

# Metrics Review

EC 421, Set 2

Edward Rubin

# Prologue

# R showcase

## New this week

Because part of this course is about learning and implementing R, I'm going to share some interesting/amazing/fun applications of R.

### **Culture of Insight website**

- R-based web application
- Maps your location data (as tracked by Google)
- Great example of R's ability to extend beyond statistical programming
- (Visualization matters.)


### **The rayshader package**

- Creates really cool shaded maps (easily!)
- What else does one need?



- Default Maptile
- Dark Maptile
- Satellite Maptile
- HeatMap
- Points





The **rayshader** package.

# Last Time

## Motivation

In our last set of slides, we

1. discussed the **motivation** for studying econometrics (metrics)
2. **introduced R**—why we use it, what it can do
3. **started reviewing** material from your previous classes

These notes continue the review, building the foundation for some new topics (soon).

Normally: R is [available at all academic workstations at UO](#).

# Review

# Population vs. sample

## Models and notation

We write our (simple) population model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + u_i$$

and our sample-based estimated regression model as

$$y_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + e_i$$

An estimated regression model produces estimates for each observation:

$$\hat{y}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i$$

which gives us the *best-fit* line through our dataset.




# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?

# Population vs. sample


**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?




**Population**

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?



**Population**




**Population relationship**

$$y_i = 2.53 + 0.57x_i + u_i$$

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + u_i$$

# Population vs. sample


**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?




**Sample 1:** 30 random individuals

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?



**Sample 1:** 30 random individuals



**Population relationship**


$$y_i = 2.53 + 0.57x_i + u_i$$

**Sample relationship**


$$\hat{y}_i = 2.36 + 0.61x_i$$

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?



**Sample 2:** 30 random individuals



**Population relationship**


$$y_i = 2.53 + 0.57x_i + u_i$$

**Sample relationship**


$$\hat{y}_i = 2.79 + 0.56x_i$$

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?



**Sample 3:** 30 random individuals



**Population relationship**

$$y_i = 2.53 + 0.57x_i + u_i$$

**Sample relationship**


$$\hat{y}_i = 3.21 + 0.45x_i$$

Let's repeat this **10,000 times**.

(This exercise is called a (Monte Carlo) simulation.)




# Population vs. sample



# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?



- On **average**, our regression lines match the population line very nicely.
- However, **individual lines** (samples) can really miss the mark.
- Differences between individual samples and the population lead to **uncertainty** for the econometrician.

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?

# Population vs. sample

**Question:** Why do we care about *population vs. sample*?

**Answer:** Uncertainty matters.

$\hat{\beta}$  itself is a random variable—dependent upon the random sample. When we take a sample and run a regression, we don't know if it's a 'good' sample ( $\hat{\beta}$  is close to  $\beta$ ) or a 'bad sample' (our sample differs greatly from the population).

# Population vs. sample

## Uncertainty

Keeping track of this uncertainty will be a key concept throughout our class.

- Estimating standard errors for our estimates.
- Testing hypotheses.
- Correcting for heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation.

# Population vs. sample

## Uncertainty

Keeping track of this uncertainty will be a key concept throughout our class.

- Estimating standard errors for our estimates.
- Testing hypotheses.
- Correcting for heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation.

First, let's refresh on how we get these (uncertain) regression estimates.

# Linear regression

## The estimator

We can estimate a regression line in **R** (`lm(y ~ x, my_data)`) and **Stata** (`reg y x`). But where do these estimates come from?

A few slides back:

$$\hat{y}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i$$

which gives us the *best-fit* line through our dataset.

But what do we mean by "best-fit line"?

# Being the "best"

**Question:** What do we mean by *best-fit line*?

**Answers:**

- In general (econometrics), *best-fit line* means the line that minimizes the sum of squared errors (SSE):


$$\text{SSE} = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2 \quad \text{where} \quad e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$$

- Ordinary **least squares (OLS)** minimizes the sum of the squared errors.
- Based upon a set of (mostly palatable) assumptions, OLS
  - Is unbiased (and consistent)
  - Is the *best* (minimum variance) linear unbiased estimator (BLUE)




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

Let's consider the dataset we previously generated.




