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## Preface

This workbook contains a set of laboratory exercises initally developed for graduate courses in Spatial Econometrics and Advanced Spatial Analysis at the University of Illinois, as well as for the ICPSR Summer Program course on Spatial Regression Analysis. It consists of a series of brief tutorials and worked examples using R and its packages spdep for spatial regression analysis and spgwr for geographically weighted regression.

Some of these materials were included in earlier tutorials available on the SAL web site. In addition, the workbook incorporates all exercise materials for the course ACE 492SE, Spatial Econometrics, offered during the Fall 2003 and Spring 2005 semesters in the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. There may be slight discrepancies due to changes in the version of $R$ and spdep. In case of doubt, the latest document available on the SAL web site should always be referred to as it supersedes all previous tutorial materials.

The examples and practice exercises use the sample data sets that are available from the SAL "stuff" web site. They are listed on and can be downloaded from http://sal.uiuc.edu/stuff/stuff-sum/data. The main purpose of these sample data is to illustrate the features of the software. Readers are strongly encouraged to use their own data sets for the practice exercises.

Warning: These notes are not polished, and remain very much in bullet style. They are intended to provide hints and additional pointers beyond what is available in the help files and the other tutorials. They also serve to define a sequence of tasks and techniques that can be covered during a given lab session. They are "in progress" and are still undergoing changes.

The development of this workbook has been facilitated by the continued research support through the U.S. National Science Foundation grant BCS9978058 to the Center for Spatially Integrated Social Science (CSISS).

## Exercise 1

## Getting Started in $\mathbf{R}$

### 1.1 Objectives

These notes are the first in a series to help you get started and working in R to carry out spatial regression analysis. The objective is that you work through the various examples at your own pace. This chapter and later ones will refer to the two short R tutorials available on SAL "stuff" web site, as well as to the Introduction to $R$ (Venables et al. 2004), available from the CRAN site. I will refer to Venables et al. (2004) as the "Introduction" tutorial. I will refer to the other tutorials as the "Data" tutorial (Data and spatial weights in spdep, Anselin 2003a), and the "Regression" tutorial (An introduction to spatial regression analysis in R, Anselin 2003b). Further details on the spdep package can be found in Bivand and Gebhardt (2000), Bivand (2001, 2002a,b), and Bivand and Portnov (2004).

### 1.2 Conventions and General Advice

Some notational conventions:

- The command line will be shown as $>$ followed by an R command.
- Command line contents will be in monospaced font.
- File names and file path names will be in italics.

A few general pointers:

- Create a separate directory for your work in R. Specify that directory as your starting directory in the R shortcut, as illustrated on p . 2 of the Regression tutorial.
- Know how to quit: >q() from the command line, or File > Exit using the R GUI.
- Know how to get help. One option is to invoke >help.start(). This launches your default browser as an interface to HTML help pages. Another option is to invoke help on a specific function or data set as >help(name of function). A powerful feature is to use fuzzy search, so that you don't have to know the exact command you need (if that is what you are looking for in the first place).
- A useful way to find out more how a command works is to cut and past sample code that is contained in the help.
- The assignment symbol is <-. This assigns the result of what it done on the RHS to the "object" on the LHS. Often it may seem like nothing happens after you run a function. Typically that is because the result was assigned to an object without an explicit call to print or summary. After this assignment you manipulate the object, e.g., to print or summarize the results.


### 1.3 Sample Session

As a first orientation, work through the sample sesssion in Venables et al. (2004), Appendix A. This is a good way to get an idea of what R can do and how it works.

You can either follow along in the pdf file, or you can open the Introduction in HTML format. To do the latter, invoke the HTML help command by selecting (>help.start()), and click on the entry "An Introduction to R," and select "A sample session".

This set of examples requires a specific sample data set, morley.tab. The tutorial asks you to copy that file to your working directory. In the current version of $\mathrm{R}(2.0 .1)$ all sample data sets are contained in the datasets package. To make it available, enter >library(datasets) followed by >data(morley). All the variables in the morley data sets should then be available. Once you complete this, either type the commands from the sample session on the command line (to get used to the experience of unforgiven typos) or cut and paste from the HTML file. Needless to say, the latter is the preferred approach. Note that when using the morley data set from the datasets package, you need to attach(morley) to get direct access to the variables. At that point, you no longer need to specify data=mm as shown
in the sample code (if you copy the commands from the html help file, this will give an error message).

After going through the sample session, you may want to experiment with some of the commands. Look up the specifics using help( ) and cut and paste code from the examples to see how it works. You may also want to run some demo( ) for applications (not all of them have a demo function implemented). For example, a nice illustration of the graphics capability is demo(graphics).

## Exercise 2

## Getting Your Data and Weights Into R

### 2.1 Objectives

The purpose of this exercise is to provide guidance in turning your data and spatial weights files into usable objects in R, and to carry out some basic data and weights manipulations. The assumption is that you have the data originally as shape files and will construct the weights files in GeoDa. Of course, R has its own set of functions to create an analyze spatial weights, and we will consider those in a separate exercise (see also the Data tutorial).

You should create a new working directory for your current R project and make sure all files (data files and weights files) are copied to that directory. This is not absolutely necessary, but it's a good idea, since it avoids problems with path names, etc.

You will be using the police sample data set from the SAL data archive. Make sure you download the file and unzip it into your working directory. After unzipping the file, check the police.html file to become familiar with the contents of the data set.

### 2.2 Getting Data and Weights File Ready

You first need to export the data from the shape file format to an ascii file that R can read. You also need to create some weights files using GeoDa. A similar exercise is described in the Data tutorial, using older versions of R and spdep.

### 2.2.1 Exporting Data with GeoDa

Load the police.shp file into GeoDa, with FIPSNO as the Key Variable. Select Tools > Data Export > Ascii. In the dialog, specify police.dbf as the input file and police.txt as the output file. Select all variables, except AREA, CNTY_, CNTY_ID and PERIMETER. Click on Export and Done to finish. Check the contents of the police.txt file and make sure it shows 82,12 on the first line and the variable names on the second line. The data, record by record, and comma-delimited make up the remainder. Copy the file to the R working directory if it is not there already.

### 2.2.2 Creating the Spatial Weights in GeoDa

For this exercise, create two spatial weights files for the police data set, one based on rook contiguity, the other on 5 nearest neighbors. Use FIPNO as the ID variable. Call these files policerook.gal and policek5.gwt, respectively. See the instructions in the $G e o D a$ Workbook for details. Make sure you save (or copy) the files to the working directory for your R project.

### 2.3 Creating a Data Frame

### 2.3.1 Command Line

In R, the easiest way to create a data frame from a comma-delimited ascii file is to use a variant of the read.table function that takes into account the presence of the comma. This is the read.csv function. Check out >help(read.csv) to see all the details and options. The files created by $G e o D a$ contain a header line (header=TRUE) and an extra first line that R doesn't need (the line with the 82,12 ). You avoid reading this line by setting the skip option to 1 . The proper command to read the file is then:

```
>police <- read.csv("police.txt",header=TRUE,skip=1)
```

As usual, nothing seems to happen when you enter this, but you can check the presence of the new police object with a summary command:

```
> summary(police)
    FIPSNO POLICE POP TAX
Min. :28001 Min. : 49.0 Min. : 2500 Min. : 81.0
1st Qu.:28042 1st Qu.: 291.5 1st Qu.: 13275 1st Qu.:106.2
Median :28082 Median : 432.5 Median : 20700 Median :125.5
```

```
Mean :28082 Mean : 927.8 Mean : 31311 Mean :142.2
3rd Qu.:28122 3rd Qu.: 955.8 3rd Qu.: 35850 3rd Qu.:156.5
Max. :28163 Max. :10971.0 Max. :253100 Max. :674.0
```

Also, an >ls() command will reveal "police" as one of the objects in your work space.

You can specify a variable to serve as the row name in the data frame, but I usually prefer not to do that. The option is row.names="varname".

### 2.3.2 Writing a Function

The real power of $R$ is obtained through writing functions that carry out repetitive actions. To practice writing functions, you will write a simple procedure to turn a GeoDa text output file into an R data frame. You will then "compile" it to make it part of your $R$ environment. At that point, you can invoke it in the same way as any other built-in R function.

Use any text editor (e.g., Notepad or similar) to create a text file, say read.geoda.R. Even if you use a "real" word processor, make sure to save the file as pure text, so that no extra characters sneak in.

Enter the following lines (lines starting with \# are comments and you can skip those to minimize typing):

```
# read.geoda
# helper function to read GeoDa export files
# specify input file = file
# default is no row names, specify row names as second parameter if needed
# example: balt <- read.geoda("baltim.txt")
# balt <- read.geoda("baltim.txt","STATION")
read.geoda <- function(file,row.names=NULL)
{
    read.csv(file=file,header=TRUE,skip=1,row.names=row.names)
}
```

The read.geoda function simply calls the standard read.csv function with some preset options. Note how the file is a required parameter, but the row. names can be omitted, since it is set to NULL as the default. The way the row. names is used in the argument list requires only that the name of the variable be specified, no need to write row. names=.

To make the function part of your environment, you must first "compile" it with the $R$ source command. Make sure the file read.geoda. $R$ is in your working directory and enter:

```
> source("read.geoda.R")
```

The read.geoda function is now available and can be invoked directly. Note that the $R$ file extension is only for the text file that contains the code, the function as defined in that file does not have an R extension. So, don't use read.geoda. $R$ as the function name. To practice, first remove the current police object using the >rm(police) command. Check that it is really gone by trying a summary (police). You should get

```
> summary(police)
Error in summary(police) : Object "police" not found
```

Next, recreate the police object with:
> police <- read.geoda("police.txt")
You can again make sure it is there with a summary command or by using ls().

### 2.4 Creating a Neighbor List from a GAL File

To manipulate spatial weights, you will need to load the spdep package. Of course, this assumes that you previously installed it (see the R tutorials on how to do this). To load the package, use the library command as illustrated below:

```
> library(spdep)
Loading required package: tripack
Loading required package: sp
Loading required package: maptools
Loading required package: foreign
Loading required package: boot
Loading required package: Matrix
Loading required package: lattice
Attaching package: 'lattice'
```

```
The following object(s) are masked from package:boot :
```

    melanoma
    $>$

You may also receive a warning:

```
The following object(s) are masked _by_ .GlobalEnv :
read.geoda
```

which is because the read.geoda function you just created conflicts with the function of the same name that is included in the latest version of spdep. ${ }^{1}$ If you did not source read.geoda.R, you will not have the warning. Note that the functions to read spatial weights have undergone several changes since the earlier Data tutorial was written. Specifically, the revised read.gal function can now read new-style GAL weights files, that is, files created by $G e o D a$. This workbook uses the most current version of these functions.

### 2.4.1 Using read.gal

Check out the features and parameters of the new read.gal function with the help(read.gal) command. You will see that there are three parameters: the name of the input file, a region.id and an override.id. The main purpose of these parameters is to avoid having to assume that the data set (the data frame) and the weights file have their observations in the same order. In GeoDa, the ID variable creates a key that can be matched with a corresponding variable in a data set to ensure the correct order. This is not an issue when both the data set and the weights are created together by $G e o D a$, as you just did, but it can be a problem when this is not the case.

For our purposes, it will suffice to set the override.id $=$ TRUE, rather than the default FALSE to force spdep to use the new GeoDa GAL weights format. For example, with the policerook.GAL file as input, this becomes: ${ }^{2}$
> polgal <- read.gal("policerook.GAL", override.id=TRUE)

[^0]This creates polgal as a neighbor list object. Technically, this is a list of lists, one for each observation, containing a list of the neighbors. In fact, it consists of more than just the neighbor information, and contains a list of ID values, and some metadata, as an attributes command reveals:

```
> attributes(polgal)
$class
[1] "nb"
$region.id
    [1] "28003" "28141" "28139" "28009" "28033" "28093" "28143" "28137" "28117"
[10] "28145" "28071" "28107" "28027" "28081" "28119" "28057" "28115" "28161"
[19] "28135" "28013" "28011" "28095" "28017" "28133" "28043" "28083" "28025"
[28] "28087" "28155" "28015" "28097" "28105" "28151" "28019" "28051" "28053"
[37] "28007" "28103" "28159" "28125" "28163" "28055" "28099" "28079" "28069"
[46] "28089" "28123" "28149" "28121" "28075" "28101" "28049" "28061" "28023"
[55] "28129" "28021" "28127" "28029" "28153" "28063" "28067" "28031" "28065"
[64] "28077" "28001" "28085" "28037" "28091" "28073" "28035" "28111" "28041"
[73] "28157" "28005" "28113" "28147" "28109" "28039" "28131" "28059" "28047"
[82] "28045"
```

\$GeoDa
\$GeoDa\$shpfile
[1] "police"
\$GeoDa\$ind
[1] "FIPSNO"

## \$gal

[1] TRUE
\$call
[1] TRUE

## \$sym

[1] TRUE
When you print the neighbor list, you no longer get a complete listing of its contents, as was the case in earlier versions. Instead, a summary-like overview of its main characteristics is listed:

```
> print(polgal)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 82
Number of nonzero links: 402
Percentage nonzero weights: 5.978584
Average number of links: 4.902439
```

This may change again in the future.

### 2.4.2 Weights Characteristics

The characteristics of the weights file are obtained with the usual summary command:

```
> summary(polgal)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 82
Number of nonzero links: 402
Percentage nonzero weights: 5.978584
Average number of links: 4.902439
Link number distribution:
    2
1 13 16 23 21 8
1 least connected region:
28045 with 2 links
most connected regions:
28145 28071 28135 28043 28155 28007 28163 28085 with 7 links
```

Note how the link number distribution and summary of the connectedness structure use the region.id values to identify the observations. If you use Tools > Weights > Properties in GeoDa, you will observe the same frequency distribution in the link histogram.

### 2.5 Creating a Neighbor List from a GWT File

The new function read.gwt2nb included in the latest versions of spdep (included since the Data tutorial) is designed to convert a GWT weights file into a neighbor list object.

### 2.5.1 Using read.gwt2nb

The function read.gwt2nb takes as arguments the file name for the GWT file and the name of an ID variable, region.id. The latter must be "available" in your workspace. This is achieved by "attaching" the data frame that contains the variable. In our case, this is the police data frame. By attaching the data frame, the variables can be accessed by their name, e.g., as FIPSNO, instead of the more cumbersome police\$FIPSNO. Attach the police data frame as:

```
> attach(police)
```

Make sure it worked by trying a summary of a variable, for example:

```
> summary(POLICE)
    Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
    49.0 291.5 432.5 927.8 955.8 10970.0
```

Now, turn the policek5.GWT file into a neighbor list, using FIPSNO as the region.id, and followed by a summary, as:

```
> polgwt <- read.gwt2nb("policek5.GWT",region.id=FIPSNO)
> summary(polgwt)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 82
Number of nonzero links: 410
Percentage nonzero weights: 6.097561
Average number of links: 5
Non-symmetric neighbours list
Link number distribution:
    5
82
82 least connected regions:
28003 28141 28139 28009 28033 28093 28143 28137
... 28039 28131 28059 28047 28045 with 5 links
82 most connected regions:
2800328141 28139 28009 28033 28093 28143 28137
... 2803928131 28059 28047 28045 with 5 links
```


### 2.5.2 Checking for Symmetry of a Neighbor List

A useful function is a check for the symmetry of the neighbor list. Spatial weights based on contiguity should be symmetric, whereas weights derived from a k-nearest neighbor relation are typically not symmetric.

The is.symmetric.nb function in spdep implements this check. It takes the name of the neighbor object as argument. In our example, for the GALbased weights:

```
> print(is.symmetric.nb(polgal))
```

[1] TRUE
and for the GWT-based weights,

```
> print(is.symmetric.nb(polgwt))
Non matching contiguities: 2 and 14
Non matching contiguities: 3 and 4
Non matching contiguities: 6 and 17
Non matching contiguities: 82 and 79
Non-symmetric neighbours list
[1] FALSE
```


### 2.6 Practice

Try the creation of a data frame, GAL-based neighbor lists and GWT-based neighbor lists for one of the other polygon sample data sets, such as the St Louis homicide data (STL HOM). Alternatively, try it on your own data set.

## Exercise 3

## Spatial Autocorrelation Analysis in $\mathbf{R}$

### 3.1 Objectives

The purpose of this exercise is to illustrate how descriptive spatial autocorrelation analysis can be carried out in the R package spdep. We will also begin exploring some basic programming techniques in $R$, and start using plotting commands to design customized graphs.

The examples below all use the built-in columbus data set from spdep. Before trying the commands, make sure spdep is loaded by typing:

```
> spdep()
[1] "spdep, version 0.4-2, 2007-03-26"
```

If spdep is not loaded, you will get an error message. Also, load the ColumbuS data set and attach it so that you can refer to the variables by name:

```
> data(columbus)
> attach(columbus)
```

For the practice sessions, you will be using the data frame for the police data set and the GAL based neighbor list constructed in Exercise 2.

### 3.2 Converting Neighbor Lists to Spatial Weights

The neighbor list (an object of class nb) considered in Exercise 2 is only one of several classes that handle spatial contiguity information in spdep. It is
primarily intended to store information on the ID of the neighbor for each observation. For the spatial autocorrelation tests and spatial diagnostics in regression analysis, a different type of object is used, referred to as a spatial weights object (an object of class listw).

One converts an nb object into a listw object by means of the nb2listw function. This function has several options, and the defaults are not necessarily what one wants. An excerpt of help(nb2listw) shows the parameter list and the default settings:

```
Usage:
    nb2listw(neighbours, glist=NULL, style="W", zero.policy=FALSE)
Arguments:
neighbours: an object of class 'nb'
glist: list of general weights corresponding to neighbours
style: 'style' can take values W, B, C, U, and S
zero.policy: If FALSE stop with error for any empty neighbour sets, if
    TRUE permit the weights list to be formed with zero-length
    weights vectors
```

Two things to watch out for is to make sure that the "islands" are handled appropriately, since this affects future analysis. The default is to have any islands induce missing value codes through zero.policy=FALSE, which will stop the program when islands are encountered. To allow islands, make sure to explicitly set zero.policy=TRUE. As before, if you are happy with the default settings, there is no need to specify any of the parameters, and a simple nb2listw(neighbor object) will do.

### 3.2.1 Example

In the built-in columbus data set, the object col.gal.nb is a neighbor list for queen contiguity. ${ }^{1}$ Since there are no islands in Columbus and the default of row-standardization (style="W") is fine, we only need to specify the neighbor list name:
> colqueen <- nb2listw (col.gal.nb)

[^1]A check on the class of colqueen reveals that it is indeed an object of class listw:

```
> class(colqueen)
```

[1] "listw" "nb"
and summary gives the same connectedness information as before for the nb object. However, note how several summary measures of the weights have been precomputed, such as the various matrix traces used in the test statistics, more precisely, nn, S0, S1 and S2:

```
> summary(colqueen)
Characteristics of weights list object:
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 49
Number of nonzero links: 230
Percentage nonzero weights: 9.579342
Average number of links: 4.693878
Link number distribution:
```

```
    2
    7
7 least connected regions:
10051008 1045 1047 1049 1048 1015 with 2 links
1 most connected region:
1017 with 10 links
Weights style: W
Weights constants summary:
    n nn S0 S1 S2
W 49 2401 49 23.48489 204.6687
```

Finally, to see the actual weights contained in the object, use colqueen\$weights, which is a list of lists of spatial weights for each observation:

```
> colqueen$weights
```

[[1]]
[1] 0.50 .5
[ [2]]
[1] 0.33333330 .33333330 .3333333
[[3]]
[1] 0.250 .250 .250 .25

### 3.2.2 Practice

Use the polgal neighbor list object created in Exercise 2 for the police data set to turn it into a listw object and check its characteristics. If you did not save polgal in your work space, you will need to recreate it from the policerook.GAL file (follow the directions in in Section 2.4.1 on p. 8). The results are listed below.

## Creating a spatial weights list

```
> polrook <- nb2listw(polgal)
> summary(polrook)
Characteristics of weights list object:
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 82
Number of nonzero links: 402
Percentage nonzero weights: 5.978584
Average number of links: 4.902439
Link number distribution:
    2
    1 13 16 23 21 8
1 least connected region:
28045 with 2 links
8 most connected regions:
28145 28071 28135 28043 28155 28007 28163 28085 with 7 links
Weights style: W
Weights constants summary:
    n nn S0 S1 S2
W 82 6724 82 35.14864 332.3231
> polrook$weights
[[1]]
[1] 0.3333333 0.3333333 0.3333333
[[2]]
```

[[3]]
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { [1] } & 0.25 & 0.25 & 0.25 & 0.25\end{array}$

### 3.3 Moran's I

Moran's I test statistic for spatial autocorrelation is implemented in spdep. There are two separate functions, moran.test, where inference is based on a normal or randomization assumption, and moran.mc, for a permutationbased test. Both take a variable name or numeric vector and a spatial weights list object (listw), in that order, as mandatory parameters. The permutation test also requires the number of permutations as a third mandatory parameter. Both functions also have several options, discussed in more detail below.

