

a)

```

. probit y x1 x2 x3 x4
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -248.43455
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -150.03919
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -147.46531
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -147.46882
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -147.46881

probit regression              Number of obs   =      400
                              LR chi2(4)          =      201.93
                              Prob > chi2         =      0.0000
                              Pseudo R2          =      0.4064

log likelihood = -147.46881

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| y      | Coef. | Std. Err. | z    | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| x1     | .3590739 | .0371539 | 9.66 | 0.000 | .2862536   .4318841 |
| x2     | -.3525746 | .144481  | -2.44 | 0.014 | -.6359997  -.0691495 |
| x3     | -.5735764 | .2202882 | -2.60 | 0.009 | -1.005333  -.1418195 |
| x4     | -1.248569 | .226762  | -5.51 | 0.000 | -1.693014  -.8041238 |
| _cons  | 1.45664  | .2037279 | 7.15  | 0.000 | 1.057341   1.85594   |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

fitstat

Measures of Fit for probit of y
Log-Lik Intercept Only:    -248.435    Log-Lik Full Model:    -147.469
D(395):                   294.938    LR(4):                201.931
                              Prob > LR:                0.000
McFadden's R2:            0.406    McFadden's Adj R2:    0.386
Maximum Likelihood R2:    0.395    Cragg & Uhler's R2:   0.557
McKelvey and Zavoina's R2: 0.640    Efron's R2:           0.446
Variance of y*:          2.775    Variance of error:    1.000
Count R2:                 0.818    Adj Count R2:         0.416
AIC:                      0.762    AIC*:                 304.938
BIC:                      -2071.691    BIC*:                 -177.966

```

normal distribution (Probit model)

$$P(y=1|x) = \Phi(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$$

Overall test : $p < \alpha = 0.05$

jointly significant in overall test

individual test (z-test)

significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Pseudo $R^2 = 0.0464$

Count $R^2 = 0.818 > 0.5$

However adj. count $R^2 < 0.5$

so, the model is not accurate

predict y

```

. logit y x1 x2 x3 x4
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -248.43455
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -154.06753
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -148.00091
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -147.90887
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -147.90869
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -147.90869

Logistic regression              Number of obs   =      400
                              LR chi2(4)          =      201.05
                              Prob > chi2         =      0.0000
                              Pseudo R2          =      0.4046

log likelihood = -147.90869

+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| y      | Coef. | Std. Err. | z    | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
| x1     | .6299401 | .0708979 | 8.89 | 0.000 | .4909828   .7688974 |
| x2     | -1.488248 | .2597744 | -5.73 | 0.000 | -1.997396  -.9790992 |
| x3     | -.9562902 | .3882611 | -2.46 | 0.014 | -1.717268  -.1953124 |
| x4     | -2.155321 | .4055058 | -5.32 | 0.000 | -2.950097  -1.360544  |
| _cons  | 2.5165   | .3714373 | 6.78  | 0.000 | 1.788496   3.244503  |
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

fitstat

Measures of Fit for logit of y
Log-Lik Intercept Only:    -248.435    Log-Lik Full Model:    -147.909
D(395):                   295.817    LR(4):                201.052
                              Prob > LR:                0.000
McFadden's R2:            0.405    McFadden's Adj R2:    0.385
Maximum Likelihood R2:    0.395    Cragg & Uhler's R2:   0.555
McKelvey and Zavoina's R2: 0.622    Efron's R2:           0.445
Variance of y*:          8.707    Variance of error:    3.290
Count R2:                 0.818    Adj Count R2:         0.416
AIC:                      0.765    AIC*:                 305.817
BIC:                      -2070.811    BIC*:                 -177.086

```

logistic distribution (logit model)

$$\hat{P}_i = P(y=1|x) = \Lambda(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$$

- overall test : $p < \alpha = 0.05$

jointly significant in overall test

- individual test (z-test)

significant at $\alpha = 5\%$

- Pseudo $R^2 = 0.4046$

- Count $R^2 = 0.818 > 0.5$

However adj. Count $R^2 < 0.5$,

the model is not accurate

predict the y

b) From the result from stata including pseudo R^2 , counted R^2 and log like lihood value from both model can conclude that they are insignificant different in term of goodness of fit.

