

[Description](#)[Syntax](#)[Remarks and examples](#)[References](#)[Quick start](#)[Options for RE model](#)[Stored results](#)[Also see](#)[Menu](#)[Options for FE model](#)[Methods and formulas](#)

## Description

`xtmlogit` fits random-effects and conditional fixed-effects multinomial logit models for a categorical dependent variable with unordered outcomes. The actual values taken by the dependent variable are irrelevant.

## Quick start

Random-effects model of `y` as a function of `x1`, `x2`, and [indicators](#) for levels of categorical variable `a` using `xtset` data

```
xtmlogit y x1 x2 i.a
```

Same as above, but report relative-risk ratios

```
xtmlogit y x1 x2 i.a, rrr
```

Same as above, but with all variances and covariances distinctly estimated

```
xtmlogit y x1 x2 i.a, rrr covariance(unstructured)
```

Conditional fixed-effects model

```
xtmlogit y x1 x2 i.a, fe
```

Random-effects model with cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within `cvar`

```
xtmlogit y x1 x2 i.a, vce(cluster cvar)
```

## Menu

Statistics > Longitudinal/panel data > Categorical outcomes > Multinomial logistic regression (FE, RE)

# Syntax

## Random-effects model

```
xtmlogit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [ , re RE_options ]
```

## Conditional fixed-effects model

```
xtmlogit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] , fe [FE_options ]
```

<i>RE_options</i>	Description
<b>Model</b>	
<u>noconstant</u>	suppress constant term
<u>re</u>	use random-effects estimator; the default
<u>baseoutcome</u> (#)	value of <i>depvar</i> that will be the base outcome
<u>constraints</u> ( <i>constraints</i> )	apply specified linear constraints
<u>covariance</u> ( <i>vartype</i> )	variance–covariance structure of the random effects; default is <code>covariance(independent)</code>
<b>SE/Robust</b>	
<u>vce</u> ( <i>vcetype</i> )	<i>vcetype</i> may be <code>oim</code> , <code>robust</code> , <code>cluster <i>clustvar</i></code> , <code>bootstrap</code> , or <code>jackknife</code>
<b>Reporting</b>	
<u>level</u> (#)	set confidence level; default is <code>level(95)</code>
<u>rrr</u>	report relative-risk ratios
<u>lrmodel</u>	perform the likelihood-ratio model test instead of the default Wald test
<u>nocnsreport</u>	do not display constraints
<u>display_options</u>	control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
<b>Integration</b>	
<u>intmethod</u> ( <i>intmethod</i> )	integration method; <i>intmethod</i> may be <code>mvaghermite</code> (the default) or <code>ghermite</code>
<u>intpoints</u> (#)	use # quadrature points; default is <code>intpoints(7)</code>
<b>Maximization</b>	
<u>maximize_options</u>	control the maximization process; seldom used
<u>startgrid</u> ( <i>numlist</i> )	improve starting values of the random-effects variance parameters by performing a grid search
<u>collinear</u>	keep collinear variables
<u>coeflegend</u>	display legend instead of statistics

<i>vartype</i>	Description
<u>independent</u>	distinct variances for each random effect and all covariances 0; the default
<u>shared</u>	one common random effect
<u>identity</u>	equal variances for random effects and all covariances 0
<u>exchangeable</u>	equal variances for random effects and one common pairwise covariance
<u>unstructured</u>	all variances and covariances to be distinctly estimated

<i>FE_options</i>	Description
-------------------	-------------

#### Model

<u>fe</u>	use fixed-effects estimator
<u>baseoutcome</u> (#)	value of <i>depvar</i> that will be the base outcome
<u>constraints</u> ( <i>constraints</i> )	apply specified linear constraints

#### SE/Robust

<u>vce</u> ( <i>vcetype</i> )	<i>vcetype</i> may be <u>oim</u> , <u>robust</u> , <u>cluster</u> <i>clustvar</i> , <u>bootstrap</u> , or <u>jackknife</u>
-------------------------------	--

#### Reporting

<u>level</u> (#)	set confidence level; default is level(95)
<u>rrr</u>	report relative-risk ratios
<u>nodots</u>	suppress display of progress bar
<u>nocnsreport</u>	do not display constraints
<u>display_options</u>	control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

#### Permutations

<u>rsample</u> (#[ , rseed(# <sub>s</sub> ) ])	draw sample of permuted outcome sequences at percentage #
<u>favor</u> ( <u>speed</u>   <u>space</u> )	favor speed or space when generating permutations of outcome sequences; default is favor(speed)
<u>force</u>	force estimation to proceed even if the number of permutations exceeds 50 million

#### Maximization

<u>maximize_options</u>	control the maximization process; seldom used
<u>collinear</u>	keep collinear variables
<u>coeflegend</u>	display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified; see [XT] [xtset](#).

*indepvars* may contain factor variables and time-series operators; see [U] [11.4.3 Factor variables](#) and [U] [11.4.4 Time-series varlists](#).

`by`, `collect`, `statsby`, and `svy` are allowed; see [U] [11.1.10 Prefix commands](#). `bayes` is allowed for the random-effects model. For more details, see [BAYES] [bayes: xtmlogit](#).

`vce()` and weights are not allowed with the `svy` prefix; see [SVY] [svy](#).

`fweights`, `iweights`, and `pweights` are allowed; see [U] [11.1.6 weight](#). Weights must be constant within panel.

`startgrid()`, `collinear`, and `coeflegend` do not appear in the dialog box.

See [U] [20 Estimation and postestimation commands](#) for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

### Model

`noconstant`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

`re` requests the random-effects estimator. This is the default.

`baseoutcome(#)` specifies the value of *depvar* to be treated as the base outcome. The default is to choose the most frequent outcome.

`constraints(constraints)`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

`covariance(vartype)` specifies the structure of the covariance matrix for the random effects. A multinomial logit model with  $J$  outcomes can have up to  $J - 1$  random effects. *vartype* determines the structure that is assumed for the random effects and is one of the following: independent, shared, identity, exchangeable, or unstructured.

`covariance(independent)` estimates distinct variances for each of the  $J - 1$  random effects and all covariances are 0. This is the default.

`covariance(shared)` has one random effect that is common to all  $J - 1$  outcome equations. Because there is only one random effect, there is no covariance.

`covariance(identity)` estimates one common variance for all  $J - 1$  random effects and all covariances are 0.

`covariance(exchangeable)` estimates one common variance for all  $J - 1$  random effects and one common pairwise covariance.

`covariance(unstructured)` allows for all variances and covariances to be distinct. With  $p = J - 1$  random-effects terms, the unstructured covariance matrix will have  $p(p + 1)/2$  distinct parameters.

### SE/Robust

`vce(vcetype)` specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (`oim`), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (`robust`), that allow for intragroup correlation (`cluster clustvar`), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (`bootstrap`, `jackknife`); see [XT] [vce\\_options](#).

Specifying `vce(robust)` is equivalent to specifying `vce(cluster panelvar)`.

If `vce(bootstrap)` or `vce(jackknife)` is specified, you must also specify `baseoutcome()`.

### Reporting

`level(#)`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

`rrr` reports the estimated coefficients transformed to relative-risk ratios, that is,  $e^b$  rather than  $b$ . Standard errors and confidence intervals are transformed accordingly. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated. `rrr` may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.

`lrmodel`, `nocnsreport`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

*display\_options*: `nocl`, `nopvalues`, `noomitted`, `vsquish`, `noemptycells`, `baselevels`, `allbaselevels`, `nofvlabel`, `fvwrap(#)`, `fvwrapon(style)`, `cformat(%fmt)`, `pformat(%fmt)`, `sformat(%fmt)`, and `nolstretch`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

## Integration

`intmethod(intmethod)`, `intpoints(#)`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

## Maximization

`maximize_options`: `difficult`, `technique(algorithm_spec)`, `iterate(#)`, `[no]log`, `trace`, `gradient`, `showstep`, `hessian`, `showtolerance`, `tolerance(#)`, `ltolerance(#)`, `nrtolerance(#)`, `nonrtolerance`, and `from(init_specs)`; see [R] [Maximize](#). These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with `xtmlogit` but are not shown in the dialog box:

`startgrid(numlist)` performs a grid search to improve starting values of the random-effects parameters.

By default, `xtmlogit` performs a grid search on `startgrid(0.2 1)`.

`collinear`, `coeflegend`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

## Options for FE model

## Model

`fe` requests the fixed-effects estimator.

`baseoutcome(#)` specifies the value of *depvar* to be treated as the base outcome. The default is to choose the most frequent outcome.

