

1. 6. a. Yes, the equation makes economic sense. Growth in tire sales are fueled by growth in miles driven and growth in new car sales.
- b. The equation performs well in explaining the past data ($R^2 = .83$). The coefficients of the two explanatory variables are highly significant, and the Durbin-Watson statistic indicates no serial correlation.
- c. The t-statistics for the respective coefficients are: $(1.41 - 1)/.19 = 2.15$ and $(1.12 - 1)/.41 = .29$. The first coefficient is significantly different than one; the second is not. If the second coefficient is taken to be one, this means that tire sales are proportional to new auto sales.
- d. The forecast is: $.45 + (1.41)(-2) + (1.12)(-13) = -16.93$. An actual drop of 18% would not be surprising; it's well within the margin of forecast error.

2. S3. a. The estimated OLS equation is: $Q = 332.5 - 506.6P$. The equation is statistically significant ($R^2 = .941$). If price is cut by \$.10, quantity increases by 50.66 units.
- b. A careful plot of the points shows a slight degree of curvature.
- c. The Log-Log equation is:

$$\text{Log}(Q) = 2.975 - 2.02\text{Log}(P).$$

This provides a better fit of the data ($R^2 = .992$) than the linear equation. The Log-Log equation implies the demand equation:

$$Q = 19.6P^{-2.02}.$$

(The antilog of 2.975 is 19.6.) The price elasticity of demand is -2.02 .

3. (a) The regression equation is: $\text{Cans} = 3055 - 120.5 \text{ OwnPrice} + 16.3 \text{ OtherPrice} + 74.8 \text{ Temperature}$. OwnPrice and Temperature have t-statistics well above 2 in absolute value, and hence are statistically significant at the 95% level. OtherPrice has a t-statistic less than 1, and hence is not statistically significant at the 95% level. A 1 cent increase in the price of soft drinks will lead to a decline in sales of 120.5 cans. A 1 cent increase in the price of candy bars will lead to 16.3 additional cans of soft drinks being sold. A 1 degree increase in the temperature of classrooms on campus will generate 74.8 additional cans of soft drinks being sold.
- (b) $R^2 = .55$ means that 55% of the variation in the dependent variable, Cans, is explained by the independent variables in the regression equation above.
- (c) Cans sold yesterday = $3055 - 120.5(50) + 16.3(60) + 74.8(72) = 3393.6 = 3394$ cans.
- (d) $\eta = -[dQ/dP][P/Q] = -[-120.5][50/4000] = 1.5$
- (e) Profit-maximizing price: $P = MC[1/(1-1/\eta)] = 20[1/(1 - 2/3)] = 20[3] = 60$ cents, not 50 cents.