## ECON 3740: INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMETRICS

#### INSTRUCTOR: CHAOYI CHEN Department of Economics and Finance, University of Guelph

Lecture 10

Instructor: Chaoyi (U. of Guelph)

ECON 3740

October 15, 2018 1 / 12

### Lecture outline

Last lecture, we learned the model, motivation, OLS estimates of the MLR as well as the FWL theorem. Today, we will

- continue multiple linear regression analysis: estimation
  - Goodness-of-fit
  - The Expected Value of the OLS Estimators
    - Standard Assumptions for the MLR Model
    - Unbiasedness of OLS
    - Including Irrelevant Variables in a Regression Model
    - Omitted Variable Bias

### MLR: algebraic properties of OLS regression

- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{\mu}_i = 0$ : deviations from the fitted regression line sum up to zero.
- ∑<sup>n</sup><sub>i=1</sub> x<sub>ij</sub> µ̂<sub>i</sub> = 0, j = 1, ..., k: correlations between deviations and regressors are zero.
- $\bar{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \bar{x}_1\hat{\beta}_1 + ... + \bar{x}_k\hat{\beta}_k$ : sample averages of y and of the regressors lie on the fitted regression plane.
- These properties are corollaries of the FOCs for the OLS estimates.

### MLR: goodness-of-fit

• Similar to the SLR, we can decompose total variation as

$$SST = SSE + SSR$$

• R-squared:

$$R^2 = \frac{SSE}{SST} = 1 - \frac{SSR}{SST}$$

• Alternative expression for R-squared [Proof not required]

$$R^{2} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{i} - \bar{y})(\hat{y}_{i} - \bar{\hat{y}})\right)^{2}}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_{i} - \bar{y})^{2}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\hat{y}_{i} - \bar{\hat{y}})^{2}\right)} = \frac{\widehat{Cov}(y, \hat{y})^{2}}{\widehat{Var}(y)\widehat{Var}(\hat{y})} = \widehat{Corr}(y, \hat{y})^{2}$$

- R-squared is equal to the squared correlation coefficient between the actual and the predicted value of the dependent variable.
- R-Squared Cannot Decrease When One More Regressor Is Added

• Assumption MLR.1 (Linear in Parameters):

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \ldots + \beta_k x_k + \mu$$

- In the population, the relationship between y and x is linear.
- The "linear" in linear regression means "linear in parameter".
- Assumption MLR.2 (Random Sampling): The data
  {(x<sub>i1</sub>, ..., x<sub>ik</sub>, y<sub>i</sub>) : i = 1, ..., n} is a random sample drawn from the
  population, i.e., each data point follows the population equation,

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \dots + \beta_k x_{ik} + \mu_i$$

## MLR: Standard Assumptions for the MLR Model continue

- Assumption MLR.3 (No **Perfect** Collinearity): In the sample (and therefore in the population), none of the independent variables is constant and there are no exact relationships among the independent variables.
  - Remark 1: The assumption only rules out perfect collinearity/ correlation between explanatory variables; imperfect correlation  $^{1}$  is allowed.
  - Remark 2: If an explanatory variable is a perfect linear combination of other explanatory variables it is superfluous and may be eliminated.
  - Remark 3: Constant variables are also ruled out (This is the case that the independent variable is collinear with intercept).
  - Remark 4: In essence, this is an extension of the assumption Var(x) is positive in the SLR model.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This is referred to as multicollinearity. We will formally discuss it later  $\exists b = 0 \leq 0$ 

# MLR: Standard Assumptions for the MLR Model: an example for perfect collinearity

• Recall the average score model,

$$avgscore = \beta_0 + \beta_1 expend + \beta_2 avginc + \mu$$

- Remark 1: we fully expect expend and avginc to be correlated
- Remark 2: Assumption MLR.3 only rules out perfect correlation between *expend* and *avginc* in our sample.
- Remark: However, in a small sample, *avginc* may accidentally be an exact multiple of expend; it will not be possible to disentangle their separate effects because there is exact covariation (Cause we cannot move one while fixing another). As a result, we will have perfect collinearity problem.

### MLR: Standard Assumptions for the MLR Model continue

• Assumption MLR.4 (Zero Conditional Mean):

 $E[\mu_i | x_{i1}, ..., x_{ik}] = 0$ 

- Remark 1: The value of the explanatory variables must contain no information about the mean of the unobserved factors.
- Remark 2: In a multiple regression model, the zero conditional mean assumption is much more likely to hold because fewer things end up in the error.
- An Example: Reconsider

$$avgscore = \beta_0 + \beta_1 expend + \beta_2 avginc + \mu$$

• Remark: If *avginc* was not included in the regression, it would end up in the error term; it would then be hard to defend that *expend* is uncorrelated with the error.

# MLR: Standard Assumptions for the MLR Model - Discussion of Assumption 4

- Explanatory/independent variables that are correlated with the error term are called endogenous; endogeneity is a violation of assumption MLR.4.
- Explanatory variables that are uncorrelated with the error term are called exogenous; MLR.4 holds if all explanatory variables are exogenous.
- Exogeneity is the **key** assumption for a causal interpretation of the regression, and for unbiasedness of the OLS estimators.

• Theorem (Unbiasedness of OLS): Under assumptions MLR.1-MLR.4,

$$E[\widehat{\beta}_j] = \beta_j, \ j = 0, 1, ..., k,$$

for every  $\beta_j$ .

• Unbiasedness is an average property in repeated samples; in a given sample, the estimates may still be far away from the true values.

#### Suppose

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \mu$$

where  $\beta_3 = 0$  (eg.  $x_3$  is irrelevant to y).

- Remark 1: This will not influence the unbiasedness property:  $E[\hat{\beta}_3] = \beta_3 = 0$
- Remark 2: However, including irrelevant variables may increase sampling variance. (More noise and no information data used to estimate the model)

### MLR: Omitted Variable Bias: the Simple Case

• Suppose the true model is

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \mu$$

i.e., the true model contains both  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  ( $\beta_1 \neq 0$ ,  $\beta_2 \neq 0$ ), while the estimated model is

$$y = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + e$$

i.e., x<sub>2</sub> is **omitted**.

• If x<sub>1</sub> and x<sub>2</sub> are correlated, assume a linear regression relationship between them:

$$x_2 = \delta_0 + \delta_1 x_1 + v.$$

Then

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 (\delta_0 + \delta_1 x_1 + v) + \mu$$
  
=  $\beta_0 + \beta_2 \delta_0 + (\beta_1 + \beta_2 \delta_1) x_1 + (\mu + \beta_2 v).$ 

- If y is only regressed on x<sub>1</sub>, the estimated intercept is β<sub>0</sub> + beta<sub>2</sub>δ<sub>0</sub> = α<sub>0</sub> and the estimated slope is β<sub>1</sub> + β<sub>2</sub>δ<sub>1</sub> = α<sub>1</sub>.
- why? The new error term  $e = \mu + \beta_2 v$  satisfies the zero conditional mean assumption:  $E[\mu + \beta_2 v | x_1] = E[\mu | x_1] + \beta_2 E[v | x_1] = 0.$
- That is, all estimated coefficients will be biased.