

# Econometrics – Problem Set #7

Junwoo Yang

May 28, 2021

## Exercise 7.4

Using the regression results in column (3):

- (a) Are there any important regional differences? Use an appropriate hypothesis test to explain your answer.
- (b) Juan is a 32-year-old male high school graduate from the North. Mel is a 32-year-old male high school graduate from the West. Ari is a 32-year-old male high school graduate from the East.
  - (i) Construct a 95% confidence interval for the difference in expected earnings between Juan and Mel.
  - (ii) Explain how you would construct a 95% confidence interval for the difference in expected earnings between Juan and Ari.

**Answer.** (a) We need to test joint hypothesis

$$H_0: \beta_4 = \beta_5 = \beta_6 = 0 \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1: \exists j \in \{4, 5, 6\} \text{ s.t. } \beta_j \neq 0.$$

With assuming that  $\hat{\rho}_{t_i, t_j}^2 = 0$ , we can simply use the  $F$ -statistics with

$$F = \frac{1}{3}(t_4^2 + t_5^2 + t_6^2) = \frac{1}{3} \left( \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}_4}{SE(\hat{\beta}_4)} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}_5}{SE(\hat{\beta}_5)} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}_6}{SE(\hat{\beta}_6)} \right)^2 \right) = 12.57971,$$

but exact  $F$ -statistic for  $H_0$  was already given as 21.87 in table of results, which is asymptotically distributed  $\chi_3^2/3$ . The 1% critical value from  $\chi_3^2/3 = F_{3, \infty}$  is 3.78 which is much lower than 21.87. Thus, the null hypothesis that the regional effects are zero is rejected at 1% significance level. Namely, there are significant differences between regions.

- (b) (i) The difference between Juan and Mel is only region which is directly written as  $\beta_4$ . The 95% confidence interval for  $\beta_4$  is

$$(\hat{\beta}_4 - z_{0.05} SE(\hat{\beta}_4), \hat{\beta}_4 + z_{0.05} SE(\hat{\beta}_4)) = (0.1141404, 0.2358596).$$

- (ii) The expected difference between Juan and Ari is  $\beta_4 - \beta_6$ . Once either *North* or *East* is setted for baseline group of region categories, the confidence interval for the difference at any  $\alpha$  can be constructed similarly to (i).

■

## Exercise 7.6

In all of the regressions in the previous Exercises, the coefficient of High school is positive, large, and statistically significant. Do you believe this provides strong statistical evidence of the high returns to schooling in the labor market?

**Answer.** If that is true, this means academic discrimination. However, it is also important to control the characteristics of workers that can affect productivity. If high school graduates are in a society where employment opportunities are guaranteed rather than those who do not, high school graduates will have a relatively higher career year, and low-educated workers will eventually have to accept the wage difference. Therefore, it is premature to conclude academic discrimination based solely on these results of three regressions.

■

---

<sup>1</sup>I replaced *East* ( $X_7$ ) with  $X_6$ .

## Exercise 7.9

Consider the regression model  $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + u_i$ . Use approach 2 from Section 7.3 to transform the regression so that you can use a t-statistic to test

- (a)  $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ .
- (b)  $\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 = 0$ .
- (c)  $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1$ .

**Answer.** (a) Transform the original regression into

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)X_{1i} + \beta_2(X_{1i} + X_{2i}) + u_i = \beta_0 + \gamma X_{1i} + \beta_2 W_i + u_i,$$

and test the hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_1 - \beta_2 = \gamma = 0$  vs.  $H_1: \gamma \neq 0$  which is just a single coefficient.

- (b) Similarly, transform the regression to

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + 2\beta_2)X_{1i} + \beta_2(X_{2i} - 2X_{1i}) + u_i = \beta_0 + \gamma X_{1i} + \beta_2 W_i + u_i,$$

and test whether  $\gamma = 0$ .

- (c) Similarly, put

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_2)X_{1i} + \beta_2(X_{2i} - X_{1i}) + u_i = \beta_0 + \gamma X_{1i} + \beta_2 W_i + u_i,$$

and test whether  $\gamma = 1$ . Alternatively, redefine the dependent variable of the regression

$$Y_i - X_{1i} = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_2 - 1)X_{1i} + \beta_2(X_{2i} - X_{1i}) + u_i = \beta_0 + \gamma X_{1i} + \beta_2 W_i + u_i,$$

and test whether  $\gamma = 0$ . ■

## Exercise 6.12

A school district undertakes an experiment to estimate the effect of class size on test scores in second-grade classes. The district assigns 50% of its previous year's first graders to small second-grade classes (18 students per classroom) and 50% to regular-size classes (21 students per classroom). Students new to the district are handled differently: 20% are randomly assigned to small classes and 80% to regular-size classes. At the end of the second-grade school year, each student is given a standardized exam. Let  $Y_i$  denote the exam score for the  $i$ -th student,  $X_i$  denote a binary variable that equals 1 if the student is assigned to a small class, and  $W_i$  denote a binary variable that equals 1 if the student is newly enrolled. Let  $\beta_1$  denote the causal effect on test scores of reducing class size from regular to small.

