

# REndo: A Package to Address Endogeneity Without External Instrumental Variables

Raluca Gui

2019-06-04

## 1. What does REndo do

**REndo** is the first **R** package to implement the most recent *internal instrumental variable* methods to address endogeneity. The package includes implementations of the latent instrumental variable approach (Ebbes et al., 2005), the joint estimation using copula (Park and Gupta, 2012), the higher moments method (Lewbel, 1997) and the heteroskedastic error approach (Lewbel, 2012). To model hierarchical data (not cross-classified) such as students nested within classrooms, nested within schools, **REndo** includes the multilevel GMM estimation proposed by Kim and Frees (2007). All approaches assume a **continuous dependent variable**.

**Internal instrumental variable** approaches, also called **instrument free methods**, have been proposed as alternative to external instrumental variable approaches (like IV regression) to address endogeneity concerns, when valid, strong instruments are difficult to find.

The only alternative to **REndo** we could find in **R** is the **ivlewb** package that implements the heteroskedastic errors method proposed by Lewbel (2012).

## 2. Short Description of REndo's Functions

### 2.1 Instrument Free Methods for Non-hierarchical Data

The four instrument free methods presented in this section share the same underlying model presented in equations (1) and (2) below. The specific characteristics of each method are discussed in the subsequent sections.

Consider the model:

$$Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 P_t + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t \quad (1)$$

where  $t = 1, \dots, T$  indexes either time or cross-sectional units,  $Y_t$  is a  $k \times 1$  response variable,  $X_t$  is a  $k \times n$  exogenous regressor,  $P_t$  is a  $k \times 1$  continuous *endogenous* regressor,  $\epsilon_t$  is a structural error term with mean zero and  $E(\epsilon^2) = \sigma_\epsilon^2$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are model parameters. The endogeneity problem arises from the correlation of  $P_t$  and  $\epsilon_t$ . As such:

$$P_t = \gamma Z_t + \nu_t \quad (2)$$

where  $Z_t$  is a  $l \times 1$  vector of internal instrumental variables, and  $\nu_t$  is a random error with mean zero,  $E(\nu^2) = \sigma_\nu^2$  and  $E(\epsilon\nu) = \sigma_{\epsilon\nu}$ .  $Z_t$  is assumed to be stochastic with distribution  $G$  and  $\nu_t$  is assumed to have density  $h(\cdot)$ .

The **latent instrumental variables** and the **higher moments** models assume  $Z_t$  to be uncorrelated with the structural error, which is similar to the exclusion restriction assumption for observed instrumental variables methods. Moreover,  $Z_t$  is also assumed **unobserved**. Therefore,  $Z_t$  and  $\nu_t$  cannot be identified without distributional assumptions.

The distributions of  $Z_t$  and  $\nu_t$  should be specified such that two conditions are met: **(1)** endogeneity of  $P_t$  is corrected, and **(2)** the distribution of  $P_t$  is empirically close to the integral that expresses the amount of overlap of  $Z$  as it is shifted over  $\nu$  (= the convolution between  $Z_t$  and  $\nu_t$ ). When the density  $h(\cdot)$  is chosen to be normal, then  $G$  cannot be normal because the parameters would not be identified (Ebbes et al., 2005). Consequently, in the LIV model the distribution of  $Z_t$  is discrete while in the higher moments and joint estimation with copulas methods, the distribution of the internal instruments is taken to be skewed.

### *Latent Instrumental Variable Approach*

Ebbes et al. (2005) propose the latent instrumental variables approach whose model is described in equations (1) and (2) above. A particular characteristic of this approach is that the internal instrumental variables  $Z_t$  are assumed **unobserved, discrete and exogenous**, with an unknown number of groups  $m$ , while  $\gamma$  is a vector of group means.

Identification of the parameters relies on the distributional assumptions of the latent instruments,  $Z_t$ , as well as that of the endogenous regressor,  $P_t$ . Specifically:

- $P_t$  should have a non-Gaussian distribution.
- $Z_t$  should be discrete and have at least two groups with different means.

A continuous distribution for the instruments leads to an unidentified model, while a normal distribution of the endogenous regressor gives rise to inefficient estimates.

### *Gaussian Copula Correction Approach*

Park and Gupta (2012) propose a method that allows for the joint estimation of the continuous endogenous regressor and the error term using Gaussian copulas (A copula is a function that maps several conditional distribution functions (CDF) into their joint CDF).

The underlying idea is that using information contained in the observed data, one selects marginal distributions for the endogenous regressor and the structural error term, respectively. Then, the copula model enables the construction of a flexible multivariate joint distribution allowing a wide range of correlations between the two marginals.

The method allows both continuous and discrete endogenous regressors. In the case of **one continuous endogenous regressor**, the model is estimated using maximum likelihood. Otherwise, an alternative approach, still based on Gaussian copulas, but using an augmented OLS estimation is being used. The assumption of a skewed endogenous regressor is maintained here as well for the recovery of the correct parameter estimates.

The structural error  $\epsilon_t$  is assumed to have a normal marginal distribution. The marginal distribution of the endogenous regressor  $P_t$  is obtained using the Epanechnikov kernel density estimator, as below:

$$\hat{h}(p) = \frac{1}{T \cdot b} \sum_{t=1}^T K\left(\frac{p - P_t}{b}\right) \quad (3)$$

where  $P_t$  is the endogenous regressor,  $K(x) = 0.75 \cdot (1 - x^2) \cdot I(\|x\| \leq 1)$  and the bandwidth  $b$  is equal to  $b = 0.9 \cdot T^{-1/5} \cdot \min(s, IQR/1.34)$ , as proposed by Silvermann (1969).  $IQR$  is the interquartile range while  $s$  is the data sample standard deviation and  $T$  is the number of time periods observed in the data. In both cases, augmented OLS and maximum likelihood, the inference procedure occurs in two stages (first the empirical distribution of the endogenous regressor is computed and then used in constructing the likelihood function), the standard errors are not correct. Therefore, in both cases, the standard errors and the confidence intervals are obtained based on the sampling distributions resulted from bootstrapping. Since the distribution of the bootstrapped parameters is highly skewed, we report the percentile confidence intervals. The variance-covariance matrix is also computed based on the bootstrapped parameters, and not based on the Hessian.

In both cases, maximum likelihood estimation and augmented OLS, the reported standard errors are the bootstrapped standard errors, due to the inference being done in two steps. The confidence intervals are also the bootstrapped confidence intervals, due to the non-normality of the bootstrapped parameters.

### ***Higher Moments Approach***

The higher moments approach proposed by Lewbel (1997) helps identify structural parameters in regression models with endogeneity caused by *measurement error*. Identification is achieved by exploiting third moments of the data, with no restrictions imposed on the distribution of the error terms.

The following instruments are constructed and can be used with two-stage least squares estimation to obtain consistent estimates:

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{1t} &= (G_t - \bar{G}) & (3a) \\
q_{2t} &= (G_t - \bar{G})(P_t - \bar{P}) & (3b) \\
q_{3t} &= (G_t - \bar{G})(Y_t - \bar{Y}) & (3c) \\
q_{4t} &= (Y_t - \bar{Y})(P_t - \bar{P}) & (3d) \\
q_{5t} &= (P_t - \bar{P})^2 & (3e) \\
q_{6t} &= (Y_t - \bar{Y})^2 & (3f)
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here,  $G_t = G(X_t)$  for any given function  $G$  that has finite third own and cross moments and  $X$  are all the exogenous in the model.  $\bar{G}$  is the sample mean of  $G_t$ . The same rule applies also for  $P_t$  and  $Y_t$ .

The instruments in equations (3e) and (3f) can be used only when the measurement and the structural errors are symmetrically distributed. Otherwise, the use of the instruments does not require any distributional assumptions for the errors. Given that the regressors  $G(X) = X$  are included as instruments,  $G(X)$  should not be linear in  $X$  in equation (3a) above.