`constraints(constraints)`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

## SE/Robust

`vce(vcetype)` specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (`oim`), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (`robust`), that allow for intragroup correlation (`cluster clustvar`), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (`bootstrap`, `jackknife`); see [XT] [vce\\_options](#).

Specifying `vce(robust)` is equivalent to specifying `vce(cluster panelvar)`.

If the `rsample()` option is specified, the default is `vce(robust)` rather than `vce(oim)`.

If `vce(bootstrap)` or `vce(jackknife)` is specified, you must also specify `baseoutcome()`.

## Reporting

`level(#)`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

`rrr` reports the estimated coefficients transformed to relative-risk ratios, that is,  $e^b$  rather than  $b$ . Standard errors and confidence intervals are transformed accordingly. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated. `rrr` may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.

`nodots` suppresses the display of the dots that show the progress of permuting the observed outcomes.

`nocnsreport`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

`display_options`: `nocl`, `nopvalues`, `noomitted`, `vsquish`, `noemptycells`, `baselevels`, `allbaselevels`, `nofvlabel`, `fvwrap(#)`, `fvwrapon(style)`, `cformat(%fmt)`, `pformat(%fmt)`, `sformat(%fmt)`, and `no1stretch`; see [R] [Estimation options](#).

## Permutations

`rsample(#[, rseed(#s)])` specifies that a random subset be drawn from the set of all permutations of the observed sequence of outcomes for each panel. Optionally, a random-number seed, `#s`, can be specified to ensure reproducibility.

The size of the random subset is given as a percentage `#` of  $K_i$ , where  $K_i$  is the total number of permutations of the outcome sequence in the  $i$ th panel. The resulting subset is of size  $L_i = \text{ceil}\{(\#/100)K_i\}$ . The observed outcome sequence is also included for a total of  $L_i + 1$  sequences. If `rsample()` is not specified, `xtmlogit` uses all  $K_i$  permutations in the conditional likelihood calculation.

Specifying `rsample()` requires setting a time variable with `xtset` so that the order of the observed outcome sequence is known.

If `rsample()` is specified, the default standard error type is `vce(robust)` rather than `vce(oim)`.

`favor(speed | space)` instructs `xtmlogit` to favor either speed or space when generating the permutations of the outcome sequences. `favor(speed)` is the default. When favoring speed, the permuted sequences are generated once and stored in memory, thus increasing the speed of evaluating the likelihood. This speed increase can be seen when the number of observations per panel is relatively high. When favoring space, the permutations are generated repeatedly with each likelihood evaluation.

`force` forces estimation to proceed even if the total number of permutations ( $\sum_i K_i$ ) exceeds 50 million. Without specification of `force`, the fixed-effects estimator issues an error message if the number of permutations exceeds 50 million. Estimation with this many permutations requires a considerable amount of memory and is computationally intensive.

## Maximization

*maximize\_options*: `difficult`, `technique(algorithm_spec)`, `iterate(#)`, `[no]log`, `trace`, `gradient`, `showstep`, `hessian`, `showtolerance`, `tolerance(#)`, `ltolerance(#)`, `nrtolerance(#)`, `nonrtolerance`, and `from(init_specs)`; see [R] **Maximize**. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with `xtmlogit` but are not shown in the dialog box:

`collinear`, `coeflegend`; see [R] **Estimation options**.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

*Introduction*

*The random-effects estimator*

*The conditional fixed-effects estimator*

*Curse of dimensionality*

*Examples*

## Introduction

xtmlogit fits random-effects and conditional fixed-effects multinomial logit (MNL) models. Whenever we refer to a fixed-effects model, we mean the conditional fixed-effects model.

Both the conditional fixed-effects and the random-effects estimators produce valid estimates in the presence of unobserved heterogeneity at the panel level. The fixed-effects estimator is described in Chamberlain (1980) and Pfoff (2014). For a description of the random-effects estimator, see Hartzel, Agresti, and Caffo (2001). For an application of the fixed-effects estimator, see Börsch-Supan (1990); for an application of the random-effects estimator, see Grilli and Rampichini (2007).

The MNL model is a popular method for modeling categorical outcome variables where the categories have no natural ordering. The MNL model is often used in the context of a random utility framework to analyze choices made by individuals. However, the MNL model can also be found used without an underlying utility theory, and the units of analysis do not necessarily have to be individuals or other decision-making entities. In what follows, however, we will refer to individuals for the sake of simplicity, and the set of choices each individual makes as a “panel”.

Unlike in cross-sectional applications of the MNL model, in the context of panel and longitudinal data, we observe a sequence of outcomes for each individual in the dataset rather than just a single observation. Each individual sequence can be thought of as a process that depends on individual characteristics.

For example, if we were to analyze restaurant choices, vegetarians would consistently choose restaurants that offer vegetarian dishes, or health-oriented people would consistently avoid fast-food restaurants. In other words, the choices made by individuals are not independent over time because of underlying individual preferences or characteristics, which often remain unobserved in the data. The fixed- and random-effects MNL estimators discussed here offer a way to explicitly account for this unobserved heterogeneity by including an additional error term at the panel level. This panel-level error term is also known as a heterogeneity term and enters the model in addition to the error term that accounts for heterogeneity at the observation (time) level.

The unobserved-heterogeneity model for both the conditional fixed-effects as well as the random-effects estimator can be written in utility-maximization form as

$$U_{ijt} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijt}$$

Assuming we have a panel dataset with repeated observations from individuals,  $U_{ijt}$  is the utility of the  $i$ th individual toward outcome  $j$  at time  $t$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, J$ , and  $t = 1, \dots, T_i$ . The observed component of utility is  $\mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  is a row vector of covariates and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$  is a column vector of coefficients for outcome  $j$ . The unobserved part consists of error components  $u_{ij}$  and  $\epsilon_{ijt}$ , where  $u_{ij}$  is the panel-level heterogeneity term and  $\epsilon_{ijt}$  is an observation-level error term.

Assuming a type-1 extreme value distribution for  $\epsilon_{ijt}$ , also known as a standard Gumbel distribution, gives rise to the MNL model

$$\Pr(y_{it} = m \mid \mathbf{x}_{it}, \beta_j, u_{ij}) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_m + u_{im})}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_j + u_{ij})}$$

For model identification, the above equation must be normalized with respect to a base category by setting both the elements in  $\beta_j$  as well as  $u_{ij}$  to zero for one of the categories of the outcome variable. If—without loss of generality—we let the base outcome be outcome 1, the probability that the  $i$ th individual chooses outcome  $m$  at time  $t$  is

$$\Pr(y_{it} = m \mid \mathbf{x}_{it}, \beta_j, u_{ij}) = F(y_{it} = m, \mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_j + u_{ij}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^J \exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_j + u_{ij})} & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_m + u_{im})}{1 + \sum_{j=2}^J \exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_j + u_{ij})} & \text{if } m > 1 \end{cases}$$

Here  $F(\cdot)$  is defined as the cumulative logistic distribution function.

The fixed-effects and random-effects estimators differ in their assumptions about the unobservables in  $\mathbf{u}_i$  and also differ in their methods that the unobservables are accounted for with respect to estimating the coefficients in  $\beta_j$ .

## The random-effects estimator

The random-effects estimator requires an assumption about the distribution of  $u_{ij}$ , and the elements in  $\mathbf{u}_i$  are assumed to be uncorrelated with the covariates in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$ . The covariates  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  may contain constant terms as well as time-invariant predictor variables. Assuming a normal distribution for  $u_{ij}$ , the panel-level likelihood is

$$l_i = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} F(y_{it} = m, \mathbf{x}_{it}\beta_j + u_{ij}) \right\} \phi(\mathbf{u}_i, \Sigma_u) d\mathbf{u}_i \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi(\mathbf{u}_i, \Sigma_u)$  is the probability density function of the normal distribution  $\mathbf{u}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_u)$ . This integral of dimension  $J - 1$  has no closed-form solution and must be approximated numerically. By default, xtmlogit uses adaptive Gauss–Hermite quadrature to approximate this integral.

xtmlogit allows for imposing a variety of structures on  $\Sigma_u$ . By default, xtmlogit estimates separate, independent variance components for each of the  $J - 1$  outcome equations. The covariance(shared) option estimates a single shared variance component for all  $J - 1$  outcome equations. The most general case is specified by the option covariance(unstructured), which freely estimates all variances and covariances among the random effects instead of treating them as independent. Not imposing any structure on  $\Sigma_u$  can potentially yield more accurate results. However, this is also more computationally intensive, resulting in longer computation times.



