

Assignment 10

1. Estimate models for Y_{1i} , Y_{2i} , and Y_{3i} assuming that the probability functions follow separate normal distribution function.

```
. probit y1 x1 x2 x3
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -45.533775
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -35.05321
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -34.122847
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -34.092095
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -34.09209
Iteration 5:  log likelihood = -34.09209
```

Probit regression	Number of obs	=	67
	LR chi2(3)	=	22.88
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -34.09209	Pseudo R2	=	0.2513

	y1	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
x1	2.574932	.7958181	3.24	0.001	1.015157	4.134707
x2	-.5031798	.297949	-1.69	0.091	-1.087149	.0807895
x3	.3449061	.1616015	2.13	0.033	.028173	.6616392
_cons	-2.186903	.6334447	-3.45	0.001	-3.428432	-.9453743

Note: 1 failure and 0 successes completely determined.

```
. probit y2 x1 x2 x3
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -22.432361
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -19.734461
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -19.678976
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -19.678766
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -19.678766
```

Probit regression	Number of obs	=	67
	LR chi2(3)	=	5.51
	Prob > chi2	=	0.1382

Log likelihood = -19.678766 Pseudo R2 = 0.1228

-----+-----							
	y2	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----							
	x1	1.196021	.8449952	1.42	0.157	-.4601389	2.852182
	x2	-.1604507	.1166507	-1.38	0.169	-.3890818	.0681804
	x3	.1023406	.2083685	0.49	0.623	-.3060541	.5107354
	_cons	.5275558	.5565448	0.95	0.343	-.563252	1.618364

. probit y3 x1 x2 x3

Iteration 0: log likelihood = -39.952416

Iteration 1: log likelihood = -35.846932

Iteration 2: log likelihood = -35.496676

Iteration 3: log likelihood = -35.486934

Iteration 4: log likelihood = -35.486933

Probit regression	Number of obs	=	67
	LR chi2(3)	=	8.93
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0302
Log likelihood = -35.486933	Pseudo R2	=	0.1118

-----+-----							
y3	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]		
-----+-----							
x1	1.549326	.6925982	2.24	0.025	.1918581	2.906793	
x2	-.33157	.2931093	-1.13	0.258	-.9060538	.2429137	
x3	.0952456	.1142564	0.83	0.404	-.128693	.3191841	
_cons	-1.713771	.5536004	-3.10	0.002	-2.798808	-.6287342	

Interpret your estimated result (sign and meaning, overall test, pseudo R2, individual test)

From model Y1i, firms with a **higher x1 and/or x3** and/or **lower x2** are associated with a higher likelihood of choosing to restructure its capital structure.

From model Y2i, interpretation should not be made as all coefficients are insignificant. This model should not be applied.

From model Y3i, firms with a **higher x1 and/or x3** and/or **lower x2** are associated with a higher likelihood of choosing to issue new stocks.

For the individual test, I have highlighted the insignificant independent variables in red. Model Y1i and Y3i are overall significant, but model Y2i is not. Pseudo R2 of model Y1i is the largest, meaning that its independent variables can explain the dependent variable best when compare with model Y2i and Y3i. Model Y1i has the best goodness of fit.

2. Estimate models for Y1i, Y2i, and Y3i assuming that the probability functions follow multivariate normal probability distribution function (MV Probit models). Determine whether MVProbit is appropriated. Why?

```
. mvprobit ( y1 x1 x2 x3 )( y2 x1 x2 x3 )( y3 x1 x2 x3 )
```

```
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -89.257789
```

```
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -88.984177
```

```
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -88.982664
```

```
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -88.982663
```

```
Multivariate probit (MSL, # draws = 5)           Number of obs   =           67
                                                    Wald chi2(9)     =           25.03
Log likelihood = -88.982663                      Prob > chi2      =           0.0029
```

-----+-----							
		Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----							
y1							
	x1	2.592376	.8023984	3.23	0.001	1.019704	4.165048
	x2	-.5314422	.3036422	-1.75	0.080	-1.12657	.0636857
	x3	.3491611	.1619024	2.16	0.031	.0318383	.6664839
	_cons	-2.194319	.6357735	-3.45	0.001	-3.440412	-.9482253
-----+-----							
y2							
	x1	1.221734	.8478931	1.44	0.150	-.4401059	2.883574
	x2	-.1557306	.1180077	-1.32	0.187	-.3870215	.0755604
	x3	.1054215	.2100288	0.50	0.616	-.3062274	.5170703
	_cons	.5119029	.5577948	0.92	0.359	-.5813547	1.605161
-----+-----							
y3							
	x1	1.535622	.6913496	2.22	0.026	.1806018	2.890642
	x2	-.3542075	.2987204	-1.19	0.236	-.9396887	.2312737

x3	.0956571	.1143892	0.84	0.403	-.1285416	.3198557
_cons	-1.691533	.5520363	-3.06	0.002	-2.773504	-.6095614
-----+-----						
/atrho21	.1028098	.306035	0.34	0.737	-.4970077	.7026274
-----+-----						
/atrho31	.1399288	.2264305	0.62	0.537	-.3038669	.5837245
-----+-----						
/atrho32	.1014794	.268692	0.38	0.706	-.4251472	.628106
-----+-----						
rho21	.1024491	.3028229	0.34	0.735	-.4597606	.6060328
-----+-----						
rho31	.1390226	.2220542	0.63	0.531	-.2948474	.5253672
-----+-----						
rho32	.1011325	.2659439	0.38	0.704	-.4012578	.5567467

Likelihood ratio test of rho21 = rho31 = rho32 = 0:

chi2(3) = .550251 Prob > chi2 = 0.9077

As the p-value is more than 0.05, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that rho equals to zero. Thus, there is no evidence that multivariate probit model is more appropriate than separate probit ones.