Since the constructed instruments come along with very strong assumptions, one of their best uses is to provide over-identifying information. The over-identification can be used to test validity of a potential outside instrument, to increase efficiency, and to check for robustness of parameter estimates based on alternative identifying assumptions (Lewbel 1997).

### ***Heteroskedastic Errors Approach***

The heteroskedastic errors method identifies structural parameters in regression models with endogenous regressors by means of variables that are uncorrelated with the product of heteroskedastic errors. The instruments are constructed as simple functions of the model's data. The method can be applied when no external instruments are available or to supplement external instruments to improve the efficiency of the IV estimator (Lewbel, 2012).

Consider the model in equations (1) and (2). This approach assumes that:

- $E(X\epsilon) = 0$
- $E(X\nu) = 0$
- $cov(Z, \epsilon\nu) = 0$ .
- the errors,  $\epsilon$  and  $\nu$ , may be correlated with each other.

Structural parameters are identified by an ordinary two stage least squares regression of  $Y$  on  $X$  and  $P$ , using  $X$  and  $[Z - E(Z)]\nu$  as instruments. A vital assumption for identification is that  $cov(Z, \nu^2) \neq 0$ .

The strength of the instrument is proportional to the covariance between  $(Z - \bar{Z})\nu$  and  $\nu$ , which corresponds to the degree of heteroskedasticity of  $\nu$  with respect to  $Z$  (Lewbel, 2012). This assumption can be empirically tested. If it is zero or close to zero, the instrument is weak, producing imprecise estimates, with large standard

errors. Under homoskedasticity, the parameters of the model are unidentified. But, identification is achieved in the presence of heteroskedasticity related to at least some elements of  $X$ .

## 2.2 Instrument Free Methods for Hierarchical Data (not cross-classified)

Like in single-level regression, also in multilevel models endogeneity is a concern. The additional problem is that in multilevel models there are multiple independent assumptions involving various random components at different levels. Any moderate correlation between some predictors and a random component or error term can result in a significant bias of the coefficients and of the variance components.

Exploiting the hierarchical structure of multilevel data, Kim and Frees (2007) propose a generalized method of moments technique for addressing endogeneity in multilevel models without the need of external instrumental variables. This approach uses both, the between and within variations of the exogenous variables, but only assumes the within variation of the variables to be endogenous.

The model comes with a set of assumptions such as:

- the errors at each level are normally distributed and independent of each other.
- the slope variables are exogenous.
- the level-1 structural error is uncorrelated with any of the regressors.

If the last assumption is not met, additional, external instruments are necessary.

Consider a hierarchical model with three levels like below:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{cst} &= Z_{cst}^1 \beta_{cs}^1 + X_{cst}^1 \beta_1 + \epsilon_{cst}^1 \\ \beta_{cs}^1 &= Z_{cs}^2 \beta_c^2 + X_{cs}^2 \beta_2 + \epsilon_{cs}^2 \\ \beta_c^2 &= X_c^3 \beta_3 + \epsilon_c^3. \end{aligned}$$

Given the set of disturbance terms at different levels, there exist a couple of possible correlation patterns that could lead to biased results:

- errors at the higher two levels ( $\epsilon_{cs}^2$  and  $\epsilon_c^3$ ) are correlated with some of the regressors,
- only third level errors ( $\epsilon_c^3$ ) are correlated with some of the regressors,
- an intermediate case, where there is concern with the higher level errors, but there is not enough information to estimate level 3 parameters.

The ingenious approach proposed by Kim and Frees (2007) lies in the fact that when all variables are assumed exogenous, the proposed estimator equals the random effects estimator. When all covariates are assumed endogenous, it equals the fixed effects estimator.

In facilitating the choice of the estimator to be used for the given data, Kim and Frees (2007) also propose an omitted variable test (which is reported by the summary function after the estimation using `multilevelIV()` function in **REndo**). This test is based on the Hausman-test (Hausman, 1978) for panel data. The omitted variable test allows the comparison of a robust estimator and an estimator that is efficient under the null hypothesis of no omitted variables, and also the comparison of two robust estimators at different levels.

## 3. Using REndo

**REndo** encompasses five functions that allow the estimation of linear models with one or more endogenous regressors using internal instrumental variables. Depending on the assumptions of the model and the structure of the data, single or multilevel, the researcher can use one of the following functions:

1. **latentIV()** - implements the latent instrumental variable estimation as in Ebbes (2005). The endogenous variable is assumed to have two components - a latent, discrete and exogenous component with an

unknown number of groups and the error term that is assumed normally distributed and correlated with the structural error. The method supports only one endogenous, continuous regressor and no additional explanatory variables. The **latent instrumental variable** function has the following syntax:

```
latentIV(y ~ P, data, start.params=c())
```

The first argument is the formula of the model to be estimated,  $y \sim P$ , where  $y$  is the response and  $P$  is the endogenous regressor. The second argument is the name of the dataset used and the last one, **start.params=c()**, which is optional, is a vector with the initial parameter values. When not indicated, the initial parameter values are taken to be the coefficients returned by the OLS estimator of  $y$  on  $P$ .

2. **copulaCorrection()** - models the correlation between the endogenous regressor and the structural error with the use of Gaussian copula (Park and Gupta, 2012). The endogenous regressor can be continuous or discrete. The method also allows estimating a model with more than one endogenous regressor, either continuous, discrete or a mixture of the two. However, the endogenous regressors cannot have a binomial distribution, due to parameter identification problems.

In the case of only one, continuous endogenous regressor, the method uses maximum likelihood estimation. In the case of a discrete endogenous regressor, or when several endogenous regressors are suspected, the estimation is carried out using an augmented OLS estimation which is nonetheless based on Gaussian copulas.

The **copula correction** function has the following syntax:

```
copulaCorrection( y ~ X1 + X2 + P1 + P2 | continuous(P1) + discrete(P2),
data, start.params=c(), num.boots=10, optimx.args=list())
```

The first argument is a two-part formula of the model to be estimated, with the second part of the RHS defining the endogenous regressor, here **continuous(P1) + discrete(P2)**. The second argument is the name of the data, the third argument of the function, **start.params**, is optional and represents the initial parameter values supplied by the user (when missing, the OLS estimates are considered); the fourth argument, **num.boots**, also optional, is the number of bootstraps to be performed (the default is 1000). The fifth argument, **optimx.args**, is used in order to choose the optimization algorithm and the maximum number of iterations for the selected algorithm. The default is the Nelder-Mead algorithm with 100.000 iterations. Transformation of explanatory variables, such as  $I(X)$ ,  $\ln(X)$  are supported. The standard errors reported are obtained through bootstrapping, since in both cases, the inference is done in two stages. Due to the skewness of the bootstrapped parameters, the confidence intervals reported are the percentile confidence intervals. The variance-covariance matrix is also based on the bootstrapped values.

3. **higherMomentsIV()** - implements the higher moments approach described in Lewbel (1997) where instruments are constructed by exploiting higher moments of the data, under strong model assumptions. The function allows just one endogenous regressor.

The **higherMomentsIV()** function has a four-part formula, with the following specification:

```
higherMomentsIV(y ~ X1 + X2 + P | P | IIV (iiv = gp , g= x2, X1, X2) +
IIV (iiv = yp) | Z1, data)
```

where:  $y$  is the response; the first RHS of the formula,  $X1 + X2 + P$ , is the model to be estimated; the second part,  $P$ , specifies the endogenous regressors; the third part, **IIV()**, specifies the format of the internal instruments; the fourth part,  $Z1$ , is optional, allowing the user to add any external instruments available.

