

Tutorial, Part 5

Example 1

a) $H_0: \beta_3 = 0$

$H_1: \beta_3 \neq 0$

$$t_{\beta_3} = \frac{b_3 - \beta_{3,0}}{\text{se}(b_3)} = \frac{-0.25036 - 0}{\sqrt{0.007921}} = -2.81$$

$$t_c (m=m-k=32-3=29, \alpha/2=0.025) = \pm 2.045$$

$|t_{\beta_3}| > t_c \Rightarrow$ We reject H_0 at $\alpha=0.05$ and conclude from H_1 , that the percentage of smokers (p-value = 0.009) affects the life expectancy at birth. $< \alpha=0.05$

b) $H_0: 100\beta_2 \leq 0.167$

$H_1: 100\beta_2 > 0.167$

LIFE (in years) \rightarrow

$$2 \text{ months} = \frac{2}{12} \text{ year} = 0.167 \text{ year}$$

$$t = \frac{100b_2 - (100\beta_2)_0}{\sqrt{\text{var}(100b_2)}} = \frac{100b_2 - 0.167}{\sqrt{100^2 \text{var}(b_2)}} = \frac{100 \cdot 0.00233 - 0.167}{\sqrt{100^2 \cdot 0.0000001376}} = 1.78$$

$$t_c (m=29, \alpha=0.05) = 1.699 \quad (\text{upper tail})$$

$t > t_c \Rightarrow$ reject H_0 at $\alpha=0.05$ and conclude from H_1 ($p=0.0428 < \alpha=0.05$)

Matrix notation:

$$H_0: c^T \beta \leq r$$

$$H_1: c^T \beta > r$$

$$c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 100 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} 79.624 \\ 0.00233 \\ -0.25036 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{var-cov}(b) = \begin{bmatrix} 7.82115 & -0.000487 & -0.24151 \\ -0.000487 & 1.376 \cdot 10^{-7} & 9.960 \cdot 10^{-6} \\ -0.24151 & 9.960 \cdot 10^{-6} & 0.007921 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$r = [0.167]$$

$$t = \frac{c^T b - r}{\sqrt{\text{var}(c^T b)}} = \frac{c^T b - r}{\sqrt{c^T \text{var-cov}(b) \cdot c}} = \dots = 1.78$$

C) $H_0: 100\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0$

$H_1: 100\beta_2 + \beta_3 \neq 0$

Like the square
of a binomial
 $(a+b)^2$

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \frac{100b_2 + b_3 - (100\beta_2 + \beta_3)_0}{\sqrt{\text{var}(100b_2 + b_3)}} = \frac{100b_2 + b_3}{\sqrt{100^2 \text{var}(b_2) + 2 \cdot 100 \cdot \text{cov}(b_2, b_3) + \text{var}(b_3)}} \\ &= \frac{100 \cdot 0.00233 - 0.25036}{\sqrt{0.011289}} = -0.16 \end{aligned}$$

$t_C (m=29, \alpha/2=0.025) = 2.045$

$|t| < t_C \Rightarrow$ We cannot reject H_0 (at $\alpha=0.05$).

Matrix notation:

$$H_0: c^T \beta = r$$

$$c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 100 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$H_1: c^T \beta \neq r$$

$$r = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

b and $\text{var-cov}(b)$
as in part b)

$$t = \frac{c^T b - r}{\sqrt{\text{var}(c^T b)}} = \dots = -0.16$$

OR:

$$H_0: 100\beta_2 + \beta_3 = 0 \Rightarrow \beta_3 = -100\beta_2$$

$$H_1: 100\beta_2 + \beta_3 \neq 0$$

$$\text{LIFE} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{EXP} + \beta_3 \text{TOBACCO} + u_i$$

BASE model

$$\text{LIFE} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{EXP} - 100\beta_2 \text{TOBACCO} + u_i$$

$$\text{LIFE} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 (\text{EXP} - 100 \text{TOBACCO}) + u_i$$