### 3.3.1 Normal and Randomization Inference

The different parameters and options for moran.test are revealed by a call to help(moran.test):

```
moran.test(x, listw, randomisation=TRUE, zero.policy=FALSE,
    alternative="greater", rank = FALSE,
    na.action=na.fail, spChk=NULL)
```

Arguments:
x : a numeric vector the same length as the neighbours list in
listw
listw: a 'listw' object created for example by 'nb2listw'
randomisation: variance of I calculated under the assumption of
randomisation, if FALSE normality
zero.policy: if TRUE assign zero to the lagged value of zones
without neighbours, if FALSE assign NA
alternative: a character string specifying the alternative
hypothesis, must be one of greater (default), less
or two.sided.
rank: logical value - default FALSE for continuous variables,
if TRUE, uses the adaptation of Moran's I for ranks

```
    suggested by Cliff and Ord (1981, p. 46)
na.action: a function (default na.fail), can also be na.omit or
        na.exclude - in these cases the weights list will
        be subsetted to remove NAs in the data. It may be
        necessary to set zero.policy to TRUE
        because this subsetting may create no-neighbour
        observations.
        Note that only weights lists created without using
        the glist argument to nb2listw may be subsetted.
        If na.pass is used, zero is substituted for NA
        values in calculating the spatial lag
spChk: should the data vector names be checked against the
        spatial objects for identity integrity, TRUE, or FALSE,
    default NULL to use 'get.spChkOption()'
```

Of the optional parameters, two are very important. The randomisation option (watch the spelling!) is set to TRUE by default, which implies that in order to get inference based on a normal approximation, it must be explicitly set to FALSE. Similarly, the default is a one-sided test, so that in order to obtain the results for the (more commonly used) two-sided test, the option alternative must be set explicitly to "two.sided". Note also that the zero.policy option is set to FALSE by default, which means that islands result in a missing value code (NA). Setting this option to TRUE will set the spatial lag for islands to the customary zero value.

To illustrate this, use the variable CRIME and the weights list colqueen with the normal approximation in a two-sided test: ${ }^{2}$

```
> moran.test(CRIME,colqueen,randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
```

    Moran's I test under normality
    data: CRIME
weights: colqueen
Moran I statistic standard deviate $=5.3818$, p -value $=7.374 \mathrm{e}-08$
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:

[^2]```
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.485770914 -0.020833333 0.008860962
```

Note how, unlike previous practice, the "object" created by moran.test was not assigned to a specific variable. If you simply want to get the results, this is not necessary. By entering the test this way, you indirectly invoke the print function for the object. If you want to access the individual results of the test for further processing, you should assign the moran. test to an object and then print that object. For example, using INC:

```
> mornorINC <- moran.test(INC,colqueen,randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
> print(mornorINC)
    Moran's I test under normality
data: INC
weights: colqueen
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 4.6495, p-value = 3.327e-06
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.416837942 -0.020833333 0.008860962
```

Note how the expectation and variance of the Moran's I test statistic is the same for both CRIME and INC. In fact, under the normal approximation, these moments only depend on the spatial weights, and not on the variable under consideration.

The mornorINC object belongs to the class htest, which is a generic class in R designed to hold the results of test statistics. Technically, it is a list and all its items can be accessed individually (provided you know what they are called; check the help). For example,

```
> class(mornorINC)
[1] "htest"
> mornorINC$statistic
Moran I statistic standard deviate
    4.649514
```

shows the information stored in the statistic element of the list.

When the null hypothesis considered is based on the randomization distribution, the randomisation option does not need to be set. For example, again using CRIME:

```
> moran.test(CRIME,colqueen,alternative="two.sided")
    Moran's I test under randomisation
data: CRIME
weights: colqueen
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 5.3427, p-value = 9.157e-08
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.485770914 -0.020833333 0.008991121
```

Note how the value of the statistic and its expectation do not change relative to the normal case, only the variance is different (and thus the $z$-value and associated p-value).

Finally, leaving all the defaults as they are:

```
> moran.test(CRIME,colqueen)
    Moran's I test under randomisation
data: CRIME
weights: colqueen
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 5.3427, p-value = 4.578e-08
alternative hypothesis: greater
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.485770914 -0.020833333 0.008991121
```

where the only thing different is the p-value (half the p-value of the two-sided test).

### 3.3.2 Permutation Inference

A Moran's I test statistic with inference based on random permutation is contained in the function moran.mc. As in moran.test, it takes the variable
name (or vector) and the weights list file (listw object) as the first two mandatory arguments. It also needs the number of permutations as the third argument (nsim). Since the rank of the observed statistic is computed relative to the reference distribution of statistics for the permuted data sets, it is good practice to set this number to something ending on 9 (such as 99 or 999 ). This will yield nicely rounded pseudo p-values (like 0.01 or 0.001 ). The other options are identical to those for the moran.test function.

For example, using the CRIME variable with the colqueen weights, setting the number of permutations to 99 and leaving everything else to the default (e.g., a one-sided test):

```
> morpermCRIME <- moran.mc(CRIME,colqueen,99)
> morpermCRIME
```

Monte-Carlo simulation of Moran's I

```
data: CRIME
weights: colqueen
number of simulations + 1: 100
statistic = 0.4858, observed rank = 100, p-value = 0.01
alternative hypothesis: greater
```

Note how the number of simulations +1 is a round 100 . None of the permuted data sets yielded a Moran's I greater than the observed value of 0.4858 , hence a pseudo p-value of $0.01 .^{3}$

In this example, the results of the procedure were assigned to an object of class htest (morpermCRIME), which must be printed to reveal its contents. One item in the list morpermCRIME is a vector with the computed statistics for each of the permuted data set. This is contained in the item \$res, as in:

```
> morpermCRIME$res
[1] -0.1211582450 0.0250296894 ... -0.0192339594 -0.1944962763
[6] 0.0397742260-0.0554032219 \ldots. 0.1625140071 -0.1785841236
[91] 0.0196008271 -0.1764712321 \ldots. -0.0832054684 0.0782020854
[96] 0.0910332773 -0.1760530540 \ldots. -0.0806383188 0.4857709137
```

Note that the "observed" value of Moran's I (0.48577) is included in this list as the last element. By default, the contents of this vector will slightly differ

[^3]from run to run, since they are based on random permutations. The default random number seed value is determined from the current time and so no random permuation will be identical. To control the seed, use the R function set.seed (seed, kind $=$ NULL) right before invoking the moran.mc command, and set the same value each time. For example, try this using set.seed(123456):

```
> set.seed(123456)
```

> morpermCRIME <- moran.mc(CRIME, colqueen,99)
> morpermCRIME\$res
[1] -6.607790e-02 1.398150e-02 $\quad 7.363572 \mathrm{e}-02 \quad \ldots$
[100] $4.857709 \mathrm{e}-01$

Unless you want to replicate results exactly, it is typically better to let the randomness of the clock set the seed.

### 3.3.3 Plotting the Reference Distribution

The full vector of Moran statistics for the permuted data sets lends itself well to a histogram or density plot. R has very sophisticated plotting functions, and this example will only scratch the surface. Consult the help files for further details and specific options.

In order to construct a density plot, we first need to create a "density" object. To make sure that this is the reference distribution plotted for the randomly permuted data sets only, we must remove the last element from morpermCRIME\$res:

```
> morp <- morpermCRIME$res[1:length(morpermCRIME$res)-1]
```

Next, we must pass the new list (morp) to the function density. This function has many options, and in this example they are all kept to their default settings (check out help(density) for further details), so that only the vector with statistics is specified. The result is stored in the object zz :

```
> zz <- density(morp)
```

Next, we will plot three graphs on top of each other: a (continuous) density function (based on $\mathbf{z z}$ ), a histogram for the reference distribution, and a line indicating the observed Moran's I. The latter is contained in the statistic attribute of the moran.mc object, morpermCRIME\$statistic.

In the code that follows, the density plot is drawn first, along with the titles (main on top and xlab under the x -axis). ${ }^{4}$ Also, to make the plot more distinct, a double line width is set ( $1 \mathrm{wd}=2$ ) and the plot is in red (col=2). Finally, to make sure that the default settings for the plot do not make it too small, we explicitly set the horizontal (xlim) and vertical (ylim) width (typically, this takes some trial and error to get it right):

```
> plot.density(zz,main="Moran's I Permutation Test",
+ xlab="Reference Distribution",xlim=c(-0.3,0.7),
+ ylim=c(0,6),lwd=2,col=2)
```

Next, you add the histogram (hist) and a vertical line (abline). The histogram is drawn in regular thickness black lines, while the vertical line is double thickness ( $1 \mathrm{wd}=2$ ) and drawn in blue ( $\mathrm{col}=4$ ):

```
> hist(morp,freq=F,add=T)
> abline(v=morpermCRIME$statistic,lwd=2,col=4)
```

The result is as in Figure 3.1 on p. 24.
Note that the example as described will plot the figure on your screen. In order to create hard copy output, you need to specify an output device. R supports several devices, but by far the most commonly used are the postscript and pdf devices. You must first open the device explicitly. For example,
>postscript(file="filename")
for a postscript file, or
>pdf(file="filename")
for a pdf file. All plotting commands that follow will be written to that device, until you close it with a dev.off() command. For example,

```
> postscript(file="moran.pdf") # file name for pdf file
...
> dev.off() # close postscript device
```

[^4]

Figure 3.1: Moran's I Permutation Test Plot.

### 3.3.4 Practice

Use the police data set and the polrook weights to test for spatial autocorrelation in the CRIME variable for the Mississippi counties. Use both the normal and randomization assumptions, as well as a permutation approach. Try making a graph of the distribution of the statistic in the simulated data sets, as in Figure 3.1.

Make sure to detach(columbus) and attach(police) before carrying out the tests so that you use the correct variable. Afterwards, do the reverse to get back to the columbus data for the remainder of the illustrations.

The results for the statistics are given below.

```
Moran's I, Normal Assumption
> moran.test(CRIME,polrook,randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
    Moran's I test under normality
data: CRIME
weights: polrook
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 1.9108, p-value = 0.05604
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.121668149 -0.012345679 0.004919118
```

Moran's I, Randomization Assumption

```
> moran.test(CRIME,polrook,alternative="two.sided")
    Moran's I test under randomisation
data: CRIME
weights: polrook
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 2.4522, p-value = 0.01420
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.121668149 -0.012345679 0.002986579
```

Moran's I, Permutation Approach

```
> morMissCRIME <- moran.mc(CRIME,polrook,999)
> print(morMissCRIME)
    Monte-Carlo simulation of Moran's I
data: CRIME
```

```
weights: polrook
number of simulations + 1: 1000
statistic = 0.1217, observed rank = 986, p-value = 0.014
alternative hypothesis: greater
```


### 3.4 Constructing a Spatially Lagged Variable

Spatially lagged variables are important elements of many spatial regression specifications. In spdep, they are constructed by means of the lag.listw function. This function takes as arguments a spatial weights object of class listw and a conforming matrix (i.e., a matrix with the same number of rows as the dimension of the spatial weights). ${ }^{5}$ Note that the documentation for lag.listw only refers to a "numeric vector," but this is incomplete. A look at the source code (type lag.listw without the usual parentheses) reveals that it works equally well for a matrix, i.e., for several variables in one function call. The third (optional) argument to lag.listw is the zero.policy, which we can ignore for the COLUMBUS and POLICE sample data sets.

### 3.4.1 Example

First, we will combine the three variables CRIME, INC and HOVAL into a matrix. ${ }^{6}$ This is accomplished by means of the cbind command and will be an often used procedure when you program your own routines based on matrix algebra. For example, you create the matrix xx as:

```
> xx <- cbind(CRIME,INC,HOVAL)
```

and check the contents with

```
> xx
            CRIME INC HOVAL
[1,] 15.725980 19.531 80.467
[2,] 18.801754 21.232 44.567
[3,] 30.626781 15.956 26.350
```

[^5]Now, you can construct a spatially lagged version of this matrix, using the colqueen weights:

```
> wxx <- lag.listw(colqueen,xx)
```

and check the contents

```
> wxx
```

|  | $[, 1]$ | $[, 2]$ | $[, 3]$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $[1]$, | 24.71427 | 18.594000 | 35.45850 |
| $[2]$, | 26.24684 | 13.321333 | 46.67233 |
| $[3]$, | 29.41175 | 14.123000 | 45.36475 |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |  |

Since this is a fairly small data set, we can easily check if the spatial lag terms are what they should be. Extract the neighbor IDs and spatial weights from listw by referring to the proper list elements (a listw object is a list, i.e., a combination of different elements). You see the names of the elements as the result of an attributes command (this lists the "attributes" of an object). For example,

```
> attributes(colqueen)
$names
[1] "style" "neighbours" "weights"
$class
[1] "listw" "nb"
$region.id
    [1] 1005 1001 1006 1002 ... 1037 1039 1040 1009
[46] 1048 1015 1027 1026
$call
nb2listw(neighbours = col.gal.nb)
```

This shows that the neighbor IDs are in colqueen\$neighbours (spelling!) and the corresponding weights in colqueen\$weights. Specifically, for the first observation:

```
> colqueen$neighbours[1]
[[1]]
[1] 2 3
```

and

```
> colqueen$weights[1]
[[1]]
[1] 0.5 0.5
```

A simple calculation yields the spatial lags for the first observation "by hand":

```
> (xx[2,] + xx[3,])/2.0
    CRIME INC HOVAL
24.71427 18.59400 35.45850
```

which are the same values as in the first row of wxx.
Compare the descriptive characteristics of the original variables to their spatial lags:

| > summary (xx) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CRIME | INC | HOVAL |
| Min. : 0.1783 | Min. : 4.477 | Min. 17.90 |
| 1st Qu.:20.0485 | 1st Qu.: 9.963 | 1st Qu.:25.70 |
| Median :34.0008 | Median :13.380 | Median :33.50 |
| Mean :35.1288 | Mean :14.375 | Mean :38.44 |
| 3rd Qu.:48.5855 | 3rd Qu.:18.324 | 3rd Qu.:43.30 |
| Max. :68.8920 | Max. $: 31.070$ | Max. $: 96.40$ |
| > summary (wxx) |  |  |
| X1 | X2 | X3 |
| Min. : 13.85 | Min. : 8.539 | Min. $: 23.41$ |
| 1st Qu.:24.71 | 1st Qu.:10.957 | 1st Qu.:30.82 |
| Median :35.90 | Median :14.303 | Median :36.38 |
| Mean :34.88 | Mean :14.742 | Mean :38.73 |
| 3rd Qu.: 45.39 | 3rd Qu.:17.161 | 3rd Qu.:45.36 |
| Max. :54.91 | Max. $: 26.066$ | Max. $: 75.13$ |

Note how the spatial lag operation compresses the distribution of the variable. The measures of "spread" are substantially smaller than for the originals.

### 3.4.2 Practice

Compute the spatial lags for the CRIME, POLICE and INC variables in the police data set, using the polrook spatial weights. Compare the descriptive statistics of the original variables to their spatial lags. Experiment
with other spatial weights and/or try some statistical plots to visualize the difference between the distributions.

The basic results are given below.

## Spatial Lags

```
> policex <- cbind(CRIME,POLICE,INC)
> wpolicex <- lag.listw(polrook,policex)
> summary(policex)
    CRIME POLICE INC
Min. : 5.0 Min. : 49.0 Min. : 4836
1st Qu.: 76.5 1st Qu.: 291.5 1st Qu.: }652
Median : 141.5 Median : 432.5 Median : 7008
Mean : 194.5 Mean : 927.8 Mean : 7198
3rd Qu.: 298.0 3rd Qu.: 955.8 3rd Qu.: }761
Max. :1739.0 Max. :10971.0 Max. :10506
> summary(wpolicex)
            X1 X2 X3
Min. : 38.5 Min. : 225.0 Min. :6109
1st Qu.:125.4 1st Qu.: 469.0 1st Qu.:6847
Median :163.0 Median : 690.5 Median :7092
Mean :191.8 Mean : 931.5 Mean :7191
3rd Qu.:224.6 3rd Qu.: 991.1 3rd Qu.:7449
Max. :732.7 Max. :3434.0 Max. :8608
```


### 3.5 Moran Scatter Plot

The Moran scatter plot is also included in the spdep functionality. It is implemented in the function moran.plot. This takes as arguments a variable name, followed by a spatial weights objects of class listw. Optional parameters are the zero.policy as well as several ways to fine tune the labeling of high influence points, the x and y -axes, and the various graphical parameters (passed as in par(..)). The function moran.plot also creates a so-called "influence" object from the influence.measures passed back from the regression model that is used to estimate the slope (Moran's I). Setting the option quiet=TRUE suppresses the influence measures (the default is quiet=FALSE).


Figure 3.2: Moran Scatter Plot for CRIME, using colqueen.

### 3.5.1 Example

Use the CRIME variable from the columbus data frame and the spatial weights colqueen to invoke the Moran scatterplot, leaving all other settings to their default:

```
> moran.plot(CRIME,colqueen)
Potentially influential observations of
        lm(formula = wx ~ x) :
    dfb.1_ dfb.x dffit cov.r cook.d hat
```

```
1004 1.55_* -1.40_* 1.55_* 0.59_* 0.86_* 0.11
1034 0.15 -0.21 -0.23 1.14_* 0.03 0.11
```

Note the list of influence characteristics and the IDs of the influential observations. The plot is as in Figure 3.2 on p. 30.

The Moran scatterplot produced by spdep differs somewhat from the one implemented in GeoDa. Most importantly, spdep uses the original variables, whereas GeoDa constructs the plot for standardized variates. Also, it is not clear how Moran's I can be extracted from the plot without an additional computation. The object returned by the function is a matrix with the observations as rows and the six influence measures as columns.

### 3.5.2 Customizing the Moran Scatter Plot

We will program a simple function that constructs a Moran scatter plot using standardized variables and shows the value of Moran's I on the plot. We will use the spdep function lag. listw to build the spatial lags and the generic R regression function lm to get the coefficients. First we test the various commands by trying them step by step, with hard-coded variables, then we generalize and turn them into a function.

First set the generic variable x to the variable of interest (CRIME), and convert it to a standardized variate, with a simple check to make sure we did it right:

```
> x <- CRIME
> zx <- (x - mean(x))/sd(x)
> mean(zx)
[1] -1.948555e-16
> var(zx)
[1] 1
```

Next, create the spatial lag for the standardized variable, after turning the weights into a generic variable:

```
> wfile <- colqueen
> wzx <- lag.listw(wfile,zx)
```

Now, compute the intercept and slope (Moran's I), using lm:

```
> morlm <- lm(wzx ~ zx)
> aa <- morlm$coefficients[1]
> mori <- morlm$coefficients[2]
```



Figure 3.3: Moran Scatter Plot for standardized CRIME, using colqueen.

```
> aa
(Intercept)
-0.01496451
> mori
    zx
0.4857709
```

Finally, we set up the plot as a simple scatterplot ( $\mathrm{plot}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ ), add the regression line and the two axes (using abline), label the axes (using xlab and yl ab ), and put a title containing the value of Moran's I at the top
(using title, the paste command to put together text fragments, and a combination of format and round to make sure the Moran's I doesn't have too many decimal digits):

```
> par(pty="s") # make sure it's square
> plot(zx,wzx,xlab="CRIME",ylab="Spatial Lag of CRIME")
> abline(aa,mori)
> abline(h=0,lty=2)
> abline(v=0,lty=2)
> title(paste("Moran Scatterplot I= ",format(round(mori,4))))
```

The result looks like Figure 3.3 on p. 32 .
To combine these commands into a function, create a file in any text editor and name it moran.plot2.R. Enter the commands listed below and save the file as a text file in your working directory.