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

For any line  $(\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x)$




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

For any line  $(\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x)$ , we can calculate errors:  $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

For any line  $(\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x)$ , we can calculate errors:  $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

For any line  $(\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x)$ , we can calculate errors:  $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$




# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

SSE squares the errors ( $\sum e_i^2$ ): bigger errors get bigger penalties.



# OLS vs. other lines/estimators

The OLS estimate is the combination of  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that minimize SSE.



# OLS

## Formally

In simple linear regression, the OLS estimator comes from choosing the  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that minimize the sum of squared errors (SSE), *i.e.*,

$$\min_{\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1} \text{SSE}$$



## Formally

In simple linear regression, the OLS estimator comes from choosing the  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that minimize the sum of squared errors (SSE), *i.e.*,

$$\min_{\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1} \text{SSE}$$

but we already know  $\text{SSE} = \sum_i e_i^2$ . Now use the definitions of  $e_i$  and  $\hat{y}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} e_i^2 &= (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 = (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i)^2 \\ &= y_i^2 - 2y_i \hat{\beta}_0 - 2y_i \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \hat{\beta}_0^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_0 \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \hat{\beta}_1^2 x_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

## Formally

In simple linear regression, the OLS estimator comes from choosing the  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that minimize the sum of squared errors (SSE), *i.e.*,

$$\min_{\hat{\beta}_0, \hat{\beta}_1} \text{SSE}$$

but we already know  $\text{SSE} = \sum_i e_i^2$ . Now use the definitions of  $e_i$  and  $\hat{y}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} e_i^2 &= (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2 = (y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\beta}_1 x_i)^2 \\ &= y_i^2 - 2y_i \hat{\beta}_0 - 2y_i \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \hat{\beta}_0^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_0 \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + \hat{\beta}_1^2 x_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

**Recall:** Minimizing a multivariate function requires **(1)** first derivatives equal zero (the *1<sup>st</sup>-order conditions*) and **(2)** second-order conditions (concavity).

## Formally

We're getting close. We need to **minimize SSE**. We've showed how SSE relates to our sample (our data:  $x$  and  $y$ ) and our estimates (*i.e.*,  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ).

$$\text{SSE} = \sum_i e_i^2 = \sum_i \left( y_i^2 - 2y_i\hat{\beta}_0 - 2y_i\hat{\beta}_1x_i + \hat{\beta}_0^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_0\hat{\beta}_1x_i + \hat{\beta}_1^2x_i^2 \right)$$

For the first-order conditions of minimization, we now take the first derivatives of SSE with respect to  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \text{SSE}}{\partial \hat{\beta}_0} &= \sum_i \left( 2\hat{\beta}_0 + 2\hat{\beta}_1x_i - 2y_i \right) = 2n\hat{\beta}_0 + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i - 2 \sum_i y_i \\ &= 2n\hat{\beta}_0 + 2n\hat{\beta}_1\bar{x} - 2n\bar{y} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_i}{n}$  and  $\bar{y} = \frac{\sum y_i}{n}$  are sample means of  $x$  and  $y$  (size  $n$ ).

## Formally

The first-order conditions state that the derivatives are equal to zero, so:

$$\frac{\partial \text{SSE}}{\partial \hat{\beta}_0} = 2n\hat{\beta}_0 + 2n\hat{\beta}_1\bar{x} - 2n\bar{y} = 0$$

which implies

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1\bar{x}$$

Now for  $\hat{\beta}_1$ .

