

ECON3150/4150 Spring 2015

Seminar 6

Siv-Elisabeth Skjelbred

University of Oslo

Last updated: March 19, 2015

Data set

- "Shall issue" laws allow citizens in some states to carry concealed weapons.
- Proponents argue: Carrying a weapon will deter criminals from attacking.
- Opponents argue: Crime will increase because of accidental or spontaneous use of the weapons.
- Data from 50 states + district of Colombia for 23 years (1977 to 1999)
- Data is from the paper "shooting Down the 'More guns less crime' hypothesis by John Donohue.

Variables

Variable	Definition
<i>vio</i>	violent crime rate (incidents per 100,000 members of the population)
<i>rob</i>	robbery rate (incidents per 100,000)
<i>mur</i>	murder rate (incidents per 100,000)
<i>shall</i>	= 1 if the state has a shall-carry law in effect in that year = 0 otherwise
<i>incarc_rate</i>	incarceration rate in the state in the previous year (sentenced prisoners per 100,000 residents; value for the previous year)
<i>density</i>	population per square mile of land area, divided by 1000
<i>avginc</i>	real per capita personal income in the state, in thousands of dollars
<i>pop</i>	state population, in millions of people
<i>pm1029</i>	percent of state population that is male, ages 10 to 29
<i>pw1064</i>	percent of state population that is white, ages 10 to 64
<i>pb1064</i>	percent of state population that is black, ages 10 to 64
<i>stateid</i>	ID number of states (Alabama = 1, Alaska = 2, etc.)
<i>year</i>	Year (1977-1999)

Exercise E10.1 a (i)

```
1 . reg lvio shall, vce(cluster stateid)
```

Linear regression

Number of obs = 1173
F(1, 50) = 7.96
Prob > F = 0.0068
R-squared = 0.0866
Root MSE = .61735

(Std. Err. adjusted for 51 clusters in stateid)

lvio	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
shall	-.4429646	.1570184	-2.82	0.007	-.7583452	-.1275839
_cons	6.134919	.0790269	77.63	0.000	5.976189	6.293649

Exercise E10.1 a (i)

```
1 . global basevars "incarc_rate density avginc pop pbl064 pw1064 pml029"  
2 . reg lvio shall $basevars, vce(cluster stateid)
```

Linear regression

Number of obs = 1173
F(8, 50) = 62.13
Prob > F = 0.0000
R-squared = 0.5643
Root MSE = .42769

(Std. Err. adjusted for 51 clusters in stateid)

lvio	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
shall	-.3683869	.113937	-3.23	0.002	-.5972361	-.1395378
incarc_rate	.0016126	.0005999	2.69	0.010	.0004076	.0028177
density	.0266885	.0414909	0.64	0.523	-.0566485	.1100255
avginc	.0012051	.0240808	0.05	0.960	-.0471626	.0495728
pop	.0427098	.011729	3.64	0.001	.0191515	.0662681
pbl064	.0808526	.0713875	1.13	0.263	-.0625334	.2242386
pw1064	.0312005	.03409	0.92	0.364	-.0372713	.0996723
pml029	.0088709	.0340964	0.26	0.796	-.0596137	.0773554
_cons	2.981738	2.166513	1.38	0.175	-1.369831	7.333307

- The coefficient is -0.368 which suggests that shall-issue laws reduce crime by 36%.

Exercise E10.1 a (ii)

```
1 .  
2 . esttab regal rega2, se
```

	(1) lvio	(2) lvio
shall	-0.443** (0.157)	-0.368** (0.114)
incarc_rate		0.00161** (0.000600)
density		0.0267 (0.0415)
avginc		0.00121 (0.0241)
pop		0.0427*** (0.0117)
pbl064		0.0809 (0.0714)
pw1064		0.0312 (0.0341)
pml029		0.00887 (0.0341)
_cons	6.135*** (0.0790)	2.982 (2.167)
N	1173	1173

Standard errors in parentheses
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

- Adding the control variable results in a small drop in the coefficient.

Exercise E10.1 a (iii)

- Attitudes towards guns and crime.
- Quality of police and other crime-prevention programs.
- Which examples do you have?

