

Final

1. When an ML estimator is applied to a model which is misspecified in ways that do not affect its consistency, it is said to be a quasi ML estimator.

2.

(i) LS estimator is unbiased and consistent, but not efficient. In addition, the test statistics based on conventional LS coefficient standard errors are invalid.

(ii) Breusch - Pagan Test

$$y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \dots + \beta_k x_{ik} + u_i \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{u}_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 x_{i2} + \dots + \alpha_k x_{ik} + v_i \quad (2)$$

$$H_0: \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \dots = \alpha_k = 0 \quad (\text{Homoscedasticity})$$

$$H_1: H_0 \text{ is not true} \quad (\text{Heteroscedasticity})$$

Step 1: obtain \hat{u}_i from (1)

Step 2: obtain R^2 from (2)

Step 3: construct LM statistic: $nR^2 \sim \chi^2_{(k-1)}$

OR

White Test

$$y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \beta_3 x_{i3} + u_i \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{u}_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 x_{i2} + \alpha_3 x_{i3} + \alpha_4 x_{i2}^2 + \alpha_5 x_{i3}^2 + \alpha_6 x_{i2} x_{i3} + v_i \quad (2)$$

$$H_0: \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = \alpha_5 = \alpha_6 = 0 \quad (\text{Homoscedasticity})$$

$$H_1: H_0 \text{ is not true} \quad (\text{Heteroscedasticity})$$

Step 1: obtain \hat{u}_i from (1)

Step 2: obtain R^2 from (2)

Step 3: construct LM statistic: $nR^2 \sim \chi^2_{(5)}$

(iii) Heteroscedasticity - Consistent Standard Errors

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\beta}) = (X'X)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2 X_i X_i' (X'X)^{-1}, \quad X = \begin{bmatrix} X_1' \\ X_2' \\ \vdots \\ X_n' \end{bmatrix}$$

AND

Generalized Least Squares / Weighted Least Squares

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &= (X'\Omega^{-1}X)^{-1} X'\Omega^{-1}y \\ &= [(px)'(px)]^{-1} (px)'(py) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i}} X_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i}} X_i' \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i}} X_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{z_i}} y_i \right), \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Var}(u) &= \sigma^2 \Omega \\ \Omega^{-1} &= P'P \\ \hat{\sigma}_i^2 &= \sigma^2 z_i \end{aligned}$$

3

(a) $H_0: \beta_2 = 0$
 $H_1: \beta_2 \neq 0$

$$\frac{-0.45 - 0}{0.3} = -1.5 > -1.684 = t_{\alpha=0.05, df=40}$$

We fail to reject $H_0: \beta_2 = 0$ and the price elasticity is not significantly different from zero.

(b) $H_0: \beta_3 \leq 1$
 $H_1: \beta_3 > 1$

$$\frac{1.25 - 1}{0.2} = 1.25 < 1.684 = t_{\alpha=0.05, df=40}$$

We fail to reject $H_0: \beta_3 \leq 1$ and the income elasticity is not significantly greater than one.

4

$$\hat{u}'\hat{u} = (18-2)0.0358 = 0.5728$$

$$\hat{u}_1'\hat{u}_1 = (9-2)0.0199 = 0.1393$$

$$\hat{u}_2'\hat{u}_2 = (9-2)0.0276 = 0.1932$$

$$F = \frac{[0.5728 - (0.1393 + 0.1932)]/2}{(0.1393 + 0.1932)/(18-4)} = 5.059 >$$

$$F_{\alpha=0.05}(df_1=2, df_2=14) = 3.74$$

We reject the null hypothesis that the saving functions are the same over the two subperiods.

5

$$X(X'X)^{-1}X'\underline{1} = [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \underline{1}' \\ \underline{x}_2' \end{bmatrix} \right\}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{1}' \\ \underline{x}_2' \end{bmatrix} \underline{1}$$

$$= [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \underline{1}'\underline{1} & \underline{1}'\underline{x}_2 \\ \underline{x}_2'\underline{1} & \underline{x}_2'\underline{x}_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \underline{1}'\underline{1} \\ \underline{x}_2'\underline{1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \begin{bmatrix} n & \sum_i x_{i2} \\ \sum_i x_{i2} & \sum_i x_{i2}^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ \sum_i x_{i2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \frac{1}{n \sum_i x_{i2}^2 - (\sum_i x_{i2})^2} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_i x_{i2}^2 & -\sum_i x_{i2} \\ -\sum_i x_{i2} & n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ \sum_i x_{i2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \frac{1}{n \sum_i x_{i2}^2 - (\sum_i x_{i2})^2} \begin{bmatrix} n \sum_i x_{i2}^2 - (\sum_i x_{i2})^2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_2] \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}_{2 \times 1}$$

$$= \underline{1}$$

The above is not the only way to show the equivalence.

$X(X'X)^{-1}X'\underline{1}$ implies $y = \hat{y} + \hat{u}$ where $y = \underline{1}$ and $\hat{y} = X\hat{\beta}$ with $\hat{\beta} = (X'X)^{-1}X'\underline{1}$.