

**COLLABORATIVE MASTERS PROGRAMME  
IN ECONOMICS FOR ANGLOPHONE AFRICA  
(CMAP)**

**JOINT FACILITY FOR ELECTIVES**



**ECONOMETRICS THEORY AND PRACTICE PART  
TWO: TOPICS IN MICRO-ECONOMETRICS**

**AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2011**

**DR. MOSES SICHEI\***

---

\* KSMS Research Centre

Mobile: +254 723383505; Email: [sichei@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:sichei@yahoo.co.uk) or [Sicheimm@centralbank.go.ke](mailto:Sicheimm@centralbank.go.ke)

**Date: 22/8/2011**

## **PRACTICAL 2: MULTINOMIAL LOGIT**

### **1. OBJECTIVE:**

Get a hands-on-experience in specifying, estimating and interpreting results from multinomial logit model. Specifically the practical focuses on;

- (i) Specification of MNL
- (ii) Estimation of these models
- (iii) Interpretation of the models
- (iv) Diagnostic statistics
- (v) Presentation of the results

### **2. DATA:**

- We use Uganda's household survey data dealing with enterprises' source of income.
- The data is called **Uganda enterprise data**
- It is a survey of 4093 firms (after cleaning the file)
- The main research problem is to *examine the factors that determine the source of funds for setting up the business.*
- In the file, this corresponds to question h9q6 which was stated in the questionnaire as

**What was the main source of money for setting up the business?**

(You can check this by right clicking and viewing the variable properties)

- The possible alternatives (look at variable definitions) are:

1. Did not need money
2. Own savings
3. Commercial/development bank
4. Microfinance institutions
5. Local group
6. NGO
7. Other

You can check this in stata by using tabulate  
**tabulate h9q6**

```
tabulate h9q6
```

what was the main source of money for setting up the busines	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
didnt need any money	476	11.65	11.65
own savings	2,989	73.15	84.80
commercial/devt bank	32	0.78	85.58
microfinance institutions	74	1.81	87.40
local group	59	1.44	88.84
ngo	9	0.22	89.06
other	447	10.94	100.00
Total	4,086	100.00	

- The following are the factors that explain the choice are;
  - Average expenditure on wages (h9q13)-  $x_{1i}$
  - Number of people hired (h9q12)-  $x_{2i}$
  - Average expenditure on raw materials (h9q14)-  $x_{3i}$
  - Other operating expenses such as fuel, kerosene, electricity (h9q15)-  $x_{4i}$
  - Monthly gross revenue (h9q11)-  $x_{5i}$
  - Months of enterprise operation (h9q10)-  $x_{6i}$
  - Age of the enterprise (h9q5 recorded as time)-  $x_{7i}$

### 3.1 Specification of the MNL

#### 3.1.1 Specify the multinomial density for one observation

Assume that the source of income is equal to  $y$

$$f(y) = p_1^{y_1} \times p_2^{y_2} \times \dots \times p_7^{y_7} = \prod_{j=1}^7 p_j^{y_j}$$

#### 3.1.2 Specify the likelihood function

$$L = \prod_{i=1}^{4093} \prod_{j=1}^7 p_{ij}^{y_{ij}}$$

Where

$$p_{ij} = \frac{e^{\beta_j x_{ij}}}{\sum_j e^{\beta_j x_{ij}}} \text{ for multinomial logit model (non-alternative}$$

varying regressors

- Average expenditure on wages (h9q13)-  $x_{1i}$
- Number of people hired (h9q12)-  $x_{2i}$
- Average expenditure on raw materials (h9q14)-  $x_{3i}$
- Other operating expenses such as fuel, kerosene, electricity (h9q15)-  $x_{4i}$
- Monthly gross revenue (h9q11)-  $x_{5i}$
- Months of enterprise operation (h9q10)-  $x_{6i}$
- Age of the enterprise (h9q5 recorded as time)-  $x_{7i}$

$$x = (x_{1i}, x_{2i}, x_{3i}, x_{4i}, x_{5i}, x_{6i}, x_{7i})$$
$$\beta^j = (\beta_1^j, \beta_2^j, \beta_3^j, \beta_4^j, \beta_5^j, \beta_6^j, \beta_7^j)$$

$$x\beta^j = (\beta_1^j x_{1i} + \beta_2^j x_{2i} + \beta_3^j x_{3i} + \beta_4^j x_{4i} + \beta_5^j x_{5i} + \beta_6^j x_{6i} + \beta_7^j x_{7i})$$

