

1.

(a) False, suppose we are estimating σ^2 , $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum (X_i - \bar{X})^2$ and $E(\hat{\sigma}^2) = \frac{n-1}{n} \sigma^2$ (biased estimator)

$\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}^2) = \frac{2\sigma^4(n-1)}{n^2}$ as n (sample size) increases, $\hat{\sigma}^2$ concentrates to σ^2 , becoming more and more consistent.

(b) False, suppose we are estimating μ , \bar{X} is unbiased estimator of μ and has distribution of $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. But, as the sample size increases, since we set the distribution fixed, it won't concentrate or change. Therefore, it is not consistent.

(c) True (d) True (e) True

2.

$$\hat{\beta}_0 = \bar{y} - \hat{\beta}_1 \bar{x}$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\beta}_0 \xrightarrow{p} \bar{y} - b_1 \bar{x} = b_0$$

3.

(a)

$$\hat{y}_i = \hat{\gamma}_1 w_i + u_i = \hat{\gamma}_1 (x_i + \varepsilon_i) + u_i$$

$$Q_n = \sum u_i^2 = \sum [\hat{y}_i - \hat{\gamma}_1 (x_i + \varepsilon_i)]^2$$

$$\frac{\partial Q_n}{\partial \hat{\gamma}_1} = -2 \sum [\hat{y}_i - \hat{\gamma}_1 (x_i + \varepsilon_i)] (x_i + \varepsilon_i) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum (\hat{y}_i x_i + \hat{y}_i \varepsilon_i - 2\hat{\gamma}_1 x_i^2 - 2\hat{\gamma}_1 x_i \varepsilon_i) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\gamma}_1 = \frac{\sum (\hat{y}_i)(x_i + \varepsilon_i)}{2 \sum x_i^2} \Rightarrow \text{plim}_{i \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\gamma}_1 = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum x_i \hat{y}_i + \sum \varepsilon_i \hat{y}_i}{2 \sum x_i^2}$$

b)

Underestimate, inconsistent

$$\text{Since } \beta_1 = \frac{\sum x_i y_i}{\sum x_i^2} \text{ and } \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum x_i y_i}{\sum x_i^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum \varepsilon_i y_i}{\sum x_i^2}$$

This part should be small, so it won't let $\gamma_1 \rightarrow \beta_1$.

(c) $\hat{\gamma}_1 = \frac{\sum (X_i + \epsilon_i) y_i}{\sum X_i^2}$. As $\sigma_x^2 \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\gamma}_1$ should converge close to 0 because the denominator is second order relative to the numerator

(d) $\hat{\gamma}_1$ should $\rightarrow \infty$ since all the other variables stay unchanged.

4.

(a) Yes, if $\text{cov}(X_1, X_2) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_1 &= \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum X_i y_i \right) \\ &= \beta_1 + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum X_i X_{2i} \right) \beta_2 + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum X_i u_i \right) \right] \\ &= \beta_1 + \frac{\sigma_{X_1 X_2}}{\sigma_{X_1 X_1}} \beta_2 \rightarrow \text{overestimate.} \end{aligned}$$

(c) By definition in slide, $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\alpha}_1 - \beta_1) \rightarrow N(0, E(X_1^2)^{-1} \sigma_{X_1 X_2} E(X_1^2))$

5.

$$\begin{aligned} R D R' &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} & \dots & d_{1(k+1)} \\ d_{21} & d_{22} & \dots & d_{2(k+1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_{(k+1)1} & d_{(k+1)2} & \dots & d_{(k+1)(k+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} d_{21} & d_{22} & \dots & d_{2(k+1)} \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & \dots & d_{3(k+1)} \\ d_{41} & d_{42} & \dots & d_{4(k+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d_{22} & d_{23} & d_{24} \\ d_{32} & d_{33} & d_{34} \\ d_{42} & d_{43} & d_{44} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$