## The conditional fixed-effects estimator

The advantages of the conditional fixed-effects estimator are that elements in  $\mathbf{u}_i$  can be correlated with the covariates in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  and no distributional assumptions need to be imposed on  $u_{ij}$ . Unlike in linear fixed-effects models, the heterogeneity term  $u_{ij}$  of the logit model cannot be eliminated by taking deviations from the group mean. Moreover, it is also not feasible to account for the heterogeneity in  $u_{ij}$  by distinctly estimating an intercept for each panel because this leads to the incidental parameters problem, which renders the estimator of  $\beta_j$  inconsistent for a fixed  $T_i$ ; see [Andersen \(1970\)](#) and [Lancaster \(2000\)](#). Instead, [Chamberlain \(1980\)](#) suggested the use of a sufficient statistic for the unobserved heterogeneity  $u_{ij}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iT_i})$  be the sequence of outcomes of the  $i$ th panel, and let  $\mathbf{Y}_{it} = (Y_{i1t}, \dots, Y_{iJt})$  be a vector with elements  $Y_{ijt} = 1$  ( $i$  chooses  $j$  at  $t$ ) that indicate the chosen outcome of the  $i$ th panel at time  $t$ . The distribution of times that panel  $i$  chose each of the  $J$  alternatives over time points  $T_i$  is then the sufficient statistic  $\Theta_i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{Y}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i = (c_{i1}, \dots, c_{iJ})$ . In other words, the elements in  $\mathbf{c}_i$  are sums of occurrences of each of the outcomes over time for the  $i$ th panel.

Conditioning on the sufficient statistic  $\Theta_i$ , the probability of panel  $i$  having a sequence  $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{s}_i$  that is consistent with  $\mathbf{c}_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{s}_i \mid \Theta_i, \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta) &= \Pr\{Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iT_i} \mid \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i), \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \beta\} \\ &= \frac{\exp\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=2}^J Y_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j\right)}{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{ijt} \in \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)} \exp\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=2}^J \tilde{Y}_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j\right)} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  is the set of all permutations of individual  $i$ 's observed sequence of outcomes that satisfy the condition  $\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i$ . That is,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i = (\tilde{Y}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{iT_i}) \mid \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i \right\}$$

and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = (\tilde{Y}_{i1t}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{iJt})$  is a vector of indicators with respect to the permutations of the observed outcome sequence  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ . The log likelihood of panel  $i$  is then the natural logarithm of the above probability

$$\log l_i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=2}^J Y_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j - \log \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{ijt} \in \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)} \exp\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=2}^J \tilde{Y}_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j\right)$$

and the overall log likelihood is  $\sum_{i=1}^N \log l_i$ .

To illustrate the concept of permutations in this context, let us suppose we had a panel dataset with three observations per individual and an outcome variable with four categories,  $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . Let us further assume that for some individual in the dataset we observe the sequence  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (3, 2, 3)$ . This sequence has a total of three permutations, so the set of all permutations (which includes the original sequence) for this individual consists of  $(2, 3, 3)$ ,  $(3, 2, 3)$ , and  $(3, 3, 2)$ . Notice that in all three permutations, outcome 3 occurs twice, and outcome 2 occurs once, just as in the original sequence.

## Curse of dimensionality

Both the random-effects and fixed-effects estimators suffer from the curse of dimensionality. For the random-effects estimator, the curse is rooted in  $J$ , the number of outcomes, because the integral in (1) is a  $J - 1$  dimensional integral unless one uses a common heterogeneity component for all outcomes. This means that the computation time can be high for more than just three or four outcomes. For example, if we had a dataset with six outcomes, we would have to approximate a five-dimensional integral. If we were to use the default seven quadrature integration points, which are integration points per dimension, we would end up with a total of  $7^5 = 16807$  integration points, resulting in substantial computation time. If computation time becomes infeasible, one might consider using a single, shared variance component, if appropriate.

For the fixed-effects estimator, the curse of dimensionality is rooted mainly in  $T_i$ , the number of repeated observations and potentially in  $J$ . The problem is that the number of permutations in  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  grows exponentially with  $T_i$  and can become infeasibly large. The number of permutations of panel  $i$ 's observed vector of outcomes is

$$K_i = \frac{T_i!}{c_{i1}! \cdots c_{ij}! \cdots c_{iJ}!}$$

For instance, suppose we observed an individual with 15 repeated observations in a dataset with 6 outcomes,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ , with the sequence of outcomes  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (3, 3, 3, 2, 4, 1, 1, 5, 4, 6, 6, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ . Here  $\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} Y_{i1t} = 4$ , which is to say that outcome  $Y_{it} = 1$  is observed 4 times,  $\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} Y_{i2t} = 2$ , and so on. The size of the set of permutations of this outcome vector is

$$K_i = \frac{15!}{4! 2! 3! 3! 1! 2!} = 378,378,000$$

Notice that this number in the hundreds of millions is the size of the permutation set of just a single panel in the dataset, and clearly this number can quickly become infeasibly large.

A potential solution that can alleviate this problem to some degree is to use a random subset of permutations (D'Haultfoeulle and Iaria 2016). The `rsample()` option can be used to specify the size of the random subset as a percentage of the full set of permutations. Realistically, however, the fixed-effects estimator is really feasible only with shorter panels where the number of repeated observations does not exceed  $T_i = 9$  or  $T_i = 10$ , depending on  $J$ , the size of the dataset, and possibly other features of the data.

## Examples

### ► Example 1: MNL model with random effects

We have a (fictitious) unbalanced panel dataset of 800 women aged 18 to 40 at the time of the first interview. We wish to estimate the effect of having children under the age of 18 in the household on the women's employment status. Specifically, we wish to find out whether women become more likely not to participate in the labor force in response to having children in the household. And if so, how much more unlikely is it?

The survey was repeated every two years, and the women were asked about their main employment status during the year preceding each of the interviews. The employment status response categories were employed (full time, part time, or self-employed), unemployed (job seeking), and out of the labor force. Here is an excerpt of the dataset, showing the employment history for three individuals:

```
. use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r19/estatus
(Fictional employment status data)
. list id year estatus hhchild age in 22/41, sepby(id) noobs
```

id	year	estatus	hhchild	age
5	2002	Employed	Yes	38
5	2004	Employed	No	40
5	2006	Employed	No	42
5	2008	Employed	No	44
5	2010	Out of labor force	No	46
5	2012	Out of labor force	No	48
5	2014	Unemployed	No	50
6	2002	Unemployed	Yes	31
6	2004	Employed	Yes	33
6	2006	Out of labor force	Yes	35
6	2008	Unemployed	Yes	37
6	2010	Out of labor force	Yes	39
6	2012	Unemployed	No	41
7	2002	Out of labor force	Yes	33
7	2004	Employed	Yes	35
7	2006	Employed	Yes	37
7	2008	Out of labor force	Yes	39
7	2010	Employed	No	41
7	2012	Employed	No	43
7	2014	Employed	No	45

The first person shown in the above excerpt (`id==5`) was observed between years 2002 and 2014. The variable `estatus` records the employment history over these years. In this case, the person has been employed between 2002 and 2008, was out of the labor force between 2010 and 2012, and was unemployed prior to the interview in 2014.

The variable `hhchild` records whether at least one child under the age of 18 was living with the surveyee in the same household at the time of the interview. Looking at the data of the first person in the above excerpt, we see that there was one or more children in the household in 2002, but no children in the household between 2004 and 2014. The variable `age` records the age of the women at each interview. In this case, the woman was observed between 38 and 50 years of age.

To inspect the distribution of employment status over the entire sample, we can use the `tabulate` command:

```
. tabulate estatus
```

Employment status	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Out of labor force	1,682	35.33	35.33
Unemployed	703	14.77	50.09
Employed	2,376	49.91	100.00
Total	4,761	100.00	

We can see that in 35% of all observations, the interviewed women reported to be out of the labor force, 15% of the time the women were unemployed, and 50% of the time the women were employed.

As with other panel-data estimators, we first need to declare our dataset to be panel data by using the `xtset` command. Here we do not plan to use any lagged covariates, so it is sufficient to `xtset` our dataset with just the person identifier `id` and without a variable for time:

```
. xtset id
Panel variable: id (unbalanced)
```

We can now go ahead and fit our model using `xtnlogit`. We will also include a number of control variables: `age`, a person's annual household income at the time of interview (`hhincome`), whether a significant other was also living in the household at the time of interview (`hhsigno`), and whether the surveyee was the sole or primary breadwinner in her household at the time of interview (`bwinner`).

