



```

name: <unnamed>
log: C:\Users\Conor\Documents\Conor\Grad School\TA Work\Econ 103 - Econometric
> s\STATA Work\Week 3\wk3_section_log.smcl
log type: smcl
opened on: 22 Jan 2018, 15:16:07

1 .
2 . // Demonstration STATA code for week 3
3 . // Principles of Econometrics 4th Edition
4 . // Covered Problems: 3.6, 4.13
5 .
6 . set more off

7 . clear all

8 .
9 . // Create a sub-directory to store figure output into
10. capture mkdir "./Figures"

11.
12. //////////////////////////////////////
> ////////////////////////////////////// Question 3.6 //////////////////////////////////////
> //////////////////////////////////////
>
13. *****
14. *Setup: We consider data on a motel that underwent repairs to fix defects in
15. * some of the rooms. It took seven months to correct the defects, during which
16. * approximately 14 rooms in the 100-unit motel were taken out of service for one
17. * month at a time. The data are in motel.dta
18. *
19. * Parts (A) - (F)
20. *****
21.
22. use motel.dta, clear

23.
24. *****
25. *3.6 Part A: In the linear regression model MOTEL_PCT = beta1 + beta2*COMP_PCT + e,
26. * test the null hypothesis H0: beta2 <= 0 against the alternative hypothesis
27. * H1: beta2 > 0 at alpha = 0.01 level of significance. Discuss your conclusion.
28. * Include in your answer a sketch of the rejection region and a calculation of
29. * the p-value.
30. *****
31.
32. //To double check the meaning of the variables, we can use the "describe" command
33. // (desc for short) to have STATA report the variable label.
34. desc motel_pct comp_pct

```

variable name	storage type	display format	value label	variable label
motel_pct	double	%10.0g		percentage motel occupancy
comp_pct	double	%10.0g		percentage competitors occupancy

```
35. reg motel_pct comp_pct
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	2208.92033	1	2208.92033	F(1, 23)	=	18.19
Residual	2792.52127	23	121.413968	Prob > F	=	0.0003
				R-squared	=	0.4417
				Adj R-squared	=	0.4174
Total	5001.4416	24	208.3934	Root MSE	=	11.019

motel_pct	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
comp_pct	.8646393	.2027119	4.27	0.000	.4452978	1.283981
_cons	21.39999	12.90686	1.66	0.111	-5.299896	48.09987

```

36.
37. //Since our null is for beta2 = 0, the t-stat reported by STATA matches the one
38. // we need for our test. We next need to calculate the appropriate critical value
39. // --> Because we have very few observations (25), the t-distribution will
40. // have wider tails, so we will have a larger critical value than normal
41. scalar criticalT_01_lside = invttail(e(df_r),0.01)

42. disp "Alpha = 0.01 Critical T-Value for RHS rejection region, DF = " e(df_r) ": " cr
    > iticalT_01_lside
    Alpha = 0.01 Critical T-Value for RHS rejection region, DF = 23: 2.4998667

43.
44. // Even with this large t critical value, we are able to reject the null of
45. // beta2 = 0 in favor of beta2 > 0
46.
47. // Alternatively, to conduct our test we could calculate a p value. This would
48. // be given as follows:
49. scalar pval = ttail(e(df_r),_b[comp_pct]/_se[comp_pct])

50. disp "P-Value for H0: beta2 <= 0 vs. H1: beta2 > 0, DF = " e(df_r) ": " pval
    P-Value for H0: beta2 <= 0 vs. H1: beta2 > 0, DF = 23: .00014531

51.
52. //Since pval is 0.00014531, for any confidence level above that number (for
53. // example, 0.005 or 0.001) we would still reject the null that beta2 <= 0 in
54. // favor of the alternative beta2 > 0
55.
56. /*Discussion:
    > We can imagine two extreme cases for how competition between the
    > two motels works:
    > (1) There is a fixed number of visitors each period and
    >     the motels compete to snag more business (e.g. there is usually 1 wedding
    >     or conference per week and all the customers go to 1 or the other). In this
    >     case, we would expect occupancy rates to be negatively correlated.
    >
    > (2) The town overall has variation in the number of customers and they
    >     (roughly equally) go to each motel. For example, there is a tourist season
    >     when all the motels are full and a slow season when the motels are mostly
    >     empty. In economics language, we would say that the motel and its competitor
    >     face the same demand shocks. In this case, we would expect occupancy rates
    >     to be positively correlated.
    >
    > Our finding here, that the competitor and our own occupancy rates are highly
    > positively correlated (point estimate of about 0.88) lends support to our
    > scenario (2).
    > */

57.
58. ////////////////////////////////////////
    > //////////////////////////////////////// Preparing a Figure ////////////////////////////////////////
    >

59. // Create the requested figure:
60. // (1) store the degrees of freedom from the last regression
61. // (2) clear the dataset and tell stata to create a blank workspace with 500 observa
    > tions
62. // (3) use STATA to generate a row of data 1 to 500 by using gen tcdf = _n
63. // (4) Convert 1 to 500 to a range 1/501 to 500/501, separated by 500 steps
64. // --> note that invt(dfree, 0) and invt(dfree, 1) don't make sense since
65. // --> the t-distribution can take on values from -infty to +infty
66. // (5) Use the invt function to convert probabilities tcdf to t-values (tval)
67. // (6) Use ntden to convert t values to values from PDF of a t (tpdf)

```

```

68. // (7) Graph the line of the pdf
69. // (8) Graph the area above the critical value we calculated earlier
70. scalar dfree = e(df_r)

71. clear

72. set obs 500
    number of observations (_N) was 0, now 500

73. gen tcdf = _n

74. replace tcdf = _n/(_N+1) // _n = row of data, while _N = total # or rows
    (500 real changes made)

75. gen tval = invt(dfree,tcdf)

76. gen tpdf = ntden(dfree,0,tval)

77. scalar criticalT_01_2side = invttail(dfree,0.01/2)

78. twoway (line tpdf tval) ///
    > (area tpdf tval if tval>criticalT_01_1side, legend(label(2 "Rejection
    > n Region (1-sided)")) color(red)) ///
    > (area tpdf tval if tval>criticalT_01_2side, legend(label(3 "Rejection
    > n Region (2-sided)")) fint(inten20) color(green)) ///
    > (area tpdf tval if tval<(-1)*criticalT_01_2side, fint(inten20) color
    > (green)), ///
    > ytitle("T-Distribution PDF - f(x)") xtitle("T-stat Value") /
    > //
    > title("Q 3.6A: T-test with Right-Side Rejection Region") ///
    > legend(order(2 3))

79. graph export "./Figures/Q 3-6A Right Side Test.pdf", replace
    (file ./Figures/Q 3-6A Right Side Test.pdf written in PDF format)

80.
81. // Note that the figure is identical if we instead shaded the region tcdf>0.99
82. // twoway (line tpdf tval) (area tpdf tval if tcdf> 1-0.01)
83.
84. // Remove the data for the figure and bring back the motel data
85. use motel.dta, clear