The coefficients for alternative 1 (did not need any money) is

$$\beta^1 = (\beta_1^1, \beta_2^1, \beta_3^1, \beta_4^1, \beta_5^1, \beta_6^1, \beta_7^1)$$

Its probability is

$$\Pr[y = 1] = \frac{e^{\beta_1^1 x_{1i} + \beta_2^1 x_{2i} + \beta_3^1 x_{3i} + \beta_4^1 x_{4i} + \beta_5^1 x_{5i} + \beta_6^1 x_{6i} + \beta_7^1 x_{7i}}}{e^{\beta_1^1 x_{1i} + \beta_2^1 x_{2i} + \beta_3^1 x_{3i} + \beta_4^1 x_{4i} + \beta_5^1 x_{5i} + \beta_6^1 x_{6i} + \beta_7^1 x_{7i}} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

Notice here that we have not substituted for the other alternatives due to space limitations

$$\Pr[y = 1] = \frac{e^{x\beta^1}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 2] = \frac{e^{x\beta^2}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 3] = \frac{e^{x\beta^3}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 4] = \frac{e^{x\beta^4}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 5] = \frac{e^{x\beta^5}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 6] = \frac{e^{x\beta^6}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 7] = \frac{e^{x\beta^7}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

- However this model is unidentified in the sense that there is more than one solution to  $\beta^1, \beta^2, \beta^3, \beta^4, \beta^5, \beta^6$  and  $\beta^7$  that lead to the same probability for  $y = 1, y = 2, y = 3, y = 4, y = 5, y = 6$  and  $y = 7$

- To identify the model, we arbitrarily set one of  $\beta^1, \beta^2, \beta^3, \beta^4, \beta^5, \beta^6$  and  $\beta^7$  equal to zero-it does not matter which one
- Suppose we choose  $\beta^2 = 0$  i.e.  

$$x\beta^2 = (0x_{1i} + 0x_{2i} + 0x_{3i} + 0x_{4i} + 0x_{5i} + 0x_{6i} + 0x_{7i}) = 0$$
- The remaining coefficients will measure the change relative to the second group (own savings)
- Once  $\beta^2 = 0$ , it means that  $e^{x\beta^2} = e^{x \cdot 0} = e^0 = 1$  and the probability equations become

- 

$$\Pr[y = 1] = \frac{e^{x\beta^1}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 2] = \frac{1}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 3] = \frac{e^{x\beta^3}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 4] = \frac{e^{x\beta^4}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 5] = \frac{e^{x\beta^5}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 6] = \frac{e^{x\beta^6}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 7] = \frac{e^{x\beta^7}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

- The relative probability of  $y = 1$  (didn't need any money) to the base outcome (own savings) is

$$\frac{\Pr[y = 1]}{\Pr[y = 2]} = \frac{e^{x\beta^1}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}} \div \frac{1}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\frac{\Pr[y = 1]}{\Pr[y = 2]} = \frac{e^{x\beta^1}}{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}} \times \frac{e^{x\beta^1} + 1 + e^{x\beta^3} + e^{x\beta^4} + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}{1}$$

$$\frac{\Pr[y = 1]}{\Pr[y = 2]} = e^{x\beta^1}$$

This is the relative risk

- The ratio of the relative risk for one unit change in the regressors is  $e^{\beta^1}$ . This is what stata presents when you invoke rrr option

### 3.2 What are the assumptions in your model?

- Sigmoid property
- Equivalence property i.e. that if the terms for each alternative are improved equally there is no change
- IIA assumption: recall the “blue/red bus paradox”

### What are the FOC for our model?

#### Multinomial Logit

$$\frac{\partial LL}{\partial \beta_k} = \sum_i [y_{ik} - p_{ik}] x_i$$

$$\frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \beta_j} = p_{ij} x_i - p_{ij} p_{ij} x_i$$

For  $j \neq k$

$$\frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial \beta_k} = -p_{ij} p_{ij} x_i$$

#### S.O.C

$$\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k'} = -\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^J p_{ij} (\delta_{ij} - p_{ij}) x_i x_i'$$

Where  $\delta_{ij}$  is an indicator variable equal to 1 if  $j = k$  and equal to 0 if  $j \neq k$