## Formally

Take the derivative of SSE with respect to  $\hat{\beta}_1$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \text{SSE}}{\partial \hat{\beta}_1} &= \sum_i \left( 2\hat{\beta}_0 x_i + 2\hat{\beta}_1 x_i^2 - 2y_i x_i \right) = 2\hat{\beta}_0 \sum_i x_i + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i \\ &= 2n\hat{\beta}_0 \bar{x} + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i\end{aligned}$$

set it equal to zero (first-order conditions, again)

$$\frac{\partial \text{SSE}}{\partial \hat{\beta}_1} = 2n\hat{\beta}_0 \bar{x} + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i = 0$$

and substitute in our relationship for  $\hat{\beta}_0$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$ . Thus,

$$2n \left( \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x} \right) \bar{x} + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i = 0$$

## Formally

Continuing from the last slide

$$2n(\bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1\bar{x})\bar{x} + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i = 0$$

we multiply out

$$2n\bar{y}\bar{x} - 2n\hat{\beta}_1\bar{x}^2 + 2\hat{\beta}_1 \sum_i x_i^2 - 2 \sum_i y_i x_i = 0$$

$$\implies 2\hat{\beta}_1 \left( \sum_i x_i^2 - n\bar{x}^2 \right) = 2 \sum_i y_i x_i - 2n\bar{y}\bar{x}$$

$$\implies \hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_i y_i x_i - 2n\bar{y}\bar{x}}{\sum_i x_i^2 - n\bar{x}^2} = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

# OLS

## Formally

Done!

We now have (lovely) OLS estimators for the slope

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

and the intercept

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$$

And now you know where the *least squares* part of ordinary least squares comes from. 🙌

# OLS

## Formally

Done!

We now have (lovely) OLS estimators for the slope

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

and the intercept

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$$

And now you know where the *least squares* part of ordinary least squares comes from. 🙌

We now turn to the assumptions and (implied) properties of OLS.



# OLS: Assumptions and properties

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Question:** What properties might we care about for an estimator?

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Question:** What properties might we care about for an estimator?

**Tangent:** Let's review statistical properties first.

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Refresher:** Density functions

Recall that we use **probability density functions** (PDFs) to describe the probability a **continuous random variable** takes on a range of values. (The total area = 1.)


These PDFs characterize probability distributions, and the most common/famous/popular distributions get names (*e.g.*, normal, *t*, Gamma).

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Refresher:** Density functions

The probability a standard normal random variable takes on a value between -2 and 0:  $P(-2 \leq X \leq 0) = 0.48$




# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Refresher:** Density functions

The probability a standard normal random variable takes on a value between -1.96 and 1.96:  $P(-1.96 \leq X \leq 1.96) = 0.95$



# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Refresher:** Density functions


The probability a standard normal random variable takes on a value beyond 2:  $P(X > 2) = 0.023$



# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

Imagine we are trying to estimate an unknown parameter  $\beta$ , and we know the distributions of three competing estimators. Which one would we want? How would we decide?





# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Question:** What properties might we care about for an estimator?

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Question:** What properties might we care about for an estimator?

**Answer one: Bias.**

On average (after *many* samples), does the estimator tend toward the correct value?

**More formally:** Does the mean of estimator's distribution equal the parameter it estimates?


$$\text{Bias}_{\beta}(\hat{\beta}) = \mathbf{E}[\hat{\beta}] - \beta$$

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Answer one: Bias.**

**Unbiased estimator:  $E[\hat{\beta}] = \beta$**




# OLS: Assumptions and properties


## Properties

**Answer one: Bias.**

**Unbiased estimator:  $E[\hat{\beta}] = \beta$**



**Biased estimator:  $E[\hat{\beta}] \neq \beta$**



# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

### **Answer two: Variance.**

The central tendencies (means) of competing distributions are not the only things that matter. We also care about the **variance** of an estimator.


$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}) = \mathbf{E}\left[\left(\hat{\beta} - \mathbf{E}[\hat{\beta}]\right)^2\right]$$

Lower variance estimators mean we get estimates closer to the mean in each sample.

