

Estimating effects from extended regression models

David M. Drukker

Executive Director of Econometrics
Stata

Stata Conference
Baltimore
July 26–27, 2017

Extended regression models

Extended regression model (ERM) is a Stata term for a class of regression models

- The outcome can be continuous (linear), probit, ordered probit, or censored (tobit)
- Some of the covariates may be endogenous
 - The endogenous covariates may be continuous, probit, or ordered probit
- Endogenous sample-selection may be modeled
- Exogenous or endogenous treatment assignment may be modeled
- The new-in-Stata-15 commands `eregress`, `eprobit`, `eoprobit`, and `eintreg` fit ERMs

Extended regression models

- Some of the covariates may be endogenous
 - The endogenous covariates may be continuous, binary, or ordinal
 - Polynomial terms and interaction terms constructed from the endogenous covariates are allowed
 - Interactions among the endogenous covariates and interactions between the endogenous covariates and the exogenous covariates are allowed

Outline

- I cannot do justice to ERMs in this short talk
- I discuss examples in which I
 - define some of the terms that I have already used
 - illustrate some command syntax
 - illustrate how to estimate some effects using postestimation commands

- Fictional data on wellness program from large company

```
. use wprogram
```

```
. describe
```

Contains data from wprogram.dta

obs: 3,000

vars: 6

28 Jul 2017 07:13

size: 72,000

variable	name	storage	display	value	label	variable	label
		type	format	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	

Sorted by:

- Weight change levels and program participation

. tabulate wchange prog

Weight change level	Participate in wellness program		Total
	No	Yes	
Loss	239	909	1,148
No change	468	605	1,073
Gain	593	186	779
Total	1,300	1,700	3,000

- Program appears to help
- But this data is observational
 - Table does not account for how observed covariates and/or unobserved errors that affect program participation also affect the outcome variable

- If only observed covariates age over and phealth affect program participation and wchange (with or without program), we could use an ordinal probit model

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

Extended ordered probit regression

Number of obs = 3,000

Wald chi2(4) = 736.09

Log likelihood = -2866.5688

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

wchange	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
prog	-.8668405	.0460018	-18.84	0.000	-.9570023 -.7766787
age	.097322	.0677733	1.44	0.151	-.0355113 .2301552
over	.3433724	.0360858	9.52	0.000	.2726456 .4140992
phealth	-.3983531	.0385081	-10.34	0.000	-.4738276 -.3228786
cut1	-.8871706	.0539205			-.9928528 -.7814885
cut2	.2358913	.0522019			.1335775 .3382051

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

Extended ordered probit regression

Number of obs = 3,000

Wald chi2(4) = 736.09

Log likelihood = -2866.5688

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

wchange	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
prog	-.86668405	.0460018	-18.84	0.000	-.9570023 -.7766787
age	.097322	.0677733	1.44	0.151	-.0355113 .2301552
over	.3433724	.0360858	9.52	0.000	.2726456 .4140992
phealth	-.3983531	.0385081	-10.34	0.000	-.4738276 -.3228786
cut1	-.8871706	.0539205			-.9928528 -.7814885
cut2	.2358913	.0522019			.1335775 .3382051

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

$$\mathbf{w}\beta = \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\beta$$

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

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

$$\mathbf{w}\beta = \beta_1 \text{prog} + \mathbf{x}\beta$$

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

$\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$ yields

$$\Pr(wchange = \text{"Loss"}) = \Phi(cut1 - \mathbf{w}\beta)$$

$$\Pr(wchange = \text{"No change"}) = \Phi(cut2 - \mathbf{w}\beta) - \Phi(cut1 - \mathbf{w}\beta)$$

$$\Pr(wchange = \text{"Gain"}) = 1 - \Phi(cut2 - \mathbf{w}\beta)$$

- I want to estimate the how changing prog=0 to prog=1 changes each of the probabilities

$\Pr(\text{wchange} = \text{"Loss"})$

$\Pr(\text{wchange} = \text{"No change"})$

$\Pr(\text{wchange} = \text{"Gain"})$

When I type

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

I am assuming that prog is independent of ϵ in

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

In other words, I am assuming that prog is exogenous

If prog is not independent of ϵ , prog is endogenous

If prog is endogenous, I must model the dependence.

