

Econometric Modeling Model Specification and Diagnostic Testing

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

Model selection criteria

According to Hendry and Richard (1983), a model chosen for empirical analysis should satisfy the following criteria

- Be data admissible
- Be consistent with theory
- Have weakly exogenous regressors
- Exhibit parameter constancy
- Exhibit data coherency
- Be encompassing

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

Type of specification errors

1. Omission of a relevant variable (s)
2. Inclusion of an unnecessary variable (s)
3. Adoption of the wrong functional form
4. Errors of measurement

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

Consequences of Model Specification Error

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

Underfitting a model (Omitting a relevant variable)

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

Underfitting a model (Omitting a relevant variable)

Suppose the true model is

$$Y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_{2i} + \beta_3 X_{3i} + u_i$$

but for some reason we fit the following model:

$$Y_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_{2i} + v_i$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongku)

The consequences of omitting variable X_3 are as follows:

- If the left-out, or omitted, variable X_3 is correlated with the included variable X_2 , that is r_{23} , the correlation coefficient between the two variables is nonzero and $\hat{\alpha}_1$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2$ are biased as well as inconsistent

$$E(\hat{\alpha}_1) \neq \beta_1$$

$$E(\hat{\alpha}_2) \neq \beta_2$$

The bias does not disappear as the sample size gets larger

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

- Even if X_2 and X_3 are not correlated, $\hat{\alpha}_1$ is biased, although $\hat{\alpha}_2$ is now unbiased

- The disturbance variance σ^2 is incorrectly estimated

- The conventionally measured variance of $\hat{\alpha}_2 (= \sigma^2 / \sum x_{2i}^2)$ is a *biased* estimator of the variance of the true estimator $\hat{\beta}_2$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

- In consequence, the usual confidence interval and hypothesis-testing procedures are likely to give misleading conclusions about the statistical significance of the estimated parameters
- As another consequence, the forecasts based on the incorrect model and the forecast (confidence) intervals will be *unreliable*

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Inclusion of an irrelevant variable (Overfitting a model)

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Underfitting a model (Omitting a relevant variable)

Suppose the true model is

$$Y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_{2i} + u_i$$

but for some reason we fit the following model:

$$Y_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_{2i} + \alpha_3 X_{3i} + v_i$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

The consequences of specification error are as follows:

- The OLS estimators of the parameters of the “incorrect” model are all unbiased and consistent, that is,

$$E(\hat{\alpha}_1) = \beta_1$$

$$E(\hat{\alpha}_2) = \beta_2$$

$$E(\hat{\alpha}_3) = \beta_3 = 0$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

- The error variance σ^2 is correctly estimated
- The usual confidence interval and hypothesis-testing procedures remain valid
- However, the estimated α 's will be generally inefficient, that is, their variances will be generally larger than those of the $\hat{\beta}$'s of the true model

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

If we **exclude** a relevant variable, the coefficients of the variables retained in the model are generally biased as well as inconsistent, the error variance is incorrectly estimated, and the usual hypothesis-testing procedures become invalid.

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

If we include an irrelevant variable in the model still gives us unbiased and consistent estimates of the coefficients in the true model, the error variance is correctly estimated, and the conventional hypothesis-testing methods are still valid.

The estimated variances of the coefficients are larger, and as a result our probability inferences about the parameters are less precise.

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Tests of Specification Errors

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Detecting the presence of unnecessary variables (Overfitting a model)

Suppose we develop a k-variable model to explain a phenomenon:

$$Y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_{i2} + \dots + \beta_k X_{ki} + u_i$$

- t test

$$t = \frac{\hat{\beta}_k}{se(\hat{\beta}_k)}$$

- F-test

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Tests for Omitted Variables & Incorrect Functional Form

- Examination of residuals
- The Durbin-Watson d Statistic
- Ramsey's RESET test

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Examination of residuals

Let us reconsider the cubic total cost of production function. Assume that the true cost function is described as follows, where Y = total cost and X = output

$$Y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i + \beta_3 X_i^2 + \beta_4 X_i^3 + u_i$$


quadratic function:

$$Y_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_i + \alpha_3 X_i^2 + u_{2i}$$

