# Lab 3

#### Barum Park

Department of Sociology New York University

Feb. 8, 2018

## Before We Start ...

- $\blacktriangleright$  Any questions regarding last class?
- $\triangleright$  From this Lab onwards, I'll try to focus more on STATA code than on the models

# <span id="page-2-0"></span>[Logistic Regression](#page-2-0)

- $\blacktriangleright$  I'll try to demonstrate one last formulation of the binary logistic regression model
- **Fig.** This representation is called the **latent variable formulation** of the logistic regression model
- It appears in many textbooks, especially in the derivation of the probit model
- $\triangleright$  It will be helpful to understand ordered logistic regression in an intuitive way
- ▶ Suppose you have a "latent" (i.e., unobserved) outcome  $y^*$ which is continuous
- $\triangleright$  We assume that this latent variable is generated by the following equation

$$
y^* = \alpha + \beta x + \epsilon^*, \quad \epsilon^* \sim \text{Logistic}(0,1)
$$

 $\blacktriangleright$  The "observed" outcome, y, is binary (either zero or one).

 $\triangleright$  Lastly, we assume that the latent variable is connected to the observed response in the following way:

$$
y = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y^* > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
$$

- ► You can think of the value 0 as a "threshold" (as  $y^* > 0$ returns a 1 for y and  $y^* \leq 0$  returns a 0 for y)
- $\blacktriangleright$  This threshold is also arbitrary (we say, "unidentified") because

$$
y^* > 0 \implies \alpha + \beta x + \epsilon^* > 0
$$

$$
\implies \beta x + \epsilon^* > -\alpha
$$

Hence, we could let  $-\alpha$  be the "threshold" and say that the "latent" regression has no constant

- It turns out that this model is the same model as the logistic regression we have learned so far!
- $\triangleright$  The derivation of this result is a little bit technical ...
- $\triangleright$  So let me convince you that these are the same models by simulation ..

#### Simulation Code

```
clear all
set seed
set obs 50000
gen x = rnormal()gen u = runiform()gen epsilonstar = ln(u/(1-u))gen ystar = .5 + .8*x + epsilonstargen y = 0replace y = 1 if ystar > 0logit y x
```
## **Results**





# <span id="page-9-0"></span>[Ordered Logistic Regression](#page-9-0)

- <span id="page-10-0"></span> $\triangleright$  When it comes to ordered logistic regression, we can use the same latent variable formulation
- $\triangleright$  But now, we have not only one threshold (0 in the previous example) but **many** thresholds
- $\blacktriangleright$  For example, with 4 categories, we have

$$
y^* = \alpha + \beta x + \epsilon^*
$$

and

$$
y = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y^* < \tau_1^* \\ 2, & \text{if } \tau_1^* \le y^* < \tau_2^* \\ 3, & \text{if } \tau_2^* \le y^* < \tau_3^* \\ 4, & \text{if } \tau_3^* \le y^* \end{cases}
$$

 $\triangleright$  Note that we have 3 thresholds if there are 4 categories

#### Simulation Code

ologit y x

```
* generate cut-points
gen taustar1 = -3gen taustar2 = .5gen taustar3 = 5* generate outcome (note that we are "replacing")
drop y
gen y = 1replace y = 2 if ystar > taustar1
replace y = 3 if ystar > taustar2
replace y = 4 if ystar > taustar3
* run logistic regression
```
#### **Results**

#### Here are the results:





▶ Note that we have **no constant(!)** and all cutpoints are off by **approximately .5** from the specified *τ* ∗ k s (which were {−3*, .*5*,* 5}. Why?

 $\blacktriangleright$  Here is why. Consider the inequality

 $y^* < \tau_1^*$ 

as  $y^* = \alpha + \beta x + \epsilon^*$ , we have

 $\alpha + \beta x + \epsilon^* < \tau_1^*$ 

Subtracting *α* from both sides yields

$$
\beta x + \epsilon^* < \tau_1^* - \alpha
$$

- ► The left-hand side is y<sup>\*</sup> without constant and the right-hand side is the threshold minus the constant (**which is set to .5**)
- $\blacktriangleright$  The same applies to all the other categories