Consider

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

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

ϵ and η are joint normal

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

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

```

. eoprobit wchange age over phealth ,                   ///
>           endog(prog = age over phealth wtprog, probit) ///
>           vsquish nolog

```

Extended ordered probit regression

Number of obs = 3,000

Wald chi2(4) = 409.97

Log likelihood = -4401.0952

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
wchange					
age	.2155906	.0705048	3.06	0.002	.0774037 .3537776
over	.4349946	.0387185	11.23	0.000	.3591078 .5108814
phealth	-.4933361	.0411866	-11.98	0.000	-.5740603 -.412612
prog					
Yes	-.3624996	.1031408	-3.51	0.000	-.5646519 -.1603473
prog					
age	-.9341234	.0840002	-11.12	0.000	-1.098761 -.7694861
over	-1.058621	.0514252	-20.59	0.000	-1.159412 -.9578294
phealth	.9001108	.0504804	17.83	0.000	.801171 .9990507
wtprog	1.631615	.0780834	20.90	0.000	1.478574 1.784656
_cons	.0090842	.0535434	0.17	0.865	-.095859 .1140274
/wchange					
cut1	-.5897304	.0781626			-.7429264 -.4365345
cut2	.5029323	.068292			.3690825 .6367821
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)	-.3478179	.0604422	-5.75	0.000	-.4603282 -.2243109

cutz	.5029323	.068292			.3690825	.6367821	
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)		-.3478179	.0604422	-5.75	0.000	-.4603282	-.2243109

- 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	.1259899	.0356631	.0560914 .1958883
(Yes vs No) 2	-.0185024	.0055583	-.0293965 -.0076084
(Yes vs No) 3	-.1074874	.0306512	-.1675628 -.0474121

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of “Loss” goes up by .13
 - On average, the probability of “No change” goes down by .02
 - On average, the probability of “Gain” goes down by .11

- `predict(fix(prog))` tells margins to specify `fix(prog)` to predict when computing each predicted probability
- `fix(prog)` causes the value the value of `prog` not to affect ϵ , even though they are correlated
 - `fix(prog)` specifies that ϵ should be held fixed when `prog` changes
 - `fix(prog)` gets us the effect of the program that is not contaminated by the selection effect/correlation between ϵ and η that increases the participation among people more likely to lose weight

- This type of prediction is 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 $\text{prog}=1$ and the mean of the average of the structural predictions when $\text{prog}=0$ 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)

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	.1259899	.0349061	.0575753	.1944045
(Yes vs No) 2	-.0185024	.0054389	-.0291624	-.0078424
(Yes vs No) 3	-.1074874	.0300866	-.1664561	-.0485188

```
. matrix b = r(b)
```

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	=	3,000
Wald chi2(6)	=	236.09	
Prob > chi2	=	0.0000	

Log pseudolikelihood = -4389.0839

	Robust					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog#c.age						
No	.3318583	.1010243	3.28	0.001	.1338543	.5298624
Yes	.0991993	.0944861	1.05	0.294	-.08599	.2843886
prog#c.over						
No	.4241221	.0527011	8.05	0.000	.3208298	.5274144
Yes	.4310345	.051217	8.42	0.000	.3306509	.5314181
prog#c.phealth						
No	-.3323793	.0665871	-4.99	0.000	-.4628875	-.201871
Yes	-.5973977	.0486921	-12.27	0.000	-.6928325	-.501963

prog

age	-.9365184	.0828734	-11.30	0.000	-1.098947	-.7740895	
over	-1.058259	.0499251	-21.20	0.000	-1.15611	-.9604071	
phealth	.8938228	.0498157	17.94	0.000	.7961859	.9914598	
19 / 30	wtprog	1.632994	.0760053	21.49	0.000	1.484026	1.781961

