

Estimating effects from extended regression models

David M. Drukker

Executive Director of Econometrics
Stata

2017 UK Stata Users Group meeting
8 September 2017

- Fictional data on wellness program from large company

```
. use wprogram2
. describe wchange age over phealth prog wtprog wtsamp
```

variable name	storage type	display format	value label	variable label
wchange	float	%9.0g	changel	Weight change level
age	float	%9.0g		Years over 50
over	float	%9.0g		Overweight (tens of pounds)
phealth	float	%9.0g		Prior health score
prog	float	%9.0g	yesno	Participate in wellness program
wtprog	float	%9.0g	yesno	Offered work time to participate in program
wtsamp	float	%9.0g		Offered work time to participate in sample

- Three levels of wchange

```
. tabulate wchange prog
```

Weight change level	Participate in wellness program		Total
	No	Yes	
Loss	194	962	1,156
No change	306	188	494
Gain	152	14	166
Total	652	1,164	1,816

- Data are observational
- Table does not account for how observed covariates and/or unobserved errors that affect program participation also affect the outcome variable

I use an ordered probit model to control for observable covariates that could affect both wchange and prog

```
. eoprobit wchange i.prog age over phealth, vsquish nolog
```

```
Extended ordered probit regression          Number of obs    =      1,816
                                           Wald chi2(4)     =      548.00
Log likelihood = -1267.3173                Prob > chi2      =      0.0000
```

wchange	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
prog						
Yes	-1.486537	.0687325	-21.63	0.000	-1.621251	-1.351824
age	.0371479	.0969554	0.38	0.702	-.1528811	.2271769
over	-.1682472	.0626191	-2.69	0.007	-.2909785	-.0455159
phealth	-.1378776	.0528111	-2.61	0.009	-.2413854	-.0343699
cut1	-.7693622	.076155			-.9186233	-.6201011
cut2	.5106948	.0763306			.3610895	.6603

```
. eoprobit wchange i.prog age over phealth, vsquish nolog
```

```
Extended ordered probit regression      Number of obs      =      1,816
                                         Wald chi2(4)       =      548.00
Log likelihood = -1267.3173             Prob > chi2        =      0.0000
```

wchange	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
prog						
Yes	-1.486537	.0687325	-21.63	0.000	-1.621251	-1.351824
age	.0371479	.0969554	0.38	0.702	-.1528811	.2271769
over	-.1682472	.0626191	-2.69	0.007	-.2909785	-.0455159
phealth	-.1378776	.0528111	-2.61	0.009	-.2413854	-.0343699
cut1	-.7693622	.076155			-.9186233	-.6201011
cut2	.5106948	.0763306			.3610895	.6603

$$wchange = \begin{cases} \text{"Loss"} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\beta + \epsilon \leq cut1 \\ \text{"No change"} & \text{if } cut1 < \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\beta + \epsilon \leq cut2 \\ \text{"Gain"} & \text{if } cut2 < \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\beta + \epsilon \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{x}\beta = \beta_2 \text{age} + \beta_3 \text{over} + \beta_4 \text{phealth}$$

```
. margins r.prog, contrast(nowald) post
```

```
Contrasts of predictive margins
```

```
Model VCE      : OIM
```

```
1._predict    : Pr(wchange==Loss), predict(outlevel(0))
```

```
2._predict    : Pr(wchange==No change), predict(outlevel(1))
```

```
3._predict    : Pr(wchange==Gain), predict(outlevel(2))
```

	Delta-method		
	Contrast	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]
prog@_predict			
(Yes vs No) 1	.5293751	.0213456	.4875385 .5712116
(Yes vs No) 2	-.313256	.0170586	-.3466903 -.2798217
(Yes vs No) 3	-.2161191	.0156092	-.2467126 -.1855256

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .52
 - On average, the probability of “No change” goes down by .31
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down .22

- I suspect that unobservables that increase program participation are negatively correlated with unobservables that affect weight gain

Those most likely to participate are most likely to lose weight, after controlling for observable covariates

- I want a model that
 - allows observed covariates to affect both $wchange$ and assignment to $prog$
 - allows the errors that affect $prog$ to be correlated with the errors that affect $wchange$
- In other words, I want to model $prog$ as endogenous