Linear function:

$$Y_i = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 X_i + u_{3i}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)



Residuals from (a) linear, (b) quadratic, and (c) cubic total cost functions

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

TABLE 13.1
Estimated Residuals
from the Linear,
Quadratic, and Cubic
Total Cost Functions

Observation Number	$\hat{u}_i$ Linear Model*	$\hat{u}_i$ Quadratic Model†	$\hat{u}_i$ Cubic Model**
1	6.600	-23.900	-0.222
2	19.667	9.500	1.607
3	13.733	18.817	-0.915
4	-2.200	13.050	-4.426
5	-9.133	11.200	4.435
6	-26.067	-5.733	1.032
7	-32.000	-16.750	0.726
8	-28.933	-23.850	-4.119
9	4.133	-6.033	1.859
10	54.200	23.700	0.022

$$* \hat{f}_i = 166.467 + 19.933X_i$$

$$R^2 = 0.8409$$

$$R^2 = 0.8210$$

$$d = 0.716$$

$$† \hat{f}_i = 222.383 - 9.0250X_i + 2.542X_i^2$$

$$R^2 = 0.9244$$

$$R^2 = 0.9079$$

$$d = 1.038$$

$$** \hat{f}_i = 141.767 + 63.478X_i - 12.962X_i^2 + 0.979X_i^3$$

$$R^2 = 0.9983$$

$$R^2 = 0.9975$$

$$d = 2.70$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

The Durbin-Watson d Statistic

1. From the assumed model, obtain the OLS residuals
2. If it is believed that the assumed model is mis-specified because it excludes a relevant explanatory variable, say, Z , from the model, order the residuals obtained in Step 1 according to increasing values of Z . Note: the Z variable could be one of the X variables included in the assumed model or it could be some function of that variable, such as X^2 or X^3

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

3. Compute the d statistic from the residuals thus ordered by the usual d formula,

$$d = \frac{\sum_{t=2}^n (\hat{u}_t - \hat{u}_{t-1})^2}{\sum_{t=1}^n \hat{u}_t^2}$$

4. From the Durbin-Watson tables, if the estimated d value is significant, then one can accept the hypothesis of model mis-specification.

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Ramsey's RESET Test


RESET = Regression specification error test

$$Y_i = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 X_i + u_{3i}$$

Where Y = total cost
 X = output

If we plot the residuals $\hat{u}_i$ obtained from this regression against $\hat{Y}_i$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)



EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

The residuals in this figure show a pattern in which their mean changes systematically with $\hat{Y}_i$

This would suggest that if we introduce $\hat{Y}_i$ in some form as regressor (s), it should increase R^2 . And if the increase R^2 is statistically significant, it would suggest that the linear cost function was mis-specified.

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

The steps involved in RESET are as follows:

1. From the chosen model, obtain R^2

$$Y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \dots + \beta_k X_k + u$$
2. Rerun equation introducing $\hat{Y}_i$ in some form as an additional regressor (s).

$$Y = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \dots + \beta_k X_k + \delta_1 \hat{Y}^2 + \delta_2 \hat{Y}^3 + u$$
3. Use F-Test

$$F = \frac{(R_{new}^2 - R_{old}^2) / \text{number of new regressors}}{(1 - R_{new}^2) / (n - \text{number of parameters in the Model})}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

4. If the computed F value is significant, say, at the 5 percent level, the model is mis-specified

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Example

$$\hat{Y}_i = 166.467 + 19.933X_i$$

$$se = (19.021) \quad (3.066) \quad R^2 = 0.8409$$

$$\hat{Y}_i = 2140.7223 + 476.6557X_i - 0.09187\hat{Y}_i^2 + 0.000119\hat{Y}_i^3$$

$$se = (132.0044) \quad (33.3951) \quad (0.00620) \quad (0.0000074) \quad R^2 = 0.9983$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Hypothesis testing