86.
87. ////////////////////////////////// End Figure Preparation //////////////////////////////////
    > //////////////////////////////////
    >
88. *****
89. *3.6 Part B: Consider a linear regression with y = MOTEL_PCT and x = RELPRICE,
90. * which is the ratio of the price per room charged by the motel in question relative
91. * to its competitors. Test the null hypothesis that there is no relationship
92. * between these variables against the alternative that there is an inverse
93. * relationship between them at the alpha = 0.01 level of significance. Discuss
94. * your conclusion. Include in your answer a sketch of the rejection region, and
95. * a calculation of the p-value. In this exercise follow and SHOW all the test
96. * procedure steps suggested in Chapter 3.4
97. *****
98.
99. // Test Procedures
100. // (1) Determine Null and Alternative Hypotheses
101. // --> H0: beta2>=0 H1: beta2<0

```

```

102 // (2) Specify test statistic and its distribution under the null
103 // --> Test Statistic:  $t = b2/se(b2)$  Distribution,  $T(n-2)$  in this case 25
104 // (3) Select alpha and determine rejection region
105 // -->  $\alpha = 0.01$  rejection region,  $t < -criticalT\_01\_lside$ 
106 // (4) Calculate sample value of test statistic (see regression output)
107 // (5) State your conclusion (see below)
108
109 reg motel_pct relprice

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	800.090527	1	800.090527	F(1, 23)	=	4.38
Residual	4201.35107	23	182.667438	Prob > F	=	0.0476
				R-squared	=	0.1600
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1234
Total	5001.4416	24	208.3934	Root MSE	=	13.515

motel_pct	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
relprice	-122.1186	58.35027	-2.09	0.048	-242.8253	-1.411883
_cons	166.656	43.57095	3.82	0.001	76.52262	256.7894

```

110 disp "Alpha = 0.01 Critical T-Value for LHS rejection region, DF = " dfree ": " (-1)
> *criticalT_01_lside

```

Alpha = 0.01 Critical T-Value for LHS rejection region, DF = 23: -2.4998667

```

111
112 // The t-statistic is -2.09 versus the critical value of -2.50 so we fail to
113 // reject the null of  $\beta_2 \geq 0$  at the 0.01 significance level.
114
115 scalar pval = 1-ttail(e(df_r),_b[relprice]/_se[relprice])

```

```

116 disp "P-Value for H0:  $\beta_2 \geq 0$  vs. H1:  $\beta_2 < 0$ , DF = " e(df_r) ": " pval
P-Value for H0:  $\beta_2 \geq 0$  vs. H1:  $\beta_2 < 0$ , DF = 23: .02379463

```

```

117
118 /* Discussion:
> One of the main ways that the motels might try to compete against each other is
> by adjusting their relative prices. In general, we would expect that a cut in
> relative price should bring in more customers. This would correspond to the
> beta estimate in the above regression being negative. The point estimate agrees
> with this idea: interpreting it directly, relprice is in decimal units, it says
> that a 1 p.p. decline (i.e. -0.01) in relative price leads to a 1.2 p.p. increase
> in occupancy rate. However, the standard error on the estimate is very large, at
> almost half the magnitude of the point estimate. This, together with the low
> sample size (which drives up the tails of the t-distribution), makes it hard to
> reject the null that there is no effect or a positive effect on occupancy from
> changes in relative price.
>
> Comparing this result to what we saw in part (a), the main driver of the
> difference in the t-statistic is likely that there isn't large variation
> in the relative price. Recall that
>  $var(b2) = \sigma\_hat^2 / (\sum (xi-xbar)^2) = \sigma\_hat^2 / ((n-1) * se(x)^2)$ 
> or put another way, we have
>  $se(b2) = \sigma\_hat / (\sqrt{n-1} * se(x))$ 
>
> Relative to the regression with comp_pct, the sigma_hat (Root MSE in stata output)
> is a bit larger (11 vs 13.5) the standard error of relprice (0.047, or 4.7 if we
> scale decimals up to percentage points by using 100*relprice) is much smaller
> than the standard error of comp_pct (11.1). It is easy to check these values by
> using sum relprice comp_pct
> */

```

```

119 ///////////////////////////////////////////////////
120 > /////////////////////////////////// Preparing a Figure ///////////////////////////////////
121 >
122 // To generate the requested figure, use the same steps as discussed above,
123 // except this time we have a left-hand-side rejection region
124 // --> Note that we already have the scalar variable dfree stored, so we don't
125 // have to generate it again
126 clear
127
128 set obs 500
129     number of observations (_N) was 0, now 500
130
131 gen tcdf = _n
132
133 replace tcdf = _n/_N // _n = row of data, while _N = total # or rows
134     (500 real changes made)
135
136 gen tval = invt(dfree,tcdf)
137     (1 missing value generated)
138
139 gen tpdf = ntden(dfree,0,tval)
140     (1 missing value generated)
141
142 twoway (line tpdf tval) ///
143 >         (area tpdf tval if tval<(-1)*criticalT_01_1side, legend(label(2 "Rej
144 > ection Region (1-sided)") color(red)) ///
145 >         (area tpdf tval if tval>criticalT_01_2side, legend(label(3 "Rejection
146 > n Region (2-sided)") fint(inten20) color(green)) ///
147 >         (area tpdf tval if tval<(-1)*criticalT_01_2side, fint(inten20) color
148 > (green)), ///
149 >                                     ytitle("T-Distribution PDF - f(x)") xtitle("T-stat Value") /
150 > //
151 >                                     title("Q 3.6B: T-Test with Left-Side Rejection Region") ///
152 >                                     legend(order(2 3))
153
154 graph export "./Figures/Q 3-6B Left Side Test.pdf", replace
155     (file ./Figures/Q 3-6B Left Side Test.pdf written in PDF format)
156
157
158 // Note that the figure is identical if we instead shaded the region tcdf<0.01
159 // twoway (line tpdf tval) (area tpdf tval if tcdf< 0.01)
160
161 // Remove the data for the figure and bring back the motel data
162 use motel.dta, clear
163
164
165 /////////////////////////////////// End Figure Preparation ///////////////////////////////////
166 > ///////////////////////////////////
167 >
168
169 *****
170 * 3.6 Part C: Consider the linear regression  $MOTEL\_PCT = \delta_1 + \delta_2 REPAIR + e$ 
171 * where REPAIR is an indicator variable taking the value 1 during the repair
172 * period and 0 otherwise. Test the null hypothesis  $H_0: \delta_2 \geq 0$  against the
173 * alternative hypothesis  $H_1: \delta_2 < 0$  at the  $\alpha = 0.05$  level of
174 * significance. Explain the logic behind stating the null and alternative
175 * hypotheses in this way. Discuss your conclusions.
176 *****

```

```

151
152 //Note the interpretation of the indicator variable:
153 //--> When using only an indicator variable on the right hand side, the constant
154 // term is the average of the left-hand side term WHEN THE INDICATOR VARIABLE IS
155 // ARE ALL ZERO (aka the average for the excluded group). Then the beta is
156 // equal to the DIFFERENCE IN THE AVERAGE between the excluded group (IND = 0)
157 // and the specified group (IND = 1).
158 //
159 //For example, in the regression results below, the b1 estimate is equal to the
160 // average of motel_pct when repair == 0 while b1 + b2 is equal to the average
161 // of motel_pct when repair==1
162
163 reg motel_pct repair

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	882.928029	1	882.928029	F(1, 23)	=	4.93
Residual	4118.51357	23	179.065807	Prob > F	=	0.0365
				R-squared	=	0.1765
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1407
Total	5001.4416	24	208.3934	Root MSE	=	13.382

motel_pct	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
repair	-13.23571	5.960615	-2.22	0.037	-25.56619	-.9052429
_cons	79.35	3.154061	25.16	0.000	72.82533	85.87467