A model when prog is endogenous

$$wchange = \begin{cases} \text{"Loss"} & \text{if } \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \leq cut1 \\ \text{"No change"} & \text{if } cut1 < \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \leq cut2 \\ \text{"Gain"} & \text{if } cut2 < \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \end{cases}$$

$$prog = (\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \gamma_1 wtime + \eta > 0)$$

ϵ and η are correlated and joint normal

$$\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \beta_2 \text{age} + \beta_3 \text{over} + \beta_4 \text{phealth}$$

$$\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \gamma_2 \text{age} + \gamma_3 \text{over} + \gamma_4 \text{phealth}$$

- $wtime$ is an instrumental variable
 - It is included in the model for treatment
 - It is excluded from the model for the potential outcomes of $wchange$

$$wchange = \begin{cases} \text{"Loss"} & \text{if } \beta_1 prog + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \leq cut1 \\ \text{"No change"} & \text{if } cut1 < \beta_1 prog + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \leq cut2 \\ \text{"Gain"} & \text{if } cut2 < \beta_1 prog + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon \end{cases}$$

$$prog = (\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \gamma_1 wtime + \eta > 0)$$

ϵ and η are correlated and joint normal

$$\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \beta_2 age + \beta_3 over + \beta_4 phealth$$

$$\mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \gamma_2 age + \gamma_3 over + \gamma_4 phealth$$

Fit by: `eoprobit wchange age over phealth ,`
`endog(prog = age over phealth wtime, probit)`

```

. eoprobit wchange age over phealth , ///
> endog(prog = age over phealth wtprog, probit) ///
> vsquish nolog
Extended ordered probit regression      Number of obs      =      1,816
                                         Wald chi2(4)       =      98.47
Log likelihood = -2177.6691             Prob > chi2        =      0.0000

```

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
age	.204564	.0980909	2.09	0.037	.0123094	.3968186
over	.0278124	.0687223	0.40	0.686	-.1068808	.1625055
phealth	-.3028088	.0575207	-5.26	0.000	-.4155473	-.1900703
prog						
Yes	-.628258	.1582358	-3.97	0.000	-.9383945	-.3181215
prog						
age	-.8484251	.1076217	-7.88	0.000	-1.05936	-.6374904
over	-1.071231	.0757757	-14.14	0.000	-1.219748	-.9227131
phealth	.873563	.0623242	14.02	0.000	.7514097	.9957163
wtprog	1.618161	.113306	14.28	0.000	1.396086	1.840237
_cons	.0856418	.0687773	1.25	0.213	-.0491592	.2204428
/wchange						
cut1	-.2589072	.1119722			-.4783686	-.0394458
cut2	.927279	.0900163			.7508504	1.103708
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.5305974	.0772131	-6.87	0.000	-.6649372	-.3630029

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
age	.204564	.0980909	2.09	0.037	.0123094	.3968186
over	.0278124	.0687223	0.40	0.686	-.1068808	.1625055
phealth	-.3028088	.0575207	-5.26	0.000	-.4155473	-.1900703
prog						
Yes	-.628258	.1582358	-3.97	0.000	-.9383945	-.3181215
prog						
age	-.8484251	.1076217	-7.88	0.000	-1.05936	-.6374904
over	-1.071231	.0757757	-14.14	0.000	-1.219748	-.9227131
phealth	.873563	.0623242	14.02	0.000	.7514097	.9957163
wtprog	1.618161	.113306	14.28	0.000	1.396086	1.840237
_cons	.0856418	.0687773	1.25	0.213	-.0491592	.2204428
/wchange						
cut1	-.2589072	.1119722			-.4783686	-.0394458
cut2	.927279	.0900163			.7508504	1.103708
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.5305974	.0772131	-6.87	0.000	-.6649372	-.3630029

- The coefficient on wtprog and its standard error give the impression that the instrument is relevant

cut2	.977279	.0900163			.7508504	1.103708
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.5305974	.0772131	-6.87	0.000	-.6649372	-.3630029