- (a) Consider the regression  $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + u_i$ . Do you think that  $E(u_i|X_i) = 0$ ? Is the OLS estimator of  $\beta_1$  unbiased and consistent? Explain.
- (b) Consider the regression  $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 W_i + u_i$ . Do you think that  $E(u_i|X_i, W_i)$  depends on  $X_i$ ? Is the OLS estimator of  $\beta_1$  unbiased and consistent? Explain. Do you think that  $E(u_i|X_i, W_i)$  depends on  $W_i$ ? Will the OLS estimator of  $\beta_2$  provide an unbiased and consistent estimate of the causal effect of transferring to a new school (that is, being a newly enrolled student)? Explain.

**Answer.** (a) There are many factors that determine test score. Because the only class size is far from enough to explain test score, there must be omitted significant variables. Therefore,  $E(u_i|X_i) = 0$  does not hold, and  $\beta_1$  suffers from omitted variable bias and inconsistency.

- (b) There are still omitted variables that represent student's ability. Therefore,  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are biased and inconsistent. ■

## Empirical Exercise 7.1

Answer the following questions.

- (a) What is the value of the estimated effect of smoking on birth weight in each of the regressions?
- (b) Construct a 95% confidence interval for the effect of smoking on birth weight, using each of the regressions.
- (c) Does the coefficient on **smoker** in regression (1) suffer from omitted variable bias? Explain.
- (d) Does the coefficient on **smoker** in regression (2) suffer from omitted variable bias? Explain.
- (e) Consider the coefficient on **unmarried** in regression (3).
  - (i) Construct a 95% confidence interval for the coefficient.
  - (ii) Is the coefficient statistically significant? Explain.
  - (iii) Is the magnitude of the coefficient large? Explain.
  - (iv) A family advocacy group notes that the large coefficient suggests that public policies that encourage marriage will lead, on average, to healthier babies. Do you agree?
- (f) Consider the various other control variables in the data set. Which do you think should be included in the regression? Using a table like Table 7.1, examine the robustness of the confidence interval you constructed in (b). What is a reasonable 95% confidence interval for the effect of smoking on birth weight?

**Answer.** (a)  $-253.228$ ,  $-217.580$ ,  $175.377$ .

(b)  $(-305.776, -200.681)$ ,  $(-268.750, -166.410)$ ,  $(-227.956, -122.797)$ .

(c) Since there is another significant regressor **nprevist** in regression (2), the coefficient on **smoker** in regression (1) suffer from omitted variable bias.

(d) With the same logic, because of another significant regressor **unmarried** in regression (3), the coefficient on **smoker** in regression (2) would suffer from omitted variable bias.

(e) (i)  $(-241.379, -132.887)$ .

(ii) Yes, it is. The coefficient is included in the 95% confidence interval, and equivalently the  $p$ -value is very low.

(iii) With other variables fixed, infants of single mothers 187.133g lighter, in average, than infants of married mothers. This is the largest relative to the coefficients of other variables, indicating that marital status has a relatively large effect on the infant's weight.

(iv) Although the result shows relatively large differences in infant weight depending on marital status, it is difficult to conclude that it is a real causal effect. Suppose nutrition is a determinant of an infant's weight. If married mothers in data belonged to more nutritious environment during pregnancy, marital status would not be a determinant of infant weight.

(f) Removing insignificant **alcohol**, and further considering **educ** and **age**, regression (4) consists only of significant regressors. Thus,  $(-228.5775, -123.8470)$  is a reasonable 95% confidence interval. ■

