

From the result, LR-Chi 2 test equals to 619.86. The p-value of LR-Chi2 equals to 0.0000 which is less than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there exists a significant heteroscedasticity problem in this model.

2.

```
. xtglm 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

```
. 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

Wald chi2(7) = 663.43
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed)              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) fixed	(B) random	(b-B) Difference	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B)) S.E.
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)

.

From the test, it can see that there are the significant fixed effects since the result from F-test equals to 0.0000 which is less than 0.05. Moreover, the fixed effects model is more appropriated than random effect model. It comes from the result of significant Hausman test which $\chi^2=190.39$ and p-value equals to 0.0000 which is less than 0.05. So, the null hypothesis of the test is rejected and it means that the fixed effects model is more appropriated than random effects model.