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Answer two: Variance.**



# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

**Answer one: Bias.**


**Answer two: Variance.**

**Subtlety:** The bias-variance tradeoff.

Should we be willing to take a bit of bias to reduce the variance?

In econometrics, we generally stick with unbiased (or consistent) estimators. But other disciplines (especially computer science) think a bit more about this tradeoff.

# The bias-variance tradeoff.





# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

As you might have guessed by now,

- OLS is **unbiased**.
- OLS has the **minimum variance** of all unbiased linear estimators.

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Properties

But... these (very nice) properties depend upon a set of assumptions:

1. The population relationship is linear in parameters with an additive disturbance.
2. Our  $X$  variable is **exogenous**, i.e.,  $\mathbf{E}[u | X] = 0$ .
3. The  $X$  variable has variation. And if there are multiple explanatory variables, they are not perfectly collinear.
4. The population disturbances  $u_i$  are independently and identically distributed as normal random variables with mean zero ( $\mathbf{E}[u] = 0$ ) and variance  $\sigma^2$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{E}[u^2] = \sigma^2$ ). Independently distributed and mean zero jointly imply  $\mathbf{E}[u_i u_j] = 0$  for any  $i \neq j$ .

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Assumptions

Different assumptions guarantee different properties:

- Assumptions (1), (2), and (3) make OLS unbiased.
- Assumption (4) gives us an unbiased estimator for the variance of our OLS estimator.

During our course, we will discuss the many ways real life may **violate these assumptions**. For instance:

- Non-linear relationships in our parameters/disturbances (or misspecification).
- Disturbances that are not identically distributed and/or not independent.
- Violations of exogeneity (especially omitted-variable bias).

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Conditional expectation

For many applications, our most important assumption is **exogeneity**, *i.e.*,

$$E[u \mid X] = 0$$

but what does it actually mean?

# OLS: Assumptions and properties

## Conditional expectation

For many applications, our most important assumption is **exogeneity**, *i.e.*,

$$E[u | X] = 0$$

but what does it actually mean?


One way to think about this definition:

For *any* value of  $X$ , the mean of the residuals must be zero.


- *E.g.*,  $E[u | X = 1] = 0$  and  $E[u | X = 100] = 0$
- *E.g.*,  $E[u | X_2 = \text{Female}] = 0$  and  $E[u | X_2 = \text{Male}] = 0$
- Notice:  $E[u | X] = 0$  is more restrictive than  $E[u] = 0$

Graphically...

Valid exogeneity, *i.e.*,  $E[u | X] = 0$



Invalid exogeneity, i.e.,  $E[u | X] \neq 0$





# Uncertainty and inference

# Uncertainty and inference

## Is there more?

Up to this point, we know OLS has some nice properties, and we know how to estimate an intercept and slope coefficient via OLS.

Our current workflow:

- Get data (points with  $x$  and  $y$  values)
- Regress  $y$  on  $x$
- Plot the OLS line (*i.e.*,  $\hat{y} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1$ )
- Done?

But how do we actually **learn** something from this exercise?

# Uncertainty and inference

## There is more

But how do we actually **learn** something from this exercise?

- Based upon our value of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ , can we rule out previously hypothesized values?
- How confident should we be in the precision of our estimates?
- How well does our model explain the variation we observe in  $y$ ?

We need to be able to deal with uncertainty. Enter: **Inference**.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

As our previous simulation pointed out, our problem with **uncertainty** is that we don't know whether our sample estimate is *close* or *far* from the unknown population parameter.<sup>†</sup>

However, all is not lost. We can use the errors ( $e_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$ ) to get a sense of how well our model explains the observed variation in  $y$ .

When our model appears to be doing a "nice" job, we might be a little more confident in using it to learn about the relationship between  $y$  and  $x$ .

Now we just need to formalize what a "nice job" actually means.

