

#### Homework 4

1a. Comparing we should get:

$$\beta_0^* = \beta_0 + \beta_1\omega_0 + \beta_3\gamma_0 + \beta_4\theta_0$$

$$\beta_2^* = \beta_1\omega_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3\gamma_1 + \beta_4\theta_1$$

Omitted Variable Bias are:

$$\beta_0^* = \beta_1\omega_0 + \beta_3\gamma_0 + \beta_4\theta_0$$

$$\beta_2^* = \beta_1\omega_1 + \beta_3\gamma_1 + \beta_4\theta_1$$

b. Putting in the values of the parameter we get a predicted Bias for  $\beta_2$ :

$$0.4*3 + (-2.4*0.5) + 3.1*0 = 0$$

2a. The coefficients for  $\beta_1$  is the coefficient of Minutes per game,  $\beta_2$  is the coefficient of height and  $\beta_3$  is the coefficient of talent. We know that an NBA player who plays more minutes and have their height and talent higher comparatively to their peers, will have a better chance of scoring more points. Thus we'd expect  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  to all be positive.

b. The correlation I expect between talent and minutes should be positive. For example, if I am managing the team and wanted certain players to play in order to win, I'd want more talented players to play more minutes in order to score more points to win. If I play less talented players more minutes or more talented players less minutes, my expected score would be lower than if I had more talented players play more minutes. So there must be a positive correlation between talent and minutes, since talent is omitted, we expect  $\beta_1$  will go up.

c. Since taller people have an easier time making it to the NBA as opposed to shorter players even if they aren't as talented as the shorter players. This will cause a bias for  $\beta_2$ , which is the coefficient for height, taller players will have a higher coefficient than shorter players. Mathematically suppose our coefficient for height is 1.2, and our taller player (A) is 80 inches and our shorter player (B) is 70 inches, if we plug in these values for height into our regression, we get,  $\widehat{points} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Minutes + 1.2ln(height)$ , if we hold all else equal, the difference in the expected points will be 0.162.

d. Two reasons why researchers may omit a variable in their regression is because of the lack of qualitative research done on the topic or change in  $R^2$  was not properly observed.

3a. With each year of experience the hourly wage of a male worker will be increased by \$0.15. With each year of experience the hourly wage of a female worker will be increased by \$0.10.

b. At zero level of experience male and female worker will have the same level of wage.

c.  $\frac{d_{wage}}{d_{female}} = -1.75 + 0.1exp + 1.5col$

The wage gap of being a female with no experience or education is -1.75.

With no degree and 5 years of experience is -1.25.

With a degree and 5 years of experience is .25.

d.  $\widehat{wage} = 7.10 - 1.75Fem + 2.50Col + 1.50Fem * Col$  (w/ Col & w/oExp)

$\widehat{wage} = 7.10 - 1.75Fem + 0.15Exp + 0.10Fem * Exp$  (w/Exp & w/o college)

How many years of experience would it take to earn the same wage as with college.

$\widehat{wage} = 7.10 - 1.75(1) + 2.50(1) + 1.5(1)(1)$  subbing in 1 for Col and Fem

$\widehat{wage} = 9.35$

$\widehat{wage} = 7.10 - 1.75(1) + 0.15Exp + 0.10(1) * Exp$  subbin in 1 for Fem

$\widehat{wage} = 5.35 + .25Exp$

$Exp = 16$  years

4a. S.d. of the sample mean:

$\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{20450}{\sqrt{100}} = 2045$

b. Test  $\mu < 32000$  with normal dist<sup>n</sup> with 10% level

Hypothesis test:

$H_0: \mu = 32000$

$H_a: \mu < 32000$

Test Statistic  $z^* = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{30755 - 32000}{20450/\sqrt{100}} = -0.61$

(P-value Approach)

P-value =  $P(Z < -0.61) = 0.2709$  (from z-table)

P-value = 0.2709

Since  $0.2709 \geq 0.1$ , we fail to reject the null hypothesis

c. Test:  $\mu \neq 33000$  with normal dist<sup>n</sup>

Hypothesis test:

$H_0: \mu = 33000$

$H_A: \mu \neq 33000$

Test Statistic  $z^* = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{30755 - 33000}{20450/\sqrt{100}} = -1.10$

(P-value Approach):

P-value =  $P(Z < -1.1 \text{ or } Z > 1.1)$

P-value =  $2 * P(Z < -1.1) = 2 * 0.1357 = 0.2714$

Since  $0.2714 \geq 0.1$  we fail to reject the null hypothesis

d. 95% CI

$\bar{x} \pm Z_{\alpha/2} \times \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}$

$30,755 + 1.96 \times \frac{20450}{\sqrt{100}} = 34763.2$

$30,755 - 1.96 \times \frac{20450}{\sqrt{100}} = 26746.8$

95% Confidence Interval: (26746.8, 34763.2)

## 5a. reg wage IQ

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	901
-----+-----				F(1, 899)	=	93.38
Model	557036.315	1	557036.315	Prob > F	=	0.0000

Wage = 1024.364 + 1.651\*IQ + u  
Strong and positive coefficient, each additional unit of IQ, increases wage by \$1.651.