```
# moran.plot2
# function for Moran scatterplot using standardized variates
# specify variable = x
# specify spatial weights (listw object) = wfile
# all other options are hard coded (so far)
# example: moran.plot2(CRIME,colqueen)
#
moran.plot2 <- function(x,wfile)
{
    xname <- deparse(substitute(x)) # get name of variable
    zx <- (x - mean(x))/sd(x)
    wzx <- lag.listw(wfile,zx)
    morlm <- lm(wzx ~ zx)
    aa <- morlm$coefficients[1]
    mori <- morlm$coefficients[2]
    par(pty="s")
    plot(zx,wzx,xlab=xname,ylab=paste("Spatial Lag of ",xname))
    abline(aa,mori,col=2)
    abline(h=0,lty=2,col=4)
    abline(v=0,lty=2, col=4)
    title(paste("Moran Scatterplot I= ",format(round(mori,4))))
}
```

The only things different from before are the use of the functions deparse
and substitute to extract the variable name for use in the plot labels xlab and ylab. Source the function as
> source("moran.plot2.R")
and invoke it as moran.plot2. For example, passing CRIME and colqueen as the parameters:

```
> moran.plot2(CRIME,colqueen)
```

will yield the same plot as in Figure 3.3 (except that the regression line is in red and the axes drawn in blue, see Figure 3.4 on p. 35).

### 3.5.3 Practice

Try out the new function using the police data frame (make sure to first detach (columbus) then attach(police)), and construct a Moran scatterplot for the variable INC using polrook as the weight file. Compare this plot to the standard spdep moran.plot. Try some other variables and/or spatial weights. Also try to get your plot written out to a postscript or pdf file (make sure to include dev.off() at the end to switch back to screen output).

If you feel adventurous, check out the source code of moran. plot and add the various safety checks and the diagnostics of high leverage to moran.plot2.

## Moran Scatter Plot

```
> pdf(file="morscatf.pdf")
> moran.plot2(INC,polrook)
> dev.off()
```



Figure 3.4: Moran Scatter Plot for standardized INC, using polrook.

## Exercise 4

## Monte Carlo Simulation (1) Assessing the Properties of a Test Statistic

### 4.1 Objectives

The purpose of this exercise is to illustrate how to set up a simple Monte Carlo simulation experiment to assess some properties of a test statistic. Specifically, the end goal is to describe the distribution and compare the nominal and empirical rejection frequencies for Moran's I under the null hypothesis. In the process, we will look at how to generate random variables and carry out basic matrix algebra in R . We will also use spdep to create spatial weights for regular grids and convert spatial weights to actual matrix objects.

As before, make sure spdep is loaded before starting the exercises. Since all the data will be generated, there is no need to specify a particular data frame.

### 4.2 Generating Random Variables

$R$ has extensive functionality to generate random variables for a wide range of distributions and to compute probabilities for those distributions. ${ }^{1}$

Each distribution function has an R name, such as norm for the normal and unif for the uniform. The different random variable related functions

[^6]are indicated by a single letter prefix to the distribution name. This includes d for the density, p for the cumulative density function, q for the quantile function, and $r$ for simulation of random variables. ${ }^{2}$ The arguments to these functions are, respectively, the value of a random variable x for dxxx and pxxx, a probability for $q x x x$, and the sample size for rxxx.

### 4.2.1 Example

To generate a vector of 25 standard normal variates, use rnorm with only the sample size as parameter, as in:
> x <- rnorm(25)
Check the mean and standard deviation: ${ }^{3}$

```
> mean(x)
[1] -0.199015
> sd(x)
[1] 0.9869352
```

Note how for a sample this small, the mean is fairly far from its theoretical expectation. To get a much closer fit and eliminate some of the extra variability induced by the random number generator, you need to generate much larger sets. For example:

```
> x <- rnorm(100000)
mean(x)
[1] -0.005083976
> sd(x)
[1] 0.996822
> x <- rnorm(1000000)
mean(x)
[1] -0.001698689
> sd(x)
[1] 1.000263
```

To generate a vector of normal random variates with a given mean and standard deviation, you need to pass these as arguments in addition to the

[^7]sample size. Note that you pass the standard deviation, not the variance. For example:

```
> x <- rnorm(1000,5,20)
> mean(x)
[1] 5.241835
> sd(x)
[1] 19.59694
```

You can now compare a given percentile in the generated distribution to its theoretical value. For example, in the 1000 generated values above the 95 th percentile will be in row 950 of the sorted vector x :

```
> z <- sort(x)
> z[950]
[1] 36.46587
```

The theoretical value is found with the qnorm function, passing 0.95 (the probability) as the argument, in addition to the mean and standard deviation:

```
> qz <- qnorm(0.95,5,20)
> qz
[1] 37.89707
```

A plot of the sorted z values against qz values for the same percentile would yield a q-q plot. Conversely, finding the cumulative probability for $z$ [950]:

```
> pz <- pnorm(z[950],5,20)
> pz
[1] 0.9421746
```


### 4.2.2 Practice

Experiment with some of the other distributions, such as the uniform, using runif ( $n, \min , \max$ ), or the Poisson, using rpois( $n, l a m b d a$ ). Use the techniques from Exercise 3 to draw a histogram or density plot for the generated variates and summarize the characteristics of the distribution (mean, sd, and summary).


Figure 4.1: Histogram for Randomly Generated Poisson Variates.

## Histogram for Poisson Variates

```
> z2 <- rpois(50,2)
> summary(z2)
    Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
    0.00 1.00 2.00 2.14 3.00 6.00
> mean(z2)
[1] 2.14
> var(z2)
[1] 2.041224
```

```
> pdf(file="poisson.pdf")
> hist(z2)
> dev.off()
```


### 4.3 Basic Matrix Algebra Operations

Operations on matrices and vectors are element by element in R. So, if $x$ is a vector (say n by 1 ) and A is a n by n matrix, then $\mathrm{A} * \mathrm{x}$ will multiply each row element in A with the matching row element in x and yield another n by n matrix, not a n by 1 vector. To illustrate, use the c operator (for concatenate) to create a 5 by 1 vector x (by default this is a column vector), and the matrix function with row and column parameters to create a 5 by 5 matrix (of sequence numbers):

```
> x <- c(1:5)
> x
[1] 1 2 3 4 5
> A <- matrix(1:25,5,5)
> A
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} & {\([, 4]\)} & {\([, 5]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 1 & 6 & 11 & 16 & 21 \\
{\([2]\),} & 2 & 7 & 12 & 17 & 22 \\
{\([3]\),} & 3 & 8 & 13 & 18 & 23 \\
{\([4]\),} & 4 & 9 & 14 & 19 & 24 \\
{\([5]\),} & 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25
\end{tabular}
```

Note how the default ordering of a matrix is in so-called "column major order" (down each column first). Alternatively, a vector can be passed to the array function with a dim attribute for the same effect (this is useful for reshaping matrices as well):

```
> z <- c(1:25)
> B <- array(z,dim=c(5,5))
>B
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} & {\([, 4]\)} & {\([, 5]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 1 & 6 & 11 & 16 & 21 \\
{\([2]\),} & 2 & 7 & 12 & 17 & 22 \\
{\([3]\),} & 3 & 8 & 13 & 18 & 23 \\
{\([4]\),} & 4 & 9 & 14 & 19 & 24 \\
{\([5]\),} & 5 & 10 & 15 & 20 & 25
\end{tabular}
```

Now, multiply A by x :

| $>z z$ | $<-A * x$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $>z z$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $[, 1]$ | $[, 2]$ | $[, 3]$ | $[, 4]$ | $[, 5]$ |
| $[1]$, | 1 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 21 |
| $[2]$, | 4 | 14 | 24 | 34 | 44 |
| $[3]$, | 9 | 24 | 39 | 54 | 69 |
| $[4]$, | 16 | 36 | 56 | 76 | 96 |
| $[5]$, | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 125 |

In order to get true matrix multiplication, following to the rules of matrix algebra, a different operator must be used, symbolized as \% $\% \%$ :

```
> zz1 <- A %*% x
> zz1
    [,1]
[1,] 215
[2,] 230
[3,] 245
[4,] 260
[5,] 275
```

A few other important basic matrix operations are:

- nrow(matrix) for the number of rows
- ncol(matrix) for the number of columns
- t(matrix) to construct the transpose of a matrix, e.g., $X^{\prime}$
- diag(matrix) to extract the diagonal elements from a matrix
- diag(vector) to create a diagonal matrix with vector as diagonal
- crossprod(matrix1, matrix2) to compute the crossproduct (e.g., $X^{\prime} y$ ) between two matrices efficiently
- \% \% for the outer product of two vectors, e.g., $x x^{\prime}$
- outer (vector1, vector2, function) for any function applied to each pair $x_{i}$ and $y_{j}$


### 4.3.1 Example

Start with a vector of 30 standard normal variates and convert it to a 10 by 3 matrix. Note how you can force "row major order" by setting the argument byrow=TRUE:

```
> x1 <- rnorm(30)
> x1
    [1] 1.86263657 -0.14248903 -1.26807899 ... -0.30481949
    [7] 1.05654040 0.46209724 -0.75313876 ... -1.95010825
[13] -0.33947593 0.55823272 -1.42072261 ... 0.37998187
[19] -0.75149464 0.47130272 0.76668664 ... 0.64171921
[25] -0.99857864 -1.53179763 1.94797343 ... -0.32623853
> XX <- matrix(x1,10,3)
> XX
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 1.8626366 & 1.02988875 & 0.7666866 \\
{\([2]\),} & -0.1424890 & -1.95010825 & 0.3450489 \\
{\([3]\),} & -1.2680790 & -0.33947593 & 0.6046427 \\
{\([4]\),} & 0.2091366 & 0.55823272 & 0.6417192 \\
{\([5]\),} & 0.4177341 & -1.42072261 & -0.9985786 \\
{\([6]\),} & -0.3048195 & 0.06214715 & -1.5317976 \\
{\([7]\),} & 1.0565404 & -0.31582345 & 1.9479734 \\
{\([8]\),} & 0.4620972 & 0.37998187 & -0.9578326 \\
{\([9]\),} & -0.7531388 & -0.75149464 & -1.5308449 \\
{\([10]\),} & 0.7728531 & 0.47130272 & -0.3262385 \\
\(>\) XX <- matrix(x1, 10,3,byrow=TRUE) \\
\(>\mathrm{XX}\) & &
\end{tabular}
> XX
    [,1] [,2] [,3]
    [1,] 1.86263657-0.1424890 -1.2680790
    [2,] 0.20913657 0.4177341 -0.3048195
    [3,] 1.05654040 0.4620972 -0.7531388
    [4,] 0.77285309 1.0298887 -1.9501082
    [5,] -0.33947593 0.5582327 -1.4207226
    [6,] 0.06214715 -0.3158235 0.3799819
    [7,] -0.75149464 0.4713027 0.7666866
    [8,] 0.34504894 0.6046427 0.6417192
    [9,] -0.99857864 -1.5317976 1.9479734
[10,] -0.95783257 -1.5308449 -0.3262385
```

Check the number of rows and columns and construct the transpose of matrix XX:

```
> rXX <- nrow(XX)
> rXX
[1] 10
> cXX <- ncol(XX)
> cXX
[1] 3
> tXX <- t(XX)
> tXX
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} & \(\ldots\) & {\([, 6]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 1.8626366 & 0.2091366 & 1.0565404 & \(\ldots\) & 0.06214715 \\
{\([2]\),} & -0.1424890 & 0.4177341 & 0.4620972 & \(\ldots\) & -0.31582345 \\
{\([3]\),} & -1.2680790 & -0.3048195 & -0.7531388 & \(\ldots\) & 0.37998187 \\
& {\([, 7]\)} & {\([, 8]\)} & {\([, 9]\)} & {\([, 10]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & -0.7514946 & 0.3450489 & -0.9985786 & -0.9578326 \\
{\([2]\),} & 0.4713027 & 0.6046427 & -1.5317976 & -1.5308449 \\
{\([3]\),} & 0.7666866 & 0.6417192 & 1.9479734 & -0.3262385
\end{tabular}
```

Compute the cross product of the two matrices (e.g., $X^{\prime} X$ ), extract the diagonal and divide by the number of rows. If these were in deviations from the mean, the result would be the estimated variance in each column of the original matrix. Note how the division / is an element by element operation:

```
> XtX <- crossprod(XX)
> XtX
\begin{tabular}{lrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 7.944244 & 3.747365 & -6.210131 \\
{\([2]\),} & 3.747365 & 7.157987 & -4.951293 \\
{\([3]\),} & -6.210131 & -4.951293 & 13.134562 \\
\(>\) v1 \(<-\operatorname{diag}(\mathrm{XtX})\) \\
> v1 & \\
[1] 7.944244 & 7.157987 & 13.134562 \\
> var1 <- v1 / nrow(XX) \\
> var1 & \\
[1] 0.7944244 & 0.7157987 & 1.3134562
\end{tabular}
```


### 4.3.2 Practice

Make sure you become familiar with the difference between element by element operations and true matrix algebra in R. Practice by creating random
vectors and matrices, multiply them, compute cross-products and extract diagonals. These will be important tools in constructing the test statistics needed in the simulation experiment.

### 4.4 Creating Spatial Weights for a Grid Layout

In many simulation settings, one controls for the spatial layout of the data by generating a sample for a regular square grid. The weights matrix for such a layout has a simple structure and does not require the checking of boundaries or computation of distances that is needed for irregular layouts. The function cell2nb in spdep creates a neighbor object for any rectangular grid, using either rook or queen as the criterion. Alternatively, a so-called torus correction may be used to avoid edge effects. ${ }^{4}$

The cell2nb function takes as required parameters the number of rows and the number of columns in the grid. In addition, the type of contiguity can be specified (default is type="rook", the other option is queen), as well as whether or not a torus correction is needed (set torus=TRUE, the default is FALSE).

### 4.4.1 Example

To create a rook type neighbor object for a 4 by 4 square grid layout, and to check its properties, use:

```
> rook4x4 <- cell2nb(4,4)
> summary(rook4x4)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 16
Number of nonzero links: 48
Percentage nonzero weights: 18.75
Average number of links: 3
Link number distribution:
```

234
484
4 least connected regions:

1:1 4:1 1:4 4:4 with 2 links

[^8]```
4 most connected regions:
2:2 3:2 2:3 3:3 with 4 links
```

Compare to the properties with a torus correction:

```
> rook4x4t <- cell2nb(4,4,torus=TRUE)
> summary(rook4x4t)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 16
Number of nonzero links: 64
Percentage nonzero weights: 25
Average number of links: 4
Link number distribution:
4
16
16 least connected regions:
1:1 2:1 3:1 4:1 1:2 2:2 3:2 4:2 ... 1:4 2:4 3:4 4:4 with 4 links
16 most connected regions:
1:1 2:1 3:1 4:1 1:2 2:2 3:2 4:2 ... 1:4 2:4 3:4 4:4 with 4 links
```


### 4.4.2 Practice

Create neighbor objects for a 5 by 10 rectangular grid using both rook and queen as contiguity criterion, and compare their properties. Experiment with other layouts and/or a torus correction.

## Creating Rectangular Grid Neighbor Objects

```
> rook5x10 <- cell2nb (5,10)
> summary(rook5x10)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 50
Number of nonzero links: 170
Percentage nonzero weights: 6.8
Average number of links: 3.4
Link number distribution:
    2 3 4
    42224
4 least connected regions:
```

```
1:1 5:1 1:10 5:10 with 2 links
24 most connected regions:
2:2 3:2 4:2 ... 4:9 with 4 links
> queen5x10 <- cell2nb(5,10,type="queen")
> summary(queen5x10)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 50
Number of nonzero links: 314
Percentage nonzero weights: 12.56
Average number of links: 6.28
Link number distribution:
```

    \(3 \quad 5 \quad 8\)
    42224
    4 least connected regions:
1:1 5:1 1:10 5:10 with 3 links
24 most connected regions:
2:2 3:2 4:2 ... 4:9 with 8 links

### 4.5 Converting Spatial Weights to a Matrix

The neighbor list nb objects and the spatial weights listw objects both store the contiguity information in an efficient (sparse) form. Sometime, it is necessary to use the full matrix representation of the weights, for example, to use them in matrix computations. ${ }^{5}$

The function nb2mat converts the contiguity information in an nb object to a full matrix. A call to the help function shows the necessary arguments and default options:

```
> help(nb2mat)
nb2mat package:spdep R Documentation
Spatial weights matrices for neighbours lists
Description:
```

The function generates a weights matrix for a neighbours list with

[^9]spatial weights for the chosen coding scheme.

Usage:
nb2mat(neighbours, glist=NULL, style="W", zero.policy=FALSE) listw2mat(listw)

## Arguments:

```
neighbours: an object of class 'nb'
```

glist: list of general weights corresponding to neighbours
style: 'style' can take values $W, B, C$, and $S$
zero.policy: If FALSE stop with error for any empty neighbour sets, if TRUE permit the weights list to be formed with zero-length weights vectors
listw: a 'listw' object from for example 'nb2listw'

### 4.5.1 Example

Convert the previously created rook neighbor list for the 4 by 4 regular grid to a full matrix, using row-standardized weights, as:

```
> wrks <- nb2mat(rook4x4)
> wrks
```

|  | $[, 1]$ | $[, 2]$ | $[, 3]$ | $[, 4]$ | $[, 5]$ | $[, 6]$ | $[, 7]$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $[1]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.5000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.5000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| $[2]$, | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 |
| $[3]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 |
| $[4]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.5000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| $[5]$, | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 |
| $[6]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 |
| $[7]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 | 0.0000000 |
| $[8]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 |
| $[9]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.3333333 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| $[10]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 | 0.0000000 |
| $[11]$, | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.2500000 |

```
[12,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.000000000.0000000 0.0000000
[13,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
[14,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
[15,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
[16,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
            [,8] [,9] [,10] [,11] [,12] [,13] [,14]
    [1,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [2,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [3,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [4,] 0.5000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [5,] 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [6,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [7,] 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [8,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [9,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000
[10,] 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.2500000
[11,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.2500000 0.0000000 0.0000000
[12,] 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
[13,] 0.0000000 0.5000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.5000000
[14,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000
[15,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333
[16,] 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.5000000 0.0000000 0.0000000
                    [,15] [,16]
    [1,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [2,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [3,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [4,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [5,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [6,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [7,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [8,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
    [9,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
[10,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
[11,] 0.2500000 0.0000000
[12,] 0.0000000 0.3333333
[13,] 0.0000000 0.0000000
[14,] 0.3333333 0.0000000
[15,] 0.0000000 0.3333333
[16,] 0.5000000 0.0000000
attr(,"call")
```

```
nb2mat(neighbours = rook4x4)
```


### 4.5.2 Practice

Create a matrix from the queen or other neighbor objects you constructed in 4.4.2. Use a matrix multiplication operation to construct a spatially lagged variable for a conforming random vector. Compare the result to what the lag.listw function yields (you must make sure to convert the nb object to a listw using nb2listw).

## Creating a Spatial Lag Using Matrix Multiplication

```
> x <- rnorm(50)
> w50 <- nb2mat(queen5x10)
> w50[1,]
    [1] 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.3333333 0.3333333 ...
> wx <- w50 %*% x
> wwx <- lag.listw(nb2listw(queen5x10),x)
> wx[1:4]
1:1 
> wwx[1:4]
[1] 0.0765760 -0.2601768 0.1325916 -0.5860503
```


### 4.6 A Simulation Experiment

An important property of any test statistic is its distribution under the null, and, more specifically, characteristics such as the mean, variance, and higher moments. In addition, the size of the test statistic is the probability of rejecting the null for a given significance level. For a test statistic to be unbiased, its size should equal the p-value corresponding to the theoretical critical value (the nominal significance). For example, if 1.96 is chose as the critical value in a two-sided test for a statistic that follows a standard normal distribution, $5 \%$ of the cases should reject the null hypothesis, even though it is true.

A simple simulation experiment can demonstrate these properties for Moran's I, applied to a generic random variable. ${ }^{6}$ We will start with considering uncorrelated standard normal variates, but this can easily be extended to other distributions.

[^10]
### 4.6.1 Computing Moran's I Using Matrix Algebra

For an $n \times n$ row-standardized weights matrix $W$ with elements $w_{i j}$, the Moran's I statistic is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
I=z^{\prime} W z / z^{\prime} z, \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $z$ is a $n \times 1$ vector of variables expressed as deviations from the mean. When the weights are not row-standardized, a scaling factor of $n / S_{0}$ is applied, where $S_{0}=\sum_{i} \sum_{j} w_{i j}$.

In our simulation experiment, we will not be relying on the built-in Moran's I calculations from spdep, but instead compute the statistic directly using matrix algebra and the spatial lag operation. The first step in this process is to generate a random vector and convert it to deviations from the mean:

```
> y <- rnorm(16)
> yz <- y - mean(y)
> mean(yz)
[1] -4.163336e-17
```

Next, we build the numerator and denominator of equation (4.1), using matrix products and the spatial lag operator lag.listw with the rook weights for the grid:

```
> yy <- crossprod(yz)
> yy
    [,1]
[1,] 13.98298
> wy <- lag.listw(nb2listw(rook4x4),yz)
> ywy <- crossprod(yz,wy)
> ywy
    [,1]
[1,] 1.294643
```

The Moran's I statistic follows directly, as:

```
> mi <- ywy / yy
>mi
    [,1]
[1,] 0.09258704
```


### 4.6.2 The Theoretical Moments of Moran's I

Under the normal assumption for the null, the theoretical moments of Moran's I only depend on the characteristics of the weights matrix. Specifically,

$$
\begin{align*}
E[I] & =\frac{-1}{n-1}  \tag{4.2}\\
E\left[I^{2}\right] & =\frac{n^{2} S_{1}-n S_{2}+3 S_{0}^{2}}{(n-1)(n+1) S_{0}^{2}} \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ are sums of weights matrix elements,

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{1} & =(1 / 2) \sum_{i} \sum_{j}\left(w_{i j}+w_{j i}\right)^{2}  \tag{4.4}\\
S_{2} & =\sum_{i}\left(w_{i *}+w_{* j}\right)^{2}, \tag{4.5}
\end{align*}
$$

with $w_{i *}$ as the row sums and $w_{* j}$ as the column sums. Note that with rowstandardized weights, these expressions simplify, since each row sum equals 1 , and therefore $S_{0}=n$.

The variance of Moran's I then follows as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}[I]=E\left[I^{2}\right]-E[I]^{2}, \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the statistic is turned into a standardized variate as

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{z}=\frac{I-E[I]}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[I]}} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the mean and variance of the statistic under the null depend solely on the weights matrix, and not on the actual variables under consideration, they must only be computed once. The required "sums" can be extracted from a spatial weights object by means of the spdep function spweights.constants.

Consider the rook $4 \times 4$ neighbor object for the square grid and extract the sums by converting the nb object to a listw object (using nb2listw):

```
> rks <- spweights.constants(nb2listw(rook4x4))
> rks
$n
[1] 16
$n1
[1] }1
```

```
$n2
[1] }1
$n3
[1] 13
$nn
[1] 256
$S0
[1] }1
$S1
[1] 11.05556
$S2
[1] 64.61111
```

Using these results, we can compute the moments of Moran's I in this example:

```
> eirk4x4 <- -1 / rks$n1
> eirk4x4
[1] -0.06666667
> ei2rk4x4 <- (rks$n^2 * rks$S1 - rks$n * rks$S2 + 3 * rks$S0^2)/
+ (rks$n1 * (rks$n + 1) * rks$S0^2)
> ei2rk4x4
[1] 0.03928377
> varirk4x4 <- ei2rk4x4 - eirk4x4^2
> varirk4x4
[1] 0.03483932
> sdirk4x4 <- sqrt(varirk4x4)
> sdirk4x4
[1] 0.1866530
```


### 4.6.3 Inference

Inference is based on a normal approximation, where the statistic is standardized and then compared to the standard normal distribution.

We standardize the statistic computed in section 4.6 .1 with the moments computed above:

```
> iz <- (mi - eirk4x4)/sdirk4x4
> iz
    [,1]
[1,] 0.8532076
```

and obtain a two-tailed significance using pnorm with the lower.tail = FALSE option, and multiplying the result by 2.0

```
> piz <- pnorm(iz,lower.tail=FALSE) * 2
> piz
```

$$
[, 1]
$$

[1,] 0.3935442
To check this, we can use the random vector y in the moran.test with the rook grid weights (see section 3.3.1 on p. 17):

```
> moran.test(y,nb2listw(rook4x4),randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
    Moran's I test under normality
data: y
weights: nb2listw(rook4x4)
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 0.8532, p-value = 0.3935
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.09258704 -0.06666667 0.03483932
```

These results are identical to those computed "by hand."