	Robust					
	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
wchange						
prog#c.age						
No	.3318583	.1010243	3.28	0.001	.1338543	.5298624
Yes	.0991993	.0944861	1.05	0.294	-.08599	.2843886
prog#c.over						
No	.4241221	.0527011	8.05	0.000	.3208298	.5274144
Yes	.4310345	.051217	8.42	0.000	.3306509	.5314181
prog# c.phealth						
No	-.3323793	.0665871	-4.99	0.000	-.4628875	-.201871
Yes	-.5973977	.0486921	-12.27	0.000	-.6928325	-.501963
prog						
age	-.9365184	.0828734	-11.30	0.000	-1.098947	-.7740895
over	-1.058259	.0499251	-21.20	0.000	-1.15611	-.9604071
phealth	.8938228	.0498157	17.94	0.000	.7961859	.9914598
wtprog	1.632994	.0760053	21.49	0.000	1.484026	1.781961
_cons	.0130243	.0531604	0.24	0.806	-.0911683	.1172168
/wchange						
prog#c.cut1						
No	-.438465	.0907758			-.6163823	-.2605477
Yes	-.3395413	.0697649			-.4762781	-.2028046
prog#c.cut2						
No	.5647753	.0811816			.4056623	.7238883
Yes	.849572	.0817844			.6892775	1.009867
corr(e.prog, wchange)	-.3419207	.0610844	-5.60	0.000	-.4556747	-.2171783

prog#age	No	.3318583	.1010243	3.28	0.001	.1338543	.5298624
	Yes	.0991993	.0944861	1.05	0.294	-.08599	.2843886
prog#c.over	No	.4241221	.0527011	8.05	0.000	.3208298	.5274144
	Yes	.4310345	.051217	8.42	0.000	.3306509	.5314181
prog# c.phealth	No	-.3323793	.0665871	-4.99	0.000	-.4628875	-.201871
	Yes	-.5973977	.0486921	-12.27	0.000	-.6928325	-.501963
prog	age	-.9365184	.0828734	-11.30	0.000	-1.098947	-.7740895
	over	-1.058259	.0499251	-21.20	0.000	-1.15611	-.9604071
	phealth	.8938228	.0498157	17.94	0.000	.7961859	.9914598
	wtprog	1.632994	.0760053	21.49	0.000	1.484026	1.781961
	_cons	.0130243	.0531604	0.24	0.806	-.0911683	.1172168
/wchange	prog#c.cut1						
	No	-.438465	.0907758			-.6163823	-.2605477
	Yes	-.3395413	.0697649			-.4762781	-.2028046
prog#c.cut2	No	.5647753	.0811816			.4056623	.7238883
	Yes	.849572	.0817844			.6892775	1.009867
corr(e.prog, e.wchange)		-.3419207	.0610844	-5.60	0.000	-.4556747	-.2171783

```
. 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		z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ATE_Pr0 prog (Yes vs No)	.1087061	.038293	2.84	0.005	.0336531	.1837591
ATE_Pr1 prog (Yes vs No)	.0288781	.0190952	1.51	0.130	-.0085478	.0663039
ATE_Pr2 prog (Yes vs No)	-.1375842	.0322663	-4.26	0.000	-.200825	-.0743433

- When everyone joins the program instead of when no one participants in the program,
 - On average, the probability of "Loss" goes up by .11
 - On average, the probability of "No change" does not change
 - On average, the probability of "Gain" goes down .14

```

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

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	.1087061	.038293	.0336531 .1837591
(Yes vs No) 2	.0288781	.0190952	-.0085478 .0663039
(Yes vs No) 3	-.1375842	.0322663	-.200825 -.0743433

Endogenous sample selection

- Reconsider our fictional weight-loss program
 - Some program participants and some nonparticipants will 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

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

$Pr(wchange == "No change")$

$$= \begin{cases} Pr(cut1_0 < \mathbf{x}\beta_0 + \epsilon \leq cut2_0) & \text{if } prog == 0 \\ Pr(cut1_1 < \mathbf{x}\beta_1 + \epsilon \leq cut2_1) & \text{if } prog == 1 \end{cases}$$

(Analogously define probabilities Loss, and Gain)

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

ξ, ϵ and η are joint normal

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

Data

```
. use wprogram2
```

```
. describe
```

Contains data from wprogram2.dta

obs: 3,000

vars: 8

28 Jul 2017 07:13

size: 96,000

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
insamp	float	%9.0g		In sample: attended initial and final weigh in

