Economics 113 Professor Spearot Fall 2014 – Midterm 2 Introduction to Econometrics

Name

ID\_\_\_\_\_

## Midterm 2 –70 Points

The exam is closed book and closed notes. You may use calculators. No cell phones. Do not use your own paper.

## You must show your work to receive full credit

I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this examination, nor have I concealed any similar misconduct by others.

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

## Problem 1

Many models of labor economics predict hours worked, and many policies depend on the number of hours worked (eg. Affordable Care Act). Suppose we wish to predict hours worked per week, *hours*, using the following regression:

 $log(hours) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 educ + \beta_2 age + \beta_3 exper + u$ 

Education, experience and age are all measured in years. The results from this regression are below.

Source	SS	df		MS		Number of obs	=	935
	+					F(3, 931)	=	3.77
Model	.261139734	3	.087	046578		Prob > F	=	0.0104
Residual	21.4864901	. 931	.023	078937		R-squared	=	0.0120
	+					Adj R-squared	=	0.0088
Total	21.7476298	934	.0	232844		Root MSE	=	.15192
log_hours	Coef.	Std.	Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	In	terval]
educ	.0052999	.0026	448	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXX		XXX	XXXXXXX
age	.0025309	.0019	156	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXX	*****	XXX	XXXXXXX
exper	0018032	.0015	286	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXX	*****	XXX	XXXXXXX
_cons	3.63621	.0616	024	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXX	******	XXX	XXXXXXX

a. Please construct a 99% confidence interval for the effect of education on hours worked. Please interpret this confidence interval. (10 Points)

b. Using the 97% confidence level, please test whether the coefficient on *age* is significantly different from zero. State your null and alternative hypotheses, and briefly interpret your result. Show your work! (10 Points)

c. Suppose that we instead estimate the following:

 $log(hours) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 educ + u$ 

Source	SS	df	MS		Number of obs = $E(1 + 0.22) =$	935
Model   Residual    Total	.214070425 21.5335594 21.7476298	1 .21 933 .02 934 .	.4070425 23079914 0232844		<pre>F(1, 955) = Prob &gt; F = R-squared = Adj R-squared = Root MSE =</pre>	0.0024 0.0098 0.0088 .15192
log_hours	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. I	nterval]
educ   _cons	.006892 3.677639	.002263 .0308812	XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX		 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX

Is this model preferred to the model in 'a'? If a hypothesis test is warranted, please test this at the 95% level, stating your null and alternative. If not, please provide other evidence for your answer. Show your work! (10 Points)

d. Suppose that we instead estimate the following:

Source	SS	df	MS		Number of obs	= 935
+-					F(2, 932)	= 5.40
Model	.249339979	2.124	669989		Prob > F	= 0.0046
Residual	21.4982898	932 .023	8066835		R-squared	= 0.0115
+-					Adj R-squared	= 0.0093
Total	21.7476298	934 .0	232844		Root MSE	= .15188
log_hours	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf.	Interval]
+-						
educ	.0052082	.0026405	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
iq	.0004765	.0003853	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX
cons	3.652058	.0371631	XXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX	*****	XXXXXXXXXX
_						

Is this model preferred to the model in 'a'? If a hypothesis test is warranted, please test this at the 95% level, stating your null and alternative. If not, please provide other evidence for your answer. Show your work! (10 Points)

e. Using the model in 'd', suppose I claim that IQ has a significant effect on hours worked. What is the probability that I'm wrong? (10 Points)

## Problem 2 (20 points)

Using the same data, but instead using hours worked per week rather than log hours, we estimate the following equation.

*hours* =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1(educ - 16) + \beta_2(iq - 140) + u$ 

Source	SS	df	MS	Nur	ber of obs	=	935
Model   Residual   Total	451.81313 48293.528 48745.3412	2 225. 932 51.8 934 52.1	906565 170902  898728	F( Prc R-s Adj Roc	2, 932) bb > F squared R-squared ot MSE	= = = =	4.36 0.0130 0.0093 0.0071 7.1984
hours	Coef.	Std. Err.	t 1	 P> t	[95% Conf.	Int	terval]
educ-16   iq-140   _cons	.2371403 .0175916 45.21085	.1251517 .0182636 .65173	XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	××××××××××× ××××××××××××××××××××××××××	XXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	×××× ×××× ××××	×××××××× ×××××××××××××××××××××××××××××

a. Please construct and interpret a 90% confidence interval for the constant in this regression. Show your work!! (10 Points)

b. Do the variables of the model tell us anything about hours worked? Test this at the 95% level, stating your null and alternative. Show your work! (10 Points)

