

Heteroscedasticity Problem

1 Nature and Consequences of heteroscedasticity for OLS

- Heteroskedasticity (broadly) -

- Heteroskedasticity (in econometrics) -

1.1 Nature of Heteroskedasticity

1.2 Consequences of Heteroskedasticity

1. Does not affect the biasedness of the OLS estimators

2. Does not affect the value of R^2 and $adj.R^2$

3. Make the estimated value of $Var(\hat{\beta}_{OLS})$ wrong

4. Affect the correctness of our inference

1.3 How can the estimated value of $Var(\hat{\beta}_{OLS})$ be wrong?

Suppose

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

Given that assumption 1 to 4 are true, but assumption 5 (homoskedasticity) is violated. Thus,

$$Var(u_i|x_i) =$$

And from the OLS estimation steps, we can write

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1 +$$

1.4 Two types of remedies

1. Passive

2. Active

2 Testing for heteroskedasticity

- The main point -

Suppose

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_k x_k + u$$

Assume that assumption 1 to 4 are true. Our hypotheses to test for heteroskedasticity would be

We know that $Var(u|\mathbf{x}) = E(u^2|\mathbf{x}) - [E(u|\mathbf{x})]^2$. But _____
according to assumption 4. Thus, H_0 and H_a can be written as

2.1 Breusch-Pagan test (BP test)

To perform the Breusch-Pagan Test in STATA

STATA commands (in case $k = 4$):

```
regress y x1 x2 x3 x4
predict u_hat, residual
generate u_hat_sq = u_hat^2
regress u_hat_sq x1 x2 x3 x4
```

** Then, check the F-statistic on the top right-hand corner of the result table.

Example: Finding the determinants of GPA.

```
. regress termgpa attend priGPA final frosh soph
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 680		
Model	226.077541	5	45.2155081	F(5, 674) = 214.13		
Residual	142.319996	674	.211157264	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Total	368.397537	679	.542558964	R-squared = 0.6137		
				Adj R-squared = 0.6108		
				Root MSE = .45952		

termgpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
attend	.046594	.0036082	12.91	0.000	.0395093	.0536787
priGPA	.5329307	.0403281	13.21	0.000	.4537468	.6121146
final	.0503197	.0040339	12.47	0.000	.0423992	.0582403
frosh	.0974307	.0560211	1.74	0.082	-.0125662	.2074276
soph	.0689273	.0467006	1.48	0.140	-.0227689	.1606236
_cons	-1.361077	.1316861	-10.34	0.000	-1.619642	-1.102513

```

. predict u_hat, residual
. generate u_hat_sq = u_hat^2
. regress u_hat_sq attend priGPA final frosh soph
regress u_hat_sq attend priGPA final frosh soph

```

Source	SS	df	MS			
Model	8.22606613	5	1.64521323	Number of obs =	680	
Residual	76.2624962	674	.113149104	F(5, 674) =	14.54	
Total	84.4885623	679	.124430872	Prob > F =	0.0000	
				R-squared =	0.0974	
				Adj R-squared =	0.0907	
				Root MSE =	.33638	

u_hat_sq	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
attend	-.0088079	.0026413	-3.33	0.001	-.0139941	-.0036218
priGPA	-.1454432	.029521	-4.93	0.000	-.2034074	-.0874791
final	.0061879	.0029529	2.10	0.036	.0003899	.0119859
frosh	-.1077493	.0410085	-2.63	0.009	-.1882692	-.0272294
soph	-.0975658	.0341858	-2.85	0.004	-.1646892	-.0304423
_cons	.7368933	.0963968	7.64	0.000	.5476191	.9261674

Alternatively, you can use the following set of STATA commands:

```

regress y x1 x2 x3 x4
estat hettest x1 x2 x3 x4

```

```
. regress termgpa attend priGPA final frosh soph
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 680		
Model	226.077541	5	45.2155081	F(5, 674)	=	214.13
Residual	142.319996	674	.211157264	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.6137
				Adj R-squared	=	0.6108
Total	368.397537	679	.542558964	Root MSE	=	.45952

termgpa	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
attend	.046594	.0036082	12.91	0.000	.0395093	.0536787
priGPA	.5329307	.0403281	13.21	0.000	.4537468	.6121146
final	.0503197	.0040339	12.47	0.000	.0423992	.0582403
frosh	.0974307	.0560211	1.74	0.082	-.0125662	.2074276
soph	.0689273	.0467006	1.48	0.140	-.0227689	.1606236
_cons	-1.361077	.1316861	-10.34	0.000	-1.619642	-1.102513


```
. estat hettest attend priGPA final frosh soph
```

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity
Ho: Constant variance
Variables: attend priGPA final frosh soph

```
chi2(5) = 93.90
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

If the null hypothesis is rejected (we have the heteroskedasticity problem), we can use the "robust" option in STATA. This option gives us the correct standard error, or "heteroskedasticity-robust standard error". We can now use the t-statistics in this case.

```
. regress termgpa attend priGPA final frosh soph, robust
```

Linear regression

termgpa	Coef.	Robust Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
attend	.046594	.0044101	10.57	0.000	.0379348	.0552532
priGPA	.5329307	.0426426	12.50	0.000	.4492023	.616659
final	.0503197	.0041066	12.25	0.000	.0422564	.058383
frosh	.0974307	.0633543	1.54	0.125	-.0269648	.2218262
soph	.0689273	.0520495	1.32	0.186	-.0332713	.1711259
_cons	-1.361077	.1448208	-9.40	0.000	-1.645431	-1.076723

2.2 *The White Test*

Similar to the Breush-Pagan test, but is stricter because it does not allow \hat{u}^2 to be correlated with x^2 or interactions among different x_s .

Suppose

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \dots + \beta_k x_k + u$$

The White Test (special case) (save degree of freedom)

1. Get $\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_k$ by OLS.
2. Calculate $\hat{u}_i^2 = [y_i - (\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 x_2 + \hat{\beta}_k x_k)]^2$
3. Calculate $\hat{y}_i = (\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 x_2 + \hat{\beta}_k x_k)$
4. Calculate \hat{y}_i^2
5. Estimate $\hat{u}_i^2 = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \hat{y}_i + \gamma_2 \hat{y}_i^2 + \text{error}$ (keep R^2 of this regression)
6. $LM = nR^2$
7. If $p - \text{value} > \text{significance level}$, cannot reject H_0 .