The Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Estimators

$$b_2 = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x}) (y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$
 (2.7)

$$b_1 = \overline{y} - b_2 \overline{x} \tag{2.8}$$

where  $\bar{y} = \sum y_i/N$  and  $\bar{x} = \sum x_i/N$  are the sample means of the observations on y and x.

## 1.Let K=2, show that (b1,b2) in p.29 of slides in Ch5 reduces to the formula of (b1,b2) in (2.7)-(2.8)

$$\left(\chi^{-1}\chi\right)^{-1} = \frac{\mu \Sigma \chi_{1,5} - (\Sigma \chi_{1})_{5}}{\mu \Sigma \chi_{1,5} - (\Sigma \chi_{1})_{5}}, \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma \chi_{1,5} - \Sigma \chi_{1} \\ \Sigma \chi_{2,5} - \Sigma \chi_{1,5} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$X^{-1}Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ X_1 & X_2 & \cdots & X_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 \\ \vdots \\ Y_N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma Y_T \\ \Sigma X_T Y_T \end{bmatrix}$$

$$=\frac{1}{h \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} - (\sum_{i} \chi_{i})^{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} - \sum_{i} \chi_{i} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} \\ - \sum_{i} \chi_{i} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$=\frac{1}{h \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} - (\sum_{i} \chi_{i})^{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} - \sum_{i} \chi_{i} - \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} \sum_{i} \chi_{i} - \sum_{i} \chi_{i}^{2} \sum_{i} \chi_{i} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$b_1 = \frac{\Gamma \chi_1^2 \Gamma \uparrow_1 - \Gamma \chi_1^2 \Gamma \chi_1^2 \gamma_1^2}{h \Gamma \chi_1^2 - \Gamma \chi_1^2 \Gamma^2} = \frac{h \Gamma \chi_1^2 \overline{\gamma} - h \overline{\chi} \Gamma \chi_1^2 \overline{\gamma}}{h \Gamma \chi_1^2 - (h \overline{\chi})^2} = \frac{\overline{\gamma} \left[ \Gamma \chi_1^2 - h \overline{\chi}^2 \right] - \overline{\chi} \left[ \Gamma \chi_1^2 + h \overline{\chi} \overline{\gamma} \right]}{\Gamma (\chi_1^2 - \overline{\chi})^2} = \overline{\gamma} - b z \overline{\chi}$$

$$\operatorname{var}(b_1|\mathbf{x}) = \sigma^2 \left[ \frac{\sum x_i^2}{N\sum (x_i - \overline{x})^2} \right]$$
 (2.14)

$$\operatorname{var}(b_2|\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum (x_i - \overline{x})^2}$$
 (2.15)

$$cov(b_1, b_2 | \mathbf{x}) = \sigma^2 \left[ \frac{-\overline{x}}{\sum (x_i - \overline{x})^2} \right]$$
 (2.16)

## 2. Let K=2, show that cov(b1,b2) in p.30 of slides in Ch5 reduces to the formula of (b1,b2) in (2.14)-(2.16)

$$\sqrt{M(p)} = C_{2}(X_{1}X)^{-1} = \frac{C_{2}}{h \sum_{x} \sum_{x} (\sum_{x} \sum_{y} \sum_{x} \sum_$$

5.3 Consider the following model that relates the percentage of a household's budget spent on alcohol WALC to total expenditure TOTEXP, age of the household head AGE, and the number of children in

$$WALC = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \ln(TOTEXP) + \beta_3 NK + \beta_4 AGE + e$$

This model was estimated using 1200 observations from London. An incomplete version of this output is provided in Table 5.6.

## TABLE 5.6 Output for Exercise 5.3

Dependent Variable: WALC Included observations: 1200				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
С	1.4515	2.2019		0.5099
ln(TOTEXP)	2.7648		5.7103	0.0000
NK		0.3695	-3.9376	0.0001
AGE	-0.1503	0.0235	-6.4019	0.0000
R-squared	Mean dependent var			6.19434
S.E. of regression		S.D. dependent var		
Sum squared resid	46221.62			

- a. Fill in the following blank spaces that appear in this table.
  - i. The *t*-statistic for *b*.
  - ii. The standard error for  $b_2$ .
  - iii. The estimate  $b_3$ .
  - **iv.**  $R^2$ .
- **b.** Interpret each of the estimates  $b_2$ ,  $b_3$ , and  $b_4$ .
- c. Compute a 95% interval estimate for  $\beta_4$ . What does this interval tell you?
- d. Are each of the coefficient estimates significant at a 5% level? Why?
- e. Test the hypothesis that the addition of an extra child decreases the mean budget share of alcohol by 2 percentage points against the alternative that the decrease is not equal to 2 percentage points. Use a 5% significance level.