RESTRICTED model

T5 / 3

$$F = \frac{(RSS_E - RSS_B) / (k_B - k_E)}{RSS_B / (n - k_B)} = \frac{(175.13 - 174.97) / (3 - 2)}{174.97 / (32 - 3)} = \\ = 0.026$$

$$F_C (m_1 = k_B - k_E = 1, m_2 = n - k_B = 29, \underline{\alpha = 0.05}) = 4.18$$

$F < F_C \Rightarrow$ cannot reject H_0 (at $\alpha = 0.05$)

If $M_1 = 1 \Rightarrow F = t^2 = (-0.16)^2 = 0.026$

Tutorial, Part 6

Example 1

a) $\boxed{M_{AR}}$: $\hat{WAGE} = b_1 + b_2 SOB + b_3 ABR + b_4 SB$
 $\hookrightarrow R^2_{AR} = 0.95$

$$H_0: \beta_j = 0, \quad j = 2, 3, 4$$

$$H_1: \beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 3, 4$$

$$\boxed{F} = \frac{R^2_{AR(\text{range})} / (k-2)}{(1-R^2_{AR}) / (n-k+1)} = \frac{0.95 / (5-2)}{(1-0.95) / (15-5+1)} = 69.7$$

$$F_c (m_1=3, m_2=11, \alpha=0.05) = 3.59$$

$F > F_c \Rightarrow$ reject H_0 at $\alpha=0.05$ and conclude
from $H_1 \Rightarrow$ variable WAGE causes
multicollinearity problems

$$\boxed{VIF}_{WAGE} = \frac{1}{1-R^2_{WAGE}} = \frac{1}{1-0.95} = 20 > 10 \quad (\text{rule of thumb})$$

$$\boxed{Tol}_{WAGE} = \frac{1}{VIF_{WAGE}} = 0.05 < 0.1$$

Interpretation: Due to $F > F_c$, $VIF > 10$ and $Tol < 0.1$
we can conclude that the variable WAGE causes a
serious multicollinearity problem in the model.

b) Possible solutions:

- As WAGE is key determinant of consumption we cannot leave it out unless we replace it with a sensible alternative (e.g. total income).
- We can combine all other sources of income:
 $\text{OINC} = \text{SOB} + \text{ABR} + \text{SBI}$
 and estimate the model
 $\hat{PC} = b_1 + b_2 \text{WAGE} + b_3 \text{OINC}$.
- We can try to estimate the initial model without variable(s) SOB, ABR and/or SBI.

Example 2

Checking for possible multicollinearity problem caused by PRE.

$$\text{MAR: } \hat{\text{PRE}}_t = b_1 + b_2 \text{AGE}_t + b_3 \text{SD}_t + b_4 \text{T3}_t$$

$$\sum \hat{\text{PRE}}_t^2 = 528 ; \sum e_{\text{PRE}, t}^2 = 14.5 ; \overline{\text{PRE}} = 2$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: \beta_j &= 0 & ; & j = 2, 3, 4 \\ H_1: \beta_j &\neq 0 & ; & j = 2, 3, 4 \end{aligned}$$

$$R_{\text{PRE}}^2 = 1 - \frac{\text{RSS}_{\text{PRE}}}{\text{TSS}_{\text{PRE}}} = *$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TSS}_{\text{PRE}} &= \sum (\hat{\text{PRE}}_t - \overline{\text{PRE}})^2 = \sum (\hat{\text{PRE}}_t^2 - 2 \cdot \hat{\text{PRE}}_t \cdot \overline{\text{PRE}} + \overline{\text{PRE}}^2) = \\ &= \sum \hat{\text{PRE}}_t^2 - 2 \cdot T \cdot \overline{\text{PRE}} \cdot \overline{\text{PRE}} + T \cdot \overline{\text{PRE}}^2 = \\ &= \sum \hat{\text{PRE}}_t^2 - T \cdot \overline{\text{PRE}}^2 = 528 - 30 \cdot 2^2 = 408 \end{aligned}$$

$$* = 1 - \frac{14.5}{408} = 0.9645 = R_{\text{PRE}}^2$$

$$F = \frac{\frac{R_{\text{PRE}}^2 / (k-2)}{(1-R_{\text{PRE}}^2) / (m-k+1)}}{\frac{0.9645 / (5-2)}{(1-0.9645) / (30-5+1)}} = 235.2$$

$$F_C (m_1=3, m_2=26, \alpha=0.05) = 2.98$$

$F > F_C \Rightarrow \text{reject } H_0 \text{ at } \alpha=0.05$

$$VIF_{\text{PRE}} = \frac{1}{1-R_{\text{PRE}}^2} = \frac{1}{1-0.9645} = 28.14 > 10$$

they found out that there is a serious multicollinearity problem in the base model caused by variable PRE.

