Review of Probability Theory and Statistics

Brief Overview of the Course

- Economics suggests important relationships, often with policy implications, but virtually never suggests quantitative magnitudes of causal effects.
  - What is the *quantitative* effect of reducing class size on student achievement?
  - How does another year of education change earnings?
  - What is the price elasticity of cigarettes?
  - What is the effect on output growth of a 1 percentage point increase in interest rates by the Fed?
  - What is the effect on housing prices of environmental improvements?

This course is about using data to measure causal effects

- Ideally, we would like an experiment
  - What would be an experiment to estimate the effect of class size on standardized test scores?
- But almost always we only have observational (nonexperimental) data.
  - returns to education
  - cigarette prices
  - monetary policy
- Most of the course deals with difficulties arising from using observational to estimate causal effects
  - confounding effects (omitted factors)
  - simultaneous causality
  - “correlation does not imply causation”

In this course you will

- Learn methods for estimating causal effects using observational data
- Learn methods for prediction – for which knowing causal effects is not necessary – including forecasting using time series data;
- Focus on applications – theory is used only as needed to understand the whys of the methods;
- Learn to evaluate the regression analysis of others – this means you will be able to read/understand empirical economics papers in other econ courses;
- Get some hands-on experience with regression analysis in your problem sets.

Review of Probability and Statistics (SW Chapters 2, 3)

- **Empirical problem:** Class size and educational output
  - Policy question: What is the effect on test scores (or some other outcome measure) of reducing class size by one student per class? by 8 students/class?
  - We must use data to find out (is there any way to answer this *without* data?)

The California Test Score Data Set

All K-6 and K-8 California school districts ($n = 420$) Variables:

- 5^{th} grade test scores (Stanford-9 achievement test, combined math and reading), district average
- Student-teacher ratio (STR) = no. of students in the district divided by no. full-time equivalent teachers

Initial look at the data: *(You should already know how to interpret this table)*

TABLE 4.1 Summary of the Distribution of Student–Teacher Ratios and Fifth-Grade Test Scores for 420 K–8 Districts in California in 1999

			Percentile						
	Average	Standard Deviation	10%	25%	40%	50% (median)	60%	75%	90%
Student–teacher ratio	19.6	1.9	17.3	18.6	19.3	19.7	20.1	20.9	21.9
Test score	654.2	19.1	630.4	640.0	649.1	654.5	659.4	666.7	679.1

This table doesn't tell us anything about the relationship between test scores and the *STR*.

Do districts with smaller classes have higher test scores?

Scatterplot of test score v. student-teacher ratio



What does this figure show?

We need to get some numerical evidence on whether districts with low STRs have higher test scores – but how?

1. Compare average test scores in districts with low STRs to those with high STRs ("***estimation***")
2. Test the "null" hypothesis that the mean test scores in the two types of districts are the same, against the "alternative" hypothesis that they differ ("***hypothesis testing***")
3. Estimate an interval for the difference in the mean test scores, high v. low STR districts ("***confidence interval***")

Initial data analysis: Compare districts with "small" (STR < 20) and "large" (STR ≥ 20) class sizes

Class Size	Average score $\bar{Y}$	Standard deviation (s^2)	n
Small	657.4	19.4	238
Large	650.0	17.9	182

1. ***Estimation*** of Δ = difference between group means
2. ***Test the hypothesis*** that $\Delta = 0$
3. Construct a ***confidence interval*** for Δ

1. Estimation

$$\bar{Y}_{\text{small}} - \bar{Y}_{\text{large}} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{small}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{small}}} Y_i - \frac{1}{n_{\text{large}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{large}}} Y_i$$
$$= 657.4 - 650.0$$
$$= 7.4$$

Is this a large difference in a real-world sense?

- Standard deviation across districts = 19.1
- Difference between 60th and 75th percentiles of test score distribution is 667.6 – 659.4 = 8.2
- This is a big enough difference to be important for school reform discussions, for parents, or for a school committee?

2. Hypothesis testing (1 of 2)

Difference-in-means test: compute the t-statistic,

$$t = \frac{\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l}{\sqrt{\frac{s_s^2}{n_s} + \frac{s_l^2}{n_l}}} = \frac{\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l}{SE(\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l)} \qquad \text{(remember this?)}$$

- where $SE(\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l)$ is the "standard error" of $\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l$, the subscripts s and/refer to "small" and "large" STR districts, and

$$s_s^2 = \frac{1}{n_s - 1}\sum_{i=1}^{n_s}(Y_i - \bar{Y}_s)^2 \text{ (etc.)}$$

2. Hypothesis testing (2 of 2)

Compute the difference-of-means *t*-statistic:

Size	$\bar{Y}$	s^2	n
small	657.4	19.4	238
large	650.0	17.9	182

$$t = \frac{\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l}{\sqrt{\frac{s_s^2}{n_s} + \frac{s_l^2}{n_l}}} = \frac{657.4 - 650.0}{\sqrt{\frac{19.4^2}{238} + \frac{17.9^2}{182}}} = \frac{7.4}{1.83} = 4.05$$

$|t| > 1.96$, so reject (at the 5% significance level) the null hypothesis that the two means are the same.