```

164 sum motel_pct if repair == 0

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
motel_pct	18	79.35	11.64592	62.9	96.2

```

165 lincom repair + _cons

```

```

( 1)  repair + _cons = 0

```

motel_pct	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
(1)	66.11429	5.057749	13.07	0.000	55.65153	76.57704

```

166 sum motel_pct if repair == 1

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
motel_pct	7	66.11429	17.38222	39.2	82.4

```

167
168 // With the interpretation of the coefficients for an indicator regression in
169 // mind, we can see that we have two ways of asking the same question:
170 // (1) Was the occupancy rate lower, on average, during the 7 months of the
171 // repair period, compared to the other 18 months in our sample?
172 // (2) Is b2 < 0?
173 //
174 // Given that the occupancy rate fluctuates from one month to the next, we would
175 // need to use a t-test to see if any observed decline during the repair period
176 // is extreme enough that we couldn't reasonably blame any decline on the typical

```

```

177 // variance in occupancy rates.
178 //
179 // Once again, the t-stat STATA reported is the one we need, so all that's left is
180 // to compare that t-stat value to the appropriate critical value. However, we
181 // don't even need to do that, since STATA already reported the 95% confidence
182 // interval. Given that 0 is outside the confidence interval, we know we will
183 // reject the null at the same confidence level for a 1-sided test.
184
185 scalar criticalT_05_1side = invttail(e(df_r),0.05)

186 disp "Alpha = 0.05 Critical Value for t-test w/ LHS rejection region, DF = " e(df_r)
187 > " : " (-1)*criticalT_05_1side
188 Alpha = 0.05 Critical Value for t-test w/ LHS rejection region, DF = 23: -1.7138715

187 disp "T-stat for H0: delta2 (>)= 0: " _b[repair]/_se[repair]
188 T-stat for H0: delta2 (>)= 0: -2.2205283

188
189 *****
190 *3.6 Part D: Using the model given in part (c), construct a 95% interval estimate
191 * for the parameter delta2 and give its interpretation. Have we estimated the
192 * effect of the repairs on motel occupancy relatively precisely, or not? Explain.
193 *****
194
195 // STATA already reported the 95% confidence interval, but here I review how to
196 // calculate it by hand
197 scalar criticalT_05_2side = invttail(e(df_r),0.05/2)

198 scalar ciLow_repair = _b[repair]-criticalT_05_2side*_se[repair]
199 scalar ciHigh_repair = _b[repair]+criticalT_05_2side*_se[repair]

200 disp "95% Confidence Interval: [" ciLow_repair " , " ciHigh_repair "]"
201 95% Confidence Interval: [-25.566186, -.9052429]

201
202 // The interpretation for the confidence interval is that, in a 2-sided test at
203 // the 95% confidence level, we cannot reject the null that delta2 = c for any
204 // value of c between ciLow (-25.6) and ciHigh (-0.9)
205
206 /* Discussion:
207 > The confidence interval is quite wide, with the effect varying from less than
208 > a 1 percentage point drop to over a 25 percentage point drop. A 25 percentage
209 > point effect would be about 3/4 of the gap between the highest occupancy rate
210 > and the lowest occupancy rate in the non-repair period. This wide estimation
211 > band reflects the small sample size and the substantial variation in occupancy
212 > rates during both the repair and non-repair periods.
213 > */
207
208 *****
209 *3.6 Part E: Consider the linear regression model with y = MOTEL_PCT - COMP_PCT
210 * and x = REPAIR that is (MOTEL_PCT - COMP_PCT) = gamma1 + gamma2*REPAIR + e.
211 * Test the null hypothesis that gamma2 = 0 against the alternative that
212 * gamma2 < 0 at the alpha = 0.01 level of significance. Discuss the meaning of
213 * the test outcome.
214 *****
215
216 // Since the degrees of freedom haven't changed, we can use the same critical
217 // value we calculated earlier. Again, we can compare our critical value to the
218 // t-statistic reported by STATA in the regression output

```

```

219
220 gen pct_diff = motel_pct - comp_pct
221 reg pct_diff repair

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	1004.59849	1	1004.59849	F(1, 23)	=	12.54
Residual	1842.05986	23	80.0895593	Prob > F	=	0.0017
				R-squared	=	0.3529
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3248
Total	2846.65835	24	118.610765	Root MSE	=	8.9493

pct_diff	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
repair	-14.11825	3.986325	-3.54	0.002	-22.3646	-5.871913
_cons	16.86111	2.109365	7.99	0.000	12.49756	21.22466

```

222
223 disp "Alpha = 0.01 Critical Value for LHS rejection region t-test, DF = " e(df_r) ":
> " (-1)*criticalT_01 lside
Alpha = 0.01 Critical Value for LHS rejection region t-test, DF = 23: -2.4998667
224 // Since the new t stat is -3.54 compared to the critical value of -2.5 this
225 // time we reject the null that there was no (or positive) effect of the repair
226 // in favor of the alternaive that the repair had a negative effect.
227
228 // Let's once again compare the beta coefficient on the indicator variable
229 // REPAIR to the difference in the average pct_diff when repair == 0 and
230 // repair == 1. We will see that the beta estimate is equal to the difference in
231 // the means. We also compare the standard error of model_pct to that of pct_diff.
232 sum pct_diff motel_pct

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
pct_diff	25	12.908	10.89086	-9	40.8
motel_pct	25	75.644	14.43584	39.2	96.2

```

233 bysort repair: sum pct_diff motel_pct

```

```

-> repair = 0

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
pct_diff	18	16.86111	9.238802	6.6	40.8
motel_pct	18	79.35	11.64592	62.9	96.2

```

-> repair = 1

```

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
pct_diff	7	2.742857	8.072764	-9	14.8
motel_pct	7	66.11429	17.38222	39.2	82.4

```

234
235 /* Discussion:
> Overall, we find a small increase in the magnitude of the point estimate
> (-13.2 to -14.1) but a big increase in the magnitude of the t statistic
> (-2.2 to -3.5). Since the right-hand side variable (repair) is the same in both
> cases, we know there was no change in the variance of our right-hand side
> variables. Instead, most of the decline is driven by a smaller estimate of
> sigma hat. That, in turn, mechanically reflects the smaller variance of pct_diff
> (conditional on repair) compared to the variance in motel_pct.
>
> So did we cheat by switching motel_pct to pct_diff, especially if what we really
> care about is the effect on motel_pct? It depends on your stance about what
> variation in motel_pct we should and shouldn't be paying attention to.
>

```


> I would argue that it makes sense to make the switch to `pct_diff`. One criticism
> of the regression in Part (D) is that mechanically all we're calculating is the
> change in average occupancy between the 7 months of the repair period and all
> other times, so other random stuff that happened during that period could have
> caused a drop in occupancy in addition to the repairs. However, from our
> regression in Part A, we know that the occupancy rate in the competitor (`comp_pct`)
> is a decent predictor of occupancy at our own motel. One interpretation of what
> we're doing is we are partly controlling for (unobserved) demand shocks by using
> the competitor occupancy as a proxy. These demand shocks (for example, if repairs
> were made during the low season in the winter) would add variance to `motel_pct`
> that hides the true effect, so we would want to try to get rid of this type of
> noise/variance in the data.