We use the variable `estatus` as our dependent variable, and `hhchild` is our independent variable of interest. Because `hhchild`, `hhsigno`, and `bwinner` are binary variables, we specify them as factor variables.

```
. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner
Fitting comparison model ...
Refining starting values:
Grid node 0:  Log likelihood = -4483.1721
Grid node 1:  Log likelihood = -4516.6753
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0:  Log likelihood = -4483.1721
Iteration 1:  Log likelihood = -4474.3849
Iteration 2:  Log likelihood = -4468.9353
Iteration 3:  Log likelihood = -4468.8415
Iteration 4:  Log likelihood = -4468.8413

Random-effects multinomial logistic regression      Number of obs    = 4,761
Group variable: id                                Number of groups = 800
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian                      Obs per group:
                                                    min = 5
                                                    avg = 6.0
                                                    max = 7

Integration method: mvaghermite                    Integration pts. = 7
Wald chi2(10) = 239.26
Prob > chi2   = 0.0000

Log likelihood = -4468.8413
```

estatus	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
Out_of_lab~e						
hhchild						
Yes	.4628125	.0962758	4.81	0.000	.2741154	.6515096
age	-.004825	.0066428	-0.73	0.468	-.0178446	.0081946
hhincome	-.0046922	.001839	-2.55	0.011	-.0082965	-.0010879
hhsigno						
Yes	.4967056	.0946442	5.25	0.000	.3112063	.6822049
bwinner						
Yes	-.4740919	.0727992	-6.51	0.000	-.6167756	-.3314082
_cons	-.4787579	.2845139	-1.68	0.092	-1.036395	.0788792
Unemployed						
hhchild						
Yes	-.0401989	.119596	-0.34	0.737	-.2746027	.1942049
age	.0042644	.0081818	0.52	0.602	-.0117716	.0203004
hhincome	-.0308468	.0026529	-11.63	0.000	-.0360463	-.0256473
hhsigno						
Yes	.0968	.1192659	0.81	0.417	-.1369568	.3305568
bwinner						
Yes	-.2252587	.0951984	-2.37	0.018	-.4118441	-.0386733
_cons	-.0953821	.3508736	-0.27	0.786	-.7830817	.5923175
Employed	(base outcome)					
var(u1)	.8587807	.1090216			.6696113	1.101392
var(u2)	.7370366	.1388917			.5094287	1.066338

LR test vs. multinomial logit: chi2(2) = 225.31      Prob > chi2 = 0.0000  
Note: LR test is conservative and provided only for reference.

Looking at the table header, we can find some useful information about the model we just fit. For example, we can see that the estimation sample consists of 4,761 observations from 800 groups (800 individuals in this case), with between 5 and 7 observations per group. The model test right above the table on the right is a joint test of all model coefficients except the constants.

Looking at the output table itself, we see the results for all  $J - 1$  equations. Because we have three outcome categories, we see the coefficient estimates for two of the outcomes, while employment is our base outcome. Here using employment as the base makes sense given our research question, and we would have chosen this as a base if we had to specify it explicitly. In this case, however, employment was chosen automatically because it is the most frequent category in our dataset, which is what `xtmlogit` defaults to. If we had wanted to specify a different category as the base, we would have used the `baseoutcome()` option.

Below the model coefficient estimates, we find the estimated variances of the random effects. In this case, we have two estimates that correspond to the nonbase equations. By default, `xtmlogit` assumes that the random effects are uncorrelated across the equations. We will see in the next example how to use the `covariance()` option to specify a different covariance structure. Here we can see that there is some considerable variance of the panel-level unobservables. The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval is not close to zero relative to their estimated standard errors. This observation is confirmed by the likelihood-ratio test shown beneath the table, which is a test of our model against the MNL model without random effects.

Let us get back to our initial research question: what is the effect of having children under the age of 18 in the household on employment status? The interpretation of the coefficients is the same as in a conventional cross-sectional MNL model, except that, in the random-effects case, they are to be interpreted as conditional on the random effects, while they naturally have a population-average interpretation in the cross-sectional case. Either way, the coefficients are difficult to interpret. They can be thought of as the natural logarithm of a double ratio: the logarithm of the relative risk, relative to the base category. Realistically, only the sign of these coefficients can be interpreted usefully. Looking at the results, we can see that the coefficient of `hhchild` in the first equation (out of labor force) is around 0.46. Thus, we can say that women with children under 18 in the household are more likely not to participate in the labor force than women with no young children in the household, relative to being employed full time.

A more informative way to interpret the results would be to use relative-risk ratios (RRRs) instead of log relative-risk ratios by exponentiating the coefficients. That is, instead of  $\beta_j$ , we use  $\exp(\beta_j)$  to interpret the results. With `xtmlogit`, we can use the `rrr` option for that purpose. This option can be used at the time of estimation or when replaying results. Here we use it as a replay option:

```
. xtnlogit, rrr
Random-effects multinomial logistic regression
Group variable: id
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
Integration method: mvaghermite
Log likelihood = -4468.8413
Number of obs = 4,761
Number of groups = 800
Obs per group:
    min = 5
    avg = 6.0
    max = 7
Integration pts. = 7
Wald chi2(10) = 239.26
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

estatus	RRR	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
Out_of_lab-e						
hhchild						
Yes	1.588535	.1529375	4.81	0.000	1.315367	1.918435
age	.9951866	.0066108	-0.73	0.468	.9823137	1.008228
hhincome	.9953188	.0018303	-2.55	0.011	.9917379	.9989127
hhsigno						
Yes	1.643299	.1555288	5.25	0.000	1.365071	1.978235
bwinner						
Yes	.6224501	.0453138	-6.51	0.000	.5396818	.7179121
_cons	.6195525	.1762713	-1.68	0.092	.3547312	1.082074
Unemployed						
hhchild						
Yes	.9605983	.1148837	-0.34	0.737	.7598739	1.214345
age	1.004274	.0082168	0.52	0.602	.9882974	1.020508
hhincome	.9696241	.0025723	-11.63	0.000	.9645956	.9746788
hhsigno						
Yes	1.10164	.1313881	0.81	0.417	.8720079	1.391743
bwinner						
Yes	.7983097	.0759978	-2.37	0.018	.6624275	.9620649
_cons	.9090255	.3189531	-0.27	0.786	.4569955	1.808174
Employed	(base outcome)					
var(u1)	.8587807	.1090216			.6696113	1.101392
var(u2)	.7370366	.1388917			.5094287	1.066338

Note: Estimates are transformed only in the first 3 equations to relative-risk ratios.

Note: **\_cons** estimates baseline relative risk (conditional on zero random effects).

LR test vs. multinomial logit: chi2(2) = 225.31      Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Note: LR test is conservative and provided only for reference.

Looking at the RRRs of hhchild in the out-of-labor-force equation, which is around 1.6, we can say that the relative risk of being out of the labor force for women having at least one child under the age of 18 in the household versus having no children under 18 in the household is 1.6 times as large as the relative risk in the case of employment. While this provides a little bit more information, it still does not provide a very intuitive way to interpret our results. It would be easier if we could just see the actual risks for each of the outcomes with respect to the hhchild variable and then also the risk differences rather than risk ratios. To that end, we can use margins:

```
. margins hhchild
Predictive margins                                Number of obs = 4,761
Model VCE: OIM
1. _predict: Pr(estatus==Out_of_labor_force), predict(pr outcome(1))
2. _predict: Pr(estatus==Unemployed), predict(pr outcome(2))
3. _predict: Pr(estatus==Employed), predict(pr outcome(3))
```

	Delta-method					[95% conf. interval]
	Margin	std. err.	z	P> z		
_predict# hhchild						
1#No	.3021986	.0131047	23.06	0.000	.2765138	.3278834
1#Yes	.3912783	.0119865	32.64	0.000	.3677852	.4147714
2#No	.1630791	.0101239	16.11	0.000	.1432367	.1829216
2#Yes	.139782	.0079417	17.60	0.000	.1242167	.1553474
3#No	.5347223	.0136504	39.17	0.000	.507968	.5614766
3#Yes	.4689397	.0116018	40.42	0.000	.4462006	.4916787

By default, margins uses predicted probabilities that account for the random effects. The probabilities are obtained by integrating out the random effects such that their averages can be used to make population-average inferences. Starting with our third outcome, employment, we can see that the averaged probability of being employed full time is around 0.47 in the presence of children under the age of 18 in the household, whereas this probability is around 0.53 in the absence of young children. Thus, women have a higher chance of being employed full time if they have no young children living with them in the same household.

We can further quantify the difference in chance by calculating the risk difference, which here is around 0.07. Using a percentage scale rather than probability scale, we can say that the chance of being employed is higher by about 7 percentage points if no young child is in the household. Looking at the other outcome of interest, we can see that the chance of being out of the labor force is about 39% in the presence of young children in the household and around 30% otherwise, resulting in a risk difference of around 9 percentage points.



We could also compute these risk differences directly by using the contrast operator `r`:

```
. margins r.hhchild
Contrasts of predictive margins                                Number of obs = 4,761
Model VCE: OIM
1. _predict: Pr(estatus==Out_of_labor_force), predict(pr outcome(1))
2. _predict: Pr(estatus==Unemployed), predict(pr outcome(2))
3. _predict: Pr(estatus==Employed), predict(pr outcome(3))
```

	df	chi2	P>chi2
hhchild@_predict			
(Yes vs No) 1	1	26.36	0.0000
(Yes vs No) 2	1	3.28	0.0700
(Yes vs No) 3	1	13.33	0.0003
Joint	2	26.40	0.0000

	Delta-method			
	Contrast	std. err.	[95% conf. interval]	
hhchild@_predict				
(Yes vs No) 1	.0890797	.0173496	.0550752	.1230843
(Yes vs No) 2	-.0232971	.0128562	-.0484948	.0019005
(Yes vs No) 3	-.0657826	.0180195	-.1011001	-.0304651

We can see that the results match the differences from the previous margins call. The predicted probabilities underlying the margins analysis are also the default predictions of `predict` after `xtnlogit, re`.

◀

## ➤ Example 2: Covariance structure of the random effects

As mentioned in the previous example, `xtnlogit` by default uses an independent covariance structure for the random effects, which is to say that the random effects for each of the  $J - 1$  equations are assumed to be uncorrelated. A more general case here would be to not impose any structure on the random effects and freely estimate the covariances among the random effects rather than assuming that the covariances are zero. To fit our model with an unstructured covariance matrix, we use the `covariance(unstructured)` option:

```
. xtnlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner,
> covariance(unstructured)
```

(output omitted)

```
Random-effects multinomial logistic regression      Number of obs   = 4,761
Group variable: id                                Number of groups = 800
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian                      Obs per group:
                                                    min   = 5
                                                    avg   = 6.0
                                                    max   = 7
Integration method: mvaghermite                    Integration pts. = 7
Wald chi2(10) = 242.93
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log likelihood = -4438.2887
```

estatus	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
Out_of_lab-e						
hhchild						
Yes	.4924799	.1002988	4.91	0.000	.295898	.6890619
age	-.004219	.0070064	-0.60	0.547	-.0179513	.0095133
hhincome	-.006046	.001992	-3.04	0.002	-.0099503	-.0021417
hhsigno						
Yes	.5036976	.0966982	5.21	0.000	.3141726	.6932225
bwinner						
Yes	-.489057	.0745454	-6.56	0.000	-.6351632	-.3429507
_cons	-.3930378	.298386	-1.32	0.188	-.9778636	.191788
Unemployed						
hhchild						
Yes	.0399687	.1238417	0.32	0.747	-.2027565	.2826939
age	.0045538	.0085081	0.54	0.592	-.0121219	.0212294
hhincome	-.0315377	.0027426	-11.50	0.000	-.0369131	-.0261624
hhsigno						
Yes	.1495817	.1214242	1.23	0.218	-.0884053	.3875687
bwinner						
Yes	-.2552257	.0968165	-2.64	0.008	-.4449826	-.0654689
_cons	-.0417024	.3633406	-0.11	0.909	-.7538368	.670432
Employed	(base outcome)					
var(u1)	1.132081	.1331468			.899012	1.425572
var(u2)	1.102612	.1698422			.8152803	1.49121
cov(u1,u2)	.7871916	.1222148	6.44	0.000	.547655	1.026728

LR test vs. multinomial logit: chi2(3) = 286.41      Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Note: LR test is conservative and provided only for reference.

At the bottom of the table, we can see the additional estimate for the covariance among the random effects. When we look at the estimate relative to its standard error, or at the corresponding test result, it looks as though the random effects are correlated considerably. To get a better idea of how strongly the random effects are correlated, we might want to look at standard deviations and correlations, rather than variances and covariances. We can do that by using the `estat sd postestimation` command:

```
. estat sd
```

estatus	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
sd(u1)	1.063993	.0625694			.9481624	1.193973
sd(u2)	1.050053	.0808731			.9029287	1.221151
corr(u1,u2)	.7045801	.0632646	11.14	0.000	.5581225	.8084624

The results of `estat sd` show that the correlation between the random effects, `u1` and `u2`, is around 0.7, which appears rather substantial. If we had more than one estimated covariance and wanted to test the inclusion of covariance estimates as a whole, we could perform a joint test on the covariances against zero using the `test` command. Testing covariances against zero is straightforward because they are not bounded, unlike the variances. Because here we have only a single covariance estimate, we can simply take the test result reported by `xtmlogit`. The results show that we can reject the hypothesis of the covariance being zero.

Alternatively, we could perform a likelihood-ratio test here because the model with independent covariance structure is a special case of the model with no structure imposed. We will fit the model with uncorrelated random effects again, store the results, and use the `lrtest` command to perform the likelihood-ratio test:

```
. estimates store unstr
. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner, baseoutcome(3)
(output omitted)
. estimates store indep
. lrtest unstr indep
Likelihood-ratio test
Assumption: indep nested within unstr
LR chi2(1) = 61.11
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

The conclusion here is the same as before: the model with no structure imposed on the random effects covariance matrix appears to be preferable. However, if we compare the results with those from our previous model, we can see that the model with unstructured covariance matrix would not necessarily lead to substantially different conclusions, judging by the differences in relative-risk ratios between the two models. This becomes even more apparent if we were to look at the differences in the averaged marginal probabilities. For example, the difference between having and not having a child in the household with respect to not participating in the labor force was 0.089 on the probability scale in the previous example with independent covariance structure. If we were to compute this risk difference again for the unstructured model, we would find a difference of 0.092 with a similar standard error.

As an aside, notice that when we refit the model with uncorrelated random effects, we specified the `baseoutcome(3)` option. We would not have to do this because we already knew that `xtmlogit` would choose the third outcome as base, but we did so anyway to point out that it is good practice to be explicit about this in this context. It is important that the models that are compared with a likelihood-ratio test use the same base outcome. This is because, unlike in a conventional cross-sectional MNL model, the likelihood solution differs with different base outcomes because the modeling of random effects depends on what category is selected as the reference category.

### ► Example 3: MNL model with conditional fixed effects

We will now use the conditional fixed-effects estimator instead of the random-effects estimator to fit our model. To do so, all we need to do is to specify the `fe` option of `xtmlogit`. However, because we have seen that the results are easier to interpret with relative-risk ratios, we will specify the `rrr` option right away:

```
. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner, fe rrr
note: 80 groups (451 obs) omitted because of no variation in the outcome
      variable over time.

Computing initial values ...
Setting up 26,168 permutations:
....10%....20%....30%....40%....50%....60%....70%....80%....90%....100%
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0:  Log likelihood = -2136.5919
Iteration 1:  Log likelihood = -2136.2728
Iteration 2:  Log likelihood = -2136.2728

Fixed-effects multinomial logistic regression
Group variable: id

                                Number of obs   = 4,310
                                Number of groups = 720
                                Obs per group:
                                    min =         5
                                    avg =        6.0
                                    max =         7

                                LR chi2(10)      = 103.29
                                Prob > chi2       = 0.0000

Log likelihood = -2136.2728
```

estatus	RRR	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
Out_of_lab-e hhchild						
Yes	1.800717	.2266555	4.67	0.000	1.407036	2.304549
age	.9996159	.0147684	-0.03	0.979	.9710854	1.028985
hhincome	.9878698	.0087391	-1.38	0.168	.9708891	1.005148
hhsigno						
Yes	1.663632	.166548	5.08	0.000	1.367233	2.024287
bwinner						
Yes	.6277743	.0491447	-5.95	0.000	.5384781	.7318786
Unemployed hhchild						
Yes	1.177757	.1930267	1.00	0.318	.8541801	1.623911
age	1.006356	.0195273	0.33	0.744	.9688014	1.045366
hhincome	.9706959	.0116513	-2.48	0.013	.9481262	.9938029
hhsigno						
Yes	1.124478	.1463356	0.90	0.367	.8713222	1.451187
bwinner						
Yes	.7795833	.0802992	-2.42	0.016	.637069	.9539784
Employed	(base outcome)					

Starting with the table header, we can see that our estimation sample consists of 4,310 observations from 720 women. We saw earlier that we had 800 women in our dataset, so why do we now have only 720? The answer to this question is given in the note near the top of the output, which lets us know

that 451 observations from 80 groups were dropped for the analysis because in these cases, there is no variation in the outcome variable over time. Technically, these observations could have been kept in the estimation sample, but with no variation in the outcome, these observations would not contribute anything to the likelihood, so they can as well be excluded. Looking at the relative-risk ratios, we see the results are fairly similar to our random-effects estimates. We observe an RRR for our variable of interest `hhchild` of around 1.8 for the out-of-labor-force category. The interpretation of the RRRs here is the same as with the random-effects model from the earlier examples.