3. Confidence interval

A 95% confidence interval for the difference between the means is,

$$(\overline{Y_s} - \overline{Y_l}) \pm 1.96 \times SE(\overline{Y_s} - \overline{Y_l})$$
$$= 7.4 \pm 1.96 \times 1.83 = (3.8, 11.0)$$

Two equivalent statements:

1. The 95% confidence interval for Δ doesn't include 0;
2. The hypothesis that $\Delta = 0$ is rejected at the 5% level.

What comes next

- The mechanics of estimation, hypothesis testing, and confidence intervals should be familiar
- These concepts extend directly to regression and its variants
- Before turning to regression, however, we will review some of the underlying theory of estimation, hypothesis testing, and confidence intervals:
  - Why do these procedures work, and why use these rather than others?
  - We will review the intellectual foundations of statistics and econometrics

Review of Statistical Theory

1. **The probability framework for statistical inference**
2. Estimation
3. Testing
4. Confidence Intervals

The probability framework for statistical inference

a) Population, random variable, and distribution

b) Moments of a distribution (mean, variance, standard deviation, covariance, correlation)

c) Conditional distributions and conditional means

d) Distribution of a sample of data drawn randomly from a population: $Y_1,\ldots, Y_n$

(a) Population, random variable, and distribution

Population

- The group or collection of all possible entities of interest (school districts)
- We will think of populations as infinitely large (∞ is an approximation to "very big")

Random variable Y

- Numerical summary of a random outcome (district average test score, district STR). Sampling. The essence of statistics and econometrics: estimate some important items from samples.

Population distribution of Y

- The probabilities of different values of Y that occur in the population, for ex. $\Pr[Y = 650]$ (when Y is discrete)
- or: The probabilities of sets of these values, for ex. $\Pr[640 \leq Y \leq 660]$ (when Y is continuous).

(b) Moments of a population distribution: mean, variance, standard deviation, covariance, correlation (1 of 3)

mean = expected value (expectation) of Y

$= E(Y)$

$= \mu_Y$

= long-run average value of Y over repeated realizations of Y

variance $= E(Y - \mu_Y)^2$

$= \sigma_Y^2$

= measure of the squared spread of the distribution

standard deviation $= \sqrt{\textbf{variance}} = \sigma_Y$

(b) Moments of a population distribution: mean, variance, standard deviation, covariance, correlation (2 of 3)

$$\textbf{\textit{skewness}} = \frac{E\left[\left(Y - \mu_Y\right)^3\right]}{\sigma_Y^3}$$

= measure of asymmetry of a distribution

- *skewness* = 0: distribution is symmetric
- *skewness* > (<) 0: distribution has long right (left) tail

$$\textbf{\textit{kurtosis}} = \frac{E\left[\left(Y - \mu_Y\right)^4\right]}{\sigma_Y^4}$$

= measure of mass in tails
= measure of probability of large values

- *kurtosis* = 3: normal distribution
- *skewness* > 3: heavy tails ("***leptokurtotic***")

(b) Moments of a population distribution: mean, variance, standard deviation, covariance, correlation (3 of 3)



Two random variables: joint distributions and covariance (1 of 2)

- Random variables X and Z have a ***joint distribution***
- The ***covariance*** between X and Z is

$$\text{cov}(X,Z) = E[(X-\mu_X)(Z-\mu_Z)] = \sigma_{XZ}$$

- The covariance is a measure of the linear association between X and Z; its units are units of $X \times$ units of Z
- $\text{cov}(X,Z) > 0$ means a positive relation between X and Z
- If X and Z are independently distributed, then $\text{cov}(X,Z) = 0$ (but not vice versa!!)
- The covariance of a random variable with itself is its variance:

$$\text{cov}(X,X) = E[(X-\mu_X)(X-\mu_X)] = E[(X-\mu_X)^2] = \sigma_X^2$$

Two random variables: joint distributions and covariance (2 of 2)

The covariance between *Test Score* and *STR* is negative:

FIGURE 4.2: Scatterplot of Test Score vs. Student–Teacher Ratio (California School District Data)



Data from 420 California school districts. There is a weak negative relationship between the student–teacher ratio and test scores: The sample correlation is −0.23.