H_0 : Model is not mis-specified

H_1 : otherwise

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

$$F = \frac{(0.9983 - 0.8409) / 2}{(1 - 0.9983) / (10 - 4)} = 284.4035$$

$$F > \text{critical } F_{(n-1, n-k)} \quad (\text{number of new regressors, } n - \text{number of parameter in the new model})$$

Reject null hypothesis

The computed F value is significant, say, at the 5 percent level, the model is mis-specified

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Error of measurement

- Errors of measurement in the Dependent variable Y
- Errors of measurement in the Explanatory variable X

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Errors of measurement in the Dependent variable Y

Consider the following model

$$Y_i^* = \alpha + \beta X_i + u_i$$

$$Y_i^* = \text{permanent consumption expenditure}$$

$$X_i = \text{current income}$$

$$u_i = \text{stochastic disturbance term}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Since Y_i^* is not directly measurable, we may use an observable expenditure variable Y_i such that

$$Y_i = Y_i^* + \varepsilon_i$$

where ε_i denote errors of measurement in Y_i^*

$$Y_i = (\alpha + \beta X_i + u_i) + \varepsilon_i$$

$$= \alpha + \beta X_i + (u_i + \varepsilon_i)$$

$$= \alpha + \beta X_i + v_i$$

where $v_i = u_i + \varepsilon_i$ is a composite error term

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Assume that $E(u_i) = E(\varepsilon_i) = 0$

$$\text{Cov}(X_i, u_i) = 0$$

$$\text{Cov}(u_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$$

With these assumptions, it can be seen that $\hat{\beta}$ estimated will be an unbiased estimator of the true β

The errors of measurement in the dependent variable Y do not destroy the unbiasedness property of OLS estimators

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

The variances and standard errors of $\hat{\beta}$ estimated

$$Y_i^* = \alpha + \beta X_i + u_i$$

$$\text{var}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\sum x_i^2}$$

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta X_i + v_i$$

$$\text{var}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{\sigma_v^2}{\sum x_i^2} = \frac{\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2}{\sum x_i^2}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkui)

Although the errors of measurement in the dependent variable still give unbiased estimates of the parameters and their variances, the estimated variances are now *larger* than in the case where there are no such errors of measurement

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Errors of measurement in the Explanatory variable X

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta X_i^* + u_i$$

Y_i = current consumption expenditure

X_i^* = permanent income

u_i = disturbance term

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Suppose instead of observing X_i^* , we observe

$$X_i = X_i^* + w_i$$

where w_i represents errors of measurement in X_i^*

We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &= \alpha + \beta(X_i - w_i) + u_i \\ &= \alpha + \beta X_i + (u_i - \beta w_i) \\ &= \alpha + \beta X_i + z_i \end{aligned}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Now even if we assume that w_i has a zero mean, is serially independent, and is uncorrelated with u_i , we can no longer assume that the composite error term z_i is independent of the explanatory variable X_i because

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(z_i, X_i) &= E[z_i(X_i - E(X_i))] \\ &= E(u_i - \beta w_i)(w_i) \\ &= E(-\beta w_i^2) \\ &= -\beta \sigma_w^2 \end{aligned}$$

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

The explanatory variable and the error term are correlated, which violates the crucial assumption of the CLRM that the explanatory variable is uncorrelated with the stochastic disturbance term.

If this assumption is violated, it can be shown that the *OLS estimators are not only biased but also inconsistent, that is, they remain biased even if the sample size n increases indefinitely*

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)

Appendix 13.A.3

$$p \lim \hat{\beta} = \beta \left[\frac{1}{1 + \sigma_w^2 / \sigma_{X^*}^2} \right]$$

where σ_w^2 and $\sigma_{X^*}^2$ are variance of w_i and X^*

Even if the sample size increases indefinitely $\hat{\beta}$ will not converge to β

EE 325 2/2011 (Ajarn Kaewkwan Tangtipongkul)