Regarding the third part of the formula, **IIV()**, it has a set of three arguments:

- **iiv** - specifies the form of the instrument,
- **g** - specifies the transformation to be done on the exogenous regressors,
- the set of exogenous variables from which the internal instruments should be built (any subset of the exogenous variables).

A set of six instruments can be constructed, which should be specified in the **iiv** argument of **IIV()**:

- **g** - for  $(G_t - \bar{G})$ ,
- **gp** - for  $(G_t - \bar{G})(P_t - \bar{P})$ ,
- **gy** - for  $(G_t - \bar{G})(Y_t - \bar{Y})$ ,
- **yp** - for  $(Y_t - \bar{Y})(P_t - \bar{P})$ ,
- **p2** - for  $(P_t - \bar{P})^2$ ,
- **y2** - for  $(Y_t - \bar{Y})^2$ ,

where  $G = G(X_t)$  can be either  $x^2$ ,  $x^3$ ,  $\ln(x)$  or  $1/x$  and should be specified in the **g** argument of the third RHD of the formula, as **x2**, **x3**, **lnx** or **1/x**. In case of internal instruments built only from the endogenous regressor, e.g. **p2**, or from the response and the endogenous regressor, like for example in **yp**, there is no need to specify **g** or the set of exogenous regressors in the **IIV()** part of the formula. The function returns a set of tests for checking the validity of the instruments and the endogeneity assumption. Here as well, transformation of explanatory variables, such as  $I(X)$ ,  $\ln(X)$ , are supported.

4. **hetErrorsIV()** - uses the heteroskedasticity of the errors in a linear projection of the endogenous regressor on the other covariates to solve the endogeneity problem induced by measurement error, as proposed by Lewbel (2012). The function allows more than one endogenous regressors.

The function **hetErrorsIV()** has a four-part formula specification:

```
hetErrorsIV(y ~ X1 + X2 + X3 + P | P | IIV(X1,X2) | Z1, data)
```

where: **y** is the response variable, **X1 + X2 + X3 + P** represents the model to be estimated; the second part, **P**, specifies the endogenous regressors, the third part, **IIV(X1, X2)**, specifies the exogenous heteroskedastic variables from which the instruments are derived, while the final part **Z1** is optional, allowing the user to include additional external instrumental variables. Like in the higher moments approach, allowing the inclusion of additional external variables is a convenient feature of the function, since it increases the efficiency of the estimates. Transformation of the explanatory variables, such as  $I(X)$ ,  $\ln(X)$  are possible both in the model specification as well as in the **IIV()** specification.

5. **multilevelIV()** - implements the instrument free multilevel GMM method proposed by Kim and Frees (2007) where identification is possible due to the different levels of the data. Endogenous regressors at different levels can be present. The function comes along a built in omitted variable test, which helps in deciding which model is robust to omitted variables at different levels.

The **multilevelIV()** function allows the estimation of a multilevel model with up to three levels, and it has a syntax in the spirit of the **lmer()** function:

```
multilevelIV(y ~ X11 + X12 + X21 + X22 + X23 + X31 + X33 + X34 +  
(1|CID) + (1|SID) | endo(X12), data, lmer.control = lmerControl(list()))
```

The call has a two-part formula and an argument for data specification. In the formula, the first part is the model specification, with fixed and random parameter specification, and the second part which specifies the regressors assumed endogenous, here **X12**. The function returns the parameter estimates obtained with fixed effects, random effects and the GMM estimator proposed by Kim and Frees (2007), such that a comparison across models can be done. The user has the possibility to choose the optimization algorithm by specifying it in the **lmer.control** argument. The default is the Nelder Mead algorithm.

## 4. Examples using Real Data

Using the publicly available dataset CASchools which comes with the **AER** package, the results of implementing the instrument-free methods are presented.

The data contain information on test performance, school characteristics and student demographic backgrounds for schools in different districts in California. The data are aggregated at the district level, across different California counties. In trying to answer the question of how does **student/teacher ratio affects the average reading score**, we use as covariates the following variables:

- student/teacher ratio (students/teachers),

- lunch (percent qualifying for reduced-price lunch),
- english(percent of English learners),
- calworks(percent qualifying for income assistance),
- income(district average income in USD 1.000),
- grades (a dummy variable if the grade is equal to KK-08)
- county (dummy for county).

The student/teacher ratio might be endogenous here since it could be correlated with unobserved factors such as teacher salaries or teacher working conditions, which are both unobserved, but can affect the reading score of the students. Having access to an additional variable, namely **expenditure** (the expenditure per student aggregated at district level), we can use it as external instrumental variable. This is possible since it is correlated with the student/teacher ratio (a correlation of  $-0.61$ ), but does not directly explain the reading score tests of the students. Therefore, we can apply both external(two-stage least squares) and internal instrumental variables techniques to estimate the model and compare their performance.

In order to have a reference point, we apply OLS on the above data:

```
library(AER)
library(REndo)
set.seed(421)
data("CASchools")
school <- CASchools
school$stratio <- with(CASchools, students/teachers)

m1.ols <- lm(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + grades + income + calworks + county,
             data=school)

summary(m1.ols)
#>
#> Call:
#> lm(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch + grades + income +
#>       calworks + county, data = school)
#>
#> Residuals:
#>      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
#> -27.973  -3.883   0.000   4.228  25.466
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>                Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
#> (Intercept)      683.45306     9.56214   71.475 < 2e-16 ***
#> stratio          -0.30036     0.25797   -1.164  0.24505
#> english          -0.20550     0.03765   -5.458 8.87e-08 ***
#> lunch            -0.38684     0.03701  -10.452 < 2e-16 ***
#> gradesKK-08      -1.91291     1.35865   -1.408  0.15999
#> income             0.71615     0.09833    7.283 1.99e-12 ***
#> calworks         -0.05273     0.06155   -0.857  0.39212
#> countyButte       -5.64523     8.31528   -0.679  0.49763
#> countyCalaveras   -4.95294    10.70095   -0.463  0.64374
#> countyContra Costa -12.20339     8.06121   -1.514  0.13092
#> countyEl Dorado    -9.50023     7.91101   -1.201  0.23057
#> countyFresno      -12.05892     7.95612   -1.516  0.13046
#> countyGlenn        2.19167     8.79250    0.249  0.80329
#> countyHumboldt    -3.08632     7.83011   -0.394  0.69369
#> countyImperial    -13.00591     8.23206   -1.580  0.11498
#> countyInyo        -5.54425    10.67474   -0.519  0.60381
```

```

#> countyKern -15.48627 7.75823 -1.996 0.04666 *
#> countyKings -9.87188 8.01894 -1.231 0.21908
#> countyLake -10.54766 9.45291 -1.116 0.26523
#> countyLassen -6.39578 8.30968 -0.770 0.44198
#> countyLos Angeles -13.52654 7.75674 -1.744 0.08202 .
#> countyMadera -9.12052 8.30801 -1.098 0.27301
#> countyMarin -9.07511 8.03938 -1.129 0.25970
#> countyMendocino -12.35672 10.71474 -1.153 0.24956
#> countyMerced -10.94356 7.96004 -1.375 0.17002
#> countyMonterey -15.56170 8.13875 -1.912 0.05664 .
#> countyNevada -7.08341 7.95868 -0.890 0.37403
#> countyOrange -12.87871 7.96190 -1.618 0.10662
#> countyPlacer -8.40483 7.89059 -1.065 0.28750
#> countyRiverside -17.15674 8.54321 -2.008 0.04535 *
#> countySacramento -16.65124 8.25221 -2.018 0.04434 *
#> countySan Benito -22.23391 8.70515 -2.554 0.01105 *
#> countySan Bernardino -15.72159 7.96618 -1.974 0.04918 *
#> countySan Diego -8.66640 7.75449 -1.118 0.26447
#> countySan Joaquin -21.38580 8.16483 -2.619 0.00918 **
#> countySan Luis Obispo -8.72532 9.26257 -0.942 0.34681
#> countySan Mateo -14.77321 7.78241 -1.898 0.05844 .
#> countySanta Barbara -9.39084 7.92940 -1.184 0.23705
#> countySanta Clara -11.73141 7.76056 -1.512 0.13147
#> countySanta Cruz -4.09549 8.11085 -0.505 0.61390
#> countyShasta -5.89520 7.90799 -0.745 0.45646
#> countySiskiyou -7.59588 8.11768 -0.936 0.35003
#> countySonoma -8.44710 7.71614 -1.095 0.27435
#> countyStanislaus -10.51403 8.07918 -1.301 0.19394
#> countySutter -16.31996 8.18308 -1.994 0.04685 *
#> countyTehama -6.53982 8.08240 -0.809 0.41895
#> countyTrinity 14.21480 9.32882 1.524 0.12843
#> countyTulare -12.82005 7.80790 -1.642 0.10146
#> countyTuolumne -8.09766 8.21279 -0.986 0.32479
#> countyVentura -13.32761 8.03568 -1.659 0.09806 .
#> countyYuba 2.51893 9.31943 0.270 0.78709
#> ---
#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Residual standard error: 7.515 on 369 degrees of freedom
#> Multiple R-squared: 0.877, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8603
#> F-statistic: 52.62 on 50 and 369 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