An unfortunate side effect of the fixed-effects estimator is that we cannot make predictions that account for the panel-level unobservables. That is because we do not estimate the unobservables explicitly. Therefore, unfortunately, we also cannot perform useful marginal analyses using the `margins` command.



#### ► Example 4: Fixed effects estimation with random permutation sampling

As noted earlier, if the number of repeated observations,  $T_i$ , becomes larger than, say,  $T_i = 10$ , the set of permutations can become very large, resulting in computations that may become infeasibly intensive. In that case, a potential solution could be to take a random sample of the set of permutations. This can be done by using the `rsample()` option, which allows one to specify the size of the sample as a percentage of the full set of permutations. Here we will fit the same model as in the previous example, except that we take a 10% random sample of the permutations.

Before we do so, however, note that in this case we have to `xtset` the data with a time variable. The reason for this is that we have to determine the observed sequence of outcomes that has to be included in the set of permutations that we use in the denominator of the formula. This is not necessary without sampling, because the full set of permutations always includes the observed sequence. Without determining the observed sequence, estimation results would randomly depend on the sort order of the data. To specify drawing a 10% random sample and to also set a random-number seed for reproducibility, we just add the `rsample(10, rseed(123))` option.

```
. xtset id year
Panel variable: id (unbalanced)
Time variable: year, 2002 to 2014, but with gaps
Delta: 1 unit

. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner, fe rrr
> rsample(10, rseed(123))
note: option vce() set to vce(robust) because of permutation sampling.
note: 80 groups (451 obs) omitted because of no variation in the outcome
variable over time.

Computing initial values ...
Setting up 3,495 permutations:
....10%....20%....30%....40%....50%....60%....70%....80%....90%....100%
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: Log pseudolikelihood = -908.26163
Iteration 1: Log pseudolikelihood = -906.4585
Iteration 2: Log pseudolikelihood = -906.45801
Iteration 3: Log pseudolikelihood = -906.45801

Fixed-effects multinomial logistic regression
Group variable: id
Number of obs      = 4,310
Number of groups   = 720
Obs per group:
    min =      5
    avg =     6.0
    max =      7
Wald chi2(10)      = 72.91
Prob > chi2         = 0.0000
Log pseudolikelihood = -906.45801
(Std. err. adjusted for 720 clusters in id)
```

estatus	RRR	Robust std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf. interval]	
Out_of_lab-e						
hhchild						
Yes	1.790876	.2663706	3.92	0.000	1.338011	2.397017
age	.994506	.0167663	-0.33	0.744	.9621816	1.027916
hhincome	.9858517	.0099036	-1.42	0.156	.9666309	1.005455
hhsigno						
Yes	1.559166	.1891864	3.66	0.000	1.229162	1.977769
bwinner						
Yes	.6304536	.0616622	-4.72	0.000	.5204757	.7636702
Unemployed						
hhchild						
Yes	1.186982	.2173595	0.94	0.349	.8290349	1.699479
age	.9953453	.0215995	-0.21	0.830	.9538986	1.038593
hhincome	.9661192	.0127244	-2.62	0.009	.9414989	.9913833
hhsigno						
Yes	.9267669	.1294269	-0.54	0.586	.7048498	1.218553
bwinner						
Yes	.7490293	.088281	-2.45	0.014	.5945326	.9436738
Employed	(base outcome)					

Looking at the output, we can see that the results are very close to the results from the previous example, with standard errors being slightly larger, as we would expect. Notice also that, by default, `xtmlogit` computes cluster-robust standard errors in this case because the likelihood function is not the true likelihood because a term that is the sum over all permutations is replaced by a sum over a sample of the permutations.



### ▷ Example 5: Choosing between fixed- and random-effects models

It can be challenging to decide a priori whether to use the fixed- or the random-effects estimator. If the assumptions of the random-effects estimator hold, then both the random and fixed-effects estimators are consistent. However, in that case, the random-effects estimator is more efficient and thus preferable. On the other hand, if the assumptions of the random-effects estimator do not hold, it becomes inconsistent, and we should use the fixed-effects estimator. In that sense, one could get the idea that we should err on the side of caution and always use the fixed-effects estimator. However, the random-effects estimator has a couple of practical advantages beyond efficiency.

For example, if we were interested in estimating the effect of a variable that is constant over time (for all observations in the dataset), then we could include that variable in the random-effects model, but not in the fixed-effects model. With the fixed-effects model, variables that are constant over time are absorbed into the fixed effects. Also, with the random-effects estimator, we can predict probabilities that account for panel-level unobservables and that lend themselves to a population-average interpretation when we use `margins`—something we cannot do with the fixed-effects estimator because the unobservables are not estimated.

A possible solution to this dilemma is to use a Hausman test. In our context here, our null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is that the panel-level unobservables are uncorrelated with the covariates in the model, while the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is that the unobservables are correlated with the covariates. The fixed-effects estimator is consistent under both  $H_0$  and  $H_a$ , while the random-effects estimator is inconsistent under  $H_a$  but efficient under  $H_0$ . To apply the Hausman test, we first fit both the fixed- and random-effects models, store their results, and then use the `hausman` command:

```
. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner, fe
(output omitted)
. estimates store FE
. xtmlogit estatus i.hhchild age hhincome i.hhsigno i.bwinner
(output omitted)
. estimates store RE
. hausman FE RE, alleqs
```

	Coefficients			
	(b) FE	(B) RE	(b-B) Difference	$\sqrt{\text{diag}(V_b - V_B)}$ Std. err.
Out_of_lab-e				
1.hhchild	.5881852	.4628125	.1253727	.0810809
age	-.0003842	-.004825	.0044408	.0131965
hhincome	-.0122043	-.0046922	-.0075122	.0086532
1.hhsigno	.5090034	.4967056	.0122977	.0326296
1.bwinner	-.4655745	-.4740919	.0085173	.0287868
Unemployed				
1.hhchild	.163612	-.0401989	.203811	.1120618
age	.0063355	.0042644	.0020711	.0175947
hhincome	-.029742	-.0308468	.0011048	.0117062
1.hhsigno	.1173192	.0968	.0205192	.0520686
1.bwinner	-.2489958	-.2252587	-.0237371	.0393297

```

              b = Consistent under H0 and Ha; obtained from xtmlogit.
              B = Inconsistent under Ha, efficient under H0; obtained from xtmlogit.
Test of H0: Difference in coefficients not systematic
      chi2(10) = (b-B)' [(V_b-V_B)^(-1)] (b-B)
              = 8.05
Prob > chi2 = 0.6238
```

Notice that we specified `hausman` such that we gave it the results of the estimator that is consistent under both  $H_0$  and  $H_a$  first (the fixed-effects estimator) and the results of the estimator that is efficient under  $H_0$  second (the random-effects estimator). We also specified the `alleqs` option to apply the test to all equations present in both models. The result of the test,  $\chi^2 = 8.05$  with  $df = 10$  yielding  $p = 0.62$ , suggests that we do not reject  $H_0$ . In other words, here we may proceed with the random-effects estimator.

## □ Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the `quadchk` command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the `intpoints()` option, and run `quadchk` again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by `quadchk` differ substantially. See [XT] [quadchk](#) for details and [XT] [xtprobit](#) for an example.