So is the ***correlation***…

The *correlation coefficient* is defined in terms of the covariance

$$\text{corr}(X,Z) = \frac{\text{cov}(X,Z)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(X)\,\text{var}(Z)}} = \frac{\sigma_{XZ}}{\sigma_X \sigma_Z} = r_{XZ}$$

- $-1 \leq \text{corr}(X,Z) \leq 1$
- $\text{corr}(X,Z) = 1$ mean perfect positive linear association
- $\text{corr}(X,Z) = -1$ means perfect negative linear association
- $\text{corr}(X,Z) = 0$ means no linear association

The correlation coefficient measures linear association



(c) Conditional distributions and conditional means (1 of 3)

Conditional distributions

- The distribution of Y, given value(s) of some other random variable, X
- Ex: the distribution of test scores, given that STR < 20

Conditional expectations and conditional moments

- *conditional mean* = mean of conditional distribution $= E(Y|X = x)$ (***important concept and notation***)
- *conditional variance* = variance of conditional distribution
- $Example: E(Test\ score|STR < 20)$ = the mean of test scores among districts with small class sizes

The difference in means is the difference between the means of two conditional distributions:

(c) Conditional distributions and conditional means (2 of 3)

$$\Delta = E(Test\ score | STR < 20) - E(Test\ score | STR \geq 20)$$

Other examples of conditional means:

- Wages of all female workers (Y = wages, X = sex)
- Mortality rate of those given an experimental treatment (Y = live/die; X = treated/not treated)
- If $E(X|Z)$ = const, then corr $(X,Z) = 0$ (not necessarily vice versa however)

The conditional mean is a (possibly new) term for the familiar idea of the group mean

(c) Conditional distributions and conditional means (3 of 3)

The conditional mean plays a key role in prediction:

- Suppose you want to predict a value of Y, and you are given the value of a random variable X that is related to Y. That is, you want to predict Y given the value of X.
  - For example, you want to predict someone's income, given their years of education.
- A common measure of the quality of a prediction m of Y is the mean squared prediction error (MSPE), given X, $E[(Y-m)^2|X]$
- Of all possible predictions m that depend on X, the conditional mean $E(Y|X)$ has the smallest mean squared prediction error (*optional proof is in Appendix 2.2*).

(d) Distribution of a sample of data drawn randomly from a population: $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$

We will assume simple random sampling

- Choose an individual (district, entity) at random from the population

Randomness and data

- Prior to sample selection, the value of Y is random because the individual selected is random
- Once the individual is selected and the value of Y is observed, then Y is just a number – not random
- The data set is (Y_1, $Y_2, \ldots, Y_n$), where Y_i = value of Y for the i^{th} individual (district, entity) sampled

Distribution of $Y_1,\ldots, Y_n$ under simple random sampling

- Because individuals #1 and #2 are selected at random, the value of Y_1 has no information content for Y_2. Thus:
  - Y_1 and Y_2 are ***independently distributed***
  - Y_1 and Y_2 come from the same distribution, that is, Y_1, Y_2 are ***identically distributed***
  - That is, under simple random sampling, Y_1 and Y_2 are independently and identically distributed (***i.i.d.***).
  - More generally, under simple random sampling, $\{Y_i\}$, $i = 1,\ldots, n$, are i.i.d.

This framework allows rigorous statistical inferences about moments of population distributions using a sample of data from that population

1. The probability framework for statistical inference
2. **Estimation**
3. Testing
4. Confidence Intervals

Estimation

$\bar{Y}$ is the natural estimator of the mean. But:

a) What are the properties of $\bar{Y}$?

b) Why should we use $\bar{Y}$ rather than some other estimator?

- Y_1 (the first observation)
- maybe unequal weights – not simple average
- median(Y_1,…, Y_n)

The starting point is the sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ …

(a) The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (1 of 3)

$\bar{Y}$ is a random variable, and its properties are determined by the ***sampling distribution*** of $\bar{Y}$

- The individuals in the sample are drawn at random.
- Thus the values of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ are random
- Thus functions of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$, such as $\bar{Y}$, are random: had a different sample been drawn, they would have taken on a different value
- The distribution of $\bar{Y}$ over different possible samples of size n is called the ***sampling distribution*** of $\bar{Y}$.
- The mean and variance of $\bar{Y}$ are the mean and variance of its sampling distribution, E($\bar{Y}$) and var($\bar{Y}$).
- The concept of the sampling distribution underpins all of econometrics.

(a) The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (2 of 3)

Example: Suppose Y takes on 0 or 1 (a ***Bernoulli*** random variable) with the probability distribution,

$$\Pr[Y = 0] = .22,\ \Pr(Y = 1) = .78$$

Then

$$E(Y) = p \times 1 + (1 - p) \times 0 = p = .78$$

$$\sigma_Y^2 = E[Y - E(Y)]^2 = p(1-p)\ [\textit{remember this?}]$$

$$= .78 \times (1 - .78) = 0.1716$$

The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ depends on n.