<sup>†</sup>: Except when we run the simulation ourselves—which is why we like simulations.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

First off, we will estimate the variance of  $u_i$  (recall:  $\text{Var}(u_i) = \sigma^2$ ) using our squared errors, *i.e.*,

$$s^2 = \frac{\sum_i e_i^2}{n - k}$$

where  $k$  gives the number of slope terms and intercepts that we estimate (*e.g.*,  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  would give  $k = 2$ ).

$s^2$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\sigma^2$ .

# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

You then showed that the variance of  $\hat{\beta}_1$  (for simple linear regression) is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \frac{s^2}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}$$

which shows that the variance of our slope estimator

1. increases as our disturbances become noisier
2. decreases as the variance of  $x$  increases

# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

More common: The **standard error** of  $\hat{\beta}_1$

$$\hat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \sqrt{\frac{s^2}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2}}$$

*Recall:* The standard error of an estimator is the standard deviation of the estimator's distribution.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

Standard error output is standard in R's `lm`:

```
tidy(lm(y ~ x, pop_df))
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>    <dbl>
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```



# Uncertainty and inference

## Learning from our errors

We use the standard error of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ , along with  $\hat{\beta}_1$  itself, to learn about the parameter  $\beta_1$ .

After deriving the distribution of  $\hat{\beta}_1$ ,<sup>†</sup> we have two (related) options for formal statistical inference (learning) about our unknown parameter  $\beta_1$ :

- **Confidence intervals:** Use the estimate and its standard error to create an interval that, when repeated, will generally<sup>††</sup> contain the true parameter.
- **Hypothesis tests:** Determine whether there is statistically significant evidence to reject a hypothesized value or range of values.

<sup>†</sup>: *Hint:* it's normal with the mean and variance we've derived/discussed above)

<sup>††</sup>: *E.g.,* Similarly constructed 95% confidence intervals will contain the true parameter 95% of the time.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

We construct  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence intervals for  $\beta_1$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \pm t_{\alpha/2, \text{df}} \widehat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\beta}_1)$$

$t_{\alpha/2, \text{df}}$  denotes the  $\alpha/2$  quantile of a  $t$  dist. with  $n - k$  degrees of freedom.


# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

We construct  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence intervals for  $\beta_1$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \pm t_{\alpha/2, \text{df}} \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$$

For example, 100 obs., two coefficients (*i.e.*,  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1 \implies k = 2$ ), and  $\alpha = 0.05$  (for a 95% confidence interval) gives us  $t_{0.025, 98} = -1.98$



# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

We construct  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence intervals for  $\beta_1$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \pm t_{\alpha/2, df} \widehat{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$$

### Example:

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5  
#>   term      estimate std.error statistic  p.value  
#>   <chr>      <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>    <dbl>  
#> 1 (Intercept)  2.53     0.422     6.00 3.38e- 8  
#> 2 x           0.567    0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

We construct  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence intervals for  $\beta_1$

$$\hat{\beta}_1 \pm t_{\alpha/2, df} \widehat{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1)$$

### Example:

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>   <dbl>
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

Our 95% confidence interval is thus  $0.567 \pm 1.98 \times 0.0793 = [0.410, 0.724]$

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

So we have a confidence interval for  $\beta_1$ , *i.e.*, [0.410, 0.724].

What does it mean?

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

So we have a confidence interval for  $\beta_1$ , *i.e.*, [0.410, 0.724].

What does it mean?

**Informally:** The confidence interval gives us a region (interval) in which we can place some trust (confidence) for containing the parameter.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

So we have a confidence interval for  $\beta_1$ , *i.e.*, [0.410, 0.724].

What does it mean?

**Informally:** The confidence interval gives us a region (interval) in which we can place some trust (confidence) for containing the parameter.

**More formally:** If repeatedly sample from our population and construct confidence intervals for each of these samples,  $(1 - \alpha)$  percent of our intervals (*e.g.*, 95%) will contain the population parameter *somewhere in the interval*.



# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