Because the `xtmlogit` likelihood function is calculated by Gauss–Hermite quadrature, on large problems computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

□



## Stored results

`xtmlogit`, `re` stores the following in `e()`:

### Scalars

<code>e(N)</code>	number of observations
<code>e(N_g)</code>	number of groups
<code>e(k)</code>	number of parameters
<code>e(k_out)</code>	number of outcomes
<code>e(k_eq)</code>	number of equations in <code>e(b)</code>
<code>e(k_eq_model)</code>	number of equations in overall model test
<code>e(k_eq_base)</code>	equation number of the base outcome
<code>e(baseout)</code>	the value of <i>depvar</i> to be treated as the base outcome
<code>e(ibaseout)</code>	index of the base outcome
<code>e(k_dv)</code>	number of dependent variables
<code>e(df_m)</code>	model degrees of freedom
<code>e(ll)</code>	log likelihood
<code>e(ll_0)</code>	log likelihood, constant-only model
<code>e(ll_c)</code>	log likelihood, comparison model
<code>e(chi2)</code>	$\chi^2$
<code>e(chi2_c)</code>	$\chi^2$ for comparison test
<code>e(p)</code>	<i>p</i> -value for model test
<code>e(p_c)</code>	<i>p</i> -value for comparison test
<code>e(df_c)</code>	comparison test degrees of freedom
<code>e(N_clust)</code>	number of clusters
<code>e(n_quad)</code>	number of quadrature points
<code>e(g_min)</code>	smallest group size
<code>e(g_avg)</code>	average group size
<code>e(g_max)</code>	largest group size
<code>e(rank)</code>	rank of <code>e(V)</code>
<code>e(rank0)</code>	rank of <code>e(V)</code> for constant-only model
<code>e(ic)</code>	number of iterations
<code>e(rc)</code>	return code
<code>e(converged)</code>	1 if converged, 0 otherwise

### Macros

<code>e(cmd)</code>	<code>gsem</code>
<code>e(cmd2)</code>	<code>xtmlogit</code>
<code>e(cmdline)</code>	command as typed
<code>e(depvar)</code>	name of dependent variable
<code>e(wtype)</code>	weight type
<code>e(wexp)</code>	weight expression
<code>e(covariance)</code>	random-effects covariance structure
<code>e(ivar)</code>	variable denoting groups
<code>e(model)</code>	<code>re</code>
<code>e(title)</code>	title in estimation output
<code>e(distrib)</code>	Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
<code>e(clustvar)</code>	name of cluster variable
<code>e(eqnames)</code>	names of equations
<code>e(baselab)</code>	value label corresponding to base outcome
<code>e(chi2type)</code>	Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^2$ test
<code>e(vce)</code>	<i>vce</i> type specified in <code>vce()</code>
<code>e(vcetype)</code>	title used to label Std. err.
<code>e(intmethod)</code>	integration method
<code>e(opt)</code>	type of optimization
<code>e(which)</code>	max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
<code>e(ml_method)</code>	type of ml method
<code>e(user)</code>	name of likelihood-evaluator program
<code>e(technique)</code>	maximization technique
<code>e(properties)</code>	<code>b V</code>

e(predict)	program used to implement predict
e(estat_cmd)	program used to implement estat
e(marginsok)	predictions allowed by margins
e(marginsnotok)	predictions disallowed by margins
e(marginsdefault)	default predict() specification for margins
e(asbalanced)	factor variables fvset as asbalanced
e(asobserved)	factor variables fvset as asobserved

#### Matrices

e(b)	coefficient vector
e(Cns)	constraints matrix
e(out)	outcome values
e(ilog)	iteration log
e(gradient)	gradient vector
e(V)	variance–covariance matrix of the estimators
e(V_modelbased)	model-based variance

#### Functions

e(sample)	marks estimation sample
-----------	-------------------------

In addition to the above, the following is stored in `r()`:

#### Matrices

r(table)	matrix containing the coefficients with their standard errors, test statistics, <i>p</i> -values, and confidence intervals
----------	--

Note that results stored in `r()` are updated when the command is replayed and will be replaced when any `r-class` command is run after the estimation command.

`xtnlogit, fe` stores the following in `e()`:

#### Scalars

e(N)	number of observations
e(N_g)	number of groups
e(N_drop)	number of observations dropped because of no variation in outcome
e(N_group_drop)	number of groups dropped because of no variation in outcome
e(k)	number of parameters
e(k_out)	number of outcomes
e(k_eq)	number of equations in <code>e(b)</code>
e(k_eq_model)	number of equations in overall model test
e(k_eq_base)	equation number of the base outcome
e(baseout)	the value of <i>devar</i> to be treated as the base outcome
e(ibaseout)	index of the base outcome
e(nperm)	number of permutations
e(nperm_sampled)	number of sampled permutations
e(rsample)	1 if permutation sampling, 0 otherwise
e(rssize)	percentage of sampled permutations
e(k_dv)	number of dependent variables
e(df_m)	model degrees of freedom
e(ll)	log likelihood
e(ll_0)	log likelihood, baseline model
e(chi2)	$\chi^2$
e(p)	<i>p</i> -value for model test
e(N_clust)	number of clusters
e(g_min)	smallest group size
e(g_avg)	average group size
e(g_max)	largest group size
e(rank)	rank of <code>e(V)</code>
e(ic)	number of iterations
e(rc)	return code
e(converged)	1 if converged, 0 otherwise

# Macros

e(cmd)	xtnlogit
e(cmdline)	command as typed
e(depvar)	name of dependent variable
e(wtype)	weight type
e(wexp)	weight expression
e(ivar)	variable denoting groups
e(model)	fe
e(title)	title in estimation output
e(clustvar)	name of cluster variable
e(eqnames)	names of equations
e(baselab)	value label corresponding to base outcome
e(chi2type)	Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^2$ test
e(vce)	<i>vcetype</i> specified in <i>vce()</i>
e(vctype)	title used to label Std. err.
e(rs_rngstate)	random-number state used
e(opt)	type of optimization
e(which)	max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
e(ml_method)	type of ml method
e(user)	name of likelihood-evaluator program
e(technique)	maximization technique
e(properties)	b V
e(predict)	program used to implement predict
e(marginsok)	predictions allowed by margins
e(marginsnotok)	predictions disallowed by margins
e(marginsdefault)	default <i>predict()</i> specification for margins
e(asbalanced)	factor variables <i>fvset</i> as <i>asbalanced</i>
e(asobserved)	factor variables <i>fvset</i> as <i>asobserved</i>

# Matrices

e(b)	coefficient vector
e(Cns)	constraints matrix
e(out)	outcome values
e(ilog)	iteration log
e(gradient)	gradient vector
e(V)	variance–covariance matrix of the estimators
e(V_modelbased)	model-based variance

# Functions

e(sample)	marks estimation sample
-----------	-------------------------

In addition to the above, the following is stored in *r()*:

# Matrices

r(table)	matrix containing the coefficients with their standard errors, test statistics, <i>p</i> -values, and confidence intervals
----------	--

Note that results stored in *r()* are updated when the command is replayed and will be replaced when any *r*-class command is run after the estimation command.

## Methods and formulas

For panels  $i = 1, \dots, N$  with outcomes  $j = 1, \dots, J$  observed at times  $t = 1, \dots, T_i$ , the model with unobserved heterogeneity at the panel level is

$$U_{ijt} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijt} \quad (2)$$

The variable  $U_{ijt}$  measures the utility of the  $i$ th panel toward outcome  $j$  at time  $t$  and is the sum of observed and unobserved components. The observed part of  $U_{ijt}$  consists of  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$ , a row vector of observed covariates of the  $i$ th panel at time  $t$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ , a column vector of coefficients for the  $j$ th outcome. The vector of covariates is the same for each outcome, and the covariates do not vary over the outcomes for a given panel at a given time point. The unobserved part of  $U_{ijt}$  consists of  $u_{ij}$  and  $\epsilon_{ijt}$ , where  $u_{ij}$  is a panel-level unobserved heterogeneity term and  $\epsilon_{ijt}$  is the observation-level error term. For model identification, (2) must be normalized with respect to a base category.

Assuming a type-1 extreme value distribution for  $\epsilon_{ijt}$  gives rise to the MNL model

$$\Pr(y_{it} = m \mid \mathbf{x}_{it}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, u_{ij}) = F(y_{it} = m, \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij}) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_m + u_{im})}{\sum_{j=1}^J \exp(\mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij})}$$

For normalization,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$  and  $u_{ij}$  are set to zero for  $j = b$ , where  $b$  is the base outcome.

The random-effects estimator of `xtlogit` assumes that  $\mathbf{u}_i$  is distributed  $\mathbf{u}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u)$ . The likelihood for the  $i$ th panel is

$$\begin{aligned} l_i &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} F(y_{it} = m, \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij}) \right\} \phi(\mathbf{u}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u) d\mathbf{u}_i \\ &\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y_{it} = m, \eta_{ijt}) d\mathbf{u}_i \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi$  is the probability density function of the normal distribution and  $\eta_{ijt} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + u_{ij}$ . This integral of dimension  $J - 1$  must be approximated numerically because it has no closed-form solution.

