate the above models using MLE with BHHH algorithm, make comparison of the estimated result with the result from (1), and give explanation why are they different?

Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ = Cumulation standard normal probability distribution function and

$$z_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} \quad (3)$$

- Estimate the models using MLE with Newton-Ralphson algorithm.

Assume that there exists heteroskedasticity in the model as: $\sigma_i^2 = \exp(\gamma x_{4i})^2$, then,

$\Phi(\cdot)$ = Cumulation standard normal probability distribution function $\Phi(z_i / \exp(\gamma x_{4i}))$

- Estimate the models with heteroskedasticity using MLE with Newton-Ralphson algorithm. Perform LR-test whether there exists significant heteroskedasticity.

a.)

```
. ml model lf ml_logit (y = x1 x2 x3 x4)
. ml maximize

initial:      log likelihood = -90.109133
Iteration 7:  log likelihood = -54.627603

                                Number of obs   =       130
                                Wald chi2(4)      =       22.79
                                Prob > chi2       =       0.0001

Log likelihood = -54.627603
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.4835128	.1686119	2.87	0.004	.1530395	.813986
x2	1.454009	.5001373	2.91	0.004	.4737577	2.43426
x3	2.173186	.7757021	2.80	0.005	.652838	3.693535
x4	1.855464	.7138855	2.60	0.009	.4562738	3.254653
_cons	-1.400447	.5531237	-2.53	0.011	-2.484549	-.316344

b.) Wald test

```
. test (x1=0) (x2=0) (x3=0) (x4=0)

( 1) [eq1]x1 = 0
( 2) [eq1]x2 = 0
( 3) [eq1]x3 = 0
( 4) [eq1]x4 = 0

             chi2( 4) =    22.79
             Prob > chi2 =    0.0001
```

LR-test

```
initial:      log likelihood = -90.109133
alternative:  log likelihood = -86.130008
rescale:     log likelihood = -86.130008
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -86.130008
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -86.129902
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -86.129902

                                Number of obs   =       130
                                Wald chi2(0)      =       .
                                Prob > chi2       =       .

Log likelihood = -86.129902
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
_cons	.5026289	.1809802	2.78	0.005	.1479141	.8573436

```
. est store res
. lrtest unres res

Likelihood-ratio test          LR chi2(4) =    63.00
(Assumption: res nested in unres) Prob > chi2 =    0.0000
```

c.)

```
initial:      log likelihood = -90.109133
alternative:  log likelihood = -86.130008
rescale:     log likelihood = -86.130008
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -86.130008
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -64.805009
Iteration 25: log likelihood = -54.627605

                                Number of obs   =       130
                                Wald chi2(4)      =       16.34
                                Prob > chi2       =       0.0026

Log likelihood = -54.627605
```

y	Coef.	OPG Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.4833318	.1542635	3.13	0.002	.180981	.7856827
x2	1.453275	.597925	2.43	0.015	.2813639	2.625187
x3	2.172641	.8589781	2.53	0.011	.489075	3.856207
x4	1.854961	.7142729	2.60	0.009	.4550117	3.25491
_cons	-1.400063	.5625155	-2.49	0.013	-2.502573	-.2975527

The different of the algorithm affect the value of estimator to be changed, also the log(L), J.E., z-value, χ^2 , etc, even though the changes is very small.

d.)

```

initial:      log likelihood = -90.109133
alternative:  log likelihood = -87.504336
rescale:     log likelihood = -86.291737
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -86.291737
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -78.555778
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -65.28309
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -60.753707
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -60.695531
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -60.695503
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -60.695503

                                Number of obs   =       130
                                Wald chi2(2)      =       22.61
                                Prob > chi2      =       0.0000

Log likelihood = -60.695503

```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
x1	.3592444	.0871351	4.12	0.000	.1884627	.5300262
x2	1.139607	.3224845	3.53	0.000	.5075491	1.771665
_cons	-.7729211	.2765064	-2.80	0.005	-1.314864	-.2309785

e.)

```

initial:      log likelihood = -90.109133
alternative:  log likelihood = -83.932039
rescale:     log likelihood = -83.932039
rescale eq:  log likelihood = -70.42663
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -70.42663
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -69.416382
Iteration 11: log likelihood = -59.404451

                                Number of obs   =       130
                                Wald chi2(2)      =       16.42
                                Prob > chi2      =       0.0003

Log likelihood = -59.404451

```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
eq1						
x1	.2921402	.0773775	3.78	0.000	.140483	.4437974
x2	.9417315	.2800569	3.36	0.001	.3928299	1.490633
_cons	-.6388427	.2144265	-2.98	0.003	-1.059111	-.2185744
eq2						
x4	1.18393	.585199	2.02	0.043	.0369609	2.330899

```

. est store hetres
. lrtest unres hetres

Likelihood-ratio test          LR chi2(1) =       9.55
(Assumption: hetres nested in unres) Prob > chi2 =       0.0020

```

H_0 : heteroskedasticity

H_a : otherwise

$$Prob > \chi^2 = 0.002 < 0.05 > \alpha$$

$\therefore H_0$ is rejected at 5% level

Heteroskedasticity is not exist.