Consider $n = 2$. The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ is,

- $\Pr(\bar{Y} = 0) = .22^2 = .0484$
- $\Pr(\bar{Y} = ½) = 2 \times .22 \times .78 = .3432$
- $\Pr(\bar{Y} = 1) = .78^2 = .6084$

(a) The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (3 of 3)

The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ when Y is Bernoulli ($p = .78$):



Things we want to know about the sampling distribution

- What is the mean of $\bar{Y}$?
  - If $\mathrm{E}(\bar{Y})$ = true μ = .78, then $\bar{Y}$ is an ***unbiased*** estimator of μ
- What is the variance of $\bar{Y}$?
  - How does var($\bar{Y}$) depend on n (famous $1/n$ formula)
- Does $\bar{Y}$ become close to μ when n is large?
  - Law of large numbers: $\bar{Y}$ is a ***consistent*** estimator of μ
- $\bar{Y}$ appears bell shaped for n large…is this generally true?
  - In fact, $\bar{Y}$ is approximately normally distributed for n large (Central Limit Theorem)

The mean and variance of the sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (1 of 3)

- General case – that is, for Y_i i.i.d. from any distribution, not just Bernoulli:

- mean: $E(\bar{Y}) = E(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} E(Y_i) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_Y = \mu_Y$

- Variance: $\text{var}(\bar{Y}) = E[\bar{Y} - E(\bar{Y})]^2$

$$= E[\bar{Y} - \mu_Y]^2$$

$$= E\left[\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i\right) - \mu_Y\right]^2$$

$$= E\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - \mu_Y)\right]^2$$

The mean and variance of the sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (2 of 3)

so
$$\text{var}(\bar{Y}) = E\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \mu_Y)\right]^2$$
$$= E\left\{\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \mu_Y)\right] \times \left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_j - \mu_Y)\right]\right\}$$
$$= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} E\left[(Y_i - \mu_Y)(Y_j - \mu_Y)\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \text{cov}(Y_i, Y_j)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_Y^2$$
$$= \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n}$$

For general n, because $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$ are i.i.d., Y_i and Y_j are independently distributed for $i \neq j$, so $cov(Y_i, Y_j) = 0$.

Thus,

$$var(\bar{Y}) = var\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} var(Y_i) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} cov(Y_i, Y_j) = \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n}, (2.45)$$

The standard deviation of $\bar{Y}$ is the square root of the variance, $\frac{\sigma_Y}{\sqrt{n}}$.

Sum of uncorrelated variables (Bienaymé formula) [edit]

See also: Sum of normally distributed random variables

One reason for the use of the variance in preference to other measures of dispersion is that the variance of the sum (or the difference) of uncorrelated random variables is the sum of their variances:

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}(X_i).$$

This statement is called the Bienaymé formula[2] and was discovered in 1853.[3][4] It is often made with the stronger condition that the variables are independent, but being uncorrelated suffices. So if all the variables have the same variance σ^2, then, since division by n is a linear transformation, this formula immediately implies that the variance of their mean is

$$\operatorname{Var}\left(\overline{X}\right) = \operatorname{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i\right) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}(X_i) = \frac{1}{n^2} n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}.$$

That is, the variance of the mean decreases when n increases. This formula for the variance of the mean is used in the definition of the standard error of the sample mean, which is used in the central limit theorem.

The mean and variance of the sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ (3 of 3)

$$E(\bar{Y}) = \mu_Y$$

$$\text{var}(\bar{Y}) = \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n}$$

Implications:

1. $\bar{Y}$ is an *unbiased* estimator of μ_Y (that is, $E(\bar{Y}) = \mu_Y$)
2. var($\bar{Y}$) is inversely proportional to n
   1. the spread of the sampling distribution is proportional to $1/\sqrt{n}$
   2. Thus the sampling uncertainty associated with $\bar{Y}$ is proportional to $1/\sqrt{n}$ (larger samples, less uncertainty, but square-root law)

The sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ when n is large

For small sample sizes, the distribution of $\bar{Y}$ is complicated, but if n is large, the sampling distribution is simple!

1. As n increases, the distribution of $\bar{Y}$ becomes more tightly centered around μ_Y (the *Law of Large Numbers*)
2. Moreover, the distribution of $\bar{Y}$ becomes normal (the *Central Limit Theorem*)

The *Law of Large Numbers*

An estimator is ***consistent*** **if the probability** that its falls within an interval of the true population value **tends** to one **as** the sample size increases.