reg wage IQwithnoise1

reg wage IQwithnoise2reg wage IQwithnoise3

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	901
				F(1, 899)	=	0.03
Model	166.772735	1	166.772735	Prob > F	=	0.8736
Residual	5919683.92	899	6584.74296	R-squared	=	0.0000
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0011
Total	5919850.7	900	6577.61189	Root MSE	=	81.146

	wage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
IQwithnoise3		-.0084542	.0531224	-0.16	0.874	-.1127126 .0958042
_cons		1191.271	2.703588	440.63	0.000	1185.965 1196.578

reg wage IQwithnoise4

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	901
Model	7812.0895	1	7812.0895	F(1, 899)	=	1.19
Residual	5912038.61	899	6576.23872	Prob > F	=	0.2760
Total	5919850.7	900	6577.61189	R-squared	=	0.0013
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0002
				Root MSE	=	81.094

	wage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
IQwithnoise4		.0601501	.0551876	1.09	0.276	-.0481614 .1684616
_cons		1191.257	2.701646	440.94	0.000	1185.955 1196.559

reg wage IQwithnoise5

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	901
Model	314.09296	1	314.09296	F(1, 899)	=	0.05
Residual	5919536.6	899	6584.57909	Prob > F	=	0.8272
Total	5919850.7	900	6577.61189	R-squared	=	0.0001
				Adj R-squared	=	-0.0011
				Root MSE	=	81.145

	wage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
IQwithnoise5		-.0119117	.0545393	-0.22	0.827	-.1189509 .0951274
_cons		1191.269	2.703373	440.66	0.000	1185.963 1196.574

C. The coefficients in part B compared to our original estimate using true value of IQ in part A shows there's some variation in IQ

d.

5a. reg salary sales roe ros indus finance consprod

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	209
Model	31762665.5	6	5293777.58	F(6, 202)	=	2.97
Residual	359970317	202	1782031.27	Prob > F	=	0.0084
Total	391732982	208	1883331.64	R-squared	=	0.0811
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0538
				Root MSE	=	1334.9

	salary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
--	--------	-------	-----------	---	------	----------------------

sales		.0111722	.0090017	1.24	0.216	-.0065773	.0289216
roe		7.970479	12.62133	0.63	0.528	-16.91598	32.85694
ros		-2.142566	1.492172	-1.44	0.153	-5.084797	.7996658
indus		279.7675	291.5297	0.96	0.338	-295.0642	854.5992
finance		552.465	300.598	1.84	0.068	-40.24739	1145.177
consprod		948.1143	322.5469	2.94	0.004	312.1236	1584.105
_cons		715.7507	276.0282	2.59	0.010	171.4845	1260.017

Salary = 715.75 + 0.011\*Sales + 7.970\*ROE - 2.143\*ROS + 279.768\*Indus + 552.465\*Finance + 948.114\*Consprod + u

An additional sale will increase the salary by \$0.011 with ceteris paribus assuming that everything is held constant.

b.  $t_{95\%} = 1.962$

c. **ttest roe == 10, level(90)**

One-sample t test

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[90% Conf. Interval]	
roe	209	17.18421	.5892376	8.518509	16.21066	18.15776
mean = mean(roe)				t = 12.1924		
Ho: mean = 10				degrees of freedom = 208		
Ha: mean < 10		Ha: mean != 10		Ha: mean > 10		
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000		Pr( T  >  t ) = 0.0000		Pr(T > t) = 0.0000		

Fail to reject the null hypothesis that return on equity (roe) has an effect that is equal to 10 at the 90% level. 0% chance that we would get this sample mean if true mean were 10.

**test \_b[roe]=10**

```
( 1)  roe = 10

      F( 1, 202) =    0.03
      Prob > F   =    0.8724
```

**d. reg salary sales roe ros indus finance consprod**

Source		SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	209
Model		31762665.5	6	5293777.58	F(6, 202)	=	2.97
Residual		359970317	202	1782031.27	Prob > F	=	0.0084
Total		391732982	208	1883331.64	R-squared	=	0.0811
					Adj R-squared	=	0.0538
					Root MSE	=	1334.9

salary		Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
sales		.0111722	.0090017	1.24	0.216	-.0065773	.0289216

roe	7.970479	12.62133	0.63	0.528	-16.91598	32.85694
ros	-2.142566	1.492172	-1.44	0.153	-5.084797	.7996658
indus	279.7675	291.5297	0.96	0.338	-295.0642	854.5992
finance	552.465	300.598	1.84	0.068	-40.24739	1145.177
consprod	948.1143	322.5469	2.94	0.004	312.1236	1584.105
_cons	715.7507	276.0282	2.59	0.010	171.4845	1260.017

### test indus finance consprod

```
( 1) indus = 0
( 2) finance = 0
( 3) consprod = 0
```

```
F( 3, 202) = 3.60
Prob > F = 0.0144
```

### reg salary sales roe ros

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	209
Model	12501859.4	3	4167286.46	F(3, 205) =	2.25
Residual	379231123	205	1849907.92	Prob > F =	0.0834
Total	391732982	208	1883331.64	R-squared =	0.0319
				Adj R-squared =	0.0177
				Root MSE =	1360.1

salary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
sales	.0154825	.0089539	1.73	0.085	-.0021711 .0331361
roe	22.00331	11.51655	1.91	0.057	-.7027663 44.70939
ros	-1.105191	1.45024	-0.76	0.447	-3.96449 1.754108
_cons	864.1175	228.3997	3.78	0.000	413.8038 1314.431