The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

The Stata Journal

Editor
H. Joseph Newton
Department of Statistics
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843
979-845-8817; fax 979-845-6077
jnewton@stata-journal.com

Editor
Nicholas J. Cox
Department of Geography
Durham University
South Road
Durham DH1 3LE UK
n.j.cox@stata-journal.com

Associate Editors

Christopher F. Baum
Boston College

Nathaniel Beck
New York University

Rino Bellocco
Karolinska Institutet, Sweden, and
University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Maarten L. Buis
Tübingen University, Germany

A. Colin Cameron
University of California–Davis

Mario A. Cleves
Univ. of Arkansas for Medical Sciences

William D. Dupont
Vanderbilt University

David Epstein
Columbia University

Allan Gregory
Queen's University

James Hardin
University of South Carolina

Ben Jann
University of Bern, Switzerland

Stephen Jenkins
London School of Economics and
Political Science

Ulrich Kohler
WZB, Berlin

Frauke Kreuter
University of Maryland–College Park

Peter A. Lachenbruch
Oregon State University

Jens Lauritsen
Odense University Hospital

Stanley Lemeshow
Ohio State University

J. Scott Long
Indiana University

Roger Newson
Imperial College, London

Austin Nichols
Urban Institute, Washington DC

Marcello Pagano
Harvard School of Public Health

Sophia Rabe-Hesketh
University of California–Berkeley

J. Patrick Royston
MRC Clinical Trials Unit, London

Philip Ryan
University of Adelaide

Mark E. Schaffer
Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh

Jeroen Weesie
Utrecht University

Nicholas J. G. Winter
University of Virginia

Jeffrey Wooldridge
Michigan State University

Stata Press Editorial Manager Lisa Gilmore
Stata Press Copy Editor Deirdre Skaggs

The *Stata Journal* publishes reviewed papers together with shorter notes or comments, regular columns, book reviews, and other material of interest to Stata users. Examples of the types of papers include 1) expository papers that link the use of Stata commands or programs to associated principles, such as those that will serve as tutorials for users first encountering a new field of statistics or a major new technique; 2) papers that go "beyond the Stata manual" in explaining key features or uses of Stata that are of interest to intermediate or advanced users of Stata; 3) papers that discuss new commands or Stata programs of interest either to a wide spectrum of users (e.g., in data management or graphics) or to some large segment of Stata users (e.g., in survey statistics, survival analysis, panel analysis, or limited dependent variable modeling); 4) papers analyzing the statistical properties of new or existing estimators and tests in Stata; 5) papers that could be of interest or usefulness to researchers, especially in fields that are of practical importance but are not often included in texts or other journals, such as the use of Stata in managing datasets, especially large datasets, with advice from hard-won experience; and 6) papers of interest to those who teach, including Stata with topics such as extended examples of techniques and interpretation of results, simulations of statistical concepts, and overviews of subject areas.

For more information on the *Stata Journal*, including information for authors, see the webpage

http://www.stata-journal.com

The *Stata Journal* is indexed and abstracted in the following:

- CompuMath Citation Index®
- Current Contents/Social and Behavioral Sciences®
- RePEc: Research Papers in Economics
- Science Citation Index Expanded (also known as SciSearch®)
- Scopus™
- Social Sciences Citation Index®

Copyright Statement: The *Stata Journal* and the contents of the supporting files (programs, datasets, and help files) are copyright © by StataCorp LP. The contents of the supporting files (programs, datasets, and help files) may be copied or reproduced by any means whatsoever, in whole or in part, as long as any copy or reproduction includes attribution to both (1) the author and (2) the *Stata Journal*.

The articles appearing in the *Stata Journal* may be copied or reproduced as printed copies, in whole or in part, as long as any copy or reproduction includes attribution to both (1) the author and (2) the *Stata Journal*.

Written permission must be obtained from StataCorp if you wish to make electronic copies of the insertions. This precludes placing electronic copies of the *Stata Journal*, in whole or in part, on publicly accessible websites, fileservers, or other locations where the copy may be accessed by anyone other than the subscriber.

Users of any of the software, ideas, data, or other materials published in the *Stata Journal* or the supporting files understand that such use is made without warranty of any kind, by either the *Stata Journal*, the author, or StataCorp. In particular, there is no warranty of fitness of purpose or merchantability, nor for special, incidental, or consequential damages such as loss of profits. The purpose of the *Stata Journal* is to promote free communication among Stata users.

The *Stata Journal*, electronic version (ISSN 1536-8734) is a publication of Stata Press. Stata, Stata, Stata Press, Mata, Mata, and NetCourse are registered trademarks of StataCorp LP.