If (Y_1, K, Y_n) are i.i.d. and $\sigma_Y^2 < \infty$, then $\bar{Y}$ is a consistent estimator of μ_Y, that is,

$$\Pr[|\bar{Y} - \mu_Y| < \mu] \to 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty$$

which can be written, $\bar{Y} \xrightarrow{p} \mu_Y$

("$\bar{Y} \xrightarrow{p} \mu_Y$" means "$\bar{Y}$ converges in probability to μ_Y").

(*the math*: as $n \to \infty$, $\text{var}(\bar{Y}) = \dfrac{\sigma_Y^2}{n} \to 0$, which implies that $\Pr[|\bar{Y} - \mu_Y| < \varepsilon] \to 1$.)

The *Central Limit Theorem* (CLT)

(1 of 3)

If (Y_1, K, Y_n) are i.i.d. and $0 < \sigma_Y^2 < \infty$, then when n is large the distribution of $\bar{Y}$ is well approximated by a normal distribution.

- $\bar{Y}$ is approximately distributed $N(\mu_Y, \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{n})$ ("normal distribution with mean μ_Y and variance σ_Y^2/n")
- $\sqrt{n}\,(\bar{Y} - \mu_Y)/\sigma_Y$ is Y approximately distributed $N(0, 1)$ (standard normal)
- **That is, "standardized"** $\bar{Y} = \frac{\bar{Y} - E(\bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{Y})}} = \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_Y}{\sigma_Y / \sqrt{n}}$ **is approximately distributed as** $N(0, 1)$
- **The larger is *n*, the better is the approximation.**

The *Central Limit Theorem* (CLT)

(2 of 3)

Sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ when Y is Bernoulli, $p = 0.78$:



The *Central Limit Theorem* (CLT)

(3 of 3)

Same example: sampling distribution of $\dfrac{\bar{Y} - E(\bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{Y})}}$:



Summary: The Sampling Distribution of $\bar{Y}$

For $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ i.i.d. with $0 < \sigma_Y^2 < \infty$,

- The exact (finite sample) sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$ has mean μ_Y ("$\bar{Y}$ is an unbiased estimator of μ_Y") and variance σ_Y^2/n
- Other than its mean and variance, the exact distribution of $\bar{Y}$ is complicated and depends on the distribution of Y (the population distribution)
- When n is large, the sampling distribution simplifies:

  -- $\bar{Y} \xrightarrow{P} \mu_Y$ (Law of Large numbers)

  -- $\dfrac{\bar{Y} - E(\bar{Y})}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\bar{Y})}}$ is approximately $N(0,1)$ (CLT)

(b) Why Use $\bar{Y}$ To Estimate μ_Y? (1 of 2)

- $\bar{Y}$ is unbiased: $E(\bar{Y}) = \mu_Y$
- $\bar{Y}$ is consistent: $\bar{Y} \xrightarrow{P} \mu_Y$
- $\bar{Y}$ is the "least squares" estimator of μ_Y; $\bar{Y}$ solves,

$$\min_m \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_i - m)^2$$

so, $\bar{Y}$ minimizes the sum of squared "residuals" *optional derivation (also see App. 3.2)*

$$\frac{d}{dm}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - m)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{d}{dm}(Y_i - m)^2 = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - m)$$

Set derivative to zero and denote optimal value of m by $\hat{m}$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{m} = n\hat{m} \quad \text{or} \quad \hat{m} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i = \bar{Y}$$

(b) Why Use $\bar{Y}$ To Estimate μ_Y? (2 of 2)

- $\bar{Y}$ has a smaller variance than all other *linear unbiased* estimators:

  consider the estimator, $\hat{\mu}_Y = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i Y_i$, where $\{a_i\}$ are such that $\hat{\mu}_Y$ is unbiased; then $\text{var}(\bar{Y}) \leq \text{var}(\hat{\mu}_Y)$ (proof: SW, Ch. 17)

- $\bar{Y}$ isn't the only estimator of μ_Y – can you think of a time you might want to use the median instead?

1. The probability framework for statistical inference
2. Estimation
3. **Hypothesis Testing**
4. Confidence intervals

Hypothesis Testing

The ***hypothesis testing*** problem (for the mean): make a provisional decision based on the evidence at hand whether a null hypothesis is true, or instead that some alternative hypothesis is true. That is, test

- $H_0: E(Y) = \mu_{Y,0}$ vs. $H_1: E(Y) > \mu_{Y,0}$ (1-sided, >)
- $H_0: E(Y) = \mu_{Y,0}$ vs. $H_1: E(Y) < \mu_{Y,0}$ (1-sided, <)
- $H_0: E(Y) = \mu_{Y,0}$ vs. $H_1: E(Y) \neq \mu_{Y,0}$ (2-sided)

Some terminology for testing statistical hypotheses (1 of 2)

p-value = probability of drawing a statistic (e.g. $\bar{Y}$) at least as adverse to the null as the value actually computed with your data, assuming that the null hypothesis is true.

