

PUAD 7972: Homework 2

The Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) is an annual survey that samples over 50,000 Americans. You can access the 2018 iteration of the CCES [here](#). You can find the codebook for this survey [here](#). Using these files, please complete the following prompts using a decision rule of $\alpha = 0.01$ (one-tailed). Don't forget to attach the commands you used to the end of your assignment. Homeworks are due by February 28, 2020 (no later than 11:59:59 pm).

1. Create a dichotomous dependent variable that takes a value of “1” if a respondent supports “Medicare for All”, and “0” if they oppose it. Now choose five covariates that you think are reasonably related to an individual's preference. Provide hypotheses for each variable, and estimate a logit/probit that examines the likelihood a respondent supports Medicare for All. Present these results in a table called Table 1. In it, provide coefficients, standard errors, and changes in predicted probability for statistically significant results. Also include measures of model fit, N , and any other needed information. Interpret statistically significant results both textually and graphically. Assess goodness of fit appropriately. Now choose one or more variables to omit, and conduct a likelihood ratio test to determine whether the constrained or unconstrained model fit the data better. Finally, should we be concerned about model specification, heteroscedasticity, or autocorrelation? If so, address whatever issues emerge.
2. Using the variable, “CC18_422f,” estimate an ordered logit/probit that includes whichever five covariates you think are appropriate to explain individual attitudes. Include hypotheses for each variable. Present these results in a table called Table 2. In it, provide coefficients, standard errors, and changes in predicted probability for statistically significant results (don't forget your intercept cut-points). Also include measures of model fit, N , and any other needed information. Interpret statistically significant results both textually and graphically. Assess goodness of fit appropriately. Should we be concerned about model specification, heteroscedasticity, or autocorrelation? If so, address whatever issues emerge.