## Appendix: R code

```
library(readxl)
bs <- read_excel("birthweight_smoking/birthweight_smoking.xlsx")

# (a) ~ (e)
ols1 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker, data=bs)
ols2 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker + alcohol + nprevist, data=bs)
ols3 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker + alcohol + nprevist + unmarried, data=bs)

library(sandwich)
Cov1 <- vcovHC(ols1, type="HC1")
Cov2 <- vcovHC(ols2, type="HC1")
Cov3 <- vcovHC(ols3, type="HC1")

library(dplyr)
selist <- list(Cov1 %>% diag() %>% sqrt(), Cov2 %>% diag() %>% sqrt(),
               Cov3 %>% diag() %>% sqrt())

library(stargazer)
stargazer(ols1, ols2, ols3, type="text", se=selist, intercept.bottom=FALSE, omit.stat=c("f"),
          title="Results of three regressions with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors")

##
## Results of three regressions with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors
## =====
##                               Dependent variable:
##                               -----
##                               birthweight
##                               (1)         (2)         (3)
## -----
## Constant          3,432.060***      3,051.249***      3,134.400***
##                   (11.891)          (43.714)          (44.149)
##
## smoker            -253.228***      -217.580***      -175.377***
##                   (26.810)          (26.108)          (26.827)
##
## alcohol
##                   -30.491
##                   (72.597)          (72.992)
##
## nprevist
##                   34.070***
##                   (3.608)          (3.583)
##
## unmarried
##                   -187.133***
##                   (27.677)
## -----
## Observations      3,000            3,000            3,000
## R2                 0.029            0.073            0.089
## Adjusted R2        0.028            0.072            0.087
## Residual Std. Error 583.730 (df = 2998) 570.471 (df = 2996) 565.698 (df = 2995)
## =====
## Note:                                     *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
```

```

stargazer(ols1, ols2, ols3, type="text", se=selist, intercept.bottom=FALSE, omit.stat=c("f"),
ci=TRUE, ci.level=0.95, report="vc*stp",
title="with 95% confidence intervals, t-statistics, p-values")

##
## with 95% confidence intervals, t-statistics, p-values
## =====
##
##                               Dependent variable:
##
##                               -----
##                               birthweight
##                               (1)          (2)          (3)
## -----
## Constant                3,432.060***      3,051.249***      3,134.400***
##                          (3,408.755, 3,455.365) (2,965.570, 3,136.927) (3,047.870, 3,220.930)
##                          t = 288.638          t = 69.800          t = 70.997
##                          p = 0.000          p = 0.000          p = 0.000
##
## smoker                  -253.228***      -217.580***      -175.377***
##                          (-305.776, -200.681) (-268.750, -166.410) (-227.956, -122.797)
##                          t = -9.445          t = -8.334          t = -6.537
##                          p = 0.000          p = 0.000          p = 0.000
##
## alcohol                  -30.491          -21.083
##                          (-172.778, 111.796) (-164.145, 121.978)
##                          t = -0.420          t = -0.289
##                          p = 0.675          p = 0.773
##
## nprevist                 34.070***          29.603***
##                          (26.998, 41.142)      (22.581, 36.625)
##                          t = 9.442          t = 8.263
##                          p = 0.000          p = 0.000
##
## unmarried                -187.133***
##                          (-241.379, -132.887)
##                          t = -6.761
##                          p = 0.000
## -----
## Observations              3,000              3,000              3,000
## R2                        0.029              0.073              0.089
## Adjusted R2               0.028              0.072              0.087
## Residual Std. Error 583.730 (df = 2998) 570.471 (df = 2996) 565.698 (df = 2995)
## =====
## Note:                                *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

```

```

# (f)
ols4 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker + nprevist + unmarried, data=bs)
ols5 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker + nprevist + unmarried + educ, data=bs)
ols6 <- lm(birthweight ~ smoker + nprevist + unmarried + age, data=bs)
Cov4 <- vcovHC(ols4, type="HC1")
Cov5 <- vcovHC(ols5, type="HC1")
Cov6 <- vcovHC(ols6, type="HC1")
selist2 <- append(selist, list(Cov4 %>% diag() %>% sqrt(), Cov5 %>% diag() %>% sqrt(),
                              Cov6 %>% diag() %>% sqrt()))
stargazer(ols1, ols2, ols3, ols4, ols5, ols6, type="text", se=selist2, intercept.bottom=FALSE,
           omit.stat=c("n","ser","f"), title="Table for (f)")

##
## Table for (f)
## =====
##                               Dependent variable:
##                               -----
##                               birthweight
##                               (1)      (2)      (3)      (4)      (5)      (6)
## -----
## Constant      3,432.060*** 3,051.249*** 3,134.400*** 3,133.957*** 3,158.304*** 3,202.003***
##                (11.891)   (43.714)   (44.149)   (44.113)   (79.999)   (76.405)
##
## smoker        -253.228*** -217.580*** -175.377*** -176.212*** -177.841*** -177.741***
##                (26.810)   (26.108)   (26.827)   (26.707)   (27.241)   (26.855)
##
## alcohol                -30.491   -21.083
##                      (72.597)   (72.992)
##
## nprevist                34.070*** 29.603*** 29.623*** 29.771*** 29.807***
##                      (3.608)   (3.583)   (3.582)   (3.600)   (3.585)
##
## unmarried                -187.133*** -187.259*** -190.016*** -199.727***
##                      (27.677)   (27.669)   (29.027)   (30.614)
##
## educ                                -1.940
##                                (5.229)
##
## age                                -2.490
##                                (2.299)
## -----
## R2              0.029      0.073      0.089      0.089      0.089      0.089
## Adjusted R2     0.028      0.072      0.087      0.088      0.087      0.088
## =====
## Note:                                                    *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

library(lmtest)
coeftest(ols4, vcov.=Cov4)

##
## t test of coefficients:
##
##           Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) 3133.9572   44.1128 71.0442 < 2.2e-16 ***
## smoker      -176.2122   26.7067 -6.5981 4.907e-11 ***
## nprevist     29.6231    3.5821  8.2697 < 2.2e-16 ***
## unmarried   -187.2587   27.6687 -6.7679 1.566e-11 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

coefci(ols4, vcov.=Cov4)["smoker",]

##           2.5 %      97.5 %
## -228.5775 -123.8470

```