at. 
$$b_1 = \frac{\hat{b}_1}{1} + 1 = \frac{\hat{b}_2}{1} = \frac{1.4575}{2.2019} = 0.6594$$

$$G_{11} SE(b_2): \frac{\hat{b}_2}{t} = \frac{27648}{5.7198} = 0.4841$$

$$Q_{1V} R^{2} = 1 - \frac{55E}{55R} \stackrel{?}{=} 1 - (\frac{4.6221.62}{(1200-1) \times (6.87549)^{2}}) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.0575$$

$$Q_{V} \hat{G} \stackrel{?}{=} \sqrt{\frac{55E}{N-k-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{4.6221.62}{1200-4}} \stackrel{?}{=} 0.6272$$

$$0 \checkmark \hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{55E}{N-k-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{4.6221.62}{1200-4}} = 70.62$$

C. CI 95% = 
$$\hat{b}_4 \pm t$$
 and  $\hat{b}_4 + t$  and  $\hat{b}_4 +$ 

$$t = \frac{\hat{b}_3 \cdot (-2)}{{}^5E(\hat{b}_3)} = \frac{-1.4549 + 2}{0.3695} \approx 1.4752$$

5.23 The file cocaine contains 56 observations on variables related to sales of cocaine powder in northeast-ern California over the period 1984–1991. The data are a subset of those used in the study Caulkins, J. P. and R. Padman (1993), "Quantity Discounts and Quality Premia for Illicit Drugs," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 88, 748–757. The variables are

 $PRICE = \text{price per gram in dollars for a cocaine sale} \\ QUANT = \text{number of grams of cocaine in a given sale} \\ QUAL = \text{quality of the cocaine expressed as percentage purity} \\ TREND = \text{a time variable with } 1984 = 1 \text{ up to } 1991 = 8 \\ \text{Consider the regression model} \\$ 

 $PRICE = \beta_1 + \beta_2 QUANT + \beta_3 QUAL + \beta_4 TREND + e$ 

a. What signs would you expect on the coefficients  $\beta_2,\,\beta_3,$  and  $\beta_4?$ 

b. Use your computer software to estimate the equation. Report the results and interpret the coefficient

d. It is claimed that the greater the number of sales, the higher the risk of getting caught. Thus, sellers are willing to accept a lower price if they can make sales in larger quantities. Set up  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  that

e. Test the hypothesis that the quality of cocaine has no influence on expected price against the alter-

f. What is the average annual change in the cocaine price? Can you suggest why price might be

would be appropriate to test this hypothesis. Carry out the hypothesis test.

What proportion of variation in cocaine price is explained jointly by variation in quantity, quality,

lm(formula = price ~ quant + qual + trend, data = cocaine)

Residuals:

Min 1Q Median 3Q Max -43.479 -12.014 -3.743 13.969 43.753

5.8 Exercises Coefficients:

(Intercept) 90.84669 -0.05997 0.01018 -5.892 2.85e-07 \*\*\* quant 0.11621 0.20326 0.572 0.5700 qual trend -2.35458 1.38612 -1.699 0.0954 . Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 20.06 on 52 degrees of freedom Multiple R-squared: 0.5097, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4814 F-statistic: 18.02 on 3 and 52 DF, p-value: 3.806e-08

b. Bz = -0,05997 符音 夏期 B3 = 0,1162) 符音 夏期 Bu = -2,35438 不符音 夏期

c. Multiple R=0,5097

表紙 51%可被解釋

"t-value for H0: beta2 = 0 is -5.892"

"Critical t-value at 5% significance level: -1.675"

d Ho: \( \beta\_2 \geq 0 \) / Hi: \( \beta\_2 \geq 0 \)

t = - 5.872 < tals,52:-1.675
Reject Ho

estimates. Have the signs turned out as you expected?

native that a premium is paid for better-quality cocaine.

and time?

changing in this direction?

4. 平均年賽化: 64=-2,354代 表示平均價格每年下降約275美元/每2 可能每回生產技術介, S过多P下降 2. t-value for testing beta3 > 0: 0.5717

| Critical t-value (5% level): 1.6462

| Ho: | B = 0. H = | B > 0

t=05717 < tags, s2 = 1.675, not reject H.