

API-209

1. Please **pick up handout #18**
2. Please take your seat **as soon as possible**
3. Please put your **name card on your desk**
4. If you don't want to appear on the film,
please sit in the left wing of the room (facing
the front)

Poll

API-209

- **Final Exercise posted**

- 3 options:

- Targeting Assessment Sierra Leone
 - Poverty Profile and Targeting Honduras
 - Currency Unions

- Start early

- Teamwork

- **Problem Set 8**

- Question on Final Exercise

HANDOUT 18

Multiple Regression III – Various Topics

1. Introduction
2. Goodness of Fit
3. The Standard Error of OLS Estimators

Source: Wooldridge (Ch 3), Hughes-Hallett (Math camp handouts)

1. INTRODUCTION

- Today we study 2 broad topics related to estimation in the context of multiple regression:
 - Goodness of fit (the famous R^2)
 - Variance of OLS estimators

2. GOODNESS OF FIT

- Consider the following terms:

Total Sum of Squares = $TSS = \sum(Y_i - \bar{Y})^2$

Explained sum of squares =

$$ESS = \sum(\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2$$

Residual sum of squares = $RSS = \sum \hat{u}_i^2$

- It turns out that $TSS = ESS + RSS$. (See Wooldridge for proof)

- The R-squared is defined to be

$$R^2 = \frac{ESS}{TSS}$$

$$R^2 = \frac{\sum(\hat{Y}_i - \bar{Y})^2}{\sum(Y_i - \bar{Y})^2} = 1 - \frac{RSS}{TSS} = 1 - \frac{\sum \hat{u}_i^2}{\sum(Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}$$

- By definition R^2 is a number between zero and one (because $TSS = ESS + RSS$, $ESS \geq 0$ and $RSS \geq 0$).

- Interpretation of R^2 : proportion of the sample variation in y that is explained by the OLS regression line.
- R^2 can also be shown to equal the ***squared correlation*** coefficient between the actual Y_i and the fitted values \hat{Y}_i . This is where the term “R-squared” comes from.

QUESTION: What happens to R^2 when an explanatory variable is added to a regression?

- A. It must increase**
- B. It increases or stays the same**
- C. It must decrease**
- D. It decreases or stays the same**
- E. Not enough information provided**

- Adjusted R^2 : Penalizes you for using irrelevant explanatory variables
- R^2 provides a measure of how well the OLS line fits the data
 - An $R^2=1$ means all the points lie on the same line, i.e. OLS provides a perfect fit to the data
 - An R^2 close to zero means a poor fit of the OLS line

QUESTION: The larger the R^2 , the lower the likelihood that our regression suffers from omitted variable bias (OVB)

- A. True
- B. False
- C. I don't know

3. THE STANDARD ERROR OF OLS ESTIMATORS

Idea: The discussion of unbiasedness gives us an assessment of the central tendencies of $\hat{\beta}_j$. Now we would like to have a measure of the spread in the sampling distribution of $\hat{\beta}_j$.

Key idea: All else equal, we would like an estimator of $\hat{\beta}_j$ that has a low standard error.

Why?

We first add an assumption to our model called **homoskedasticity**. We do so for two reasons:

- (1) The formulas for the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_j$ are simplified, which allows us to develop more easily the intuition behind the determinants of the standard error
- (2) OLS has important efficiency properties under the homoskedasticity assumption (see below)

ASSUMPTION MLR.5 [HOMOSKEDASTICITY]

$$\text{Var}[u|X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k] = \sigma^2$$

If this assumption fails, then the model exhibits heteroskedasticity. See Appendix #3 for details.

Assumptions MLR.1 through MLR.5 are collectively known as the Gauss-Markov assumptions (for cross-sectional regression)

Efficiency of OLS: The Gauss-Markov Theorem

Under assumptions MLR.1 through MLR.5, $\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_k$ are the Best Linear Unbiased Estimators (BLUEs) of $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$ respectively.

Best: lowest variance

Linear: Can be expressed as a linear function of the data on the dependent variable

Unbiased: $E(\hat{\beta}_j) = \beta_j$

Estimator: Rule/Method/Formula that can be applied to any sample to produce an estimate

Key idea: The importance of the Gauss-Markov Theorem is that, when the standard set of assumptions holds, we need not look for alternative linear unbiased estimators: none will be better than OLS.

Terminology

For the purposes of the next section, it will be helpful to think about various R^2 s, which we define here. Consider the following regression:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + u$$

The following R^2 s can be defined:

Name	R^2 computed from the following regression:
R^2	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + u$
R_1^2	$X_1 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_2 + \alpha_2 X_3 + v$
R_2^2	$X_2 = \delta_0 + \delta_1 X_1 + \delta_2 X_3 + \varepsilon$
R_3^2	$X_3 = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 X_1 + \gamma_2 X_2 + \eta$

More generally, R_j^2 is the R-squared from regressing X_j on all other explanatory variables (and including an intercept).