```

The OLS coefficient estimate for the student/teacher ratio is **-0.30**. Now, using **expenditure** as external IV, we can estimate a two-stage least squares model, using **ivreg()**:

```

m2.2sls <- ivreg(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + grades + income + calworks +
  county | expenditure + english + lunch + grades + income + calworks +
  county , data=school)

summary(m2.2sls)
#>
#> Call:
#> ivreg(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch + grades + income +
#> calworks + county | expenditure + english + lunch + grades +

```



```

#> income + calworks + county, data = school)
#>
#> Residuals:
#>      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
#> -29.0462  -3.7187   0.0505   4.1665  25.8737
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
#> (Intercept)      700.47892    13.58064   51.579 < 2e-16 ***
#> stratio          -1.13674     0.53534   -2.123  0.0344 *
#> english          -0.21397     0.03848   -5.561 5.16e-08 ***
#> lunch            -0.39384     0.03774  -10.437 < 2e-16 ***
#> gradesKK-08      -1.89228     1.37792   -1.373  0.1705
#> income            0.62488     0.11199    5.580 4.67e-08 ***
#> calworks         -0.04951     0.06244   -0.793  0.4284
#> countyButte      -5.52747     8.43314   -0.655  0.5126
#> countyCalaveras  -2.90824    10.91220   -0.267  0.7900
#> countyContra Costa -10.58271    8.22516   -1.287  0.1990
#> countyEl Dorado   -8.72667     8.03452   -1.086  0.2781
#> countyFresno     -11.82403     8.06971   -1.465  0.1437
#> countyGlenn        4.49013     9.00875    0.498  0.6185
#> countyHumboldt    -3.42491     7.94310   -0.431  0.6666
#> countyImperial    -10.73839     8.44397   -1.272  0.2043
#> countyInyo        -3.82602    10.86816   -0.352  0.7250
#> countyKern       -14.23285     7.89903   -1.802  0.0724 .
#> countyKings       -8.71091     8.15816   -1.068  0.2863
#> countyLake       -10.67969     9.58689   -1.114  0.2660
#> countyLassen      -4.43217     8.49825   -0.522  0.6023
#> countyLos Angeles -10.86844     8.00527   -1.358  0.1754
#> countyMadera      -8.40685     8.43493   -0.997  0.3196
#> countyMarin       -8.19774     8.16779   -1.004  0.3162
#> countyMendocino   -10.97330    10.89371   -1.007  0.3144
#> countyMerced      -9.64042     8.10536   -1.189  0.2351
#> countyMonterey    -13.35809     8.34508   -1.601  0.1103
#> countyNevada      -7.04427     8.07127   -0.873  0.3834
#> countyOrange     -10.07189     8.22523   -1.225  0.2215
#> countyPlacer      -6.81552     8.05126   -0.847  0.3978
#> countyRiverside   -14.86610     8.75796   -1.697  0.0905 .
#> countySacramento -16.10164     8.37455   -1.923  0.0553 .
#> countySan Benito  -22.27075     8.82830   -2.523  0.0121 *
#> countySan Bernardino -13.60833     8.16459   -1.667  0.0964 .
#> countySan Diego   -7.10461     7.91238   -0.898  0.3698
#> countySan Joaquin -20.52627     8.29421   -2.475  0.0138 *
#> countySan Luis Obispo -7.89207     9.40509   -0.839  0.4019
#> countySan Mateo   -13.73300     7.91382   -1.735  0.0835 .
#> countySanta Barbara -7.38357     8.11930   -0.909  0.3637
#> countySanta Clara  -9.63336     7.95705   -1.211  0.2268
#> countySanta Cruz   -2.92678     8.25142   -0.355  0.7230
#> countyShasta      -5.58137     8.02175   -0.696  0.4870
#> countySiskiyou    -10.04256     8.34509   -1.203  0.2296
#> countySonoma       -8.17297     7.82677   -1.044  0.2971
#> countyStanislaus   -9.20225     8.22613   -1.119  0.2640
#> countySutter      -14.89933     8.33665   -1.787  0.0747 .

```

```
#> countyTehama          -5.90143      8.20446   -0.719    0.4724
#> countyTrinity          13.98620      9.46162    1.478    0.1402
#> countyTulare          -11.13579      7.97399   -1.397    0.1634
#> countyTuolumne         -8.75429      8.33701   -1.050    0.2944
#> countyVentura         -10.36121      8.31598   -1.246    0.2136
#> countyYuba              3.28346      9.46088    0.347    0.7287
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Residual standard error: 7.621 on 369 degrees of freedom
#> Multiple R-Squared:  0.8735,   Adjusted R-squared:  0.8564
#> Wald test: 51.23 on 50 and 369 DF,   p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

The external IV method returns an estimate for the assumed endogenous regressor equal to **-1.13**, very different from the OLS estimate.

Next, we estimate the same model using the instrument-free methods from **REndo**. The **latent instrumental variables** approach will probably return a coefficient very different from the other methods, given that the only regressor allowed is the endogenous one. Let's see:

```
m3.liv <- latentIV(read ~ stratio, data=school)
#> No start parameters were given. The linear model read ~ stratio is fitted to derive them.
#> The start parameters c((Intercept)=706.449, stratio=-2.621, pi1=19.64, pi2=21.532, theta5=0.5, theta8=1)
summary(m3.liv)
#>
#> Call:
#> latentIV(formula = read ~ stratio, data = school)
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>             Estimate Std. Error z-score Pr(>|z|)
#> (Intercept)  699.601    268.619   2.604  0.00953 **
#> stratio      -2.273     13.678  -0.166  0.86811
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Further parameters estimated during model fitting:
#>           pi1          pi2        theta5        theta6        theta7        theta8
#> -4.896e+01  1.964e+01  6.939e-152  3.788e+02 -1.228e+00  3.574e+00
#> (see help file for details)
#>
#> Initial parameter values:
#> (Intercept)=706.4485 stratio=-2.621 pi1=19.6404 pi2=21.5322
#> theta5=0.5 theta6=1 theta7=0.5 theta8=1
#>
#> The value of the log-likelihood function: 2705.967
#> AIC: -5395.934 , BIC: -5363.612
#> KKT1: TRUE KKT2: FALSE Optimx Convergence Code: 0
```

Indeed, the value returned is equal to **-2.273**. The **latentIV()** function returns, besides the coefficient estimates, also the initial parameter values used in the maximum likelihood optimization and the AIC and BIC. The latter two can also be accessed calling **AIC(m3.liv)** and **BIC(m3.liv)**. The function also returns the fitted values and the residuals, as well as the confidence interval for the coefficients.

Next, we call the **copulaCorrection()** function:

