This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: Housing Markets and Racial Discrimination: A Microeconomic Analysis

Volume Author/Editor: John F. Kain and John M. Quigley

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-870-14270-4

Volume URL: http://www.nber.org/books/kain75-1

Publication Date: 1975

Chapter Title: Appendix E: The Effect of Weighting on Attribute Prices

Chapter Author: John F. Kain, John M. Quigley

Chapter URL: http://www.nber.org/chapters/c3726

Chapter pages in book: (p. 336 - 339)

The Effect of Weighting on Attribute Prices

In Appendix D, we presented estimates of simple expenditure models, where the sample observations are weighted by the inverse of the sample proportions. A similar procedure has been applied to the rent and value models, and as the estimates shown in Table E-1 indicate, weighting has slight effects upon several of the parameter estimates. Table E-1 shows weighted and unweighted estimates of attribute prices for rental units and for single detached, owner-occupied units for ghetto and for nonghetto properties.

As the comparison indicates, there are no substantial differences between attribute prices estimated for owner and renter units in the ghetto for weighted and unweighted regressions. This largely reflects the more uniform sampling rate for ghetto properties which results from stratification. Estimated coefficients for owners and renters are well within their sampling errors for comparisons of weighted and unweighted regressions. The only sign reversal for ghetto properties caused by weighting observations by their sampling rates changes the number-of-rooms variable to the correct sign, but it is still insignificant.

For nonghetto properties, where the sampling rates have more variation, especially between central city and suburban observations, there are slight differences between estimated coefficients for weighted and unweighted regressions. For both owner-occupied and rental units, the coefficient of determination is marginally higher when observations are weighted. For owner-occupied units, the coefficient of the exteriorquality measure has the right sign and is larger than its standard error in the weighted regression. The coefficient of the measured distance from the CBD is larger than in unweighted estimates and exceeds its standard error in the weighted specification. The coefficients of the measures of the quality of adjacent units and neighborhood prestige (median schooling) are less reliable. Weighting has the greatest effect upon the R^2 for renter-occupied units outside the ghetto. The most pronounced differences between coefficients are noted for the structure-type dummies; their magnitudes are considerably larger, and they have smaller standard errors in the weighted regressions.

For owner and renter properties both inside and outside the ghetto, the weighted regressions increase the magnitude of the coefficient of the number of rooms. For nonghetto rental properties, the difference is most substantial; weighting increases the magnitude of the estimated coefficient by more than 60 percent.

In general, differences between coefficient estimates based on weighted and unweighted regressions are rather small. Although the weighted estimates would be preferred a priori if there were no errors in specification, the differences between results, especially when we expect that specification errors exist, are small enough to justify our use of simple unweighted regression estimates throughout the main text as a convenience.

TABLE E-1 Weighted and Unweighted Rent and Value Models for the Entire Nonghetto and Ghetto Samples: Linear Specifications

| | | Ren | Renters | | | MO | Owners | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | Nongh | Nonghetto (All) | ΰ | Ghetto | Nongh | Nonghetto (All) | Ð | Ghetto |
| Variables | Weighted | Unweighted | Weighted | Weighted Unweighted Weighted Unweighted | Weighted | Weighted Unweighted | Weighted | Weighted Unweighted |
| Unit quality | | | | | | | | |
| Interior | 4.81 ² | 6.991 | 65 | 48 | 19.091 | 14.831 | 11.294 | 10.694 |
| Exterior | 7.24^{2} | 5.392 | 2.684 | 2.684 | 10.724 | - 1.84 | -17.57^{4} | -17.68^{4} |
| Hot water | -1.29 | 5.08 | 4.024 | 4.232 | 1 | | I | |
| Central heating | -2.12 | 90. | 8.881 | 7.76^{1} | 1 | | I | |
| Age | 461 | 371 | 16^{1} | 17 | 611 | 851 | 633 | 661 |
| Size | | | | | | | | |
| Rooms | 47.921 | 30.08^{1} | 21.60^{1} | 20.24^{1} | 63.71 ¹ | 49.081 | 22.61 | -15.44 |
| Baths | 9.30^{3} | 13.72^{1} | 8.16 ¹ | 7.381 | 19.471 | 16.26 ¹ | 4.49 | 7.254 |
| Floor area | I | | I | | 11.791 | 10.60^{1} | 5.911 | 5.16 ¹ |
| Parcel area | 08 | .844 | 36 | 26 | .014 | .014 | .731 | .741 |
| Neighborhood | | | | | | | | |
| Adjacent units | -1.62 | 1.22 | 1.71^{4} | 1.68^{4} | -1.98 | 2.31 | 7.56 | 9.08 |
| Block face | 4.16^{3} | 2.924 | 5.911 | 5.241 | 5.87 | 6.964 | 8.86 | 8.50 |
| Median schooling | 1.18^{4} | 2.68^{1} | 2.912 | 3.61 ¹ | 1.94 | .21 | 26.11^{1} | 26.83^{1} |
| Miles from CBD | 2.70^{1} | 1.85 ¹ | -1.69^{2} | .32 | -1.094 | 65 | -4.53 | -2.96 |
| School quality | Ι | I | ı | 00.– | I | I | I | .01 |
| Crime | I | I | ı | | I | ł | I | |

| Structure type | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| Single detached | 29.321 | 602 | 4.724 | 4.374 | | · . <u>.</u> | | |
| Duplex | 40.981 | 18.241 | 10. | 1.14 | | | | |
| Row house | 16.96^{2} | 6.544 | 4.544 | 2.87 | | | | |
| Apartment | 29.291 | 2.33 | 8.332 | 7.651 | | | | |
| Flat | 26.00^{1} | 7.364 | 5.42 ³ | 5.053 | | | | |
| Rooming house | -3.97 | -28.70^{3} | 7.484 | 7.61 | | | | |
| Tenancy terms | | | | | | | | |
| No heat | -3.05^{4} | -7.54^{1} | -8.14^{1} | -8.19^{1} | | | | 7 |
| No water | -4.254 | -2.77^{4} | -1.29 | 97 | | | | |
| No furniture | - 14.40 ¹ | -9.941 | -7.17^{2} | -7.34^{2} | | | | |
| No appliances | -9.171 | -16.17^{1} | -8.111 | -6.971 | | | | |
| Owner in building | -5.10^{3} | 6.551 | -1.44 | -1.79 | | | | |
| Years of occupancy | 241 | 231 | 134 | 16^{2} | • | | | |
| Constant | 44.304 | 7.32 | -21.13 | -11.87 | 1.46 | 3.74 | -138.1^{1} | - 102.00 |
| \mathbb{R}^2 | .865 | .781 | .718 | .7243 | .754 | .715 | .893 | .859 |
| Norte: Tabla notas indicata similoanca of 1 ratios for coafficients (turctailed test) | indicate sin | ifrance of . | ration for con | fficients (two-ta | iled tect) | | | |

NOTE: Table notes indicate significance of *t* ratios for coefficients (two-tailed test). ^{1>} .01. ^{2>} .05. ^{3>} .10. ⁴ r ratio greater than 1.0.