### 4.6.4 Setting up the Experiment

The simulation experiment will require the following steps:

- initialize the number of simulations ( r ), sample size ( n ) and critical value (either a p-value, such as 0.05 , or its counterpart in the distribution, such as 1.96)
- create a neighbor object for a given lattice layout (see cell2nb in section 4.4)
- convert the neighbor object to a weights list (nb2listw)
- compute the theoretical moments of Moran's I (section 4.6.2)
- initialize vectors with results (value of statistic, decision)
- loop over each random replication
- generate standard normal vector (section 4.2)
- compute Moran's I (section 4.6.1) and store result in vector
- compute p-value (section 4.6.3) and store decision in vector
- summarize results
- compute mean and variance (standard deviation) of results vector with Moran's I
- do tests on normal distribution for results vector (q-q plot)
- plot the density of the statistics, compute proportion above 1.96
- compute percent rejection


### 4.6.5 The Simulation Loop

The simulation loop requires so-called "flow control." We will use a simple for loop, which iterates over elements in a sequence. For example, we will compute 1000 iterations of our random vectors and associated statistics. ${ }^{7}$ We start by initializing the number of replications as well as the two results vectors:

```
r <- 1000
> moran <- vector(mode="numeric",length=r)
> reject <- vector(mode="numeric",length=r)
```

Also, to avoid having to convert the rook4x4 neighbor list to a listw object over and over again, we create a new spatial weights object, and also set the sample size to 16 and the critical value to crit:
> n <- 16
$>$ crit <- 0.05
> w4 <- nb2listw(rook4x4)
Next, we organize the main computations into a loop, using for (i in $1: r)$ as the iterator:

[^11]```
> for (i in 1:r){
+ y <- rnorm(n)
+ yz <- y - mean(y)
+ yy <- crossprod(yz)
+ wy <- lag.listw(w4,yz)
+ ywy <- crossprod(yz,wy)
+ mi <- ywy / yy
+ morans[i] <- mi
+ iz <- (mi - eirk4x4)/sdirk4x4
+ piz <- pnorm(iz,lower.tail=FALSE) * 2
+ if (piz < crit) { reject[i] <- 1 }
+ }
```

Note the use of an if statement in the loop. The condition in parentheses is checked, and if it is evaluated as TRUE the action that follows is executed. In this example, this means that when the null hypothesis is rejected (as a two-sided test with a p-value of 0.05 ) then it is stored in the reject vector. Otherwise, the initialized value of zero remains.

### 4.6.6 Analyzing the Results

The results are contained in the vectors morans and reject. We can use the contents of morans to get the summary descriptive statistics for the Moran's I under the simulated null hypothesis, and use it to create histograms and density plots.

For example, the mean and variance in the simulation were (these results will obviously vary from simulation to simulation):

```
> mean(morans)
[1] -0.0744135
> sd(morans)
[1] 0.185987
> summary(morans)
    Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
-0.75700 -0.19800 -0.07318 -0.07441 0.04712 0.50160
```

These estimated moments can now be compared to the theoretical results obtained in section 4.6.2.

The rejection frequency is the sum of rejections (values of 1 in the vector reject) divided by the number of replications (r):

```
> rejfreq <- sum(reject) / r
> rejfreq
[1] 0.018
```

While this seems well below the nominal Type I error of crit $=0.05$, a proper comparison needs to take into account the random variability in the simulation itself. The rejection frequency can be considered to be an estimate for the underlying probability of a series of Bernoulli random variates, each with $p=0.05$. The variance associated with $r$ such draws is $p(1-p) / r$. With $p=0.05$ and $r=1000$, this variance and the corresponding standard error of the simulation experiment are:

```
> varsim <- crit * (1.0 - crit) / r
> varsim
[1] 4.75e-05
> sdsim <- sqrt(varsim)
> sdsim
[1] 0.006892024
```

An interval around the true Type I error of two standard deviations would then be:

```
> simint <- c(crit - 2*sdsim,crit + 2*sdsim)
> simint
[1] 0.03621595 0.06378405
```

Taking this into account, our experiment would suggest that the Moran's I test statistic "significantly" under-rejects the null hypothesis in a small data set of 16 observations, using the rook criterion to define contiguity.

### 4.6.7 Practice

You have now all the pieces to put together a function that simulates Moran's I under the null hypothesis for a generic sample size, number of replications and weights matrix, reporting at a minimum the mean, standard deviation and rejection frequency. Using the examples in Exercise 3, you can also create density plots or histograms for the simulated statistic. You can assess the difference in the properties of the test statistic between rook and queen definition of contiguity and compare to when a torus adjustment is made. You can experiment with distributions other than the normal as well.

As a challenge, you can also consider what it would take to compute the inference under the randomization assumption.

## Simulating Moran's I

For example, consider the following small function to run the simulations for any rectangular lattice, using the rook contiguity and the randomization option to carry out inference. Note that this function is slow, since it uses the built-in moran.test function (and associated overhead) in each iteration. For simulations, considerable speed up can be obtained by limiting the computations purely to the necessary items, without the overhead associated with all the features of a function like moran.test.

```
# sim.moran.rand.R
# generates reference distribution for Moran's I
# calculates rejection frequency using randomization
# Usage:
# sim.moran.rand(rn,cn,rpl)
# Arguments
# rn: number of rows in the lattice
# cn: number of columns in the lattice
# rpl: number of replications
sim.moran.rand <- function(rn,cn,rpl,pvalue=0.05)
{
    morans <- vector(mode="numeric",length=rpl)
    reject <- vector(mode="numeric",length=rpl)
    W <- nb2listw(cell2nb(rn, cn))
    n <- rn * cn
    for (i in 1:rpl){
            y <- rnorm(n)
            mi <- moran.test(y,w,alternative="two.sided")
            morans[i] <- mi$statistic
            if (mi$p.value) { reject[i] <- 1}
            }
        rejfreq <- sum(reject) / rpi
        value <- list(morans = morans, rej = rejfreq)
}
```

To run this function, source it first (>source("sim.moran.rand.R")), then invoke it, for example. as in:

```
> resu <- sim.moran.rand(5,5,1000)
```

The result is a list containing a vector with all the computed statistics in resu\$morans and the rejection frequency in resu\$rej:
> resu\$rej
[1] 0.06
A pdf file with a frequency plot of the simulated distribution is constructed as:

```
> pdf(file="moransim.pdf")
> plot.density(zz,main="Moran's I under Null - Randomization",
+ xlab="Reference Distribution",lwd=2,col=2)
> dev.off()
```

The resulting plot is given in Figure 4.2 on p. 59. Other summaries are possible as well, such as histograms, qq plots or descriptive statistics.


Figure 4.2: Moran's I Under the Null.

## Exercise 5

## Monte Carlo Simulation (2) Assessing the Properties of an Estimator

### 5.1 Objectives

The purpose of this exercise is to develop some further skills in designing and carrying out a Monte Carlo simulation experiment, this time focused on the properties of an estimator. The main objective is to obtain results for the bias, standard error and mean squared error of an estimator for different scenarios of error distributions. Along the way, we will review ordinary least squares regression in $R$, as well as how to simulate spatially correlated error terms (using spdep).

As before, make sure spdep is loaded before starting the exercises, using library (spdep), and that the columbus data frame is attached.

### 5.2 Ordinary Least Squares Regression

We will focus on the ordinary least squares estimator in the linear regression model:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y=X \beta+\epsilon, \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y$ is a $n$ by 1 vector of observations on the dependent variable, $X$ is a $n$ by $k$ matrix of observations on the explanatory variables with matching $k$ by 1 coefficient vector $\beta$, and $\epsilon$ is a $n$ by 1 vector of random error terms.

For now, we will assume that the error terms are independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.).

The familiar OLS estimator for $\beta, \hat{\beta}$ is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{\beta}=\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1} X^{\prime} y, \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left(X^{\prime} X\right)$ is a $k$ by $k$ matrix and $X^{\prime} y$ is a $k$ by 1 vector.
Under the classical regularity conditions, the OLS estimator is unbiased, such that $E[\hat{\beta}]=\beta$ and its precision can be obtained from

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\beta}]=\sigma^{2}\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sigma^{2}$ is the unknown error variance, estimated as $\hat{\sigma^{2}}=e^{\prime} e /(n-k)$, with $e=y-X \hat{\beta}$ as the vector of OLS residuals.

### 5.2.1 OLS Using Im

The standard approach to get OLS estimates in R is to use the linear model or lm functionality. This gets passed a formula object, which takes the form $\mathrm{y} \sim \mathrm{x} 1+\mathrm{x} 2$, where y is the dependent variable and the variables to the right of the $\sim$ are the explanatory variables. Check help(lm) for extensive documentation of the various options.

For example, using the columbus data frame and the variables CRIME, INC, and HOVAL, the standard regression yields:

```
> col1 <- lm(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL)
> summary(col1)
Call:
lm(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & \(3 Q\) & Max \\
-34.418 & -6.388 & -1.580 & 9.052 & 28.649
\end{tabular}
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
(Intercept) & 68.6190 & 4.7355 & 14.490 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *\) \\
INC & -1.5973 & 0.3341 & -4.780 & \(1.83 \mathrm{e}-05\) & \(* * *\) \\
HOVAL & -0.2739 & 0.1032 & -2.654 & \(0.0109 *\)
\end{tabular}
```

---

```
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 11.43 on 46 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.5524, Adjusted R-squared: 0.5329
F-statistic: 28.39 on 2 and 46 DF, p-value: 9.34e-09
```

The result object coll has many attributes, including the vector of coefficients, col1\$coefficients, the vector of residuals, col1\$residuals, and the predicted values, col1\$fitted.values.

### 5.2.2 OLS Matrix Algebra

In a simulation experiment, one needs to avoid recomputing items that do not change between replications. For example, if an OLS estimation is part of a replication loop, and the design matrix $(X)$ does not change between replications, using a call to 1 m is not a good idea. Instead, you want to compute all the parts that do not change before the loop is started and only keep what changes inside the loop.

In the case of OLS, this means that we need to compute the estimates by using matrix algebra. From equation 5.2 , we know that this involves the computation of two cross products, the inverse of a cross product, and the product of a matrix with a vector. The matrix products are straightforward to implement, using the crossprod and $\% * \%$ operators. The inverse is something that usually requires some care, and for numerical stability a Cholesky decomposition or qr approach is often preferable. For this example, we will use the solve operator. This supports two operations, the inverse of a matrix, such as solve(A), and the solution to a system of linear equations, as solve( $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{b}$ ), where the result equals $A^{-1} b$.

### 5.2.3 Example

Before proceeding to the solution of the OLS normal equations, we first need to turn the relevant elements of the columbus data frame into vectors and matrices. For the dependent variable, this is a simple assignment:

```
> y <- CRIME
> y
    [1] 15.725980 18.801754 30.626781 ... 0.178269
    [8] 38.425858 30.515917 34.000835 ... 57.066132
[43] 36.663612 25.962263 29.028488 ... 22.541491
```

For the matrix of observations on the explanatory variables, $X$, we use the cbind function and exploit the recycling rule to add a vector of ones as the first column:

```
> X <- cbind(1,INC,HOVAL)
> X
            INC HOVAL
    [1,] 1 19.531 80.467
    [2,] 1 21.232 44.567
[49,] 1 18.796 35.800
```

Note how even though we only include the scalar 1 , the recycling rule turns this into a vector of the same length as the other two vectors.

Next, we need to construct the matrix of cross products $X^{\prime} X$ and the vector $X^{\prime} y$ :

```
> XX <- crossprod(X)
> XX
INC HOVAL
    49.000 704.372 1883.375
INC 704.372 11686.673 29600.442
HOVAL 1883.375 29600.442 88757.619
> Xy <- crossprod(X,y)
> Xy
        [,1]
        1721.312
INC 21557.532
HOVAL 57640.624
```

Note how we only need to specify X as the argument in the first crossprod operation, since R constructs $X^{\prime} X$ by default. The inverse $\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1}$ follows directly, as:

```
> XXi <- solve(XX)
> XXi
```

|  | INC | HOVAL |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 0.171498009 | -0.0072068055 | -0.0012356172 |
| INC | -0.007206805 | 0.0008538132 | -0.0001318211 |
| HOVAL -0.001235617 | -0.0001318211 | 0.0000814476 |  |
| $>$ XX $\% * \%$ XXi |  |  |  |

```
            INC HOVAL
                1.000000e+00 3.018903e-17 7.543415e-18
    INC -5.933489e-15 1.000000e+00 -1.250043e-16
    HOVAL -1.711690e-14 -1.422552e-15 1.000000e+00
```

The OLS estimates follow as:

```
> bols <- XXi %*% Xy
> bols
```

    [,1]
        68.6189611
    INC -1.5973108
HOVAL -0. 2739315

A more efficient (and numerically more accurate) way is to include both XX and Xy in the solve operation, as:

```
> b <- solve(XX,Xy)
> b
    [,1]
    68.6189611
INC -1.5973108
HOVAL -0.2739315
```

The drawback of this for our simulation is that it does not give us a separate $\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1}$, which is the part that remains constant between replications. Also, we need the inverse separately if we want to compute the standard errors of the OLS estimates and the usual t-test statistics.

First, we need to obtain an estimate for the error variance. This requires the calculation of the residuals and their sum of squares, which then need to be divided by the degrees of freedom, as:

```
> e <- y - X %*% b
>e
[,1]
    [1,] 0.3465419
    [2,] -3.6947990
...
    [49,] -6.2476690
> ee <- crossprod(e)
> ee
```

```
                    [,1]
    [1,] 6014.893
> vare <- ee / (nrow(X) - ncol(X))
> vare
    [,1]
    [1,] 130.7585
    > sqrt(vare)
    [,1]
    [1,] 11.43497
```

Compare to the results printed in the summary of the lm function.
The standard errors of the estimates are the square roots of the diagonal elements of the matrix $\hat{\sigma^{2}}\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1}$. We extract these by means of the diag function and apply the square root function, to yield:

```
> varb <- vare * diag(XXi)
> seb <- sqrt(varb)
> seb
[1] 4.7354861 0.3341308 0.1031987
```

Note how we do not need to use the matrix multiplication operator to multiply the scalar vare with the diagonal elements of the inverse matrix. The t-test statistics then follow as the ratio of the coefficient estimates over their standard error:

```
> tb <- b / seb
> tb
    [,1]
        14.490373
INC -4.780496
HOVAL -2.654409
```

The associated probabilities are found from the Student $t$ distribution (note the use of the abs function for this to work properly):

```
> pb <- pt(abs(tb),df=nrow(X)-ncol(X),lower.tail=FALSE) * 2
> pb
```

    [,1]
    \(9.210890 \mathrm{e}-19\)
    INC $1.828960 \mathrm{e}-05$
HOVAL $1.087450 \mathrm{e}-02$
Again, compare to the output of 1 m applied to the Columbus example.

### 5.2.4 Practice

Use the POLICE sample data set to replicate the regression in the $1992 R e$ gional Science and Urban Economics Kelejian-Robinson article. For simplicity, you could also use a subset of the regressors. The Kelejian-Robinson specification was a regression of police expenditures on the tax rate, intergovernmental transfers, per capital income, crime rate, unemployment rate, home ownership, percent college, percent white and percent commuters (see Kelejian and Robinson 1992, pp. 323-324). Use both the standard Im function as well as an explicit matrix computation.

## Kelejian-Robinson Baseline OLS Regression

```
> police.ols <- lm(POLICE ~ TAX + TRANSFER + INC + CRIME +
+ UNEMP + OWN + COLLEGE + WHITE + COMMUTE)
> summary(police.ols)
Call:
lm(formula = POLICE ~ TAX + TRANSFER + INC + CRIME + UNEMP +
    OWN + COLLEGE + WHITE + COMMUTE)
Residuals:
    Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
-841.75 -99.18 15.94 127.21 1007.11
Coefficients:
                    Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) -4.858e+02 5.136e+02 -0.946 0.3474
TAX 2.182e-01 4.715e-01 0.463 0.6450
TRANSFER 7.553e-02 2.819e-03 26.789 < 2e-16 ***
INC 1.028e-01 5.031e-02 2.043 0.0447 *
CRIME 1.331e+00 1.661e-01 8.011 1.46e-11 ***
UNEMP -1.990e+01 1.724e+01 -1.154 0.2522
OWN -7.929e+00 5.658e+00 -1.401 0.1654
COLLEGE -3.686e-01 4.013e+00 -0.092 0.9271
WHITE -3.408e-01 2.586e+00 -0.132 0.8955
```

```
COMMUTE 3.268e+00 2.996e+00 1.091 0.2789
---
Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*'0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
Residual standard error: 272.4 on 72 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.9708, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9671
F-statistic: 265.9 on 9 and 72 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```


### 5.3 Spatial Autoregressive Random Variables

In Exercise 4, we conducted a simulation experiment under the null, when it was not necessary to specify a particular form or magnitude for the spatial autocorrelation. In order to obtain spatially autocorrelated random variables, we will need to apply a transformation that turns uncorrelated variates into correlated ones. We will focus on spatial autoregressive (SAR) and spatial moving average (SMA) processes, although this by no means exhausts the set of possibilities. In this section, we deal with SAR processes. SMA processes are treated in section 5.4.

In its simplest form, a spatial autoregressive process is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon=\rho W \epsilon+u \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u$ and $\epsilon$ are $n$ by 1 random vectors, $\rho$ is the autoregressive parameter, and $W$ is a $n$ by $n$ spatial weights matrix. The $u$ vector is i.i.d., and $\epsilon$ is spatially correlated. We can obtain $\epsilon$ directly from $u$ by means of a so-called spatial autoregressive transformation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon=(I-\rho W)^{-1} u \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The package spdep contains the function invIrM which constructs the inverse matrix $(I-\rho W)^{-1}$ required in a spatial autoregressive transformation. It takes as arguments a neighbor list (nb) or weights list (listw) object, followed by a value for the autoregressive parameter (rho). In addition, a list of general weights can be optionally included, as well as a specific style for the weights (the default is style="W", a row-standardized weights matrix). The result is an $n$ by $n$ matrix. In contrast to the original spatial weights, which tend to be sparse, the inverse is typically dense, requiring a lot of memory for larger data sets.

### 5.3.1 Example

Use the col.gal.nb neighbor list for Columbus to create a spatial autoregressive transformation matrix, with 0.5 for the autoregressive parameter:

```
> c05 <- invIrM(col.gal.nb,0.5)
```

Now use this transformation matrix to turn a vector of 49 standard (uncorrelated) random variates into a vector of spatially correlated random variables, as: ${ }^{1}$

```
> uu <- rnorm(49)
```

$>$ mean(uu);sd(uu)
[1] 0.2138447
[1] 1.247263
> e05 <- c05 \%*\% uu
$>$ mean(e05);sd(e05)
[1] 0.3113457
[1] 1.397368
Check with a Moran spatial autocorrelation test:

```
> moran.test(e05,nb2listw(col.gal.nb),randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
    Moran's I test under normality
data: e05
weights: nb2listw(col.gal.nb)
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 3.4981, p-value = 0.0004687
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.308448612 -0.020833333 0.008860962
```


### 5.3.2 Practice

Use one of the spatial weights created for the regular lattices in Exercise 4, or the spatial weights for the police sample data set to generate vectors

[^12]with spatially autocorrelated normal random variables. Experiment with different values for the spatial autoregressive parameter and check if the moran.test rejects the null. Specifically, check for small values of rho, such as 0.1 or 0.05 .

## Creating Spatially Autoregressive Variables

Consider a simple function (without any error checking) that takes as arguments a vector, a nb object and a value for the autoregressive parameter. It uses this and the spdep function invIrW to create a spatial autoregressive transformation.

```
# sar.transform
# transform a vector into spatially autoregressive vector
# Usage:
# sar.transform(x,w,rho)
# Arguments:
# x: vector of values
# w: spatial weights nb object
# rho: spatial autoregressive coefficient
# Value:
# vector
# uses spdep invIrM
# WARNING: no error checking!
sar.transform <- function(x,w,rho)
{
    irw <- invIrM(w,rho)
    wx <- irw %*% x
    wx
}
```

Create a spatial autoregressive transformation of the POLICE variable, and test for spatial autocorrelation as:

```
> source("sar.transform.R")
> wpolice05 <- sar.transform(POLICE,polgal,0.5)
> moran.test(wpolice05,polrook,alternative="two.sided")
```

Moran's I test under randomisation

```
data: wpolice05
weights: polrook
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 6.1307, p-value = 8.752e-10
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.365968180 -0.012345679 0.003807943
```


### 5.4 Spatial Moving Average Random Variables

A spatial moving average process is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon=\rho W u+u . \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to construct a random variable that follows this process, no inverse is required, but only the sum of a random variable and its spatial lag, the latter multiplied by the spatial parameter. This is a simple operation that does not require matrix operations, but can be implemented using the sparse lag.listw function in spdep.

### 5.4.1 Example

Using the same col.gal.nb neighbor list and the same vector of standard normal variates uu as in Section 5.3.1, create a spatial lag for the random vector:

```
> wu <- lag.listw(nb2listw(col.gal.nb),uu)
```

Now, carry out a spatial moving average transformation as:

```
> em05 <- 0.5 * wu + uu
> mean(em05);sd(em05)
[1] 0.2490343
[1] 1.279354
```

Compare the degree of spatial autocorrelation to that of the SAR counterpart with a moran.test:

```
> moran.test(em05,nb2listw(col.gal.nb),randomisation=FALSE,
+ alternative="two.sided")
```

```
    Moran's I test under normality
data: em05
weights: nb2listw(col.gal.nb)
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 2.5339, p-value = 0.01128
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.217686051 -0.020833333 0.008860962
```


### 5.4.2 Practice

Use the same weights and normal random variates as in 5.3.2 to create a new random vector that follows a spatial moving average process. Compare the degree of spatial autocorrelation as indicated by a Moran test for different values of the spatial parameter.