```

set.seed(110)
m4.cc <- copulaCorrection(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + calworks +
  grades + income + county | continuous(stratio), data= school,
  optimx.args = list(method=c("Nelder-Mead"), itnmax= 60000),
  num.boots=2, verbose = FALSE)
#> Warning: It is recommended to run 1000 or more bootstraps.

summary(m4.cc)
#>
#> Call:
#> copulaCorrection(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch +
#>   calworks + grades + income + county | continuous(stratio),
#>   data = school, num.boots = 2, verbose = FALSE, optimx.args = list(method = c("Nelder-Mead"),
#>   itnmax = 60000))
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>
#>
#> Point Estimate Boots SE Lower Boots CI (95%)
#> (Intercept) 682.565624 5.957311 -
#> stratio -0.403224 0.298678 -
#> english -0.203807 0.001656 -
#> lunch -0.364262 0.064622 -
#> calworks -0.071866 0.195057 -
#> gradesKK-08 -0.720456 2.625048 -
#> income 0.789111 0.028532 -
#> countyButte -5.479607 3.781670 -
#> countyCalaveras -8.569725 3.747992 -
#> countyContra Costa -12.674997 4.569201 -
#> countyEl Dorado -8.835638 0.782200 -
#> countyFresno -12.657606 0.227733 -
#> countyGlenn -0.396484 2.628378 -
#> countyHumboldt -1.619174 3.340256 -
#> countyImperial -13.819832 3.703114 -
#> countyInyo -12.570555 28.602896 -
#> countyKern -15.738156 2.091599 -
#> countyKings -9.882331 2.982905 -
#> countyLake -8.391185 6.400876 -
#> countyLassen -8.623148 5.386855 -
#> countyLos Angeles -14.410264 4.008043 -
#> countyMadera -9.323744 2.291126 -
#> countyMarin -8.945930 0.371789 -
#> countyMendocino -15.809413 18.202589 -
#> countyMerced -11.542303 3.719099 -
#> countyMonterey -16.260118 3.207088 -
#> countyNevada -6.618215 5.901268 -
#> countyOrange -13.089799 2.421280 -
#> countyPlacer -8.053084 2.165213 -
#> countyRiverside -17.846364 7.117200 -
#> countySacramento -16.085165 6.531714 -
#> countySan Benito -21.191212 2.986569 -
#> countySan Bernardino -15.850419 5.115118 -
#> countySan Diego -8.793639 2.368126 -
#> countySan Joaquin -21.165667 3.713039 -
#> countySan Luis Obispo -10.258366 4.278351 -

```

```

#> countySan Mateo -14.538313 3.869838 -
#> countySanta Barbara -9.662167 2.304929 -
#> countySanta Clara -12.720440 4.056116 -
#> countySanta Cruz -3.338640 2.019196 -
#> countyShasta -5.532578 3.041433 -
#> countySiskiyou -6.412953 0.902344 -
#> countySonoma -7.343663 5.446315 -
#> countyStanislaus -10.760086 11.333970 -
#> countySutter -15.661473 3.823191 -
#> countyTehama -6.744382 0.721643 -
#> countyTrinity 13.386526 7.317696 -
#> countyTulare -13.805892 3.599127 -
#> countyTuolumne -6.812164 0.790134 -
#> countyVentura -15.067289 0.663488 -
#> countyYuba -0.483019 13.632164 -
#> Upper Boots CI (95%)
#> (Intercept) -
#> stratio -
#> english -
#> lunch -
#> calworks -
#> gradesKK-08 -
#> income -
#> countyButte -
#> countyCalaveras -
#> countyContra Costa -
#> countyEl Dorado -
#> countyFresno -
#> countyGlenn -
#> countyHumboldt -
#> countyImperial -
#> countyInyo -
#> countyKern -
#> countyKings -
#> countyLake -
#> countyLassen -
#> countyLos Angeles -
#> countyMadera -
#> countyMarin -
#> countyMendocino -
#> countyMerced -
#> countyMonterey -
#> countyNevada -
#> countyOrange -
#> countyPlacer -
#> countyRiverside -
#> countySacramento -
#> countySan Benito -
#> countySan Bernardino -
#> countySan Diego -
#> countySan Joaquin -
#> countySan Luis Obispo -
#> countySan Mateo -

```

```

#> countySanta Barbara -
#> countySanta Clara -
#> countySanta Cruz -
#> countyShasta -
#> countySiskiyou -
#> countySonoma -
#> countyStanislaus -
#> countySutter -
#> countyTehama -
#> countyTrinity -
#> countyTulare -
#> countyTuolumne -
#> countyVentura -
#> countyYuba -
#> Number of bootstraps: 2
#>
#> Continuous endogenous variables: stratio
#>
#> Further parameters estimated during model fitting:
#> rho sigma
#> 0.2296 10.1344
#> (see help file for details)
#>
#> Initial parameter values:
#> (Intercept)=683.4531 stratio=-0.3004 english=-0.2055
#> lunch=-0.3868 calworks=-0.0527 gradesKK-08=-1.9129 income=0.7162
#> countyButte=-5.6452 countyCalaveras=-4.9529 countyContra
#> Costa=-12.2034 countyEl Dorado=-9.5002 countyFresno=-12.0589
#> countyGlenn=2.1917 countyHumboldt=-3.0863
#> countyImperial=-13.0059 countyInyo=-5.5442 countyKern=-15.4863
#> countyKings=-9.8719 countyLake=-10.5477 countyLassen=-6.3958
#> countyLos Angeles=-13.5265 countyMadera=-9.1205
#> countyMarin=-9.0751 countyMendocino=-12.3567
#> countyMerced=-10.9436 countyMonterey=-15.5617
#> countyNevada=-7.0834 countyOrange=-12.8787 countyPlacer=-8.4048
#> countyRiverside=-17.1567 countySacramento=-16.6512 countySan
#> Benito=-22.2339 countySan Bernardino=-15.7216 countySan
#> Diego=-8.6664 countySan Joaquin=-21.3858 countySan Luis
#> Obispo=-8.7253 countySan Mateo=-14.7732 countySanta
#> Barbara=-9.3908 countySanta Clara=-11.7314 countySanta
#> Cruz=-4.0955 countyShasta=-5.8952 countySiskiyou=-7.5959
#> countySonoma=-8.4471 countyStanislaus=-10.514
#> countySutter=-16.32 countyTehama=-6.5398 countyTrinity=14.2148
#> countyTulare=-12.8201 countyTuolumne=-8.0977
#> countyVentura=-13.3276 countyYuba=2.5189 rho=0 sigma=0
#>
#> The value of the log-likelihood function: 1784.639
#> AIC: -3463.278 , BIC: -3249.144
#> KKT1: NA KKT2: NA Optimx Convergence Code: 0

```

The copula correction with one endogenous continuous regressor, estimates the model using maximum likelihood. The optimization algorithm used is the Nelder-Mead, which it is known to converge slowly, so it might happen that sometimes your code will not converge (Converge Code = 1). Therefore, the copulaCorrection allows the user to specify the desired optimization algorithm (see the optimx function for a

list of available options) and also the maximum number of iterations for the optimization algorithm.

In the current case, the algorithm converged, and we see that the coefficient of the student/teacher ratio returned is equal to **-0.38**.

The **heteroskedastic errors** approach returns an estimate of the student/teacher ratio equal to **0.71**, far away from the coefficients returned by the external instrumental variables or even OLS. As Lewbel (2012) underlined, it is often better to use this approach in order to create additional instruments, which together with external ones, could lead to improved efficiency.