The ***significance level*** of a test is a pre-specified probability of incorrectly rejecting the null, **when** the null is true. <=5%.

Calculating the p-value based on $\bar{Y}$:

$$p - \text{value} = \boxed{\Pr[|\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}| > |\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{\mu_{Y,0}}|]}$$

Where $\bar{Y}^{act}$ is the value of $\bar{Y}$ actually observed (nonrandom)

How to describe p-value? Probability of $|\bar{Y} - \mu|/\sigma$ greater than $|Y^{act} - \mu|/\sigma$ is an area under the probability density curve.



The p-value is the probability, computed using the test statistic, that measures the support provided by the sample for the null hypothesis.

Some terminology for testing statistical hypotheses (2 of 2)

- To compute the *p*-value, you need the to know the sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$, which is complicated if n is small.
- If n is large, you can use the normal approximation (CLT):

$$p\text{-value} = \Pr_{H_0}[|\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}| > |\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}|],$$

$$= \Pr_{H_0}\left[\left|\frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right| > \left|\frac{\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right|\right]$$

$$= \Pr_{H_0}\left[\left|\frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_{\bar{Y}}}\right| > \left|\frac{\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_{\bar{Y}}}\right|\right]$$

$\cong$ probability under left + right $N(0,1)$ tails

where $\sigma_{\bar{Y}} =$ std. dev. of the distribution of $\bar{Y} = \sigma_Y/\sqrt{n}$.

Calculating the p-value with σ_Y known



- For large n, p-value = the probability that a $N(0,1)$ random variable falls outside $\left|(\bar{Y}^{act}-\mu_{Y,0})/\sigma_{\bar{Y}}\right|$
- In practice, $\sigma_{\bar{Y}}$ is unknown – it must be estimated

Estimator of the variance of Y

$$s_Y^2 = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \bar{Y})^2 = \text{“sample variance of } Y\text{”}$$

Fact:

If $(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)$ are i.i.d. and $E(Y^4) < \infty$, then

$$s_Y^2 \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_Y^2$$

Why does the law of large numbers apply?

- Because s_Y^2 is a sample average; see Appendix 3.3
- Technical note: we assume $E(Y^4) < \infty$, because here the average is not of Y_i, but of its square; see App. 3.3

Computing the p-value with σ_Y^2 estimated

$$p\text{-value} = \Pr_{H_0}[|\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}| > |\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}|],$$

$$= \Pr_{H_0}\left[\left|\frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right| > \left|\frac{\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}}{\sigma_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right|\right]$$

$$\cong \Pr_{H_0}\left[\left|\frac{\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}}{s_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right| > \left|\frac{\bar{Y}^{act} - \mu_{Y,0}}{s_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right|\right] \quad \text{(large } n\text{)}$$

so

$$\boxed{p\text{-value} = \Pr_{H_0}[|t| > |t^{act}|]} \quad \textbf{(}\sigma_Y^2\textbf{estimated)}$$

$\cong$ probability under normal tails outside $|t^{act}|$

where $t = \dfrac{\bar{Y} - \mu_{Y,0}}{s_Y/\sqrt{n}}$ (the usual t-statistic)

Example: Let's say you want to test whether the mean weight of a sample differs from 70 kg. You collect a sample of 10 individuals with the following weights (in kg):

Weights: 68, 72, 71, 70, 69, 73, 74, 67, 70, 69

1. State the Hypotheses

H_0: $\mu = 70$ (The mean weight is 70 kg)

H_1: $\mu \neq 70$ (The mean weight is not 70 kg)

2. Choose the Test Statistic

Use a t-test since the sample size is small and the population standard deviation is unknown.

3. Calculate the Test Statistic

Compute the sample mean ($\bar{x}$) and the sample standard deviation (s).

$$\bar{x} = \frac{68+72+71+70+69+73+74+67+70+69}{10} = 70.3, \; s = \sqrt{\frac{(x_i-\bar{x})^2}{n-1}} \approx 2.26$$

Calculate the t-statistic: $t = \frac{\bar{x}-\mu_0}{s/\sqrt{n}} = \frac{70.3-70}{2.26/\sqrt{10}} \approx 0.419$

4. Calculate the P-Value: Use a t-distribution table or software to find the p-value associated with t = 0.419 and 9 degrees of freedom. Using a t-table or software, you find: p-value≈0.686

What is the link between the *p*-value and the significance level?