## Creating Spatial Moving Average Variables

Again, consider a simple function (without any error checking) that takes as arguments a vector, a nb object and a value for the spatial moving average parameter. It uses this and the spdep function lag. listw to create a spatial moving average transformation.

```
# sma.transform
# transform a vector into spatial moving average vector
# Usage:
# sma.transform(x,w,rho)
# Arguments:
# x: vector of values
# w: spatial weights nb object
# rho: spatial autoregressive coefficient
# Value:
# vector
# uses spdep lag.listw
# WARNING: no error checking!
sma.transform <- function(x,w,rho)
{
    wx <- lag.listw(nb2listw(w),x)
```

```
    smax <- rho * wx + x
    smax
}
```

As before, source the function and invoke it to transform the POLICE variable into a moving average form.

```
> source("sma.transform.R")
> smapolice05 <- sma.transform(POLICE,polgal,0.5)
> moran.test(smapolice05,polrook,alternative="two.sided")
Moran's I test under randomisation
data: smapolice05
weights: polrook
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 5.1891, p-value = 2.113e-07
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Moran I statistic Expectation Variance
    0.302526841 -0.012345679 0.003682022
```


### 5.5 A Simulation Experiment

We will implement a simple simulation experiment to assess the properties of the OLS estimator when the regression error term follows a spatial autoregressive process. We know from theory that OLS should remain unbiased, but will be less efficient than for i.i.d. errors. Also, the standard errors of the estimates as suggested by OLS will be biased and tend to underestimate the true variability of the estimates.

The basic design of the experiment consists of generating vectors of simulated "observations" on $y$ by using $y=X \beta+\epsilon$, for a fixed matrix $X$ and a given parameter vector $\beta$. The $\epsilon$ vectors are constructed by a spatial autoregressive transformation. Starting with an i.i.d. random vector $u$, a value for the parameter $\rho$ and a spatial weights matrix, $\epsilon=(I-\rho W)^{-1} u$. The simulated $\epsilon$ is added to $X \beta$ to yield the $y$ vector. The product $X \beta$ is fixed and must only be computed once, so it should be outside the main simulation loop.

There are many design aspects that need to be controlled for in a simulation experiment such as this one. Paradoxically, one aspect that requires
very little attention is the choice of the value for the true $\beta$ parameters. Typically, one takes a single vector of random $X$ values and sets $\beta=1$ for simplicity. In order to make sure the regressions have a similar and reasonable fit, the variance of the simulated $X$ is chosen together with the variance of the error term. Consider that the true regression total variance (of $y$ ) can be decomposed into variance due to $X$ and variance due to the error term, we select the two variances such that the regression $R^{2}$ is something like 0.9 . For example, we could randomly generate $X$ as a normal variate with mean zero and variance 9 , and the error term as a standard normal variate. This would yield regressions with "on average" an $R^{2}$ of 0.9 . Note that this only holds under the null of no spatial autocorrelation. The spatially correlated error terms will no longer be homoskedastic, so that the notion of an $R^{2}$ is not valid in a strict sense, nor is there a common error variance.

The properties of the estimator can be quantified in a number of ways. First, we consider the bias of the estimator, which is estimated as the difference between the average of $\hat{\beta}$ across all replications and the true parameter value $\beta$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { bias }=\sum_{r} \hat{\beta}_{r} / R-\beta \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $R$ is the total number of replications. The precision of the estimator can be measured as the variance (or, standard error) of the reference distribution of the $\hat{\beta}_{r}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\beta}]=(1 / R) \sum_{r}\left(\hat{\beta}_{r}-\overline{\hat{\beta}}\right)^{2}, \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\overline{\hat{\beta}}=\sum_{r} \hat{\beta}_{r} / R$, and the standard error is the square root of this result. The result for the simulated data can be compared to its theoretical counterpart, the matching diagonal element in $\sigma^{2}\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1}$ with $\sigma^{2}$ replaced by the value chosen for the simulated error term.

Alternatively, the measure of precision can be computed with respect to the true value of $\beta$, yielding the mean squared error (MSE):

$$
\begin{equation*}
M S E[\hat{\beta}]=(1 / R) \sum_{r}\left(\hat{\beta}_{r}-\beta\right)^{2} . \tag{5.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The MSE is particularly appropriate when comparing estimators that are not necessarily unbiased, since it consists of the sum of the variance and the squared bias. For an unbiased estimator, the latter is zero ("in expected value") and MSE and variance are the same.

### 5.5.1 Setting up the Experiment

The simulation experiment will require the following steps:

- initialization of parameters
- set the number of replications (r), sample size (n), value range for the autoregressive parameters (rho), variance of the error terms (sigma)
- initialization and preprocessing of $X$ matrix
- generate a random vector ( x ) with variance such that the regression $R^{2}$ is a given target value (e.g., 0.9).
- create the X matrix as $1+\mathrm{x}$, this implicitly sets $\beta$ to (1.0, 1.0)
- compute XXi $=\left(X^{\prime} X\right)^{-1}$
- compute vb2 $=\sigma^{2}\left(X^{\prime} X\right)_{2,2}^{-1}$, the theoretical variance of OLS
- initialization and preprocessing of spatial weights
- create a neighbor object for a chosen regular lattice layout (cell2nb)
- if needed, convert neighbor object to list weights (nb2listw)
- initialize vector (or matrix) to hold estimated coefficients
- loop over values for rho
- create SAR transformation matrix for given rho and weights (invIrM)
- main simulation loop
- generate i.i.d. random vector uu
- transform uu to spatially autoregressive vector eps
- compute dependent variable vector $\mathrm{y}=\mathrm{Xb}+\mathrm{eps}$
- compute cross product $\mathrm{Xy}=X^{\prime} y$
- obtain OLS estimate $\mathrm{b}=\mathrm{XXi} \% * \% \mathrm{Xy}$
- store bin results vector
- summarize results
- compute average b
- compute bias
- compute variance of $b$
- compare variance to "theoretical" variance
- compute MSE of b
- (optional) graph reference distribution of $b$


### 5.5.2 Example

We start with the various initializations, to keep things generic for later incorporation into a function:

```
> n <- 49
r r <- 1000
> rho <- c(0.0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9)
```

Next we construct the X matrix, its cross product and inverse:

```
> X <- cbind(1,rnorm(n,0,3))
> XX <- crossprod(X)
> XX
[,1] [,2]
[1,] 49.000000 -3.904727
[2,] -3.904727 391.827489
> XXi <- solve(XX)
> XXi
    [,1] [,2]
[1,] 0.0204243828 0.0002035376
[2,] 0.0002035376 0.0025541719
> vb2 <- XXi[2,2]
> vb2
[1] 0.002554172
```

Note that we use 3 as the standard deviation in the standard normal variate (to obtain a variance of 9 ) and how again the recycling rule is exploited to create the constant term. The theoretical variance of the OLS estimator for $\beta_{2}$ is extracted as the $[2,2]$ element of the variance matrix (since $\sigma^{2}=1$ ). Also, the value of $X \beta$ can be pre-computed as the row sum of the matrix X (rather than an explicit matrix-vector multiplication):
> Xb <- rowSums (X)

Now, we construct a neighbor list for rook contiguity on a 7 by 7 regular lattice. The spatial autoregressive transformation is different for each value of rho, so that must be carried out inside the loop over the values of rho:

```
> w <- cell2nb(7,7)
```

Next, initialize the matrix that will hold the results for $\beta_{2}$ (the slope) for each of the values of rho ( 0.0 to 0.9 , as columns) and in each of the replications:

```
> bres <- matrix(0, nrow=r, ncol= length(rho))
> bres
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrr} 
& {\([, 1]\)} & {\([, 2]\)} & {\([, 3]\)} & {\([, 4]\)} & {\([, 5]\)} \\
{\([1]\),} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
    [999,] 0
[1000,] 0
```

We are now ready for the main simulation loop. There is actually a double loop, one over the elements of rho, the second over the replications. In the outer loop, the spatial autoregressive transformation matrix is built for the corresponding value of rho. In the inner loop, the random errors are generated and transformed, the "observed" y is constructed, the regression is estimated and the result for $\hat{\beta}$ stored in bres:

```
> for (j in 1:length(rho)) {
+ iw <- invIrM(w,rho[j])
+ for (i in 1:r) {
+ e <- iw %*% rnorm(n)
+ y <- Xb + e
+ Xy <- crossprod(X,y)
+ b <- XXi %*% Xy
+ bres[i,j] <- b[2]
+ }
+ }
```

The summary characteristics of the OLS estimator are:

```
> summary(bres)
\begin{tabular}{llllll} 
X1 & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ X2 } & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ X3 } & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ X4 } \\
Min. \(\quad: 0.8474\) & Min. & \(: 0.8357\) & Min. \(: 0.8364\) & Min. \(: 0.8155\) \\
1st Qu.:0.9670 & 1st Qu.:0.9663 & 1st Qu.:0.9640 & 1st Qu.:0.9637
\end{tabular}
```

| Median :0.9996 | Median :1.0015 | Median :0.9986 | Median :1.0013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean :0.9993 | Mean :1.0006 | Mean :0.9999 | Mean :1.0006 |
| 3rd Qu.:1.0333 | 3rd Qu.:1.0361 | 3rd Qu.:1.0349 | 3rd Qu.:1.0392 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max. } \quad: 1.1515 \\ & \text { X5 } \end{aligned}$ | Max. :1.1707 | Max. : 1.2232 | Max. :1.1838 |
| Min. 00.7475 |  |  |  |
| 1st Qu.:0.9337 |  |  |  |
| Median :0.9990 |  |  |  |
| Mean :0.9985 |  |  |  |
| 3rd Qu.:1.0607 |  |  |  |
| Max. $: 1.2515$ |  |  |  |

This illustrates how the mean and median don't change much from the expected value of 1 , but the range of the distribution widens with $\rho$ (first slightly, but then quite dramatically with $\rho=0.9$ ). More precise characteristics of the distribution are the average (bavg, note the use of the function colMeans), the bias (bias), variance (varb, note again the use of colMeans), the standard error (sdeb), difference with the theoretical standard error (the square root of vb2), and the mean squared error (mseb):

```
> bavg <- colMeans(bres)
> bavg
[1] 0.9993119 1.0006317 0.9999488 1.0006297 0.9985044
> bias <- bavg - 1.0
> bias
[1] -6.880809e-04 6.316951e-04 -5.124518e-05 6.296576e-04
    -1.495599e-03
> varb <- colMeans((bres - bavg)^2)
> varb
[1] 0.002373828 0.002616419 0.002882452 0.003484847 0.008237334
> sdeb <- sqrt(varb)
> sdeb
[1] 0.04872195 0.05115094 0.05368848 0.05903260 0.09075976
> sdeb - sqrt(vb2)
[1] -0.0018168670 0.0006121246 0.0031496605 0.0084937801
    0.0402209418
> mseb <- colMeans((bres - 1)^2)
> mseb
[1] 0.002371185 0.002614124 0.002878571 0.003485413 0.008236709
In essence, the OLS estimator remains unbiased, even with \(\rho=0.9\), but its variance, standard error and mean squared error are affected. They increase
```

with $\rho$, first slightly, but then much more so for $\rho=0.9$.
To end in beauty, we will plot the empirical densities for the estimates obtained in the simulation, for each of the values of $\rho$ and use some fancy plotting techniques to combine them all in one graph, plot in different colors, and add a legend to boot. As in Exercise 3, we start by turning the columns of the matrix bres into density objects, zz0 through zz4:

```
> zz0 <- density(bres[,1])
> zz1 <- density(bres[,2])
> zz2 <- density(bres[,3])
> zz3 <- density(bres[,4])
> zz4 <- density(bres[,5])
```

Next, we draw a density plot for the last graph (zz4), set the main title and the label for the x-axis (xlab), and specify the color to be red (2). In addition, to make sure that all the plots will fit on the same graph, we use the min and max values from the summary (bres) to set the xlim and ylim parameters (the range for the values on the $x$ - and $y$-axis respectively). We further add the other graphs as lines (since the add option is not implemented for a density.plot), specifying the x -value as $\mathbf{z z} \$ \mathrm{x}$ and the $y$-value as zz $\$ y$, with a different color for each. Finally, we add a legend (one of the more complex but also more powerful options). We set the coordinates for the upper left corner, specify the text for the legend (using paste to add the words rho $=$ in front of the value taken from the rho vector), set the type to line (lty=1), in the same dimension as the legend "words" (i.e., a five element vector), and set the matching colors in a vector (col):

```
> plot.density(zz4,main="Density of beta hat",xlab="beta hat",
+ xlim=c(0.7,1.3),ylim=c(0,8),col=2)
> lines(zz3$x,zz3$y,col=6)
> lines(zz2$x,zz2$y,col=5)
> lines(zz1$x,zz1$y,col=3)
> lines(zz0$x,zz0$y,col=4)
> legend(0.7,8,paste("rho = ",rho),lty=c(1,1,1,1,1),
+ col=c(4,3,5,6,2))
```

The result looks like Figure 5.1, illustrating the effect of $\rho$ on the spread of the distribution (of course, you need colors to distinguish the lines).


Figure 5.1: Empirical Distribution of $\hat{\beta}$ for different $\rho$.

### 5.5.3 Practice

You can now combine the various commands into a function that allows you to make the sample size generic, specify the type of distribution for the error term, include both spatial autoregressive as well as spatial moving average transformations, etc. In addition, you could try to assess the effect on OLS of an omitted spatial lag variable (the transformation is slightly more complex than in the error case). The sky is the limit ...

## Exercise 6

## Regression Diagnostics for Spatial Autocorrelation

### 6.1 Objectives

This exercise provides and overview of specification testing for spatial autocorrelation in regression residuals. We will build upon the basic linear regression reviewed in Section 5.2 and use as a running example the homicide regression for Southern US counties, detailed in Chapters 24 and 25 of the GeoDa Workbook (Anselin 2005). We will focus on Moran's I for regression residuals and on the Lagrange Multiplier test statistics for spatial error and spatial lag correlation.

### 6.2 Preliminaries

As before, make sure spdep is loaded before starting the exercises, using library (spdep).

First, we will create two text files containing a subset of the variables from the SOUTH data set. For the purposes of this exercise, we will be using the variables pertaining to 1960 and 1990 and create a different data frame for each. Use the same approach as outlined in Section 2.2.1. Specifically, load the south. shp file into GeoDa, with FIPSNO as the Key Variable. Select Tools > Data Export > Ascii. In the dialog, specify south.dbf as the input file and south60.txt as the output file. Select FIPSNO, HR60, RD60, PS60, MA60, DV60 and UE60. ${ }^{1}$

[^13]

Figure 6.1: Cumulative first and second order rook weights

Next, click on Export and Done to finish. Check the contents of the south.txt file and make sure it shows 1412,7 on the first line and the variable names on the second line. The data, record by record, and commadelimited make up the remainder. Copy the file to the R working directory if it is not there already.

Repeat the same procedure to create a file south 90 .txt with the variables FIPSNO, HR90, RD90, PS90, MA90, DV90 and UE90.

Also create two spatial weights files. One is a simple rook contiguity (southrk.gal), the other one that uses a cumulative first and second order rook criterion. For the latter, in GeoDa, select Tools > Weights > Create, enter south.shp as the input file and southrk12.gal as the output file and FIPSNO as the ID. Select the rook criterion, change the order of contiguity to 2 and check the box to Include all the lower orders, as shown in Figure 6.1. For the first order rook weights, proceed in the same way, but leave the option to rook.

Copy all the files to the R working directory. First, create a separate data frame for the south60 and south90 data and make sure the variables are entered properly, as in:

```
> south60 <- read.csv("south60.txt",header=TRUE,skip=1)
> summary(south60)
    FIPSNO HR60 RD60
    Min. : 1001 Min. : 0.000 Min. :-1.85781
    1st Qu.:13284 1st Qu.: 3.213 1st Qu.: 0.04904
    Median :37088 Median : 6.245 Median : 0.66042
    Mean :31936 Mean : 7.292 Mean : 0.68974
    3rd Qu.:48158 3rd Qu.: 9.956 3rd Qu.: 1.32815
    Max. :54109 Max. :92.937 Max. : 3.45354
```

here are slightly different. Check the article and the code book for the nat.shp sample data set for a detailed explanation of the variables and theoretical background.
and

```
> south90 <- read.csv("south90.txt",header=TRUE,skip=1)
> summary(south90)
    FIPSNO HR90 RD90
    Min. : 1001 Min. : 0.000 Min. :-2.2006
    1st Qu.:13284 1st Qu.: 4.805 1st Qu.:-0.1021
Median :37088 Median : 8.221 Median : 0.3720
Mean :31936 Mean : 9.549 Mean : 0.5536
3rd Qu.:48158 3rd Qu.:13.038 3rd Qu.: 1.1203
Max. :54109 Max. :64.261 Max. : 5.5831
```

Next, with spdep active, turn both gal text files into a neighbor object by means of the read.gal function, as in:

```
> srk12 <- read.gal("southrk12.gal",override.id=TRUE)
> summary(srk12)
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 1412
Number of nonzero links: 23768
Percentage nonzero weights: 1.192129
Average number of links: 16.83286
Link number distribution:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrr}
2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
1 & 4 & 4 & 8 & 9 & 11 & 31
\end{tabular}
1 least connected region:
54029 with 2 links
1 most connected region:
51015 with 29 links
and finally into a listw object as in:
```

```
> srk12w <- nb2listw(srk12)
```

> srk12w <- nb2listw(srk12)
> summary(srk12w)
> summary(srk12w)
Characteristics of weights list object:
Characteristics of weights list object:
Neighbour list object:
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 1412
Number of regions: 1412
Number of nonzero links: 23768

```
Number of nonzero links: 23768
```

Percentage nonzero weights: 1.192129
Average number of links: 16.83286
Link number distribution:

| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 31 |

1 least connected region:
54029 with 2 links
1 most connected region:
51015 with 29 links

Weights style: W
Weights constants summary:
n nn S0 S1 S2
W $141219937441412180.5536 \quad 5703.863$
Proceed in the same way for southrk.gal:

```
> srk <- read.gal("southrk.gal",override.id=TRUE)
> srkw <- nb2listw(srk)
> summary(srkw)
Characteristics of weights list object:
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 1412
Number of nonzero links: 7700
Percentage nonzero weights: 0.3862081
Average number of links: 5.453258
Link number distribution:
\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8
\end{tabular}
16
```

Weights style: W
Weights constants summary:
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{n} & \mathrm{nn} & \mathrm{S} 0 & \mathrm{~S} 1 & \mathrm{~S} 2\end{array}$
W 141219937441412552.11015767 .949

We are now ready to start the analysis.

### 6.3 Baseline OLS Regression

We start by creating an lm object that will need to be passed to the specialized functions that carry out the spatial autocorrelation tests. We use the familiar lm function. We start with the analysis for 1960 with HR60 as dependent variable and explanatory variables RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60. First, we attach the south60 data frame so that we can easily refer to the variables:

```
> attach(south60)
> sols60 <- lm(HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
> summary(sols60)
Call:
lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-13.5265 & -3.6178 & -0.8159 & 2.4218 & 88.4821
\end{tabular}
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr (>|t|)
\begin{tabular}{lrrrrr} 
(Intercept) & 13.21547 & 1.12457 & 11.752 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *\) \\
RD60 & 1.76448 & 0.19824 & 8.901 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *\) \\
PS60 & 0.29930 & 0.21426 & 1.397 & 0.163 \\
MA60 & -0.27521 & 0.03806 & -7.230 & \(7.89 \mathrm{e}-13 * * *\) \\
DV60 & 1.17945 & 0.24352 & 4.843 & \(1.42 \mathrm{e}-06 * * *\) \\
UE60 & -0.29186 & 0.07117 & -4.101 & \(4.35 \mathrm{e}-05 * * *\)
\end{tabular}
---
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 6.09 on 1406 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.1037,Adjusted R-squared: 0.1005
F-statistic: 32.52 on 5 and 1406 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

The values are identical to those listed in the GeoDa Workbook (Figure 24.3), as they should be.

We next create a similar object for the 1990 analysis, using the same variables (with a 90 posfix). First detach the south60 data frame and attach the south90 data frame.

```
> detach(south60)
> attach(south90)
> sols90 <- lm(HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
> summary(sols90)
Call:
lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-19.5829 & -3.5137 & -0.7474 & 2.5908 & 41.8327
\end{tabular}
Coefficients:
    Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 8.96250 1.78133 5.031 5.50e-07 ***
RD90 4.58778 0.21457 21.381 < 2e-16 ***
PS90 1.95589 0.20540 9.522 < 2e-16 ***
MA90 -0.04948 0.04890 -1.012 0.312
DV90 0.46159 0.11517 4.008 6.45e-05 ***
UE90 -0.52440 0.07003 -7.489 1.22e-13 ***
---
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 5.861 on 1406 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.3092,Adjusted R-squared: 0.3067
F-statistic: 125.8 on 5 and 1406 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

These results are identical to what is listed in Figure 25.2 of the GeoDa Workbook. Relative to 1960, the overall fit is better in 1990. The significances and signs are generally the same, except for PS not being significant in 1960 while significant in 1990, and the reverse for MA.

### 6.4 Moran's I for Regression Residuals

In order to carry out Moran's I test on the residuals in these regressions, we need to pass the regression object and a spatial weights object (listw) to the lm.morantest function (check the help file for details). The print command provides the results.