> Let's phrase this in terms of an ad hoc economic model. Imagine that the truth
> is that `motel_pct` and `comp_pct` behave as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{motel_pct} &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \text{repair} + (d + a) \\ \text{comp_pct} &= \delta_1 + (d + b) \end{aligned}$$

> where d , a , and b are all unobserved shocks which are normal, mean zero, have
> constant variance and are all mutually independent. Using economic language, we
> can say that d is a common demand shock, while a and b are idiosyncratic shocks
> for the motel and the competitor, respectively.

> Below, I will use (#) to refer to the "true" economic model in terms of the two
> equations shown above, and (#a) to refer to the "econometric" or "reduced form"
> model that is being fed into the OLS procedure.

> Given the economic model I proposed, consider two options for estimating α_2 :

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \text{motel_pct} &= \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \text{repair} + (d + a) \\ (1a) \quad \text{motel_pct} &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{repair} + e(1) \\ (2) \quad (\text{motel_pct} - \text{comp_pct}) &= (\alpha_1 - \delta_1) + \alpha_2 \text{repair} + (a - b) \\ (2a) \quad (\text{motel_pct} - \text{comp_pct}) &= \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \text{repair} + e(2) \end{aligned}$$

> Given our assumptions about d , a , and b both options (1a) and (2a) satisfy all
> the OLS assumptions, so both are valid regressions. While the meaning of the
> constant in the regression changes (β_1 estimates α_1 while γ_1 estimates
> $\alpha_1 - \delta_1$), the term on `repair` is an estimator for α_2 in both cases.
> Which estimator should we prefer, β_2 or γ_2 ? Well, we know the variance of
> β_2 depends on the variance of $e(1)$ while the variance of γ_2 depends on
> the variance of $e(2)$. Given our assumptions, $\text{Var}(e(1)) = \text{Var}(d) + \text{Var}(a)$ and
> $\text{Var}(e(2)) = \text{Var}(a) + \text{Var}(b)$. So the question is whether we think the variance of
> the common shocks d is larger or smaller than the idiosyncratic shocks b . Given
> our results, it seems likely that $\text{Var}(d) > \text{Var}(b)$.

> We can also use this model to rule out an alternative regression that might
> seem to have an intuitive appeal. Earlier we said `comp_pct` is acting like a
> control for the unobserved common demand shock, so would it be reasonable to try
> running OLS as follows:

$$(3a) \quad \text{motel_pct} = z_1 + z_2 \text{repair} + z_3 \text{comp_pct} + e(3)$$

> Mapping this regression model back to our simple economic model, the economic
> model would say that the truth is:

$$(3) \quad \text{motel_pct} = (\alpha_1 - \delta_1) + \alpha_2 \text{repair} + (1)(\delta_1 + d + b) + (a - b)$$

> We would want to say that z_1 is an estimator for $(\alpha_1 - \delta_1)$, z_2 is
> an estimator for α_2 and z_3 is an estimator for the number 1. However, our
> economic model tells us that this regression violates the OLS assumptions. Notice
> that the shock for the competitor (b) appears in both the right-hand side variable
> `comp_pct` and in the error term $e(3)$. The bias introduced here could be thought of
> as measurement error for the common shock d , which results in "attenuation bias"
> reflected in an estimate for z_3 that is below the magnitude of the true value.
> This attenuation bias also potentially affects the estimates for z_1 and z_2 .

> To (potentially) see attenuation bias in action, let's think about the regression
> from Part A in terms of the economic model I proposed:

$$(4a) \quad \text{motel_pct} = x_1 + x_2 \text{comp_pct} + e(4)$$

```

>      (4)  motel_pct=(alpha1-delta1+avg(alpha2*repair)) + (1)*(delta1+d+b) + (a-b)
>
> Notice that x2 is supposed to be an estimator for the number (1), but that we
> have this issue that (b) appears in both comp_pct and the error term e(4). In
> Part A we found a point estimate for x2 that was about 0.86 and failed to reject
> the null that x2 >= 1. However, if we had a large sample the attenuation bias
> would remain and we would eventually be able to reject the null that x2 >=1.
> */
236
237 ////////////////////////////////////////
> //////////////////////////////////////// Preparing a Figure ////////////////////////////////////////
>
238 //To fix ideas, let's plot the data and fitted values for part (d) and part (e)
239 //--> Note: Don't get too worried about where I put in missing value, this is just
240 //      to help make the figure look nice.
241 sort time

242 reg motel_pct repair

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	882.928029	1	882.928029	F(1, 23)	=	4.93
Residual	4118.51357	23	179.065807	Prob > F	=	0.0365
				R-squared	=	0.1765
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1407
Total	5001.4416	24	208.3934	Root MSE	=	13.382

motel_pct	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
repair	-13.23571	5.960615	-2.22	0.037	-25.56619 - .9052429
_cons	79.35	3.154061	25.16	0.000	72.82533 85.87467

```

243 predict fit_partD, xb
244 gen fit_partD_norepair = fit_partD
245 replace fit_partD_norepair = . if repair == 1 // Put in "missing value" when repair
> == 1
  (7 real changes made, 7 to missing)
246 gen fit_partD_repair = fit_partD
247 replace fit_partD_repair = . if repair == 0 // Put in "missing value" when repair ==
> 0
  (18 real changes made, 18 to missing)
248 twoway (line fit_partD_norepair time, cmissing(n) lcolor(blue) legend(label(1 "Fitted:
> Repair == 0"))) //
>      (line fit_partD_repair time, cmissing(n) lcolor(red) legend(label(2
> "Fitted: Repair == 1"))) //
>      (scatter motel_pct time if repair == 0, mcolor(blue) legend(label(3
> "Data: Repair == 0"))) //
>      (scatter motel_pct time if repair == 1, mcolor(red) legend(label(4 "
> Data: Repair == 1"))), //
>      ytitle("Motel Occupancy Rate (%)") xtitle("Time") //
>      title("Motel Occupancy") subtitle("Repair and Non-Repair Per
> iods") //
>      text(45 1 "Model: motel_pct = b1 + b2*repair", place(e))

```

```

249
250 graph export "./Figures/Q 3-6 Motel_Pct Regression.pdf", replace
    (file ./Figures/Q 3-6 Motel_Pct Regression.pdf written in PDF format)

```

```

251
252 reg pct_diff repair

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	25
Model	1004.59849	1	1004.59849	F(1, 23)	=	12.54
Residual	1842.05986	23	80.0895593	Prob > F	=	0.0017
				R-squared	=	0.3529
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3248
Total	2846.65835	24	118.610765	Root MSE	=	8.9493

pct_diff	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
repair	-14.11825	3.986325	-3.54	0.002	-22.3646	-5.871913
_cons	16.86111	2.109365	7.99	0.000	12.49756	21.22466

```

253 predict fit_partE, xb
254 gen fit_partE_norepair = fit_partE
255 replace fit_partE_norepair = . if repair == 1 // Put in "missing value" when repair
    > == 1
    (7 real changes made, 7 to missing)
256 gen fit_partE_repair = fit_partE
257 replace fit_partE_repair = . if repair == 0 // Put in "missing value" when repair ==
    > 0
    (18 real changes made, 18 to missing)
258 twoway (line fit_partE_norepair time, cmissing(n) lcolor(blue) legend(label(1 "Fitted:
    > d: Repair == 0"))) ///
    > (line fit_partE_repair time, cmissing(n) lcolor(red) legend(label(2
    > "Fitted: Repair == 1"))) ///
    > (scatter pct_diff time if repair == 0, mcolor(blue) legend(label(3 "
    > Data: Repair == 0"))) ///
    > (scatter pct_diff time if repair == 1, mcolor(red) legend(label(4 "D
    > ata: Repair == 1"))), ///
    > ytitle("Motel - Competitor Occupancy Rate (p.p.)") xtitle("Time") ///
    > title("Gap in Occupancy Rate vs Competitor") subtitle("Repair
    > and Non-Repair Periods") ///
    > text(-5 1 "Model: pct_diff = b1 + b2*repair", place(e))
259
260 graph export "./Figures/Q 3-6 Pct_Diff Regression.pdf", replace
    (file ./Figures/Q 3-6 Pct_Diff Regression.pdf written in PDF format)