### Marginal effects

$$\frac{\partial p_{ij}}{\partial x_i} = p_{ij} (\beta_j - \bar{\beta}_i)$$

$$\text{Where } \bar{\beta}_i = \sum_j p_{ij} \beta_j$$

In the command space type

### mlogit funds h9q12 h9q14 h9q15 h9q11 h9q10 age, nolog

```
. mlogit funds h9q12 h9q14 h9q15 h9q11 h9q10 age, nolog
```

```
Multinomial logistic regression      Number of obs   =      3336
                                     LR chi2(30)     =      359.15
                                     Prob > chi2     =      0.0000
Log likelihood = -1915.3927          Pseudo R2      =      0.0857
```

	funds	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
1						
	h9q12	.0636653	.0323901	1.97	0.049	.0001819 .1271486
	h9q14	-8.92e-06	1.57e-06	-5.68	0.000	-.000012 -5.84e-06
	h9q15	-.0000278	6.22e-06	-4.47	0.000	-.00004 -.0000156
	h9q11	-1.31e-06	5.08e-07	-2.59	0.010	-2.31e-06 -3.20e-07
	h9q10	-.0071651	.014215	-0.50	0.614	-.035026 .0206959
	age	-.0084486	.0056344	-1.50	0.134	-.0194919 .0025946
	_cons	-.4174905	.4813677	-0.87	0.386	-1.360954 .5259729
3						
	h9q12	.0631741	.0326544	1.93	0.053	-.0008273 .1271756
	h9q14	-7.73e-08	4.28e-08	-1.80	0.071	-1.61e-07 6.66e-09
	h9q15	7.67e-07	3.78e-07	2.03	0.042	2.71e-08 1.51e-06
	h9q11	6.30e-08	3.30e-08	1.91	0.056	-1.75e-09 1.28e-07
	h9q10	.0848217	.060003	1.41	0.157	-.0327821 .2024255
	age	.0996839	.0451355	2.21	0.027	.0112198 .1881479
	_cons	-13.51407	3.866806	-3.49	0.000	-21.09287 -5.935268
4						
	h9q12	.0631793	.032445	1.95	0.052	-.0004118 .1267704
	h9q14	4.12e-08	1.26e-07	0.33	0.743	-2.05e-07 2.87e-07
	h9q15	7.78e-07	3.72e-07	2.09	0.037	4.87e-08 1.51e-06
	h9q11	-5.03e-08	1.09e-07	-0.46	0.645	-2.64e-07 1.64e-07
	h9q10	.085028	.0390105	2.18	0.029	.0085689 .1614872
	age	.0603862	.0232125	2.60	0.009	.0148905 .105882



	_cons	-9.378446	1.998056	-4.69	0.000	-13.29456	-5.462328
5	h9q12	.0632242	.0324871	1.95	0.052	-.0004494	.1268978
	h9q14	-2.88e-07	3.76e-07	-0.77	0.443	-1.02e-06	4.48e-07
	h9q15	-9.63e-08	8.88e-07	-0.11	0.914	-1.84e-06	1.65e-06
	h9q11	6.76e-08	4.96e-08	1.36	0.173	-2.96e-08	1.65e-07
	h9q10	-.0638766	.0364832	-1.75	0.080	-.1353825	.0076292
	age	.0483246	.0265675	1.82	0.069	-.0037468	.100396
	_cons	-7.30361	2.260212	-3.23	0.001	-11.73354	-2.873675
6	h9q12	.0636869	.0345752	1.84	0.065	-.0040792	.131453
	h9q14	4.86e-09	1.38e-06	0.00	0.997	-2.70e-06	2.71e-06
	h9q15	-.0000935	.0000885	-1.06	0.291	-.000267	.00008
	h9q11	-9.95e-08	1.40e-06	-0.07	0.943	-2.84e-06	2.64e-06
	h9q10	.0523304	.1050051	0.50	0.618	-.1534758	.2581367
	age	.5404869	.309054	1.75	0.080	-.0652478	1.146222
	_cons	-50.72461	26.38474	-1.92	0.055	-102.4378	.9885384

(funds==2 is the base outcome)

- The multinomial logit is equivalent to running a series of binomial logits:

