

## Review OLS Example: Solutions

1.  $\text{saleprice} = 115017 + 73.77 \times \text{sqfeet}$ .

2. OLS minimizes  $\sum_{i=1}^N u_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \beta_1 - \beta_2 x_i)^2$   
gives  $\hat{\beta}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})(x_i - \bar{y}) / \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})^2$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_2 \bar{x}$ .

3. By \$73.77.

4.  $R^2 = 0.6175$ . This is quite high for cross-section data.

This is fraction of variation explained by model:  $R^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{y}_i - \bar{y})^2 / \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})^2$ .

5. Yes as  $p = 0.00 < 0.05$  or  $t = 6.60 > t_{.025;27} = \text{invttail}(27, .025) = 2.05$ .

6. That  $y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_i + u_i$  where  $u_i$  are iid  $\mathcal{N}[0, \sigma^2]$ .

7.  $t = (\hat{\beta}_2 - 50) / s_{\hat{\beta}_2} = (73.77 - 50) / 11.175 = 2.13$ .

$p = \text{ttail}(27, 2.13) \times 2 = .021 \times 2 = .042$ .

Reject  $H_0 : \beta_{\text{sqfeet}} = 50$  against  $H_a : \beta_{\text{sqfeet}} \neq 50$  as  $p < .05$ .

8. By \$68.37.

9. Yes as  $p = 0.00 < 0.05$  or  $t = 4.40 > t_{.025;27} = \text{invttail}(27, .025) = 2.07$ .

10. No. All have  $p > 0.05$  using two-sided tests.

11.  $R^2 = 0.6506$ . This is not a big improvement on 0.6175 with just `sqfeet` as regressor.

12. Yes.  $F = 6.83$  has  $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ .

13. Yes using  $R^2$ . No using  $\bar{R}^2$  which falls from 0.6033 to 0.5552.

We could also do  $F$ -test on the five extra regressors (but this will lead to non-rejection of  $H_0$  since  $\bar{R}^2$  did not increase).