```

```

261
262 ////////////////////////////////////// End Figure Preparation //////////////////////////////////////
    > //////////////////////////////////////
    >
263 *****
264 *3.6 Part F: Using the model in part (e), construct and discuss the 95% interval
265 * estimate of gamma2.

```

```

266 *****
267
268 // STATA already calculated the 95% confidence interval above in the output
269 // for reg pct_diff repair
270
271 /* Discussion:
  > As we noted earlier, the magnitude of the t statistic is larger in part (e)
  > because of a larger point estimate and a smaller se(b2). The same forces are
  > moving the confidence interval around. First, the confidence interval is shifted
  > lower because of the lower (more negative) point estimate. Second, the width
  > of the confidence interval shrank because of the smaller se(b2). Both forces
  > tend to bring ciHigh down, but they work in opposite direction for ciLow; we
  > can see that most of the impact is coming from se(b2) because ciLow is higher
  > (less negative) than it was in part (d) despite the lower point estimate.
  > */
272
273 //////////////////////////////////////// Question 4.13 ////////////////////////////////////////
  > ////////////////////////////////////////
  > ////////////////////////////////////////
  >
274 *****
275 *Setup: Consider data on 880 houses sold in Stockton, CA during mid-2005
276 *
277 * Parts (A) - (H)
278 *****
279
280 use stockton2.dta, clear

281
282 *****
283 *4.13 Part A: Estimate the log-linear model in  $\ln(\text{PRICE}) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \text{SQFT} + e$ .
284 * Interpret the estimated model parameters. Calculate the slope and elasticity
285 * at the sample means, if necessary.
286 *****
287
288 gen ln_price = log(price)

289 reg ln_price sqft

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	880
Model	88.3556977	1	88.3556977	F(1, 878)	=	2143.38
Residual	36.1934444	878	.041222602	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.7094
				Adj R-squared	=	0.7091
Total	124.549142	879	.141694132	Root MSE	=	.20303

ln_price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
sqft	.000596	.0000129	46.30	0.000	.0005707 .0006212
_cons	10.59379	.02185	484.84	0.000	10.5509 10.63667

```

290
291 // STATA Note: to have STATA run a command but NOT report the output in the
292 // results window, you can put quietly (or qui for short) before a command.
293 // We don't want to see all the summary detail for sqft and price, we just want
294 // to use STATA to calculate the mean for later use, so we use qui here
295 qui sum sqft

```

```
296 scalar mean_sqft = r(mean)
```

```
297 qui sum price
```

```
298 scalar mean_price = r(mean)
```

```
299 // Slope: since  $y = \exp(\sigma^2/2) \cdot \exp(b1 + b2 \cdot x)$ , we have
```

```
300 // -->  $dy/dx = \exp(\sigma^2/2) \cdot \exp(b1+b2 \cdot x) \cdot b2 = y \cdot b2$ 
```

```
301 lincom `=mean_price'*_b[sqft]
```

```
( 1) 112810.8*sqft = 0
```

ln_price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
(1)	67.23106	1.45218	46.30	0.000	64.38091	70.0812

```
302 // Elasticity: Given our model,  $dlny/dlnx = (x/y) \cdot (dy/dx) = x \cdot b2$ 
```

```
303 lincom `=mean_sqft'*_b[sqft]
```

```
( 1) 1611.968*sqft = 0
```

ln_price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
(1)	.9606732	.0207504	46.30	0.000	.9199471	1.001399

```
304
```

```
305 // Compare estimate of the elasticity using lincom to the margins command using
```

```
306 // the dyex option. The dyex tells stata to calculate the "margin" of the form
```

```
307 //  $dy/dlnx$ , but since  $dy$  is already  $dlny$ , and the elasticity is equal to
```

```
308 //  $dlny/dlnx$  this gets us to our desired answer
```

```
309 margins, dyex(sqft) atmeans
```

```
Conditional marginal effects      Number of obs      =      880
Model VCE      : OLS
```

```
Expression      : Linear prediction, predict()
dy/ex w.r.t.    : sqft
at              : sqft              =      1611.968 (mean)
```

	Delta-method		t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	dy/ex	Std. Err.				
sqft	.9606732	.0207504	46.30	0.000	.919947	1.001399

```
310
```

```
311 // Store residuals and fitted values for later
```

```
312 predict ln_price_hat_loglin, xb
```

```
313 predict residual_loglin, residual
```

```
314 label var residual_loglin "Residual (Log-Linear)"
```

```
315 gen price_hat_loglin = exp(ln_price_hat_loglin)
```

```

316 gen price_hat_loglin_adju = price_hat_loglin*exp(e(rmse)^2/2)
317 //stdf option for predict = standard error of forecast
318 //aka s.e.(yi - yhati) where yi refers to OLS regression (not any transformations)
319 predict stdf_loglin, stdf

320
321 *****
322 *4.13 Part B: Estimate the log-log model  $\ln(\text{PRICE}) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \ln(\text{SQFT}) + e$ .
323 * Interpret the estimated parameters. Calculate the slope and elasticity at the
324 * sample means, if necessary.
325 *****
326
327 gen ln_sqft = log(sqft)

328 reg ln_price ln_sqft

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	880
Model	86.4716562	1	86.4716562	F(1, 878)	=	1993.88
Residual	38.0774859	878	.043368435	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.6943
				Adj R-squared	=	0.6939
Total	124.549142	879	.141694132	Root MSE	=	.20825

ln_price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ln_sqft	1.006582	.0225423	44.65	0.000	.9623386	1.050825
_cons	4.170677	.1655084	25.20	0.000	3.845839	4.495515

```

329
330 // In a log-log model, the beta coefficient corresponds to an elasticity, so we
331 // don't need to do any more calculation for that.
332 // The formula for slope dy/dx can be found by noting that
333 //  $y = \exp(b_1 + b_2 \ln(x)) = \exp(b_1) * x^{b_2}$ 
334 // -->  $dy/dx = \exp(b_1) * b_2 * x^{(b_2-1)} = (y/x) * b_2$ 
335 lincom `=mean_price' / `=mean_sqft' * _b[ln_sqft]

```

(1) **69.98327*ln_sqft = 0**

ln_price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
(1)	70.44388	1.577587	44.65	0.000	67.3476	73.54017

```

336
337 // Store residuals and fitted values for later
338 predict ln_price_hat_loglog, xb

339 predict residual_loglog, residual

340 label var residual_loglog "Residual (Log-Log)"

341 gen price_hat_loglog = exp(ln_price_hat_loglog)

342 gen price_hat_loglog_adju = price_hat_loglog*exp(e(rmse)^2/2)

343 //stdf option for predict = standard error of forecast