### 3.3 Interpretation

- The output has six parts, labelled with the categories of the outcome funds. They correspond to 6 equations. For instance equation 1 is

$$\log \left[ \frac{\Pr(y=1)}{\Pr(y=2)} \right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1^1 x_{1i} + \beta_2^1 x_{2i} + \beta_3^1 x_{3i} + \beta_4^1 x_{4i} + \beta_5^1 x_{5i} + \beta_6^1 x_{6i} + \beta_7^1 x_{7i}$$

$$\log \left[ \frac{\Pr(y=3)}{\Pr(y=2)} \right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1^3 x_{1i} + \beta_2^3 x_{2i} + \beta_3^3 x_{3i} + \beta_4^3 x_{4i} + \beta_5^3 x_{5i} + \beta_6^3 x_{6i} + \beta_7^3 x_{7i}$$

⋮

- With the betas being the raw regression coefficients from the output above
- For instance we can say that for a one unit change in the variable h9q12 (number of people hired), the log of the ratio of the two probabilities  $\left[ \frac{\Pr(y=1)}{\Pr(y=2)} \right]$  i.e. didn't need any money vs own savings will be increased by 0.064

## Let's rerun the model with base category as 4

mlogit funds h9q12 h9q14 h9q15 h9q11 h9q10 age, base(4)

```
. mlogit funds h9q12 h9q14 h9q15 h9q11 h9q10 age, base(4)
```

```
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2094.9693
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -2076.3472
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2064.924
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -2056.514
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -2043.4081
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -2024.253
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -2006.9297
Iteration 7: log likelihood = -1999.0699
Iteration 8: log likelihood = -1985.7619
Iteration 9: log likelihood = -1979.0517
Iteration 10: log likelihood = -1948.6815
Iteration 11: log likelihood = -1932.0869
Iteration 12: log likelihood = -1927.9138
Iteration 13: log likelihood = -1916.7655
Iteration 14: log likelihood = -1915.4309
Iteration 15: log likelihood = -1915.3938
Iteration 16: log likelihood = -1915.3927
Iteration 17: log likelihood = -1915.3927
```

Multinomial logistic regression

```
Number of obs = 3336
LR chi2(30) = 359.15
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Pseudo R2 = 0.0857
```

Log likelihood = -1915.3927

	funds	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
-----						
1						
	h9q12	.0004859	.0024853	0.20	0.845	-.0043851 .005357
	h9q14	-8.97e-06	1.58e-06	-5.69	0.000	-.0000121 -5.88e-06
	h9q15	-.0000286	6.23e-06	-4.59	0.000	-.0000408 -.0000164
	h9q11	-1.26e-06	5.17e-07	-2.45	0.014	-2.28e-06 -2.51e-07
	h9q10	-.0921931	.0408577	-2.26	0.024	-.1722728 -.0121134
	age	-.0688349	.0236984	-2.90	0.004	-.1152829 -.0223868
	_cons	8.960956	2.038385	4.40	0.000	4.965795 12.95612
-----						
2						
	h9q12	-.0631794	.032445	-1.95	0.052	-.1267704 .0004117
	h9q14	-4.12e-08	1.26e-07	-0.33	0.743	-2.87e-07 2.05e-07
	h9q15	-7.78e-07	3.72e-07	-2.09	0.037	-1.51e-06 -4.86e-08
	h9q11	5.03e-08	1.09e-07	0.46	0.645	-1.64e-07 2.64e-07
	h9q10	-.085028	.0390105	-2.18	0.029	-.1614871 -.0085689
	age	-.0603862	.0232124	-2.60	0.009	-.1058818 -.0148907
	_cons	9.378447	1.998047	4.69	0.000	5.462347 13.29455
-----						
3						
	h9q12	-5.22e-06	.0051624	-0.00	0.999	-.0101234 .010113
	h9q14	-1.18e-07	1.32e-07	-0.90	0.371	-3.78e-07 1.41e-07
	h9q15	-1.11e-08	6.58e-08	-0.17	0.866	-1.40e-07 1.18e-07
	h9q11	1.13e-07	1.11e-07	1.02	0.308	-1.05e-07 3.31e-07
	h9q10	-.0002062	.0710356	-0.00	0.998	-.1394334 .139021
	age	.0392977	.0504232	0.78	0.436	-.0595299 .1381253
	_cons	-4.135626	4.322286	-0.96	0.339	-12.60715 4.335898
-----						
5						
	h9q12	.0000449	.0038893	0.01	0.991	-.007578 .0076677
	h9q14	-3.29e-07	3.96e-07	-0.83	0.405	-1.10e-06 4.46e-07
	h9q15	-8.74e-07	9.41e-07	-0.93	0.353	-2.72e-06 9.70e-07
	h9q11	1.18e-07	1.19e-07	0.99	0.323	-1.16e-07 3.52e-07
	h9q10	-.1489046	.0528149	-2.82	0.005	-.25242 -.0453893