To overcome the problem there are several possible solutions:

- leave out the problematic variable (if not a key one)
- leave out any other (similar) explanatory variable (e.g. SD or T3)
- transform the model (e.g. take logs).

Example 3

$$M_B: \text{PRICE}_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{SIZE}_i + \beta_3 \text{AGE}_i + \beta_4 \text{ROOMS}_i + \beta_5 \text{BEDROOMS}_i + \mu_i$$

$$R^2 = 0.886 \text{ high}$$

(most) partial regr. coeft. not significant
wrong sign with bedrooms

possible multicollinearity problem

Correlations between explanatory variables

- $r_{SIZE, ROOMS} = 0.8457 \rightarrow r^2_{SIZE, ROOMS} = 0.7152$ high
($p = 0.0000$)
- $r_{SIZE, BEDROOMS} = 0.7934 \rightarrow r^2_{SIZE, BEDROOMS} = 0.6295$ high
($p = 0.0000$)
- $r_{ROOM, BEDROOMS} = 0.9244 \rightarrow r^2_{ROOM, BEDROOMS} = 0.8545$ serious
($p = 0.0000$) $\approx R^2$ problem

F-tests based on auxiliary regressions for problematic variables

e.g. for ROOMS

Model: $\hat{ROOMS} = b_0 + b_1 SIZE + b_2 AGE + b_3 BEDROOMS$
 $\hookrightarrow R^2_{ROOMS} = 0.8887$

$$F = \frac{R^2_{ROOMS} / (k-2)}{(1 - R^2_{ROOMS}) / (n-k+1)} = \frac{0.8887 / (5-2)}{(1 - 0.8887) / (27-5+1)} = 62.216$$

$$F_C (m_1 = 3, m_2 = 23, \alpha = 0.05) = 3.028$$

$F > F_C \Rightarrow$ reject $H_0: \beta_j = 0 ; j = 2, 3, 4$
at $\alpha = 0.05 \Rightarrow$ ROOMS cause

serious multicollinearity

$$VIF_{ROOMS} = \frac{1}{1 - 0.8887} = 8.98 \approx 10$$

$$Tol_{ROOMS} = \frac{1}{VIF_{ROOMS}} = \frac{1}{8.98} = 0.113 \approx 0.1$$

- - - 11 - - -

Possible solutions:

- ROOMS and BEDROOMS are related as bedrooms also count as rooms \rightarrow no need for BEDROOMS

- ROOMS and SIZE are related as rooms count up for size \rightarrow no need for ROOMS

\hookrightarrow exclude variables ROOMS and BEDROOMS from the model

Testing for normal distribution of disturbances

$$\text{PRICE}_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{SIZE}_i + \beta_3 \text{AGE}_i + u_i$$

Jarque-Bera test

H_0 : Residuals (variable u) are normally distributed.

H_1 : Residuals (variable u) are not normally distributed.

$$\begin{aligned} JB &= n \cdot \left(\frac{s^2}{6} + \frac{(k-3)^2}{24} \right) = 27 \left(\frac{(1-0.3192)^2}{6} + \frac{(2.3499-3)^2}{24} \right) = \\ &= 0.934 \sim \chi^2_{(2)} \end{aligned}$$

s - coeff. of skewness

k - coeff. of kurtosis

$$\chi^2_C(m=2, \alpha=0.05) = 5.997$$

$JB < \chi^2_C \Rightarrow$ cannot reject H_0 (at $\alpha=0.05$)

(Stata: `jb 6` $\rightarrow p = 0.6269 > \alpha = 0.05$)