- The nonzero correlation between e.prog and e.wchange indicates that prog is endogenous
- Those who are more likely to participate are more likely to lose weight

```

. margins r.prog, ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss")) ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No change")) ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain")) ///
> contrast(nowald)

```

Contrasts of predictive margins

Model VCE : OIM

1._predict : Pr(wchange==Loss), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))

2._predict : Pr(wchange==No change), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No change"))

3._predict : Pr(wchange==Gain), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))

	Delta-method			
	Contrast	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
prog@_predict				
(Yes vs No) 1	.231068	.0583617	.1166812	.3454547
(Yes vs No) 2	-.146159	.0392355	-.2230591	-.0692589
(Yes vs No) 3	-.084909	.0201163	-.1243361	-.0454818

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .23
 - On average, the probability of “No change” goes down by .15
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down by .08

- `fix(prog)` gets us the effect of the program that is not contaminated by the correlation between ϵ and η that increases the participation among people more likely to lose weight
- If you specify `fix(prog)`, `predict` ignores the correlation between `prog` and ϵ in estimating the prediction
 - Specifying `fix(prog)` gets the prediction you want to estimate the effect of the program that is not contaminated by the endogenous selection into the program
- If you do not specify `fix(prog)`, `predict` includes the correlation between `prog` and ϵ in estimating the prediction
 - Not specifying `fix(prog)` gets the prediction you want if you are betting on whether someone with specific covariates and program status will lose weight

- `fix(prog)` predictions are sometimes called the structural prediction or an average structural function; see Blundell and Powell (2003), Blundell and Powell (2004), Wooldridge (2010), and Wooldridge (2014),
- The difference between the mean of the average of the structural predictions when `prog=1` and the mean of the average of the structural predictions when `prog=0` is an average treatment effect (Blundell and Powell (2003) and Wooldridge (2014))

Standard errors for population versus sample

- The delta-method standard errors reported by `margins` hold the covariates fixed at their sample values
 - The delta-method standard errors are for a sample-average treatment effect instead of a population-averaged treatment effect
 - The sample-averaged treatment effect is for those individuals that showed up in that run of the treatment
 - The population-averaged treatment effect is for a random draw of individuals from the population
- To get standard errors for the population-average treatment effect, specify `vce(robust)` to the estimation command and specify `vce(unconditional)` to `margins`


```

. quietly eoprobit wchange age over phealth , ///
> endog(prog = age over phealth wtprog, probit) ///
> vce(robust)
. margins r.prog, ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss")) ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No change")) ///
> predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain")) ///
> contrast(nowald) vce(unconditional) post

```

Contrasts of predictive margins

```

1._predict : Pr(wchange==Loss), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))
2._predict : Pr(wchange==No change), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No
change"))
3._predict : Pr(wchange==Gain), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))

```

	Unconditional			
	Contrast	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
prog@_predict				
(Yes vs No) 1	.231068	.0583663	.1166721	.3454639
(Yes vs No) 2	-.146159	.0391262	-.222845	-.069473
(Yes vs No) 3	-.084909	.0202105	-.1245208	-.0452971

Interacting an endogenous variable with other covariates

```
. eoprobit wchange i.prog i.prog#c.(age over phealth) , ///
>         endog(prog = age over phealth wtprog, nomain probit)    ///
>         vce(robust) vsquish nolog
```

Extended ordered probit regression Number of obs = 1,816
 Wald chi2(7) = 111.63
 Log pseudolikelihood = -2158.8165 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog						
Yes	.0018457	.1781571	0.01	0.992	-.3473357	.3510272
prog#c.age						
No	.3123571	.1331677	2.35	0.019	.0513531	.573361
Yes	.0730845	.1298635	0.56	0.574	-.1814432	.3276122
prog#c.over						
No	.17194	.0854484	2.01	0.044	.0044641	.3394158
Yes	-.2479575	.1063778	-2.33	0.020	-.456454	-.0394609
prog#						
c.phealth						
No	-.0730391	.0899687	-0.81	0.417	-.2493744	.1032963
Yes	-.5054434	.0741897	-6.81	0.000	-.6508525	-.3600342

prog						
age	-.8543462	.106038	-8.06	0.000	-1.062177	-.6465156
over	-1.069359	.0736758	-14.51	0.000	-1.213761	-.9249569
phealth	.8570916	.0608459	14.09	0.000	.7378359	.9763473
wtprog	1.627213	.1077598	15.10	0.000	1.416007	1.838418

