PUBLIC POLICY 639: QUIZ 2 SOLUTIONS Winter 2011

Bivariate Regression

On page 3 you will see variable definitions, summary statistics, and regression output from a regression of annual earnings on months spent in job training. The data is from a sample of participants in a federal job training program run in the late 1970s.

1. (1 point) Write the formula for the sample regression that we have run.

$$earnings_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_i Months Training_i + \hat{u}_i$$
 OR $earnings_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_i Months Training_i$

2. (1 point) What is the value of $\hat{\beta}_1$ in the regression we have run? Interpret $\hat{\beta}_1$ in words. [Note that earnings are in \$1,000]

One month in training is associated with a \$243 increase in earnings.

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = 0.24$$

3. (1 point) What is the value of $\hat{\beta}_0$ in the regression we have run? Interpret $\hat{\beta}_0$ in words. [Note that earnings are in \$1000]

Based on our estimates, individuals with zero training are predicted to have earnings of \$1,863.

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = 1.86$$

4. (1 point) What is the predicted annual earnings for someone who participates in a ten-month job training program?

$$\widehat{earnings}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 Months Training_i$$

$$\widehat{earnings}_i = 1.86 + (.24) \times (10) = 1.86 + 2.43 = \$4,289 \text{ or } \$4,290 \text{ depending on how your rounded}$$

5. (3 points) Test the hypothesis that there is a population relationship between months spent in training and annual earnings. Clearly state your null and alternative hypotheses, test statistic, and conclusion (in words).

$$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$$
 $H_a: \beta_1 \neq 0$ (1 point) $t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1}{SE(\hat{\beta}_1)} = \frac{0.24}{0.11} = 2.16$ (1 point)

Since t = 2.16 with a p-value = .032, we reject the null hypothesis at an alpha level of .05. (1 point)

Conceptual

6. (1 point) What does the OLS estimator minimize?

These are all correct:

The sum of squared residuals (this is the most common usage)

The sum of squared mistakes (found in book, shouldn't use this term as no one uses it)

The sum of the squared errors

$$\sum \hat{\mu}_i^2 OR \sum (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$$

7. (1 point) Why would a researcher consider using the "robust" regression option in Stata?

The robust regression option in Stata is used if the variance of μ is dependent on a given level of X. If there is evidence of heteroskedasticity, then the robust option provides the heteroskedasticity-robust standard error of $\hat{\beta}_1$. By not using the robust option, the estimated standard errors (using the homoskedasticity-only formula) are most likely wrong due to the violation of the OLS assumption.

8. (1 point) You see we used the "robust" option in our regression. If we had forgotten to do so, what might we get wrong? Circle all that apply.

a.
$$\hat{\beta}_1$$
 - No

b.
$$SE(\hat{\beta}_l)$$
 - Yes, might get this wrong

- c. Confidence interval for $\hat{\beta}_l$ Yes, might get this wrong
- d. Predicted test score for each of the data points No
- e. t-test for the null hypotheses that $\hat{\beta}_1 = 0$ Yes, might get this wrong

Failing to use the robust option will only affect things related to the standard errors (e.g. confidence intervals, test statistics). The coefficient estimates (or predicted values) will not be affected.

STATA OUTPUT

Variable Description

. desc re78 mostrn

variable name		display format	value label	variable label
re78 mostrn	float byte			real earns., 1978, \$1000s months in training

Summary Statistics

. sum re78 mostrn

Variable	obs	Mean	std. Dev.	Min	Max
re78	185	6.349145	7.867405	0	60.3079
mostrn	185	18.49189	4.911299		24

Regression output

. reg re78 mostrn, robust

Linear regression

Number of obs = 185 F(1, 183) = 4.66 Prob > F = 0.0322 R-squared = 0.0229 Root MSE = 7.7979

re78	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
mostrn	2426028	.1123987	2.16	0.032	.0208388	4643668
_cons	1.86296	1.907693	0.98	0.330	-1.90094	5 62686