

SABRE

EXERCISE 3 STATE DEPENDENCE ANSWERS

File: WEMP2.DAT

THE VARIABLES

| | |
|------|---|
| case | individual identifier |
| femp | wife's employment status; 1=employed, 0=unemployed |
| mune | husband's employment status; 1=unemployed, 0=employed |
| time | calendar time (year-1975) |
| und1 | children aged < 1 year old; 1=yes, 0=no |
| und5 | children aged 1 - 5 years old; 1=yes, 0=no |
| age | mother's age |

5. Note the deviance and degrees of freedom for these models.

int Deviance=2054.4619 on 1579 residual degrees of freedom

int + mune Deviance=1970.9970 on 1578 residual degrees of freedom

int + mune + und5 Deviance= 1757.3600 on 1577 residual degrees of freedom

mixture model

Deviance=1237.1568 on 1574 residual degrees of freedom

dis e

| <i>Parameter</i> | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>S. Error</i> | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <i>int</i> | 2.0098 | 0.19833 | |
| <i>mune</i> | -2.7033 | 0.42577 | |
| <i>und5</i> | -2.6619 | 0.23273 | |
| <i>scale</i> | 2.1082 | 0.19258 | |
| | | | <i>PROBABILITY</i> |
| <i>end-point 0</i> | 0.78410E-01 | 0.37373E-01 | 0.68815E-01 |
| <i>end-point 1</i> | 0.61023E-01 | 0.55981E-01 | 0.53556E-01 |

8.

drop y

Model type: `dropped` binary logistic-normal mixture with end-points

Number of observations = 1425

Number of cases = 151

X-vars df = 3

Scale df = 1

End-point df = 2

Deviance = 1099.6531 on 1419 residual degrees of freedom

dis e

| <i>Parameter</i> | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>S. Error</i> | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <i>int</i> | 2.0887 | 0.19711 | |
| <i>mune</i> | -2.8095 | 0.45169 | |
| <i>und5</i> | -2.4720 | 0.24501 | |
| <i>scale</i> | 2.2569 | 0.19934 | |
| | | | <i>PROBABILITY</i> |
| <i>end-point 0</i> | 0.75473E-01 | 0.39736E-01 | 0.67582E-01 |
| <i>end-point 1</i> | 0.41291E-01 | 0.58963E-01 | 0.36974E-01 |

9. Now fit a lagged y variable.

lag y

Deviance = 878.93601 on 1420 residual degrees of freedom

Deviance decrease = 220.71708 on 1 residual degree of freedom

THERE IS NOT AN ERROR IN SABRE HERE - THE DF SHOULD BE 1420

dis e

| <i>Parameter</i> | <i>Estimate</i> | <i>S. Error</i> | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <i>int</i> | -0.81251 | 0.22417 | |
| <i>mune</i> | -1.6864 | 0.41477 | |
| <i>und5</i> | -1.0872 | 0.23191 | |
| <i>lag</i> | 3.5967 | 0.22898 | |
| <i>scale</i> | 0.93090 | 0.21221 | |
| | | | <i>PROBABILITY</i> |
| <i>end-point 0</i> | 0.00000E+00 | FIXED | 0.00000E+00 |
| <i>end-point 1</i> | 0.00000E+00 | FIXED | 0.00000E+00 |

10. Is the lag significant?

Yes.

11. What does this mean substantively?

The wife's employment status in the previous year is important in the explanation of her current employment status.

(The wife's employment status at t-1 is important as an explanation of her employment status at t.)

12. Is there still significant residual heterogeneity?

Yes. *Scale* = 0.93090 with a standard error of 0.21221.

13. Now fit a two-state Markov model.

markov y
Deviance = 846.49334 on 1417 residual degrees of freedom

dis e

| Parameter | Estimate | S. Error | |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| <i>State 0</i> | | | |
| <i>int</i> | -1.3981 | 0.29059 | |
| <i>mune</i> | -1.9934 | 0.74696 | |
| <i>und5</i> | -0.25101 | 0.35122 | |
| <i>scale</i> | 1.2878 | 0.29949 | |
| <i>State 1</i> | | | |
| <i>int</i> | 3.0890 | 0.18017 | |
| <i>mune</i> | -1.3567 | 0.46530 | |
| <i>und5</i> | -1.8990 | 0.26430 | |
| <i>scale</i> | 0.11596 | 0.27669 | |
| <i>PROBABILITY</i> | | | |
| <i>end-point 0</i> | 0.00000E+00 | <i>FIXED</i> | 0.00000E+00 |
| <i>end-point 1</i> | 0.00000E+00 | <i>FIXED</i> | 0.00000E+00 |

14. State 0 are the women who were unemployed at t-1. What is the effect of husband's employment status for these women?

A husband being unemployed has a significant negative effect.

15. State 1 are women who were employed at t-1. What is the effect of husbands's employment status for these women?

A husband being unemployed has a significant negative effect however this is smaller than for women who are unemployed at t-1 (State 0).

16. What is the effect of having a child age 1- 5 years old the same for women in State 0 and State 1?

They are not significant for women who were unemployed at t-1 (State 0) but are significant for women who were employed at t-1 (State 1).

17. Is there significant residual heterogeneity?

Yes, for women in State 0 but not for women in State 1.