QUESTION: When would you expect R_j^2 to be large?

THEOREM 3.2 [Sampling variances of the OLS slope estimators]

Under assumptions MLR.1 through MLR.5,
conditional on the sample values of the
explanatory variables,

$$\text{Std. Error}(\hat{\beta}_j) = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2}{TSS_j(1-R_j^2)}} \quad (3.51)$$

for $j=1,2,\dots,k$, where $TSS_j = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2$ is the total sample variation in X_j , and R_j^2 is the R-squared from regressing X_j on all other explanatory variables (and including an intercept).

Note: The proof of theorem 3.2 can be found in Wooldridge.

<p>FORMULA FOR STANDARD ERROR</p> $STD. ERROR(\hat{B}_j) = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{TSS_j(1-R_j^2)}}$	<p>EXAMPLE</p>
---	-----------------------

Determinant of Standard Error	Analysis
<p>(1) The variance of the error term (σ^2)</p>	
<p>(2) The Total Sample Variation in X_j (TSS_j):</p> $TSS_j = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2$	
<p>(3) The Linear Relationships Among the Explanatory Variables (R_j^2)</p>	

THE COMPONENTS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF OLS ESTIMATORS

Eq. (3.51) shows that the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_j$ depends on three factors: σ^2 , TSS_j , and R_j^2 .

We now consider each of these factors separately.

(1) The variance of the error term (σ^2)

Key: σ^2 is a feature of the population; it has nothing to do with sample size.

(2) The Total Sample Variation in X_j (TSS_j):

$$TSS_j = \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j)^2$$

Everything else equal, for estimating β_j , we prefer to have as much variation in X_j as possible. When sampling randomly from the population, TSS_j increases with sample size.

(3) The Linear Relationships Among the Explanatory Variables (R_j^2)

It is important to see that this R-squared is distinct from the R-squared in the regression of Y on X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k .

Extreme cases:

- $R_j^2 = 0$ [smallest $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j)$ for a given σ^2 and TSS_j]
- $R_j^2 = 1$ [violates assumption MLR.3]

Key case: When R_j^2 is “close” to 1, $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_j)$ might become too large. High (but not perfect) correlation between two or more of the independent variables is called ***multicollinearity***.

Key idea #1: Worrying about high degrees of correlation among the independent variables in the sample is really no different from worrying about a small sample size: both work to increase $Var(\hat{\beta}_j)$.

Example: Estimating the effect of school expenditure categories on student performance.

Key idea #2: A high degree of correlation between certain explanatory variables can be irrelevant as to how well we can estimate other parameters in the model. For example, consider:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + u$$

Say X_2 and X_3 are highly correlated. Then $Var(\hat{\beta}_2)$ and $Var(\hat{\beta}_3)$ may be large. But the amount of correlation between X_2 and X_3 has no direct effect on $Var(\hat{\beta}_1)$.

Suppose we estimate the following regression:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + u$$

Adding an explanatory variable X_4 that is correlated with X_1 will:

- A. Increase the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_1$**
- B. Have no effect on the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_1$**
- C. Decrease the standard error of $\hat{\beta}_1$**
- D. Not enough information given**
- E. I don't know**

Standard Errors in Misspecified Models

Key idea: The choice of whether or not to include a particular variable in a model can sometimes be made by analyzing the tradeoff between bias and variance.

Estimating the Standard Errors of the OLS Estimators

Problem: The formula for $Std\ Error(\hat{\beta}_j)$ (and hence the formula for the standard error) depends on σ^2 , which we don't observe since it's a population parameter.

Solution: Obtain an unbiased estimator of σ^2 , which will then allow us to obtain unbiased estimators of $Std\ Error(\hat{\beta}_j)$. See Appendix #4 for details.

Key Ideas

- **Goodness of fit (R2)**: What it is and what it is not.
- **Standard Errors**:

- We care about *magnitude* of coefficient but also *standard error*
- Important to understand *determinants* of standard errors to be able to better design and consume empirical studies
- *Tradeoff* between *bias* and *variance*

4. APPENDIX #1– OLS IN MATRIX NOTATION

(Adapted from Johnston and Hughes Hallett)

- In this course, we have expressed the linear PRF for a regression with k explanatory variables in the following form:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1i} + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \dots + \beta_k X_{ki} + u_i \quad (4)$$

- We can write (4) using matrix algebra. This may be useful to you for two reasons:
 - Both in API-210 and in many academic papers you will see the PRFs written in matrix algebra form, so it is important for you to be familiar with this notation
 - Matrix algebra allows us to specify how to compute the OLS estimators when we have more than one explanatory variable in our PRF
- There are several matrix algebra notations used. We will focus on two that are commonly used:
 - **Notation #1**: Will be used in API-210 and has some computational advantages. This notation will be covered by Deb Hughes Hallett in Math Camp.
 - **Notation #2**: Used in classic textbooks such as Johnston and Greene.

