

# Homework #5

A. Shawn Bandy

March 14th, 2013

## 1 Lab Problems

L1 STATA log:

```

-----
      name: <unnamed>
      log:  /Users/shawn/src/econ485/lab5/mlb1.log
log type: text
opened on: 14 Mar 2013, 11:08:38

. use "mlb1.dta";

. /*a. Run a regression where the dependent variable is salary and the explanatory v
> ariables are teamsal
> pcinc yrsallst years hits runsyr. In other words, the total team salary, the avera
> ge income of the city
> where the team is located, the number of years on the All-Star team, the number of
> year the player has
> been in the League, the number of all-time hits (over all years), and runs per yea
> r.*/
>
> regress salary teamsal pcinc yrsallst years hits runsyr;

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	353
Model	3.8936e+14	6	6.4894e+13	F( 6, 346) =	72.94
Residual	3.0782e+14	346	8.8966e+11	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	6.9718e+14	352	1.9806e+12	R-squared =	0.5585
				Adj R-squared =	0.5508
				Root MSE =	9.4e+05

```

-----
      salary |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
      teamsal |   .0143053   .006004     2.38   0.018   .0024964   .0261142
        pcinc |  -3.081507   17.9635    -0.17   0.864  -38.41291   32.24989
     yrsallst |  196930.8   40981.67     4.81   0.000   116326.2  277535.3
         years |   53884.84  33490.08     1.61   0.109  -11984.91  119754.6

```

hits		-365.6974	335.6952	-1.09	0.277	-1025.957	294.5627
runsyrr		32917.18	3553.05	9.26	0.000	25928.88	39905.47
_cons		-609625.3	374222.5	-1.63	0.104	-1345662	126411.9

```

. /*b. Look at the simple correlation between the variables in your model, using cor
> relate.*/
>
> correlate salary teamsal pcinc yrsallst years hits runsyr;
(obs=353)

```

		salary	teamsal	pcinc	yrsallst	years	hits	runsyrr
salary		1.0000						
teamsal		0.2247	1.0000					
pcinc		0.0874	0.1891	1.0000				
yrsallst		0.5856	0.1082	0.0877	1.0000			
years		0.4782	0.1774	0.0843	0.5751	1.0000		
hits		0.6271	0.1721	0.1044	0.7678	0.8824	1.0000	
runsyrr		0.7033	0.1887	0.0979	0.5677	0.5018	0.7328	1.0000

```

. /*c. Test for multicollinearity by using the vif command.*/
>
> vif;

```

Variable		VIF	1/VIF
hits		14.76	0.067746
years		6.68	0.149676
runsyrr		2.84	0.351592
yrsallst		2.84	0.352695
teamsal		1.09	0.921569
pcinc		1.04	0.958082
Mean VIF		4.88	

```

. /*d. Look at your regression results, the test for multicollinearity, and the test
> for correlation.
> Is there a problem with multicollinearity in the model? Look at the variables in
> the model. If you believe
> there is a problem with multicollinearity, explain why you might have that proble
> m.
>
> INTERPRETATION
>
> */
>
>

```

```

>
> /*e. Now, use the regression command to estimate a linear regression model where t
> he dependent variable is salary
> and the explanatory variables are teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase
> scndbase shrtstop thrdbase
> outfield. In this new model, the explanatory variables are team salary, per capit
> a income of the city where
> the team is located, percentage of years as an All-Star, career slugging average,
> career fielding percentage,
> and dummy variables for the various positions on the team, with catcher excluded.
> */
>
> regress salary teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop t
> hrdbase
> outfield;

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	353
Model	3.3921e+14	10	3.3921e+13	F( 10, 342) =	32.41
Residual	3.5797e+14	342	1.0467e+12	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.4865
				Adj R-squared =	0.4715
Total	6.9718e+14	352	1.9806e+12	Root MSE =	1.0e+06

salary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
teamsal	.0247805	.0064344	3.85	0.000	.0121244 .0374365
pcinc	.2530229	19.56027	0.01	0.990	-38.22055 38.7266
allstar	47920.33	3013.114	15.90	0.000	41993.77 53846.9
slugavg	2060.333	2853.358	0.72	0.471	-3552.007 7672.673
fldperc	5877.833	3111.61	1.89	0.060	-242.4695 11998.13
frstbase	320346.8	210323.1	1.52	0.129	-93342.88 734036.5
scndbase	134556.9	224728.1	0.60	0.550	-307466.3 576580.1
shrtstop	87293.44	213623.5	0.41	0.683	-332887.8 507474.7
thrdbase	382886.7	244737.8	1.56	0.119	-98494.21 864267.6
outfield	485142.8	170914.1	2.84	0.005	148967.7 821317.9
_cons	-5977180	3125933	-1.91	0.057	-1.21e+07 171294.5

```

. /*f. Test for multicollinearity again for the model in part e.*/
>
> vif;

