

AE HW 5

5.1. In this problem you are to establish the algebraic equivalence between 2SLS and OLS estimation of an equation containing an additional regressor. Although the result is completely general, for simplicity consider a model with a single (suspected) endogenous variable:

$$y_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \delta_1 + \alpha_1 y_2 + u_1$$

$$y_2 = \mathbf{z}_2 \pi_2 + v_2$$

For notational clarity, we use y_2 as the suspected endogenous variable and \mathbf{z} as the vector of all exogenous variables. The second equation is the reduced form for y_2 . Assume that \mathbf{z} has at least one more element than \mathbf{z}_1 .

We know that one estimator of (δ_1, α_1) is the 2SLS estimator using instruments \mathbf{x} . Consider an alternative estimator of (δ_1, α_1) : (a) estimate the reduced form by OLS, and save the residuals \hat{v}_2 ; (b) estimate the following equation by OLS:

$$y_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \delta_1 + \alpha_1 y_2 + \rho_1 \hat{v}_2 + \text{error} \quad (5.52)$$

Show that the OLS estimates of δ_1 and α_1 from this regression are identical to the 2SLS estimators. [Hint: Use the partitioned regression algebra of OLS. In particular, if $\hat{y} = \mathbf{x}_1 \hat{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2 \hat{\beta}_2$ is an OLS regression, $\hat{\beta}_1$ can be obtained by first regressing \mathbf{x}_1 on \mathbf{x}_2 , getting the residuals, say $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1$, and then regressing y on $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1$; see, for example, Davidson and MacKinnon (1993, Section 1.4). You must also use the fact that \mathbf{z}_1 and \hat{v}_2 are orthogonal in the sample.]

Following given steps

$$y_1 = \underbrace{\mathbf{z}_1 \delta_1}_{\mathbf{x}_1} + \underbrace{\alpha_1 y_2}_{\mathbf{x}_2} + \underbrace{\rho_1 \hat{v}_2}_{\mathbf{x}_2} + \text{error}$$

$$\text{Step 1. } L(\mathbf{z}_1, y_2 | \hat{v}_2)$$

$$\text{Since } \hat{v}_2 \perp \mathbf{z}_1$$

$$L(\mathbf{z}_1 | \hat{v}_2) = 0 \hat{v}_2 + \mathbf{z}_1$$

$$\text{Since } y_2 = \hat{y}_2 + \hat{v}_2$$

$$\therefore \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v}_2 & \hat{v}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 \\ \hat{y}_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{Step 2 } L(y_1 | \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1)$$

$$= L(y_1 | \mathbf{z}_1, \hat{y}_2)$$

2SLS Steps

when we treat y_2 as the endogeneous variable in the system

then we take the following two steps:

$$\text{Step 1. } L(y_2 | \mathbf{z}) \Rightarrow \hat{y}_2$$

$$\text{Step 2. } L(y_1 | \mathbf{z}_1, \hat{y}_2)$$

=

5.9. Suppose that the following wage equation is for working high school graduates:

$$\log(\text{wage}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{exper} + \beta_2 \text{exper}^2 + \beta_3 \text{twoyr} + \beta_4 \text{fouryr} + u$$

where *twoyr* is years of junior college attended and *fouryr* is years completed at a four-year college. You have distances from each person's home at the time of high school graduation to the nearest two-year and four-year colleges as instruments for *twoyr* and *fouryr*. Show how to rewrite this equation to test $H_0: \beta_3 = \beta_4$ against $H_0: \beta_4 > \beta_3$, and explain how to estimate the equation. See Kane and Rouse (1995) and Rouse (1995), who implement a very similar procedure.

$$\theta_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta_4 - \beta_3 \Rightarrow \beta_4 = \beta_3 + \theta_k$$

Plug in the specification

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\text{wage}) &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{exper} + \beta_2 \text{exper}^2 + \beta_3 (\text{twoyr} + \text{fouryr}) + \theta_k \text{fouryr} + u \\ &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{exper} + \beta_2 \text{exper}^2 + \beta_3 \text{totcoll} + \theta_k \text{fouryr} + u \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{totcoll} = \text{twoyr} + \text{fouryr}$$

Now, just estimate the latter equation by 2SLS.

w/ *exper*, *exper*², *dist2yr*, *dist4yr* as IV's