We start with the analysis for 1960 using the cumulative weights:

```
> sols60.moran <- lm.morantest(sols60,srk12w)
> sols60.moran
Global Moran's I for regression residuals
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 14.8749, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: greater
sample estimates:
Observed Moran's I Expectation Variance
    1.365683e-01 -2.215366e-03 8.705017e-05
```

Note that the default setting for this statistic is to compute the p-value for a one sided test. To get a two-sided test, the alternative argument must be specified explicitly, as in:

```
> lm.morantest(sols60,srk12w,alternative="two.sided")
Global Moran's I for regression residuals
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 14.8749, p-value < 2. 2e-16
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Observed Moran's I Expectation Variance
    1.365683e-01 -2.215366e-03 8.705017e-05
```

In this example, it does not make a difference, due to the large sample size and the extreme significance of the test statistic. However, in small samples, inference will be affected when the wrong option is used.

For the simple first order rook contiguity weights, the results are very similar:

```
> lm.morantest(sols60,srkw,alternative="two.sided")
```

```
Global Moran's I for regression residuals
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srkw
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 8.3495, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Observed Moran's I Expectation Variance
    0.1356298451 -0.0024963269 0.0002736731
```

The results show a Moran's I statistic of respectively 0.137 and 0.136 , which are highly significant and reject the null hypothesis of uncorrelated error terms.

For 1990, similar results are obtained, with slightly smaller values for the test statistic, 0.122 using the simple rook, and 0.009 using the cumulative rook:

```
> lm.morantest(sols90,srkw,alternative="two.sided")
Global Moran's I for regression residuals
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srkw
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 7.5134, p-value = 5.76e-14
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Observed Moran's I Expectation Variance
    0.1218894764 -0.0023982682 0.0002736415
```

and

```
> lm.morantest(sols90,srk12w,alternative="two.sided")
```

Global Moran's I for regression residuals
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)

```
weights: srk12w
Moran I statistic standard deviate = 9.8644, p-value < 2.2e-16
alternative hypothesis: two.sided
sample estimates:
Observed Moran's I Expectation Variance
    8.993101e-02 -2.133033e-03 8.710495e-05
```


### 6.5 Lagrange Multiplier Test Statistics

The Morans I test statistic has high power against a range of spatial alternatives. However, it does not provide much help in terms of which alternative model would be most appropriate. The Lagrange Multiplier test statistics do allow a distinction between spatial error models and spatial lag models.

Both tests, as well as their robust forms are included in the lm. LMtests function. Again, a regression object and a spatial listw object must be passed as arguments. In addition, the tests must be specified as a character vector (the default is only LMerror), using the c ( ) operator (concatenate), as illustrated below.

First consider the 1960 results, for both spatial weights.

```
> lm.LMtests(sols60,srk12w,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
LMerr = 205.9506, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
RLMerr = 1.8681, df = 1, p-value = 0.1717
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
```

```
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
LMlag = 222.528, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srk12w
RLMlag = 18.4456, df = 1, p-value = 1.748e-05
> lm.LMtests(sols60,srkw,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srkw
LMerr = 66.4285, df = 1, p-value = 3.331e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srkw
RLMerr = 5.1188, df = 1, p-value = 0.02367
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
weights: srkw
LMlag = 80.3219, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
```

```
weights: srkw
RLMlag = 19.0122, df = 1, p-value = 1.299e-05
```

The results are listed in order with LMerr and RLMerr first, followed by LMlag and RLMlag. The values for the srk12w weights correspond to the results shown in Figure 24.4 of the GeoDa Workbook. Both LMerr and LMlag are highly significant, with a slight edge for the latter. In a specification search, this is an inconclusive results, necessitating the consideration of the robust forms of the tests.

These provide a clear preference in favor of the lag alternative. While RLMlag is still strongly significant, for both weights, there is much weaker evidence given by RLMerr. For the srkw weights it is still marginally significant, but much less so than the robust lag test. However, for the srk12w weights it is no longer significant ( $p=0.17$ ), clearly pointing to the lag model as the proper alternative.

Interestingly, the results are the opposite for 1990:

```
> lm.LMtests(sols90,srk12w,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srk12w
LMerr = 89.3063, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srk12w
RLMerr = 22.3826, df = 1, p-value = 2.234e-06
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srk12w
LMlag = 71.6978, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
```

```
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srk12w
RLMlag = 4.774, df = 1, p-value = 0.02889
> lm.LMtests(sols90,srkw,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srkw
LMerr = 53.6508, df = 1, p-value = 2.395e-13
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srkw
RLMerr = 5.5171, df = 1, p-value = 0.01883
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srkw
LMlag = 50.5794, df = 1, p-value = 1.144e-12
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90)
weights: srkw
RLMlag = 2.4457, df = 1, p-value = 0.1178
```

Again, both LMerr and LMlag are highly significant for both weights. However, the robust statistics point to the error model as the proper alternative. For srk12w, RLMlag is only weakly significant ( $\mathrm{p}=0.03$ ), but RLMerr is still very strongly significant. The evidence is clearer for srkw, where RLMlag reaches a p-value of 0.12 , whereas RLMerr is significant with $\mathrm{p}=0.02 .{ }^{2}$

With this information in hand, we can select the spatial lag model as the alternative for 1960 and the spatial error model as the alternative for 1990. Given the magnitude of the test statistics for the different weights, we opt for srkw12 for the lag model in 1960 and srkw for the error model in 1990. Maximum Likelihood estimation is covered in the next chapter.

### 6.6 Practice

Run the diagnostics for the same specification in years 1970 and 1980 and assess whether a spatial lag or error model is the proper model. Alternatively, use the POLICE sample data set and rerun the regression from Kelejian and Robinson (1992), using POLICE as the dependent variable, and TAX, INC, CRIME, UNEMP, OWN, COLLEGE, WHITE and COMMUTE as explanatory variables (see Kelejian and Robinson 1992, pp. 323-324). Does your analysis support the conclusions found in that article. Experiment with different spatial weights to assess the sensitivity of your findings.
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## Exercise 7

## Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Spatial Regression Models

### 7.1 Objectives

This exercise illustrates how to estimate spatial regression models using the maximum likelihood method. Both spatial lag and spatial error models are included. The example continues the analysis of Southern US county homicides from the previous exercise and matches the results in Chapters 24 and 25 of the GeoDa Workbook (Anselin 2005).

### 7.2 Preliminaries

Make sure to have the spdep library active before starting the exerices, or else invoke library (spdep). Also, you will need the data frames and spatial weights for the 1960 and 1990 homicides used in Exercise 6. Refer to Section 6.2 to recreate these if necessary.

### 7.3 ML Estimation of the Spatial Lag Model

Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation of the spatial lag model is carried out with the lagsarlm( ) function. The required arguments are a regression formula, a data set and a listw spatial weights object. The default method uses Ords eigenvalue decomposition of the spatial weights matrix (Ord 1975).

There is also a sparse weights method available which may be necessary for large(r) data sets. However, the inference provided by the sparse method is limited (for details, see the help file).

In our example, we will use the srk12w weights and the south60 data frame, with the same specification as for the OLS regression. The dependent variable is HR60, and the explanatory variables are RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60.

We create a new object as the output of the estimation procedure. This will allow us to extract specific results, such as coefficients, residuals and predicted values.

```
> lag60 <- lagsarlm(HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60,
+data=south60,srk12w)
> summary(lag60)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60,
    data = south60, listw = srk12w)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-14.97132 & -3.25129 & -0.79033 & 2.22485 & 86.27312
\end{tabular}
Type: lag
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
            Estimate Std. Error z value Pr}(>|z|
(Intercept) 6.574961 1.172724 5.6066 2.064e-08
RD60 1.100473 0.196339 5.6050 2.083e-08
PS60 0.037912 0.202678
MA60 -0.175256 0.036712 -4.7738 1.808e-06
DV60 0.935208 0.230386 4.0593 4.922e-05
UE60 -0.132660 0.067353-1.9696 0.04888
Rho: 0.53289 LR test value: 125.07 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Asymptotic standard error: 0.045668 z-value: 11.669 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Wald statistic: 136.16 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Log likelihood: -4488.967 for lag model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 33.045, (sigma: 5.7485)
Number of observations: 1412
Number of parameters estimated: 8
```

```
AIC: 8993.9, (AIC for lm: 9117)
LM test for residual autocorrelation
test value: 4.3536 p-value: 0.03693
```

The results match those reported in Figure 24.9 of the GeoDa Workbook even though GeoDa uses a different numerical approach to maximize the likelihood function. Some caution is needed with the eigenvalue approach used in the sarlaglm function, since it may be numerically unstable for large data sets ( $>1,000$ ). In the current example, that does not seem to be an issue. Note that compared to the OLS results, PS is still not significant, but now UE has become only marginally significant. The autoregressive coefficient of 0.533 is high in magnitude and highly significant.

The output also contains a LM test statistic for remaining spatial error autocorrelation. The value of 4.35 is marginally significant ( $p=0.037$ ) suggesting remaining issues with the specification of the spatial dependence.

Note how different the output is when you specify Matrix as the estimation method instead of the default eigen:

```
> lag60s <- lagsarlm(HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60,
+ data=south60,srk12w,method="Matrix")
> summary(lag60s)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60,
    data = south60, listw = srk12w, method = "Matrix")
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-14.97132 & -3.25129 & -0.79033 & 2.22485 & 86.27312
\end{tabular}
```

| Type: lag |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coefficients: (log likelihood/likelihood ratio) |  |  |  |  |
| Estimate Log likelihood LR statistic |  |  |  | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|z\|)$ |
| (Intercept) | $6.5750 \mathrm{e}+00$ | NA | NA | NA |
| RD60 | $1.1005 \mathrm{e}+00$ | -4.5049e+03 | 31.8236 | $1.688 \mathrm{e}-08$ |
| PS60 | $3.7912 \mathrm{e}-02$ | -4.4890e+03 | 0.0348 | 0.85211 |
| MA60 | -1.7526e-01 | -4.5002e+03 | 22.5635 | $2.033 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| DV60 | $9.3521 \mathrm{e}-01$ | -4.4971e+03 | 16.3583 | $5.243 \mathrm{e}-05$ |
| UE60 | -1.3266e-01 | -4.4908e+03 | 3.7600 | 0.05249 |

Rho: 0.53289 LR test value: 125.07 p-value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$

```
Log likelihood: -4488.967 for lag model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 33.045, (sigma: 5.7485)
Number of observations: 1412
Number of parameters estimated: 8
AIC: 8993.9, (AIC for lm: 9117)
```

While the coefficient estimates are identical, there are quite some differences in terms of the inference. First of all, there is no asymptotic variance for any of the coefficients. Instead, significance is based on a Likelihood Ratio test (LR). For the autoregressive coefficient, this is the LR test for the full model. This shows the same value of 125.07 as with the eigenvalue method. There is no inference for the constant term. For the regression coefficients, the value reported in the column customarily reserved for the asymptotic standard error is actually the $\log$ likelihood of a model where this variable has been dropped from the specification. For example, for RD60, this value is -4504.9 . The next item, customarily reserved for the $t$-value, is the LR test statistic from comparing the log likelihood of the unrestricted model (with the variable) to that of the restricted model (without the variable). Formally, $L R=-2\left(L_{U}-L_{R}\right)$. In our example, the negative difference between -4488.967 and -4504.879 is 15.912 , and twice this value (the LR test statistic) is 31.824 , the value listed in the third column next to RD60. The fourth column shows the p-value for the LR test.

These individual log-likelihoods can also be extracted explicitly from the fitted object, as the list item LLs, using the familiar \$ notation to extract an element from a list:

```
> lag60s$LLs
[[1]]
'log Lik.' -4504.879 (df=7)
[[2]]
'log Lik.' -4488.985 (df=7)
[[3]]
'log Lik.' -4500.249 (df=7)
[[4]]
'log Lik.' -4497.146 (df=7)
[[5]]
'log Lik.' -4490.847 (df=7)
```

Other items of interest are the residuals, e.g., lag60\$residuals, and the predicted (fitted) values, e.g., lag60\$fitted.values. Note that lagsarlm
uses a different approach from GeoDa to compute the predicted values. In $G e o D a$ the latter are obtained from the reduced form, as $\hat{y}=(I-\hat{\rho} W)^{-1} X \hat{\beta}$, whereas lagsarlm uses $\hat{y}=\hat{\rho} W y+X \hat{\beta}$. See Section 24.4 of the GeoDa Workbook for an in-depth discussion of this issue and some illustrations. See also the lagsarlm help file for further technical details on its implementation.

### 7.4 ML Estimation of the Spatial Error Model

ML estimation of the spatial error model is similar to the lag procedure and implemented in the errorsarlm( ) function. Again, the formula, data set and a listw spatial weights object must be specified at a minimum. The default estimation procedure is the eigenvalue decomposition.

To illustrate this, consider the estimation of the homicide specification for 1990, using south90 as the data set, srkw as the weights matrix, and the specification with HR90 as the dependent variable, and RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90 as the explanatory variables.

```
> err90 <- errorsarlm(HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
+ data=south90,srkw)
> summary(err90)
Call:errorsarlm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
    data = south90, listw = srkw)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-18.17590 & -3.50131 & -0.63837 & 2.43642 & 41.70782
\end{tabular}
Type: error
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
            Estimate Std. Error z value Pr}(>|z|
(Intercept) 6.693514 1.958045 3.4185 0.0006297
RD90 4.407396 0.237668 18.5443 < 2.2e-16
PS90 1.766328 0.225652 7.8276 4.885e-15
MA90 -0.016640 0.052990 -0.3140 0.7535090
DV90 0.499146 0.124912 3.9960 6.443e-05
UE90 -0.387841 0.078478-4.9420 7.731e-07
Lambda: 0.29161 LR test value: 52.11 p-value: 5.2491e-13
Asymptotic standard error: 0.037275 z-value: 7.8231 p-value: 5.107e-15
```

```
Wald statistic: 61.201 p-value: 5.107e-15
Log likelihood: -4471.317 for error model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 32.407, (sigma: 5.6927)
Number of observations: 1412
Number of parameters estimated: 8
AIC: 8958.6, (AIC for lm: 9008.7)
```

The results are identical to those listed in Figure 25.6 of the $G e o D a$ Workbook, even though a different numerical optimization approach is used. The results are similar to those obtained with OLS (MA remains insignificant). Again, when specifying the method Matrix the inference differs but not in the same way as for the lag case.

For example, consider the results below:

```
> err90s <- errorsarlm(HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
+ data=south90,srkw,method="Matrix")
> summary(err90s)
Call:errorsarlm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
        data = south90, listw = srkw, method = "Matrix")
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-18.17590 & -3.50131 & -0.63837 & 2.43642 & 41.70782
\end{tabular}
```

| Type: error |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | $\operatorname{Pr}(>\|z\|)$ |
| (Intercept) | 6.693514 | 1.958045 | 3.4185 | 0.0006297 |
| RD90 | 4.407397 | 0.237668 | 18.5443 | < $2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$ |
| PS90 | 1.766328 | 0.225652 | 7.8277 | $4.885 \mathrm{e}-15$ |
| MA90 | -0.016640 | 0.052990 | -0.3140 | 0.7535090 |
| DV90 | 0.499146 | 0.124912 | 3.9960 | $6.443 \mathrm{e}-05$ |
| UE90 | -0.387841 | 0.078478 | -4.9420 | 7.731e-07 |

Lambda: 0.29161 LR test value: 52.11 p-value: $5.2491 \mathrm{e}-13$

Log likelihood: -4471.317 for error model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 32.407, (sigma: 5.6927)

```
Number of observations: 1412
Number of parameters estimated: 8
AIC: 8958.6, (AIC for lm: 9008.7)
```

There is no asymptotic error variance for the autoregressive coefficient. As for the lag, a LR test is used instead. The inference for the regression coefficients is the same as for the eigenvector approach. This is because, unlike what holds for the lag model, the asymptotic variance matrix in the error model is block diagonal between the spatial parameter and the other parameters of the model. The asymptotic variance for the latter is obtained by plugging the estimate for the spatial autoregressive coefficient into the familiar FGLS expression. In the lag model, there is no such simple block diagonal shape.

Specific components of the fitted model can be extracted in the usual fashion. For example, residuals are obtained as err90\$residuals and predicted values as err90\$fitted.values. See the help file for details.

### 7.5 Spatial Durbin Model

An important specification test in the spatial error model is a test on the so-called spatial common factor hypothesis. This exploits the property that a spatial error model can also be specified in spatial lag form, with the spatially lagged explanatory variables included, but with constraints on the parameters (the common factor constraints). The spatial lag form of the error model is also referred to as the spatial Durbin specification. In spdep, this is implemented by specifying the mixed option for type in the spatial lag estimation (the spatially lagged explanatory variables need not be specified).

To assess whether the common factor constraints are satisfied for the spatial error model of HR90, we run the same specification as a lag model, with the type="mixed" option.

```
> lag90durbin <- lagsarlm(HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
+ data=south90,srkw,type="mixed")
> summary(lag90durbin)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR90 ~ RD90 + PS90 + MA90 + DV90 + UE90,
    data = south90, listw = srkw, type = "mixed")
Residuals:
    Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
```

```
-18.26433 -3.30003 -0.69833 2.43177 39.77795
Type: mixed
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
            Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 10.861374 2.571244 4.2242 2.398e-05
RD90 4.176400 0.283976 14.7069 < 2.2e-16
PS90 1.373438 0.258171 5.3199 1.038e-07
MA90 0.035280 0.059578 0.5922 0.5537373
DV90 0.561657 0.139475 4.0269 5.651e-05
UE90 -0.137848 0.093086 -1.4809 0.1386421
lag.RD90 -0.441362 0.431248-1.0235 0.3060940
lag.PS90 0.536691 0.370724 1.4477 0.1477053
lag.MA90 -0.152049 0.090370 -1.6825 0.0924669
lag.DV90 -0.224587 0.201777 -1.1130 0.2656886
lag.UE90 -0.482028 0.127317 -3.7860 0.0001531
Rho: 0.2547 LR test value: 41.96 p-value: 9.318e-11
Asymptotic standard error: 0.037956 z-value: 6.7105 p-value: 1.9398e-11
Wald statistic: 45.031 p-value: 1.9398e-11
Log likelihood: -4453.823 for mixed model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 31.747, (sigma: 5.6344)
Number of observations: 1412
Number of parameters estimated: 13
AIC: 8933.6, (AIC for lm: 8973.6)
LM test for residual autocorrelation
test value: 12.986 p-value: 0.00031377
```

The output lists the estimates, standard errors, etc. for each explanatory variable as well as its spatially lagged counterpart (e.g., lag.RD90). Several of the coefficient estimates for the latter are not significant. Note also how the spatial autoregressive coefficient of 0.2547 is slightly different from the value obtained with the pure error model ( 0.2916 ). Also, there is evidence of remaining spatial error autocorrelation, as indicated by the signficant LM test statistic.

The main purpose of this exercise is to test whether the product of this spatial autoregressive coefficient with each of the regression coefficients equals negative the coefficient of the matching spatially lagged explanatory variable. There are a total of 5 such constraints, which gives the degrees of
freedom for the test on the common factor constraints.
This is implemented through the LR.sarlm function, which allows a likelihood ratio test between two nested models (i.e., one must be found from the other by setting coefficients equal to zero). In this case, the nested models are the unconstrained spatial Durbin model (lag90durbin) and the constrained spatial error model (err90). This yields:

```
> LR.sarlm(lag90durbin,err90)
Likelihood ratio for spatial linear models
data:
Likelihood ratio = 34.9882, df = 5, p-value = 1.513e-06
sample estimates:
Log likelihood of lag90durbin Log likelihood of err90
    -4453.823 -4471.317
```

The constraints are strongly rejected. In other words, the spatial autoregressive error specification is internally inconsistent. This can be due to a poor choice of the spatial weights, or to a misspecification of the error process (e.g., when the true error process is not SAR). The upshot of this evidence is that the model specification should be reconsidered.

### 7.6 Practice

Experiment with different spatial weights to obtain a more satisfactory spatial regression model for HR90. Alternatively, explore the spatial regression estimation in one of the sample data sets, e.g., replicating the POLICE example, or the Baltimore or Boston house price examples.

## Exercise 8

## Discrete Spatial Heterogeneity

### 8.1 Objectives

While spdep does not contain specific functionality to address spatial heterogeneity, it is possible to get some useful results by manipulating the regression format and extracting information from the fitted spatial regression object. This exercise illustrates the analysis of discrete spatial heterogeneity in the form of spatial analysis of variance (spatial ANOVA) and tests for the presence of spatial regimes.

### 8.2 Preliminaries

As a running example, we will continue the analysis of homicide rates in US counties, but now consider the whole country. Follow the instructions given in Section 6.2 to create a data frame from the sample data set nat.shp, selecting the variables FIPSNO, SOUTH, HR60, RD60, PS60, MA60, DV60 and UE60. Turn this into the data frame nat60.

In addition, create a neighbor and listw object from the queen contiguity file natqueen.gal using the read.gal and nb2listw functions. Call the final listw object natq.