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog						
Yes	.0018457	.1781571	0.01	0.992	-.3473357	.3510272
prog#c.age						
No	.3123571	.1331677	2.35	0.019	.0513531	.573361
Yes	.0730845	.1298635	0.56	0.574	-.1814432	.3276122
prog#c.over						
No	.17194	.0854484	2.01	0.044	.0044641	.3394158
Yes	-.2479575	.1063778	-2.33	0.020	-.456454	-.0394609
prog#						
c.phealth						
No	-.0730391	.0899687	-0.81	0.417	-.2493744	.1032963
Yes	-.5054434	.0741897	-6.81	0.000	-.6508525	-.3600342
prog						
age	-.8543462	.106038	-8.06	0.000	-1.062177	-.6465156
over	-1.069359	.0736758	-14.51	0.000	-1.213761	-.9249569
phealth	.8570916	.0608459	14.09	0.000	.7378359	.9763473
wtprog	1.627213	.1077598	15.10	0.000	1.416007	1.838418
_cons	.0965657	.0688104	1.40	0.161	-.0383003	.2314316
/wchange						
cut1	.0358062	.115777			-.1911124	.2627249
cut2	1.227726	.097207			1.037204	1.418248
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.5476024	.076449	-7.16	0.000	-.6799189	-.3807508

```

. margins r.prog,          ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))  ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No change"))  ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))  ///
>   contrast(nowald) vce(unconditional) post

```

Contrasts of predictive margins

```

1._predict   : Pr(wchange==Loss), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))
2._predict   : Pr(wchange==No change), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No
change"))
3._predict   : Pr(wchange==Gain), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))

```

	Unconditional		
	Contrast	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]
prog@_predict			
(Yes vs No) 1	.2357078	.0600875	.1179385 .3534772
(Yes vs No) 2	-.1546622	.0401367	-.2333286 -.0759957
(Yes vs No) 3	-.0810456	.0209271	-.1220621 -.0400292

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .24
 - On average, the probability of “No change” goes down by .15
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down by .08

Endogenous treatment model

```
. eoprobit wchange (age over phealth) , ///
>      entreat(prog = age over phealth wtprog ) ///
>      vce(robust) vsquish nolog
```

```
Extended ordered probit regression      Number of obs      =      1,816
                                         Wald chi2(6)        =      61.42
Log pseudolikelihood = -2158.1656      Prob > chi2         =      0.0000
```

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog#c.age						
No	.3122714	.1314859	2.37	0.018	.0545638	.5699791
Yes	.071914	.1308732	0.55	0.583	-.1845927	.3284208
prog#c.over						
No	.1742641	.0843392	2.07	0.039	.0089624	.3395659
Yes	-.2519632	.107001	-2.35	0.019	-.4616814	-.042245
prog#						
c.phealth						
No	-.0765452	.0887458	-0.86	0.388	-.2504837	.0973933
Yes	-.5094441	.0751039	-6.78	0.000	-.656645	-.3622432
prog						
age	-.8545688	.1060258	-8.06	0.000	-1.062375	-.6467621
over	-1.069774	.0736061	-14.53	0.000	-1.21404	-.9255089
phealth	.8569976	.0608534	14.08	0.000	.7377271	.9762682
wtprog	1.627411	.107371	15.16	0.000	1.416967	1.837854
c.phealth	.0078712	.0689011	1.42	0.155	.0271724	.2220142