```
set.seed(111)
m5.hetEr <- hetErrorsIV(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + calworks + income +
  grades+ county | stratio | IIV(income, english), data=school)

summary(m5.hetEr)
#>
#> Call:
#> hetErrorsIV(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch + calworks +
#>     income + grades + county | stratio | IIV(income, english),
#>     data = school)
#>
#> Residuals:
#>      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
#> -30.700151  -4.217847  -0.005104   4.668987  24.971417
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>                Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
#> (Intercept)      662.78792    27.90173   23.754 < 2e-16 ***
#> stratio           0.71481     1.31077    0.545  0.5859
#> english          -0.19522     0.04058   -4.811 2.19e-06 ***
#> lunch            -0.37834     0.03928   -9.632 < 2e-16 ***
#> calworks         -0.05665     0.06302   -0.899  0.3693
#> income            0.82694     0.17237    4.798 2.34e-06 ***
#> gradesKK-08      -1.93796     1.38723   -1.397  0.1633
#> countyButte       -5.78817     8.48989   -0.682  0.4958
#> countyCalaveras   -7.43471    11.36530   -0.654  0.5134
#> countyContra Costa -14.17050     8.59657   -1.648  0.1001
#> countyEl Dorado   -10.43914     8.16217   -1.279  0.2017
#> countyFresno      -12.34401     8.12935   -1.518  0.1298
#> countyGlenn        -0.59809     9.64386   -0.062  0.9506
#> countyHumboldt     -2.67536     8.00961   -0.334  0.7386
#> countyImperial    -15.75811     9.09557   -1.733  0.0840 .
#> countyInyo         -7.62974    11.21118   -0.681  0.4966
#> countyKern        -17.00761     8.14978   -2.087  0.0376 *
#> countyKings       -11.28101     8.37728   -1.347  0.1789
#> countyLake        -10.38742     9.65135   -1.076  0.2825
#> countyLassen       -8.77910     9.00202   -0.975  0.3301
#> countyLos Angeles -16.75282     8.90759   -1.881  0.0608 .
#> countyMadera       -9.98673     8.55103   -1.168  0.2436
#> countyMarin        -10.14003     8.31615   -1.219  0.2235
#> countyMendocino    -14.03584    11.14156   -1.260  0.2085
#> countyMerced       -12.52525     8.36803   -1.497  0.1353
#> countyMonterey     -18.23633     8.97019   -2.033  0.0428 *
#> countyNevada       -7.13092     8.12418   -0.878  0.3807
#> countyOrange      -16.28550     9.19897   -1.770  0.0775 .
```

```

#> countyPlacer          -10.33386      8.41593 -1.228  0.2203
#> countyRiverside       -19.93701      9.40301 -2.120  0.0346 *
#> countySacramento      -17.31832      8.46574 -2.046  0.0415 *
#> countySan Benito      -22.18920      8.88612 -2.497  0.0130 *
#> countySan Bernardino -18.28656      8.75495 -2.089  0.0374 *
#> countySan Diego       -10.56202      8.27072 -1.277  0.2024
#> countySan Joaquin     -22.42905      8.43821 -2.658  0.0082 **
#> countySan Luis Obispo -9.73669      9.54108 -1.021  0.3082
#> countySan Mateo       -16.03575      8.10296 -1.979  0.0486 *
#> countySanta Barbara  -11.82716      8.66086 -1.366  0.1729
#> countySanta Clara    -14.27791      8.55153 -1.670  0.0958 .
#> countySanta Cruz      -5.51401      8.47149 -0.651  0.5155
#> countyShasta          -6.27611      8.08659 -0.776  0.4382
#> countySiskiyou        -4.62622      9.09788 -0.508  0.6114
#> countySonoma          -8.77983      7.88762 -1.113  0.2664
#> countyStanislaus     -12.10620      8.48930 -1.426  0.1547
#> countySutter          -18.04425      8.63306 -2.090  0.0373 *
#> countyTehama          -7.31467      8.30826 -0.880  0.3792
#> countyTrinity         14.49227      9.52902  1.521  0.1292
#> countyTulare          -14.86433      8.37901 -1.774  0.0769 .
#> countyTuolumne        -7.30068      8.44374 -0.865  0.3878
#> countyVentura         -16.92807      9.38201 -1.804  0.0720 .
#> countyYuba            1.59098      9.58511  0.166  0.8683
#>
#> Diagnostic tests:
#>
#>          df1 df2 statistic p-value
#> Weak instruments  2 368      7.738 0.000511 ***
#> Wu-Hausman       1 368      0.651 0.420400
#> Sargan           1 NA       0.104 0.747600
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Residual standard error: 7.671 on 369 degrees of freedom
#> Multiple R-Squared:  0.8718, Adjusted R-squared:  0.8545
#> Wald test: 50.48 on 50 and 369 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

```

Last, but not least, **higher moments approach** returns an estimate in the range of the estimate produced by the two-stage least squares and control function methods, namely **-1.30**:

```

set.seed(112)
m6.highMoment <- higherMomentsIV(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + calworks + income +
                                grades + county | stratio | IIV(g = x3, iiv = gp, income), data=school)

summary(m6.highMoment)
#>
#> Call:
#> higherMomentsIV(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch +
#>   calworks + income + grades + county | stratio | IIV(g = x3,
#>   iiv = gp, income), data = school)
#>
#> Residuals:
#>      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
#> -29.36633  -3.85498   0.04463   4.10135  25.95692
#>

```



```

#> Coefficients:
#>               Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
#> (Intercept)      703.95606    56.18285   12.530 < 2e-16 ***
#> stratio          -1.30755     2.73072   -0.479  0.6323
#> english          -0.21570     0.04726   -4.564 6.85e-06 ***
#> lunch            -0.39527     0.04409   -8.965 < 2e-16 ***
#> calworks         -0.04885     0.06368   -0.767  0.4435
#> income            0.60624     0.31313    1.936  0.0536 .
#> gradesKK-08      -1.88806     1.38805   -1.360  0.1746
#> countyButte      -5.50342     8.49392   -0.648  0.5174
#> countyCalaveras  -2.49065    12.78252   -0.195  0.8456
#> countyContra Costa -10.25172    9.76761   -1.050  0.2946
#> countyEl Dorado  -8.56869     8.45511   -1.013  0.3115
#> countyFresno     -11.77606     8.15459   -1.444  0.1496
#> countyGlenn       4.95954    11.67444    0.425  0.6712
#> countyHumboldt   -3.49406     8.06561   -0.433  0.6651
#> countyImperial   -10.27530    11.17431   -0.920  0.3584
#> countyInyo        -3.47511    12.24073   -0.284  0.7766
#> countyKern        -13.97686     8.90326   -1.570  0.1173
#> countyKings       -8.47380     9.01077   -0.940  0.3476
#> countyLake       -10.70665     9.65572   -1.109  0.2682
#> countyLassen      -4.03115    10.61236   -0.380  0.7043
#> countyLos Angeles -10.32558    11.71617   -0.881  0.3787
#> countyMadera      -8.26110     8.78937   -0.940  0.3479
#> countyMarin       -8.01855     8.68510   -0.923  0.3565
#> countyMendocino   -10.69077    11.82199   -0.904  0.3664
#> countyMerced      -9.37428     9.16044   -1.023  0.3068
#> countyMonterey    -12.90805    10.96616   -1.177  0.2399
#> countyNevada      -7.03627     8.12240   -0.866  0.3869
#> countyOrange      -9.49866    12.21514   -0.778  0.4373
#> countyPlacer      -6.49094     9.56602   -0.679  0.4979
#> countyRiverside   -14.39829    11.46357   -1.256  0.2099
#> countySacramento  -15.98939     8.60826   -1.857  0.0640 .
#> countySan Benito  -22.27827     8.88395   -2.508  0.0126 *
#> countySan Bernardino -13.17675    10.64160   -1.238  0.2164
#> countySan Diego    -6.78565     9.40082   -0.722  0.4709
#> countySan Joaquin -20.35073     8.78752   -2.316  0.0211 *
#> countySan Luis Obispo -7.72189     9.83218   -0.785  0.4327
#> countySan Mateo   -13.52057     8.63103   -1.567  0.1181
#> countySanta Barbara -6.97363    10.39340   -0.671  0.5027
#> countySanta Clara  -9.20488    10.44988   -0.881  0.3790
#> countySanta Cruz   -2.68810     9.10649   -0.295  0.7680
#> countyShasta      -5.51727     8.13387   -0.678  0.4980
#> countySiskiyou    -10.54224    11.48204   -0.918  0.3591
#> countySonoma       -8.11698     7.92414   -1.024  0.3063
#> countyStanislaus   -8.93435     9.28127   -0.963  0.3364
#> countySutter       -14.60919     9.54161   -1.531  0.1266
#> countyTehama       -5.77106     8.50457   -0.679  0.4978
#> countyTrinity      13.93952     9.54850    1.460  0.1452
#> countyTulare      -10.79181     9.66641   -1.116  0.2650
#> countyTuolumne     -8.88840     8.64810   -1.028  0.3047
#> countyVentura      -9.75539    12.65573   -0.771  0.4413
#> countyYuba         3.43960     9.82916    0.350  0.7266

```



