The Stata Journal

The *Stata Journal*, electronic version (ISSN 1536-8734) is a publication of Stata Press. Stata and Mata are registered trademarks of StataCorp LP.

The Stata Journal (2006)
6, Number 4, pp. 590–592

Stata tip 38: Testing for groupwise heteroskedasticity

Christopher F. Baum
Department of Economics
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
baum@bc.edu

A natural source of heteroskedasticity in many kinds of data is *group membership*: observations in the sample may be a priori defined as members of groups, and the variance of a series may differ considerably across groups. This concept will also apply to the errors from a linear regression. The assumption of homoskedasticity in the relationship may reasonably hold within each group, but not between groups. This assumption most commonly arises in cross-sectional datasets. In economic data, for instance, the groups may correspond to firms in different industries or workers in different occupations. It could also apply in a time-series context: for instance, the variance of daily temperature may not be constant over the four seasons. In any case, a test for heteroskedasticity of this sort should take this a priori knowledge into account.

How might we test for groupwise heteroskedasticity in a variable or in the errors from a regression? In the context of regression, if we can argue that each group's regression equation satisfies the classical assumptions (including that of homoskedasticity), the s^2 computed by `regress` (see [R] **regress**) is a consistent estimate of the group-specific variance of the disturbance process. For two groups, an F test may be constructed, with the larger variance in the numerator; the degrees of freedom are the residual degrees of freedom of each group's regression. Conducting an F test is easy if both groups' residuals are stored in one variable, with a group variable indicating group membership (in this case 1 or 2). The third form of `sdtest` may then be used, with the `by(`*groupvar*`)` option, to conduct the F test.

What if there are more than two groups across which we wish to test for equality of disturbance variance, for instance, a set of 10 industries? We may then use the `robvar` command (see [R] **sdtest**), which like `sdtest` expects to find one variable containing each group's residuals, with a group membership variable identifying them. The `by(`*groupvar*`)` option is used here as well. The test conducted is that of Levene (1960) labeled as W_0, which is robust to nonnormality of the error distribution. Two variants of the test proposed by Brown and Forsythe (1974), which uses more robust estimators of central tendency (e.g., median rather than mean), W_{50} and W_{10}, are also computed.

We illustrate groupwise heteroskedasticity with state-level data: 1 observation per year for each of the six states in the New England region of the United States for 1981–2000. We first apply `robvar` to the state-level population series to examine whether the variance of population is constant across states.

 st0117

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/imeus/NEdata
. robvar pop, by(state)
            |         Summary of pop
      state |        Mean   Std. Dev.       Freq.
------------+------------------------------------
         CT |   3276614.5   81452.212          20
         MA |   6030915.5   178354.76          20
         ME |   1212718.1   46958.538          20
         NH |   1094238.9   94362.302          20
         RI |   1000209.9   29548.701          20
         VT |   562960.65   31310.625          20
------------+------------------------------------
      Total |   2196276.3   1931629.4         120
W0  =  13.856324   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00000000
W50 =  11.820938   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00000000
W10 =  13.306895   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00000000
```

All forms of the test clearly reject the hypothesis of homoskedasticity across states' population series: hardly surprising when the standard deviation of Massachusetts' (MA) population is six times that of Rhode Island (RI).

We now fit a linear trend model to state disposable personal income per capita, `dpipc`, by regressing that variable on `year`. The residuals are tested for equality of variances across states with `robvar`.

```
. regress dpipc  year
      Source |       SS       df       MS              Number of obs =     120
-------------+------------------------------           F(  1,   118) =  440.17
       Model |  3009.33617     1  3009.33617           Prob > F      =  0.0000
    Residual |  806.737449   118  6.83675804           R-squared     =  0.7886
-------------+------------------------------           Adj R-squared =  0.7868
       Total |  3816.07362   119  32.0678456           Root MSE      =  2.6147

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
       dpipc |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
        year |   .8684582   .0413941    20.98   0.000     .7864865    .9504298
       _cons |  -1710.508   82.39534   -20.76   0.000    -1873.673   -1547.343
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
. predict double eps, residual
. robvar eps, by(state)
            |      Summary of Residuals
      state |        Mean   Std. Dev.       Freq.
------------+------------------------------------
         CT |    4.167853   1.3596266          20
         MA |    1.618796   .86550138          20
         ME |  -2.9841056   .93797625          20
         NH |   .51033312   .61139299          20
         RI |   -.8927223   .63408722          20
         VT |  -2.4201543   .71470977          20
------------+------------------------------------
      Total |  -6.063e-14   2.6037101         120
W0  =  4.3882072   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00108562
W50 =  3.2989851   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00806751
W10 =  4.2536245   df(5, 114)     Pr > F = 0.00139064
```

The hypothesis of equality of variances is soundly rejected by all three `robvar` test statistics, with the residuals for Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Maine possessing a standard deviation considerably larger than those of the other three states.

References

Brown, M. B., and A. B. Forsythe. 1974. Robust tests for the equality of variances. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 69: 364–367.

Levene, H. 1960. Robust tests for equality of variances. In *Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of Harold Hotelling*, ed. I. Olkin, S. G. Ghurye, W. Hoeffding, W. G. Madow, and H. B. Mann, 278–292. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford University Press.