Economics 466 Introduction to Econometrics Spring 2009, Midterm Exam I Total points - 100, Time - 1 hr. 15 min.

Note: Answer all questions clearly. Show your work for full credit.

1. (50 points) You are given the following data to estimate regression coefficients in several models.

$$n = 25, \bar{X} = 5, \bar{Y} = 10, \sum_{i} X_{i}^{2} = 650, \sum_{i} Y_{i}^{2} = 2600, \sum_{i} X_{i}Y_{i} = 1275.$$
(1)

- (a) (5 points each) Estimate the intercept and slope coefficients for the following models.
 - (i) $Y_{i} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}X_{i} + u_{i}$ (ii) $Y_{i} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}(X_{i} - \bar{X}) + u_{i}$ (iii) $Y_{i} - \bar{Y} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}X_{i} + u_{i}$ (iv) $Y_{i} - \bar{Y} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}(X_{i} - \bar{X}) + u_{i}$
- (b) (12 points) Compute the standard error of the slope coefficient and the *t-value* for testing the null hypothesis $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ for the model in (i). Do you think that the standard errors and the *t-values* of the slope coefficient for the models in (ii)-(iv) will be the same? Explain.
- (c) (8 points) Find R^2 in model (i) and show that $R^2 = r^2$ where r^2 is the correlation coefficient between the dependant and independent variables. Do you think that R^2 for the models in (ii)-(iv) will be the same? Why?
- (d) (9 points) Your friend Don is estimating the model (v) $Y_i = \beta_1 X_i + u_i$. Compute Don's slope coefficient and its standard error. If the true model is given in (i), which model would you prefer, (i) or (v)? Explain.
- 2. Using data on 53 observations, the following model was estimated

$$\ln Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + u, \tag{2}$$

where Y = number of car sales (in thousands), $X_1 =$ car price (in thousand dollars), $X_2 =$ average family income (in thousand dollars). The regression results for this model are reported in the following table.

Coefficient	estimate	std. error	t-value
\hat{eta}_0	-51.25	10.12	
\hat{eta}_1	-1.45	0.29	
\hat{eta}_2	1.13	0.64	
R^2	.81	_	

- (a) Compute the t-values in the last column of the table. (6 points)
- (b) Interpret the coefficients of $\ln X_1$, $\ln X_2$ and R^2 in words. From the above table is it possible to find the marginal effects of an increase in price $(\partial \hat{Y}/\partial X_1)$ and family income $(\partial \hat{Y}/\partial X_2)$? If not, what additional information do you need? (12 points)
- (c) Explain how you would test the following hypothesis: (i) $\beta_1 = -1$, (ii) $\beta_2 = 1$, (iii) joint test on (i) and (ii). Choose your level of significance and perform the tests, when possible. (12 points)
- (d) How would you test the hypothesis that $2\beta_1 + 3\beta_2 = 0$? Explain in details. (6 points)
- (e) Your friend estimated the simple regression $\ln Y$ on $\ln X_1$ and found the slope coefficient to be -1.25. Using the result (discussed in class) relating simple to multiple regression coefficients $(\tilde{\beta}_1 = \hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 \hat{\delta})$, find the value of $\hat{\delta}$ (which is the regression coefficient of $\ln X_2$ on $\ln X_1$). Based on this result what can you say about your friend's regression? (8 points)
- (f) Use the results in the above table to test the hypothesis that there is no regression. (8 points)

$$\begin{split} \text{ii} \hat{\beta}_{1} &= \overline{Z(X_{i} - \overline{X})Y} - n(\overline{X_{i} - \overline{X}})\overline{Y} \\ \text{note that } \overline{X_{i} - \overline{X}} = n(\overline{X_{i} - \overline{X}})^{2} \\ \text{note that } \overline{X_{i} - \overline{X}} = \overline{Z(X_{i} - \overline{X})} = \frac{\overline{X}}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{k} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{k} \frac{1}$$

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_1 (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}) = \bar{Y} = 10$$

$$iv)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_{i} = \overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})(t_{i}-\overline{y}) - n\overline{x}\overline{y}}}{\overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})^{2} - n\overline{x}}}$$

$$\overline{Z} = \overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})}, \quad \overline{y} = \overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})}$$
So $\overline{x} = 0$ and $\overline{y} = 0$

$$\hat{\beta}_{1} = \overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})(t_{i}-\overline{y})}}{\overline{Z(x_{i}-\overline{x})^{2}}}$$

$$= \overline{ZXY} - n\overline{X\overline{y}}}{\overline{Zx^{2}} - n\overline{X^{2}}}$$

$$= \frac{25}{25} = 1$$

$$\hat{\beta}_{0} = \overline{y} - \hat{\beta}_{1}\overline{x} = 0$$

b)
$$se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \sqrt{Var(\hat{\beta}_{1})}$$