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog#c.age						
No	.3122714	.1314859	2.37	0.018	.0545638	.5699791
Yes	.071914	.1308732	0.55	0.583	-.1845927	.3284208
prog#c.over						
No	.1742641	.0843392	2.07	0.039	.0089624	.3395659
Yes	-.2519632	.107001	-2.35	0.019	-.4616814	-.042245
prog# c.phealth						
No	-.0765452	.0887458	-0.86	0.388	-.2504837	.0973933
Yes	-.5094441	.0751039	-6.78	0.000	-.656645	-.3622432
prog						
age	-.8545688	.1060258	-8.06	0.000	-1.062375	-.6467621
over	-1.069774	.0736061	-14.53	0.000	-1.21404	-.9255089
phealth	.8569976	.0608534	14.08	0.000	.7377271	.9762682
wtprog	1.627411	.107371	15.16	0.000	1.416967	1.837854
_cons	.0978712	.0689011	1.42	0.155	-.0371724	.2329148
/wchange						
prog#c.cut1						
No	.0527717	.1152427			-.1730998	.2786432
Yes	.0186214	.107202			-.1914907	.2287335
prog#c.cut2						
No	1.210627	.0970201			1.020471	1.400783
Yes	1.301471	.151592			1.004356	1.598586
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)						
	-.5501941	.0753943	-7.30	0.000	-.680788	-.3856995

prog#c.age	No	.3122714	.1314859	2.37	0.018	.0545638	.5699791
	Yes	.071914	.1308732	0.55	0.583	-.1845927	.3284208
prog#c.over	No	.1742641	.0843392	2.07	0.039	.0089624	.3395659
	Yes	-.2519632	.107001	-2.35	0.019	-.4616814	-.042245
prog# c.phealth	No	-.0765452	.0887458	-0.86	0.388	-.2504837	.0973933
	Yes	-.5094441	.0751039	-6.78	0.000	-.656645	-.3622432
prog	age	-.8545688	.1060258	-8.06	0.000	-1.062375	-.6467621
	over	-1.069774	.0736061	-14.53	0.000	-1.21404	-.9255089
	phealth	.8569976	.0608534	14.08	0.000	.7377271	.9762682
	wtprog	1.627411	.107371	15.16	0.000	1.416967	1.837854
	_cons	.0978712	.0689011	1.42	0.155	-.0371724	.2329148
/wchange	prog#c.cut1						
	No	.0527717	.1152427			-.1730998	.2786432
	Yes	.0186214	.107202			-.1914907	.2287335
	prog#c.cut2						
	No	1.210627	.0970201			1.020471	1.400783
	Yes	1.301471	.151592			1.004356	1.598586
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)		-.5501941	.0753943	-7.30	0.000	-.680788	-.3856995

```
. estat teffects
```

```
Predictive margins
```

```
Number of obs = 1,816
```

```
ATE_Pr0 : Pr(wchange=0=Loss)  
ATE_Pr1 : Pr(wchange=1=No change)  
ATE_Pr2 : Pr(wchange=2=Gain)
```

	Unconditional Margin	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ATE_Pr0 prog (Yes vs No)	.2252647	.0600534	3.75	0.000	.1075623	.3429671
ATE_Pr1 prog (Yes vs No)	-.1349272	.0438049	-3.08	0.002	-.2207833	-.0490711
ATE_Pr2 prog (Yes vs No)	-.0903375	.0216817	-4.17	0.000	-.1328328	-.0478422

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .23
 - On average, the probability of “No change” goes down by .14
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down .09


```

. margins r.prog,          ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))    ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No change"))  ///
>   predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))    ///
>   contrast(nowald) vce(unconditional) post

```

Contrasts of predictive margins

```

1._predict : Pr(wchange==Loss), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Loss"))
2._predict : Pr(wchange==No change), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("No
change"))
3._predict : Pr(wchange==Gain), predict(fix(prog) outlevel("Gain"))

```

	Unconditional		
	Contrast	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]
prog@_predict			
(Yes vs No) 1	.2252647	.0600534	.1075623 .3429671
(Yes vs No) 2	-.1349272	.0438049	-.2207833 -.0490711
(Yes vs No) 3	-.0903375	.0216817	-.1328328 -.0478422

Endogenous sample selection

- Reconsider our fictional weight-loss program
 - Some program participants and some nonparticipants did not show up for the final weigh in
This is commonly known as lost to follow up
 - If unobservables that affect whether someone is lost to follow up
 - are independent of the unobservables that affect program participation
 - and they are independent of the unobservables that affect the outcomes with and without the program,
 - the previously discussed estimator consistently estimates the effects
- Any dependence among the unobservables must be modeled