```

#>
#> Diagnostic tests:
#>              df1 df2 statistic p-value
#> Weak instruments    1 369      3.461 0.0636 .
#> Wu-Hausman         1 368      0.143 0.7059
#> Sargan              0 NA        NA      NA
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Residual standard error: 7.668 on 369 degrees of freedom
#> Multiple R-Squared: 0.8719, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8546
#> Wald test: 50.51 on 50 and 369 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

```

The **CASchools** dataset has information at the district level, where the districts are clustered into counties. One could be tempted to apply the multilevel GMM method to these data, as implemented in the **multilevelIV()** function. However, the endogeneity problem solved by the multilevel GMM approach considers only correlations between level-1 variables and level-2 errors, while the endogeneity presented in the example above deals with endogeneity between a level-1 variable and the level-1 error. Therefore, we expect that the **multilevelIIV()** function will indicate the use of *fixed effects* method. In other words, the results should be similar with the ones returned by OLS since we included county dummy variables. Indeed, the omitted variable test between the fixed effects and the GMM model rejects the null hypothesis, therefore indicating an endogeneity problem at level one and the use of fixed effects.

```

set.seed(113)
school$gr08 <- school$grades=="KK-06"
m7.multilevel <- multilevelIV(read ~ stratio + english + lunch + income + gr08 +
  calworks + (1|county) | endo(stratio), data=school)
summary(m7.multilevel)
#>
#> Call:
#> multilevelIV(formula = read ~ stratio + english + lunch + income +
#>   gr08 + calworks + (1 | county) | endo(stratio), data = school)
#>
#> Number of levels: 2
#> Number of observations: 420
#> Number of groups: L2(county): 45
#>
#> Coefficients for model REF:
#>              Estimate Std. Error z-score Pr(>|z|)
#> (Intercept) 675.82287    5.58009 121.113 < 2e-16 ***
#> stratio      -0.49561    0.23923  -2.072  0.0383 *
#> english      -0.25998    0.03414  -7.616 2.61e-14 ***
#> lunch        -0.36930    0.03560 -10.373 < 2e-16 ***
#> income        0.67231    0.08862   7.586 3.29e-14 ***
#> gr08TRUE      2.15903    1.28167   1.685  0.0921 .
#> calworks     -0.05706    0.05712  -0.999  0.3178
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Omitted variable tests for model REF:
#>              df  Chisq p-value
#> FE_L2_vs_REF    7 40.886 8.52e-07 ***
#> GMM_L2_vs_REF    1  0.644   0.422
#> ---

```

```
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

However, we can use the simulated data that comes with the package in order to give an example of the workings of the `multilevelIV()` function.

The dataset has five level-1 regressors, X11, X12, X13, X14 and X15, where X15 is correlated with the level two error, thus endogenous. There are four level-2 regressors, X21, X22, X23 and X24, and three level-3 regressors, X31, X32, X33, all exogenous. We estimate a three-level model with X15 assumed endogenous.

Having a three-level hierarchy, `multilevelIV()` returns five estimators, from the most robust to omitted variables (FE\_L2), to the most efficient (REF), i.e. lowest mean squared error. The random effects estimator (REF) is efficient assuming no omitted variables, whereas the fixed effects estimator (FE) is unbiased and asymptotically normal even in the presence of omitted variables. Because of the efficiency, one would choose the random effects estimator if confident that no important variables were omitted. On the contrary, the robust estimator would be preferable if there was a concern that important variables were likely to be omitted. The estimation result is below:

```
data(dataMultilevelIV)
set.seed(114)
formula1 <- y ~ X11 + X12 + X13 + X14 + X15 + X21 + X22 + X23 + X24 +
X31 + X32 + X33 + (1 | CID) + (1 | SID) | endo(X15)
m8.multilevel <- multilevelIV(formula = formula1, data = dataMultilevelIV)
coef(m8.multilevel)
```

	REF	FE_L2	FE_L3	GMM_L2	GMM_L3
#> (Intercept)	64.3168856	0.0000000	0.0000000	64.3485944	64.3168868
#> X11	3.0213405	3.0459605	3.0214255	3.0146686	3.0213403
#> X12	8.9522160	8.9839088	8.9524723	8.9747533	8.9522169
#> X13	-2.0194178	-2.0145054	-2.0193321	-2.0021426	-2.0194171
#> X14	1.9651420	1.9791437	1.9648317	1.9658681	1.9651421
#> X15	-0.5647915	-0.9777361	-0.5647621	-0.9750309	-0.5648070
#> X21	-2.3316225	0.0000000	-2.2845297	-2.3052516	-2.3316215
#> X22	-3.9564944	0.0000000	-3.9553644	-4.0130975	-3.9564966
#> X23	-2.9779887	0.0000000	-2.9756848	-2.9488487	-2.9779876
#> X24	4.9078293	0.0000000	4.9084694	4.7933756	4.9078250
#> X31	2.1142348	0.0000000	0.0000000	2.1164477	2.1142349
#> X32	0.3934770	0.0000000	0.0000000	0.3799626	0.3934764
#> X33	0.1082086	0.0000000	0.0000000	0.1108386	0.1082087

As we have simulated the data, we know that the true parameter value of the endogenous regressor (X15) is  $-1$ . Looking at the coefficients of X15 returned by the five models, we see that they form two clusters: one cluster is composed of the level-two fixed effects estimator and the level-two GMM estimator (both return  $-0.975$ ), while the other cluster is composed of the other three estimators, FE\_L3, GMM\_L3, REF, all three having a value of  $-0.564$ . The bias of the last three estimators is to be expected since we have simulated the data such that X15 is correlated with the level-two error, to which only FE\_L2 and GMM\_L2 are robust.

To provide guidance for selecting the appropriate estimator, `multilevelIV**` function performs an **omitted variable test**. The results are returned by the `**summary` function. For example, in a three-level setting, different estimator comparisons are possible:

- **Fixed effects versus random effects estimators:** To test for omitted level-two and level-three omitted effects, simultaneously, one compares FE\_L2 to REF. The test does not indicate the level at which omitted variables might exist.
- **Fixed effects versus GMM estimators:** Once the existence of omitted effects is established but not certain at which level (see 1), we test for level-two omitted effects by comparing FE\_L2 versus GMM\_L3. A rejection of the null hypothesis will imply omitted variables at level-two. The same is accomplished by testing FE\_L2 versus GMM\_L2, since the latter is consistent only if there are no omitted effects at level two.