	Normal I	Distribut	tion			
	from _0	o to Z				
R		0102				
Z   0.00 0.01	0.02 0.03 0	0.04 0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09
0.0   0.5000 0.5040	0.5080 0.5120 0	.5160 0.5199	0.5239	0.5279	0.5319	0.5359
0.1   0.5398 0.5438	0.5478 0.5517 0	0.5557 0.5596	0.5636	0.5675	0.5714	0.5753
0.2   0.5793 0.5832	0.5871 0.5910 0	0.5948 0.5987	0.6026	0.6064	0.6103	0.6141
0.3   0.6179 0.6217	0.6255 0.6293 0	0.6331 0.6368	0.6406	0.6443	0.6480	0.6517
0.4   0.6554 0.6591	0.6628 0.6664 0	0.6700 0.6736	0.6772	0.6808	0.6844	0.6879
0.5   0.6915 0.6950	0.6985 0.7019 0	0.7054 0.7088	0.7123	0.7157	0.7190	0.7224
0.7   0.7580 0.7611	0.7524 0.7557 0	7704 0 7734	0.7434	0.7400	0.7823	0.7852
0.8   0.7881 0.7910	0 7939 0 7967 0	7995 0 8023	0.8051	0.8078	0.8106	0.8133
0.9   0.8159 0.8186	0.8212 0.8238 0	.8264 0.8289	0.8315	0.8340	0.8365	0.8389
1.0   0.8413 0.8438	0.8461 0.8485 0	.8508 0.8531	0.8554	0.8577	0.8599	0.8621
1.1   0.8643 0.8665	0.8686 0.8708 0	.8729 0.8749	0.8770	0.8790	0.8810	0.8830
1.2   0.8849 0.8869	0.8888 0.8907 0	.8925 0.8944	0.8962	0.8980	0.8997	0.9015
1.3   0.9032 0.9049	0.9066 0.9082 0	.9099 0.9115	0.9131	0.9147	0.9162	0.9177
1.4   0.9192 0.9207	0.9222 0.9236 0	0.9251 0.9265	0.9279	0.9292	0.9306	0.9319
1.5   0.9332 0.9345	0.9357 0.9370 0	0.9382 0.9394	0.9406	0.9418	0.9429	0.9441
1.6   0.9452 0.9463	0.9474 0.9484 0	0.9495 0.9505	0.9515	0.9525	0.9535	0.9545
1.7   0.9554 0.9564	0.9573 0.9582 0	0.9591 0.9599	0.9608	0.9616	0.9625	0.9633
1.8   0.9641 0.9649	0.9656 0.9664 0	0.9671 0.9678	0.9686	0.9693	0.9699	0.9706
1.9   0.9713 0.9719	0.9726 0.9732 0	0.9738 0.9744	0.9750	0.9756	0.9761	0.9767
2.0 0.9772 0.9778	0.9783 0.9788 0	0.9793 0.9798	0.9803	0.9808	0.9812	0.9817
2.1   0.9821 0.9826	0.9830 0.9834 0	0.9838 0.9842	0.9846	0.9850	0.9654	0.9857
2 3   0 9893 0 9896	0 9898 0 9901 0	9904 0 9906	0.9001	0.9004	0.9007	0.9090
2 4   0 9918 0 9920	0 9922 0 9925 0	9927 0 9929	0 9931	0 9932	0.9934	0 9936
2.5   0.9938 0.9940	0.9941 0.9943 0	.9945 0.9946	0.9948	0.9949	0.9951	0.9952
2.6   0.9953 0.9955	0.9956 0.9957 0	.9959 0.9960	0.9961	0.9962	0.9963	0.9964
2.7   0.9965 0.9966	0.9967 0.9968 0	.9969 0.9970	0.9971	0.9972	0.9973	0.9974
2.8   0.9974 0.9975	0.9976 0.9977 0	.9977 0.9978	0.9979	0.9979	0.9980	0.9981
2.9   0.9981 0.9982	0.9982 0.9983 0	.9984 0.9984	0.9985	0.9985	0.9986	0.9986
3.0   0.9987 0.9987	0.9987 0.9988 0	0.9988 0.9989	0.9989	0.9989	0.9990	0.9990

TABLE G.3b 5% Critical Values of the F Distribution

r,

Numerator Degrees of Freedom											
		1	.2	3	4	5	6	7	8	<u>.</u> 9.	
	~	3.84	3.00	2.60	.2.37	2.21	2.10	2.01	1.94	1.88	1.83

*Example:* The 5% critical value for numerator df = 4 and large denominator  $df(\infty)$  is 2.37. *Source:* This table was generated using the Stata<sup>®</sup> function invFtail.