Make sure everything is correct by comparing your data summaries to the results below:

```
> summary(nat60)
    FIPSNO SOUTH HR60
    Min. : 1001 Min. :0.0000 Min. : 0.000
    1st Qu.:19037 1st Qu.:0.0000 1st Qu.: 0.000
```

| Median $: 29197$ | Median $: 0.0000$ | Median $: 2.783$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean $: 30592$ | Mean $: 0.4577$ | Mean $: 4.504$ |
| 3rd Qu.: 45083 | 3rd Qu.: 1.0000 | 3rd Qu.: 6.885 |
| Max. $: 56045$ | Max. $: 1.0000$ | Max. $: 92.937$ |

and
> summary (natq)
Characteristics of weights list object:
Neighbour list object:
Number of regions: 3085
Number of nonzero links: 18168
Percentage nonzero weights: 0.1908960
Average number of links: 5.889141
Link number distribution:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24 | 36 | 91 | 281 | 620 | 1037 | 704 |  |  |
| •. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 most connected region: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49037 with 14 links |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Weights style: W
Weights constants summary:
n nn S0 S1 S2
W 3085951722530851104.15612568 .36

### 8.3 Spatial ANOVA

Spatial analysis of variance can be implemented as a simple dummy variable regression. In our example, HR90 is the dependent variable, with the dummy variable SOUTH as the explanatory variable. The estimate of the dummy indicates the difference between the regime SOUTH $=1$ and the overall mean.

### 8.3.1 OLS Estimation

We first implement this using the standard 1 m function and create a regression object to test for spatial error autocorrelation.

Before you start, make sure to attach the nat60 data frame. The results show a highly significant effect of the South.

```
> attach(nat60)
> hr60an <- lm(HR60 ~ SOUTH)
> summary(hr60an)
Call:
lm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH)
Residuals:
    Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
-7.292 -2.151 -1.052 1.467 85.645
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
(Intercept) & 2.1510 & 0.1231 & 17.47 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *\) \\
SOUTH & 5.1412 & 0.1820 & 28.25 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16 * * *\)
\end{tabular}
---
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 5.036 on 3083 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.2056,Adjusted R-squared: 0.2053
F-statistic: 797.9 on 1 and 3083 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

We next check the LM statistics for spatial autocorrelation:

```
> lm.LMtests(hr60an,natq,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH)
weights: natq
LMerr = 332.4194, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
```

```
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH)
weights: natq
RLMerr = 13.1194, df = 1, p-value = 0.0002923
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH)
weights: natq
LMlag = 359.7856, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH)
weights: natq
RLMlag = 40.4856, df = 1, p-value = 1.981e-10
```

The results show very strong evidence of spatial autocorrelation, with a slight edge in favor of the lag alternative. We will estimate both and assess the effect on the magnitude and significance of the coefficient of the SOUTH dummy.

### 8.3.2 Spatial Dummy Variable Regression

For completeness sake, we check both lag and error alternatives. The spatial lag version of the ANOVA model yields:

```
> hr60anlag <- lagsarlm(HR60 ~ SOUTH,data=nat60,
+ natq)
> summary(hr60anlag)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR60 ~ SOUTH, data = nat60, listw = natq)
Residuals:
-12.99088 -2.11958 -0.93541 1.37336 86.54842
Type: lag
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
    Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
```

| (Intercept) | 1.29761 | 0.12815 | $10.125<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SOUTH | 3.16222 | 0.20923 | $15.114<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$ |

Rho: 0.38603 LR test value: 261.92 p-value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Asymptotic standard error: 0.024275 z-value: 15.902 p-value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$ Wald statistic: 252.88 p-value: < 2.22e-16

Log likelihood: -9232.926 for lag model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 22.626, (sigma: 4.7566)
Number of observations: 3085
Number of parameters estimated: 4
AIC: 18474, (AIC for lm: 18734)
LM test for residual autocorrelation
test value: 151.76 p -value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Compared to the OLS results, the dummy remains strongly significant, even though its magnitude decreases considerably after the spatial lag filter is implemented. A cursory look at the diagnostics shows that considerably spatial autocorrelation remains, which is not surprising, given the simplicity of the specification.

The spatial error version of the ANOVA model yields:
> hr60anerr <- errorsarlm(HR60 ~ SOUTH, data=nat60,

+ natq)
> summary(hr60anerr)

Call:errorsarlm(formula $=$ HR60 ~ SOUTH, data $=$ nat60, listw $=$ natq)
Residuals:

| Min | $1 Q$ | Median | 3Q | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| -12.75378 | -2.15718 | -0.95972 | 1.42182 | 86.62697 |

Type: error
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
Estimate Std. Error $z$ value $\operatorname{Pr}(>|z|)$
(Intercept) $2.24729 \quad 0.18495 \quad 12.151<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$
SOUTH $4.85680 \quad 0.26892 \quad 18.061<2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$

Lambda: 0.37676 LR test value: 241.96 p-value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Asymptotic standard error: 0.024649 z-value: 15.285 p -value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Wald statistic: 233.62 p-value: < 2.22e-16

```
Log likelihood: -9242.908 for error model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 22.806, (sigma: 4.7756)
Number of observations: 3085
Number of parameters estimated: 4
AIC: 18494, (AIC for lm: 18734)
```

Here again, incorporating spatial effects does not substantially change the evidence. The dummy variable remains highly significant. Compared to the OLS results, its value is slightly lower, but the standard error is larger.

The fit of the two spatial models can be compared by means of the maximized $\log$ likelihood. For the error model this is -9242.9 but for the lag model it is -9232.9 , confirming its superiority. However, both models leave a lot unexplained and should only be used in an exploratory phase of possible spatial heterogeneity.

### 8.4 Spatial Regimes

Spatial regime regressions allow the model coefficients to vary between discrete spatial subsets of the data. We will implement this by taking advantage of the interaction feature of the formula in $R$ (indicated by the : symbol between two sets of variables). Specifically, we will create a dummy variable for each regime (i.e., taking a value of one for observations in the regime and zero for all others) and then interact each explanatory variable with each dummy. A Chow test and its extension to spatial regressions (spatial Chow test) forms the basis for assessing the significance of the regimes.

### 8.4.1 Preliminaries

We create two new variables and add them to the nat60 data frame. First, we construct the complement of the SOUTH dummy, NOSOUTH. Next, we construct a vector of ones of the same length as the other variables. This is easily done by adding SOUTH and NOSOUTH without having to worry about specifying the length. We call the new data frame nat60a.

```
> NOSOUTH = 1 - SOUTH
> ONE = SOUTH + NOSOUTH
> nat60a <- cbind(nat60,ONE,NOSOUTH)
```

Check that everything went fine using a summary. Note how the mean of SOUTH is 0.4577 and the mean of NOSOUTH is 0.5423 . To have easy access to the variables, attach(nat60a) (detach other data sets if necessary).

### 8.4.2 Spatial Regimes in OLS

We will first run a base regression for the whole nation, in which the coefficients are kept fixed and without a SOUTH dummy. This will be referred to as the constrained model (since the coefficients are constrained to be equal across regimes). The corresponding output is:

```
> nat60ols <- lm(HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 +
+ DV60 + UE60)
> summary(nat60ols)
Call:
lm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-14.999 & -2.427 & -0.821 & 1.434 & 90.954
\end{tabular}
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr (>|t|)
(Intercept) 10.51667 0.61064 17.222 < 2e-16 ***
RD60 2.69490 0.09653 27.919 < 2e-16 ***
PS60 0.60360 0.09141 6.603 4.72e-11 ***
MA60 -0.27212 0.01935-14.063 < 2e-16 ***
DV60 1.29591 0.09599 13.501 < 2e-16 ***
UE60 -0.10610 0.03565 -2.976 0.00294 **
---
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 4.84 on 3079 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.2673,Adjusted R-squared: 0.2661
F-statistic: 224.7 on 5 and 3079 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

To obtain the unconstrained regression, we need to drop the default constant from the formula in order to make sure that a different intercept is estimated for each regime. This is done by specifying 0 in the formula for the regression specification. We also need to interact each of the explanatory
variables (including the constant, hence the need for ONE) with the SOUTH and NOSOUTH dummies.

We get the results from the familiar Im function with the customized formula, as shown:

```
> nat60rega <- lm(HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 +
+ MA60 + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
> summary(nat60rega)
Call:
lm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 + MA60 +
        DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-13.5265 & -2.1820 & -0.6467 & 1.3390 & 88.4821
\end{tabular}
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr (>|t|)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ONE: SOUTH & 13.21547 & 0.87183 & 15.158 & \(<2 \mathrm{e}-16\) & \\
\hline NOSOUTH & 6.39963 & 0.99955 & 6.403 & \(1.76 e-10\) & \\
\hline RD60: SOUTH & 1.76448 & 0.15369 & 11.481 & < 2e-16 & \\
\hline RD60:NOSOUTH & 1.85730 & 0.23653 & 7.852 & 5.60e-15 & \\
\hline PS60:SOUTH & 0.29930 & 0.16611 & 1.802 & 0.07166 & \\
\hline PS60:NOSOUTH & 0.37748 & 0.11730 & 3.218 & 0.00130 & \\
\hline MA60: SOUTH & -0.2752 & 0.02951 & -9.326 & < 2e-16 & \\
\hline MA60:NOSOUTH & -0.19537 & 0.02978 & -6.560 & \(6.27 e-11\) & \\
\hline DV60: SOUTH & 1.17945 & 0.18879 & 6.247 & \(4.75 \mathrm{e}-10\) & \\
\hline DV60:NOSOUTH & 1.11883 & 0.11463 & 9.761 & < 2e-16 & *** \\
\hline UE60: SOUTH & -0.29186 & 0.05518 & -5.289 & \(1.31 \mathrm{e}-07\) & *** \\
\hline UE60 : NOSOUTH & 0.09277 & 0.04554 & 2.037 & 0.04173 & * \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 4.721 on 3073 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.5746,Adjusted R-squared: 0.5729
F-statistic: 345.9 on 12 and 3073 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

Note that the R-Squared may not be computed correctly when the intercept is excluded in this fashion, but we can ignore that for now. The results
show some differences in significance between regimes for some of the coefficients, such as PS60 (not significant in SOUTH but significant in NOSOUTH) and UE60 (strongly significant and negative in SOUTH and positive but marginally significant in NOSOUTH).

### 8.4.3 Chow Test

A straightforward test on the constraint that the coefficients are equal across regimes is the Chow test contained in any standard econometrics test:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C=\frac{e_{R}^{\prime} e_{R}-e_{U}^{\prime} e_{U}}{k} / \frac{e_{U}^{\prime} e_{U}}{N-2 k} \sim F(k, N-2 k) \tag{8.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $e_{R}$ is the vector of residuals from the constrained regression (constant coefficients) and $e_{U}$ is the vector of residuals from the unconstrained regression (regime coefficients).

We extract the residuals from the regression object by means of the residuals method applied to the object.

```
> er <- residuals(nat60ols)
```

We also extract the degrees of freedom in a similar way.

```
> k <- nat60ols$rank
> n2k <- nat60ols$df.residual - k
```

The Chow test can be computed in a short function, shown below:

```
chow.test <- function(rest,unrest)
{
    er <- residuals(rest)
    eu <- residuals(unrest)
    er2 <- sum(er^2)
    eu2 <- sum(eu^2)
    k <- rest$rank
    n2k <- rest$df.residual - k
    c <- ((er2 - eu2)/k) / (eu2 / n2k)
    pc <- pf(c,k,n2k,lower.tail=FALSE)
    list(c,pc,k,n2k)
}
```

This function is contained in a file chow.test. R, which needs to be sourced to bring it into your workspace (make sure the file is in your working directory). Alternatively, you can type it in at the command line.

The function simply extracts the respective residual vectors from the regression objects, as well as the degrees of freedom and computes the simple statistic. Inference is based on the F distribution using the pf function. The results are passed back as a list containing the test statistic, $p$ value and two degrees of freedom.

In our example, this gives:

```
> source("chow.test.R")
> chow.test(nat60ols,nat60rega)
[[1]]
[1] 27.11882
[[2]]
[1] 1.141437e-31
[[3]]
[1] 6
[[4]]
[1] 3073
```

The value of the test statistic is 27.12 , which is highly significant. Hence, there is strong evidence that the model coefficients indeed are not constant across regimes, indicating spatial heterogeneity.

### 8.4.4 Spatial Regimes in Spatial Regression

The residuals of the spatial regime regression continue to show strong evidence of spatial autocorrelation. Both LMerr and LMlag statistics are highly significant, as are their robust forms, with a slight edge in favor of the lag alternative.

```
> lm.LMtests(nat60rega,natq,
+ test=c("LMerr","RLMerr","LMlag","RLMlag"))
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 + MA60
    + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
weights: natq
LMerr = 97.6755, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
```

```
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 + MA60
    + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
weights: natq
RLMerr = 9.8075, df = 1, p-value = 0.001738
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 + MA60
    + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
weights: natq
LMlag = 129.1925, df = 1, p-value < 2.2e-16
Lagrange multiplier diagnostics for spatial dependence
data:
model: lm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 + MA60
    + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH))
weights: natq
RLMlag = 41.3245, df = 1, p-value = 1.289e-10
```

Spatial regimes can be incorporated in spatial lag and spatial error models in the same way as for OLS, by means of the interaction terms in the model formula.

For the spatial lag model, this gives:

```
> hr60rlag <- lagsarlm(HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 +
+ MA60 + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH),data=nat60a,
+ natq)
> summary(hr60rlag)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR60 ~ 0 + (ONE + RD60 + PS60 +
    MA60 + DV60 + UE60):(SOUTH + NOSOUTH),
    data = nat60a, listw = natq)
Residuals:
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & \(1 Q\) & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-13.41352 & -2.11313 & -0.62028 & 1.33659 & 88.38962
\end{tabular}
```

| Type: lag |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | ) |
| NE:SOUTH | 9.739325 | 0.895945 | 10. | < $2.2 \mathrm{e}-16$ |
| SOUT | 5.273614 | 0.982158 | 5.369 | 99e-08 |
| 60: SOUTH | 1.420458 | 0.153772 | 9 | < 2.2e-16 |
| 60 : NOSOUT | 1.625286 | 0.231632 | 7.0167 | $2.272 \mathrm{e}-12$ |
| S60:SOUTH | 0.208484 | 0.162155 | 1.2857 | 0.198544 |
| 60:NOSOUTH | 0.385196 | 0.114367 | 3.3681 | 0.000757 |
| A60: SOUTH | -0.213140 | 0.029087 | -7.3277 | $2.340 \mathrm{e}-13$ |
| 60 : NOSOUTH | -0.165157 | 0.029204 | -5.6553 | 56-08 |
| V60:SOUTH | 0.979970 | 0.184224 | 5.3195 | $1.041 \mathrm{e}-07$ |
| DV60:NOSOUTH | 0.898503 | 0.112754 | 7.9687 | $1.554 \mathrm{e}-15$ |
| UE60 : SOUTH | -0.210014 | 0.053885 | -3.8974 | $9.722 \mathrm{e}-05$ |
| E60 : NOSOUTH | 0.083777 | 0.044455 | 1.8845 | 0.059494 |

Rho: 0.25961 LR test value: 106.05 p-value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Asymptotic standard error: 0.02568 z-value: 10.11 p -value: < $2.22 \mathrm{e}-16$
Wald statistic: 102.21 p-value: < 2.22e-16

```
Log likelihood: -9106.562 for lag model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 21.189, (sigma: 4.6032)
Number of observations: 3085
Number of parameters estimated: 14
AIC: 18241, (AIC for lm: 18345)
LM test for residual autocorrelation
test value: 38.109 p-value: 6.6914e-10
```

Here again, there is evidence of a difference between regimes for the coefficients of PS60 and UE60. In order to assess this more rigorously, we also need the results for the spatial lag model of the constrained specification. The corresponding result is:

```
> hr60lag <- lagsarlm(HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 +
+ DV60 + UE60,data=nat60a,natq)
> summary(hr60lag)
Call:lagsarlm(formula = HR60 ~ RD60 + PS60 + MA60 + DV60 + UE60,
    data = nat60a, listw = natq)
```

Residuals:

```
\begin{tabular}{rrrrr} 
Min & 1Q & Median & 3Q & Max \\
-13.89718 & -2.17000 & -0.74723 & 1.37653 & 90.09303
\end{tabular}
Type: lag
Coefficients: (asymptotic standard errors)
    Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept) 7.048613 0.629963 11.1889 < 2.2e-16
RD60 1.912544 0.106597 17.9419 < 2.2e-16
PS60 0.456590 0.088178 5.1781 2.242e-07
MA60 -0.190804 0.019269 -9.9023 < 2.2e-16
DV60 0.942877 0.093493 10.0850< 2.2e-16
UE60 -0.052096 0.034187 -1.5239 0.1275
Rho: 0.32721 LR test value: 192.26 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Asymptotic standard error: 0.024022 z-value: 13.621 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Wald statistic: 185.53 p-value: < 2.22e-16
Log likelihood: -9143.04 for lag model
ML residual variance (sigma squared): 21.528, (sigma: 4.6399)
Number of observations: 3085
Number of parameters estimated: 8
AIC: 18302, (AIC for lm: 18492)
LM test for residual autocorrelation
test value: 50.95 p-value: 9.4769e-13
```


### 8.4.5 Spatial Chow Test

When the regression error terms are spatially autocorrelated, the simple form of the Chow test shown in (8.1) is no longer valid. A corrected version of the test is referred to as a spatial Chow test (see Anselin 1988, pp. 123124). With the results of both the constrained and unconstrained models at hand, this can be implemented as a LR test, since the constrained model is nested within the unconstrained one.

This can be readily implemented in a small function:

```
spatialchow.test <- function(rest,unrest)
{
    lrest <- rest$LL
    lunrest <- unrest$LL
    k <- rest$parameters - 2
```

```
    spchow <- - 2.0 * (lrest - lunrest)
    pchow <- pchisq(spchow,k,lower.tail=FALSE)
    list(spchow,pchow,k)
}
```

The function takes the spatial regression objects and extracts the maximized log-likelihood as the \$LL item. The degrees of freedom are obtained as the number of parameters in the constrained model less two (for the autoregressive parameter and the error variance), using \$parameters. The computation of the LR test is straightforward. Significance is assessed from the Chi-squared distribution. The results are returned as a list.

This function is contained in the file spatialchow.test.R. Source this file to incorporate it into your workspace and invoke the test by passing the two spatial lag regression objects to it: hr60lag for the restricted model and hr60rlag for the unrestricted model. The result shows a strong rejection of the null hypothesis, suggesting significantly different coefficients in each of the regimes, even after correcting for the spatial lag.

```
> source("spatialchow.test.R")
> spatialchow.test(hr60lag,hr60rlag)
[[1]]
    [,1]
[1,] 72.95666
[[2]]
    [,1]
[1,] 1.010420e-13
[[3]]
[1] 6
```

The approach for a spatial error model is similar, by passing the appropriate constrained and unconstrained models to the spatialchow.test function.

### 8.5 Practice

To practice, assess the spatial heterogeneity for other years of the US homicide data set, using a spatial Chow test for both lag and error specifications.

## Exercise 9

## Continuous Spatial Heterogeneity

### 9.1 Objectives

We continue the analysis of spatial heterogeneity in two forms: spatial expansion and geographically weighted regression (GWR). These both yield individual coefficient estimates for each location. This exercise illustrates how you can manipulate the regression formula to implement spatial expansion and introduces the basic GWR approach, highlighting the sensitivity of the results to the choice of bandwidth and kernel function. We will map the location-specific coefficient estimates in GeoDa and ArcMap.

### 9.2 Preliminaries

For the spatial expansion example, we will use the built-in columbus data set to keep matters simple. Make sure you have the spdep library loaded. We won't actually use its functionality, but we need it for easy access to the Columbus sample data.

For GWR, we will use the package spgwr: ${ }^{1}$
> library (spgwr)

[^15]If you want to make maps of the individual coefficient estimates, make sure you have GeoDa or ArcMap handy, with the columbus.shp shape file.

### 9.3 Spatial Expansion Method

As the first example of modeling continuous spatial heterogeneity, we consider Casetti's expansion method. This is a special case of a model with varying coefficients, where the variation is driven by an expansion equation.

In the simplest example, the expansion equation is a linear trend surface. This yields a final equation that contains the original explanatory variables, as well as interaction terms with the X and Y coordinates. A straightforward calculation yields individual coefficient values for each location, which can then be mapped and further analyzed.

A common problem in the implementation of the spatial expansion method is the high degree of multicollinearity that results from the interaction terms. In practice, this requires the use of some adjustments, such as replacing the original interaction terms by their principal components. Such adjustments are outside the current scope and we will ignore the potential multicollinearity.

We will use the built-in columbus data set to illustrate this procedure. Start by loading the data set and attaching it.

```
> data(columbus)
> attach(columbus)
```

We will run the standard regression example, with CRIME as the dependent variable and INC and HOVAL as the explanatory variables. The expansion will consist of a linear trend in the coordinates X and Y .

To create the proper interaction terms, we use the cross form of the formula (symbolized by $*$ ). The final regression is then as shown.

```
> colex <- lm(CRIME ~ (INC + HOVAL)*(X + Y))
> summary(colex)
Call:
lm(formula = CRIME ~ (INC + HOVAL) * (X + Y))
Residuals:
    Min 1Q Median 3Q Max
-18.5556 -7.6351 -0.6181 7.8363 30.1948
```

```
Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 108.97559 69.36676 1.571 0.1241
INC -5.82949 3.84408 -1.516 0.1373
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
HOVAL & 0.27337 & 0.82049 & 0.333 & 0.7407
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\(X\) & -0.76287 & 1.13692 & -0.671 & 0.5061
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\(Y\) & -0.26332 & 1.21420 & -0.217 & 0.8294
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
INC: X & -0.01854 & 0.05396 & -0.344 & 0.7329
\end{tabular}
INC:Y \(0.13949 \quad 0.08004 \quad 1.743 \quad 0.0891\).
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
HOVAL:X & 0.03159 & 0.01549 & 2.040 & 0.0480
\end{tabular}
-
Signif. codes: 0 *** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 1
Residual standard error: 11.04 on 40 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared: 0.6375,Adjusted R-squared: 0.5649
F-statistic: 8.791 on 8 and 40 DF, p-value: 7.663e-07
```

Note how very few coefficients are shown to be significant, even though the R-squared is more than acceptable. This is a typical symptom of high multicollinearity.

For our purposes, we will ignore this potential problem and compute individual coefficients for HOVAL for each location. This is accomplished by extracting the relevant coefficients from the regression object using the \$coefficients item.