```

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
outfield	2.33	0.428590
shrtstop	1.84	0.543536
thrdbase	1.76	0.568754
frstbase	1.66	0.602641

scndbase		1.60	0.625738
fldperc		1.27	0.788590
teamsal		1.06	0.944026
slugavg		1.06	0.945291
allstar		1.05	0.948811
pcinc		1.05	0.950678
-----			
Mean VIF		1.47	

```
. corr salary teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop thrdb
> ase outfield;
(obs=353)
```

		salary	teamsal	pcinc	allstar	slugavg	fldperc	frstbase
-----								
salary		1.0000						
teamsal		0.2247	1.0000					
pcinc		0.0874	0.1891	1.0000				
allstar		0.6638	0.1186	0.0993	1.0000			
slugavg		0.1436	0.0890	-0.0151	0.1504	1.0000		
fldperc		0.0714	-0.0414	-0.0183	0.0112	-0.0311	1.0000	
frstbase		0.0656	0.0499	0.0678	0.0469	0.0768	0.2177	1.0000
scndbase		-0.0088	0.0099	0.0005	0.0408	0.0924	-0.0084	-0.1308
shrtstop		-0.0790	0.0061	0.0262	-0.0056	-0.0997	-0.1863	-0.1535
thrdbase		0.0086	0.0117	-0.0252	0.0178	0.0029	-0.3144	-0.1248
outfield		0.1091	-0.0492	-0.0401	0.0092	0.0115	0.0126	-0.3026
-----								
		scndbase	shrtstop	thrdbase	outfield			
-----								
scndbase		1.0000						
shrtstop		-0.1374	1.0000					
thrdbase		-0.1117	-0.1311	1.0000				
outfield		-0.2709	-0.3178	-0.2585	1.0000			

```
. /*g. Is multicollinearity a problem for the model in part e. Why do you think this
> result is different from before?
>
> INTERPRETATION
>
> */
>
> /*h. Now, predict the residuals for each observation in the model from part e.*/
>
> predict res, r;

. /*i. Create a new variable resid_2 using the generate command.*/
>
```

```
> gen res2 = res^2;

. /*j. Regress resid_2 on the explanatory variables (not salary) from part f.*/
>
> regress res2 teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop thrdbase
> ase outfield;
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	353
Model	8.0464e+25	10	8.0464e+24	F( 10, 342) =	3.31
Residual	8.3174e+26	342	2.4320e+24	Prob > F =	0.0004
				R-squared =	0.0882
				Adj R-squared =	0.0615
Total	9.1221e+26	352	2.5915e+24	Root MSE =	1.6e+12

res2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
teamsal	24251.53	9808.036	2.47	0.014	4959.863 43543.2
pcinc	-5131792	2.98e+07	-0.17	0.863	-6.38e+07 5.35e+07
allstar	1.42e+10	4.59e+09	3.10	0.002	5.18e+09 2.33e+10
slugavg	6.91e+09	4.35e+09	1.59	0.113	-1.65e+09 1.55e+10
fldperc	5.68e+09	4.74e+09	1.20	0.232	-3.65e+09 1.50e+10
frstbase	3.29e+11	3.21e+11	1.03	0.306	-3.02e+11 9.59e+11
scndbase	-1.27e+09	3.43e+11	-0.00	0.997	-6.75e+11 6.73e+11
shrtstop	8.28e+10	3.26e+11	0.25	0.799	-5.58e+11 7.23e+11
thrdbase	3.41e+11	3.73e+11	0.91	0.362	-3.93e+11 1.07e+12
outfield	5.57e+11	2.61e+11	2.14	0.033	4.47e+10 1.07e+12
_cons	-5.89e+12	4.76e+12	-1.24	0.217	-1.53e+13 3.48e+12