	age		-.0120617	.0349543	-0.35	0.730	-.0805707	.0564474
	_cons		2.074837	2.987156	0.69	0.487	-3.779881	7.929554
-----								
6								
	h9q12		.0005075	.0124897	0.04	0.968	-.0239719	.024987
	h9q14		-3.63e-08	1.39e-06	-0.03	0.979	-2.75e-06	2.68e-06
	h9q15		-.0000943	.0000885	-1.06	0.287	-.0002677	.0000792
	h9q11		-4.92e-08	1.40e-06	-0.04	0.972	-2.80e-06	2.70e-06
	h9q10		-.0326976	.1117159	-0.29	0.770	-.2516567	.1862616
	age		.4801006	.3098751	1.55	0.121	-.1272434	1.087445
	_cons		-41.34616	26.45603	-1.56	0.118	-93.19904	10.50671

(funds==4 is the base outcome)

$$\Pr[y = 1] = \frac{e^{x\beta^1}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 2] = \frac{e^{x\beta^2}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 3] = \frac{e^{x\beta^3}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 4] = \frac{1}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 5] = \frac{e^{x\beta^5}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 6] = \frac{e^{x\beta^6}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

$$\Pr[y = 7] = \frac{e^{x\beta^7}}{e^{x\beta^1} + e^{x\beta^2} + e^{x\beta^3} + 1 + e^{x\beta^5} + e^{x\beta^6} + e^{x\beta^7}}$$

- Do you see the effect of the IIA assumption? (outcome 2 and outcome 4 results are exactly the same)
- We could do the same for other pairs

How do we present such results?

### Multinomial logit estimates

Variable	4 v.1	4 v.2	4 V.3	4 v.5	4 v.6	2 V.1
h9q12	.0004859					
h9q14	-8.97e-06***					
h9q15	-.0000286**					

h9q11	-1.26e-06**					
h9q10	-.0921931**					
age	-.0688349**					

### Alternatives

1. Did not need money
2. Own savings
3. Commercial/development bank
4. Microfinance institutions
5. Local group
6. NGO
7. Other

- The sign of a coefficient estimate reflects the direction of change in the risk ratio (the ratio between  $P(Y=ngo) / P(Y=own\ savings)$ ) in response to a ceteris paribus change in the value to which the coefficient is attached.
  - It does not reflect the direction of change in the individual probabilities  $P(Y=k)$ .

### Relative odds ratio

- Odds ratios: The odds ratios are simply the ratio of the exponentiated coefficients.
- This is computed in stata using the relative risk ratio (rrr) as follows

Type **mlogit,rrr**

```
mlogit, rrr
```

```
Multinomial logistic regression
```

```
Number of obs   =    3336
LR chi2(30)     =    359.15
Prob > chi2     =    0.0000
Pseudo R2      =    0.0857
```

```
Log likelihood = -1915.3927
```

	funds	RRR	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
1						
	h9q12	1.000486	.0024865	0.20	0.845	.9956245 1.005371
	h9q14	.999991	1.58e-06	-5.69	0.000	.9999879 .9999941
	h9q15	.9999714	6.23e-06	-4.59	0.000	.9999592 .9999836
	h9q11	.9999987	5.17e-07	-2.45	0.014	.9999977 .9999997
	h9q10	.9119291	.0372594	-2.26	0.024	.8417495 .9879597
	age	.9334808	.022122	-2.90	0.004	.891114 .9778619