Exercise E10.1 b

```
1 . xtreg lvio shall $basevars, fe vce(cluster stateid)
```

```
Fixed-effects (within) regression                Number of obs   =       1173
Group variable:  stateid                      Number of groups =        51

R-sq:  within =  0.2178                        Obs per group:  min =        23
          between = 0.0033                          avg =       23.0
          overall = 0.0001                          max =        23

corr(u_i, Xb) =  -0.3687                        F(8,50)         =       34.10
                                          Prob > F        =       0.0000
```

(Std. Err. adjusted for 51 clusters in stateid)

lvio	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
shall	-.0461415	.0417616	-1.10	0.275	-.1300223	.0377392
incarc_rate	-.000071	.0002504	-0.28	0.778	-.0005739	.0004318
density	-.1722901	.1376129	-1.25	0.216	-.4486936	.1041135
avginc	-.0092037	.0129649	-0.71	0.481	-.0352445	.016837
pop	.0115247	.014224	0.81	0.422	-.0170452	.0400945
pbl064	.1042804	.0326849	3.19	0.002	.0386308	.1699301
pwl064	.0408611	.0134585	3.04	0.004	.0138289	.0678932
pml029	-.0502725	.0206949	-2.43	0.019	-.0918394	-.0087057
_cons	3.866017	.7701057	5.02	0.000	2.319214	5.412819
sigma_u	.68024951					
sigma_e	.16072287					
rho	.94712779	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

- The coefficient on shall falls to -0.046, a large reduction in the coefficient from 2.
- The estimate now is not statistically significantly different from zero

Exercise E10.1 c

```

1 . xtreg lvio shall Sbasevars Syr_vars, fe vce(cluster stateid)

Fixed-effects (within) regression              Number of obs   =       1173
Group variables:   stateid                    Number of groups =        51

R-sq:  within =  0.4180                      Obs per group:  min =        23
        between = 0.0419                      avg =             23.0
        overall  = 0.0009                      max =             23

corr(u_i, Xb) = -0.2929                      F(30, 50)       =       56.86
                                                Prob > F        =       0.0000

```

(Std. Err. adjusted for 51 clusters in stateid)

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
lvio					
shall	-.0279935	.0407168	-0.69	0.495	-.1097757 .0537886
incarc_rate	.000076	.0002079	0.37	0.716	-.0003416 .0004935
density	-.091595	.1286222	-0.74	0.463	-.3403396 .1572296
avginc	.0009587	.0164931	0.06	0.954	-.0321688 .0340861
pop	-.0047544	.0152294	-0.31	0.756	-.0353436 .0258347
pbl064	.0291862	.0495407	0.59	0.558	-.0703192 .1286916
pml064	.0092501	.0237564	0.39	0.699	-.0384659 .0569662
pml029	.0733254	.0524733	1.40	0.168	-.0320704 .1787211
yr2	.0282621	.0161556	3.62	0.001	.0260767 .0909755
yr3	.1839486	.0244579	6.70	0.000	.1148233 .2130738
yr4	.2170759	.0334184	6.50	0.000	.1499531 .2841987
yr5	.2172551	.0391956	5.54	0.000	.1385284 .2959819
yr6	.1946328	.0465743	4.18	0.000	.1010856 .28818
yr7	.158645	.0593845	2.67	0.010	.0393676 .2779223
yr8	.1929883	.0770021	2.51	0.015	.0383251 .3476515
yr9	.2444764	.0922217	2.65	0.011	.0592438 .4297091
yr10	.3240904	.1089181	2.98	0.004	.1053219 .5428589
yr11	.324365	.1249881	2.60	0.012	.073319 .5754111
yr12	.3867412	.1397074	2.77	0.008	.1061305 .6673518
yr13	.4422143	.1535358	2.88	0.006	.1338286 .7505999
yr14	.5430478	.1960959	2.77	0.008	.1491976 .936899
yr15	.5959456	.2040685	2.92	0.005	.1860618 .1.005829
yr16	.6275171	.2170306	2.89	0.006	.1915982 .1.063436
yr17	.6497414	.2246177	2.89	0.006	.1985834 .1.100899
yr18	.6354187	.2332437	2.72	0.009	.1669349 .1.103903
yr19	.6276831	.2423607	2.59	0.013	.1408874 .1.114479
yr20	.5713423	.2534067	2.25	0.029	.06236 .1.080236
yr21	.5501153	.2613516	2.10	0.040	.0251751 .1.075055
yr22	.4932904	.2746546	1.80	0.079	-.0583697 .1.04495
yr23	.4328776	.2862197	1.51	0.137	-.1420117 .1.007767
_cons	3.765525	1.152108	3.27	0.002	1.451448 .6.079603
sigma_u	.6663043				
sigma_e	.1400264				
rho	.95770338				(fraction of variance due to u_i)

- The coefficient falls further to -0.028.
- The coefficient is significantly different from zero.