```
. /*k. Run the regression from part e again.*/
>
> regress salary teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop thrdbase
> rdbase
> outfield;
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	353
Model	3.3921e+14	10	3.3921e+13	F( 10, 342) =	32.41
Residual	3.5797e+14	342	1.0467e+12	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.4865
				Adj R-squared =	0.4715
Total	6.9718e+14	352	1.9806e+12	Root MSE =	1.0e+06

salary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
teamsal	.0247805	.0064344	3.85	0.000	.0121244 .0374365
pcinc	.2530229	19.56027	0.01	0.990	-38.22055 38.7266
allstar	47920.33	3013.114	15.90	0.000	41993.77 53846.9

slugavg	2060.333	2853.358	0.72	0.471	-3552.007	7672.673
fldperc	5877.833	3111.61	1.89	0.060	-242.4695	11998.13
frstbase	320346.8	210323.1	1.52	0.129	-93342.88	734036.5
scndbase	134556.9	224728.1	0.60	0.550	-307466.3	576580.1
shrtstop	87293.44	213623.5	0.41	0.683	-332887.8	507474.7
thrdbase	382886.7	244737.8	1.56	0.119	-98494.21	864267.6
outfield	485142.8	170914.1	2.84	0.005	148967.7	821317.9
_cons	-5977180	3125933	-1.91	0.057	-1.21e+07	171294.5

```

. /*l. Use the standard STATA Breusch-Pagan test for heteroskedasticity (estat hett
> est).*/
>
> estat hettest;

```

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of salary

```

chi2(1)      =    28.48
Prob > chi2  =    0.0000

```

```

. /*m. Run the standard STATA Whites test for heteroskedasticity (imtest, white).*/
>
>
> imtest, white;

```

White's test for Ho: homoskedasticity

against Ha: unrestricted heteroskedasticity

```

chi2(50)     =    78.33
Prob > chi2  =    0.0064

```

Cameron & Trivedi's decomposition of IM-test

Source	chi2	df	p
Heteroskedasticity	78.33	50	0.0064
Skewness	-328.67	10	1.0000
Kurtosis	.	1	.
Total	.	61	.

```

. /*n. For now, assume there is a problem with heteroskedasticity in the model from
> part e,
> estimate the model again with robust standard errors.*/
>

```

```
> regress salary teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop th
> rdbase
> outfield, r;
```

Linear regression

Number of obs = 353  
 F( 10, 342) = 28.36  
 Prob > F = 0.0000  
 R-squared = 0.4865  
 Root MSE = 1.0e+06

salary	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
teamsal	.0247805	.0062627	3.96	0.000	.0124623	.0370987
pcinc	.2530229	18.49531	0.01	0.989	-36.12585	36.6319
allstar	47920.33	3449.219	13.89	0.000	41135.98	54704.69
slugavg	2060.333	3705.825	0.56	0.579	-5228.745	9349.411
fldperc	5877.833	2054.141	2.86	0.004	1837.491	9918.174
frstbase	320346.8	205440.1	1.56	0.120	-83738.5	724432.1
scndbase	134556.9	189707.4	0.71	0.479	-238583.3	507697.2
shrtstop	87293.44	176727.7	0.49	0.622	-260316.6	434903.5
thrdbase	382886.7	220391.2	1.74	0.083	-50606.24	816379.6
outfield	485142.8	156000.3	3.11	0.002	178301.9	791983.7
_cons	-5977180	2107467	-2.84	0.005	-1.01e+07	-1831951

```
. /*o. Pick a factor that you believe is missing from the regression equation in par
> t e.
> Add that variable to the regression equation for salary using STATA. Test for mult
> icollinearity
> and heteroskedasticity (using the standard STATA Breusch-Pagan test) in your model
> . Rerun your model
> to account for heteroskedasticity, if appropriate.*/
>
> regress salary teamsal pcinc allstar slugavg fldperc frstbase scndbase shrtstop th
> rdbase outfield hrns;
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 353		
Model	3.7811e+14	11	3.4373e+13	F( 11, 341) = 36.74		
Residual	3.1908e+14	341	9.3571e+11	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Total	6.9718e+14	352	1.9806e+12	R-squared = 0.5423		
				Adj R-squared = 0.5276		
				Root MSE = 9.7e+05		

  

salary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
teamsal	.0212326	.0061086	3.48	0.001	.0092173	.0332478