So we have a confidence interval for  $\beta_1$ , *i.e.*, [0.410, 0.724].

What does it mean?

**Informally:** The confidence interval gives us a region (interval) in which we can place some trust (confidence) for containing the parameter.

**More formally:** If repeatedly sample from our population and construct confidence intervals for each of these samples,  $(1 - \alpha)$  percent of our intervals (*e.g.*, 95%) will contain the population parameter *somewhere in the interval*.

Now back to our simulation...

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

We drew 10,000 samples (each of size  $n = 30$ ) from our population and estimated our regression model for each of these simulations:

$$y_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_i + e_i$$


(repeated 10,000 times)

Now, let's estimate 95% confidence intervals for each of these intervals...

# Uncertainty and inference

## Confidence intervals

**From our previous simulation:** 97.6% of 95% confidence intervals contain the true parameter value of  $\beta_1$ .



# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

In many applications, we want to know more than a point estimate or a range of values. We want to know what our statistical evidence says about existing theories.

We want to test hypotheses posed by officials, politicians, economists, scientists, friends, weird neighbors, *etc.*

### Examples

- Does increasing police presence **reduce crime**?
- Does building a giant wall **reduce crime**?
- Does shutting down a government **adversely affect the economy**?
- Does legal cannabis **reduce drunk driving** or **reduce opioid use**?
- Do air quality standards **increase health** and/or **reduce jobs**?

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing relies upon very similar results and intuition.

While uncertainty certainly exists, we can still build *reliable* statistical tests (rejecting or failing to reject a posited hypothesis).

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing relies upon very similar results and intuition.

While uncertainty certainly exists, we can still build *reliable* statistical tests (rejecting or failing to reject a posited hypothesis).

**OLS  $t$  test** Our (null) hypothesis states that  $\beta_1$  equals a value  $c$ , *i.e.*,

$$H_o : \beta_1 = c$$

From OLS's properties, we can show that the test statistic

$$t_{\text{stat}} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_1 - c}{\widehat{\text{SE}}(\hat{\beta}_1)}$$

follows the  $t$  distribution with  $n - k$  degrees of freedom.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

For an  $\alpha$ -level, **two-sided** test, we reject the null hypothesis (and conclude with the alternative hypothesis) when

$$|t_{\text{stat}}| > |t_{1-\alpha/2, df}|$$

meaning that our **test statistic is more extreme than the critical value**.

Alternatively, we can calculate the **p-value** that accompanies our test statistic, which effectively gives us the probability of seeing our test statistic *or a more extreme test statistic* if the null hypothesis were true.

Very small p-values (generally  $< 0.05$ ) mean that it would be unlikely to see our results if the null hypothesis were really true—we tend to reject the null for p-values below 0.05.

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

R and **Stata** default to testing hypotheses against the value zero.

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>    <dbl>
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```



# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

R and **Stata** default to testing hypotheses against the value zero.

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5  
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value  
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>    <dbl>  
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8  
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  vs.  $H_a: \beta_1 \neq 0$

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

R and **Stata** default to testing hypotheses against the value zero.

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5  
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value  
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>    <dbl>  
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8  
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  vs.  $H_a: \beta_1 \neq 0$

$t_{\text{stat}} = 7.15$  and  $t_{0.975, 28} = 2.05$

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

R and **Stata** default to testing hypotheses against the value zero.

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5  
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value  
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>   <dbl>  
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8  
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  vs.  $H_a: \beta_1 \neq 0$

$t_{\text{stat}} = 7.15$  and  $t_{0.975, 28} = 2.05$  which implies  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

R and **Stata** default to testing hypotheses against the value zero.