```

```

344 //aka s.e.(yi - yhati) where yi refers to OLS regression (not any transformations)
345 predict stdf_loglog, stdf

```

```

346
347 *****
348 *4.13 Part C: Compare the R2 value from the linear model PRICE = betal + beta2*SQFT
> + e
349 * to the "generalized" R2 measure for the models in (b) and (c).
350 *****
351
352 reg price sqft

```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	880
Model	1.6479e+12	1	1.6479e+12	F(1, 878)	=	1799.75
Residual	8.0391e+11	878	915618929	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.6721
				Adj R-squared	=	0.6717
Total	2.4518e+12	879	2.7893e+09	Root MSE	=	30259

price	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
sqft	81.38899	1.918489	42.42	0.000	77.62363	85.15435
_cons	-18385.65	3256.424	-5.65	0.000	-24776.94	-11994.37

```

353 predict price_hat_lin, xb

```

```

354
355 // The "generalized" R2 measure is the square of the correlaton between the
356 // fitted values (yhat) and the actual values of the dependent variable (y)
357 //
358 // (1) Use STATA to calculate the correlation coefficients
359 corr price price_hat_lin price_hat_loglin price_hat_loglog price_hat_loglin_adju pri
> ce_hat_loglog_adju
(obs=880)

```

	price	pri~_lin	pri~glin	price~g	p~n_adju	p~g_adju
price	1.0000					
price_h~_lin	0.8198	1.0000				
price_h~glin	0.8455	0.9546	1.0000			
price_hat~g	0.8201	1.0000	0.9549	1.0000		
price~n_adju	0.8455	0.9546	1.0000	0.9549	1.0000	
price~g_adju	0.8201	1.0000	0.9549	1.0000	0.9549	1.0000

```

360 // --> The correlations that we care about are the values in the first column
361 //      in rows 2 and on. The diagonals are all equal to 1 because by definition
362 //      the correlation of a variable with itself must be 1.
363 //
364 // --> Note that the correlation coefficients are identical for the adjusted
365 //      and unadjusted versions of the log-linear and log-log models. In other
366 //      words, the values in rows 3 and 5 match along with rows 4 and 6. This is
367 //      guaranteed to be the case because the adjustment only involved multiplying
368 //      by a fixed number, so it ends up cancelling in the top and bottom of the
369 //      correlation calculation.
370 //
371 // Calculate "generalized" R2 by hand using numbers reported by corr
372 scalar r2_lin = 0.8198^2

```

```

373 scalar r2_loglin = 0.8455^2
374 scalar r2_loglog = 0.8201^2

375
376 // View Results
377 disp "R2 - Linear: " r2_lin
R2 - Linear: .67207204

378 disp "R2 - Log-Linear: " r2_loglin
R2 - Log-Linear: .71487025

379 disp "R2 - Log-Log: " r2_loglog
R2 - Log-Log: .67256401

380
381 ////////////////////////////////////////////////// Random STATA Tip ///////////////////////////////////
> // We could have done the corr command above faster using the character * wildcard.
382 // By typing price_hat*, STATA will find ALL the workspace variables that begin
383 // with price_hat regardless of what follows.
384 // Note that in the output the order will be the order of variables in the
385 // workspace (e.g. higher in variable list, closer to left hand side of the
386 // workspace browser) when you use * to fill in all the names. Try using the
387 // command input:
388 // corr price price_hat*
389
390 ////////////////////////////////////////////////// Warning: Advanced STATA Usage Below ///////////////////////////////////
> ////////////////////////////////////////////////// Feel free to ignore Steps (2) through (5) ///////////////////////////////////
>
391 // (2) The full correlation matrix is saved in the return list as r(C). Store
392 // r(C) as a matrix variable.
393 matrix full_corr_mat = r(C)

394
395 // (3) Select only the elements of full_corr_mat that we care about: the first
396 // column from rows 2, 3, and 4 (as noted above rows 5 and 6 are redundant).
397 matrix y_yhat_corr = full_corr_mat[2..4,1]

398
399 // (4) Calculate the square of each corr(price,price_hat), aka the square of
400 // each individual element of y_yhat_corr
401 // Option A: Loop. Write a short program that isolates each value in
402 // y_yhat_corr and calculates the square of that value.
403 matrix r2_vectorA = [1\1\1] // create a column of ones (to be overwritten later)

404 forvalues x = 1/3 {
405     2. matrix r2_vectorA[`x',1] = y_yhat_corr[`x',1]^2
406     3. }

407 // Option B: Matrix multiplication. If we take a column vector (let's call it v),
408 // then the diagonal elements of v*v' will be the square of the
409 // elements of v itself.
410 matrix r2_vectorB = vecdiag(y_yhat_corr*y_yhat_corr')'

411
412 // (5) To have STATA display the contents of a matrix, use the command input:
413 matrix list [matrix name]
414 matrix list r2_vectorA

r2_vectorA[3,1]
      c1
r1  .67211304
r2  .7147877
r3  .67255133

```



```

413 matrix list r2_vectorB

      r1
r2_vectorB[3,1]
price_h~_lin    .67211304
price_h~glin    .7147877
price_hat~g     .67255133

414
415 ////////////////////////////////// End: Advanced STATA Usage \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\
>
416 // Store residual and fitted values for later
417 predict residual_lin, residual

418 label var residual_lin "Residual (Linear)"

419 //stdf option for predict = standard error of forecast
420 //aka s.e.(yi - yhati) where yi refers to OLS regression (not any transformations)
421 predict stdf_lin, stdf

422
423 *****
424 *4.13 Part D: Construct histograms of least squares residuals from each of the
425 * models in (a), (b), and (c) and obtain the Jarque-Bera statistics. Based on
426 * your observations, do you consider the distributions of the residuals to be
427 * compatible with an assumption of normality?
428 *****
429
430 sum residual loglin, detail

```

Residual (Log-Linear)

	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	-.4598814	-.710299		
5%	-.3142879	-.6619065		
10%	-.2410653	-.6477303	Obs	880
25%	-.1200507	-.6345798	Sum of Wgt.	880
50%	-.0139173		Mean	-1.73e-10
		Largest	Std. Dev.	.202918
75%	.1158161	.7670023		
90%	.2606355	.7681834	Variance	.0411757
95%	.3558994	.8957195	Skewness	.3239307
99%	.5422422	.9086631	Kurtosis	4.315611

```
431 scalar jbb loglin = (r(N)/6)*(r(skewness)^2 + ((r(kurtosis)-3)^2)/4)
```

```
432
433 sum residual loglog, detail
```

Residual (Log-Log)

	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	-.49264	-.7518981		
5%	-.3091487	-.6739541		
10%	-.2441997	-.6184166	Obs	880
25%	-.1303633	-.5487044	Sum of Wgt.	880
50%	-.018237		Mean	-2.38e-10
		Largest	Std. Dev.	.2081324
75%	.1182303	.7180918		
90%	.2746109	.7190305	Variance	.0433191
95%	.3657138	.8612714	Skewness	.3488042
99%	.5302507	.8624387	Kurtosis	3.975605

```
434 scalar jb_loglog = (r(N)/6)*(r(skewness)^2 + ((r(kurtosis)-3)^2)/4)
```

```
435
```

```
436 sum residual_lin, detail
```

