

Assignment 3

1. Estimate the model assuming that the probability function is (a) cumulative normal probability distribution function and (b) logistic probability distribution function. Interpret your estimated result (overall test, individual test, pseudo R^2 counted R^2).

```
. probit y x1 x2 x3 x4
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -248.43455
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -150.03919
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -147.48531
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       =         0.4064
```

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	.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:     0.396    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*n:                304.938
BIC:                       -2071.691    BIC':                 -177.966
```

```
. estat clas
```

Probit model for y

Classified	True		Total
	D	~D	
+	251	49	300
-	24	76	100
Total	275	125	400

Classified + if predicted $\Pr(D) \geq .5$
True D defined as $y \neq 0$

Sensitivity	$\Pr(+ D)$	91.27%
Specificity	$\Pr(- \sim D)$	60.80%
Positive predictive value	$\Pr(D +)$	83.67%
Negative predictive value	$\Pr(\sim D -)$	76.00%
False + rate for true ~D	$\Pr(+ \sim D)$	39.20%
False - rate for true D	$\Pr(- D)$	8.73%
False + rate for classified +	$\Pr(\sim D +)$	16.33%
False - rate for classified -	$\Pr(D -)$	24.00%
Correctly classified		81.75%

From the probit model,

Likelihood Ratio (LR) chi-Square test of 201.93 with the P-value of 0.001. Thus we could conclude that at least one of the regression coefficients in the model is not equal to Zero and all explanatory variables could to use to explain the dependent variables

Pseudo R-squared could be used only to compare between models. The model with higher likelihood, Pseudo R-squared will be higher. In probit pseudo R-squared is equal to 0.4064.

Counted R-squared indicates the number of correct predictions over the total number of observations. In probit model, Counted R-squared equal to 81.75% so, Model could correctly predict outcomes by 81.75%

Individual Test indicates whether each explanatory variable could be explained by the dependent variable. All of explanatory variables have P-value lower than 0.05 suggesting that each of the variables could be used to explain the dependent variable.

```
. 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
Log likelihood = -147.90869                        Pseudo R2      =         0.4046
```

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*n:	305.817
BIC:	-2070.811	BIC':	-177.086

From the logit model,

Likelihood Ratio (LR) chi-Square test of 201.05 with the P-value of 0.000. Thus we could conclude that at least one of the regression coefficients in the model is not equal to Zero and all explanatory variables could be used to explain the dependent variables.

Pseudo R-squared could be used only to compare between models. The model with higher likelihood, Pseudo R-squared will be higher. In logit pseudo R-squared is equal to 0.405.

Counted R-squared indicates the number of correct predictions over the total number of observations. In probit model, Counted R-squared equal to 81.8% so, Model could correctly predict outcomes by 81.8%

Individual Test indicates whether each explanatory variable could be explained by the dependent variable. All of explanatory variables have P-value lower than 0.05 suggesting that each of the variables could be use to explain the dependent variable.

2. Make comparison of the goodness of fit of the two models.

According to the result, Probit has a higher Pseudo R-squared than Logit model (0.4064>0.4046) which indicates that the Probit model is better fitting the data and more appropriate to use than the logit model.

3. From Probit model, show how to compute Overall LR-test

```
. probit y, nolog
```

Probit regression	Number of obs	=	400
	LR chi2(0)	=	0.00
	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

From Overall LR-test statistic= $2(\ln L_{ur} - \ln L_r) = 2(-147.46881 + 248.43455) = 201.93$ which has P-value of 0.000

4. From Logit model, compute predicted value of index value and predicted probability of being bad loan by using mean value of all Xs.

```
. mfx, predict(xb)
```

Marginal effects after logit

y = Linear prediction (log odds) (predict, xb)

= 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

$$\hat{I} = 2.52 + 0.62(0.45) - 1.49(0.81) - 0.96(0.56) + 2.16(0.12) = 1.32$$

5. Compute marginal effect at mean and at median for Logit model

```
. 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	

6. Compute marginal effect at the value of X1=0.5, X2=1, X3=0.5, X4=0 for the Probit model.

```
. 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	-.193777	1	
x3	-.2022572	.07644	-2.65	0.008	-.352085	-.05243	.5	
x4	-.4402764	.08419	-5.23	0.000	-.605293	-.275259	0	

```
.
```


7. Determine counted R2 using the threshold of predicted value = 0.5 for Logit models

```
. estat clas
```

Logistic model for y

Classified	True		Total
	D	~D	
+	251	49	300
-	24	76	100
Total	275	125	400

Classified + if predicted $\Pr(D) \geq .5$

True D defined as $y \neq 0$

Sensitivity	$\Pr(+ D)$	91.27%
Specificity	$\Pr(- \sim D)$	60.80%
Positive predictive value	$\Pr(D +)$	83.67%
Negative predictive value	$\Pr(\sim D -)$	76.00%
False + rate for true ~D	$\Pr(+ \sim D)$	39.20%
False - rate for true D	$\Pr(- D)$	8.73%
False + rate for classified +	$\Pr(\sim D +)$	16.33%
False - rate for classified -	$\Pr(D -)$	24.00%
Correctly classified		81.75%

8. Determine counted R2 using the threshold of predicted value = 0.7 for Logit models.

```
. estat clas, cut(0.7)
```

Logistic model for y

Classified	True		Total
	D	~D	
+	217	24	241
-	58	101	159
Total	275	125	400

Classified + if predicted $\Pr(D) \geq .7$

True D defined as y != 0

Sensitivity	$\Pr(+ D)$	78.91%
Specificity	$\Pr(- \sim D)$	80.80%
Positive predictive value	$\Pr(D +)$	90.04%
Negative predictive value	$\Pr(\sim D -)$	63.52%
False + rate for true ~D	$\Pr(+ \sim D)$	19.20%
False - rate for true D	$\Pr(- D)$	21.09%
False + rate for classified +	$\Pr(\sim D +)$	9.96%
False - rate for classified -	$\Pr(D -)$	36.48%
Correctly classified		79.50%

Wannakit Pora

6004640857