 $= \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^{2}}{\Sigma(x_{1}-\bar{x})^{2}}}$
 $\hat{\tau}^{2} = \frac{\Sigma \hat{u}_{1}^{2}}{n-2}$
 $= \frac{5ST - SSE}{n-2}$
 $= \frac{\Sigma(Y-\bar{y})^{2} - \hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} \Sigma(x_{1}-\bar{x})^{2}}{n-2}$
 $= \frac{\Sigma(Y-\bar{y})^{2} - \hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} \Sigma X_{1}^{2} + \hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} n \bar{x}^{2}}{n-2}$
 $= \frac{2600 - 25(10)^{2} - 650 + 25(5)^{2}}{23}$
 $= \frac{75}{23} = 3 \cdot 26$
 $Se(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \sqrt{\frac{3\cdot 26}{25}} = 0.361$

The std errors will be the same. Why? Berause the SSTE SSE do not change for any of these models

The t-values will also be the same since the std emors are the same

C)
$$R^{2} = \frac{SSE}{SST} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} Z(X_{1} - \overline{X})^{2}}{\overline{Z}(Y_{1} - \overline{Y})^{2}}$$

 $= \frac{\hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} ZX_{1}^{2} - \hat{\beta}_{1}^{2} n \overline{X}^{2}}{\overline{Z}Y^{2} - n \overline{Y}^{2}}$
 $= \frac{650 - 625}{2600 - 25(10)^{2}} = \frac{25}{100} = 0.25$

$$\Gamma^{2} = \frac{\left[20V(X,Y) \right]^{2}}{V_{44}X V_{44}Y} = \frac{\left[\overline{Z}(X-\overline{X})(Y-\overline{Y}) \right]^{2}}{\overline{Z}(X-\overline{X})^{2}} = \frac{\left(\overline{Z}XY - n\overline{X}\overline{Y} \right)^{2}}{\left(\overline{Z}X^{2} - n\overline{X}^{2} \right) \left(\overline{Z}Y^{2} - n\overline{Y}^{2} \right)}$$
$$= \frac{\left(1275 - 1250 \right)^{2}}{\left(650 - 625 \right) \left(2600 - 2500 \right)} = \frac{25^{2}}{25 \cdot 100} = 0.25$$
$$= R^{2}$$

d)
$$\tilde{\beta}_{1} = \frac{\Sigma XY}{\Sigma X^{2}} = \frac{1275}{650} = 1.96$$

 $Se(\tilde{\beta}_{1}) = \sqrt{Vat} \tilde{\beta}_{1}$
 $= \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{D}^{2}}{\Sigma X^{2}}}$
 $= \sqrt{\frac{3.26}{650}} = 0.0708$

d) contid It depends. Since $\hat{\beta}_i$ is unbiased of $\hat{\beta}_i$ is brased we cannot say that we will choose the One with minimum variance. Comparing variances will not make sense. If unbiaseciness is more important then prefer (i) If minimum variance is more important then prefer (v) Ques 2

X)	Coefficient	estimate	std-emor	t-value
	ĥo	-51.25	10.12	-5.06
	Ĝ,	-1.45	0.29	-5
	B2	1.13	0.64	1.766
	I	itsing	$t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_{j}}{se(\hat{\beta}_{j})}$	

- b) $\hat{\beta}_i$: Holding average family income fixed, a 1 percent increase in car price will lead to a 1.45 percent decrease in the estimated number of car sales.
 - \$\vec{\beta}_2\$: Holding car price fixed, a 1% increase in average family income will lead to a 1.13% increase in the estimated number of car sales.
 \$\vec{R}^2\$: \$\vec{81\%}_6\$ of the total sample variation in # of car sales is explained by car price and any family income.

$$\frac{\partial \ln Y}{\partial \ln X} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial X} \cdot \frac{x}{Y} = \frac{\partial Y}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial \ln Y}{\partial \ln X} \cdot \frac{Y}{X}$$