Residual (Linear)				
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	-68089.01	-101224.1		
5%	-41894.24	-91337.09		
10%	-30454.09	-84395.79	Obs	880
25%	-16140.87	-76857.88	Sum of Wgt.	880
50%	-2667.711		Mean	-9.86e-06
		Largest	Std. Dev.	30241.98
75%	12093.73	166920.7		
90%	28794.58	168413	Variance	9.15e+08
95%	50104.84	186850.3	Skewness	1.59206
99%	112023.8	204279.8	Kurtosis	10.53922

```
437 scalar jb_lin = (r(N)/6)*(r(skewness)^2 + ((r(kurtosis)-3)^2)/4)
```

```
438
```

```
439 // The distribution for the Jarque-Bera statistic is Chi Square w/ 2 degrees of
```

```
440 // freedom, so for each of these we can also calculate a p-value using the
```

```
441 // 1 minus the Chi Square (2) CDF
```

```
442
```

```
443 disp "JB Stat - Linear: " jb_lin ", (p-value = " 1 - chi2(2,jb_lin) ")"
```

```
JB Stat - Linear: 2455.8747, (p-value = 0)
```

```
444 disp "JB Stat - Log Linear: " jb_loglin ", (p-value = " 1 - chi2(2,jb_loglin) ")"
```

```
JB Stat - Log Linear: 78.853742, (p-value = 0)
```

```
445 disp "JB Stat - Log Log: " jb_loglog ", (p-value = " 1 - chi2(2,jb_loglog) ")"
```

```
JB Stat - Log Log: 52.743634, (p-value = 3.523e-12)
```

```
446
```

```
447 hist residual_lin, kdensity title("Q 4-13: Histogram for Residuals from Linear Model  
> ")
```

```
(bin=29, start=-101224.08, width=10534.615)
```

```
448 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Linear Residual Histogram.pdf", replace
```

```
(file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Linear Residual Histogram.pdf written in PDF format)
```

```
449
```

```
450 hist residual_loglin, kdensity title("Q 4-13: Histogram for Residuals from Log-Linear  
> Model")
```

```
(bin=29, start=-.71029896, width=.05582628)
```

```
451 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Linear Residual Histogram.pdf", replace
```

```
(file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Linear Residual Histogram.pdf written in PDF format)
```

```
452
```

```
453 hist residual_lin, kdensity title("Q 4-13: Histogram for Residuals from Log-Log Mode  
> l")
```

```
(bin=29, start=-101224.08, width=10534.615)
```

```
454 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Log Residual Histogram.pdf", replace
```

```
(file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Log Residual Histogram.pdf written in PDF format)
```

```

455
456 /* Discussion:
  > Overall, looking at the distribution and reviewing the summary statistics it is
  > clear that there is a long positive tail which corresponds to the positive skew
  > reported in the summary table. If the residuals were distributed normally there
  > should be no skew. Kurtosis is a measure of how "fat" the tails are - i.e. how
  > much of the probability mass is concentrated in events further from the mean.
  > While this is harder to distinguish by looking at the histogram in isolation,
  > the summary statistics show large kurtosis (greater than 3) for the residuals
  > from all the models. The skew and kurtosis both contribute to large Jarque-Bera
  > statistic, which leads to small p-values and clearly support rejecting the null
  > that the residuals are distributed normally. This situation is most severe for
  > the regressions from the linear model.
  > */
457
458 *****
459 *4.13 Part E: For each of the models in (a)-(c), plot the least squares residuals
460 * against SQFT. Do you observe any patterns?
461 *****
462
463 gen zero_val = 0

464 twoway (scatter residual_lin sqft) (line zero_val sqft, lcolor(black)), ///
  > title("Q 4-13: Scatter of Residuals from Linear Model") lege
  > nd(off)

465 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Linear Residual Scatter.pdf", replace
  (file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Linear Residual Scatter.pdf written in PDF format)

466
467 twoway (scatter residual_loglin sqft) (line zero_val sqft, lcolor(black)), ///
  > title("Q 4-13: Scatter of Residuals from Log-Linear Model")
  > legend(off)

468 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Linear Residual Scatter.pdf", replace
  (file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Log-Linear Residual Scatter.pdf written in PDF format)

469
470 twoway (scatter residual_loglog sqft) (line zero_val sqft, lcolor(black)), ///
  > title("Q 4-13: Scatter of Residuals from Log-Log Model") legend(off)

471 graph export "Q 4-13 Log-Log Residual Scatter.pdf", replace
  (file Q 4-13 Log-Log Residual Scatter.pdf written in PDF format)

472
473 /* Discussion:
  > In all cases, the residuals appear to be more spread out (higher variance) for
  > home with higher square footage. In addition, for the Linear and Log-Log models
  > there is a clear tendency for the few observations in sqft>3500 to have large
  > positive residuals, suggesting the model does poorly for fitting the data in
  > that region.
  > */
474
475 *****
476 *4.13 Part F: For each of the models in (a)-(c), predict the value of a house
477 * with 2700 square feet.
478 *****
479
480 //It turns out there are a few observations that already have sqft = 2700 so
481 // we can just look at the predicted values from those points

```

```
482 list price_hat_lin price_hat_loglin_adju price_hat_loglog_adju if sqft == 2700
```

	pri~_lin	p~n_adju	p~g_adju
556.	201364.6	203515.8	188220.8
668.	201364.6	203515.8	188220.8

```
483
484 // To avoid showing multiple observations, let's quickly find a single row number
485 // where sqft == 2700
486 gen count = _n

487 qui sum count if sqft == 2700

488 scalar first_sqft2700 = r(min)

489
490 *****
491 *4.13 Part G: For each model in (a)-(c), construct a 95% prediction interval for
492 * the value of a house with 2700 square feet.
493 *****
494
495 // For the linear model, the (1-alpha) confidence interval at each x value is
496 // defined as:
497 // --> [ yhat(x) - tc(alpha)*stdf(x), yhat(x) + tc(alpha)*stdf(x) ]
498 // while for regression with ln(y) on the left-hand side we have:
499 // --> [ exp( ln_y_hat(x) - tc(alpha)*stdf(x) ), exp( ln_y_hat(x) + tc(alpha)*stdf(x)
500 // Note that tc(alpha) is the same in all circumstances
501 //
502 // Also, it's important to recall the distinction between stdf and stdp:
503 //      stdp = s.e.(yhat)
504 //      stdf = s.e.(y - yhat)
505 // yhat = b0 + b1*x so that the randomness in yhat comes from b0 and b1, while
506 // for stdf y-yhat = (beta0-b0) + (beta1-b1)*e which has randomness from b0 and
507 // b1 along with randomness from e. The textbook refers to the concept tied to
508 // stdf as the "prediction interval" and the concept for stdp as the "interval
509 // estimate for E(y)". Somewhat confusingly, STATA refers to stdp as the "standard
510 // error of the prediction", so you should be a bit careful about which concept
511 // is intended in which context.
512
513 // (1) Calculate critical t value for 2-sided 95% interval
514 // --> use regress to get degrees of freedom
515 qui reg price sqft

516 scalar criticalT_05_2side = invttail(e(df_r), 0.05/2)

517 // (2) Calculate low- and high- points of confidence interval for the 3 models
518 // --> Linear
519 gen cilow_price_hat_lin = price_hat_lin - criticalT_05_2side*stdf_lin

520 gen cihigh_price_hat_lin = price_hat_lin + criticalT_05_2side*stdf_lin

521 // --> Log-Linear
522 gen cilow_price_hat_loglin = exp(ln_price_hat_loglin - criticalT_05_2side*stdf_logli
523 > n)

523 gen cihigh_price_hat_loglin = exp(ln_price_hat_loglin + criticalT_05_2side*stdf_logli
524 > in)
```

```

524 // --> Log-Log
525 gen cilow_price_hat_loglog = exp(ln_price_hat_loglog - criticalT_05_2side*stdf_loglo
> g)

526 gen cihigh_price_hat_loglog = exp(ln_price_hat_loglog + criticalT_05_2side*stdf_logl
> og)

527
528 // (3) Use list to display the confidence intervals at sqft == 2700
529 disp "95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Linear: "
95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Linear:

530 list cilow_price_hat_lin cihigh_price_hat_lin in `=first_sqft2700'