-----							
2	h9q12	.9387751	.0304586	-1.95	0.052	.8809359	1.000412
	h9q14	1	1.26e-07	-0.33	0.743	.9999997	1
	h9q15	.9999992	3.72e-07	-2.09	0.037	.9999985	1
	h9q11	1	1.09e-07	0.46	0.645	.9999998	1
	h9q10	.9184866	.0358306	-2.18	0.029	.8508775	.9914677
	age	.9414009	.0218522	-2.60	0.009	.899531	.9852196
-----							
3	h9q12	.9999948	.0051624	-0.00	0.999	.9899277	1.010164
	h9q14	.9999999	1.32e-07	-0.90	0.371	.9999996	1
	h9q15	1	6.58e-08	-0.17	0.866	.9999999	1
	h9q11	1	1.11e-07	1.02	0.308	.9999999	1
	h9q10	.9997938	.071021	-0.00	0.998	.8698509	1.149148
	age	1.04008	.0524441	0.78	0.436	.9422073	1.148119
-----							
5	h9q12	1.000045	.0038895	0.01	0.991	.9924506	1.007697
	h9q14	.9999997	3.96e-07	-0.83	0.405	.9999989	1
	h9q15	.9999991	9.41e-07	-0.93	0.353	.9999973	1.000001
	h9q11	1	1.19e-07	0.99	0.323	.9999999	1
	h9q10	.8616513	.045508	-2.82	0.005	.7769184	.9556254
	age	.9880108	.0345352	-0.35	0.730	.9225896	1.058071
-----							
6	h9q12	1.000508	.0124961	0.04	0.968	.9763132	1.025302
	h9q14	1	1.39e-06	-0.03	0.979	.9999972	1.000003
	h9q15	.9999058	.0000885	-1.06	0.287	.9997323	1.000079
	h9q11	1	1.40e-06	-0.04	0.972	.9999972	1.000003
	h9q10	.9678312	.1081221	-0.29	0.770	.7775116	1.204737
	age	1.616237	.5008316	1.55	0.121	.8805193	2.966684
-----							

(funds==4 is the base outcome)

- Notice that all the coefficients with negative signs have less than 1 odds ratio
- If the odds ratio is higher than 1 it favours the numerator outcome, if it is less than 1, it favours the base outcome
- These results show the relative risk ratio for one unit change in the corresponding variable (measured as the risk of the outcome relative to the base outcome)

$$\frac{\Pr[y = j]}{\Pr[y = 2]} = e^{x\beta^j}$$

#### 4. Computation of the Marginal effects (partial effects)

- We need the marginal effects to interpret the results of MNL effectively

- The marginal effects show how the probabilities of each outcome change with respect to changes in regressors
- To calculate the marginal effects we run the **mf** command separately for each outcome

mf, predict(outcome(1))

```
. mf, predict(outcome(1))
```

Marginal effects after mlogit

```
y = Pr(funds==1) (predict, outcome(1))
= .00228193
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[ 95% C.I. ]	X
h9q12	.0001379	.0001	1.35	0.177	-.000062 .000338	2.00779
h9q14	-2.03e-08	.00000	-2.26	0.024	-3.8e-08 -2.7e-09	255965
h9q15	-6.34e-08	.00000	-2.58	0.010	-1.1e-07 -1.5e-08	74137.4
h9q11	-2.99e-09	.00000	-1.51	0.132	-6.9e-09 9.0e-10	506088
h9q10	-.0000201	.00003	-0.58	0.561	-.000088 .000048	9.25869
age	-.0000263	.00002	-1.37	0.172	-.000064 .000011	78.4206

```
. mf, predict(outcome(2))
```

Marginal effects after mlogit

```
y = Pr(funds==2) (predict, outcome(2))
= .94850262
```

variable	dy/dx	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[ 95% C.I. ]	X
h9q12	-.0030878	.00171	-1.81	0.071	-.006437 .000261	2.00779
h9q14	2.36e-08	.00000	2.18	0.029	2.4e-09 4.5e-08	255965
h9q15	3.80e-08	.00000	1.26	0.208	-2.1e-08 9.7e-08	74137.4
h9q11	2.39e-09	.00000	0.72	0.473	-4.1e-09 8.9e-09	506088
h9q10	-.0015592	.00115	-1.35	0.176	-.003818 .000699	9.25869
age	-.0029235	.00073	-4.01	0.000	-.004351 -.001496	78.4206

We can do for the rest of the categories

### Change in predicted probabilities/Marginal effects

Variable	Did not need money	Own savings	Commercial /development bank	Microfinance	Local group	NGO
h9q12	.0001379	-.0030878*	.0005089*	.001425*	.001016*	2.35e-08
h9q14	-2.03e-08**	2.36e-08 **	-4.45e-10	1.57e-09	-4.46e-09	1.16e-14
h9q15	-6.34e-08**	3.80e-08	6.86e-09*	1.95e-08**	-9.52e-10	-3.64e-11
h9q11	-2.99e-09	2.39e-09	5.57e-10**	-1.14e-09	1.19e-09	-3.78e-14
h9q10	-.0000201	-.0015592	.0007064	.0019829**	-.00111*	1.97e-08

age	-.0000263	-.0029235 ***	.0008204**	.0013627	.0007665*	2.09e-07
Mean value	.00228193	.94850262	.00849295	.02378039	.01694173	3.894e-07

## Attributes

- Average expenditure on wages (h9q13)-  $x_{1i}$
- Number of people hired (h9q12)-  $x_{2i}$
- Average expenditure on raw materials (h9q14)-  $x_{3i}$
- Other operating expenses such as fuel, kerosene, electricity (h9q15)-  $x_{4i}$
- Monthly gross revenue (h9q11)-  $x_{5i}$
- Months of enterprise operation (h9q10)-  $x_{6i}$
- Age of the enterprise (h9q5 recorded as time)-  $x_{7i}$

## Interpretation of marginal effects

- We interpret the results the same way we did for the logit and probit model

## 4.2 Predicting

Could predict

- Probabilities such as **predict p1 if e(sample),outcome(1)**
- Index values e.g. **predict idx2, outcome(2) xb.**
- Notice that own savings was our base case-the outcome for which all the coefficients were set to 0-so the index is always 0

## 4.3 Test of Hypothesis about coefficients

### 4.3.1 Testing whether variables have zero effects across all equations

- If we list variables after the test command, we are testing that the corresponding coefficients are all zeros across all equations

### **test age h9q11**