Sorted by:

```

. 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	=	1,884	
Nonselected	=	1,116	
Wald chi2(6)	=	180.18	
Prob > chi2	=	0.0000	

Log pseudolikelihood = -4484.2347

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
wchange					
prog#c.age					
No	.3833806	.1306121	2.94	0.003	.1273856 .6393756
Yes	-.0630257	.1084828	-0.58	0.561	-.2756482 .1495967
prog#c.over					
No	.4734046	.0775788	6.10	0.000	.321353 .6254561
Yes	.2110918	.0774768	2.72	0.006	.0592401 .3629436
prog# c.phealth					
No	-.3910086	.0839247	-4.66	0.000	-.5554981 -.2265192
Yes	-.8192438	.0675175	-12.13	0.000	-.9515757 -.6869119
insamp					
age	-.0239454	.0805554	-0.30	0.766	-.181831 .1339403
over	-.7639015	.045083	-16.94	0.000	-.8522626 -.6755404
phealth	.7762507	.0467149	16.62	0.000	.6846911 .8678104
wtsamp	2.614852	.2666563	9.81	0.000	2.092215 3.137489
cons	2834801	.0516434	5.49	0.000	1822608 3846994

c.phealth	No	-.3910086	.0839247	-4.66	0.000	-.5554981	-.2265192
	Yes	-.8192438	.0675175	-12.13	0.000	-.9515757	-.6869119
insamp							
	age	-.0239454	.0805554	-0.30	0.766	-.181831	.1339403
	over	-.7639015	.045083	-16.94	0.000	-.8522626	-.6755404
	phealth	.7762507	.0467149	16.62	0.000	.6846911	.8678104
	wtsamp	2.614852	.2666563	9.81	0.000	2.092215	3.137489
	_cons	.2834801	.0516434	5.49	0.000	.1822608	.3846994
prog							
	age	-.9366997	.0818766	-11.44	0.000	-1.097175	-.7762245
	over	-1.062399	.0491499	-21.62	0.000	-1.158731	-.9660671
	phealth	.8913551	.0494733	18.02	0.000	.7943892	.988321
	wtprog	1.645957	.0729847	22.55	0.000	1.502909	1.789004
	_cons	.016411	.0527191	0.31	0.756	-.0869166	.1197386
/wchange							
prog#c.cut1	No	-.3561706	.1278314			-.6067155	-.1056258
	Yes	-.4668053	.0986098			-.660077	-.2735335
prog#c.cut2	No	.6304983	.1309562			.3738289	.8871677
	Yes	.721275	.1430156			.4409696	1.00158
corr(e.insamp,							
e.wchange)		-.5691458	.0901455	-6.31	0.000	-.7199754	-.366975
corr(e.prog,							
e.wchange)		-.5310186	.0707529	-7.51	0.000	-.6553935	-.3786047
corr(e.prog,							
e.insamp)		.4757458	.0296034	16.07	0.000	.4156943	.5316674



wprog	.0345587	.0725847	22.88	0.000	1.002503	1.705504
_cons	.016411	.0527191	0.31	0.756	-.0869166	.1197386
/wchange						
prog#c.cut1						
No	-.3561706	.1278314			-.6067155	-.1056258
Yes	-.4668053	.0986098			-.660077	-.2735335
prog#c.cut2						
No	.6304983	.1309562			.3738289	.8871677
Yes	.721275	.1430156			.4409696	1.00158
corr(e.insamp,						
e.wchange)	-.5691458	.0901455	-6.31	0.000	-.7199754	-.366975
corr(e.prog,						
e.wchange)	-.5310186	.0707529	-7.51	0.000	-.6553935	-.3786047
corr(e.prog,						
e.insamp)	.4757458	.0296034	16.07	0.000	.4156943	.5316674

- Nonzero correlation between e.insamp and e.wchange implies endogenous sample selection for outcomes
- Nonzero correlation between e.prog and e.wchange implies endogenous treatment assignment

```
. 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		z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ATE_Pr0 prog (Yes vs No)	.1552606	.051808	3.00	0.003	.0537189	.2568024
ATE_Pr1 prog (Yes vs No)	.006893	.0300435	0.23	0.819	-.0519913	.0657772
ATE_Pr2 prog (Yes vs No)	-.1621536	.038066	-4.26	0.000	-.2367616	-.0875457

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

- 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.