## Chapter 4 - Inference

Thalles Quinaglia Liduares

29/03/2022

## Exercise 4.11

Upload packages

```
library(wooldridge)
library(lmreg)
library(car)
```

Upload database

```
data<-wooldridge::htv
attach(data)</pre>
```

Use the data in HTV.RAW to answer this question. See also Computer Exercise C10 in Chapter 3.

(i) Estimate the regression model

```
educ = \beta_0 + \beta_1 motheduc + \beta_2 fatheduc + \beta_3 abil + \beta_4 abil^2 + u
```

by OLS and report the results in the usual form. Test the null hypothesis that educ is linearly related to abil against the alternative that the relationship is quadratic.

```
summary(lm1<-lm(educ~motheduc+fatheduc+abil+I(abil^2)))</pre>
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2))
##
## Residuals:
##
      Min
             1Q Median
                           3Q
                                  Max
## -5.2506 -1.1274 -0.1355 1.0223 7.0482
##
## Coefficients:
             Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
## (Intercept) 8.240226   0.287410   28.671   < 2e-16 ***
## motheduc
            ## fatheduc
             0.401462
                      0.030288 13.255 < 2e-16 ***
## abil
## I(abil^2) 0.050599 0.008304 6.093 1.48e-09 ***
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 1.758 on 1225 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.4444, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4425
## F-statistic: 244.9 on 4 and 1225 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

```
\widehat{educ} = 8.2 + 0.19 motheduc + 0.10 fatheduc + 0.40 abil + 0.05 abil^2
```

```
linearHypothesis(lm1, c("I(abil^2)=0"))
```

```
## Linear hypothesis test
##
## Hypothesis:
## I(abil^2) = 0
##
## Model 1: restricted model
## Model 2: educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2)
##
## Res.Df RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)
## 1 1226 3900.0
## 2 1225 3785.2 1 114.73 37.13 1.478e-09 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

linearHypothesis(lm1, c("abil=0","I(abil^2)=0"))

```
## Linear hypothesis test
##
## Hypothesis:
## abil = 0
## I(abil^2) = 0
##
## Model 1: restricted model
## Model 2: educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2)
##
## Res.Df RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)
## 1 1227 5114.3
## 2 1225 3785.2 2 1329.1 215.06 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1</pre>
```

```
linearHypothesis(lm1,c("abil=0"))
```

```
## Linear hypothesis test
##
## Hypothesis:
## abil = 0
##
## Model 1: restricted model
## Model 2: educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2)
##
              RSS Df Sum of Sq
##
    Res.Df
                                F
                                       Pr(>F)
      1226 4328.1
## 1
      1225 3785.2 1
                        542.9 175.7 < 2.2e-16 ***
## 2
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Based on all combinations of hypothesis tests, its possible to reject the null that abil^2 is equal to 0 in the estimated model.

\*\*(ii) Using the equation in part (i), test \$H\_0: \_1 = \_2 \$ against a two-sided alternative. What is the p-value of the test?\*\*

```
linearHypothesis(lm1, c("motheduc-fatheduc=0"))
```

```
## Linear hypothesis test
##
## Hypothesis:
## motheduc - fatheduc = 0
## Model 1: restricted model
## Model 2: educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2)
##
##
    Res.Df
              RSS Df Sum of Sq F Pr(>F)
      1226 3796.8
## 1
      1225 3785.2 1
## 2
                       11.578 3.7468 0.05314 .
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

In this case, its not possible to reject the null hypothesis, because the p-value associated to F-Test is equal to 0.053>0.05.

(iii) Add the two college tuition variables to the regression from part (i) and determine whether they are jointly statistically significant.

```
summary(lm2<-lm(educ \sim motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2)+tuit17+tuit18))
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2) +
      tuit17 + tuit18)
##
##
## Residuals:
##
   Min
           10 Median
                       3Q
                                Max
## -5.148 -1.161 -0.114 1.032 7.071
##
## Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
## (Intercept) 8.082e+00 3.128e-01 25.840 < 2e-16 ***
## motheduc 1.929e-01 2.818e-02 6.845 1.21e-11 ***
## fatheduc
             1.084e-01 1.962e-02 5.528 3.96e-08 ***
## abil
            3.990e-01 3.035e-02 13.148 < 2e-16 ***
## I(abil^2) 5.055e-02 8.313e-03 6.082 1.59e-09 ***
## tuit17
            1.576e-02 6.250e-02 0.252
                                            0.801
## tuit18
              6.033e-05 6.365e-02
                                   0.001
                                            0.999
## ---
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 1.758 on 1223 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.4451, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4424
## F-statistic: 163.5 on 6 and 1223 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

```
linearHypothesis(lm2, c("tuit17=0","tuit18=0"))
```

```
## Linear hypothesis test
##
## Hypothesis:
## tuit17 = 0
## tuit18 = 0
##
## Model 1: restricted model
## Model 2: educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2) + tuit17 + tuit18
##
    Res.Df
               RSS Df Sum of Sq
##
                                    F Pr(>F)
## 1
      1225 3785.2
## 2
       1223 3780.1 2
                         5.1884 0.8393 0.4322
```

Based on the estimated coefficients and the hypothesis test its possible conclude that both tuit17 and tuit18 do not influence the dependent variable educ .

(iv) What is the correlation between tuit17 and tuit18? Explain why using the average of the tuition over the two years might be preferred to adding each separately. What happens when you do use the average?

Correlation

```
cor(tuit17, tuit18)
```

```
## [1] 0.9808333
```

The extreme high correlation between tuit17 and tuit18 equal to 98% might be causing multicollinearity problems in the estimation. Using, one of the two, or the median between them, might be a possible solution to this problem.

## (v) Do the findings for the average tuition variable in part (iv) make sense when interpreted causally? What might be going on?

```
data$tuit_mean<-(tuit17+tuit18)/2
```

```
summary(lm3<-lm(educ \sim motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2) + data<math>tuit_mean)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = educ ~ motheduc + fatheduc + abil + I(abil^2) +
##
     data$tuit_mean)
##
## Residuals:
     Min
            1Q Median
                         3Q
                               Max
## -5.1469 -1.1591 -0.1132 1.0312 7.0709
##
## Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
##
                       0.312614 25.851 < 2e-16 ***
## (Intercept)
              8.081339
## motheduc
              ## fatheduc
              0.399081 0.030336 13.156 < 2e-16 ***
## abil
## I(abil^2)
              ## data$tuit_mean 0.015963 0.012373 1.290
                                       0.197
## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 1.757 on 1224 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared: 0.4451, Adjusted R-squared: 0.4428
## F-statistic: 196.4 on 5 and 1224 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

The inclusion of tuit\_mean do not show individual significance.