```
> b <- colex$coefficients
> b [3]
    HOVAL
0.2733714
> b [8]
    HOVAL:X
0.03159375
> b[9]
    HOVAL:Y
-0.05034417
```

The individual coefficients are obtained as;

```
> bihoval <- b[3] + b[8] * X + b[9] * Y
> bihoval
```



Figure 9.1: Join tables dialog in GeoDa
[1] -0.71945869 -0.73484522 -0.54173838
[49] 0.36488625
> summary (bihoval)
Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max. $-0.7348-0.3418-0.1479-0.1096 \quad 0.1362 \quad 0.6105$

We see that the varying coefficients range from -0.7348 to 0.6105 (compare this to an estimate of -0.2739 in the fixed coefficient model).

We can now create a data frame that can be written out to a dbf file, to be joined with the dbf file of the columbus shape file for mapping.

```
> bi <- data.frame(POLYID,bihoval)
```

> write.dbf(bi,"bihoval.dbf")

In $G e o D a$, load the columbus.shp shape file and select the table. Right click and choose join table. In the dialog, enter the name of the dbf file bihoval.dbf, the Key as POLYID, and the variable to be joined as BIHOVAL, as illustrated in Figure 9.1.


Figure 9.2: Map of spatially expanded coefficients for HOVAL

Now, the new variable is available to all the analyses and visualization methods in $G e o D a$. For example, we can create a simple quantile map using 6 quantiles to show the gradual change of the coefficients across the city neighborhoods, with the low values in the upper left, and the highest values in the lower right, as in Figure 9.2. Note that the spatial expansion does not need to be limited to the use of X and Y coordinates, but can be applied to any set of variables that may underlie the spatial heterogeneity in the model.

### 9.4 GWR

### 9.4.1 Basics

Make sure the spgwr library is active and the columbus data set attached. We first explore the basics of the gwr function. This function creates an object that contains a data frame with the individual coefficient estimates for each variable and each location. The arguments to this function are a
formula (for the model specification), a data set, a matrix with the $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ coordinates of the locations (or polygon centroids) and a bandwidth. The default kernel function is the Gaussian.

The bandwidth is hard to specify a priori and the preferred approach is to carry out a cross-validation, minimizing the root mean square prediction error. For now, we'll try three values of 20,3 and 2 . As the bandwidth widens, the surface of estimated coefficients becomes smoother.

With the familiar CRIME regression, the coordinates as the X and Y variables from the built in data set and the bandwidth of 20 , this yields:

```
> colg1 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),bandwidth=20)
> colg1
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = 20)
Kernel function: gwr.gauss
Fixed bandwidth: 20
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
                        Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 68.0700 69.0300 69.4500 69.8000 71.1700 68.6190
INC -1.7200 -1.6590 -1.6210 -1.5600 -1.4510 -1.5973
HOVAL -0.3407 -0.3078 -0.2789 -0.2454 -0.1903 -0.2739
```

The print command gives a summary of the estimated coefficients (note that summary is not useful in this context), listing the basic parameters (kernel and bandwidth) and providing descriptive statistics for each of the estimated coefficients. For example, the estimates for HOVAL range from -0.3407 to -0.1903 and are not that far from the global estimate of -0.2739 . The main reason for this is the large bandwidth, which does not allow for much variability. Compare this to the range obtained for the spatial expansion method of -0.7348 to 0.6105 .

For the two other bandwidths, we get the following results:

```
> colg2 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),bandwidth=3)
> colg2
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = 3)
Kernel function: gwr.gauss
```

```
Fixed bandwidth: 3
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
    Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 23.03000 53.33000 62.96000 68.72000 81.39000 68.6190
INC -3.22200 -1.88300 -0.75950 -0.34360 1.30700 -1.5973
HOVAL -1.07400 -0.38630 -0.12820 0.04305 0.85320 -0.2739
> colg3 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),bandwidth=2)
> colg3
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = 2)
Kernel function: gwr.gauss
Fixed bandwidth: 2
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
    Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 20.87000 43.06000 65.07000 71.34000 88.53000 68.6190
INC -6.01900 -1.74400 -0.71910 -0.03815 3.85400 -1.5973
HOVAL -3.47700 -0.46420 -0.20710 0.04728 1.40400 -0.2739
```

The bandwidth of 3 yields a similar range to the expansion method, while the bandwidth of 2 results in a very wide range. The three distributions can be compared to that of the expansion method by means of a box plot.

To extract the vector of coefficients we need to access the SDF attribute of the gwr class. This is a data frame containing the coordinates, coefficients and a measure of error. For example, for the second bandwidth (2), this looks like (the R2 and gwr.e columns have been dropped):
> colg3\$SDF
coordinates sum.w X.Intercept. INC HOVAL ...
1 (38.8, 44.07) 1.146372 $46.18933-0.70880055-0.207112745 \ldots$
$2(35.62,42.38) 1.425847 \quad 43.06483-0.66509539-0.222184163 \ldots$
3 (39.82, 41.18) 1.269489 53.52575-0.97462747-0.248571427 ...
$4(36.5,40.52) 1.918875 \quad 58.23655-0.22800553-0.678264390 \ldots$
.
$49(42.67,24.96) 1.883877 \quad 74.88421 \quad 3.85392142-3.477123284 \ldots$
A vector with values for an individual coefficient is extracted using the familiar \$ notation for a list item, e.g.:

```
> hovg3 <- colg2$SDF$HOVAL
```



Figure 9.3: Box plots for different bandwidths in GWR

```
> summary(hovg3)
```

Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
$-1.07400-0.38630-0.12820-0.14260 \quad 0.043050 .85320$
We create vectors for the other two bandwidths in a similar way:
> hovg20 <- colg1\$SDF\$HOVAL
> summary (hovg20)
Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
-0.3407-0.3078-0.2789-0.2768-0.2454 -0.1903
> hovg2 <- colg3\$SDF\$HOVAL

```
> summary(hovg2)
    Min. 1st Qu. Median Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
-3.47700 -0.46420 -0.20710 -0.25020 0.04728 1.40400
```

We can now put box plots for the three coefficient vectors side by side.

```
> boxplot(bihoval,hovg20,hovg3,hovg2,
```

+ names=c("Expansion", "bw=20", "bw=3", "bw=2"))

This yields Figure 9.3. Note how the distribution for bandwidth 20 is concentrated around the median value (a very smooth surface), whereas the distribution for bandwidth 2 shows several outliers. The distribution for the linear expansion methods is similar in range to that for a bandwidth of 3 , but the median is lower.

Just as for the expansion method coefficients, we can group the vectors for GWR into a data frame, export it to a dbf file to join with the columbus.shp shape file.

```
> colgwr <- data.frame(POLYID,hovg20,hovg3,hovg2)
> write.dbf(colgwr,"colgwr.dbf")
```

We can then map these, say in ArcMap, as illustrated in Figures 9.4 and 9.5. ${ }^{2}$ Here, we show a choropleth map using natural breaks with 8 categories. This clearly illustrates the smoothing effect of the larger bandwidth.

### 9.4.2 Selecting the Optimal Bandwidth

So far, the bandwidth we specified for the gwr procedure was purely ad hoc. spgwr implements two methods to select an optimal bandwidth. The most commonly used is cross validation, minimizing the mean squared prediction error when each observation is left out in turn. A second method is based on the minimization of the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (for technical details, see Fotheringham et al. 2002, pp. 59-62).

The optimal bandwidth is returned by the gwr.sel function, for a given formula, data set, coordinate matrix and kernel (the default is the Gaussian kernel, gwr.gauss). The default method is cross-validation (method="cv"). In order to use the AIC criterion, the method argument must be set explicitly, as method="aic".

[^16]

Figure 9.4: GWR coefficients for HOVAL, bandwidth $=20$

This suggests a two step procedure to implement GWR: first, run gwr . sel to obtain the bandwidth, next use this value in a final run of gwr. In our example, with cross validation first, this yields:

```
> bw1 <- gwr.sel(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y))
Bandwidth: 12.65221 CV score: 12.25277
Bandwidth: 20.45127 CV score: 12.32858
Bandwidth: 7.83213 CV score: 12.22244
Bandwidth: 4.853154 CV score: 11.7606
Bandwidth: 3.012046 CV score: 11.15676
Bandwidth: 1.874179 CV score: 14.61981
Bandwidth: 3.715287 CV score: 11.24019
Bandwidth: 3.041249 CV score: 11.14678
Bandwidth: 3.276828 CV score: 11.12378
Bandwidth: 3.444304 CV score: 11.15169
```



Figure 9.5: GWR coefficients for HOVAL, bandwidth=2

```
Bandwidth: 3.233495 CV score: 11.12159
Bandwidth: 3.22236 CV score: 11.12143
Bandwidth: 3.216871 CV score: 11.12141
Bandwidth: 3.217402 CV score: 11.12141
Bandwidth: 3.217443 CV score: 11.12141
Bandwidth: 3.217484 CV score: 11.12141
Bandwidth: 3.217443 CV score: 11.12141
> bw1
[1] 3.217443
```

The second step follows as:

```
> colg4 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),bandwidth=bw1)
> colg4
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
```

```
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = bw1)
Kernel function: gwr.gauss
Fixed bandwidth: 3.217443
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
    Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 23.23000 54.12000 63.90000 68.76000 80.90000 68.6190
INC -3.13100 -1.91300 -0.98440 -0.36860 1.29100 -1.5973
HOVAL -1.05300 -0.37670 -0.09739 0.03004 0.79460 -0.2739
```

To use the AIC criterion, we include the method argument explicitly in the call to gwr.sel:

```
> bw2 <- gwr.sel(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),method="aic")
Bandwidth: 12.65221 AIC: 382.8966
Bandwidth: 20.45127 AIC: 383.3532
Bandwidth: 7.83213 AIC: 382.1
Bandwidth: 4.853154 AIC: 381.4758
Bandwidth: 3.012046 AIC: 412.4025
Bandwidth: 5.991021 AIC: 380.7834
Bandwidth: 6.106824 AIC: 380.8622
Bandwidth: 5.718077 AIC: 380.6517
Bandwidth: 5.387706 AIC: 380.6667
Bandwidth: 5.578766 AIC: 380.6282
Bandwidth: 5.573107 AIC: 380.6281
Bandwidth: 5.563802 AIC: 380.628
Bandwidth: 5.564886 AIC: 380.628
Bandwidth: 5.564926 AIC: 380.628
Bandwidth: 5.564967 AIC: 380.628
Bandwidth: 5.564926 AIC: 380.628
> colg4 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),bandwidth=bw2)
> colg4
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = bw2)
Kernel function: gwr.gauss
Fixed bandwidth: 5.564926
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
    Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 30.0400 62.2700 69.5000 70.9200 75.3900 68.6190
```

$$
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\text { INC } & -2.5810 & -2.0010 & -1.6170 & -0.8033 & -0.2798 & -1.5973 \\
\text { HOVAL } & -0.8032 & -0.3798 & -0.1042 & -0.0458 & 0.2542 & -0.2739
\end{array}
$$

Note how the AIC criterion results in a much smoother parameter map than the one obtained with cross validation. There is little evidence as to which is superior since they optimize different objective functions. Since our use of GWR is primarily as a diagnostic for spatial heterogeneity, a careful sensitivity analysis is recommended in any case.

As an exercise, compare the distribution of the HOVAL (or other) coefficient between the two optimal bandwidths and to its counterpart obtained with the spatial expansion method in a box plot and choropleth map.

### 9.4.3 Selecting a Kernel Function

A second important practical aspect of the use of GWR is the selection of the kernel function that is at the basis of the computation of the local estimates. This is carried out by means of the gweight argument to the gwr.sel and gwr functions. So far, we have used the Gaussian kernel, but spgwr also implements a bisquare kernel. In contrast to the Gaussian kernel, which has an infinite range (the bandwidth is not an absolute cut off), the bisquare kernel sets all values beyond the bandwidth to zero. While the choice of a kernel function should not be arbitrary, in the literature the emphasis is on the sensitivity of the results to the choice of a bandwidth, rather than the kernel function.

With the cross-validation approach an optimal bandwidth of 33 is selected, which is much larger than for the Gaussian kernel. The resulting GWR estimates for HOVAL are roughly comparable to the ones obtained with a bandwidth of 20 for the Gaussian kernel.

```
> bwbs1 <- gwr.sel(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),gweight=gwr.bisquare)
Bandwidth: 12.65221 CV score: 12.92097
Bandwidth: 20.45127 CV score: 12.41531
Bandwidth: 25.27136 CV score: 12.37858
Bandwidth: 23.70165 CV score: 12.38804
Bandwidth: 28.25033 CV score: 12.36507
Bandwidth: 30.09144 CV score: 12.36080
Bandwidth: 31.69725 CV score: 12.35831
Bandwidth: 31.08388 CV score: 12.35917
Bandwidth: 32.22175 CV score: 12.35763
Bandwidth: 32.54591 CV score: 12.35724
```

```
Bandwidth: 32.74625 CV score: 12.35701
Bandwidth: 32.87007 CV score: 12.35687
Bandwidth: 32.94660 CV score: 12.35678
Bandwidth: 32.99389 CV score: 12.35673
Bandwidth: 33.02312 CV score: 12.35670
Bandwidth: 33.04119 CV score: 12.35668
Bandwidth: 33.05235 CV score: 12.35666
Bandwidth: 33.05925 CV score: 12.35666
Bandwidth: 33.06351 CV score: 12.35665
Bandwidth: 33.06615 CV score: 12.35665
Bandwidth: 33.06778 CV score: 12.35665
Bandwidth: 33.06879 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.06941 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.06979 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07003 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07018 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07027 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07032 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07037 CV score: 12.35664
Bandwidth: 33.07037 CV score: 12.35664
> colg5 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),gweight=gwr.bisquare,
+ bandwidth=bwbs1)
> colg5
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = bwbs1,
    gweight = gwr.bisquare)
Kernel function: gwr.bisquare
Fixed bandwidth: 33.07037
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
                    Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 68.3100 68.9600 69.2600 69.5700 71.6400 68.6190
INC -1.7270 -1.6480 -1.6140 -1.5690 -1.4680 -1.5973
HOVAL -0.3331 -0.3052 -0.2806 -0.2535 -0.1883-0.2739
```

The AIC criterion yields a much smaller optimal bandwidth of 11 .

```
> bwbs2 <- gwr.sel(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),gweight=gwr.bisquare,method="aic")
```

```
Bandwidth: 12.65221 AIC: 382.7242
Bandwidth: 20.45127 AIC: 384.3786
Bandwidth: 7.83213 AIC: 386.7498
Bandwidth: 15.27372 AIC: 384.0654
Bandwidth: 10.81111 AIC: 381.6533
Bandwidth: 9.673238 AIC: 383.0491
Bandwidth: 11.25258 AIC: 381.6384
Bandwidth: 11.07023 AIC: 381.6049
Bandwidth: 11.05193 AIC: 381.6044
Bandwidth: 11.04548 AIC: 381.6044
Bandwidth: 11.04647 AIC: 381.6044
Bandwidth: 11.04651 AIC: 381.6044
Bandwidth: 11.04655 AIC: 381.6044
Bandwidth: 11.04651 AIC: 381.6044
> colg6 <- gwr(CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL,data=columbus,
+ coords=cbind(X,Y),gweight=gwr.bisquare,
+ bandwidth=bwbs2)
> colg6
Call:
gwr(formula = CRIME ~ INC + HOVAL, data = columbus,
    coords = cbind(X, Y), bandwidth = bwbs2,
    gweight = gwr.bisquare)
Kernel function: gwr.bisquare
Fixed bandwidth: 11.04651
Summary of GWR coefficient estimates:
                            Min. 1st Qu. Median 3rd Qu. Max. Global
X.Intercept. 27.04000 63.63000 69.37000 71.06000 77.33000 68.6190
INC -2.57400 -2.03700 -1.65300 -0.66770 -0.26290 -1.5973
HOVAL -0.73720 -0.43290 -0.08757 -0.04483 0.26540 -0.2739
```

As before, the individual parameter estimates can be extracted from the gwr object, plotted or mapped.

### 9.5 Practice

To practice, plot or map the coefficient vector for the other coefficients in the model. Alternatively, check for continuous spatial heterogeneity in the BOSTON or BALTIMORE data sets. Compare the insights provided by the expansion method to those from GWR, and carry out sensitivity analysis for the choice of bandwidth and kernel function.

## Appendix

## Summary of Data and Spatial Weights Operations

- Data import and setup
- library (spdep): load the spdep package library
- source("read.geoda.R"): load and compile the source file read.geoda. $R$
- read.geoda: read a data set exported from GeoDa
- data(dataset): load an R data set
- attach(dataset): attach the data frame, making the variables available by name
- summary (dataset): summary descriptive statistics of all variables in the data set
- Types of spatial weights objects
- nb: neighbor list, contiguities only
- listw: neighbor list with weights, sparse format
- knn: k-nearest neighbor object
- matrix: standard matrix object
- Reading spatial weights files into neighbor lists
- read.gal: read GAL format weights files
- read.gwt2nb: read GWT format weights files
- Creating spatial weights objects
- cell2nb(nrow,ncol): neighbor list for rectangular regular grid cells
- dnearneigh(coordinatematrix,lowdist,updist): create distance band weights using the lowdist and updist limits
- knearneigh(coordinatematrix,k): create a matrix with the indices of the k-nearest neighbors
- nblag (nb,maxlag): higher order neighbors
- poly2nb(polygonlist): neighbor object from polygon boundary file
- tri2nb (coordinatematrix): create neighbor list using Thiessen polygon neighbor structure
- Conversion between weights objects
- knn2nb(knn): create a neighbor list object from a knn object (a matrix)
- nb2listw(nb): create a listw weights object from a neighbor list
- mat2listw (matrix): convert a spatial weights $n$ by $n$ matrix to a listw object
- nb2mat (nb) : convert a neighbor list to a matrix
- make.sym.nb(nb): force a possibly asymmetric neighbor list (e.g., from k-nearest neighbors) to a symmetric form
- Characteristics of spatial weights
- summary (nb): connectivity summary of neighbor list
- card (nb): number of neighbors for each observation
- is.symmetric.nb(nb): check on symmerty of connectivity structure
- Spatial transformations
- lag.listw(listw, variables): create spatially lagged variables using a listw object
- invIrM(listw, rho) : create inverse matrix $(I-\rho W)^{-1}$
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ These functions are basically the same, except that the "official" version has skip $=$ 0 as the default. So, to use the read.geoda function from spdep, make sure to set the option skip = 1 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Make sure to check the spelling of the file name, specifically, whether the GAL file extension is in caps or lowercase. R is case sensitive.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note that the queen contiguity weights are the ones originally included with the columbus data set on the now deprecated geog55.geog. uiuc.edu ftp site. These weights differ slightly from the ones constructed by GeoDa.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Make sure you have the columbus data set attached, so that the variables can be referred to by name.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ This is obtained as the ratio of the number of values greater or equal to observed statistic +1 over the number of simulations +1 . In the example, this is $(0+1) /(99+1)=0.01$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ Several, but not all the plotting functions in R support an add=T argument, which adds a graph to an existing plot. Since the current version of plot.density does not support this argument, while the other two plots do, it has to be drawn first.

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ The order of these arguments is the reverse of that in the Moran test statistics. Here, the weights object must come first, and the vector or matrix second. This order must be respected.
    ${ }^{6}$ Make sure you detached the police data frame and attached columbus.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Chapter 8 on Probability Distributions in Venables et al. (2004) for further details.

[^7]:    ${ }^{2}$ The CDF and quantile functions have the special arguments lower. tail and log that are very useful in practice. For example, to compute the upper tail of a distribution as when the p -value of a statistic is required, or, $1-\operatorname{CDF}(\mathrm{x})$, set lower.tail $=$ FALSE.
    ${ }^{3}$ Note that your results will vary, since the seed of the random number generator was not fixed using set.seed.

[^8]:    ${ }^{4}$ The torus correction connects the grid cells in the right-most cell to those in the leftmost cell, and those in the top row to those in the bottom row, thus ensuring that each cell has four neighbors (for rook).

[^9]:    ${ }^{5}$ Typically, however, it is very inefficient to operate on the full matrix, and sparse operations should be pursued as much as possible.

[^10]:    ${ }^{6}$ The theoretical moments for Moran's I applied to regression residuals are different.

[^11]:    ${ }^{7}$ Using 1000 replications is for illustrative purposes only, a "real" simulation experiment would require a much larger sample to achieve a reasonable degree of precision.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ While the standard deviation of the spatially correlated e05 is reported, this is not totally valid, since these variables are heteroskedastic and thus do not have a common variance.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ This replicates the analysis in Baller et al. (2001), although the spatial weights used

[^14]:    ${ }^{2}$ These results are also shown in Figure 25.3 of the GeoDa Workbook.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ There is also a specialized software package GWR 3.x, distributed by Professor Stewart Fotheringham at the National Centre for Geocomputation of the National University of Ireland. It can be obtained from http://ncg.nuim.ie/ncg/GWR/software.htm. For any in-depth analysis using GWR, the use of this more comprehensive software package is recommended. The spgwr package currently only replicates a small subset of its functionality.

[^16]:    ${ }^{2} G e o D a$ is less appropriate for this purpose, since in the current version the join function only allows one additional variable to be added. To add more variables, use Excel to join and save as dbf before loading the shape file into $G e o D a$. Alternatively, one could use the mapping capabilities built into the sp package when the data set is a spatial data frame.