c)

```
. probit y x1 x2 x3 x4
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -248.43455
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -150.09919
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -147.40531
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -147.46882
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -147.46881

Probit regression              Number of obs   =      400
                              LR chi2(4)       =     201.93
                              Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
Log likelihood = -147.46881    Pseudo R2       =     0.4964
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1	.3590739	.0371539	9.66	0.000	.2862536 .4318941
x2	-.8525746	.144481	-5.90	0.000	-1.135752 -.569397
x3	-.5735764	.2202882	-2.60	0.009	-1.005333 -.1418195
x4	-1.248569	.326762	-5.51	0.000	-1.693014 -.8041238
_cons	1.45664	.2037279	7.15	0.000	1.057941 1.85594

overall test $H_0: \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \dots = \beta_n = 0$

$$\text{test stat} = 2(\ln L_w - \ln L_n) - \chi^2_{(k-1)}$$

$$= 2(-147.46882 + 248.43455)$$

$$= 201.93$$

```
. probit y, nolog
Probit regression              Number of obs   =      400
                              LR chi2(0)       =     0.000
                              Prob > chi2       =     .
Log likelihood = -248.43455    Pseudo R2       =     0.0000
```

y	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
_cons	.4887764	.0654634	7.47	0.000	.3604706 .6170822

d)

```
. mfx, predict(xb)
Marginal effects after logit
y = Linear prediction (log odds) (predict, xb)
dy/dx = 1.32418
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% C.I.]	X
x1	.6299401	.0709	8.89	0.000	.490983 .768897	.454973
x2	-1.488248	.25977	-5.73	0.000	-1.9974 -.979099	.809344
x3	-.9562902	.38826	-2.46	0.014	-1.71727 -.195312	.556712
x4	-2.155321	.40551	-5.32	0.000	-2.9501 -1.36054	-.119684

```
. mfx
Marginal effects after logit
y = Pr(y) (predict)
dy/dx = .7898763
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% C.I.]	X
x1	.1045522	.01146	9.12	0.000	.082083 .127022	.454973
x2	-.247007	.04388	-5.63	0.000	-.333011 -.161003	.809344
x3	-.1587171	.06397	-2.48	0.013	-.2841 -.033334	.556712
x4	-.3577223	.06679	-5.36	0.000	-.488633 -.226812	-.119684

e)

```
. mfx
Marginal effects after logit
y = Pr(y) (predict)
= .7898763
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% C.I.]	X
x1	.1045522	.01146	9.12	0.000	.082083	.127022	.454973	
x2	-.247007	.04388	-5.63	0.000	-.333011	-.161003	.809344	
x3	-.1587171	.06397	-2.48	0.013	-.2841	-.033334	.556712	
x4	-.3577223	.06679	-5.36	0.000	-.488633	-.226812	-.119684	

```
. mfx, at(median)
Marginal effects after logit
y = Pr(y) (predict)
= .84127022
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% C.I.]	X
x1	.0841188	.00961	8.76	0.000	.065292	.102946	.655749	
x2	-.1987326	.03349	-5.93	0.000	-.264373	-.133093	.692745	
x3	-.1276979	.04944	-2.58	0.010	-.224597	-.030799	.488768	
x4	-.28781	.05616	-5.12	0.000	-.397881	-.177739	-.109732	

at mean

at median

f)

```
. mfx, at(0.5 1 0.5 0)
Marginal effects after probit
y = Pr(y) (predict)
= .69034
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% C.I.]	X
x1	.1266183	.01307	9.69	0.000	.101001	.152235	.5	
x2	-.3006389	.05452	-5.51	0.000	-.4075	-.193778	1	
x3	-.2022572	.07644	-2.65	0.008	-.352085	-.05243	.5	
x4	-.4402764	.08419	-5.23	0.000	-.605293	-.27526	0	

g)

```
. predict pr
(option p* assumed; Pr(y))
. g yhat1=0 if pr<=0.5
(300 missing values generated)
. replace yhat1=1 if pr>0.5
(300 real changes made)
. tabulate y yhat1
```

y	yhat1		Total
	0	1	
0	76	49	125
1	24	251	275
Total	100	300	400

Counted $R^2 = \frac{76+251}{400}$
 $= 0.8175$

h)

```
. g yhat2=0 if pr<=0.7  
(241 missing values generated)  
  
. replace yhat2=1 if pr>0.7  
(241 real changes made)  
  
. tabulate y yhat2
```

y	yhat2		Total
	0	1	
0	101	24	125
1	58	217	275
Total	159	241	400

$$\text{Counted } P^2 = \frac{101 + 217}{400} \\ = 0.795$$

610464130 0