제 7 장 Weighted Least Squares

$$y_{i} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}x_{i1} + \cdots + \beta_{p}x_{ip} + \epsilon_{i}, \qquad \epsilon_{i} \sim \ iid$$

- ▷ Ch 7 and Ch 8 investigate non-iid case.
 - Ch 7 deals with the heteroscedasticity,
 - Ch 8 treats the autocorrelation problem.
- hirproopthigo Equal variance assumtion is relaxed : ϵ_i : independent with variance σ_i^2
 - Ch 6: transformation and OLS cf
 - Ch 7 Use wieghted least squares(WLS)

$$\text{Minimize} \ : \ \sum_i w_i (y_i - (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p x_{ip}))^2, \qquad w_i \varpropto \ \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$$

 w_i : weights inversely proportional to the variances of the errors

Any observation with a small weight will be

severely discounted by WLS

eg. If $w_i = 0$ the effect of WLS is to exclude the i -th observation.

Note: If the weights are unknown: two stage procedure

step 1 : Use OLS to estimate $\boldsymbol{w_i}$

step 2 : WLS with w_i

◆ Heteroscedastic models

There are three types:

type 1: we can expect the variance structure from information in the raw data.

type 2: observations are average of individual sampling units taken over well-defined groups(clusters)

type 3: structure of heteroscedasticity is determined empirically

 \triangleright Type I: We can expect the variance structure from information in the raw data.

© Example: Supervisor data (Industrial data)

data: Table 6.9 on p.176,

 \boldsymbol{X} : no. of supervised workers

Y: no. of supervisors

$$\label{eq:model} \bmod el \ : \ y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i, \qquad \ \sigma_i^2 = k^2 x_i^2, \qquad k > 0$$

$$\mbox{minimize} \; : \quad \sum w_i (y_i - (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i))^2, \qquad w_i = \frac{1}{x_i^2}$$

equivalently, use OLS with model:

$$\frac{y_i}{x_i} = \frac{\beta_0}{x_i} + \beta_1 + \frac{\epsilon_i}{x_i},$$

This approach may be considered in multiple regression.

eg
$$y_i=\beta_0+\beta_1x_{i1}+\cdots\beta_px_{ip}+\epsilon_i, \qquad \text{ If } \sigma_i^2=k^2x_{i2}^2$$

WLS: with
$$w_i = \frac{1}{x_{i2}^2}$$

or

OLS:
$$\frac{y_i}{x_{i2}} = \beta_0 \frac{1}{x_{i2}} + \beta_1 \frac{x_{i1}}{x_{i2}} + \beta_2 + \beta_3 \frac{x_{i3}}{x_{i2}} + \dots + \beta_p \frac{x_{ip}}{x_{i2}} + \frac{\epsilon_i}{x_{i2}}$$

- Type 2 : occurs in large scale surveys ; Observations are average of individual sampling units taken over well-defined groups(clusters)
- © **Example**: College expense data variable in Table 7.1 A set of schools are selected and interview a prescribed number of randomly selected students at each school.

$$\begin{aligned} Var(\overline{y_i}) &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n_i}, & n_i \ : \ \# \ \text{of obs at} \ i \ \text{-th institution} \\ \text{Minimize} & \sum n_i \! \left(y_i - \left(\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j x_{ij} \right) \right)^2 \\ &\Rightarrow & \text{WLS with} \ w_i = n_i \\ & \text{or} \\ & \text{OLS} & \sqrt{n_i} \, y_i = \beta_0 \sqrt{n_i} + \beta_1 x_{i1} \sqrt{n_i} + \cdots \, \beta_6 x_{i6} \sqrt{n_i} + \epsilon_{isqrt} n_i \\ & \text{:} \ 7 \ \text{predictors with no intercept} \end{aligned}$$

- ➤ Type 3 : Structure of heteroscedasticity is determined empirically.
 there is no prior indication that the variances are not equal.
 residual plots can serve as a first step
 to detect heteroscedasticity.
- \Rightarrow Two stage estimation

If there are replicated measurements on y.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{eg} & \text{ Fig } 7.2 \\ &y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_j + \epsilon_{ij}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, n_j, \qquad Var(\epsilon_{ij}) = \sigma_j^2 \\ &\Rightarrow \quad \hat{y_{ij}} = \hat{y_j} \\ &e_{ij} = \left(y_{ij} - \hat{y_{ij}}\right) = \left(y_{ij} - \overline{y_j}\right) + \left(\overline{y_j} - \hat{y_j}\right) \\ &\text{pure error lack of fit error} \\ &s_j^2 = \frac{1}{n_j - 1} \sum \left(y_{ij} - \overline{y_j}\right)^2, \\ &\Rightarrow \qquad w_i = \frac{1}{s_j^2} \end{aligned}$$

But the presence of replications on the response variable for a given value of X is rather uncommon when data are collected in a non-experimental setting.

 \Rightarrow A more plausible way to investigate heteroscedasticity in (multiple) regression is by clustering obs according to prior, natural, and meaningful associations.

© **Example**: Education expenditure data in sec 5.7 use only 1975 data (p.198), Variable list: Table 7.2

Objective: to get the best representation of the relationship between expenditure on education and the other variables.

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$$

Grouping geographically : 4 groups j=1,2,3,4

j -th group error variance : $c_j^2 \sigma^2$

Minimize $S_w = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4$

$$S_j = \sum_{i \in I_j} \frac{1}{c_j^2} \big(y_i - (\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \beta_3 x_{i3} + \beta_4 x_{i4}) \big)^2, \qquad j = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

 I_i contains index of j-th group

 c_i : unknown

 \Rightarrow ① use OLS :

result Table 7.4 on p. 200

residual plot Fig7.3-7.7 : unequal variance

#49(Alaska) is influential, high leverage, outlier

Alaska is a state with very small population and a boom in revenue from oil...

- ⇒ better omit the #49 and do separate analysis...

 Table 7.5 shows: the values of coefs changed significantly...

 residual plot(Fig 7.8-7.9) still shows unequal variance
- ② use WLS with $\hat{c_j^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{n_j 1} \sum_{i \in I_j} e_i^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2}$, Table 7.6

result Table 7.7 : $R_{O\!L\!S}^2 > R_{W\!L\!S}^2$ due to the definition of OLS residual plot (original y scale에 대한 그림임)

Note : region에 대하여 group을 나누고 WLS를 시행함으로 region에 대한 unequal variance는 상당부분 해소됨을 볼 수 있다.

 $R^2 = 0.477 \Rightarrow$ the search for other factors must continue

▷ Binary reponse data (Logistic model)

eg ① x: different dose of a drug or poison

y: death or survival

y: purchase or non purchase

 $Var(\mathit{Y}) = p(1-p) \text{ depends on } p = P(\mathit{Y}=1) = E(\mathit{Y}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$

 \Rightarrow Transformations to stabilize variance (and normalizing) : See Table 6.5 on p. 161

Ch 12: more in details