

$$1. \text{ Since } k=2 \Rightarrow X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x_1 \\ 1 & \vdots \\ 1 & x_n \end{bmatrix}, Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow X' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ x_1 & \dots & x_n \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } X'X = \begin{bmatrix} n & n\bar{x} \\ n\bar{x} & \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow (X'X)^{-1} = \frac{1}{n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n^2 \bar{x}^2} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 & -n\bar{x} \\ -n\bar{x} & n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\Rightarrow (X'X)^{-1}X' = C \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n\bar{x}x_1 & \dots & \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n\bar{x}x_n \\ -n(\bar{x}-x_1) & \dots & -n(\bar{x}-x_n) \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } C = \frac{1}{n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n^2 \bar{x}^2}$$

$$\Rightarrow (X'X)^{-1}X'Y = C \begin{bmatrix} (y_1 + \dots + y_n) \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n\bar{x} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \right) \\ -(y_1 + \dots + y_n)n\bar{x} + n \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \begin{bmatrix} n \cdot \bar{y} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n\bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i \\ -\bar{y} n^2 \bar{x} + n \sum x_i y_i \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{n(\bar{y} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - \bar{x} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i)}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \\ \frac{-n \bar{y} \bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{n\bar{y} \sum x_i^2 - \bar{y} n^2 \bar{x}^2 + \bar{y} n^2 \bar{x}^2 - n\bar{x} \sum x_i y_i}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \\ \frac{\sum x_i y_i - n\bar{x} \bar{y} + n\bar{x} \bar{y} - n\bar{x} \bar{y}}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{y} (n \sum x_i^2 - n^2 \bar{x}^2) + n\bar{x} (\bar{y} n\bar{x} - \sum x_i y_i)}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} = \bar{y} - \frac{n\bar{y} \bar{x} + n \sum x_i y_i}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \bar{x} \\ \frac{\sum x_i y_i - \bar{y} \sum x_i + \bar{x} \bar{y} - \bar{x} \sum y_i}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ since } b_1 = \bar{y} - b_2 \bar{x} \\ b_2 = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

$$2. \text{ since } \text{var}(b) = \sigma^2 (X'X)^{-1}$$

$$= \sigma^2 C \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 & -n\bar{x} \\ -n\bar{x} & n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \sigma^2 \frac{1}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \begin{bmatrix} \sum x_i^2 & -n\bar{x} \\ -n\bar{x} & n \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \sigma^2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sum x_i^2}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} & \frac{-\bar{x}}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \\ \frac{-\bar{x}}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} & \frac{1}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \text{var}(b_1|x) & \text{cov}(b_1, b_2|x) \\ \text{cov}(b_1, b_2|x) & \text{var}(b_2|x) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Since } \text{var}(b_1|x) = \sigma^2 \left[\frac{\sum x_i^2}{n \sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \right]$$

$$\text{var}(b_2|x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

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

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 the household NK .

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

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.
C	1.4515	2.2019	0.6591907	0.5099
$\ln(TOTEXP)$	2.7648	0.4842	5.7103	0.0000
NK	-1.455	0.3695	-3.9376	0.0001
AGE	-0.1503	0.0235	-6.4019	0.0000
R-squared	0.0595	Mean dependent var		6.19434
S.E. of regression	6.22	S.D. dependent var		6.39547
Sum squared resid	46221.62			

a. Fill in the following blank spaces that appear in this table.

- The t -statistic for b_1 .
 - The standard error for b_2 .
 - The estimate b_3 .
 - R^2 .
 - $\hat{\sigma}$.
- b. Interpret each of the estimates b_2 , b_3 , and b_4 .
- c. Compute a 95% interval estimate for β_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.

$$\frac{\text{coeff}}{\text{se}} = t\text{-statistic}$$

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{SSE}{SST} = 1 - \frac{SSE}{1199577}$$

$$\hat{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{SSE}{1196}}$$

b.

$b_2 = 2.7648$, when $\ln(TOTEXP)$ increase 1 unit, the mean $WALC$ will increase 2.7648.

$b_3 = -1.455$, when NK increase (resp. decrease) 1 unit, the mean $WALC$ will decrease (resp. increase) 1.455.

$b_4 = -0.1503$, when AGE increase (resp. decrease) 1 unit, the mean $WALC$ will decrease (resp. increase) 0.1503.

c. $t_{(0.95, 1196)} = 1.962$

$$\Rightarrow \text{the interval is } [-0.1503 - 1.962 \times 0.0235, -0.1503 + 1.962 \times 0.0235] \\ = [-0.1964, -0.1042]$$

d. Since $t_{(0.95, 1196)} = 1.962$, all the absolute value of test-statistic are greater. Thus, They are significant at 5% level.

e. $H_0: \beta_3 = -2$

$$H_1: \beta_3 \neq -2$$

$$\text{the test-statistic} = \frac{-1.455 - (-2)}{0.3695} = 1.474$$

$$\text{Since } |1.474| < t_{(0.05, 1196)}$$

\Rightarrow We fail to reject H_0

picture for (b) - (c)

```

Coefficients:
(Intercept)      quant      qual      trend
    90.84669    -0.05997     0.11621    -2.35458

> summary_mod1 <- summary(mod1)
> #c
> summary_mod1$r.squared
[1] 0.50965

```

5.23 The file *cocaine* contains 56 observations on variables related to sales of cocaine powder in northeastern 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

$PRICE$ = price per gram in dollars for a cocaine sale
 $QUANT$ = number of grams of cocaine in a given sale
 $QUAL$ = quality of the cocaine expressed as percentage purity
 $TREND$ = a time variable with 1984 = 1 up to 1991 = 8
 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 β_2 , β_3 , and β_4 ?

- Use your computer software to estimate the equation. Report the results and interpret the coefficient estimates. Have the signs turned out as you expected?
- What proportion of variation in cocaine price is explained jointly by variation in quantity, quality, and time?
- 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 would be appropriate to test this hypothesis. Carry out the hypothesis test.
- Test the hypothesis that the quality of cocaine has no influence on expected price against the alternative that a premium is paid for better-quality cocaine.
- What is the average annual change in the cocaine price? Can you suggest why price might be changing in this direction?

a. I expect that $\beta_2 < 0$, $\beta_3 > 0$, $\beta_4 < 0$.

b. Since $\beta_2 = -0.06$, when $QUANT$ increase 1 unit, the price will

decrease 0.06.

Since $\beta_3 = 0.1162$, when $QUAL$ increase 1 unit, the price will

increase 0.1162.

Since $\beta_4 = -2.35$, when $TREND$ increase 1 unit, the price will

decrease 2.35.

All of the sign are same as my expectation.

c.

Approximately 50% variation in cocaine price is explain jointly.

d. $H_0: \beta_2 \geq 0$

$$H_1: \beta_2 < 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{test-statistic } t = \frac{-0.06}{\text{se}\beta_2} = \frac{-0.06}{0.01} = -6 < -t_{(0.95, 52)}$$

\Rightarrow We reject H_0 .

e. $H_0: \beta_3 \leq 0$

$$H_1: \beta_3 > 0 \Rightarrow \text{test-statistic } t = \frac{0.1162}{0.2032} = 0.5718 < t_{(0.95, 52)} \Rightarrow \text{fail to reject } H_0$$

f. β_4 . As the time past, if we produce more cocaine than before (higher technology or more people are willing to produce), then the supply exceed demand \Rightarrow price lower.