Since β_i $i=1,2$ captures only $\frac{\partial \ln Y}{\partial \ln X}$ then you need
More information. You also need $\frac{Y}{X_i}$ $i=1,2$

(4)

Question 2 centred
C) i) step 1: set up null hypothesis & alternative hypothesis
Ho:
$$\beta_1 = -1$$

H₁: $\beta_1 \neq -1$
step2: then calculate t-value
 $t = \frac{\beta_1 + 1}{\Re(\beta_1)} = -\frac{1.45 + 1}{9} = -1.55$
choosing 10% level of significance at so df, $t_{50} = \frac{1.675905}{1.600}$
choosing 5% " " 50 f, $t_{50} = 2.0085591$
" 50 f, $t_{50} = 2.6777193$
We fail to reject the null hypothesis since
 $ft-stat | < t_c$

ii) step 1: Set up null hypothesis & alternative hypothesis
Ho:
$$\beta_2 = 1$$

H₁: $\beta_2 \neq 1$
step 2: then calculate t-value
 $t = \frac{\beta_2 - 1}{15} = \frac{1\cdot 13 - 1}{0.64} = 0.203$
choosing 10% level of significance at 50 df, teo = 1:675905
10% level of significance at 50 df, teo = 2:008559
10% level n n 50 df, too = 2:008559
Ne fail to reject the null hypothesis since
 $[t-stat] < t_c$

(ii) i)
$$\xi$$
 ii) jointly
stup 1: Ho: $\beta_1 = -1$, $\beta_2 = 1$
H; mult is not true
This is a joint lest so it requires the use of the F-dist.
step 2: (alculati F-stat.
 $F = (SSR_A - SSR_{UR})/2$
 $SSR_{UR}/n-k-1$
in $P_1 = hr X_1 + hr X_1 - hr X_2 = \beta_0 + u$
 $= hr Y^* = \beta_2 + u$ where $Y^* = \frac{X_1Y}{X_2}$
Sleps: Find $F_{2,50}$ at 5_{10} , 1_{10} or 1_{10} is 1_{10} or 1_{10}

d) set
$$\Theta_1 = 2\beta_1 + 3\beta_2$$
 $\Theta = 2\beta_1 + 3\beta_2$
H₁: $\Theta_1 = O$
H₁: $\Theta_1 \neq O$
In order to get $\widehat{\Theta}$ we first have to modify the equation
In $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + u$
 $\beta_1 = \frac{\Theta - 3\beta_2}{2}$
 $\ln Y = \beta_0 + \frac{\Theta_1 - 3\beta_2}{2} \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + u$
 $2\ln Y = 2\beta_0 + \Theta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 (2\ln X_2 - 3\ln X_1) + u$
let $Y' = Y'''$, $\beta_0'' = \beta_0$; $X''_2 = X''_2/X''_3$
then $Y'' = \beta_0'' + \Theta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X''_2 + u$

Run this regression to get

$$\hat{\gamma}^* = \hat{\beta}_0^* + \hat{\theta}_1 \ln X_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 \ln X_2^*$$

 $\hat{\theta}_1$ is the coefficient on $\ln X_1$. Extract this coefficient of its
corresponding std. error when you run this regression in
a software package such as tree!.
then we can calculate the t-stat.
 $t = \hat{\theta}_1$. We compare this t-stat to the critical
 $\operatorname{se}(\hat{\theta})$ value, t_{50} at our chosen significance
level to determine whether we reject
or fail to reject the null hypothesis.

e) $\hat{\beta}_1 = \hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 \hat{\beta} \Longrightarrow \hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_1 = -\frac{1\cdot25 + 1\cdot45}{1\cdot13} = 0.177$ First since $\hat{\beta}_{\neq 0}$, we can pay that there is correlation between X_1 and X_2 to my friend's regression (simple) is not identical to the multiple regression. We can also assume that the partial relationship between $X_2 \notin Y$ is positive of the correlation between $X_1 \notin X_2$ is also positive. So it would seem there is a positive bias.

f)
$$H_0: \beta_1 = 0, \beta_2 = 0$$

 $H_1: null is not correct$
 $F = R^2 / c$

$$F = \frac{K_{ur} / 9}{(1 - R_{ur}^2)/n - k - 1} = \frac{0.81/2}{0.19/50} = 106.58$$

al 5% level of significance, 5,50 = 3:1826. Hence we reject the null. Given the large value of the F-stat, we can safely say that we can reject the null at any level of significance.