Data

```
. describe
```

```
Contains data from wprogram2.dta
```

```
  obs:      3,000
```

```
  vars:      8
```

```
  size:     96,000
```

```
6 Sep 2017 12:10
```

variable name	storage type	display format	value label	variable label
wchange	float	%9.0g	change1	Weight change level
age	float	%9.0g		Years over 50
over	float	%9.0g		Overweight (tens of pounds)
phealth	float	%9.0g		Prior health score
prog	float	%9.0g	yesno	Participate in wellness program
wtprog	float	%9.0g	yesno	Offered work time to participate in program
wtsamp	float	%9.0g		Offered work time to participate in sample
insamp	float	%9.0g		In sample: attended initial and final weigh in

```
Sorted by:
```

```
Note: Dataset has changed since last saved.
```

$$insamp = (\mathbf{x}\alpha + \alpha_1 wtsamp + \xi > 0)$$

$$prog = (\mathbf{x}\gamma + \gamma_1 wtprog + \eta > 0)$$

$$wchange = \begin{cases} \text{"Loss"} & \text{if } \mathbf{x}\beta_0 + \epsilon \leq cut1_0 \\ \text{"No change"} & \text{if } cut1_0 < \mathbf{x}\beta_0 + \epsilon \leq cut2_0 \\ \text{"Gain"} & \text{if } cut2_0 < \mathbf{x}\beta_0 + \epsilon \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{x}\beta_0 = \beta_{1,0}age + \beta_{2,0}over + \beta_{3,0}phealth$$

for the observations at which $prog=0$, and

$$wchange = \begin{cases} \text{"Loss"} & \text{if } \mathbf{x}\beta_1 + \epsilon \leq cut1_1 \\ \text{"No change"} & \text{if } cut1_1 < \mathbf{x}\beta_1 + \epsilon \leq cut2_1 \\ \text{"Gain"} & \text{if } cut2_1 < \mathbf{x}\beta_1 + \epsilon \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{x}\beta_1 = \beta_{1,1}age + \beta_{2,1}over + \beta_{3,1}phealth$$

for the observations at which $prog=1$

ξ, ϵ and η are correlated and joint normal

```
Fit by: eoprobit wchange (age over phealth) ,  
        entreat(prog = age over phealth wtprog )  
        select(samp = age over phealth wtsamp )  
        vce(robust)
```

```

. eoprobit wchange (age over phealth) ,      ///
>       entreat(prog = age over phealth wtprog ) ///
>       select(insamp = age over phealth wtsamp ) ///
>       vce(robust) vsquish nolog

```

```

Extended ordered probit regression           Number of obs   =       3,000
                                             Selected       =       1,816
                                             Nonselected    =       1,184
                                             Wald chi2(6)   =       200.16
                                             Prob > chi2    =       0.0000

Log pseudolikelihood = -4402.4852

```

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog#c.age						
No	.2977275	.1074884	2.77	0.006	.0870541	.5084009
Yes	.1653358	.1026185	1.61	0.107	-.0357928	.3664644
prog#c.over						
No	.5347524	.0680259	7.86	0.000	.401424	.6680808
Yes	.23094	.0953423	2.42	0.015	.0440725	.4178075
prog#						
c.phealth						
No	-.4092577	.0708874	-5.77	0.000	-.5481944	-.2703209
Yes	-.75997	.0626118	-12.14	0.000	-.8826868	-.6372532
insamp						
age	.0511126	.0789532	0.65	0.517	-.1036328	.2058579
over	-.7893401	.0445127	-17.73	0.000	-.8765835	-.7020968
phealth	.7739903	.0461381	16.78	0.000	.6835613	.8644193
wtsamp	2.20639	.4215291	5.23	0.000	1.380208	3.032571
cons	3026734	.0507938	5.96	0.000	2031193	4022275