- The significance level is pre-specified. For example, if the pre-specified significance level is 5%,
  - you reject the null hypothesis if $|t| \geq 1.96$.
  - Equivalently, you reject if $p \leq 0.05$.
  - The *p*-value is sometimes called the ***marginal significance level***.
  - Often, it is better to communicate the *p*-value than simply whether a test rejects or not – the *p*-value contains more information than the "yes/no" statement about whether the test rejects.

The Chi-Squared Distribution

The chi-squared distribution is used when testing certain types of hypotheses in statistics and econometrics.

The **chi-squared distribution** is the distribution of the sum of m squared independent standard normal random variables.

This distribution depends on m, which is called the degrees of freedom of the chi-squared distribution.

For example, let Z_1, Z_2, and Z_3 be independent standard normal random variables.

Then $Z_1^2 + Z_2^2 + Z_3^2$ has a chi-squared distribution with 3 degrees of freedom.

The name for this distribution derives from the Greek letter used to denote it: A chi-squared distribution with m degrees of freedom is denoted χ_m^2.

Selected percentiles of the X_m^2 distribution are given in Appendix Table 3.

For example, Appendix Table 3 shows that the 95th percentile of the X_m^2 distribution is 7.81, so $Pr(Z_1^2 + Z_2^2 + Z_3^2 \leq 7.81) = 0.95$.

The Student t Distribution

The **Student *t* distribution** with m degrees of freedom is defined to be the distribution of the ratio of a standard normal random variable, divided by the square root of an independently distributed chi-squared random variable with m degrees of freedom divided by m.

That is, let Z be a standard normal random variable, let W be a random variable with a chi-squared distribution with m degrees of freedom, and let Z and W be independently distributed.

Then the random variable $\frac{Z}{\sqrt{W/m}}$ has a Student *t* distribution (also called the ***t* distribution**) with m degrees of freedom.

This distribution is denoted t_m. Selected percentiles of the Student *t* distribution are given in Appendix Table 2.

The Student *t* distribution depends on the degrees of freedom m.

Thus the 95th percentile of the t_m distribution depends on the degrees of freedom m.

The Student *t* distribution has a bell shape similar to that of the normal distribution, but when m is small (20 or less), it has more mass in the tails—that is, it is a "fatter" bell shape than the normal.

When m is 30 or more, the Student *t* distribution is well approximated by the standard normal distribution and the t_∞ distribution equals the standard normal distribution.

At this point, you might be wondering,… What happened to the *t*-table and the degrees of freedom?

Digression: the Student *t* distribution

If $Y_i, i = 1, \text{K}, n$ is i.i.d. $N(\mu_Y, \sigma_Y^2)$, then the t-statistic has the Student t-distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom. $t = \frac{\bar{Y} - \mu}{s/\sqrt{N}}$

The critical values of the Student *t*-distribution is tabulated in the back of all statistics books. Remember the recipe?

1. Compute the *t*-statistic
2. Compute the degrees of freedom, which is $n-1$
3. Look up the 5% critical value
4. If the *t*-statistic exceeds (in absolute value) this critical value, reject the null hypothesis.

Comments on this recipe and the Student *t*-distribution (1 of 5)

1. The theory of the *t*-distribution was one of the early triumphs of mathematical statistics. It is astounding, really: if Y is i.i.d. normal, then you can know the *exact*, *finite-sample* distribution of the *t*-statistic – it is the Student *t*. So, you can construct confidence intervals (using the Student *t* critical value) that have *exactly* the right coverage rate, no matter what the sample size. This result was really useful in times when "computer" was a job title, data collection was expensive, and the number of observations was perhaps a dozen. It is also a conceptually beautiful result, and the math is beautiful too – which is probably why stats profs love to teach the *t*-distribution. But….

Comments on this recipe and the Student *t*-distribution (2 of 5)

2. If the sample size is moderate (several dozen) or large (hundreds or more), the difference between the *t*-distribution and $\mathrm{N}(0,1)$ critical values is negligible. Here are some 5% critical values for 2-sided tests:

degrees of freedom $(n-1)$	5% *t*-distribution critical value
10	2.23
20	2.09
30	2.04
60	2.00
∞	1.96

Comments on this recipe and the Student *t*-distribution (3 of 5)

3. So, the Student-*t* distribution is only relevant when the sample size is very small; but in that case, for it to be correct, you must be sure that the population distribution of Y is normal. In economic data, the normality assumption is rarely credible. Here are the distributions of some economic data.
   - Do you think earnings are normally distributed?
   - Suppose you have a sample of n = 10 observations from one of these distributions – would you feel comfortable using the Student t distribution?