Notation #1

- You can write the PRF: $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \beta_k x_{ki} + \varepsilon_i$ in the following way:
 $y_i = x_i \beta + \varepsilon_i$, where:

$$\beta = [\beta_0 \ \beta_1 \ \beta_2 \ \dots \ \beta_k] \quad \text{and} \quad x_i = [1 \ x_{1i} \ x_{2i} \ \dots \ x_{ki}]$$

i denotes the observation, and $'$ denotes the transpose of the matrix.

- The OLS estimators from the linear PRF $y_i = x_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i$ can be computed as follows:

$$\hat{\beta} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i Y_i$$

Notation #2

The hypothesized model is:

$$y = X\beta + u$$

Where

$$y = [Y_1 \ Y_2 \ \dots \ Y_n]$$

$$X = [1 \ x_{11} \ x_{12} \ \dots \ x_{1k} \ 1 \ x_{21} \ x_{22} \ \dots \ x_{2k} \ \dots \ \dots \ \dots \ 1 \ x_{n1} \ x_{n2} \ \dots \ x_{nk}] \quad \beta = [\beta_0 \ \beta_1 \ \beta_2 \ \dots \ \beta_k]$$

and $u = [u_1 \ u_2 \ \dots \ u_n]$

The OLS estimator of the population parameters represented in the vector β is given by:

$$\hat{\beta}_{OLS} = (X'X)^{-1} X'y$$

and under certain conditions the variance of this estimator is given by:

$$Var(\hat{\beta}_{OLS}) = \sigma^2(X'X)^{-1}$$

5. APPENDIX #2 - STUDIES ABOUT CLASS SIZE AND TEST SCORES

Study #1 - Randomized Experiment in Tennessee (STAR)

```
. reg tscorek sck, robust;
Regression with robust standard errors
```

Number of obs =	5786
F(1, 5784) =	40.67
Prob > F =	0.0000
R-squared =	0.0073
Root MSE =	73.483

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
tscorek					
sck	13.74055	2.154628	6.38	0.000	9.516677 17.96443
_cons	918.2013	1.135073	808.94	0.000	915.9762 920.4265

sck: dummy for small class size

Study #2 - Observational Study in California

```
. reg testscr str, robust;
Regression with robust standard errors
```

Number of obs =	420
F(1, 418) =	19.26
Prob > F =	0.0000
R-squared =	0.0512
Root MSE =	18.581

	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
testscr					
str	-2.279808	.5194892	-4.39	0.000	-3.300945 -1.258671
_cons	698.933	10.36436	67.44	0.000	678.5602 719.3057

str: student-teacher ratio

6. APPENDIX #3 – HETEROSKEDASTICITY

- Note that the standard error formula in (3.58) is not a valid estimator of $sd(\hat{\beta}_j)$ if the errors exhibit heteroskedasticity. Thus, while the presence of heteroskedasticity does not lead to bias in $\hat{\beta}_j$, it does lead to bias in the usual formula for the variance of $\hat{\beta}_j$, which then invalidates the standard errors.
- There are statistical tests to assess the presence of heteroskedasticity (see chapter 8 of Wooldridge for details).
- However, for the purposes of this course, we will adopt Stock and Watson's guideline of always calculating standard errors assuming the presence of heteroskedasticity. These are called heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors.
- The heteroskedasticity-robust standard error formula is:

$$se(\hat{\beta}_j) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{r}_{ij}^2 \hat{u}_i^2}{RSS_j^2}}$$

Where \hat{r}_{ij}^2 denotes the square of the residual from regressing X_j on all other explanatory variables, and RSS_j^2 is the sum of squared residuals from this regression.

- In Stata you get this standard error by using the **“robust” option** when you run a regression. For example, “regress lcd cigs, robust”

7. APPENDIX #4 - ESTIMATING THE STANDARD ERRORS OF THE OLS ESTIMATORS

Problem: The formula for $Std\ Error(\hat{\beta}_j)$ (and hence the formula for the standard error) depends on σ^2 , which we don't observe since it's a population parameter.

Solution: Obtain an unbiased estimator of σ^2 , which will then allow us to obtain unbiased estimators of $Std\ Error(\hat{\beta}_j)$.

The unbiased estimator of σ^2 in the general multiple regression case is:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2}{(n-k-1)}$$

where n = number of observations and k = number of explanatory variables

The term $n-k-1$ is the **degrees of freedom (df)** for the general OLS model with n observations and k explanatory variables.

Standard error of $\hat{\beta}_j$:
$$Std\ Error(\hat{\beta}_j) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{TSS_j(1-R_j^2)}} \quad (3.58)$$