The Stata Journal (2012)
12, Number 2, pp. 342–344

Stata tip 108: On adding and constraining

Maarten L. Buis
Department of Sociology
Tübingen University
Tübingen, Germany
maarten.buis@uni-tuebingen.de

In many estimation commands, the `constraint` command (see [R] **constraint**) can impose linear constraints. The most common of these is the constraint that two or more regression coefficients are equal. A sometimes useful characteristic of models with that constraint is that they are equivalent to a model that includes the sum of the variables that are constrained. Consider the relevant part of a regression equation:

$$\beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2$$

If we constrain the effects of x_1 and x_2 to be equal, then we can replace β_1 and β_2 with β:

$$\beta x_1 + \beta x_2 = \beta(x_1 + x_2)$$

One situation where this characteristic can be useful occurs when you have created a variable by adding several variables and you wonder whether that was a good idea. In the example below, there are three variables on the degree of trust a respondent has in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the U.S. federal government: `confed`, `conlegis`, and `conjudge`, respectively. These can take the values 0 (hardly any trust), 1 (only some trust), or 2 (a great deal of trust). I think that these three variables say something about the trust in the federal government, and I created a single variable that captures that, `congov`, which I use to predict whether a respondent voted for Barack Obama in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. This results in model `sum1`.

If I want to check whether adding these three confidence measures was a good idea, I can use the fact that adding variables is equivalent to constraining their effects to be equal. So you can operationalize the rather vague idea "adding these variables is a good idea" to the testable statement "the effects of these three variables are the same". As a check, I first fit a model that constrains the effects to be equal. This is model `constr1`, and as expected, the resulting coefficients, standard errors, and log likelihood are exactly the same. I then fit a model with the three confidence variables without constraint, `unconstr1`. The resulting coefficients are very different from one another: the effects do not even have the same sign.[1] A likelihood-ratio test also rejects the hypothesis that these variables have the same effect on voting for Obama. So adding the sum of the three confidence measures was not a good idea in this case.

1. These are odds ratios, so the sign is determined by whether the ratio is larger or smaller than 1.

© 2012 StataCorp LP

```
. use gss10
(extract from the 2010 General Social Survey)
. generate byte congov = confed + conlegis + conjudge
(463 missing values generated)
. quietly logit obama congov, or nolog
. estimates store sum1
. constraint 1 confed = conlegis
. constraint 2 confed = conjudge
. quietly logit obama confed conlegis conjudge, or constraint(1 2) nolog
. estimates store constr1
. quietly logit obama confed conlegis conjudge, or nolog
. estimates store unconstr1
. estimates table sum1 constr1 unconstr1, stats(ll N) eform b(%9.3g) se(%9.3g)
> stfmt(%9.4g)
```

Variable	sum1	constr1	unconstr1
congov	1.62		
	.11		
confed		1.62	3.47
		.11	.576
conlegis		1.62	1.69
		.11	.305
conjudge		1.62	.674
		.11	.107
_cons	.461	.461	.689
	.0833	.0833	.134
ll	-347.8	-347.8	-324.9
N	557	557	557

legend: b/se

```
. lrtest constr1 unconstr1
Likelihood-ratio test                                 LR chi2(2)  =     45.77
(Assumption: constr1 nested in unconstr1)             Prob > chi2 =    0.0000
```

Another situation where this characteristic can be useful occurs when you have two or more ordinal or categorical variables that you want to combine. Consider the example below. In that example, I want to treat education as an ordinal variable, and I want to see the effect of "family educational background" on the educational attainment of the children.

I think of family educational background as some sort of sum of the father's and mother's educations, but how do I create a sum of two ordinal variables? That is hard, but it is easy to consider the equivalent model that constrains the effects of father's education to be equal to the effects of mother's education. In this example, the effects of mother's and father's educations are fairly similar, and the test of the hypothesis that they are equal cannot be rejected (compare `unconstr2` with `constr2`). It also shows that constraining effects to be the same is equivalent to adding the sums of the indicator variables (compare `constr2` with `sum2`).

```
. quietly ologit degree i.madeg i.padeg, or nolog
. estimates store unconstr2
. constraint 1 1.madeg = 1.padeg
. constraint 2 2.madeg = 2.padeg
. quietly ologit degree i.madeg i.padeg, or constraint(1 2) nolog
. estimates store constr2
. generate byte p_hs = 1.madeg + 1.padeg
(329 missing values generated)
. generate byte p_mths = 2.madeg + 2.padeg
(329 missing values generated)
. quietly ologit degree p_hs p_mths, or nolog
. estimates store sum2
. estimates table unconstr2 constr2 sum2, stats(ll N) eform b(%9.3g) se(%9.3g)
> stfmt(%9.4g) keep(degree:)
```

Variable	unconstr2	constr2	sum2
madeg			
1	2.5	2.17	
	.449	.199	
2	4.89	5.51	
	1.26	.691	
padeg			
1	1.88	2.17	
	.322	.199	
2	6.08	5.51	
	1.46	.691	
p_hs			2.17
			.199
p_mths			5.51
			.691
ll	-799.1	-800.5	-800.5
N	972	972	972

legend: b/se

```
. lrtest unconstr2 constr2
Likelihood-ratio test                                 LR chi2(2)  =      2.79
(Assumption: constr2 nested in unconstr2)             Prob > chi2 =    0.2484
```