Comments on this recipe and the Student *t*-distribution (4 of 5)

FIGURE 2.4: Conditional Distributions of Average Hourly Earnings of U.S. Full-Time Workers in 2015, Given Education Level and Sex



The four distributions of earnings are for women and men, for those with only a high school diploma (a and c) and those whose highest degree is from a four-year college (b and d).

Comments on this recipe and the Student *t*-distribution (5 of 5)

4. You might not know this. Consider the *t*-statistic testing the hypothesis that two means (groups s, l) are equal:

$$t = \frac{\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l}{\sqrt{\frac{s_s^2}{n_s} + \frac{s_l^2}{n_l}}} = \frac{\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l}{SE(\bar{Y}_s - \bar{Y}_l)}$$

Even if the population distribution of Y in the two groups is normal, this statistic doesn't have a Student *t* distribution!

There is a statistic testing this hypothesis that has a normal distribution, the "pooled variance" *t*-statistic – see SW (Section 3.6) – however the pooled variance *t*-statistic is only valid if the variances of the normal distributions are the same in the two groups. Would you expect this to be true, say, for men's v. women's wages?

The Student-t distribution – Summary

- The assumption that Y is distributed $N(\mu_Y, \sigma_Y^2)$ is rarely plausible in practice (Income? Number of children?)

- For $n > 30$, the *t*-distribution and $N(0,1)$ are very close (as n grows large, the t_{n-1} distribution converges to $N(0,1)$)
- The *t*-distribution is an artifact from days when sample sizes were small and "computers" were people
- For historical reasons, statistical software typically uses the *t*-distribution to compute *p*-values – but this is irrelevant when the sample size is moderate or large.
- For these reasons, in this class we will focus on the large-n approximation given by the CLT

1. The probability framework for statistical inference
2. Estimation
3. Testing
4. **Confidence intervals**

Confidence Intervals (1 of 2)

- A 95% ***confidence interval*** for μ_Y is an interval that contains the true value of μ_Y in 95% of repeated samples.
- *Digression*: What is random here? The values of $Y_1,...,Y_n$ and thus any functions of them – including the confidence interval. The confidence interval will differ from one sample to the next. The population parameter, μ_Y, is not random; we just don't know it.

Confidence Intervals (2 of 2)

A 95% confidence interval can always be constructed as the set of values of μ_Y not rejected by a hypothesis test with a 5% significance level.

$$\left\{\mu_Y: \left|\frac{\bar{Y}-\mu_Y}{s_Y/\sqrt{n}}\right| \leq 1.96\right\} = \left\{\mu_Y: -1.96 \leq \frac{\bar{Y}-\mu_Y}{s_Y/\sqrt{n}} \leq 1.96\right\}$$

$$= \left\{\mu_Y: -\bar{Y} - 1.96\frac{s_Y}{\sqrt{n}} \leq -\mu_Y \leq -\bar{Y} + 1.96\frac{s_Y}{\sqrt{n}}\right\}$$

$$= \left\{\mu_Y \in \left(\bar{Y} - 1.96\frac{s_Y}{\sqrt{n}}, \bar{Y} + 1.96\frac{s_Y}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right\}$$

This confidence interval relies on the large-n results that $\bar{Y}$ *is approximately normally distributed and* $s_Y^2 \xrightarrow{P} \sigma_Y^2$.

Summary

From the two assumptions of:

1. simple random sampling of a population, that is, $\{Y_i, i=1,\ldots,n\}$ are i.i.d.
2. $0<E(Y^4)<\infty$

we developed, for large samples (large n):

- Theory of estimation (sampling distribution of $\bar{Y}$)
- Theory of hypothesis testing (large-n distribution of t-statistic and computation of the p-value)
- Theory of confidence intervals (constructed by inverting the test statistic)

Are assumptions (1) & (2) plausible in practice? **Yes**

Chebyshev's Theorem: At least $\left(1 - \frac{1}{z^2}\right)$ of the data values must be within z standard deviations of the mean, where z is any value greater than 1.

One of the advantages of Chebyshev's theorem is that it applies to any data set regardless of the shape of the distribution of the data.

Some of the implications of this theorem, with z=2, 3, and 4 standard deviations, follow.

- At least 75%, of the data values must be within z=2 standard deviations of the mean.
- At least 89%, of the data values must be within z=3 standard deviations of the mean.
- At least 94%, of the data values must be within z=4 standard deviations of the mean.

Let’s go back to the original policy question

What is the effect on test scores of reducing STR by one student/class?

Have we answered this question?

FIGURE 4.2: Scatterplot of Test Score vs. Student–Teacher Ratio (California School District Data)



Data from 420 California school districts. There is a weak negative relationship between the student–teacher ratio and test scores: The sample correlation is −0.23.