```
. test age h9q11
```

```
( 1) [1]age = 0
( 2) [3]age = 0
( 3) [4]age = 0
( 4) [5]age = 0
( 5) [6]age = 0
( 6) [1]h9q11 = 0
( 7) [3]h9q11 = 0
( 8) [4]h9q11 = 0
( 9) [5]h9q11 = 0
(10) [6]h9q11 = 0
```

```
chi2( 10) = 29.37
Prob > chi2 = 0.0011
```

- We reject the null that the age and monthly gross revenue do not affect the probability of choosing the different alternatives

### **4.3.2 Testing whether all the coefficients (except the constant) in a single equation are zero**

- Simply use test and type the outcome in a square bracket
- Example
- The results are

```
. test [6]
```

```
( 1) [6]h9q12 = 0
( 2) [6]h9q14 = 0
```



- ( 3) [6]h9q15 = 0
- ( 4) [6]h9q11 = 0
- ( 5) [6]h9q10 = 0
- ( 6) [6]age = 0

chi2( 6) = 7.61  
 Prob > chi2 = 0.2677

- We cannot reject the null implying that the factors do not affect the probability of getting funds from ngo

### 4.3.3 Testing whether a specific variable in a single equation are zero

Type  
**test [outcome]: var1 var2....varn**

Example  
**test [6]:age h9q10**

The results are;  
 test [6]:age h9q10

- ( 1) [6]age = 0
- ( 2) [6]h9q10 = 0

chi2( 2) = 3.17  
 Prob > chi2 = 0.2048

- We reject the null hypothesis

### 4.3.4 Testing whether coefficients are equal across equations

For instance we can test whether all the coefficients except the constant are equal for the did not need money and commercial bank outcomes as follows

**test [1=3]**

- ( 1) [1]h9q12 - [3]h9q12 = 0
- ( 2) [1]h9q14 - [3]h9q14 = 0
- ( 3) [1]h9q15 - [3]h9q15 = 0
- ( 4) [1]h9q11 - [3]h9q11 = 0
- ( 5) [1]h9q10 - [3]h9q10 = 0
- ( 6) [1]age - [3]age = 0

chi2( 6) = 103.40  
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Can we reject the null hypothesis?

### **4.3.5 Testing whether some variables are equal across equations**

To test that only the age and h9q10 are equal in the local group and ngo outcomes. We type the following

#### **Test [5=6]: age h9q10**

The results are as follows

test [other=ngo]: age h9q10

. test [5=6]: age h9q10

- ( 1) [5]age - [6]age = 0
- ( 2) [5]h9q10 - [6]h9q10 = 0

chi2( 2) = 2.67  
Prob > chi2 = 0.2628

## **5. Testing for the IIA Assumption**

- The strategy is to estimate the model with the choice you want to check (unconstrained model) and without the choice (the constrained model)

- If the IIA assumption is true, the constrained and the unconstrained estimated coefficients on the remaining categories should not be statistically different
- The Hausman test statistic is
 
$$(b_c - b_u)' [Cov(b_c) - Cov(b_u)]^{-1} (b_c - b_u)$$
- Where  $b_c$  and  $b_u$  are the constrained and unconstrained coefficients and  $Cov(b_c)$  and  $Cov(b_u)$  are the estimated covariances
- The statistic has an approximate chi-square distribution with the number of degrees of freedom equal to the number of coefficients in the constrained model
- Let's do this for a simple mlogit model of the form
- We use Hausman test in stata to do this

The unconstrained model is

### mlogit funds gender