Exercise E10.1 c

```
1 . test $yr_vars

( 1)  yr2 = 0
( 2)  yr3 = 0
( 3)  yr4 = 0
( 4)  yr5 = 0
( 5)  yr6 = 0
( 6)  yr7 = 0
( 7)  yr8 = 0
( 8)  yr9 = 0
( 9)  yr10 = 0
(10)  yr11 = 0
(11)  yr12 = 0
(12)  yr13 = 0
(13)  yr14 = 0
(14)  yr15 = 0
(15)  yr16 = 0
(16)  yr17 = 0
(17)  yr18 = 0
(18)  yr19 = 0
(19)  yr20 = 0
(20)  yr21 = 0
(21)  yr22 = 0
(22)  yr23 = 0

F( 22,      50) =      21.62
Prob > F =      0.0000
```

- The coefficients are jointly statistically significant.
- This specification is thus better specified than the previous.

Exercise E10d

```
1 . esttab regd1 regd2 regd3 regd4, se drop(yr*) stats(F_year State_FE Year_FE)
```

	(1) lrob	(2) lrob	(3) lrob	(4) lrob
shall	-0.773** (0.225)	-0.529** (0.161)	-0.00782 (0.0552)	0.0268 (0.0522)
incarc_rate		0.00101 (0.000640)	-0.0000763 (0.000321)	0.0000314 (0.000348)
density		0.0905 (0.0460)	-0.186 (0.166)	-0.0447 (0.198)
avginc		0.0407 (0.0282)	-0.0175 (0.0220)	0.0144 (0.0248)
pop		0.0778** (0.0225)	0.0163 (0.0276)	0.0000164 (0.0259)
pbl064		0.102 (0.0894)	0.112* (0.0512)	0.0141 (0.0841)
pwl064		0.0275 (0.0450)	0.0272 (0.0164)	-0.0128 (0.0328)
pml029		0.0273 (0.0417)	0.0112 (0.0291)	0.105 (0.0730)
_cons	4.873*** (0.116)	0.904 (3.061)	2.446* (1.013)	3.279 (1.677)
F_year				25.86
State_FE	NO	NO	YES	YES
Year_FE	NO	NO	NO	YES

Standard errors in parentheses

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

1 . esttab regmur1 regmur2 regmur3 regmur4, drop(yr*) stats(F_year State_FE Year_FE)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	lmur	lmur	lmur	lmur
shall	-0.473** (-3.18)	-0.313** (-3.16)	-0.0608 (-1.65)	-0.0150 (-0.39)
incarc_rate		0.00210*** (4.56)	-0.000360 (-0.85)	-0.000116 (-0.32)
density		0.0397 (0.99)	-0.671 (-1.69)	-0.544 (-1.70)
avginc		-0.0773** (-2.86)	0.0243 (1.55)	0.0566** (3.42)
pop		0.0416** (3.49)	-0.0257 (-1.26)	-0.0321 (-1.53)
pbl064		0.131* (2.14)	0.0307 (0.39)	0.0220 (0.29)
pw1064		0.0471 (1.65)	0.0103 (0.80)	-0.000489 (-0.02)
pml029		0.0655 (1.81)	0.0392 (1.82)	0.0692 (1.66)
_cons	1.898*** (20.37)	-2.486 (-1.25)	0.460 (0.55)	0.188 (0.18)
F_year				19.61
State_FE	NO	NO	YES	YES
Year_FE	NO	NO	NO	YES

Exercise E10d

- The quantitative results are similar to the results using violent crimes
- There is a large estimated effect of concealed weapons laws in specification 1 and 2
- This effect is spurious and due to omitted variable bias as specification 3 and 4 shows.

Threats to internal validity

- Omitted variable bias
- Functional form misspecification
- Measurement error
- Sample selection
- Simultaneous causality
- Heteroskedasticity and/or correlated error terms } violation of i.i.d.

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \bullet \text{ Omitted variable bias} \\ \bullet \text{ Functional form misspecification} \\ \bullet \text{ Measurement error} \\ \bullet \text{ Sample selection} \\ \bullet \text{ Simultaneous causality} \end{array} \right\} E(u_i|x_{1i}) \neq 0$$

Exercise E10e

Potential two-way causality between crime and shall.

- Laws for carrying guns is likely to affect crime rates.
- Crime rates can affect the laws for carrying guns - states with high crime rates are those that will consider actions they believe reduce crime rates.

Exercise E10.2 f

- Regression 4 is the most credible regression as it controls for both time and state fixed effects.
- The estimated effect is not statistically significant, thus there is no evidence that the shall carry law has any effect on crime rates.