

Binary Choice Model:

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{yes} \\ 0 & \text{no} \end{cases}$$

In the background is some latent variable

$$Y_i^* = X_i' \beta + u_i$$

$$\Rightarrow Y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & Y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & Y_i^* \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

wlog, let $c=1$ (this is wlog if X_i includes a constant)

$$\text{ie. } Y_i^* = \alpha_0 + X_{1i}' \beta_0 + u_i > c \\ \text{iff } \underbrace{(\alpha_0 - c)}_{\alpha_0^*} + X_{1i}' \beta_0 + u_i > 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [Y_i = 1 | X_i] &= \Pr [Y_i^* > 0 | X_i] \\ &= \Pr [X_i' \beta + u_i > 0 | X_i] \\ &= \Pr [u_i > -X_i' \beta | X_i] \end{aligned}$$

Everything that follows is based on our assumptions about the distribution of u_i

LPM

$$E[Y_i | X_i] = X_i' \beta$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \square Y_i = X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i \\ \square E[\varepsilon_i | X_i] = 0 \end{cases}$$

How can we ensure that $0 < X_i' \hat{\beta} < 1$?

• We cannot.

$$\text{Note that } Y_i = 1 \Rightarrow X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i = 1 \Rightarrow \varepsilon_i = 1 - X_i' \beta$$

$$Y_i = 0 \Rightarrow X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i = 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon_i = -X_i' \beta$$

Then $\varepsilon_i | X_i$ has only two support points.

$$\Pr[Y_i = 1 | X_i] = X_i' \beta$$

$$\Pr[Y_i = 0 | X_i] = 1 - X_i' \beta$$

$$\Rightarrow \varepsilon_i = \begin{cases} 1 - X_i' \beta & \text{w/prob } X_i' \beta \\ -X_i' \beta & \text{w/prob } 1 - X_i' \beta \end{cases}$$

↳ This is a weird assumption

$$VC(\varepsilon_i | X_i) = (X_i' \beta)(1 - X_i' \beta)$$

$$L_n(\beta; \{X_i\}, \{Y_i\}) = \prod_{i=1}^n (X_i' \beta)^{Y_i} (1 - X_i' \beta)^{1 - Y_i}$$

Using MLE, we get $\hat{\beta}$

Logit/Probit: we take as a starting point assumptions about u_i .

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[Y_i = 1 | X_i] &= \Pr[u_i > -X_i' \beta | X_i] \\ &= 1 - \Pr[u_i \leq -X_i' \beta | X_i] \\ &= 1 - F_{u_i | X_i}(-X_i' \beta) \end{aligned}$$

if $u_i | X_i$ is symmetric around 0. \rightarrow

$$= F_{u_i | X_i}(X_i' \beta)$$

Probit: Assume $u_i | X_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$

$$\Rightarrow -u_i | X_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus } \Pr[Y_i = 1 | X_i] &= \Pr[-u_i \leq X_i' \beta | X_i] \\ &= \Pr\left[-\frac{u_i}{\sigma_u} \leq X_i' \frac{\beta}{\sigma_u} | X_i\right] \\ &= \Phi\left(X_i' \frac{\beta}{\sigma_u}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can only estimate $\frac{\beta}{\sigma_u}$.

If we assume $u_i | X_i \sim \Lambda$, then $-u_i | X_i \sim \Lambda$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \Pr[Y_i = 1 | X_i] &= \Pr[-u_i \leq X_i' \beta | X_i] \\ &= \Lambda(X_i' \beta) \\ &= \frac{\exp\{X_i' \beta\}}{1 + \exp\{X_i' \beta\}} \end{aligned}$$

Recall: Long ago, we estimated
 $\tilde{Y}_i = Y_i^* = X_i' \beta + u_i$, $u_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$

and we estimated $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_u^2$.

Why can we identify both here but not in the Probit model? We cannot see Y_i^* is the Probit model, so we cannot estimate σ_u^2 .

All we see is $Y_i = \tau(Y_i^*)$. Since we do not know τ , we cannot derive $V(Y_i^*)$ from $V(Y_i)$.

$$L_n(\beta | \{X_i\}, \{Y_i\}) = \prod_{i=1}^n [F_{u_i | X_i}(X_i; \beta)]^{Y_i} [1 - F_{u_i | X_i}(X_i; \beta)]^{1 - Y_i}$$

$$\ln L_n(\beta | \{X_i\}, \{Y_i\}) = \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i \ln F_{u_i | X_i}(X_i; \beta) + (1 - Y_i) \ln (1 - F_{u_i | X_i}(X_i; \beta))]$$

The logistic distribution has slightly larger tails.

Semiparametric least squares (late 1980s - early 1990s)

◦ Hidehiko Ichimura

$\hat{E}[Y_i | X_i]$ Nadaraya-Watson

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \hat{E}[Y_i | X_i])^2$$

$$\circ Y_i = X_i' \beta + u_i$$

parametric if we make assumptions about u_i

$$\circ Y_i = X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i$$

no assumptions about ε_i .
semi-parametric

$$\circ Y_i = h(X_i, \theta, \varepsilon_i)$$

$$\text{or } Y_i = h(X_i, \theta) + \varepsilon_i$$

with no assumptions about the function. non-parametric

What can one do with $\hat{\beta}$?

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X_{ki}} \hat{P}_r[Y_i = 1 | X_i] = \frac{\partial}{\partial X_{ki}} \Phi(X_i' \hat{\beta}_n) = \varphi(X_i' \hat{\beta}_n) \hat{\beta}_{nk}$$

This is a function of i : Thus we have to report

$$\varphi\left(\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right)' \hat{\beta}_n\right) \hat{\beta}_{nk} \text{ or } \bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(X_i' \hat{\beta}_n) \hat{\beta}_{nk} \quad \text{Buchinsky reports this one!}$$

$$sd(\bar{\eta}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\varphi(X_i' \hat{\beta}_n) \hat{\beta}_{nk} - \bar{\eta})^2$$