

ECON-320-Lab-6

Sonan Memon

Introduction

- There are many possible causes of failure in accurate causal inference with econometric models; one of them is omitted variable bias.
- Correlation is not causation.

Packages

```
library(tinytex)
```

```
library(tidyverse)
```

```
library(dslabs)
```

```
library(dplyr)
```

```
library(ggplot2)
```

```
library(tibble)
```

```
library(modelsummary)
```

```
library(broom)
```

```
library(haven)
```

Example with Simulation

```
n <- 1000

set.seed(1)

# Generate data in a tibble
data_sim = tibble(
  e1 = rnorm(n, sd = 3),
  e2 = rnorm(n, sd = 2),
  e3 = rnorm(n, sd = 1),
  x = runif(n, min = 0, max = 10),
  y = runif(n, min = 10, max = 20),
  z = 20 - 0.3*y + 3*x + e1,
  a = 6 + 2*x - 1.5*y + e2,
  b = 10 - 0.5*y + 4*z + e3)

lm1 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ x)
lm2 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ y)
lm3 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ x + y)
```

Example with Simulation

- Is there omitted variable bias in any of the following models?

$$a = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$$

$$a = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y$$

$$a = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 y$$

Regression Table: Models for a

Table 1: Results From Simulated Data

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
(Intercept)	-16.565*** (0.308)	17.031*** (1.026)	5.842*** (0.370)
x	2.037*** (0.052)		1.994*** (0.023)
y		-1.548*** (0.068)	-1.490*** (0.023)

+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Example with Simulation

- Is there omitted variable bias in any of the following models?

$$b = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$$

$$b = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y$$

$$b = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \beta_2 y$$

Example with Simulation

```
lm4 = lm(data = data_sim, b ~ y)
lm5 = lm(data = data_sim, b ~ z)
lm6 = lm(data = data_sim, b ~ y + z)
```


Regression Table: Models for b

Table 2: Results From Simulated Data

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
(Intercept)	152.698*** (6.230)	2.093*** (0.193)	9.971*** (0.213)
y	-1.751*** (0.411)		-0.498*** (0.011)
z		4.015*** (0.006)	4.001*** (0.004)

+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Bad Controls

- Irrelevant and bad controls can soak up all the variance and block causal pathways of interest.
- Examples below add an irrelevant control correlated with x and another correlated with a , which are both bad controls.
- Look at adjusted R^2 values and coefficient significance for below.

```
data_sim$c <- data_sim$x + rnorm(nrow(data_sim), sd = 0.5)
```

```
data_sim$d <- data_sim$a + rnorm(nrow(data_sim), sd = 0.5)
```

```
lm9 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ y + x)
```

```
lm10 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ y + x + c)
```

```
lm11 = lm(data = data_sim, a ~ y + x + d)
```

F Tests

- Consider the model: $b = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y + \beta_2 z$
- If we want to test null hypotheses such as $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2$ or $H_0 : \beta_1 = 2 * \beta_2$ or $H_0 : \beta_1 > \beta_2$ etc, we can use F tests.
- Restricted versus unrestricted models, Under $H_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2$, model is: $b = \beta_0 + \beta_1(y + z)$.

```
data_sim <- data_sim %>%  
mutate(plus = y + z)  
  
restricted = lm(data = data_sim, b ~ plus)  
unrestricted = lm(data = data_sim, b ~ y + z)
```

- $F_{q,n-k-1} = \frac{\frac{RSS_r - RSS_u}{q}}{\frac{RSS_u}{n-k-1}}$
- For $H_o : \beta_1 = \beta_2$, $q = 1$, $k = 2$, $n = 1000$

Manual Computation of F-Test

```
res_r_sq = (unname(resid(restricted)))^2
res_u_sq = (unname(resid(unrestricted)))^2

rss_r = sum(res_r_sq)
rss_u = sum(res_u_sq)

q = 1
k = 2

F_stat <- ((rss_r - rss_u)/q)/(rss_u/(n - k - 1))
F_stat
```

```
[1] 150181.6
```

F-statistic and Critical Value

- Once you have a F-statistic, you need to compare it against a critical value, which comes from a **F-Table**.
- $F_{1,1000-3} = \text{Critical Value} \approx 3.841$ and $F_{stat} = 150181.6 > 3.841$; we reject at $\alpha = 0.05$ and beyond.

Regression Table: Models for b

F-Distribution with Critical Value and F-Statistic