```

	cil~_lin	cih~_lin
556.	141801	260928.2

```

531 disp "95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Log-Linear: "
95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Log-Linear:

532 list cilow_price_hat_loglin cihigh_price_hat_loglin in `=first_sqft2700'

```

	cil~glin	cih~glin
556.	133683.1	297315.2

```

533 disp "95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Log-Log: "
95% Confidence Interval for price_hat(sqft = 2700) - Log-Log:

534 list cilow_price_hat_loglog cihigh_price_hat_loglog in `=first_sqft2700'

```

	cilow~g	cihigh~g
556.	122267	277454.2

```

535
536 *****
537 *4.13 Part H: Based on your work in this problem, discuss the choice of functional
538 * form. Which functional form would you use? Explain.
539 *****
540
541 /* Discussion:
> All the models give estimates in roughly the same ball park (large overlaps in
> confidence interval estimates), and all have wide dispersion in the point
> estimates (i.e. relatively wide confidence intervals). The strongest arguments
> for which model to use probably comes from the our analysis of the residuals,
> where the linear model performed very poorly in for high-square footage homes.
> The two log(price) models corrected for this, but between these two the log-
> linear model seemed to do better. Comparing the log-linear model to the log-log
> model, the log-linear has smaller residuals in the high-square footage homes,
> an overall lower sigma_hat^2 estimate, larger t-stat, and higher R2 in both
> the log(price) and price estimates. It is useful to note that it is hard to
> directly compare the regression sigma_hat^2 between the log(price) and price
> regression due to the change in scale caused by using log values.
> */

```

```

542 *****
543 *****
544 *4.13 - Supplementary Figures
545 *WARNING: This section uses some "advanced STATA" techniques, and has no
546 *      content related to the class directly.
547 *****
548 *****
549 // Graph to compare fitted values of price. Use only the adjusted values for the
550 // log-log and log-linear regression
551
552 // Have STATA take a picture of the workspace variables that we can return to
553 // later, undoing any changes that take place between "preserve" and "restore"
554 preserve
555
556 // Create a varlist including all variables with names starting with "price",
557 // or "cilow" or "cihigh", with * meaning any values (including nothing) after
558 // the given prefix are allowable.
559 local price_scale_vars "price* cilow* cihigh*"
560
561 // Just to check what variables got put into this local, let's have STATA
562 // report the names of the variables in this loop. Notice the order of the
563 // variables (1) the order of the stubs provided, and (2) within each stub, the
564 // order follows the order in which variables are stored in the workspace
565 foreach x of varlist `price_scale_vars' {
566     2.      disp "`x'"
567     3. }
568 price
569 price_hat_loglin
570 price_hat_loglin_adju
571 price_hat_loglog
572 price_hat_loglog_adju
573 price_hat_lin
574 cilow_price_hat_lin
575 cilow_price_hat_loglin
576 cilow_price_hat_loglog
577 cihigh_price_hat_lin
578 cihigh_price_hat_loglin
579 cihigh_price_hat_loglog
580
581 // Before plotting, let's adjust the scale of all these variables so that they
582 // are in terms of thousands of dollars instead of single dollars
583 foreach x of varlist `price_scale_vars' {
584     2.      replace `x' = `x' / 1000
585     3. }
586 (880 real changes made)
587 (880 real changes made)
588 (880 real changes made)
589 (880 real changes made)
590 (880 real changes made)
591 (880 real changes made)
592 (880 real changes made)
593 (880 real changes made)
594 (880 real changes made)
595 (880 real changes made)
596 (880 real changes made)
597 (880 real changes made)
598 (880 real changes made)
599 (880 real changes made)
600 (880 real changes made)

```

```

570
571 // In addition, let's update the variable labels, since this will be the
572 // automatic legend labels when we make a figure
573 label var price "Price - Raw Data"

574 label var price_hat_lin "Fitted Values: Linear"

575 label var price_hat_loglin_adju "Fitted Values: Log-Linear"

576 label var price_hat_loglog_adju "Fitted Values: Log-Log"

577
578 // Now, sort by sqft, plot the raw data as a scatter plot, and the fitted
579 // values for each model as a line
580 sort sqft

581 twoway (scatter price sqft) ///
>         (line price_hat_lin sqft, lcolor(red)) ///
>         (line price_hat_loglin_adju sqft, lcolor(green)) ///
>         (line price_hat_loglog_adju sqft, lcolor(orange)) ///
>         ytitle("Price ($ thousands)") xtitle("Square Footage") ///
>         title("Price Fitted Values vs. Sqft")

582 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Price Sqft Fitted Value Lines.pdf", replace
(file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Price Sqft Fitted Value Lines.pdf written in PDF format)

583
584 twoway (scatter price sqft, mcolor(navy)) ///
>         (line price_hat_lin sqft, lcolor(red)) ///
>         (line price_hat_loglin_adju sqft, lcolor(green)) ///
>         (line price_hat_loglog_adju sqft, lcolor(orange)) ///
>         (line cilow*_lin sqft, lcolor(red) lpattern
> (" _")) ///
>         (line cihigh*_lin sqft, lcolor(red) lpattern
> (" _")) ///
>         (line cilow*_loglin sqft, lcolor(green) lpatte
> rn(" _")) ///
>         (line cihigh*_loglin sqft, lcolor(green) lpattern(" _"))
>         ///
>         (line cilow*_loglog sqft, lcolor(orange) lpatt
> ern(" _")) ///
>         (line cihigh*_loglog sqft, lcolor(orange) lpattern(" _"))
>         , ///
>         ytitle("Price ($ thousands)") xtitle("Square Footage") ///
>         title("Price Fitted Values vs. Sqft") subtitle("(With Confid
> ence Intervals)") ///
>         legend(order(1 2 3 4)) text(700 900 "Dashed Lines are Foreca
> st Confidence Intervals", place(e))

585 graph export "./Figures/Q 4-13 Price Sqft Fitted Value Lines with CI.pdf", replace
(file ./Figures/Q 4-13 Price Sqft Fitted Value Lines with CI.pdf written in PDF format
> )

586
587 // Return value of all STATA variables to what they were when I used the
588 // "preserve" command earlier
589 restore

590
591 //Convert log file (smcl) to pdf

```