Lecture 10 - Economics 113

Professor Spearot

Agenda

- 1. Bias Examples
- 2. Other Examples

Exam Reminders

- 1. No graphing calculators or notes
- 2. Be on time!!!

Omitted variable bias

- What happens when we omit an important variable?
- Need to conjecture regarding the relationship between the omitted variable and included x and y variables

The Table

		Corr(omitted variable,x)	
		positive	negative
Corr(omitted variable,y)	positive	upward bias	downward bias
	negative	downward bias	upward bias

- Upward bias:
 - Estimate is *higher* than the true parameter: $\beta < \widehat{\beta}$
- Downward bias:
 - Estimate is *lower* than the true parameter: $\hat{\beta} < \beta$

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Example: Effect of class attendance on grades
- Population follows:

final =
$$\beta_0 + \beta_1$$
attend + β_2 study + u

We instead forget about study and estimate:

$$\widehat{\mathit{final}} = \widehat{eta}_0 + \widehat{eta}_1$$
attend

- Suppose we estimate β
 ₁ > 0, and conclude that attendance increases your grade (β₁ > 0). Is this right?
- Positive correlation between study and final
- Positive correlation between study and attend
- \widehat{eta}_1 suffers from an upward bias. $eta_1 < \widehat{eta}_1$

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Intuition
 - + $\widehat{\beta}_1 > 0$ suggests that higher attendance improves your grade
 - However, students who attend class often tend to study more
 - Thus, attend may actually be accounting for the effects of studying, and not attendance.
- ► Overall, given $\beta_1 < \hat{\beta}_1$, the result $\hat{\beta}_1 > 0$ is *insufficient* to guarantee that $\beta_1 > 0$.

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Example: Effect of drugs on crime
- Population follows:

$$\textit{crime} = eta_0 + eta_1 \textit{educ} + eta_2 \textit{drugs} + u$$

• We instead forget about *drugs* and estimate:

$$\widehat{\mathit{crime}} = \widehat{eta}_0 + \widehat{eta}_1$$
educ

- Suppose we estimate β
 ₁ < 0, and conclude education reduces your likelihood of committing a crime (β₁ < 0)</p>
- Positive correlation between drugs and crime
- Negative correlation between *drugs* and *educ*
- \widehat{eta}_1 suffers from an downward bias. $\widehat{eta}_1 < eta_1$

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Intuition
 - + $\hat{\beta}_1 < 0$ suggests that education reduces your likelihood of committing a crime
 - However, people who go to school are less likely to abuse drugs
 - Thus, *educ* may actually be accounting for the propensity of drug use, not the effects of education
- Overall, given β
 ₁ < β₁, the result β
 ₁ < 0 is *insufficient* to guarantee that β₁ < 0.

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Example: Effect of graduate education on wages
- Population follows:

$$log(wage) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 geduc + \beta_2 Exper + u$$

• We instead forget about *Exper* and estimate:

$$\widehat{\log(\textit{wage})} = \widehat{\beta}_0 + \widehat{\beta}_1 \log(\textit{geduc})$$

- Suppose we estimate β
 ₁ > 0, and conclude that graduate education increases your wage (β₁ > 0)
- Positive correlation between Exper and log(wage)
- Negative correlation between Exper and geduc (by construction)
- \widehat{eta}_1 suffers from an downward bias. $\widehat{eta}_1 < eta_1$

Omitted variable bias - Examples

- Intuition
 - + $\widehat{\beta}_1 > 0$ suggests that graduate education of some sort increases your wage
 - However, people who pursue graduate education have lower levels of experience
 - Thus, people with no graduate education may earn relatively high wages since they have lots of experience.
- ▶ Overall, given $\hat{\beta}_1 < \beta_1$, the result $\hat{\beta}_1 > 0$ is *sufficient* to guarantee that $\beta_1 > 0$.