- **Fixed effects versus fixed effects estimators:** We can test for omitted level-two effects, while allowing for omitted level-three effects. This can be done by comparing FE\_L2 versus FE\_L3 since FE\_L2 is robust against both level-two and level-three omitted effects while FE\_L3 is only robust to level-three omitted variables.

In general, testing for higher level endogeneity in multilevel settings one would start by looking at the results of the omitted variable test comparing REF and FE\_L2. If the null hypothesis is rejected, this means the model suffers from omitted variables, either at level two or level three. Next, test whether there are level-two omitted effects, since testing for omitted level three effects relies on the assumption there are no level-two omitted effects. To this end, one can rely on one of the following model comparisons: FE\_L2 versus FE\_L3 or FE\_L2 versus GMM\_L2. If no omitted variables at level-two are found, proceed with testing for omitted level-three effects by comparing FE\_L3 versus GMM\_L3 or GMM\_L2 versus GMM\_L3.

The `summary()` function takes two arguments: the name of the model object (here `m8.multilevel`) and the estimation method (here `REF`). Without a second argument, the summary displays simultaneously the coefficients obtained with all the different estimation approaches (fixed effects, GMM, random effects). The second parameter can take the following values, depending on the model estimated (two or three levels): `REF`, `GMM_L2`, `GMM_L3`, `FE_L2`, `FE_L3`. It returns the estimated coefficients under the model specified in the second argument, together with their standard errors and z-scores. Further, it returns the chi-squared statistic, degrees of freedom and p-value of the omitted variable test between the focal model (here `REF`) and all the other possible options (here `FE_L3`, `GMM_L2` and `GMM_L3`).

```
summary(m8.multilevel, "REF")
#>
#> Call:
#> multilevelIV(formula = formula1, data = dataMultilevelIV)
#>
#> Number of levels: 3
#> Number of observations: 2824
#> Number of groups: L2(CID): 1368 L3(SID): 40
#>
#> Coefficients for model REF:
#>               Estimate Std. Error z-score Pr(>|z|)
#> (Intercept)  64.31689    7.87332   8.169 3.11e-16 ***
#> X11          3.02134    0.02576 117.306 < 2e-16 ***
#> X12          8.95222    0.02572 348.131 < 2e-16 ***
#> X13         -2.01942    0.02409 -83.835 < 2e-16 ***
#> X14          1.96514    0.02521  77.937 < 2e-16 ***
#> X15         -0.56479    0.01950 -28.962 < 2e-16 ***
#> X21         -2.33162    0.16228 -14.368 < 2e-16 ***
#> X22         -3.95649    0.13119 -30.160 < 2e-16 ***
#> X23         -2.97799    0.06611 -45.044 < 2e-16 ***
#> X24          4.90783    0.19796  24.792 < 2e-16 ***
#> X31          2.11423    0.10433  20.264 < 2e-16 ***
#> X32          0.39348    0.30426   1.293  0.1959
#> X33          0.10821    0.05236   2.067  0.0388 *
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Omitted variable tests for model REF:
#>               df      Chisq p-value
#> GMM_L2_vs_REF   7      18.74 0.009040 **
#> GMM_L3_vs_REF  13    -12872.98 1.000000
#> FE_L2_vs_REF   13      39.99 0.000139 ***
#> FE_L3_vs_REF   13      39.99 0.000138 ***
```

```
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

In the example above, we compare the random effects (REF) with all the other estimators. Testing REF, the most efficient estimator, against the level-two fixed effects estimator, FE\_L2, which is the most robust estimator, we are actually testing simultaneously for level-2 and level-3 omitted effects. Since the null hypothesis is rejected with a p-value of 0.000139, the test indicates severe bias in the random effects estimator. In order to test for *level-two omitted effects regardless of the presence of level-three omitted effects*, we have to compare the two fixed effects estimators, FE\_L2 versus FE\_L3:

```
summary(m8.multilevel,"FE_L2")
#>
#> Call:
#> multilevelIV(formula = formula1, data = dataMultilevelIV)
#>
#> Number of levels: 3
#> Number of observations: 2824
#> Number of groups: L2(CID): 1368  L3(SID): 40
#>
#> Coefficients for model FE_L2:
#>
#>      Estimate Std. Error z-score Pr(>|z|)
#> (Intercept)  0.000e+00  4.275e-19    0.00      1
#> X11          3.046e+00  2.978e-02  102.30 <2e-16 ***
#> X12          8.984e+00  3.360e-02  267.41 <2e-16 ***
#> X13         -2.015e+00  3.107e-02  -64.83 <2e-16 ***
#> X14          1.979e+00  3.203e-02   61.80 <2e-16 ***
#> X15         -9.777e-01  3.364e-02  -29.06 <2e-16 ***
#> X21          0.000e+00  1.824e-18    0.00      1
#> X22          0.000e+00  1.303e-18    0.00      1
#> X23          0.000e+00  4.389e-18    0.00      1
#> X24          0.000e+00  1.724e-18    0.00      1
#> X31          0.000e+00  1.468e-17    0.00      1
#> X32          0.000e+00  8.265e-18    0.00      1
#> X33          0.000e+00  2.793e-17    0.00      1
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#>
#> Omitted variable tests for model FE_L2:
#>
#>      df Chisq p-value
#> FE_L2_vs_REF    13 39.99 0.000139 ***
#> FE_L2_vs_FE_L3    9 36.02 3.92e-05 ***
#> FE_L2_vs_GMM_L2  12 39.99 7.21e-05 ***
#> FE_L2_vs_GMM_L3  13 39.99 0.000139 ***
#> ---
#> Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

The null hypothesis of no omitted level-two effects is rejected (p-value is equal to  $3.92e - 05$ ). Therefore, we conclude that there are omitted effects at level-two. This finding is no surprise as we simulated the dataset with the level-two error correlated with X15, which leads to biased FE\_L3 coefficients. The omitted variable test between level-two fixed effects and level-two GMM should show that the null hypothesis of no omitted level-two effects is rejected (p-value is 0). In case of wrongly assuming that an endogenous variable is exogenous, the random effects as well as the GMM estimators will be biased, since the former will be constructed using the wrong set of internal instrumental variables. Consequently, comparing the results of the omitted variable tests when the variable is considered endogenous versus exogenous can indicate whether

the variable is indeed endogenous or not. To conclude this example, the test results provide support that the FE\_L2 should be used.

## References

- Ebbes P, Wedel M, Boeckenholt U, Steerneman A (2005). “Solving and Testing for Regressor- Error (In)Dependence When no Instrumental Variables Are Available: With New Evidence for the Effect of Education on Income.” *Quantitative Marketing and Economics*, 3(4), 365–392.
- Epanechnikov V (1969). “Nonparametric Estimation of a Multidimensional Probability Density.” *Teoriya veroyatnostei i ee primeneniya*, 14(1), 156–161.
- Kim S, Frees F (2007). “Multilevel Modeling with Correlated Effects.” *Psychometrika*, 72(4), 505–533.
- Lewbel A (1997). “Constructing Instruments for Regressions with Measurement Error When No Additional Data are Available, With an Application to Patents and R and D.” *Econometrica*, 65(5), 1201–1213.
- Lewbel A (2012). “Using Heteroscedasticity to Identify and Estimate Mismeasured and Endogenous Regressor Models.” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 30(1), 67–80.
- Park S, Gupta S (2012). “Handling Endogeneous Regressors by Joint Estimation Using Copulas.” *Marketing Science*, 31(4), 567–586.