```
mlogit funds gender
```

```
Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -2293.3044
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -2290.1421
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -2289.9838
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -2289.9833
```

```
Multinomial logistic regression      Number of obs   =      3639
                                      LR chi2(5)      =        6.64
                                      Prob > chi2     =      0.2486
Log likelihood = -2289.9833          Pseudo R2      =      0.0014
```

	funds	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
1	gender	.0111597	.0987067	0.11	0.910	-.1823018 .2046212
	_cons	-1.842911	.0702081	-26.25	0.000	-1.980516 -1.705306
3	gender	-.9523214	.3948708	-2.41	0.016	-1.726254 -.1783889
	_cons	-4.167002	.2101237	-19.83	0.000	-4.578837 -3.755167
4	gender	-.0140518	.2353558	-0.06	0.952	-.4753407 .4472372
	_cons	-3.691579	.1664358	-22.18	0.000	-4.017787 -3.36537
5	gender	-.0479533	.2629723	-0.18	0.855	-.5633695 .4674628

```

      _cons | -3.901299   .1844104  -21.16   0.000   -4.262737  -3.539861
-----+-----
6      gender | .2090918   .6718172    0.31   0.756   -1.107646   1.525829
      _cons | -5.916202   .5006734  -11.82   0.000   -6.897504   -4.9349
-----+-----
(funds==2 is the base outcome)

```

Lets store the coefficients and the covariances using the command  
**est store all**

Let's estimate the constrained model excluding category 1

**mlogit funds gender if funds !=1**

```
mlogit funds gender if funds !=1
```

```

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -881.68375
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -878.54174
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -878.38548
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -878.38503

```

```

Multinomial logistic regression              Number of obs   =       3163
                                             LR chi2(4)      =         6.60
                                             Prob > chi2     =       0.1588
Log likelihood = -878.38503                 Pseudo R2      =       0.0037

```

```

-----+-----
      funds |          Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
3      gender |  -.9523214   .3948709    -2.41  0.016   -1.726254   -.1783887
      _cons | -4.167002   .2101237   -19.83  0.000   -4.578837   -3.755167
-----+-----
4      gender |  -.0140518   .2353558    -0.06  0.952   -.4753407    .4472372
      _cons | -3.691579   .1664358   -22.18  0.000   -4.017787   -3.36537
-----+-----
5      gender |  -.0479533   .2629723    -0.18  0.855   -.5633695    .4674628
      _cons | -3.901299   .1844104   -21.16  0.000   -4.262737   -3.539861
-----+-----
6      gender |  .2090918   .6718172    0.31   0.756   -1.107646    1.525829
      _cons | -5.916202   .5006734   -11.82  0.000   -6.897504   -4.9349
-----+-----
(funds==2 is the base outcome)

```

Let's store the coefficients and the covariances  
**est store partial**

## Finally, let's do the Hausman test hausman partial all, alleqs constant

hausman partial all, alleqs constant

		---- Coefficients ----			
		(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
		partial	all	Difference	S.E.
3	gender	-.9523214	-.9523214	-3.67e-11	.000329
	_cons	-4.167002	-4.167002	-5.63e-13	.0000838
4	gender	-.0140518	-.0140518	1.91e-15	.0000292
	_cons	-3.691579	-3.691579	-5.77e-15	.0000114
5	gender	-.0479533	-.0479533	-4.71e-14	.0000329
	_cons	-3.901299	-3.901299	5.06e-14	.0000126
6	gender	.2090918	.2090918	7.24e-15	.0000803
	_cons	-5.916202	-5.916202	-5.33e-15	.0000345

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from mlogit  
B = inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from mlogit

Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic

chi2(8) = (b-B)'[(V\_b-V\_B)^(-1)](b-B)  
= 0.00  
Prob>chi2 = 1.0000

## Interpretation

- Look at the way the Hausman test is computed
- It has 8 degrees of freedom
- We cannot reject the null that the constrained and unconstrained coefficients are the same
- This implies that IIA assumption is true
- This calls for other methods of estimation such as nested logit or multinomial probit