```
lm(y ~ x, data = pop_df) %>% tidy()
```

```
#> # A tibble: 2 × 5
#>   term          estimate std.error statistic  p.value
#>   <chr>          <dbl>     <dbl>     <dbl>   <dbl>
#> 1 (Intercept)    2.53      0.422      6.00 3.38e- 8
#> 2 x              0.567     0.0793     7.15 1.59e-10
```

$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$  vs.  $H_a: \beta_1 \neq 0$

$t_{\text{stat}} = 7.15$  and  $t_{0.975, 28} = 2.05$  which implies  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$

Therefore, we **reject  $H_0$** .

# Uncertainty and inference

## Hypothesis testing

Back to our simulation! Let's see what our  $t$  statistic is actually doing.

In this situation, we can actually know (and enforce) the null hypothesis, since we generated the data.


For each of the 10,000 samples, we will calculate the  $t$  statistic, and then we can see how many  $t$  statistics exceed our critical value (2.05, as above).

The answer should be approximately 5 percent—our  $\alpha$  level.

# Uncertainty and inference

In our simulation, 2.4 percent of our  $t$  statistics reject the null hypothesis.


The distribution of our  $t$  statistics (shading the rejection regions).



# Uncertainty and inference

Correspondingly, 2.4 percent of our p-values reject the null hypothesis.

The distribution of our p-values (shading the p-values below 0.05).



# Uncertainty and inference

## *F* tests

You will sometimes see *F* tests in econometrics.

We use *F* tests to test hypotheses that involve multiple parameters

(e.g.,  $\beta_1 = \beta_2$  or  $\beta_3 + \beta_4 = 1$ ),

rather than a single simple hypothesis

(e.g.,  $\beta_1 = 0$ , for which we would just use a *t* test).



# Uncertainty and inference

## *F* tests

### **Example**

Economists love to say "Money is fungible."

Imagine that we might want to test whether money received as income actually has the same effect on consumption as money received from tax rebates/returns.

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Income}_i + \beta_2 \text{Rebate}_i + u_i$$

# Uncertainty and inference

## F tests

### Example, continued

We can write our null hypothesis as

$$H_o : \beta_1 = \beta_2 \iff H_o : \beta_1 - \beta_2 = 0$$

Imposing this null hypothesis gives us the **restricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Income}_i + \beta_1 \text{Rebate}_i + u_i$$

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Income}_i + \text{Rebate}_i) + u_i$$

# Uncertainty and inference

## *F* tests

### Example, continued

To test the null hypothesis  $H_o : \beta_1 = \beta_2$  against  $H_a : \beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ , we use the *F* statistic

$$F_{q, n-k-1} = \frac{(\text{SSE}_r - \text{SSE}_u) / q}{\text{SSE}_u / (n - k - 1)}$$

which (as its name suggests) follows the *F* distribution with  $q$  numerator degrees of freedom and  $n - k - 1$  denominator degrees of freedom.

Here,  $q$  is the number of restrictions we impose via  $H_o$ .

# Uncertainty and inference

## *F* tests

### **Example, continued**

$SSE_r$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **restricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Income}_i + \text{Rebate}_i) + u_i$$

and  $SSE_u$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **unrestricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Income}_i + \beta_2 \text{Rebate}_i + u_i$$

# Uncertainty and inference

## *F* tests

### Example, continued

$SSE_r$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **restricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Income}_i + \text{Rebate}_i) + u_i$$

and  $SSE_u$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **unrestricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Income}_i + \beta_2 \text{Rebate}_i + u_i$$

An *F* test compares the unrestricted model's performance to the restricted model's performance using their SSEs.

# Uncertainty and inference

## $F$ tests

### Example, continued

$SSE_r$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **restricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{Income}_i + \text{Rebate}_i) + u_i$$

and  $SSE_u$  is the sum of squared errors (SSE) from our **unrestricted model**

$$\text{Consumption}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Income}_i + \beta_2 \text{Rebate}_i + u_i$$

An  $F$  test compares the unrestricted model's performance to the restricted model's performance using their SSEs.

$$F_{\text{stat}} = \frac{(SSE_r - SSE_u) / q}{SSE_u / (n - k - 1)} \sim F_{q, n-k-1}$$