c. phealth							
No		-.4092577	.0708874	-5.77	0.000	-.5481944	-.2703209
Yes		-.75997	.0626118	-12.14	0.000	-.8826868	-.6372532
insamp							
age		.0511126	.0789532	0.65	0.517	-.1036328	.2058579
over		-.7893401	.0445127	-17.73	0.000	-.8765835	-.7020968
phealth		.7739903	.0461381	16.78	0.000	.6835613	.8644193
wtsamp		2.20639	.4215291	5.23	0.000	1.380208	3.032571
_cons		.3026734	.0507938	5.96	0.000	.2031193	.4022275
prog							
age		-.9408839	.0823665	-11.42	0.000	-1.102319	-.7794485
over		-1.061503	.050071	-21.20	0.000	-1.15964	-.9633653
phealth		.8896701	.0494006	18.01	0.000	.7928467	.9864935
wtprog		1.629244	.0764087	21.32	0.000	1.479486	1.779002
_cons		.0199176	.0530267	0.38	0.707	-.0840128	.1238481
/wchange							
prog#c.cut1							
No		-.3821007	.0926799			-.5637499	-.2004514
Yes		-.4393841	.0802464			-.5966641	-.2821041
prog#c.cut2							
No		.5051071	.1022236			.3047525	.7054618
Yes		.5437111	.1399479			.2694182	.818004
corr(e.insamp,							
e.wchange)		-.8266016	.0514301	-16.07	0.000	-.9043439	-.6957701
corr(e.prog,							
e.wchange)		-.4910402	.0594322	-8.26	0.000	-.5985767	-.366119
corr(e.prog,							
e.insamp)		.0835352	.0350767	2.38	0.017	.0144972	.1517805

corr(e.insamp, e.wchange)	-.8266016	.0514301	-16.07	0.000	-.9043439	-.6957701
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.4910402	.0594322	-8.26	0.000	-.5985767	-.366119
corr(e.prog, e.insamp)	.0835352	.0350767	2.38	0.017	.0144972	.1517805

- Nonzero correlation between e.insamp and e.wchange implies endogenous sample selection for outcomes
 - Those more likely to show up for final weigh in are more likely to lose weight
- Nonzero correlation between e.prog and e.wchange implies endogenous treatment assignment
 - Those more likely to participate in program are more likely to lose weight
- Nonzero correlation between e.prog and e.insamp implies endogenous sample selection for program
 - Those more likely to participate in program are more likely to show up for the final weigh in


```
. estat teffects
```

```
Predictive margins
```

```
Number of obs      =      3,000
```

```
ATE_Pr0      : Pr(wchange=0=Loss)  
ATE_Pr1      : Pr(wchange=1=No change)  
ATE_Pr2      : Pr(wchange=2=Gain)
```

	Unconditional Margin	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ATE_Pr0 prog (Yes vs No)	.1616204	.0403782	4.00	0.000	.0824805	.2407603
ATE_Pr1 prog (Yes vs No)	.0021599	.0256098	0.08	0.933	-.0480345	.0523542
ATE_Pr2 prog (Yes vs No)	-.1637803	.0372978	-4.39	0.000	-.2368826	-.0906779

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .16
 - On average, the probability of “No change” does not change
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down by .16

Modeling endogeneity and sample selection can make a difference

```
. estimates table exog linear interact full essample
```

Variable	exog	linear	interact	full	essample
prog@					
_predict					
(Yes vs No)					
1	.52937505	.23106797	.23570783	.22526472	.16162041
(Yes vs No)					
2	-.31325598	-.14615901	-.15466218	-.13492724	.00215985
(Yes vs No)					
3	-.21611907	-.08490896	-.08104565	-.09033748	-.16378026

More about ERM commands

- Extended regression model (ERM) is a Stata term for a class of regression models
- The commands `eregress`, `eprobit`, and `eintreg` fit ERMs handle continuous-and-unbounded, binary, and censored/corner outcomes
- Look at

<http://www.stata.com/manuals/erm.pdf>

for more examples and a wealth of details

- Blundell, R. W., and J. L. Powell. 2003. Endogeneity in nonparametric and semiparametric regression models. In *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Eighth World Congress*, ed. M. Dewatripont, L. P. Hansen, and S. J. Turnovsky, vol. 2, 312–357. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. Endogeneity in semiparametric binary response models. *Review of Economic Studies* 71: 655–679.
- Wooldridge, J. M. 2010. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- . 2014. Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and testing for nonlinear models with endogenous explanatory variables. *Journal of Econometrics* 182: 226–234.