```

      pcinc |   .1465059   18.49417    0.01   0.994   -36.23052   36.52353
    allstar |  34989.41   3484.092   10.04   0.000    28136.4   41842.43
    slugavg |   735.0951   2705.659    0.27   0.786   -4586.788   6056.978
    fldperc |  5203.643   2943.874    1.77   0.078   -586.7948   10994.08
    frstbase |  76981.29   202410.7    0.38   0.704   -321149.4    475112
    scndbase |  184091.7   212618.5    0.87   0.387   -234117.2   602300.5
    shrtstop |  125129.3   202065.4    0.62   0.536   -272322.3   522580.9
    thrdbase |  235571.4   232524.2    1.01   0.312   -221790.9   692933.6
    outfield |  281214.6   164665.2    1.71   0.089   -42672.72   605101.9
      hruns |   5902.807   915.5657    6.45   0.000    4101.939   7703.674
     _cons |  -5247160   2957727   -1.77   0.077   -1.11e+07   570525.9
-----

```

```
. vif;
```

```

      Variable |      VIF      1/VIF
-----+-----
    outfield |      2.42    0.412775
    shrtstop |      1.84    0.543078
    thrdbase |      1.78    0.563262
      hruns |      1.72    0.581221
    frstbase |      1.72    0.581682
    scndbase |      1.60    0.624921
    allstar |      1.58    0.634383
    fldperc |      1.27    0.787595
    teamsal |      1.07    0.936364
    slugavg |      1.06    0.939835
      pcinc |      1.05    0.950677
-----+-----
    Mean VIF |      1.56

```

```
. estat hettest;
```

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity

Ho: Constant variance

Variables: fitted values of salary

chi2(1) = 83.88

Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

```

. /*p. Why did you decide to include the variable you chose for your model in part o
> ?
>
> INTERPRETATION
>
> */
>
> /*q. Did your estimate and statistical significance for allstar (percent of years
> as an All-Star) change from

```



```

> the model in part e to the final estimation model in part o (controlling for heter
> oskedasticity, if appropriate)?
> Explain why you might have a difference.*/
>
>
> log close;
    name: <unnamed>
    log: /Users/shawn/src/econ485/lab5/mlb1.log
    log type: text
    closed on: 14 Mar 2013, 11:08:38
-----

```

Answers:

- d. Look at your regression results, the test for multicollinearity, and the test for correlation. Is there a problem with multicollinearity in the model? Look at the variables in the model. If you believe there is a problem with multicollinearity, explain why you might have that problem.
- g. Is multicollinearity a problem for the model in part e. Why do you think this result is different from before?
- p. Why did you decide to include the variable you chose for your model in part o?

## 2 Questions

Q1 Which of the following factors can cause OLS estimators to be biased? Explain.

- a. Heteroskedasticity.
- b. Omitting an important variable.
- c. A sample correlation coefficient of 0.95 between two independent variables both included in the model.

Q2 Which of the following factors will lower the variance of an OLS estimator. Explain.

- a. Increasing the number of observations.
- b. Increasing the number of explanatory variables that reduce the error variance in the model.
- c. Minimizing the multicollinearity in the model.

Q3 Use your results from L1 for this problem.

- a. Use your results from part j of L1. Calculate the Chi-square statistic for the Breusch-Pagan test. Since this model has 10 explanatory variables, this statistic has 10 degrees of freedom and the critical Chi-Square value is 18.31. Write down the null and alternative hypothesis for the Breusch-Pagan test and whether or not you reject the null (or fail to reject the null) based on your results.
- b. Is your conclusion about heteroscedasticity in part a of this problem the same as what you found using the standard STATA Breusch-Pagan test (L1, part l)? I know the values will be different, but did you come to the same conclusion regarding the errors?

- c. Based on your answer to part a of this problem and the results of the STATA Breusch- Pagan and Whites test in L1 (parts l and m), which model (L1 part e or L1 part n) is consistent with your results?
- d. Using the best model (you identified in part c) interpret the coefficient on team salary (teamsal).
- e. Are there any variables missing from this model that might be biasing the results? Which ones? Explain.