In the univariate case, the integral of a function multiplied by the kernel of the standard normal distribution can be approximated using Gauss–Hermite quadrature. For  $q$ -point Gauss–Hermite quadrature, let the abscissa and weight pairs be denoted by  $(a_k^*, w_k^*)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, q$ . The Gauss–Hermite quadrature approximation is then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \exp(-x^2) dx \approx \sum_{k=1}^q w_k^* f(a_k^*)$$

Using the standard normal distribution yields the approximation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \phi(x) dx \approx \sum_{k=1}^q w_k f(a_k)$$

where  $a_k = \sqrt{2}a_k^*$  and  $w_k = w_k^*/\sqrt{\pi}$ .

We can use a change-of-variables technique to transform the multivariate integral into a set of nested univariate integrals. Each univariate integral can then be evaluated using Gauss–Hermite quadrature. Let  $\mathbf{v}$  be a random vector whose elements are independently standard normal, and let  $\mathbf{L}$  be the Cholesky decomposition of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u$ ; that is,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}'$ . In the distribution, we have that  $\mathbf{u}_i \approx \mathbf{L}\mathbf{v}$ , and the linear predictions vector as a function of  $\mathbf{v}$  is

$$\tilde{\eta}_{ijt} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{v}$$

so the likelihood for a given panel is

$$l_i = (2\pi)^{-r/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ \log f(y_i, \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^r v_k^2 \right\} dv_1 \dots dv_r$$

Consider an  $r$ -dimensional quadrature grid,  $r = J - 1$ , containing  $q$  quadrature points in each dimension. Let the vector of abscissas  $\mathbf{a}_k = (a_{k_1}, \dots, a_{k_r})'$  be a point in this grid, and let  $\mathbf{w}_k = (w_{k_1}, \dots, w_{k_r})'$  be the vector of corresponding weights. The Gauss–Hermite quadrature approximation to the likelihood for a given panel is

$$\dot{l}_i = \sum_{k_1=1}^q \dots \sum_{k_r=1}^q \left[ \exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \log f(y_{it} = m, \tilde{\eta}_{ijt\mathbf{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s=1}^r w_{k_s} \right]$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}_{ijt\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + \mathbf{L}\mathbf{a}_k$$

In the case of adaptive Gauss–Hermite quadrature, the likelihood is approximated with

$$\dot{l}_i = \sum_{k_1=1}^q \dots \sum_{k_r=1}^q \left[ \exp \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \log f(y_{it} = m, \tilde{\eta}_{ijt\mathbf{k}}) \right\} \prod_{s=1}^r \omega_{k_s} \right]$$

where

$$\tilde{\eta}_{ijt\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{x}_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j + \mathbf{L}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$  and the  $\omega_{k_s}$  are the adaptive versions of the abscissas and weights after an orthogonalizing transformation, which eliminates posterior covariances between the latent variables.  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k$  and the  $\omega_{k_s}$  are functions of  $\mathbf{a}_k$  and  $\mathbf{w}_k$  as well as the posterior mean and the posterior variance of  $\mathbf{v}$ .

The fixed-effects estimator follows the derivations in Chamberlain (1980) and Pfarr (2014). Let  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iT_i})$  be the sequence of outcomes of the  $i$ th panel, and let  $\mathbf{Y}_{it} = (Y_{i1t}, \dots, Y_{iJt})$  be a vector with elements  $Y_{ijt} = 1$  ( $i$  chooses  $j$  at  $t$ ) that indicate the chosen outcome of the  $i$ th panel at time  $t$ .

The distribution of times that panel  $i$  chose each of the  $J$  alternatives over time points  $T_i$  is the sufficient statistic  $\Theta_i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{Y}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i = (c_{i1}, \dots, c_{iJ})$ . Conditioning on the sufficient statistic  $\Theta_i$ , we find the probability of panel  $i$  choosing a sequence  $\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{s}_i$  that is consistent with  $\mathbf{c}_i$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathbf{Y}_i = \mathbf{s}_i \mid \Theta_i, \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \Pr\{Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iT_i} \mid \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i), \mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}\} \\ &= \frac{\exp \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J Y_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_j \right)}{\sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{ijt} \in \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)} \exp \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J \tilde{Y}_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_j \right)} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  is the set of all permutations of individual  $i$ 's observed sequence of outcomes that satisfy the condition  $\sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i$ . That is,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i) = \left\{ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i = (\tilde{Y}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{iT_i}) \left| \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = \mathbf{c}_i \right. \right\}$$

and  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{it} = (\tilde{Y}_{i1t}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{iJt})$  is a vector of indicators with respect to the permutations of the observed outcome sequence  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ . The log likelihood of panel  $i$  is then the natural logarithm of the above probability

$$\log l_i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J Y_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j - \log \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{ijt} \in \Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)} \exp \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J \tilde{Y}_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j \right)$$

and the overall log likelihood is  $\sum_{i=1}^N \log l_i$ .

Consistent, albeit less efficient, estimates of the parameters in  $\beta_j$  can be obtained by taking a random sample of the elements in  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$ . The total number of permutations in  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  is

$$K_i = \frac{T_i!}{c_{i1}! \cdots c_{ij}! \cdots c_{iJ}!}$$

Let  $\check{\Psi}(\mathbf{c}_i)$  be a random subset of  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$ .  $\check{\Psi}(\mathbf{c}_i)$  consists of  $L_i + 1$  elements, where  $L_i$  elements are randomly drawn without replacement and equal probability from the set  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  that has the observed sequence of outcomes removed, and then the observed sequence is added such that  $\check{\Psi}(\mathbf{c}_i)$  always contains the observed outcome sequence. The log likelihood with sampled permutations is

$$\log l_i = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J Y_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j - \log \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{ijt} \in \check{\Psi}(\mathbf{c}_i)} \exp \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \sum_{j=1, j \neq b}^J \tilde{Y}_{ijt} \mathbf{x}_{it} \beta_j \right)$$

The above is a consistent estimator of  $\beta_j$  but is less efficient compared with using the full set of permutations  $\Psi(\mathbf{c}_i)$  because of the added Monte Carlo variance. The smaller the size of the sample relative to  $K_i$ , the number of all permutations, the less efficient it becomes. The permutation sampling implemented in `xtmlogit` follows the approach outlined in D'Haultfœuille and Iaria (2016).

## References

- Andersen, E. B. 1970. Asymptotic properties of conditional maximum-likelihood estimators. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, B ser.*, 32: 283–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1970.tb00842.x>.
- Börsch-Supan, A. 1990. Panel data analysis of housing choices. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 20: 65–82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-0462\(90\)90025-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0166-0462(90)90025-X).
- Chamberlain, G. 1980. Analysis of covariance with qualitative data. *Review of Economic Studies* 47: 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2297110>.
- D'Haultfœuille, X., and A. Iaria. 2016. A convenient method for the estimation of the multinomial logit model with fixed effects. *Economics Letters* 141: 77–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2016.02.002>.
- Grilli, L., and C. Rampichini. 2007. A multilevel multinomial logit model for the analysis of graduates' skills. *Statistical Methods and Applications* 16: 381–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10260-006-0039-z>.
- Hartzel, J., A. Agresti, and B. S. Caffo. 2001. Multinomial logit random effects models. *Statistical Modelling* 1: 81–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1471082X0100100201>.
- Lancaster, T. 2000. The incidental parameter problem since 1948. *Journal of Econometrics* 95: 391–413. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076\(99\)00044-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076(99)00044-5).
- Pfrr, K. 2014. `femlogit`—Implementation of the multinomial logit model with fixed effects. *Stata Journal* 14: 847–862.

## Also see

- [XT] **xtnlogit postestimation** — Postestimation tools for xtnlogit
- [XT] **quadchk** — Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
- [XT] **xtlogit** — Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
- [XT] **xtset** — Declare data to be panel data
- [BAYES] **bayes: xtnlogit** — Bayesian random-effects multinomial logit model
- [R] **cllogit** — Conditional (fixed-effects) logistic regression
- [R] **mlogit** — Multinomial (polytomous) logistic regression
- [R] **mprobit** — Multinomial probit regression
- [SVY] **svy estimation** — Estimation commands for survey data
- [U] **20 Estimation and postestimation commands**

Stata, Stata Press, and Mata are registered trademarks of StataCorp LLC. Stata and Stata Press are registered trademarks with the World Intellectual Property Organization of the United Nations. StataNow and NetCourseNow are trademarks of StataCorp LLC. Other brand and product names are registered trademarks or trademarks of their respective companies. Copyright © 1985–2025 StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA. All rights reserved.

For suggested citations, see the FAQ on [citing Stata documentation](#).

